

**Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD
Housing Omission Site – 91 Barrow Road, Barton upon Humber**

The Proposal and Potential Impacts on Heritage Assets at 91 Barrow Road, Barton upon Humber

The archaeological remains at Barrow Road are of particular significance for the understanding of the Saxon origins of Barton upon Humber. The application site contains important evidence of the early settlement of the historic town between the mid-8th to the 12th centuries including a section of the town ditch known as Castledyke; archaeological survival of Saxon and medieval remains at Barton is a resource of national importance.

The applicant undertook an archaeological evaluation of the proposed site in 2008 and has submitted the report of these investigations with their planning applications in 2010 & 2011 (Lindsey Archaeological Services, 2008, *Seaforth, 91 Barrow Road, Barton on Humber, North Lincolnshire; Archaeological Evaluation*).

The archaeological evaluation comprised the excavation of sixteen trial trenches across the proposed development site. Significant archaeological remains were recorded in fourteen of these sixteen trenches dating mainly from the mid 8th to the 12th century AD. Over 100 cut features, mainly linear ditches, pits and postholes were recorded, representing a continuation of the Saxon and Medieval occupation remains excavated in 1999-2000 on the neighbouring site at 89 Barrow Road. The medieval Castle Dyke, or town ditch, was encountered running diagonally across the development, cutting through earlier Saxon features. Evidence of metal-working of this date was also found.

The density of archaeological features in each of the trenches was consistent across the site with the exception of the two trenches placed to the south of the existing house where features were absent or truncated by later activity and the construction of the house.

The presence of this archaeology provides further evidence that the Saxon settlement of Barton was not confined to the area of the Saxon enclosure in the immediate vicinity of St Peter's Church, but was clearly much more extensive and probably of a polyfocal nature.

The remains at 89 and 91 Barrow Road are thus of particular significance for the understanding of the Saxon origins of Barton-on-Humber, being located within 100m of the Saxon enclosure and manorial site at Tyrwhitt Hall adjacent to St Peter's Church, as well as relating to the later 12th century town defences and castle erected by Earl Gilbert on the Tyrwhitt Hall manorial site. St Peter's Church and the Saxon manorial site at Tyrwhitt Hall are Scheduled Monuments.

PLANNING CONSULTATIONS

REFERENCE: PA/2011/1554

CASE OFFICER: WILLIAM HILL



TEAM: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD

AUTHOR: ALISON WILLIAMS, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER

TEL: 01724 297471

EMAIL: alison.williams@northlincs.gov.uk



SUBJECT: Planning permission to erect 14 dwellings (Re-submission of PA/2010/1513), Land at, 91 Barrow Road, Barton Upon Humber

PARISH: BARTON UPON HUMBER

DATE ISSUED: 01/04/2014

SUMMARY OF ADVICE

- The application site contains important evidence of the early settlement of Barton between the mid-8th to the 12th centuries including a section of the town ditch known as Castledyke; archaeological survival of Saxon and medieval remains at Barton is a resource of national importance.
- The applicant has submitted a Heritage Asset Impact Assessment incorporating a mitigation strategy to preserve remains in situ below development and a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological excavation and recording where loss of archaeological evidence is unavoidable
- The HER considers that the mitigation scheme as proposed is unacceptable for reasons set out below and advises **REFUSAL** as the application would be contrary to national and local planning policies

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD (HER) GROUP FUNCTION: To hold, maintain, interpret and manage heritage information, enhancing the understanding of the area's historical development as a distinctive and attractive place. HER information provides source material for interpretation by heritage professionals and for use by community groups and individuals.

The Group also provides advice on development proposals that affect, or may affect, the sites and settings of all heritage assets i.e. designated and non-designated historic buildings,

- There is insufficient information relating to the proposed area and location of the archaeological excavation
- The WSI is not sufficiently robust to ensure that, where necessary, the requirements for archaeological mitigation will take priority over the construction and that the archaeologist has the authority to ensure that ground excavations are undertaken to the agreed levels.
- There remain too many uncertainties both to the ground raising and construction methods and to the archaeological response such that I cannot advise that this is an acceptable scheme that will adequately achieve the applicant's objective to preserve the archaeology in situ or by record.

Further detailed comments on the mitigation strategy are set out in the appendix below.

Accordingly, the application should be **refused** as it is contrary to the NPPF, Core Strategy policy CS6 and Local Plan policy HE9; inadequate information has been provided to allow the Local Planning Authority to assess the impact of the development on the heritage assets, and to approve an appropriate mitigation strategy that can be effectively implemented and ensures mitigation of damage.

I trust this advice is acceptable.

