



# The Sizewell C Project

## 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 16 Terrestrial Historic Environment

---

Revision: 1.0

Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(a)

PINS Reference Number: EN010012

---

May 2020

Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



## Contents

16.	Terrestrial Historic Environment .....	1
16.1	Introduction.....	1
16.2	Legislation, policy and guidance.....	2
16.3	Methodology .....	5
16.4	Baseline environment .....	16
16.5	Environmental design and mitigation .....	57
16.6	Assessment.....	62
16.7	Mitigation and monitoring.....	96
16.8	Residual effects .....	98
	References .....	121

## Tables

Table 16.1:	Requirements of the National Policy Statements.....	3
Table 16.2:	Assessment of the value or sensitivity of receptors for terrestrial historic environment.....	8
Table 16.3:	Assessment of magnitude of impact for terrestrial historic environment .....	9
Table 16.4:	Classification of effects .....	10
Table 16.5:	Summary of survey status. ....	14
Table 16.6:	Summary of survey results. ....	17
Table 16.7:	Summary of effects for the construction phase.....	100
Table 16.8:	Summary of effects for the operational phase. ....	115

## Plates

**None provided.**

## Figures

- Figure 16.1: Designated Heritage Assets
- Figure 16.2: Non-Designated Heritage Records
- Figure 16.3: Previous Archaeological Event Records (HER)

Figure 16.4A: Heritage assets in main development site settings assessment - North

Figure 16.4B: Heritage assets in main development site settings assessment - South

Figure 16.5: Field names and archaeological fieldwork completed to date (Jan 2020)

Figure 16.6: Historic Landscape Character

## **Appendices**

Appendix 16A: Gazetteer of heritage assets

Appendix 16B: Updated Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment

*Appendix 16C: Geophysical Survey Reports:*

Appendix 16C\_a Geophysical survey 2010-11

Appendix 16C\_b Geophysical survey 2019

Appendix 16C\_c Geophysical survey 2019 (Sandy Lane)

Appendix 16C\_d Geophysical survey 2016

*Appendix 16D: Evaluation Trenching Reports:*

Appendix 16D\_a Main development site interim evaluation summary

Appendix 16D\_b LEEIE Archaeological Evaluation

Appendix 16D\_c Pillbox Field Archaeological Evaluation

Appendix 16E: Upper Abbey Farm Heritage Asset Assessment

Appendix 16F: Off-site Developments Assessment:

Appendix 16G: Peat Strategy

Appendix 16H: Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation

## 16. Terrestrial Historic Environment

### 16.1 Introduction

16.1.1 This chapter of **Volume 2** of the **Environmental Statement (ES)** (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents an assessment of the potential effects on the terrestrial historic environment arising from the construction and operation of the main development site (referred to throughout this volume as the 'proposed development'). This includes an assessment of potential impacts, the significance of effects, the requirements for mitigation and the residual effects.

16.1.2 Detailed descriptions of the main development site (referred to throughout this volume as 'the site'), the proposed development, and the different phases of development, are provided in **Chapters 1 to 4** of this volume of the **ES**. A description of the anticipated activities for the decommissioning of the Sizewell C power station, including a summary of the types of environmental effects likely to occur is provided in **Chapter 5** of this volume. A glossary of terms and list of abbreviations used in this chapter is provided in **Volume 1, Appendix 1A** of the **ES**.

16.1.3 This assessment has been informed by data from other assessments as follows:

- **Chapter 11** of this volume: Noise and Vibration.
- **Chapter 13** of this volume: Landscape and Visual.
- **Chapter 23** of this volume: Marine Historic Environment.

16.1.4 This assessment has also been undertaken in accordance with or informed by data presented in the following technical appendices:

- **Appendix 16A** of this volume: Gazetteer of heritage assets based on a search of the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER) and National Heritage List for England Undertaken in August 2018.
- **Appendix 16B** of this volume: Updated Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment. September 2015.
- **Appendix 16C** of this volume: Geophysical survey reports.
- **Appendix 16D** of this volume: Evaluation trenching reports.

- **Appendix 16E** of this volume: Upper Abbey Farm Heritage Asset Assessment.
- **Appendix 16F** of this volume: Off-site Developments Assessment.
- **Appendix 16G** of this volume: Peat Strategy.
- **Appendix 16H** of this volume: Overarching Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation (WSI).
- **Annex 6L.1 of Volume 1 of the ES:** Historic Environment Settings Scoping Update, 2019.

**16.1.5** Please note that the red line boundary used in the figures within the appendices was amended after these documents were finalised, and therefore does not reflect the boundaries in respect of which development consent has been sought in this application. However, the amendment to the red line boundary does not have any impact on the findings set out in this document and all other information remains correct.

**16.1.6** In addition, a standalone ES was prepared for the Sizewell B relocated facilities works for submission with the hybrid planning application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (East Suffolk Council application ref. DC/19/1637/FUL). Chapter 8 of the Sizewell B relocated facilities ES (refer to **Volume 1, Appendix 2A**) included an assessment of likely significant effects on terrestrial historic environment and identified mitigation specific to Sizewell B relocated facilities works. However, as the Sizewell B relocated facilities works form part of the Sizewell C Project and consent is sought for these works through the Development Consent Order (DCO), an assessment of the likely significant effects of these works is also set out in this chapter.

## 16.2 Legislation, policy and guidance

**16.2.1** **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES** identifies and describes legislation, policy and guidance of relevance to the assessment of the potential terrestrial historic environment impacts associated with the Sizewell C Project across all **ES** volumes.

**16.2.2** This section provides an overview of the specific legislation, policy and guidance of relevance to the assessment of the proposed development.

a) International

**16.2.3** No international legislation or policy is deemed relevant to the Terrestrial Historic Environment Assessment for this site.

b) National

i. Legislation

**16.2.4** National legislation relating to the Terrestrial Historic Environment Assessment include:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979;
- The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990;
- The Infrastructure (Decisions) Regulations 2010;
- The Hedgerow Regulations 1997; and
- The Protection of Military Remains Act 1986.

**16.2.5** The requirements of these, as relevant to the Terrestrial Historic Environment Assessment, are set out in **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES**.

ii. Planning policies

**16.2.6** The National Policy Statement (NPS) 2011 sets out the national policy for energy infrastructure. The overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1) (Ref. 16.1) and NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) (Ref. 16.2) provide the primary policy framework within which the development will be considered. A summary of the relevant planning policy and heritage legislation, together with consideration of how the advice has been taken into account is provided in **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES**, with requirements specific to this site set out in **Table 16.1**.

**Table 16.1: Requirements of the National Policy Statements.**

Ref.	NPS Topic Requirement	How the Requirement Has Been Addressed for the Proposed Development
EN-1 Para. 5.8.9	EN-1 Paragraph 5.8.9 states that “Where proposed development will affect the setting of a heritage asset,	Relevant visualisations are supplied as <b>Figures 13.9 and 13.10</b> and at <b>Appendix 13A</b> of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) in <b>Chapter 13</b> of this

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	NPS Topic Requirement	How the Requirement Has Been Addressed for the Proposed Development
	<i>representative visualisations may be necessary to explain the impact."</i>	volume, as agreed with Historic England and the local authority Conservation Officer.

## c) Regional

16.2.7 No regional policy is deemed relevant to the Terrestrial Historic Environment Assessment for this site.

## d) Local

16.2.8 Local policies relating to the Terrestrial Historic Environment Assessment include:

- Suffolk Coastal District Council Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (Ref. 16.3):
  - Development Management Policy DM21; and
  - Strategic Policy SP15.
- Suffolk Coastal District Council Final Draft Local Plan (Ref. 16.4):
  - Policy SCLP11.3;
  - Policy SCLP11.4;
  - Policy SCLP11.5;
  - Policy SCLP11.6;
  - Policy SCLP11.7;
  - Policy SCLP11.8; and
  - Policy SCLP11.9.
- Supplementary Planning Guidance, 6 Historic Parks and Gardens (Ref. 16.5).
- The requirements of these, as relevant to the Terrestrial Historic Environment Assessment, are set out in **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the ES.

## e) Guidance

16.2.9 This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the following guidance documents:

- Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in decision-taking in the Historic Environment. Historic England, 2015 (Ref. 16.6).
- Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance. Historic England, 2008 (Ref. 16.7).
- Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets. Historic England, 2017 (Ref. 16.8).
- Research and Archaeology: Framework for the East of England (2000, 2011 and draft updates 2018-19) (Ref. 16.9 to Ref. 16.12).
- National and Local Archaeological Standards and Guidance (Ref. 16.13 to Ref. 16.20).

## 16.3 Methodology

## a) Scope of the assessment

16.3.1 The generic Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) methodology is detailed in **Volume 1, Chapter 6** of the **ES**.

16.3.2 The full method of assessment for the terrestrial historic environment that has been applied for the Sizewell C Project is included in **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES**. The terrestrial historic environment formally comprises tangible remains of human activity within the zone above mean high water mark (MHWM), with remains below MHWM being considered in **Chapter 23** of this volume of the **ES**. Where appropriate, comments have been made on features within the intertidal zone which form part of terrestrial heritage assets.

16.3.3 This section provides specific details of the terrestrial historic environment methodology applied to the assessment of the proposed development, and a summary of the general approach to provide appropriate context for the assessment that follows. The scope of assessment considers the impacts of the construction and operation of the proposed development. Rather than considering specific years or phases of construction, the effects are stated as the worst-case during the construction phase.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**16.3.4** The scope of this assessment has been established through a formal EIA scoping process undertaken with the Planning Inspectorate. A request for an EIA Scoping Opinion was initially issued to the Planning Inspectorate in 2014, with an updated request issued in 2019. Further details are provided in **Volume 1, Appendix 6A** of the **ES**.

**16.3.5** Comments raised in the EIA Scoping Opinion received in 2014 and 2019 have been taken into account in the development of the assessment methodology. These are detailed in **Volume 1, Appendices 6A to 6C** of the **ES**.

**b) Consultation**

**16.3.6** The scope of the assessment for the proposed development has also been informed by ongoing consultation and engagement with statutory consultees throughout the design and assessment process. A summary of the comments raised and Szc Co.'s responses are detailed in **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES**.

**16.3.7** Consultation was undertaken with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) with regards to the suitability of the study area for the data search. Confirmation that the assessment and information was adequate was achieved through the Stage 3 consultation, and within the 2019 EIA Scoping Opinion with SCCAS.

**16.3.8** The Settings Assessment Scoping Report, provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**, was also consulted upon with SCCAS, Historic England and East Suffolk Council (ESC) and the results of that consultation have been incorporated into this assessment.

**c) Study areas**

**16.3.9** The geographical extent of the study area comprises:

- the site (the main development site);
- a 13.4 kilometre<sup>2</sup> (km<sup>2</sup>) study area, the 'data search study area', agreed by SCCAS for gathering data on all recorded heritage assets, historic mapping and cartographic and documentary sources; and
- a second, wider study area, the 'settings study area', agreed with SCCAS, Historic England and ESC for identifying designated heritage assets which may be subject to indirect effects. This area was initially defined as the area bounded by the River Alde to the south, the A12 to the West and the River Blyth to the North. This area was subsequently

extended along the coast as far as Covehithe to the north and Orford Ness to the south. Further details are provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**.

- 16.3.10** Consultation was undertaken with Historic England and SCCAS to inform the development of the spatial scope and data search study area. Confirmation that the proposed spatial scope was adequate was received in the responses to Stage 3 consultation and 2019 Settings Assessment Scoping Report which is provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**. The site and study area are illustrated in **Figure 16.1**.

**d) Assessment scenarios**

- 16.3.11** The Terrestrial Historic Environment Assessment comprises the assessment of both the construction and operational phases of the proposed development, rather than specific assessment years. Further detail on the different considerations of these phases is provided in the assessment of individual assets below in **section 16.6**.

**e) Assessment criteria**

- 16.3.12** As described in **Volume 1, Chapter 6** of the **ES**, the EIA methodology considers whether impacts of the proposed development would have an effect on any resources or receptors. Assessments broadly consider the magnitude of impacts and value/sensitivity of resources/receptors that could be affected in order to classify effects.

- 16.3.13** A detailed description of the assessment methodology used to assess the potential effects on the terrestrial historic environment arising from the proposed development is provided in **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES**. A summary of the assessment criteria used in this assessment is presented in the following sub-sections.

**i. Sensitivity (heritage significance)**

- 16.3.14** Heritage assets that may be affected by the proposed development have been assigned a level of heritage significance (value or sensitivity) in accordance with the definitions set out in **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES**. Heritage significance is rated within the range of high-medium-low-very low.

- 16.3.15** The assessment of assigning the levels of sensitivity to receptors is set out in **Table 16.2**:

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

**Table 16.2: Assessment of the value or sensitivity of receptors for terrestrial historic environment.**

Heritage Significance (Value or Sensitivity)	Summary Rationale	Example Asset Class
High	Asset has significance for an outstanding level of archaeological, architectural, historic and/or artistic interest.	All designated heritage assets or non-designated assets of demonstrably, schedulable quality.
Medium	Asset has significance for a high level of archaeological, architectural, historic and/or artistic interest.	Locally listed buildings and buildings of merit.  Regionally significant non-designated archaeological sites.
Low	Asset has significance for elements of archaeological, architectural, historic or artistic interest.	Locally-significant archaeological site.
Very Low	Due to its nature or form/condition/survival, cannot be considered as an asset in its own right.	Non-extant HER record.

ii. Magnitude

- 16.3.16 The magnitude of impact is based on the consequences that the proposed development would have on the heritage significance of the historic environment resource and has been considered in terms of high-medium-low-very low; as set out in **Table 16.3** below and detailed in **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES**.
- 16.3.17 Potential changes have also been considered in terms of duration; whether the impact is permanent, temporary or reversible, adverse (negative) or beneficial (positive); and whether the change is likely to give rise to cumulative effects. Although it is recognised that, for some parts of the site (e.g. Land to the East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) and the temporary construction area), the proposed development described in this assessment is temporary, any potential loss of heritage significance resulting from the disturbance of buried archaeological remains associated with construction activity would be permanent.
- 16.3.18 The criteria for the assessment of magnitude of impact are shown in **Table 16.3**.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

**Table 16.3: Assessment of magnitude of impact for terrestrial historic environment.**

Magnitude	Summary Rationale (Negative)	Summary Rationale (Positive)
High	<p>Loss of significance of an order of magnitude that would result from irreversible total or substantial demolition/disturbance of a heritage asset or from the disassociation of an asset from its setting.</p> <p>Impacts of this magnitude would generally be considered substantial harm on the heritage significance of an asset.</p>	<p>Sympathetic restoration of an at-risk or otherwise degraded heritage asset and/or its setting and bringing into sustainable use with robust long-term management secured.</p>
Medium	<p>Loss of significance arising from partial disturbance or inappropriate alteration of asset which will adversely affect its importance. Change to the key characteristics of an asset's setting, which gives rise to lasting harm to the significance of the asset but which still allows its archaeological, architectural or historic interest to be appreciated.</p> <p>Impacts of this magnitude would generally be considered less than substantial harm on the heritage significance of an asset.</p>	<p>Appropriate stabilisation and/or enhancement of a heritage asset and/or its setting that better reveal the significance of the asset or contribute to a long-term sustainable use or management regime.</p>
Low	<p>Minor loss to or alteration of an asset which leaves its current significance largely intact. Minor and/or short term<sup>1</sup> changes to setting which do not affect the key characteristics and in which the historical context remains substantially intact.</p> <p>Impacts of this magnitude would generally be considered less than substantial harm on the heritage significance of an asset.</p>	<p>Minor enhancements to a heritage asset and/or its setting that better reveal its significance or contribute to sustainable use and management.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Short term is defined within this project and technical discipline as being of less than approximately 2 years' duration, medium term of 2-10 years and long-term of 10-25 years duration. Any effects anticipated to persist for over 25 years would normally be considered permanent.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Magnitude	Summary Rationale (Negative)	Summary Rationale (Positive)
Very Low	<p>Minor alteration of an asset which does not affect its significance in any discernible way. Minor and/or short term or reversible change to setting which does not affect the significance of the asset.</p> <p>Impacts of this magnitude would generally be considered of limited harm to heritage significance.</p>	<p>Minor alteration of an asset which does not affect its significance in any discernible way. Minor and/or short term or reversible change to setting which does not affect the significance of the asset.</p>

## iii. Effect definitions

- 16.3.19 The classification of the effect is judged on the basis of the magnitude of impact to the assessed heritage significance of the resource, and a narrative discussion given to support the conclusion. These effects may be adverse (negative) or beneficial (positive).
- 16.3.20 The definitions of effect for the terrestrial historic environment are shown in **Table 16.4**.

Table 16.4: Classification of effects.

		Heritage Significance (Sensitivity)			
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High
Magnitude	Very Low	Negligible	Negligible	Minor	Minor
	Low	Negligible	Minor	Minor	Moderate
	Medium	Minor	Minor	Moderate	Major
	High	Minor	Moderate	Major	Major

- 16.3.21 Following the classification of an effect as presented in **Table 16.4**, a clear statement and rationale is provided as to whether the effect is 'significant' or 'not significant'. As a general rule, major and moderate effects are considered to be significant, and minor and negligible effects are considered to be not significant. However, professional judgement is also applied where appropriate.
- 16.3.22 The assessment of the predicted significance of the effects is reported following incorporation of environmental measures embedded within design, as set out within **section 16.5** of this chapter.

## f) Assessment methodology

16.3.23 Heritage assets were identified through:

- A search of the records held at the National Record of the Historic Environment and the Suffolk County Council (SCC) HER. The data search also included Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) information; these are only referred to in broad terms given their sensitive nature. These searches were conducted in 2010, and updated data searches were undertaken in June 2015 and April 2018;
- A search of the National Heritage List for England, which identifies all designated heritage assets in England. An initial search carried out in 2010 was updated in June 2015, and in January 2019.
- Analysis of the Historic Land Characterisation (HLC) data for Suffolk, conducted in February 2014.
- Analysis of the Southwold to Clacton historic seascape characterisation conducted in September 2018.
- A review of the two available Suffolk National Mapping Programme (NMP<sup>2</sup>) data sets obtained in April 2018.
- A review of the available Light Detecting and Ranging (LiDAR) data from Environment Agency Geomatics obtained in April 2018.
- A search of historical maps and documentation at the Ipswich branch of the Suffolk Record Office, conducted in 2014 – 2015.
- Five aerial photographs, dating to 1978, were supplied by SCC HER, and a search of the National Monuments Record (June 2015 and April 2018) identified a total of 74 aerial photographs (aps) for the data search study area (12 specialist oblique and 64 vertical), all of which were reviewed.

---

<sup>22</sup> Project comprising large area archaeological survey, which maps and records archaeological features using aerial photographs and airborne laser scanning (LiDAR) as the main sources.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- A search of the Cambridge University Collection of Aerial Photography did not identify any relevant imagery.
- 16.3.24** In addition to the desk based research, site investigations were carried out at the site in order to identify both known and previously unrecorded heritage assets (e.g. historic landscape features, extant earthworks). These are detailed in **Table 16.5** and included in the following appendices of this volume:
- Site visit (described within the desk based assessment (DBA)) - **Appendix 16B** of this volume.
  - Detailed geophysical magnetometry survey - **Appendix 16C** of this volume.
  - Evaluation trenching - **Appendix 16D** of this volume.
  - Upper Abbey Farm Heritage Asset Assessment - **Appendix 16E** of this volume.
- 16.3.25** The full list of identified archaeological and historical sites, features and finds identified within the study area is presented in **Appendix 16A** of this volume - the Gazetteer of Heritage Assets (the ‘gazetteer’), and illustrated in **Figures 16.1, 16.2 and 16.3**.
- 16.3.26** Direct effects on heritage assets are those which result from physical damage or disturbance which gives rise to a loss of heritage significance. Consequently, it is only those assets which might be physically disturbed by (i.e. within the footprint of) the site which are potentially subject to direct effects. As archaeological features are not always evident, a DBA, provided in **Appendix 16B** of this volume, was undertaken in 2010, and updated in 2015, to examine the potential presence of archaeological heritage assets within the site area and to ascertain the potential for heritage assets to be directly affected. An updated data search was undertaken in 2018 to ensure that the baseline information held was current and relevant.
- 16.3.27** The results of further survey work, comprising geophysical survey in 2016 and 2019, provided in **Appendix 16C** of this volume, and evaluation trenching in 2015–19, provided in **Appendix 16D** of this volume, have also been incorporated into the assessment of direct effects from the proposed development. The programme of evaluation trenching was designed in consultation with SCCAS and has been carried out in order to further characterise potential archaeological features identified through the DBA

and the geophysical survey. The work was carried out in accordance with an agreed WSI for archaeological investigation where land was accessible for survey.

**16.3.28** A summary of the surveys carried out by individual fields is provided in **Table 16.5** of this chapter and illustrated on **Figure 16.5**.

**16.3.29** Indirect effects on heritage assets are those which result in impacts on heritage significance, but do not give rise to physical damage or disturbance to the asset. In this context, these effects would generally arise through change to the settings of heritage assets. Historic England guidance (Ref. 16.8) sets out a methodology for considering any effects on the significance of heritage assets arising from changes to their setting. This is summarised in **Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES**.

**16.3.30** The heritage assets identified within the settings search area through the desk based research comprise a number of different asset types with differing characteristics. The Settings Assessment Scoping report, provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**, has regard to the specific nature of the setting of assets within the settings study area, and considers factors such as visibility of the proposed development in views of, and from, heritage assets as well as other potential perceptual change, such as increased traffic movements and noise.

#### g) Assumptions and limitations

**16.3.31** The following limitations have been identified in this assessment:

- It has not been possible to undertake evaluation trenching on some areas of the site for a number of reasons including ecological constraints, inability to access third party land and the presence of woodland. The whole main development site is within the area considered by the DBA. The majority of the site has been subject to a magnetometry survey, and most areas have also been subject to evaluation trenching. Areas which have undergone geophysical survey and, or, evaluation trenching are indicated on **Figure 16.5** and are summarised at **Table 16.5** below. Field names used in **Table 16.5** are shown at **Figure 16.5**, and are used throughout the chapter.
- DBA is a predictive tool and relies on a series of assumptions and extrapolations to develop an understanding of the potential extent and character of archaeological remains within the site.
- Geophysical survey is based on taking measurements of physical properties of the site that may have a number of causes, and

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

conclusions from this type of survey remain predictive, but allows more refined inferences to be drawn on the basis of the nature and morphology of discrete anomalies.

- Evaluation trenching tests inferences made on the basis of desk based and geophysical survey. While this approach considers a sample area of a site, it allows a clear understanding of the location, nature and significance of heritage assets, which is considered robust.
- Where assessment conclusions are based on desk based or geophysical survey, the implications for the robustness of conclusions based on a reasonable worst-case are provided.

**Table 16.5: Summary of survey status.**

Field	Geophysical Survey Complete	Evaluation Trenching Complete	Comments
LEEIE	✓	✓	
Pillbox Field	✓	✓	Evaluation Report presented in <b>Sizewell B relocated facilities ES</b> included in <b>Volume 1, Appendix 2A</b> of the ES.
Barn Piece	✓	✓	
10 Acres	✓	✓	
Stone Walk South	✓	✓	
Stone Walk North	✓	✓	
12 Acres	✓	✓	
Badgers Burrows	✓	✓	
Old Covey	✓	✓	
Broom Walk	✓	✓	
Main Development Site Area 1	✓	✓	
Stack	✓	✓	
20 Acres	✓	✓	
East Lawn	✓	✓	
Front Meadow	✓	✓	
Back Meadow	✓	✓	

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Field	Geophysical Survey Complete	Evaluation Trenching Complete	Comments
White Gate	✓	✓	
Captain Rye	✓	✓	
Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) crossing	n/a	n/a	Area not accessible for survey. Programme of work to be set out in detailed WSI for the <b>Peat Strategy</b> presented in <b>Appendix 16G</b> of this volume.
Lover's	✓	✗	Area not accessible for intrusive survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.
Main Development Site Area 3	✓	✓	Trenching underway in January/February 2020.
Main Development Site Area 2	✗	✗	Area not accessible for survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.
Long Walk	✓	✓	
Black Walks	✓	✗	Geophysical survey limited by ground conditions. Area not accessible for intrusive survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.
Red Rails	✓	✓	
Aldhurst	✓	✗	Area not accessible for intrusive survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.
Main Development Site Cabling /Sandy Lane	✓	✗	Area not accessible for intrusive survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.
Sports Pitch	✓	✗	Area not accessible for intrusive survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI, including geophysical survey on Sandy Lane (not previously surveyed) where appropriate
Main island	✓	n/a	Resistivity tomography and boreholes reported in the <b>Peat Strategy</b> presented in <b>Appendix 16G</b> of this volume.
Retsoms/Water Management Zone (WMZ)	✓	✗	Area not accessible for intrusive survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.
Dunwich Forest	✗	✗	Area not accessible for survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.
Goose Hill	✗	✗	Area not accessible for survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.

