

Wiktorja Sypnicka

From: Wiktorja Sypnicka
Sent: 12 September 2022 16:26
To: Cook Andrew
Cc: Caroline Payne; anthony.hanna175@btinternet.com
Subject: Comments on geophysical survey at Thornbridge Hall

Dear Andrew,

Further to exchange of correspondence regarding the geophysical survey, please find below a MailBigFile link to a corrected and combined Phase 1 and Phase 2 report with complete WSI, together with comments from ARS, who were the contractor for the work, added to the email correspondence in purple below.

Link: <http://mbf.co/qULGKQ>

Best wishes,

Wiki Sypnicka BA (Hons)

ASSISTANT CONSULTANT

Direct Dial : 01625 442789
Mobile : 07895 363054
Email : WSypnicka@emeryplanning.com

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

Regus House
Herons Way
Chester Business Park
CH4 9QR

emeryplanning.com

01625 433881

01244 732447



Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as Emery Planning | Registered in England No. 4471702 | Registered Office: 2-4 South Park Court, Hobson Street, Macclesfield, SK11 8BS | 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: 18 August 2022 15:07
To: Cook Andrew <Andrew.Cook@peakdistrict.gov.uk>
Cc: Caroline Payne <>; Wiktorja Sypnicka <WSypnicka@emeryplanning.com>; Badcock Anna <anna.badcock@peakdistrict.gov.uk>; Hawksworth Jo <Jo.Hawksworth@peakdistrict.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 3279072 - Land at Thornbridge Hall, Baslow Road, Ashford-in-the-Water

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. Figure 4 reissued and point noted although there is no impact on the overall interpretation of the report.***
- *The interpretation is minimal – evidence for phasing has not been discussed. **Again, I will request clarification from the contractor. The interpretation offered is in line with the evidence gained from the survey. Any discussion of phasing could only be speculative for the evidence presented. Any discussion of the phasing was intentionally avoided to prevent a priori assumptions being made about the site.***

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. New report issued with extended WSI. Phase 2 work followed the same protocol as Phase 1 and did not differ.***
- *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. There is no fundamental reason that magnetometry cannot be used over tarmac, especially freshly laid tarmac which has not had chance to incorporate ferrous debris. The data is very stripey indicating problems with data collection and/or processing. The data is less than ideal but this is an occurrence that can be observed on across several sites. It is true that it compromises the interpretive value of the data but this may not be due to recent groundworks as much as the tarmac overburden. 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



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

Roger Doonan
Head of Specialist Services

07734 504842

www.archaeologicalresearchservices.com

Connect with us   



**ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RESEARCH SERVICES LTD**
Digging with Purpose

**Environmental Impact Assessment – Desk-Based Assessments – Heritage Statements – Geophysics –
Historic Buildings – Evaluation – Excavation – Watching Briefs – Palaeoenvironment – Publication**

Sponsors of the Community Archaeology Radiocarbon Dating Fund