



Norwich Western Link Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage

Author: WSP UK Limited

Document Reference: 3.08.00

Version Number: 00

Date: March 2024



Contents

Glossary of Abbreviations and Defined Terms	4
8 Cultural Heritage	7
8.1 Introduction.....	7
8.2 Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance.....	9
8.3 Consultation, Scope, Methodology and Significance Criteria	11
8.4 Baseline Conditions.....	28
8.5 Sensitive Receptors	40
8.6 Assessment of Potential Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects	52
8.7 Difficulties and Uncertainties	71
8.8 Summary.....	71
8.9 References	78

Tables

Table 8-1 Summary of consultation undertaken.....	12
Table 8-2 Scoping opinion responses	12
Table 8-3 Elements scoped out of the assessment.....	14
Table 8-4 Significance of heritage assets.....	24
Table 8-5 Magnitude of change.....	26
Table 8-6 Significance of environmental effect defined by Heritage Asset (Receptor) significance versus magnitude of change.....	28
Table 8-7 Sensitive Receptors (heritage assets).....	41
Table 8-8 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects – Construction Phase	56
Table 8-9 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Barn 50m north west of Low Farm House.....	63
Table 8-10 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Abattoir at the Old Butcher’s Shop.....	64
Table 8-11 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – The Lodge.....	64
Table 8-12 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Church of St Margaret.....	65



Table 8-13 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Garden Walls to West of Morton Hall..... 65

Table 8-14 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Morton Hall 66

Table 8-15 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Garden Walls including Owl House at Home Farm, Morton Hall Estate..... 66

Table 8-16 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Church of All Saints including boundary wall to churchyard 67

Table 8-17 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Church of St Peter 67

Table 8-18 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Stables and Coach House to Honingham Hall and Site of Honingham Hall..... 68

Table 8-19 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Honingham Park..... 68

Table 8-20 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Attlebridge World War Two Airfield 69

Table 8-21 Summary of cultural heritage effects, construction phase 72

Table 8-22 Summary of cultural heritage effects, operational phase..... 74



Glossary of Abbreviations and Defined Terms

The definition of key terms used in this report are provided below. These definitions have been developed by reference to the definitions used in EU and UK legislation and guidance relevant to Cultural Heritage as well as professional judgement based on knowledge and experience of similar schemes to the Proposed Scheme.

Term	Definition
CifA	Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
HE	Historic England
HER	Historic Environment Record
NHLE	National Heritage List for England
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
Above ground heritage assets	Structures and landscapes of heritage interest (including listed buildings, scheduled monuments with standing remains, registered parks and gardens, and conservation areas)
Buried heritage assets	Known or potential buried heritage assets (archaeological remains)



Term	Definition
Designated heritage assets	<p>Assets that receive a greater degree of protection within the planning system than non-designated heritage assets; works to some assets, including listed buildings and scheduled monuments, are subject to additional consent regimes.</p> <p>Annex 2 of the NPPF states that designated heritage assets are: “A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.”</p>
Heritage assets	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) defines a heritage asset as: 'A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest.'</p>
Non-designated heritage assets	<p>Non-designated heritage assets are 'buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets.'</p>
Setting	<p>Setting is the way in which the asset is understood and experienced. It is not an asset in itself. The setting of heritage assets, whilst not statutorily protected, is a material consideration in the planning process</p>

Note on Red Line Boundary and Site Boundary

All areas of land required temporarily or permanently for the construction and operational activities of the Proposed Scheme would be contained within the Red Line Boundary. The EIA is based upon this Red Line Boundary. The Red Line Boundary includes:



- Site Boundary: The areas within which the main engineering works (structures, carriageway, drainage, earthworks etc) and areas for temporary use during construction such as works compounds will be undertaken as outlined in this chapter.
- The remaining areas within the RLB include areas for Essential Environmental Mitigation, Marl Hill Cycleway and Honingham Lane Closure.



8 Cultural Heritage

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 This chapter reports the outcome of the assessment of likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Scheme upon Cultural Heritage (also known as the 'Historic Environment') comprising buried heritage assets (archaeological remains) and above ground heritage assets (structures and landscapes of heritage interest and their setting) within or near the Proposed Scheme.

8.1.2 The chapter describes the assessment methodology, the baseline conditions in the Study Area, a summary of the likely significant effects, any mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant negative effects, and the likely residual effects after these measures have been employed.

8.1.3 This chapter describes the assessment methodology and the baseline conditions relevant to the assessment, which have been used to reach these conclusions, as well as a summary of the likely significant effects leading to the additional mitigation measures required to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset any likely significant adverse effects, and the likely residual effects.

8.1.4 This chapter is intended to be read as part of the wider Environmental Statement (ES) and is supported by the following technical appendices:

- **Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (HEDBA) – Appendix 8.1** (Document Reference: 3.08.01). This initial report has been updated to reflect the results of the evaluation undertaken to date (geophysical survey, trial trenches and deposit model).
- **Geophysical Survey Report – Appendix 8.2** (Document Reference 3.08.02). This non-intrusive survey covered a total of 102 hectares (ha) across 27 discreet land parcels. The survey revealed archaeological



activity along the length of the Proposed Scheme according to the Red Line Boundary in 2021.

- **Archaeological Evaluation Report - Appendix 8.3** (Document Reference 3.08.03). A total of 246 trial trenches of the planned 277 trenches (2% sample) were excavated within 22 fields, many of which were targeted on cropmarks and geophysical anomalies. The evaluation uncovered evidence of Iron Age, Romano-British, medieval, and post-medieval activity. It has been agreed with the local planning authority Archaeological Advisor that areas previously inaccessible due to land access will be trenched post-determination.
- **Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Archaeological Mitigation Works - Appendix 8.4** (Document Reference 3.08.04). This design document sets out the scope and methodology for archaeological mitigation, including areas of 'strip, map and sample' and archaeological watching brief during construction. It also includes the scope of additional trial trenching required to inform a suitable mitigation strategy for these previously inaccessible areas, should significant remains be identified.
- **Geoarchaeological Deposit Model - Appendix 8.5** (Document Reference 3.08.05). Buried palaeoenvironmental / archaeological remains in the Wensum channel have been modelled using borehole data to produce a risk map. The deposit model identified deeper floodplain zones where organic alluvial deposits survive with potential to preserve palaeoenvironmental remains. It recommends a transect of six purposive boreholes to be undertaken on the floodplain to collect sediment for off-site assessment with the aim of understanding floodplain evolution and environmental change.
- **In-Combination Assessment - Appendix 8.6** (Document Reference 3.08.06). In-Combination Assessment of Committed Development Short List.



- **HEDBA Figures – Appendix 8.7** (Document Reference 3.08.07). The following chapter includes figures showing Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment within the Red Line Boundary of the Proposed Scheme. These 34 figures form the model and accompany the text.
- **WSI Figures – Appendix 8.8** (Document Reference 3.08.08). The following chapter includes figures showing the proposed archaeological mitigation works within the Red Line Boundary of the Proposed Scheme. These fourteen figures form the model and accompany the text.

8.2 Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance

Legislative Framework

- 8.2.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (**Ref. 8.6**) sets out the legal requirements for the control of development and alterations which affect listed buildings or conservation areas (including buildings of heritage interest which lie within a conservation area).
- 8.2.2 Should human remains be encountered, a licence from the Secretary of State, under Section 25 of the *Burial Act 1857* as amended by the *Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2014* is required. Under the *Town and Country Planning (Churches, Places of Religious Worship and Burial Grounds) Regulations 1930*, the removal and re-interment of human remains should be in accordance with the direction of the local Environmental Health Officer.
- 8.2.3 The *Hedgerow Regulations 1997* presents the criteria for determining important hedgerows.

Policy

- 8.2.4 The applicable planning policy is summarised as follows:
- Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2023) December 2023 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (**Ref. 8.2**);



- Broadland District Council, 2011, Joint Core Strategy (**Ref. 8.7**).

8.2.5 The NPPF requires that the significance of heritage assets should be considered in the planning process, whether designated or not. Section 16 of the NPPF deals with 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment'. The NPPF recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource which 'should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations' (para 195).

8.2.6 Professional judgement has been used to consider the impact (the magnitude of change) of the Proposed Scheme on the significance of a known or potential heritage asset. This is assessed in **Appendix 8.1 HEDBA** (Document Reference 3.08.01) using NPPF terms of 'no harm', 'less than substantial harm', 'substantial harm' or 'total loss of significance'.

8.2.7 Broadland District Council's Joint Core Strategy addresses the built environment, heritage assets, and the wider historic environment, including the protection of buildings and structures which contribute to their surroundings and the protection of their settings.

Emerging Policy

8.2.8 Broadland District Council, Norfolk County Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council (draft, 2021) are currently working together to produce the Greater Norwich Local Plan (**Ref. 8.10**). The Greater Norwich Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination on 30 July 2021.

8.2.9 The relevant wording from these policies is reproduced in **Appendix 8.1 HEDBA** (Document Reference 3.08.01).

Guidance

8.2.10 The following guidance documents have been used during the preparation of this Chapter:

- Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (**Ref. 8.8**);



- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) 2014, Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (**Ref. 8.9**);
- Historic England (2008) Conservation Principles (**Ref. 8.3**);
- Historic England (2019) Statements of Heritage Significance (**Ref. 8.4**);
- Historic England (2017) The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning: Note 3, Second Edition (**Ref. 8.1**); and
- Highways England (2020) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA106 Cultural heritage assessment (**Ref 8.5**).

8.3 Consultation, Scope, Methodology and Significance Criteria

Consultation Undertaken to Date

8.3.1 **Table 8-1** provides a summary of the consultation activities undertaken in support of the preparation of this assessment.

Table 8-1 Summary of consultation undertaken

Individual / stat body / organisation	Meeting dates and other forms of consultation	Summary of outcome of discussions
Norfolk County Archaeologist County Planning Authority (CPA) Archaeological Advisor	Email dated 10/12/2019	<p>Given the archaeological potential of the area, the CPA Archaeological Advisor (Norfolk County Archaeologist) stated in an email dated 10/12/2019, that a staged strategy involving Stage 1 geophysical (magnetometry) survey followed by Stage 2 trial trenching to inform safeguarding measures (i.e. preservation in situ or investigation and recording in advance of development) was appropriate.</p> <p>The Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Stage 1 Geophysical Survey was approved by the CPA Archaeological Advisor on 22/10/2020. The Geophysical Survey was subsequently undertaken in June 2021. Following the results of the Geophysical Survey, and the agreement of the need for further works, a WSI for Stage 2 trial trenching was approved by the CPA Archaeological Advisor on 05/05/2022. The work was undertaken between May and July 2022 Appendix 8.3 Archaeological Evaluation Report (Document Reference: 3.08.03).</p> <p>As part of Stage 2 WSI approval, the CPA Archaeological Advisor agreed that the floodplain, wooded areas and Essential Environmental Mitigation areas can be evaluated post-determination of the planning consent.</p>

Scope of the Assessment

8.3.2 The scope of this assessment has been established through an ongoing scoping process. Further information can be found in **Chapter 5: Approach to EIA** (Document Reference: 3.05.00).

8.3.3 This section provides an update to the scope of the assessment and re-iterates the evidence base for scoping out elements following further iterative assessment.

