



NORTHAMPTON
GATEWAY
STRATEGIC RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

ARCHAEOLOGY STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN THE APPLICANT AND NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

DOCUMENT 7.8A

The Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Order 201X

ARCHAEOLOGY STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN THE APPLICANT AND
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL | 30 NOVEMBER 2018

www.northampton-gateway.co.uk

ROXHILL

Planning Inspectorate Ref:
TR050006

**PROPOSED NORTHAMPTON GATEWAY STRATEGIC RAIL
FREIGHT INTERCHANGE**

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL & ROXHILL
(JUNCTION 15) LTD
RELATING TO
ARCHAEOLOGY**

November 2018

NORTHAMPTON GATEWAY, NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

1. Introduction:

- 1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("Statement") sets out the archaeology matters that have been agreed between Northamptonshire County Council ("NCC"), South Northamptonshire Council's (SNC) Archaeological Advisor and Roxhill (Junction 15) Limited (the Applicant) in relation to the proposed Northampton Gateway Strategic Rail Freight Interchange development ("the Site").
- 1.2 Issues regarding the historic built environment and landscape are managed directly by SNC.

2. Relevant Documents comprise:

- i) Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment: Land off Junction 15, M1, Collingtree, Northamptonshire (CgMs, October 2017)
- ii) Geophysical Survey Report: Junction 15 of M1, Northamptonshire (Stratascan, October 2014)
- iii) Geophysical Survey Report: Roade Bypass and Junction 15 of the M1, Northamptonshire (Stratascan, September 2017)
- iv) ES Chapter: Chapter 10, Cultural Heritage (CgMs, June 2018)
- v) Land off Junction 15, M1, Collingtree, Northamptonshire: Archaeological Evaluation (Cotswold Archaeology, June 2018)

3. Areas of agreement on technical matters:

1. It is agreed that the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (DBA) and Geophysical Survey Report previously submitted are technically competent and accord with relevant professional standards and guidelines.
2. It is agreed that there are no designated archaeological assets as recorded by Historic England on the site.
3. The DBA consulted the Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record and the Northamptonshire Record Office, and conformed to the relevant industry guidelines. The DBA identified potential for Iron Age, Roman and possibly Saxon evidence on the Main Site. Potential was identified for Prehistoric and Medieval activity in the Roade Bypass Corridor. The DBA also concluded that archaeological remains on the site would be of no more than regional significance and should not preclude development.
4. Two geophysical surveys were undertaken on site. The 2014 survey covered parts of the Main Site only. The 2017 survey covered a strip

along the western boundary of the Main Site (adjacent to the railway), but also covered the proposed Roade Bypass Corridor. These surveys identified a number of geophysical anomalies of a probable archaeological origin.

5. A targeted archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) exercise was undertaken on the Main Site. The aim of this was two-fold: all areas where the geophysical survey on the site had identified anomalies likely to be archaeological in origin were subject to trial trenching (3% by area, in line with trenching density recommended by South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological Advisor). In addition to this, a number of areas where geophysical survey suggested that there was little evidence for archaeological anomalies were investigated through trial trenching at a density of 2%.
6. The artefactual evidence from the evaluation indicates that permanent settlement within the central part of the Main Site began during the middle Iron Age, with evidence for settlement predominantly dating to the 1st century AD. An area of 2nd-4th century settlement was identified in the north-western part of the Main Site. The earliest activity on site comprised an undated ditch overlain by a charcoal-rich deposit dated to the middle Bronze Age.
7. The archaeological evaluation report stated that the findings of the trenching correlated well with the preceding geophysical surveys in that the pattern of enclosures predicted by the survey was largely confirmed by the evaluation trenching.

4. Areas of common ground:

In connection with archaeological issues on land at Northampton Gateway, Northamptonshire the Local Planning Authority, their Archaeological Advisor, the Applicant and their Archaeological Consultant, CgMs Heritage, agree that:

1. The geophysical surveys and trial trench evaluation were undertaken and reported on in accordance to recognised standards and guidance.
2. The remainder of the Main Site will require archaeological trial trenching to further confirm the findings of the geophysical survey.
3. Archaeological trial trenching will also need to be undertaken within the Bypass Corridor to confirm the results of the geophysical survey..
4. A significant programme of archaeological mitigation will be required prior to construction to excavate and record archaeological remains previously identified as part of the desk-based assessment, geophysical survey and trial trenching undertaken to date, as well as any new sites identified during the archaeological evaluation of the remaining areas of the Main site and the Bypass Corridor not previously trial trenched.

