



Land North of Camer Road, Meopham Environmental Statement

Chapter 9: Archaeology

Iceni Projects on behalf of The
McManus Family

February 2026

Iceni Projects Ltd.

Da Vinci House, 44 Saffron Hill, London, ECN1 8FH

T: 020 3640 8508 **F:** 020 3435 4228 **W:** iceniprojects.com

9. ARCHAEOLOGY

Introduction

- 9.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared by Iceni Projects and presents an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development with respect to Archaeology. Mitigation measures are identified, where appropriate, to avoid, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects identified and/or enhance likely beneficial effects. Taking into account the mitigation measures, the nature and significance of the likely residual effects are reported.
- 9.2 This document includes minor contributions produced with the aid of an AI language model, with all outputs reviewed for accuracy.
- 9.3 This chapter is supported by the following technical appendices:
- **Appendix 9.1: 2025, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA)**¹; and
 - **Appendix 9.2: 2025, Geophysical Survey Report**².
- 9.4 This report is supported by the following figure:
- **Appendix 9.3: Figure 1; HER Data.**

Legislation and Policy Context

Legislation Context

- 9.5 The following legislation is relevant to the Proposed Development:
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979³.
- 9.6 The following national planning policy is relevant to the Proposed Development:
- National Planning Practice Guidance⁴; and
 - National Planning Policy Framework⁵.

Local Planning Policy

- 9.7 The following local planning policies are relevant to the Proposed Development.

¹ Iceni Projects 2025. Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Land at Camer Road, Meopham.

² Magnitude Surveys 2025. Geophysical Survey Report. Land north of Camer Road, Meopham, Kent

³ Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 – Part 1 Ancient monuments Protection of Scheduled Monuments (<https://legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46/section/1>)

⁴ National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) – including in particular the Green Belt PPG

⁵ National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024 – updated 2025)

- Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy⁶; and
- Gravesham Local Plan⁷ First Review (1994) – saved Policies.

Guidance

- 9.8 All guidance used in this document is listed in the reference section (see References).

Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

- 9.9 This section presents the methodology used to assess the potential effects of the Proposed Development in relation to Archaeology.

Consultation

- 9.10 In addition to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping exercise, consultation was undertaken directly with Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) as part of on-going technical engagement. This was undertaken by Icen Projects throughout the project evolution to inform the archaeological approach and fieldwork. **Table 9.1** presents a summary of comments raised in discussions with relevant consultees.

⁶ Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy and Local Plan Policies Map (2014)

⁷ Gravesham Local Plan First Review (1994) – saved Policies

Table 9.1 Summary of Comments

Consultee	Comment	Response
Kent County Council (KCC) Heritage (during consultations)	On the 30 of July 2025, the Senior Archaeological Officer at GBC requested that the planning application to be supported by a Desk Based Assessment (DBA), geophysical survey and an ES chapter. A trial trenching evaluation may be required if the findings of the geophysical survey records sensitive buried assets.	Comments have been considered for this assessment and a DBA and geophysical survey undertaken.
Historic England (in response to Scoping Opinion)	The Environmental Statement should consider the potential impacts on non-designated features of historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest. A DBS and a geophysical survey (GS) will be undertaken to further assess the potential for previously unknown archaeological deposits. If significant archaeology is recorded during the geophysical survey, a trial trench evaluation may also be required, and/or clear options for post-determination flexibility in layout/design for preservation in situ and/or recording. The Environmental Chapter should include the reports and results of these investigations as appendices. The assessment should take account of the potential impact which associated activities might have upon perceptions, understanding and appreciation of the heritage assets in the area. The assessment should consider the likelihood of alterations to drainage patterns that might lead to in situ decomposition or destruction of below ground archaeological remains and deposits.	Comments have been considered for this assessment and a DBA and geophysical survey undertaken.
KCC Heritage (in response to Scoping Opinion)	The archaeological advisor to GBC confirmed archaeology and heritage to be 'scoped in' for the EIA process and that the process set out in Chapter 9 of the Iceni EIA Scoping Report would be appropriate, as would the model structure of the ES chapter.	Comments have been considered for this assessment and included in this Chapter.