Table 8-2 Scoping opinion responses

Consultee	Comments provided in Scoping Opinion Response	Response to comments
Historic Environment Senior Officer (Norfolk County Council CPA)	The scoping report incorporates the advice previously given to the applicant's archaeological consultants and there are no further comments to make.	Not applicable



- 8.3.4 This chapter considers a baseline of known or potential buried heritage assets (archaeological remains) and above ground heritage assets (structures and landscapes of heritage interest) within the Study Area identified from a broad range of standard sources (see **Appendix 8.1 HEDBA** (Document reference 3.08.01) **Table 3.1** Data sources consulted). These are identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions and includes designated heritage assets, assets identified by Norfolk County Council (including local listing) and non-designated assets.
- 8.3.5 Professional expert opinion has been used to assess heritage significance, based on archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic interest, considering past ground disturbance which may have compromised survival.
- 8.3.6 In terms of considering the setting of designated above ground heritage assets, the scope focuses on those assets that may be subject to a 'significant' change to their setting in accordance with the stepped approach set out in Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets (GPA3 reissued 2017 **Ref: 8.1**).

Elements Scoped out of the Assessment

- 8.3.7 The elements shown in **Table 8-3** are not considered to give rise to likely significant effects as a result of the Proposed Scheme and have therefore not been considered within this assessment:

Table 8-3 Elements scoped out of the assessment

Element scoped out	Justification
<p>Construction effects on the Grade II listed Barn 50m north west of Low Farm House (and the dairy barn and farmhouse, presumed to be curtilage listed to the barn).</p>	<p>One designated (protected) heritage asset is located within the Site Boundary, the Grade II listed Barn 50m north west of Low Farm House (as are the dairy barn and the farmhouse presumed to be curtilage listed to the barn) and comprise the above ground heritage assets closest to the Proposed Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant, as the owner of Low Farm, would monitor potential construction impacts from noise, vibration, and construction traffic through the installation of Tell-Tale crack monitors and, if necessary, carry out remedial action.</p> <p>Construction phase activities are short-term and temporary. The impacts to setting from the phases of construction activities are not considered to be a significant change and have therefore been scoped out.</p> <p>Management measures would be developed and implemented as part of Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) (Document Reference 3.03.01), and would likely prevent, reduce and mitigate the potential for adverse impacts.</p>



Element scoped out	Justification
Construction effects on the setting of above ground heritage assets	<p>The impacts from the phases of construction activities on the significance of heritage assets through changes to setting are not considered to be a significant change and have therefore been scoped out.</p> <p>Management measures would be developed and implemented as part of OCEMP (Document Reference: 3.03.01), and would likely prevent, reduce and mitigate the potential for adverse impacts.</p>
Operational effects on buried heritage assets (scoped out in the Scoping Report)	<p>An assessment of operational effects on buried heritage assets have been scoped out on the basis that, once the Proposed Scheme has been completed, no further ground disturbance would occur as part of the Proposed Scheme.</p> <p>The impact of the presence of the proposed road viaduct piles on any archaeological deposits within the alluvium is not considered significant enough to warrant specialist assessment. As such, effects on the buried heritage assets are 'scoped out' of further consideration within this chapter.</p>



Element scoped out	Justification
Cumulative effects and buried heritage assets (scoped out in the Scoping Report)	Cumulative effects are ‘elevated’ effects which occur where the combined effect of the Proposed Scheme with other Committed Developments in the vicinity, on a discrete and significant shared buried heritage asset, is more severe than that reported at the Proposed Scheme. This is scoped out on the basis that for intangible and deeply buried heritage assets it is not feasible to quantify accurately the nature of the resource across the Study Area, which would enable the identification of a cumulative impact and potential elevated effect. It is noted that other developments would have to assess their own impacts on buried assets within the boundary of their project.
Possible historic hedgerows (scoped out in the Scoping Report)	The assessment of important hedgerows is set out in Chapter 10: Biodiversity – Appendix 10: Hedgerow Report 2021 (Document Reference: 3.10.10) None of the hedgerows reviewed by Chapter 10 were determined to be historic under the Hedgerows Regulations (1997).



Element scoped out	Justification
Construction and operational effects on the setting of non-designated below ground heritage assets (scoped out in the Scoping Report)	An assessment of the impact on the significance of known buried heritage remains through possible changes to setting has been scoped out on the basis that it is not possible to determine the setting of assets whose presence, nature, date, significance and extent is unknown. The absence of archaeological information severely limits the extent to which the contribution of setting can be understood with any accuracy.



8.3.8 Following Step 1 of the Historic England settings guidance (**Ref. 8.8**), the list below indicates which above-ground heritage assets within the Study Area (and selected assets located beyond the 1km Study Area) have been scoped out of the assessment as their significance would not be affected at all by the operational phase of the Proposed Scheme in terms of material changes to their setting and how the asset is understood and appreciated. This is based on the distance of the asset from the Red Line Boundary and the Site Boundary; the asset's location, scale and orientation, and the nature, extent and scale of intervening built form, vegetation and topography between asset and the Red Line Boundary and the Site Boundary.

8.3.9 These scoped out assets are shown in **Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07) **Figures 2 (Historic Environment features map – Designated heritage assets and 4b (Historic Environment features map – Non-designated heritage assets (North-central area))**, and comprise:

- Gates and railings to Lenwade Lodge to Weston House (NHLE ref: 1372690; listed Grade II);
- Garden House 100m north-west of Weston Hall (NHLE ref: 1171334; listed Grade II);
- Weston Hall (NHLE ref: 1051514; listed Grade II);
- Barn 50m west of Weston Hall (NHLE ref: 1372651; listed Grade II);
- Weston Park (NHER ref: 33733; non-designated);
- The Woodlands (NHLE ref: 1372688; listed Grade II);
- Willows Farmhouse (NHLE ref: 1051510; listed Grade II);
- Church of St Andrew (NHLE ref: 1372661; listed Grade II*);
- Church Farm House (NHLE ref: 1051535; listed Grade II);
- Ashtree Farm House (NHLE ref: 1306042; listed Grade II);



- Ashtree Farm Barn (NHLE ref: 1170523; listed Grade II);
- Round barrow SE of the Lodges (NHLE ref: 1003623; scheduled monument);
- North Lodges to Weston House, Connected by Railings, Piers and Gates (NHLE ref: 1170882; listed Grade II);
- Ringland School and Attached Schoolmasters House (NHLE ref: 1031568; listed Grade II);
- Pond Farm Barn (NHLE ref: 1051515; listed Grade II);
- The Old Rectory (NHLE ref: 1051511; listed Grade II);
- Water Cistern at south east corner of St Margaret's Churchyard (NHLE ref: 1170905; listed Grade II);
- Weston Longville War Memorial (NHLE ref: 1456237; listed Grade II);
- Church Farm House (NHLE ref: 1051512; listed Grade II);
- Former Spread Eagle Public House (NHLE ref: 1051513; listed Grade II);
- Green Farm House (NHLE ref: 1372687; listed Grade II);
- Berry Hall (NHLE ref: 1306730; listed Grade II);
- Icehouse (NHLE ref: 1077350; listed Grade II);
- 39, 40 and 41 The Street (NHLE ref: 1170745; listed Grade II);
- Honingham and East Tuddenham War Memorial (NHLE ref: 1458759; listed Grade II);
- Green Farm Barns (NHER ref: 56258; non-designated);
- Thatched Cottage or The Cottage, Weston Green (NHER ref: 50383; non-designated); and
- The Old School, The Street (NHER ref: 55185; non-designated).



Elements Scoped into the Assessment

Construction Phase

8.3.10 The following elements are considered to have the potential to give rise to likely significant effects during construction of the Proposed Scheme and have therefore been considered within this assessment:

- Partial or complete loss of buried heritage assets in areas where ground disturbance is proposed. This may be the result of enabling works, site strip, new services / utilities, temporary ground works, landscaping, planting and the road construction itself.
- Permanent removal of Historic Landscape, which forms the setting of a number of heritage assets scoped into this assessment.

Operation Phase

8.3.11 The following elements are considered to have the potential to give rise to likely significant effects during operation of the Proposed Scheme and have therefore been considered within this assessment:

- Permanent impacts to setting of heritage assets located within and beyond the Site Boundary and the Red Line Boundary.

Extent of the Study Area

8.3.12 In order to determine the presence of heritage assets and the potential impacts to the historic environment arising from the Proposed Scheme, a broad range of standard documentary and cartographic sources, including results from any archaeological investigations in the Study Area were examined. This provided information on the likely nature, extent, preservation and significance of any known or possible buried heritage assets (including non-designated) that may be present.

8.3.13 For the purposes of the setting assessment of heritage assets, a second, extended, Study Area of 1km from the Red Line Boundary has been defined.

8.3.14 The Study Areas, defined for built heritage as 1 kilometre from the Red Line Boundary) and buried heritage as 500 metres from the Red Line Boundary,



are considered through professional judgement to be appropriate to characterise the historic environment of the Proposed Scheme and the surrounding area. Occasionally there is reference to assets beyond these Study Areas, where appropriate, e.g., where such built heritage assets are particularly significant and / or where they contribute to current understanding of the historic environment.

Method of Baseline Data Collation

Desk Study

8.3.15 **Appendix 8.1 HEDBA** (Document Reference: 3.08.01) provides a desk-based study and includes a review of available information to determine the baseline conditions within the Study Area for above ground heritage assets. This assessment consisted of an analysis of existing written, graphic, photographic, electronic information, site walkovers, in order to identify the likely heritage assets within the Site Boundary and the Study Area to determine their significance. The following data sources have been reviewed:

- The National Heritage List for England (NHLE) for details of designated heritage assets (including World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields);
- The Norfolk Historic Environment Record (HER) for records on statutory designated sites, and for records of known archaeological or historical interest and archaeological events;
- Norfolk County Council (NCC acting in its capacity as County Planning Authority) information on areas of high archaeological potential, conservation areas, areas of special character and locally listed buildings;
- Ordnance Survey maps from the 1st edition (1860–70s) to present day;
- British Geological Survey data and available geotechnical and topographical survey data;



- Online sources, such as British History Online, The Norfolk Heritage Explorer and the Archaeological Data Service;
- Historic Landscape Characterisation data; and
- Environment Agency – LiDAR data.

Site Visit

8.3.16 A site visit was undertaken on 6 June 2019 as part of the optioneering exercise. This was a rapid visual appraisal of above ground heritage assets potentially impacted by five route options that were under consideration at the time. Assets were viewed from publicly accessible areas.

8.3.17 A second site visit was undertaken on 7 November 2019 as part of the Strategic Outline Business Case. Surveyors undertook an initial visual assessment of designated heritage assets potentially impacted by the Proposed Scheme, including possible impacts to heritage significance through changes to setting. Heritage assets were viewed from publicly accessible areas. Surveyors did not enter the internal spaces of any above ground heritage assets.

8.3.18 A third site visit was undertaken on 16 and 17 March 2021 as part of the HEDBA detailed in **Appendix 8.1 HEDBA** (Document Reference: 3.08.01). Surveyors undertook a walkover of the whole of the Proposed Scheme's route and a visual assessment of designated heritage assets potentially impacted by the Proposed Scheme, including possible impacts to heritage significance through changes to setting. Surveyors did not enter the internal spaces of any above ground heritage assets. Surveyors were not able to view assets located within the Morton Hall Estate, as this is a private estate and was not accessed.

