

Morris, Rachael

From: Morris, Rachael
Sent: 04 July 2023 16:26
To: Morris, Rachael
Subject: FW: Planning Application Consultation Request F/23/95045

From: Hayes, Thom <Thom.Hayes@hants.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 July 2023 16:23
To: Morris, Rachael <Rachael.Morris@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning Application Consultation Request F/23/95045

Dear Rachael,

Planning Application Consultation Request F/23/95045

Thank you for your consultation, regarding the amended archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) for the above site.

The amendments to the DBA goes some way to address the concerns I expressed in my original consultation response. Although the discussion regarding the site's geology with regards to the existing borehole data still requires a little refinement, the overall argument and conclusion presented (especially with regards to the previous impacts of existing drainage) is sound.

The natural geology for the site is represented by superficial geology and bedrock geology. The superficial geology is 'River Terrace Deposits 1 – Sand and Gravel', which overlies bedrock geology of 'London Clay Formation – Clay, Silt and Sand' (BGS 2023). The bedrock geology was formed between 56 and 47.8 million years ago. The superficial geology has formed more recently through sedimentary processes (formed over the last 2.5 million years). In this landscape, we would anticipate that the superficial deposits would represent the archaeological horizon for remains dating to at least the later prehistoric period and possibly earlier. The borehole data referred to in the DBA is not clear in differentiating between topsoil and superficial geology but seems to imply that they are both mixed, possibly indicating some level of previous disturbance. Whilst this is not absolutely clear, when taken together with the evidence of known previous impact caused by the installation of existing drainage, it suggests that the site's archaeological potential has been compromised. Although the existing drainage does not cover the whole proposed development area, any area of new impact would be relatively limited. Whilst it is not possible to completely rule out the possibility that archaeological remains could survive, the relatively low potential for archaeology and potentially compromised nature of the archaeological potential suggest that, on balance, the imposition of an archaeological condition would not be justified under the terms NPPF. On this basis, I do not wish to raise any archaeological issues.

Yours sincerely,

Thom Hayes BA(Hons) MRes, ACIfA
Senior Archaeologist

Specialist Environmental Services, Universal Services Directorate
Hampshire County Council
The Castle, Winchester SO23 8UD
Email: thom.hayes@hants.gov.uk
Phone: 0370 779 3795