Field	Geophysical Survey Complete	Evaluation Trenching Complete	Comments
Coronation Wood	x	x	Walkover survey undertaken and reported as appendix to <b>Sizewell B relocated facilities ES</b> included in <b>Volume 1, Appendix 2A</b> of the <b>ES</b> .
Broom Covert	x	x	Area not accessible for survey. Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.
Main Development Site Area 4 (water resource storage area)	✓	x	Evaluation trenching underway at time of writing (February 2020).
Water detention area	x	x	Programme of further work set out in site-specific WSI.

## 16.4 Baseline environment

- 16.4.1 This section presents a description of the baseline environmental characteristics within the site of the proposed development and surrounding area.
- 16.4.2 Further detail can be found in **Appendices 16A to 16E** of this volume of the **ES**.
- 16.4.3 A description of the baseline environment relevant to Sizewell B relocated facilities is set out in **Chapter 8 of Sizewell B relocated facilities ES**, included in **Volume 1, Appendix 2A** of the **ES**. The baseline description presented in this chapter includes the description of baseline conditions presented within the Sizewell B relocated facilities ES.
- 16.4.4 Baseline information for off-site development areas, including off-site sports facilities at Leiston, fen meadow compensation sites south of Benhall and east of Halesworth and, if required, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area (Westleton), is set out in **Appendix 16F** of this volume.
- a) Current baseline
- 16.4.5 The current baseline environmental information is drawn from the Sizewell C main development site DBA, provided in **Appendix 16B** of this volume; subsequent geophysical and geoarchaeological survey, provided in **Appendix 16C** and **Appendix 16G** of this volume; archaeological evaluation trenching, provided in **Appendix 16D** of this volume; and the 2018 updated datasets, provided in **Appendix 16A** of this volume. The

results of these surveys are summarised in **Table 16.6** below and included in the discussion of the baseline.

**Table 16.6: Summary of survey results.**

Field	Results
LEEIE	Prehistoric trackway with flanking ditches, further ditches defining parcels of land to the east of trackway. Small pits indicate nearby settlement activity. Three early-medieval sunken feature buildings and/post-built structures focused in north-western corner of site on either side of palaeochannel. Medieval rectilinear enclosures and domestic plots fronting on Valley Road and Lover's Lane. No structural remains.
Pillbox Field	Medieval hearths and post holes. Two parallel medieval ditches flanking an informal trackway. Medieval finds correspond with previous investigation to the south-west, marking agricultural activity close to Sizewell village. A Second World War (WWII) communications trench was observed heading to the pillbox, located within Pillbox Field. Several undated field boundary ditches do not relate well to medieval or modern field systems.
Barn Piece	Several ditches found within the trenches. Most were undated, but also included a possible Roman ditch corresponding to geophysical anomalies recorded (sherd of pottery). Modern concrete post-pad possibly relating to WWII military installations.
10 Acres	Undated ditches near northern, southern and eastern edges of the field (representing successive re-establishment of a large enclosure the size of the extant field. Post-medieval or modern cow/horse burial near centre of field.
Stone Walk South	Parallel north – south ditches, probably related to current field layout (possibly drainage) but may pre-date 1884 mapping. Single medieval pot sherd.
Stone Walk North	Medieval activity and associated sub-rectangular enclosures concentrated in the eastern half of the field. Large pits encompassing possible clay ovens/kilns (not excavated in full). Also prehistoric activity (enclosure ditches) near northern boundary of field.
12 Acres	Much of the field has been subjected to post-medieval and modern sand extraction. Small pit with Bronze Age pottery; and several undated ditches. First World War uniform button.
Badgers Burrows	Small pit with prehistoric pottery in the north-west of the field. Medieval sub-rectangular enclosures and possible buried ground surface in south of field; several further undated ditches and area of post-medieval or modern sand extraction.
Old Covey	Prehistoric pits containing struck flint; prehistoric pottery and pot boilers and ditches also containing prehistoric pottery possibly constituting three separate enclosures or boundaries. Several undated ditches towards centre of field. Post-medieval or modern sand extraction pits in northern part of the field.
Broom Walk	Medieval sub-rectangular enclosures as well as large pits encompassing possible clay ovens/kilns. Pottery dating to the prehistoric period found in ditches which may have formed part of an enclosure.
Main Development Site Area 1 (south)	Undated ditches observed, possibly forming part of a field system, although no discernible pattern in their layout.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Field	Results
Stack	Possible prehistoric and medieval ditches, as well as several undated ditches which corresponded with faint geophysical anomalies depicting a rectilinear enclosure or field system.
20 Acres	Prehistoric pit, medieval and undated ditches, including possible building. Much of the field had been subjected to post-medieval and modern sand extraction activity.
East Lawn	Roman settlement activity observed; buried soil deposit below aeolian sand contained large quantities of Roman pottery as well as finds including ceramic building material (CBM), wall plaster and nails. These were focused in eastern half of the field, with further sherds in the western part of field. Wall footings, and the presence of roof slates in the western part of the field suggests a structure of post-medieval or early modern date.
Front Meadow	Unurned late prehistoric cremation burial, significant disturbance by sand/gravel pitting across the central and southern parts of the field.
Back Meadow	Small dispersed scatter of prehistoric features (ditches, small pits and postholes). Medieval enclosure. Undated ditches and pits.
White Gate	Large prehistoric pits at south of field, extensive disturbance by sand/gravel pitting.
Captain Rye	Roman ditch corresponding to geophysical anomalies recorded, potentially forming part of a rectilinear enclosure. Several undated ditches possibly forming part of a former field system.
Lover's	Features possibly related to medieval settlement observed on geophysical survey.
Main Development Site Area 3	Possible enclosure and field boundaries of uncertain date observed within geophysical survey. Early results from evaluation trenching in January and February 2020 indicate dispersed prehistoric features (pits and ditches) possibly on the brow of a hill in the western part of the site; possible kiln (currently undated, possibly Iron Age or medieval) located towards centre of field. Single inhumation burial aligned east-west found in the centre-north of the area (currently undated).
Long Walk	Three large medieval sub-rectangular enclosures each with a layer containing cultural waste material including pottery sherds and CBM indicating a possible buried ground surface. Area of extensive post-medieval or modern sand extraction within the centre and south of the field.
Black Walks	No clear archaeological features identified on geophysical survey.
Red Rails	Prehistoric activity across whole of field comprising small pits and ditches. Prehistoric pottery and daub recovered from some of the pits. Ditches present at the northern end of the field, probably forming part of a rectilinear field system.
Aldhurst	Rectangular feature (enclosure/building) located at the eastern end of the area on geophysical survey. Uncertain date.
Main Development Site Cabling	No clear archaeological features identified on geophysical survey. Features possibly related to medieval settlement observed at western end of cable route.
Sports Pitch	No clear archaeological features identified on geophysical survey.
Main Island	Prehistoric peat and riverine/estuarine deposits identified at depth
Retsoms/Water	Possible linear feature of uncertain date/interpretation identified on geophysical

Field	Results
Management Zone (WMZ)	survey.

**16.4.6** The full list of identified archaeological and historical sites, features and finds identified within the study area are presented in the gazetteer, provided in **Appendix 16A** of this volume, and are illustrated on **Figures 16.1 and 16.3**. The gazetteer refers to heritage assets by their HER parish number or National Heritage List for England number.

i. **Site description**

**16.4.7** The proposed development comprises five components, which combined are referred to as the main development site:

- Main platform: the area that will become the power station. This includes the main platform and foreshore works.
- Sizewell B relocated facilities and National Grid land: the area that certain Sizewell B facilities would be moved to in order to release land for Sizewell C, including Coronation Wood and Pillbox Field, and land required for the National Grid infrastructure.
- Offshore works area: the area where offshore cooling water infrastructure and other marine works would be located, assessed in **Chapter 23** of this volume of the **ES**.
- Temporary construction area: the area located primarily to the north and west of the SSSI crossing which would be used to support construction activity on the main platform. This would include a temporary accommodation campus, site entrance hub, construction contractors' compounds, borrow pits and storage areas.
- LEEIE: the area directly north of Sizewell Halt, which would be used to support construction on the main platform and temporary construction area.
- A full description of the proposed development during the construction and operational phases can be found in **Chapters 2 to 4** of this volume of the **ES**.

## ii. Site topography and geology

- 16.4.8** The site is principally made up of agricultural land and plantation woodland to the north-east of Leiston. The site's western boundary primarily runs along Lover's Lane, the B1122 (Abbey Road) and Eastbridge Road from the B1122 to Eastbridge. The southern boundary follows the Saxmundham to Leiston railway line, immediately to the north-east of Leiston, before turning north up Lover's Lane and east to cross Broom Covert. The eastern boundary traces the edge of the existing power stations at Sizewell A and B, and includes an area of Minsmere Haven in the North Sea. The northern boundary passes through Dunwich Forest on Goose Hill and turns north-west to meet the western boundary at Lower Abbey Farm. To the north of Goose Hill lies Minsmere, a broad area of coastal marsh.
- 16.4.9** The site is relatively flat and low-lying, with one river valley running broadly west-east from Leiston and Abbey Road to the north of Sizewell A and B power stations. The watercourse in this valley has been diverted and irrigation channels cut, and represents the lowest part of the site, measuring as low as c.0.6m below sea level in places. Higher ground is found in the north and west of the site: Kenton Hills and Goose Hill, covered in plantations, and the ridge running south-west to north-east between Old Abbey Farm and Upper Abbey Farm rise to approximately 21m above sea level.
- 16.4.10** The British Geological Survey solid geological mapping shows that the whole study area overlies sedimentary bedrock comprising Neogene and Quaternary Rocks, which formed up to 23 million years ago in shallow seas with mainly siliciclastic sediments deposited as mud, silt, sand and gravel (Ref. 16.21).
- 16.4.11** Within the site boundary, bedrock is overlain principally by glacial sand and gravel formed up to 3 million years ago in cold periods with Ice Age glaciers scouring the landscape, and depositing moraines of till with outwash sand and gravel deposits from seasonal and post-glacial meltwaters (Ref. 16.21). Higher areas of these sandy soils comprise the distinctive Sandlings landscape. Lower-lying marshland areas to the west and north of Sizewell are primarily alluvial and estuarine deposits.
- 16.4.12** Geoarchaeological studies of marshland to the north and west of the existing Sizewell A and B sites, and at the main platform, identified a complex depositional sequence of marine inundations and periods of freshwater carr within river valleys. These valleys displayed a high degree of mobility and change as a result of erosive and accretive processes along the shoreline, and within the aforementioned river valley. This has resulted in the formation of interleaved peat and silt deposits, which potentially seal

earlier phases of human activity. The surveys also noted a very large degree of modern disturbance which occurred during the construction of Sizewell B, with modern made ground directly overlying Neolithic deposits at depths of between 4 metres (m) and 5m below present ground level. Further details are provided in **Appendix 16G** of this volume.

### iii. Designated heritage assets

#### Designated heritage assets within the site boundary

- 16.4.13** Two designated heritage assets lie within the site, both of which are Grade II listed buildings – Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216394), and the Barn, 40m north of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216655).

#### Designated heritage assets within the study area

- 16.4.14** The study area contains two Scheduled Monuments – Leiston Abbey (second site) and moated site (SM 1014520), and Leiston Abbey (first site) with later chapel and pillbox (SM 1015687). In addition, there are 11 listed buildings within the study area. One of these is listed at Grade I (St Mary's Abbey, LB 1215753), with the remainder being listed at Grade II and comprising mainly farmhouses and associated buildings, cottages, and a coastal watch house (LB1391360). Designated heritage assets are presented on **Figure 16.1**.

- 16.4.15** In consultation with SCCAS and Historic England, offsite heritage assets with settings that may be affected by the proposed development were scoped into this assessment, and further details are provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**. These are illustrated on **Figure 16.4** and comprise:

- Scheduled Monument (SM 1014520), Grade I and Grade II listed buildings at Leiston Abbey (LB 1215753, LB 1215754, LB 1216380 and LB 1268290), which could also be subject to change to setting arising from the proposed green rail route. Further details are provided in **Volume 8, Chapter 9** of the **ES**.
- Leiston Conservation Area.
- Scheduled Monument (SM 1015687) at Leiston Abbey (first site) with later chapel and pillbox.
- Grade II listed buildings and associated non-designated structures at Upper Abbey Farm (LB 1216394 and LB 1216655).

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- Non-designated pillbox in Pillbox Field (LCS112), which could be subject to change to setting arising from the Sizewell B relocated facilities development. Further details are provided in **Volume 1, Appendix 2A** of the **ES**.
- Grade II Listed Cottage 450m south-west of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (Abbey Cottage – LB 1216395).
- Grade II Listed Potter's Farmhouse (LB 1228267).
- Grade II Listed The Watch House (LB 1391360).
- Grade II listed buildings at Potter's Street crossroads (LB 1228263, LB 1228262 and LB 1228265).
- Conservation Area and Grade II listed buildings at Thorpeness.
- Non-designated coastguard cottages, Dunwich Heath.
- Conservation Area and Grade I, II\* and II listed buildings at Aldeburgh.
- Scheduled Monument and Grade II\* listed Slaughden Martello Tower (SM 1006041 and LB 1269724).
- Conservation Area and Grade I, II\* and II listed buildings and non-designated assets at Southwold.
- Scheduled Monument and Grade I listed Orford Castle (SM 1014860 and LB 1030873).
- Scheduled Monument and Grade II listed lighthouse and former military structures at Orford Ness (SM 1416933, LB 1392631, LB 1416866, LB 1416867, LB 1416868 and LB 1416869).

**iv. Non-designated heritage records**

- 16.4.16** There are 108 HER monument records located within the site boundary. These include prehistoric field systems, possible funerary monuments, and settlement features; medieval settlement and agricultural features; post-medieval pits and earthworks; extensive features relating to WWII defences and training; and many undated artefact scatters.

**16.4.17** A further 124 HER monument records are located within the data search study area. The heritage monument records comprise a variety of heritage features ranging from prehistoric flint artefact scatters to WWII defences. These records are discussed more fully in the site chronology section.

**16.4.18** The HER includes 34 records of previous archaeological investigations undertaken across the site, and the study area including geophysical survey, evaluation trenching and the archaeological monitoring of boreholes. These records include archaeological investigations undertaken in relation to schemes such as the Greater Gabbard and Galloper offshore wind farms, as well as previous phases of work directly related to the Sizewell C Project proposals.

**16.4.19** Non-designated heritage records are illustrated on **Figures 16.2 and 16.3**.

v. **Historic landscape character**

**16.4.20** The HLC data for the site shows the area predominantly comprising “*18th century and later enclosure and modern plantation*”, both of which were created on former common arable or heathland. The eastern part of the site comprises “*current industrial landscape*”, Sizewell A and B power stations, and “*unimproved land*” along the coastal marshes. In the west, in the area surrounding Old Abbey Farm, “*pre-18th century enclosures*” are recorded.

**16.4.21** Thus, as shown on **Figure 16.6**, the site can be divided between:

- The coastal margin with heath and pasture and industrial character; while this is less intensively farmed than the inland zone, the coastal marshes have been partially drained since the construction of Minsmere Sluice in the late-18th century.
- A central area of agricultural fields and woodland defined during the 18th and 19th century as part of the improvement and enclosure of common land in the Sandlings and marshland fringes.
- An established agricultural landscape with origins thought to pre-date the late 18th century in the west, where the Sandlings tend into clay soils.

**16.4.22** The majority of character areas identified within the site are of low historic value, including significantly modified wetlands, and substantial areas where historic landscape elements have either been erased, or have been obscured by modern planting schemes or hedgerow loss.

**16.4.23** The agricultural landscape surrounding Leiston Old Abbey and Old Abbey Farm is also of low historic value. The Suffolk HLC records this area as

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

being pre-18th century enclosure, a higher valued historic landscape type. Further analysis of historic maps at this location indicate that there was extensive reorganisation of this agricultural landscape in the late 18th and early 19th century. The 18th century, or older enclosures, were centred on Upper Abbey Farm, recorded in the late 18th century as a “mansion” with yard and garden (Ref. 16.22 and Ref. 16.23). In the 1790s a new house was built for William Tatnall, Leiston Old Abbey, and the enclosures surrounding the new house were reorganised with some to the west and north becoming part of a designed parkland landscape, and others, to the south, being rationalised and extended. As part of this reorganisation, Lover’s Lane, south of Leiston Old Abbey, was slightly realigned to take a more direct approach to the junction with the B1122, Abbey Road (Ref. 16.22 and Ref. 16.23). The character of this late 18th or early 19th century parkland and reorganised enclosed landscape endures.

- 16.4.24** Even so, these areas of low value retain some historic interest, as illustrative aspects of the history of the area, and the development of historic landscape character.
- 16.4.25** The vast majority of hedgerows within the site could be considered of potential historic importance, as they follow boundaries shown on pre-1845 mapping (Ref. 16.22 and Ref. 16.23), and other hedgerows not shown on historic mapping are likely to be of similar antiquity, and contribute to the understanding of the overall historic landscape character. There has been some hedgerow loss on the site as a result of agricultural intensification, but the basic field pattern remains discernible.
- 16.4.26** This landscape has some historic and archaeological value for the preservation of the existing field system. It also has a degree of aesthetic interest arising from the placement of the dispersed farmsteads within the landscape, and the transition from settled farmland into coastal marsh. Although this value is limited by the loss of hedgerows, and changes to land and woodland management, this has resulted in a reduction of species diversity and a move away from historic patterns of agricultural use of the Sandlings and inland clays. Consequently, this landscape is assessed as being of low heritage significance.

**vi. Historic Seascape Character**

- 16.4.27** The Southwold to Clacton Historic Seascape Characterisation identifies the proposed development as located within the Sizewell power stations Historic Seascape Characterisation sub-area of the Southwold Historic Seascape Characterisation area. This sub-area is dominated and defined by the presence of the existing Sizewell A and B power stations, contrasting with the other sub areas of the Southwold Historic Seascape

Characterisation Area. While the Historic Seascape Characterisation does not attribute specific value to Historic Seascape Characterisation areas, or sub areas, this contrast between industrial and rural is an important element in the historic seascape character of the area, and is therefore considered to be of low significance.

vii. Archaeological and historical background

- 16.4.28 Field names referenced in this section are shown on **Figure 16.5**.

**Prehistoric (Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age)**

- 16.4.29 To date, there are no records of archaeological material dating from the Palaeolithic period within the study area, and no evidence from this period has been identified during evaluation trenching.

- 16.4.30 Evaluation trenching did not reveal any securely dated Mesolithic cultural deposits or features. However, peat deposits, which accumulated in the Mesolithic period, have been identified in an infilled former river channel, which runs to the west and north of the existing Sizewell A and B sites. These deposits have been found to extend below the MHWM and are also considered within **Chapter 23** of this volume and **Appendix 16G** of this volume. It is possible that these peat deposits may contain archaeological material, although none has been recovered from these contexts to date. Flint scatters dating from the Mesolithic have been found within the study area, as well as two Mesolithic maceheads (LCS 005). It is likely that the coastal margins would have offered favourable conditions for human occupation during this period.

- 16.4.31 Neolithic activity is represented solely by lithic objects and, while the well-drained Sandlings soils and wetland-edge environments would have offered favourable conditions for settlement, no settlement remains have been observed. PAS data records one find, a Neolithic axehead, within the study area. Neolithic peats have been identified in the infilled former river channel which runs to the west and north of Sizewell A and B. Evaluation trenching and geophysical survey on the main development site, including at Pillbox Field, has not revealed any archaeological deposits, or features securely dated to this period. However, no evaluation trenching has yet been carried out east and south-east of Lower Abbey Farm, on the site of the proposed water resource storage area. This part of the main development site, on the fringes of relatively stable coastal marsh, has high potential for remains of this period.

- 16.4.32 Evaluation trenching at LEEIE uncovered probable Bronze Age pottery stratified in pits and postholes within several trenches, **Appendix 16D** of this volume provides further details, as well as an arrowhead dating to the

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age. Previously recorded Bronze Age activity within the study area includes findings of two cinerary urns from Leiston (LCS 004), and a possible round barrow (LCS 199) recorded at the southern end of the parkland around Theberton House.

- 16.4.33 A number of cropmarks within the study area are recorded in the HER as possible ring ditches (e.g. LCS 069; LCS 071). Several of these cropmarks were targeted during the evaluation trenching at the site, and further details are provided in **Appendix 16D** of this volume. No features supporting the interpretation as ring ditches were identified.
- 16.4.34 A possible Iron Age or Roman saltern mound or ‘Red Hill’ (LCS 182) was identified from aerial photographs during the National Mapping Programme for the Suffolk Coast within the site. This was investigated by evaluation trenching, detailed in **Appendix 16D** of this volume, but no evidence of the feature was uncovered. Other possible saltern mounds are recorded in the HER within the study area (e.g. LCS 134). These features are tentatively dated from the Early Iron Age to the Roman Period, although the absence of evidence from the archaeological evaluation in 10 acres field, where this feature was identified, suggests that these interpretations may be erroneous. Ditches of possible Iron Age date were also observed in the excavations and evaluation for the Greater Gabbard substation, located at the southern edge of the site (Ref. 16.24). A single unurned cremation burial was identified on this ridge, in Front Meadow. The cremation was presumed to date to the Iron Age period, but Roman material found in the immediate vicinity may imply a later date.
- 16.4.35 Evaluation trenching revealed a low-density spread of ditches and pits representing enclosures and settlement across the whole site, with a focus of activity upon a north-east/south-west aligned ridge along the western site boundary, close to Upper Abbey Farm.
- 16.4.36 Prehistoric remains, dating from the Bronze Age, through to the Iron Age, observed during the evaluation at LEEIE included a trackway defined by parallel flanking ditches, a series of ditches setting out parcels of land, and small pits and worked flint suggesting nearby occupation.
- 16.4.37 To date, prehistoric remains observed in the temporary construction area and LEEIE evaluations comprise scattered elements of field systems and possible peripheral elements of settlement, which add to the general understanding of the extent and nature of prehistoric activity in this area, but are of limited heritage significance. Where the presence of prehistoric features suggested by the National Mapping Programme has been tested through field evaluation, it has been identified that these interpretations are erroneous.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 16.4.38** The types of settlement and activity associated with earlier prehistory in the study area are not always readily apparent on aerial photography or geophysical survey. During evaluation trenching at East Lawn, some prehistoric features were observed which had not been visible on the geophysical survey, particularly in areas where they were overlain by localised deposits of windblown sand, or where they had been masked by later archaeological features with stronger responses.
- 16.4.39** There is no evidence that suggests the presence of more extensive or significant remains, and the relative absence of chance finds or artefactual material in excavated contexts supports the inference that any, as yet unrecorded prehistoric remains, are likely to be of similar character and heritage significance to those observed in evaluation trenching.
- 16.4.40** The potential for more significant remains of these periods to be present within the site is considered to be limited, with a higher likelihood of more important remains being present along the wetland edge, an environment that is elsewhere known to have been favoured by prehistoric people and with conditions which permit greater archaeological survival.
- 16.4.41** The deposit sequence preserved within the former estuarine channel at the main development site concludes in the Neolithic period, and represents a dynamic and erosive past environment that would not be suited to presence of past occupation, a conclusion supported by the absence of cultural material.
- 16.4.42** Prehistoric remains observed within the site would be of archaeological interest, providing new information to understand the prehistoric occupation of this part of the Suffolk Coast, and would fit into a clearly defined regional context. Where these features have been observed within the site, they are of low to medium heritage significance, and it is likely that if as yet unknown other remains of this date are present elsewhere in the site, these would be of equivalent heritage significance.

**Romano-British**

- 16.4.43** An area of Romano-British settlement activity was identified during evaluation trenching in East Lawn in 2019. The recovery of ceramic building material and wall plaster suggests proximity to a substantial domestic structure, although no *in situ* remains or structures were identified. Fragments of domestic greywares, finer tablewares and imported wares, including Samian, were also identified, along with 2nd and 3rd century coins. It has not been possible to accurately date a single, unurned cremation burial identified in Front Meadow to the north of this settlement activity, which is either Iron Age or Romano-British in date.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 16.4.44 Two ditches, corresponding to geophysical anomalies consistent with rectilinear enclosures, were recorded in Barn Piece and Captain Rye. These appear to represent part of a Romano-British agricultural landscape extending over the northern and north-western part of the site, possibly associated with the East Lawn structural remains.
- 16.4.45 Elsewhere, there is limited evidence for Romano-British activity within the study area. Artefact scatters and chance finds are recorded around Leiston. The HER records potential Roman field systems and stock enclosures, visible as cropmarks within the study area.
- 16.4.46 Settlements dating to the Romano-British period are usually readily apparent on geophysical survey and aerial photography, and are frequently evidenced by discernible surface scatters of artefactual material in arable land. However, localised sand deposits overlying the buried cultural layers masked the East Lawn structural remains in the geophysical survey. There is a clear potential for further remains dating to the Romano-British period to be present within the site boundary.
- 16.4.47 Remains dating to the Romano-British period would be of archaeological interest for informing the study of Romano-British agricultural settlement and activity. The East Lawn structural remains appear to be of medium heritage significance for archaeological interest. Where further features are identified, it is anticipated that these are likely to be of low to medium heritage significance.

