

From: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk
Sent: 22 January 2024 18:07
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: FW: Response To Application Number DOV/23/01363 at Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash,
Attachments: Response_DOV-23-01363.pdf
Importance: High

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi [REDACTED]

I have an email direct from the applicant to respond to requesting a meeting to discuss. Is this something you would like to be involved with or are you happy for me to go ahead and report back to you how it went?

Kind regards

[REDACTED] | Senior Development Planner | Highways and Transportation | Kent County Council | Javelin Way, Henwood Industrial Estate, Ashford, Kent, TN24 8AD | [REDACTED] | www.kent.gov.uk

From: KCC Highway Consultations - GT <kcchighwayconsultations@kent.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2024 11:39 AM
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk
Subject: FW: Response To Application Number DOV/23/01363 at Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash,
Importance: High

Hi [REDACTED]

Please see query below.

Many thanks
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2024 11:07 AM
To: KCC Highway Consultations - GT <kcchighwayconsultations@kent.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Response To Application Number DOV/23/01363 at Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash,
Importance: High

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good morning [REDACTED]

Thanks for your consultation response for the above application. The agents are keen to discuss this further, are you able to provide a direct email address for yourself please?

Many thanks,
[REDACTED]



██████████
Senior Planning Officer

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: ██████████@DOVER.gov.uk

Web: dover.gov.uk

Phone: ██████████



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: kcchighwayconsultations@kent.gov.uk <kcchighwayconsultations@kent.gov.uk>

Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 6:58 PM

To: ██████████@DOVER.GOV.UK>; DDC SupportAssistants

<SupportAssistants@DOVER.GOV.UK>

Subject: Response To Application Number DOV/23/01363 at Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash,

Dear ██████████

Please find attached my representation in relation to the above planning application.

I'm happy to talk through any of the issues raised with you and the applicant if necessary.

Regards

██████████

Kent County Council

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.



Dover District Council
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent
CT16 3PJ

Highways and Transportation

Kroner House

Eurogate Business Park

Ashford

TN24 8XU

Tel: 03000 418181

Date: 3 January 2024

Our Ref: TJ

Application - DOV/23/01363

Location - Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash,

Proposal - Construction of a solar farm, with associated access and infrastructure for an operational period of 40 years

Thank you for your consultation in relation to the above planning application. I have the following comments to make with respect to highway matters :-

1. It is accepted that once completed, the traffic associated with an operational solar farm is minimal in nature, this is in most cases fewer movements even than would be associated with the agricultural use for the same footprint of land. So with this regard, the proposed access locations for the operational solar farm are acceptable.
2. Access for the construction and decommissioning phases is not quite as simple:
 - a. The access routing from the A257 benefits from a wide junction and a right turn lane when approaching from the east. The applicant has opted for an access strategy for the construction and decommissioning stages that utilises an on site haul road to avoid an extremely restricted section of Cooper Street Drove close to Goss Hall. This is a sensible approach to the limitations of the public highway in this area.
 - b. The remainder of the approach route to site however uses Cooper Street Drove, which in this location is only a single running lane in width. This section of the access route on highway is approximately 200m long, there are no passing places within the public highway and although largely straight, there is no clear line of sight in between the site entrance and the proposed temporary haul road access.
 - c. If two vehicles meet on this section of road there is no space to pass and one driver will have to reverse a significant distance. It is not common for a HGV to be expected to reverse any significant distance safely.
 - d. Site Access 1 is located at the exit of a bend in the road when traveling south. Traffic on Cooper Street Drove travelling southbound would not be able to see a delivery vehicle heading north until after it has passed the entrance to Site Access 1. In this event, to clear the road for the delivery vehicle to enter the site access, they would have to reverse back into a blind bend.

3. The southern temporary site access junction where it meets Cooper Street Drove is shown as being directly adjacent to the East Street junction. This would not be acceptable for a road junction design, however for a temporary haul road which has light use, in an area where background movements are low and visibility is good, I do not consider this to be a hazard.
4. Paragraph 4.2.3 of the supporting Transport Statement (TS) reads:
 - a. *“Site Access 1 will be the only permanent access used during construction, operations and decommissioning. It is acknowledged that the visibility splay within the vicinity of the junction onto Cooper Street Drove is restricted, **as such minimal hedgerow cutting and road signs will be erected to warn of the presence of construction vehicles using the junction.** This is considered to be appropriate given that it will minimise ecology impact, all roads have very low levels of traffic and vehicle speeds are low. Swept path analysis for construction delivery vehicles is contained in Appendix B.”*
 - b. Site Access 1 visibility is currently severely restricted to the north due to a bend in the road and vegetation. This will be subject to an intensification in use over its existing state. As such visibility for this access needs to be fit for purpose, demonstrated as part of this application and evidenced as suitable. Minimal cut back is unlikely to be adequate. This could be informed by an ATC speed survey to minimise vegetation loss.
5. Visibility plays have not been provided for any of the temporary haul road site access points. I accept that current crop planting regime may not cause an issue at present, this may in time change however and it is important for visibility splays to be provided with the planning application so that these can be safeguarded through the planning process. Further supporting information is required.
6. Irrespective of the wheel washing measures proposed though any future Construction Management Plan (CMP), to reduce the amount of mud and loose material dragged onto the highway, the accesses should be macadam for a minimum of 10m back from the edge of the highway. The vehicle crossover at Site Access 1 will also need to be widened and macadam surfaced to cater for the turning movements. This may be intended, but is not shown on the provided vehicle track drawings. Further supporting information is required.
7. Details of delivery timings and site traffic management can be established using a CMP via planning condition should the LPA deem to grant consent. Measures will be required to ensure site traffic does not conflict with each other, inbound and outbound trips could be split by the hour as detailed in the TS or a call ahead system with the site manager. Considering the proximity of the A257 and A256 with laybys within reach, either option should not be difficult to achieve. This does not however get around the potential problem of other highway users meeting construction delivery vehicles in areas with no passing places.
8. The above problems would be removed if the temporary haul road were to take a different alignment, behind the nearby properties and Brookesteet Farm, crossing Brooke Street (private track) and directly into the site compound. To inform this issue I cannot see a blue line drawing indicating land under the control of the applicant as would normally be supplied with a planning application.

