

From: Development Management
Subject: FW: Fareham Borough Council - Consultation: Residential Development Land to the East of Down End Road

From: Historic Environment <historic.environment@hants.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 September 2020 10:26
To: Development Management <devcontrol@fareham.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Fareham Borough Council - Consultation: Residential Development Land to the East of Down End Road

Dear Mr Wright,

Fareham Borough Council - Consultation: Residential Development Land to the East of Down End Road

Thank you for your consultation. I would draw your attention to the statement on heritage within the Planning Statement, paragraphs 3.44 and 3.45, and to the Heritage Statement submitted with its attendant supporting documentation. I would endorse these to you. The amount of archaeological and geo archaeological work that has been completed to support the Heritage Statement is very much welcomed.

The below ground archaeological issues might be considered in two parts, the geo archaeological potential relating to evidence of Palaeolithic date embedded within the geological context and reflecting the proximity of the site to the well known and nationally important Red Barns site; and other archaeological remains dating from the Holocene period, that is the Mesolithic through to the present day.

With regard to Palaeolithic archaeology the site has been subject to geo archaeological study which identified a series of geo archaeological potential zones (GPZs) of which GPZ 5 is regarded as having the potential to contain archaeological remains of Palaeolithic date that are of national importance, albeit not designated. The impact of development on such remains should be 'wholly exceptional' and the application has used the layout and design to deflect impact away from GPZ 5. This is summarised in the Planning Statement paragraph 3.45. "The results of the archaeological investigations have revealed the site contains areas of deposits that are likely to be considered as nationally important non designated heritage assets comprising geo archaeological deposits dating to the Palaeolithic period, within identified areas of the site" (that is GPZ 5). "The archaeological nature of the site has been used to influence the layout and design of the proposed development and a preservation insitu strategy has been incorporated to ensure any nationally significant remains are not disturbed". This is endorsed and very much welcomed. The layout has preserved the most important archaeological remains.

Further archaeological work is planned within the GPZs of local and regional potential, as set out in the Heritage Statement paragraph 5.11, using suitably qualified geo archaeologists, working to a written scheme of investigation to be submitted and approved (by the local authority not the local authority's archaeological advisor as currently stated). I would welcome this and recommend that an archaeological condition is attached to any planning permission which might be issued to secure further geoarchaeological work to mitigate the impact of development on Palaeolithic remains outside GPZ 5.

With regard to archaeology that dates to after the Palaeolithic the Planning statement paragraph 3.45 states "Further archaeological investigation is planned in advance of development to ensure any remains affected by the development are suitable recorded". This is welcomed. The results of

a geophysical survey are already available and presented as an appendix of the Heritage Statement, and this demonstrates the absence of substantive archaeological remains, but cannot rule out the presence of less than substantive archaeological remains, such as for example unenclosed settlement. The interventions necessary for the geo archaeological study will have given some idea of the archaeological potential of the site. None the less some further preliminary archaeological evaluation is needed to describe the location, character and extent of archaeological remains which might need to be mitigation by archaeological recording.

I recommend that archaeological conditions are attached to any planning permission which might be issued to secure an archaeological evaluation and archaeological mitigation by recording of archaeological remains identified.

I very much welcome the amount of care that has been taken to date to ensure that the Palaeolithic potential of the site has been considered and that the area with the potential for the most important archaeological remains of Palaeolithic date have been preserved insitu by use of the design and layout of the development.

Yours sincerely

David Hopkins
(County Archaeologist)

Specialist Environmental Services
Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle, Winchester SO23 8UD

Share your thoughts on our service here: <http://twitter.com/hantsconnect>

From: devcontrol@fareham.gov.uk <devcontrol@fareham.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 September 2020 11:44
To: Historic Environment <historic.environment@hants.gov.uk>
Subject: Fareham Borough Council - Consultation: Land to the East of Down End Road

I am writing to consult you on a planning application I have received (P/20/0912/OA). Details of the application and how to respond are in the attached PDF document.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss this.

Richard Wright
Principal Planner (Development Management)
Fareham Borough Council
01329 824758

This email (and its attachments) is intended only for the use of the person(s) to whom it is addressed and may contain information which is privileged and/or confidential. If it has come to you in error, you must take no action based on it nor must you copy or show it to anyone.

This email is confidential but may have to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 2018 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. If you are not the person or organisation it was meant for, apologies. Please ignore it, delete it and notify us. Emails may be monitored.