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Executive Summary

This archaeological desk-based assessment has been prepared by Archaeology Collective, on behalf of David Adams and Frank Cundell to inform planning proposals for the construction of a commercial development and Country Park on land at the former Furtho Pit, Old Stratford, Northamptonshire.

The report has confirmed that the application site does not contain any designated heritage assets such as world heritage sites, scheduled monuments, or registered battlefields where there would be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation in situ and against development.

A review of historic mapping, alongside documentary research, has indicated that parts of the Site have been subject to quarrying and land extraction activities, followed by subsequent refilling and landscaping. This would have truncated archaeological deposits within these parts of the Site. However, there are some areas of the Site which have not previously been impacted and there is the potential for the proposed development to have below ground impacts on any archaeological deposits within these parts of the Site.

It is considered that the Site is unlikely to contain any archaeological deposits of high significance or value.

The conclusions of this assessment and in particular the recommendations in respect of the determination of the planning application, are in accordance with both local and national planning policy.
1. Introduction

Project Background

1.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment has been prepared by Rebecca Ryan BA (Hons) ACIfA, Archaeological Consultant at Archaeology Collective on behalf of David Adams and Frank Cundell. Documentary research was carried out by the author.

1.2 The subject of this assessment is the site known as the former Furtho Pit, Old Stratford, Northamptonshire, hereafter referred to as the ‘Site’ (Figures 1.1 & 1.2). The area which the Site occupies is approximately 16ha and is centred at National Grid Reference (NGR) SP 78219 41648. Administratively, for local government purposes, the Site lies in the South Northamptonshire Council boundaries.

1.3 The purpose of this assessment is to determine and assess the archaeological potential of the Site informed by available historical information and data on designated and non-designate heritage assets in order to provide sufficient information for the Local Planning Authority to come to an informed understanding of the potential impact of the development proposal on the significance of those assets.

1.4 In addition, the assessment will enable stakeholders to assess the archaeological potential of the site and to consider the need for design, civil engineering and archaeological solutions to the potentials identified, where appropriate.

1.5 The report considers only designated and non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest as recorded in statutory or non-statutory repositories of historic environment data. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Finds/findspots of artefactual material (e.g. stone tools);
- Finds/findspots of ecofactual material (e.g. animal bone);
- Locations, features or objects referenced from historic documents;
- Archaeological or palaeoenvironmental deposits;
- Sub surface archaeological remains of features, buildings or structures;
- Scheduled monuments; and
- Registered Battlefields
1.6 The report will not address designated or non-designated built heritage. Specifically:

- Listed buildings;
- Conservation areas;
- Registered Parks and Gardens; and
- Locally listed buildings.

1.7 The Site is formed by a mixture of farmland, former (now filled) gravel pits and a plant hire testing and demonstration area and builder’s storage facility. The Grand Union Canal Conservation Area runs through the eastern half of the Site. In keeping with the approach noted above, the heritage significance of this asset will not be assessed in this report, which will be limited to heritage assets of archaeological interest only. However, impacts upon the conservation area will be discussed in a separate Heritage Statement.¹

1.8 David Adams and Frank Cundell have commissioned Archaeology Collective to establish the archaeological potential of the site, to identify any particular areas of archaeological potential or significance and to provide guidance on ways to accommodate any relevant constraints identified. This assessment is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the procedures set out in CIfA’s ‘Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment’².

1.9 This desk-based assessment comprises an examination of digital data held by the Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record (NHER) together with documentary research. The report incorporates the results of a map regression exercise in order to review the impacts of existing and previous development on potential underlying archaeological deposits. Consultation of additional sources has been undertaken where appropriate.

1.10 This data has been collected for an area comprising a 1km radius from the centre point of the Site; the ‘study area’. This radius has been selected on the basis of professional judgement to be appropriate to determining the archaeological potential of the Site given its location and character.

Geology

1.11 The British Geological Survey identifies the solid geology as a mixture of Whitby Mudstone formation, Rutland Formation (mudstone) and Bilsworth Limestone Formation which is indicative of an environment previously dominated by shallow

¹ Prepared by Heritage Collective.
² CIfA. Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment 2017
seas and shallow carbonate seas. The solid geology is overlain by superficial deposits of Oadby Member, Mid Pleistocene Glaciofluvial Deposits of sand and gravel and alluvium which are indicate of environments previously dominated by ice age conditions and rivers. There are some parts of the Site which are not overlain by any superficial deposits\(^3\) (Figure 2.1).

1.12 A borehole survey was undertaken across the western half of the Site and identified made ground to depths of 0.3m to 2m below ground levels, with organic clay (in two test pits) to a depth of 0.5m below ground level beneath the made ground. Superficial clay extending to depths greater than 4m below ground level and superficial granular Glacial Til were also identified beneath the made ground deposits.\(^4\)

Topography

1.13 The Site is located within an undulating landscape which is located c.77m aOD (above Ordnance Datum) at its south western corner, descending to c.72m aOD towards the centre of the Site and descending further to c.68m-69m aOD at the eastern boundary of the Site. The most northerly point of the Site is located c.78m aOD (Figure 2.2).

