



Northamptonshire County Council

Daniel Callis
Principal Planning Officer
Major Projects Team
South Northamptonshire Council
The Forum
Moat Lane
Towcester, NN12 6AD

Please ask for: Lesley-Ann Mather
Tel: 01604 367909
Our ref:
Your ref: S/2017/2577/EIA
Date: 15th November 2017

Dear Mr Callis

Proposal: Outline application for a residential development of up to 525 dwellings, open space, children's play area and associated infrastructure (Application accompanied by an Environmental Statement)

Location: Land North of Newport Pagnell Road, Hackleton

Thank you for your consultation.

In my response in relation to S/2017/0082/SCO I advised that the applicant undertake a review of the known archaeological assets and then produce a Desk Based Assessment. This document has been submitted by CSA Environmental. It covers the known archaeological activity including previous surveys within the area and also takes into account the results of the ground investigations within the site.

The DBA indicates that the results of previous evaluation in Field 2 were fairly limited although the geophysical survey was undertaken in strips rather than covering the site as a whole. The trial trenches were predominately set on these and as such discrete areas of archaeological activity could have been missed. The limitations of this technique should be taken into account and provision made for investigation around the trench which contained the Iron Age activity. The author suggests that any archaeological activity if present within Field 1 will have been impacted on by the tree roots. I agree that tree roots have the potential to impact on archaeological remains however this is not to say that they remove them entirely. I would advise that the potential for archaeological activity should not be so readily dismissed.

The report has used the results of the ground investigation works: test pits and boreholes to produce a plan, Figure 10 which shows the extent of the areas of landfill. This illustrates that all of Field 4 and parts of Field 3 have areas of major and deep landfill. The assessment also contains an aerial photograph, Figure 9 which shows some element of disturbance across parts of Field 3. The author suggests that these demonstrate that it is highly likely that any archaeology in this area will have been damaged or removed by this process. I have checked the ground investigation reports and although I accept that Field 4 has been subject to major disturbance I do not believe that they demonstrate conclusively that the disturbance in Field 3 has totally removed any archaeological activity.

Planning Services
One Angel Square
Angel Street
Northampton
NN1 1ED

W www.northamptonshire.gov.uk
t. 01604 367909.



The report, 5.4 concludes that the potential for archaeological activity within the site as a whole is generally low and that this can be dealt with by condition. I agree that no further archaeological survey will need to be undertaken at this stage. I do however disagree that the only requirement for archaeological mitigation would be to undertake a Watching Brief around the Iron Age post holes in Field 2.

The potential for archaeological survival in Field 3 as shown in Figure 10 and the made ground zoning plan within the ground investigation reports (Drawings 20168-04-003 and 20168-04-140-003) indicate that there is the potential for survival albeit potentially truncated. There is a lack of certainty in this area. I would advise that this could be addressed by a relatively small number of evaluation trenches concentrated predominately in the area closest to the known prehistoric/roman activity archaeological in the adjacent field to the east as shown in Figure 3: 6.

It would be beneficial if this assessment was carried out at the earliest opportunity should permission be granted. Mitigation would be undertaken in the area around the post holes although this would be undertaken according to a strip, map and sample methodology.

In the event of permission being granted I would expect to produce a mitigation strategy in the form of a Brief which would clearly identify the archaeological work which would be needed to discharge the archaeological condition.

The proposed development will have a detrimental impact upon any archaeological deposits present. This does not however represent an over-riding constraint on the development provided that adequate provision is made for the investigation and recording of any remains that are affected. **In order to secure this please attach Conditions 9.18 and 9.19 for a programme of archaeological work as per NPPF paragraph 141 to any permission granted in respect of this application.**

Yours sincerely,



Lesley-Ann Mather
County Archaeological Advisor
Planning Services