

Archaeology and Planning Case Studies

Volume 2

The Case Studies

Jan Wills and Stewart Bryant

August 2019

The case studies are presented below in numerical order (gaps in the numbering system reflect the data handling process during the project and the small number of submitted cases that remain confidential). To search for cases that illustrate any of the archaeology and planning themes explored in the project please refer to the tables in Volume 1, Appendix 4, which list themes and cases by number.

Further information about individual case studies can be found on the relevant local authority websites by searching under the planning application reference number, or by using the Planning Portal, at

<https://www.planningni.gov.uk/index/tools/public-access-info.htm>

Case study no.	1
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7.Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Cutacre Open Cast, straddling Bolton, Wigan and Salford, Salford Road, Hulton, Greater Manchester
Type of application & broad category	Minerals; mixed-use, major
Date(s)	1991-2014
Local Planning Authority	Bolton, Salford and Wigan Councils
Planning reference(s)	APP/N4205/A/97/289386 and EIA – permission granted at appeal in 2001 90539/13
Development proposal	Large-scale mining operation requiring removal of a massive colliery waste mound together with winning coal from areas of previous conventional coal mining. To be followed by mixed used commercial development and public open space. Total area of application 314ha
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The HER was poorly represented for this area. This was enhanced by desk-based assessments carried out in the 1990s.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The processes of assessment and evaluation for this very large and complex development took place over an extended time frame from 1991 until 2014 (details in OA North 2016, referenced below).</p> <p>The first stages of archaeological work took place pre-application and comprised desk-based assessment and walkover survey in 1991, which was revised and updated in 1996. This indicated medieval and later potential; there was no indication of potential for prehistoric archaeological sites.</p> <p>A programme of geophysical survey in selected areas in 2005 and 2006 was followed by trial trench evaluation of 14 sites in 2006. This identified prehistoric and medieval features alongside a range of mainly post-medieval farm sites. Three sites were then subject to excavation, also in 2006. These revealed a middle Bronze Age round house with associated 4 poster structure and a medieval iron smelting complex. The middle Bronze Age hut and 4 poster are the only ones known in Greater Manchester and very rare in the NW region.</p> <p>A further programme of evaluation took place in 2014 in response to the 2013 planning application, although this did not lead to any further investigation.</p>

Outcomes: archaeological	A programme of pre-application assessment for the initial 1997 application identified significant archaeological potential for the medieval and later periods which was confirmed by post-determination evaluation and excavation in 2005-6. The evaluation and excavations in 2006 also revealed significant and unexpected evidence of Bronze Age settlement of regional importance. This work was secured by pre-commencement conditions.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	A monograph publication of the archaeological survey and investigation at Cutacre is in preparation. This will also place the former early farming landscape at Cutacre within its regional context through comparisons with another large-scale landscape redevelopment at Kingsway in Rochdale. There will also be a popular booklet in the GM Past Revealed Series and information panels on site.
References and links/bibliography	Oxford Archaeology North 2016, Cutacre, Bolton, Greater Manchester: Archaeological Analysis Report. Unpublished report, OA North Job No: L10766.

Case study no.	2
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Port Salford/Salford City Road, Barton Lane, Salford Previously known as Salford City Reds development
Type of application & broad category	Major, Leisure
Date(s)	2008-13
Local Planning Authority	Salford City Council
Planning reference(s)	09/58376/FUL 10/59697/FUL – EIA - approved 2011
Development proposal	<p>Erection of a 12,000 capacity Community Stadium, training pitches, parking, access and associated works for Salford City Reds.</p> <p>Application Included new access road cutting through promontory overlooking the River Irwell and defined by kink in former Barton Road line.</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	No HER entries for the site but a desk based assessment in 2003, and consultation with GMAU, identified the site as a favourable topographic location for early settlement. This was based on the site being a promontory on a narrow spit of habitable land sandwiched between the expanse of wetland known as Chat Moss on one side and the River Irwell flood plain on the other.
Archaeological/planning processes	Pre-application evaluation trenching and a small 5x5m investigation in 2008 identified prehistoric and Roman remains. This suggested that the promontory was the location for multi-phase occupation in the late Mesolithic-Neolithic period and during the late Iron Age/Roman period.
Outcomes: archaeological	The above evaluation led to open area excavations in 2013 revealing a series of boundary ditches, possible hut circles, sub-circular enclosures, and a cremation.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	<p>The excavation forms part of an exhibition on Salford's Early Past in Salford Central Station foyer.</p> <p>It has informed our understanding of potential early settlement sites on promontories where existing knowledge in the HER is very poor.</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>Gregory, R. & Garratt, R. 2008, City of Salford Stadium, Barton: An Archaeological Evaluation and Building Survey. Unpublished report, University of Manchester Archaeological Unit, Report No. 44.</p> <p>Note: Draft final excavation report submitted but still awaiting corrected and updated version</p>

Case study no.	5
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>9. The commencement of development (with or without a pre-commencement condition) before the completion of archaeological mitigation fieldwork caused problems e.g. Health and Safety; conservation of archaeology; additional resources required, including for agreeing and implementing complex method statements</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest including those of national importance.
Type of application & broad category	Local authority road scheme; infrastructure; EIA
Site name/address	Bexhill Hastings Link Road, A259 Belle Hill, Bexhill on Sea to B2092 Queensway, St Leonards on Sea, East Sussex.
Date(s)	2006-08; 2012-14
Local Planning Authority	East Sussex County Council
Planning reference(s)	RR/2474/CC (2009) plus EIA
Development proposal	Construction of a new road, including environmental treatment with earthworks, planting, flood and noise attenuation, wildlife compensation, and facilities for non-motorised users.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The desk-based assessment for the Environmental Statement in 2004 identified the Combe Haven Valley alluvial deposits as an area of high palaeo-environmental potential and with archaeological interest.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Initial field assessment was undertaken in 2006-08. Conventional geophysics and fieldwalking revealed little additional information, especially for the areas covered by alluvium.</p> <p>The high potential for early prehistoric archaeology along the proposed route, especially the areas with alluvium, was confirmed from geo-archaeology investigations in 2008 comprising boreholes, targeted test pits and an electrical conductivity survey.</p> <p>These surveys informed a field evaluation in 2013 which comprised 58 boreholes, hand-dug 24 test pits and 181 trial trenches. The evaluation identified a number of lithic scatters, including <i>in situ</i> sites on former land surfaces beneath later alluvial deposits. However, the fragility of the deposits meant that the recovery rate for the trenches was much lower than the test pits. Only 5% of the 200 sites and 0.04% of the flints eventually found on the route were identified from the initial evaluation. Thereafter, test-pits were used successfully as the primary means of identifying lithic scatters. These</p>

	<p>revealed an exceptionally well preserved and extensive nationally important landscape dating from the late upper Palaeolithic until the Bronze Age.</p> <p>Commencement of development occurred before the completion of archaeological mitigation fieldwork, which caused problems due to the complexity of both the archaeology and the road scheme and its attendant landscaping.</p> <p>The large numbers of <i>in situ</i> flint scatters of upper Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic date required significant additional funding (fully met by the Council) in order to complete the programme of archaeological work in accordance with the approved Written Schemes of Investigation and deliver the construction project.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>Sites were preserved <i>in situ</i> by re-design and where this was not possible sites were fully excavated in advance of and during the development project.</p> <p>This is an example of a project that was carried out fully in compliance with the planning and the EIA process but still encountered higher than expected levels of significant archaeology. The benefit of the existing planning system was that the requirements of the necessary work could be fully justified in terms of increased expenditure and the public benefit that would result from carrying out the programme of archaeological work.</p>
<p>Other outcomes e.g. public benefits such as public engagement or research or new/improved work practices</p>	<p>The particular nature of the geological and archaeological deposits and finds encountered led to the use of innovative techniques for archaeological assessment and evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Electrical conductivity survey to produce a deposit model for targeting investigation; - Hand-dug test-pits - rather than trial trenches - as the optimum technique for evaluating the very fragile <i>in situ</i> archaeological deposits. - The use of both techniques is likely to have implications for the assessment and evaluation of other comparable landscapes in East Sussex and elsewhere.
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Chris Blandford Associates 2004, Hastings to Bexhill Link Road: Archaeological Desk Based Assessment. Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 13 - Cultural Heritage. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Historic England. National Importance Project Report. Identifying and Mapping Sites of National Importance Within The East Sussex Wetlands. Oxford Archaeology. Unpublished report, February 2015.</p> <p>Historic England 2019. Managing Lithic Scatters: Lithic scatters Case Studies. Case Study 7: A Mesolithic lithic and early prehistoric landscape at Bexhill to Hastings Link Road, East Sussex Mike Donnelly (Oxford Archaeology South). Unpublished report, Historic England.</p> <p>https://library.thehumanjourney.net/4701/3/Lithics%20Scatter%20Case%20studies.pdf</p>

Case study no.	6
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land north of Hare Street Road, Buntingford, Hertfordshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential – 8.6ha
Date(s)	2012-15
Local Planning Authority	East Hertfordshire District Council
Planning reference(s)	3/13/1000/FP
Development proposal	Erection of 160 dwellings with associated garages, car parking, public open space, children's play area, landscaping, diversion of footpath, pumping station with associated works and new vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist accesses and the provision of allotments and the change of use of land for a cemetery with associated accesses, car parking and landscaping.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	No archaeology known from the site, but prehistoric and Roman archaeology known from the vicinity and it is topographically suited to settlement.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-application evaluation advised in response to enquiry from developer. This was undertaken in 2012 and comprised desk-based assessment, geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation.</p> <p>The geophysical survey identified anomalies of archaeological origin which were then evaluated, identifying later Iron Age enclosures and early Roman pits.</p> <p>A planning application was submitted in 2013; refused by the LPA (not on archaeology grounds); appealed by developer; application then approved by planning inspector in December 2013 with archaeology pre-commencement condition.</p> <p>Further post-determination trial trench evaluation in 2014, via condition, identified middle Iron Age settlement and Neolithic pits.</p> <p>The evaluation was followed by open excavations in three areas of the site between September and December 2014 which produced extensive and significant archaeological evidence. These included middle Neolithic remains (decorated pottery and flint flakes), and rural settlement remains including roundhouses with an associated system of land division and enclosure originating in the middle Iron Age and evolving through the late</p>

	<p>Iron Age period and into the early Roman period. Late Iron Age remains that appear to respect the middle Age remains indicate some continuity in the use of the site. A quantity of Iron Age pottery and kiln furniture was recovered that demonstrate good research potential at both local and regional level.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>Pre-application evaluation successfully identified archaeology potential, which was significant, but was not an issue at appeal.</p> <p>The pre-commencement condition secured the post-determination archaeological mitigation including publication.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Northamptonshire Archaeology 2012, An archaeological trial trench evaluation of land to the east of Buntingford Hertfordshire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology East 2015, An Iron Age settlement at land north of Hare Street Road, Buntingford, Hertfordshire: post-excavation assessment and updated project design. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Clarke, Graeme, A middle to late Iron Age farmstead and enclosures at Hare Street Road, Buntingford, <i>Hertfordshire Archaeology and History</i> forthcoming</p>

Case study no.	7
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land north of the Park Farm Industrial Estate and the Freman College, Ermine Street, Buntingford, Hertfordshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential, including care home, c.15ha
Date(s)	2013-16
Local Planning Authority	East Hertfordshire District Council
Planning reference(s)	3/13/1375/OP
Development proposal	Full permission for the erection of 180 homes, extension to the Freman College playing fields, the creation of four new accesses onto Ermine Street and one new access onto the A10; upgrading of one access onto Ermine Street, and the provision of amenity space and associated infrastructure, and in outline with all matters reserved, a 50-60 bed care home and sheltered accommodation
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	No archaeology known from the site, but is immediately adjacent to Roman Ermine Street and topographically suited to settlement
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A pre-determination evaluation was requested in response to the planning application. This comprised desk-based assessment, geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation.</p> <p>The geophysical survey identified anomalies of archaeological origin, which were then evaluated, identifying Mesolithic to Bronze Age struck flints, early and middle Iron Age settlement, earlier Iron Age ditches, and hollow ways. One, alongside Ermine Street, is probably an earlier course of Ermine Street.</p> <p>The planning application was approved with a pre-commencement condition in 2015.</p> <p>Open area excavation was undertaken in two parts of the site in 2015-6 through a WSI secured by the pre-commencement condition. The excavation produced extensive and significant archaeological remains. These included Neolithic flint scatters, Bronze Age and Iron Age routes and paths through the landscape, and evidence for prolonged settlement from the early Iron Age through to the Roman period. The early Iron Age settlement comprised roundhouses with associated field systems and related features including pits, post-holes, four-post structures and burials. Late Iron</p>

	<p>Age/Roman evidence consisted of a number of Iron Age inhumation and cremation burials present along the line of Ermine Street and a series of Roman quarry pits, running parallel to Ermine Street.</p> <p>Post-excavation analysis of the results of the investigations has also identified a repeated pattern of activity over an extensive time period. This consisted of the establishment of routes through the landscape with subsequent moves to block or control them during the later Bronze Age and Iron Age periods. It also confirmed the existence of later prehistoric routeways on the same alignment as Ermine Street suggesting that there may be a pre-conquest precursor to the Roman road.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Pre-determination evaluation successfully identified significant archaeological potential.</p> <p>A pre-commencement condition secured the post-determination archaeological mitigation that produced evidence of regional significance in respect of the origins of Ermine Street, and publication.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	
References and links/bibliography	<p>Oxford Archaeology East 2013, Iron Age cultivation and settlement features and post-medieval boundaries at land north of Buntingford, Hertfordshire: archaeological evaluation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2016, Land north of Park Farm Industrial Estate and Freman College, Ermine Street, Buntingford: archaeological excavation: Post-Excavation Assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Jones, M, A Later Bronze Age and Early Iron Age landscape at North Buntingford, <i>Hertfordshire Archaeology and History</i>, forthcoming.</p>

Case study no.	8
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Quedgeley Trading Estate East, Haresfield, Gloucestershire
Type of application & broad category	Major, Commercial
Date(s)	2015-6
Local Planning Authority	Stroud District Council
Planning reference(s)	16/1724/OUT
Development proposal	Business park
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There were no known archaeological remains on the site, apart from a possible windmill mound recorded on early maps, and ridge and furrow earthworks identified from historic aerial photographs (levelled by the time that development was proposed). The general area is also thought to have been the location of a locally significant medieval pottery industry, and nearby RAF structures were also of heritage interest.
Archaeological/planning processes	An EIA undertaken in relation to a proposed business park development included a desk-based assessment and subsequent field evaluation in the form of geophysical survey and trial trenching.
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>A geophysical (magnetometer) survey was undertaken over 14ha. The report interpreted the results as including a possible circular prehistoric enclosure in one corner of the site, with a further rectilinear enclosure nearby, also thought likely to be prehistoric. An area of strong anomalies was tentatively interpreted as evidence for medieval pottery kilns, and the ridge and furrow that had previously been mapped from aerial photographs was also recorded.</p> <p>Subsequent evaluation trenching led to the circular enclosure being reinterpreted as a Bronze Age round barrow (possibly the feature wrongly labelled on early maps as a windmill mound; the barrow may have subsequently been reused as a windmill mound). The fills of the rectilinear enclosure ditches were, however, of medieval date. There was no evidence for pottery production on the site itself; the anomaly thought to have resulted from kiln waste turned out to be a large modern pit, probably associated with a WWII RAF station nearby.</p> <p>The evaluation report stated that there was 'poor correlation' between identified archaeological features and geophysical anomalies. In particular, the geophysical survey had failed to predict an extensive medieval field system (unrelated to the later ridge and furrow), the ditches of which produced significant quantities of the local 11th – 13th century pottery.</p> <p>A pre-commencement planning condition specifying a programme of</p>

	<p>archaeological investigation was attached to the planning permission for development, and a WSI has recently been approved.</p> <p>This case demonstrates the importance of evaluation trenching to test the results of geophysical survey. The interpretation and presumed date of the features identified by geophysical survey were significantly altered following evaluation and extensive further features were discovered.</p> <p>The need for trial trenching to confirm geophysical results is often questioned by consultants. This case illustrates that the assessments of significance of heritage assets required by the NPPF may be unreliable when only remote sensing data is provided.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Cotswold Archaeology 2015, Land at East Quedgeley: Heritage Assessment. Unpublished report, CA report 15794.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2016, Land at East Quedgeley, Gloucestershire, Archaeological Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2016, Land at Quedgeley East, Gloucestershire, Archaeological evaluation. Unpublished report, CA report 16505.</p>

Case study no.	9
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land south and east of Lubstree Park, Humber Lane, Preston Upon The Weald Moors, Telford, Shropshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, Residential
Date(s)	2015 - current
Local Planning Authority	Telford and Wrekin Council
Planning reference(s)	TWC/2015/1112
Development proposal	Outline application for housing development of up to 500 dwellings, over 5ha in extent
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Prehistoric and Roman finds, reported through the Portable Antiquities Scheme, and a medieval deer park in the vicinity, suggested that the development site might have archaeological potential. However, there was no known archaeological interest on the site itself that was recorded in the HER.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Shropshire Council (advising the LPA) has a policy of requesting a desk-based assessment and a field evaluation on all proposed development sites over 5ha in area. Below that the threshold for assessment and evaluation requirements will depend on an assessment of the archaeological potential of the proposed development site based on the HER and associated, readily accessible, sources (e.g. Tithe and historic Ordnance Survey maps, aerial photographic information, LiDAR data). Pre-determination evaluation of this proposed large housing development site was therefore requested, based on size of the development area, and known sites in the vicinity.</p> <p>An initial desk-based assessment considered that the site had low archaeological potential. Geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation located a previously unknown Roman farmstead enclosure that is of a type typical for this region but few examples of which have been investigated.</p> <p>The adviser to the LPA has recommended that the Roman farmstead should be preserved in open space within the development. Should this not prove possible a full programme of archaeological recording will be secured through the use of a pre-commencement planning condition.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The planning application has not yet been determined.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g.	-

<p>other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>CgMs 2015, Archaeological desk-based assessment: land off Humber Lane, Telford, Shropshire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Archaeological Services Durham University 2016, Land off Humber Lane, Telford, Shropshire: geophysical survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Wessex Archaeology 2016, Land off Humber Lane, Telford, Shropshire: archaeological evaluation. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	10
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated historic assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land south of junction, A41/Pave Lane, Newport, Shropshire
Type of application & broad category	Minerals
Date(s)	2016 - 18
Local Planning Authority	Telford and Wrekin Council
Planning reference(s)	TWC/2016/0437
Development proposal	Proposed quarry for the extraction of sand and gravel and importation of inert fill material for the restoration of the site
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	No heritage assets were recorded on the application site.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Shropshire Council (advising the LPA) has a policy of requesting a desk-based assessment and a field evaluation on all proposed development sites over 5ha in area. Below that threshold for assessment and evaluation requirements will depend on an assessment of archaeological potential based on the HER and associated, readily accessible, sources (e.g. Tithe and other historic Ordnance Survey maps, aerial photographic information, LIDAR data).</p> <p>Pre-determination evaluation of the proposed mineral extraction site was therefore requested in line with this policy and with the recommendations of the Shropshire Minerals Resource Assessment 2013. The evaluation located the truncated remains of a single-ditched enclosure of possible Roman date.</p> <p>A pre-commencement planning condition to enable strip, map and sample recording was recommended.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The application was subsequently considered at a planning inquiry which dismissed an appeal against non-determination in 2018 (APP/C3240/W/17/3167459).
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work	-

practices	
References and links/bibliography	<p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2016, Archaeological desk-based assessment: Pave Lane Quarry, Shropshire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Geophysics 2016, Geophysical survey on proposed quarry site, Pave Lane. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Archaeological Services 2016, Land at Pave Lane, Telford, Shropshire: archaeological evaluation report. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	12
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land north of Oxford Road, Thame, Oxfordshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, Residential
Date(s)	2014-18
Local Planning Authority	South Oxfordshire District Council
Planning reference(s)	P14/S3841/FUL
Development proposal	Erection of 203 dwellings, with new allotment plots, public open space, new pedestrian and cycle routes, construction of internal access roads, foul water pump station, surface water attenuation, ancillary enabling works, together with the formation of new vehicular and pedestrian access points
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>A single 'Belgic' (late Iron Age) pottery jar had been recovered from the site in the 1960s, and traces of ridge and furrow were present.</p> <p>The development site is on a ridge but largely on north-facing land sloping down to the River Thame, and so might not, <i>a priori</i>, be considered to have the highest potential for early activity. In addition, there were no real clues to the presence of the complex and significant remains prior to the evaluation.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment and a field evaluation carried out before the determination of the planning application gave rise to concerns that important archaeological remains were present. Evidence of activity in the Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman periods was recovered.</p> <p>Planning permission was given for the development with a pre-commencement planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological investigation. Prior to planning permission being given mitigation works were agreed with Oxfordshire County Council Historic and Natural Environment Team. A total of 3.9ha (40% of the total area proposed for development) was machine-stripped and investigated through full excavation.</p> <p>Once the initial area of archaeological features had been uncovered and understood, their significance led to re-design of subsequent phases of the development to achieve preservation <i>in situ</i>.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The mitigation fieldwork, undertaken by Oxford Cotswold Archaeology (a joint venture between Oxford Archaeology and Cotswold Archaeology, OCA), revealed over 5000 years of human occupation on the site, which sits on a ridge of higher ground with wide vistas across the surrounding landscape, overlooking the River Thame to the north and the Cuttle Brook watercourse to the east.

	<p>By far the most significant result was the discovery of a large part of a triple-ditched early Neolithic (c. 3800 BC) causewayed enclosure monument. A number of early Neolithic pit clusters highlight the importance of this location just prior to, or contemporary with, the causewayed enclosure. A hengiform monument and a probable barrow ring-ditch were also recorded. The monument complex is of national importance.</p> <p>Later activity was represented by an early Iron Age (700 – 400 BC) D-shaped enclosure, some c. 150 pits (some of them probably grain storage pits), and a number of roundhouses and four-post granary structures. Some of the storage pits contained human and animal burials and artefacts which had been ritually deposited, a widespread phenomenon of this period.</p> <p>In the Roman period (AD 43 – 410) a dramatic change was evident on the site, with the development of a highly structured and integrated land management system of ditched features. It included droeways that led from the available watercourses up onto the ridge, associated with a sequence of integrated settlement and stock enclosures. Several corn driers dated to this period suggest the presence of a settlement that was engaged in grain processing for supply to a Roman hinterland. Inhumation burials and urned cremation burials also testify to the enduring importance of the site during this period.</p> <p>In the early– middle Saxon period (410 – 850 AD) at least 11 (and possibly 13) sunken-featured buildings (SFBs) as well as a possible ‘hall’ structure (undated) were constructed at the site, all bar one SFB lying on the highest ground. A number of artefacts indicative of textile production (loomweights, spindle whorls, textile combs, needles) were recovered from the SFBs, a common phenomenon for these Saxon structures, which strongly suggests a function as textile workshops. In the late Saxon – early medieval period (9th – 12th centuries AD) a substantial ditched enclosure was constructed, but no associated settlement features were identified.</p> <p>A post-excavation assessment has been completed; a full monograph is in preparation and is expected for publication in 2020.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>OCA undertook a series of visits to local schools and hosted local archaeological and historical societies on site. A display was exhibited in Thame Museum. A day of talks was held, in conjunction with the museum, at Thame Town Hall, as part of the Festival of Archaeology.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>John Moore Heritage Services 2014, An Archaeological Evaluation at Site F, Oxford Road, Thame, Oxfordshire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>http://cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk/important-discoveries-at-thame-oxfordshire/</p> <p>Oxford Cotswold Archaeology Joint Venture 2017, Site F, Oxford Road, Thame, Oxfordshire; Post-excavation Assessment and Updated Project Design: Volume 1. Unpublished report, OCA Project: 669021.</p>

Case study no.	14
Planning scenario(s)	1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	West Buckland Junction, A361 North Devon Link Road, Devon
Type of application & broad category	Infrastructure
Date(s)	2018- 19
Local Planning Authority	Devon County Council
Planning reference(s)	DCC/4091/2018
Development proposal	Improvements to the A361 North Devon Link Road and the creation of a road bridge and junction at West Buckland
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>There were no HER records for the immediate area affected by the West Buckland junction.</p> <p>Prehistoric activity has been recorded in the much wider landscape; there was no known Romano-British activity. A fishpond c.1km to the east and a deserted medieval settlement some 4.2km to the west are both scheduled monuments. There were HER records nearby for landscape features associated with a Registered Park, historic farmscape and quarries.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	The site topography was assessed as being conducive to settlement, i.e. a flat terrace just above the valley floor with good prospects across the landscape. A programme of geophysical survey and evaluation was therefore requested pre-application in advance of the production of, and to support, an EIA.
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>A prehistoric or Romano-British ditched enclosure and associated field system were identified through geophysical survey and confirmed by field evaluation.</p> <p>This work has enabled Devon County Council to scope out any unexpected significant archaeological deposits within the road scheme and allowed the mitigation (small-scale area excavation) to be integrated into the project budget and construction timetable. Those elements of the field system affected by the scheme can be excavated in advance of construction. The area of more sensitive archaeology – the enclosure – has been identified and will not be impacted by the scheme.</p> <p>Carrying out this work pre-application has enabled a WSI to be submitted in support of the planning application for the archaeological work and no pre-commencement condition will be required. Instead the recommended condition refers to the WSI prepared by Cotswold Archaeology and submitted with the planning application. This is worded as:</p> <p><i>'The development shall proceed in accordance with the programme of archaeological work as set out in the written scheme of investigation (WSI) prepared by Cotswold Archaeology that has been submitted in support of the planning application in Appendix 7.6 (West Buckland Junction - Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological SMS Excavation, CA Project ref: 880347 and dated 19th October 2018). The development shall be carried out at all times in accordance with the approved scheme, or such other details as</i></p>

	<p><i>may be subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>Reason:</i> <i>To ensure, in accordance with paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), that an appropriate record is made of archaeological evidence that may be affected by the development'</i></p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	-
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Cotswold Archaeology 2018, North Devon Link Road Improvements Bourners Bridge to Buckleigh Road, Devon, Heritage Assessment. Unpublished report, CA 18005.</p> <p>Substrata 2018, An archaeological magnetometer survey, Land at West Buckland Junction, A361, Devon. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2018, Land at West Buckland Junction, A361, Devon, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report CA 18525.</p>

Case study no.	15
Planning scenario(s)	1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land at Burwood Lane, Great Torrington, Devon
Type of application & broad category	Residential
Date(s)	2016 - 18
Local Planning Authority	Torridge District Council
Planning reference(s)	1/0246/2017/OUTM, 1/0246/2018
Development proposal	Major, Residential development of up to 181 dwellings and ancillary works
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There was no HER data for the site or for the vicinity. A Civil War battle was thought to have taken place somewhere in this landscape. The site overlooks the town of Great Torrington.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-application assessment was requested because of the possibility of a Civil War battlefield site in the area. The size of the application area and its location in a prominent position in the landscape meant that its archaeological potential was defined by its topographical position and size rather than by known archaeology. This part of the county is rural and there has been little large-scale development – though this is changing now – so the absence of HER data doesn't really reflect an absence of archaeology but the absence of opportunities to identify archaeology.</p> <p>A desk-based assessment identified the archaeological potential of the study area as low.</p> <p>Pre-application geophysical survey was requested by the Historic Environment Team, and on the basis of the results, a field evaluation. The results of this work were submitted to support the planning application to enable an informed and reasonable planning decision to be made.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>A large possible Iron Age enclosure, measuring c.150m by at least 100m, was identified through the geophysical survey and confirmed by field evaluation. Isolated pits were also exposed.</p> <p>A pre-commencement condition to secure a programme of archaeological investigation and recording was recommended but the application was refused by the LPA on other grounds.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work	Had the scheme been granted permission public outreach would have been specified as part of the archaeological works and this would have been set out in the WSI.

practices	
References and links/bibliography	<p>Archaeological Landscape Investigation 2017, Desk Based Assessment: Land off Burwood Lane/Caddywell Lane, Great Torrington, Devon. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Archaeological Surveys 2017, Land off Burwood Lane/Caddywell Lane, Great Torrington, Devon, Magnetometer Survey Report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>AC archaeology 2017, Land off Burwood Lane/Caddywell Lane, Great Torrington, Devon, Results of an archaeological trench evaluation. Unpublished report ACD1608/2/0.</p>

Case study no.	18
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological interest
Site name/address	Wimpole Hall, Arrington, Royston, Cambridgeshire
Type of application and broad category	Commercial
Date(s)	2017
Local Planning Authority	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Planning reference(s)	S/1543/17/E1, S/2214/17/FL
Development proposal	New car park and entrance buildings at Lamp Hill, Wimpole Hall, a National Trust property
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>There was no HER data for the development site itself</p> <p>The surrounding landscape contains Iron Age and Romano-British settlements and field systems. Several areas of deserted medieval and later settlement, together with elements of their contemporary agricultural landscapes, are present on the estate, two of which are scheduled monuments, at Thresham End and Bennall End.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the estate of Wimpole Hall, a mid 17th century house and a Grade I listed building. The landscape surrounding the house is a Registered Park and Garden, and there are other listed buildings in the grounds.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A geophysical survey was commissioned in 2015 and revealed extensive enclosures suggesting Iron Age-Roman settlement.</p> <p>Subsequently, a local amateur group fieldwalked the site, recovering a small amount of abraded Roman pottery.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching revealed a well-preserved and extensive late Iron Age-early Roman rural settlement</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Planning permission was given with a pre-commencement planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological investigation. Full archaeological excavation (of 11 weeks duration) was undertaken in advance of the development.</p> <p>A previously unknown late Iron Age-early Roman settlement was revealed, part of a larger settlement that extends to the south and west of the site. The settlement has links to Roman military activity in the area (it lies close to the Ermine Street and Akeman Street Roman roads) and is very rich in finds</p>

	including metalwork; it functioned as a trading post and may have even garrisoned military personnel.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	<p>Wimpole Hall is a National Trust property, very well visited, and had an excellent archaeological site to showcase. Therefore, to maximise the public and research benefit from this project, an archaeology and community programme was incorporated into the work during the excavation in 2018, in response to the Local Authority brief.</p> <p>A two-week student excavation was carried out in advance of the main excavation. During the latter 62 volunteers worked on the site; there were twice daily guided tours (about 40 with an average of 50 visitors per tour); two open days at weekends reached a further 500+ people; family archaeology trails around Wimpole Hall and evening talks on post-excavation were delivered. In total there were over 2,000 visitors to the excavation.</p> <p>Follow-up work with the National Trust is intended to maximise the results of the excavation (to date the largest NT-funded archaeology project) and to display the results of the excavation and the finds on site, providing a prehistoric and Roman story to the Wimpole Hall visitor experience.</p> <p>With agreement from the LPA the final outputs from the project will not only be an archaeology report and publication, but a focus also on public archaeology, display and the wider media to maximise the value and the reach of the information recovered from the site.</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>Cranfield University Forensic Institute 2015, Geophysical Survey of land at Wimpole Hall, Cambridgeshire, Lamp Hill Field. Unpublished report 127.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology East 2016, Late Iron Age and Roman Settlement at Lamp Hill, Wimpole Hall, Cambridgeshire, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report 2000.</p>

Case study no.	19
Planning scenario(s)	1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Wellcome Genome Campus, Cambridge Road, Hinxton, Cambridgeshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, commercial and residential
Date(s)	2018 - ongoing
Local Planning Authority	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Planning reference(s)	S/2209/18/E2 EIA Scoping, S/4329/18/OL
Development proposal	Up to 175,000 sq m of Gross External Area (GEA) of flexible employment space including research and development, office and workspace and associated uses. Land uses will comprise primarily B1 (office, labs, light industry); Up to 1,500 new residential dwellings; Supporting social infrastructure including a nursery and primary school and community uses; Ancillary retail and leisure uses including shops, restaurants, cafes and bars; Landscape and public realm, including areas for sustainable drainage and biodiversity enhancements; Energy centre and utilities; Site access, car and cycle parking and highways improvements; and Associated works. Expansion of Research Campus and associated accommodation
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There was very little evidence of heritage assets on the development site itself. However, it is located in an area where there is extensive evidence of prehistoric, Roman, Anglo-Saxon and medieval settlement and other activity, including from development of the nearby research centre itself over the last c. 25 years.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A baseline assessment for cultural heritage was presented at the start of the EIA process in the scoping document. The local authority archaeology adviser recommended a series of techniques to evaluate the proposal area, not all of which was available for evaluation at that stage because of crop trials taking place on the land.</p> <p>Discussions between the archaeological adviser to the LPA and the developer's archaeological consultants took place regarding techniques to be used in the EIA.</p> <p>A desk-based assessment, geophysical survey and a field evaluation were subsequently undertaken. The desk-based assessment concluded that the site was considered to have a high potential to contain Roman remains, a high potential to contain Anglo-Saxon funerary remains, a moderate to high potential to contain Bronze Age remains, and a moderate potential to contain early prehistoric and Iron Age remains.</p> <p>The geophysical survey identified a probable trackway and other linear</p>

	<p>features.</p> <p>The evaluation comprised 159 trenches over an area of 63ha, a 2.5% sample of the site. The earliest material recovered comprised early prehistoric flint assemblages, and small amounts of Neolithic, early and later Bronze Age features and finds. Later Iron Age and early Roman remains consisted of ditches with associated pits and postholes along a formalised section of the Icknield Way. An early Roman or later trackway was associated with field boundaries.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The case is ongoing.</p> <p>The EIA is under review and comments on the Environmental Statement have been supplied by the local authority adviser. Linear features will be referenced in the layout of the new development, and mitigation areas have been selected for excavation in advance of development should consent be granted.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	<p>Public benefit will ensue through management of impacts on the archaeological resource. All previous phases of archaeological work on the campus have resulted in outreach work both within the campus and in the local community. The S106 Heads of Terms will include the cultural heritage so that display and interpretation will take place.</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>Quod 2018, Wellcome Genome Campus Development Project, EIA Scoping Report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology South 2018, Wellcome Genome Campus Development, Hinxton, Archaeological desk-based assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Magnitude Surveys 2018, Wellcome Genome Campus Development, Hinxton, Geophysical Survey report.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology East 2018, Wellcome Genome Campus Development Project, Hinxton, Cambridgeshire, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report, OAE no 2266.</p>

Case study no.	20
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land adjacent to The Pack, Burgh by Sands, Carlisle, Cumbria
Type of application and broad category	Minor, Residential
Date(s)	2017-8
Local Planning Authority	Carlisle City Council
Planning references(s)	17/1012
Development proposal	Erection of single dwelling and garage, site area 0.12ha
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The development site is situated close to the north-western corner of Burgh II (the Roman <i>Aballava</i>), a military fort on Hadrian's Wall, the northern frontier of the Roman empire, constructed in the early 2nd century AD. A civilian settlement lay to the south and south-east of the fort, and other extramural activity, including intensive industrial activity, has been found to the east.</p> <p>Hadrian's Wall represents the most complete of the frontiers of the Roman Empire, and its archaeological and historic significance is reflected in its designation as a scheduled monument (NHLE no. 1018457), and its inclusion by UNESCO in the list of World Heritage Sites (as part of <i>Frontiers of the Roman Empire</i>).</p> <p>The development site was a disused agricultural storage yard and itself not scheduled.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>In view of the proximity of the application site to the Roman wall and fort both Historic England and the LPA's archaeological adviser recommended archaeological evaluation prior to the determination of the application.</p> <p>An evaluation comprising two trenches found significant archaeological remains. A very large ditch of Roman military character aligned west-east may have been associated with either the Roman wall or the nearby fort. Despite the small size of the site, and the consequently limited area of the evaluation, the results are significant for the understanding of this part of the Roman frontier that has not been intensively studied.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The archaeological evidence recovered by the evaluation identified Roman features which were assessed as being of national importance, of equivalent significance to designated heritage assets, and therefore covered by NPPF 2012, paragraph 139.