Site Visit

1.14 A site walkover survey was undertaken on the 2nd August 2018.

1.15 The A5 forms the southern boundary of the Site, with Cosgrove Road bisecting it, as does the Buckingham Arm of the Grand Union Canal, although this is part of the canal is no longer used and is now dry. The majority of the land to the west of Cosgrove Road has been excavated and re-filled and was overgrown grassland at the time of the site visit. The land to the east of Cosgrove Road is currently in use for a mixture of agricultural and pasture use. A small part of the Site is currently in use as a plant hire testing and demonstration area and a builder’s storage facility. Parts of the site have been quarried and subsequently backfilled (see Figure 5.1). Photograph 3 shows the difference in ground levels east and west of the Stratford Arm, the land to the west (on the right of the photograph) having been quarried and built back up and the land to the east (on the left of the photograph) having never been extracted from.

1.16 The following photographs are a selection of those taken during the visit:

---

\(^3\) British Geological Society online viewer http://www.bgs.ac.uk/
\(^4\) Enzyo 2015: 18
Photograph 1: Facing south along Cosgrove Road.

Photograph 2: Facing north along disused Stratford Arm.

Photograph 3: Facing south along disused Buckingham Arm.

Photograph 4: Facing north east across western part of Site.
Photograph 5: Facing north east towards north eastern corner of Site.

Photograph 6: Facing south across pastoral land, towards south eastern corner of Site.
2. Archaeological and Historical Background

Introduction

2.1 The Site does not contain any designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, such as scheduled monuments or registered battlefields where there would be a presumption in favour of preservation in situ and against development proceeding, nor are there any in the 1km study area. However, the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area, runs through the Site.

2.2 The Northamptonshire HER contains records for the following non-designated heritage assets are located within the Site:

- Roman ditches and finds (MNN20121);
- The route of the London to Derby road (MNN14161);
- Area of ridge and furrow (MNN132448);
- Possible post-medieval quarry pit (MNN25573); and
- The former Buckingham Arm of the Grand Union Canal (MNN115113/MNN115114).

2.3 There are a further 119 records for non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest within the study area.

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

2.4 This section considers the archaeological finds and features from within the 1km study area, held within the HER, together with a map regression exercise charting the history of the site from the 18th century to the present day.

2.5 Timescales used in this section:

**Prehistoric**

Palaeolithic 450,000 - 12,000 BC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
<td>- 410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon/Early Medieval</td>
<td>AD 410</td>
<td>- 1066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1066</td>
<td>- 1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1486</td>
<td>- 1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>AD 1800</td>
<td>- Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 The HER map and list are included in this report at Appendix 3, showing the distribution of entries within the 1km study area.

**Prehistoric**

2.7 The NHER holds records for 11 assets of prehistoric date, none of which are within the Site.

2.8 There are no assets of Palaeolithic or Mesolithic date recorded within the study area and the earliest period to be represented is the Neolithic period. However, evidence of Neolithic activity is limited to the find spot of a greenstone adze blade (MNN151077), identified c.209m to the north west of the Site.
2.9 The Palaeolithic period is considered as the earliest period of known human culture, although very little evidence of Palaeolithic activity survives beyond residual finds of flint artefacts, usually found along river terraces. Evidence of Mesolithic activity is also limited to similar finds and flint tools. The Neolithic period in general was a period of increasing settlement and is characterised by the development of early farming communities and the introduction of large scale burial monuments. However, surviving earthworks are rare, and the findspots of material, artefact scatters and cropmarks are the most common categories for evidence of Neolithic, and Bronze Age, activity across the East Midlands region.\(^5\)

2.10 Throughout the Bronze Age, and onwards into the Iron Age, the landscape became increasingly organised as recognisably agricultural. Evidence of later Neolithic and early Bronze Age settlements in the region are limited to discrete deposits, such as pits or hearths\(^6\) and evidence of later Bronze Age settlements, revealed by features, layers and stratified finds, are equally rare.\(^7\) The main source of evidence for later Bronze Age activity comes from metalwork.\(^8\) There are no assets of Bronze Age date recorded within the study area.

2.11 The best represented prehistoric period within the study area is the Iron Age. An area of occupation activity, including field systems and a trackway (MNN170053) has been recorded c.283m to the south west of the Site. Evidence of round houses have also been recorded within the study area, including c.209m to the north west of the Site (MNN170156) and c.615m to the north west of the Site (MNN170158). A possible enclosure (MNN170160), located c.602m to the north west of the Site, and ditches (MNN170159 & MNN170157), located c.602m to the north west of the Site, have also been recorded within the study area. The final asset of Iron Age date is an area of uncertain activity (MNN161660), recorded c.467m to the north west of the Site.

2.12 A possible enclosure (MNN124495), identified from aerial photography, located c.251m to the south west of the Site, and a possible area of activity (MNN3990), located c.223m to the south west of the Site, may also date to the Roman period.

2.13 The final assets of prehistoric date recorded within the study area have not been dated to a specific prehistoric period and comprise the find spots of flints (MNN25944 & MNN13746).

\(^5\) Clay 2006: 70
\(^6\) Clay 2006: 77
\(^7\) Willis 2006: 92
\(^8\) Willis 2006: 96
2.14 Evidence of the early prehistoric periods is limited to the find spot of a single Neolithic artefact. The Iron Age is the best represented prehistoric period within the study area and indicates that the study area was well utilised during this period.

2.15 The potential for archaeological deposits of Palaeolithic to Bronze Age date is considered to be negligible, however, the potential for archaeological deposits of Iron Age date is considered to be medium. Any archaeological deposits of Iron Age data are likely to be of low significance.

**Roman**

2.16 The NHER holds records for 10 assets of Roman date recorded within the study area, one of which is located within the Site. Ditches were noted in a section of a quarry pit (MNN20121), and it is thought that they extended further to the east. A large amount of pottery was also identified c.10 to 100 feet into the quarry.

