

[REDACTED]

From: Fluck, Hannah [Hannah.Fluck@hants.gov.uk]
Sent: 11 July 2012 09:38
To: Planning and Development Shared Mailbox
Cc: Havant Auto-Reply
Subject: Consultation APP/12/00610 - Portsmouth Golf Club, Crookhorn Lane, Waterlooville. Archaeological consultation response.
Attachments: DocConsult01.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: APP/12/00610 - Portsmouth Golf Club, Crookhorn Lane, Waterlooville.

Thank you for consulting us regarding the above planning application. I previously commented upon a similar application at preapplication and I would reiterate those comments here. Contrary to the DBA the site of proposed development has considerable archaeological potential. Portsdown Hill is known to have been an important landscape feature in prehistoric times with a unique number and range of ancient monuments along its length. These include Bevis Grave, a Neolithic long barrow, and a number of Bronze Age barrows and cremations. There is also evidence for prehistoric occupation from the Mesolithic onwards in the form of stone tools. Iron Age occupation has been found with pits and evidence of structures and to the north of the proposed site is a Roman villa, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The ridge has not been subject to thorough archaeological survey and therefore the full extent of the archaeological evidence is unknown, however its potential must be considered moderate to high for most periods. The Desk Based Assessment implies that as the area was forested there will no longer be any archaeology present. Whilst it is true that trees will impact upon below ground archaeological remains they disturb and disrupt but do not remove the archaeological finds and features altogether. There are many examples of archaeological sites within wooded, or previously wooded, areas where excavation has revealed complex, intact and valuable evidence. The golf course is also likely to have affected the preservation of any archaeological remains, but to what extent is currently unknown, it should not be assumed that therefore no valuable archaeological information remains.

In short the DBA presents a misleading appraisal of the archaeological potential of the site. Although archaeology does not present an overriding concern as for previous applications some archaeological assessment of areas to be impacted will be needed, probably in the form of evaluation trenches, and this should include invasive archaeological investigation the results of which will inform the nature of any further mitigation. I would recommend that this work be secured through the attachment of a suitable condition to any planning consent that might be granted. For example:

That no development take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written specification that has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

In the first instance this should take the form of a trenched evaluation, the results of which will inform any subsequent mitigation.

While the proposed works do not appear to affect any of the Scheduled Monuments in the vicinity the applicant should ensure that any moving of plant, storage of spoil etc will not impact upon any Scheduled Monument. They should seek the advice of English Heritage in this regard.

Should you or the applicant have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Faithfully,

Dr Hannah Fluck
Senior Archaeologist

Strategic Environmental Delivery Group,
Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West,
The Castle,
Winchester SO23 8UD