As presented, I am not convinced that the proposals adequately protect the safety of other highway users. As such I would like to place a holding objection on this application until the issues raised above are settled.

I will be pleased to provide further comment when additional information has been provided.

Informative: It is important to note that planning permission does not convey any approval to carry out works on or affecting the public highway.

Any changes to or affecting the public highway in Kent require the formal agreement of the Highway Authority, Kent County Council (KCC), and it should not be assumed that this will be given because planning permission has been granted. For this reason, anyone considering works which may affect the public highway, including any highway-owned street furniture, is advised to engage with KCC Highways and Transportation at an early stage in the design process.

Across the county there are pieces of land next to private homes and gardens that do not look like roads or pavements but are actually part of the public highway. Some of this highway land is owned by Kent County Council whilst some is owned by third party owners. Irrespective of the ownership, this land may have highway rights over the topsoil.

Works on private land may also affect the public highway. These include works to cellars, to retaining walls which support the highway or land above the highway, and to balconies, signs or other structures which project over the highway. Such works also require the approval of the Highway Authority.

Kent County Council has now introduced a formal technical approval process for new or altered highway assets, with the aim of improving future maintainability. This process applies to all development works affecting the public highway other than applications for vehicle crossings, which are covered by a separate approval process.

Should the development be approved by the Planning Authority, it is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure, before the development is commenced, that all necessary highway approvals and consents have been obtained and that the limits of the highway boundary have been clearly established, since failure to do so may result in enforcement action being taken by the Highway Authority. The applicant must also ensure that the details shown on the approved plans agree in every aspect with those approved under the relevant legislation and common law. It is therefore important for the applicant to contact KCC Highways and Transportation to progress this aspect of the works prior to commencement on site.

Guidance for applicants, including information about how to clarify the highway boundary and links to application forms for vehicular crossings and other highway matters, may be found on Kent County Council's website: <https://www.kent.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/highway-permits-and-licences/highways-permissions-and-technical-guidance>. Alternatively, KCC Highways and Transportation may be contacted by telephone: 03000 418181

Yours Faithfully

Director of Highways & Transportation

*This is a statutory technical response on behalf of KCC as Highway Authority. If you wish to make representations in relation to highways matters associated with the planning application under consideration, please make these directly to the Planning Authority.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Historic England and Richborough Roman fort
Date: 29 January 2024 10:13:11

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email to my colleague in relation to application DOV/23/01363 – Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash. A consultation request has been sent to Historic England and their comments will be available to view in the online planning file when they are received.

I hope this is of assistance, however please email me if you have any questions.

Kind regards,
Rachel



[REDACTED]
Senior Planning Officer
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk

Web: [dover.gov.uk](https://www.dover.gov.uk)

Phone: [REDACTED]



Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 4:04 PM
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: FW: Historic England and Richborough Roman fort

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 1:12 PM
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: Historic England and Richborough Roman fort

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear [REDACTED],

Please excuse me using your personal email address but with most systems still being 'down' at Dover I was anxious to contact you before too much time passes.

Re: EIA/22/00245 Scoping report re Solar farm at Goshall Valley, East Street
DOV/23/01363 Full Application re Solar Farm

I have been asked to contact you by several people in the village who query why Historic England has not been included on the list of Consultees for the Full Application. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (Inspector of Ancient Monuments) wrote in her response to the EIA that " Given the importance of the heritage assets within the area, we would expect to provide further advice in due course on this application"

Many of us consider this Grade 1 Listed site is a priceless heritage asset in our district and is afforded the highest level of protection.

We would therefore appreciate if a further response could be obtained from HE given there are now six chapters dealing with archaeology submitted by the applicant in 23/01363.

Thank you

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

T. [REDACTED]

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [DDC Development Management](#)
Subject: RE: Dover District Council- Planning Application consultation on 23/01363
Date: 14 February 2024 09:26:34
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Hi [REDACTED]

I agree the extension of time for Historic England as I need their comments.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Senior Planning Officer
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk

Web: dover.gov.uk

Phone: [REDACTED]



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: DDC Development Management <DevelopmentManagement@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 5:06 PM
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: FW: Dover District Council- Planning Application consultation on 23/01363

Hi [REDACTED]

Is the below extension request ok?

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Support Officer
Development Management

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: developmentmanagement@dover.gov.uk

Web: <http://dover.gov.uk>

Tel: [REDACTED]

Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 4:43 PM
To: DDC Development Management <DevelopmentManagement@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: RE: Dover District Council- Planning Application consultation on 23/01363

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@historicengland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@historicengland.org.uk)>. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your reply.

If possible, we would like to extend until the 29th February?

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Business Officer (Kent) | London & South East Region
Historic England, 4th Floor The Atrium, Cannon Bridge House, 25 Dowgate Hill,
London EC4R 2YA
[REDACTED]

Please note that Wednesday is my non-working day



Historic England

Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: DDC Development Management <DevelopmentManagement@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: 13 February 2024 16:30
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Dover District Council- Planning Application consultation on 23/01363



-- WARNING: This is an external message. Please use caution when replying, opening attachments or clicking on any links in this e-mail.--

Hi [REDACTED]

Can I confirm what date you would like to extend until?