- 1.7 This also contradicts the section in the document titled Construction Works that Cannot be Mitigated that includes the access roads and service trenches.
- 1.8 The document offers a number of assurances with regard to the construction methodology to protect the archaeological deposits, such as controlling the movement of machinery, the use of matting or terram. It is not however clear how these will be implemented during construction and who will decide whether and what additional protection is appropriate.
- 1.9 The document states that '*A protocol will be prepared for protection of the individual house plots to protect the garden areas surrounding the house footprints during building construction*'. This information is required to be detailed as part of the archaeological mitigation strategy.
- 1.10 The dimensions of the flood attenuation tank are currently unknown but it is intended to locate the tank within the existing cellar to minimise the impact on archaeology; no alternative provision has been made should this not be possible, or if for example the tank covers a larger area than the cellar, or a different location is required. There are insufficient details about the tank and its potential impact such that mitigation cannot be agreed.
- 1.11 Given that accurate levels are of critical importance to this mitigation scheme, it is of considerable concern that the levels of the original topographical survey submitted with the application are at some considerable variance with the levels stated in the archaeological evaluation report, for which no explanation has been provided in this document. In addition, the levels on the various figures in this document are impossible to decipher.
- 1.12 This document presents the archaeological response whilst the engineering specification for the raising of ground levels is not adequately included. There is no provision for independently recording the ground levels during the construction to ensure that the mitigation is achieved, or if not, for immediate remedial action and alternative strategies.

2. Piling strategy

- 2.1 Based on the preliminary assessment of ground bearing conditions submitted with the document, the engineer's recommendation is for further borehole information to determine actual strata strength (Waldeck, 9/5/12). Until the results are available the proposed piled foundation design cannot be considered to be definitely capable of implementation, therefore the feasibility of the mitigation strategy is in question. No alternatives are provided.
- 2.2 English Heritage guidelines on Piling and Archaeology (EH, 2007) suggest that the piling should impact no more than 2% of the site area and that taking account of all other engineering works such as services, a maximum of 5% of the total site should be seen as the upper limit of loss from foundation construction. Not enough information is provided in the document to calculate the total loss of archaeological evidence.
- 2.3 A pile design drawing is only available for semi-detached house plots 1 & 2, not for the larger detached house plots and those with integral garage. The piling design drawing indicates a total of 17 piles for plots 1 & 2, whereas the

- 3.5 *'Proposed base level for the floor slab is 15.44m OD giving clearance of 0.54m above the archaeology.'* Top of archaeology in trench 8 to west 15.05m and in trench 7 bank material apparently at 14.90m. Clearance is therefore between 0.39m & 0.54m, only just within tolerance.
- 3.6 Plot 8 - Fig 4 top of archaeology shown incorrectly as 13.60, should be c.0.15m either side of 14.55m ie 14.70-14.40m, dipping to west as shown on fig 12; document states under plot 7 that height of bank in trench 7 was recorded at 14.90m in house plot 8, so 14.90m is the top of archaeology. Proposed base level of floor slab is 15.09m giving clearance of only 0.19m above top of bank, therefore mitigation strategy of 0.40m not achieved.
- 3.7 Plot 9 - Base of floor slab level acceptable albeit with some potential for disturbance at SW corner where inferred bank material may survive. *'Proposed base level for the floor slab is 14.95m giving clearance of 0.40-0.70m'* Archaeological layers at 14.55-14.45m (Layers 711, 716 & 739 are at 14.45m) therefore clearance only 0.40-0.50m. Inferred top of bank beneath SW corner of plot 9 would be 15.00m therefore base of floor slab at 14.95m would directly impact archaeology but likely to already be destroyed given that ground level only 14.93m.
- 3.8 Plot 10 - Fig 4 top of archaeology incorrectly shown as 13.16 should be 13.36m - 13.53m but base of floor slab level acceptable.

4. **Access Road, Pumping Station and associated sewer pipes**

- 4.1 Insufficient information is provided to assess the impact of the construction of the access road and the excavation of service trenches to and from the proposed pumping station and the public sewer system.
- 4.2 The pumping station is placed in the middle of the site, and the depth will therefore have to take account of lower levels to the north. The pipes connecting the plots on the lower north side of the PS will by necessity have to be of sufficient depth for gravity feed into the PS, this depth is likely to be considerable and will impact on the archaeological deposits, as will the pipes from the PS to AW sewer connection.
- 4.3 The document refers only to a 2m wide strip within the access road to accommodate services and drainage but in the inserted table titled 'Development at Barrow Road, Barton upon Humber, Volume of archaeological disturbance', further calculations are based only on the width of pipe 0.50m.
- 4.4 There is no drawing *indicating* the route of service pipes between the individual house plots in relation to the archaeological deposits and as such, there is insufficient evidence to confirm that the overall disturbance will be within the acceptable limit of 5% of the site (EH, 2007).

5. **Archaeological Excavation Area**

- 5.1 The document proposes to mitigate the loss of archaeological remains through the controlled excavation of an area that will maximise the results in the context of the regional research objectives rather than piecemeal excavation of those areas that would be destroyed by development.

further post-excavation analysis as appropriate leading to a final report and, potentially, publication of results.