**Early-medieval and medieval**

- 16.4.48 The DBA revealed no specific evidence for activity dating from the early-medieval period within the site or study area. Evaluation trenching within LEEIE, however, identified the remains of three sunken featured buildings dating to the early-medieval period along with a large number of postholes, which may represent up to two post-built structures, within the northern part of the area. Further details are provided in **Appendix 16D** of this volume.
- 16.4.49 There is significant archaeological evidence for the use of the area within the medieval period. This activity was principally focused around five locations – the two sites of Leiston Abbey and the villages of Sizewell, Leiston and Theberton.
- 16.4.50 Leiston Abbey was originally founded as a Premonstratensian house in 1182, on a site approximately 1km north of the main development site (SM 1015687). As a result of coastal erosion, and following unsuccessful attempts at land reclamation, the Canons were granted a papal licence in 1363 to relocate the Abbey from its original site on the shore of the estuary to a more favourable location inland, approximately 200m west of the site

(SM 1014520 and LB 1215753). The original building was retained as a monastic cell (Ref. 16.25).

- 16.4.51** The monastic sites would have comprised relatively small and tightly grouped building complexes, neither of which would have extended onto the main development site. However, the main development site is likely to include elements of the wider monastic landholdings, primarily comprising land, which would have been in agricultural use at that time. Similarly, the villages of Leiston and Theberton would not have extended onto the main development site, although elements of their associated agricultural landscapes are potentially present, principally in the form of grazing land within the Sandlings heath, and the seasonal grazing marshes, but also potentially including activities such as peat cutting or outlying farmsteads.
- 16.4.52** The village of Sizewell was substantially larger in this period than at present, extending further to the east into land which has been lost through coastal retreat. The full extent of the village and its associated agricultural landscape has been reconstructed through detailed documentary survey and archaeological evaluation has been carried out at Pillbox Field. These demonstrate that the extreme southern part of the site occupies fields immediately outside the former village. Medieval features and finds within Pillbox Field suggest agricultural activity in this part of the site, close to Sizewell village, dating to the 11th to 14th centuries. A medieval trackway was identified crossing the field and connecting to an extant track and bridleway, bridleway 19, which runs north-west to Sandy Lane, which itself branches from Lover's Lane. Further details are provided in **Appendix 16D** of this volume.
- 16.4.53** Evaluation trenching at LEEIE in 2017 observed a series of rectilinear enclosures at the junction of Lover's Lane and Valley Road dating to the medieval period, including possible domestic plots, although no structures were evident. This suggests a possible focus of settlement at the junction of these routeways, whose medieval origins are implied. Details are provided in **Appendix 16D** of this volume.
- 16.4.54** Evaluation in 2017 and 2019 identified further medieval remains comprising sub-rectangular enclosures in discrete areas including Badgers Burrow, Broom Walk, Long Walk and Stone Walk North. A large pit containing possible industrial material was also found within one of the enclosures. Near the enclosures in Broom Walk and Stone Walk North were further large pits, possibly clay-built ovens/kilns, adding to the evidence for medieval agricultural activity within the site. These provide further evidence that remains dating to the medieval period are present within the main development site, although at this stage the observed remains largely

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

represent dispersed agricultural, and industrial activity rather than discrete settlements. Details are provided in **Appendix 16D** of this volume.

- 16.4.55** Archaeological evaluation in advance of residential development at Abbey View Lodges, Leiston, identified medieval ditches (LCS 228). Evaluation and excavation (LCS 148) in advance of the Greater Gabbard onshore works, to the south and west of Pillbox Field, recorded a medieval site including ovens and associated structures (granaries), and possible fishing equipment, representing an ‘industrial suburb’ on the periphery of the village (Ref. 16.24).
- 16.4.56** There is moderate potential for further remains dating to the early-medieval and medieval period within the site boundary. Areas of higher potential have been identified during the geophysical survey and evaluation trenching.
- 16.4.57** Remains dating to early-medieval and medieval periods are of archaeological interest for informing the study of early-medieval agricultural settlement and activity, as well as understanding later medieval exploitation of the coastal marshes and Sandlings, particularly where they could be associated with monastic activity. Depending on the nature, preservation and extent of medieval features, they would be of low to medium heritage significance. Remains dating to the early-medieval period, particularly more substantial evidence of settlement and dwellings such as those identified at LEEIE, are likely to be of medium heritage significance.

**Post-medieval**

- 16.4.58** The basic settlement geography established in the medieval period remained through the post-medieval period, with the former monastic site at Leiston becoming a secular manorial centre. The principal change in the post-medieval period was in terms of the use and division of land, with the progressive enclosure and ‘improvement’ of lands within the Sandlings and marshland to provide more productive land.
- 16.4.59** Evaluation in 2019 in East Lawn identified the rubble footings of a post-medieval building, likely an agricultural ‘walk barn’. Evaluation trenching across the site has identified extensive post-medieval sand and mineral extraction, extending into the modern period. It is also possible that some of the extraction pits predate the post-medieval period. These pits have likely removed any archaeological remains. Details are provided in **Appendix 16D** of this volume.
- 16.4.60** Previously recorded heritage assets within the main development site dating from the post-medieval period include farmsteads which are still extant (including the listed buildings of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB

1216394), and Potter's Farmhouse (LB 1228267)), as well as evidence of quarrying (LCS 154). The former Aldeburgh branch line (ADB 226), which still survives to service Sizewell Halt, runs along the south-west boundary of LEEIE, and was built as far as Leiston in 1850, carrying passengers until 1966.

- 16.4.61** Within the study area, the heritage assets dating from the post-medieval period largely comprise agricultural features and buildings, including those associated with the drainage and improvement of the marshes.
- 16.4.62** The potential for further as yet unknown heritage assets dating to the post-medieval period is considered low. The existing pattern of farmsteads and settlements appears to have been established by the late 18th century, and mapping evidence does not suggest the presence of any significant sites other than the still extant farmsteads. The presence of features such as an outlying field barn, possibly such as the structure identified in East Lawn and shown on historic mapping, suggest that some associated structures could have been present and may survive as archaeological features.
- 16.4.63** Designated heritage assets dating to the post-medieval period are of high heritage significance. The majority of non-designated remains dating to this period would be of archaeological interest primarily for their contribution to historic landscape character and development, rather than as individual assets, and are likely to be of low heritage significance.

#### Modern

- 16.4.64** The modern period experienced a general continuity of settlement and agricultural land use from the post-medieval period.
- 16.4.65** Evaluation trenching, reported in **Appendix 16D** of this volume, identified a concrete post-pad in Barn Piece and a First World War military uniform button from the topsoil in 12 Acres. These likely relate to the military use of the area in the 20th century.
- 16.4.66** There are extensive records of the defensive works and activities undertaken within the site and study area, as part of the defence of the East Coast of England during WWII. In particular, a complex of WWII emplacements is known to the north of Sizewell B, comprising a variety of earthworks and structures (LCS 102), which formed part of the wider coastal anti-invasion defences. Also, to the north-west of Sizewell B, on Goose Hill and in Dunwich Forest, was an extensive WWII site comprising two anti-aircraft batteries, associated buildings and numerous practice trenches (LCS 094). Other remains across the site and study area include pillboxes, the site of a probable WWII 'SOS' Field Artillery position, and slit trenches. Anti-invasion obstacles made of scaffolding were constructed on

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

Sizewell beach, and appear to have been partially dismantled at the end of WWII.

**16.4.67** Key sites of this type and period can be confidently located as they either survive as visible features, or are recorded on aerial photographs or in documentary records. Many of these sites have been demolished, leaving fragmentary sub-surface remains, while others (particularly entrenchments), may have more extensive below ground remains surviving. The construction of the Sizewell A and B power stations has also removed a substantial section of the defences. Further remains are occasionally uncovered, as was the case with beach scaffolding and ‘pikes teeth’ in front of Sizewell B uncovered during storms in early 2018. There is a low potential for areas of as yet unknown modern military remains.

**16.4.68** Remains dating to this period have a degree of archaeological and historic interest, but are likely to be of low heritage significance as a result of poor preservation.

**Previously unrecorded heritage assets**

**16.4.69** There is a potential that heritage assets which have not previously been identified or recorded will be present in areas of the site that have not been subject to archaeological geophysical survey and/or evaluation. While it is most likely that these would be of equivalent nature and heritage significance to remains observed elsewhere in the site, the historic context provided by intrusive works elsewhere in the site allows more detailed comments to be made:

- Water resource storage area: this area is immediately to the south of the trackway leading to the site of Leiston Abbey (first site), which becomes a causeway to the north-east of the site (LCS 144). The site is located on the landward margins between the Sandlings and what would have been coastal marsh on the fringes of the Minsmere River estuary. These wetland edge sites are frequently favoured locations for activity related to past exploitation of the marshes, and the SCCAS HER notes the presence of cropmarks thought to represent medieval common-edge enclosures (LCS 189) associated with the use of the marshes as common grazing land and of WWII military features (LCS 204). There is also a cropmark of a possible ring ditch (LCS 034) immediately to the south of the site, although as noted elsewhere in the study area, this is likely to be illusory and may be related to the possible saltern (LCS 195) located to the south-west of the water resource storage area. Geophysical survey undertaken in December 2019 revealed anomalies which may represent further medieval remains, possibly associated with the medieval finds further to the west in Long Walk. The existing

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

evidence suggests that archaeological remains of low to medium heritage significance are present on this part of the site.

- WMZ: This area is within an HER area record (LCS 032) which records the presence of Roman and medieval pottery and cropmarks of possible enclosures. Immediately to the north and east are further features (LCS 033, LCS 134). These records are suggestive of the presence of archaeological remains of low to medium heritage significance on this part of the site.
- SSSI crossing: The archaeological potential of this area is likely to vary significantly depending on location. Within the former Sizewell B compound area, it is anticipated that a significant depth of modern made ground/disturbance will overlie archaeological deposits. To the north, the pre-1950s field system remains legible but the area has been densely planted. It is not clear how much disturbance this will have given rise to, but it is likely that any near surface remains have been significantly disturbed. As a result, it is anticipated that any near surface archaeological remains that may be present would be of at most low heritage significance. It is possible that more significant deposits of geoarchaeological interest may be present, although this area is on the fringes of the former estuarine channel and the full depth of the sequence may not be present.
- Black Walks WMZ and Borrow Pit Field 2: Black Walks was subject to geophysical survey, which proved inconclusive, with no clear anomalies of identifiable archaeological origin. Borrow Pit Field 2 has not been surveyed. These areas form elements of the enclosed Sandlings landscape and are likely to be of equivalent archaeological interest to adjoining fields, which primarily contained elements of the medieval field system. It is possible that the medieval trackway identified during evaluation in Long Walks extends eastwards into Borrow Pit Field 2. The HER records only the WWII training area (LCS 204) and cropmarks of possible field boundaries (THB 027). Remains in this area are therefore likely to be of low to medium heritage significance.
- Main Development Site Area 3 and Aldhurst Land: These areas have been subject to a geophysical survey. Geophysical survey of Aldhurst land, to the south of Lover's Lane, identified only faint traces of possible ditches and pits, but no features that could be confidently interpreted as of archaeological origin. The HER records finds of medieval pennies (LCS 147), cropmarks of uncertain origin (LCS 198) and a possible double ring ditch (LCS 199) on the southern edge of this area. The cropmarks and pennies are consistent with the findings of the

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

geophysical survey, but the ring-ditch cropmark appears unlikely to be. Where these cropmarks have been identified elsewhere in the study area they have been found, upon further investigation, to be illusory. Geophysical survey of Main Development Site Area 3 to the north of Lover's Lane was similarly inconclusive, and the HER does not record any features within this area. This absence may reflect a real absence of past activity or may reflect ground conditions which have obscured remains. However, it appears likely that any archaeological remains in these areas are of similar character and heritage significance to those observed elsewhere on the site and would be of low to medium heritage significance.

- Cabling Route/Sandy Lane: the majority of this area has been subject to geophysical survey, which noted the presence of anomalies consistent with a former settlement at the western end of the route and the HER notes a cropmark of uncertain origin (LCS 067) and scatters of medieval and post-medieval pottery here (LCS 066). This may form an element of the medieval settlement remains observed at LEEIE. These remains would be of equivalent value to those observed at LEEIE and would therefore be of low to medium heritage significance.
- Forested areas: There are substantial areas of forestry plantation within the site which it has not been practicable to survey. In general, forestry plantation is not conducive to the preservation of near surface archaeological remains of the character that has been observed within the site, with disturbance during the preparation of the ground for planting and subsequent root action giving rise to further extensive disturbance, exacerbated by subsequent windthrow and restocking. This is particularly true of later 20th century planting where mechanical preparation became more common, and in areas subject to mechanical preparation, it is unlikely that coherent archaeological remains will survive outside areas of clearing. However, archaeological remains can survive in areas of forestry plantation, where less intrusive preparation and planting methods are used, although archaeological remains are still likely to have been disturbed, but more substantial features such as ditches may survive in recognisable form. Where archaeological features survive in areas of former woodland, it is likely that these would be of low heritage significance.

**Deposits of geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental interest**

- 16.4.70** Sizewell B was constructed on an island of gravel which was formerly adjacent to a river valley or channel. This valley has become infilled over

millennia, resulting in the accumulation of significant deposits of soils and peats.

- 16.4.71** Geoarchaeological survey comprising resistivity tomography and intrusive survey work has determined that these deposits are potentially of high paleoenvironmental interest as they formed over a prolonged period of time during the Mesolithic and Neolithic periods. The peats are likely to be primarily of interest for their ability to enhance understanding of past environments, rather than past human activity. The dynamic and fast-flowing nature of later periods would not have been favourable for settlement, and the peat deposits were inundated by the early Bronze Age, further discussed in **Appendix 16G** of this volume.
- 16.4.72** These peats were significantly disturbed during the construction of Sizewell B, with widespread removal of peats from the southern part of the area, where peats survive, and compaction of the northern part, with subsequent disturbance during the heathland creation trials. Further details can be found within the **Peat Strategy** provided in **Appendix 16G** of this volume.
- 16.4.73** This disturbance, taken with the early inundation of these deposits means that there is a low potential for extensive archaeological remains, although some material related to exploitation of the estuarine fringes may be present. Any archaeological remains that are present are likely to be of medium heritage significance at most as relics of what were once more extensive remains.
- 16.4.74** These deposits extend below the mean high-water mark and into the area considered in the Marine Historic Environment Assessment, provided in **Chapter 23** of this volume.
- viii. Previous impacts
- 16.4.75** The DBA indicated that small-scale sand and gravel extraction is likely to have occurred across the site. This was confirmed by evaluation trenching which identified former post-medieval and modern extraction pits in most fields evaluated, with a particular concentration in the western part of the site. It is likely that any disturbance of archaeology in these areas is localised.
- 16.4.76** Evaluation trenching revealed that arable cultivation of the site during the 20th century has disturbed the upper layers of buried archaeology. Repeated ploughing can be expected to have disturbed near-surface features across the site. More substantial features, such as ditches and pits, were found to be relatively well-preserved.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**16.4.77** The construction of the existing Sizewell power station complex will have given rise to a **significant** degree of disturbance across the main platform area, through ground reduction, compaction and build-up of construction-related material at the site.

**16.4.78** Geoarchaeological surveys of the peat deposits on the main platform area found that the southern part of the proposed platform area had been extensively disturbed during the construction of Sizewell B power station. The northern part of the site had been less disturbed but was heavily compacted by the same construction activity. This northern part has been further disturbed by the removal of peat during heathland creation trials. These surveys are summarised at **Appendix 16G** of this volume.

**ix. Archaeological heritage assets within the site subject to potential direct effects**

**16.4.79** The areas of highest potential for the survival of archaeological remains within the main development site can be summarised as follows:

- Remains of low-density prehistoric field systems and activity peripheral to settlement, represented by ditches, pits, and pottery and worked flint fragments, within the Sandlings and the fringes of the coastal marshes, particularly in the north and north-west of the site. Evaluation trenching on the main development site has identified previously unknown prehistoric features, suggesting a potential that further, as yet unknown prehistoric remains are present. These are likely to be of low to medium heritage significance.
- Romano-British settlement and agricultural remains on higher ground in the western part of the site, in the area of Upper Abbey Farm and Old Abbey Farm which are likely to be of low to medium heritage significance.
- Romano-British agricultural remains on high ground on the west of Goose Hill. These are likely to be of low heritage significance.
- Early-medieval settlement remains in the south-western part of the site, in the area of Lover's Lane and on LEEIE. Early-medieval burials are often found close to contemporary settlements and, while no such funerary remains have been recorded, the identification of an early-medieval settlement increases the potential for as yet unidentified burial remains of this period to be located nearby. These are likely to be of medium heritage significance.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- Remains associated with medieval agricultural and industrial exploitation of the hinterland of known settlements at Sizewell and Leiston. These are likely to be of low heritage significance.
- Remains associated with medieval agricultural and exploitation related to the monastic site of Leiston Abbey. These remains are likely to be of medium heritage significance.
- Medieval settlement activity along Lover's Lane. Where substantial remains survive, such as dwellings, these are likely to be of medium heritage significance.
- Ditches, drains, and other features associated with post-medieval agricultural land improvements. These features are likely to be of low heritage significance.
- There is some potential for remains associated with military defensive schemes constructed during WWII. However, the location of features associated with these are typically well-known. Where previously unknown remains are encountered these will have a degree of archaeological and historic interest, but are likely to be of low heritage significance due to poor preservation.
- Deposits of geoarchaeological interest in the northern part of the main platform area which have the potential to provide information on past environments. These are of medium heritage significance due to the potential that they may provide an important context for understanding how the formation processes of this mobile landscape have influenced the past environment and human activity. The potential for surviving complete sequences of peat is low due to extensive disturbance on the main platform area and is likely to be focussed in the northern part of the platform. There is a potential for archaeological remains to be present as loss or discard of artefactual material or isolated elements of activity associated with access to the river channel.

x. Heritage Assets subject to potential indirect effects

Heritage Assets within the Site

*Grade II listed buildings and associated non-designated structures at Upper Abbey Farm (LB 1216394 and LB 1216655)*

- 16.4.80 This group of assets comprises Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216394), the Barn 40m north of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216655) and

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

associated structures, the coach house and other agricultural buildings including stables, cart shed, garden walls and further, modern barns of no historic interest. The listed and curtilage structures are of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest.

- 16.4.81 Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216394) was built in the 17th century and extended in the late-18th century. The surviving elements of the original building are timber-framed whilst the later additions are brick. The Farmhouse lies within gardens on the south-eastern edge of the group of farm buildings. The Farmhouse suffered from a fire in 2009 which damaged the roof and much of the interior. Following extensive restoration, the Farmhouse was divided into two separated properties in 2016. The walls surrounding the garden have low heritage significance as they contribute to the architectural interest of the Farmhouse, allowing it to be appreciated as a discrete and separate domestic space within the wider context of the farm.
- 16.4.82 The Barn (LB 1216655) lies to the north of the Farmhouse, on the northern side of the farm cluster. The barn is listed as an 18th century timber-framed and thatched barn, although more recent research, discussed in **Appendix 16E** of this volume, suggests a 17th century date. The structure currently requires repair. There is a shelter shed to the north of the barn. The western section of this structure is shown on 1881 Ordnance Survey mapping, but was largely rebuilt and enlarged in the 20th century. The eastern section of this structure is now largely ruinous, but is shown on an estate map of 1856 (Ref. 16.23).
- 16.4.83 The Farmhouse (LB 1216394) is currently occupied by Sizewell B whilst the Barn (LB 1216655) is used by Suffolk Wildlife Trust.
- 16.4.84 Upper Abbey Farm is arranged as two clusters of buildings around yards, with a main yard and a secondary yard to its west. The eastern and larger cluster includes the Farmhouse and Barn, whilst the western includes smaller ancillary buildings and a large, modern agricultural shed. Lying between these two clusters is a range of late 18th or early 19th century stables. These are curtilage structures which contribute to the setting of the Farmhouse and the Barn by adding to their historic and architectural interest and their group value as part of an historic farmstead. The cart shed is not in use but the central stable range is occupied as office and storage space.
- 16.4.85 In the north-west corner of the farm group there is a further residential property set within a garden. This is the former head stockman's house which dates to the 19th century and holds heritage significance for its

historic and architectural interest and its contribution to the setting of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216655).

- 16.4.86 The eastern boundary of the farm is marked by a north-south track, used as a publicly accessible bridleway. The whole group is surrounded by shelter planting which serves to unify the buildings and separate them from the agricultural fields on all sides.
- 16.4.87 The setting of these assets is defined by their location within a distinct farm cluster in an agricultural landscape, and the coherence of the group contributes positively to the historic and architectural interest of individual structures within the group, particularly when seen together. While the group is surrounded by shelter planting, filtered views of the surrounding agricultural landscape, which formerly comprised part of the lands farmed from the farmstead, are present, and contribute by providing a visual element to the tenurial and functional relationship of the asset group with the wider landscape.
- 16.4.88 The principal contribution of the setting of the asset group is to historic interest, placing it into a regionally distinctive agricultural context. The distinct farm cluster contributes to architectural interest, and from within this confined area architectural elements of the individual buildings can be appreciated. The setting also has the potential to add to the archaeological interest of the asset group through the presence of related, but as yet undiscovered, heritage assets which add to understanding of the asset group. Archaeological remains are likely to comprise features such as field boundaries and drainage ditches. In closer proximity to the farm, the foundations of former buildings, made surfaces, and middens may be encountered, and this is discussed further in **Appendix 16E** of this volume.
- 16.4.89 Baseline views from the area around Upper Abbey Farm are illustrated at Representative Viewpoint 1, included at **Figure 13.9.01** in **Chapter 13** of this volume.

#### *Pillbox in Pillbox Field (LCS112)*

- 16.4.90 The pillbox in Pillbox Field is a heritage asset of low heritage significance for historic interest. Its setting contributes to this interest to a limited degree because of the fundamental change to the coastal landscape caused during the construction of the Sizewell A and B power stations and associated planting, as well as by the removal of associated elements of the coastal crust which has removed visual reference to associated elements of the planned defensive scheme.

## Offsite heritage assets subject to potential indirect effects

*Scheduled Monument (SM 1014520), Grade I and Grade II listed buildings and associated non-designated structures at Leiston Abbey (LB 1215753, LB 1215754, LB 1216380 and LB 1268290)*

- 16.4.91 This asset group comprises the remains of the former Premonstratensian Abbey of Leiston. The Leiston Abbey complex comprises a number of heritage assets, both designated and non-designated. These are:
- Leiston Abbey (second site) and moated site (SM 1014520).
  - St Mary's Abbey, Grade I (LB 1215753).
  - Retreat House, Grade II (LB 1215754).
  - Barn at Abbey Farm, Grade II (LB 1216380).
  - The Guesten Hall at Abbey Farm, Grade II (LB 1268290).
  - Related non-designated assets, the most visible of which comprise the field system around the Abbey (which relates to the agricultural improvement of the land around Abbey Farm in the post-medieval period), but which may also include features associated with the use of the Abbey as an estate centre (such as craft-working sites or ancillary structures).
- 16.4.92 While these heritage assets comprise a coherent group, the heritage significance of individual heritage assets within this group varies, and the designations reflect that some assets are recognised as of higher value. The designated elements of the group are individually of high heritage significance for a combination of archaeological, architectural, and historic interests, while the various non-designated assets are of low, or medium, heritage significance. They are also listed for their group value. For the purposes of this assessment, and to avoid unnecessary repetition, the description of the setting and the characterisation of potential change is discussed in terms of the asset group as a whole, but effects are considered against individual heritage assets.
- 16.4.93 Leiston Abbey was founded in 1182 by Ranulph de Glanville for the Premonstratensian order. The original site was located in the coastal marshes south of Minsmere (SM 1015687) and is discussed below; however, due to flooding, the Abbey was moved to a second site (SM 1014520 and LB 1215753), north of the village of Leiston, in c.1363. A ditch

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

on the site of the second Abbey is interpreted as a former moat, which likely predates the creation of the Abbey in this location. Architectural elements are believed to have been taken from the original Abbey and used in the construction of the new site: 12th to early 14th century stonework is evidenced within the mid-14th century church. A fire in 1380 damaged buildings on the site, with the exception of the church. The Abbey was suppressed in 1536, was granted to the Duke of Suffolk and, henceforth, used as a farmstead (Ref. 16.25).