	<p>In view of the depth below current ground surface at which the archaeological features were present it was possible to adjust the depth of foundations and services required for the new development, and to restrict these to a depth at which they would not affect the archaeological features. These details were agreed with the LPA before the determination of the planning application. The archaeological remains were therefore preserved <i>in situ</i>.</p> <p>Planning permission was given for the development with a pre-commencement planning condition attached to secure a watching brief during development to record any other archaeological remains that might be present.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Oxford Archaeology North 2018, Archaeological Evaluation Report. Unpublished report, OAN no. 1909.</p>

Case study no.	21
Planning scenario(s)	7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Farriers Way, Warboys, Cambridgeshire
Type of application and broad category	Major, Residential
Date(s)	2014- 8
Local Planning Authority	Huntingdonshire District Council
Planning reference(s)	14/01887/OUT
Development proposal	Construction of up to 74 dwellings including access
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There were no known heritage assets recorded on the HER, although cropmarks were clearly visible on Google Earth.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The adviser to the LPA's comments on the proposal are summarised as follows: <i>The site is located on the southern edge of the historic settlement of Warboys. Archaeological investigations in advance of development to the west identified features of medieval date. Within the broader landscape, archaeological investigations have demonstrated that the clay landscape around Warboys was extensively settled and managed throughout the late prehistoric and Roman periods. It is likely that significant archaeological assets will survive in the area and that these would be severely damaged or destroyed by the proposed development.</i></p> <p>A pre-determination desk-based assessment indicated 'negligible/low potential for the presence of currently unknown buried archaeological remains' on the development site.</p> <p>Pre-determination evaluation was recommended by the archaeological adviser although this advice was not followed by the LPA and all works were undertaken post-permission. A pre-commencement planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological investigation was attached to the planning permission.</p> <p>A geophysical survey revealed extensive settlement across the entire (4 ha) site.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching identified a very well preserved, dense, and extensive Roman rural settlement comprising rectilinear enclosures aligned along a metalled trackway. Late Iron Age and Anglo-Saxon pottery was also present.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The evaluation was successful in determining the extent, density and character of the archaeological remains on the site and a mitigation scheme was planned for a minimum of 22 weeks. The mitigation programme took 24

	<p>weeks in total, although this was also impacted by weather and phased soil movements. Excavation confirmed a very rich archaeological landscape, which resulted in considerable costs for the archaeological excavation.</p> <p>The main archaeological remains were Roman, with some late Iron Age and later Saxon activity on site of the abandoned Roman settlement in the 5th and 6th centuries AD. Roman settlement of this wealth and density was previously unknown in the parish and adds significantly to knowledge of Roman Fen edge activity in the Cambridgeshire Fens. In addition, the continuity of activity from the late Iron Age, through the whole of the Roman period and into the early Saxon period is also very unusual.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>As excavation has progressed the client has been able to move onto the site and commence development work. This has not impeded the archaeological investigation or the community/volunteer involvement, so it is an excellent example of effective working together by all parties.</p> <p>The local community was involved in the excavation and Warboys Archaeology Project members were on site. The developer (Bellway Homes) has also supported the local archaeology group with equipment. They have now carried out a geophysical survey on the adjacent rugby pitch, west of the development site, where the Roman settlement continues. There are plans to carry out a community dig (with Oxford Archaeology support) in the future.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>CGMS 2014, Land south of Farriers Way, Warboys, Cambridgeshire, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Archaeological Services WYAS 2017, Farrier's Way, Warboys, Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology East 2018, Farriers Way, Warboys, Archaeological Evaluation Report. Unpublished report, OAE No. 2218.</p>

Case study no.	22
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Type of application & broad category	Solar farm; major, residential (withdrawn)
Site name/address	Conesby Farm, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire
Date(s)	2015-19
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2018/2140 for solar farm; N/A for housing proposal
Development proposal	A major housing allocation proposal for up to 900 dwellings was successfully rejected by the LPA in 2015. An application for a solar farm 74ha in size was subsequently put forward by the developer in 2018 and was approved in 2019.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	A pre-application evaluation was undertaken in 2015 in connection with an unsuccessful housing allocation proposal (see above). This revealed a previously unknown Roman settlement including a building with internal floor surfaces, a rare survival on North Lincolnshire rural sites. Medieval stone structures were also recorded, these being associated with South Conesby deserted medieval village, the majority of which was destroyed by ironstone quarrying in the 19th/20th centuries.
Archaeological/planning processes	The results of the pre-application evaluation undertaken in 2015 were used to inform the mitigation strategy for the Solar Farm development. The implementation of the agreed archaeological mitigation strategy has been secured through a pre-commencement condition. The strategy will employ non-intrusive installation techniques within the areas of archaeological significance and archaeological recording where the remains cannot be preserved <i>in situ</i> .
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The results of the pre-application archaeological evaluation were a factor in the decision by the LPA to reject an inappropriate residential development proposal and the subsequent bringing forward of a more acceptable proposal for a solar farm. The solar farm will have a much lower impact on the archaeological remains than the previously proposed residential development.</p> <p>By having the evaluation on this large site completed well in advance, and an agreed mitigation strategy submitted with the planning application, determination of the application was straightforward and the implementation of the mitigation strategy is a condition of the planning permission.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs	The developer is happy to provide an interpretative panel for heritage assets

<p>e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>at an appropriate location off-site.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Archaeological Project Services 2015a, Archaeological Fieldwalking on Land at Conesby Farm, Normanby Road, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Archaeological Project Services 2015b, Land at Conesby Farm, Normanby Road, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire: Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Archaeological Project Services 2015c, Archaeological Evaluation on Land at Conesby Farm, Normanby Road, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2018, Conesby Farm, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire: Heritage Assessment. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	23
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Able UK Ltd, East Halton (c. 1.5km north of no. 24), North Lincolnshire.
Type of application & broad category	Major planning application and EIA for commercial port-related storage facilities
Date(s)	2009-2017
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2009/0600; PA/2015/1264
Development proposal	Planning permission to erect buildings and use land for purposes within Use Classes A3, C1, B1, B2 and B8 for port-related storage and associated service facilities together with amenity landscaping and habitat creation, including flood defences, new railway siding, estate roads, sewage and drainage facilities - 388ha.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	An area of known potential due to previous surveys and investigations in the area including the Humber Wetlands Survey.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment and some non-invasive surveys were undertaken for a Heritage Assessment in 2009 as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Pre-determination evaluation of Phases 1 & 2 (of 7) of the development was completed in 2010, revealing a hitherto unknown landscape of regularly spaced Iron Age and Romano-British settlements located along the former saltmarsh. Phases 1 & 2 have since been fully archaeologically investigated as provided for by a pre-commencement condition on the planning permission, and are awaiting commencement of the development. Mitigation of the remaining areas has also been secured as part of the framework for archaeological evaluation and mitigation.</p> <p>After a hiatus, evaluation continued in 2017 with a geophysical survey that has identified further Iron Age/Romano British settlement across the rest of the site.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Pre-determination evaluation revealed significant new, and unexpected, archaeology in an area of known potential.</p> <p>The developer is aware of the potential delays that could be caused by unexpected archaeology turning up just before or during development and is willing to commission both the post-determination evaluation and</p>

	mitigation works in good time in relation to their plans.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>AC Archaeology 2010, Able UK Humber Ports Facility - PA/2009/0600 Framework for archaeological evaluation and mitigation strategies. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Allen Archaeology Ltd, 2018 Archaeological Assessment Report and Updated Project Design: Able Humber Port, East Halton & North Killingholme, North Lincolnshire. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	24
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Able UK Ltd, North and South Killingholme, North Lincolnshire, on the south bank of the Humber estuary (c.1.5km south of Case Study no. 23)
Type of application & broad category	Marine Energy Park (AMEP) – 408 ha
Date(s)	2012-15
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council and National Infrastructure Commission
Planning reference(s)	NSIP ref: TR03001; EIA; PA/2013/1034
Development proposal	Construction of manufacturing and logistics facilities to support the offshore wind industry
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	An area of known archaeological potential due to previous surveys and investigations in the area including the Humber Wetlands Survey
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-determination evaluation of the Able Marine Energy Park site in 2012 uncovered Iron Age and Roman settlement as above (Case Study no. 23). Permission was granted by the Secretary of State in 2013.</p> <p>A pre-commencement condition was placed on planning approval PA/2013/1034 .</p> <p>Evaluation was followed by machine stripping and excavation of a total of 12ha across 11 sites.</p> <p>This revealed a series of small, isolated middle Iron Age enclosures followed by a more complex pattern of late Iron Age enclosures and open settlements that extended across a large area of the Humber foreshore. Many of the large earthworks constructed during the later Iron Age were later used to form a part of an extensive Romano-British field system. These were associated with much larger, estate-like settlements that included aisled buildings, grain stores, metalworking areas.</p> <p>Construction of the marine energy park is yet to commence, but the land is being used for port-related storage of vehicles.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Pre-determination evaluation revealed significant new, and unexpected, archaeology in an area of known potential.</p> <p>The Able UK developments on the Humber (see also Case Study no. 23) have continued intermittently for well over a decade. Completing the evaluations</p>

	and mitigation works at an early stage has provided the developer with flexibility to their plans without delays for undertaking archaeological investigation at the last minute, or finding unexpected archaeological remains during the development.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>GSB Prospection 2010, Able UK Ltd Marine Energy Park. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd 2012, Proposed Able UK Ltd Marine Energy Park, North Killingholme, North Lincolnshire, Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Allen Archaeology Ltd 2013, Archaeological evaluation report: Able Marine Energy Park, North Killingholme. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Allen Archaeology Ltd 2018 Archaeological Assessment Report and Updated Project Design: Able Humber Port, East Halton & North Killingholme, North Lincolnshire. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	25
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest of regional or national importance.
Site name/address	Seaforth, Barton upon Humber, North Lincolnshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2011-19
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2011/1554; withdrawn December 2018
Development proposal	14 dwellings
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The sites lies within the late Saxon and Medieval town and is close to St Peter's Church (in English Heritage Guardianship). Excavation in advance of the construction of an adjacent property in 1999 revealed significant late Saxon occupation and the medieval town defences.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-application evaluation trial trenching within the garden of a detached Victorian property in 2008 revealed numerous remains dating mainly from the mid 8th - 12th century and also dated the Town Ditch to the mid 11th/12th century. The site is significant because it demonstrates that Saxon settlement was not confined to the adjacent Pre-Conquest enclosure associated with St Peter's Church. The remains survived at differing depths across the site from 0.25m to 0.70m.</p> <p>In view of the importance of the remains, preservation <i>in situ</i> was considered to be the preferred option. In consideration of the fragility and shallow depth of the remains, the applicant submitted mitigation plans to raise each proposed house platform above the archaeology. However, the strategy was considered by the archaeological advisor to the LPA to be insufficiently detailed to secure satisfactory preservation <i>in situ</i>. Refusal of the application on archaeological grounds has been recommended.</p> <p>The existing house and property were sold in late 2018 and the application was withdrawn in December 2018.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The importance and fragility of the archaeology revealed in the pre-determination evaluation has made the securing of adequate mitigation for the proposed development problematic. The planning application has been withdrawn.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public	-

engagement, research and new/changed work practices	
References and links/bibliography	<p>Rodwell, W (with Atkins, C) 2011, <i>St Peter's, Barton-upon-Humber, Lincolnshire - A Parish Church and its Community. Volume 1: History, Archaeology and Architecture</i>. Oxbow Books.</p> <p>Field, N 2011, Seaforth, 91 Barrow Road, Barton-on-Humber: Heritage Impact Assessment. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	26
Planning scenario(s)	2. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to refusal of planning permission on archaeological grounds
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	St Mary's Works, Barton-upon-Humber, North Lincolnshire.
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2005-12
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2005/1898
Development proposal	108 dwellings
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site is within the proto-urban core of Barton-upon-Humber which has been the subject of a major English Heritage research project on St Peter's Church. The archaeological remains therefore have an important contribution to make to the heritage of Barton and are of regional significance for northern Lincolnshire.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Limited pre-determination trial trenching in 2006 (less than 1% partly due to extant buildings) revealed medieval and earlier remains along medieval street frontage. However, the trenches placed around the periphery of the site uncovered well-preserved remains of Saxon and Medieval date, with indications that the areas which were not evaluated are also likely to contain similar significant evidence.</p> <p>The application remained undetermined until 2012 during which time the buildings on site were demolished but no further evaluation was undertaken. Permission for the development was then refused by the LPA, and the reasons included incomplete archaeological assessment. The subsequent appeal was dismissed and the Inspector upheld the archaeological reason, namely that the extent of the archaeological evaluation was inadequate to agree an appropriate mitigation strategy (Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/A/12/2179203).</p> <p>The site came forward again in 2016 and more trial trenching was recommended in response to the above appeal decision, but has yet to be undertaken.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	An appeal for refusal on archaeological grounds was successfully dismissed.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>Rodwell, W (with Atkins, C) 2011, <i>St Peter's, Barton-upon-Humber, Lincolnshire - A Parish Church and its Community. Volume 1: History, Archaeology and Architecture</i>. Oxbow Books.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2007, Archaeological Field Evaluation, St Mary's</p>

	Works, Barton upon Humber. Unpublished report.
--	--

Case study no.	27
Planning scenario(s)	2. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to refusal of planning permission on archaeological grounds
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	White Swan, Barton upon Humber, North Lincolnshire
Type of application & broad category	Minor, residential
Date(s)	2012-14
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2012/1175 PA/2014/0032 PA/2014/0881
Development proposal	PA/2014/0881: Outline planning permission to erect five 2/3-bedroomed townhouses.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site lies at the head of Barton Haven, the mercantile quarter of the medieval town, which was the pre-eminent port on the Humber prior to the foundation of Kingston upon Hull in 1299. The development had the potential to destroy evidence of the medieval town and its trading heritage.
Archaeological/planning processes	The application (PA/2012/1175) was refused on archaeological grounds due to absence of pre-determination evaluation. This reason was upheld at the subsequent appeal which was dismissed (Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/A/13/2195165). The application was resubmitted in 2014 (PA/2014/0032) without an evaluation; permission was refused again finally prompting the applicant to commission the trial trenching. In the event, whilst some archaeology was found it was not of high significance and an appropriate mitigation strategy was agreed and conditioned on the planning permission.
Outcomes: archaeological	Appeal against refusal of application on archaeological grounds was dismissed and a second application was also refused until an evaluation was undertaken. The case demonstrates the cost benefits to prospective developers of undertaking early evaluation.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	Network Archaeology 2014, Land to the rear of the White Swan, Barton-on-Humber: heritage assessment report. Unpublished report.

Case study no.	28
Planning scenario(s)	<p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	North Street, Winterton, North Lincolnshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2015-18
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2015/1390
Development proposal	Demolition of a house and outline planning permission for the erection of 135 dwellings - 6.8ha
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	A Romano British settlement site, excavated in 1953, lies adjacent to the development site. The site also contains a Royal Observer Corps underground monitoring post, one of only three surviving posts in North Lincolnshire.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-application evaluation by geophysical survey and trial trenching in 2015 revealed the extent of features associated with the known site of a Roman building and a previously unknown cemetery. The site is considered to be of regional importance. In addition, an extant Royal Observer Corps underground monitoring post was assessed.</p> <p>The application was refused (not on archaeological grounds) in 2016 and was granted on appeal in 2017.</p> <p>A mitigation strategy combining areas of preservation and excavation was negotiated as a condition of the planning approval in 2017.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	Excavation of the well-preserved Roman inhumation cemetery in 2018 has received regional and national publicity including on the BBC website and an article in <i>Current Archaeology</i> .
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	The S106 agreement will provide for information boards about the heritage assets and funds towards the refurbishment of the Royal Observer Corps post which will be passed to a local community heritage group to manage as a local heritage asset.
References and links/bibliography	<p>Allen Archaeology 2015, Heritage Assessment: land off North Street, Winterton, North Lincolnshire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Kathryn Krakowka 2018 'Revealing the dead in North Lincolnshire' <i>Current Archaeology</i> no. 345, November 2018.</p>

Case study no.	29
Planning scenario(s)	11. The presence of a ‘live’ and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest, of national importance
Site name/address	North Conesby Moat, former Normanby Park Steelworks, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire.
Type of application & broad category	Major, land reclamation
Date(s)	2001-2019
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2000/1074
Development proposal	Land reclamation to excavate contaminated steelworks waste from the former Normanby Park steelworks
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Medieval moated site at North Conesby. Buried by slag from the Normanby Park Steelworks in the 1920s, uncovered and partially excavated in 2003.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A pre-commencement condition was included on the planning permission to clean up contaminated steelworks waste and slag. The condition secured the evaluation and subsequent partial investigation of the medieval moat and manor house of North Conesby. The well-preserved remains, including a timber bridge, had (miraculously) survived 80 years buried beneath 30m high slag heaps.</p> <p>The moat is recognised as an archaeological site of national importance by Historic England. However, a request in 2003 for it to be scheduled was declined on the grounds that planning system should provide the necessary protection.</p> <p>A post-excavation assessment report was produced in 2003, but no further funding was made available to undertake the analysis and publish the results in accordance with the agreed archaeological mitigation strategy. The relevant planning conditions have not been discharged and are still ‘live’, and so there may be scope in the future to progress the analysis and publication of the results of the investigation.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The moat’s current protection as a nationally important non-designated monument provided by the NPPF 2019 (footnote 63) is being undermined by the failure of this protection to be properly considered in heritage assessments of the area.</p> <p>The moat is now surrounded by existing and proposed industrial development and opportunities to promote the site and enhance its setting are therefore in danger of being completely lost.</p>

Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	Leahy, K and Steedman, K, 2008, <i>Current Archaeology</i> , 26-31

Case study no.	30
Planning scenario(s)	<p>8. Pre-commencement conditions could not be attached to a planning permission resulting in the loss of archaeological information (no condition or watching brief/access condition only was provided instead)</p> <p>9. The commencement of development (with or without a pre-commencement condition) before the completion of archaeological mitigation fieldwork caused problems e.g. Health and Safety; conservation of archaeology; additional resources required, including for agreeing and implementing complex method statements</p>
Heritage assets affected	Listed Building; heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest.
Site name/address	13 Church Street, Owston Ferry, North Lincolnshire
Type of application & broad category	Listed building consent to demolish a listed dwelling and an application to replace it with three dwellings.
Date(s)	2017
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2017/534 & PA/2017/1728
Development proposal	As above
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The Grade II Listed Building was an early-mid 18th century house, with potential earlier origins and possible timber-framing. As such, this was a relatively rare survival in North Lincolnshire.</p> <p>The building was unoccupied and had fallen into a very dilapidated state since its listing in 1987.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The following is a summary of the sequence of events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Conservation Officer, Historic England and SPAB all sought retention of the building. - The recommendation from the archaeological advisor to the LPA was that a pre-determination historic building assessment should be undertaken and if necessary a full record of the building should be made if consent was granted. - A demolition order was issued by the local authority under health and safety regulations and the Listed Building was demolished before an assessment could be carried out. - Following the demolition of the Listed Building, the archaeological advisor to the LPA recommended that the pre-determination assessment and recording of the demolition debris left on the site should still take place (which included several structural timbers) and of the below-ground remains of the building. A full programme of excavation and recording could then be conditioned, should planning permission be granted for the development. - Historic England subsequently advised the LPA that the demolished

	<p>building held no further significance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The developer promptly removed the remains as being of no significance, no longer listed and under no other planning protection. - The planning authority subsequently granted permission for the new dwellings with a condition requiring an archaeological watching brief.
Outcomes: archaeological	A Listed Building was demolished without pre-determination assessment or any recording before demolition. Some below-ground archaeological recording may be possible during development.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	-

Case study no.	31
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest, some of national importance.
Site name/address	Messingham Quarry, Manton, North Lincolnshire
Type of application & broad category	Minerals
Date(s)	2009-15
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2009/0356
Development proposal	Quarry for silica sand extraction
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Evidence of early iron working sites uncovered during quarrying operations to the south. Former slag mounds known locally as 'cinder hills' recorded in the area; one such mound survives along southern boundary of site.
Archaeological/planning processes	Pre-determination evaluation which comprised fieldwalking, geophysics and extensive trial trenching identified the presence of several early metal working sites as either furnaces or slag debris. Early identification ensured that a sound mitigation strategy was in place as a condition of planning permission and this also facilitated an unforeseen change of contractor undertaking the excavation works. Further excavation in 2015 revealed the remains of a furnace that was radiocarbon dated 776-590 BC, making this the earliest dated smelting furnace in the country.
Outcomes: archaeological	Comprehensive pre-determination evaluation and a pre-commencement condition enabled the identification and excavation of important Iron Age remains, some of which have been identified as being of national importance.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	The early date of one of the furnaces is of national (possibly international) research interest.
References and links/bibliography	<p>Clarke, G, 2015, <i>In Touch</i>, <i>Oxford Archaeology Review</i> 2014/15 Issue 35, 8.</p> <p>Archaeological Survey and Evaluation Ltd 2009, Land at Greetwell Hall Farm, Messingham Quarry, Manton, Trial Trench Evaluation. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	32
Planning scenario	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest of regional importance
Site name/address	Red Lion, High Street, Broughton, North Lincolnshire
Type of application & broad category	Minor, residential
Date(s)	2015-19
Local Planning Authority	North Lincolnshire Council
Planning reference(s)	PA/2017/124
Development proposal	6 dwellings
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Within a medieval village and located adjacent to St Mary's Church, Broughton, which has an 11 th century tower and stair turret.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-application evaluation trenching in 2015, close to the parish church, revealed medieval structural remains and uncovered middle Saxon remains including a possible sunken-featured building that pre-date the church by c.200 years.</p> <p>The archaeological interest of the site, therefore, has high significance for the origins of the village and potentially for the period of the building of the church.</p> <p>The results of the evaluation led to the agreement of a mitigation strategy, including excavation, and the preparation of a WSI that was submitted with the subsequent planning application. This has been approved but (as of February 2019) has yet to be implemented.</p> <p>The implementation of the programme of archaeological work set out in the WSI has been specified in the planning conditions together with the submission of a timetable to ensure that the pre-commencement archaeological works are all completed without delaying the commencement of the construction work. This approach ensures all concerned understand their obligations and that the planning conditions meet the five tests of reasonableness set out in the NPPF.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Excavation of a regionally important archaeology has been secured through a pre-commencement condition but has yet to be implemented.</p> <p>The evaluation has produced a newly identified type of medieval pottery and therefore has the potential to throw light on the local production of this</p>

	pottery.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>Allen Archaeology Ltd 2015, Heritage Impact Assessment: Land to the rear of The Red Lion, High Street, Broughton, North Lincolnshire. Unpublished report, AAL2015169.</p> <p>Allen Archaeology Ltd 2017, Archaeological Mitigation Strategy: Land off High Street, Broughton North Lincolnshire. Unpublished Report.</p>

Case study no.	33
Planning scenario(s)	4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest of national importance
Site name/address	Land off Barnsley Road, Wath upon Dearne, Rotherham
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2005-6
Local Planning Authority	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	RB/2006/0848 (withdrawn)
Development proposal	Major, Residential, 5ha
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Wath Hall, the known site of a mediaeval moat.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The moated site was proposed for housing development, as part of a much larger area.</p> <p>A pre-determination evaluation was undertaken in 2005 and comprised geophysical survey and trial trenches. It demonstrated excellent below-ground preservation of the moat and structures on the island. The moat was subsequently assessed by English Heritage as being of schedulable quality.</p> <p>The planning authority agreed with the recommendation of their archaeological advisors that the application should be refused, as it was contrary to local policies on scheduled/nationally important archaeology.</p> <p>The applicant then agreed to remove the moat from the development proposal. However, a revised plan still included part of the moated site and both South Yorkshire Archaeology Service and English Heritage objected. Subsequently, although the application was not formally withdrawn, the application for the whole area has been treated as withdrawn by the planning authority.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	Pre-determination evaluation enabled the moat to be assessed and it was determined to be nationally important. It also led to re-design of the development and contributed to the eventual withdrawal of the development.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and	West Yorkshire Archaeology Service 2005, Land off Barnsley Road, Wath-

links/bibliography	upon-Dearne: Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report. West Yorkshire Archaeology Service 2006, Land off Barnsley Road, Wath-upon-Dearne: Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report.
---------------------------	---

Case study no.	34
Planning scenario(s)	4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	King St Chapel, Salford
Type of application & broad category	Brownfield, currently used as a surface-level car park
Date(s)	2017
Local Planning Authority	Salford City Council
Planning reference(s)	N/A
Development proposal	New multi-story car park part of Salford Greengate Redevelopment
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Very large graveyard on the site, known from the HER
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>One of the major developers for the Greengate regeneration scheme in the historic core of Salford consulted the archaeological advisors to the LPA on the cusp of purchasing a car park on King Street for redevelopment as a multi-storey car park development. The archaeological advisors were able to recommend (using the HER and a previous desk based assessment for the wider regeneration area) that the car park covered a former graveyard for 'Christ Church' a Swedenborgian chapel, built in 1800.</p> <p>Christ Church was the meeting place of the Bible Christians, a branch of the Swedenborgians founded by the Reverend William Cowherd. In 1800 he established a new church on King Street with himself as minister. In 1809 he adopted the title of Bible Christian for his own branch of Swedenborgian belief, which included vegetarianism among its doctrines. The church offered free burial for the poor, and as a consequence, there are known to be a large number of people buried within the graveyard who were not members of the congregation. Estimates suggest up to 30,000 burials in total.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The scheme was re-considered and replaced with a proposal for a pocket park with minimal disturbance of existing ground levels.</p> <p>The advice to the would-be developer therefore served to protect the graveyard from disturbance and saved the developer from the substantial financial commitment of archaeological investigation of the graveyard and to meet legal obligations for a large graveyard clearance and re-internment.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and	Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit 2006, Public Realm Works, Exchange

links/bibliography	Greengate Redevelopment, Salford: An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Unpublished report.
---------------------------	--

Case study no.	35
Planning scenario(s)	4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Manchester Metrolink Second City Crossing, Manchester
Type of application & broad category	Infrastructure, New metrolink line
Date(s)	2012-15
Local Planning Authority	Manchester City Council
Planning reference(s)	2CC Parliamentary Order; 100118/VO/2012/C1 and EIA
Development proposal	Metrolink second city crossing
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Minimal, a few HER entries with not much detail.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>An Environmental Statement was produced for the proposed Metrolink route (URS 2012). This included an assessment of the potential for a graveyard extending into Cross Street and the potential impacts of the proposed development.</p> <p>A detailed desk based assessment and archaeological trial trenching in 2013 identified intact burial vaults under St Peters Church in St Peters Square, Manchester. Negotiations between archaeologists (including the archaeological planning adviser to Manchester City Council) and Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) established that it would be possible and cost effective to protect the burial chambers <i>in situ</i> by putting concrete rafts over the vaults to support the weight of the new Metrolink platforms and rails.</p> <p>Further along the route, on Cross Street, the archaeologists' research and test trenching showed that a former part of the Cross Street Chapel graveyard had survived under a 19th century widening scheme for Cross Street, whereas the rest of the graveyard had been removed in the 1970s.</p> <p>The site was the main centre of Unitarianism in Manchester from the late 17th century onwards and a chapel still exists there. TfGM dealt with the sensitive issues regarding the treatment of the remains according to best archaeological practice. This was achieved through the archaeology strategy which included where necessary the excavation of burials, which were respectfully re-buried at Southern Cemetery, and the preservation of some of the burials <i>in situ</i> through careful planning.</p> <p>The archaeological work delayed the scheme and it can be argued that earlier evaluation and costing of exhumation would have helped. However, the scheme demonstrated the value of archaeologists working closely with project managers and engineers to reduce impact and preserve some of the human remains <i>in situ</i> at deeper levels at the former Cross Street Chapel</p>

	and all of the human remains and vaults at St Peters' Church.
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Crypts and burials were preserved under St Peter's church.</p> <p>The archaeology strategy achieved selective excavation, preservation and reburial at Cross St.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	<p>The c. 250 burials excavated at Cross St provided a significant study of the impact of industrialisation on a middle class sector of 18th and 19th century Manchester society.</p> <p>A GM Past Revealed publication is to be prepared and published, along with an academic article</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>URS 2012, The Transport for Greater Manchester: Light Rapid Transit System, Second City Crossing, Environmental Statement, May 2012</p> <p>CFA Archaeology Ltd 2016, Cross Street Chapel Manchester: Archaeological Excavation and Exhumation Assessment Report. Unpublished report No. Y220/16.</p>

Case study no.	36
Planning scenario(s)	4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Trafford Old Hall, Chester Road, Trafford, Greater Manchester
Type of application & broad category	Commercial
Date(s)	1998
Local Planning Authority	Trafford Council
Planning reference(s)	H/46272/98 and H/UDC/39503
Development proposal	Erection of a bingo hall with ancillary car parking and landscaping, and access from Chester Road, former Car Auction Site, Talbot Road, Old Trafford, later changed to: Erection of a vehicle sales centre with ancillary repair workshop and car display area.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The former site of Trafford Old Hall, demolished in the 1930s, which was used as a car park and car auction compound.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A pre-application desk-based assessment was followed by a total archaeological strip, clean and record exercise in 1998. This demonstrated that the full footprint of the hall had survived in the form of the dwarf stone walls for a timber-framed structure, although there were pockets of 19th and 20th century disturbance. Finds recovered dated from the 12th to 20th century.</p> <p>The new sales warehouse building was proposed to be fairly lightweight and did not require substantial earthmoving and foundations.</p> <p>The archaeological advisor to the LPA and the archaeology contractor worked with the developer and the LPA to agree a scheme of clusters of micro-pile foundations that were targeted at disturbed areas to minimise harm to the archaeology.</p> <p>It was not necessary therefore to have costly full excavation. The remains were sealed with a protective layer and are preserved under the new building.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	Early assessment and archaeological investigation enabled well-preserved medieval archaeological remains to be preserved <i>in situ</i> by redesign of building foundations, thereby also minimising costs to the developer.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-

References and links/bibliography	MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd 2005, Trafford Old Hall, Manchester, Archaeological Excavations and Watching Brief. Unpublished report.
--	--

Case study no.	37
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HE</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Arkwright's Shudehill Mill, Miller Street, Manchester
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential, regeneration
Date(s)	2014
Local Planning Authority	Manchester City Council
Planning reference(s)	107722/FO/2014/C1
Development proposal	Erection of part 6 storey, part 33 storey buildings to form a mixed use development comprising 458 residential apartments (Use Class C3) and ground floor commercial units maximum of 1954 sqm (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, B1 and D1) along with associated roof top garden and Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) to 6 storey element, basement car parking, hard and soft landscaping and associated works including the creation of a new pedestrian route between Angel Street and Miller Street, Land Bounded By Miller Street, Rochdale Road and Angel Street, Manchester
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Remains of nationally important cotton mill. It was amongst the first steam powered cotton mills in the world, erected around 1783. It was destroyed in an air raid in 1940 and became a car park.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>In 2005 Time Team undertook a three day evaluation of the site of the mill, working with the local archaeology planning advisers, Manchester University's archaeology unit and local archaeology society members.</p> <p>Well preserved remains were identified but not fully understood within the constraints of the timescale. However, it was clear that there was good archaeological potential for significant archaeology which might be of national significance – although this was not pursued at the time in terms of designation as a Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>In 2014 the car park became the focus of a major regeneration project. The new development required that three new buildings cover the mill site, which would destroy the archaeological remains.</p> <p>Unfortunately, neither Historic England nor the LPA archaeology advisers were consulted at the early design stage so that the scheme was presented as a fait accompli.</p>

	<p>In 2014, the regeneration company funded detailed historical research, comparative analysis and a full archaeological strip of the site, with sample excavation.</p> <p>NPPF 2012 paragraph 139 (now footnote 63) was invoked and meetings held at which it was agreed that the remains could be of national significance but much more detailed research and evaluation excavation needed to be undertaken to establish this, particularly as the scheme would not be viable if the remains were to be preserved <i>in situ</i>.</p> <p>The resulting information was subject to an internal designation review by English Heritage. It was found that the mill had been destroyed by a fire in the mid-19th century and rebuilt as a warehouse. The engine house had been sealed at that time. The mill body was of only local significance but the engine house with its sequence of boilers, flues and engine bases, and the remains of the original wheel pit were clearly nationally significant although should be addressed through the planning system rather than via statutory designation.</p> <p>Analysis of levels from the excavation against the proposed development foundation levels confirmed that nearly all of the archaeology would be removed. It was agreed that public benefit arising from the development outweighed that of preserving the remains <i>in situ</i>. Full planning permission was therefore granted for the development in 2014 with a pre-commencement archaeological condition.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>A substantial part of the public benefit was provided by the full excavation and detailed analysis of the mill in 2015 to provide a maximum record and understanding, the production of a popular booklet, dedicated website including educational materials, and state of the art digital presentation of the archaeology and history of the mill, together with specially designed references and interactive interpretation within the public realm, with a new street being named 'Thread Street' to commemorate the site. An academic monograph is currently in preparation.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Oxford Archaeology North 2014, NOMA Plot L, Angel Square, Miller Street, Manchester: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment. Unpublished report, no 2013-14/1594.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology North 2015, 'Hell upon Earth': the archaeology of Angel Meadow, <i>Greater Manchester's Past Revealed</i> 14.</p>

Case study no.	39
Planning scenario(s)	3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest, Listed Building
Site name/address	Chelwood, Pound Lane, Laughton, East Sussex
Type of application & broad category	Householder, residential
Date(s)	2018
Local Planning Authority	Wealden District Council
Planning reference/s	WD/2018/0234/FR
Development proposal	Single story extension to provide ground floor bedroom, utilities and kitchen/dining space with associated landscaping to private outdoor amenity. Double timber-frame garage to replace existing single garage.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	No pre-existing record on the HER.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A response to a pre-application enquiry revealed a building on the application site that was also identified on a manorial map of 1730.</p> <p>The building was due to be demolished as part of the development. Pre-determination building assessment and evaluation undertaken in conjunction with the Conservation Officer led to identification of the building as being potentially of listable quality. The LPA issued a Building Preservation Order which allowed Historic England assess its significance and subsequently to List it (Grade II).</p> <p>The List describes the buildings as follows: <i>'a house which probably dates of from c. AD1600 or earlier; a good example of a small vernacular building which retains a significant proportion of its three-bay timber frame'</i>.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	A non-designated historic building was Listed. The proposal to demolish was withdrawn and the (now) Listed Building has been restored and will be sold as part of the development
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. public benefits such as public engagement, research or new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>National Heritage List entry reference: 1436424.</p> <p>Chris Butler Archaeological Services 2018, An Archaeological Evaluation and Excavation at Chelwood, Pound Lane, Laughton, BN8 6BE. Unpublished report, no.0970.</p>

Case study no.	40
Planning scenario(s)	4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest of national importance
Site name/address	St Francis Farm, Potmans Lane, Catsfield/Bexhill, East Sussex
Type of application & broad category	Solar farm
Date(s)	2014-15
Local Planning Authority	Rother District Council
Planning reference/s	RR/2014/558/P
Development proposal	Solar farm covering c.25ha
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Nothing on the HER, but a site of potential due to its size and location.
Archaeological/planning processes	A pre-determination evaluation in advance of an application to construct a solar farm led to the identification and preservation <i>in situ</i> of prehistoric Bronze Age burial mounds achieved through layout re-design of the solar farm. The mounds are potentially of schedulable quality. Application approved with pre-commencement condition (no. 8) on 26/08/14
Outcomes: archaeological	See above. A planning condition (no. 4) includes provision for the protection of the burial mounds when the solar farm is due to revert to its former agricultural use 25 years after the commencement of the solar farm's operation.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. public benefits such as public engagement, research or new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	Archaeology South-East 2014, An Archaeological Evaluation at Potmans Lane, Catsfield: Interim Summary Report. Unpublished report, no. 6753. Archaeology South-East 2015, Archaeological Evaluation Report, Land to the East of Potman's Lane, Catsfield, East Sussex. Unpublished report, no. 7103.

