

Dear Mrs Miszewskie,

Planning Application APP/25/00162 Coastal Defence Land and coast adjacent to, Langstone Road, Havant

Thank you for your consultation regarding the proposed coastal defences at Langstone Road. I would particularly draw your attention to the heritage section of the Design and Access Statement, and to appendices M1 (Cultural Desk Based assessment) and M2 (Heritage Statement).

The position with regard to archaeology is set out in the Design and Access Statement which suggest the need for “an appropriate scheme of mitigation relating to potential archaeological remains”. Para 8.2.6 states, “where proposed works include substantial ground disturbance an appropriate scheme of possible mitigation works has been suggested on a frontage by frontage basis”.

Appendices M1 and M2 explore the archaeological potential recognising that an archaeological potential does exist, particularly for the prehistoric and Roman periods, based on the available existing archaeological evidence (including the evidence set out in the CBA Langstone Harbour report which identifies considerable harbour side activity through these periods). I would also note that whilst the Wade Way is acknowledged as a medieval structure in its present form it is also very likely to have been a significant crossing point throughout the prehistoric and Roman periods also making it's location of landfall an archaeologically significant location.

M2 rehearses on a frontage by frontage basis the archaeological potential and in each case recognises the archaeological potential that exists. (para 4.6.7, 4.6.9-13, 4.6.14 – 16, 4.8.3, 4.9.3, 4.10.3, 4.11.2, 4.12.2, 4.13.2, 4.14.2, 4.15.2 and 4.15.2)

Within the discussion set out in M1 it indicates that any intrusive groundworks could impact on previously unknown archaeological remains (ie the archaeological potential) and therefore recommends “if intrusive ground works are undertaken it is recommended that an archaeological watching brief is undertaken during construction” and expands to include any geotechnical work.

Para 6.2.3 of M2 also includes potential archaeological monitoring of the stripping of the works compound.

M2 has reviewed the archaeological implications of the specific impacts in each frontage section and has concluded that sections 1,2 and 4 would not require any archaeological mitigation (para 6.3, 6.4, 6.6). Sections 3 (6.5) and 5 (6.7) would require archaeological mitigation works (as well as the compound stripping – 6.2.3).

I am happy to endorse the approach that has been taken and the conclusions that have been arrived at.

I recommend that an archaeological condition is attached to any planning permission which might be issued to secure an appropriate scheme of archaeological mitigation in response to the phases and nature of the works in progress in the form of an archaeological watching brief at the relevant stages of development.

Yours sincerely

David Hopkins
County Archaeologist

Waste and Environmental Services
Universal Services
Hampshire County Council