Online Comment

Application	H23-0943-20
Location	WAYSIDE WASHWAY ROAD SARACENS HEAD PE12 8AY
Proposal	Proposed 3 bed chalet bungalow - approved under H23-0557-18. Removal of Conditions 7 & 8 relating to archaeological report

---

Name	Ian Marshman - Historic Environment Officer
Address	Historic Environment Officer Lincolnshire County Council Lancaster House LN1 1XX
Date Submitted	09-11-20
For/Against	Comments

This office recommended that archaeological conditions be required on this site in order to record potential archaeological remains that may be impacted by development. This was because the site lies within an area of known medieval salterns and the proposed development had the potential to disturb previously unknown archaeological finds and features relating to the medieval saltern site.

Unfortunately in this instance the developer has not adhered to the archaeological conditions, which were required in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms (NPPF 199). Initially a scheme of works was produced detailing how the archaeological remains were to be recorded as we recommended. This scheme of works was prepared and a copy was supplied by the developer's archaeologist to our office for informal approval. A copy of it was submitted to the local planning authority alongside other plans during the application process, and it became part of the approved plans for the development (Condition 2), with Condition 7 requiring that notification to this department of the intention to start the archaeological work, and Condition 8 to require the final report to be approved, and the paper archive and any finds to be deposited with a museum.

However, the developer then breached their conditions by beginning the groundworks and proceeding to fully complete the new dwelling without providing due notification, or of carrying out the archaeological work they had agreed with the local planning authority in order to secure planning permission. The developer's archaeologist was also not notified of the works starting, nor was he on site to monitor the groundworks. No explanation has been provided by the developer as to how or why this situation occurred.

In this instance there is no scope to carry out any additional archaeological investigations within the plot as there is very little undeveloped space within which an trench could be placed in order to evaluate what, if any, remains may have been destroyed without record. As the development has been completed it would also not be proportionate to require the foundations to be removed so that the area affected could be investigated.

There is therefore no longer any way for Condition 2, or Condition 7 and 8 to be complied with as the archaeological work cannot be carried out retrospectively.