Case study no.	41
Planning scenario(s)	<p>3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site</p> <p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p>
Heritage assets affected	Scheduled Monument Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest, of national importance
Site name/address	A22 New Route, Dittons to Willingdon Drove, Eastbourne, East Sussex
Type of application & broad category	Road scheme
Date(s)	c.1990-98
Local Planning Authority	East Sussex County Council
Planning reference(s)	EB/1227/CC 1990, permission granted March 1991
Development proposal	Local authority road scheme
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Nothing on the HER, and at the time of the development the potential of route (which included areas of wetland) was thought to be low.
Archaeological/ planning processes	<p>No provision for evaluation, or mitigation by planning condition. Important archaeology was identified through a watching brief.</p> <p>A subsequent programme of investigation funded by the developer (County Council) led to the partial destruction, partial recording and partial preservation <i>in situ</i> of an internationally important Late Bronze Age site comprising a 'causeway and platform', rich in evidence for buildings, burials and artefacts. Some of the surviving elements of the site have subsequently been scheduled.</p> <p>The archaeological condition of the wetland areas continues to be monitored.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	See above
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>National Heritage List reference for Scheduled Monument: no. 1400780: Shinewater Bronze Age settlement.</p> <p>Archaeology South-East 1998, The Shinewater track: An excavation of a late</p>

	Bronze Age waterlogged structure on the Willingdon Levels, Near Eastbourne, East Sussex. Unpublished report, no. 408.
--	---

Case study no.	42
Planning scenario(s)	<p>3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest. Scheduled Monument
Site name/address	Land on the north east side of Priors Hill and opposite Hill Farm, Priors Hill, Pirton, Hertfordshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential, outline application for housing
Date(s)	2014-19
Local Planning Authority	North Hertfordshire District Council
Planning reference(s)	14/03369/OP- withdrawn 17/04239/OP – approved August 2018
Development proposal	<p>14/03369: Outline application for residential development. Land On The North East Side Of Priors Hill and Opposite Hill Farm Priors Hill Pirton.</p> <p>17/04239: Outline application for the erection of 24 dwellings (including 8 affordable dwellings), together with provision of open space with seating, a perimeter path, archaeological information boards, footpath link and access to Priors Hill.</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Known potential moderate. Adjacent to known late Iron Age and Roman remains, but no archaeology known from the site itself. An evaluation in an adjacent area of the field in 2012, followed by archaeological monitoring, had recorded pits and postholes containing prehistoric pottery, a Roman pit, and a few possibly later features.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-determination evaluation requested for application 14/03369. This comprised geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation undertaken in 2015.</p> <p>The geophysical survey identified anomalies of archaeological origin, which were then evaluated, identifying the probable remains of prehistoric burial mounds and evidence of 5th to 9th century Anglo-Saxon settlement and burials. The Anglo-Saxon evidence was considered to be nationally important and an application was made by on behalf of the local community to schedule these remains. This was successful and the planning application was withdrawn in October 2016.</p> <p>A further application - 17/04239/1/OP - to develop part of the original application area was submitted to the LPA at the same time as an application was made to Historic England by the owner to de-schedule the</p>

	<p>part of the planning application site that was designated as a Scheduled Monument. The latter was successful, and further pre-determination archaeological investigation of the development site (including the newly de-scheduled area) was carried out in response to the planning application. The evaluation revealed a further single inhumation burial which was fully excavated as an additional phase of the evaluation. The application was approved in August 2018 with a pre-commencement condition</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>Pre-determination evaluation of an area of moderate archaeological potential (based upon information including an evaluation of an adjacent area) led to remains of national importance being identified.</p> <p>An application to Historic England to schedule the site was successful although the scheduled area was later reduced in size following an application by the owner.</p> <p>The owner withdrew the initial application and later submitted a new application for residential development excluding the reduced scheduled area. This application was approved in 2018 following the results of a 2nd archaeological evaluation. It is likely that further burials will be discovered from excavation of the site in due course.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>The results of the archaeological evaluations are significant for research and understanding of the mid/late Saxon period in the local region.</p> <p>The scheduled area is planned to be a public open space with an information board.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Archaeological Solutions Ltd 2015, Land at Pollards Way/Priors Hill, Pirton, Hertfordshire: a geophysical survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Archaeological Solutions Ltd 2015, Land at Pollards Way/Priors Hill, Pirton, Hertfordshire: trial trench evaluation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>(CgMs) Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited 2018, Land adjacent to Priors Hill, Pirton, Hertfordshire: An Archaeological Evaluation. CgMs unpublished report.</p> <p>(CgMs) Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited 2018, Land adjacent to Priors Hill, Pirton, Hertfordshire: An Archaeological Evaluation. CgMs unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	43
Planning scenario(s)	4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land South of Doveside Drive, Wombwell, Barnsley; Land North of Everill Gate Lane, Wombwell, Barnsley.
Type of application & broad category	Habitat creation
Date(s)	2017-18
Local Planning Authority	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	2017/1264
Development proposal	Planning application for wetland and habitat creation schemes comprising works to two sites : Doveside (Site B, 4.4ha) and Wings Across the Ings (Site A, 'WATI' 9.3ha). Conversion into a nature reserve entailing extensive landscaping and excavation of 'scrapes'
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The HER had a record of cropmarks on one land parcel (Site A, WATI) so a desk-based assessment was recommended.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment highlighted potential for the cropmarks within Site A to be of Iron Age/Romano-British date.</p> <p>Pre-determination evaluation comprising geophysical survey and trial trenching was undertaken on Site A , the area with cropmarks.</p> <p>The design for the smaller plot of land (Site B, Doveside) was changed prior to the evaluation in order to accommodate all of its groundworks within areas of very low archaeological potential, previously disturbed in the 1990s. The LPA then agreed that Site B could be scoped out of future investigations.</p> <p>Geophysical survey within Area A identified anomalies consistent with a field system, two enclosures, possible kilns and an archaeologically 'busy' area. Trenching clarified this as a Romano-British field system and enclosures, post-medieval lime kilns, and Edwardian landfill.</p> <p>The archaeological evaluation report considered the types of evidence recovered and the impact of changes to the water table upon them. Palaeo-environmental potential was considered to be low. The few finds recovered were Roman pottery, and a piece of a quern. There was some early 20th century landfill.</p> <p>The design of the groundworks was then altered to take account of these results: the wetland area and scrapes were positioned over the landfill area and the bunding and the fill areas positioned over field boundaries (mostly later features). The enclosures and kilns will be preserved by being taken out</p>

	<p>of the current ploughing regime and returned to permanent grass pasture. Some mitigation by excavation will be required in areas of lesser significance.</p> <p>The desk-based assessment, geophysical survey and trenching reports, along with an archaeological statement providing an overview, were all submitted as supporting information with the planning application. The archaeological advisor to the LPA recommended a pre-commencement condition to secure the mitigation.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	Pre-determination assessment and evaluation were applied successfully to provide greater understanding of the archaeology of the application site and to use this understanding to minimise the impact of the development (new habitat creation) on the archaeological remains.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	<p>The successful integration of natural environment habitat enhancement and creation with historic environment conservation.</p> <p>The applicant has plans to enhance the story of the nature reserve with the archaeological information. A satisfying outcome all round and a job well done by the consultant.</p>
References and links/bibliography	Archaeological Services WYAS 2018, Wings Across The Ings, Wombwell South Yorkshire, Archaeological Evaluation Report. Unpublished report no. 3136.

Case study no.	44
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest of regional importance
Site name/address	Morley Carr Farm, Yarm, Stockton-on-Tees
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2011-14
Local Planning Authority	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	12/0980/OUT
Development proposal	Residential development of up to 350 dwellings and associated community facilities, on a 22.18ha site
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	An area of potential due to its size and proximity to a green lane, a situation that has numerous local comparators in respect of prehistoric and Roman activity. The farm buildings were also identified of being of possible interest.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A direct enquiry regarding the potential of the land was made in August 2011 by a prospective developer to the LPA's archaeological advisors.</p> <p>Pre-application evaluation was recommended and a geomagnetic survey carried out in February 2012 in response to a brief. It noted a number of discrete areas of anomalies. Further work was requested pre-determination, and trial trench evaluation took place in March which revealed a well-preserved Iron Age settlement.</p> <p>The planning application was submitted in April 2012. It included (following advice from the LPA's archaeological advisors) a scheme for preservation <i>in situ</i> of the identified archaeological deposits relating to the Iron Age settlement.</p> <p>The archaeological advisors requested the inclusion of two conditions, one of which was a to ensure the physical preservation of the Iron Age site during development. The other condition made provision for archaeological monitoring in the vicinity of site and post-excavation/publication for the results including of the evaluation. Both conditions were added as advised, and were implemented successfully.</p>

	Archaeological monitoring in 2014, during installation of access road to south of the archaeology, revealed the western ditch of the Iron Age settlement.
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Pre-determination evaluation led to the preservation <i>in situ</i> and archaeological mitigation by recording of different parts of the development site. The site is considered to be of regional importance, one of a growing number of later prehistoric settlement sites identified in the Tees Valley through developer-funded fieldwork.</p> <p>The two planning conditions used were:</p> <p><i>'4 No development shall commence until the developer has provided a method statement detailing the how the physical preservation of the Iron Age settlement will be achieved. This should include proposals for fencing around the [heritage asset] to a design approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. No works shall take place within the area inside that fencing unless approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interests of the preservation of any archaeological remains.'</i></p> <p><i>'24 A) No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and: 1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording, 2. The programme for post investigation assessment, 3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording, 4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation, 5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation, 6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.</i></p> <p><i>B) No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).</i></p> <p><i>C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured. Reason: In the interests of the preservation of any archaeological remains.'</i></p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	Archaeology Services, West Yorkshire Archaeology Service 2012, Land at Morley Carr Farm, Yarm, Stockton-on Tees. Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report, No. 2313.

	Archaeological Service, West Yorkshire Archaeology Service 2012, Morley Carr Farm Yarm, Cleveland, Archaeological Trial Trenching. Unpublished report no. 2330.
--	---

Case study no.	45
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological interest
Site name/address	Greet Road, Winchcombe, Gloucestershire
Type of application & broad category	Major, Residential
Date(s)	2012-16
Local Planning Authority	Tewkesbury Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	12/00464/OUT
Development proposal	Outline application for residential development comprising up to 120 dwellings, vehicular access, public open space, facilities for sport and recreation and other associated infrastructure.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>A Roman agricultural landscape and the southern wall of a Romano-British masonry building were discovered and excavated in 2007/8 on the adjacent land prior to proposed development on this site.</p> <p>These features extended up to (and were presumed to continue beyond) the southern edge of the development site but there was no evidence of heritage assets recorded on the HER for the site itself.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A large area to the immediate north of the previously excavated Roman archaeological features was proposed for development. In response to a pre-application enquiry the prospective developers were advised that archaeological evaluation should be undertaken to assess the extent and significance of the presumed continuation of the archaeological remains already identified.</p> <p>A geophysical survey was undertaken in March 2009 and evaluation trenching followed in April and May 2009.</p> <p>An unusually well preserved stratified sequence of Iron Age and Roman settlement was identified and was of sufficient importance for the site to be recommended for designation by Gloucestershire County Council. Part of the site was subsequently scheduled as a Romano-British villa. Key to the assessment of significance was the presence on the site of not only two phases of Roman activity (possibly a villa, with well-preserved structural remains) but also earlier, Iron Age, activity. This stratified sequence, including Iron Age settlement sealed by Roman terracing and buildings, is extremely unusual in a rural context in Gloucestershire, where the majority of such sites have been adversely affected by subsequent cultivation; where Iron Age - Roman sequences exist they are more usually truncated with no remaining</p>

	vertical stratigraphy.
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Part of the area originally proposed for development was scheduled (SM 21700 Romano-British villa 170m south-west of Winchcombe School, Greet Road, Winchcombe, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, NHLE no. 1021449) and excluded from the area to be developed.</p> <p>Development subsequently proceeded in the western half of the site that was not designated as a Scheduled Monument. A pre-commencement planning condition was attached to the planning permission. Archaeological excavation was undertaken, revealing Neolithic and Bronze Age features as well as the expected Iron Age and Roman agricultural activity.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>Bartlett-Clark Consultancy 2009, Land at Greet Road, Winchcombe, Gloucestershire. Report on Archaeogeophysical Survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>John Moore Heritage Services 2009, An Archaeological Evaluation at land off Greet Road, Winchcombe, Gloucestershire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Nichols 2016, Iron Age and Roman settlement at Greet Road, Winchcombe: Excavations in 2007-8 and evaluation in 2009, Paul Nichols, <i>Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society</i> 134, 2016, 127-156.</p> <p>Simmonds and Walsh 2016, Prehistoric Settlement and Roman Features on the periphery of the possible villa complex at Greet Road, Winchcombe, A Simmonds and K Walsh, <i>Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society</i> 134, 2016, 157-188.</p> <p>Simmonds and Nichols 2016, Greet Road, Winchcombe: A possible Roman villa in context, A Simmonds and P Nicols, <i>Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society</i> 134, 2016, 189-202.</p>

Case study no.	46
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological interest
Site name/address	Land south of the A46, Pamington, Ashchurch, Gloucestershire
Type of application & broad category	Major, Residential
Date(s)	2014
Local Planning Authority	Tewkesbury Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	14/00972/OUT
Development proposal	Outline planning application for the proposed development of up to 150 dwellings including access, landscaping, open space and associated infrastructure
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	No archaeological information had been recorded on the HER before the current development was proposed.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Environmental screening of a large proposed development site resulted in desk-based assessment, which suggested that a Roman road might be present (or located nearby) and that the site was of moderate archaeological potential.</p> <p>Geophysical survey in late 2014, however, produced spectacular results that suggested extremely dense archaeological features indicative of an Iron Age and/or Roman settlement present in the north-western part of the site.</p> <p>The density of archaeology was such that the developer decided, on the basis of the geophysical survey results, that the area of greatest archaeological interest was to be left undisturbed as public open space in the planning application for the development. Trial trenching was only undertaken on its edges, to determine its outer extent, and also over the rest of the area that was proposed for housing development. The peripheral features of the settlement that were sampled, including field boundaries, a well, and a corn-drier, produced early Roman pottery of first to second century date.</p> <p>A pre-commencement planning condition was attached to the planning permission for development. Archaeological investigation in advance of construction confirmed that the correct area had been excluded from</p>

	development.
Outcomes: archaeological	The main area of archaeological interest was preserved <i>in situ</i> .
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>Avon Archaeology, 2014, Land off the A46, Ashchurch, Gloucestershire. Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Archaeological Surveys, 2014, Land off the A46, Ashchurch, Gloucestershire. Magnetometer Survey Report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2014, Land South of A46, Ashchurch, Gloucestershire. Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report, CA report 14536.</p>

Case study no.	47
Planning scenario	<p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest within an Area of Archaeological Importance (AAI)
Site name/address	The Odeon, Hunter Street, Chester
Type of application & broad category	Major, regeneration
Date(s)	2012-14
Local Planning Authority	Cheshire West and Chester Council
Planning reference(s)	14/02792/FUL
Development proposal	Conversion of redundant cinema to a new library and theatre, with a substantial extension to the west into an area occupied by a 1970s office block.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The former Chester Odeon is a Grade II Listed Building dating from the 1930s. In addition, it occupies a central location within the north-western quarter of Chester's Roman fortress and the later walled city. As such, it is included within Chester's AAI and is recognised as a Primary Zone in the Chester Archaeological Plan.</p> <p>Limited excavation in the surrounding area on a number of occasions in the past had demonstrated the survival of well-preserved deposits in this part of the city, with particular reference to the Roman period.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>When the local authority began to develop proposals for the site and building (see above) it was therefore clear this would be a development with significant archaeological constraints. In particular, it was recognised that measures would be required to minimise damage to the archaeological deposits through careful foundation design. This was particularly the case with regard to the western extension because, although the 1970s block had been basemented, the proposed extension required significant intrusions to accommodate the features associated with the theatre stage.</p> <p>Preliminary assessment and evaluation work undertaken in 2012-13 provided a comprehensive picture of the nature and extent of the archaeological remains on the site and the local authority's curatorial service worked closely with staff at Historic England, the authority's regeneration staff, and the structural engineers to devise a robust and detailed foundation design which did the minimum damage to archaeology judged 'significant' and worthy of preservation <i>in situ</i>.</p> <p>A loss of up to 5% of significant archaeology was judged acceptable and was concentrated in the western extension, excluding the basement of the office block. Intrusions within the existing cinema were almost wholly avoided and restricted to two small lift pits. The resulting foundation plan was submitted in support of the planning application and formed part of the approved documentation.</p>

	<p>Subsequent fieldwork in 2013-14 was carried out efficiently and revealed traces of drains, a road, and stone and wooden buildings associated with the Roman fortress. The work was completed on time and the only real surprise was the survival of truncated and fragmented remains underneath the basement slab of the office block. This part of the site could not be included in the evaluation trenching because of structural stability issues and the thickness of the slab.</p> <p>The post-excavation assessment and subsequent publication report were all completed on time (as set out in the original project design and updated project design) and the report has appeared in the latest edition of the peer-reviewed local archaeological journal (see below)</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>It is clear that the pre-determination evaluation, close liaison with the structural engineers at this early stage, and preparation of a detailed foundation design as part of the planning application submission were all vital to the successful completion of the fieldwork and subsequent post-excavation project. It is not suggested that this pre-determination approach should be adopted in all cases where evaluation is required as, apart from anything else, many planning authorities in the region would not accept this approach. It is argued, however, that it is appropriate and vital in certain specific circumstances, which will include major developments in the region's historic cities and towns.</p> <p>The rapid completion of the publication report is particularly pleasing in a region which has sometimes struggled in its responsibilities with regard to the publication of major archaeological sites.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>Chester and Cheshire West Council 2012, Chester Theatre (Odeon Site) Archaeological desk-based assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>L-P: Archaeology 2013, Odeon Theatre Chester: archaeological evaluation report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Dodd, L, Ball, M, Druce, D, Mason, D, 2018, Excavations at Hunter Street, Chester 2014-15: new light on the <i>retentura</i> of the Roman fortress, <i>Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society</i>, 88, 19-54.</p>

Case study no.	49
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Former Gloscat college sites to the northeast and southwest of Brunswick Road: Media Studies site, part of the 'Gloucester Greyfriars' development, Gloucester, Gloucestershire
Type of application & broad category	Major, mixed use
Date(s)	2011 - 2016
Local Planning Authority	Gloucester City Council
Planning reference(s)	11/00107/FUL
Development proposal	Mixed use redevelopment including 254 residential units, A1 and A3 uses, and associated car parking, access roads, public open space
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	During the development of the site in the 1960s two Roman pottery kilns and 37 Roman burials were found. The burials were part of a Roman cemetery located just outside the eastern boundary of the Roman town of Gloucester (<i>Glevum</i>).
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Parts of the development site could not be adequately evaluated prior to the granting of planning permission because of the presence of standing buildings. The limited evaluation that took place indicated fairly poor archaeological survival, and it was assumed that extensive truncation of the site had taken place during previous development.</p> <p>Planning permission was granted and a pre-commencement planning condition attached. The agreed WSI stipulated further evaluation after site clearance, followed by the mitigation of the impact of the development by archaeological excavation.</p> <p>Following the granting of planning permission and site clearance it soon became apparent that archaeological preservation was, in fact, very good. The site was shown to contain multi-phase archaeological deposits including an extensive inhumation cemetery. It was not possible to redesign the scheme to preserve these remains <i>in situ</i> and so mitigation by excavation was required.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	A stratified sequence that extended from the early Roman to the post-medieval period was recorded. Later 1 st to later 2 nd century Roman features included enclosures, trackways, pits, postholes, a well and two pottery kilns. Following a period of disuse a cemetery comprising at least 152 inhumations

	<p>and several cremations was subsequently laid out. The cemetery was in use mainly from the late 3rd to late 4th century, but burial may have continued into the 5th or 6th centuries AD. Medieval features included a building and boundaries marking small plots, probably agricultural in function. The site was then abandoned until development in the 19th century.</p> <p>Archaeological investigation was completed but with significant delay to the development programme on site, and additional costs for both the excavation and the post-excavation that arose because of the better than anticipated preservation and the hand excavation of the many inhumations.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>Talks about the project have been given to the community.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Cotswold Archaeology 2016, Gloscat Redevelopment Project, Media Studies Site, Brunswick Road, Gloucester, Archaeological Excavation. Unpublished report, CA Report 15620.</p>

Case study no.	50
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	<p>Designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest</p> <p>Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest of national importance</p> <p>Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest</p>
Site name/address	Former Gloucester Prison, Barrack Square, Gloucester, Gloucestershire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2017-2019
Local Planning Authority	Gloucester City Council
Planning reference(s)	17/00659/FUL
Development proposal	Redevelopment of the former HMP Gloucester site comprising the partial demolition and conversion of Grade II* and Grade II listed buildings to provide 38 residential dwellings, demolition of non-listed structures and the construction of seven new buildings up to six storeys to accommodate 164 residential dwellings, with associated other works.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The application site lies just outside the western boundary of the Roman town of <i>Glevum</i> and was known to include the location of the second of Gloucester's two medieval castles, constructed in the 12th century and used as a prison from the 15th century onwards. The buildings were demolished in the 18th century for the construction of a new prison. Further redevelopment took place in the 19th and 20th centuries.</p> <p>The prison buildings are redundant and have been sold for redevelopment. Very little archaeological investigation had been undertaken within the site, so the extent of the survival of archaeological remains was poorly understood.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A programme of assessment was undertaken to inform a planning application for redevelopment, including a desk-based assessment, a geo-archaeological borehole survey, a watching brief during geotechnical site investigation, and evaluation trenches, followed by the preparation of an archaeological impact and mitigation statement.</p> <p>Despite the difficulties of evaluating this complex site with standing buildings the above programme identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roman deposits at depth including palaeo-environmental remains • The 12th century castle keep survives as a buried standing ruin at about 0.6m below current ground level (0.2m in some places). An associated building, part of one of the inner bailey walls, and part of

	<p>the inner defensive castle ditches, were also identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other castle structures survive across the site but were more badly damaged with remains more isolated and deeper. • Prison buildings from 18th century onwards with associated human burials. <p>The archaeological adviser to the LPA advised the developer that the remains of the keep, being of national importance, would need to be preserved <i>in situ</i> as part of any redevelopment scheme (citing paragraph 139 of the NPPF 2012).</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>The above advice has led to the redesign of the redevelopment scheme to take account of the unexpected and exceptional survival of the castle keep and the presence of other deposits and structures of archaeological and historic interest, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The preservation <i>in situ</i> of the castle keep – there will be no impact at all on the keep structure. • Low impact from piled foundations, ground beams and pile caps. • Reduction of impact through reuse of existing piles where possible. • Reuse where possible of existing drain and utility runs. • Archaeological observation and recording during groundworks to increase understanding of the site. • Recording of historic buildings affected by the redevelopment. <p>This scheme now has planning permission, with appropriate pre-commencement planning conditions to control impact, and to facilitate archaeological recording, and interpretation.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>A public viewing chamber will be constructed over part of the medieval keep, with further interpretation of its layout in the landscaping of the site. A programme of public engagement during and after redevelopment is proposed.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Cotswold Archaeology 2013, HMP Gloucester, Gloucester, Gloucestershire: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment. Unpublished report, CA Report 13162.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2016, Former HMP prison, Gloucester, Gloucestershire, Archaeological evaluation. Unpublished report, CA report 15811.</p>

Case study no.	51
Planning scenario(s)	<p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Barbican Car Park, Ladybellegate Street, Gloucester, Gloucestershire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2016 - 7
Local Planning Authority	Gloucester District Council
Planning reference(s)	16/01525/FUL
Development proposal	Redevelopment of the site for the construction of student accommodation of 295 bedrooms, and associated works
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The site is located within the historic core of Gloucester and includes part of the Roman fort, part of the Roman town of <i>Glevum</i>, evidence for Anglo-Saxon occupation and of the 11th century Norman castle at Gloucester. Two areas of the site form part of the scheduled monument of <i>Glevum Roman colonia</i>.</p> <p>The site had been vacant and undeveloped since the 1990s.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Prior to the determination of this planning application a desk-based assessment, followed by a trial trench evaluation supported by a watching brief on geotechnical investigations, were carried out and a deposit model produced.</p> <p>The evaluation indicated that much of the site contained well preserved and deeply stratified urban archaeological remains of national importance, including evidence of the rampart and probable wall of the Roman defences, several Roman buildings (probably town houses), and Anglo-Saxon and medieval deposits including ditch deposits that may be part of the 11th century castle.</p> <p>This information enabled the developer, during the determination period, to redesign their scheme largely to avoid archaeological impacts (in accordance with Historic England piling and preservation <i>in situ</i> guidance).</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The result was that the overall cost of archaeological mitigation was reduced and the scheme was able to achieve very high levels of preservation <i>in situ</i> (the impact of piling within the building footprint is often less than 1%). This is a very sustainable approach that should be reproduceable elsewhere in Gloucester city.</p> <p>The development was given planning permission with pre-commencement planning conditions covering:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeological investigation • Public engagement • Prior approval of foundations, and all groundworks in order to minimise impact <p>There was still a need for some archaeological excavation in advance of development, and a watching brief during development, as some impacts could not be avoided. But, given the scale of the development and the importance of the archaeology, these were limited in scale.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>Planning permission included a condition to secure a programme of public engagement.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Cotswold Archaeology 2016, Cityheart Barbican Student Accommodation, Historic Environment Study. Unpublished report, CA report 16583.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2016, Greater Blackfriars (Quayside/Blackfriars), Gloucester, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report, CA report 16366.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2016, Gloucester Quayside and Blackfriars, Gloucestershire, Archaeological Assessment. Unpublished report, CA report 16567.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2016, Greater Blackfriars (Quayside/Blackfriars), Gloucester, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report, CA report 16366.</p>

Case study no.	55
Planning scenario(s)	<p>3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	4-6 New Inn Broadway, Shoreditch, Hackney, London
Type of application & broad category	Major, commercial
Date(s)	2006-17
Local Planning Authority	London Borough of Hackney
Planning reference(s)	2016/2895
Development proposal	The original proposal was the construction of a new, modern theatre. This was later changed to an office development with exhibition space at ground floor level.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site was formerly part of Holywell Priory, a 12 th century Augustinian nunnery that, following the Dissolution, was sold off in several land parcels. One parcel was developed in 1576 by James Burbidge and John Brayne as <i>The Theatre</i> , an early Elizabethan playhouse and the first successful one. <i>The Theatre</i> hosted William Shakespeare's company during the 1590s and is likely to have first staged his plays of the period. The archaeological potential of the site, including nationally important remains, was known to the applicants.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Two stages of pre-determination field evaluation in 2006 and 2008 identified structural remains contemporary with <i>The Theatre</i>.</p> <p>As part of a proposed scheme to display the remains in a new basement, the deposits and features later in date than <i>The Theatre</i> were archaeologically excavated in 2010. Portions of the inner and outer walls of <i>The Theatre</i> were identified, along with associated surfaces and structures, some of which were medieval features re-used from the priory. This allowed the extent and form of the playhouse and its ancillary structures to be revealed and mapped for the first time, before the site was backfilled and an acceptable engineering scheme devised.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The evidence presented in the post-excavation assessment was a key source in the decision to preserve the remains of <i>The Theatre</i> and to designate it as a scheduled monument in 2016, the first in the borough (<i>The Theatre Playhouse</i>, NHLE no. 1433271).</p> <p>Further thought was given to various methods both to secure a new theatre at the site and to preserve and display the remains but the small size of the site and other non-archaeological factors led the applicants to re-consider. In 2017, scheduled monument consent and planning consent were therefore granted for a new office scheme with a permanent ground floor exhibition, viewing window and heritage-themed public realm improvements.</p>

