

Chapter 12: Archaeology

ARCHAEOLOGY	
AUTHOR	Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA)
SUPPORTING APPENDIX	ES Volume 3, Appendix: Archaeology: Annex 1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA); Annex 2: Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI); and Annex 3: Consultation with Christopher Constable (London Borough of Southwark’s Archaeology Advisor).
KEY CONSIDERATIONS	<p>The site is within the ‘Tier 2 <i>Peckham Village</i> Archaeological Priority Area (APA) which covers the historic settlement of Peckham. The APA is designated by the London Borough of Southwark (LBS) on the basis of Peckham being a rare example of a village that developed in close proximity to central London in the later medieval period but appears to have resisted being swallowed up by the expanding metropolis in the 18th century.</p> <p>This ES chapter has considered the potential effects resulting from the demolition and construction phases of the Proposed Development on the following potential sensitive receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prehistoric remains;• Roman agricultural and residual remains;• Medieval agricultural and residual remains; and• Post-medieval structural and agricultural remains.
CONSULTATION	<p>An EIA Scoping Report was prepared and submitted to the LBS on 11th January 2024 to confirm general acceptance on the proposed scope of the EIA. The EIA Scoping Report is appended to this ES in ES Volume 3, Appendix: EIA Methodology – Annex 1.</p> <p>An EIA Scoping Opinion was issued by LBS on 27th March 2024. This ES chapter has been produced in line with the EIA Scoping Opinion comments and where the approach differs with LBS’s EIA Scoping Opinion, this is clearly set out and justified.</p> <p>In general, the proposed scope and content of the Archaeology ES chapter was agreed. However, the EIA Scoping Opinion indicated that although it was argued that cumulative effects could be scoped out LBS considered that the Proposed Development has the potential to give rise to cumulative effects. Thus a qualitative assessment of cumulative effects has been undertaken and included in ‘Cumulative Effects Assessment’ of this ES chapter. Furthermore, the EIA Scoping Opinion suggested that assessment be made of the impact on Archaeological Priority Area (APA), however, an APA is not a heritage asset, it simply defines an area of interest, therefore has not been considered as a specific receptor within the cumulative effects assessment</p> <p>The EIA Scoping Opinion also suggests that it may prove difficult to distinguish between ‘significance’ of a buried heritage asset and the ‘significance of an effect’. However, the standard terminology adopted by MOLA has been applied.</p> <p>Lastly, the EIA Scoping Opinion stated that the NPPF makes reference to ‘setting’ and suggests that MOLA ‘may wish’ to consider an overarching statement to explain why it has not been discussed. However, this has been clarified with LBS’s archaeology advisor, Christopher Constable, who advised that this was not necessary and therefore no further discussion has been provided within the ES chapter.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, a 250m radius study area was agreed on 12th March 2024 in consultation with Christopher Constable, LBS’s Archaeology Advisor. It was also agreed that any geotechnical investigations undertaken should be archaeologically monitored.</p>

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Defining the Baseline

- 12.1 The National Planning Policy Framework¹ (NPPF) (refer to **ES Volume 3, Appendix: Archaeology – Annex 1**) defines a heritage asset as a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. The archaeological baseline considers the likelihood of archaeological remains of any period to be present in the site, i.e. the archaeological potential. In line with the NPPF, and for the purposes of this ES chapter, archaeological ‘sensitive receptors’ are referred to as ‘buried heritage assets’.
- 12.2 The methodology and sources consulted for the baseline characterisation of the site, i.e. consideration of the potential for archaeological remains (buried heritage assets) to be present in the site, are set out in detail in the

Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment **ES Volume 3, Appendix: Archaeology – Annex 1**. In summary, this entailed:

- The collection and assessment of information on known historic environment features within a study area, considered through professional judgement to be appropriate to characterize the historic environment of the site. As there is no specific guidance on the size of study areas, Christopher Constable, the LBS’s Archaeology Advisor was consulted (refer to **ES Volume 3, Appendix: Archaeology – Annex 3**), and agreed that a study area of a 250m radius from the centre of the site was appropriate. The data for the study area comes from the primary repositories of such information in London, primarily the Greater London Historic Environment Record (‘GLHER’), Historic England and the Museum of London Archaeological Archive;
 - Consideration of the results of relevant archaeological investigations within the study area;
 - Consultation of a broad range of relevant documentary and cartographic sources, including published histories and journals, British Geological Survey (‘BGS’) data, available geotechnical data and historic maps; and
 - A site visit was undertaken in order to determine the topography of the site and existing land use / the nature of the existing buildings, and to provide further information on areas of potential past ground disturbance and general historic environment potential. The baseline conditions have not changed since that visit therefore it was considered that the observations made were still relevant.
- 12.3 Based on the above information, and using professional judgement, an assessment of the archaeological potential of the site is set out, as described in the ‘*Impact Assessment Methodology*’ section below.
- 12.4 The NPPF defines ‘Significance’ in the context of heritage policy as “*The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic*”^{2,3}. There is no single defining criterion that dictates overall asset significance; each asset has to be evaluated based on existing designations, and (where assets have no formal designation) using professional judgement against the range of criteria listed below on a case-by-case basis.
- 12.5 Accordingly, the baseline then sets out the ‘heritage significance’ of the buried heritage assets known or likely to be present in the site, using a range of Very High, High, Medium, Low, Negligible or Uncertain.
- 12.6 The determination of the significance of buried heritage assets is based on statutory designation and/or professional judgement against four values set out in English Heritage’s (now Historic England) Conservation Principles:
 - **Evidential value:** the potential of the physical remains to yield evidence of past human activity. This might take into account date; rarity; state of preservation; diversity/complexity; contribution to published priorities; supporting documentation; collective value and comparative potential;
 - **Aesthetic value:** this derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from the heritage asset, taking into account what other people have said or written;
 - **Historical value:** the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through heritage assets to the present, such a connection often being illustrative or associative; and
 - **Communal value:** this derives from the meanings of a heritage asset for the people who know about it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory. Communal values are closely bound up with historical, particularly associative, and aesthetic values, along with educational, social or economic values.

¹ Department of Levelling Up, Housing & Communities, 2023; ‘National Planning Policy Framework.’
² Historic England, 2008; ‘Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment.’

³ Historic England, 2017; ‘Conservation Principles for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment, Consultation Draft, 10th November 2017.’

Evolution of the Baseline

- 12.7** The evolution of the baseline is not relevant to the assessment of archaeology, as there would be no change expected to the below ground conditions on site prior to the Proposed Development commencing, and therefore any archaeological remains would remain as the existing baseline condition.
- 12.8** In relation to the wider understanding of archaeology in the area, should new information come to light in the course of any archaeological work in the study area, this may enhance the understanding of the baseline conditions at the site.

Impact Assessment Methodology

Demolition and Construction

- 12.9** The proposed demolition and construction works and an outline programme for the work are described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Demolition and Construction**. Impacts on archaeological remains arise from ground disturbance during the demolition and construction stage such as site set-up works, contamination investigation and remediation, landscaping and the construction of new basements and foundations. They are limited to the area of the physical impact and are permanent. Such impacts and their resulting effects are assessed within this ES chapter, for which the methodology is set out below.
- 12.10** The impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the standards specified by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists ('CIfA') and Historic England's Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS)^{4,5,6}. The methodology used to determine the significance of buried heritage assets (i.e. archaeological remains), the severity of any impacts upon them and the resulting significance of environmental effect is based on that typically used in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)^{7,8}. Following the characterisation of the baseline conditions, the methodology used to characterise the potential effects on likely buried heritage assets on the site include:
- Evaluating the heritage significance of known or likely buried heritage assets (based on existing designations and professional judgement, where assets have no formal designation);
 - Prediction of the magnitude of change (likely impact) upon the heritage significance of buried heritage assets;
 - Determining the scale of the likely environmental effect by comparing the heritage significance of the baseline heritage asset with the magnitude of impact (change) upon that asset as a result of the Proposed Development and the resulting significance of the likely effect;
 - Identifying any measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any potential adverse environmental effects; and
 - Quantification of residual effects (those that might remain after mitigation and/or offsetting).

Phasing

- 12.11** The effects to archaeological receptors will occur throughout the demolition and construction stage, regardless of phasing, where ground disturbance takes place. Phasing is therefore not considered further within this ES chapter.

Completed Development

- 12.12** Any potential impacts and effects on buried heritage assets will occur as a result of ground disturbance during the enabling, demolition and construction works. No impacts or effects will occur on buried heritage assets on completion of the Proposed Development since no further ground disturbance will occur.
- 12.13** It is possible, however, that changes to the existing hydrological regime of buried deposits will give rise to changes in moisture levels which could lead to the desiccation and decay of any buried heritage assets *left in situ* which rely on constant water levels for their preservation. The MOLA Principal Geoarchaeologist has advised that the geologies present within the site are unlikely to contain remains that would be impacted by such changes, therefore are not considered further.
- 12.14** There is therefore no need to further consider the completed Proposed Development in respect of buried heritage assets within this ES chapter.