8.3.19 Further site visits were undertaken on 25 January 2023 and 8 February 2023 to take account of the alignment refinement. The site visit in February specifically assessed the Grade II listed Barn 50m north west of Low Farm House and the wider Low Farm complex, and the immediate and wider setting



of the barn and the farm complex. Surveyors did not enter the internal spaces of any above ground heritage assets at Low Farm.

Assessment Methodology

8.3.20 Following the characterisation of the baseline conditions, the methodology used to characterise the likely environmental effects on potential archaeological buried heritage assets and above ground heritage assets within the Site Boundary and the Study Area has entailed:

- Evaluating the significance of heritage assets, based on existing designations and professional judgment where such resources have no formal designation, and considering historical, archaeological, architectural / artistic interest as outlined in the NPPF (**Ref. 8.2**) and the four values identified in Historic England's Conservation Principles (**Ref. 8.3**);
- Evaluating the contribution that setting makes to the overall significance of above ground heritage assets selected for assessment, using the Historic England settings guidance (**Ref. 8.1**);
- Predicting the magnitude of change (impact) upon the known or potential heritage significance of assets, and the likelihood and resulting significance of environmental effect as a result of the Proposed Scheme, including considering embedded mitigation measures. It is assumed that there is no embedded mitigation relevant to heritage;
- Considering any additional mitigation that might be required in order to avoid, reduce or off-set any significant negative effects; and
- Quantifying any residual effects (those that might remain after additional mitigation).

Significance Criteria

8.3.21 The significance level attributed to each effect has been assessed based on the sensitivity / value of the affected receptor(s) and the magnitude of change



arising from the Proposed Scheme, as well as a number of other factors that are outlined in more detail in **Chapter 5: Approach to EIA** (Document Reference: 3.05.00).

8.3.22 The NPPF defines significance as 'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic' (Annex 2 Glossary). The determination of the significance in this assessment is based on statutory designation and / or professional judgement against the four values identified in Historic England's Statements of Heritage Significance (**Ref. 8.4**).

8.3.23 Reference is also made to Historic England Conservation Principles (**Ref. 8.3**), which historically identifies four high level values: evidential, historic, aesthetic, and communal. These values encompass the criteria that Historic England are obliged to consider when statutorily designating heritage assets. Each asset is evaluated against the range of criteria listed above on a case-by-case basis. Unless the nature and exact extent of buried heritage assets within any given area has been determined through prior investigation, significance is often uncertain.

8.3.24 In relation to heritage assets, the assessment considers the contribution which the historic character and setting makes to the overall significance of the asset.

Table 8-4 gives examples of the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets for both above ground and buried heritage assets.

Table 8-4 Significance of heritage assets

Heritage asset description	Significance
World heritage sites	Very High
Scheduled monuments	High
Grade I and II* listed buildings	High
Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens	High



Heritage asset description	Significance
Designated historic battlefields	High
Protected Wrecks	High
Undesignated heritage assets of high national importance	High
Grade II listed buildings	Medium
Grade II registered parks and gardens	Medium
Conservation areas	Medium
Burial grounds	Medium
Protected heritage landscapes (e.g. ancient woodland or historic hedgerows)	Medium
Undesignated heritage assets of lower national, regional or county importance	Medium
Locally listed buildings	Low
Heritage assets with a district value or interest for education or cultural appreciation	Low
Heritage assets with a local (i.e. parish) value or interest for education or cultural appreciation	Low
Item with no significant value or interest	Negligible
Heritage assets that have a clear potential, but for which current knowledge is insufficient to allow significance to be determined	Uncertain

Magnitude of Change

8.3.25 Determination of magnitude of change upon the significance of known or potential heritage assets is based on the severity of the likely impact (e.g. the truncation or removal of buried archaeological remains, physical effects on built heritage assets or the permanent presence of new structures etc. that result in changes to the contribution of setting to the heritage significance of a



built heritage asset). **Table 8-5** describes the criteria used in this assessment to determine the magnitude of change.

Table 8-5 Magnitude of change

Magnitude of change	Description of change
High	<p>Complete removal of asset.</p> <p>Change to asset significance resulting in a fundamental change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context, character and setting. The transformation of an asset’s setting in a way that fundamentally compromises its ability to be understood or appreciated. The scale of change would be such that it could result in a designated asset being undesignated or having its level of designation lowered.</p>
Medium	<p>Change to asset significance resulting in an appreciable change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting. Notable alterations to the setting of an asset that affect our appreciation of it and its significance; or the unrecorded loss of archaeological interest.</p>
Low	<p>Change to asset significance resulting in a small change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting.</p>
Negligible	<p>Negligible change or no material change to asset significance. No real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting.</p>
Uncertain	<p>Level of survival / condition of resource in specific locations is not known magnitude of change is therefore not known.</p>
No change	<p>No change.</p>



Effect Significance

8.3.26 The assessment of likely significant effects has taken into account the site preparation, demolition, construction and operational stages. The significance level attributed to each effect has been assessed based on the heritage significance of the affected receptor (above ground or buried heritage asset) and the magnitude of change (impact) to the heritage significance of the receptor due to the Proposed Scheme.

8.3.27 The following terms have been used to define the significance of the effects identified and apply to both beneficial and adverse effects:

- Major effect: where the Proposed Scheme could be expected to have a substantial improvement or deterioration on receptors;
- Moderate effect: where the Proposed Scheme could be expected to have a noticeable improvement or deterioration on receptors;
- Minor effect: where the Proposed Scheme could be expected to result in a perceptible improvement or deterioration on receptors; and
- Negligible: where no discernible improvement or deterioration is expected as a result of the Proposed Scheme on heritage assets (receptors), including instances where no change is confirmed.

8.3.28 The significance of environmental effect is outlined in **Table 8-6**. Effects may be either negative (adverse) or positive (beneficial) and are defined initially without additional mitigation. The table is essentially a guide only, so that the process is transparent and the rationale for the effect scores is provided in the relevant sections. Where the resulting effect comprises two separate levels (i.e. 'moderate or minor' or 'minor or negligible'), professional judgement has been applied to select the most appropriate significance of effect.

8.3.29 **Table 8-6** shows the significance of environmental effect as derived from receptor significance and magnitude of change. Note there are no heritage assets of very high significance within the Study Area.



Table 8-6 Significance of environmental effect defined by Heritage Asset (Receptor) significance versus magnitude of change

Magnitude of change	High significance	Medium significance	Low significance	Negligible significance
High	Major	Moderate to Major	Minor to Moderate	Negligible
Medium	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Low	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor	Negligible
Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
No change	No change	No change	No change	No change

8.3.30 As set out in **Chapter 5: Approach to EIA** (Document Reference: 3.05.00), effects that are classified as **moderate or above** are considered to be **significant**. Effects classified as below **moderate** are considered to be **not significant**.

8.4 Baseline Conditions

8.4.1 **Appendix 8.1 HEDBA** (Document Reference: 3.08.01) provides a comprehensive baseline of the Proposed Development, incorporating the results of investigations undertaken within the Site Boundary and Red Line Boundary, which is summarised briefly here.

8.4.2 There is one statutory designated heritage asset within the Site Boundary. There are a number of listed buildings beyond the Red Line Boundary, which are predicted to experience impacts to significance through changes to setting. Those affected designated heritage assets, along with known and possible non-designated heritage assets affected by the Proposed Scheme, are set out in **Table 8-7 Sensitive Receptors (heritage assets)**.



Site Topography and Geology

- 8.4.3 Topography can provide an indication of suitability for settlement, and ground levels can indicate whether the ground has been built up or truncated, which can have implications for archaeological survival.
- 8.4.4 The Red Line Boundary traverses undulating land between the valleys of the River Wensum to the north-east and the River Tud to the south-west. It reaches its highest point on Breck Road in the southern part of the Red Line Boundary (57.5 metres Ordnance Datum / OD) and its lowest point on the floor of the Wensum Valley in the northern part of the Red Line Boundary (8.8 metres OD).
- 8.4.5 The bedrock geology within the Red Line Boundary comprises a range of Cretaceous chalk formations, while the superficial geology (deposited during the Quaternary) is more varied. The Quaternary is subdivided into the Pleistocene (the ice ages c. 2.6 million – 10,000 years Before Present / BP, concurrent with the Palaeolithic), and the Holocene (our current warm stage, 10,000 BP – present, corresponding to the Mesolithic to post-medieval periods). The Red Line Boundary lies on Pleistocene glacial deposits (otherwise referred to as diamicton, till or Boulder Clay). Tills are mapped as the Sheringham Cliff Formation (sands and gravels spanning the Lower to Middle Palaeolithic transition) at the northern end of the Red Line Boundary, and the older Lowestoft Formation (chalky clay, deposited c. 0.5 million years BP) at the southern end. Where the River Wensum and the Foxburrow stream cross the Site in the north and the south respectively, Holocene alluvium comprising sand, silt, clay, and in places organic deposits, infills the valleys. River Terrace deposits and slope deposits (Head) outcrop on the sides of the Wensum Valley.

Past Archaeological Investigations

- 8.4.6 **Appendix 8.2 Geophysical Survey Report** (Document Reference: 3.08.02) provides the results of a geophysical survey within the Red Line Boundary (mainly within the Site Boundary) carried out from November 2020 to March



2021. A total of 102ha was surveyed in 27 areas. The results of the survey found probable and possible archaeological activity along the length of the route, in the form of enclosures, possible kilns or ovens, a trackway and medieval/ or post-medieval agricultural activity.

8.4.7 **Appendix 8.3 Archaeological Evaluation Report** (Document Reference: 3.08.03) provides the results of the subsequent trial trenching completed between May and July 2022; 24 fields were included in the programme, although access to two fields (Fields TT21 and TT24) was denied due to the presence of livestock and newly planted trees. A total of 246 trenches were opened across the remainder of the Site which encountered evidence for Iron Age occupation in Fields TT05, TT07, TT08 and TT20 and Roman activity in Fields TT07 and 20 as well as evidence for possible Romano-British field systems. A medieval settlement and its associated fields were identified in Field TT05.

8.4.8 Four areas within the Red Line Boundary have been subject to previous evaluation and are excluded from the evaluation.

- An evaluation for Norwich Northern Distributor Route recorded several ditches and pits which contained possible Middle Bronze Age pottery, Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age pottery, 11th century pottery and struck and burnt flints.
- An evaluation at Old Hall Farm in 2019 recorded pits and ditches. In one of the pits and one of the ditches, pottery of late Neolithic / Early Bronze Age was recorded.
- An evaluation for the A47 Improvement Works (North Tuddenham to Easton DCO) was undertaken in 2019 and 2020. A total of 48 areas were investigated, two of which extended into the southern part of the site. Pits, ditches and postholes with later medieval metalwork and pottery and post-medieval pottery were recorded.



- An evaluation on the route of the Hornsea pipeline in the central part of the site was limited to post-medieval field boundaries.

8.4.9 The area of the Wensum valley was excluded from the evaluation area due to its level of environmental protection on the floodplain. Any evaluation trenches in this area would be subject to water ingress and would therefore not be practical to excavate.