	Development is underway at the time of writing, and the impact has been managed through the use of a pre-commencement planning condition and a s106 agreement.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	A programme of public engagement including public realm interpretation and links with the nearby <i>Curtain Theatre</i> and Hackney's other Elizabethan heritage was also agreed.
References and links/bibliography	<p>MoLA 2008, 4–6 New Inn Broadway, London EC2 – A report on the evaluation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>MoLA 2009, 4–6 New Inn Broadway London EC2 – A report on the Phase 2 Evaluation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Bowsher, J, <i>Shakespeare's London Theatreland: Archaeology, History and Drama</i>, MoLA 2012</p> <p>MoLA 2013, 4–6 New Inn Broadway, London EC2A, London Borough of Hackney, Post-excavation assessment. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	56
Planning scenario(s)	<p>3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land bounded by Curtain Road/Hewett Street/Great Eastern Street/Fairchild Place/Plough Yard/Hearn Street, Shoreditch, Hackney
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential and commercial
Date(s)	2010-17
Local Planning Authority	London Borough of Hackney
Planning reference(s)	2012/3871
Development proposal	A large mixed scheme of 385 flats, office and retail
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site was a candidate for the location of <i>The Curtain</i> , an Elizabethan playhouse built by 1577, close to an earlier playhouse called <i>The Theatre</i> . William Shakespeare's acting company were resident at <i>The Curtain</i> c. 1597 and his plays of the period are likely to have received their first performances there.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-determination evaluation trenching in 2010 identified structural and artefactual remains contemporary with <i>The Curtain</i> and evidence in them compatible with the former presence of a stage.</p> <p>The developer was highly engaged with the discovery and with proposals for exhibition of the remains of <i>The Curtain</i> theatre in a publicly-accessible basement, with associated interpretation.</p> <p>Post-determination evaluation, secured by condition, provided further important evidence that <i>The Curtain</i> stood at the site and that it was well-preserved. Plans for preservation and display were drawn up and agreed, based on the inferred form and extent of <i>The Curtain</i>, informed by the evaluation results and similar examples. Deposits and features unconnected with <i>The Curtain</i> were subsequently archaeologically excavated across the site in 2016 by MoLA before the site was backfilled and an acceptable engineering scheme for redevelopment devised. During excavation it became clear that the playhouse was not polygonal as had been presumed, but rectangular. The new information necessitated significant redesign of the exhibition space and the engineering to support the buildings above.</p> <p>Some limited further excavation was carried out and a number of exotic engineering solutions including canted piles and plunge piles were agreed with GLAAS and the local planning authority to permit the consented</p>

	<p>scheme to go ahead with a differently-shaped exhibition space to that originally planned. A pre-commencement planning condition was attached to the planning permission.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>The site was preserved in the revised exhibition space (see above) and is awaiting the completion of development, after which it will be uncovered and the public display created. It is intended that it will then be designated as Hackney's second scheduled monument and linked with <i>The Theatre</i> nearby and with other examples of Hackney's Elizabethan heritage. At the time of writing, the site is being considered for designation by Historic England.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>Public display of the excavated theatre, an exhibition, and links with other contemporary heritage in the borough</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>MoLA 2011, Curtain Road, Hewett Street London EC2A, London Borough of Hackney, An evaluation report. MoLA Unpublished report.</p> <p>Bowsher, J, <i>Shakespeare's London Theatreland: Archaeology, History and Drama</i>, MoLA 2012.</p> <p>MoLA 2015, Land Bounded by Hearn Street, Curtain Road, Hewett Street and Plough Yard, Shoreditch London EC2A, Report on 2nd and 3rd phase archaeological evaluations. Unpublished report.</p> <p>MoLA 2017, The Stage site bounded by Hearn Street Curtain Road and Hewett Street London EC2A, London Borough of Hackney, Interim post-excavation assessment. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	57
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Heritage assets with archaeological, historic and artistic interest
Site name/address	Nazareth House, Isleworth, London
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2014
Local Planning Authority	London Borough of Hounslow
Planning reference(s)	P/2014/2204
Development proposal	Conversion of grade II listed house and outbuildings. Erection of 98 new residential units with new access, car parking and landscaping.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site lay in an Archaeological Priority Area alongside the River Thames and on the edge of the medieval village of Isleworth. Prehistoric finds have been recovered from this stretch of the river. The Greater London HER recorded a 'post-medieval pottery kiln' of unspecified type. Nazareth House itself was early 19 th century in date.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment indicated the presence of an unspecified type of post-medieval pottery kiln at the south end of the site. A special interest group identified this as an early porcelain factory.</p> <p>An archaeological evaluation established significant survival, and a thematic study by Historic England Listing Group judged this to be the best-preserved example of the small number of such factories in London. It was the last remaining of only five porcelain manufactories operating in London in the mid 18th century and as such represented the origins and early development of this industry in England.</p> <p>The LPA was advised to apply the NPPF policy on undesignated heritage assets of national importance (NPPF 2012, paragraph 139) and require preservation <i>in situ</i>.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>A pre-commencement planning condition was attached to the planning permission requiring partial archaeological excavation of the site. The new building foundations were redesigned and the remainder of the site was preserved within landscaping.</p> <p>The site was scheduled (Isleworth Pottery, NHLE no. 1435957) after</p>

	development.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	<p>A site tour was arranged for the English Ceramic Circle Society who are also involved in the post-excavation work.</p> <p>An interpretation panel has been installed on site.</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2014, The site of Isleworth House, Richmond Road, Isleworth, London Borough of Hounslow. A predetermination Evaluation Report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>A publication is in preparation by Pre-Construct Archaeology.</p>

Case study no.	58
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>12. The absence of specialist archaeological curatorial advice (adviser not in post; advice not given because of capacity or other issues) led to the determination of an application without appropriate consideration of the archaeological implications</p>
Heritage assets affected	Designated asset of architectural and historic interest Undesignated assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	St Georges Church, High Street, Brentford, London
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2009-15
Local Planning Authority	London Borough of Hounslow
Planning reference(s)	P/2008/200, P/2014/2390
Development proposal	Conversion of grade II listed church and demolition of associated hall to create 21 dwellings
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	19 th century parish church on the site of an 18 th century church. It was suggested that the burial ground associated with the earlier church had been substantially cleared in the late 19 th century.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A planning application submitted in 2009 was determined in 2011 and an archaeological planning condition was attached. However, a full assessment of archaeological impact had not taken place, and an archaeological evaluation comprising two small test pits had led to the conclusion that the cemetery had been cleared in the 19th century.</p> <p>A second planning application in 2014 was accompanied by a desk-based assessment (incorporating the results of the earlier very limited test pit evaluation) which suggested only low potential for human burials 'of local interest' on the historic church site:</p> <p><i>'A chapel and burial ground is known to have occupied the study site in the 18th and 19th centuries. The extent, to which the burial ground was cleared in the late 19th century, is uncertain. Therefore, a potential for in situ burials and disarticulated human remains cannot be entirely precluded. These remains, if present, are considered to be of no more than local historic interest.'</i></p> <p>Pre-determination evaluation was recommended by GLAAS and carried out by Allen Archaeology. The results indicated that the chapel cemetery extended over much of the development site excepting the former chapel itself.</p>

	The planning permission given in 2015 included a bespoke planning condition to secure archaeological investigation, recording, analysis and publication, including the subsequent reburial of the human remains.
Outcomes: archaeological	GLAAS involvement after the 2011 permission identified the potential for burials associated with a mid-18th century chapel beneath the 19th century parish church. Subsequent investigation revealed about 650 human burials underneath and around the 19 th century church. The excavated burials were dated 1828-1861, forming a small part of the 2290 recorded in burial registers.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	There was substantial delay and cost to the developer who is understood to have acquired the site having gained the impression that the site had been cleared of burials.
References and links/bibliography	<p>Allen Archaeology 2014, Historic Building Survey Report: 367-368 High Street, Brentford, London Borough Of Hounslow. Unpublished report 2014050.</p> <p>CgMs 2014, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment: St George's Church, High Street, Brentford, London. Unpublished report including a report by PCA on Archaeological Evaluation at St Georges Church, High Street, Brentford. Unpublished report 2004.</p> <p>Allen Archaeology 2014, Archaeological Scheme of Works Report: 367 – 368 High Street, Brentford, London Borough of Hounslow. Unpublished report.</p> <p><i>Under the Roof and the Shadow of a Noble Church: archaeological investigation at St George's, Brentford, 2014–2017</i>, Alan Telford and Elizabeth Knox, excavation publication in preparation.</p>

Case study no.	59
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historical interest
Site name/address	Priory Orchard, Godalming, Surrey
Type of application & broad category	Residential
Date(s)	2011-6
Local Planning Authority	Waverley Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	WA/2011/1981
Development proposal	Erection of 14 affordable residential dwellings with associated landscaping and car parking following demolition of existing dwelling
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The development site was within the Area of High Archaeological Potential defined around the historic centre of Godalming. This area is likely to contain archaeological remains relating to the origins and development of the town from the medieval period onwards.</p> <p>The site also encompassed an area where human remains had been revealed previously. A soakaway excavated in 2007, in connection with Local Authority drainage works for an existing house that did not require planning permission, revealed human remains which were reported to the LPA. Members of the Surrey Heritage Conservation Team attended and recorded the remains, and the site was entered onto the Surrey HER in 2010.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>An application for affordable housing was submitted in 2011 by the local authority.</p> <p>Advice was given that the application should not be determined until an evaluation had been carried out, in order to identify if there were human remains on the site, and the extent of any other archaeological features present. Instead, planning permission was granted with a model condition attached (<i>cf</i> Circular 11/95) requiring a programme of archaeological investigation.</p> <p>The subsequent evaluation and excavations revealed a previously unknown late Saxon–early Medieval cemetery containing at least 300 burials within the footprint of the development. This was at too late a stage for the development to be redesigned. Delays and costs to the programme were therefore incurred.</p> <p>Radiocarbon dating and artefactual evidence, as well as burial practices associated with the late Saxon period, indicated that the cemetery was in use from the 9th to the early 13th century (c.850-1200). 301 <i>in situ</i> inhumations</p>

	were recorded. The site was assessed as being of national importance due to its date and restricted period of use.
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The cemetery was part-excavated and part-preserved <i>in situ</i>. The fact that the scheme design did not take account of the buried archaeological remains meant that the archaeological mitigation works were not part of the construction programme, leading to delay and to three separate phases of archaeological excavation.</p> <p>The post excavation works proceeded in accordance with the approved excavation WSI, and have been carried out satisfactorily. A publication is in preparation</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	None - the developer did not want any publicity or information to be made public at the time
References and links/bibliography	<p>Surrey County Archaeological Unit 2010, Land at Priory Orchard and car park, Station Road, Godalming, Surrey, A desk based archaeological assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Surrey County Archaeological Unit 2013, Priory Orchard, Station Road, Godalming, Surrey. An Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Surrey County Archaeological Unit 2015, An Archaeological Excavation of Land at Priory Orchard, Station Road, Godalming, Surrey: An Assessment Report. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	61
Planning scenario(s)	<p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land At Penns Mount, Vicarage Hill, Kingsteignton, Devon
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2016-7
Local Planning Authority	Teignbridge District Council
Planning reference(s)	16/02222/MAJ
Development proposal	Outline application for the erection of up to 90 dwellings, access and landscaping, 4.56ha
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The application site is situated on a hilltop. Isolated flint finds have come from the area to the north of the site, and the HER has records of lynchets on hill.</p> <p>Archaeological work in connection with a previous development on the lower hillslope and adjacent to part of this proposed development site revealed the entrance to a double-ditched Romano-British enclosure that contained 1st century AD pottery suggesting early occupation or contact with the Roman military. This enclosure was situated overlooking the river crossing and eastwards along the estuary where other Romano-British enclosures are recorded. The other enclosures are located 5-6 km to the east on the north side of the estuary, and therefore probably outside the scope of the desk-based assessment (see below), but when these sites are considered together they form a Romano-British landscape adjacent to the estuary rather than just isolated settlements.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment identified only a small collection of flint from the development site, but noted that its prominent hilltop location might have made it an attractive location for prehistoric settlement.</p> <p>A programme of geophysical survey and field evaluation was undertaken. This identified the remaining two-thirds of the substantial double-ditched enclosure. The site had been truncated by ploughing and, while no internal features appeared to have survived, the ditches were well preserved. The site was readable in the landscape as a strategic Roman site, with prospects along the estuary where other Romano-British settlements are known. It is probably situated at the main crossing point of the River Teign</p> <p>Because of the significance of the early Roman enclosure it was recommended that it should be preserved <i>in situ</i> by excluding it from the development area.</p> <p>The application was refused by the LPA on landscape and archaeology grounds, but permission was granted at a planning inquiry with a pre-commencement planning condition. The enclosure site will now be developed</p>

	and will be fully excavated in advance.
Outcomes: archaeological	Complete archaeological excavation of the Romano-British enclosure.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	<p>The planning condition attached to the permission given at appeal included public interpretation:</p> <p><i>“Condition 21 - No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, and proposals for interpretation boards, or the like, including a timetable for their installation, which have been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out at all times in strict accordance with the approved scheme, or such other details that may subsequently be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.”</i></p> <p>While the Roman enclosure site will be developed (and the site fully excavated) there will be public open days allowing access to the on-going work, as set out in the WSI.</p> <p>The public open space within the development has been redesigned in the shape of a Roman shield to ‘reflect’ the heritage of the site. There will also be a time-trail in the new development and an interpretation board. The public engagement and interpretation proposals are set out in the WSI submitted to, but not yet formally approved by, the LPA.</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>AC Archaeology 2013, Land at Penns Mount, Vicarage Hill, Kingsteignton, Devon, Historic Environment Assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Substrata 2015: An Archaeological Gradiometer Survey. Land at Penns Mount, Kingsteignton, Teignbridge, Devon. Unpublished report 1509PEN-R-1.</p> <p>AC Archaeology 2016: Land East of Penns Mount, Vicarage Hill, Kingsteignton, Devon, Results of an Archaeological Trench Evaluation. Unpublished report ACD1479/2/0.</p> <p>AC Archaeology 2016: Land East of Penns Mount, Vicarage Hill, Kingsteignton, Devon, Results of an Archaeological Trench Evaluation. Unpublished report ACD1479/3/0.</p> <p>AC Archaeology 2016, Land at Penns Mount, Vicarage Hill, Kingsteignton, Devon, Updated Historic Environment Assessment. Unpublished report ACD1479/4/1.</p>

Case study no.	62
Planning scenario(s)	4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Chapel Downs Farm, North of Queen Elizabeth Drive, Crediton, Devon
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2017-8
Local Planning Authority	Mid Devon District Council
Planning reference(s)	17/01511/MOUT
Development proposal	Outline application for the erection of up to 120 dwellings, public open space, vehicular access and associated infrastructure
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The HER contained aerial photographic evidence of a circular cropmark in the centre of the application area.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A programme of geophysical survey and field evaluation was undertaken at the request of the adviser to the LPA to support the application. This confirmed the presence of a locally significant Romano-British enclosure with evidence of possible internal building platforms, and a hut circle outside the enclosure.</p> <p>Once this information was available the preservation <i>in situ</i> of the Romano-British enclosure – in public open space – and a pre-commencement condition for the excavation of the archaeological deposits outside the enclosure were recommended to the LPA.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The proposed outcome was that the Romano-British enclosure would be preserved <i>in situ</i> and incorporated into redesigned circular public open space with interpretation.</p> <p>However, the application was refused by the LPA on other grounds.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>Substrata 2016, An Archaeological Magnetometer Survey: Land at Chapel Downs Farm, Crediton, Devon. Unpublished report, 1607CHA-R-1.</p> <p>AC Archaeology 2016 updated 2017, Land at Chapel Downs Farm, Crediton, Devon: Historic Environment Assessment. Unpublished report, ACD1410/1/2.</p> <p>AC Archaeology 2017, Land at Chapel Downs Farm, Crediton, Results of an archaeological trench excavation. Unpublished report, ACD1410/2/0.</p>

Case study no.	64
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land north of Crediton Road, Crediton Road, Okehampton, Devon
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2013-15
Local Planning Authority	West Devon Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	01089/2013
Development proposal	Outline application for residential development (up to 375 dwellings), primary school, retail unit and associated works
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The development site lies adjacent to Okehampton Roman fort that is a scheduled monument (NHLE no. 1015829), and a putative Roman road crosses the site. Aerial photographic evidence suggested the presence of other enclosures within the application area.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment identified a number of undesignated heritage assets on the application site: a possible prehistoric enclosure, two Roman roads and a possible church site.</p> <p>Geophysical survey and field evaluation were required and undertaken at pre-application stage. A second phase of evaluation was undertaken as part of a staged programme of post determination work – using a pre-commencement planning condition - to refine the scope of mitigation (area excavation) required and to be undertaken in advance of construction.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>On the basis of the results of the evaluation the preservation <i>in situ</i> of the Roman road was recommended, together with the excavation of other archaeological features. The masterplan for the development has been altered to preserve the alignment of the Roman road as part of the development's green infrastructure.</p> <p>Archaeological excavation in advance of development has now identified the remains of extra mural settlement along the Roman roads. The remains of at least 25 timber buildings line both sides of a well-preserved Roman road, leading eastward from the Roman fort. The settlement seems to have been abandoned around the same time as occupation ended at the fort, c. AD 75</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit	There has been a public open day, and public interpretation of the results of the archaeological investigations.

<p>such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>AC Archaeology 2013, Land off Crediton Road, Okehampton, West Devon, Historic Environment Assessment. Unpublished report ACD630/1/1.</p> <p>Substrata 2014, An archaeological gradiometer survey, Land to the north of Crediton Road, Okehampton, Devon. Unpublished report 140129.</p> <p>AC archaeology 2014, Land off Crediton Road, Okehampton, West Devon: Results of an Archaeological Trench Evaluation and Auger Survey. Unpublished report ACD630/2/1.</p> <p>https://www.archaeology.co.uk/articles/vicus-discovered-in-devon.htm</p>

Case study no.	65
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological interest
Site name/address	Rydon Farm, Two Mile Oak, Devon
Type of application & broad category	Solar farm
Date(s)	2013-14
Local Planning Authority	Teignbridge District Council
Planning reference(s)	13/02129/MAJ
Development proposal	Installation of ground mounted solar array (total site area of 68000 m2), and associated infrastructure
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There was no HER information for the development site itself. Prehistoric activity had been recorded in the surrounding landscape and adjacent field, with findspots and enclosures identified through aerial photography.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment identified that there was ‘little potential for any archaeological remains to lie undetected within the site.’</p> <p>Pre-application geophysical survey and evaluation were subsequently undertaken revealing a sub-circular Bronze Age ditched enclosure containing evidence of a possible building and other features.</p> <p>The Historic Environment Team advising the LPA requested that this area was excluded from development.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The area of the Bronze Age enclosure was excluded from development.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>Cotswold Archaeology 2013, Rydon Farm, Ogwell, Devon, Heritage Desk-Based Assessment. Unpublished report CA 13423.</p> <p>Stratascan 2014, Rydon Farm, Devon, Geophysical survey report. Unpublished report, J5760.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2014, Rydon Farm, Ogwell, Devon, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report CA 13711.</p>

Case study no.	66
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land At Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, Eye, Suffolk
Type of application and broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2015 - 2018
Local Planning Authority	Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils
Planning reference(s)	3563/15
Development proposal	Outline application for a development comprising up to 280 dwellings, a 60 bed residential care home, associated infrastructure and other facilities
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>Evidence of human use of the landscape from the prehistoric period onwards has been found in close proximity to the development site, including Neolithic flint finds, late Neolithic- early Bronze age cremations and a burial, late Bronze Age- early Iron Age settlement, several areas of Roman settlement, an Anglo-Saxon settlement and probable cemetery, medieval and later activity including the small medieval town of Eye to the south.</p> <p>From the development site itself metal detecting finds have included Anglo-Saxon brooches.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-determination desk-based assessment and evaluation was recommended by the LPA's archaeological adviser.</p> <p>Following the desk-based assessment, and in view of the previous metal-detected finds from the site, a metal detecting survey was carried out; no further material of significance was identified.</p> <p>A geophysical survey detected linear features which could have represented former ditches or drains, or perhaps traces of an enclosure relating to a former field system.</p> <p>Subsequent evaluation trenching identified early Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron age, Anglo-Saxon and late medieval activity. Sixty-three trenches were excavated within the proposed development area, with some trenches targeting archaeological features suggested by geophysical survey and others located to test supposedly blank areas.</p> <p>The earliest recorded features comprised six postholes, ascribed to a possible early Neolithic settlement site. Later Prehistoric, early and middle</p>

	<p>Iron Age occupation was present in two forms, the first being a trackway aligned north to south, for which there was evidence of metalling in the form of a remnant of a cobbled surface, and also in the form of a series of discrete and dispersed pits and postholes.</p> <p>In the eastern part of the site, were three graves and a horse burial which are potentially of Anglo-Saxon date. These may form a small burial ground for a family group, associated with the settlement site located to the south at Hartismere School.</p> <p>Later medieval activity comprised the remains of two phases of field boundaries, and a pre-enclosure field boundary.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>It has been proposed that the most sensitive area of the site – that of the small cemetery - should be preserved <i>in situ</i> by using it as open space within the development area. An appropriate planning condition (Condition 14) was attached to the planning permission to achieve this, and to secure a management plan for the ongoing protection of this area.</p> <p>The pre-commencement planning condition also requires the archaeological investigation of the rest of the site, the analysis of the evidence recorded, and the preparation of a report and archive.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Oxford Archaeology East 2015, Desk-based Assessment, Eye Airfield, Parcels 13-15, Eye, Suffolk. Unpublished report, OAE no 1748.</p> <p>Bartlett-Clark Consultancy 2015, Land at Eye Airfield Eye, Suffolk, Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology East 2015, Multi-Period Remains at Eye Airfield, Parcels 13-15, Eye, Suffolk, Archaeological Evaluation Report. Unpublished report, OAE no 1742.</p>

Case study no.	69
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Willerby and Derringham Flood Alleviation Scheme (WaDFAS), land north-east and south-west of the Ketch, Great Gutter Lane, West Willerby, East Riding of Yorkshire
Type of application & broad category	Flood Alleviation Scheme
Date(s)	2012 - ongoing
Local Planning Authority	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Planning reference(s)	12/04551/STPLF
Development proposal	Willerby and Derringham Flood Alleviation Scheme: Construction of flood dam attenuation with linking drainage pipework and/or open watercourses connecting to existing and newly excavated flood water storage lagoons
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There was limited information for the area of the flood alleviation scheme; this included cropmarks of probable prehistoric and Roman date, evidence of medieval activity and a range of finds.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>An Archaeological Appraisal (WYG 2012) using HER information identified various archaeological remains within, but mainly around the scheme area, including the scheduled monument of Haltemprice medieval priory (NHLE no. 1019825) immediately to the north of the Carr Lane reservoir. The appraisal recommended a programme of archaeological evaluation, commencing with geophysical survey, followed by appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>A formal desk-based assessment was not undertaken as part of the planning application.</p> <p>The planning application was submitted in November 2012 and approved March 2013.</p> <p>The archaeological adviser to the LPA had highlighted the potential impact of the scheme on the adjacent scheduled monument and the general archaeological potential of the scheme area, both in terms of known sites and also the potential for previously undiscovered archaeological remains to be present, recommending evaluation prior to the determination of the application.</p> <p>A pre-commencement planning condition was attached to the planning</p>

	<p>permission to secure a programme of archaeological investigation, analysis, publication, and archiving, commencing with evaluation.</p> <p>A geophysical survey on two of the four main areas to be affected by the scheme (WYAS 2013) suggested limited remains, comprising occasional ditches, field boundaries shown on the Ordnance Survey First Edition maps, ridge and furrow, field drains, and a single square anomaly at Carr Lane.</p> <p>The monitoring of limited geotechnical works (Atkinson 2014; Jobling 2014) did not identify any further archaeological remains.</p> <p>A mitigation strategy for four areas for lagoons (totalling 20 ha) and several hundred metres of interconnected drainage was proposed. The WSI for the strategy (Barton Howe Associates 2014a) synthesised information from the HER, previous archaeological investigations in the area, aerial photographic information and the results of the geophysical survey. Given the limited results, the WSI concluded that none of the investigation areas had high potential for archaeological remains.</p> <p>The mitigation strategy envisaged a two-stage process in the field: during the first, referred to as ‘evaluation’ the archaeological areas would be stripped and mapped, with a representative selection of features sample excavated. Proposals for investigation would then be submitted for a second stage, comprising detailed excavation.</p> <p>Fieldwork (March-Nov 2015): The stripping of the topsoil in areas to be investigated was undertaken as part of the general development groundworks, albeit that the plant was supervised by archaeologists. Sufficient staff were deployed to supervise stripping across several active locations, together with a small investigation team to characterise selected findings, in line with the low density of archaeological remains expected. However, concentrations of prehistoric, Roman, early medieval and later medieval archaeological remains were soon identified across many of those areas that were stripped to the surface of the natural geology. These not only exceeded the capacity of the investigation team, but were also in locations that were on the critical path for drainage infrastructure. The situation was not aided by soft ground and machine rutting, which meant that the stripping/spoil management methodology also had to be revised.</p> <p>It soon became apparent that it would not be possible in either practical terms, or within the constraints of the project timetable, to strip, map and sample-excavate each archaeological area, submit an ‘evaluation’ report, and agree proposals for subsequent detailed excavation. Instead, it was agreed that detailed excavation would commence immediately, following the sampling strategies that had been set out in the WSI and Scope of Archaeological Works, and developed in the OA North Project Design (2015). As a result, large numbers of archaeologists were rapidly deployed to undertake the detailed excavation.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>From an archaeological perspective, the outcome was acceptable: the client honoured their commitment to fund the fieldwork, archive processing, and</p>

	<p>post-excavation assessment and also, it is anticipated, the forthcoming stage of analysis, archiving, and publication. However, the lack of an appropriate scheme of evaluation in advance of the start of the development groundworks meant that the situation must have been very stressful for the developer and client, as the project required more staff, prices escalated and the programme edged nearer to the deadline.</p> <p>Moreover, there was an imperative to excavate remains as they were revealed, and it was not possible to view a site as a whole and consider a more strategic, research-led approach that might have been possible had there been more time, and which may well have been more cost-effective for the client.</p> <p>In summary, a full desk-based assessment at an early stage in the scheme development, followed by more extensive on-site evaluation in advance of the commencement of construction, would have allowed a more strategic approach to the archaeological mitigation programme, to the benefit of both the developer and the archaeological outcome.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>The scheme was given an award for construction excellence: http://constructingexcellence.org.uk/the-willerby-and-derringham-flood-alleviation-scheme/</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>White Young Green (WYG) 2012, Willerby and Derringham Flood Alleviation Scheme (WaDFAS): Archaeology and Heritage Options Appraisal Report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>West Yorkshire Archaeology Service (WYAS) 2013, Willerby and Derringham Flood Alleviation Scheme, East Yorkshire: Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Atkinson 2014, Archaeological Observation, Investigation and Recording during an Earthwork Compaction Test on the Site of the Proposed Filling Station Lagoon, Willerby and Derringham Flood Alleviation Scheme. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Barton Howe Associates (BHA) 2014a, Willerby and Derringham Flood Alleviation Scheme, East Riding of Yorkshire; Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Barton Howe Associates (BHA) 2014b, Willerby and Derringham Flood Alleviation Scheme, East Riding of Yorkshire; Specification for Archaeological Works. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Jobling 2014, Archaeological Observation, Investigation and Recording of Test Pits at the Willerby and Derringham Flood Alleviation Scheme. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology North 2015, Willerby and Derringham Flood Alleviation Scheme, East Riding of Yorkshire; Project Design for Archaeological Strip, Map and Record. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	100
Planning scenario(s)	<p>6. Post-determination archaeological evaluation (in the absence of any work pre-determination) revealed archaeology of national importance and/or archaeology of a scale and complexity that the resources required for mitigation affected the viability of the development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Site name/address	Park View – site of, The Street, Sedlescombe, East Sussex
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Type of application & broad category	Minor, residential
Local Planning Authority	Rother District Council
Planning reference(s)	RR/2003/1617; RR/2004/3642/P; RR/2004/3717/H; RR/2009/3066/P; RR/2010/1131/P
Date(s)	2003-2010
Development proposal	<p>RR/2003/1617 application for demolition of Park view and outbuildings buildings and election of 7 houses: refused; appeal dismissed</p> <p>RR/2004/3642/P application for 4 houses and demolition of Park View and outbuildings: refused; allowed at appeal. Pre-commencement archaeology condition included in the permission.</p> <p>RR/2004/3717/H Conservation Area Consent for demolition of Park View and outbuildings; approved with archaeology pre-commencement condition</p> <p>RR/2009/3066/P Construction of 4 houses; withdrawn</p> <p>RR/2010/1131/P Amended application for 4 houses approved with archaeology condition.</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	A Conservation Area with surviving historic buildings and the site of a medieval monastic tannery recorded on the HER. Archaeological potential enhanced by riverside location.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A pre-determination assessment recommended by archaeological advisors to the LPA in response to an application in 2003. This was not undertaken due to objections from the developer.</p> <p>Permission was granted in 2004 with a planning condition, specifying a programme of archaeological work. A desk-based assessment was produced in 2007 and a post-determination evaluation was undertaken in 2008 together with historic building recording in advance of demolition. Well-preserved post-medieval tannery remains were discovered and the buildings provided evidence from 17th to 19th century.</p> <p>The planning application was re-submitted in 2009 and again 2010. The development then became financially unviable and the application was withdrawn due to the costs of archaeological excavation and the effects of the financial crash.</p>

Outcomes: archaeological	A subsequent developer was able to re-design, undertake sufficient sample excavation and secure preservation <i>in situ</i> of the remainder of the important archaeology. Investigation of the waterlogged deposits was also minimised to retain the viability of the development. This was achieved by a combination of piling, rafting of foundations and the moving of some of the proposed buildings.
Other outcomes e.g. public benefits such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>Wessex Archaeology 2007, Park View, The Street, Sedlescombe, East Sussex Archaeological Desk-based Assessment. Unpublished report, Wessex Archaeology report no. 64730-02.</p> <p>Wessex Archaeology 2008, Park View, The Street, Sedlescombe, East Sussex, Archaeological Evaluation Report. Unpublished report, Wessex Archaeology report no. 64732-03.</p>


Case study no.	101
Planning scenario(s)	<p>6. Post-determination archaeological evaluation (in the absence of any work pre-determination) revealed archaeology of national importance and/or archaeology of a scale and complexity that the resources required for mitigation affected the viability of the development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest of regional importance
Site name/address	Land north of Fentons Farm, Stanningfield Road, Great Whelnetham, Suffolk
Type of application & broad category	Minor, residential
Date(s)	2018
Local Planning Authority	St Edmundsbury Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	DC/16/1268
Development proposal	Housing development of 10 dwellings, on an area of land just under 0.4ha in size.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site is situated within an area of archaeological potential, with a known Roman settlement recorded to the north. However, no archaeological remains were previously recorded within the site, the closest record of Roman activity being 200m away.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The archaeological advisors to the LPA highlighted the archaeological potential of the site and advised early evaluation. However, they did not insist on evaluation in this instance due to the evidence suggesting that Roman activity was focused to the north and the fairly modest scale of the proposal.</p> <p>The application was granted planning permission, with pre-commencement conditions securing archaeological evaluation, mitigation, assessment, reporting, dissemination and outreach. At the post-determination evaluation stage (5% trial trenching was undertaken) Roman pits and 3 human burials within a ditch were identified in two of the trenches. Excavation of this area was therefore required.</p> <p>Upon excavation more than 50 burials were identified, many at some depth, forming part of an extensive Roman deviant burial cemetery. The excavation was completed in 2018 and received national publicity including a report in the East of England episode of 'Digging for Britain' in December 2018.</p> <p>The evaluation was therefore representative, but given the distance from the known Roman settlement and lack of records on or in the immediate vicinity of the site, the size and the unusual nature of the cemetery was unexpected.</p>

	<p>Due to the small scale of the housing development and the fact that some of the houses are social housing, the time and resources required to fully mitigate the impact of the development on archaeological remains has caused serious concerns. There are ongoing discussions regarding the resourcing of post-excavation and archiving/publication.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>The size and importance of the Roman cemetery, identified at the excavation stage, was unexpected and affected the viability of the development.</p> <p>The absence of pre-determination evaluation clearly reduced the options for archaeological mitigation including design solutions for preservation. However, the post-determination evaluation, although it identified the cemetery, didn't reveal its importance. This is understandable given the nature of the evidence which is contained within a small proportion of the burials. Its also unlikely, given the nature of the evidence, that options for preservation of the cemetery would have been acceptable to a developer intending to build and sell houses, leaving refusal of the application as the only other option for the LPA.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>The national publicity from the press and BBC television provided significant public benefit and also advocacy for the archaeology sector - nationally and locally.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Archaeological Solutions Ltd 2017, An Archaeological Evaluation, Land North of Fenton's Farm, Stanningfield Road, Great Whelnetham. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Digging for Britain, BBC, December 2018: https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m0001jg7</p>

Case study no.	102
Planning scenario(s)	<p>6. Post-determination archaeological evaluation (in the absence of any work pre-determination) revealed archaeology of national importance and/or archaeology of a scale and complexity that the resources required for mitigation affected the viability of the development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Guildford fire station, Guildford, Surrey
Type of application & broad category	Residential and new fire station
Date(s)	2012-4
Local Planning Authority	Guildford Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	12/P/00801
Development proposal	Erection of a replacement fire station, ancillary buildings and residential dwellings.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The HER recorded that Mesolithic flints had been recovered from allotments at the rear of the fire station.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Appropriate archaeological assessment and evaluation were undertaken, with unremarkable results, revealing a small number of ditches of Roman date and some residual Mesolithic flints.</p> <p>A planning permission was given with a pre-commencement archaeological planning condition attached.</p> <p>Subsequent excavation revealed a hitherto unknown nationally important Palaeolithic flint working site <i>in situ</i>. The evaluation had comprised a 5% sample of the available development area and the Palaeolithic site was revealed once the area had been stripped in order to investigate further the Roman ditches. Due to the small size of the <i>in situ</i> Palaeolithic scatter (c. 5 x 5m) the evaluation would have been unlikely to have discovered it, unless one of the trenches was placed directly over it.</p> <p>Subsequent investigations caused issues for the developer, although they were fully supportive of the work and the results.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The substantial scatter of worked flint has been assigned to either the Creswellian or Federmesser industries of the Late Glacial period. The assemblage was found in an exceptional state of preservation stratified within sand deposits and is likely to represent the <i>in situ</i> remains of a Later Upper Palaeolithic temporary campsite</p> <p>Open air sites of this period, representing the first re-colonisation of the British Isles following the Last Glacial Maximum, are exceptionally rare. The</p>

	<p>Guildford site is therefore considered to be of national importance. Due to the significance, elements of the post–excavation analysis (flint refitting and microwear analysis) were funded by Historic England.</p> <p>A publication about this nationally important site is now in preparation.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>Research papers presented at conferences</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Oxford Archaeology 2014, Guildford Fire Station, Guildford, Surrey, Post Excavation Assessment and Updated Project Design. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	103
Planning scenario(s)	<p>6. Post-determination archaeological evaluation (in the absence of any work pre-determination) revealed archaeology of national importance and/or archaeology of a scale and complexity that the resources required for mitigation affected the viability of the development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Churchill's Farm, High Street, Hemyock, Cullompton, Devon
Type of application & broad category	Residential
Date(s)	2007
Local Planning Authority	Mid Devon District Council
Planning reference	07/01005/MFUL
Development proposal	Erection of 23 dwellings with access, garaging, parking and associated works
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There was no HER data for the application area itself, but the site was on the edge of the historic core of the village and in an area where some fragments of putative Saxon/early medieval iron smelting slag had been found.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The local authority adviser requested a pre-commencement planning condition for a staged programme of investigation, commencing with evaluation. Pre-determination evaluation was not considered appropriate in view of the existing terracing on the site, its use as a working farmyard, and the lack of specific evidence of heritage assets on the site itself.</p> <p>A previously unrecorded early 16th century pottery production site was encountered, along with some early medieval iron furnaces, that could not have been reasonably anticipated, and in this case was only identified by a fortuitously placed trench excavated on the last day of the staged programme of works, where a pit full of wasters was exposed.</p> <p>This site is a late medieval and early post-medieval pottery production site of regional significance.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The pottery production site and iron furnaces were excavated in advance of the development. No kilns were identified, only the pits from which the clay was probably derived and which had been infilled with wasters. The bases of iron furnaces were also exposed.</p> <p>However, due to the significance of the site and the scale of the pottery assemblage (over 40,000 sherds of pottery were recovered), funding had to be secured from Historic England to cover post-excavation analysis and publication. Funding was provided because the developer had undertaken all reasonable steps to deal with the archaeology and the archaeological deposits could not have been reasonably anticipated prior to the post-</p>

	determination evaluation.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	Public outreach, and involvement in the post-excavation assessment of the pottery assemblage and public talks.
References and links/bibliography	Smart C (ed) 2018, <i>Industry and the Making of a Rural Landscape: Iron and pottery production at Churchills Farm, Hemyock, Devon</i> . BAR British Series 636, Oxford: BAR Publishing. 