2.17 The route of Watling Street Roman road (MNN3501 & MNN11430) is located c.112m to the south of the Site, forming part of the route between Stoney Stratford and Towcester. A foundation pit (MNN20128) was identified on the eastern side of Watling Street, c.296m to the south of the Site, in which Samian, tile fragments and bone were found.

2.18 The remaining assets of Roman date recorded within the study area comprise find spots, including the find spots of coins (MNN137478, MNN147931, MNN150475 & MNN101654), pottery (MNN151076) and coins alongside a Saxon strap (MNN137477).

2.19 Within the wider area, a Roman villa was excavated c.1.2km to the north west of the Site. Coins were identified during the excavation for the canal, and subsequent excavations led to the identification of a double corridor villa around a large courtyard, with an associated bathhouse and temple. The villa was constructed c.100 AD, the bathhouse c.150AD and the temple c.300 AD, which may have replaced an earlier building. However, the villa was located approximately a mile from Watling Street, so the location of the villa is puzzling.9 The Stony Stratford Hoard was identified in the late 18th century c.1.2km to the south of the Site, and consisted of fragments of 30 silver plaques, two priestly chain head dresses and three fibulae within a pottery container.10

2.20 The Site is located between the Roman route of Watling Street and an extensive Roman villa and temple site. Ditches and pottery (MNN20121) recorded within the study area indicate that the Site was utilised during this period. However, there is

---

9 Fletcher 2002: 78
10 Anon 2015: 9
no clear evidence of an established settlement, either within the study area, or the wider area.

2.21 The potential for archaeological deposits of Roman date is considered to be medium. Any archaeological deposits are likely to be of low significance.

Saxon/Early Medieval

2.22 The NHER holds records for nine assets within the study area, none of which is located within the Site.

2.23 The route of the road between London and Derby (MNN14161) runs through the study area. Possible areas of activity have been identified c.123m to the north east of the Site (MNN160248) and c.271m to the south west of the Site (MNN3061).

2.24 The majority of assets recorded within the study area relate to the find spots of artefacts and comprise the find spots of pottery (MNN20559 & MNN160247), coins (MNN151406 & MNN161309) and a silver penny with a ring of plaited silver wire (MNN101653). An area of pottery representing three different vessels (MNN31546) which may have been associated with a posthole, recorded c.5m to the south of the pottery.

2.25 Areas of Saxon/early medieval activity have been identified within the study area but no assets of Saxon/early medieval date have been identified within the Site. Although, the focus of Saxon/early medieval activity lay outside of the Site, it is likely the Site formed open land during this period, potentially used for agricultural purposes associated with the settlements which were located around it.

2.26 The potential for archaeological deposits of early medieval date is considered to be low.

Medieval

2.27 The NHER holds records for 22 non-designated assets dating to the medieval period within the study area. An area of ridge and furrow (MNN132448) extends across the centre of the Site, along the southern boundary.

2.28 Although the parish of Old Stratford (MNN626) is a modern creation, settlement this location is thought to date to the medieval period. A second medieval settlement has been recorded within the study area (MNN621) and is thought to have been a hamlet located within the parish of Furtho, although the name and the history of this settlement is unknown and it had disappeared by the mid-19th century.
2.29 The existence of a hermitage and chapel (MNN11712) within the study area has been suggested. This may be the same as a hospital and chapel (MNN885) dedicated to St. John, which was the earliest recorded building in Old Stratford.

2.30 There is also evidence of medieval activity identified from within the study area, comprising cropmarks of closes (MNN32240), an open field system (MNN135752), areas of ridge and furrow (MNN132448, MNN132449, MNN133555 & MNN160258), a hollow-way (MNN26867) and evidence of possible field boundaries (MNN170162). Evidence of possible fisheries (MNN140549 & MNN140547) and quarrying (MNN143344) has also been recorded within the study area.

2.31 The final assets of medieval date recorded within the study area mainly all comprise the find spots of artefacts and consist of the find spots of two grooved stone net-sinkers and a pierced fish basket weight (MNN102414 & MNN102415), a pottery scatter (MNN20119), a buckle frame and coin (MNN147957), a copper alloy padlock (MNN150825) and a manuring scatter of pottery (MNN25945). However, the location of a 14th century bridge has also been recorded within the study area (MNN36669).

2.32 The medieval parish of Furtho included land both to the north and south, which is now part of Cosgrove and Old Stratford, although Furtho was always taxed with Cosgrove. However, by 1600 Edward Furtho had extended the parish, de-populated the village, diverted the main road an rebuilt the church.11 Furtho was recorded within the Domesday Book as a medium sized settlement within the Cleyley hundred.12

2.33 The current evidence indicates that settlements at Furtho and Cosgrove developed during the medieval period. Although there is no evidence to suggest that settlement activity extended into the Site, the identification of an area of ridge and furrow (MNN132448) indicates that at least part of the Site was used for agricultural purposes during the medieval period.

2.34 The potential for archaeological deposits of medieval date is considered to be medium. Any archaeological deposits are likely to relate to the agricultural use of the Site and are likely to be of low significance.

Post Medieval & Modern

2.35 The NHER holds records for three assets of post-medieval and modern date within the Site; the former Buckingham Arm of the Grand Union Canal (MNN/115112/MNN115113/MNN115114) and a quarry pit (MNN25573). The NHER

11 RCHME 1982: 119
12 http://opendomesday.org/place/SP7743/furtho/
holds records for a further 46 asset of post-medieval and modern date within the study area.

