

**OUTCOMES OF MEETING HELD AT COUNTY HALL, LEWES  
ON THURSDAY 17<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2008**

**FOR PLANNING APPLICATION: BEXHILL HASTINGS LINK ROAD APPLICATION  
CULTURAL HERITAGE RESPONSES**

**Present**

Paul Roberts – English Heritage (Planning Consultee)

Casper Johnson – County Archaeologist, East Sussex County Council (Planning Consultee)

Giles Hewson (GH) - Project Design Team, ES co-ordinator, Mott MacDonald

Peter Hayward (PH) – Project Design Team, Project Manager, East Sussex County Council

Nigel Marshall (NM) – Project Design Team, Landscape Architect, East Sussex County Council

Debbie Mallard (DM) – Project Team, managing Oxford Archaeology contract, East Sussex County Council.

ITEM		ACTION
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Draft ES Addendum for the Cultural Heritage Chapter Reg 19 Comments</b>	
	<p><b>1. Comment 1 (ref: 57) – re: results of stage one evaluation.</b></p> <p>The ES Addendum Cultural Heritage Chapter draft submission also includes the additional study requested by CJ and PR at the last meeting:            •Geophysical Mapping Report by Dr M Bates.</p>	
	<p><b>2. Comment 2 (ref: 58) – re indirect effects construction of scheme will have on the hydrology and therefore long term preservation of water logged deposits.</b></p> <p>Although no significant change in water level is predicted by Faber Maunsell, OA have reaffirmed in clause 1.6.2 a statement made in the original ES, that changes in hydrology which result in dewatering of preserved archaeological deposits could result in significant adverse direct impact.</p> <p>OA further state that the hydrology situation should be reviewed in further design and construction stages. Monitoring of ground water levels should be considered and could be an important factor.</p> <p>OA suggest in clause 1.6.2 that the impact on archaeological features could be mitigated by a design change (relocation or reshaping of a pond).</p>	
	<p>There was explicit recognition from all that monitoring of ground water level and quality would be necessary in order to recognise potential risks to archaeological remains.</p>	
	<p><u>GH</u> – stated that clarification is required from Tony Cook (TC) (Planning, East Sussex County Council) about what would constitute a significant design change and trigger a new planning application.</p>	
*	<p><u>NM</u> to clarify this issue with TC. (Post meeting note to be added to minutes to confirm TC's response to this point.)</p>	NM
	<p><u>GH</u> – Chris Frith of Faber Maunsell needs carry out the following amendments to the hydrology chapter:-</p>	GH

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- insert a paragraph relating to the construction strategy.</li> <li>- confirm the meaning of the word 'significant' (in the context of 'no significant changes in ground water levels are expected').</li> </ul> <p>GH to organise.</p>	
	<p>There was explicit recognition from all that monitoring of ground water level and quality would be necessary in order to recognise potential risks to archaeological remains.</p>	
	<p><b>3. Comment 3 (ref: 59) re clarification on whether stage one evaluation would also cover side valleys, borrow pits, balancing ponds, greenway, enabling works etc.</b></p>	
	<p><u>PR</u> is satisfied that this point has been covered adequately in the Addendum. He agrees that stage 2 evaluation will be done post planning determination.</p>	
	<p><b>4. Comment 4 (ref: 60) re stage 2 of the evaluation – should this have been completed prior to submission of the ES.</b></p>	
	<p>CJ and PR agree that OA can state in the Addendum that the approach whereby stage 2 evaluation is carried out post determination, has been developed as a way forward and agreed with the County Archaeologist and English Heritage. PR says that this is based on there being sufficient mitigation post determination.</p>	DS
	<p><u>PR</u> – stated that a detailed WSI should be a condition.</p>	
	<p>All agreed that the wording of the WSI condition should be agreed with the County Archaeologist.</p>	
	<p>GH and PH to consider including a paragraph in the Geotechnical Investigation contract to make an allowance for some archaeology investigations to be carried out at the same time. All agree that this is a good idea but CJ stated that the archaeology work would need to be carried out correctly and the results would inform and not replace an archaeological evaluation.</p>	GH/PH
	<p>Clause 1.8.5 refers to the <b>geophysical mapping</b> report in Appendix B.2. All present confirmed that they are satisfied with the report.</p>	
	<p><u>DS</u> will adjust the Addendum conclusion to include an explanation of the meaning of the results of the additional surveys and will refer back to the original conclusion in the ES.</p> <p>DS will also confirm in the ES Addendum that all the works described in the ES Addendum and included in the appendices form Stage 1 of the Evaluation and this is now complete. All further works will form part of the Stage 2 evaluation.</p> <p>DS will also highlight that the geophysical mapping had been considered to be part of the stage 2 works but it was brought forward into phase 1 and presented in the ES Addendum.</p>	DS

<b>3.0</b>	<b>Outline WSI</b>	
	GH confirmed that at the last meeting held on the 30.11.07, CJ and PR considered that it would be acceptable for the applicant to put forward an 'outline' WSI. Surveys, studies and the latest geophysical mapping would inform the outline WSI. It was accepted that the WSI would be subject to some change in response to archaeological needs that may arise during the project.	
	<u>DS</u> Agreed to rephrase the <b>methodology section</b> to allow for more flexibility. DS will provide a general impression of work that will be required but what is actually done will be negotiated with the curators including English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The trenching plan will be labelled as 'indicative' only.	DS
	<u>DS</u> to include justification for the low percentage of trial trenching being proposed.	DS
	<b>DS – Section 5 Resources and Programme</b>	
	All agreed that some detail and the costs should be taken out of the WSI. It was explicitly recognised that the details and costs in the draft version considered at the meeting were understood and accepted. They are being removed for the purposes of complying with tender rules and commercial sensitivity.	
	DS to take out the following: section 9.0 estimated costs; all references to OA (to include the skills base required instead of the OA list of staff); how OA specifically will do the work. DS to add in the requirement for ecological support.	DS
	<u>CJ</u> – OA can refer to the 'ESCC Standards and Guidance document' in the main methodology section.  Also OA to refer to English Heritage guidance for archaeology evaluation and palaeoenvironmental evaluation. DS could append these guidance documents to the WSI.	DS
	<u>PR</u> wants assurance that there will be enough money to do the mitigation works.	
	<u>PH</u> confirmed that there would be 2 million pounds in the business case and another sum of money in the risk register.	
	<u>PH</u> will send PR extracts of the business case and the risk register as requested, at the end of June 2008.	PH
	<u>CJ</u> would like to talk to NM separately about landscaping and ponds etc to achieve the flexibility in the design that is required. CJ to organise.	CJ
<b>4.0</b>	<b>POST MEETING NOTE Refer to item 2.0, comment 2 *</b>	
	NM's e-mail to Tony Cook dated 17.04.08: <i>I understand from our consultants that recent changes in planning rules have resulted in less flexibility in changing details of a scheme, which has planning consent, without applying for a new consent.</i> Response from Tony Cook dated 29.04.08: <i>As far as I am aware no changes have yet been enacted. Changes are being debated and a review of the General Permitted Development Order for minor developments on non residential land has been undertaken by White Young Green with the Government likely to publish consultation proposals this summer.</i>	