Many thanks,



[REDACTED]
Support Officer
Development Management
Dover District Council
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16
3PJ
Email: developmentmanagement@dover.gov.uk
Web: <http://dover.gov.uk>
Tel: [REDACTED]

Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 3:09 PM
To: DDC Development Management <DevelopmentManagement@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: FW: Dover District Council- Planning Application consultation on 23/01363

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@historicengland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@historicengland.org.uk)>. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Team,

As outlined in the email below, would it be possible to confirm whether an extension of 11 days on application 23/01363 would be possible please?

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Business Officer (Kent) | London & South East Region
Historic England, 4th Floor The Atrium, Cannon Bridge House, 25 Dowgate Hill,
London EC4R 2YA
[REDACTED]

Please note that Wednesday is my non-working day



Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: South East ePlanning

Sent: 30 January 2024 15:50

To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>

Subject: RE: Dover District Council- Planning Application consultation on 23/01363

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for sending across this consultation for 23/01363.

The Inspector of Ancient Monuments has confirmed that they will respond to the consultation, but due to significant issues affecting capacity they will be unable to provide comments by the 21 deadline. Would it be possible to grant an extension until the 29th February? This would be an extension of 11 days.

Please advise whether this would be agreeable to you.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Business Officer (Kent) | London & South East Region

Historic England, 4th Floor The Atrium, Cannon Bridge House, 25 Dowgate Hill,
London EC4R 2YA

[REDACTED]

Please note that Wednesday is my non-working day

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>

Sent: 29 January 2024 10:43

To: South East ePlanning <e-seast@HistoricEngland.org.uk>

Subject: Dover District Council- Planning Application consultation on 23/01363

-- WARNING: This is an external message. Please use caution when replying, opening attachments or clicking on any links in this e-mail.--

Please find attached correspondence relating to Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash,
Regards
Development Management
Dover District Council



[REDACTED]
Support Officer
Development Management
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ
Email [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk
Web: <http://dover.gov.uk>



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at: <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.
If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.
Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.
By communication with this Council by e-mail, you consent to such correspondence being monitored or read by any other officer of the Council.
All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.
Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: 14 February 2024 12:03
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: 23/01363 Goshall Valley

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear [REDACTED]

Sorry for the delay in getting this to you.

I have reviewed Chapter 8 of the submitted EIA, along with other associated documents, including the Ecology baseline report, Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy and the Arboricultural report.

Local Wildlife Site / Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh (Priority habitat)

The proposed development is situated within and will result in impacts to the Ash Level and South Richborough Pasture LWS, including permanent and temporary loss of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh (priority habitat).

It is stated in the EIA that the proposed development will result in improvements to the condition and extent of the coastal and floodplain grazing marsh habitat that will offset the habitat losses, I acknowledge that the cessation of arable cultivation and reversion to grassland and management by low-intensity grazing, along with the creation of the nature restoration area, will provide ecological benefits. The use of the land for the solar array does though present a significant change and, to help my understanding, I query what the impact from the installation of the PV array will be (e.g. from shading and rainfall run off from the panels), as compared to a restored CFGM grassland without the PV array.

For the long-term management of the grassland, the area beneath the solar array is proposed to be managed by 'low-intensity sheep grazing'. I query what the alternative management would be for the grassland if it is not possible to secure grazing flocks for the site, and advise that further information on this is sought from the applicant. I also advise that clarification is sought as to the management of the ditch landscape buffers and whether these will be subject to grazing.

Other habitats

I note that dense / scattered (both terms are used) scrub is stated to be present on the site in small areas and seek further information regarding the justification for omitting them from the habitat survey mapping and biodiversity net gain calculations; what size are the areas of scrub? Do they have potential to support nesting birds? Will any scrub be lost as a result of the proposed development, and if so what protection measures will be implemented?

I note in the Arboricultural Report that additional trees and hedgerows to those identified in the Chapter 8 are proposed for removal (see sections 3.3 to 3.5). I advise that clarification is sought as to whether works to these trees and hedgerows present any additional potential ecological impacts to those already identified, along with justification for their omission from the biodiversity net gain strategy.

Limited information is provided regarding the loss of 4m of hedgerow; it is not clear where exactly this is, and although there is provision for method statements to ensure the potential for impacts to dormice and breeding birds are avoided and / or minimised, the potential for reptiles and amphibians to be present along or within the hedgerow is not directly addressed. I advise that further information is sought from the applicant to clearly show the location of the hedgerow, along with provision for the method statement to protect herptiles from killing and / or injury.

With regards to the proposed 7.5m landscape buffers to all ditches. It is not clear from the submitted plans whether it is realistic and achievable that these buffers will be in place prior to any construction works commencing; the General PV Layout Plan indicates that the locations of the maintenance roads and the PV panels appear in places to be in relatively close proximity to the ditches and I query whether the proposed buffers will allow sufficient space in which construction vehicles can operate. I suggest that more detailed plans are sought, to demonstrate how construction will be achieved without incursion into the buffer zones.

Protected and designated species

I advise that there is a need for the applicant to take account of the presence of beavers in the area. Further information must be sought to demonstrate an understanding of the potential use of the site by beavers, the potential for impacts to beavers, and the need for any mitigation measures to minimise the potential for impacts during construction and operation of the proposed development.

Toad records were returned in the KMBRC data search, but they are not specifically mentioned. I assume that they are included under 'amphibians', but the detailed text refers only to great crested newts. I advise that clarification on this point is sought, to demonstrate that this species of principle importance will be protected from harm during construction.

Other matters

I also advise that clarification is sought regarding the timing of installation, and the relationship between, the perimeter fencing and the biodiversity exclusion zone fencing, noting that in some places the perimeter fence cuts through the buffer zones and in others it overlaps the exclusion zone fencing. Approaches to any necessary mitigation measures must be sought from the applicant.

