




Dear Bryony,

Thank you, that is indeed very helpful. The post excavation assessment that you forwarded, which I have attached here in case Havant planning do not have a copy, is not in our filing and not reflected on our HER, and so (although this site as dealt with by an erstwhile colleague) I don't think that we have seen it before.

Para 1.1.3 states that it addresses 9 areas of excavation named A to I

Para 1.2.2 indicates that 'due to the long lived and complex nature of the project' the site numbering has been changed.

Figure 1 shows that the excavation in Phase 8 is known as Area H in this report, and the results for Area H are described in Fig 22 and described in the text 5.8.

Table 4 states in regard to Area H "the final extent of the excavated area was reduced due to the unexpected paucity of archaeological features".

On that basis I can confirm to you and to the planning authority that the archaeological work as described in the submitted WSI was indeed implemented and an account of the results is available in the post excavation assessment (as attached). Therefore there is no outstanding archaeological field work required ahead of implementing the development.

I will add the post excavation assessment document to our electronic filing.

Thank you for all of your help,

Yours sincerely

David

David Hopkins

County Archaeologist

Waste and Environmental Services

Universal Services

Hampshire County Council