

Dear Mr Ellis,

Planning Application APP/21/00647 Residential development Land south of The Mallards and west of Langstone Road, Havant

Thank you for your consultation. I would draw your attention to the archaeological desk based assessment which I can partially endorse to you, although as you will note below I do have some comments regarding its conclusions.

Paragraphs 4.15 and 4.18 indicate that the study feels that the archaeological potential for encountering archaeological remains of the Mesolithic and Neolithic respectively is low. I would not agree. Archaeological study in the wider area does suggest that Langstone harbour edge (and presumably Chichester harbour too) was being exploited in the Mesolithic and Neolithic and whilst this evidence has come from the harbour shore it is to be anticipated that grazing, exploitation and harbour edge resources will have encouraged camps and occupation within the vicinity of the natural harbour edge.

Paragraph 4.20 suggests that there is low archaeological potential for archaeological remains of Bronze Age date. I would not agree. Whilst the argument above applies, in addition it is noted that a Bronze Age cremation cemetery has been discovered in the approach to Hayling Island and another Bronze Age cremation cemetery was found on the Hayling Island side also. This does suggest that the approach to Hayling island had some significance in the Bronze Age and it has been postulated that the Wadeway may have its origins in this period.

Paragraph 4.29 suggest that the site has moderate archaeological potential for Roman occupation evidence. I would agree. Roman coastal sites have been located in the area including a Roman villa at Langstone, and at Warblington, and there is a major Roman temple on Hayling island. The approach to the Hayling Island crossing is likely to have had some significance in the Roman period.

For these reasons I do not endorse the sentiment in para 5.7 that the archaeological interest is of low significance or para 6.6 that there will not be a significant impact. I do however concur with the conclusion that archaeological matters are unlikely to emerge as overriding and might be secured by archaeological conditions. But the essence of my comments is that, whilst I anticipate any archaeological remains encountered can be mitigated by archaeological recording, I would not wish the planning authority (or the applicant) to regard the burden of the archaeological condition as without risk of being onerous.

Paragraph 6.7 suggest that an iterative approach to evaluation would be appropriate with preliminary geophysical survey and 'targeted' evaluation by trenching. I would agree in principle but am hesitant with the use of the word targeted. The geophysical survey may provide some insight

into the location and character of substantive buried sites, such as a Roman building, and so might enable trenches to be targeted by that information, but I would not extend that to 'only those targeted trenches need be excavated'. The site has the potential for archaeological remains which will not always respond well to geophysical survey, such as Mesolithic camps, Bronze Age cremation burials or enclosed settlement.

I recommend that archaeological conditions are attached to any planning permission which might be issued. These should secure preliminary archaeological survey; appropriate archaeological mitigation according to the results of the survey; and appropriate levels of recording and publishing of the results.

Yours sincerely

David Hopkins

County Archaeologist

Hampshire County Council

Economy, Transport and Environment Department

Telephone 0370 779 8025

Due to COVID I am presently working from home but can be contacted by email and on the phone number above.