2.36 Furtho pit (MNN25573) is located in the eastern half of the Site. It is recorded as a trench-like pit which was orientated roughly north to south, but may also be a quarry feature. Two small pieces of post-medieval pottery were identified close to the bottom of the pit which indicate a post-medieval date for the excavation of the pit. The formation of the fill of the pits indicates deliberate backfilling.

2.37 The former Buckingham Arm of the Grand Union Canal (MNN/115112/MNN115113/MNN115114) extends through the eastern half the study area. The Buckingham branch of the canal opened in 1801 but closed for commercial traffic in 1910. The route of the Grand Union Canal, including the section which runs through the Site, has been designated as a conservation area and will therefore be discussed in more detail in the Heritage Statement. A canal bridge (MNN32103) has also been recorded within the study area.

2.38 The route of two turnpike roads have been recorded within the study area, comprising the Old Stratford to Dunchurch turnpike (MNN101325/MNN10295), which was the first turnpike in the country and the Hardingstone to Stoney Stratford turnpike (MNN135323).

2.39 The majority of assets of post-medieval and modern date recorded within the study area relate to the settlements at Cosgrove, to the north east of the Site, and Old Stratford, to the south of the Site. Such assets comprise walls (e.g. MNN162964, MNN162965, MNN163413, MNN163415 & MNN163622), houses (e.g. MNN164185, MNN164186, MNN164191, MNN164193 & MNN164198), farmhouses (MNN169218 & MNN161312), a former inn (MNN170127), a possible village hall (MNN164197) and a now demolished building (MNN164188).

2.40 Cosgrove Hall (MNN7135) was recorded in 1779 as a house and small enclosure belonging to John Biggins. A lodge to Cosgrove Hall (MNN163261) and garden building located in the lodge’s grounds (MNN163260) are also located within the study area.

2.41 Other assets recorded within the study area comprise post-medieval furrows (MNN137479), a stone path and field drain (MNN169220), the remains of walls (MNN169219 & MNN169221), the location of possible activity (MNN161635), the location of a building (MNN143348) and the find spots of artefacts (MNN150999 & MNN151081).

2.42 The earliest map examined as part of this assessment is Boyce’s 1814 Ordnance Survey (OS) drawing (Figure 4.1) which shows the Site as open fields with the

---

13 Being prepared by Heritage Collective.
route of a road and the Buckingham Canal run through the centre. There is no change shown to the Site on the 1834 OS map (Figure 4.2). The 1883 OS map (Figure 4.3) shows the Site in more detail, showing the division of fields within the Site, as well as a small watercourse running in a broadly east to west direction towards the north of the Site (and forming part of the Site boundary) and gravel pits in the eastern and northern parts of the Site. The 1900 OS map (Figure 4.4) shows little change to the Site, although the gravel pits towards the north of the Site are no longer annotated. The greatest changes shown on the 1927 OS map (Figure 4.5) is the marking of allotment gardens immediately to the east of the canal and the addition of a sewage works in the south east corner of the Site.

2.43 The final asset of post-medieval and modern date recorded within the study area is the location of a World War II ammunition store (MNN104085).

2.44 The 1951 OS map (Figure 4.6) shows little change to the Site, although the gravel pits are only shown as earthworks. The most northerly field which forms the Site is also marked as ‘Old Limekilns’. Both the 1973 OS map (Figure 4.7) and 1991 OS map (Figure 4.8) show the location of the sand and gravel pit in the western half of the Site. The 1991 OS map also shows the construction of the A5, which forms the southern boundary of the Site.

2.45 The post-medieval and modern periods are the best represented within the study area and evidence dating to these periods indicates the continued agricultural use and the development of the industrial use of the Site, as well as the continued development of the settlements which surround the Site. The map regression shows the location of gravel and sand pits and old limekilns across the Site, as well as the route of the Buckingham Arm of the Grand Union Canal and sewage works. Otherwise, the Site has remained as undeveloped agricultural land.

2.46 It is considered that there is a medium potential for archaeological deposits of post-medieval and modern date. Any archaeological deposits are likely to be of low significance.

Undated

2.47 There are 23 assets of unknown date recorded within the study area. A number of these assets have been identified from aerial photography and comprise enclosures (MNN12416 – MNN12419, MNN124522, MNN124523, MNN124525 & MNN124526), a trackway (MNN124520) and pits (MNN124521 & MNN124524). The remaining assets of unknown date comprise a possible gully and pit (MNN131547), a possible cemetery (MNN32243), a pit (MNN137480), quarry features (MNN143345 & MNN143346), a possible mine entrance (MNN143347), brick structures (MNN143349), agricultural features (MNN170057), possible settlement (MNN6857 & MNN6858) and the find spot of unstratified finds (MNN26870 & MNN35883).
LiDAR Processing Analysis and Reproduction

2.48 Model (DTM) format from the Environment Agency LiDAR archive. The data was processed and interrogated using industry-standard GIS software. Multiple hill-shades and floating surface models were created, principally via adjustment of the following variables: azimuth, height, and ‘z-factor’ or exaggeration. The models created were colourised using pre-defined ramps and classified attribute data.

2.49 Features noted from the LiDAR data (Figure 2.4) relate to the current and former use of the Site, and include the route of the Buckingham Arm of the Grand Union Canal through the centre of the Site and traces of ridge and furrow or ploughing remains. The outlines of areas of previous quarrying activity, or land extraction, can also be noted from the LiDAR data across the Site (which are further discussed in Section 3.1 below).