It is stated in the submission that existing crossing points (over the ditches) will be used for access, though the submission includes provision for repairs to and replacement crossings, along with two new crossing points. To provide a good understanding of all the potential ecological impacts, I advise that details of the locations and structure of any replacement crossings, along with the proposed new crossing points are sought from the applicant. Approaches to any necessary mitigation measures must be sought from the applicant.

The only plans submitted are at a large scale of the whole site. To aid clarity in understanding the site and its ecological features, I advise that detailed plans of sub-sections of the habitats within the proposed development site are sought from the applicant, so that areas of suitable habitat for protected and designated species can more easily be identified, along with the areas in which there is potential for impacts to arise.

Biodiversity net gain

This application is not subject to mandatory biodiversity net gain, but is within Ash parish and proposals indicate an aim to achieve at least 10% biodiversity net gain.

In section 2.22 of the Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy, it is stated that the User Guide for Biodiversity Metric 4.0 was not followed. While I understand the rationale behind this, I advise that the User Guide for the relevant metric should be followed. I have sought advice from Natural England's Biodiversity Net Gain Policy Team, who advise that: *"It is important that the version of the Biodiversity Metric that is used adheres to its associated guidance – applications submitted using Biodiversity Metric 4.0 need to follow Metric 4.0 guidance which says that 'Any ditches within recorded FWM-CFGM are part of the FWM-CFGM condition assessment and should not be recorded in separate modules'. The professional judgement of the competent person should be used alongside the guidance to judge how to represent the habitats present at baseline and post-intervention as accurately as possible. The competent person should justify how habitats have been recorded in the Metric, especially where error flags are raised in the Metric, to assist the reviewer."*

I therefore advise that a revised Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy and accompanying Biodiversity Metric are sought from the applicant, taking into account the above comments. Please note that the Statutory Metric treats the mosaic habitat situation differently to Metric 4.0, so the applicant should consider using the Statutory Metric, which does allow the fields and watercourses to be accounted for in the different modules of the metric.

The applicant should also be advised that local guidance on the application of Strategic Significance multipliers was published in January 2024 and can be found here: [Biodiversity Net Gain for Kent and Medway | Making Space For Nature Kent](#) and should be used by the applicant in their resubmitted Biodiversity Metric.

Kind regards,



[Redacted]
Senior Natural Environment Officer

Dover District Council
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park,
Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [Redacted]@dover.gov.uk

Phone: [Redacted]

Web: dover.gov.uk

My working days are Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: Proposed Solar Farm, east Street, Ash.
Date: 26 February 2024 14:39:43

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi [REDACTED]

Just to keep you informed. I've just had a quick Teams meeting with the applicant's new transport consultant.

If they put in place all the measures and revisions we discussed then they will be able to overcome my initial objections to the application.

He wasn't expecting to be ready to submit the revisions for a few weeks yet.

Kind regards

[REDACTED] | Senior Development Planner | Highways and Transportation | Kent
County Council | Javelin Way, Henwood Industrial Estate, Ashford, Kent, TN24
8AD | [REDACTED] | www.kent.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Proposed Solar Farm, east Street, Ash.
Date: 26 February 2024 14:53:15

Hello [REDACTED]

Thank you for letting me know, it's much appreciated.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Senior Planning Officer
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk

Web: [dover.gov.uk](https://www.dover.gov.uk)

Phone: [REDACTED]



Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 2:40 PM
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: Proposed Solar Farm, east Street, Ash.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi [REDACTED]

Just to keep you informed. I've just had a quick Teams meeting with the applicant's new transport consultant.

If they put in place all the measures and revisions we discussed then they will be able to overcome my initial objections to the application.

He wasn't expecting to be ready to submit the revisions for a few weeks yet.

Kind regards

[REDACTED] | Senior Development Planner | Highways and Transportation | Kent County Council | Javelin Way, Henwood Industrial Estate, Ashford, Kent, TN24 8AD | [REDACTED] | www.kent.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Sent: 08 March 2024 02:05
To: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Subject: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 23/01363
Attachments: 2301363_HERef_P01571894_L445428.doc

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@historicengland.org.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear [REDACTED],

Please find attached our advice on the following site -

Goshall Valley East Street Ash
Application No(s):23/01363

Please note that Historic England object to the application.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Inspector of Ancient Monuments
E-mail: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk

Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. Please read our full privacy policy (<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/terms/privacy-cookies/>) for more information.



Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.



[REDACTED]
Dover District Council
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent
CT16 3PJ

Direct Dial: [REDACTED]

Our ref: P01571894

8 March 2024

Dear [REDACTED]

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**GOSHALL VALLEY EAST STREET ASH
Application No. 23/01363**

Thank you for your letter of 29 January 2024 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Summary

The proposed solar farm would harm the significance of Richborough Roman site, which is an exceptionally important site in our national story.

The proposals would erode the ability to appreciate Richborough's significance, which its landscape setting currently supports, and have the potential to destroy archaeology associated with the site. This harm would be greater than that indicated in the environmental statement.

We consider the level of harm to Richborough's significance would be less than substantial, and approaching, but not at, the upper end of the scale.

We think that solar infrastructure anywhere in the proposal area raises concern and mitigation would not help sufficiently overcome those concerns.

Historic England objects to this application because it causes notable heritage harm to assets of the highest order. Harm has not been accurately identified, demonstrably avoided or minimised, and clear and convincing justification for it has not been given.

If the above process has not been undertaken, the application is not consistent with the requirements of the NPPF, and it would not be possible to weigh any residual harm against benefits that might be identified.



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk



We recommend refusal of this application.