- 16.4.94** The Retreat House (LB 1215754) stands in the south aisle of the Abbey church and was formerly a farmhouse, built in the 17th century. The house was extended in the 19th and 20th century and partially rebuilt in the late 20th century. The Barn at Abbey Farm (LB 1216380) is a 15th century agricultural barn, believed to be part of the original Abbey buildings. The Guesten Hall at Abbey Farm (LB 1268290) is a late 14th or 15th century building, probably originally used as a monastic guest house. As with the Retreat House, the Hall was rebuilt in the late 20th century.
- 16.4.95** The ruins of St Mary's Abbey church, and the remains of the buildings around its cloister, are in the guardianship of English Heritage and are publicly accessible.
- 16.4.96** The site is presently used as a music school and residential study centre by Pro Corda; this represents an appropriate reuse that has and continues to support the ongoing conservation of the heritage asset group and accords well with the heritage interests of the asset.
- 16.4.97** The non-ruinous standing buildings are presently in a variety of uses related to residential accommodation, practice and performance space. The Retreat House (LB 1215754), Barn at Abbey Farm (LB 1216380) and Guesten Hall (LB 1268290) form a discrete and private courtyard space set back from the publicly accessible ruins, though some accommodation is provided within parts of the St Mary's Abbey buildings which have remained in residential use.
- 16.4.98** The ruins of St Mary's Abbey church and the scheduled associated buildings are visible in glimpsed and passing views from the roads and fields around the asset as a tightly-grouped collection of structures, which is visible above hedgerows and woodland planting or through gaps in hedgerows.
- 16.4.99** The clearest views of the ruins are from the south and west along the B1122 Abbey Road; longer views from this direction are more sporadic as a result of intervening planting. In these closer views, the ruins can be seen in a generally agricultural/rural context. Views from the assets are varied,

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

and primarily relate to views of other elements of the asset group or views into the farmland around the asset group, which serve to place the assets into a rural context.

- 16.4.100 Within the asset group, there is a sense of calm and seclusion which accords with the perceptions of the former use of the Abbey. This is most marked in the vicinity of the courtyard formed by the Retreat House (LB 1215754), Barn at Abbey Farm (LB 1216380) and Guesten Hall (LB 1268290) buildings and in parts of the Abbey ruins (SM 1014520 and LB 1215753) where traffic noise from the B1122 is less audible, although even in the parts of the ruins closest to the road, traffic noise is not particularly intrusive.
- 16.4.101 The principal contribution of the setting of the asset group is to historic interest, placing it into a rural, agricultural context which affords a sense of seclusion that corresponds with perceptions of the function of the Abbey, and allows the surviving architectural interest of the Abbey to be appreciated. The principal contribution of the setting to architectural interest is to present a series of views which offer a number of opportunities to appreciate the interest of specific architectural details, of individual buildings and of the composition of the group as a whole.
- 16.4.102 The setting also has the potential to add to the archaeological interests of the asset group through the presence of related, but as yet undiscovered, archaeological heritage assets, which have the potential to contribute to the understanding of the asset group.
- 16.4.103 Baseline views from the area around the asset group are illustrated at Illustrative Viewpoint I6 (footpath to south of Abbey) and Illustrative Viewpoint I11 (Aldhurst Farm) provided in **Appendix 13A** of this volume and Representative Viewpoint R5 (footpath to south of Abbey) and Representative Viewpoint R8 (footpath to North of Abbey) provided in **Figures 13.9.05 and 13.9.08**. Views from the Abbey ruins are illustrated at Representative Viewpoint R24 and Representative Viewpoint R25 provided in **Figures 13.9.24 and 13.9.25**.

*Scheduled Monument (SM 1015687) at Leiston Abbey (first site) with later chapel and pillbox*

- 16.4.104 The first site of Leiston Abbey is designated as a scheduled monument, which is of high heritage significance primarily for archaeological interest, but also for elements of historic and aesthetic interest arising from the presence of the former chapel. It is located in open marshland close to the mouth of the Minsmere River. The monument occupies a slightly elevated area of land, a former island within the marsh, and the only visible remains

are of the former chapel, which shows evidence of substantial alteration at the time that it was converted into a pillbox during WWII.

- 16.4.105** Leiston Abbey was founded in 1182 by Ranulph de Glanville for the Premonstratensian order. The Premonstratensians are generally held to have valued austerity and seclusion and founded their monasteries in rural locations, of which the Leiston first site is a good example, although references to a medieval harbour here suggest that this isolation may have been illusory (Ref. 16.26). The Abbey was relocated due to flooding in c. 1363 to a site approximately 3.4km to south-west, north of the village of Leiston (SM 1014520 and LB 1215753), and is discussed above. The church and other buildings were demolished, and their stone reused in the construction of the second site. The precinct of the first Abbey, and a later chapel, were retained as a small cell of the second Abbey (Ref. 16.25). The foundations of the demolished buildings along with other features, such as a fishpond, water channels and enclosure ditches, survive below ground and are included within the scheduled area. The ruins of a later chapel, constructed within the nave of the original church, remain standing on a discernible marsh ‘island’ within the centre of the designated area.
- 16.4.106** In the 19th century, agricultural improvements in the immediate area surrounding the asset remodelled the coastal marsh landscape, including extensive water management, the creation of enclosures, canalisation of the Minsmere River, and the creation of a sea wall. A brick and cement pillbox was constructed within the chapel ruins during WWII as part of coastal defences. Ground levels were altered in places during WWII to allow flooding of the former marsh and the construction of peat scrapes at Minsmere.
- 16.4.107** The setting of the asset within the Minsmere marshes means that it has clear views in all directions, except to the sea where views are blocked by the sea wall at Minsmere. The low-lying nature of the site and the presence of higher ground to the north and plantation woodland to the west and south means, despite the open nature of the asset’s immediate surroundings, views from the asset are closed off at distances between 1km and 1.5km by topography and 19th to 20th century woodland planting.
- 16.4.108** The existing Sizewell B power station is clearly visible against the horizon over the woodland in views to the south. It is partially screened by the topography of Goose Hill and woodland planting, but forms a clear background element within views from the asset. In views of the asset from the north, the existing Sizewell B power station is juxtaposed with the chapel ruins. The abbey ruins and the power station both appear as block-like structures on the horizon, forming focal points in the foreground and background respectively. This juxtaposition is enhanced by the relatively

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

featureless middle-ground between; the complementary forms and relative isolation of these structures provide a contrast that provides a sense of the changing use and appearance of the Suffolk coast over time.

- 16.4.109 Despite this visual presence, the Sizewell B power station is sufficiently separated from the Abbey to not preclude the sense of isolation that feels appropriate for a monastic site and contributes to historic value. This sense of isolation is augmented by the low levels of noise at the asset and the surrounding agricultural land.
- 16.4.110 The chapel ruins are visible from a considerable distance, particularly on the approach to the asset from Eastbridge and along the Suffolk Coast Path from the north and south, although these views are influenced significantly by whether the viewer follows the path along the top or the base of the sea wall, with the sea wall precluding views of the Abbey from the path along the beach edge. These views contribute to the historic and architectural interest of the asset.
- 16.4.111 Visibility of the existing Sizewell B from the pillbox is framed through the southern embrasure in the ruins of the chapel. The presence of Sizewell B does not hinder appreciation of the setting's contribution to the heritage significance of the pillbox.
- 16.4.112 The pillbox is understood and perceived within the wider context of fragmentary survivals of WWII defences along the Suffolk Coast; viewers approaching from the north and south pass through lines of anti-tank cubes placed to defend the potential invasion site at Minsmere.
- 16.4.113 The principal contribution of the setting of the asset is to historic interest, placing it into a rural, and agricultural, context which affords a sense of seclusion that corresponds with perceptions of the function of the Abbey, increased by the slight rise on which the Abbey ruins are located which affords a sense of localised prominence. The coastal margin context allows appreciation of the historic events which led to the relocation of the Abbey in the 14th century. The setting contributes to architectural interest by providing a dramatic and regionally distinctive context in which the surviving ruins can be appreciated. The architectural details of the chapel ruins and pillbox are best appreciated in closer views which do not depend on this setting.
- 16.4.114 The contribution of setting to archaeological interest is limited and would primarily arise from the presence of related archaeological remains in the surrounding area. This contribution is at best latent and restricted to the area immediately adjacent to the scheduled area.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

---

- 16.4.115 Baseline views from the assets and its surroundings are illustrated at Illustrative Viewpoint I12 and Illustrative Viewpoint I13 provided in **Appendix 13A** of this volume, and Representative Viewpoint R14 (Minsmere Sluice) provided in **Figure 13.9.14**.

*Grade II Listed Cottage 450m south-west of Upper Abbey Farmhouse  
(Abbey Cottage – LB 1216395)*

- 16.4.116 This listed building is of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests. The Cottage (LB 1216395) dates to the late-18th century and was likely originally associated with the house at Leiston Old Abbey to the south, with the Cottage lying within the dense woodland planting associated with that house.

- 16.4.117 The Cottage (LB 1216395) is located approximately 50m to the east of the B1122 (Abbey Road), on Eastbridge Road. The Cottage is screened from the B1122 (Abbey Road) by dense woodland planting. It is screened at ground-level from the Eastbridge Road by garden hedgerows. The asset is only clearly visible from within the planting around it and from its access gate, creating an intimate and secluded setting in which the historic and architectural interests can be appreciated fully. The adjacent agricultural land is only clearly visible in sequential views as the viewer approaches or leaves the Cottage, reinforcing the general rural context. There are some views from the asset, particularly from the upper storey to the north. The rural context is further enhanced by the generally low-levels of noise at the Cottage (LB 1216395).

- 16.4.118 The principal contribution of the setting to the asset is to historic interest, placing it into a rural context, and maintaining a perceptual relationship to Leiston Old Abbey and its surrounding designed landscape. Setting contributes slightly to architectural interest, by providing, close views in which the architectural details of the house can be appreciated within its garden and surrounding planting.

*Grade II Listed Potter's Farmhouse (LB 1228267)*

- 16.4.119 Potter's Farmhouse (LB 1228267), a 17th century farmhouse with a later extension, is located within a discrete farmyard comprising associated structures, including farmyard walls and barns. The listed building is of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests. Other buildings within the farmyard are of low heritage significance for historical interest, primarily deriving from their association with the listed farmhouse.

- 16.4.120 The setting of the Farmhouse (LB 1228267) is defined by its location within the farmyard surrounded by shelter and hedgerow planting, which provides the context in which its architectural and historic interest can be most

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

readily appreciated. Views out of the farmyard at ground level are restricted, and are primarily experienced as the viewer moves in and out of the farmyard. Clearer views into agricultural land may be possible from the upper storey. Views out of the farmyard provide a relatively minor contribution to historic interest by reinforcing the tenurial and functional links with the agricultural landscape.

- 16.4.121 The principal contribution of the setting of the Farmhouse (LB 1228267) is to historic interest, placing it into a rural, agricultural context. The planting around the farmyard contributes slightly to architectural interest, permitting occasional, short-range views within which the architectural detail of the house can be appreciated. The surrounding farm buildings also contribute to architectural interest, providing a local, vernacular context for the farmhouse.

*Grade II Listed The Watch House, Sizewell (LB 1391360)*

- 16.4.122 The Watch House (LB 1391360), a coastguard watch-house built c.1823, is of high heritage significance for architectural and historical interests. It is located within sand dunes behind the beach at Sizewell. It is separated from the other houses at Sizewell by open land and is positioned within a tight cluster of weather boarded sheds.

- 16.4.123 Views out to sea from the Watch House make the most significant contribution to historic significance, reflecting the design intention of the building. It is prominently visible in close views on the approach to the village along Sizewell Gap and from the village, where it is seen against the horizon. These views contribute to historic and architectural interests of the asset by reinforcing its functional links with the sea and with the village. The rather haphazard group of weather boarded buildings, of which the Watch House is the largest and tallest, provides a distinctive regional context for these assets.

- 16.4.124 The existing Sizewell A station and some associated buildings are prominently visible in views from the asset, and in views of the asset from the south, with its elevated position above Sizewell Gap providing a sense of dominance in these views.

*Grade II listed buildings at Potter's Street crossroads (LB 1228263, LB 1228262, LB 1228265)*

- 16.4.125 This asset group consists of three individual Grade II listed houses, Flash Cottages (LB 1228263), The Cottage (LB 1228262) and Woodview (LB 1228265). These assets are of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests.

- 16.4.126 Flash Cottages (LB 1228263) are a pair of 18th century timber-framed cottages, to the west of Potter's Street. Across the road lies the late-17th century The Cottage (LB 1228262), a timber-framed house which formerly comprised two properties. Further along the road, north of the crossroad with Bakers Hill and Onners Lane, lies Woodview (LB 1228265), a pair of brick cottages with a datestone of 1845.
- 16.4.127 The setting of these assets is primarily defined by their relationship to the adjacent minor roads. Visibility from these buildings at ground level is severely restricted by high and mature hedgerows which also serve to limit the number of viewpoints in which their architectural interest can be appreciated, but which contributes to a sense of a general secluded rural context which does enhance historic interest. The rising ground to the south and south-east of these buildings further restricts views. Woodview (LB 1228265) and The Cottage (LB 1228262) have some views out to the south over farmland, particularly from the upper storey of each house, although these views are variously filtered and make a limited contribution to historic interest by reinforcing the wider rural context.

#### *Leiston Conservation Area*

- 16.4.128 Leiston Conservation Area comprises the surviving core of the early 19th century industrial town focused on the former Garrett's works and associated factory housing. The Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset and is of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests.
- 16.4.129 The former works and associated buildings form a thematically and chronologically coherent group of structures built in a consistent palette of red and white brick and flint, typical of east Suffolk during the early industrial era. The former functional relationships of the buildings and their consistent appearance provide clear historic associations with the industrial past of the town, and are illustrative of the town's regional context.
- 16.4.130 The listed buildings and non-designated buildings which contribute to the character within the Conservation Area derive heritage significance from the visual relationships between them, primarily available in close views from within the Conservation Area, and do not depend on long views into the surrounding town or rural areas beyond. The Conservation Area Appraisal notes that the Conservation Area's setting is primarily urban and that the rural surroundings of the town are not readily apparent from within the Conservation Area (Ref. 16.27).
- 16.4.131 There are a small number of longer views from upper storeys of buildings within the town, such as the Long Shop Museum, including views in which

some elements of Sizewell B are visible, but these views are largely incidental and do not contribute to heritage significance beyond reinforcing the general rural context.

*Conservation Area and Grade II listed buildings at Thorpeness*

- 16.4.132 Thorpeness is a planned seaside resort village which was built during the early 20th century. It contains a large number of interesting buildings, of which 12 have been listed at Grade II. The whole village is designated as a conservation area. A full list of the individual heritage assets within this asset group is included with the Settings Assessment Scoping Report provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**.
- 16.4.133 The Conservation Area is characterised by its unplanned layout and appearance: individual building styles are found side-by-side, houses are scattered within the natural landscape of heather and scrub, and there are few main streets. The resort was designed for visitors to make use of The Mere (an artificially maintained lake), the sea and the beach and views of and access to these contributes to the heritage significance of the Conservation Area.
- 16.4.134 Individual listed buildings are of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests. Of particular interest are Westbar (LB 1287172), a gate house and water tank; Thorpeness Mill (LB 1215702), a windmill; and the House in the Clouds (LB 1287261), a water tower and house. These are distinctive features on the skyline in a number of close and more distant views of the village.
- 16.4.135 The settings of the buildings within the Conservation Area contribute to heritage significance primarily by allowing the individual buildings to be seen in the context of the resort and its unusual history, reinforcing their architectural and historic interests.
- 16.4.136 Views are generally from close distances and within the Conservation Area itself. Views out of the Conservation Area at ground level are limited by buildings and planting. Views of the sea and beach are limited at ground level by the flat topography, and can only be appreciated from higher viewpoints within buildings, or from Bent hills and The Headlands. Perceptibility of The Mere is strongest along The Haven, where there are a number of communal facilities, and along Lakeside Avenue.
- 16.4.137 The House in the Clouds (LB 1287261), and, to a lesser extent, Westbar (LB 1287172) and Thorpeness Mill (LB 1215702) are visible in views to the north, particularly from Aldeburgh and the flat coastal land between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness. This visibility enhances their architectural and historic interests, particularly in the case of the House in the Clouds, which

presents a unique and intriguing appearance in these longer views, particularly with its contrast against the existing Sizewell A and B stations. The House in the Clouds is the most prominent and distinctive of these three assets, with the other two being noticeably more difficult to pick out against the horizon.

- 16.4.138 In these longer views, the majority of the settlement is not clearly visible and the viewer is unable to experience the historic character of the Conservation Area, which is appreciated only from within the settlement.
- 16.4.139 Upper elements of the existing Sizewell A and B stations are visible against the horizon in the approach to the Conservation Area from Aldeburgh. In these views, the white dome of the Sizewell B station is most clearly visible, particularly when the sun is from the south, with the Sizewell A station appearing lower on the horizon. In these views, the perceptual prominence and scale of Sizewell A and B is reduced by the presence of other prominent features along the horizon, particularly the House in the Clouds (LB 1287261). Sizewell A and B are visible as very distant elements in the background of views along the coast, forming a landmark that contributes to a sense of place that does not detract from the historic and architectural interests of the Conservation Area or listed buildings.
- 16.4.140 Baseline views from the centre of the Thorpeness Conservation Area are illustrated at Illustrative Viewpoint I19 provided in **Appendix 13A** of this volume. The view from Thorpeness Beach in Representative Viewpoint R15, provided in **Figure 13.9.15**, is taken from north of the Conservation Area and does not reflect the screening of views to the north provided by the underlying landform.

*Non-designated coastguard cottages, Dunwich Heath*

- 16.4.141 These buildings comprise a row of two-story whitewashed terraced cottages with a three-story observation tower to the east end. The terrace and tower were built in the mid-19th century but were significantly altered in 1989, with few original features surviving internally. Their prominent coastal location at high level (and colour) makes them highly visible within their landscape setting. The buildings are of medium heritage significance for architectural and historical interests, primarily deriving from their location on an exposed section of the Suffolk coast which sets them into a distinctive regional context paralleling similar examples at Dunwich and Shingle Street.
- 16.4.142 The observation tower was built to provide clear views out to sea and along the coast, allowing vessels and distress signals to be seen and acted on. During WWII it was used as a battery observation post and there was a

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

radar station located at Dunwich Heath, reinforcing the designed connection with the sea.

- 16.4.143 Their present setting within heathland reinforces a sense of isolation and a specifically local context for these buildings, and views out to sea contribute to an understanding of the purpose, and past function, of the buildings, adding to the asset's historic interest. Southwold is visible as a distant element in views to the north from the asset, and the dome of the existing Sizewell B station is prominently visible in views to the south, as well as in views of the asset from the approach road to the north of the asset. This visibility provides a strong sense of contrast, but one which reinforces the local context. The distance and intervening landscape between the existing Sizewell B power station, and the asset, is sufficient to provide a strong sense of separation and for the qualities of remoteness, the distinctive heathland landscape, and the coastal relationship to remain intact.
- 16.4.144 Baseline views from the Coastguard Cottages are illustrated at Illustrative Viewpoint I15, provided in **Appendix 13A** of this volume, and Representative Viewpoint R17, provided in **Figure 13.9.17**.

*Conservation Area and Grade I, II and II\* listed buildings at Aldeburgh*

- 16.4.145 Aldeburgh Conservation Area comprises the historic core of the town and the sea front. The Conservation Area contains over 50 listed buildings, primarily Grade II listed structures of post-medieval and 19th century date, but also the 16th century Moot Hall (Grade I, LB 1269716) and Church of St Peter and St Paul (Grade II\*, LB 1269731). A full list of the individual heritage assets within this asset group is included with the Settings Assessment Scoping Report provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the ES.
- 16.4.146 These assets are of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests, and many of these buildings have contributing elements of archaeological interest. The Conservation Area is of high heritage significance, primarily for architectural and historic interests, but also holds archaeological interest.
- 16.4.147 The settings of the designated heritage assets within Aldeburgh are defined largely by their immediate surroundings, with few having longer views in or out of the Conservation Area. Other than views out to the sea from within the Conservation Area, or along the coast in either direction from the beach and sea front, most views from within the Conservation Area and its immediate surroundings relate to close-distance views along or across the streets and open spaces within the town, and do not include any more distant elements. The settings of the buildings within the Conservation Area contribute to heritage significance primarily by allowing the individual

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

buildings to be seen in the context of the town and its history, reinforcing their architectural and historic interests.

**16.4.148** The Conservation Area Appraisal notes a number of important views; those which look out of the Conservation Area are limited to:

- view north along Crabbe Street towards the Moot Hall;
- view north along the beach to Sizewell;
- view south along the beach to Slaughden; and
- views east to sea from Town Steps, Churchyard of St Peter and St Paul, garden of Wyndham House and from The Terrace.

**16.4.149** Individual listed buildings are of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests. Of particular interest are the Moot Hall (LB 1269716), a 16th century market hall now used as the town hall, and the Church of St Peter and St Paul (LB 1269731), parts of which date back to the 14th century. These are significant for their contribution to understanding of the development of Aldeburgh in the later medieval period. The principal contribution of the setting of the Moot Hall is to historic interest, with the hall lying within an open space, the former market place, surrounded by the historic core of town and close to the coast, with which it had a functional relationship. The open space around the Moot Hall also contributes to architectural interest by providing close views within which the architectural details of the building can be appreciated.

**16.4.150** The setting of the Church of St Peter and St Paul (LB 1269731) contributes primarily to its historic interest, placing the asset within the historic core of the town and surrounded on three sides by its substantial graveyard. Surrounding structures permit close views of the Church, allowing appreciation of the architectural details of the building, particularly the 14th century tower. This tower can be seen in views of the town and, in views from the south, where the tower is juxtaposed with the existing Sizewell A and B stations which is seen at a distance against the horizon. The Church tower is, therefore, a prominent feature in views of the town, which contributes to its historic interest; however, within the Conservation Area, its visual prominence is restricted by intervening buildings and the relatively low height of the tower.

**16.4.151** Upper elements of the existing Sizewell A and B stations are visible in views north from the beach, and along Crag Path, from around the Royal National Lifeboat Institution shop northwards, appearing with increased

clarity as the viewer moves northwards. From Market Cross Place, the existing Sizewell A and B stations are visible from the Wentworth Hotel northwards, and these existing structures are visible from the north end of the Moot Hall. In these views, the white dome of Sizewell B is most clearly visible, particularly when the sun is from the south, with Sizewell A appearing lower on the horizon. In these views, the perceptual prominence and scale of Sizewell A and B is reduced by the presence of strong vertical elements much closer to the viewer, including the 'heritage-style' street lighting standards along Market Cross Place and the structures to either side of Crabbe Street.

- 16.4.152 The dome of Sizewell B is also visible as a distant element in the background of views northwards towards Aldeburgh from Slaughden. The masts of the dinghies and yachts stored on the gravel spit between Slaughden and Aldeburgh present strong vertical elements which reduce the perceptual prominence and visibility of the existing power stations.
- 16.4.153 Baseline views from Aldeburgh and the surrounding area are illustrated at Illustrative Viewpoint I6 (Moot Hall, Aldeburgh) and Illustrative I7 (Martello Tower, Slaughden) contained in **Appendix 13A** of this volume, and at Representative Viewpoint R20 (Suffolk Coast Path north of Aldeburgh) and Representative Viewpoint R21 (Aldeburgh Beach) contained in **Figures 13.9.20 and 13.9.21**.

*Scheduled Monument and Grade II\* Listed Slaughden Martello Tower (SM 1006041 and LB 1269724)*

- 16.4.154 Slaughden Martello Tower was built in the early-19th century as a coastal defence against a possible French invasion. It is the most northerly and largest of the Martello Towers built during the Napoleonic War. It is of high heritage significance as a scheduled monument and Grade II\* listed building, primarily for historic and architectural interests, but with some archaeological interest. It is located on the seaward side of the narrow gravel spit which becomes Orford Ness, and is discernibly distinct from the town of Aldeburgh.
- 16.4.155 This setting provides clear visual links to the sea which reinforces the historic interest of the asset, as well as views north to Aldeburgh, south to Orford Ness and west to the coastal marshes either side of the River Alde. These views contribute to historic interest by providing a regionally distinctive landscape context. The present isolation of the tower, which is most clearly discerned in views from the approach along the sea wall from Aldeburgh to the north, in which it is visually dominant, contributes to architectural interest, and in very close views where the unique form of this tower can be seen and appreciated. At ground level, the dome of the

existing Sizewell B station is visible at a distance as a background element against the horizon, but is not readily discernible beyond the town of Aldeburgh and through the masts of the yachts and dinghies stored on the gravel spit. Views from the top of the tower would be clearer, but even from here the Sizewell power stations are visible only as very distant background elements.

- 16.4.156 Baseline views from the Martello Tower are illustrated at Illustrative Viewpoint I7 provided in **Appendix 13A** of this volume.

*Conservation Area and Grade I, II\* and II listed buildings and non-designated assets at Southwold*

- 16.4.157 Southwold Conservation Area comprises the majority of the town, excepting an area of more recent development to the north of the Conservation Area. It contains almost 150 listed building entries, including the Grade I listed Church of St Edmund (LB 1384321) and the Grade II\* listed Lloyds Bank (LB 1384386), Buckenham House (LB 1384375), Manor House and Manor Gate (LB 1384370), and Sutherland House (LB 1384369). For the purposes of this assessment, a small number of listed buildings which are located beyond the designated Conservation Area have also been included within this asset group, as has the non-designated Southwold Pier. A full list of the individual heritage assets within this asset group is included with the Settings Assessment Scoping Report provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**.