Assumptions and Limitations

- 12.15** The assessment relies on available data, and best endeavours have been made to ensure that these are accurate and up to date. It is assumed that information on the GLHER database is accurate. However, whilst compiling the baseline, a process of review and validation of the GLHER data has taken place (for example ensuring assets are correctly located), and undertaking further research, where appropriate, into GLHER entries with little information.
- 12.16** The main limitation to the assessment is the nature of the archaeological resource, i.e. buried and not visible, which means it can be difficult to predict accurately the presence, extent and likely significance of buried heritage assets, and consequently the impact upon them. Notwithstanding this limitation, the methodology is considered robust, utilising reasonably available information, and conforms to the requirements of local and national guidance and planning policy.

Embedded Mitigation

- 12.17** No embedded mitigation measures are proposed in relation to the demolition and construction impacts on buried heritage assets. Where possible, adverse effects will be offset by a programme of archaeological investigation, publications and dissemination secured through measures set out under a planning condition.

Methodology for Defining Effects

Receptors and Receptor Sensitivity

- 12.18** In line with the NPPF, and for the purposes of this ES chapter, 'heritage significance' is used in place of 'sensitivity'. The use of 'heritage significance' and 'significance of (environmental) effect' are clearly differentiated throughout. All archaeological remains are highly sensitive to physical change because their heritage significance is derived from their physical form and location.
- 12.19** Table 12.1 describes the significance of designated and non-designated buried heritage assets as applied in this assessment. It sets out the full range of possible significance to provide a context for the receptors likely to be present at the site.
- 12.20** Heritage significance lies in the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. The determination of the significance of

⁴ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014a, *Standards and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment*, Published December 2014, Reading.

⁵ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2017, *Standards and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment*, Published December 2014, updated January 2017, Reading

⁶ Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service; Historic England, 2015. *Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London*.

⁷ Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), LA 101, *Introduction to environmental assessment*. Updated July 2019

⁸ Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), LA 106, *Cultural heritage assessment*. Updated January 2020

such assets is based on statutory designation and/or professional judgement against four values set out in English Heritage’s (now Historic England) Conservation Principles⁶, listed in Paragraph 12.6.

12.21 Unless the nature and exact extent of buried archaeological remains within any given area has been determined through prior investigation, significance is often uncertain.

Table 12.1 Significance (Sensitivity) of Buried Heritage Assets

Asset Significance*	Buried Heritage Assets
Very High	World Heritage Sites; Scheduled Monuments; Grade I and II* Registered parks and gardens; and Non-designated sites, settlements and landscapes of equivalent – international/national – value or interest (exceptional heritage value).
High	Burial grounds; Grade II Registered parks and gardens; Designated battlefields; and Non-designated sites, settlements and landscapes of equivalent – regional/county – value or interest (rare and well preserved examples).
Medium	Non-designated sites, settlements and landscapes with a district/borough value or interest for education or cultural appreciation (good preservation, sufficient for comparative study and educational/cultural appreciation).
Low	Heritage assets with a local e.g. parish value or interest for education or cultural appreciation.
Negligible	Insignificant and/or badly damaged resources of little appreciable value or interest.
Uncertain	Resources that have a clear potential, but for which current knowledge is insufficient to allow significance to be determined.
*It is noted that the criteria stated within this table, specifically in relation to significance levels of ‘very high’ and ‘uncertain’ do differ from general EIA methodology as set out within ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology , however this divergence is considered to be standard practice with regard to assessing buried heritage.	

Magnitude of Impact

12.22 Determination of magnitude of impact (i.e. change) upon the significance of known or potential heritage assets is based on the severity of the potential physical impact (e.g. any activity that would entail ground disturbance, from piling, ground reduction, etc.). Table 12.2 describes the criteria used in this assessment to determine the magnitude of change.

Table 12.2 Magnitude of Impact Criteria

Magnitude*	Criteria
High	Complete removal of asset. Change to asset significance resulting in a fundamental change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context, character and setting. The transformation of an asset's setting in a way that fundamentally compromises its ability to be understood or appreciated. The scale of change would be such that it could result in a designated asset being undesignated or having its level of designation lowered.
Medium	Change to asset significance resulting in a considerable change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting. Notable alterations to the setting of an asset that affect our appreciation of it and its significance.
Low	Change to asset significance resulting in a small change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting.
Very Low	Negligible change or no material change to asset significance. No real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting.
Uncertain	Level of survival/condition of resource in specific locations is not known: magnitude of change is therefore not known.
*It is noted that the criteria stated within this table, specifically in relation to ‘uncertain’ magnitude of impact levels, differs from general EIA methodology as set out within ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology , however this divergence is considered to be standard practice with regard to assessing buried heritage.	