Previous Archaeological Work

2.50 The GLHER holds records for 59 investigations within the study area, two of which are located within the Site, both which relate to the observation of quarry working (ENN7867 & ENN7870).

2.51 In addition to the investigations listed above, there have been a further 57 investigations undertaken within the study area. Twenty-nine of these relate to intrusive investigations, comprising four watching brief exercise, five trial trench excavations, one excavation, 10 metal detecting surveys, three fieldwalking surveys, four observation exercise, a geophysical survey and one quarry working observation. The remaining investigations comprise eight architectural surveys, five aerial photography surveys, three photographic recording, two desk-based assessment, an enhancement survey, a garden survey, four records of documentary research and records of finds. Many of the archaeological remains identified as a result of the events correspond with other HER recorded within the study area.
3. Previous Impacts, Proposed Development and Impact Assessment

Previous Impacts

3.1 Previous impacts on archaeological potential will largely derive from the previous land extraction activities across the Site. Figure 5.1 shows the various areas of the Site which have previously been excavated and, in some areas, subsequently refilled\textsuperscript{14}. There is evidence across the Site of the creation of spoil heaps as well as areas of levelling. Although archaeological deposits have been identified during quarrying activity (MNN20121), the areas of land extraction and subsequent re-filling will have resulted in deep-cutting and truncation of archaeological deposits within these parts of the Site. This will have reduced the archaeological potential in those parts of the Site.

Proposed Development

3.2 Specific development proposals were not available at the time of the production of this report, however, it is understood that the Site is being examined for potential commercial development of up to 15.35ha in the western and northern part of the Site, formed by a mixture of manufacturing and warehouse spaces, office units with associated car parking and landscaping. A Country Park will be located in the southern and eastern parts of the Site.

Impact Assessment

Designated Heritage Assets

3.3 There are no designated heritage assets of archaeological interest recorded within the study area which will be impacted by the proposed development. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development will not affect the significance of such monuments, or the ability to appreciate their significance.

\textsuperscript{14} Based on information provided by David Adams.
3.4 This report does not consider built heritage assets.

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

3.5 Based on the information with the NHER, supplemented by historic mapping and other research, it has been established that parts of the Site have been quarried and subsequently refilled and landscaped. Whilst this is considered to have had a below ground impact upon archaeological deposits within these parts of the Site, there is the potential for archaeological deposits to survive in areas unaffected by these activities. It is considered that there is medium potential for archaeological deposits of Iron Age, Roman date and medieval to post-medieval date, a low potential for archaeological deposits of Saxon/early medieval date and a negligible potential for archaeological deposits of Palaeolithic to Bronze Age date. Any archaeological deposits are likely to be of low significance.

3.6 Works associated with the construction of new structures, the laying of new access roads and car parks and landscaping, as well as ancillary works for new utilities are likely to have an impact on below ground archaeological remains (both archaeological deposits previously recorded within the Site and unrecorded archaeological deposits), as well any landscaping associated the creation of the County Park, if they are present and which may survive in areas not previously impacted by quarrying and land extraction activities, as discussed in Section 3.1.
4. Conclusions

4.1 Proposals for the site known as the former Furtho Pit, Old Stratford, Northamptonshire comprise the potential construction of a commercial development and Country Park.

4.2 In line with the policies of the local planning authority and national government guidance as set out in the NPPF, an archaeological desk-based assessment has been undertaken to clarify the archaeological potential of the Site.

4.3 This archaeological and heritage assessment concludes that the application site does not contain any world heritage sites, scheduled monuments, or registered battlefields where there would be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation in situ and against development.

4.4 Based on the information within the NHER, supplement by other research, the Site has been shown to have a medium to negligible potential for archaeological deposits (Section 3.5). Although the previous quarrying and land extraction activities and subsequent re-filling across parts of the Site will have truncated archaeological remains within the footprint of these areas, there are other areas of the Site which have not previously been impacted by this activity. The construction of new structures, as well as ground disturbance as a result of the associated car parking, utilities and landscaping have the potential to create impacts upon any archaeological deposits which survive in the parts of the Site which have been previously undisturbed. Any archaeological deposits are likely to be of low significance.

4.5 On the basis of available evidence, it is considered that the proposed development accords with current legislation, the planning policies contained within the NPPF and the policies of the adopted South Northamptonshire Local Plan Saved Policies and West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan.
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5. Methodology

Archaeological Assessment Methodology

5.1 This report has been produced in accordance with the Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment issued by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA, 2017). These guidelines provide a national standard for the completion of desk-based assessments.

5.2 The assessment principally involved consultation of readily available archaeological and historical information from documentary and cartographic sources. The major repositories of information comprised:

- Information held by the Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record on known archaeological sites, monuments and findspots within 1km of the Site;
- Maps and documents held by the Northamptonshire Archives and online;
- The National Heritage List for England curated by Historic England; and
- Records made during a site visit in August 2018.

5.3 This report provides a synthesis of relevant information for the site derived from a search area extending up to 1km from its boundary, hereafter known as the ‘study area’, to allow for additional contextual information regarding its archaeological interest or potential to be gathered.

5.4 The information gathered from the repositories and sources identified above was checked and augmented through the completion of a site visit and walkover. This walkover considered the nature and significance of known and/or potential archaeological assets within the site, identified visible historic features and assessed possible factors which may affect the survival or condition of known or potential assets.

5.5 The report concludes with (1) an assessment of the site’s likely archaeological potential, made with regard to current best practice guidelines, and (2) an assessment of the likely effects of the proposed development upon designated and undesignated archaeological assets, whether direct or indirect.