- 16.4.158 The listed buildings within the Conservation Area are of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests, and the Conservation Area is also of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests, with elements of archaeological interest.

- 16.4.159 The settings of the majority of designated heritage assets within the Conservation Area are defined by their immediate surroundings, with the centre of the town being characterised by very dense development on a relatively narrow and constricted street plan. Even where the street plan opens up around South Green, the principal contribution of setting to the heritage significance of these assets is to provide a context in which the varied historic buildings of the town can be seen and understood, reinforcing their architectural and historic interests.

- 16.4.160 There are views out to sea, and to north and south along the coast from the sea front, with views south being clearest from The Promenade as the viewer enters South Green and the views south open up. There are also longer views into the coastal marshes at Walberswick and Southwold Harbour and to the sea from the southern fringes of the Conservation Area,

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

particularly around the playing fields at Godyll Road and from South Green. These views provide a distinctive regional context for the Conservation Area and designated heritage assets, and reinforce the historic links to the sea, particularly of assets such as the Lighthouse (LB 1384444) and Pier.

- 16.4.161 The Southwold Conservation Area Appraisal notes a number of important views. These are predominantly relatively close views either along streets or towards specific buildings or building groups. A few longer views are noted from the sea front, with important views south from Gun Hill and North Parade, and views south-west from Godyll Road.
- 16.4.162 The existing Sizewell A and B stations are visible in views south from the southern part of North Parade and the Promenade, in which they appear intermittently, where they are not screened by the buildings to the west of North Parade, beyond the strong vertical elements of the street lights as a very distant element of the background at a distance of around 13km. In views from North Parade and the Promenade, this visibility is incidental, with the viewer's attention drawn more to the sea or to the attractive buildings facing onto North Parade and the Promenade, and the visibility of the existing Sizewell power stations is not a detracting element.
- 16.4.163 The existing Sizewell A and B are similarly visible as a very distant element of the background in views from Southwold Pier, although the absence of the competing elements in the foreground mean that they are more readily discernible than in views from North Parade.
- 16.4.164 The existing Sizewell A and B are more clearly visible against the horizon from South Green and Gun Hill, where the viewer's eye is drawn southwards along the coastline, and there are fewer competing elements on the horizon. Even so, the viewer's attention is drawn initially to the composition of the open space and buildings around the green, and to the sea, which contribute discernibly to both historic and architectural interests. Sizewell A and B are visible as very distant elements in the background of views along the coast, forming a landmark that draws the viewers' eye along the coast and contributes to a sense of place that does not detract from the historic and architectural interests of the Conservation Area or listed buildings.
- 16.4.165 Views from the Conservation Area are illustrated at Illustrative Viewpoints I3 (Southwold Pier), I5 (Southwold Common), I17 (Gun Hill) and I18 (Car Park at Alfred Corey Museum), provided in **Appendix 13A** of this volume, and at Representative Viewpoint R23 (Southwold Promenade) provided in **Figure 13.9.23**.

*Scheduled Monument and Grade I Listed Orford Castle, with adjoining quarry and remains of 20th century look-out post (SM 1014860 and LB 1030873)*

- 16.4.166 Orford Castle is located to the west of the village of Orford, and comprises a polygonal stone keep, which is Grade I listed, on top of an earth motte, within a wider enclosure which survives as earthworks. It was built towards the end of the 12th century, and is of high heritage significance for architectural interest as a result of its excellent preservation, which allows its unique architectural form to be seen and appreciated. It also has historical significance for its place in a number of recorded events, such as the re-establishment of royal authority in Suffolk by Henry II, the attempted French invasion following the revolt against King John and the capture of the legendary Wild Man of Orford, as well as later use as a coastal defence during WWII. It also has archaeological interest, which is primarily intrinsic to an understanding of the form, development and use of the castle.
- 16.4.167 The setting contributes to all these interests, primarily through the surviving relationship of town and castle, which provides the castle with a sense of dominance over the surrounding town. This relationship also allows for a number of views of the castle from the village in which its architectural and historic interests can be appreciated. The relationship with the sea and with Orford Ness is also important, particularly in the light of the French attack and the Wild Man, but also deriving from its later use as a coastal defence, closely related to the military establishment at Orford Ness. This relationship is most clearly defined in the views from the roof of the castle, which is maintained as a viewpoint from where panoramic views over Orford Ness, out to sea and along the coast are available.
- 16.4.168 The existing Sizewell A and B stations are visible from the top of the Grade I listed Castle Keep as a background element silhouetted against the horizon, approximately 14km to the north and above the houses of Orford village. The viewer's attention is drawn to the village in the foreground and the intervening rural landscape and coastline which contribute discernibly to both historic and architectural interests. While visible, the existing Sizewell stations do not detract from the historic or architectural interests of the scheduled monument and listed building.
- 16.4.169 Baseline views from Orford Castle are illustrated at Illustrative Viewpoint I8, provided in **Appendix 13A** of this volume.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

*Scheduled Monument and Grade II listed lighthouse and former military structures at Orford Ness (SM 1416933, LB 1392631, LB 1416866, LB 1416867, LB 1416868, LB 1416869)*

- 16.4.170 These assets comprise a nationally unique group of structures that are of high heritage significance for their historical associations with the development of radar, radio communications, and the British atomic and nuclear weapons programmes. Some structures, particularly the 'Black Beacon' (LB 1416868), the 'pagodas', and the centrifuge building (SM 1416933), have high architectural interest as unique purpose-built structures, while other buildings, such as huts and sheds represent variously preserved examples of more standardised and well-known types. Similarly, some structures hold a degree of archaeological interest, particularly in the absence of records, which are either lost or remain unreleased.
- 16.4.171 Orfordness Lighthouse (LB 1392631) was built in 1792 and was one of the first lighthouses in the country to use oil rather than coal. In 1915, the Royal Flying Corps established a flying field and ancillary buildings on the spit of land on which the lighthouse lies. The site was used to research weapon development and aerial reconnaissance and navigation during the First World War. The experimental use of the site continued in the inter-war years, and was instrumental in the development of radar technology to identify aircraft. From the 1950s, the site was used for atomic weapons research. The designated buildings associated with the site comprise:
- Grade II listed Orford Ness: former Royal Flying Corps Officers' Mess and AWRE canteen building (LB 1416867).
  - Grade II listed Orford Ness: former Royal Flying Corps barrack block (LB 141866).
  - Grade II listed Orford Ness: the Black Beacon and associated power house (LB 1416868).
  - Grade II listed Orford Ness: Bomb Ballistics building (LB 1416869).
  - Scheduled Monument Orford Ness: the Atomic Weapons Research Establishment test buildings and associated structures (SM 1416933).
- 16.4.172 The setting of these assets is defined by their location on the remote coastal shingle spit. The site was closed to the public throughout its military operational life, and the restricted access to the Ness retains a sense of separateness and secrecy. The coastal location also provides a visually

dramatic location, with taller structures such as the Lighthouse (LB 1392631), and the pagodas (SM 1416933), appearing silhouetted against the skyline in many views, emphasising their architectural interest.

**16.4.173** Views out to sea and along the coast contribute to the understanding of the functional operation of the Lighthouse (LB 1392631) and are, therefore, of historic and architectural interest.

**16.4.174** While views up and down the coast and out to sea do not generally contribute to any understanding of the functional aspects of the military research site, the existing and barely visible Sizewell A and B stations are an interesting visual and thematic counterpoint to the associations of the group of structures with Britain's defence and nuclear programme. Views along the coast also include relict coastal defensive structures and well-known related sites, such as Orford Castle, Shingle Street and the Felixstowe Seaplane Base, which further reinforce the thematic links to the military history of the Suffolk coast.

**16.4.175** Views from Orford Ness are illustrated at Illustrative Viewpoint I9 provided in **Appendix 13A** of this volume.

b) Future baseline

**16.4.176** There are no committed development(s) or forecasted changes that would materially alter the baseline conditions during the construction and operation of the proposed development. It is likely, however, that continuing intensive arable cultivation of the site would result in the progressive disturbance of any archaeological remains which may be present.

**16.4.177** The Coast Geography and Hydrodynamic assessment, reported in **Chapter 20** of this volume, does not predict any trends in coastal change that would give rise to adverse changes to the terrestrial historic environment.

## 16.5 Environmental design and mitigation

**16.5.1** As detailed in **Volume 1, Chapter 6** of the **ES**, a number of primary mitigation measures have been identified through the iterative EIA process and have been incorporated into the design and construction planning of the proposed development. Tertiary mitigation measures are legal requirements or are standard practices that will be implemented as part of the proposed development.

**16.5.2** The assessment of likely significant effects of the proposed development assumes that primary and tertiary mitigation measures are in place. For the terrestrial historic environment, these measures are identified with a

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

summary provided on how the measures contribute to the mitigation and management of potentially significant environmental effects.

- 16.5.3 Primary and tertiary mitigation for off-site development areas, including the off-site sports facilities at Leiston, fen meadow compensation sites south of Benhall and east of Halesworth and, if required, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area (Westleton), are set out in **Appendix 16F** of this volume where relevant.
- 16.5.4 For terrestrial historic environment the following primary and tertiary mitigation measures have been embedded into the design and construction management of the proposed development.
- Environmental design and mitigation for the Sizewell B relocated facilities works during Phase 0**
- 16.5.5 In line with the project programme set out in **Chapter 3** of this volume, it is anticipated that the first phase of the Sizewell B relocated facilities works, which is referred to as ‘Phase 0’, would be carried out pursuant to the planning permission granted by East Suffolk Council on 13 November 2019 (application ref. DC/19/1637/FUL). The second phase of the Sizewell B relocated facilities works would take place in Phases 1 and 2 in parallel with other DCO works due to take place at this time and would be carried out pursuant to the DCO.
- 16.5.6 Under the existing planning permission, mitigation measures for effects on terrestrial historic environment that occur as a result of Phase 0 of the Sizewell B relocated facilities works include the following:
- Primary mitigation: measures embedded within the design to reduce the visibility of new buildings in views of and from heritage assets, avoiding the archaeologically sensitive area at the southern end of Pillbox field and retaining the pillbox in Pillbox field.
  - Secondary mitigation: a scheme of archaeological works to allow for further investigation and recording of the archaeological remains within Pillbox Field, Coronation Wood and the photographic recording of buildings of heritage interest within the Sizewell B site (if demolished as part of Phase 0).
- 16.5.7 Details of these measures are provided in Chapter 8 of the Sizewell B relocated facilities ES (refer to **Volume 1, Appendix 2A**).
- 16.5.8 It is anticipated that the mitigation measures summarised above would largely be in place or under way by the end of Phase 0. However, in order

to allow for this mitigation to be implemented in Phases 1 and 2, if required (or if the works are instead carried out entirely under the DCO – see **Volume 2, Appendix 6A** of the ES), these measures have also been incorporated within the DCO.

b) Environmental design and mitigation for the DCO

i. Primary mitigation

- 16.5.9** Primary mitigation is often referred to as ‘embedded mitigation’ and includes modifications to the location or design to mitigate impacts; these measures become an inherent part of the proposed development. A summary of the key design decisions made to mitigate effects on heritage assets is provided.
- 16.5.10** Hedgerows to the site boundary will be retained and strengthened where possible, and where appropriate, planting, bunding and acoustic fencing will be installed to minimise visibility of, and noise from, the proposed construction works and development.
- 16.5.11** Changes to setting arising from visibility and noise from construction works and visibility of the proposed development can give rise to loss of or harm to heritage significance. Detailed design and landscaping will seek to minimise perceptual change to setting, wherever practicable, for example, construction and operational site lighting will be designed to minimise light spill. Further details are outlined in the **Lighting Management Plan (LMP)** for construction and operational sites provided in **Appendix 2B** of **Volume 2** of the **ES**. Further details on the design and management of landscape are set out in the **Sizewell C Main Development Site Design and Access Statement** (Doc Ref. 8.1) and the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 8.2). Generic measures to reduce noise and visibility of construction works of the proposed development, and to ensure that its composition in views from out with the site view remains coherent are set out in the **Sizewell C Main Development Site Design and Access Statement**.
- 16.5.12** A number of design changes have been made to reduce the impact on Leiston Abbey (second site). Between Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultation, the proposed T-junction for access to the temporary construction area was replaced with a roundabout, offset from the B1122, with associated landscape screening in order to reduce visual impacts on the Abbey, further discussed in **Chapter 6** of this volume of the **ES**.
- 16.5.13** Furthermore, as described in **Chapter 6** of this volume of the **ES**, between Stage 2 and Stage 3 consultation, borrow pit field 1 was discounted, and campus option 2ii chosen, both of which decrease development west of

Eastbridge Road thereby increasing the distance between Leiston Abbey and the proposed development, and reducing potential noise and visual impacts. Relocation of the sports facilities off-site would also reduce noise and lighting impacts on the Abbey complex. The campus blocks would be orientated west-east to minimise the extent of the elevations/built mass along the western edge of the site closest to Leiston Abbey.

- 16.5.14 Re-masterplanning of option 2ii between Stage 2 and Stage 3 consultation has also reduced the maximum height of buildings from 5-storeys to 4-storeys, further decreasing visual impacts from the Abbey complex.
- 16.5.15 The campus design incorporates a series of landscape buffers in order to enhance screening to the west of the site. These comprise a 4.5m strip between Eastbridge Road and the re-aligned bridleway, a 4m landscape buffer between the re-aligned bridleway and security zone, and a further 2.5m planted strip between the security zone and the campus access road. For further information see the **Sizewell C Main Development Site Design and Access Statement** (Doc Ref. 8.1).
- 16.5.16 Mitigation of adverse change during construction within the setting of Upper Abbey farm would be provided by the retention, as far as possible, of existing mature tree and hedgerow planting and structures which contribute to significance, with the repair, replacement or removal of detracting elements of the farmyard. These measures would provide visual screening and retain the perceptual integrity of the farmyard and house as a discrete unit. This planting would be maintained in the operational phase, screening permanent elements of the proposed development and maintaining the coherence of the farmyard unit; a discernible enhancement to the asset.
- 16.5.17 Re-masterplanning of option 2ii, between Stage 2 and 3 consultation, has enabled the access road to Upper Abbey Farm and adjacent hedgerows to be retained (these were truncated in the Stage 2 option 2ii layout). The emergency equipment store and Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant have been located as far as possible to screen views from the Grade II listed Farmhouse and Barn, through use of adjacent buildings and existing vegetation. Surface finishes will be chosen to fit as far as possible with the architectural language of the existing vernacular.
- 16.5.18 The institution of a direct off-road link between the two Leiston Abbey sites, provided by the diversion of the Suffolk Coastal Path, would restore connectivity between these sites, and provide a discernible enhancement to the historic interests of these sites. This link would be retained after the completion of the construction phase, to provide lasting enhancements to these heritage assets.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- 16.5.19 The proposed WMZ to the north of Goose Hill would be screened through landscape bunds and tree planting, to minimise any visual intrusion of the development during the construction phase on the setting of the Leiston Abbey (first site). The WMZ will be removed, and plantation woodland restored, following the completion of the construction phase. This would remove any visual change in the setting of Leiston Abbey (first site).
- 16.5.20 Design iterations (based on iterative environmental assessments) have resulted in the adoption of an **Integrated Transport Strategy**, and the removal of the proposals for a jetty at Sizewell C. This would reduce any visual change in the settings of heritage assets which draw significance from views along the coast, particularly the Aldeburgh and Southwold Conservation Areas.
- 16.5.21 Construction phase change to the setting of heritage assets would largely be reversed on the completion of construction activities in the temporary construction area, and LEEIE, and the subsequent removal of temporary structures and surfaces associated with construction. Landscape restoration would respond to local historic landscape character. For further information see the **Sizewell C Main Development Site Design and Access Statement** (Doc Ref. 8.1).
- ii. **Tertiary mitigation**
- 16.5.22 Tertiary mitigation will be required regardless of any EIA assessment, as it is imposed, for example, as a result of legislative requirements and/or standard sectoral practices.
- 16.5.23 The **Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)** (Doc Ref. 8.11) sets out best-practice measures for the reduction of construction disturbance, such as noise . Further details of these measures are provided in **Chapter 11** of this volume.
- 16.5.24 NPS EN-1 requires mitigation of any loss of archaeological interest through development. Consequently, archaeological mitigation may be required in cases where effects are assessed as less than significant. For the purposes of this assessment, all archaeological mitigation is considered as secondary mitigation, as it would need to be secured via a Development Consent Order requirement, and discussed within **section 16.7** of this chapter. The effects of any loss of archaeological significance presented in **section 16.6** below are considered in the absence of secondary mitigation.

## 16.6 Assessment

### a) Introduction

- 16.6.1 This section presents the findings of the Terrestrial Historic Environment Assessment for the construction and operation of the proposed development.
- 16.6.2 This section identifies any likely significant effects that are predicted to occur, and **section 16.7** of this chapter then highlights any secondary mitigation and monitoring measures that are proposed to minimise any adverse effects (if required).
- 16.6.3 The assessment of effects associated with off-site developments, including off-site sports facilities at Leiston, fen meadow compensation sites south of Benhall and east of Halesworth and, if required, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area (Westleton), is set out in **Appendix 16F** of this volume where relevant.

### b) Construction

#### i. Sizewell B relocated facilities effects

- 16.6.4 An assessment of terrestrial historic environment effects that would occur due to Sizewell B relocated facilities works is presented in Chapter 8 of the Sizewell B relocated facilities ES (that ES is provided in full at **Volume 1, Appendix 2A**). ‘Phase 0’ (description contained in **Chapter 3** of this volume) would occur prior to the implementation of the DCO.
- 16.6.5 Likely significant effects, before mitigation, of the Sizewell B relocated facilities works that would occur during Phase 0 comprise the disturbance of archaeological remains at Pillbox Field. These are discussed further in the main development site assessment section below.
- 16.6.6 Phase 0 effects would also include disturbance to potential archaeological remains in Coronation Wood (if present), impacts on historic landscape (including important hedgerows), change to the setting of the pillbox in Pillbox Field and loss of existing Sizewell B buildings of heritage interest (if demolished during Phase 0). These effects are discussed further in the main development site assessment section below and are assessed as **not significant** before and after mitigation.
- 16.6.7 Phase 1 effects would comprise demolition of buildings of heritage interest within the existing Sizewell B power station (if not demolished during Phase 0) and impacts on historic landscape character and the setting of the pillbox in Pillbox field. These are assessed as **not significant** before and after

mitigation as described further in the main development site assessment section below.

- 16.6.8** A summary of the effect categories associated with the Sizewell B relocated facilities works is provided in **section 16.8** of this chapter.

- ii. Main development site construction (including the Sizewell B relocated facilities)

#### Direct effects on heritage assets

##### *Archaeological heritage assets*

- 16.6.9** Intrusive groundworks would take place across the site, including topsoil stripping and sub-soil disturbance during the construction of the proposed development. Invasive works of this nature would adversely affect any surviving sub-surface archaeological remains, reducing or removing their ability to be further interpreted, resulting in the loss of archaeological interest.

- 16.6.10** DBA, geophysical survey and evaluation trenching have suggested the presence of previously unrecorded archaeological remains in the site boundary that form elements of asset groups of low to medium heritage significance. These groups that are either known to be present, or can be reasonably predicted on the basis of the existing evidence, are assessed as follows.

##### *Prehistoric occupation of the Sandlings and the wetland edge*

- 16.6.11** The construction of the proposed development is most likely to impact remains associated with prehistoric activity in the north and north-west of the site, particularly around Upper Abbey Farm, and on the land east and south-east of Lower Abbey Farm. The temporary construction area in the vicinity of Upper Abbey Farm, therefore, has the greatest potential to impact on prehistoric remains. Ground works associated with this part of the development, particularly the construction of the accommodation campus and the excavation of borrow pits, are likely to remove all archaeological material.

- 16.6.12** The construction of the proposed water resource storage area south-east of Lower Abbey Farm, being on the wetland edge, also has the potential to affect archaeological remains. This land has been subject to geophysical survey, but not evaluation trenching to date. Remains dating to the medieval period are anticipated to be present. Additionally, being on the wet-land edge, an environment known to have been used by prehistoric peoples, and with conditions conducive to archaeological survival, it is

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

possible that archaeological remains would be impacted here. Ground reduction for the creation of the water resource storage area would likely remove all archaeological evidence.

- 16.6.13 While evaluation has identified a concentration of prehistoric activity in the north and north-west of the site, it has also identified activity extending across the whole of the site. Intrusive works elsewhere in the site, therefore, have the potential to remove archaeological evidence relating to prehistoric activity.
- 16.6.14 In the vicinity of Upper Abbey farm, where these remains are of low to medium heritage significance, the likely total loss of archaeological remains would be an effect of high magnitude, resulting in a major adverse effect, which, in the absence of further mitigation, would be **significant**.
- 16.6.15 Elsewhere in the site, remains of field systems and peripheral elements of settlement of low heritage significance are likely to be partially or wholly removed. It is unlikely, however, that complete field systems or settlements would be lost, which would be an effect of medium magnitude, resulting in a minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

*Roman settlement and agricultural activity*

- 16.6.16 Evidence of Romano-British activity within the site is confined to the higher ground associated with the south-west/north-east ridge between Old Abbey Farm and Upper Abbey Farm in the west of the site, and on the western end of Goose Hill, in the fields of Barn Piece and Captain Rye, in the north of the site. The settlement activity identified on the ridge, in East Lawn, and possibly Front Meadow, is likely to be affected by the construction of the substation, and the main site entrance hub. The impact on archaeological deposits will vary depending on the depth of ground works associated with elements of these developments and would range from total removal within the footprint of buildings to little or no effect in areas outside of core development areas.
- 16.6.17 Romano-British agricultural activity further east, around Goose Hill, is likely to be affected by the construction of the temporary haul road, the site access road, WMZ, and temporary plant such as the concrete batching facility. The impact on archaeological remains will vary according to the depth and scale of ground works associated with these elements of the proposed development, but may involve the removal of elements of a wider Romano-British agricultural system.
- 16.6.18 In the vicinity of the ridge between Old Abbey Farm and Upper Abbey Farm, and particularly in East Lawn, where settlement remains are of medium heritage significance, total loss of archaeological remains would be

an impact of high magnitude, resulting in a major adverse effect, which, in the absence of further mitigation, would be **significant**.

- 16.6.19** On the western end of Goose Hill, remains of field systems of low heritage significance are likely to be partially, or wholly removed. It is unlikely, however, that complete field systems would be lost, which would be an impact of medium magnitude, resulting in a minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

*Early medieval settlement*

- 16.6.20** Early medieval settlement activity at LEEIE, principally postholes, property boundary ditches, and sunken featured buildings, is likely to be affected by the proposed construction support area. The magnitude to which archaeological remains would be affected would vary depending on the ground works required for the different elements of this part of the development. It is possible that total removal within the site would occur. The remains are, however, located close to the site boundary and it is possible that the early medieval settlement extends further to the north.

- 16.6.21** In the northern part of the LEEIE, where these remains are of medium heritage significance, it is possible that total loss of settlement remains would occur within the site. It is not known whether the early medieval settlement extends beyond the site boundary, so this change may represent the total loss of the settlement, an impact which would be of a high magnitude. This would be a major adverse effect, which, without further mitigation, would be **significant**.

*Medieval agricultural and industrial exploitation*

- 16.6.22** Medieval activity, namely ditches, pits, trackways, and kilns, is likely to be encountered in the vicinity of the historic settlements of Sizewell and Leiston, and associated with Leiston Abbey.

- 16.6.23** The proposed development is likely to have the greatest effect on remains associated with activity surrounding the villages of Sizewell and Leiston in the south-east of the site, where the relocated Sizewell B facilities are proposed (Pillbox Field), and in the south-west at the LEEIE proposed construction support area. The impact on archaeological remains will vary according to the depth and scale of ground works associated with these elements of the proposed development, but may involve the total removal of field boundary ditches, pits, trackways, and kilns, particularly within the footprint of proposed buildings.

- 16.6.24** Remains associated with Leiston Abbey are likely to be more focussed in the north and north-west of the site, particularly to the west of Upper Abbey

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

Farm, where the accommodation campus is proposed. Remains relating to the Abbey are, therefore, likely to be affected by the construction of the temporary construction area, particularly the accommodation campus, the main site entrance hub, and the borrow pits. Groundworks associated with some elements of these proposals, especially the accommodation blocks and the borrow pits, are likely to be extensive and result in the total removal of archaeological features, such as ditches and pits.