Defining the Effect

12.23 Adverse (negative) effects are those which cause harm to, or loss of, the significance of a heritage asset as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.

12.24 Beneficial (positive) effects are those which enhance a heritage asset’s significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.

Effect Scale

12.25 The scale of the likely environmental effect is determined by comparing the significance value of the baseline heritage asset with the magnitude of impact (change) upon that asset as a result of the Proposed Development and are presented initially without mitigation/offsetting. The results are presented in Table 12.3. Where information is insufficient to quantify the asset significance or magnitude of change, the scale of the effect is given as ‘uncertain’.

Table 12.3 Effect Scale

Magnitude of Impact	Heritage Asset Significance					
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible	Uncertain
High	Major	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor	Uncertain
Medium	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Uncertain
Low	Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Uncertain
Very Low	Minor	Minor	Negligible/None	Negligible/None	Negligible/None	Uncertain
Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain

12.26 Table 12.4 describes each scale and nature of effect.

Table 12.4 Description of Effect

Scale and Nature of Effect	Description
Major Adverse	Substantial harm to, or loss of, significance of an asset of very high, high or medium heritage significance, as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
Moderate Adverse	Less than substantial harm to the significance of an asset of very high, high or medium heritage significance, as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
Minor Adverse	Limited harm to the significance of an asset of very high, high or medium heritage significance, as a result of changes to its physical form or setting, or substantial harm to, or the loss of, significance of an asset of low or very low heritage significance.
Negligible	No appreciable change to an asset’s significance.
Uncertain	Significance of effect uncertain due to lack of information on buried heritage asset significance.
Minor Beneficial	Limited enhancement of an asset’s significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
Moderate Beneficial	Notable enhancement of an asset’s significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
Major Beneficial	Substantial enhancement of an asset’s significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.

12.27 Buried heritage assets are finite and non-renewable, and irreplaceable once physically disturbed. The understanding of the significance of any individual heritage asset or group of assets often relies on a physical relationship to other heritage assets adjacent, or an associative relationship to assets nearby or in the wider environment. For this reason, once damaged or removed from their context, buried heritage assets cannot be meaningfully replicated or replaced and their significance is likely to be reduced or lost. Effects arising from their disturbance or removal are therefore usually adverse.

12.28 An appropriate mitigation strategy would aim to eliminate or reduce physical disturbance. Measures to offset adverse effects on buried heritage assets would normally consist of design adjustments, to allow significant resources to be protected and retained (preservation *in situ*). Where preservation *in situ* is not proportionate or feasible, adverse effects may be offset through measures such as archaeological investigation and recording

before and during development. Archaeological excavation is by its nature also destructive, but it can facilitate Social Value through the knowledge-gain of investigation and dissemination of the results by appropriate means to ensure that the public benefit arising from the archaeological process is realised.

- 12.29** Based on professional judgement, an appropriate offsetting strategy will reduce adverse effects by one 'level' of severity when presenting residual effects, since it is considered an improved outcome rather than archaeological remains being removed by development without investigation, recording, and dissemination of the results.
- 12.30** As buried heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource it is generally considered as standard practice within the planning system to implement measures in order to offset any level of adverse effect on a heritage asset, including minor adverse. This is to ensure that finite remains are not removed without record. The measures proposed are, in each case, proportionate to the significance of the asset being affected and are based on professional judgement.
- 12.31** Based upon the information presented within **ES Volume 3, Appendix: Archaeology – Annex 1**, appropriate mitigation / offsetting measures are identified, and the resulting residual environmental effect is re-assessed using Table 12.3.

Geographic Extent of Effect

- 12.32** The geographic extent of the effects is also identified. At a spatial level, 'site' or 'local' effects are those affecting the site and neighbouring assets: although impacts on buried heritage assets are typically limited to the area of the actual physical impact. However, depending on the significance of the asset, the effects upon the overall archaeological resource could apply over a wider geographic extent, i.e. at a 'district / borough' (LBS) level; at a 'regional / county' (Greater London) level; whilst any which affect different parts of the country, or England as a whole, are considered being at a 'national' level.

Effect Duration

- 12.33** Although impacts on archaeological remains only occur during the demolition and construction phases, the resulting effects are permanent.

Direct and Indirect Effects

- 12.34** The below assessment also identifies whether the effect is 'direct' (i.e. resulting without any intervening factors) or 'indirect' or 'secondary' (i.e. not directly caused or resulting from something else).

Categorising Likely Significant Effects

- 12.35** 'Significant' environmental effects are those that are Moderate or Major in scale. Effects that are 'Not Significant' are Minor or Negligible in scale.
- 12.36** Where the effect is uncertain, further work may be needed to clarify the anticipated effect.