8.4.10 Parts of the site that are wooded were also unsuitable for evaluation.

8.4.11 Some areas were not evaluated as new proposals have since come to light, including ecological mitigation areas, along with refinements to the site Red Line Boundary. It has been agreed with the CPA Archaeological Advisor that such areas can be evaluated post-determination of the planning consent.

8.4.12 **Appendix 8.5 Geoarchaeological Deposit Model** (Document Reference: 3.08.05) provides an assessment of geoarchaeological potential of the River Wensum floodplain. Deeper floodplain zones near the present-day channels preserve organic alluvial deposits (fibrous 'peat'), considered as heritage assets with potential to provide paleoenvironmental data. The assessment recommends a geoarchaeological borehole survey to collect sediment for offsite study.

Chronological Summary

Prehistoric period (800,000 BC–AD 43)

8.4.13 While there is little known evidence for activity within the Red Line Boundary during the early prehistoric period, there is clear evidence for activity (including agricultural and possibly settlement activity) from the Neolithic onwards.

8.4.14 The 2021 geophysical survey (**Appendix 8.2 Geophysical Survey Report** (Document Reference 03.08.02)) identified possible enclosures that may be of late prehistoric date. The subsequent 2022 trial trench evaluation (**Appendix 8.3 Archaeological Mitigation Works** (Document Reference: 3.08.03)) identified three sites suggesting short-lived, small-scale Early–Middle Iron



Age occupation as well as a rectilinear enclosure, from which Middle Iron Age and Romano-British pottery was recovered. A moderate quantity of Neolithic–Early Bronze Age worked flints were found within the topsoil suggesting background level of activity during these periods.

- 8.4.15 At the Norwich Northern Distributor Route (Block F1a) in the northern part of the Red Line Boundary along the A1067 several ditches and pits which contained possible Middle and Late Bronze Age pottery were recorded (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3a: Asset 8a**).
- 8.4.16 The evaluation at Old Hall Farm in the northern part of the Red Line Boundary revealed ditches and pits in three trial trenches which contained later Neolithic / Early Bronze Age pottery **Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3a: Asset 10**).
- 8.4.17 north-east Fieldwalking within the Study Area has also recorded Neolithic flint tools at three locations: 250 metres to the south-west of the northern part of the Red Line Boundary where a tanged flint arrowhead and 40 flint flakes were recorded (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3b: Asset 36**); Immediately to the south of the Red Line Boundary (Primrose Grove), where 13 flint flakes and two scrapers were recorded (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 4b: Asset 41**); and 180 metres north-east of the northernmost part of the Red Line Boundary at Morton where a polished flint axe, a scraper and a blade were recorded (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA** (Document Reference: 3.08.01): **Figure 4b: Asset 158**).
- 8.4.18 Neolithic or Bronze Age flint tools and a fragment of Bronze Age pottery are recorded as having been found in waste matter from a quarry, 350 metres north of the northern part of the Red Line Boundary (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3b: Asset 20**), while a small Neolithic polished flint axehead is recorded as having been found by chance 300 metres to the east of the southern part of the Red Line Boundary



(Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures (Document Reference: 3.08.07): Figure 5b: Asset 66).

8.4.19 Cropmarks of possible Bronze Age ring ditches or barrows are recorded 60 metres to the east of the Red Line Boundary, 350 metres south-west of Ringland Lane **(Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures (Document Reference: 3.08.07): Figure 5b: Asset 48)..**

8.4.20 Iron Age evidence has been found within the Red Line Boundary. At the Norwich Northern Distributor Route (Block F1a) in the northern part of the Red Line Boundary along the A1067, an evaluation recorded ditches which contained Early Iron Age pottery **(Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures (Document Reference: 3.08.07): Figure 3a: Asset 8a)**. Partly within the Red Line Boundary, to the immediate north-east of Breck Road there are cropmarks of possible Iron Age ditches and enclosures **(Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures (Document Reference: 3.08.07): Figure 5b: Asset 60)**.

8.4.21 Early–Middle Iron Age activity, possibly short-lived occupation and a Middle Iron Age pit were recorded during trial trench evaluation (Appendix 8.3) **(Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures (Document Reference: 3.08.07): Figures 3a, 4a and 5a: A124)**.

8.4.22 Possible Iron Age ditches and enclosures have also been identified within the Study Area from crop marks 120 metres to the east of the northern part of the Red Line Boundary **(Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures (Document Reference: 3.08.07): Figure 3b: Asset 14)**; 100 metres to the south of the northern part of the Red Line Boundary; 150 metres to the south-west of the Red Line Boundary along Ringland Lane **(Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures (Document Reference: 3.08.07): Figure 3b: Asset A15)**; outside the Red Line Boundary 280 metres south-west of Ringland Lane **(Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures (Document Reference: 3.08.07): Figure 4b: Asset 45)**; and partly within the Red Line Boundary straddling Weston Road **(Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures (Document Reference: 3.08.07): Figure 4b: Asset 51)**.



Roman Period (AD 43–410)

- 8.4.23 The Red Line Boundary was primarily agricultural fields and woodland throughout this period, although there is some evidence from the site-based investigations for small-scale rural settlement.
- 8.4.24 The main Roman settlement in the area of Norfolk was located at Caistor St. Edmund (*Venta Icenorum*), 15 kilometres south-east of the Red Line Boundary. There was a network of Roman roads within the area; the nearest to the Red Line Boundary were 6 kilometres to the south of the Red Line Boundary and 7 kilometres to the north of the Red Line Boundary. In addition, there will most likely have been numerous minor Roman roads and tracks linking small settlements, farmsteads and villas.
- 8.4.25 Trial trench evaluation encountered a rectilinear enclosure from the south of central area of the Red Line Boundary (**Appendix 8.3 Archaeological Evaluation Report** (Document Reference: 3.08.03), TT07 Figure, 3a) which contained Roman pottery (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 5a: A124**). Towards the centre of the Red Line Boundary a Romano-British ditch was recorded and a pit containing pottery (**Appendix 8.3 Archaeological Evaluation Report** (Document Reference: 3.08.03), TT10), and in the north of the Red Line Boundary (**Appendix 8.3 Archaeological Evaluation Report** (Document Reference: 3.08.03), TT20) a small quantity of animal bone and charred plant remains was recorded along with evidence of the Roman fieldscape. These three sites may indicate focal points of localised, but as yet undefined activity within a landscape otherwise dominated by field systems.
- 8.4.26 It is possible that the enclosures may have originated in the Iron Age and remained in use during the Roman period.
- 8.4.27 The cropmarks of fragmentary ditches and probable former field boundaries of unknown date are visible on aerial photographs extending into the northern part of the Red Line Boundary on both sides of the A1067 (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3b: Asset 16**). The



date of the ditches is uncertain, although a Roman date is a possibility. Metal detecting in this area found two Roman brooches (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3b: Asset 17**).

8.4.28 Further areas of cropmarks of possible ditches may also have a Roman date: 45 metres to the north-west of the northern part of the Red Line Boundary, on either side of the A1067 (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3b: Asset 22**); slightly extending into and adjoining the Red Line Boundary to the south in the area of Low Farm (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3b: Asset 33**); immediately adjacent to the south-east of the Red Line Boundary in the area of Low Farm (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3b: Asset 35**); and 25m to the north-west of the Red Line Boundary at the junction of Ringland Road and Marl Hill Road (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3b: Asset 39**).

Early Medieval Period (AD 410–1066)

8.4.29 The Red Line Boundary lies in the historic parishes of Attlebridge, Ringland, Morton on the Hill, Weston Longville and Honingham. Settlement was likely concentrated in these villages in the latter half of this period. The Proposed Scheme was probably in agricultural fields and woodland, away from the known settlements, throughout this period.

8.4.30 Attlebridge is 1.4 kilometres north-west of the northern part of Site Boundary of the Proposed Scheme. The name Attlebridge is derived from 'Aetla's bridge'. The river crossing over the Wensum in the village dates to before the Norman Conquest in 1066. The settlement probably grew up around the river crossing.

8.4.31 Ringland is 1 kilometre to the south-east of the central part of the Site Boundary of the Proposed Scheme. Ringland has a long history and was an established settlement prior to the Norman Conquest. The name of Ringland is thought to derive from 'the newly cultivated land of Rymi's people'.



8.4.32 Morton on the Hill is 1.6 kilometres north of the northern part of the Site Boundary of the Proposed Scheme. It is not recorded in the Domesday Book so there may not have been a settlement here until the later medieval period.

8.4.33 Weston Longville is 1.1 kilometre to the north-west of the Site Boundary of the Proposed Scheme. Settlement at Weston Longville dates to the early medieval period, being well established by the time of the Norman Conquest.

8.4.34 Honingham is 700 metres south-east of the southern part of the Site Boundary of the Proposed Scheme. Early medieval settlement was probably focussed in the area of St Andrew's Church, 1.6 kilometres south-east of the southern part of the Site Boundary.

8.4.35 The only early medieval remains in the Study Area is a small assemblage of Late Saxon and early medieval pottery recorded during an evaluation in the northern part of the Red Line Boundary (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3a: Asset 8a**).

Later Medieval Period (AD 1066–1540)

8.4.36 Trial trench evaluation encountered evidence for a deserted rural medieval settlement, comprising rectilinear enclosures, six postholes and a possible corn-dryer, as well as an associated field system towards the south of the Red Line Boundary, east of Wood Farm (**Appendix 8.3 Archaeological Evaluation Report** (Document Reference: 3.08.03), TT05, Figure 3a) (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figures 6a: A124**). The site had originally been identified as a possible medieval–post medieval field system visible on aerial photographs (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 5b: Asset 69**).

8.4.37 Elsewhere the later medieval settlement probably continued to be focussed on the villages of Attlebridge, Ringland, Morton on the Hill, Weston Longville and Honingham.

8.4.38 The earthworks and cropmarks of a medieval moat and associated boundaries and drains are visible on aerial photographs of the valley floor of



the River Wensum are also located within the Red Line Boundary at the north-eastern end (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 4b: Asset 26**).

8.4.39 Cropmarks, which may be of former field boundaries of possible later medieval date are noted extending slightly within the Red Line Boundary and adjoining to the south-east at Weston Road (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 4b: Asset 52**); 150 metres south of Wood Farm (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 5b: Asset 69**). The cropmarks of a linear boundary or trackway of possible later medieval to post medieval date, are also within the Red Line Boundary 140 metres to the south-west of Weston Road. (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 5b: Asset 57**). The cropmarks of possible later medieval boundary extend into the northern portion of the Red Line Boundary at the junction of Ringland Lane and Marl Hill Road (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 4b: Asset 148**).

8.4.40 Within the Study Area, a possible deserted medieval settlement is recorded at Deighton Hills Shooting School, 450 metres north-east of the northern part of the Red Line Boundary (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3b: Asset 135**). Later medieval pottery was recorded during fieldwalking as part of an evaluation at the Norwich Northern Distributor Route (Field 1), 80 metres to the north-east of the north-eastern part of the Red Line Boundary (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 3a: Asset 6**).

8.4.41 Other than the medieval settlement located towards the southern end of the Red Line Boundary (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 5b: Asset 69**), the remainder of the Site probably continued to be in agricultural fields throughout the later medieval period.