Consultee	Comment	Response
KCC Heritage (during consultation)	Following the results of the geophysical survey, on the 12 th of November 2025, the Advisor asked for a limited trial trench evaluation focussing on the anomalies and blank areas recorded to determine the sensitivity of the buried assets in support of the application.	As trial trenching was not requested as part of the Scoping by KCC, the requested trial trenching will not be submitted with the ES in support of the planning application.

Study Area and Scope

Study Area

- 9.11 To assess the archaeological potential of the Site, Historic Environment Record (HER) data has been obtained for a 1km study area from the Site boundary.
- 9.12 The Kent HER (KHER) data is an extensive collection of information relating to heritage and archaeology, from the earliest human occupation to the present day.
- 9.13 The extent of the study area was acknowledged, and the records issued on 28 July 2025 by the HER Officer.

Scope

- 9.14 The assessment identifies and evaluates buried heritage assets within the Site and within a set study area, and makes an assessment, based on the information available at the time of writing, of how the Proposed Development will affect their heritage sensitivity.
- 9.15 Mitigation measures are identified, where appropriate, to avoid, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects identified and/or enhance likely beneficial effects. Taking into account the mitigation measures, the nature and sensitivity of the likely residual effects is reported.
- 9.16 Above ground historic structures (built heritage) are not specifically considered within this Chapter except where they are relevant to the archaeological interpretation of the Site. Please refer to **Chapter 11: Built Heritage**.

Assessment Methodology

Impact Areas

- 9.17 All types of intrusive, below ground works that would occur as part of the Proposed Development will have the potential to negatively impact on any surviving below ground archaeological remains within their footprint. These include, but are not limited to, earthworks and ground reprofiling, demolition of existing structures on the Site and construction of buildings and associated infrastructure. Mitigation strategies outlined in this report, such as the implementation of an archaeological site investigation, are proposed to reduce adverse effects during demolition and construction.
- 9.18 For the purposes of this assessment, a detailed design of the Proposed Development will be a consideration for future reserved matters application. A maximum (and, where relevant, minimum) parameters for the Proposed Development are applied based on a reasonable worst-case scenario

to determine the significance of effects, assuming that the full extent of the maximum parameters are built on.

Predicting the Effects

- 9.19 The following section describes the methods used to determine the likely significant effects during the construction and operational phases associated with the Proposed Development on potential buried heritage assets.
- 9.20 In line with the NPPF, for the purposes of this report, archaeological 'receptors' are referred to also as 'buried heritage assets' and heritage 'Sensitivity (Value)' is used in place of 'Significance'. The use of heritage 'Sensitivity' and 'Significance of (environmental) Effect' are clearly differentiated throughout.
- 9.21 This report considers the following:
- The Sensitivity (Value) of receptors;
 - Magnitude of Change arising from the Proposed Development; and
 - The significance of effect upon receptors.
- 9.22 This report identifies and assesses potential direct effects upon the Sensitivity of known and potential archaeological receptors. The Significance of the Effect of the Proposed Development was assessed by combining buried heritage asset sensitivity with magnitude of change, considering embedded and construction-phase mitigation measures applied.
- 9.23 The Sensitivity of buried heritage assets is considered in relation to statutory designations, and priorities or recommendations set out in regional research agenda. The NPPF defines Sensitivity for heritage policy as 'the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic' (NPPF 2024⁵). The NPPF's heritage interests, definition of Sensitivity (for heritage policy), along with professional judgement, are used to determine the importance/value of the resource.
- 9.24 The assessment of physical effects will consider direct effects upon buried heritage assets, where archaeological sites or potential archaeological sites and buried heritage assets are at risk of being disturbed or destroyed.