Case study no.	104
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1.Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (ie the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7.Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land at Pottery Lane, to the north of railway line and Ashburys rail station, Bradford , Manchester
Type of application & broad category	Infrastructure
Date(s)	2011-12
Local Planning Authority	Manchester City Council
Planning reference(s)	097478/FO/2011/N2
Development proposal	Development of a Rail Operating Centre with associated access, car parking and landscaping, on land off Wolverton Street
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The proposed development was on the site of Ashbury's rail carriage engineering works and foundry.</p> <p>Further research and archaeological investigation was deemed to be important because almost no historical records have survived of the mid-19th to early 20th century works. It was one of Manchester's largest foundries that had around 1000 employees, with several of its rail carriages still surviving on heritage railways around the world.</p>
Archaeology/planning processes	A desk-based assessment produced in response to a pre-application enquiry from Network Rail confirmed the archaeological potential of the application site. Planning permission, granted early in 2012 (with a pre-commencement condition), was followed by an evaluation that demonstrated excellent preservation of buried remains. Excavation then followed in August and September of 2012.
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The following summary of the results of the excavation is taken from the excavation report (SLR Consulting 2013):</p> <p><i>'The excavation exposed the remains of an extensive range of structures located within and adjacent to the 19th and early 20th Century foundry buildings, including reverberatory furnaces, Rastrick boilers, flues, chimneys, an open hearth furnace, cupola furnaces and foundations for a travelling crane. The changing iron-working technologies during the working life of the works are well represented in the recorded archaeology. Industrial processes not readily recognized in the physical remains on site were identified by the analysis of industrial residues (specifically the presence of cupola furnaces). Post-excavation analysis of a sample of bricks and conservation of a metal-sampling ladle have also been undertaken and are reported upon here'</i></p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work	The specified works included an academic article and popular publication, and the requirement to engage with volunteers from the Manchester Region Industrial Archaeology Society who were able to take part in the excavation and lend their considerable expertise on identifying the function of industrial features. The popular booklet won the national industrial

practices	archaeology publication award.
References and links/bibliography	<p>SLR Consulting 2013, Ashbury's, Manchester: Archaeological Excavation Report. Unpublished report ref: 410.00232.00058.</p> <p>Hayes, L 2014, Iron & Steel in Openshaw: excavating John Ashbury's Carriage and Iron Work, <i>Greater Manchester's Past Revealed</i> 11.</p>

Case study no.	105
Planning scenario(s)	11. The presence of a 'live' and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	The Exchange, Greengate Embankment, Salford
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2015-17
Local Planning Authority	Salford City Council
Planning reference(s)	11/60256/HYB
Development proposal	Partial demolition of viaduct structure. Full planning permission for a 10-storey class B1 office building. Outline Planning Permission for a 9-storey class B1 office building – approval sought for access, layout, and scale. Full planning permission for a car park together with class A1, A22, A3, A4 and B1 retail/commercial units, land bounded by the River Irwell, Chapel Street, Greengate, and the former Liverpool to Manchester Railway Line.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Based on archaeological research in the near vicinity, the site was known to be in the heart of the medieval borough of Salford, with later post medieval residential and industrial development truncated by the late 19 th Exchange Station. The latter had, in turn, been demolished except for the impressive brick railway arches forming the undercroft to the former station.
Archaeological/planning process	<p>The investment bank financing the development required discharge of conditions before development groundworks commenced.</p> <p>Work already undertaken comprised: a desk-based assessment, historic building survey of the brick arches forming the undercroft of the late 19th century former station, and evaluation trenches. The latter revealed medieval and post-medieval remains sealed under the arches.</p> <p>A contractual agreement was prepared between the archaeological contractor and the developer concerning costs of outstanding archaeological investigations (defined by the evaluation), including archive deposition and dissemination of the results through publication of a popular booklet, and submitted to the archaeological advisor to the LPA and the LPA for approval.</p> <p>This then allowed the archaeological advisor to the LPA to recommend discharge of the archaeological condition.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	Public benefit in terms of publication, archiving and popular booklet secured through contractual agreement. This made possible the developer's request to discharge of the condition before commencement of the development.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	See above
References and	Pre-Construct Archaeology 2014, The Exchange, Greengate Embankment,

<p>links/bibliography</p>	<p>Salford, Manchester: Historical Background. Unpublished report no. R11636.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2014, An Archaeological Evaluation at The Exchange Bridge Car Park, Greengate/Chapel Street, Salford, Greater Manchester. Unpublished report no. R11635.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2015, An Archaeological Excavation at The Exchange, Greengate Embankment, Salford, Manchester: Assessment Report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2015, Built Heritage Recording at the Exchange, Greengate Embankment, Salford, Greater Manchester. Unpublished report no R11636.</p> <p>Haslam, R, Proctor, J & Ridgeway, V 2017, The Exchange Station, Greengate, Salford: the history and archaeology of a transformed urban landscape, <i>Greater Manchester's Past Revealed</i> 18.</p>
----------------------------------	---

Case study no.	107
Planning scenario(s)	7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted
Heritage assets affected	Listed structures (Grade I) Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological, historic, and architectural interest.
Site name/address	Ordsall Chord, River Irwell, Manchester and Salford
Type of application & broad category	Infrastructure
Date(s)	2014-16
Local Planning Authority	Manchester City Council, and Salford City Council
Planning reference(s)	The Network Rail (Ordsall Chord) Order: Parliamentary Order for a new railway bridge, and an EIA
Development proposal	A new direct rail link between the three main stations in Manchester (Victoria, Oxford Road, and Piccadilly). The link achieved by the construction of a new rail chord, some 340m in length. The chord would cross the River Irwell on a new bridge and span the Trinity Way dual carriageway on a new viaduct.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The new rail bridge across the River Irwell is in a very sensitive heritage location. It runs between the Grade I Stephenson's rail bridge and the Grade I Warehouse and Arrival Station of 1830.
Archaeological/planning processes	A planning inquiry was held in 2014, during which Historic England opposed the location of the bridge. The Inspector ruled in favour of the route in 2015, concluding that public benefit for the new rail route connecting Piccadilly to Victoria rail stations outweighed the damage to the railway heritage. A number of conditions were included in the permission. These conditions were implemented by the LPA's archaeological advisors in conjunction with Historic England and conservation specialists.
Outcomes: archaeological	An extensive programme of archaeological recording of the built heritage (including 3 listed bridges to be removed) and below-ground remains was secured by planning conditions in the permission given following the inquiry. In addition, provision has been made through conditions for technical reports, a published article and a conservation architect-led restoration of the 1830 Stephenson railway bridge.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work	The archaeological advisors to the LPAs have worked closely with the Conservation Architect on the public benefit and archaeological recording programme which they had advised was necessary. Part of the public benefit is to consolidate and display Stephenson's Bridge and to present the heritage of the site with information panels, plaques, and

practices	<p>publications. A popular publication in the Greater Manchester's Past Revealed series will also be produced. A journal article has recently been completed (see below). On site information panels have been provided with images of public realm heritage.</p> <p>Technical reports on below-ground archaeology and built heritage are still awaited (being prepared by Salford Archaeology)</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>Wild, C 2018, Tracks Across the Irwell: From the Liverpool & Manchester Railway to the Ordsall Chord, <i>Industrial Archaeology Review</i>, 40:2, 74-87.</p>

Case study no.	108
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>11. The presence of a ‘live’ and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Carillion development site, Greengate, Salford
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential and commercial
Date(s)	2015 and 2017
Local Planning Authority	Salford City Council
Planning reference(s)	15/66621/FULEIA, 17/70626/FUL condition 22, and EIA
Development proposal	<p>Demolition of existing structures and erection of three-interconnected residential buildings at ground plus 12 storeys, 25 storeys and 33 storeys, with ancillary commercial units at ground floor level (use classes A1, A2, A3 and A4), residents’ amenity spaces and associated works, including access and landscaping at Embankment West, off Salford Approach, and New Kings Head Yard, Chapel Street, Salford’</p> <p>Erection of one 18 storey residential building (Block A, Use Class C3); one 16 storey residential building (Block B, Use Class C3); one 18 storey building providing a mix of residential and serviced apartment accommodation and amenity facilities including lounge, swimming pool and gym (Block C, Use Class Sui Generis); 536sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4); new access from Greengate; car and cycle parking; public realm and landscaping; and other associated works, Embankment West, off Salford Approach, and New Kings Head Yard, Chapel Street, Salford</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The archaeological section in the Environmental Statement and a separate archaeological baseline study indicated the potential for medieval and post-medieval archaeology between the foundation piers of the 19 th century railway viaduct.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Planning permission was granted in November 2017 with a pre-commencement condition.</p> <p>Evaluation was followed by targeted open area excavation in 2018 and a laser survey of brick railway arches.</p> <p>However, the closure of the main developer Carillion in the autumn of 2018 resulted in a cessation of all works and the prospect of very large potential bad debts for the site contractors including the archaeological contractor. The archaeological site excavation and historic building survey had been completed as part of the demolition, pre-commencement condition, but the post excavation analysis and reporting were still outstanding.</p>

	<p>A different planning application was subsequently put forward as part of the overall Greengate development to continue the development. This led to a separate consent for the development. The archaeological advisors to the LPA worked with the planning case officer to advise that construction could not re-commence until the archaeology condition for the demolition phase is fully met, which includes funding the excavation as well as the post excavation.</p> <p>As of May 2019, a comprise agreement has been reached which will limit the liabilities of the new developer and the archaeological contractor and should enable some provision for archaeological post-excavation.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	Resources for post-excavation and reporting were lost due to the demise of the developer Carillion. The presence of a pre-commencement condition proved to be helpful in securing provisional agreement to secure some post-excavation provision.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	Pre-Construct Archaeology 2017, Embankment West, Greengate, Salford, An Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment. Unpublished report, PCA Report no: R12998.

Case study no.	109
Planning scenario(s)	7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Salford central regeneration
Type of application & broad category	Major, regeneration; brownfield. 17.7ha
Date(s)	2009-2018
Local Planning Authority	Salford City Council
Planning reference(s)	09/57950/EIAHYB; 18/71823/FUL & 18/71824/LBC
Development proposal	<p>09/ 57950: Outline Application for a comprehensive phased regeneration of 'Salford Central', land bounded by Cleminson St to north, New Bailey St to east, River Irwell to south-east, Trinity Way and North Star Drive to south and Adelphi St to west, extending to 17.7 hectares</p> <p>18/71823: Erection of 7-storey office building (Use Class B1a) and formation of parking area within railway arches and pedestrian link between New Bailey and Gore Street, means of access, landscaping, together with ancillary facilities, servicing and public realm, associated localised repair and redecoration of the Southern Railway Viaduct (Grade II* Listed), Plot 1 New Bailey / Plots B2/B3 Salford Central Masterplan, at land southwest of New Bailey Street and Southeast Salford Central Station, M3 5ET</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Numerous HER entries. The archaeological and historic interest is mainly in the post-medieval and industrial periods identified in EIA Chapter 9, produced in 2009.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>This major regeneration project envisaged dozens of new developments across car parks, run-down industrial premises and wasteland on the west side of Salford's historic core.</p> <p>The application for the original hybrid overarching regeneration scheme was approved in 2010 and the decision notice includes a pre-commencement condition (36) for archaeology.</p> <p>The archaeological advisor to the LPA then worked with Salford LPA to devise a blanket archaeology condition to cover all the development sites, informed by an overarching desk-based assessment and selected archaeological evaluation. Subsequently as each site comes forward the archaeological advisors to the LPA will consider the need for a more detailed site specific desk-based assessment and evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Application 18/71823 is a notable recent example of a specific proposal for the erection of 7-storey office building at Plot 1 New Bailey. The application was on the site of New Bailey Prison, a reform prison built towards the end of the 18th century. An understanding of the site and the likely impact of</p>

	<p>the development was already known from previous archaeological evaluation including a desk-based assessment. This helped facilitate the approval of the application by the LPA which included a specific pre-commencement archaeology condition. A detailed WSI for archaeological excavation of the prison was produced by the archaeological advisors to the LPA and the site was excavated in 2018.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>The above approach of an overarching archaeological planning provision with supporting evidence which is able to inform specific proposals as they come forward, has proved to be efficient and cost-effective for the archaeological advisors to the LPA and the developers. It has also resulted in the discovery of some remarkable archaeology relating to early industrial Salford including back-to-back workers' housing and the extensive remains of a late 18th century reform prison which will feature on 'Digging for Britain.' A monograph is being prepared.</p> <p>Overarching planning condition:</p> <p><i>'36. Prior to any demolition, site clearance or demolition commencing on any phase or plot within the site other than the hereby approved highway and associated works to Chapel street (Zone K) and the laying out of public space at Stanley Street (within Zone B) and Archaeological Management Strategy for that phase or plot shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Strategy shall include the following matters:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) a written scheme of investigation;</i> <i>b) a framework for undertaken consultation;</i> <i>c) agreed recording standards and reporting; and</i> <i>d) a programme of archaeological work.</i> <p><i>The agreed programme of archaeological work shall be secured and completed in accordance with the Strategy and written scheme for each phase or plot unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>To make a record of historic building fabric and archaeological remains for archive and research purposes, and for public benefit in accordance with policy CH5 of the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan.'</i></p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>Opportunities have been taken to incorporate community engagement in excavations and in open days/guided tours.</p> <p>There will be a monograph on New Bailey Prison and the landscaping scheme will incorporate heritage references and information boards.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Salford Archaeology Centre for Applied Archaeology, University of Salford 2018, One New Bailey: A Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Excavation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Ove Arup & Partners Ltd 2009, Central Salford Masterplan, Environmental Impact Assessment, Chapter 9, Archaeology. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	110
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest of national importance, now including a Scheduled Monument
Site name/address	Colchester Garrison, Colchester
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2001-2011
Local Planning Authority	Colchester Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	O/COL/01/0009 - Re-development of Colchester Garrison
Development proposal	New 'Urban Village' comprising residential development (up to approx. 2600 dwellings), mixed uses including retail, leisure and employment, public open space, community facilities, landscaping, new highways, transport improvements and associated ancillary development
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Roman remains including burials were known from the vicinity of the initial find of robbed Roman walls in 2002.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Outline planning application submitted at the end of 2000 and approved in 2003.</p> <p>A pre-determination trial-trench evaluation was undertaken by Colchester Archaeological Trust (CAT) in 2002 which defined robbed Roman walls, but at the time, these were identified as the remains of a Roman building (i.e. not a circus).</p> <p>The planning permission for the development included a pre-commencement archaeology condition allowing for a full programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>The remains originally found in 2002 were identified as potentially those of part of a Roman Circus during investigations in 2004 (following stripping of an area identified for excavation). Various further sections of the Circus were then subsequently revealed and investigated in advance of other development. It formed the subject of a special Channel 4 Time Team programme in 2005.</p>

	<p>The Roman Circus is located to the south of Colchester town centre, and c.400m outside the town wall, within the Victorian military garrison. It is orientated east-west, and is located between NGR TL 9938 2453 (west) and NGR TL 9977 2455 (east), c.450m long and c.75m wide. In 2007, the remains of the Circus were designated as a Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Several further areas, in which the projected line of the Circus is located, will come forward for development in the next few years, and these sections will (it is anticipated) be taken into public ownership/management, so that most of the monument will be protected. The LPA, with Historic England and the developer/s, will look at ways in which it can most effectively present/display the Circus site. The LPA is currently in the process of preparing a management plan.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The entire area of the Circus is designated as a Scheduled Monument, No. 1021426. At over 30ha, it is one of the largest Scheduled Monuments in England.</p> <p>An article on the Colchester Circus was published in 2008. A monograph is currently in preparation.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	<p>The Colchester Archaeological Trust opened a Roman Circus Centre in 2011: http://www.romancircus.co.uk/. The centre has free entry and a wide range of public information including artistic reconstructions and a scale model of the circus, guided tours, public walks and a free car park.</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>Crummy, P. 2008, The Roman Circus at Colchester, <i>Britannia</i> XXXIX, 2008, 15-31.</p> <p>Colchester Archaeological Trust 2002, An archaeological evaluation by trial-trenching on Areas A, B, D, GJ, H, J, N, V and YP at Colchester Garrison PFI site, Colchester, Essex. Unpublished report, CAT report no. 206.</p> <p>Colchester Archaeological Trust 2011, Archaeological investigations on the 'Alienated Land', Colchester Garrison, Colchester, Essex, May 2004-October 2007. Unpublished report, CAT report no. 412.</p>

Case study no.	112
Planning scenario(s)	7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land at Congleton Road, Sandbach, Cheshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2012-15
Local Planning Authority	Cheshire East Council
Planning reference(s)	12/1903C and APP/R0660/A/13/2189733
Development proposal	Outline application for the erection of up to 160 dwellings, including landscaping, access and associated infrastructure, and the demolition of 130 Congleton Road, c.8.2 ha
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There was nothing on the HER within the proposed development area but there was a light spread of metal detector finds from the surrounding area.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Application for development of an extensive area of farmland on the outskirts of Sandbach. It was refused by the LPA in 2012 and granted at Appeal in 2013. The permission was accompanied by a pre-commencement condition requiring a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>The programme comprised an initial supervised metal detector survey across the whole development area with provision for further targeted investigation of any area of interest. Survey and subsequent investigation took place in 2015.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Over 200 metal finds were recovered from the supervised metal detecting survey. They were distributed sparsely across the area. Most were of post-medieval date and were interpreted as evidence of casual loss and spreading of household rubbish on the fields. However, a small number of Roman finds were made including three coins, a lead weight, a rivet and the arm of a small bronze figurine.</p> <p>On the basis of this small assemblage, the removal of the topsoil was monitored across the western part of the site (c.2.1ha). This revealed the plough-damaged remains of an area of Roman activity which was excavated and recorded. The remains consisted of shallow ditches, pits, gullies and postholes, all of which had been seriously eroded by ploughing. Further finds were limited and consisted of 37 sherds of Roman pottery.</p> <p>This example is included because its ephemeral and plough damaged features and sparse artefactual assemblage are typical of rural sites in the lowland north west. However, the approach outlined above (a staged programme of work secured by condition) has the potential to identify such</p>

	sites in an efficient and proportionate way which is supported by the planning authority.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	The archaeological advisor to the LPA has recommended the use of supervised metal detecting as a survey technique on a number greenfield development sites in Cheshire recently. The results have been assessed in an article by Dr Rob Philpott of Liverpool University which has been published in volume 88 of the Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society.
References and links/bibliography	<p>Wardell Armstrong 2015a, Land at Congleton Road, Sandbach, Cheshire: metal-detector survey report July 2015. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Wardell Armstrong 2015b, Land at Congleton Road, Sandbach, Cheshire: archaeological watching brief report November 2015. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Philpott, R A, 2019, 'An assessment of the utility of supervised metal detecting in development-led archaeological work in Cheshire', <i>Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society</i> 87-114, Volume 88 for 2018.</p>

Case study no.	113
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	167 Barnwood Road, Gloucester, Gloucestershire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential and commercial
Date(s)	2012-3
Local Planning Authority	Gloucester City Council
Planning reference(s)	12/00686/FUL
Development proposal	Demolition of existing building and erection of Class A1 food store and 12 no. apartments with associated cycle and car parking facilities
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>While outside the historic core of Gloucester this development site was located next to a known Roman road in an area that had previously produced evidence for settlement and burial activity of Roman date.</p> <p>A World War II civil defence fire station building was present on the site.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment was undertaken, followed by limited on site evaluation (two trenches). The scope of the evaluation was restricted by standing buildings and by the access needs of businesses operating on the site.</p> <p>The desk-based assessment indicated '<i>some potential for below ground archaeological remains, particularly of Roman or medieval date...not of such significance so as to require preservation in situ, or that would influence the development design</i>' (Cotswold Archaeology 2012). It was thought probable that previous development on the site would have heavily disturbed ground levels.</p> <p>The evaluation identified Roman features of the mid 1st /early 2nd century AD including a pit, ditch, possible trackway and walls that were aligned with nearby Roman Ermin Street, as well as some medieval features.</p> <p>A pre-commencement planning condition requiring further evaluation and any appropriate mitigation was the only way to allow the application to proceed. Following the granting of planning permission evaluation found</p>

	significant archaeological remains of Roman date.
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>A collection of 1st century AD pottery, metalwork and glass had been deposited in one of several quarry pits, and an unusual cremation burial was located within a mortuary enclosure next to the Roman road.</p> <p>The Roman material is of considerable significance in both a local and a national context. The unpredicted mortuary enclosure and pottery assemblage necessitated additional time and resources during the archaeological programme on site and in subsequent analysis.</p> <p>The results of this investigation are published in <i>Britannia</i>, from which the following summary is taken:</p> <p><i>'Excavations at Barnwood, Gloucestershire, revealed several phases of activity dating to the AD 60s. This included gravel quarrying, with one quarry pit containing a significant assemblage of pottery, metalwork and glass with strong first-century military associations. A large roadside enclosure contained ditches and a post-hole alignment; these were replaced by a square burial plot containing a post-built structure and several pits, which yielded a lead ossuary containing cremated human remains and a collection of burnt beans and hobnails. The location of the site raises questions regarding the organisation of the military landscape around Gloucester during the first century (Brindle, Holbrook, and Sausins 2018).</i></p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	Two public talks were given about the results of the project.
References and links/bibliography	<p>Cotswold Archaeology 2012, 167 Barnwood Road, Gloucester, Heritage Desk-Based Assessment. Unpublished report, CA Report 12235.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2013, 167 Barnwood Road, Gloucester, Gloucestershire, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report, CA report 13104.</p> <p>Brindle, T, Holbrook, N, and Sausins, D, 2018, A First-Century AD Burial Plot at Barnwood, Gloucestershire: Excavations in 2013–14, <i>Britannia</i> 49, 147-177.</p>

Case study no.	114
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest, of regional importance
Site name/address	Former allotment site, 1.4ha in size, located at Itter Crescent, Walton, Peterborough
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2011-12
Local Planning Authority	Peterborough City Council
Planning reference(s)	11/00836/FUL
Development proposal	Residential development comprising 34 dwellings with associated access, landscaping and ancillary works
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	A preliminary assessment of the available evidence based on a standard 500m radius HER search and mapping regression indicated low/unknown potential for the existence of buried remains of any date.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Given the history of land use as an allotment, the inconclusive results from the desk-based assessment, and the relatively small size of the site, the archaeological advisor to the LPA did not request pre-determination geophysical survey and/or evaluation by trial trenching. This latter was secured by a standard pre-commencement condition.</p> <p>The evaluation was carried out in August 2011. It revealed significant Roman remains of a probable villa situated in the south-eastern corner of the site. The evaluation lasted only two days and was abandoned, as the significance of the site was apparent. In consultation with the developer and Historic England, an area 0.5ha in size was stripped for total excavation. The rationale was that the last Roman villa in the Peterborough area had been excavated by E T Artis in the 1820s. Therefore, excavation with modern techniques would have furthered the current understanding of Roman occupation in the area. In addition, half of the villa is preserved under the current Fane Road allotments which are not planned to be developed.</p> <p>The excavation was carried out between August 2011 and February 2012 in advance of a residential development. The following is a summary of the results:</p> <p>The earliest cut feature was an early Iron Age crouched burial of a young</p>

	<p>woman. Overlying this were the remains of a substantial Iron Age settlement, which consisted of a rectilinear ditch and banked enclosure N-S aligned, with an entrance on the east side, and measuring c. 60m x 55m. Within the north-east part of the enclosure three roundhouses and associated domestic pits were recorded, with a fourth building being located at the Fane Road site. The Iron Age enclosure was re-cut and maintained with the addition of a cobbled entrance way.</p> <p>Structures on site during the early Roman phase included a high status timber building and barn. Evidence suggests this building may have been destroyed by fire and replaced by a new masonry building (the villa) that was reworked and extended over time and which comprised three ranges. A further wing of the villa lies protected under the allotments to the south. Identified rooms within the excavated part of the villa included a kitchen, and a bathhouse with hypocaust. A small area of tessellated pavement remained in its original position in one of the corridors.</p> <p>A large dump of small, fine tesserae in a range of colours (totalling 27 buckets' worth) was uncovered from a 1st to 2nd century layer. A square stone-lined well was also uncovered containing demolition rubble, a child's skeleton, and an antler artefact. A tile kiln - with two phases of use - was found within the top of the Iron Age enclosure ditch.</p> <p>In addition, a number of skeletons were found (41 individuals – 16 adult and 22 neonates). The majority of adults were buried following the abandonment and robbing of the villa and were laid to rest in haphazard orientation, some reduced to a disarticulated mass of bones. Preliminary analysis shows that they suffered from an unusual condition which caused their skulls to deteriorate as the bones grew porous and thin, probably due to a deficiency in their diet. As these burials had no grave goods, C14 dating was carried out. However, so far only one burial on site provided evidence for date of interment – a Saxon female.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The post-excavation assessment has been completed. The remaining half of the villa is currently protected under allotments.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	<p>In this instance, it was difficult to make the case for archaeological pre-determination evaluation to the LPA and developer due to the small size of the development and the absence of at least some evidence of archaeological activity on or around the site that could have provided sufficient evidence of 'potential'. However, the unexpected nature of the discovery of the site will be helpful to inform advice on comparable developments in the future including making the case for pre-determination evaluation.</p> <p>The archaeological excavation identified an Iron Age and Roman site of regional importance which has made a significant contribution to the understanding of those periods in the local area.</p> <p>The excavation has also led to a HLF community dig carried out by the Fane Road Allotment Association, and coordinated by Oxford Archaeology East, within the current allotment site, to the south of the developed site.</p>
References and	<p>Oxford Archaeology 2012, An Iron Age Settlement and Romano-British Villa</p>

links/bibliography	Complex at Itter Crescent, Peterborough, Bar Hill, Cambridgeshire: Post Excavation Assessment. Unpublished report, no 1329.
---------------------------	---

Case study no.	118
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>9. The commencement of development (with or without a pre-commencement condition) before the completion of archaeological mitigation fieldwork caused problems e.g. Health and Safety; conservation of archaeology; additional resources required, including for agreeing and implementing complex method statements</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	The, Rattle Road, Stone Cross, Pevensey, East Sussex
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2013
Local Planning Authority	Wealden District Council
Planning reference(s)	WD/2013/1564/MAO
Development proposal	Residential development comprising the erection of up to 276 dwellings.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Archaeological Notification Area – location of the Roman road to Pevensey Saxon Shore Fort.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The site was allocated for development in the local plan without consulting the archaeology service. Because of this (and no reasonable prospect of refusal) the LPA was only prepared to ask for a geophysical survey pre-determination and then to add a condition to the planning permission.</p> <p>Geophysical survey and post-determination evaluation, followed by strip, map and sample investigation, was undertaken. This revealed a multi-period landscape with a dense concentration of archaeological remains. These included a Bronze Age cremation and boundary ditches, a late Iron Age/early Roman settlement and field system, and an early Anglo Saxon cremation cemetery.</p> <p>Issues of resourcing and the speed of development led to great pressure on the archaeological contractor to excavate and record areas containing a significant amount of archaeological features.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The archaeological processes have been unsatisfactory due to the absence of pre-determination archaeological assessment. Post-excavation is still ongoing.
Other outcomes e.g. public benefits such as public engagement or research or	The arrangements for local plan consultation on land allocations with the county archaeology service have improved as a result of the experience of this development.

new/improved work practices	
References and links/bibliography	SWAT Archaeology 2015, Archaeological Evaluation of Land (Phase 1) at Rattle Road, Stone Cross, Pevensey, East Sussex. Unpublished report.

Case study no.	120
Planning scenario(s)	9. The commencement of development (with or without a pre-commencement condition) before the completion of archaeological mitigation fieldwork caused problems e.g. Health and Safety; conservation of archaeology; additional resources required, including for agreeing and implementing complex method statements
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Former Griff Works, Stannington, Sheffield
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2016-17
Local Planning Authority	Sheffield City Council
Planning reference(s)	16/04749/FUL
Development proposal	Demolition and site clearance, erection of 62 dwellings, with access, parking, open space, landscaping and associated works
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	19 th century disused brickworks known from historic maps and HER
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A pre-commencement condition was attached to a planning permission, requiring formal submission of a WSI before works could commence.</p> <p>The process of submission and implementation of the WSI was unsatisfactory. A problematic issue was that site remediation works commenced before archaeological evaluation had been undertaken.</p> <p>Some evaluation was eventually undertaken in parts of the site, but with remediation - and in some parts, construction - underway around.</p> <p>Mitigation by excavation was possible for those parts of the site not affected by the early commencement of remediation and construction works. This revealed that the remains of the brickworks were well-preserved including the flues for the kilns.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Commencement of the development, including construction, before the evaluation was completed resulted in the inability to complete the evaluation and the damage/destruction of a significant part of the surviving archaeological resource.</p> <p>Excavation of the area not affected by premature commencement of the development was successfully undertaken and the post- excavation assessment report was completed in 2018.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research	-

and new/changed work practices	
References and links/bibliography	URS Heritage Assessment Report 2014, Former Griffs Works, Stopes Road Stannington, Sheffield. Unpublished report. Archaeological Services WYAS 2018, Griff Works, Stannington South Yorkshire. Archaeological Works. Unpublished report.

Case study no.	121
Planning scenario(s)	10. A planning condition has been discharged before investigation has been completed in accordance with the WSI, or the post-excavation stage agreed and resourced, and this caused difficulties with securing post-excavation, publication, archiving
Heritage assets affected:	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Beetham Tower, Manchester
Type of application & broad category	Major, Hilton hotel (lower 22 floors) and residential
Date(s)	2003-05
Local Planning Authority	Manchester City Council
Planning reference(s)	068662/FO/2003//C3
Development proposal	Demolition of existing section of viaduct and redevelopment to create a hotel (Class C1) incorporating associated retailing, restaurants, bars and cafes (A1, A2, A3), conferencing, other associated facilities including a health and fitness centre (Class D2) with 219 residential units (Class C3) above and a sky bar (Class A3), with related access, servicing, basement car parking, landscaping and associated works. The construction of an office building (Class B1) with related access, servicing, car parking, landscaping and associated works and incorporating a public lift and stair linking to the G-Mex podium, Land Bound by Deansgate/ Great Bridgewater Street/Trafford Street and the G Mex viaduct.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Immediately adjacent to the Roman vicus for <i>Mamucium</i> Roman Fort.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>An archaeological pre-commencement condition was attached to the planning consent for this 47 storey tower which included the Hilton Hotel on Deansgate, Manchester.</p> <p>Extensive remains of the Roman vicus of <i>Mamucium</i> Roman fort were revealed, with ditches, pits, and buildings recorded. These were the first excavations on the east side of Deansgate and have extended the known area of the vicus. The post excavation assessment was completed in April 2005 and the contractor made recommendations for publication.</p> <p>However, without consulting its archaeological advisors, Manchester LPA discharged the archaeology condition (in 2005) before the resources for publication could be secured. It has not proved possible since then to obtain the necessary resources to publish the results of this important investigation.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	An important excavation was undertaken in 2004 and post-excavation with publication was secured by condition, but the condition was discharged in 2005 before resources for publication could be secured. The excavations have since remained unpublished.
Other outcomes/outputs	-

e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	
References and links/bibliography	Pre-Construct Archaeology 2005, The Beetham Tower, Deansgate Manchester: Post-Excavation Assessment. Unpublished report.