Assessment of Heritage Significance and Importance

5.6 Heritage assets are assessed in terms of their significance and importance, following the requirement in NPPF paragraph 189, and taking account of Historic
England’s guidance in Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (GPA2). Significance, in relation to heritage policy, is defined by the NPPF as

"the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting."

5.7 As noted above, setting is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as:

"the surroundings in which an asset is experienced. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance, or may be neutral."

5.8 Where potential impacts on the settings of a heritage assets are identified, the assessment of significance includes ‘assessing whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s)’, following Step 2 of the staged approach to setting recommended in Historic England’s guidance in The Setting of Heritage Assets (GPA3). Attributes of an asset’s setting which can contribute to its significance are listed on page 9 of GPA3.

5.9 The importance of a heritage asset is the overall value assigned to it based on its heritage significance, reflecting its statutory designation or, in the case of undesignated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor (Table 1). Historic England guidance also refers to an asset’s ‘level of significance’ (GPA2, paragraph 10), which in this usage has the same meaning as importance. Nationally and internationally designated assets are assigned to the highest two levels of importance. Grade II Listed Buildings and Grade II Registered Parks & Gardens are considered of medium importance, reflecting the lower level of policy protection provided by the NPPF (paragraph 194). Conservation Areas are not assigned to either level of importance by the NPPF but their status as local designations and their omission from the National Heritage List justifies their classification here as assets of medium importance. Other non-designated assets which are considered of local importance only are assigned to a low level of importance. Following the NPPF (Annex 2), a historic feature which lacks ‘a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest’ is not considered to be a heritage asset; it may also be said to have negligible heritage importance.
Table 1: Criteria for Assessing the Importance of Heritage Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of the asset</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>World Heritage Sites and other assets of equal international importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Monuments, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Battlefields, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings, and undesignated heritage assets of equal importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Conservation Areas, Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens, Grade II Listed Buildings, heritage assets on local lists and undesignated assets of equal importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Undesignated heritage assets of lesser importance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential for unknown heritage assets

5.10 Archaeological features are often impossible to identify through desk-based assessment. The likelihood that significant undiscovered heritage assets may be present within the application site is referred to as archaeological potential. Overall levels of potential can be assigned to different landscape zones, following the criteria in Table 2, while recognising that the archaeological potential of any zone will relate to particular historical periods and types of evidence. The following factors are considered in assessing archaeological potential:

- The distribution and character of known archaeological remains in the vicinity, based principally on an appraisal of data in the [HER];
- The history of archaeological fieldwork and research in the surrounding area, which may give an indication of the reliability and completeness of existing records;

- Environmental factors such as geology, topography and soil quality, which would have influenced land-use in the past and can therefore be used to predict the distribution of archaeological remains;

- Land-use factors affecting the survival of archaeological remains, such as ploughing or commercial forestry planting; and

- Factors affecting the visibility of archaeological remains, which may relate to both environment and land-use, such as soils and geology (which may be more or less conducive to formation of cropmarks), arable cultivation (which has potential to show cropmarks and create surface artefact scatters), vegetation, which can conceal upstanding features, and superficial deposits such as peat and alluvium which can mask archaeological features.

5.11 In light of the above, the assessment of heritage significant heritage within Sections 2 and 3 of this report has been prepared in a robust manner, employing current best practice professional guidance and giving due regard to the methodology detailed above.
Table 2: Archaeological potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Undiscovered heritage assets of high or medium importance are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Undiscovered heritage assets of low importance are likely to be present; and it is possible, though unlikely, that assets of high or medium importance may also be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The study area may contain undiscovered heritage assets, but these are unlikely to be numerous and are highly unlikely to include assets of high or medium importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>The study area is highly unlikely to contain undiscovered heritage assets of any level of importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>There is no possibility of undiscovered heritage assets existing within the study area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.12 In light of the above, the setting assessment within Sections 4 and 5 of this report has been prepared in a robust manner, employing current best practice professional guidance and giving due regard to the methodology detailed above.

Introduction

6.1 This section sets out existing legislation and planning policy, governing the conservation and management of the historic environment, of relevance to this application.

6.2 In terms of “effects on the historic environment”, the following paragraphs summarise the principal legislative instruments and planning policy framework.

Current Legislation

6.3 The relevant legislation concerning the treatment of scheduled monuments is the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (HMSO 1979).

6.4 This act details the designation, care and management of scheduled monuments, as well as detailing the procedures needed to obtain permission for works which would directly impact upon their preservation. The Act does not confer any statutory protection on the setting of scheduled monuments, with this considered as a policy matter in Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

6.5 The balancing exercise to be performed – between the harm arising from a proposal and the benefits which would accrue from its implementation – is then subsequently presented in Paragraphs 195 and 196 of the NPPF.

National Planning Policy

6.6 The NPPF sets out the government’s approach to the conservation and management of the historic environment, through the planning process, with paragraph 185 of Section 16 emphasising the need for local authorities to set out a clear strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, where heritage assets are recognised as a finite and irreplaceable resource, to be preserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

6.7 Paragraph 184 states that:
"Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance…’

6.8 Paragraph 189 concerns planning applications, stating that:

"In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation”.

6.9 Designated assets are addressed in Paragraphs 193 and 194. Paragraph 193 states that:

"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less then substantial harm to its significance’.

6.10 Paragraph 194 states that:

‘Any harm to or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;

b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.’