BASELINE CONDITIONS

- 12.37** The site is located within the 'Tier 2' Peckham Village APA which covers the historic settlement of Peckham. The APA is designated by the LBS on the basis of Peckham being a rare example of a village that developed in close proximity to central London in the later medieval period but appears to have resisted being swallowed up by the expanding metropolis in the 18th century.
- 12.38** The eastern edge of the site lies within Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area, based upon the commercial core of Peckham and defined by its three principal roads: Peckham High Street, Peckham Hill Street and Rye Lane.

Topography and Geology

- 12.39** The general landscape of the area slopes downward from south to north: ground level within the site generally mirrors the wider topography. The highest point is 8.8m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) towards the southern end of the carpark with the lowest point at 7.0m AOD in the Morrisons store access road in the north-west corner of the site.
- 12.40** The British Geological Survey (BGS) online mapping suggests that the site overlies alluvial deposits and is located at the edge of a boundary in the drift geology between Woolwich beds and Floodplain gravels. In such transitional zones the detailed geology is very variable. However, in this instance the site occurs on an outcrop of the underlying London Clay. The periglacial and alluvial processes causing the formation of the gravels to the north will have scoured away the Woolwich/Gravel deposit exposing the underlying clay. The absence of any gravel is best accounted for by the natural slope dipping from south to north.
- 12.41** An archaeological evaluation and excavation were undertaken by MoLAS in 1996 (sitecode HAN96) within the north-eastern part of the site, on land that had been Peckham Bus Garage prior to the extension of an existing supermarket to the west. Five trenches were opened, including two positioned to examine more fully the extent of a scatter of prehistoric artefacts. The number of prehistoric artefacts recovered was limited but included a Neolithic scraper and nine shards of Late Bronze / Early Iron Age pottery which had survived later cultivation of the soil in a natural depression with later pottery. In Trenches 1, 3 and 4, the natural clay was encountered below soil deposits. Two separate soils were identified in Trench 1. The deeper soil, a loamy clay which measured between 0.1 to 0.3m thick, was overlaid by a garden soil into which numerous features had been cut.

Past Impacts Affecting Archaeological Survival

- 12.42** The north-west corner of the site was redeveloped at the end of the 19th century as a department store, which is recorded as having a basement which extended 3.4m below the road level. Following World War II, a number of pre-War buildings within the site were demolished; the depth of ground disturbance from site clearance is not known. The north-east corner of the site was redeveloped as a bus garage: its construction is likely to have truncated the top of their underlying clay layer, removing all earlier deposits within its footprint.
- 12.43** The construction of the existing modern buildings, structures and basements in the eastern half of the site will have removed any archaeological remains within the footprint of their foundations, to their formation level. Any piling will have removed any remains from the footprint of each pile. The petrol station includes five below ground tanks which are likely to extend into the underlying natural deposits, and any archaeological remains within the footprint of each tank will therefore have been completely removed.
- 12.44** Archaeological survival in the site is therefore likely to be primarily in the currently open areas which have been subject to the least previous development.

Archaeological and Historical Background

Prehistoric Period (800,000 BC–AD 43)

- 12.45** The site has moderate potential for prehistoric remains. Residual prehistoric finds were found in cultivation soils in the eastern part of the site during the 1996 evaluation and additional finds have been recorded within the study area. Further isolated artefacts would be of low heritage significance, derived from their evidential value.

Roman Period (AD 43–410)

- 12.46** The site has moderate potential for Roman remains derived from cultivation, i.e. occasional artefacts or fragments deposited on the land as waste, and subsequently incorporated by ploughing. The site is located away from main roads and known areas of settlement during this period, as such there is a low potential for structural remains. Roman remains were collected from the eastern part of the site during the 1996 evaluation.

These finds were residual pottery fragments within a cultivated soil layer. Where this soil layer is present elsewhere in the site it could contain similar remains, of low heritage significance, derived from their evidential and historical value.

Medieval Period (AD 410–1485)

12.47 The site has moderate potential for medieval agricultural remains. Evidence recorded during the 1996 evaluation in the eastern part of the site suggests that cultivation of the land continued throughout the medieval period. There is a limited potential for remains directly related to settlement, which would be in areas adjacent to the main roadways which have been subject to subsequent development in the western part and northern extent of the site. Cultivation soils would be heritage assets of low heritage significance; any pits or ditches of possibly medium heritage significance, derived from their evidential and historical value.

