

**Highways England: A303 Amesbury to Berwick
Down Project, Development Consent Order
Application**

Scheme Reference: TR010025

**Response to Highways England's "8.11 (Rev 2) –
Draft Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy
(DAMS) submitted at Deadline 6":**

REP 6-014

for

**The Stonehenge Alliance
(Reference No. 2001870)**

by

Dr. Kate Fielden

1. Introduction

1.1. The Stonehenge Alliance has not commented in detail on the dDAMS, since other archaeologists as objectors to the Scheme are better qualified to do so. Our failure to comment on issues raised in the dDAMS does not indicate our agreement with what is said therein. We support the submission on the latest dDAMS by the Council for British Archaeology.

1.2. We note that not all of the changes to the revised document have been tracked since the previous dDAMS submitted at Deadline 4. For example, Section 3 in the previous dDAMS related to the “Archaeological Research Strategy”; Section 3 in the latest dDAMS relates to “The Scheme, Previous Surveys and Studies”. Sections 3 and 4 appear to have been transposed, while the texts and paragraph numbering differ. This is confusing and makes commenting difficult.

2. Comments for the Stonehenge Alliance

2.1. Our overall observations on the dDAMS Rev. 2 in relation to General and Detailed Principles (Sections 2.2.2 and Section 2.3, respectively), the Archaeological Research Strategy (Section 4) and the PACE Strategy (Section 5.4) are as for our REP5-023 submission on the dDAMS submitted at Deadline 4 (REP4-025).

2.2. With reference to para. 2.2.3 of the latest dDAMS, last bullet point under “General Principles”, we repeat that it is acknowledged that certain flint scatters are indicative of settlement sites; we submit that such flint scatters should be considered under the “precautionary principle” to be attributes of OUV.

2.3. Under “Detailed Principles” at para. 2.3.1, new bullet point 9 gives rise to some concern in view of the apparent difficulties in understanding the concept of OUV: who would provide the training?

Bullet point 10 could be made clearer by re-drafting: it does not make sense at present and would be best left as in the earlier draft, even though the earlier version could not be followed given the Scheme proposals.

2.4. With reference to the latest dDAMS, Section 6, “Approaches to Archaeological Mitigation”, we are concerned that the intention to undertake 100% sampling of ploughsoil is not stated. We support the submissions of Professor Parker Pearson on this matter.