

## EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

A47 Case work Team Our ref: PL00331862

By Email Only

A47WansfordtoSutton@planninginspectorate.gov.uk Your ref: TR010039

09 June 2022

Dear A47 Team

## Re: ExA 3rd written questions

Please find below Historic England response to the ExA written questions published on the **24th May 2022**.

Question Reference	Question	Historic England (HBMCE) response
3.4.1	Scheduled monument north of A47 (List	We are aware that Option 3 has not
	entry 1006796)	been progressed to a full scheme proposal. Our understanding is
	In the Minutes of the Meeting held on 15	therefore based upon the schematic
	June 2007 set out in Appendix O of the	drawing provided in the document
	Scheme Assessment Report 2018 – Appendices Preferred Route Decision in	referenced (Scheme Assessment
	relation to Option 3 [AS-031] in paragraph	Report 2018 – Appendices Preferred Route Decision in relation to Option 3)
	7.0 it is stated that Option 3 was rejected	[Examination Reference AS-031]. This
	because "we [the now Applicant] cannot	scenario shows the proposed
	demonstrate a wholly exceptional case for progressing with Option 3". Option 3 being a	carriageway passing through the southern part of the scheduled
	route through the Scheduled Monument.	monument and would result in the
		loss of this part of the monument and
	NPSNN paragraph 5.131 indicates that the "wholly exceptional" test applies when there	reduction in its overall size and area.
	would be "substantial harm", (this test does	This would result in the loss of
	not apply to less than substantial harm) and	important elements and features that
	it must therefore be assumed that this must	contribute to the overall significance
	have been the judgement in question. Reference ID 18a-018-20190723 of the PPG	of the asset. In particular, construction of a new double carriageway in this
	gives guidance on substantial harm and less	location would result in the total loss
	than substantial harm.	of a number of the key burial features
	(a) Could the Applicant please set out	that make up the late Neolithic and early bronze age burial cemetery.
	precisely why it considered that Option 3	These features, particularly the







would lead to "substantial harm". The minutes only state that this decision was based on the "risk that Historic England will object", and the comment at 3.1 of the Applicant's response to Written Representations [REP3-026] of "Bifurcation of the Scheduled Monument would result in substantial harm in either eventuality" is assertion as it does not explain why it considers substantial harm would be occasioned. The ExAwould particularly appreciate documents dating contemporaneously (2017) with this decision.

(b) Could HMBCE please provide its assessment in relation to route Option 3 (ie through the Scheduled Monument) in terms of whether this would result in substantial harm, less than substantial harm (quantifying if necessary), or preserve, providing justification for its conclusion?

barrows and ring ditches are an important part of its designation. They have high archaeological and historic interest and therefore removal of these features would severely compromise the integrity of the cemetery as a whole and diminish the heritage values of the remaining part of the monument.

In our view the loss of key features the reduction of the overall designated area, the loss of integrity and the resulting loss of significance is likely to equate to substantial harm.

We trust this of assistance.

Yours sincerely

Will Fletcher

Dr Will Fletcher

Team Leader