Post-Medieval and Modern Periods (AD 1540–Present)

- 8.4.42 Historic mapping shows that the Red Line Boundary was in open fields or woodland during the post-medieval period. The southern part of the Site Boundary extended into Honingham Park, a landscape park dating the 18th century (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 6b: Asset 65**). A tree-lined avenue belonging to the park is partly within the Site Boundary, to the south of The Broadway.
- 8.4.43 Attlebridge Airfield was constructed during World War Two and extended into the southern part of the Site Boundary (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 6b: Asset 54**). A number of surviving structures dating to World War Two are recorded on the Historic Environment Record (HER) as still extant. Unfortunately, it was not possible to confirm whether these were still extant during the site walkover inspections due to access restrictions and obscuring vegetation. Structures recorded comprise air raid shelters, fuel stores, concrete structures of unknown function, concrete foundations of sentry boxes, barracks and the Officers' Quarters. The locations of some of the recorded structures is within the Site Boundary or in near proximity to it. In an area of woodland between Broadway and Breck Road, straddling the Site Boundary, there are three air raid shelters, a fuel store compound and a building (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 5b: Assets 74 to 78**). Another air raid shelter is recorded within the Site Boundary, 290 metres to the south of The Broadway (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 5b: Asset 91**). Two further World War Two concrete structures of unknown function are recorded within the Site Boundary on The Broadway (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 5b: Assets 79 and 80**). Four further air raid shelters are recorded close to the Site Boundary, 40 metres to the north of The Broadway (**Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 5b: Assets 81, 84 to 86**).



8.4.44 Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) data show that the majority of the Proposed Scheme is characterised as 20th century agriculture with small, fragmented areas of 18th to 19th century enclosure, pre-18th century enclosure, 18th to 20th century woodland plantation and managed wetland. Several of the undated linear features, recorded during the 2022 trial trench evaluation (**Appendix 8.3 Archaeological Evaluation Report** (Document Reference: 3.08.03)), are likely to represent former post medieval field boundaries.

Factors Affecting Archaeological Survival

8.4.45 Archaeological survival across the majority of the Proposed Scheme is high, as confirmed by the archaeological trial trench evaluation. According to historic mapping, apart from a small number of roads crossing the Red Line Boundary it has remained undeveloped in fields and woodland and has not been previously built on as shown on aerial photographs and LiDAR survey. Archaeological remains can be found beneath the topsoil, mostly at a depth of no more than 1.0 metre below ground level (other than where alluvium is present).

8.4.46 Ploughing, root action, and localised historic small-scale hand-dug quarrying not shown on historic maps will have comprised archaeological survival in part of the Site.

8.4.47 According to HLC data the historic landscape is not intact. There are small areas of pre-18th and 18th to 19th century enclosure but these have been fragmented by 20th century agriculture.

Future Baseline

8.4.48 For buried heritage assets within the Red Line Boundary, the future baseline is expected to be the same as the present. Such remains are a static resource, which have reached equilibrium with their environment and do not change (i.e., decay or grow) unless their environment changes as a result of human or natural intervention.



8.4.49 For above ground heritage assets, the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton DCO scheme would potentially result in increased impacts to setting from traffic flows.

8.5 Sensitive Receptors

8.5.1 The following heritage assets (sensitive receptors) have been identified for assessment. The Asset no. is that used in in **Appendix 8.1 HEDBA** (Document Reference: 3.08.01). Where significance is noted as uncertain, site-based investigation would be required to clarify the nature, date, extent and significance of the remains.



Table 8-7 Sensitive Receptors (heritage assets)

Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Above ground	105	Barn 50m north west of Low Farm House located within the Site Boundary and listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	165	Abattoir at the Old Butcher's Shop located 245m south-east of the Red Line Boundary on Marl Hill Road / Fakenham Road / The Street, and 1.6km north-west of the Site Boundary. Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	106	The Lodge located 255m north-west of the Red Line Boundary and 1.6km north-west of the Site Boundary (and located 1.2km north-east of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	107	Church of St Margaret located 75m north of the Red Line Boundary and 320m north-west of the Site Boundary at its closest point (and 670m north-east of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade II*	High

Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Above ground	108	Water cistern at south-east corner of St Margaret's Churchyard located 55m north of the Red Line Boundary and 305m north-west of the Site Boundary at its closest point (and 685m north-east of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	109	Garden Walls to west of Morton Hall located 115m north-west of the Red Line Boundary and 360m north-west of the Site Boundary at its closest point (and 690m north-east of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	110	Morton Hall located 105m north-west of the Red Line Boundary and 370m north-west of the Site Boundary at its closest point (and 735m north-east of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	111	Garden Walls including Owl House at Home Farm, Morton Hall Estate located 95m south of the Red Line Boundary and 320m north-west of the Site Boundary at its closest point (and 430m north-east of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade II	Medium



Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Above ground	112	Church of All Saints including boundary wall to churchyard located in Weston Longville, 190m south-west of the Red Line Boundary and 1km north-west of the Site Boundary (and located 390m south-west of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade I	High
Above ground	113	Weston Longville War Memorial located 250m south-west of the Red Line Boundary and 1km north-west of the Site Boundary (and located 455m south-west of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	114	Church Farm House located 255m south-west of the Red Line Boundary and 1km north-west of the Site Boundary (and located 455m south-west of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	115	Former Spread Eagle Public House located in Weston Longville, 285m south-west of the Red Line Boundary and 1.1km north-west of the Site Boundary (and located 500m south-west of the Red Line Boundary at Ringland Lane / Marl Hill Road). Listed at Grade II	Medium

Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Above ground	116	Green Farm House located 85m north-east of the Red Line Boundary and 570m north-west of the Site Boundary. Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	117	Church of St Peter located in Ringland, 135m north of the Red Line Boundary and located 920m south-east of the Site Boundary at its closest point. Listed at Grade I	High
Above ground	118	Stables and Coach House to Honingham Hall located 790m south-east of the Site Boundary at its closest point. Listed at Grade II. The asset is located within the boundary of the non-designated Site of Honingham Hall (see 164).	Medium
Above ground	119	Berry Hall located 575m south-west of the Site Boundary. Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	120	Icehouse to Berry Hall located 805m south-west of the Site Boundary. Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	121	39, 40 and 41 The Street located in Honingham, 385m south-east of the Site Boundary. Listed at Grade II	Medium



Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Above ground	122	Honingham and East Tuddenham War Memorial located 430m south-east of the Site Boundary. Listed at Grade II	Medium
Above ground	164	Site of Honingham Hall is a non-designated asset, 750m south-east of the Site Boundary at its closest point. It is the site of a former house, demolished in 1967.	Low
Above ground	65	Honingham Park is a non-designated asset partly located within the Site Boundary. A former designed landscape, it forms a group with the Grade II listed Stables and Coach House to Honingham Hall and the non-designated Site of Honingham Hall, which are located beyond the Site Boundary	Low
Above ground	54	Attlebridge World War Two Airfield is partly located within the Site Boundary. The airfield extended into the southern part of the site. Features recorded within site comprise air raid shelters, fuel stores, sentry post and barracks associated with the former airfield.	Low
Above ground	A74	World War Two air raid shelter at Attlebridge airfield.	Low



Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Above ground	A79	Possible World War Two concrete structure at Attlebridge airfield.	Low
Above ground	A80	A World War Two concrete structure at Attlebridge airfield.	Low
Above ground	A89	A concrete slab survives Attlebridge airfield.	Low
Above ground	A90	A World War Two air raid shelter.	Low
Above ground	A91	A World War Two air raid shelter.	Low
Above ground	A92	A World War Two air raid shelter along with concrete slabs and steps.	Low

Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Above ground	n/a	The historic landscape is fragmented consisting of 20th century agriculture with small, fragmented areas of 18th to 19th century enclosure, pre-18th century enclosure, 18th to 20th century woodland plantation and managed wetland.	Low
Buried	A16	Cropmarks of undated linear features. Geophysical survey in 2021 revealed anomalies thought to be post-medieval field ditches but the nature and date has yet to be confirmed by intrusive evaluation.	Probably Low
Buried	A26	Earthwork and Cropmarks of a medieval moat and associated boundaries and drains.	Medium
Buried	A28	Area of possible Prehistoric Activity identified by small group of undated worked flints identified during field walking. Archaeological evaluation is yet to be conducted in the area.	Uncertain
Buried	A29	Area of possible Prehistoric activity identified by small group of undated worked flints identified during field walking. Archaeological evaluation is yet to be conducted in the area.	Uncertain



Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Buried	A30	Area of possible Prehistoric activity identified by small group of undated worked flints identified during field walking. Archaeological evaluation is yet to be conducted in the area.	Uncertain
Buried	A32	Area of possible Prehistoric Activity identified by small group of undated worked flints identified during field walking. Archaeological evaluation is yet to be conducted in the area.	Uncertain
Buried	A33	Possibly Roman or post-medieval- cropmarks of multi-period linear ditches. Archaeological evaluation is yet to be conducted.	Uncertain
Buried	A38	Area of Roman activity of unknown extent in the vicinity of a cropmark of probable Roman farmstead (likely outside the site) including Roman chance finds. No archaeological evaluation and geophysical survey data available.	Uncertain possibly High
Buried	A42	Site extends into the periphery of a World War Two accommodation and training area. No archaeological evaluation and geophysical survey data available.	Low
Buried	A50	The site of World War Two military structure visible on Aerial Photograph.	Medium

Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Buried	A69	Area of Iron Age and Roman activity in the form of pits and ditches identified during the 2022 evaluation.	High
Buried	A148	Undated cropmark of ditches and field boundaries.	Low
Buried	A182	Area of Prehistoric to Iron Age activity identified during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	Medium
Buried	A183	Undated pits and ditches along with undated prehistoric worked flints recorded during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	Medium
Buried	A184	Ditch containing Neolithic flint along with undated pits and ditches identified during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	Low
Buried	A186	Two ditches containing Roman pottery recovered from during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	Medium
Buried	A187	Two ditches containing Undated burnt flint and charcoal found during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	Low



Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Buried	A188	Pits and ditches with medieval and prehistoric identified during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	Low
Buried	A189	Area of Iron Age, Roman and medieval activity identified during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	High
Buried	A190	Charcoal fragments of unknown period recovered from ditch during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	Low
Buried	A191	Pit containing prehistoric worked and medieval finds along with some undated ditches found during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	Medium or Low
Buried	A192	Ditch containing Charcoal flecks and other organic materials of unknown period recovered from ditch during archaeological evaluation in 2022.	Low
Buried	A193	Undated pit containing fragments of fired clay, a single unworked burnt flint, and a few fragments of charcoal along with ditches recovered during archaeological evaluation conducted by Oxford Archaeology in 2022.	Low



Asset type	Asset (A) ref.	Heritage asset / receptor	Heritage significance
Buried	Not applicable	Alluvial deposits in the Wensum Valley and Foxburrow stream (a tributary of the River Tud) hold moderate or high potential for palaeoenvironmental remains.	Low or medium
Buried	Not applicable	Possible previously unrecorded prehistoric or Roman remains in those parts of the site that have yet to see intrusive evaluation (moderate to high potential).	Uncertain
Buried	Not applicable	Later medieval and post medieval agricultural activity (moderate potential).	Low



8.6 Assessment of Potential Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects

Outline of proposals relevant to Cultural Heritage

Preliminary site strip

- 8.6.1 It is assumed for the purposes of this assessment that in a 'worst case' scenario, topsoil would be stripped from the entire footprint of the Site Boundary and the temporary construction areas (**Appendix 3.3** Figure 3.1, Document Reference 03.03.03)) as part of the pre-construction works. Removal of topsoil is a potential impact as, in addition to the loss of any residual evidence it contains, it exposes any archaeological remains that may be present immediately beneath the topsoil. These may then be affected by movement of vehicles and plant involved in construction activities, for example through rutting and compaction. In addition, it is possible that topsoil removal without archaeological supervision may result in overstripping, which would have an impact upon archaeological remains located beneath the topsoil, or understripping, where archaeological features are concealed beneath a thin layer of topsoil but are then exposed and unprotected from subsequent construction activities.

