

Wiktorja Sypnicka

From: Tony Hanna <tony.hanna@lanproservices.co.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2022 15:07
To: Cook Andrew
Cc: Caroline Payne; Wiktorja Sypnicka; Badcock Anna; Hawksworth Jo
Subject: RE: 3279072 - Land at Thornbridge Hall, Baslow Road, Ashford-in-the-Water

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good afternoon Andrew,

Thank you for taking the time to review the geophysical reports, and the resulting comments. I will address the comments in red below.

I note that these have been sent for our information. Could you please let us know whether you intend to submit them as formal documents (i.e. additional evidence) in connection with the appeal? If so, and the Planning Inspectorate agrees to accept them, we would naturally want the opportunity to formally respond before the public inquiry. **We intend to submit the documents formally to PINS. I thought it important to at least consult with PDNPA as usual practice prior to submission.**

In the meantime, our Cultural Heritage team note the contents of the surveys and have made the following general observations:

Phase 1 Report

- *In general, many anomalies were detected, some of which are likely to be archaeological in origin. **Agreed, however, geophysics allows for identification and location of anomalies and some interpretation as archaeological and or geological features. For clarity when a site may be impacted by a development, targeted trenching is required to characterise such features in terms of extent, condition, date, and significance. The anomalies are not particularly dense and appear to provide evidence for agricultural systems such as boundaries and ridge and furrow.***
- *Not all the anomalies in the text have been mapped (e.g. 2b and 2m are missing from Figure 4). Some anomalies seem to be the wrong colour for their given interpretation. **I will request clarification from the archaeological contractor.***
- *The interpretation is minimal – evidence for phasing has not been discussed. **Again, I will request clarification from the contractor.***

Phase 2 Report

- *A Written Scheme of Investigation for this phase of work was not seen by the Cultural Heritage Team. The original WSI did not cover these additional areas. The report suggests that a WSI is appended, but neither Appendix 2 or 3 are present. **This will be rectified and the WSI amended to cover all areas, 1, 2 and 3.***
- *We are extremely surprised that a geophysical survey was conducted on the tarmac surface of the car park (Area 1). This is not something we would recommend. The data is very stripey indicating problems with data collection and/or processing. There has been no attempt to discuss the large anomaly that was detected in the data. Given the poor quality of the data this strong anomaly could perhaps be geological in origin, but no discussion of this has been made. It is likely that any more ephemeral archaeological features were removed or heavily truncated during the soil strip for the car park. **The survey was intended to provide as much relevant evidence as possible to inform the hearing regarding potential for archaeology and impact from the works. The large linear anomaly may be the remains of the lynchet evident below the tarmac surface, which appears to correspond with the LiDAR.***
- *In Area 2 anomalies were detected, some of which are likely to be archaeological in origin. This includes a possible pit. **I agree, and here we do have phasing of archaeological features, possible rectilinear and sub***

circular enclosures, a pit, possible med ridge and furrow, a post med boundary and modern ploughing. This is useful and this area should be avoided as part of a CMP.

Tony Hanna's e-mail mentions that targeted trial trenching would be appropriate to evaluate the geophysical anomalies. This is not something we would recommend in this case. None of these areas are currently under threat from disturbance; the work would cause unnecessary damage to possible archaeological deposits. It would be more appropriate to examine any geophysical anomalies/archaeological deposits through the normal planning process for any future planning proposals – each judged on its own merit. We would not normally recommend evaluation trial trenching purely for the purposes of a Conservation Management Plan. I agree. The purpose has been to inform and provide further evidence for archaeological potential, location of that potential regarding impact – and inform a future CMP.

The intention is to inform the hearing and provide a template for archaeological elements for a future CMP. The client has agreed to this non-intrusive work to enable this clarity and to inform the preservation and conservation of heritage assets across the site. This can also inform any further works such as drainage plans and any other ground works that may be required throughout the estate.

Best wishes
Tony

Tony Hanna
Head of Archaeological & Heritage Consultancy | MCIfA

D: +44 (0)161 7111740
M: +44 (0)7587 909665
W: lanproservices.co.uk

Lanpro»



PLANNING | ARCHITECTURE | ARCHAEOLOGY | URBAN DESIGN | LANDSCAPE | HERITAGE | ARBORICULTURE | ENVIRONMENTAL

Linked 

Connect with us

Confidentiality:

This email and its attachments are intended for the above named only and may be confidential. If they have come to you in error you must take no action based on them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone; please reply to this email and highlight the error.

Security Warning:

Please note that this email has been created in the knowledge that Internet email is not a 100% secure communications medium. We advise that you understand and accept this lack of security when emailing us.

Viruses:

Although we have taken steps to ensure that this email and attachments are free from any virus, we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free.

 Before printing, think about the environment

From: Cook Andrew <Andrew.Cook@peakdistrict.gov.uk>

Sent: 17 August 2022 16:18

To: Wiktoria Sypnicka <WSypnicka@emeryplanning.com>

Cc: Caroline Payne <CPayne@emeryplanning.com>; Badcock Anna <Anna.Badcock@peakdistrict.gov.uk>;
Hawksworth Jo <Jo.Hawksworth@peakdistrict.gov.uk>; Tony Hanna <tony.hanna@lanproservices.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 3279072 - Land at Thornbridge Hall, Baslow Road, Ashford-in-the-Water

Hi Wiki

Thank you for sending these Phase 1 and Phase 2 geophysical surveys.

I note that these have been sent for our information. Could you please let us know whether you intend to submit them as formal documents (i.e. additional evidence) in connection with the appeal? If so, and the Planning Inspectorate agrees to accept them, we would naturally want the opportunity to formally respond before the public inquiry.

