

From: Hopkins, David (ENV) <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 15 April 2020 16:25
To: Matthew Pickup; Historic Environment
Cc: Oliver, Lewis
Subject: RE: APP/20/00251 - North Street Arcade, Havant

Dear Mr Pickup and Mr Oliver,

APP/20/00251 - North Street Arcade, Havant

Thank you for drawing this to my attention. I have had a chance to look at both planning applications, although as Mr Adam now works at Wiltshire County Council it would be more difficult for me to ask him directly to talk me through what has happen, so my comments here are based on what I can assess and surmise from the paper work only.

We do try to be consistent in our advice regarding the same location, although each application is judged on its own terms, in particular what changes in impact might be apparent between applications and how the understanding of the archaeology might change with time.

With regard to the impact between the two applications they do appear to be very similar (perhaps some additional groundwork implied on the North Street frontage where an access now appears to be a property). Mr Adam particularly referenced the impact of Apartment 6 which he suggests is within the existing courtyard. Previously the archaeological potential was acknowledged but emphasis placed on the detrimental impact of previous development at the site having compromised that archaeological potential. Our understanding of the archaeology has changed a little in so far as we now better understand the potential Roman origins of this part of Havant, but that there was some archaeological potential at the location was not previously in question and so it is the impact of development and not the understanding of the archaeology that is material.

In this case Mr Adam seems to perceive apartment 6 as being within the courtyard, an area less impacted by past development, and as a result has laid less emphasis on the impact of past development. Having reviewed the plans it appears to me that the 'development' footprint is the largely same as previously in this regard and that in both applications that apartment does not lie more in the courtyard than previously shown and in both applications does encroach the courtyard area more than marginally.

It would appear to me that Mr Adam mistakenly perceived a greater impact in the courtyard area where, because of less past development impact, some archaeological watching brief on deeper groundwork would be merited and amended his comments accordingly. However it seems to me that the impact in the courtyard area is no greater and in both applications is only a marginal. In light of this I am inclined to believe that there should be consistency between the archaeological advice given in each application.

Accordingly my advice to the planning authority is that the archaeological consultation response to application 18/00530 should be repeated for application 20/00251.

"The site lies within the historic core of the medieval town of Havant and in an area where the street layout tentatively suggests that there might have been an early focus. However the existing development on site will have severely compromised, if not totally removed, the archaeological potential. On that basis I would not wish to raise any archaeological issues in this instance."

I do apologise that the advice was inconstant between the two applications.

Sincerely

David Hopkins
(County Archaeologist)

Specialist Environmental Services
Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle, Winchester SO23 8UD

 [andscape-and-heritage/historic-environment.htm](#)

Share your thoughts on our service here: <http://twitter.com/hantsconnect>

From: Matthew Pickup < >
Sent: 15 April 2020 14:11
To: Hopkins, David (ENV) < > Historic Environment
<historic.environment@hants.gov.uk>
Cc: Lewis Oliver <Lewis.Oliver@havant.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: APP/20/00251 - North Street Arcade, Havant

Dear David,

I have just received an email from Neil advising me that he has now left the employment of HCC.

I would be really grateful if you could look in to the matter that I raised with Neil in the email below?

Kind Regards,

Matthew

Matthew R. Pickup MRTPI
Chartered Town Planner

Pickup Town Planning
57 Sea View Road
PORTSMOUTH
Hampshire
PO6 1EW

This Email and files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended for the sole use of the individual or organisation to whom they are addressed. If you have received this Email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without using, copying, storing, forwarding or disclosing its contents to any other person. Pickup Town Planning has endeavoured to scan this Email message and attachments for computer viruses and will not be liable for any losses incurred by the recipient.

From: Matthew Pickup <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 15 April 2020 14:07
To: 'neil.adam@hants.gov.uk' <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Lewis Oliver (Lewis.Oliver@havant.gov.uk) <Lewis.Oliver@havant.gov.uk>
Subject: APP/20/00251 - North Street Arcade, Havant

Dear Neil,

Please could I query with you your consultation response in regard to the above planning application?

You may recall that you previously provided comments with regards to an almost identical scheme on this site which was granted planning permission in December 2019. Your previous consultation response (attached) stated "The site lies within the historic core of the medieval town of Havant and in an area where the street layout tentatively suggests that there might have been an early focus. However the existing development on site will have severely compromised, if not totally removed, the archaeological potential. On that basis I would not wish to raise any archaeological issues in this instance..." I was, therefore, a bit surprised therefore to see your comments with regards to the current scheme (also attached).

You will see that the footprints of the two developments (copied below) are almost identical – in particular the floor plan for Unit 6 is very similar to that for Unit 7 / stair core of the original scheme that was permitted last year. I don't really understand how things have changed to the extent that a WSI and Watching Brief are now required. The application that was permitted in 2019 could be commenced without the need to undertake a WSI and Watching Brief (at additional cost to my client).

Please could I ask that you reconsider your response to the LPA?

Many thanks.

Kind Regards,

Matthew Pickup



I was obviously quite surprised therefore to see your comments with regards to the current scheme

Matthew R. Pickup MRTPI
Chartered Town Planner

Pickup Town Planning
57 Sea View Road

PORTSMOUTH
Hampshire
PO6 1EW



This Email and files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended for the sole use of the individual or organisation to whom they are addressed. If you have received this Email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without using, copying, storing, forwarding or disclosing its contents to any other person. Pickup Town Planning has endeavoured to scan this Email message and attachments for computer viruses and will not be liable for any losses incurred by the recipient.
