

Planning Application APP/21/01071 Land south of, Lower Road, and west of Old Manor Farm, Havant

Thank you for your consultation. I would refer you to the archaeological desk based assessment which has been submitted. I would particularly refer you to those paragraphs that relate to archaeological work on the land immediately to the east of the present application site. This was subject to an archaeological evaluation and subsequently to an open area archaeological excavation to investigate the archaeological remains encountered by that evaluation. The archaeological evaluation found evidence of features of Bronze Age and Iron Age date as well as Roman material indicating that the area was in use in those periods. Subsequent archaeological excavation found evidence of occupation (possibly temporary, seasonal or activity based occupation rather than permanent) and particularly associated with considerable material of Roman date. An enclosure, possibly two, were revealed and an array of post holes or stake holes might indicate some processing activity at the site as might be associated with activity on the periphery of the harbour, such as drying or smoking racks. It seems likely the at the archaeological evidence found to the east represents utilisation of this harbour side landscape, and whilst not necessarily indicative of permanent settlement is indicative of archaeological evidence in the landscape that sheds light on the nature of the landscape and how it has been used over time.

However the report concludes that there is a low to medium potential for prehistoric remains (para 5.9) and a low potential for Roman remains (5.10). This review chimes with para 2.9 which indicates that the high archaeological potential of the land to the east (that is the likelihood of encountering archaeological remains) “has in no way been borne out by the results of the subsequent trial trench evaluation”. Whilst para 4.29 states “The archaeological features identified during the evaluation appear to date primarily from the late Bronze Age to the Iron Age, but also the Romano-British period. The archaeological features were found sparsely distributed, were limited in extent and depth and form no coherent pattern or trend, such as might represent a focus of activity, industry, settlement or discernible monument. They mainly comprised pits, linears representing field boundaries or drainage ditches and two postholes. Nonetheless, the features do provide slight evidence for use of the landscape, which may have been marginal and not suited to permanent exploitation”.

The evaluation having successfully identified archaeological remains and the subsequent archaeological excavation having successfully characterised those remains I suspect that where I have used the term ‘high archaeological potential’ to denote a high potential to encounter archaeological remains (which was borne out by the evaluation) the desk based assessment is referring to perhaps a low potential to encounter archaeological remains of over riding significance. This interpretation would accord with para 5.14 which summarises the archaeological potential “Based on the assessment of the recorded archaeological resource in the study area, it is unlikely that the archaeological resource within the PDA, that is currently unknown & unquantified would represent a risk or constraint to the development i.e. in terms of a requirement for preservation in situ of significant remains”.

I would agree that there is a low potential for archaeological remains to be encountered that would prove overriding to the principle of development, but I would argue that there is a high potential that some archaeological remains will none the less be encountered during development which would merit mitigation.

The conclusion of the desk based assessment para 7.14 offers that “An appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy, trial trenching followed by appropriate area specific preservation by record (as per the necessary investigations on the phase 1 site immediately east) could be undertaken pre-

commencement of any development preparation works at the site, the details of which to be agreed in consultation with the archaeological advisor to the local planning authority. Any archaeological work therefore could be carried out under the terms of a standard archaeological planning condition set out with the granting of planning consent". I would agree. Such an approach proved effective on the land to the easts in identifying, characterising and recording the archaeological remains.

Accordingly I would recommend that archaeological conditions are attached to any planning permission which might be issued. One archaeological condition should secure a preliminary archaeological survey, often known as an evaluation. Another archaeological condition should secure appropriate archaeological mitigation by recording of the archaeological remains identified by that evaluation and impacted by the proposed development.

Yours sincerely

David Hopkins
County Archaeologist

Hampshire County Council