Case study no.	122
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>12. The absence of specialist archaeological curatorial advice (adviser not in post; advice not given because of capacity or other issues) led to the determination of an application without appropriate consideration of the archaeological implications</p>
Heritage assets affected:	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest within a World Heritage Site. Listed Buildings
Site name/address	The Old Dock and Chavasse Park, Liverpool - area now known as Liverpool 1
Type of application & broad category	Major, multi-use urban development
Date(s)	2001-06
Local Planning Authority	Liverpool City Council
Planning reference(s)	04O/0600. There are a number of planning applications, but this is the primary, overarching planning reference. There was also an EIA.
Development proposal	To redevelop land bounded by Redcross Street, Strand Street, Law Courts, Lord Street, Church Street, School Lane, Fleet Street, Gradwell Street, Hanover Street, Price Street, Paradise Street, Park Lane and Canning Place, otherwise known as the Paraside Street Development Area, (PSDA), for a mix of uses including retail (Class A1), food and drink (Class A3), leisure (Class D1 and D2), residential apartments (Class C3), broadcasting studios, offices (Class B1), Meeting Hall, Gallery (Class D1), ancillary accommodation, 2 hotels, new bus station, bus layover provision plus ancillary facilities, circa 3000 public car parking spaces, new means of access, public open space including a new public park, and associated servicing, highway works and landscaping.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	World Heritage Site (inscribed in 2004).
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A Desk-Based Assessment (1999) identified the high potential of the development area.</p> <p>Planning permission was granted in 2004 with pre-commencement conditions (66-72) for archaeological and historic building mitigation.</p> <p>A series of evaluations, excavations, watching briefs and building recording took place between 2001-2006.</p> <p>Below-ground archaeological investigation was concentrated within a c.2.0ha area known as Mann Island for which a planning application was submitted and approved by Neptune Ltd. The investigations took place in 2006 and a post-excavation assessment report was produced in 2010.</p>

	<p>The report summary says:</p> <p><i>'The investigations have generated large amounts of stratigraphic and structural data and substantial assemblages of finds. This report assesses the potential of the archive and presents an updated project design for its analysis and publication. It concludes that the data have considerable potential to address a number of regional, national and international research aims, unique to the work undertaken in Liverpool. The proposed revised project design provides for the post-excavation analysis of the finds and dataset, culminating in the publication of the results in a volume which will bring together the evidence for the development of Liverpool's docks and associated settlement, and will be accessible to the general public.'</i></p> <p>The analysis and publication of the investigation are however still outstanding. A task list and costs for analysis and publication at 2008-9 prices is contained within the report appendices.</p> <p>The planning permission for 040/6000 includes provision to secure analysis and publication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition 66 of 04PO/0600 does require a programme of archaeological work, and the attached Reason for the Condition includes the following 'To ensure that any archaeological remains are adequately assessed, recorded as appropriate and the results published'. • In the accompanying Notes for Planning Decision Notices, the text on compliance with the permission/consent includes 'where a planning permission is granted subject to conditions it is important that these are fully complied with.' <p>The lack of progress between 2010 and 2015 is partly due to the absence of archaeological advice whilst the Merseyside Archaeology Service had no staff and the service was closed.</p> <p>Discussions are currently taking place with the relevant parties (City Council, site owner, developer, archaeological contractor and Historic England) to resolve the issue.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>A pre-commencement condition allowed for appropriate mitigation by archaeological investigation of an internationally important site.</p> <p>Little progress has been made with analysis and publication of the results since 2010 partly due to the absence of archaeological advice to the LPA. Since the restoration of archaeological advice from the Merseyside Environment Advisory Service in 2016, discussions have resumed between the relevant parties to progress the matter.</p>

<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Liverpool Museum 1999, An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of Land at Chavasse Park, Liverpool 1997 (NGR SJ 343 901). Unpublished report.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology North 2010, Mann Island Liverpool, Merseyside: Archaeological Post-excavation Assessment Report. Unpublished report, Oxford Archaeology North report no: 2008/898.</p>

Case study no.	123
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>12. The absence of specialist archaeological curatorial advice (adviser not in post; advice not given because of capacity or other issues) led to the determination of an application without appropriate consideration of the archaeological implications</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological, historic and architectural interest.
Site name/address	Everton Academy Training Ground, Finch Farm, 3 Finch Lane, Halewood, Knowsley L26 3UE
Type of application & broad category	Major, leisure, 24ha
Date(s)	2002-05
Local Planning Authority	Knowsley Council
Planning reference(s)	02/00823/FUL
Development proposal	Erection of academy/training building, groundsman's store and security lodge, construction of 10 full-sized and 2 half-sized practice areas and 1 outdoor artificial surface and car parking areas.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	An HER search and desk-based assessment in 2004 indicated moderate potential from historic farms and landscape including standing buildings.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment was produced in 2004 and the planning application approved with a pre-commencement condition (no. 19) in May 2004.</p> <p>Historic building recording and field evaluation – principally of the historic farm sites - took place in June and July 2005. This revealed 17th-19th century archaeology and surviving historic building fabric.</p> <p>A limited programme of excavation followed from July-Nov 2005, mainly concentrated around the historic Finch Farm complex.</p> <p>A post-excavation assessment report (PXA) was produced in August 2006. This was subsequently lodged with the LPA.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The project has not progressed to publication between 2006 and 2016 despite containing clear research/public benefit potential. The PXA summary says:</p> <p><i>'The assessment of the results of the fieldwork has shown that the excavated data have good potential for further analysis, firstly in terms of accurately dating and phasing the historic development of the identified settlement foci and, secondly, in providing a basis for the comparison of the two settlements onsite and between these and contemporary farmsteads within the wider</i></p>

	<p><i>region.</i>' The report contains a task list and costs as appendices.</p> <p>Since its formation in 2016, The Merseyside Environmental Advice Service has taken up the issue of publication with the LPA and the developer. Discussions are ongoing.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	-
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>RPS Planning and Environment 2004, Proposed Everton Academy and Training Centre, Halewood: Desk-Based Assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology North 2006, Everton Academy Training Ground, Finch farm, Finch Lane, Halewood, Merseyside: Archaeological Post-excavation Assessment. Unpublished Report, Oxford Archaeology North Job no. L9672.</p>

Case study no.	124
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>12. The absence of specialist archaeological curatorial advice (adviser not in post; advice not given because of capacity or other issues) led to the determination of an application without appropriate consideration of the archaeological implications</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest.
Site name/address	Land between Blackbrook Road and A580 East Lancashire Road, Blackbrook Road, St Helens
Type of application & broad category	Infrastructure, County road scheme
Date(s)	2000-06
Local Planning Authority	St Helens Council
Planning reference(s)	P/2002/1181, EIA
Development proposal	Proposed by-pass, A58 Blackbrook Diversion
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	A desk-based assessment produced in 1993 identified potential for evidence of the post-medieval and industrial periods.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A new desk-based assessment and walkover survey in 2000 (report produced in 2002) identified potential for the survival of a relict industrial landscape including the extraction/working of coal, iron, copper and stone, and evidence of post-medieval settlement. An Environmental Statement was produced in 2002 and planning permission was granted with a pre-commencement condition in 2003.</p> <p>Field evaluation followed by selective excavation and a watching-brief (during construction) took place between 2004 and 2006.</p> <p>A post excavation assessment report was also produced in 2006. This concluded:</p> <p><i>'An assessment of the collated excavation and evaluation archive has been undertaken, to establish the potential for further analysis of the data and the corresponding publication of the results. This identified that there was limited potential for analysis of the finds, but that the stratigraphic and structural data had considerable potential subject to the implementation of a detailed documentary study into the development of the industrial landscape. It recommended publication of the results as an article within the journal, The Industrial Archaeology Review.'</i></p> <p>The report also contains a task list and costs as appendices.</p> <p>The project has not progressed to publication since 2006.</p>
Outcomes:	Since its formation in 2016, the Merseyside Environmental Advice Service

archaeological	has taken up the issue of publication with the developer (the local authority) regarding the outstanding analysis and publication. Discussions are ongoing.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>Oxford Archaeology North 2002, A58 Blackbrook Diversion, St Helens Merseyside: Archaeological Assessment. Unpublished report, Oxford Archaeology North, Job No. L9070.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology North 2006, A58 Blackbrook Diversion, St Helens Merseyside: Archaeological Evaluation and Excavation Assessment report. Unpublished report, Oxford Archaeology North, Job No. L9670.</p>

Case study no.	125
Planning scenario(s)	10. A planning condition has been discharged before investigation has been completed in accordance with the WSI, or the post-excavation stage agreed and resourced, and this caused difficulties with securing post-excavation, publication, archiving.
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	17A South Street, Ditchling, East Sussex
Type of application broad category	Minor, residential
Date(s)	2010-11
Local Planning Authority	Lewes District Council
Planning reference(s)	LW/11/0187
Development proposal	Partial demolition, refurbishment and erection of a two storey extension to an existing dwelling at 17A South Street and erection of a single storey dwelling
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Within a medieval village and an Archaeological Notification Area
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-determination evaluation revealed significant archaeology dating to the medieval period. A pre-commencement condition was included on the planning permission. However, a second condition which was also recommended by the archaeological advisors to the LPA in order to ensure that post-excavation and publication would be secured before occupation of the development, was omitted from the planning permission by LPA.</p> <p>The pre-commencement condition was inadvertently fully discharged by the LPA planning officer at WSI submission stage. The developer initially was reluctant to commission the post-excavation work, but the archaeological contractor and developer eventually agreed that the post excavation would be progressed, with the key “hook” being that the work of the professional archaeologist was still required as their WSI had been approved.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	However, as of February 2019, the developer has still not funded the post-excavation and enforcement action is being considered by the LPA
Other outcomes e.g. public benefits such as public engagement or research or new/improved work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	Archaeology South-East 2011, Archaeological Evaluation at Jointure Estate, 11 South Street, Ditchling, East Sussex, BN6 8UQ. Unpublished report, Archaeology South-East report no. 4700.

Case study no.	126
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>10. A planning condition has been discharged before investigation has been completed in accordance with the WSI, or the post-excavation stage agreed and resourced, and this caused difficulties with securing post-excavation, publication, archiving</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	St John's Church, Redhill, Surrey
Type of application & broad category	New church hall
Date(s)	2012-6
Local Planning Authority	Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Surrey
Planning reference(s)	12/01483/F
Development proposal	Construction of a detached church hall
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site was a graveyard that commenced use in 1843, and officially closed in 1896. Some family plots remained in use, however, after this time.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A planning application was made for the construction of a new church hall. No pre-determination evaluation was carried out in view of the good level of documentation available for the graveyard. An archaeological planning condition was attached to the planning permission. Subsequent to the permission being granted the developer commissioned an evaluation to determine the extent of the remains and the level of risk.</p> <p>The footprint of the new building was therefore evaluated after the determination of the planning application, revealing a series of well-preserved regularly spaced burials including a comparatively high number of young children.</p> <p>The removal of the human remains was necessary in advance of the construction of the new church hall. An excavation of the development footprint was subsequently carried out, and a post-excavation assessment produced.</p> <p>The excavation and assessment had identified that the site contained an unusually high percentage of juvenile burials, probably related to a nearby workhouse. Because of this, and the restricted date range of the cemetery, Historic England considered that the site was of regional significance</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The Parochial Church Council questioned the need for the further analytical work recommended in the post-excavation assessment report and it was discovered that the archaeological condition had been discharged following the evaluation, against the advice of the archaeological adviser to the LPA.

	<p>The Parish subsequently decided not to fund any further work as it was felt that sufficient money had already been spent on archaeology and, as the condition had been discharged, it was argued there were no moral, legal or contractual obligations to provide further funds to complete the project. Although the Local Authority acknowledged there had been an error, they were unable to require that the analysis was carried out.</p> <p>Some osteological work is now being carried out by undergraduates at Reading University</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>AOC Archaeology 2014, St John the Evangelist Church, Redhill, Surrey, An Archaeological Evaluation Report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>AOC Archaeology 2016, St John the Evangelist Church, Redhill, Surrey, Post Excavation Assessment Report. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	131
Planning scenario(s)	11. The presence of a 'live' and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Adelphi Street, Salford
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2006-08; 2014-15
Local Planning Authority	Salford City Council
Planning reference(s)	06/53224/FUL; 14/65820/FUL
Development proposal	<p>06/53224/FUL: Construction of a mixed-use development comprising four ground floor commercial units, a total of 220 residential units within a 22 storey block and accompanied by associated landscaped piazza and basement car parking, land west of Adelphi Street and south of Trinity Riverside, Salford</p> <p>14/65820/FUL: Erection of buildings (up to 8 storeys in height) to provide 206 apartments, communal gymnasium, undercroft car parking and associated access and landscaping, land west of Adelphi Street and south of Trinity Riverside, Salford</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>06/53224/FUL: Remains of former 18th and 19th century dyeworks and associated workers' housing</p> <p>14/65820/FUL: Remains of 18th century Bank Mill (in addition to above)</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The planning application in 2006 was supported by a desk-based assessment and was granted planning permission in 2007 with a staged pre-commencement archaeological condition. Building recording, evaluation and selected excavation of two areas (an area of workers housing and an area of the dyeworks) took place in 2007 and 2008.</p> <p>A post-excavation assessment report was produced in 2008. The most significant artefacts from the excavation were a deposit of around 5000 fragments of clay pipes comprising waste and kiln furniture which had been dumped within the shared toilet block for workers' housing. The assemblage was dated to c.1810 and had been produced at an identified kiln site which, together with its large size, meant that it was considered to be of regional significance and potentially of national significance. This deposit was therefore considered to be a priority for detailed analysis and publication.</p> <p>However, the developer was hit by the recession and went bankrupt before resources for analysis and publication could be secured. No further progress was therefore possible with the programme of analysis and publication.</p> <p>In 2014 a different developer came forward with a new scheme (see above 14/65820) and, because the condition had not been discharged, it was</p>

	<p>possible for the archaeological advisors to the LPA to recommend that the detailed clay pipe report be finished and published before the old condition could be fully discharged. This was agreed by the LPA and the author of the post-excavation assessment of the clay pipe assemblage was commissioned to complete the analysis and report. This has now been completed and an addendum report to the main excavation report has been prepared for publication in <i>Post Medieval Archaeology</i>.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>The archaeological condition will be recommended to be discharged when final proof of intent to publish is provided by the developer</p> <p>The 2014 application was granted permission in 2015 and a desk-based assessment was also produced in 2015.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>The archaeology was reported on and the results have also been summarised in a Greater Manchester's Past Revealed booklet focusing on another site in Salford's historic core.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>West Yorkshire Archaeology Service 2015, Adelphi Street, Salford, Greater Manchester: archaeological desk-based assessment. Unpublished report no. 2791.</p> <p>Gregory, R. & Miller, I 2015, Greengate: the archaeology of Salford's Historic Core, <i>Greater Manchester's Past Revealed 13</i>.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology North 2008, Adelphi Street, Salford, Greater Manchester: Archaeological Building Survey and Excavation. Unpublished report, Oxford Archaeology North L9855.</p> <p>Wardell Armstrong 2006, Land at Adelphi Street, Salford, Greater Manchester: archaeological desk-based assessment. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	132
Planning scenario(s)	11. The presence of a 'live' and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Meridian public house, Western Road, Lewes, East Sussex
Type of application & broad category	Minor, residential
Date(s)	2010
Local Planning Authority	Lewes District Council
Planning reference(s)	LW/10/0264
Development proposal	Conversion of public house to dwelling, construction of five new houses
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Archaeological Notification Area
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The proposed development was granted planning permission with a pre-commencement condition.</p> <p>Archaeological excavation uncovered important remains dating to the later Medieval period including evidence for two possible houses fronting onto Western Road, one of which contained a hearth, whilst to the rear of these properties were two large pits, one of which contained a brick wall structure. A large assemblage of pottery, animal bone and other artefacts has been recovered, the pottery covering a (provisional) date range of 1450-1550AD.</p> <p>Full discharge of the planning condition was refused by the LPA until agreement had been reached with the developer (in line with the WSI) for publication of the results of the excavation in a local archaeological journal. This was to ensure that the results of the work could be made available to the public.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	A request by the developer for the discharge of archaeological planning condition was refused until the developer agreed to fund publication. Publication work is still in progress.
Other outcomes e.g. public benefits such as public engagement or research or new/improved work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	News item on archaeological contractor website: http://cbasltd.co.uk/news%202010.html

Case study no.	133
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>11. The presence of a 'live' and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Brookers Yard, Suzuki and Peter Fish Premises, off Paynes Park, Hitchin, Hertfordshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2007-19
Local Planning Authority	North Hertfordshire District Council
Planning reference(s)	06/02007/1
Development proposal	2, 3 & 4 storey buildings together with conversion of part of existing Carling Building and Building B to provide 141 residential units (23 one bedroom and 102 two bedroom flats; 1 one bedroom, 12 two bedroom and 3 three bedroom houses). Basement parking for 175 cars and cycle storage.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>Located behind the medieval street frontage of Hitchin town. Medieval, Anglo-Saxon and some Roman and prehistoric finds known from the general area.</p> <p>Desk-based assessment and geotechnical investigation revealed that a significant proportion of the area had been disturbed by post-medieval development.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Excavation was secured by a pre-commencement planning condition. It revealed significant archaeological remains, including the discovery of a very substantial boundary ditch (2-3m deep), apparently delimiting the Saxon burh and/or minster church at Hitchin.</p> <p>The applicant subsequently went bankrupt before the funding for post-excavation could be secured. The Administrator in the case didn't see the need to comply with the archaeological condition which was still in place. Funding was therefore still required for post-excavation assessment and publication, and following negotiation, £8,300 was finally offered in 2014 by the management company towards the costs of the archiving/analysis and publication costs. While falling short of the real figure needed to undertake all necessary analysis and publication costs, it enabled the preparation of a post-excavation programme and proposals for publication.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The analysis and publication are progressing, much has been completed, including the pottery analysis.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research	The discovery of the large Anglo-Saxon ditch has provided a major contribution to the understanding and archaeological management of Hitchin.

and new/changed work practices	
References and links/bibliography	Heritage Network 2009, Brooker's Yard, Hitchin, Hertfordshire: archaeological assessment report. Unpublished report.

Case study no.	134
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>11. The presence of a 'live' and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	137 West Bar, Sheffield
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2006-17
Local Planning Authority	Sheffield City Council
Planning reference(s)	06/04556/FUL
Development proposal	Erection of 4/5/6 storey building for mixed-use development including 46 residential units, office space, retail unit and associated car parking.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Nothing recorded was on the HER for the development site.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment revealed that a pair of steel cementation furnaces for the production of blister steel had been constructed on the West Bar frontage of the site by 1775, and were probably the furnaces of Samuel Shore, shown on a 1737 illustration of Sheffield. Shore's furnaces were first recorded in 1717 and were probably the first built in the town.</p> <p>This planning application was first proposed in 2006 and approved in May 2007. However, part 2 of the pre-commencement archaeological condition was not fulfilled until late 2017. The following is a summary of the events and milestones during that period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Archaeological investigations were undertaken in 2008 and revealed a well-preserved early crucible furnace. The foundation design for the development was subsequently revised to protect the furnace <i>in situ</i>; -The developer then went out of business; - Much later, a new developer took over the development, which was amended; - The post-excavation assessment report of the archaeological investigation in 2008 was produced in 2015. This recommended that some further works should be undertaken (mainly metallurgical analysis) to be included in a final report;

	<p>- The new developer argued that there was no need to do this but the LPA confirmed that it was a requirement of the planning condition. This has two parts - the second part requires that <i>"the development shall only take place in accordance with the approved WSI and the development shall not be brought into use until the Local Planning Authority has confirmed in writing that the requirements of the WSI have been fulfilled or alternative timescales agreed."</i> The developer wanted to proceed with the development, but it was made clear that, if the archaeological work was not completed, enforcement might prevent use of the development;</p> <p>- The eventual way forward to resolve the issue was for the developer to enter into an agreement with the archaeological contractor to complete the outstanding archaeological work, including paying in advance. The developer was thus able to use the property and the work was undertaken by the archaeological contractor.</p> <p>Without the threat of enforcement, this successful outcome might not have happened. The early crucible furnace is now preserved under the development.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>The pre-commencement condition (part 1) allowed for the investigation of the cementation crucibles (which are of at least regional significance) and their preservation through redesign of the development.</p> <p>The fact that Part 2 of the archaeology condition was not discharged by the LPA resulted in the second developer providing the necessary funding to complete the scientific analysis of the regionally important steel cementation crucibles.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>ARCUS 2006, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of 137 West Bar, Sheffield. Unpublished report, ARCUS Report no. 1037.1</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology North 2015, Furnace Hill, West Bar, Sheffield, South Yorkshire: Archaeological Excavation Assessment Report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Gregory R.A. and R.G. Mackenzie, 'Archaeological analysis of a mid-19th-century steel crucible furnace from Sheffield', <i>Historical Metallurgy</i> (forthcoming).</p>

Case study no.	135
Planning scenario	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>11. The presence of a ‘live’ and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest within an Area of Archaeological Importance (AAI)
Site name/address	Land at Forest Street, Chester
Type of application & broad category	Major, regeneration, commercial and residential
Date(s)	2000-2019
Local Planning Authority	Cheshire West and Chester Council
Planning reference(s)	00/1140/FUL, 07/00812/FUL, 18/00022/S73
Development proposal	Demolition of vacant office building and construction of new hotel and apartments
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	This site lies within Chester’s Area of Archaeological Importance and occupies a plot to the east of the Roman fortress and later walled city, some way to the south of the road leading from the east gate. This is an area occupied by deep accumulations of material, some of which are waterlogged, with evidence for Roman activity and medieval tanning.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Evaluation in 2000 revealed evidence for multi-period activity and the submission of a planning application in 2008 resulted in a condition requiring a detailed foundation design to preserve the bulk of the deposits <i>in situ</i>. Limited further excavation, to accommodate a lift shaft and pile caps, formed part of the programme of mitigation and this work was carried out in 2008.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the company carrying out the work failed and became bankrupt. Although the fieldwork had been carried out, the development did not proceed and the post-excavation work was not completed.</p> <p>In 2018 the scheme was resurrected and, because the archaeological condition had not been discharged, it has proved possible to require the production of a report on the work carried out in 2008.</p> <p>Negotiations are still underway, with particular reference to the timetable, but the fact that the condition remained undischarged has been crucial in securing the progress made to date.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	The development has yet to start and there will be monitoring of the implementation of the foundation design during development when this happens. Report production will follow in order to allow final discharge of the condition.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public	-

engagement, research and new/changed work practices	
References and links/bibliography	Earthworks Archaeology Team 2000, Proposed Residential Development on land north of Forest Street, Chester: An Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report no. E467.

Case study no.	137
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>11. The presence of a 'live' and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Wootton, Esher Park Avenue, Esher, Surrey
Type of application & broad category	Residential
Date(s)	2011-16
Local Planning Authority	Elmbridge Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	2010/1199
Development proposal	Construction of 5 detached and 8 semi-detached (13 in total) three storey houses, following demolition of existing 36 flats
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site was adjacent to a defined Area of High Archaeological Potential and in size was in excess of the Local Plan policy threshold (0.4ha) above which archaeological assessment is required. The application was submitted without the required assessment, the production of which was made a pre-determination requirement.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A pre-determination desk-based assessment, followed by a nine-trench evaluation secured by a pre-commencement planning condition, and three targeted excavations were undertaken in 2011. The desk-based assessment showed a moderate potential for unknown heritage assets of archaeological significance to be present.</p> <p>The excavation identified early Mesolithic flints, including microlithic flint points, microburins and at least four core adze fragments and a scraper (c. 9600-7600 cal BC) suggesting the presence of a discrete short-stay knapping episode centred around a hearth. Activity appears to have been geared to the maintenance and repair of a hunting and foraging kit, rather than any long-stay 'base-camp' type occupation.</p> <p>Within the northern part of the site was a circular structure formed by postholes suggesting a small Iron Age roundhouse. Within the southern part of the site was a series of Saxon pits and gullies. Overlying these features were ard marks that represent a rare example of early ploughing on the site.</p> <p>Following the excavation the developer queried the need to fund the further work recommended in the resulting Updated Project Design and the condition remained undischarged (no restriction on occupancy relating to archaeological work was attached).</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	Contact via the Enforcement Officer of the LPA in 2016 produced a written assurance from the developer of the provision of funding, following which the condition was discharged. The report is awaiting publication in the local archaeological society journal.

	<p>Saxon occupation evidence in Surrey is rare. Whilst the use of the Saxon ard is well documented, the discovery of ard marks is very rare as they are usually obliterated by later ploughing. Environmental samples recovered from nearby pits showed that barley was the most abundant cereal in terms of grains but it was evident that wheat was also an important cereal in the settlement. The discovery of such evidence is certainly of regional significance and, together with more recent finds in the locale, is allowing a picture to be formed of how the area around Esher was utilised during this under-represented period. In addition, it has shed further light on the broad timescale of the utilisation of the immediate vicinity from at least the early Mesolithic, where the flint assemblage represents the remains of a relatively undisturbed short-stay occupancy by a hunter-gatherer group, through to the early medieval origins of the settlement.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>MoLA 2011, Wootton, Esher Park Avenue, Esher, Surrey: evaluation report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>MoLA 2012, Esher Park Avenue, Esher, Surrey, Post-excavation assessment and updated project design. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	140
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>11. The presence of a 'live' and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land west of Barton and north of A40, Wolvercote, Oxford, Oxfordshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential, commercial
Date(s)	2009-13
Local Planning Authority	Oxford City Council
Planning reference(s)	13/01383/OUT
Development proposal	Outline application for the erection of: A maximum of 885 residential units (Class C3); a maximum of 2,500 sq m gross Class A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 uses (with a maximum of 2,000 sq m gross foodstore Class A1); a maximum of 50 extra care housing units; a maximum of 7,350 sq m GEA hotel (Class C1); a maximum of 3,000 sq m GEA Class D1, D2 floorspace (community hub and primary school); in development blocks ranging from 2 to 5 storeys with associated cycle and car parking, landscaping, public realm works, interim works and associated highway works.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There was very little archaeological information from the development site itself, but evidence of activity during most earlier periods in the surrounding landscape.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment in 2009 summarised the available archaeological information from the development site and surrounding area. It concluded that: There was generally low potential for prehistoric remains other than of Neolithic and Iron Age date where the potential was higher; low to moderate potential for Roman remains; the potential for Anglo-Saxon remains was high in view of an inhumation found very close to the site; there was high potential for medieval and post-medieval agricultural features. Geophysical survey and evaluation trenching were recommended.</p> <p>A geophysical survey in 2011, followed by a 57-trench evaluation in 2012, identified a dispersed pattern of ditches representing fields, paddocks and droveways of predominantly medieval date.</p> <p>Planning permission was granted in 2013 with a pre-commencement planning condition attached to secure archaeological investigation, including evaluation of areas of the site to which access was not previously available.</p> <p>A series of small-scale excavations was undertaken across the site to target specific areas of high density archaeology, and the results can be summarised as follows:</p>

	<p><i>'The excavated features comprised the remains of Romano-British and later field systems including rectilinear enclosures and possible trackways, perhaps representing a number of sequential attempts to cultivate an area of poor and frequently waterlogged land. These features were overlain and truncated by medieval ridge and furrow on a different alignment again. The pottery assemblage from the site was paltry, comprising little more than 40 identifiable sherds of Roman or medieval date. There were, however, some notable isolated finds including a Middle Bronze Age pit, an early Roman cremation burial and a single first-century AD Roman coin. Furthermore, residual finds of a spearhead and knife, although more than 200m distance apart, indicate the possibility of an early Anglo-Saxon inhumation cemetery in the vicinity. Finally, a modest assemblage of medieval and post-medieval horseshoes possibly indicates that the site was once situated along a traversable route, perhaps between the medieval settlements of Headington and Wick' (Martin and Champness forthcoming).</i></p> <p>The fieldwork was completed on time and to budget.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the archaeology present on the site a brief publication report in the regional journal was proposed by the LPA's archaeological adviser.</p> <p>Following the completion of the fieldwork the developer assumed that the project had been completed. Negotiation over the post-excavation programme and costs continued for some time. The issue was resolved by reference to the planning condition which could not be discharged until an agreement had been reached over the post-excavation, publication and archiving, including funding.</p> <p>Total project budget – 47.9 million Archaeological cost as a percentage of the budget – 0.1%</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	Because of the live planning condition it was possible to secure funding for the publication and archiving of the site.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	Local opposition to the development limited opportunities for publicity.
References and links/bibliography	<p>John Moore Heritage Services 2009, An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of Land at Barton, Oxford. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2012, Land at Barton, Oxford, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report, Cotswold Archaeology no. 12312.</p> <p>Toby F Martin and Carl Champness, Cultivating the margins: the Roman and early medieval rural landscape of Barton Park, Oxford, <i>Oxoniensia</i> forthcoming.</p>

Case study no.	142
Planning scenario(s)	7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Former Welsh Baptist Chapel, Upper Brook Street, Manchester
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2013-15
Local Planning Authority	Manchester City Council
Planning reference(s)	102531/FO/2013
Development proposal	<p>Repairs and alterations to the former Welsh Baptist Chapel and attached Islamic Academy building, in association with: conversion to self-contained residential units together with erection of detached single storey building to form additional residential units (93 units in total), vehicular access from Upper Brook Street and associated works - Former Welsh Baptist Chapel and Islamic Academy of Manchester, 19 Upper Brook Street, Ardwick</p> <p>This scheme involved creating 93 new residences including refurbishing and converting the ruined Grade II* 1839 Unitarian Chapel (later Welsh Baptist) and building new residential blocks alongside.</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Listed chapel (Grade II*) with associated graveyard. A survey of the chapel was undertaken by the Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit in 2005.
Archaeology/planning processes	<p>The historical assessment submitted by developer in support of the application in 2013 was undertaken without consulting the HER and it proposed to remove the burials without any archaeological recording.</p> <p>English Heritage had been consulted on the scheme and had commented they were happy with it but did not identify archaeological interests or recommend consultation with the archaeological advisors to the LPA.</p> <p>The archaeological advisors recommended to the LPA that the removal of burials would need to be undertaken archaeologically. It also flagged up a special historic interest in relation to the burial of Mary Barton (died 1851) who would have been known to Elizabeth Gaskell who lived nearby and whose first novel is 'Mary Barton'.</p> <p>They recommended a condition to the LPA to secure developer funded recording of the graveyard and skeletal remains (a detailed historic building survey had already been carried out and reported on) and to disseminate the results through a popular booklet in the Greater Manchester's Past Revealed series and an information panel.</p> <p>The application was approved in 2014 and included a pre-commencement</p>

	archaeological condition.
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Following the granting of planning permission, a desk-based assessment and graveyard survey was undertaken in 2014, and the excavation of 35 burial vaults impacted by the development took place in 2015.</p> <p>Full analysis of the graveyard and excavated burials has been completed.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	<p>The identification of the possible relationship of one of the burials with the 19th century author, Elizabeth Gaskell.</p> <p>The results are summarised in a popular publication about the chapel and graveyard and Unitarianism in Manchester in the 19th century, and also provide an insight into health issues within a 19th century population.</p> <p>The human remains were respectfully re-buried at Manchester's Southern Cemetery.</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>Phoenix Exhumation Ltd 2014, Former Welsh Baptist Chapel, Upper Brook Street, Manchester: An Archaeological Desk-based Assessment and Graveyard Survey. Unpublished report, No. PE/2014/7.</p> <p>Phoenix Exhumation Ltd 2017, Former Welsh Baptist Chapel, Upper Brook Street, Manchester, Excavation and Exhumation of 35 Vaults. Unpublished report No. PEL/2015/17.</p> <p>Gregory, R and Keen, D, Architecture, Burial and Reform: the Upper Brook Street Unitarian Chapel, Manchester, <i>Greater Manchester's Past Revealed</i> 19, 2018.</p>

Case study no.	143
Planning scenario	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources.</p> <p>12. The absence of specialist archaeological curatorial advice (adviser not in post; advice not given because of capacity or other issues) led to the determination of an application without appropriate consideration of the archaeological implications</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest.
Site name/address	Shakespeare North, Mill Street, Prescot, Knowsley, L34 5QA
Type of application & broad category	Major, leisure
Date(s)	2015-18
Local Planning Authority	Knowsley Council
Planning reference(s)	15/00838/FUL
Development proposal	Erection of a four storey building (including basement) to accommodate a 350 seat theatre with ancillary teaching facilities and film screenings and a car park.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site is adjacent to the church, and shown on a 1592 plan of the town as the location of a pottery kiln. Pottery had been recovered from the site in a small excavation in 1980-1, but the reporting was poor. It is a prime site in the medieval town, and for which pre-determination evaluation would be a standard recommendation.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment was produced in March 2016 and the application was approved in April 2016. The planning application was determined without any evaluation, but works were made a condition of the planning consent.</p> <p>The Merseyside Environmental Advice Service (MEAS) became operational for planning advice to the LPA from July 2016. A project brief was prepared by MEAS, but contractors were initially reluctant to quote against it due to the high archaeological potential of the site and the lack of information (i.e. no evaluation). In due course, tenders came in with costings but these were considered to be too high (five times as much as expected). MEAS was tasked with negotiating a reduction in costs, which was achieved, but this led to a significant delay in starting. It had been intended to be finished on site by August 2017, but works didn't start until December 2017 and finished in January 2018 – including a two week Xmas break.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	Significant archaeology was excavated rapidly and under difficult weather conditions. The post-excavation assessment report is in progress and forthcoming.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public	The cost-reduction process did see some outreach proposals (including an open-day) removed from the programme, but they were later re-instated at short notice (including a VIPs tour on the last day) when interesting

engagement, research and new/changed work practices	archaeology was found.
References and links/bibliography	Philpott, R A 2016, Desk-based Archaeological Assessment of Land at Mill Street, Prescott, Knowsley. Unpublished report.