Post-medieval Period (AD 1485 – present)

12.48 The site has high potential for post-medieval remains. The site continued to exist, at least partially, as fields, orchards and gardens throughout the 19th century, with development slowly taking place throughout this period also. The remains of cultivated soil, pre-20th century building foundations, cellars or related cut features, such as wells, ditches or pits may survive within the site. Post-medieval soils and a well have been previously identified in the north-western part of the site. The significance of any post-medieval agricultural remains, building foundations or landscape features would be of low heritage significance, derived from their evidential and historical value.

HERITAGE ASSETS (RECEPTORS) AND SIGNIFICANCE (RECEPTOR SENSITIVITY)

Existing

12.49 Table 12.5 lists buried heritage assets that may be affected by the Proposed Development.

Table 12.5 Known and Likely Buried Heritage Receptors

Asset	Asset Potential	Asset Heritage Significance
Residual prehistoric remains	Moderate	Low significance, based on their likely evidential and historic value in providing information on past activity within the site.
Roman agricultural soils and residual remains	Moderate	Low significance, based on their likely evidential and historic value in providing information on past activity within the site.
Medieval agricultural soils and residual remains	Moderate	Low significance, based on their likely evidential and historic value in providing information on past activity within the site.
Possible later-medieval pits or ditches	Moderate	Medium significance, based on their likely evidential and historic value in providing information on past activity within the site.
Post medieval structural remains and cut features	High	Low significance, based on their likely evidential and historic value in providing information on past activity within the site.
Post medieval agricultural soils	High	Negligible significance, based on their likely evidential and historic value in providing information on past activity within the site.

Introduced

12.50 No new/additional buried heritage assets will be introduced on the site as part of the Proposed Development.

POTENTIAL EFFECTS

Demolition and Construction

12.51 The Proposed Development comprises the following elements that are likely to have an impact upon the assets detailed in Table 12.5 during the demolition and construction works:

- Preliminary site works (including site stripping, demolition, site levelling and pile / obstruction removal);
- Piled foundations;
- Basement construction;
- Services / utilities trenches / drains; and
- Soft landscaping / yard / carpark.

Preliminary Site Works

Shallow Works

12.52 Preliminary site works across the site including site stripping and demolition, the installation of site fencing and welfare facilities; the works will cause ground disturbance to a maximum depth of 0.5m below ground level (bgl). This would extend into the top of undated made ground. Given the maximum depth this would only interact with two assets, having a low magnitude of impact resulting in a:

- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on post-medieval structural remains and cut features of low significance; and
- Direct, permanent, long-term Negligible Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on post-medieval agricultural soils of negligible significance.

Removal of Obstructions

12.53 Grubbing-out any foundations or other obstructions which extend beyond the depths of modern made ground would remove any remains within the extent of the ground disturbance. This would have a medium magnitude of impact resulting in a:

- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on residual prehistoric remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on Roman agricultural soils and residual remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on medieval agricultural soils of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Moderate Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on later-medieval pits and ditches of medium significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on post-medieval structural remains and cut features of low significance; and
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on post-medieval agricultural soils of negligible significance.

Piled Foundations

12.54 Piles, including any secant piled walls, would remove any archaeological remains within the footprint of each pile as it is driven downwards. Additionally, closely spaced piles could make any archaeological remains

surviving between the piles inaccessible in the future, depending on the density of the proposed piling solution. The impact would also depend on if it was done prior to the basement excavation or post the excavation.

12.55 Piling prior to basement excavation, or outside the basement footprint if after basement excavation, would have a high (localised) magnitude of impact resulting in a:

- Direct, permanent, long-term Moderate Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on residual prehistoric remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Moderate Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on Roman agricultural soils and residual remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Moderate Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on medieval agricultural soils and residual remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Major Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on later-medieval pits and ditches of medium significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Moderate Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on post-medieval structural remains and cut features of low significance; and
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on post-medieval agricultural soils of negligible significance.

12.56 If undertaken after basement excavation, then piling would have no additional impact within the basement footprint.

12.57 The construction of pile caps and connecting ground beams, along with the excavation of a pile guide trench, typically extend no more than 1.0–1.5 m below the ground floor or basement slab and would remove any archaeological remains within the footprint of these works to their formation level. However, pile caps beneath the basement slab would have no additional impact. Pile caps outside the basements would have an impact similar to shallow ground works such as service trenches set out below.

Basement Construction

12.58 The basement would extend across the eastern third of the site, beneath the proposed replacement supermarket, and the excavation for it would have a high magnitude of impact and result in a:

- Direct, permanent, long-term Moderate Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on residual prehistoric remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Moderate Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on Roman agricultural soils and residual remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Moderate Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on medieval agricultural soils and residual remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Major Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on later-medieval pits and ditches of medium significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Moderate Adverse effect (significant) at a Local level on post-medieval structural remains and cut features of low significance; and
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on post-medieval agricultural soils of negligible significance.