Road construction

- 8.6.2 Construction of foundations for the carriageway would entirely remove any archaeological remains within the excavation footprint.

Viaduct construction and bridge construction

- 8.6.3 Excavations for the piers for the River Wensum Viaduct over the River Wensum Special Area of Conservation and floodplain and for the foundations of the road bridges would entirely remove any archaeological remains within pile footprints. Pile diameter and spacing is not currently known, but for the purposes of this assessment are assumed to be large diameter and widely spaced. The viaduct piers would cause a localised impact on any palaeoenvironmental remains in the Wensum within the excavation footprint.



Attenuation ponds

- 8.6.4 The excavations for the attenuation ponds would entirely remove any archaeological remains within the excavation footprint, to the depth of excavation (assumed here to be 2.0 metres maximum).

Services / utilities trenches / drains

- 8.6.5 The excavation of any new service trenches and drains, along with temporary and permanent fencing, would extend to a depth of 1.0–2.0 metres below ground level as assumed for the purposes of this assessment. Any remains within their footprint would be removed or truncated.

Woodland enhancement and hedge creation / enhancement

- 8.6.6 The proposed enhancements and hedge creation are focused upon existing woodland, to include understorey planting (planting of small, shade-tolerant shrubs or trees), and existing and former hedgerows. There would be no impacts to currently unknown archaeological remains associated with planting in these areas.

Woodland and scrub creation

- 8.6.7 Woodland and scrub creation, part of Essential Environmental Mitigation, is proposed for six land parcels within the Red Line Boundary as well as along a proposed 10 metres strip either side of the River Wensum as part of the Water Framework Directive mitigation areas (riparian planting).
- 8.6.8 Essential Environmental Mitigation Areas have the potential to impact upon currently unknown archaeological remains in areas within the Red Line Boundary. Ground intrusion from the proposed tree planting and subsequent root action is assumed for the purposes of this assessment to reach a depth of 1.0–1.5 metres below ground level. This would entirely remove or severely disturb any archaeological remains at the tree location.



Grassland creation and enhancement

- 8.6.9 Nine land parcels within the Red Line Boundary have been identified for grassland creation and enhancement. Four of these areas are located on pasture within the Wensum valley.
- 8.6.10 Grassland creation is proposed for land currently under arable cultivation. No groundworks are proposed below the existing ploughsoil and no impact to currently unknown buried archaeological remains is therefore expected.
- 8.6.11 The site of a probable moat and other associated earthworks (**Appendix 8.1 HEDBA** (Document Reference: 3.08.01) and **Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07): **Figure 4b, Asset A26**) are recorded within the area proposed for grassland enhancement within the Wensum valley. No groundworks (such as topsoil stripping or ploughing) is proposed in order to enhance the existing grassland and consequently there would be no impact to the moat or to currently unknown buried archaeological remains.

Water Framework Directive mitigation

- 8.6.12 The works would include rewatering a former meander of the River Wensum as well as the riparian planting mentioned above. There are no works proposed in the vicinity of the medieval moat (**Appendix 8.1 HEDBA** (Document Reference: 3.08.01): **Asset A26 and Appendix 8.7 HEDBA Figures** (Document Reference: 3.08.07) 4b) within the Wensum valley, which would be preserved in situ. There is low potential for previously unrecorded remains to be present within Water Framework Directive areas. Any remains would likely be related to agricultural activity or geoarchaeology (e.g. ecofacts within alluvium) of no more than low heritage significance. Effects are therefore not likely to be significant (no more than minor adverse).

Construction Phase

- 8.6.13 **Table 8-8** presents the assessment of potential effects on buried heritage assets. Due to the number of assets affected, these have been grouped into a single table, rather than one table per asset (as is the case for the Operational Phase Tables 8-9 to 8-15). Structures associated with Attlebridge Airfield are



assessed according to current understanding of impacts and survival of remains. The remains are likely to be part-buried or completely buried, and due to existing vegetation growth, woodland cover and land access were not fully evaluated. Given that the assets are of low heritage significance, effects are not significant (negligible or minor adverse), depending on impacts of detailed design.

8.6.14 **Table 8-8** shows effects prior to the implementation of an agreed programme of archaeological mitigation, as set out in **Appendix 8.4: Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Mitigation** (Document Reference: 3.08.04) approved by the CPA Archaeological Advisor and including a WSI for geoarchaeological borehole survey (as recommended in **Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Deposit Model** (Document Reference: 3.08.05)) to mitigate the removal of sediments in the Wensum Channel (to be approved and appended to the WSI for Archaeological Mitigation). **Table 8-8** also shows the level of residual effect, following that programme of mitigation. Note that it is only proposed to mitigate 'significant' negative effects. Mitigation is not proposed for those effects that are considered to be minor and 'not significant'.

8.6.15 This takes account of the measures set out in **Appendix 3.1: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan** (OCEMP) (Document Reference: 3.03.01) that has been included in the Planning Application, compliance with which is proposed to be secured by planning condition. This includes the principles of mitigation that would be implemented prior to the implementation of and during the Construction Phase for heritage matters. Mitigation would comprise archaeological 'strip, map and sample' well in advance of the construction phase, to avoid delays to programme. An archaeological watching brief in Essential Environmental and Water Framework mitigation areas is also proposed as other archaeological work would be impractical. The detailed CEMP would be developed to be consistent with the OCEMP, and approved pursuant to condition and be implemented during construction.

Table 8-8 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects – Construction Phase

Sensitive receptor (Heritage Asset)	Magnitude of change due to construction	Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Additional Mitigation	Residual effect
Linear features of post-medieval field ditches (A16). Low heritage significance.	High (preliminary strip; road foundation, embankment, drainage and pond construction)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Area of possible Prehistoric Activity (A28). Uncertain heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip and road embankment construction)	Minor, Moderate or Major negative (depending on asset significance)	Post-determination field evaluation leading to an agreed programme of mitigation, if required.	Negligible (not significant)
Area of possible Prehistoric Activity (A29). Uncertain heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip, road embankment construction, drainage works)	Minor, Moderate or Major negative (depending on asset significance)	Post-determination field evaluation leading to an agreed programme of mitigation, if required.	Negligible (not significant)
Area of possible Prehistoric Activity (A30). Uncertain heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip, road embankment construction, drainage works)	Minor, Moderate or Major negative (depending on asset significance)	Post-determination field evaluation leading to an agreed programme of mitigation, if required.	Negligible (not significant)
Area of possible Prehistoric Activity (A32). Uncertain heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip, road embankment construction)	Minor, Moderate or Major negative (depending on asset significance)	Post-determination field evaluation leading to an agreed programme of mitigation, if required.	Negligible (not significant)
Cropmarks of multi-period linear ditches (A33). Uncertain heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip, road embankment construction, drainage works)	Minor, Moderate or Major negative (depending on asset significance)	Post-determination field evaluation leading to an agreed programme of mitigation, if required.	Negligible (not significant)
Area of Roman activity in the vicinity of a cropmark of probable Roman farmstead (likely outside the site). (A38) Medium heritage significance.	Medium (localised preliminary topsoil strip for temporary access road)	Minor or Moderate negative (depending on asset significance)	Post-determination field evaluation leading to an agreed programme of mitigation, if required.	Negligible (not significant)

Sensitive receptor (Heritage Asset)	Magnitude of change due to construction	Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Additional Mitigation	Residual effect
Site of World War Two accommodation and training area (A42). Low heritage significance.	Low (localised preliminary topsoil strip for temporary access road)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Possible buried remains associated with a World War Two military structure visible on aerial photograph (A50). Low heritage significance.	Low (preliminary topsoil strip)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Area of Iron Age and Roman activity in the form of pits and ditches identified during the 2022 evaluation (A69). High heritage significance	High (preliminary topsoil strip, road embankment construction, drainage works)	Major negative	Programme of archaeological strip, map and sample mitigation, to achieve preservation by record.	Negligible (not significant)
Undated cropmark of ditches and field boundaries (A148). Low heritage significance.	Medium (preliminary topsoil strip)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Area of Prehistoric to Iron Age activity identified during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A182). Medium heritage significance	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment construction; swales and planting	Major negative	Programme of archaeological strip, map and sample mitigation, to achieve preservation by record.	Negligible (not significant)
Undated pits and ditches along with undated prehistoric worked flints recorded during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A183) Medium heritage significance	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment construction; swales and planting	Major negative	Programme of archaeological strip, map and sample mitigation, to achieve preservation by record.	Negligible (not significant)
Undated pits and ditches identified during archaeological evaluation in 2022. Neolithic worked flints in topsoil (A184). Low heritage significance	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment construction; temporary construction compound	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Two ditches containing Roman pottery recovered from during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A186). Medium heritage significance	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment; swales, planting)	Major negative	Programme of archaeological strip, map and sample mitigation, to achieve preservation by record.	Negligible (not significant)

Sensitive receptor (Heritage Asset)	Magnitude of change due to construction	Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Additional Mitigation	Residual effect
Two ditches containing undated burnt flint and charcoal found during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A187). Low heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment; swales, planting)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Pits and ditches with prehistoric and medieval finds identified during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A188). Low heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment; swales, planting)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Area of significant Iron Age, Roman and medieval activity identified during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A189). High heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment; swales, planting)	Major negative	Programme of archaeological strip, map and sample mitigation, to achieve preservation by record.	Negligible (not significant)
Charcoal fragments of unknown period recovered from ditch during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A190). Low heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment; swales, planting)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Pit containing prehistoric worked and medieval finds along with some undated ditches found during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A191). Low heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment; swales, planting)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Ditch containing Charcoal flecks and other organic materials of unknown period recovered from ditch during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A192). Low heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Undated pit and ditches containing fragments of fired clay and charcoal recorded during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A193). Low heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip; road embankment; drainage)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Hollow containing charcoal and weed seeds along with an unworked burnt flint and a retouched flake of probable Neolithic date recorded during archaeological evaluation in 2022 (A194). Medium heritage significance.	Medium (preliminary topsoil strip)	Moderate negative	Programme of archaeological strip, map and sample mitigation, to achieve preservation by record.	Negligible (not significant)