6.11 Footnote 63 then goes on to state that:

‘non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets’
6.12 With regard to the decision making process, paragraphs 195 and 196 are of relevance. Paragraph 195 states that:

"Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use."

6.13 Paragraph 196 states that:

"Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use."

6.14 The threshold between substantial and less than substantial harm has been clarified in the courts. Whilst the judgement cited relates specifically to the impact of development proposals on a listed building, Paragraphs 24 and 25 of Bedford BC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2013] EWHC 2847 remain of relevance here in the way they outline the assessment of ‘harm’ for heritage assets:

"What the inspector was saying was that for harm to be substantial, the impact on significance was required to be serious such that very much, if not all, of the significance was drained away.

6.15 Plainly in the context of physical harm, this would apply in the case of demolition or destruction, being a case of total loss. It would also apply to a case of serious damage to the structure of the building. In the context of non-physical or indirect harm, the yardstick was effectively the same. One was looking for an impact which would have such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either “vitiated altogether [i.e. destroyed] or very much reduced”.

6.16 In other words, for the ‘harm’ to be ‘substantial’ – and therefore require consideration against the more stringent requirements of Paragraph 195 of the

---

15 Paragraphs 24 and 25 of Bedford BC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2013] EWHC 2847
NPPF compared with Paragraph 196; the proposal would need to result in the asset’s significance either being:

“vitiated altogether or very much reduced”.\textsuperscript{16} Quite evidently, this represents a very high threshold to be reached.

6.17 Paragraph 200 advises that:

“...local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.”

6.18 With regard to non-designated heritage assets, Paragraph 197 states that:

“The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgment will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”

6.19 Finally, paragraph 199 states that:

‘Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset 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) publically accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted’.

6.20 Footnote 64 then states:

‘Copies of evidence should be deposited with the relevant historic environment record, and any archives with a local museum or other public depository’

Local Policies

South Northamptonshire Local Plan Saved Policies (December 2014)

6.21 The Local Plan was adopted in 1997 and contains details on how development is controlled within the district. Certain policies from the 1997 Local Plan were ‘saved’

\textsuperscript{16} Paragraphs 24 and 25 of Bedford BC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2013] EWHC 2847
and still form part of South Northamptonshire’s planning policy. However, Policy EV34 which relates to archaeology has been deleted from the 1997 Local Plan.

West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) (December 2014)

6.22 The Joint Core Strategy Local Plan covers the South Northamptonshire District and sets out the long term vision and objectives, as well as including strategic policies to steer and shape development. The following policy is relevant to the historic environment and this assessment:

Policy BN5 – The Historic Environment and Landscape

DESIGNATED AND NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS AND LANDSCAPES WILL BE CONSERVED AND ENHANCED IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR INDIVIDUAL AND CUMULATIVE SIGNIFICANCE AND CONTRIBUTION TO WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE’S LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS AND SENSE OF PLACE.

IN ENVIRONMENTS WHERE VALUED HERITAGE ASSETS ARE AT RISK, THE ASSET AND ITS SETTING WILL BE APPROPRIATELY CONSERVED AND MANAGED.

IN ORDER TO SECURE AND ENHANCE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AREA’S HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS AND LANDSCAPES, DEVELOPMENT IN AREAS OF LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY AND/ OR KNOWN HISTORIC OR HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE WILL BE REQUIRED TO:

1. SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE HERITAGE AND LANDSCAPE FEATURES WHICH CONTRIBUTE TO THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA INCLUDING:
   a) CONSERVATION AREAS;
   b) SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC LANDSCAPES INCLUDING HISTORIC PARKLAND, BATTLEFIELDS AND RIDGE AND FURROW;
   c) THE SKYLINE AND LANDSCAPE SETTINGS OF TOWNS AND VILLAGES;
   d) SITES OF KNOWN OR POTENTIAL HERITAGE OR HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE;
   e) LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY IMPORTANT BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES AND MONUMENTS

2. DEMONSTRATE AN APPRECIATION AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON SURROUNDING HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTING IN ORDER TO MINIMISE HARM TO THESE ASSETS; WHERE LOSS OF HISTORIC FEATURES OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS IS UNAVOIDABLE AND JUSTIFIED, PROVISION SHOULD BE MADE FOR RECORDING AND THE PRODUCTION OF A SUITABLE ARCHIVE AND REPORT

3. BE SYMPATHETIC TO LOCALLY DISTINCTIVE LANDSCAPE FEATURES, DESIGN STYLES AND MATERIALS IN ORDER TO CONTRIBUTE TO A SENSE OF PLACE

THE RETENTION AND SENSITIVE RE-USE OF DISUSED OR UNDERUSED HERITAGE ASSETS AND STRUCTURES IS ENCOURAGED IN ORDER TO RETAIN AND REFLECT
THE DISTINCTIVENESS OF THE ENVIRONMENT, CONTRIBUTE TO THE SENSE OF PLACE AND PROMOTE THE SUSTAINABLE AND PRUDENT USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES.

PROPOSALS TO SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE AREA’S UNDERSTANDING OF HERITAGE ASSETS, FOR TOURISM AND HISTORIC INTEREST AS PART OF CULTURAL, LEISURE AND GREEN NETWORKS WILL BE SUPPORTED.

Local Plan Part 2

6.23

The Local Plan Part 2 will build on the Joint Core Strategy and include a detailed and wide variety of policies to guide decision making in the District. The Submission Draft is anticipated to be published in Summer 2018, although the following policies in the Pre-Submission Draft Plan are relevant to the historic environment and this assessment:

Policy Historic Environment 1: The Historic Environment

The Council will seek to preserve what is special about South Northamptonshire’s Historic Environment and its Heritage Assets, ensuring that their significance is properly understood and recognised allowing the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that they bring to be positively utilised in the delivery of sustainable development and the growth of the district.