Excavation for New Services, Hard and Soft Landscaping and Car Park

12.59 Excavation for new service trenches/drains, hard and soft landscaping and creation of a car park generally extend no more than 1.0m to 1.5m bgl, extending into the undated made ground and would have a localised and shallow impact of removing any archaeological remains within the footprint and depth of the work. Such works would be of low magnitude of impact and result in a:

- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on residual prehistoric remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on Roman agricultural soils and residual remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on medieval agricultural soils and residual remains of low significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on later-medieval pits and ditches of medium significance;
- Direct, permanent, long-term Minor Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on post medieval structural remains and cut features of low significance; and
- Direct, permanent, long-term Negligible Adverse effect (not significant) at a Local level on post-medieval agricultural soils of negligible significance.

Summary

12.60 Table 12.6 summarizes the effects on buried heritage assets prior to the implementation of a mitigation and/or offsetting strategy.

Table 12.6 Evaluation of Potential Impacts and Effects (Pre-Mitigation)

Asset	Asset Significance	Geographic Extent	Magnitude of Impact	Direct or Indirect; Duration	Scale of Effect
Residual prehistoric remains	Low	Borough / Local	Medium (Obstruction Removal)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
			High (Localised piling)	Direct, Permanent	Moderate Adverse (significant)
			High (Basement construction)	Direct, Permanent	Moderate Adverse (significant)
			Low (Pile caps and ground beams outside basement footprint, services, hard and soft landscaping and car park)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Roman agricultural soils and residual remains	Low	Borough / Local	Medium (Obstruction Removal)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
			High (Localised piling)	Direct, Permanent	Moderate Adverse (significant)
			High (Basement construction)	Direct, Permanent	Moderate Adverse (significant)
			Low ((Pile caps and ground beams outside basement footprint, services, hard and soft landscaping and car park)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Medieval agricultural soils and residual remains	Low	Borough / Local	Medium (Obstruction Removal)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
			High (Localised piling)	Direct, Permanent	Moderate Adverse (significant)
			High (Basement construction)	Direct, Permanent	Moderate Adverse (significant)
			Low	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse

Asset	Asset Significance	Geographic Extent	Magnitude of Impact	Direct or Indirect; Duration	Scale of Effect
			((Pile caps and ground beams outside basement footprint, services, hard and soft landscaping and car park))		(not significant)
Later-medieval pits and ditches	Medium	Borough / Local	Medium (Obstruction Removal)	Direct, Permanent	Moderate Adverse (significant)
			High (Localised piling)	Direct, Permanent	Major Adverse (significant)
			High (Basement construction)	Direct, Permanent	Major Adverse (significant)
			Low ((Pile caps and ground beams outside basement footprint, services, hard and soft landscaping and car park))	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Post-medieval structural remains and cut features	Low	Borough / Local	Low (Shallow enabling works)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
			Medium (Obstruction Removal)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
			High (Localised piling)	Direct, Permanent	Moderate Adverse (significant)
			High (Basement construction)	Direct, Permanent	Moderate Adverse (significant)
			Low ((Pile caps and ground beams outside basement footprint, services, hard and soft landscaping and car park))	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Post-medieval agricultural soils	Negligible	Borough / Local	Low (Shallow enabling works)	Direct, Permanent	Negligible Adverse (not significant)
			Medium (Obstruction Removal)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
			High (Localised piling)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
			High (Basement construction)	Direct, Permanent	Minor Adverse (not significant)
			Low ((Pile caps and ground beams outside basement footprint, services, hard and soft landscaping and car park))	Direct, Permanent	Negligible Adverse (not significant)

Completed Development

12.61 The completed and operational Proposed Development would not result in any further ground disturbance; consequently, there would be no additional impacts or resulting effects upon any remaining buried heritage assets, an assessment of the completed and operational Proposed Development has been scoped out.

MITIGATION, MONITORING AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Demolition and Construction Mitigation

- 12.62 Archaeological monitoring of future geotechnical investigations will take place as agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to the LBS. The archaeological monitoring of geotechnical investigations, of which Phase 1 of the geotechnical investigations will likely commence in August 2024, will clarify levels of truncation and the depth of deposit survival, and will be undertaken in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which accompanies this assessment as **ES Volume 3, Appendix: Archaeology – Annex 2**.
- 12.63 Depending on the results, targeted trial evaluation trenches may be necessary to confirm the presence, nature and significance of any archaeological remains in the areas of proposed impact. The results would allow an informed decision to be made regarding an appropriate mitigation strategy for any significant archaeological assets. This might comprise targeted archaeological excavation in advance of construction, and/or a watching brief during groundworks. This would ensure that any significant archaeological assets are not removed without record and the opportunity to secure public benefits from the archaeological process.
- 12.64 The requirement for any required archaeological investigations should be secured by the LBS by way of an appropriately worded planning condition.
- 12.65 The post-consent archaeological work will be undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) approved by the Archaeological Advisor to the LBS and could be carried out under the terms of a standard archaeological planning condition set out under the granting of planning permission.