5. The scope of the archaeological mitigation works will need to be determined in consultation with the Archaeological Advisor to Northamptonshire.

5. Areas of Disagreement

1. CgMs Heritage (Part of RPS) consider that the archaeological evaluation undertaken to date, including geophysical survey and trial trenching, has been sufficient to present a robust assessment of the archaeological potential and significance of the Application Site sufficient to allow determination of the application to be made.
2. CgMs have had regard to Paragraph 5.127 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks ('NPSNN'), which expressly addresses the basis on which an applicant should address archaeological issues. The guidance states:

"Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, the applicant should include an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation".
3. In 2017, the Applicant's heritage consultants undertook an archaeological desk based assessment in line with best-practice as provided by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists ('CIfA'). This first stage of assessment included analysis of the Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record, the Historic England Archive and Historic England's Nation Heritage List for England. It also had regard to previous archaeological investigations on the Main Site, including geophysical survey and ground investigations.
4. This assessment concluded that whilst there was potential for settlement activity on the Main Site and Roade Bypass areas, these were likely to be of no more than regional significance and would not preclude development.
5. As a second stage of assessment the Applicant commissioned a geophysical survey of both the Main Site and Roade Bypass area, which survey was also undertaken in accordance with CIfA best practice, as well as guidance from Historic England.
6. Finally, and informed by both the desk based assessment and geophysical survey, the Applicant commissioned sample trenching to be undertaken. This exercise was carried out by Cotswold Archaeology, one of the country's leading archaeological contractors, pursuant to a Written Scheme of Investigation submitted to and approved by Northamptonshire County Council ('NCC'). The trenching work was also

monitored by NCC as it was undertaken. In the view of CgMs none of the archaeological remains identified were of significance to preclude development.

7. The Applicant's position is that it has addressed archaeological matters in a manner that is wholly consistent with guidance set out in the relevant National Policy Statement. The extent of investigation and analysis undertaken to date more than satisfies the requirement for scrutiny of archaeological impacts at the application stage.
8. CgMs therefore consider that any further archaeological investigation should be carried post-consent, secured through the imposition of a requirement in the Development Consent Order.
9. South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological Advisor disagrees with points above. The South Northamptonshire Council Archaeological Advisor considers that more archaeological evaluation trenching is required in order to have sufficient information to determine the application.
10. The DBA stated that any archaeological remains within the site are likely to be of no more than regional significance and should not preclude development. SNC's Archaeological Advisor disagrees with this conclusion. The aim of a DBA is to provide a summary of the known archaeological activity it cannot provide a definitive answer with regard to the presence or not or significance of any archaeological activity that maybe present within the development area.
11. The archaeological evaluation report stated that the results of the trenching correlated well with the results of the geophysical survey. South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological Advisor is of the opinion that insufficient trenching has been carried out in order to make a correlation between the results.
12. Although it is agreed that there are no designated archaeological assets as recorded by Historic England on the site, South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological Advisor is of the opinion that this does not preclude the potential survival of undesignated heritage assets of equivalent status to designated assets.
13. The DBA concluded that archaeological remains on the site would be of no more than regional significance and should not preclude development. South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological Advisor is of the opinion that the DBA's conclusions were based on the known information within the Historic Environment Record (HER). It is the view of South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological Advisor that there is insufficient information to provide an informed assessment of the archaeological potential of a development area. It only provides a background to the known archaeological activity this needs to be supplemented by fieldwork

14. Although the trial trenching was undertaken on the Main Site, South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological Advisor is of the opinion that the agreed programme of work was identified as preliminary only and that this is insufficient to adequately characterise the archaeological potential of the site.

15. South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological Advisor agree that the results of the limited archaeological evaluation generally correlated well with the preceding geophysical surveys but is of the opinion that it is not possible to determine how well the results correlate within the development area as a whole given the limited sample of the site subject to evaluation trenching.

16. South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological Advisor is of the opinion that a significant programme of archaeological evaluation is required to inform the Examining Authority and that this should be undertaken pre-consent. South Northamptonshire Council's Archaeological advisor is of the opinion that insufficient evaluation has been undertaken to enable consideration of appropriate mitigation, to be implemented prior to construction.

Signed by: [REDACTED]

Date: 5th November 2018

On behalf of: [REDACTED]

Signed by: [REDACTED]

Date: 5/11/18

On behalf of: [REDACTED]