The Council will ensure that the significance of the district’s heritage is properly understood, recognised and preserved by:

- systematically undertaking the review of conservation areas and where appropriate ensuring the production of up-to-date conservation area appraisals and management plans.
- considering the further designation of Article 4 Directions.
- developing and maintaining a local list of non-designated heritage assets.
- Identifying heritage assets that are ‘at risk’ and taking appropriate measures to secure their futures.

Policy Historic Environment 2: Significance of Heritage Assets

When considering proposals that affect both designated and non-designated heritage assets including those identified on local lists, the significance of those assets, including their settings, should first be established by the applicant through a proportionate but thorough and systematic heritage assessment.

Such an assessment should be sufficient so as to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the asset.
Policy Historic Environment 3: Significance of Heritage Assets

Development that would harm nationally important scheduled ancient monuments or archaeological remains or their settings, whether scheduled or not will not be permitted except in wholly exceptional circumstances where a clear and convincing justification can be demonstrated.

Development that would harm regionally and locally important archaeological remains or their settings will only be permitted where the public benefits of that development are significant and can be demonstrated to outweigh the harm to the archaeological interest of the asset and its setting.

There is a presumption in favour of preservation in situ in the case of both nationally, regionally and locally important remains. Preservation of important remains by record will only be supported where the public benefits derived from a development can be demonstrated to outweigh the ability to preserve those remains in situ.

Where considering proposals that may affect sites that are considered to potentially have remains of archaeological importance, those proposals will not be assessed until an appropriate desk based assessment and where necessary, a field assessment has been undertaken.

Where archaeological sites are known or found to exist within a development site the design of the development should seek to preserve the site in the overall scheme to minimise any harm.

Policy Historic Environment 8: Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Development proposals which positively sustain or enhance the significance of any local heritage asset and its setting will be permitted.

Alterations, additions and changes of use should respect the character appearance and setting of the asset in terms of design, materials, form, scale and massing.

Proposals involving the full or partial loss of a non-designated asset will be resisted unless sufficient justification as to why the asset is not capable of reuse or adaptation is provided to allow a thorough understanding of the proposed scheme and how its public benefits would outweigh the harm that would be caused by the loss of the asset. Where loss is permitted a full recording of the asset is likely to be requested.

Policy Rural Employment 2: Land at Former Furtho Pit, Old Stratford/Cosgrove

Development Area: 16 hectares (in total)

Development Description: Located at an important position adjoining the A5 and A508, this development site provides for 16 hectares of mixed employment generating development. A variety of employment types will be sought to reflect
the need for diversity and resilience in the local economy as expressed in the Council's Economic Growth Strategy.

An integrated, coordinated and comprehensive planning approach will be taken for the employment site and a masterplan must be prepared, in consultation with the District Council, Northamptonshire County Council and other statutory undertakers prior to the submission of a planning application covering the development of the whole site.

Employment

- Use classes – An equal proportion of B1 (Office), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Distribution)

Access

- Access from a new roundabout from the A508.

Key site specific design and place shaping principles

- Provision of new footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks including to a proposed new adjoining Country Park and utilising the existing pedestrian crossing over the A5 linking to Old Stratford;

- Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for including contributions to the cost of establishing bus services including stops to the site, to help reduce over-dependence on the car and consequent congestion on the road network;

- A transport assessment and travel plan will be required to assess the transportation implications of the proposed development (including noise from the A5 and A508) and to identify appropriate mitigation measures;

- A high quality design and finish, with careful consideration given to layout, heights of buildings, architecture, materials and colourings to reduce overall visual impact, particularly with landscape planting to reduce the impact of the development on open countryside to the north and east of the site;

- A comprehensive landscaping scheme including on-site provision to enhance the setting of the new buildings and to limit visual intrusion into the wider landscape together with appropriate planting of vegetation along strategic route ways to screen the noise. The layout will, where possible, be expected to retain and enhance any significant landscape features (including the Dogsmouth Brook watercourse and Former Buckingham Arm Canal embankment) which are or may be of ecological value; and where possible introduces new features;

- Detailed consideration of ecological impacts, wildlife mitigation and the creation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife corridors to preserve and
enlarge biodiversity. Ecological Surveys to accompany any development proposal;

- Detailed consideration of any archaeological impacts including the need to record and preserve findings ahead of any development, together with a programme of archaeological mitigation;

- Detailed consideration of any impacts on designated and non designated heritage assets including a programme of mitigation;

- Provision of appropriate lighting and the minimisation of light pollution based on appropriate technical assessment

- Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site and use of Sustainable urban drainage techniques in accordance with Policies BN7 and BN7A of the WNJCS

- A detailed survey of the agricultural land quality identifying the best and most versatile agricultural land and a soil management plan;

- Protection of the existing Anglian Water drainage and water infrastructure crossing that crosses the site;

- Appropriate financial contributions to mitigate the impact of the development on services and facilities as required by the Council’s policies.

6.24 The above Acts, Regulations, plans and policies have been taken into account in the preparation of this assessment.
7. Appendix 1 – Site Location
Figure 1.1: Site Location.
Figure 1.2: Detailed Site Location.
8. Appendix 2 – Geology, Topography & LiDAR
Figure 2.2: Superficial Geology
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