Residual Effects

- 12.66 With the above mitigation in place, the residual demolition and construction effects of basement construction and piling would be reduced from Major Adverse (**significant**) to Moderate Adverse (**significant**) for:
- Later-medieval pits and ditches.
- 12.67 With the above mitigation in place, the residual demolition and construction effects of obstruction removal, basement construction and piling would be reduced from Moderate Adverse (**significant**) to Minor Adverse (not significant) for:
- Residual prehistoric remains;
 - Roman and medieval soils and residual remains; and
 - Post-medieval structural remains and cut features.
- 12.68 With the above mitigation in place, the residual demolition and construction effects of obstruction removal would be reduced from Moderate Adverse (**significant**) to Minor Adverse (not significant) for:
- Later-medieval pits and ditches.
- 12.69 With the above mitigation in place, the residual demolition and construction effects of all other works would be reduced to Negligible Adverse (not significant) for:
- Residual prehistoric remains;
 - Roman and medieval soils and residual remains,
 - Later-medieval pits and ditches.
 - Post-medieval structural remains and cut features, and
 - Post-medieval agricultural soils.

12.70 The residual effects are summarised in Table 12.7.

Table 12.7 Residual Effects

Receptor	Description of the Residual Effect	Scale and Nature	Significant / Not Significant	Geo	D I	P T	St Mt Lt
Demolition and Construction							
Residual prehistoric remains	Complete removal of asset (obstruction removal, basement construction and piling)	Minor Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
	Localised removal of asset (all other works)	Negligible Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
Roman agricultural soils and residual remains	Complete removal of asset (obstruction removal, basement construction and piling)	Minor Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
	Localised removal of asset (all other works)	Negligible Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
Medieval agricultural soils and residual remains	Complete removal of asset (obstruction removal, basement construction and piling)	Minor Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
	Localised removal of asset (all other works)	Negligible Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
Later-medieval pits and ditches	Complete removal of asset (basement construction and piling)	Moderate Adverse	Significant	L	D	P	Lt
	Localised removal of asset (obstruction removal)	Minor Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
	Localised removal of asset (all other works)	Negligible	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
Post-medieval structural remains and cut features	Complete removal of asset (obstruction removal, basement construction and piling)	Minor Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
	Localised removal of asset (all other works)	Negligible Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
Post-medieval agricultural soils	Complete or Localised removal of asset	Negligible Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
Notes: Residual Effect - Scale = Negligible / Minor / Moderate / Major - Nature = Beneficial or Adverse Geo (Geographic Extent) = Local (L), Borough (B), Regional (R), National (N) D = Direct / I = Indirect P = Permanent / T = Temporary St = Short Term / Mt = Medium Term / Lt = Long Term N/A = not applicable / not assessed							

ASSESSMENT OF THE FUTURE ENVIRONMENT

Evolution of the Baseline Scenario

- 12.71** There will be no change to the archaeological baseline of the site and the surrounding area in the absence of the Proposed Development. The archaeological baseline would remain as currently understood and as presented within this ES chapter.
- 12.72** It is however understood that new archaeological investigations in the surrounding area (including those for schemes recently granted) may produce information which enhances understanding of the likely archaeological conditions at the site.

Cumulative Effects Assessment

Demolition and Construction

- 12.73** Cumulative effects occur when a single discrete buried heritage asset is affected by more than one impact at any point in time. This assessment considers potential effects from the cumulative schemes (refer to **ES Volume 3, Appendix: EIA Methodology – Annex 3** for the full list).
- 12.74** Only those located within a 250m radius of the Proposed Development have been considered further as they share the same geological conditions as the site and have a similar history of development and, therefore, are expected to have similar archaeological characteristics. No schemes have been identified as having or contributing cumulative impacts to the Proposed Development.
- 12.75** From a wider perspective, however, any development project that has an impact on archaeology contributes to the incremental erosion of this resource.

Completed Development

- 12.76** No further effects would occur following the demolition and construction phase.

LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

- 12.77** Following the implementation of a successful programme of offsetting approved by the LBS, as a result of the basement construction and piling of the Proposed Development, there will be significant adverse residual effects on any later-medieval pits and ditches. There will be no other significant adverse residual effects as a result of the Proposed Development.