Significance Criteria

- 9.25 The scale attributed to each effect has been determined based on the sensitivity of the receptor and magnitude of change arising as a result of the Proposed Development. Professional judgement and experience have been drawn upon to assess the scale and sensitivity.

Receptors and Receptor Sensitivity

- 9.26 The significance of an effect on a buried heritage asset is mainly determined by the asset's sensitivity and the scale of change that could harm it, supported by professional judgement. An assessment of Impact on a buried heritage asset involves an understanding of the heritage Sensitivity of the asset and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024, section 16; para. 207) advises that the

level of detail should be proportionate to the Sensitivity of the heritage asset and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential Magnitude of Change arising from the Proposed Development.

- 9.27 Receptors comprise known and unknown archaeological assets, such as World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments and designated and non-designated heritage assets. Their potential presence is given in the baseline section of this report and is further detailed in the archaeological DBA (**Appendix 9.1**).
- 9.28 Direct effects are qualified by the extent and nature of remains (when considering archaeological buried heritage assets) associated with an asset which would be disturbed or lost, and the effect of this loss on the heritage interests (heritage Sensitivity) of the asset. In respect of buried archaeological remains with no visible above ground remains, this would normally result in the loss of archaeological interest.
- 9.29 The Sensitivity of each receptor was evaluated as being high, medium, low or negligible based on a review of the baseline position of each receptor and its performance against benchmark areas. The receptors and the definition of sensitivity of a receptor (high, medium, low) is based on a scale set out in **Table 9.2**.

Table 9.2 Receptor Sensitivity Description

Value (Sensitivity)	Description
High	• World Heritage Sites • Assets of acknowledged international importance • Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives • Historic landscapes (including National Landscapes) of international value (designated or not) • Scheduled Monuments and undesignated assets of schedulable quality and importance, and their setting • Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings • Archaeological assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives • Designated and undesignated historic landscapes of outstanding interest (including Grade I and Grade II* Registered Historic Parks and Gardens) • Non-designated landscapes of high quality and importance and of demonstrable national value • Wrecked ships and aircraft that are protected under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973, Ancient monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 or Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 with an international dimension to their importance, plus as-yet undesignated sites that are demonstrably of equivalent archaeological value
Medium	• Designated or undesignated archaeological assets that contribute to regional research objectives • Grade II Listed Buildings • Conservation Area • Designated special historic landscapes of special historic interest (including Grade II Registered Historic Parks and Gardens) • Wrecks of ships and aircraft that do not have statutory protection on a formal assessment of their importance in terms of build, use, loss, survival and investigation • Prehistoric deposits with moderate potential to contribute to an understanding of the palaeoenvironment

Value (Sensitivity)	Description
Low	- Non-designated Heritage assets, including locally listed buildings, other buildings, and wrecks that are considered to be of local interest - Archaeological assets of limited value, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives
Very Low	- Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest/buildings with little or no value at local or other scale - Landscapes with little or no significant historical interest

Magnitude of Change

- 9.30 The magnitude of change, based on the change that the Proposed Development would have upon the resource/receptor, is considered within the range of high, medium, low, very low. Consideration is given to scale, duration of impact/effect (e.g. for construction, short-term for 1-2 years, medium-term for 3-5 years, long-term for 5 years and greater, and permanent, dependent upon project timeframes) and extent of Proposed Development. The scale used for determining the magnitude of a change has been based on **Table 9.3**.

