

Memorandum

From	Doug Moir	To	Jonathan Haine
Extension			
Our Ref	LCC_2021_0012-HET.DM	Your Ref:	LCC/2021/0012/ASPJMH
Date	20 th April 2021		

APPLICATION: LCC/2021/0012

**EXTRACTION OF SAND AND GRAVEL INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACCESS ROAD AND NEW JUNCTION WITH A59 PRESTON NEW ROAD, CREATION OF PLANT SITE, WEIGHBRIDGE AND STOCKPILING AREA, SILT PONDS, LANDSCAPING INCLUDING SCREEN MOUNDING, WITH PROGRESSIVE RESTORATION TO WETLAND AND PASSIVE FLOOD MANAGEMENT FACILITY, WOODLAND AND AGRICULTURE LOWER HALL FARM SAMLESBURY
GR: 359126 431260**

The following non-designated heritage assets are recorded on the Lancashire Historic Environment Record as lying within the redline boundary of the application:

PRN 1722 – the former site of Alit Grayson's Cross

PRN 6455 – a sandpit

PRN 15231 – Unidentified earthworks, possibly of a much mutilated motte and bailey

PRN 32937 – A copper-alloy late medieval chape, found by a metal detectorist in 2008

PRN 35968 – An Elizabeth I sixpence, dated 1567, found by a metal detectorist in 2011

PRN 35969 – An Elizabeth I half-groat, 1591/2-94, found by a metal detectorist in 2011

Only PRN 15231 lies within the orange development boundary and will be affected by the proposals. If the earthworks do date to the medieval period, as the remains of either a motte and bailey castle or are associated with the medieval Lower Hall estate they might be considered to be of sufficient significance to merit preservation in situ, and realignment of the access road may need to be considered. Further investigation (earthwork survey and intrusive evaluation) is therefore likely to be required to help resolve this question.

The ruins of Samlesbury Lower Hall, a designated heritage asset, a grade II Listed Building (PRN1717) lie immediately to the south-east of the boundary of the site. The site is thought to have been occupied since the late 12th century, and there remains a potential that associated estate buildings might have once extended into the application site.

The proposals do however lie on the second river terrace, and it was on this terrace at Lower Brockholes Quarry, c. 1.5km west, between 2007-9, that evidence of seasonal Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age activity in the form of a number of pits, postholes and gullies from which a significant assemblage of Beaker pottery of the later Neolithic and earlier Bronze Age, c. 2500-1700 BC, was recovered. The assemblage was thought to be indicative of domestic activity, and at the time was one of the largest such assemblages to have been found in the County, and considered to be of regional significance. A small number of flint implements were also recovered from the site at the same time.

The application is accompanied by a Heritage and Archaeology Assessment (Archaeology Collective, 2019) in which the site's high potential to contain archaeological deposits from the prehistoric period is recognised in section 4.21 of the Assessment. The HET would however, in light of the finds recovered at Lower Brockholes Quarry, disagree with the conclusion that "any such finds would be of low to medium significance".

The NPPF 189 is clear that:

"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.

205. ...In considering proposals for mineral extraction, minerals planning authorities should:

b) ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality."

The Environmental Statement section 6.8 concludes that the proposed development will have no significant negative environmental effects, although in the absence of any intrusive archaeological investigation of the site it is not possible to know if this is the case, as the nature, extent and date of any surviving archaeological deposits that might be encountered is currently unknown.

Historic England's Advice Note 13: Mineral Extraction and Archaeology ([HEAG \(historicengland.org.uk\)](http://historicengland.org.uk)), section 66 mentions that:

"Given the extensive scale and depth of archaeological interest (and almost complete deposit removal), a geoarchaeological assessment is an important component of a DBA on all mineral sites where the overburden (the material that covers the mineral body) is deep (eg where alluvial and colluvial sediments exist) or where there is the potential for archaeology to be in the mineral body itself."

and goes on to outline who should undertake such work and what the assessment should ideally contain in order that it can then:

"be used to enable subsequent evaluation stages (e.g. geophysical survey, test pits and evaluation trenching) to be targeted on areas where they are best suited."

This was a form of assessment undertaken at Lower Brockholes, and which suggested settlement to be limited to a raised area of sandbar, subsequently proven by the archaeological watching brief and excavation, and broadly coincided with the limits of the mapped second river terrace as shown in Figure 2.1 of the DBA.

Previous mineral working can be seen on an aerial photograph of 1938 (Britain from Above: <http://www.britainfromabove.org.uk/en/image/EPW059493>) and which had extended by the 1950s to include the field to the south-east as shown on Figure 4.4. The aerial photograph and mapping are considered to demonstrate that these fields have suffered some excavation, but would wish to see the results of the walkover survey before reaching a decision as to how extensive those works might have been, and if there is a potential for a small part of this area not to have been worked.

The Historic Environment Team would therefore advise that in order for the County Council to be able to make a reasoned and informed decision the applicant be required to submit the following further documentation:

- i) a Geoarchaeological Assessment,
- ii) as section 7.2 of the DBA acknowledges "Archaeological remains can survive as earthworks" and given that the Heritage Collective were not able to conduct a site visit, the results of a walkover of the site,
- iii) a survey of the surviving earthworks that form the site of the possible motte and bailey, as well as any other such features identified from the work in ii) above

prior to the determination of the application.

The works mentioned above will in all likelihood form only the first stages of the necessary archaeological evaluation of the site that the HET might consider necessary to be undertaken prior to the determination of this application.

As well as enabling an informed decision to be reached, data gathered at the evaluation stage can also help inform the nature, extent and cost of any further archaeological mitigation considered necessary, thereby reducing the chances of unexpected and costly delays, and enabling at an early stage in the project, the full scope of the works and their reporting to be better understood and costed.

Thank you for your consultation

Doug Moir

For the Head of Service for Planning and Environment