- 16.6.25 At Pillbox Field and the LEEIE, where remains of agricultural and industrial activity are of medium heritage significance, partial or total loss of remains would occur. However, elements of this medieval landscape would survive both within and without the site, which would be an impact of medium magnitude, resulting in a moderate adverse effect, which would be **significant**.
- 16.6.26 Where demonstrably associated with Leiston Abbey, likely in the vicinity of Upper Abbey Farm, remains may be of medium heritage significance, and are likely to be wholly removed. Remains associated with the Abbey are likely to survive outside the site, however, which would be an impact of medium magnitude, resulting in a moderate adverse effect, which, in the absence of further mitigation, would be **significant**.

*Medieval settlement*

- 16.6.27 The proposed works and realignment of Lover's Lane at LEEIE have the potential to affect medieval settlement remains of low heritage significance, namely domestic plots along Lover's Lane. The impact on archaeological remains would vary according to the extent of groundworks associated with these proposed elements of the development, but may involve the total removal of those elements of the archaeological remains which fall within the site.
- 16.6.28 The impact at LEEIE would be permanent and of a high magnitude, resulting from the total loss of archaeological interest to an asset of low heritage significance. This would be a moderate adverse effect and without further mitigation, this would be **significant**.

*Post-medieval agricultural improvement of the Sandlings and coastal marshes*

- 16.6.29 Evidence of agricultural improvements dating to the post-medieval period, of low heritage significance, have been identified across the site and include ditches, drains, and a barn site. Intrusive groundworks are likely to affect these features and may result in their total loss.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

---

- 16.6.30** This impact would be permanent and of a high magnitude, resulting from the total loss of archaeological interest of an asset of low heritage significance. This would be a moderate adverse effect, which, without further mitigation, would be **significant**.

*20th century military activity*

- 16.6.31** It is possible that elements of the beach landing facility would disturb archaeological features within the beach; these would be restricted to disturbance of partly dismantled WWII anti-invasion obstacles, which are of low heritage significance.
- 16.6.32** Effects on any potential remains below MHWL have been considered within **Chapter 23** of this volume.
- 16.6.33** Borrow pits and the temporary haul road within the temporary construction area have the potential to affect remains associated with military use of this part of the site, certainly during WWII but possibly also during the First World War, as suggested by the presence of a First World War military uniform button.
- 16.6.34** This impact would be permanent and of high magnitude, resulting in the total loss of archaeological interest on an asset of low heritage significance. This would be a moderate adverse effect, which, without further mitigation, would be **significant**.

*Deposits of geoarchaeological interest*

- 16.6.35** Deposits of geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental significance would be subject to disturbance localised to the main platform area, leaving extensive deposits out with the main platform area undisturbed in situ. There would be total loss of archaeological interest of peats within the permanent development site, although peats in the channel to the west of Sizewell B would remain in situ.
- 16.6.36** Removal of the peats within the main platform, which are considered to be of medium heritage significance, would be permanent and of medium magnitude. This would be a moderate adverse effect, which, without further mitigation, would be **significant**.

*Previously unrecorded archaeological remains*

- 16.6.37** Colluvial deposits were identified across the site during evaluation trenching, in discrete and localized areas, the result of ploughing and natural processes. These were, in places, found to have preserved earlier features.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 16.6.38 Windblown sand deposits were identified in specific parts of the site during evaluation trenching. On the southern and eastern facing slopes of the ridge-running south-west/north-east close to Old Abbey Farm, these deposits were found to seal archaeological contexts beneath. It is possible that similar deposits survive elsewhere on the site, where windblown sand has been identified.
- 16.6.39 Many of the former field boundaries within the site boundary have been removed and infilled, although some are visible either as cropmarks (caused by differential growth of crops over archaeological features), or soilmarks (differential subsoils brought to the surface during ploughing) on aerial photographs, or as magnetic anomalies within the geophysical surveys.
- 16.6.40 There is a potential for further, previously unrecorded archaeological heritage assets to be present within the site within areas which have not been surveyed by evaluation trenching. This includes areas where access has not been practicable as a result of ground conditions, such as areas which are currently wooded, or were under crop at the time of survey, or areas where access could not be agreed. Given the significance of known heritage assets within the site, it is anticipated that these would primarily be of low heritage significance, with the potential that some remains could be more significant.
- 16.6.41 Intrusive groundworks would take place across the site, including topsoil stripping and sub-soil disturbance during the construction of the proposed development. The construction would include further excavation for utilities and services, surface water drainage, borrow pits, a water resource storage area, a water detention area and sub-soil disturbance for road access. Invasive works of this nature would adversely affect any surviving sub-surface archaeological remains, reducing or removing their ability to be further interpreted, resulting in the loss of archaeological interest.
- 16.6.42 Any archaeological remains, which would be of low to medium heritage significance, depending on their nature and level of preservation, within the site boundary would be disturbed, if not removed entirely, by the proposed development. This would give rise to a high magnitude of impact which would, in the absence of further mitigation, result in a moderate to major adverse effect, which would be **significant**.

**Effects arising through change to the setting of heritage assets**

- 16.6.43 Change to setting would occur during the construction period. In this case, the construction works would be of sufficient duration, and present a sufficient increase in magnitude of change over those occurring during the

operation of the proposed development that these effects need to be considered separately.

- 16.6.44** A list of scoped in heritage assets is provided in **section 16.4** below.

Scheduled Monument (SM 1014520), Grade I and Grade II listed buildings and associated non-designated structures at Leiston Abbey (LB 1215753, LB 1215754, LB 1216380 and LB 1268290)

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.45** During the early phase of construction, the development of the accommodation campus and site access to the north-east of the asset group, primarily the proposed roundabout, main site entrance and associated revisions to street lighting, would introduce new visible and perceptual elements to the setting of the asset group. As work progresses, at-height construction activity, and upper elements of the accommodation campus, may become visible from elevated viewpoints in the Abbey ruins (SM 1014520 and LB 1215753), and from upper floors of the Retreat House (LB 1215754,) and Guesten Hall (LB 1268290), as glimpsed views between intervening architecture and planting.
- 16.6.46** Construction phase impacts would vary across the asset, with effects being most noticeable within parts of the Abbey ruins. During Phase 1a (initial site earthworks lasting a few months), construction noise would be greatest and would detract to a degree from the understanding of the abbey as a quiet place, however in subsequent phases noise would reduce and in Phases 3/4 any increase would be very limited. Further details of noise levels are provided in **Chapter 11** of this volume. Any effects arising from construction noise would occur early in the construction programme and persist in the medium-term.
- 16.6.47** The construction of the proposed roundabout, main site entrance, and the accommodation campus early within the construction phase, would mean that visitors travelling by road along the B1122 (Abbey Road) from the north would have to pass elements of the construction infrastructure throughout most of the construction phase, although in these close views, visibility of the more intrusive elements of the works would be effectively screened by planting to the site boundary. Similarly, elements of the proposed roundabout would likely be visible to those approaching from the south, at the point at which the Abbey access road branches from the B1122 (Abbey Road).
- 16.6.48** In later stages of the construction phase, some elements of the construction of the Sizewell C power station, primarily at-height construction activity, would be visible against the horizon, particularly from elevated viewpoints

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

within the asset group as illustrated by Representative Viewpoint R8, included in **Figure 13.9.08** and **Figure 13.10.33**.

- 16.6.49 Any change would be limited by the retention of the arable land between the asset group, and the B1122 (Abbey Road), which would serve to maintain a strong perceptual buffer between the proposed development and the asset group. This would also ensure that the relationships between the individual elements of the asset group were not compromised, retaining the core contribution of the setting to both architectural, and historic interests.
- 16.6.50 In general, these new elements are unlikely to be of a magnitude that would change the perception of the asset group as within a rural, agricultural context, but they would diminish this contribution of the setting to the heritage significance of the asset group. These effects would be exacerbated at night by lighting to the road junction and the construction campus. Visibly and audibly increased road traffic and construction activities would reduce the sense of seclusion and calm.
- 16.6.51 Visibility of construction of the proposed development would not detract from views of the asset in which its architectural interest is best appreciated. Particularly, the view along the bridleway from Abbey Lane to the south, the view of the ruins from the approaches to the south along Abbey Road, and from the north close to Theberton House, nor would it detract from architectural interest in views of the Abbey ruins from within the monument from where visibility is restricted by the ruins, and intervening planting, and the viewer's focus is on the detail of the ruins in the foreground rather than the more general context.
- 16.6.52 The offsetting of the proposed roundabout and main site entrance from the B1122 (Abbey Road) reduces visibility of the development as the viewer approaches from the south. Additionally, due to its positioning, there would be no juxtaposed views of the asset group, and the roundabout on the approach from the north along the B1122 (Abbey Road).
- 16.6.53 The confinement of heavy construction traffic to the north of the proposed roundabout would reduce the impact on the sense of approach to a historic site, preserving the revealed views of the Abbey ruins, and appreciation of its rural setting for visitors approaching from the direction of Leiston in the south. Furthermore, the audible change arising from construction-related traffic movements will be reduced from within the asset group.
- 16.6.54 Intervening hedgerows and mature trees, supplemented by additional planting, will create layers of screening in views from the asset group towards the accommodation campus, and construction activity at the

Sizewell C power station. This screening would be complementary to the existing landscape character, and would reflect the current appearance of the horizon as broken by trees. The accommodation blocks would be placed end-on to these views to reduce their perceptual massing, and allow for these structures to better fit into this broken horizon.

- 16.6.55** Groundworks associated with the construction of the accommodation campus, roundabout, and site entrance could also potentially harm buried archaeological remains associated with the asset group, particularly the non-designated field system. However, these comprise relatively minor and peripheral elements of the monastic landholding, such as former field boundaries, and would not discernibly affect the informative potential of the designated assets.
- 16.6.56** These changes would be greatest during the construction of the accommodation campus, main site entrance, and roundabout, and would decrease as these works are completed and screening planting matures. However, changes would persist throughout the construction period, with a discernible reduction in magnitude of change at the completion of the construction programme.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.57** The list entry for St Mary's Abbey (LB 1215753) refers to the above-ground remains, which are also part of the scheduled monument (SM 1014520), and these are considered here as a single asset. Perceptual change arising from the proposed construction would be greatest here, with changes to views from the asset, noise environment and the approach to the asset from Eastbridge and Leiston. There are parts of the asset, however, where these changes would not be readily perceived. Where perceived, this would give rise to a discernible loss of historic interest. This would be greatest during the early stages of the construction period, but would continue at a reduced level throughout the construction phase as the focus of construction activity moves eastwards. Change to this heritage asset, which is of high heritage significance, would give rise to less than substantial harm to heritage significance, and would be medium-term temporary. This is assessed as an impact of low magnitude, which would give rise to a moderate adverse effect which would be **significant**.

- 16.6.58** Perceptibility of the construction of the proposed development from, and in views of the Guesten Hall (LB 1268290), would be limited as a result of screening from the Barn (LB 1216380) and the surrounding shelter planting. Any effect on this asset would, therefore, primarily arise from the sequential visibility or audibility of change as the viewer approached, or left the asset. This would result in a slight loss of historic interest. Any impact to this

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

asset, which is of high heritage significance, would be of a very low magnitude, with a resulting minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

- 16.6.59 Similarly, perceptibility of the construction of the proposed development from, and in views of the Barn (LB 1216380), would be limited. Any effect on this asset would, therefore, arise from the sequential visibility or audibility of change as the viewer approached, or left the asset. This would result in a slight loss of historic interest. This asset is of high heritage significance, and impact would be of a very low magnitude, with a resulting minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.
- 16.6.60 The proposed construction works would not be visible from the Retreat House (LB 1215754) at ground level, and would be visible only from the upper storeys of the house. In these views, visibility would be limited as the views would be through the Abbey ruins. Any effect on this asset would, therefore, arise from the sequential visibility, or audibility of change, as the viewer approached or left the asset. This would result in a slight loss of historic interest. Any impact to this asset, which is of high heritage significance, would be of a very low magnitude, with a resulting minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.
- 16.6.61 The effect of the Sizewell C Project considering effects of the main development site taken cumulatively with the green rail route are considered further at **Volume 10, Chapter 2** of the **ES**.

[Scheduled Monument \(SM 1015687\) at Leiston Abbey \(first site\) with later chapel and pillbox](#)

**Predicted change**

- 16.6.62 During the early phases of construction, predicted change will be limited, with groundworks associated with site preparation screened from the asset by intervening topography and existing planting, namely Goose Hill and the associated 19th century woodland plantation at Sizewell Belts.
- 16.6.63 As construction progresses, at-height construction activity followed by the partially built upper elements of the proposed development, principally the turbine halls, reactor buildings and the National Grid overhead line connection, will become visible in views from the asset to the south. The buildings would be discernibly closer to the asset than Sizewell B, but would remain contained beyond Goose Hill and the woodland plantation, maintaining the sense of separation between the asset, and the proposed development, and preserving its coastal marshland context. During construction, the appearance of the proposed development would be changing and elements, such as cranes would become prominently visible,

drawing the viewer's eye in views of construction activity for the proposed development from the asset, and in views of the asset.

**16.6.64** Views to the asset from the approach from Eastbridge would, during the construction phase, gradually include the proposed development. They would be discernibly closer than the current Sizewell B station, but partially screened by topography and woodland planting. On this approach, the proposed development would be on the southern periphery of views of the asset. In contrast, in approaches from the north, views of the asset would, as with the existing Sizewell B, be juxtaposed with the proposed development. The approach to the asset from the south along the Suffolk Coast Path will be suspended for periods during the construction phase, removing the appreciation of the asset from this access route entirely. Access along the path from the north will be retained.

**16.6.65** Construction activity associated with the proposed water resource storage area would be encountered on the approach to the asset from Eastbridge, with activity being both visible and audible during excavation work. This would alter the perception of entering a secluded, rural landscape appropriate for a monastic establishment, but would occur for a relatively limited period at an early stage of the construction programme.

**16.6.66** Visibility of the proposed development in views from the area around the asset are illustrated at Representative Viewpoints R14 (Minsmere Sluice), R16 (Whin Hill, Minsmere) and R17 (Dunwich Heath, Coast Guard Cottages), which are included at **Figures 13.9.14, 13.9.16, 13.9.17, 13.10.58, 13.10.63 and 13.10.68**.

**16.6.67** Construction activity relating to the beach landing facility would be screened by the sea wall, contributing no change to the heritage significance of the asset.

#### *Significance of effect*

**16.6.68** No change to the archaeological interest of the asset would occur.

**16.6.69** By being prominently visible in views from the asset and juxtaposed in views of the chapel ruins from the north, and the approaches from Eastbridge and the north, the proposed development, and associated construction activities would detract slightly from the appreciation of the architectural and historic interests of the asset.

**16.6.70** Change to the asset, which is of high heritage significance, would give rise less than substantial harm to heritage significance resulting from the diminution of architectural and historic interests which would be medium-

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

term and temporary. This would be an impact of medium magnitude, which would give rise to a major adverse effect, which would be **significant**.

**Grade II listed buildings and associated non-designated structures at Upper Abbey Farm (LB 1216394 and LB 1216655)***Predicted change*

- 16.6.71 During the early phases of construction, an emergency equipment store and a CHP are proposed at the farm. Adjacent to the farm, to the south, the main site entrance hub, comprising car parks, set down areas, site offices, bus pick-up/drop off and parking, and a sub-station are proposed and, to the west, an accommodation campus will be developed. To the east of Bridleway 19, the existing agricultural fields will be used as a temporary materials storage area and as borrow pits. Within the area beyond the immediate surroundings of the farmyard, the existing agricultural landscape would be replaced by construction activity. This activity would generate visual and audible intrusion, contributing to the severance of the link between the farm buildings and their agricultural context.
- 16.6.72 Construction of the emergency equipment store, CHP plant, main site entrance hub, sub-station, accommodation campus, roundabout and site entrance could potentially harm buried archaeological remains associated with the asset group. Groundworks within the main cluster of farm buildings will be limited, and the impact on potential archaeological remains associated with this is likely to be minimal.
- 16.6.73 These changes would primarily affect the historic interests of the asset. The viewer would still be able to appreciate both the architectural interests of the individual buildings within the asset group, and the overall composition and functional layout of the farmyard, although the loss of connectivity to lanes and fields adjacent, and the visibility of new structures means that this interest would also be reduced. The archaeological interests of the individual structures and the farmyard as a whole, would remain largely unchanged.
- 16.6.74 These changes would be greatest during the earliest phase of construction, when the accommodation campus, roundabout, main site entrance hub, emergency equipment store, CHP plant, and sub-station are being built, and can be anticipated to reduce slightly as these elements of the construction works are completed and as borrow pits are worked out and backfilled. However, changes will persist throughout the construction period, while the storage area and accommodation campus remain in use.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.75 Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216394), the Barn (LB 1216655) and associated curtilage structures would be retained within a discrete farmstead setting and repaired where necessary, preserving their structural integrity and the viewer's ability to understand their functional relationships and the architectural composition of the farmstead. The predicted changes would, however, result in a discernible loss of historic interest as a result of the development of agricultural land, which would sever functional, and tenurial links to the surrounding landscape during the construction period. Changes may also give rise to a slight loss of archaeological interest through disturbance of related archaeological remains. Any such remains that contribute to archaeological interest are, however, likely to be of limited heritage significance and confined to the existing farmstead, which would not be extensively disturbed.
- 16.6.76 Change at Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216394), an asset of high heritage significance, during construction would be medium-term temporary, and give rise to less than substantial harm to heritage significance resulting from the diminution of historic and archaeological interest. This would be an impact of medium magnitude, a major adverse effect which would be **significant**.
- 16.6.77 Change at the Barn north of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216655), an asset of high heritage significance, during construction would be medium-term temporary, and give rise to less than substantial harm to heritage significance resulting from the diminution of historic and archaeological interest. This would be an impact of medium magnitude, a major adverse effect which would be **significant**.

**Change to Setting of Pillbox in Pillbox Field (LCS112)**

- 16.6.78 The **Sizewell B relocated facilities ES**, included in **Volume 1, Appendix 2A** of the **ES**, assessed effects on the pillbox in Pillbox Field as of short-term temporary, and of medium magnitude. During the construction period, at-height works would be visible to varying degrees behind the existing Sizewell A and B power stations, and associated planting. These works would be seen entirely in the context of these structures, and while clearly visible would give rise to a limited change to setting. While the magnitude of impact would not increase, its duration would be increased to medium-term temporary. Consequently, this impact on an asset of low heritage significance is assessed as of medium magnitude, a minor effect that would be **not significant**.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED****Grade II Listed Cottage 450m south-west of Upper Abbey Farmhouse  
(Abbey Cottage – LB 1216395)***Predicted change*

- 16.6.79 The Cottage (LB 1216395) would be located close to the proposed roundabout and main site entrance plaza. These would remain relatively well-screened from construction views due to existing, and supplementary intervening planting, although there would be increased noise from vehicle movements and construction activity. Views to the north from the asset would be affected by the construction of the roundabout, and its associated lighting. The construction of the roundabout would be visible on the approach to the Cottage along the B1122 (Abbey Road). However, the cottage would remain in a discernibly rural context.
- 16.6.80 During construction, Eastbridge Road will be diverted. This will result in the asset no longer being accessed via a through-road but a private drive, although the route of the access will remain the same. This would isolate the access to the asset from construction traffic and activity, contributing to the rural context. However, the position of the asset on the junction of historic roads would be removed.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.81 Predicted changes would result in a slightly discernible loss of historic interest, resulting from changes to the approach to the asset which would affect the rural context and the appreciation of the position of the asset on the junction of historic roads. There would be no change to architectural interest.
- 16.6.82 Change at the Cottage 450m south-west of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216395), which is of high heritage significance, would be medium-term temporary and would give rise to less than substantial harm to heritage significance resulting from the diminution of historic interest. This is assessed as an impact of low magnitude, a moderate adverse effect which would be **significant**.

**Grade II Listed Potter's Farmhouse (LB 1228267)***Predicted change*

- 16.6.83 Early in the construction phase, activity at the accommodation campus would be partially screened by the existing shelter planting. As construction progresses, at-height activity and the taller elements of the campus, specifically the accommodation blocks, would become more visible, reducing the contribution of wider views to historic interest. New elements

of the proposed development would not, however be seen in juxtaposition with the asset, and the architectural interest of the asset, when seen in the context of the adjacent farm buildings, would be retained.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.84 Predicted changes would result from changes to views from the asset which would affect appreciation of its rural, agricultural context, diminishing historic interest, and no discernible loss of architectural interest would arise.
- 16.6.85 Change to the asset, which is of high heritage significance, would be medium-term temporary and would give rise to a limited harm to heritage significance resulting from the diminution of historic interest. This would be an impact of very low magnitude, a minor adverse effect which would be **not significant**.

[Grade II Listed The Watch House, Sizewell \(LB 1391360\)](#)

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.86 The earliest phases of construction are unlikely to be visible from the Watch House, being obscured behind the existing Sizewell A and B stations and associated shelter belts. As construction progresses, some construction activities, principally at-height construction, and the partially-built turbine halls, reactor buildings and National Grid overhead line connection would become visible, beyond and around the existing Sizewell A and B stations. Whilst the majority of the construction work would be hidden behind the existing Sizewell A station, construction activity would present a more cluttered and busy appearance. However, this change would not affect the contribution of the setting to either historical, or architectural interest.
- 16.6.87 There would be some visibility of marine operations from the Watch House, but these operations would be infrequent and limited in duration and would be seen in the context of the existing marine structures at Sizewell A.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.88 These changes would be incremental, and would present a limited magnitude of change to the asset, which is of high heritage significance, which would not adversely affect the contribution of the setting to significance. Consequently, no effect would arise.

Grade II listed buildings at Potter's Street crossroads (LB 1228263, LB 1228262, LB 1228265)

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.89 At Woodview (LB 1228265) and The Cottage (LB 1228262), construction activity would become visible during the earlier phases of construction, although visibility would be oblique and very restricted. Change associated with this development would be greatest during early phases of construction, but would persist, at a reduced scale throughout the construction period. Visibility from Flash Cottages (LB 1228263) would be precluded by intervening hedgerows.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.90 The limited perceptibility of the proposed development from these assets, which are of high heritage significance, would not give rise to any discernible reduction in architectural or historic interests, with their rural context being preserved. As a result, no effect would arise.

*Leiston Conservation Area*

- 16.6.91 The proposed development would not be visible at ground level from within the Leiston Conservation Area, and would be visible only in a small number of incidental views from upper storeys. These changes would not give rise to any loss of heritage significance. While the construction works would be progressively revealed as the viewer passed northwards along the B1120 Abbey Road out of the town, the area of non-designated urban development between this area and the Conservation Area would provide a clear perceptual break between the Conservation Area and the proposed development.

- 16.6.92 The existing rail line through Leiston passes approximately 100m north of the northern boundary of the Conservation Area. It would be used for construction traffic in the early years of construction while the green rail route is being built. While the individual trains would be discernible from the northern part of the Conservation Area, this would represent a continuation of an existing use and at the frequency predicted, rail traffic would be intermittent and transient.

- 16.6.93 It is anticipated that traffic movements in Leiston along the B1119 Saxmundham Road and B1122 Station Road will increase markedly during construction, with peak traffic increasing discernibly above present levels, although less so against the predicted reference case. This would mean that a change in the perception of those roads would arise, although not to the degree that traffic levels would be incongruous to the urban context.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 16.6.94** There would be limited harm to the heritage significance of the asset for a medium-term temporary period. This is assessed as a very low magnitude of impact, resulting in a minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

Conservation Area and Grade II listed buildings at Thorpeness

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.95** The construction of the proposed development would not be visible from the majority of the Conservation Area as a result of screening by the natural topography, planting and intervening buildings. It would also not be visible in views of the assets from within the Conservation Area.

- 16.6.96** During construction, higher elements of the proposed development would become visible as background elements, beyond the existing Sizewell A and B stations, in views from the south in which Thorpeness Mill (LB 1215702), the House in the Clouds (LB 1287261) and Westbar (LB 1287172) are visible. These elements of the development would also be visible in views from upper storeys of these assets, in views in which the existing Sizewell A and B stations are already prominent elements.

- 16.6.97** These views are illustrated at **Figure 13.9.21**.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.98** The character and significance of Thorpeness Conservation Area is determined primarily by the built form of the settlement within the Conservation Area, and is not generally perceptible in longer views towards the settlement, in which only the taller, landmark structures are visible. There would be no discernible change in the setting of the Thorpeness Conservation Area, which is of high heritage significance. No harm to heritage significance would arise, and no effect would arise. Any adverse impacts arising through change to setting should therefore be considered in terms of how they may affect the heritage significance of these structures individually.

- 16.6.99** The perception of the House in the Clouds (LB 1287261) as a prominent landmark would not be affected and the existing contrast with the dome of the Sizewell B station would be retained. In views from upper storeys of the House in the Clouds, the proposed development would be visible as an element of the existing power station complex at Sizewell; however, this would not detract from either the architectural or historic interest of the asset, which is of high heritage significance, and no effect would arise.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 16.6.100 Change in the setting of Thorpeness Mill (LB 1215702) and Westbar (LB 1287172), assets of high heritage significance which do not derive significance for their visibility on the horizon to the same degree, would not affect the heritage significance of these assets and no effect would arise.