Case study no.	147
Planning scenario(s)	13. Recent changes in the planning system (e.g. extension of Permitted Development rights, use of Permission in Principle) prevented or compromised the use of pre-determination evaluation or the attachment of archaeological conditions to a permission.
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Type of application & broad category	Householder
Site name/address	32 Baldwin Avenue, Eastbourne, East Sussex
Date(s)	2013
Local Planning Authority	Eastbourne Council
Planning reference(s)	Initial planning reference: 140648 (2013).
Development proposal	Proposed two storey extension at rear and first floor extension over porch. Erection of garage and formation of new crossover and driveway (existing entrance to be blocked off). Rear extension
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Roman remains were known from the HER.
Archaeological/planning processes	The applicant reduced the size of the proposed rear extension to within permitted development parameters on a site where Roman remains were known to be present in order to avoid an archaeological condition or other requirement in connection with a planning application.
Outcomes: archaeological	No information is available about the impact of the development since it became permitted development.
Other outcomes e.g. public benefits such as public engagement or research or new/improved work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	-

Case study no.	148
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Footprint Tools, Site of 20 Hollis Croft and 31 Hollis Croft, City Centre, Sheffield
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2016
Local Planning Authority	Sheffield City Council
Planning reference(s)	16/02910/FUL
Development proposal	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed use development incorporating student accommodation, comprising 346 studio apartments.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site of Footprint Tools was known to have been the location of two early steel making sites, one of which had eventually expanded to cover the whole footprint of the modern Footprint Tools works.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Pre-determination desk-based assessment was carried out and identified that some archaeological evidence could have survived construction of the then standing buildings, although this was thought to be relatively limited - being restricted to areas where the buildings had not been terraced into the slope.</p> <p>Given the presence of standing buildings, pre-determination evaluation was not thought to be feasible and the archaeological advisor to the LPA recommended a pre-commencement condition to secure appropriate investigation. Following the demolition of buildings to slab level, a phase of trial trenching was undertaken to confirm the site's archaeological potential. This work indicated that terracing had impacted on the survival of buried evidence but, despite this, there was good archaeological survival in several areas. In one of these areas, the remains of a pair of 19th century steel cementation furnaces was identified. As the scheme had consent, preservation <i>in situ</i> was not an option, since the scheme's design was already fixed.</p> <p>The impact of the development on the remains was mitigated by detailed recording of the furnaces and associated remains, as well as the more fragmentary remains of the earlier 18th century steelworks on this site; final reporting and publication are currently awaited.</p>

	Whether the additional work required put strain on the budget for the development is unknown. If evaluation could have been carried out pre-determination and the furnace remains identified at that stage, the archaeological advisors to the LPA would have requested them to be incorporated within the scheme.
Outcomes: archaeological	The desk-based assessment predicted survival of buried archaeological evidence and a pre-commencement condition was successful in ensuring that important archaeological remains, probably of regional significance, were investigated. However, if the presence of the cementation furnaces had been known before a planning decision, they could have been preserved <i>in situ</i> by redesign of the development.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	Archaeology and Planning Solutions 2016, Hollis Croft, Sheffield Mixed Use Student Residential Development: Archaeological Assessment. Unpublished report. Wessex Archaeology 2017, Hollis Croft, Sheffield, South Yorkshire: Summary Evaluation Report Trenches C-H. Unpublished report 116361.07.

Case study no.	149
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources.</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	North Ridge Community School, Doncaster
Type of application & broad category	New local authority school
Date(s)	2007-8
Local Planning Authority	Doncaster Council
Planning reference(s)	07/01456/3FULM
Development proposal	New special school, c.1.5ha
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Adwick-le-Street, Doncaster, is an area that the archaeological advice service to the LPA considered to be archaeologically sensitive given the number of discoveries made previously, including the burial of a Viking woman with a pair of tortoise broaches.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The archaeological adviser to the LPA requested pre-determination desk-based assessment of the proposal. This suggested the site's potential was low partly because no finds were known from the site, although in the opinion of the archaeological adviser the potential was still unknown and could have been significant.</p> <p>However, in view of the desk-based assessment's conclusions, the archaeological adviser decided not to request a full pre-determination evaluation, and recommended to the LPA that further investigative work could be secured by a pre-commencement condition. The condition was attached and an initial phase of post-determination trial trenching was carried out in order to establish the site's archaeological potential in more detail.</p> <p>One of the trial trenches revealed three inhumation burials, part of a hitherto unknown cemetery. This confirmed that the site's archaeological potential was indeed high and that there was a link to the known archaeological evidence from the vicinity.</p> <p>Further investigative work was therefore agreed under the terms of the planning condition. This went on to reveal a small of cemetery of c. 40 individuals that has been dated to the Anglo-Saxon period - the first confirmed cemetery of this date in South Yorkshire.</p>

	<p>Whether this put strain on the budget for the development is unknown but the client was Doncaster Council and they found the resources required. Additional complications resulted from the closure of the field team that carried out the fieldwork and post-excavation assessment. The archaeological advisor discussed this issue with the Council and an alternative contractor was appointed to complete the analysis, reporting and publication required. The only outstanding issue now is archiving, which awaits resolution of issues at Doncaster Museum.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>A pre-commencement condition was able to secure the excavation and publication of an unexpected regionally important Anglo-Saxon cemetery. The work was completed despite the initial archaeological contractor ceasing trading during the post-excavation phase.</p> <p>The excavation report abstract summarises the project as follows:</p> <p><i>‘Excavations by Archaeological Research and Consultancy University of Sheffield in 2007–8 revealed the remains of an Anglo-Saxon inhumation cemetery at North Ridge Community School, Woodlands, Doncaster. Forty graves were excavated, thirty-seven of which contained in situ burial remains. Radiocarbon samples from five graves gave an overall date range extending from the late seventh to late eight centuries AD. The latter is commensurate with that suggested by the limited range of grave goods recovered from two of the graves. The majority of the burials were made supine and extended within graves predominantly arranged in two rows, and the demographic profile suggests it served a domestic population. There were occasional deviations from the ‘norm’ in burial position and orientation, and one adult female appears to have suffered a violent death. Strontium and Oxygen (Sr/O) isotope analysis of seven individuals showed mixed origins including local, regional/national migrants and two long-distance migrants’</i></p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>McKinley, J I, 2016, ‘A Conversion-Period Cemetery at Woodlands, Adwick-le-Street, South Yorkshire’, <i>Yorkshire Archaeological Journal</i> 88 issue 1, 77-120.</p>

Case study no.	150
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (ie the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	87 Trippet Lane, Sheffield
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2015-16
Local Planning Authority	Sheffield City Council
Planning reference(s)	15/02370/FUL
Development proposal	Demolition of existing building and erection of 7 storey building to create 50 student apartments
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The building lay within the city centre Conservation Area and the LPA required submission of an appropriately detailed heritage statement.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The heritage statement submitted by the applicant was basic and the archaeological advisor to the LPA recommended that a detailed building appraisal (combined with an archaeological assessment) be submitted as well.</p> <p>The detailed pre-determination appraisal submitted in support of the application was helpful but found that the level of modern cladding obscured any surviving early features. The report went on to recommend further work on the former mission hall prior to demolition.</p> <p>The archaeological advice to the LPA was that, if the buildings were not to be retained, detailed recording of both the mission hall and the domestic/workshop premises at the rear of the site should be required. In addition, investigation of below-ground evidence was recommended, following any demolition. A pre-commencement condition was then attached to the consent for demolition and new build.</p> <p>A WSI for building recording was drafted by the developer's consultant. However, before this had been formally accepted by the LPA, monitoring of the soft strip of the buildings revealed that historic fabric and features, including a stone fireplace, did survive. In addition, the domestic/workshop buildings at the rear of the site were probably earlier than had originally been supposed and warranted more detailed recording than had previously been envisaged. This more detailed recording was agreed via an updated WSI submitted to and formally accepted by the LPA.</p>

	<p>The detailed recording work was undertaken and the stone fireplace was removed and proposed for re-use, potentially within the scheme.</p> <p>The archaeological advisor to the LPA is currently awaiting a report on the recording and completion of other elements of the agreed scheme of archaeological investigation. Whether the additional work required put strain on the budget for the development is unknown.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>A request for pre-determination building and below-ground archaeological assessment by the archaeological advisors to the LPA to improve on the initial heritage statement was successful but highlighted that understanding of the buildings was masked by modern cladding. Monitoring the removal of the cladding revealed that the buildings had greater significance than had been anticipated and an agreed the WSI for enhanced mitigation by recording was approved by the LPA.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>The Jessop Consultancy 2015, 87 Trippet Lane, Sheffield, South Yorkshire: Archaeological desk-based assessment and buildings appraisal. Unpublished report no. TJC2015.24.</p>

Case study no.	152
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site</p> <p>4. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to a change in the extent or design of development</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest, of national importance
Site name/address	Two developments on the east and south east side of Hart village adjacent to Milbank Close, Hartlepool
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2014-19
Local Planning Authority	Hartlepool Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	H/2015/0209 H/2016/0140; H/2017/0174
Development proposal	<p>Site 1: H/2015/0209: Outline application for residential development comprising 15 dwellings (later amended to 22 dwellings), Land adjacent to Milbank Close, Hart c.0.85ha</p> <p>Site 2: H/2016/0140: Outline application for two dormer bungalows, land adjacent to Millbank Close, Hart, and</p> <p>H/2017/0174 Outline application for one dormer bungalow, land adjacent to Millbank Close, Hart (resubmitted application).</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Nothing was known from the site of planning application H/2015/0209, but it is in an area of high potential for Anglo-Saxon activity
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Application H/2015/0209 (Site 1)</p> <p>2014 A pre-application enquiry was made in October 2014 for new cul-de-sac development. It was outside the known extent of the medieval village but Anglo-Saxon finds had been reported immediately to the south and east.</p> <p>The applicant's planning statement said that they would produce a desk-based assessment and carry out geophysical survey and trial trenching in support of the application as required. This approach was supported by the archaeological advisor to the LPA.</p> <p>2015 The desk-based assessment was produced and geophysical survey carried</p>

out in March 2015. Some linear features of potential archaeological origin were noted. The planning application, together with the desk-based assessment and geophysical survey, was submitted in June.

Advice to the LPA was that trial trenching would be required to properly identify the significance of the application site. This was carried out (and the report produced) in July. It revealed significant archaeology including evidence for what at the time was thought to be a small Anglo-Saxon cemetery and several linear features with well preserved environmental evidence. Excavation secured by a pre-commencement condition was recommended by the LPA's archaeological advisors.

2016

A second, informal enquiry concerning the same site was made to the LPA's archaeological advisors August 2016 by a new developer for an amended proposal for a larger area with 22 houses.

In the light of the enquiry and the results of the evaluation undertaken in 2014, Historic England was consulted by the LPA's archaeological advisors regarding the importance of the application site (including the additional area) and its suitability for scheduling. Historic England agreed it could be of national importance but declined to schedule the site due to lack of information, in particular regarding the date of the cemetery. A brief was therefore provided to the new developer in October 2014 for further targeted evaluation and radiocarbon dating.

2017-18

Further trenching was carried out in February 2017 and identified additional significant archaeology including the remains of at least six more burials. At this point, the new developer withdrew their interest in the site and the development proposal was taken up again by the original applicant. The original application for 15 dwellings was then approved by the LPA in March 2017.

Enquiries were received from archaeological contractors in September 2017 regarding excavation of the site and a brief was provided for excavation in October. A WSI from the appointed contractor was approved in April 2018, excavation commenced in May and is still continuing (as of September 2018).

The cemetery has been revealed as extensive and multi-phased with potentially 180-200 inhumations probably dating from the early medieval through to the medieval period. Associated activity is also represented to the west with ditches, gullies and postholes

H/2016/0140; H/2017/0174 (Site 2)

2016

A planning application was made for two houses on land to the east of village. Previous finds from the areas had included an architectural fragment, a silver brooch and anecdotal evidence of human remains.

	<p>The archaeological advisor to the LPA recommended field evaluation prior to determination. A brief was produced for the applicant in May 2016 and following this, the application was withdrawn.</p> <p>A geophysical survey was then received from the applicant in July 2016 revealing a possible wall and ditches to south of the area. An evaluation comprising four trial trenches was undertaken in August 2016. This revealed an E-W-aligned stone wall, three disturbed graves with disarticulated human remains, metalwork and an Anglo-Saxon namestone.</p> <p>The archaeological advisors contacted Historic England again in September 2016 about possibility of designating this and the adjacent site (see above H/2015/0209), but they declined to do so. A site meeting took place with the owner and applicant in December 2016 following receipt of the report from Historic England. The owner agreed to submit a new application with single house in the much less sensitive western part of the site with provision for archaeological mitigation. The application was re-submitted in April 2017 as agreed, together with a request by the archaeological advisors for an archaeological monitoring condition, and it was approved on this basis by the LPA.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>Excavation of the major part of a large, nationally important Anglo-Saxon cemetery in advance of a residential development was secured by condition (and was carried out in 2018) following unsuccessful requests to Historic England to assess the cemetery for designation as a Scheduled Monument. Post-excavation is currently ongoing.</p> <p>Additional burials from the cemetery were revealed in an evaluation in advance of another, smaller development c.10m away. Following the second unsuccessful request for designation of the cemetery, the developer was persuaded to re-submit a smaller application which enabled the burials on the smaller development site to be preserved <i>in situ</i>.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Archaeological Services Durham University 2015, Land at Milbank Close, Hart, Hartlepool: archaeological desk-based survey and geophysical survey. Unpublished report, No. 3699.</p>

Case study no.	155
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>12. The absence of specialist archaeological curatorial advice (adviser not in post; advice not given because of capacity or other issues) led to the determination of an application without appropriate consideration of the archaeological implications</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	King Square Estate, Islington, London
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2014-16
Local Planning Authority	London Borough of Islington
Planning reference(s)	P2014/5216/FUL
Development proposal	Residential estate regeneration, comprising partial demolition of existing and construction of 6 new buildings providing 140 residential units and a community centre.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The site did not lie in an Archaeological Priority Area at the time of the application although documentary evidence indicated that a poorly located English Civil War fort and a later plague burial ground lay in the vicinity.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Islington Council granted itself planning permission for major estate regeneration without undertaking any consultation on the potential archaeological implications.</p> <p>Once development had commenced groundworks revealed human remains. As an immediate consequence the police were involved but it became clear that the remains were from disturbed post-medieval charnel pits, disarticulated human remains being scattered across the development site.</p> <p>The developer subsequently applied for a burial licence which specified the excavation of the pits and large-scale sifting of spoil. It transpired that the charnel pits were cut into the ditch of a Civil War fort. Mount Mill Fort was one of the largest forts in what was at the time one of the largest defended areas in Europe.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>As a consequence of the discoveries the developer incurred significant extra costs, and delay to the development programme.</p> <p>No resources were made available for post-excavation analysis and reporting. Human remains were reburied; the rest of the archive is currently held by MoLA. A request by MoLA for Historic England funding was not successful since the problems have arisen as a result of a failure to implement NPPF policy.</p>

	Partial publication is currently being considered in connection with an adjacent site.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	<p>Islington's Archaeological Priority Areas are now being revised and Historic England has commissioned a pilot project to review evidence for London's English Civil War defences.</p> <p>The fort extends beyond the development site discussed here and another part of it has subsequently been recorded nearby.</p>
References and links/bibliography	https://www.mola.org.uk/blog/charnel-pits-excavating-historic-human-bones-islington

Case study no.	156
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>9. The commencement of development (with or without a pre-commencement condition) before the completion of archaeological mitigation fieldwork caused problems e.g. Health and Safety; conservation of archaeology; additional resources required, including for agreeing and implementing complex method statements</p> <p>11. The presence of a 'live' and undischarged planning condition after completion of a development was considered to be important and beneficial in helping to secure adequate resources for post-excavation</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Marshall Street Baths, Westminster
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential, leisure and commercial
Date(s)	2007-14
Local Planning Authority	City of Westminster
Planning reference(s)	07/03088/FULL
Development proposal	Alterations to Leisure Centre, including partial demolition and extensions to provide enhanced leisure facilities, a new council depot, commercial offices and 52 residential units.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Burial grounds were known in the immediate vicinity but it was not clear if the development site itself lay on one.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A planning application was determined in 2007 with a desk-based assessment. The assessment identified that the development site might include part of a post-medieval burial ground but concluded that, because of previous extensive disturbance to the site, it was unlikely that the proposed development would have a significant impact on archaeological remains.</p> <p>The archaeological adviser to the LPA drew attention to the presence of a burial ground of uncertain extent to the rear of the site and sought further information. Planning permission was granted with a planning condition requiring a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>Post-permission evaluation identified stacked post-medieval coffined burials. The subsequent investigation was a watching brief conducted in very difficult circumstances during the excavations for pile caps and other groundworks. 2553 inhumations of 16th to 18th century date were excavated.</p>

	The applicant subsequently sought to avoid post-excavation commitments beyond the post-excavation assessment stage until Westminster City Council wrote to them indicating that they would commence enforcement action if the work was not commissioned. This resolved the situation and post-excavation is now well advanced.
Outcomes: archaeological	A report is now in preparation by MoLA (see below)
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	The Marshall Street burial ground has group value as the immediate precursor burial ground to St James Gardens, Euston, currently being excavated in advance of the construction of HS2.
References and links/bibliography	<p>Waterman CPM Ltd 2007, Marshall Street Regeneration, Archaeological and Heritage Report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>MoLA 2009, Marshall Street Baths and Dufours Place Cleansing Depot London W1, Post-excavation assessment and updated project design. Unpublished report.</p> <p><i>Parishioner and pauper burials from St James, Westminster (1695–1790); excavations at Marshall Street, London W1, 2008–9</i>, Michael Henderson and Adrian Miles, MoLA monograph series, forthcoming. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	157
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land north west of Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2013-19
Local Planning Authority	St Edmundsbury Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	DC/13/0932/HYB and EIA
Development proposal	Outline application for c.900 houses, link road and change of use of c.16ha of agricultural land to green space.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The large proposed development site was on ground sloping up from the valley of the River Lark.</p> <p>There was little known archaeological information from the development site apart from a find spot of an Anglo-Saxon disc from a hanging bowl, a Roman coin and a prehistoric socketed axe. However, topographically, the site was in an area of high archaeological potential. It is also less than 100m from cropmarks of ring ditches associated with one end of the Neolithic Fornham Cursus, a Scheduled Monument. In addition, the Anglo-Saxon find from the site indicated some potential for contemporary burials in the vicinity.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Given the potential of the site, the developer's consultant engaged in early dialogue with the LPA's archaeological advisors.</p> <p>Pre-determination assessment and evaluation was undertaken and comprised fieldwalking, geophysical survey and a trial trench evaluation sample of between 3.5 and 5%. It identified Iron Age and Roman remains in two particular areas of the development site. Although these features formed part of the continuum of landscape use in the vicinity of the cursus, there were no grounds for their preservation. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were therefore recommended to be attached to the planning permission. There were, however, local challenges to this course of action that were eventually resolved, as the approach could be demonstrated to be proportionate and systematic.</p> <p>Excavation of a multi-period landscape took place in 2016. Approximately 20ha of the c.70ha development was archaeologically investigated. A notable additional discovery during excavation was two prehistoric burnt mounds deemed to be of national interest.</p> <p>The pre-commencement conditions were successfully implemented and were finally discharged in 2019.</p>
Outcomes:	A pre-determination evaluation was successful in revealing a multi-period

archaeological	<p>landscape of regional significance and allowing an informed decision to be made about its mitigation. However, the evaluation missed an important and well-preserved Bronze Age focus. The pre-commencement condition enabled this to be investigated.</p> <p>The pre-commencement condition was successfully implemented and covered the production of a comprehensive post-excavation assessment and a strategy for community engagement (see below).</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices	<p>A strategy for community engagement was included in the WSI and helped to maximise the public benefit of the investigation of the archaeology on the site. This included talks, open days, community excavation, welcome packs, the use of digital media and a popular publication.</p> <p>There was positive public feedback to the developer about the welcome pack and the local outreach events from a number of the smaller housebuilders working on the site, to the effect that people appreciated seeing the time depth of history on the site of the new houses. It also helped to address previous concerns from the local community about the wider archaeological processes and strategy.</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>Suffolk Archaeology 2013, Land North-West of Bury St Edmunds Phase 2, Fornham, All Saints, Archaeological Evaluation Report. Unpublished report, Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service Report no. 2013/035</p> <p>Suffolk Archaeology 2018, Marham Park, Bury St-Edmunds, Suffolk, Post-excavation assessment report. Unpublished report, Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service Report no. 2018/040.</p>

Case study no.	160
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Carlisle Northern Development Route (A689), between the A595 Wigton Road, south-west of the city, and Junction 44 of the M6, to the north, Cumbria
Type of application & broad category	Infrastructure
Date(s)	2004 -2012
Local Planning Authority	Cumbria County Council
Planning reference(s)	1/04/9032
Development proposal	8.5km of new-build road around the western and northern sides of Carlisle
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The route crossed the line of Hadrian's Wall, the northern frontier of the Roman empire, constructed in the early 2 nd century AD. Hadrian's Wall represents the most complete of the frontiers of the Roman Empire, and its archaeological and historic significance is reflected in its designation as a scheduled monument (NHLE no. 1018309), and its inclusion by UNESCO in the list of World Heritage Sites (as part of <i>Frontiers of the Roman Empire</i>).
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Planning for the Northern Development Route began in the 1990s and an initial assessment was undertaken in 1995. The first phase of evaluation focused on the part of the route that would have an impact on Hadrian's Wall at a new crossing over the River Eden.</p> <p>A small-scale evaluation consisting of one trench was undertaken in 1997 to assess the survival and condition of Hadrian's Wall on the line of the proposed road.</p> <p>A more extensive evaluation was conducted in 2005 when 20 trenches were excavated which confirmed that Hadrian's Wall, the <i>vallum</i>, and an associated track and mounds, were preserved on the line of the proposed road. The remains of the wall were found to be fragmentary, with only the southern face and part of its core surviving; much of the wall had already collapsed into the River Eden.</p> <p>An overall archaeological strategy was produced for the road construction consisting of a programme of investigation through evaluation, excavation and a watching brief during construction, including the excavation of the remains of Hadrian's Wall to be affected by the scheme.</p> <p>This work was secured by two conditions attached to the planning</p>

	<p>permission: to implement a programme of archaeological investigation along the route, and to investigate and protect the remains of Hadrian's Wall. The work was undertaken between May 2008 and April 2011.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>Fifteen archaeological sites were investigated through evaluation and excavation.</p> <p>The most significant results were from Stainton West, on the floodplain on the northern bank of the River Eden, opposite Knockupworth. Nationally important prehistoric remains were unexpectedly found there, unprecedented in the north of England. A huge undisturbed assemblage of late Mesolithic worked stone (c. 300,000 pieces) had accumulated adjacent to a waterlogged palaeochannel (a relict watercourse) during repeated activity at an extremely long-lived and well-organised hunter-gatherer encampment. Exceptionally well-preserved organic deposits in the channel were contemporary with the Mesolithic activity and continued to form during the Neolithic period and Bronze Age. This material was not identified during evaluation (no geoarchaeological investigation was undertaken on the floodplain at that stage) but the area was inspected after topsoil stripping and the site identified at that stage.</p> <p>The road scheme also provided a rare opportunity to excavate a transect through the Hadrian's Wall Frontier, which provided important new information on the poorly understood sector west of Carlisle.</p> <p>The results of the programme of archaeological work have been analysed and a publication produced.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>A popular publication has been produced, a contribution to the forthcoming prehistoric gallery at Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery, and numerous public presentations of the results.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Lancaster University Archaeological Unit 1996, Cumbria Northern Relief Road, Archaeological assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Carlisle Archaeological Unit 1997, Knockupworth Farm, Carlisle, Cumbria: report on an archaeological evaluation on the proposed line of the Carlisle Northern Development Route. Unpublished report.</p> <p>CFA Archaeology 2003, Carlisle Northern Development Route: archaeological evaluation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>CFA Archaeology 2005, Carlisle Northern Development Route: Land affected at the crossing of Hadrian's Wall (Parcel 21); archaeological evaluation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>CFA Archaeology 2005, Carlisle Northern Development Route: Parcels 27N and 41N, Stainton, Carlisle; archaeological evaluation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology North, 2011, Stainton West, Carlisle Northern Development Route: Archaeological Assessment. Unpublished report.</p>

	<p>Oxford Archaeology North, 2011, Carlisle Northern Development Route, Cumbria, post-excavation assessment. Unpublished report.</p>
--	--

Brown, F, Clark, P, Dickson, A, Gregory, R A, and Zant, J, *From an ancient Eden to a new frontier: an archaeological journey along the Carlisle Northern Development Route*, Lancaster Imprints, forthcoming.

Case study no.	162
Planning scenario(s)	This case does not align with the archaeology and planning scenarios explored by the project. It has been included because it provides an illustration of crucial factors affecting all non-designated heritage assets that rely on the planning system for protection: the statutory role of Local Planning Authorities to determine planning applications and, in doing so, to understand national policy and guidance and apply it to local circumstances.
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with historic and archaeological interest
Site name/address	Thames Hospice, Land south of Bray Lake and east of Court Close, Windsor Road, Maidenhead, Berkshire
Type of application & broad category	Hospice
Date(s)	2017-18
Local Planning Authority	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Planning reference(s)	17/00798; 18/02013/VAR
Development proposal	Construction of a 28-bedroom hospice and out-patient unit with associated works and new access from Windsor Road
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Moderate to good archaeological potential based on known sites within an area of 500m+ from the development location, and also on its position within the Thames valley.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Planning application 17/00798</p> <p>A pre-application desk-based assessment was produced in January 2017.</p> <p>The planning application for the hospice was submitted in March 2017.</p> <p>A letter in April 2017 to the LPA from its archaeological advisors noted that north-west half of the 3.2ha site had previously been extracted for gravel and had no remaining archaeological potential. The letter therefore recommended a pre-commencement condition, if permission were to be granted, applying to the south-east half of the development site which still had archaeological potential. The condition required an archaeological field evaluation, the results of this evaluation being used to inform an archaeological mitigation strategy.</p> <p>The evaluation was undertaken in January 2018 and reported on in March 2018.</p> <p>The granting of full permission for the application took place on 28th March 2018 following completion of a S106 agreement and receipt of a letter from the Secretary of State which said that it had been decided not to call the application in.</p> <p>Subsequent advice to the LPA from its archaeological advisors on 16th May 2018 said that the evaluation had revealed evidence of prehistoric (Bronze</p>

Age and Iron Age) activity on a part of the site that probably represented occupation on an island in the River Thames. It assessed this evidence as particularly noteworthy and important, and in view of the fact that the archaeology would be destroyed by the development, it stated that the remains would require further archaeological investigation in advance of the commencement of the development.

Application 18/02013, made by the developer to remove the archaeological condition attached to planning permission 17/00798

An application was made by the developer to the LPA on 9th July 2018 to remove the archaeological condition (no. 23) attached to planning permission 17/00798. An initial decision (made by the case officer under delegated powers) to approve this application on 12th July was subsequently delayed by the LPA's decision to call in the planning application for decision by the Planning Committee (a standard procedure if there are any significant objections or any Councillor requests it). Objections were received from the CBA and the Parish Council. The application was however approved at the Development Control Panel meeting on 28th August and the permission was issued on 12th September.

The following is an extract from planning case officer's report to the Development Control Panel which supported the application (see below for LPA Development Control Panel report reference):

1. SUMMARY

1.1 Planning permission for a new 28 bedroom hospice and out-patient unit was granted in March of this year, subject to planning conditions. Condition 23 required an archaeological field evaluation to be undertaken, which was carried out and found a number of archaeological remains. Based on the findings, Berkshire Archaeology advised that the application site was considered to be on an area of land with archaeological importance and recommended further investigations of the site to be undertaken. The minimum cost of these investigations would be £30000.

1.2 The applicant, a local charity, has advised that the new hospice will be funded entirely by voluntary donations and it therefore has to be able to justify every penny it spends. In this case, it does not consider that it can justify this particular further expense to its supporters, as not only is it a considerable sum that could escalate further, but this is money that could be spent on providing essential care to its patients and their families. It should be noted that, with the exception of condition 23, the applicant has submitted comprehensive details in relation to the other pre-commencement conditions (of which there were 11), that have all been approved.