Historic England Advice

Introduction

The development proposals are for a photovoltaic (PV) solar electricity generating facility with associated infrastructure on c.83 ha of flat low-lying land (reclaimed grazing marsh) in Goshall, Dover.

The proposed construction of a solar farm here has significant implications for the historic environment, both within the boundary of the proposal area, and affecting the nationally important heritage asset of Richborough (Saxon Shore Fort, Roman Port and associated remains; National heritage list for England nos 1014642 and 1363256) through development within its setting. We provide advice here on the impacts to this monument including the Grade I listed upstanding Shore Fort remains.

We defer to the local authority Conservation Officer for advice on impacts to Grade II listed buildings, and the County Archaeological Officer for undesignated archaeology, however we acknowledge the potential for archaeological remains on the proposal site to enhance our understanding and appreciation of the significance of Richborough.

Significance

1. The scheduled area

As one of the most important Roman sites in England, Richborough is an exceptionally significant place.

The assumed landing point of the Claudian invasion in AD43, with extensive occupation throughout the Roman period, it was a key gateway to Roman Britain, and is pivotal in understanding of this period of our history.

Its significance is formed from the substantial and imposing standing remains of its Shore Fort, the different phases of military and civilian settlement represented here, its archaeological potential, and its great historical and strategic importance. It is a part of the national heritage collection and since the early part of the 20th century has been, and continues to be today, an important visitor site.

The ability to understand and appreciate these elements is supported by Richborough's setting, and the ability to understand the former landscape within which the remains are set.



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk





The site has evolved from the Iron Age, through the Roman period with archaeological evidence for the Early Roman military camp and supply base with timber structures later replaced by stone, notably a huge marble faced gilded monumental arch constructed AD85-90. A substantial walled Saxon Shore Fort was added around 277 AD. The scheduled area is part of the larger Roman town that developed around the fort and associated port, so extensive archaeological remains for this also lie outside the scheduled area forming an exceptional evidence base.

In the southern part of the monument on the highest part of the site is an amphitheatre, which survives as a well-defined raised earthwork, and which recent excavations have shown to be Early Roman in date. The amphitheatre was one of the earliest significant structures at Richborough, being a stand-alone, prominent earthwork long before the towering remains of the monumental arch or Shore Fort.

The visitor experience of this part of the site has recently been enhanced, meaning that it is possible to stand in this location to appreciate both the function of the amphitheatre, and how it is positioned in relation to the expansive landscape below. Only a small number of amphitheatres have been identified in Britain, and as such this is a particularly important monument.

2. Setting of Richborough

The setting of Richborough, including the proposal site, is fundamental to understanding how the location of the Roman Fort was deliberately sited on a high point within a formerly watery landscape, for defensive reasons.

It appears that Richborough was purposefully sited next to a large natural Harbour in the Wantsum Channel (a broad stretch of sea water which separated the Isle of Thanet from the Kent mainland until at least the Late Roman period), and near to the mouth of the River Stour. Given its location close to the continent, this meant the town served as a major gateway to Roman Britain and was occupied extensively throughout the Roman period. The major Roman road known as Watling Street, the main Roman road from London and Canterbury, was also first constructed shortly after the invasion and begins/terminates here.

The Roman site is in a unique location on Richborough Bluff, now a highpoint in the surrounding shallow valley landscape, which was effectively an island surrounded by water at the time of the Roman invasion. This translates an important element of its past use. Understanding this context is key to understanding the significance of the site and its strategic location.

In its modern context the former channel is now a distinctive large, flat area of reclaimed marshland, with a network of drainage ditches crossing expansive open



agricultural land. Although this landscape is different from that during the Roman period, it is possible to stand on either side of the valley and look across the former channel to the rising ground beyond, and understand the topography of the landscape and the strategic position that Richborough held. The lack of vegetation or trees within the former waterway, including the proposal site, also contributes to the legibility of the channel in the landscape today. This is particularly evident from the elevated amphitheatre where views to the south and west are extensive.

The low-lying ground of the adjacent valley, which was formally a water channel, and the raised earthworks of the amphitheatre, means the structure would have been (and still is) very visible on approach to Richborough from the south and west (see verified view D), and from some distance afar on the opposite side of the valley. An alien and perhaps, therefore, simultaneously impressive, intriguing, and intimidating presence to the native population at that time.

The former Wantsum Channel, including the proposal site, therefore makes a very important contribution to the ability to appreciate significance of the scheduled Fort.

The landscape setting of Richborough, including the proposal site, also holds important potential for archaeological remains including palaeoenvironmental features associated with the Wantsum Channel and evidence of a Roman Road. Geophysical survey indicates a principal street within Richborough connects with Watling Street, curves past the amphitheatre, and projects south-west i.e., towards the application site. Excavation in the valley within the former channel has also identified further parts of a Roman road on this alignment, suggesting a road, potentially with a causeway or crossing point, which would have connected with Richborough, passes through the application site.

Archaeological remains could significantly increase understanding of the landscape context of Richborough. As such, the archaeology here may be of an elevated significance because of its relationship with the scheduled monument.

Impact

The proposed solar farm would cause harm to the significance of Richborough Roman site, by reducing the contribution that its setting makes, and by reducing the ability to appreciate the site in its landscape context.

This is most evident in regard to changes in the landscape of the former Wantsum channel, visible from the amphitheatre, and also potentially through destruction of, and setting impacts to, archaeology that may be associated with the monument. This harm would, in our view, be greater than that indicated in the environmental statement.

The installation of the solar farm would result in marked change to the character of the



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk





landscape to the south of Richborough bluff. The landscape represents the now silted channel of the Wantsum and is recognisable as such because of its extensive and distinctive open flat character, with networks of waterways alluding to its watery past. The addition of the solar panels and infrastructure would compromise an appreciation that this was formally a water channel surrounding the fort, by filling the area with modern infrastructure that covers the features that create its landscape character.