**Non-designated coastguard cottages, Dunwich Heath**

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.101 Construction works associated with the proposed development would be prominently visible from the asset at a distance of approximately 3.5km. Works on the main construction area, including cranes, and National Grid overhead line connection would present a more cluttered, and busy appearance, which would present a sense of change in the setting of the asset. This would slightly affect the contribution of the setting to the historic interests of the asset, primarily by affecting the sense of seclusion, and would detract from the viewer's aesthetic appreciation of the asset, particularly when the cottages are viewed from the north, where the proposed development would be juxtaposed with the cottages against the horizon. There would be no loss of architectural interest. These effects are illustrated at **Figure 13.10.65-67** and discussed in **Chapter 13** of this volume at **Table 13.13**.

- 16.6.102 These changes would persist throughout the construction period, although in the early stages of site preparation, much of the work would be screened by the planting to the south of Minsmere, and as the buildings neared completion, the appearance of the proposed development would be less intrusive, reflecting the existing colour palette of the view.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.103 Change to the asset, which is of medium heritage significance, would be medium-term temporary, and result in an impact of low magnitude, deriving from a loss of historic interest, and the diminution of aesthetic appreciation. This would be a minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

**Conservation Area and Grade I, II and II\* listed buildings at Aldeburgh**

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.104 The vast majority of the individual listed buildings within the Conservation Area would be entirely unaffected by the proposed development as there is no intervisibility with the construction of the proposed development in views of, or from, most individual assets, and there will not be any audible change in the setting of these assets during the construction phase. Assets which may be affected comprise the Grade I listed Moot Hall (LB 1269716), the

Grade II\* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul (LB 1269731) and the Conservation Area as a whole.

- 16.6.105** During the earliest phases of construction, there is likely to be no effect to the Conservation Area or assets within, as construction activity will be screened by the existing Sizewell A and B power stations. As construction progresses, works on the main construction area, including cranes would become visible from the north end of the Moot Hall (LB 1269716), and in some views from Crag Walk to the south of the Moot Hall. The construction would be seen beyond the existing Sizewell A and B stations, at a distance of at least 7km. The changing appearance, and movement of cranes and the part-built structures, could present a more readily discernible, and potentially intrusive appearance, than the present Sizewell A and B power stations, which would present a sense of change in the setting of the asset. However, at the distance involved, and when seen through the strong vertical emphasis of the existing ‘heritage-style’ street lighting standards along Market Cross Place, any change would be difficult to discern and would not detract from the asset’s historic or architectural interests.
- 16.6.106** Any change in the setting of the Church of St Peter and St Paul (LB 1269731) would be discernible only in views from the church tower or in views of the town from Slaughden, in which the Church is the most readily discernible listed building. However, at the distances involved and seen though intervening strong vertical elements and behind the existing Sizewell A and B power stations, this is unlikely to affect the prominence of the Church in these views and there will be no discernible loss of historic interest. There would be no loss of architectural or archaeological interest.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.107** In all cases, where discernible change occurs in the setting of these assets, which are of high heritage significance, there would be no reduction in the architectural or historic interests of the assets, and consequently there would be no effect on the Aldeburgh Conservation Area or buildings within it.

Scheduled Monument and Grade II\* Listed Slaughden Martello Tower (SM 1006041 and LB 1269724)

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.108** During the earliest phases of construction, it is unlikely that any construction activity would be perceptible from the asset as it would be screened by topography, existing buildings and vegetation, and the Sizewell A and B stations. As construction progressed, at-height construction activity associated with the proposed development would

become visible beyond the existing Sizewell B station, and the upper elements of the part-built turbine halls and reactor buildings would gradually become visible. The appearance of cranes, and the buildings under construction, would present a more readily discernible, and potentially intrusive appearance, although for the vast majority of the time, and in most accessible views from the asset, these elements would be visible through the strong verticals of the stored boats on the spit, reducing their visual prominence. The distances involved would also significantly reduce the ability to discern any construction activity. These changes would persist through the construction period, but would appreciably decrease as construction neared completion. These changes would not discernibly affect the appreciation of the architectural interest of the asset, and would not diminish the contribution of the setting to historic interest. They would also not affect archaeological interest.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 16.6.109 Change here would not discernibly affect the heritage interests of the asset, which is of high heritage significance, and no effect would arise.

#### *Conservation Area and Grade I, II\* and II listed buildings and non-designated assets at Southwold*

#### *Predicted change*

- 16.6.110 The vast majority of the heritage assets within this group would not have any visibility towards the proposed development, and would consequently not be affected in any way. Other assets may be visible in simultaneous views with the proposed development, but the distance involved means that this visibility would be insufficient to give rise to any harm. Visibility of the proposed construction works would be clearest from the assets identified below, which have been considered in more detail:

- Southwold Pier;
- Southwold Conservation Area;
- Grade II listed Gun Hill Place (LB 1384353);
- Grade II listed Stone House (LB 1384354);
- Grade II listed The Watch House (LB 1384355); and
- Grade II listed The Old Water Tower (LB 1384310).

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.111 At the distances involved, the distant and incidental visibility of the proposed development would not detract from any appreciation of the architectural composition of the conservation area, which is of high heritage significance, and would not affect the generalised contribution of place and context provided by longer views to historic interests. There would consequently be no discernible impact on the heritage significance of the Southwold Conservation Area, and no effect would arise.
- 16.6.112 The Old Water Tower (LB 1384310), which is of high heritage significance, does not derive significance from visibility of the coast, and visibility of the proposed development would not affect heritage significance. Consequently, no effect would arise.
- 16.6.113 The proposed development would be visible in distant views to the south from Southwold Pier, and upper storeys of Gun Hill Place (LB 1384353), Stone House (LB 1384354), and The Watch House (LB 1384355) as an expansion of the existing power station complex at Sizewell. These changes would not affect any ability to appreciate the architectural interests of these buildings, which are of high heritage significance, and would not affect the contribution of place and context to historical interests. No effect would arise.
- 16.6.114 Other listed buildings within the Southwold Conservation Area, which are of high heritage significance, would have no, or very restricted, visibility of the proposed development and would not be affected in any way. No effect would arise.

**Scheduled Monument and Grade I Listed Orford Castle, with adjoining quarry and remains of 20th century look-out post (SM 1014860 and LB 1030873)***Predicted change*

- 16.6.115 During the earliest phases of construction, it is unlikely that any construction activity would be perceptible from the asset as it would be screened by topography, existing vegetation, and the Sizewell A and B stations. As construction progressed, upper elements of the proposed development, principally the turbine halls and reactor buildings, would become visible during the construction phase, at a distance of over 14km, as a very distant feature in the background of panoramic views from the roof of the keep, beyond the existing Sizewell A and B stations. The view in this direction is over the nearby houses, and primarily contributes to the appreciation of the historical relationship of the Castle to the town. At the separation involved, the visibility of additional visual clutter, such as cranes,

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

during construction would be very limited, and would not be sufficient to give rise to any increased effect. The proposed development would not be visible in any ground level views or views from the windows in the keep, and would not be visible in any views of the Castle.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.116 In that the proposed development would not result in the loss of any historic, architectural or archaeological interest to an asset of high heritage significance, no effect would arise.

Scheduled Monument and Grade II listed lighthouse and former military structures at Orford Ness (SM 1416933, LB 1392631, LB 1416866, LB 1416867, LB 1416868, LB 1416869)

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.117 During the earliest phases of construction, it is unlikely that any construction activity would be perceptible from the asset, as it would be screened by topography, existing vegetation, and the Sizewell A and B stations. As construction progressed, upper elements of the proposed development, principally the turbine halls and reactor buildings, would become visible during the construction phase, at a distance of between 12km and 16km, as a very distant feature in the background of panoramic views from some viewpoints on Orford Ness. The low elevation of potential viewpoints means that visibility would be partial and frequently precluded, and the prominence of the proposed development would be such that the viewer would have to actively search to see it. The massing of the emerging structures would be consistent with the existing Sizewell A and B stations, with which it would be seen. At the separation involved, the presence of additional visual clutter, such as cranes, during construction would not be sufficient to give rise to any effect.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.118 In that the proposed development would not result in the loss of any historic architectural or archaeological interest, to an asset of high heritage significance, no effect would arise.

*Effects arising through change to historic landscape character**Predicted change*

- 16.6.119 The works to enable the proposed development would, within the site boundary, result in the loss of all boundaries and some hedgerows of potential historic importance, and entirely change the use of land within the

site boundary. The existing hedgerows would be maintained on the perimeter of the development, where possible.

**16.6.120** The proposed realignment of the B1122 to facilitate the new roundabout and alterations to the course of Eastbridge Road and Lover's Lane, would affect the form of the landscape and alter historic boundaries.

**16.6.121** Construction activity would introduce new visual and audible elements to an otherwise agricultural landscape. This would affect historic and aesthetic interest within, and in, the immediate area of the proposed development.

#### **Significance of effect**

**16.6.122** Change resulting from the loss of archaeological, historic, and aesthetic interest would be medium-term temporary, and would result in a high magnitude impact to an asset of low heritage significance. This would give rise to a moderate adverse effect, which would be **significant**.

#### **Effects arising through change to historic seascape character**

##### *Predicted change*

**16.6.123** The proposed works would add further visible elements of an industrial character to the historic seascape character sub-area. While these would present a discernible change, and introduce an element of visual clutter, this would be in keeping with the existing historic seascape character, and would not erode the contrast between the modern, industrial buildings of the Sizewell power station complex, and the surrounding marshland and Sandlings, that provides the historic significance of the sub-area.

##### **Significance of effect**

**16.6.124** There will be no change to historic seascape character and no effect would arise.

#### **Inter-relationship effects**

**16.6.125** The archaeological remains on the site are not sensitive to changes predicted within this **ES** other than the direct disturbance considered in this chapter, and consequently no inter-relationship effect is anticipated.

**16.6.126** Any visual effects would arise as a result of effects on valued views, which represent a subset of the changes already considered within the assessments of effects, arising as a result of change to setting, and historic landscape character. Similarly changes in noise environment are already considered, insofar as these are appropriate, in the assessments of effects

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

arising as a result of change to setting. Therefore, the consideration of inter-relationship effects forms an inherent part of the assessment presented within this chapter.

**c) Operation****i. Direct effects on archaeological heritage assets**

- 16.6.127 Any ground disturbance and/ or removal of archaeological heritage assets within the site would have occurred during the construction phase, and no further effects are anticipated during the operation of the proposed development.

**ii. Effects arising through change to the setting of heritage assets**

Grade II listed buildings and associated non-designated structures at Upper Abbey Farm (LB 1216394 and LB 1216655)

***Predicted change***

- 16.6.128 Following construction, the emergency equipment store will be retained and the CHP plant used as a back-up generator. To the south of the farm, a sub-station used during construction will also be retained.
- 16.6.129 These buildings have been designed to minimise effects to heritage significance during both the construction, and operational phases. The design, materials, and form of the proposed emergency equipment store and generator will be in keeping with agricultural buildings of a similar size. The buildings will be positioned to maintain the two distinct clusters within the farm, and would utilise a separate access. Further, the buildings would be positioned so as to be sympathetic to the clustered character of the farm, creating a third cluster and yard to the west of the existing. This would be separated from the existing farm clusters by screening planting.
- 16.6.130 The open space to the south-west of the main farmyard and Farmhouse will be improved, enhancing the sense of green space immediately surrounding the Farmhouse.
- 16.6.131 The approach to the asset would be via the proposed roundabout and diverted access road. However, once the agricultural land has been restored, this would not detract from the historical interest of the asset as the rural approach would be maintained.
- 16.6.132 The reinstatement of agricultural land and heathland surrounding the farm would introduce slightly beneficial changes by restoring agricultural operations, which are more sympathetic to the historic context of the farm.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- 16.6.133 Visibility of the proposed development during operation are illustrated at **Figure 13.10.02-04**.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.134 The impact at Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216394), an asset of high heritage significance, would be neutral with limited harm arising from a slight diminution of historic interest from the presence of the emergency equipment store, and the back-up generator, and the changed appearance of the agricultural landscape around the farm being balanced by the preservation of the Barn, a key element of the farmhouse's setting and the reconnection of the farmhouse with the agricultural landscape. On balance, heritage significance would not be altered and no effect would arise.

- 16.6.135 Any impact on the Barn north of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216655), an asset of high heritage significance, would be positive. Any loss of historic interest arising from the presence of the emergency equipment store and the back-up generator and changes to the wider landscape out with the farmyard would be outweighed by the repair of the barn during the construction period. This repair would contribute to the conservation of the barn and a low magnitude positive impact would arise. This would be a moderate positive effect which would be **significant**. The non-designated curtilage elements of the asset group, which are of low heritage significance, would be subject to a neutral impact, and no effect would arise.

**Pillbox in Pillbox Field (LCS112)**

- 16.6.136 On the completion of the construction phase, any adverse effect arising from visibility of the main development site construction works would be reversed. No effect would arise during operation, other than the low magnitude impact assessed in the relocated facilities development. This impact on a heritage asset of low heritage significance would be a minor effect, which would be **not significant**.

**Scheduled Monument (SM 1014520), Grade I and Grade II listed buildings at Leiston Abbey (LB 1215753, LB 1215754, LB 1216380 and LB 1268290)***Predicted change*

- 16.6.137 The removal of the accommodation campus on the completion of the construction programme would reduce the perceptual prominence and proximity of elements of the proposed development. The view to the east from the Abbey buildings would return to a view of a predominantly agricultural landscape. Similarly, the cessation of at-height works would result in a discernible reduction in the visibility of the proposed

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

development. Any construction noise would cease with the completion of construction and operational noise would not be audible from the asset group.

- 16.6.138 Upper elements of the proposed development would be partially visible in a small number of glimpsed views from elevated viewpoints in the Abbey ruins (SM 1014520 and LB 1215753) towards the east as a distant background element on the horizon, adjacent to the existing Sizewell A and B power stations. This visibility is shown in Representative Viewpoints R5 (footpath south of the Abbey), R8 (Footpath south of the Abbey), R24 and R25 (Abbey Ruins), included in **Figures 13.10.30-32, 13.10.82-84, and 13.10.86-88**. Existing and proposed intervening trees in the middle ground, along the B1122 and field boundaries, will create layers of screening of views from the asset group towards the new Sizewell C power station and break up the horizon, with the effectiveness of the screening increasing as on-site planting continues to mature.
- 16.6.139 The roundabout to the east of the site would be visible in some views from the Abbey ruins (SM 1014520 and LB 1215753), particularly from the elevated viewing platforms. The roundabout would be encountered by visitors travelling along the B1122 from Eastbridge. Elements of the proposed roundabout would also likely be visible to those approaching from the south, at the point at which the Abbey access road branches from the B1122. This would not preclude the perception of an agricultural landscape and the roundabout would not be juxtaposed with the Abbey in views from this approach.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.140 No discernible loss of the Abbey's archaeological interest would arise. The architectural interest of the structures within the Abbey would also remain unaffected. The change to the approach from Eastbridge, and the visibility of the proposed development, would result in a minor harm arising from loss of historic interest, which would persist through the operational period. The magnitude of impact to the heritage significance of the scheduled and Grade I listed Abbey ruins (SM 1014520 and LB 1215753), which are of high heritage significance, would reduce to very low, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be **not significant**.
- 16.6.141 The lasting impact to the Guesten Hall (LB 1268290), Barn (LB 1216380) and Retreat House (LB 1215754), which are of high heritage significance, would be reduced and no effect would arise.

Scheduled Monument (SM 1015687) at Leiston Abbey (first site) with later chapel and pillbox

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.142 The completed turbine halls, reactor buildings and the National Grid overhead line connection would remain prominently visible in views from and views of the asset during its operation. The sense of separation between the asset and the proposed development would be maintained, with Goose Hill, woodland plantation, and marshland in between. The visual clutter presented by the construction works would be reduced, presenting a more coherent group, although the proposed development would be discernibly closer to the asset than the existing Sizewell B power station and the National Grid overhead line connection would remain visible on the skyline in views south from the Abbey.
- 16.6.143 By being prominently visible in views from within the asset, and in views of the asset from the north, the proposed development would detract slightly from the appreciation of the historic interest of the asset, and would detract from architectural value to a degree.
- 16.6.144 Post-construction, the restoration of historic landscape character would present an opportunity to enhance the appreciation of the asset's historic interest.
- 16.6.145 Visibility of the proposed development in views from the area around the asset are illustrated at Representative Viewpoints R14 (Minsmere Sluice), R16 (Whin Hill, Minsmere) and R17 (Dunwich Heath, Coast Guard Cottages), included in **Figures 13.10.55-57, 13.10.60-62 and 13.10.65-67**.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.146 On completion of the construction programme, the lasting effects would reduce, but still give rise to less than substantial harm to heritage significance. This is assessed as a low magnitude impact on an asset of high heritage significance, resulting in a moderate adverse effect which would be **significant**.

**Grade II Listed Cottage 450m south-west of Upper Abbey Farmhouse  
(Abbey Cottage – LB 1216395)**

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.147 The decommissioning of the proposed accommodation campus, main site entrance hub, and storage areas, would result in the reversal of the principal adverse changes experienced during the construction phase.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 16.6.148 The roundabout to the north of the asset, and the diverted access road, would remain during the operational phase and effects associated with these would persist, although construction traffic would cease, which would reduce noise experienced at the asset.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.149 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the operational phase and no effect would arise.

*Grade II Listed Potter's Farmhouse (LB 1228267)**Predicted change*

- 16.6.150 The decommissioning of the proposed accommodation campus would result in the reversal of the principal adverse changes experienced during the construction phase.

- 16.6.151 The approach to the asset from the B1122 would be via the proposed roundabout which would be retained throughout operation. However, this would not detract from the historical interest of the asset as the rural approach would be maintained.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.152 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the operation phase, and no effect would arise.

*Grade II Listed The Watch House, Sizewell (LB 1391360)**Predicted change*

- 16.6.153 On completion of the construction programme, visible elements of the construction work would be removed. Views of the proposed main site platform, National Grid overhead electricity connection, and re-located Sizewell B facilities would be almost entirely precluded by existing and proposed screening planting and the Sizewell A and B stations.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.154 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the operation phase and no effect would arise.

Grade II listed buildings at Potter's Street crossroads (LB 1228263, LB 1228262, LB 1228265)

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.155 The decommissioning of the proposed accommodation campus would result in the reversal of the adverse changes experienced during the construction phase.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.156 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the operation phase and no effect would arise.

**Leiston Conservation Area**

*Predicted Change*

- 16.6.157 The increased traffic and rail movements predicted during the construction period would reduce with the completion of construction and the effect experienced during construction would cease.

*Significance of Effect*

- 16.6.158 No effect would arise on the heritage significance of Leiston Conservation Area during operation of the proposed development.

**Conservation Area and Grade II listed buildings at Thorpeness**

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.159 The proposed development would not be visible from the majority of the Conservation Area, as a result of screening by the natural topography, planting, and intervening buildings. It would also not be visible in views of the assets from within the Conservation Area.

- 16.6.160 On the completion of the construction programme, the proposed development would be visible in the background of views from upper storeys of Westbar (LB 1287172), the House in the Clouds (LB 1287261) and Thorpeness Mill (LB 1215702), and in longer views of these buildings from the south, as elements around the existing Sizewell power station complex site.

- 16.6.161 The massing of the proposed development would be consistent with the existing Sizewell A and B buildings, and the proposed development would be visible as part of a coherent group of structures. This coherence with the

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

existing stations will preclude any impact to historic and architectural interest. The removal of potentially distracting elements such as cranes would reduce the perceptual prominence of the proposed development.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.162 The character and significance of Thorpeness Conservation Area is determined primarily by the built form of the settlement within the Conservation Area, and is not generally perceptible in longer views towards the settlement, in which only the taller, landmark structures are visible. There would be no discernible change in the setting of the Thorpeness Conservation Area, which is of high heritage significance. No harm to heritage significance would arise, and no effect would arise.
- 16.6.163 The visibility of elements of the proposed development in views of Westbar (LB 1287172), the House in the Clouds (LB 1287261), and Thorpeness Mill (LB 1215702) from the south experienced during construction, would reduce with the completion of at-height works, and no effect would arise.
- 16.6.164 There would be no discernible change in the setting of the Thorpeness Conservation Area, or the other listed buildings within it and no effect would arise.

*Non-designated coastguard cottages, Dunwich Heath**Predicted change*

- 16.6.165 On completion of the construction programme, the proposed development would be prominently visible as a background feature against the horizon in views south from the cottages. The development would be juxtaposed in views of the cottages on the approach from the north. It would, however, appear as part of a coherent group with the existing power stations A and B. These effects are illustrated in **Figure 13.10.65-67** and discussed in **Chapter 13** of this volume at **section 13.6, Table 13.16**.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.166 Impact to this asset of medium heritage significance would be lasting and give rise to a low magnitude impact, resulting in a minor adverse effect which would be **not significant**.

## Conservation Area and Grade I, II and II\* listed buildings at Aldeburgh

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.167 The proposed development would not be visible from the majority of the conservation area as a result of screening by the natural topography, planting and intervening buildings.
- 16.6.168 On the completion of the construction programme, the proposed development would be visible, beyond the existing Sizewell A and B stations, in the background of some views to the north from the conservation area, and from Moot Hall, and the Church of St Peter and St Paul. Views of the town from Slaughden, in which the Church is the most readily discernible listed building, would also feature the proposed development as a background element.
- 16.6.169 The proposed development would be viewed as part of a coherent group of buildings around the existing Sizewell power station complex site, with comparable massing. This coherence with the existing stations will preclude any sense of visual intrusion. At a distance, and when viewed through the strong vertical emphasis of the existing 'heritage-style' street lighting standards along Market Cross Place, any lasting change would be difficult to discern. The removal of potentially distracting elements, such as cranes, would reduce the perceptual prominence of the proposed development.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.170 In all cases, where discernible change occurs in the setting of these assets, which are of high heritage significance, there would be no reduction in the architectural or historic interests of the assets and consequently, there would be no impact, and no effects would arise on the Moot Hall, the Church of St Peter and St Paul and the Aldeburgh Conservation Area.

## Scheduled Monument and Grade II\* Listed Slaughden Martello Tower (SM 1006041 and LB 1269724)

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.171 On completion of the construction programme, upper elements of the proposed development, principally the turbine halls and reactor buildings, would be visible as a distant element, beyond the existing Sizewell A and B stations, in the background of views to the north from the Martello Tower. It would appear as part of a coherent group of buildings around the existing Sizewell power station complex site, with comparable massing. This coherence with the existing Sizewell A and B stations will preclude any impact to historic and architectural interest.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.172 There would be no change to heritage interests of the asset, which is of high heritage significance, during the operation phase and no effect would arise.

**Conservation Area and Grade I, II\* and II listed buildings and non-designated assets at Southwold**

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.173 On completion of the construction programme, upper elements of the proposed development, principally the turbine halls and reactor buildings, would be visible in views of or from Southwold Pier and Grade II listed Gun Hill Place (LB 1384353), Stone House (LB 1384354), The Watch House (LB 1384355), and The Old Water Tower (LB 1384310) as a very distant element against the horizon.
- 16.6.174 These upper elements would also be visible as a very distant element in the background of some views to the south from the conservation area. It would appear as part of a coherent group of buildings around the existing Sizewell power station complex site. At the separation involved, while the massing of the combined structures would be increased, this would remain comparable. This coherence with the existing Sizewell A and B stations will preclude any impact to historic and architectural interest. The removal of potentially distracting elements such as cranes would reduce the perceptual prominence of the proposed development.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.175 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the operation phase, and no effect would arise to the Southwold Conservation Area or listed buildings within it.

**Scheduled Monument and Grade I Listed Orford Castle, with adjoining quarry and remains of 20th century look-out post (SM 1014860 and LB 1030873)**

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.176 On completion of the construction programme, the proposed development would be visible as a very distant element in the background of views to the north from the Castle Keep (LB 1030873) roof, behind the existing Sizewell A and B power stations, and at the distances and prominence anticipated, any change would be difficult to discern.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.177 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the operational phase, and no effect would arise.

Scheduled Monument and Grade II listed lighthouse and former military structures at Orford Ness (SM 1416933, LB 1392631, LB 1416866, LB 1416867, LB 1416868, LB 1416869)

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.178 On completion of the construction programme, upper elements of the proposed development, principally the turbine halls and reactor buildings, would be visible as a very distant element in the background of some views to the north from the assets, behind the existing Sizewell A and B power stations. At distances of between 12km and 16km and at such low elevations, the prominence of the proposed development would be such that even in clear weather conditions, the viewer would have to actively search to see it. It would appear as part of a coherent group of buildings around the existing Sizewell power station complex site, with comparable massing. This coherence with the existing stations will preclude any impact to historic and architectural interest.