1.3 Having regard to the advice contained in the NPPF, it is considered that while the proposal would have less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset, (the area of archaeological importance), the removal of condition 23 from application 17/00798 is outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme as a whole and the particular

	<p><i>circumstances of the applicant.</i></p> <p>Observations on the report and its use of NPPF policies by Stewart Bryant:</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 above (highlighted in bold) seems to represent a misunderstanding of the status of the identified heritage assets and of NPPF policy. The case officer appeared to regard the notification of the archaeological site to the LPA as conferring designated (Scheduled Monument or Area of Archaeological Importance) status on the site. Because of this, the substance of the NPPF 2019 policies 194-6 have been used as policy justification for removing the condition.</p> <p>These NPPF policies concern the degree of harm which may be caused to (nationally) designated heritage assets affected by proposed development. However, as the heritage assets on the site were not designated (nor was there any reference to their being nationally important and potentially falling under the definition of NPPF paragraph 194, footnote 63), the relevant NPPF policies that should have been used to support the case are paragraphs 197 and 199 (see below for the wording of the latter).</p> <p>While it seems unlikely - given the financial issue referenced in the report - that consideration of the correct policies would have materially altered the advice of the case officer and the subsequent decision of the Committee, the application of the incorrect NPPF policies means that the Committee did not have the opportunity to consider the correct NPPF policy case for retaining the condition. This policy case derives from the wording of NPPF 2019, paragraph 199: <i>‘Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible’</i></p> <p>In this instance, the fact that non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest of at least local significance were known to be affected by the development means that their total destruction without record was not a proportionate response and thereby contrary to the NPPF paragraph 199.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>A decision by the LPA to remove the archaeological condition without reference to and application of the correct NPPF policies has resulted in non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest being destroyed without record contrary to national planning policy.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>CgMs 2017, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment: Thames Hospice, Windsor, Berkshire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Report to Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Planning Committee,</p>

	Maidenhead Development Control Panel, 28 th August 2018, Item 6, Application No. 18/02013/VAR.
--	--

Case study no.	163
Planning scenario(s)	1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER 7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted
Heritage assets affected	Designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest: scheduled monument Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Park Farm, Leigh Road, Wimborne Minster, Dorset
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential and leisure
Date(s)	2015-18
Local Planning Authority	East Dorset District Council
Planning reference(s)	3/15/0789/COU
Development proposal	Hybrid Planning Application comprising 1) Outline planning application for residential development with associated roads, parking, turning and amenity areas; provision of local centre; provision of public open space, landscaped areas and allotments; provision of Rugby Club including clubhouse, parking and pitches; and 2) Full Planning application for change of use of agricultural land to (SANG) Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The development site contained a section of Roman road that is protected as a Scheduled Monument (NHLE no. 1018028)
Archaeological/planning processes	A desk-based assessment identified moderate potential for the presence of further Roman remains, in addition to the Roman road. Geophysical survey and evaluation trenching were subsequently carried out before the determination of the planning application. Three main phases of activity were identified during an initial evaluation: a late Bronze Age/early Iron Age pit; a late Iron Age/ Roman agricultural settlement, with possible corn-dryer/pottery kiln, and field system; and enclosure ditches broadly dated to the 3 rd century AD. A second evaluation identified further prehistoric features, together with the metalled surface of the Roman road and its two flanking ditches. Despite targeted trenches, no evidence of the Roman road was found to survive outside the scheduled area.
Outcomes: archaeological	Planning permission was granted with a pre-commencement planning condition, and the scheduled monument was excluded from the development area. The archaeological excavation has recently been completed.
Other outcomes/outputs	-

<p>e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>CgMs 2014, Land South of Leigh Road, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Archaeological Desk Based Assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Geophysics, 2014, Land South of Leigh Road, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Archaeological Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2015, Land South of Leigh Road, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report, CA report 15695.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2016, Land South of Leigh Road, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Phase II, Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report, CA report 16184.</p>

Case study no.	165
Planning scenario(s)	10. A planning condition has been discharged before investigation has been completed in accordance with the WSI, or the post-excavation stage agreed and resourced, and this caused difficulties with securing post-excavation, publication, archiving
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land between High Street and Long Lane, Willingham, Cambridgeshire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	1995-6
Local Planning Authority	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Planning reference(s)	S/1659/95/F
Development proposal	Construction of 77 dwellings and associated works
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The development site was located within the historic core of the village of Willingham.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>The archaeological potential of the site was identified by a desk-based assessment and evaluation trenching in 1995.</p> <p>Planning permission was given for the development with a pre-commencement planning condition, requiring a programme of archaeological investigation before each phase of the development.</p> <p>Following the excavation a post-excavation assessment and proposal for analysis and publication was compiled. The LPA were not aware that no agreement had been reached with the developer over the programme and costs, and so discharged the planning condition.</p> <p>A summary of the results of the archaeological investigation was produced and published, but full analysis and publication could not be undertaken.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The excavations in 1996-7 in advance of and during the housing development revealed extensive early to middle Anglo-Saxon settlement remains. The following summary is taken from the draft post-excavation assessment and project design of 1996:</p> <p><i>‘Two areas contained evidence for post-built double-square ‘hall’ type buildings, the largest c. 10 m by c. 5 m. Eight were complete and discernible in plan, a further two were seen in partial plan, and other post-holes may represent other buildings or fence lines. Of particular interest was a Saxon well with its wattle lining and other timber surviving intact.</i></p> <p><i>Provisional study suggested an early Saxon date for some of the pottery, although there were certainly pieces dating to the middle (Ipswich ware) and late (Thetford ware and St Neots ware) Saxon periods. The latter was associated with ditches to the north of the area, which appeared to define the rear boundaries of properties fronting Church Street. Only isolated</i></p>

	<p><i>features produced conclusively middle Saxon pottery. A small number of pits and a ditch were thought to be medieval, although dwellings had shifted elsewhere by this time. A number of postmedieval boundary ditches were also noted. These are thought to represent the boundary to 'Berrycroft', an undeveloped close in the centre of Willingham which existed prior to 1575.'</i></p> <p>A significant Anglo-Saxon settlement site was therefore recorded in advance of development. The analysis of the results remains unfinished and there is no report or publication. The premature discharge of the planning condition prevented enforcement action to secure the completion of the project.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Willingham, High Street, Aileen Connor, in <i>Fieldwork in Cambridgeshire: April 96 - July 97</i>, Christopher Evans, Gavin Lucas, Tim Malim, and Twigs Way, in <i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society</i> vol LXXXV for 1996, 1997.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeological Field Unit 1997, <i>Early-Middle Anglo-Saxon Settlement at High Street, Willingham, Cambridgeshire: Draft Assessment and Post-Excavation Project Design</i>. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	166
Planning scenario(s)	12. The absence of specialist archaeological curatorial advice (adviser not in post; advice not given because of capacity or other issues) led to the determination of an application without appropriate consideration of the archaeological implications
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Birmingham Children's Hospital, Whittall Street/St Mary's Row, Birmingham
Type of application & broad category	New hospital building
Date(s)	2015-7
Local Planning Authority	Birmingham City Council
Planning reference(s)	2015/09050/PA
Development proposal	Construction of four-storey building and associated works
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	None known prior to the desk-based assessment
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment was undertaken prior to the determination of the planning application (A B Heritage 2016). The study noted that no prehistoric or Roman remains were present in the immediate vicinity. Historic map evidence suggested that, in the medieval period, the site had been part of the land used as a rabbit warren by the late 13th-century Priory of St Thomas, until its dissolution in the mid-16th century. A map of 1778 depicted a chapel of St Mary set within a rectangular plot of land; the proposed hospital development lay within the western part of this land and overlay part of the site of the church building.</p> <p>Although the desk-based assessment identified that the site of St Mary's church lay within the development area the probable full extent of the graveyard was not identified. The archaeological potential of the area was assessed as low because of previous development with deep foundations, and the overall impact of the development on any surviving below ground archaeology as negligible. No further archaeological investigation was recommended.</p> <p>Planning permission was given for the development, and no provision was made for further archaeological work.</p> <p>After the commencement of the development on site human remains were discovered by contractor during deep excavation in advance of piling, and reported to the local authority. Worcestershire Archaeology were engaged to investigate the site and to record the human remains. The developer of the site was helpful and facilitated the archaeological recording needed.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	This summary of the archaeological results of the project is based on Bradley, Western and Hurst 2018:

	<p>Documentary evidence indicates that the development site was a part of land given in the late 18th century for the construction of a new chapel of ease (St Mary's) to the parish church of St Martins, with a surrounding graveyard. The church remained in use until 1925, although the graveyard had been closed in the 1860s. It was demolished in 1927, and the graveyard cleared in several phases, before a multi-storey carpark was constructed there in the mid 20th century and, following demolition of the latter, the site became a part of the Birmingham hospital.</p> <p>A considerable amount of disturbance had taken place to the graveyard during previous development. Before the archaeological recording commenced in 2016 further archaeological remains were probably destroyed during the demolition of the multi-storey car park, site clearance and earlier phases of the new development; at least part of the octagonal brick footings for St Mary's Church are reported to have been present when development commenced.</p> <p>Evidence consistent with the use of the site as a graveyard between 1774 and the 1860s was recovered. A minimum of five graves and one possible charnel pit were recorded, most of the human bones being disarticulated and disturbed. Broken gravestones, some with inscriptions, and coffin fittings were also recorded.</p> <p>Both male and female adults, as well as children were present, and analysis of the human bone has provided evidence of insights into living conditions, medical practice and levels of disease and injury, including rickets, infection and trauma. Also present was a craniotomy carried out as part of a post-mortem examination procedure, the skeletal evidence for which in Birmingham is relatively rare, despite the known presence of teaching hospitals there from 1779.</p> <p>The graveyard was in use during a notable period in the history of the city, when it was developing into a major manufacturing centre and expanding rapidly. Birmingham was an important centre not only in terms of its expansive economic development but also its medical development and the provision of health care at this time.</p> <p>By expanding the current skeletal dataset and allowing comparisons to be made between contemporary populations in Birmingham and the wider region, osteoarchaeological analysis of human remains, such as those from St Mary's, continues to provide a unique and significant contribution towards improving understanding of life, disease, medical intervention, death and burial amongst the populace in a key period of Birmingham's past.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and</p>	<p>AB Heritage 2016, Birmingham Children's Hospital, corner of Whittall Street</p>

links/bibliography	<p>and St Mary's Row, Birmingham: Historic Environment desk-based assessment. Unpublished report, AB Heritage 10753.</p> <p>Bradley, Western and Hurst 2018, An archaeological watching brief at the site of St Mary's Church, Birmingham Children's Hospital, Birmingham, Richard A Bradley, Gaynor Western and Derek Hurst, <i>Transactions of the Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Society</i> 120, 93-105.</p>
---------------------------	--

Case study no.	167
Planning scenario(s)	2. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation results led to refusal of planning permission on archaeological grounds
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	East Deanery, South Church, Bishop Auckland, County Durham
Type of application & broad category	Minor, residential
Date(s)	2009 – 2010
Local Planning Authority	Durham County Council
Planning reference(s)	3/2009/0478
Development proposal	Three new dwellings
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>A college of priests documented from 13th century, and the East Deanery, a Grade I listed building, lay immediately to the north of the application site. A watching brief during development to the east had recorded a medieval wall.</p> <p>The area was also identified as an Area of Archaeological Interest in the Local Plan; Policy BE 17 stated that an archaeological assessment/evaluation would be needed in advance of proposed development.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	The required evaluation was not carried out by the developer. The application was refused because of the lack of information on the archaeological significance of the site, and the refusal reason cites the absence of an archaeological evaluation, contrary to the Local Plan Policy.
Outcomes: archaeological	The planning application refused on archaeological grounds.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	-

Case study no.	168
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land north of Hurworth-on-Tees, Darlington, County Durham
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential
Date(s)	2016 - 2017
Local Planning Authority	Darlington Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	Pre-Application enquiry (16/00048/PREAPP), followed by outline application (16/00886/OUT),
Development proposal	Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 100 dwellings
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Cropmarks of uncertain identification had been recorded east and north of the development site. There was nothing recorded on the HER within the site boundary.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A greenfield site over the Durham County Council 1 ha threshold for evaluation.</p> <p>A desk-based assessment identified and mapped cropmarks within the site boundary, and recommended geophysical survey.</p> <p>The geophysical survey showed very clearly that the cropmarks were evidence of a series of ditched enclosures with internal features, probably a settlement.</p> <p>Subsequent trial trenching broadly confirmed the results of the survey, identifying a settlement of 2nd – 4th century Roman date</p> <p>A pre-commencement planning condition was attached to the planning permission requiring a programme of archaeological investigation, recording, analysis, publication and archiving.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The excavations recorded a Roman settlement, including a sandstone building, other structures, a kiln for making tiles, and a well. A regionally significant site in an area where evidence of Roman settlement is not very common.</p> <p>Post-excavation is currently in progress.</p>

<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Archaeological Services Durham University 2016, Hurworth-on-Tees, Darlington: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment. Unpublished report, no 4031.</p> <p>Archaeological Services Durham University 2016, Hurworth-on-Tees, Darlington: Geophysical Survey. Unpublished report, no 4052.</p> <p>Archaeological Services Durham University 2016, Hurworth-on-Tees: geophysical survey phase two. Unpublished report, no 4132.</p> <p>Archaeological Services Durham University 2016, Hurworth-on-Tees: archaeological evaluation. Unpublished report, no 4212.</p>

Case study no.	169
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Bishop Middleham quarry, nr Sedgefield, County Durham
Type of application & broad category	Minerals
Date(s)	April 2013 - 2015
Local Planning Authority	Durham County Council
Planning reference(s)	8/CMA/7/102
Development proposal	Proposed western extension of quarry for the extraction of 5.5 million tonnes of magnesian limestone from 15.7ha over a 14 year period, with restoration to agricultural through landfilling of clag and soils over a 20 year period
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There were no recorded archaeological remains on the application site. Evidence of prehistoric and Roman settlement was present in the surrounding landscape.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment found no evidence of archaeological remains on the application site itself but recommended further evaluation through geophysical survey and/or trenching.</p> <p>The geophysical survey found a large boundary ditch, which appeared to intersect two sub-circular features.</p> <p>Trial trenching was carried out, and archaeological remains of probable prehistoric date were identified in a number of the trenches.</p> <p>A pre-commencement planning condition was attached to the planning permission to secure archaeological investigation and recording.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	In addition to features of prehistoric and Roman date, a very early Christian cemetery, comprising 10 graves, some of which were rock cut, containing 7 surviving inhumations, was identified. Some of the inhumations showed evidence of possible continuing pagan burial practices. Post excavation work is still ongoing, and so these interpretations may change.
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	-
References and	Pre-Construct Archaeology 2012, Bishop Middleham Quarry western

links/bibliography	<p>extension, Bishop Middleham, nr Sedgefield, County Durham, Desk-Based Heritage Assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2013, Archaeological Geophysical Survey: Bishop Middleham Quarry Western Extension, Bishop Middleham. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2014, An Archaeological Evaluation at Bishop Middleham Quarry (Western Extension), Bishop Middleham, Near Sedgefield, County Durham. Unpublished report.</p>
---------------------------	--

Case study no.	170
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site</p>
Heritage assets affected	<p>Designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest</p> <p>Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest</p>
Site name/address	Convoys Wharf, Deptford Dockyard, and part of Sayes Court Estate, London Borough of Lewisham
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential and commercial
Date(s)	2002 – on-going
Local Planning Authority	London Borough of Lewisham
Planning reference(s)	<p>2002/52533/O:</p> <p>2005 resolved to approve by Lewisham BC and referred to GLA (not actioned)</p> <p>2005 safeguarded wharf appraisal, not compliant with London Plan</p> <p>2010 amended outline application submitted</p> <p>2010 additional material submitted</p> <p>2011 GLA report on the 2010 application,</p> <p>2011 Lewisham BC issued a Regulation 19 Request</p> <p>2011 Revised application submitted</p> <p>DC/13/083358:</p> <p>2013 outline application - permitted</p>
Development proposal	Outline application for the comprehensive redevelopment of Convoys Wharf, to provide a mixed-use development of up to 447,045m ² , comprising residential units, employment space including waste recycling and processing facility, boat repair yard, river bus facility, wharf with associated vessel moorings, retail, restaurants/bars, cultural/community space, leisure facilities and provision of car parking spaces together with revised vehicular access.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>Deptford Royal Dockyard, operational between 1513 and 1869, was one of the largest industrial complexes in the country until the mid-19th century, and used for the construction and repair of warships. This internationally important site includes: a Tudor naval storehouse (scheduled monument, NHLE no 1021239); the Olympia warehouse, a master shipwright's house, a former office building of the royal dockyard, the boundary wall of the royal dockyard, gate piers of the dockyard, all of which are Grade II listed buildings, with the exception of the master shipwright's house which is Grade II*.</p> <p>The site was recently described in the press as '<i>Henry VIII's royal dockyard, founded in 1513, where Queen Elizabeth I knighted Francis Drake in 1581 after he circumnavigated the globe aboard the Golden Hind. Nearby, the 17th-century diarist John Evelyn, created a famous garden in the grounds of</i></p>

	<p><i>his house, Sayes Court, where the young Peter the Great of Russia, in Deptford to study shipbuilding, wrecked a fine holly hedge in 1696, crashing through it in a wheelbarrow in a drunken episode.'</i></p> <p>Following the Napoleonic Wars the yard was a key site for stores and was commissioned to build small ships. The yard closed in 1869 and the buildings were demolished to foundation level or dismantled for rebuild elsewhere. The Corporation of London then used the site for the import of cattle.</p>
<p>Archaeological/planning processes</p>	<p>Given the importance and complexity of the site there have been successive phases of archaeological assessment and evaluation as the redevelopment scheme has progressed, undertaken pre-application or pre-determination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2000 archaeological desk-based assessment 2000 evaluation trial trenches 2001 further trial trench evaluation 2008 historic fabric assessment 2010 geo-archaeological borehole and test pit evaluation 2010 second stage trial trench evaluation – 5% sample 2011-2 area excavation <p>Archaeological evaluation showed that the remains of elements of the 19th century docks survived well on the site, including the five 19th-century slipways, together with the stone-lined 19th-century entrance to the Great Dock, and the contemporary masonry-lined version of the Dockyard basin. The survival of earlier phases had been affected by the later (especially 19th century) redevelopment and expansion of the docks but elements from the Tudor, Stuart and Georgian docks were present including storehouses, dock basins, slipways, and boundary walls.</p> <p>The site of the Tudor storehouse was scheduled in 2003. Other elements of the site were also assessed as being of national importance, including the Great Dock and other docks (including that which contained the Golden Hind), the Basin, mastponds, slips, wharfs and river wall, together with their associated buildings and working surfaces.</p> <p>In 2003 the (then) English Heritage non-designated archaeology adviser to the LPA produced an overall framework document that set out the means by which the protection and management of the site could be addressed, through one of three strands: management agreement, conditions, and S106 agreement.</p> <p>In response to the 2003 framework document, the developer's archaeological consultant produced a Scheme for Archaeological Resource Management, that, after negotiation, was recommended for approval as part of the 2013 scheme.</p> <p>In 2011-12 area excavations (the largest undertaken on any naval dockyard) were undertaken further to inform the redevelopment of the site and the eventual full planning applications, by establishing the degree of survival of the archaeological remains present and the requirements for preservation <i>in</i></p>

	<p><i>situ.</i></p> <p>In 2015 a draft decision notice was issued, granting planning permission subject to the conclusion of a S106 agreement, with the following conditions relating to heritage assets:</p> <p>6 River wall survey to inform repair or replacement work</p> <p>7 Tall building design statement</p> <p>13 Each Reserved Matters application shall be accompanied by a Heritage Statement demonstrating how the design (including but not limited to layout, public realm, architectural treatment and materials) has been informed by heritage assets, both above and below ground.</p> <p>34 Prior to any site work a Scheme of Archaeological Resource Management has to be submitted and agreed in accordance with Our Future Heritage (English Heritage 2003)</p> <p>35 Pre-commencement archaeology condition</p> <p>36 Pre-commencement building recording condition</p> <p>37 Pre-commencement details of any below-ground development need to be approved in order to protect archaeology</p> <p>38 Foundation design condition</p> <p>39 Fencing off of sensitive heritage asset</p> <p>40 Structural survey and protection measures for Olympia slip cover</p> <p>54 Possible repairs to jetty</p> <p>64 Archaeological work to be carried out by a qualified body</p> <p>67 Setting-back the building mass at Plot P01 to respect Master Shipwrights House, Grade II*</p> <p>Attention is drawn to Condition 13 above which requires that each reserved matters application will have to demonstrate how the design of the development has been informed by the heritage assets present.</p> <p>In 2018 reserved matters planning applications have begun to be submitted for the development of individual areas of the site.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>At the time of writing (2019) all applications are currently on hold awaiting the submission of further information, including site wide cultural, destination and remediation strategies, and plot specific remediation strategies.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>There has been huge public interest in the site, as reflected in national press articles; the responses of interest groups, the local MP and Government Minister; and a House of Commons Adjournment Debate.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Pre-Construct Archaeology 2001, An archaeological evaluation of Convoy's Wharf, Deptford. Unpublished report.</p> <p>CGMS 2000, Convoys Wharf, Deptford, An archaeological desk-based assessment. Unpublished report.</p>

CgMs 2003, Independent appraisal of the archaeological importance of the Convoys Wharf site, Deptford. Unpublished report.

English Heritage 2003, Our Future Heritage: a framework for the management of the heritage resource. Unpublished report.

MoLA 2010, Convoy's Wharf, Prince Street, London, Evaluation Report. Unpublished report.

CgMs 2010, Scheme of Archaeological Resource Management, Land at Convoys Wharf, Deptford, London, 5th Revision, D Hawkins, (original document September 2009, revised October 2009, 2nd revision November 2009, 3rd revision December 2009, 4th revision January 2010, 5th revision January 2010, 6th revision November 2018). Unpublished report.

Alan Baxter Ltd 2013, Convoy's Wharf Heritage Statement. Unpublished report.

MoLA 2017, *The Deptford royal dockyard and manor of Sayes Court, London: excavations 2000-12*, ed. Anthony Francis, monograph 71.

<https://www.mola.org.uk/deptford-royal-dockyard-and-manor-sayes-court-london-excavations-2000%E2%80%9312>

Case study no.	172
Planning scenario(a)	3. Pre-determination results led to the designation of heritage asset(s) on the development site
Heritage assets affected	Non-designated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest, subsequently scheduled.
Site name/address	18-25 Park Crescent and 77-81 Portland Place, London W1B 1AL
Type of application & broad category	Residential, major
Date(s)	2014-15
Local Planning Authority	City of Westminster
Planning reference(s)	15/11488/LBC
Development proposal	<p>Development site at 16, 18-25 & 26 Park Crescent & 77-81 Portland Place: Demolition and redevelopment of 16-26 Park Crescent and partial demolition of 77-81 Portland Place to provide residential accommodation (Class C3) comprising of two basement levels, lower ground, ground and first to fourth floor levels (64 flats).</p> <p>The development of 8 mews properties comprising lower, ground, first and second floors within the rear courtyard of Park Crescent Mews. Creation of terraces at rear ground, third, and fourth floor levels and car-parking and plant in the basement of the Park Crescent property; use of part ground, lower ground and basement level as community use, associated landscaping within the rear courtyard area.</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Prior to the evaluation there was no information relating to the ice well on the HER.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A reference to an ice well was found by the conservation officer dealing with the application. It suggested that the top of a large ice well had been uncovered by builders in the 1960s.</p> <p>An archaeological evaluation was subsequently carried out in order to locate the ice well, using the source discovered by the conservation officer.</p> <p>The evaluation successfully located and recorded a rare, almost intact, early commercial ice well and the structure appeared to be in very good condition.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The proposals were subsequently redesigned to ensure the protection of the ice well. It lay within the vehicle access to the site, so detailed engineering plans had to be submitted which ensured that weight of the vehicles would not be loaded onto the ice well.</p> <p>The ice well was subsequently designated as a scheduled monument and redesigns to the development took place to ensure the protection of the monument.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit	Public access to the ice well will be possible through pre-arranged visits.

<p>such as public engagement, research and new/changed work practices</p>	
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Historic England List Entry Number: 1427239.</p> <p>MoLA 2015, Park Crescent West, London, W1, City of Westminster: Watching Brief interim report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>MoLA 2015, Park Crescent West, London, W1, City of Westminster: Pre-determination evaluation report. Unpublished report.</p> <p>J Sisk and Son Ltd 2015, Park Crescent West, Development & Planning Ltd, Construction Management. Unpublished report.</p> <p>MoLA, March 2014, 16-26 Park Crescent West, 77-81 Portland Place, London W1: Historic Environment Assessment. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	173
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Cleevelands, Bishops Cleeve, Gloucestershire
Type of application & broad category	Major, residential and commercial
Date(s)	2010-18
Local Planning Authority	Tewkesbury Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	10/01216/OUT
Development proposal	Outline application for up to 550 dwellings, including 30 units for retired people; a high street comprising 4 units with a gross retail floor space of 475sqm, plus ancillary accommodation of 475sqm (Class A1, A2, A3, A4 AND A5): 15 Units
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	Cropmarks identified from aerial photographs, thought possibly to be ring ditches, had been recorded in the south-western part of the site and previous works along the south-eastern boundary had produced Roman material, suggesting that activity of this date was likely to extend onto the site of the proposed development. Other developments in the vicinity had produced significant archaeological evidence.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>A desk-based assessment was followed by geophysical survey over 56ha which produced evidence of enclosures and settlement remains concentrated in the south-western quadrant of the site but other less certain responses elsewhere.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching in 2010 identified a single Bronze Age ditch and three areas where Iron Age and Roman activity was concentrated.</p> <p>A pre-commencement planning condition requiring mitigation by archaeological excavation was recommended. Phased mitigation of the areas of interest was completed in 2017. Some of the archaeological features were preserved in the green space within the development area required because of flooding issues.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>The excavations recorded a long sequence of human activity from the Mesolithic to the Roman period.</p> <p>The earliest evidence comprised an assemblage of residual Mesolithic to late Neolithic flints, including blades and tools.</p> <p>A small group of middle Bronze Age cremations was unaccompanied but dated by radiocarbon analysis. Four large pits of similar date were also found and produced several highly significant and well-preserved wooden items, including a bark container, a paddle-shaped object that may have been used for beating plant fibres and a log ladder. The remnants of wattle</p>

	<p>and timber linings were present in all but one of the pits, and other finds included an early Bronze Age flint arrowhead, middle Bronze Age pottery, a fragment of a saddle quern and a gold strip.</p> <p>A circular posthole building was of late Bronze Age date.</p> <p>Later remains included middle Iron Age roundhouses and field boundaries, and the edge of a Roman rural settlement, including field boundaries, a crop-drying oven and a scatter of burials. Successive remodelling of the field boundaries took place subsequently until the 4th century AD when the evidence of occupation became sparser. No clear Roman structures were present but abundant pottery and other artefacts (especially of metal) indicated domestic occupation. Millstone fragments suggested the presence of a nearby mill. A small number of burials spanning the Roman phases included a cremation dated by radiocarbon to the 5th to early 6th centuries AD.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>CgMs Consulting 2009, Land to the northwest of Bishop's Cleeve, Gloucestershire: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Bartlett Clark Consultancy 2009, Cleavelands, Bishop's Cleeve, Gloucestershire: Report on Archaeogeophysical Survey. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2010, Cleavelands, Bishop's Cleeve, Gloucestershire: Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished report, CA report 10041.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2016-7, Cleavelands (Phase 1A and 2A), Bishops Cleeve, Gloucestershire: Post-Excavation Assessment and Updated Project Design. Unpublished report, CA Report 15671.</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology 2018, Cleavelands (Swales), Bishop's Cleeve, Post-Excavation Assessment and Updated Project Design. Unpublished report, CA report 9215.</p>

Case study no.	175
Planning scenario(s)	<p>1. Pre-determination assessment/evaluation identified significant archaeology on the development site (i.e. the results created significant new knowledge), especially where none was previously known in the HER</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were essential to enable the development to be permitted.</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological interest
Site name/address	Land opposite Ford Close, Kingston Road, Ashford, Surrey
Type of application & broad category	New fire station
Date(s)	2015
Local Planning Authority	Spelthorne Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	15/01590/SCC
Development proposal	Construction of new single storey fire station and ancillary facilities
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	There were no recorded heritage assets within the application site.
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>In size the development site was in excess of the Local Plan policy threshold (0.4ha) above which archaeological assessment is required. A pre-application desk-based assessment was undertaken, and assessed the archaeological potential of the development site as high in view of the similarity of its topographical and geological location to nearby areas where significant archaeological remains have been identified. Further archaeological evaluation was recommended.</p> <p>The evaluation identified archaeological features of Bronze Age or Iron Age date. As a consequence a pre-commencement planning condition was attached to the planning permission requiring a programme of archaeological investigation comprising strip, map and sample.</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Findings and features from the site were mainly of a date range between the mid Bronze Age and the middle Iron age, with some post-medieval structures.</p> <p>A Bronze Age ditch system ran from the southeast to the middle of the site and then turned southwest towards the River Ash. It was substantially deeper than successor features and extended to the east beyond the limit of excavation. It may, in part, have been constructed for drainage but is more likely to have formed a land boundary associated with nearby farmsteads and settlement areas beyond the excavation limits.</p> <p>In the northwest corner of the excavation, a series of curvilinear ditches indicated the presence of settlements associated with roundhouses from the Iron Age period. In the east, Iron Age features consisted of two large,</p>

	<p>parallel linear ditches that crossed the site, aligned northeast/southwest.</p> <p>The post-medieval features were located in the middle of the site and took the form of a small building with associated brick lined well and soakaway.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	-
References and links/bibliography	<p>https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/culture-and-leisure/archaeology/archaeological-unit/spoilheap-publications/archaeological-discoveries-in-ashford-and-laleham</p> <p>Surrey County Archaeological Unit 2015, New Spelthorne Fire Station, Kingston Road, Ashford, Surrey, Heritage Statement. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Surrey County Archaeological Unit 2015, Proposed fire station development near Fordbridge roundabout, Ashford, Surrey, An archaeological trial trench evaluation. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Collie T 2018, A Bronze Age field system and Iron Age settlement at Spelthorne Firestation, Fordbridge Roundabout, Ashford, in <i>Neolithic, later Bronze Age, Middle Iron Age and Medieval discoveries in Ashford and Laleham, Spoilheap Occasional Paper 9</i>, 2018.</p>

Case study no.	176
Planning scenario(s)	<p>5. The absence of pre-determination assessment/evaluation on all or part of the development site (e.g. because of difficulties with access, refusal to evaluate) led to the unexpected discovery of archaeology during development that caused problems, such as delays to the development programme and/or the need for additional resources</p> <p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	Land north of Lepe Country Park, Lepe, Fawley, Hampshire
Type of application & broad category	Infrastructure: gas pipeline
Date(s)	2007-8
Local Planning Authority	New Forest National Park
Planning reference	08/93154/FULL
Development proposal	<p>Temporary use of land for a trial drill (in connection with Hampshire – Isle of Wight gas pipeline).</p> <p>The application was for exploratory works of short duration only, the rest of the scheme being Permitted Development.</p>
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	<p>The drill site lay in a sensitive area, adjacent to an SSSI, SAC and RAMSAR site with consequent requirements for the land to be restored to its former condition after the works had taken place.</p> <p>No archaeological information was available for the development site itself, but it is within an area of high archaeological potential with finds from the Neolithic, Roman and later periods.</p> <p>A desk-based assessment had been undertaken in connection with an adjacent water pipeline; this, and the subsequent watching brief on the pipeline route, were considered to be a good guide to the archaeological potential of the area.</p>
Archaeological/planning processes	<p>Consultation was undertaken with the National Park archaeological adviser, who responded using information from the County HER, the Hampshire Archaeological and Historic Buildings Record, the results of the desk-based assessment for the adjacent water pipeline, and the report on the watching brief during this scheme.</p> <p>No objection was made to the proposal but a pre-commencement planning condition to secure archaeological recording was recommended, with information that this would probably comprise a watching brief. Planning permission was granted in 2007 with the recommended planning condition.</p> <p>A WSI for a watching brief during the site clearance of the compound and exploratory area was agreed. The watching brief revealed a small pit and little else. The pit contained comminuted charcoal of late Neolithic date.</p> <p>A watching brief was agreed for the remainder of the easement where the pipe was to be constructed.</p>

	<p>Initial topsoil clearance close to and north of the site compound and exploratory area revealed archaeological deposits along all of the pipeline route where clearance had taken place.</p> <p>Further negotiations took place and the developers agreed a programme of work, enabling the archaeological remains that were revealed to be cleaned, mapped, and sampled, and a post-excavation programme to be agreed subsequently.</p> <p>In view of the archaeological remains identified it was agreed that no further top soil stripping was to take place and that bog mats or terram and scalpings were to be placed on the soil surface to remove the necessity to strip the top soil and thus to avoid disturbance to any further archaeological remains.</p> <p>It was also agreed that no deep mole ploughing would take place to a greater depth than routine ploughing once the installation had been completed in order to minimise damage to the surviving archaeological remains during future agricultural operations.</p>
<p>Outcomes: archaeological</p>	<p>The archaeological investigation revealed some evidence of prehistoric activity in the form of Mesolithic and later flints. A complex area of Roman settlement comprised ditches, pits, kilns/hearths and structural features of at least two phases, during the 1st and 2nd centuries, and then a main phase of occupation dated to the 3rd and 4th centuries. During this later phase a rectilinear field system, aligned on the nearby Roman road, was laid out across the landscape, followed by the production of grog-tempered pottery in a number of small kilns.</p> <p>Aerial photographs and previously discovered finds suggest that this newly discovered settlement covered an area some 300m square, straddling the narrow strip of land along which a Roman road passed to reach the coast of the Solent less than 1km to the south. The settlement undoubtedly formed an important node between land and sea trade in the Roman period.</p>
<p>Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices</p>	<p>Research undertaken for the final report located information on Roman coins and other metalwork obtained during metal detecting in the vicinity of the site, published in 2003 but not recorded in the County HER, and which was therefore not available during the initial consultation response on the development. Lack of resources has an impact on the ability of some HERs regularly to capture published material, and therefore on the completeness of the record.</p>
<p>References and links/bibliography</p>	<p>Southampton Archaeology Unit 2009, Archaeological watching brief at Lepe, Hampshire. Unpublished report.</p> <p>Southampton Archaeology Unit 2012, Report on a watching brief and archaeological excavation at Lepe, Hampshire. Unpublished report.</p>

Case study no.	177
Planning scenario(s)	<p>7. Pre-commencement archaeological conditions were attached to a planning permission and were necessary in order to enable the development to be permitted</p> <p>10. A planning condition has been discharged before investigation has been completed in accordance with the WSI, or the post-excavation stage agreed and resourced, and this caused difficulties with securing post-excavation, publication, archiving</p>
Heritage assets affected	Undesignated heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest
Site name/address	59-61 West Street, Havant, Hampshire
Type of application & broad category	Residential
Date(s)	2012-13
Local Planning Authority	Havant Borough Council
Planning reference(s)	APP/12/01233
Development proposal	Conversion of existing joinery (Henry Jones building) to form flats, demolition of remaining buildings and construction of 16 houses.
Archaeological information known about the site before the planning application was made, or before the development commenced, as appropriate	The application site is situated close to the historic core of Havant where there is evidence of Roman, medieval and later activity.
Archaeological/ planning processes	<p>An archaeological evaluation identified Roman material, mainly of the 1st – 3rd centuries AD and ‘including samian ware, fragments of amphorae from southern Spain, pottery from the nearby kilns at Rowland’s Castle, a well-preserved Roman copper alloy spoon, and a fragment of imported green marbled limestone veneer, similar to that used on the walls at Fishbourne Roman Palace’ (Oxford Archaeology 2015, 6). Medieval activity of the 13th - 14th century, and late Medieval – Tudor pits were also recorded.</p> <p>Planning permission was granted with a pre-commencement planning condition requiring a programme of archaeological investigation.</p> <p>Three small areas of excavation, together with a watching brief on other parts of the site, were subsequently carried out. The results are summarised by the post-excavation assessment as follows:</p> <p><i>‘Excavations in the south-eastern area (Area 1) revealed a number of postholes and pits dating to the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. Other postholes were undated, but appeared to form part of a rectangular structure along with the Roman features. Further postholes contained medieval pottery. Area 2 (the north-eastern area) was dominated by a straight ditch of early Roman date, extending SE-NW across the site. A brick and chalk block-constructed well of post-medieval date was found in the south-eastern corner of Area 2. Close to this well was a chalk block wall that had suffered</i></p>

	<p><i>extensive damage but whose construction was similar enough to suggest it was contemporary with the well. Area 3 (the north-western area) produced four isolated features of which two were dated: a posthole of 2nd century AD date and a linear feature of likely post-medieval date' (Oxford Archaeology 2015, 4).</i></p> <p>The fieldwork was completed on time and to budget. The watching brief was reduced to concentrate resources on the remains discovered during the excavation.</p> <p>A short post-excavation assessment report and publication proposal was completed following the fieldwork. The agreed analysis and publication work was 3-4 months into production before it was cancelled, following the early discharge of the planning condition by the LPA.</p> <p>Project budget - unknown Fieldwork and PXA - £17,690 Publication - £12,000 (cancelled)</p>
Outcomes: archaeological	<p>Because the planning condition that specified the archaeological work had been discharged there was no longer any formal requirement for the post-excavation and publication to be completed. As a consequence the work remains incomplete; no publication has been produced and the archive cannot be deposited with an appropriate museum.</p>
Other outcomes/outputs e.g. other public benefit such as public engagement, new/changed work practices	<p>A local press release was proposed but not authorised.</p> <p>This outcome of this case will influence future procedure on the discharge of archaeological planning conditions.</p>
References and links/bibliography	<p>Southampton Archaeology Unit 2014, Archaeological Evaluation of Land at 59-61 West Street, Havant, Hampshire. Unpublished report, no 1172.</p> <p>Oxford Archaeology 2015, 59-61 West Street, Havant, Hampshire: Post-excavation assessment and project design. Unpublished report OA 6190.</p>