Table 9.3 Magnitude of Change Description

Impact Magnitude	Description
High	Total loss of or major alteration to a site, building or other feature (e.g. destruction of archaeological feature, demolition of a building), that results in a total loss of significance
Medium	Major physical damage to or significant alteration to a site, building or other feature, that results in a total loss of significance
Low	Minor damage or alteration to a site, building or other feature. Encroachment on an area where it is considered that low archaeological potential exists, that results in some loss of significance
Very Low	Very minor damage or alteration to a site, building or other feature, that results in minor loss of significance or no physical effect and no loss of significance

Assessing Significance of Effect

- 9.31 The predicted significance of effect is determined by looking at how large the impact is and how important the heritage resource is, leading to a professional judgement about how important the effect will be. This report considers the significance of effects both in terms of the EIA terminology and the NPPF and in respect of the potential for loss of Sensitivity ('harm') to occur.
- 9.32 In making the final prediction on the significance of effect, consideration is given not only to the importance and heritage Sensitivity of an asset in terms of its designation. Consideration is also given to the sensitivity of an asset to the type of change or impact anticipated, as well as the magnitude of that change.

- 9.33 **Table 9.4** illustrates how the heritage Sensitivity of the asset and the Magnitude of Change are combined to produce an assessment of the significance of effect upon the heritage sensitivity of the archaeological resource.
- 9.34 Effects are considered to be significant or not significant in EIA terms according to the matrix in **Table 9.4**. In line with the EIA Regulations, a Moderate, or Major effect would be considered to be significant in EIA terms, depending upon the heritage Sensitivity of the asset (above) and the exercise of professional judgement.
- 9.35 Once the significance of effect has been classified, consideration is given to whether the qualitative nature of the resultant effect is, therefore, 'significant beneficial', 'significant adverse' or 'not significant'.
- 9.36 **Table 9.4** provides a matrix for determining the significance of an effect based on the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of change.

Table 9.4 Significance of Effect Matrix

Receptor Significance	Magnitude of Change			
	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
High	Major Beneficial / Adverse	Major Beneficial / Adverse	Moderate Beneficial / Adverse	Minor Beneficial / Adverse
Medium	Major Beneficial / Adverse	Moderate Beneficial / Adverse	Minor Beneficial / Adverse	Negligible
Low	Moderate Beneficial / Adverse	Minor Beneficial / Adverse	Negligible	Negligible
Very Low	Minor Beneficial / Adverse	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

Limitations and Assumptions

- 9.37 The presence of and sensitivity of below-ground archaeological remains is often uncertain, until their nature and extent has been sufficiently determined through archaeological evaluation. Notwithstanding, the assessment methodology is considered robust, utilising reasonably available information, and conforms to the requirements of a guidance and planning policy.
- 9.38 The assessment is based upon data and records provided by third parties, and therefore it has proceeded on the assumption that this information is accurate and up to date at the time of reporting.
- 9.39 The records held by KHER represents known buried heritage assets in the area but may not necessarily be exhaustive. The distribution of known data does not preclude the subsequent discovery of further elements of the historic environment that are, at present, unknown.

Baseline Conditions

Establishing Baseline Conditions

- 9.40 The archaeological baseline has been established and assessed using the HER data and other available sources, including grey literature reports on previous archaeological investigations in the study area, historic mapping and the geophysical survey undertaken within the Site in 2025.
- 9.41 The data retrieved via the HER search and examination of other sources of pertinent information enables not only the assessment of known buried heritage assets which may be affected by the Proposed Development. It also informs the extrapolation of data and the prediction of potential assets on Site and their sensitivity. This informed the analysis of the likely effects of the Proposed Development on known and unknown buried heritage assets.
- 9.42 Iceni Projects prepared an archaeological DBA (**Appendix 9.1**), which assessed the potential presence and sensitivity of archaeological assets on the Site and within the 1km study area of the Site boundary. This was supported by drawing on a range of sources available, including;
- Archaeological Data Service (ADS) – a comprehensive archive of published and unpublished fieldwork reports;
 - British Geological Survey (BGS) – solid and drift geology digital mapping and geological borehole data where applicable;
 - Details of the Proposed Development – existing and proposed site plan, topographical survey, contamination report, existing site services and utilities report;
 - Grey Literature Reports – reports on past archaeological investigations;
 - Historic England – information on statutory designated assets data including the National Heritage List for England (NHLE), World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, and any identified Heritage at Risk;
 - Local Planning Authority Local Plan and other information on historic environment policies, conservation areas and locally listed buildings where published online;
 - Mapping – Ordnance Survey (OS) maps from their historic first edition through to modern OS mapping. Earlier historic maps from were also consulted where available;
 - KHER – data detailing the results of previous archaeological investigations on the Site and in the surrounding study area; and
 - Site Visit – a site visit was undertaken by Iceni on the 19th of September 2025. Nothing of particular note with regards to potential archaeology was noted.