In the meantime, our Cultural Heritage team note the contents of the surveys and have made the following general observations:

Phase 1 Report

- *In general, many anomalies were detected, some of which are likely to be archaeological in origin*
- *Not all the anomalies in the text have been mapped (e.g. 2b and 2m are missing from Figure 4). Some anomalies seem to be the wrong colour for their given interpretation.*
- *The interpretation is minimal – evidence for phasing has not been discussed*

Phase 2 Report

- *A Written Scheme of Investigation for this phase of work was not seen by the Cultural Heritage Team. The original WSI did not cover these additional areas. The report suggests that a WSI is appended, but neither Appendix 2 or 3 are present.*
- *We are extremely surprised that a geophysical survey was conducted on the tarmac surface of the car park (Area 1). This is not something we would recommend. The data is very stripey indicating problems with data collection and/or processing. There has been no attempt to discuss the large anomaly that was detected in the data. Given the poor quality of the data this strong anomaly could perhaps be geological in origin, but no discussion of this has been made. It is likely that any more ephemeral archaeological features were removed or heavily truncated during the soil strip for the car park.*
- *In Area 2 anomalies were detected, some of which are likely to be archaeological in origin. This includes a possible pit.*

Tony Hanna's e-mail mentions that targeted trial trenching would be appropriate to evaluate the geophysical anomalies. This is not something we would recommend in this case. None of these areas are currently under threat from disturbance; the work would cause unnecessary damage to possible archaeological deposits. It would be more appropriate to examine any geophysical anomalies/archaeological deposits through the normal planning process for any future planning proposals – each judged on its own merit. We would not normally recommend evaluation trial trenching purely for the purposes of a Conservation Management Plan.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards

Andrew Cook
Team Manager - Monitoring & Enforcement
[Planning Service](#)

direct tel: 01629 816304

From: Wiktoria Sypnicka <WSypnicka@emeryplanning.com>

Sent: 27 July 2022 10:03

To: Cook Andrew <Andrew.Cook@peakdistrict.gov.uk>

Cc: Caroline Payne <CPayne@emeryplanning.com>

Subject: FW: 3279072 - Land at Thornbridge Hall, Baslow Road, Ashford-in-the-Water

Exercise caution - check attachments and links before opening them.

This email originated from outside the Authority's email system.

Hi Andrew,

Please find attached further geophysical fieldwork reports for your information. Please note these have also been sent to Anna Badcock, the email is below for reference.

I will send the phase 2 report via a separate email due to size.

Kind Regards,

Wiki Sypnicka BA (Hons)
Assistant Consultant

Macclesfield: 01625 433 881
Chester: 01244 732 447
Mobile: 07895 363 054

www.emeryplanning.com



Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity or to make a donation, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com

emery
planning

Emery Planning
2-4 South Park Court
Hobson Street
Macclesfield
SK11 8BS

Emery Planning
Regus House
Herons Way
Chester Business Park
CH4 9QR

Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as
Emery Planning
Registered in England No. 4471702

Registered office as
above

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. If you are not the intended recipient (nor the person responsible for delivering to that recipient) be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify Emery Planning on.

info@emeryplanning.com

From: Tony Hanna <tony.hanna@lanproservices.co.uk>

Sent: 26 July 2022 18:01

To: anna.badcock@peakdistrict.gov.uk

Cc: Caroline Payne <CPayne@emeryplanning.com>; Wiktoria Sypnicka <WSypnicka@emeryplanning.com>

Subject: Re: RE: 21-294 - Thornbridge Hall - Enforcement Appeal

Good afternoon Anna,

I trust you are well.

As part of the case against the enforcement appeal, as you know, I had instructed Archaeological Research Services to carry out a geophysical survey across several areas of the site to evaluate the archaeological potential with regard to impact from the unauthorised development. I attach the 2 geophysical fieldwork reports for your information regarding the enforcement appeal. They show very much as expected with agricultural cultivation and field boundaries of possible post-medieval and medieval date. To characterise these anomalies a scheme of targeted trenching would be appropriate. This would also add to any Conservation Management Plan in the future.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Best wishes

Tony

Tony Hanna

Head of Archaeological & Heritage Consultancy | MCIfA

D: +44 (0)161 7111740

M: +44 (0)7587 909665

W: lanproservices.co.uk



PLANNING | ARCHITECTURE | ARCHAEOLOGY | URBAN DESIGN | LANDSCAPE | HERITAGE | ARBORICULTURE | ENVIRONMENTAL



Confidentiality:

This email and its attachments are intended for the above named only and may be confidential. If they have come to you in error you must take no action based on them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone; please reply to this email and highlight the error.

Security Warning:

Please note that this email has been created in the knowledge that Internet email is not a 100% secure communications medium. We advise that you understand and accept this lack of security when emailing us.

Viruses:

Although we have taken steps to ensure that this email and attachments are free from any virus, we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free.

 Before printing, think about the environment

Peak District National Park Authority, Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell, DE45 1AE. Phone:01629 816200

This email message may contain confidential information, may be legally privileged and /or contain personal views or opinions that are not the Authority's. It is intended only for the use of the addressee or those included on the email recipients. If you have received this email in error please tell us and delete it immediately. Under Freedom of Information legislation email content may be disclosed. The Authority may monitor email traffic data and also the content of email for the purposes of security. Our Privacy Notice tells you about how we will use, and store your information, in line with the GDPR. Please click [here](#) to view the notice.

No employee or agent is authorised to conclude any legally binding agreement on behalf of the Authority with another party by email without express written confirmation by the Authority's Head of Law or authorised deputy for the specific agreement.

This e-mail has been scanned for all viruses by CensorNet. The service is powered by [MailSafe](#).
For more information please visit <http://www.censornet.com>