In moving through this flat landscape, with the solar panels in place, it would also be much more difficult to appreciate the character and topography of the former channel, with the panels obscuring views across the former water channel, and also views looking up to Richborough Bluff. This is clearly demonstrated by verified views D fig 11 and 12.

This is harmful to the interpretation and appreciation of Richborough Roman site as a former island built on a high point for strategic reasons, and protected in part by the water of the Wantsum channel, because understanding that it was located on an island surrounded by water at the time of the Roman invasion is key to understanding the significance of the site and its important strategic location.

The amphitheatre appears to have been intentionally placed on the highest available ground in the Early Roman period when there would have been few other constraints for its location. This suggests intentional positioning; it would have been in a position of status, commanding impressive uninterrupted views across the Wantsum for those experiencing it, and being highly visible when being approached from the south and west, presumably along the Roman road network identified in the valley floor.

The solar arrays would make it harder to understand the character and topography of the landscape below. The panels would occupy a large part of the valley floor making the former channel appear narrower, and the proposed planting would not only be uncharacteristic to this open landscape, but would foreshorten the view considerably, making it difficult to appreciate the width of the former channel and the way the land rises beyond. This is demonstrated in the ES verified views A fig 2 and 3, B fig 5 and 6, and C fig 8 and 9.

The amphitheatre is particularly affected, as the ability for a modern visitor to the monument to look across the former channel on either side of the valley, and understand its importance in relation to Richborough, would be harmed by the proposals.

We do not therefore agree with the applicant's assessment that the effect on the setting of Richborough would be minor adverse (ES Table 10.7).

Additionally, the installation of the solar arrays could impact on archaeological deposits that are either related to the Roman occupation of Richborough, or which could



significantly contribute to our understanding of its landscape context. Tree planting for mitigation would increase the impact. We do not agree with the applicant's assessment that the proposed development site is of low archaeological potential (ES chapter 6.83), and that no significant residual effects have been identified in regard to the construction phase (ES chapter 6.104).

In particular we note the Roman road which may continue through the proposal area. Preserving the Roman road in a 'corridor' within the proposed development (as suggested in ES Table 10.1) may help to preserve archaeological deposits but would not address issues in relation to its setting.

Policy

1. National Planning Policy Framework:

Para 201 notes that Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Para 205 says that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Para 206 is clear that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

2. Planning Practice Guidance

PPG acknowledges that development of large scale solar farms in rural environments can have a negative impact. It says that great care should be taken to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including impacts on views important to the heritage assets setting.

Position



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk



The proposed solar farm would harm the significance of Richborough Roman site, which is an exceptionally important site in our national story.

The proposals would erode the ability to appreciate Richborough's significance, which its landscape setting currently supports, and have the potential to destroy archaeology associated with the site. This harm would be greater than that indicated in the environmental statement.

The impact to the visitor experience at Richborough and the landscape context of the amphitheatre to support that, has also been poorly represented in the application.

We have concerns regarding the applicant's assessment of levels of harm and impact, and the lack of recognition in the ES of the contribution the landscape of the former Wantsum Channel makes to the significance of Richborough Roman site.

We think that solar infrastructure anywhere in the proposal area raises concern and mitigation would not help to sufficiently overcome those concerns. In the case of tree planting as visual screening, it would in fact, increase the level of harm.

Given the remarkable historic significance of Richborough, the harm that these proposals would cause, and the planning policy context, Historic England considers this proposal to be poorly conceived. While we are supportive of the aspiration to provide low carbon energy, we object to these proposals which have not sought to avoid or minimise harm to heritage of the highest significance.

In the language of the NPPF we consider the level of harm to Richborough's significance would be less than substantial, and approaching, but not at, the upper end of the scale. We do not therefore agree with the applicants ES that identifies the harm as minor (adverse) harm, which might translate to a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the Roman site.

An accurate level of harm would need to be identified in the ES, that harm demonstrably avoided and minimised, and residual harm clearly and convincingly justified. It would not otherwise be possible to progress to the final step of weighing residual harm against any proposed benefits of the application.

Recommendation

Historic England objects to the application on heritage grounds.

It causes notable heritage harm to assets of the highest order. Harm has not been demonstrably avoided or minimised, and clear and convincing justification for it has not been given.

Your authority should take these representations into account in determining the



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk





Historic England

application. If you propose to determine the application in its current form, please inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity.

Please contact me if we can be of further assistance.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Inspector of Ancient Monuments

E-mail: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 23/01363
Date: 11 March 2024 14:49:30

Thanks [REDACTED] An objection from HE is a rare object.

Can you let me know how you're going to deal with this case- will it be officer or committee? If the latter then I'd be happy to attend albeit I'm not an archaeologist, if you feel that would be helpful.

Thanks,



[REDACTED]
Principal Heritage Officer
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@Dover.gov.uk

Tel: [REDACTED]

Web: <http://dover.gov.uk>



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.



From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 9:59 AM
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Cc: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: FW: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 23/01363

Morning both,

Just forwarding for info the comments from HE on the solar farm north of Ash.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk <[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 2:05 AM
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Cc: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Subject: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 23/01363

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@historicengland.org.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear [REDACTED],

Please find attached our advice on the following site -

Goshall Valley East Street Ash
Application No(s):23/01363

Please note that Historic England object to the application.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Inspector of Ancient Monuments

E-mail: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk

Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. Please read our full privacy policy (<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/terms/privacy-cookies/>) for more information.