Baseline Conditions

- 9.43 The following section provides a summary of the recorded archaeological resource within the 1km study area, compiled from the sources summaries above and detailed in the references section of this Chapter.

9.44 There is Low Potential for archaeological remains within the Site from the prehistoric to the medieval period, considered to be of **negligible** to Local Significance, with Moderate Potential for the post-medieval archaeological remains assessed as Local Significance.

9.45 A full description of the archaeological potential of the Site and its surrounding is provided in **Appendix 9.1**.

Palaeolithic Period to Iron Age (Before AD 43)

9.46 There are no records prehistoric finds or features within the Site recorded on the KHER, however the study area yielded a variety of significant prehistoric finds, spanning from the Palaeolithic through to the Iron Age.

9.47 Surface finds recovered during the 1960s include Palaeolithic handaxes and Mesolithic stone lithic implements. From the Neolithic period a polished axe has been recovered along with a Bronze Age axe and copper alloy awl.

9.48 Additionally, coins from various periods have been recovered in the wider study area.

Roman period (AD 43- 410)

9.49 There are no records of Roman finds or features within the Site recorded on the KHER, however the Roman period is represented in the wider study area by scattered distribution of artefacts with no evidence for settlement.

9.50 Isolated finds include a Roman copper alloy disc brooch, a plate brooch, isolated coins and Roman pottery in the form of a small vase and an urn.

Saxon and Medieval period (AD 410 – 1485)

9.51 There are no records of Saxon and Medieval finds or features within the Site recorded on the KHER., however Meopham is recorded in Domesday Book of 1086 under the name “Mepeham” and describes Meopham as settlement with arable land, meadow and woodland along with a church.

9.52 Documentary evidence indicates that Meopham was an Anglo-Saxon settlement described in secondary sources with a group of Saxon buildings recorded in the wider study area.

9.53 Artefactual finds recorded in the wider study area includes a copper alloy mirror case, an early medieval silver hooked tag, lead gaming piece and a copper alloy mount to the south of the Site. A lead weight, copper alloy dagger and multiple coins have been recorded in the northeast.

Post-medieval to Modern period (AD 1485-present)

9.54 Evidence from the post-medieval period reflects a landscape of rural activity, agricultural development and local trade. Standing structures demonstrate organised farming practices from the post medieval period through to the modern period.

9.55 A range of small finds and farmsteads in the wider study area indicate everyday domestic use, personal ownership and circulation of currency in the local area, illustrating the Site’s role as part of a working rural community during the post medieval period to the modern period.

Archaeological Investigations within the Application Site

9.56 A fluxgate gradiometer geophysical survey was carried out on the Site by Magnitude Surveys² in October 2025. The survey was affected by magnetic disturbance in the form of biodegradable organic waste material across the entire Proposed Development. Several anomalies were detected of an undetermined origin, generally clustered around areas of heavy 20th century activity in adjacent fields.

Receptors

9.57 A list of existing and future receptors is included in **Table 9.5**.

Table 9.5 Existing and Future Sensitive Receptors

Receptor	Sensitivity
Existing Receptors	
Prehistoric Remains	Low
Roman Remains	Low
Saxon and Medieval Remains	Low
Post-medieval Remains	Low

Future Baseline

9.58 In the event of the Proposed Development not being implemented, it is expected that the Site will maintain its current use as predominantly arable land. Whilst this would prevent any impact arising from the Proposed Development, changes to buried heritage assets may still occur due to the long-term disturbance and soil erosion connected to agricultural activities, such as ploughing, and use of heavy machinery.