*Significance of effect*

- 16.6.179 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the operational phase and no effect would arise.

iii. Effects arising through change to historic landscape character

*Predicted change*

- 16.6.180 On completion of the construction programme, the accommodation campus, main site entrance hub, storage areas and construction compounds would be removed, the land returned to agricultural land and heathland, and hedgerows replanted to reflect the historic use and form of the landscape. While, in the long-term, this would reverse the loss of aesthetic interest, and partially mitigate against loss of the historic interest, any loss of archaeological interest would persist. This represents a reduction in the magnitude of change from the construction phase, resulting in a low magnitude, permanent change.

- 16.6.181 Changes associated with the realignment of the B1122, Eastbridge Road, and Lover's Lane would persist, and affect, the legibility of the historic landscape, removing some elements and reorganising others.

**Significance of effect**

- 16.6.182 Change to this asset of low heritage significance resulting from diminution of historic interest would be lasting giving rise to a low magnitude impact, a minor adverse effect which would be **not significant**.

**iv. Effects arising through change to historic seascape character****Predicted change**

- 16.6.183 The completed development would reduce visual intrusion from that experienced during construction, presenting a more coherent composition that would be entirely in keeping with the existing historic seascape character and would not erode the contrast between the modern, industrial buildings of the power station complex and the surrounding marshland and Sandlings that provides the historic significance of the sub-area.

**Significance of effect**

- 16.6.184 There will be no change to historic seascape character and no effect would arise.

**v. Inter-relationship effects**

- 16.6.185 Effects including noise, and landscape and visual, have been considered within the settings assessment. Therefore, the consideration of inter-relationship effects forms an inherent part of the assessment presented within this chapter.

**16.7 Mitigation and monitoring****a) Introduction**

Primary and tertiary mitigation measures, which have been accounted for as part of the assessment, are summarised in **section 16.5** of this chapter. Where required, secondary mitigation measures have been proposed.

- 16.7.1 This section describes the proposed secondary mitigation measures for terrestrial historic environment as well as describes any monitoring required of specific receptors/resources or for the effectiveness of a mitigation measure.

- 16.7.2 A summary of additional mitigation and monitoring measures relevant to Sizewell B relocated facilities is set out in **Chapter 8** of **Sizewell B relocated facilities ES**, included in **Volume 1, Appendix 2A** of the **ES**. No

change to the additional mitigation and monitoring measures set out within **Sizewell B relocated facilities ES** is required.

- 16.7.3** Additional mitigation and monitoring measures and impact assessment for off-site development areas, including off-site sports facilities at Leiston, fen meadow compensation sites south of Benhall and east of Halesworth and, if required, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area (Westleton), are set out in **Appendix 16F** of this volume where relevant.
- b) **Mitigation**
- 16.7.4** It has been established that there is a potential for further remains dating to all periods within the site as set out in **section 16.4** of this chapter, which would be of low to high heritage significance, and in the absence of further mitigation, could be subject to a **significant** adverse effect.
- 16.7.5** Secondary mitigation in this case would comprise the adoption of an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation, to ensure that the archaeological interest of any significant deposits, and features within the site, could be appropriately investigated, recorded and disseminated, preserving the archaeological interest of these remains.
- 16.7.6** To mitigate effects on known buried archaeology, an overarching WSI has been produced for the Sizewell C Project, detailed in **Appendix 16H** of this volume. Individual site WSIs produced to supplement this will be agreed with SCCAS. These site-specific WSIs will also set out requirements for further investigation of areas that could not be surveyed pre-consent, to allow for the agreement of finalised mitigation proposals.
- 16.7.7** A **Peat Strategy**, provided in **Appendix 16G** of this volume, has been agreed with SCCAS and Historic England, setting out appropriate investigative techniques to allow loss of archaeological interest in the peats on the main platform site to be mitigated. A WSI setting out specific details of the methodology to be adopted will be agreed with SCCAS and Historic England once the earthworks contractor is appointed.
- 16.7.8** Publication and popular dissemination of the results would allow any informative, and historic value, to be fully realised, and details of this will be set out within the WSIs.
- 16.7.9** The barn at Upper Abbey Farm would be repaired during the construction period. This would comprise the making good of historic elements of the structure, and the replacement of modern additions and repairs. These repairs would secure the future of the barn, allow its significance to be conserved and enhanced, and retain its contribution to the setting of the Grade II listed Upper Abbey farmhouse. Works would be undertaken within

the wider farmyard to stabilise, or remove, unstable structures, and to remove intrusive vegetation.

- 16.7.10 Additional mitigation is proposed via the Section 106 agreement to provide for enhancements to the visitor experience of the two Leiston Abbey sites. This would enhance the historic interest of these sites by allowing visitors to better engage with these assets and mitigate against the harm caused by the loss of historic interest arising from the perceptual presence of the proposed development during the construction period. It is envisaged that the works funded by this agreement would provide a lasting benefit that would persist into the operational period, complementing the creation and retention of an off-road link between the two assets.

c) Monitoring

- 16.7.11 Monitoring of the agreed programme of archaeological investigation would be carried out by SCCAS during the implementation of the scheme, the details of which are set out within the WSIs.

## 16.8 Residual effects

- 16.8.1 **Tables 16.6 and 16.7** of this chapter present a summary of the Terrestrial Historic Environment Assessment. They identify the receptor/s likely to be impacted, the level of effect and, where the effect is deemed to be significant, the tables include the mitigation proposed and the resulting residual effect.

- 16.8.2 Residual effects summarised in **Tables 16.6 and 16.7** also account for the effects of the Sizewell B relocated facilities proposals presented in the **Sizewell B relocated facilities ES**, provided in **Volume 1, Appendix 2A** of the **ES**.

- 16.8.3 **Tables 16.6 and 16.7** also present a summary of the residual effects associated with off-site developments, as described in **Appendix 16F** of this volume. No effects associated with the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton were identified. Furthermore, no effects from the operation of the off-site developments were identified.

- 16.8.4 In general, mitigation through recording would be effective in retaining much of the archaeological interest of a heritage asset. However, to reflect the basic principle, acknowledged in NPS EN-1, that a retained record is not as valuable as archaeological interest retained in an asset which is actively conserved, this mitigation would serve as partial mitigation, reducing the magnitude of any adverse effect to low. In all cases identified in this assessment, this mitigation would be sufficient to ensure that no

residual significant adverse effects would arise as a result of disturbance of archaeological remains.

- 16.8.5** Mitigation of harm arising through change to setting has primarily been achieved through the provision of primary and tertiary mitigation. Funding would be made available through a Section 106 agreement for localised enhancements to heritage assets at the two Leiston Abbey sites to complement the creation of an off-road link between these sites. This mitigation would enhance the historic interests of these assets, addressing the potential loss presented by the construction and operation of the proposed development.
- 16.8.6** Works to ensure the conservation of the listed structures at Upper Abbey Farm would similarly provide a degree of mitigation for the change to setting arising in the construction phase and a lasting enhancement through operation.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Table 16.7: Summary of effects for the construction phase.

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
<b><i>Sizewell B relocated facilities works during Phase 0</i></b>					
Potential archaeological remains in Coronation Wood	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Negligible effect. <b>(not significant).</b>	None required.	Negligible effect <b>(not significant)</b>
Potential archaeological remains in Pillbox field	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	Avoidance of the archaeologically sensitive area at the southern end of Pillbox field.	Moderate adverse effect. <b>(significant).</b>	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect <b>(not significant)</b>
Buildings within the existing Sizewell B power station	Loss of ephemeral ancillary building due to demolition	None.	Minor adverse effect <b>(not significant).</b>	Agreed WSI.	Negligible effect <b>(not significant).</b>
Pillbox in Pillbox field	Change to the setting of the asset arising from construction at Pillbox field	Retention of the pillbox in Pillbox field.	Minor adverse effect <b>(not significant).</b>	None required.	Minor adverse effect <b>(not significant).</b>
Important hedgerows	Loss of short section of important hedgerow to west side of Pillbox field	None.	Minor adverse effect <b>(not significant).</b>	None required.	Minor adverse effect <b>(not significant).</b>
Historic landscape character	Change to existing landscape character	None.	Minor adverse effect <b>(not significant).</b>	None required.	Minor adverse effect <b>(not significant).</b>
<b><i>Main development site construction</i></b>					
Remains associated with Prehistoric occupation of the Sandlings and wetland edge.	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Major adverse effect <b>(significant).</b>	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect <b>(not significant).</b>

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
Remains associated with Romano-British settlement and agricultural activity.	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Remains associated with early-medieval settlement.	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Remains associated with medieval agricultural and industrial exploitation (LEEIE).	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Remains associated with medieval agricultural and industrial exploitation (in vicinity of Upper Abbey Farm).	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Remains of medieval settlement.	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Moderate to major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Post-medieval agricultural improvement of the Sandlings and coastal marshes.	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
20th century military activity.	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Deposits of geoarchaeological interest.	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed Peat Strategy and associated WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
Previously unrecorded archaeological remains.	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None	Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216394).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	<p>As set out in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2), retention of existing mature tree and hedgerow planting where possible.</p> <p>Maintenance of existing access road and hedgerows, as discussed in the <b>oLEMP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2).</p> <p>Positioning of new structures within farmyard beyond existing structures to minimise visibility.</p> <p>Form and materials of new structures to be in keeping with vernacular agricultural architecture.</p>	Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Repairs to Barn at Upper Abbey farm and enhancement of farmyard.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Barn north of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216655).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to	As set out in the <b>oLEMP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2),	Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Repair of barn.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
	setting.	<p>retention of existing mature tree and hedgerow planting where possible.</p> <p>Maintenance of existing access road and hedgerows, as discussed in the oLEMP.</p> <p>Positioning of new structures within farmyard beyond existing structures to minimise visibility.</p> <p>Form and materials of new structures to be in keeping with vernacular agricultural architecture.</p>			
Pillbox in Pillbox Field (LCA112).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Landscape mitigation as set out in the relocated facilities application, and discussed further in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2).	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).	None required.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Leiston Abbey (second site) and moated site (SM 1014520)/St Mary's Abbey,	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	<p>Offset roundabout on B1122.</p> <p>Design of lighting to</p>	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Section 106 agreement to provide for enhancements to the	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
Grade I (LB 1215753).		<p>minimise light spill, as outlined in the <b>LMP</b> found in <b>Appendix 2B</b> of this volume.</p> <p>Amended campus design west of Eastbridge Road to increase separation from asset.</p> <p>As discussed in the <b>oLEMP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2), retained landscape buffers between accommodation campus and asset.</p> <p>Strengthen planting in hedgerow to Abbey Lane, as detailed in the <b>oLEMP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2).</p> <p>Enhanced connectivity with Leiston Abbey (second site) via Suffolk Coast Path diversion.</p> <p>Best-practice noise mitigation during construction, as discussed in the <b>CoCP</b></p>		<p>visitor experience.</p>	

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
		(Doc Ref. 8.11).			
The Guesten Hall at Abbey Farm, Grade II (LB 1268290).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Offset roundabout on B1122. Design of lighting to minimise light spill, as outlined in the <b>LMP</b> . Amended campus design west of Eastbridge Road to increase separation from asset. Retained landscape buffers between accommodation campus and asset. Strengthened planting in hedgerow to Abbey Lane, as discussed in the <b>oLEMP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2). Best-practice noise mitigation during construction, outlined in the <b>CoCP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11)	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).	None required.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Barn at Abbey Farm, Grade II (LB 1216380).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to	Offset roundabout on B1122.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).	None required.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
	setting.	<p>Design of lighting to minimise light spill, as outlined in the <b>LMP</b>.</p> <p>Amended campus design west of Eastbridge Road to increase separation from asset.</p> <p>Retained landscape buffers between accommodation campus and asset.</p> <p>Strengthened planting in hedgerow to Abbey Lane, as discussed in the <b>oLEMP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2).</p> <p>Best-practice noise mitigation during construction, as outlined in the <b>CoCP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>			
Retreat House, Grade II (LB 1215754)	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting	<p>Offset roundabout on B1122.</p> <p>Design of lighting to minimise light spill as outlined in the <b>LMP</b>.</p> <p>Amended campus</p>	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).	None required.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
		<p>design west of Eastbridge Road to increase separation from asset.</p> <p>Retained landscape buffers between accommodation campus and asset.</p> <p>Strengthened planting in hedgerow to Abbey Lane, as discussed in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2).</p> <p>Best-practice noise mitigation during construction, outlined in the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>			
Leiston Abbey (first site) with later chapel and pillbox (SM 1015687).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	<p>Screening of Water Management Zone from asset using bunds and tree planting, discussed in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2).</p> <p>Enhanced connectivity with Leiston Abbey (second site) via Suffolk Coast Path</p>	Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Section 106 agreement to provide for enhancements to the visitor experience.	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
		diversion.			
Cottage 450m south-west of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216395).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Design of lighting to minimise light spill, as outlined in the <b>LMP</b> . Additional planting between the asset and the proposed roundabout and main site entrance as discussed in the <b>oLEMP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2). Separation of access to asset from main site entrance.	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	None applicable to settings effects.	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).
Potter's Farmhouse (LB 1228267).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Design of lighting to minimise light spill, as outlined in the <b>LMP</b> . Strengthened planting in existing hedgerows along Eastbridge Road and on boundary between accommodation campus and borrow pits, as discussed in the <b>oLEMP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2).	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).	None required.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
The Watch House (LB 1391360).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Screening of Pillbox Field development using tree planting, as discussed in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2).	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Woodview Cottage (LB 1228265).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
The Cottage (LB 1228262).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Flash Cottages (LB 1228263).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Leiston Conservation Area.	Change to historic character and loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Primary road access for construction is from North via Theberton.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).	None required.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Thorpeness Conservation Area and listed buildings.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Removal of proposals for a jetty at Sizewell C.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
The House in the Clouds (LB 1287261).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Thorpeness Mill (LB 1215702).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
Westbar (LB 1287172).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Non-designated coastguard cottages, Dunwich Heath.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Retention of existing woodland on Goose Hill, where possible. Additional woodland planting to the north of the proposed main platform, as discussed in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2).	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).	None required.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Aldeburgh Conservation Area and listed buildings.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Removal of proposals for a jetty at Sizewell C.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Moot Hall (LB 1269716).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Church of St Peter and St Paul (LB 1269731).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Slaughden Martello Tower (SM 1006041 and LB 1269724).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Southwold Conservation Area and listed buildings.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to	Retention of existing woodland on Goose	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
	setting.	Hill, where possible. Additional woodland planting to the north of the proposed main platform, as discussed in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2). Removal of proposals for a jetty at Sizewell C.			
The Old Water Tower (LB 1384310).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Southwold Pier.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Retention of existing woodland on Goose Hill, where possible. Additional woodland planting to the north of the proposed main platform, as discussed in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2). Removal of proposals for a jetty at Sizewell C.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Gun Hill Place (LB 1384353).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Retention of existing woodland on Goose Hill, where possible. Additional woodland	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
		planting to the north of the proposed main platform, as discussed in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2).			
Stone House (LB 1384354).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Retention of existing woodland on Goose Hill, where possible. Additional woodland planting to the north of the proposed main platform, as discussed in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2).	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
The Watch House (LB 1384355).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Retention of existing woodland on Goose Hill, where possible. Additional woodland planting to the north of the proposed main platform, as discussed in the oLEMP (Doc Ref. 8.2).	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Castle with adjoining quarry and remains of 20th century lookout (SM 1014860 and LB 1030873).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
Orfordness Lighthouse (LB 1392631).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	N/A.	No effect.
Orford Ness: former Royal Flying Corps Officer's Mess and AWRE canteen building (LB 1416867).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Ness: former Royal Flying Corps barrack block (LB 141866).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Ness: the Black Beacon and associated power house (LB 1416868).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Ness: Bomb Ballistics building (LB 1416869).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Ness: the Atomic Weapons Research Establishment test buildings and associated structures (SM 1416933).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Historic landscape character.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to use of site and removal of potentially important historic hedgerows and the realignment	Retention of hedgerows and other landscape features where possible, as discussed in the oLEMP (Doc	Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed written scheme of archaeological investigation.	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
	of historic routeways.	Ref. 8.2).			
Historic Seascapes Character.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to historic seascapes character.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
<i>Off-site development areas</i>					
Archaeological remains at off-site sports facilities in Leiston	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None.	Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Archaeological remains at fen meadow compensation site south of Benhall	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None.	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Archaeological remains at fen meadow compensation site east of Halesworth	Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.	None.	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreed WSI.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).

Table 16.8: Summary of effects for the operational phase.

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
<b>Main development site</b>					
Archaeological heritage assets within the site.	No impact.	None.	No further effect.	None required.	No further effect.
Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216394).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Reinstatement of agricultural landscape, enhancement of spaces around the farmyard.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Barn north of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216655).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Reinstatement of agricultural landscape, enhancement of spaces around the farmyard.	Moderate beneficial effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	None required.	Moderate beneficial effect ( <b>significant</b> ).
Non-designated structures at Upper Abbey Farm.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Reinstatement of agricultural landscape, enhancement of spaces around the farmyard.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Pillbox in Pillbox Field (LCS112).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Scheme of landscape mitigation.	Minor adverse ( <b>not significant</b> ).	None required.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Leiston Abbey (second site) and moated site (SM 1014520)/St Mary's Abbey, Grade I (LB 1215753).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Restoration of agricultural land and heathland east of B1122. Retention of established vegetation.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).	None required.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
The Guesten Hall at Abbey Farm, Grade II (LB 1268290).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Restoration of agricultural land and heathland east of B1122. Retention of established vegetation.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
Barn at Abbey Farm, Grade II (LB 1216380).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Restoration of agricultural land and heathland east of B1122. Retention of established vegetation.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Retreat House, Grade II (LB 1215754).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Restoration of agricultural land and heathland east of B1122. Retention of established vegetation.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Leiston Abbey (first site) with later chapel and pillbox (SM 1015687)	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Removal of WMZ north of Goose Hill and restoration of plantation woodland.	Moderate adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ).	Agreement of scheme of interpretation and enhancement of visitor experience to allow perceptual aspects of the asset to be better appreciated.	Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).
Cottage 450m south-west of Upper Abbey Farmhouse (LB 1216395).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Removal of main site entrance hub and temporary construction area and reinstatement of agricultural land and heathland.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Potter's Farmhouse (LB 1228267).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	Removal of temporary construction area, particularly the accommodation campus, and reinstatement of agricultural land.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
The Watch House (LB 1391360).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
Woodview Cottage (LB 1228265).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
The Cottage (LB 1228262).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Flash Cottages (LB 1228263).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Leiston Conservation Area.	Potential loss of historic character and heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Thorpeness Conservation Area and listed buildings.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
The House in the Clouds (LB 1287261).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Thorpeness Mill (LB 1215702).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Westbar (LB 1287172).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
Non-designated coastguard cottages, Dunwich Heath.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Aldeburgh Conservation Area and listed buildings.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Moot Hall (LB 1269716).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Church of St Peter and St Paul (LB 1269731).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Slaughden Martello Tower (SM 1006041 and LB 1269724).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Southwold Conservation Area and listed buildings.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
The Old Water Tower (LB 1384310).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Southwold Pier.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Gun Hill Place (LB	Potential loss of heritage	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
1384353).	significance through change to setting.				
Stone House (LB 1384354).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
The Watch House (LB 1384355).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Castle with adjoining quarry and remains of 20th century lookout (SM 1014860 and LB 1030873).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orfordness Lighthouse (LB 1392631).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Ness: former Royal Flying Corps Officer's Mess and AWRE canteen building (LB 1416867).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Ness: former Royal Flying Corps barrack block (LB 141866).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Ness: the Black Beacon and associated power house (LB 1416868).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Receptor	Impact	Primary or Tertiary Mitigation	Assessment of Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects
Orford Ness: Bomb Ballistics building (LB 1416869).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Orford Ness: the Atomic Weapons Research Establishment test buildings and associated structures (SM 1416933).	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Historic landscape character.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to use of site.	Restoration of agricultural land and heathland appropriate to historic land use. Replanting of hedgerows designed to reflect historic form of landscape.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.
Historic Seascapes Character.	Potential loss of heritage significance through change to historic seascapes character.	None.	No effect.	None required.	No effect.

## References

- 16.1 DECC (2011) Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (NPS EN-1)  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/47854/1938-overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47854/1938-overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf) [Accessed July 2019]
- 16.2 DECC (2011) National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statements-for-energy-infrastructure> [Accessed July 2019]
- 16.3 ESC (2013) Suffolk Coastal District Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies  
<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/local-plans/suffolk-coastal-local-plan/existing-local-plan/core-strategy-and-development-management-policies/> [Accessed July 2019]
- 16.4 ESC (2019) Suffolk Coastal District Council Final Draft Local Plan  
<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/local-plans/suffolk-coastal-local-plan/local-plan-review/final-draft-local-plan/> [Accessed July 2019]
- 16.5 Suffolk Coastal District Council (1995) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 6 Historic Parks and Gardens  
<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Suffolk-Coastal-Local-Plan/Supplementary-Planning-Guidance/SPG6-Historic-parks-and-gardens.pdf> [Accessed September 2019]
- 16.6 Historic England, (2015). Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in decision-taking in the Historic Environment.  
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa2-managing-significance-in-decision-taking/gpa2/> [Accessed July 2019]
- 16.7 Historic England (2008) Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance.  
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-principles-sustainable-management-historic-environment/conservationprinciplespoliciesandguidanceapril08web/>. [Accessed July 2019]
- 16.8 Historic England, (2017). Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets. <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/> [Accessed July 2019]
- 16.9 Jenny Glazebrook (ed.). (1997). Research and Archaeology: a Framework for The Eastern Counties 1. Resource assessment. East Anglian

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

---

- Archaeology Occasional Papers 3.  
[http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap3/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap3/). [Accessed March 2019].
- 16.10 Nigel Brown, Jenny Glazebrook (eds). (2000). Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties 2. Research agenda and strategy. East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 8.  
[http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap8/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap8/). [Accessed March 2019]
- 16.11 Maria Medlycott (ed.). (2011). Research and Archaeology Revisited: a revised framework for the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 24. [http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap24/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap24/). [Accessed March 2019]
- 16.12 East Anglian Archaeology (2019). Regional Research Framework Review.  
<http://eaareports.org.uk/algao-east/regional-research-framework-review/> [Accessed March 2019]
- 16.13 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ClfA). (2017). Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessment.  
[https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GDBA\\_3.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GDBA_3.pdf) / [Accessed July 2019].
- 16.14 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ClfA). (2014). Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment.  
[https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS&GCommissioning\\_1.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS&GCommissioning_1.pdf). [Accessed July 2019].
- 16.15 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ClfA). (2014). Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation.  
[https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS&GFieldevaluation\\_1.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS&GFieldevaluation_1.pdf). [Accessed July 2019].
- 16.16 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ClfA). (2014). Standard and guidance for archaeological geophysical survey.  
[https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GGeophysics\\_2.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GGeophysics_2.pdf). [Accessed July 2019].
- 16.17 Gurney, D. (2003). Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England.  
[http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap14/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap14/). [Accessed July 2019].
- 16.18 Schmidt et al. (2016). EAC Guidelines for the use of Geophysics in Archaeology [http://old.european-archaeological-council.org/files/eac\\_guidelines\\_2\\_final.pdf](http://old.european-archaeological-council.org/files/eac_guidelines_2_final.pdf). [Accessed July 2019].

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 16.19 Historic England (2011) Environmental Archaeology ([https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/environmental\\_archaeology/](https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/environmental_archaeology/)). [Accessed July 2019].
- 16.20 Historic England (2015) Geoarchaeology (<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geoarchaeology-earth-sciences-to-understand-archaeological-record/heag067-geoarchaeology/>). [Accessed July 2019].
- 16.21 British Geological Survey. Geology of Britain Map Viewer <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html> [accessed September 2019].
- 16.22 Suffolk Record Office HD 306/1/1 “Estate lying in Leiston, Suffolk, in the occupation of Geo. Doughty, gent., and belonging to W. Tatnall, esq.”, by Isaac Johnson of Woodbridge.
- 16.23 HD 306/1/2Rough Plan: Estate lying in Leiston in Suffolk, in the occupation of Geo. Doughty, gent., and belonging to Wm. Tatnall, esq., by Isaac Johnson of Woodbridge.
- 16.24 Atfield, R., Breen, A., Darrah, R. and Tyers, I. 2009 ‘Leiston, Greater Gabbard Offshore Wind Farm, Sizewell’ Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute for Archaeology and History XLII, part 1.
- 16.25 Mortimer, R. 1979 Leiston Abbey Cartulary and Butley Abbey Charters. Boydell and Brewer.
- 16.26 Dig Ventures. 2016. Leiston Abbey (First and Second Site) Updated Project Design.  
[https://www.dropbox.com/s/pzam5okkc1cwv1g/Leiston\\_Abbey\\_2016\\_UPD\\_V2.0.pdf?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/pzam5okkc1cwv1g/Leiston_Abbey_2016_UPD_V2.0.pdf?dl=0) [accessed September 2019].
- 16.27 ESC (2014) Leiston Conservation Area Appraisal.  
<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Design-and-Conservation/Conservation-Area-Appraisals/Leiston-Conservation-Area-Appraisal-December-2014.pdf> [accessed May 2019].