Sensitive receptor (Heritage Asset)	Magnitude of change due to construction	Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Additional Mitigation	Residual effect
Complex rectilinear enclosures were identified during a geophysical survey. Evaluation in 2022 only included one trench here which found no finds (A195). Medium heritage significance.	Medium (preliminary topsoil strip)	Moderate negative	Programme of archaeological strip, map and sample mitigation, to achieve preservation by record.	Negligible (not significant)
Alluvial deposits in the Wensum Valley and Foxburrow stream (a tributary of the River Tud) hold moderate or high potential for palaeoenvironmental remains. Low or medium heritage significance.	Medium. (piling for viaduct, carriageway construction in the tributary of the Tud; grassland creation; Water Framework directive mitigation)	Moderate negative	Geoarchaeological deposit model	Minor negative (not significant)
Possible previously unrecorded prehistoric or Roman remains in those parts of the site that have yet to see intrusive evaluation (moderate to high potential). Heritage significance dependent on nature, date, and extent of the remains, if present.	High (preliminary topsoil strip and other proposed works)	Minor, Moderate or Major negative (depending on asset significance)	Post-determination field evaluation leading to an agreed programme of mitigation, if required.	Negligible (not significant)
Later medieval and post medieval agricultural activity (moderate potential). Low heritage significance.	High (preliminary topsoil strip and other proposed works)	Minor negative	No proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
Historic landscape fragmentary remnants. Low heritage significance.	Medium (Road construction and associated works)	Minor negative	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)
World War Two air raid shelter at Attlebridge airfield (A74). Low heritage significance.	Uncertain: negligible or medium. The impacts at this location are currently uncertain and it is not known whether the asset would be impacted or not.	Negligible or minor adverse, depending on impacts.	Method dependent on extent of survival, but if required, likely to comprise post-determination watching brief and / or building recording.	None or Minor adverse (not significant)

Sensitive receptor (Heritage Asset)	Magnitude of change due to construction	Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Additional Mitigation	Residual effect
Possible World War Two concrete structure at Attlebridge airfield (A79). Low heritage significance	Uncertain: negligible or medium. The impacts at this location are currently uncertain and it is not known whether the asset would be impacted or not.	Negligible or minor adverse, depending on impacts.	Method dependent on extent of survival, but if required, likely to comprise post-determination watching brief and / or building recording	None or Minor adverse (not significant)
A World War Two concrete structure at Attlebridge airfield (A80). Low heritage significance.	Uncertain: negligible or medium. The impacts at this location are currently uncertain and it is not known whether the asset would be impacted or not.	Not applicable. Negligible or minor adverse, depending on impacts.	Method dependent on extent of survival, but if required, likely to comprise post-determination watching brief and / or building recording.	None or Minor adverse (not significant)
A concrete slab survives Attlebridge airfield (A89). Low heritage significance.	Uncertain: negligible or medium. The impacts at this location are currently uncertain and it is not known whether the asset would be impacted or not.	Negligible or minor adverse, depending on impacts.	Method dependent on extent of survival, but if required, likely to comprise post-determination watching brief and / or building recording.	None or Minor adverse (not significant)
A World War Two air raid shelter (A90). Low heritage significance.	Uncertain: negligible or medium. The impacts at this location are currently uncertain and it is not known whether the asset would be impacted or not	Negligible or minor adverse, depending on impacts.	Method dependent on extent of survival, but if required, likely to comprise post-determination watching brief and / or building recording.	None or Minor adverse (not significant)
A World War Two air raid shelter (A91). Low heritage significance.	Uncertain: negligible or medium. The impacts at this location are currently uncertain and it is not known whether the asset would be impacted or not	Negligible or minor adverse, depending on impacts.	Method dependent on extent of survival, but if required, likely to comprise post-determination watching brief and / or building recording.	None or Minor adverse (not significant)

Sensitive receptor (Heritage Asset)	Magnitude of change due to construction	Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Additional Mitigation	Residual effect
A World War Two air raid shelter along with concrete slabs and steps (A92). Low heritage significance.	Uncertain: negligible or medium. The impacts at this location are currently uncertain and it is not known whether the asset would be impacted or not.	Negligible or minor adverse, depending on impacts.	Method dependent on extent of survival, but if required, likely to comprise post-determination watching brief and / or building recording.	None or Minor adverse (not significant)



Operational Phase

8.6.16 **Tables 8-9 to 8-15** show the assessment of potential effects during the operational phase. These are restricted to permanent adverse effects on the significance of above ground heritage assets, due to changes in the setting and how the asset is understood and appreciated.

Table 8-9 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Barn 50m north west of Low Farm House

Sensitive receptor	Barn 50m north west of Low Farm House (listed Grade II, including the dairy barn and Low Farm House which are assumed to be curtilage listed to the barn). Medium heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Medium.</p> <p>The location of the River Wensum Viaduct crossing the River Wensum Special Area of Conservation and floodplain and its abutment would impact views towards the barn when looking north-west from The Street or looking north-west and north from the fields immediately surrounding the farm complex. The viaduct would also be visually intrusive in views looking north and north-west from the dairy barn towards and across the River Wensum. The Proposed Scheme would also be visible in views from inside the farm complex itself and in views out from the farmhouse. The Proposed Scheme would also impact on the asset's visual and possible historic relationship to Attlebridge Hall and impact on its possible historic relationship to the Morton Hall Estate. The Proposed Scheme would impact on current noise levels. There would be no physical impact to the barn (or to the dairy barn or the farmhouse), and while some of the visual connections to the wider landscape would be affected, it would still be possible to understand the asset, and its curtilage structures, as agricultural buildings in a farmland setting. The construction of the new road would introduce a new component into the landscape and introduce a change in setting so far as visual linkages are concerned, although it would be possible to enjoy wider views at ground level, under the viaduct. It would also still be possible to understand the possible historic connections to the Morton Hall Estate and Attlebridge Hall.</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme would not impact on the Grade II listed barn's key visual and historic relationship to the wider farm complex, notably to the dairy barn, or to the farmhouse. The asset's relationship to The Street, the key network that links the farm to Ringland, would also not be impacted by the Proposed Scheme, while the footpath leading to Attlebridge would be retained. Views of the wider landscape when viewed out from the end of The Street towards the north-east, east and south-east would not be impacted by the Proposed Scheme, preserving the relationship of the barn and the wider farm complex to much of the surrounding rural landscape and to the Wensum Valley.</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Moderate negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>The close proximity and design of the Proposed Scheme means that no additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Moderate negative (significant)

Table 8-10 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Abattoir at the Old Butcher’s Shop

Sensitive receptor	Abattoir at the Old Butcher’s Shop (listed Grade II). Medium heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Low.</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new road at some distance from the asset. The asset’s relationship to The Street would not be impacted, nor would its relationship to the Grade II listed The Lodge, also formerly part of the Morton Hall Estate. Visual or noise impacts are unlikely. The Proposed Scheme would be built on the surrounding rural agricultural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate.</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-11 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – The Lodge

Sensitive receptor	The Lodge (listed Grade II). Medium heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Low.</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new road at some distance from the asset. However, views out from the asset, towards the south and south-east would be impacted, while visual impacts from traffic are also likely. The Proposed Scheme would also be built on the surrounding rural agricultural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate (of which the Lodge was formerly a part of), while the River Wensum Viaduct crossing the River Wensum Special Area of Conservation and floodplain would create a new built form in the wider landscape. Its historic relationships to designated heritage assets on the Morton Hall Estate would not be impacted by the Proposed Scheme.</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-12 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Church of St Margaret

Sensitive receptor	Church of St Margaret (listed Grade II*). High heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Low.</p> <p>Views of the Proposed Scheme are unlikely due to the presence of thick tree belts on the estate. The Proposed Scheme would not impact on the church's visual and historic relationship to other designated heritage assets located on the estate or to the former Morton Lodge. However, the Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate, together with a likely minor increase in traffic noise.</p> <p>This would be a low magnitude of change resulting in a minor adverse effect ('not significant').</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-13 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Garden Walls to West of Morton Hall

Sensitive receptor	Garden Walls to West of Morton Hall (listed Grade II). Medium heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Low.</p> <p>Views of the Proposed Scheme are unlikely due to the presence of thick tree belts on the estate. The Proposed Scheme would not impact on the visual and historic relationship of the garden walls to other designated heritage assets located on the estate or to the former Morton Lodge. However, the Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate, together with a likely minor increase in traffic noise.</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-14 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Morton Hall

Sensitive receptor	Morton Hall (listed Grade II). Medium heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Low.</p> <p>Views of the Proposed Scheme are unlikely due to the presence of thick tree belts on the estate. The Proposed Scheme would not impact on the visual and historic relationship of Morton Hall to other designated heritage assets located on the estate or to the former Morton Lodge. However, the Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate, together with a likely minor increase in traffic noise.</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-15 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Garden Walls including Owl House at Home Farm, Morton Hall Estate

Sensitive receptor	Garden Walls including Owl House at Home Farm, Morton Hall Estate (listed Grade II). Medium heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Low.</p> <p>Views of the Proposed Scheme are unlikely due to the presence of thick tree belts on the estate. The Proposed Scheme would not impact on the visual and historic relationship of the Garden Walls including Owl House to other designated heritage assets located on the estate or to the former Morton Lodge. However, the Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate, together with a likely minor increase in traffic noise.</p> <p>This would be a low magnitude of change resulting in a minor adverse effect ('not significant').</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-16 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Church of All Saints including boundary wall to churchyard

Sensitive receptor	Church of All Saints including boundary wall to churchyard (listed Grade I). High heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Low.</p> <p>Views of the Proposed Scheme are unlikely due to intervening built form and vegetation, while the new road would be located at some distance from the asset. The Proposed Scheme would not impact on the asset's key relationships to its churchyard or to the village of Weston Longville, while visual or noise impacts from traffic are likely to be limited. However, due to the asset's prominent location, the introduction of a new built form in the landscape would result in a minor impact on how the church is currently experienced, notably in the perception of those undertaking journeys towards or away from the asset, currently characterised by a wider rural and agricultural landscape.</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-17 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Church of St Peter

Sensitive receptor	Church of St Peter (listed Grade I). High heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Low</p> <p>The asset's rural landscape is marked by thick tree belts which is likely to shield the church from visual or noise impacts from the Proposed Scheme. The asset's key relationships with its churchyard and to the wider village of Ringland would also not be impacted by the Proposed Scheme. The Proposed Scheme is located at some distance from the asset, which means that its immediate rural landscape would not be affected. However, the introduction of a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape would result in a minor impact on how the church is currently experienced, notably in the perception of those undertaking journeys towards or away from the asset, currently characterised by a wider rural and agricultural landscape.</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-18 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Stables and Coach House to Honingham Hall and Site of Honingham Hall

Sensitive receptor	Stables and Coach House to Honingham Hall (listed Grade II). and Site of Honingham Hall (non-designated) (High and Low heritage significance respectively)
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Low</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form into the wider historic Honingham Park, physically impacting on the non-designated heritage asset, and impacting on the overall historic landscape in which the Grade II listed Stables and Coach House and the non-designated Site of Honingham Hall are located. However, the Proposed Scheme would not impact on the designated heritage asset's key relationship to the Site of Honingham Hall. The stables, the site of the now demolished hall, and the former park would also remain as a recognisable group. Distance and intervening vegetation mean that any noise or visual impacts from the Proposed Scheme would likely be limited. The new road would not impact on the either asset's relationship with its immediate setting or to neighbouring villages, notably Honingham or to the Grade II listed Honingham and East Tuddenham War Memorial.</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-19 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Honingham Park