9.59 Therefore, in absence of the Proposed Development going ahead, the sources of information referenced above is therefore considered applicable to establishing the future baseline conditions on Site.

Assessment of Effects (Construction and Operational)

9.60 As this Chapter has been prepared in support of a submission for an Outline Planning Application, full detailed design and construction methodology is to be agreed at Reserved Matters.

9.61 The following section presents an assessment of the environmental effects of the construction of the Proposed Development. This Chapter will address direct effects (i.e. damage or removal of archaeological remains) on archaeological remains.

Environmental Design and Management

9.62 As proposed during consultation with GBC, a geophysical survey evaluation has been carried out. The results of this evaluation will inform if any mitigation is required. Inherent design mitigation usually includes the identification of areas with archaeological assets that warrant preservation in

situ and/or avoidance. If required, these requirements will inform, and be incorporated into, the final design of the Proposed Development.

- 9.63 At the current stage, no inherent design mitigation measures have been embedded into the design of the Proposed Development for the purposes of avoiding adverse effects to buried heritage assets.

Effects During Construction

- 9.64 All types of intrusive, below ground works that would occur as part of the Construction Phase for the Proposed Development will have the potential to negatively impact on any surviving buried heritage assets within their footprint, potentially leading to permanent and irreversible truncation, compaction, full or partial loss of archaeological remains or deposits. The following indicative activities during the demolition and construction phases have the potential to affect buried remains:

- Piling, earthworks and ground re-profiling, primarily in relation to excavation below ground level to facilitate drainage and flood mitigation;
- New construction access;
- Obstruction of buildings, including associated infrastructure, drainage features/SuDS and utilities; and
- Foundations for the new structures.

- 9.65 Within the maximum extent of the Proposed Development, the buildings are likely to have foundations extending below ground level, including piles and pile caps. The installation of buried services, landscaping, ground raising and any resurfacing would also have a below ground impact.

- 9.66 It is expected that the construction works associated with the Proposed Development will have a Large Magnitude of Change on any buried heritage assets present within the footprint of such activities.

Effects Once the Proposed Development is Operational

- 9.67 It is not expected that the Proposed Development will result in any further intrusive ground activities beyond those associated with the Construction Phase once the Proposed Development is operational. Therefore, direct and indirect impacts to known and unknown buried heritage assets are not expected during operational phase.

Mitigation Measures

- 9.68 As proposed during the consultation with GBC, if buried heritage assets are detected during the geophysical survey, a trial trench evaluation may be required at prior to submission of the application, and/or clear option for post-determination flexibility in layout/design for preservation in situ and/or recording.

Mitigation During Construction

- 9.69 If sensitive remains are found to be present during the evaluation, a programme of archaeological mitigation may be necessary prior to construction.

- 9.70 All archaeological site-based work would be undertaken prior to the commencement of below-ground works associated with the Proposed Development.
- 9.71 Potential adverse effects on buried archaeological remains during the construction works could be successfully mitigated by a programme of archaeological excavation and recording where remains of higher sensitivity are present, or a combination of both where necessary, via an appropriately worded pre-commencement condition.
- 9.72 The method statements, or Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), detailing the archaeological site investigation, and any subsequent mitigation, would be developed in consultation with KCC, and submitted against the relevant condition followed by the results of the work. If sensitive archaeological remains are encountered, the assessment, publication and archiving of the results may also be required.
- 9.73 Mitigation and subsequent public dissemination of the results would be an appropriate strategy to offset the adverse effects (defined pre-mitigation) on archaeology, if found to survive on the Site. As a result of the proposed mitigation measures, the Magnitude of Change at these receptors would be reduced to Low. The likely residual effects after mitigation will therefore be permanent and **minor (not significant)** for prehistoric, Roman, and medieval remains, and **negligible** for post-medieval remains, if present. This would extend across areas of the Site where below-ground impact would occur.