Historic England

Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 23/01363
Date: 12 March 2024 14:22:25

Hello

I can do Wednesday 3-5 or all day Thursday.

Have copied [REDACTED] in- [REDACTED] if you can read the HE response (and preferably the KCC and EH responses) so you can see the arguments that are being made, then would be beneficial if you could attend the meeting just to listen in, but also be prepped in case you need to come back on anything re the built heritage aspect as [REDACTED] won't be considering that.

Thanks,



[REDACTED]
Principal Heritage Officer
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@Dover.gov.uk

Tel: [REDACTED]

Web: <http://dover.gov.uk>



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.



From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK<
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 10:43 AM
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK<
Subject: RE: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 23/01363

Hello [REDACTED]

Please let me know when works best for you from the dates/times below and I'll send a Teams

invite?

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>

Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 10:40 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>

Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>

Subject: RE: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 23/01363

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@historicengland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@historicengland.org.uk)>. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello [REDACTED]

Yes of course, I could do Weds or Thursday next week:

Weds available 10-1 and 3-5

Thursday available 10-12 and 2-5

Do send a Teams invite for whichever time works best for you both.

The applicant has also been in touch and I have offered them a discussion to clarify any points in the letter.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Kent, East and West Sussex
Regions Group: London and South East

Historic England

Floor 4 The Atrium, Cannon Bridge House, 25 Dowgate Hill, London, EC4R 2YA

Direct dial: [REDACTED] Mob: [REDACTED]

Main office: 020 7973 3700

For new case submissions and enquiries you can also email the south east
inbox: e-seast@historicengland.org.uk



Historic England

Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: Rachel Morgan <Rachel.Morgan@DOVER.GOV.UK>

Sent: 12 March 2024 09:32

To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>

Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>

Subject: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 23/01363

-- WARNING: This is an external message. Please use caution when replying, opening attachments or clicking on any links in this e-mail.--

Good morning [REDACTED]

Thank you for your consultation response on the above application for a solar farm. Would it be possible to arrange a brief Teams call with myself and the Principal Heritage Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to discuss your comments? If so, please could you let me know your availability next week?

Many thanks and kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Senior Planning Officer
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk)>

Web: dover.gov.uk

Phone: [REDACTED]



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)> [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 2:05 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>

Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>

Subject: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 23/01363

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@historicengland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@historicengland.org.uk)>. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear [REDACTED],

Please find attached our advice on the following site -

Goshall Valley East Street Ash
Application No(s):23/01363

Please note that Historic England object to the application.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Inspector of Ancient Monuments

E-mail: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk

Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at [historicengland.org.uk/strategy](https://www.historicengland.org.uk/strategy).

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. Please read our full privacy policy (<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/terms/privacy-cookies/>) for more information.



Historic England

Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at [historicengland.org.uk/strategy](https://www.historicengland.org.uk/strategy).

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Farm
Date: 18 March 2024 10:35:19

Hello

Yes that's fine for me- are we meeting HE ourselves beforehand? Might be a good idea or for us to at least have a pre-meet inhouse?



[REDACTED]
Principal Heritage Officer
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@Dover.gov.uk
Tel: [REDACTED]
Web: <http://dover.gov.uk>



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.



From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2024 10:27 AM
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: Fw: Little South Solar Farm
Importance: High

Hi [REDACTED]

Your calenda looks free but please could you confirm if you'd be available at 2:30pm on Thursday 21st to discuss the solar farm with the agent and historic england?

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>

Sent: 18 March 2024 10:25

To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

Subject: Little South Solar Farm

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@stantec.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi [REDACTED]

We have been in touch with [REDACTED] at Historic England regarding her objection as we are keen to discuss it further to clarify various aspects.

We have arranged a meeting at 2.30pm on Thursday (21st), and I suggested to her that I would invite you and your Conservation Officer to attend which she is happy with.

Could you let me know whether you can attend and who the Conservation Officer is so that I can invite them?

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Associate

Direct: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@stantec.com

Please note: I work part time.

I am available all day Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays, and Wednesday mornings.

I am not at work Wednesday afternoons or Fridays.

Stantec

3rd Floor, 50-60 Station Road

Cambridge CB1 2JH



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Farm
Date: 18 March 2024 15:20:50

Thanks [REDACTED] – very glad to hear you can both attend.

The client has got the KCC response and is not averse to carrying out trial trenching etc – however, we would like to bottom out the objection from Historic England at the meeting on Thursday before we respond fully to KCC's consultation response.

I will let you know about highways as soon as I hear back from the consultant.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Planning Associate

Direct: + [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@stantec.com

Please note: I work part time.

I am available all day Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays, and Wednesday mornings.

I am not at work Wednesday afternoons or Fridays.

Stantec
3rd Floor, 50-60 Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JH



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2024 10:45 AM
To: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Cc: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: Little South Solar Farm

Good morning [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. Myself and the Principal Heritage Officer [REDACTED] (CC'd) are available to join your meeting with Historic England on Thursday 21st at 2.30pm.

I understand your consultants have met with KCC Highways to discuss their comments and would be grateful if you could advise if there is any update on this please?

KCC County Archaeology have provided a detailed consultation response on the application (a copy is attached and also available on the online planning file). They recommend that further intrusive evaluation works are required before the application is determined. Please let me know if you have any comments on their response?

If you have any questions then please contact me.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Senior Planning Officer
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk

Web: [dover.gov.uk](https://www.dover.gov.uk)

Phone: [REDACTED]



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>

Sent: 18 March 2024 10:25

To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

Subject: Little South Solar Farm

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@stantec.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi [REDACTED]

We have been in touch with [REDACTED] at Historic England regarding her objection as we are keen to discuss it further to clarify various aspects.

We have arranged a meeting at 2.30pm on Thursday (21st), and I suggested to her that I would invite you and your Conservation Officer to attend which she is happy with.

