

12<sup>th</sup> August 2016

Peter Baraclough-Smith  
Technical manager  
Gleeson Homes  
5 Europa Court  
Sheffield Business Park  
Sheffield S9 1XE

Our Ref: 403.03044.00035

Dear Mr Baraclough-Smith

**RE: LAND OFF BARNBURGH LANE, GOLDTHORPE: ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
CONDITION**

Thank you for sending me the planning permission with associated conditions for Application 2015/1198, and previous reports relating to Phases 1 and 2 of the development. These documents include:

- An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment: OSA Report No: OSA11DT06 December 2011
- Barnburgh Lane, Goldthorpe, South Yorkshire: Archaeological Assessment SLR Ref : 403.03044.00001 December 2011
- Barnburgh Lane, Goldthorpe, South Yorkshire: Geophysical Survey APS Report No: 5/12 January 2012
- Barnburgh Lane, Goldthorpe, South Yorkshire: Report on Trench-Based Archaeological Site Investigation SLR Ref : 403.03044.00001 March 2012
- Barnburgh Lane, Goldthorpe, South Yorkshire: Phase 2 Archaeological Assessment SLR Ref : 403.03044.00035 June 2015

The results from the various programmes of assessment and site investigation are summarized in the last document above, and in spite of the general background around the area for cropmarks interpreted as prehistoric or Roman field-systems and later medieval ridge and furrow cultivation, section 3.3 states "*There is no direct evidence indicating that earlier archaeological remains extend within the application site, and none were identified with certainty during the Phase 1 investigations*". Later archaeological activity is noted through the survival of an 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> century mineshaft within the field, but our conversation regarding this confirmed that action has already been taken to drill and grout this feature.

The magnetometer survey of Phase 1 undertaken in January 2012 resulted in "*Few clearly archaeological features have been identified within the geophysical survey. A pattern of probable drainage features – very straight and parallel – can be seen within the northwest corner*" (Section 5 Discussion). To test the results of the geophysical survey and intervening "blank areas", nine trial trenches were excavated in March 2012. These were found to be devoid of archaeology, although a small undated ditch was identified in one trench. The results of this investigation were sufficient for the LPA to agree that no further archaeological work was required.

The Phase 2 field is a small plot which effectively forms a continuation of the field at the south end of the Phase 1 development. Site inspection in June 2015 revealed that the southern part of Phase 2 is wet ground, and that there was a suggestion of previous disturbance from ridge and furrow cultivation in the centre of the site, as well as historic mapping which suggested disturbance from mining activity. This was confirmed by a geotechnical test pit (EP8) which showed a deposit of coal and made ground in the north-eastern part of the site. Ground investigation consisted of 16 test pits plus boreholes undertaken in 2014 and 2016, which showed elsewhere that topsoil was 0.2 – 0.45m deep, directly overlying natural geology and without indication of archaeological deposits.

As Figure 2 within the 2011 SLR assessment document shows, the site is c 0.5km east from the historic core of Goldthorpe, and at least the same distance west from the nearest Iron Age or Romano-British field system cropmarks. Although within an area of probable ridge and furrow, this type of feature forms a common relict of medieval cultivation practice, and has little archaeological significance, especially at Goldthorpe Phase 2 where it has not been preserved as an earthwork feature. Historic mining activity extends into the field, and it is likely that this would have caused disturbance to the field during the 18<sup>th</sup> - 19<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Condition 18 placed on the planning permission relates to the need for a programme of archaeological investigation, but unlike the other conditions placed on the development, Condition 18 fails to include the council policy context to substantiate the need for this work. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment within chapter 12. Paragraph 128 requires applicants to describe the significance of heritage assets affected, and to support this with consultation of the Historic Environment Record, appropriate desk-based assessment, and where necessary field evaluation. Paragraph 129 requires planning authorities to identify and assess particular significance and any heritage asset that might be affected, so as to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. Paragraph 141 requires planning authorities to make information about the significance of the historic environment accessible, and to require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost in a manner proportionate to their importance.

I would suggest that in this particular case Gleeson has already satisfactorily completed the studies specified in a manner that is reasonable and proportionate to their heritage significance, by undertaking three desk-based assessments and a site visit of the site in question, and through having conducted geophysical survey and trial trenching in the Phase 1 part of the development, which proved the lack of archaeological remains. If both phases had been submitted at the same time as a single application, then no additional investigation would have been asked for Phase 2. In my opinion it would therefore be perfectly acceptable, on this occasion, to discharge Condition 18 on the existing evidence.

Yours sincerely  
**SLR Consulting Limited**



**Tim Malim BA, FSA, MCIfA**  
Technical Director