Mitigation Once the Proposed Development is Operational

- 9.74 In light of what is discussed in **paragraph 9.67** no mitigation measures are proposed once the Proposed Development is operational.

Residual Effects and Monitoring

- 9.75 The residual effects arising from the Proposed Development are summarised in **Table 9.6**.

Table 9.6 **Summary of Residual Effects**

Effect	Receptor (Significance)	Nature of Effect and Geographic Scale	Magnitude of Change*	Classification of Effect	Mitigation and Monitoring	Residual Effect
Construction Effects						
Damage/loss of prehistoric remains	Prehistoric (Low)	Local	High	Moderate adverse (Significant)	Archaeological mitigation	Negligible
Damage/loss of Roman remains	Roman (Low)	Local	High	Moderate adverse (Significant)	Archaeological mitigation	Negligible
Damage/loss of Medieval remains	Medieval (Low)	Local	High	Moderate adverse (Significant)	Archaeological mitigation	Negligible
Damage/loss of post-medieval remains	Post-medieval (Low)	Local	High	Moderate adverse (Significant)	Archaeological mitigation	Negligible

Notes: * incorporating environmental design and management, ** incorporating mitigation and monitoring measures

Likely Significant Environmental Effects

- 9.76 It is anticipated that any surviving buried heritage assets within the footprint of the Proposed Development will be removed as part of archaeological mitigation through excavation and recording. Therefore, no further effects resulting from climate change are expected.
- 9.77 In the event of buried heritage assets selected for preservation in situ as preferred mitigation, any impact arising from environmental effects will have to be assessed and mitigated according to the nature, material and potential change to the current environment of the buried heritage assets(s) selected for such mitigation.
- 9.78 At this stage, it is not expected that the combined effects of significant environmental effects associated with the Proposed Development will result in any significant impact beyond those caused by climate change alone.

Summary and Conclusions

- 9.79 A DBA¹ (**Appendix 9.1**) has been undertaken to assess the potential and significance of the buried heritage assets within a 1km study area of the Proposed Development. This concluded a Low Potential for the prehistoric to medieval periods of Local Significance, and a Moderate Potential for post-medieval remains of Local Significance.
- 9.80 Likely sensitive effects on archaeological receptors are only anticipated during the Construction Phase, where below-ground works may result in high adverse effects on any surviving archaeological remains. These effects would be direct, permanent and irreversible but are limited to the extent of below-ground construction activity.
- 9.81 The magnitude of impact arising from these effects is considered to be Moderate, and therefore significant in EIA terms. The significance of this effect is related to the heritage sensitivity of the known and predicted archaeological resource.
- 9.82 Intrusive below-ground works as part of the Construction Phase may potentially have a negative impact on surviving buried heritage assets. This can be mitigated via a trial trench evaluation, prior to commencement of the Construction Phase, to ascertain their extent and sensitivity of the buried heritage assets. This may be followed by an archaeological mitigation via preservation by record prior to commencement of the Construction Phase, informed by a Written Scheme of Investigation.

References

¹ Government Planning Practice Guidance 2023 (www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment);

² English Heritage (2008) Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance;

³ Historic England (2015), managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment – Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans (GPA);

- ⁴ Good Practice Advice in Planning 3 ('GPA 3') (2017); The Setting of Heritage Assets;
- ⁵ Historic England (2020) Good Practice in Planning: Enabling Development and Heritage Assets;
- ⁶ Historic England (2022) Planning and Archaeology: Historic England Advice Note 2017;
- ⁷ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2020, Standard for archaeological geophysical survey;
- ⁸ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2023, Standard for archaeological excavation;
- ⁹ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2023, Standard for archaeological monitoring and recording;
- ¹⁰ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2014, Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials (revised 2020);
- ¹¹ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2014, Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (revised 2023);
- ¹² Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2014, Code of Conduct (revised 2023); and
- ¹³ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2014, Standard and Guidance for the Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Deposition of Archaeological Archives (revised 2020)