Sensitive receptor	Honingham Park (non-designated). Low heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Medium.</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form into and immediately beyond the boundary of the asset. It would introduce visual and noise impacts from traffic and impact on its relationship to the B1535 Wood Lane, which marks its western boundary and to The Broadway, which marks its northern boundary. It would also impact on tree belts located to the south of The Broadway, which historically had been the location of a tree lined avenue, presumably shielding the estate from the road.</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme would not impact on the primary historic relationship between the Grade II listed Stables at Honingham Park to the non-designated Site of Honingham Hall, which was demolished in 1967. These two assets, together with the park, would remain as a recognisable group. The Proposed Scheme would also not impact on the park's relationship to the village of Honingham, notably to the Grade II listed Honingham and East Tuddenham War Memorial, connected to the Honingham Hall Estate. However, its immediate setting would be impacted by the new built form located outside of its boundary.</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>

Sensitive receptor	Honingham Park (non-designated). Low heritage significance
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)

Table 8-20 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during operation – Attlebridge World War Two Airfield

Sensitive receptor	Attlebridge World War Two Airfield (non-designated). Low heritage significance
Magnitude of change during operation	<p>Medium.</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form into part of the boundary of the airfield site and into its immediate setting. It would introduce visual and noise impacts from traffic and impact on its relationship to some of the individual extant built heritage assets located within its boundary. It would further impact the setting of extant built heritage assets located within and beyond the Site Boundary. However, the Proposed Scheme would not impact on the majority of the site. It would also not impact on the relationship of the airfield to the wider community.</p> <p>See also construction phase impacts.</p> <p>This would be a medium magnitude of change resulting in a low adverse effect ('not significant').</p>
Significance of effect prior to mitigation	Minor negative
Mitigation	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>
Residual effect	Minor negative (not significant)



Assessment against Future Baseline

- 8.6.17 For buried heritage assets within the Red Line Boundary, the future baseline is expected to be the same as the present. Such remains are a static resource, which have reached equilibrium with their environment and do not change (i.e., decay or grow) unless their environment changes as a result of human or natural intervention.
- 8.6.18 An in-combination assessment of committed development is provided (**Appendix 8.6 In-Combination Assessment** (Document Reference: 3.08.06), Table 1-1). For above ground heritage assets, the A47 DCO could potentially result in physical impacts to the non-designated Honingham Park. There is also the potential for settings impacts to the non-designated Honingham Park, the Grade II listed Stables and Coach House to Honingham Hall, and the non-designated Site of Honingham Hall. However, taken overall, any potential cumulative effects would be negligible as it would not impact on the historic relationship between the Grade II listed Stables at Honingham Park and the non-designated Site of Honingham Hall. These two assets, together with the non-designated Honingham Park, would remain as a recognisable group. No further mitigation is required with respect to above ground assets.
- 8.6.19 For above ground heritage assets, the relocation of Wensum Valley Hotel, Golf and Country Club's proposed golf course reservoir could potentially result in settings impacts to the Grade II listed Barn 50m north west of Low Farm House (including the dairy barn and Low Farm House which are assumed to be curtilage listed to the barn). However, taken overall, any potential in-combination effects would be negligible as the asset's primary relationships to the wider farm complex would not be impacted by the proposed reservoir. Additionally, it would not significantly alter the wider landscape, and the asset (together with its curtilage structures) would still be experienced as agricultural buildings in a farmland setting. No further mitigation is required with respect to above ground assets.



In-combination climate change impacts

8.6.20 In-combination climate change impacts for Cultural Heritage have not been identified.

8.6.21 No opportunities for environmental enhancement for Cultural Heritage have been identified.

8.7 Difficulties and Uncertainties

8.7.1 The main limitation to the assessment is the nature of the archaeological resource in areas that have seen no site-based archaeological evaluation due to land access restrictions or such. The desk-based assessment provides an initial indication of archaeological potential rather than a definitive list of all potential buried heritage assets because the full extent of a buried heritage resources cannot be known prior to site-specific archaeological field investigation. Notwithstanding this limitation, the methodology is robust, utilising available information, and conforms to the requirements of local and national guidance and planning policy.

8.7.2 **Appendix 8.4: Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Mitigation** (Document Reference: 3.08.04) provides a strategy for site-based evaluation to be undertaken following the granting of planning consent, under the terms of a standard archaeological planning condition. The results will be used to inform a programme of archaeological mitigation, if significant remains are found to be present in areas of proposed impact. This would achieve preservation by record, and following the successful implementation would offset / reduce any negative effects to negligible (not significant).

8.8 Summary

8.8.1 **Table 8-26** provides a summary of the findings of the assessment.

Table 8-21 Summary of cultural heritage effects, construction phase

Key to table:

P / T = Permanent or Temporary, D / I = Direct or Indirect, ST / MT / LT = Short Term, Medium Term or Long Term, N/A = Not Applicable

Receptor	Potential Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Monitoring
Numerous buried heritage assets identified during the course of the assessment, of low heritage significance (A16, A42, A50 A69, A148, A184, A187, A188, A190, A191, A192, A193, Later medieval / post medieval agricultural remains)	Minor negative (not significant)	None proposed	Minor negative (not significant)	No monitoring required.
Numerous buried heritage assets identified during the course of the assessment, of Medium heritage significance (A182, A183, A186, A189, A194, A195)	Moderate or Major negative (significant)	Programme of archaeological strip, map and sample mitigation, to achieve preservation by record.	Negligible (not significant)	Archaeological watching brief may be required during proposed works where earlier investigation is not practicable.

Receptor	Potential Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Monitoring
Palaeoenvironmental remains in the Wensum Valley and tributary of the Tud (Foxburrow Stream)	Moderate negative ('significant'). P/D/LT	A geoarchaeological deposit model produced for greater understanding of the geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental potential of the Wensum Valley alluvium (Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Deposit Model) identifies two deeper areas where organic deposits are likely (Landscape Zone 3) Mitigation in the form of purposive geoarchaeological boreholes is recommended to collect sediment and provide data on past environmental or landscape change. A WSI for geoarchaeological borehole survey will be appended to Appendix 8.4 WSI for Archaeological Mitigation (Document Reference 3.08.04).	Negligible (not significant) N/A	No monitoring required.
Possible, previously unrecorded remains dating to the prehistoric or Roman periods, of uncertain significance, in areas yet to have site-based evaluation. Significance will depend on the nature, date and extent of remains. (A28, A29, A30, A32, A33, A38)	Minor, Moderate or Major negative ('significant'). P/D/LT	Post-determination field evaluation leading to an agreed programme of mitigation, if required.	Negligible (not significant) N/A	Archaeological watching brief may be required during proposed works where earlier investigation is not practicable.

Receptor	Potential Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Monitoring
World War Two structures at Attlebridge Airfield (A74, A79, A80, A89, A90, A91, A92)	Uncertain. The impacts at this location are currently uncertain and it is not known whether the asset would be impacted or not. Negligible or minor adverse, depending on impacts. P/D/LT	Method dependent on extent of survival, but if required, likely to comprise post-determination watching brief and / or building recording	None or Minor adverse (not significant)	Method dependent on extent of survival, but if required, likely to comprise post-determination watching brief and / or building recording.
Historic Landscape	Minor adverse ('not significant'). P/D/LT	No mitigation is proposed	Minor Adverse (not significant) P/D/LT	No monitoring required.

Table 8-22 Summary of cultural heritage effects, operational phase

Receptor	Potential Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Monitoring
Barn 50m north west of Low Farm House (listed Grade II; including the dairy barn and farmhouse Low Farm House which are presumed to be curtilage listed to the barn)	The asset's isolated position and surrounding rural agricultural landscape would be impacted by the Proposed Scheme. Moderate Adverse ('significant') P/D /LT	The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable. The close proximity and design of the Proposed Scheme means that no additional mitigation is proposed.	Moderate Adverse (significant) P/D /LT	N/A

Receptor	Potential Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Monitoring
Abattoir at the Old Butcher's Shop	<p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new road at some distance from the asset. The Proposed Scheme would be built on the surrounding rural agricultural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor Adverse (not significant)</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	N/A
The Lodge	<p>Views out from the asset, towards the south and south-east would be impacted, while visual impacts from traffic are also likely. The Proposed Scheme would also be built on the surrounding rural agricultural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor Adverse (not significant)</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	N/A
Church of St Margaret	<p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate, together with a likely increase in traffic noise.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor Adverse (not significant)</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	N/A
Garden Walls to West of Morton Hall	<p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate, together with a likely increase in traffic noise.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor Adverse (not significant).</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	N/A

Receptor	Potential Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Monitoring
Morton Hall	<p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate, together with a likely increase in traffic noise.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor Adverse (not significant).</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	N/A
Garden Walls including Owl House at Home Farm, Morton Hall Estate	<p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape, some of which is historically connected to the Morton Hall Estate, together with a likely increase in traffic noise.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor Adverse (not significant).</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	N/A
Church of All Saints including boundary wall to churchyard	<p>The introduction of a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape would impact on how the church is currently experienced, notably in journeys towards or away from the asset.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor Adverse (not significant).</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	N/A
Church of St Peter	<p>The introduction of a new built form in the wider surrounding rural landscape would impact on how the church is currently experienced, notably in journeys towards or away from the asset.</p> <p>Minor adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	N/A

Receptor	Potential Effects	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Monitoring
Stables and Coach House to Honingham Hall and Site of Honingham Hall	<p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new road into the wider historic Honingham Park, physically impacting on the non-designated heritage asset, and impacting on the overall historic landscape in which the Grade II listed Stables and Coach House and the non-designated Site of Honingham Hall are located.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P/D/LT</p>	N/A
Honingham Park	<p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new road into the boundary of the asset. It would introduce visual and noise impacts, and impact on its relationship to the B1535 Wood Lane, which marks the western boundary of the asset and to The Broadway, which marks its northern boundary.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant').</p> <p>P / D / LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No mitigation is proposed.</p>	<p>Minor Adverse (not significant)</p> <p>P / D / LT</p>	N/A
Attlebridge World War Two Airfield	<p>The Proposed Scheme would introduce a new built form into part of the boundary of the airfield site and into its immediate setting. It would introduce visual and noise impacts from traffic and impact on its relationship to some of the individual extant built heritage assets located within its boundary. It would further impact the setting of extant built heritage assets located within and beyond the Site Boundary.</p> <p>Minor Adverse ('not significant')</p> <p>P / D / LT</p>	<p>The landscape design (verge planting) has been developed to integrate the Proposed Scheme into the landscape as far as practicable.</p> <p>No additional mitigation is proposed</p>	<p>Minor Adverse (not significant)</p> <p>P / D / LT</p>	N/A



8.9 References

- Reference 8.1: Historic England (2017) The setting of heritage assets. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3. Swindon.
- Reference 8.2: Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) (December 2023). National Planning Policy Framework.
- Reference 8.3: Historic England (2008) Conservation principles, policies and guidance. Swindon.
- Reference 8.4: Historic England (2019) Statements of Significance. Swindon.
- Reference 8.5: Highways England (2020) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA106 Cultural heritage assessment.
- Reference 8.6: HM Government (1990) The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- Reference 8.7: Broadland District Council, 2011, Joint Core Strategy.
- Reference 8.8: Planning Practice Guidance. [Online] [Gov.uk Website](#)
- Reference 8.9: Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (2014) Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment.
- Reference 8.10: Broadland District Council, Norfolk County Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council (draft, 2021) Greater Norwich Local Plan.