Could you let me know whether you can attend and who the Conservation Officer is so that I can invite them?

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Planning Associate

Direct: + [REDACTED]

Mobile: + [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@stantec.com

Please note: I work part time.
I am available all day Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays, and Wednesday mornings.
I am not at work Wednesday afternoons or Fridays.

Stantec
3rd Floor, 50-60 Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JH



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome precauciones adicionales.

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: 20 March 2024 10:22
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: 23/01363 - heritage consultee reps attached
Attachments: 23_01363-HISTORIC_ENGLAND-2506886.doc; 23_01363-ARCHAEOLOGICAL_OFFICER-2497337.pdf; 23_01363-ENGLISH_HERITAGE-2499228.pdf; Goshall Valley East Street Ash 23.01363.docx

Hi Both,

Heritage reps from consultees attached for ease.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Senior Planning Officer
Dover District Council
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ
Email: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk
Web: [dover.gov.uk](https://www.dover.gov.uk)
Phone: [REDACTED]



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.



[REDACTED]
Dover District Council
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent
CT16 3PJ

Direct Dial: [REDACTED]

Our ref: P01571894

8 March 2024

Dear [REDACTED]

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**GOSHALL VALLEY EAST STREET ASH
Application No. 23/01363**

Thank you for your letter of 29 January 2024 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Summary

The proposed solar farm would harm the significance of Richborough Roman site, which is an exceptionally important site in our national story.

The proposals would erode the ability to appreciate Richborough's significance, which its landscape setting currently supports, and have the potential to destroy archaeology associated with the site. This harm would be greater than that indicated in the environmental statement.

We consider the level of harm to Richborough's significance would be less than substantial, and approaching, but not at, the upper end of the scale.

We think that solar infrastructure anywhere in the proposal area raises concern and mitigation would not help sufficiently overcome those concerns.

Historic England objects to this application because it causes notable heritage harm to assets of the highest order. Harm has not been accurately identified, demonstrably avoided or minimised, and clear and convincing justification for it has not been given.

If the above process has not been undertaken, the application is not consistent with the requirements of the NPPF, and it would not be possible to weigh any residual harm against benefits that might be identified.



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk



We recommend refusal of this application.

Historic England Advice

Introduction

The development proposals are for a photovoltaic (PV) solar electricity generating facility with associated infrastructure on c.83 ha of flat low-lying land (reclaimed grazing marsh) in Goshall, Dover.

The proposed construction of a solar farm here has significant implications for the historic environment, both within the boundary of the proposal area, and affecting the nationally important heritage asset of Richborough (Saxon Shore Fort, Roman Port and associated remains; National heritage list for England nos 1014642 and 1363256) through development within its setting. We provide advice here on the impacts to this monument including the Grade I listed upstanding Shore Fort remains.

We defer to the local authority Conservation Officer for advice on impacts to Grade II listed buildings, and the County Archaeological Officer for undesignated archaeology, however we acknowledge the potential for archaeological remains on the proposal site to enhance our understanding and appreciation of the significance of Richborough.

Significance

1. The scheduled area

As one of the most important Roman sites in England, Richborough is an exceptionally significant place.

The assumed landing point of the Claudian invasion in AD43, with extensive occupation throughout the Roman period, it was a key gateway to Roman Britain, and is pivotal in understanding of this period of our history.

Its significance is formed from the substantial and imposing standing remains of its Shore Fort, the different phases of military and civilian settlement represented here, its archaeological potential, and its great historical and strategic importance. It is a part of the national heritage collection and since the early part of the 20th century has been, and continues to be today, an important visitor site.

The ability to understand and appreciate these elements is supported by Richborough's setting, and the ability to understand the former landscape within which the remains are set.



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk





The site has evolved from the Iron Age, through the Roman period with archaeological evidence for the Early Roman military camp and supply base with timber structures later replaced by stone, notably a huge marble faced gilded monumental arch constructed AD85-90. A substantial walled Saxon Shore Fort was added around 277 AD. The scheduled area is part of the larger Roman town that developed around the fort and associated port, so extensive archaeological remains for this also lie outside the scheduled area forming an exceptional evidence base.

In the southern part of the monument on the highest part of the site is an amphitheatre, which survives as a well-defined raised earthwork, and which recent excavations have shown to be Early Roman in date. The amphitheatre was one of the earliest significant structures at Richborough, being a stand-alone, prominent earthwork long before the towering remains of the monumental arch or Shore Fort.

The visitor experience of this part of the site has recently been enhanced, meaning that it is possible to stand in this location to appreciate both the function of the amphitheatre, and how it is positioned in relation to the expansive landscape below. Only a small number of amphitheatres have been identified in Britain, and as such this is a particularly important monument.

2. Setting of Richborough

The setting of Richborough, including the proposal site, is fundamental to understanding how the location of the Roman Fort was deliberately sited on a high point within a formerly watery landscape, for defensive reasons.

It appears that Richborough was purposefully sited next to a large natural Harbour in the Wantsum Channel (a broad stretch of sea water which separated the Isle of Thanet from the Kent mainland until at least the Late Roman period), and near to the mouth of the River Stour. Given its location close to the continent, this meant the town served as a major gateway to Roman Britain and was occupied extensively throughout the Roman period. The major Roman road known as Watling Street, the main Roman road from London and Canterbury, was also first constructed shortly after the invasion and begins/terminates here.

The Roman site is in a unique location on Richborough Bluff, now a highpoint in the surrounding shallow valley landscape, which was effectively an island surrounded by water at the time of the Roman invasion. This translates an important element of its past use. Understanding this context is key to understanding the significance of the site and its strategic location.

In its modern context the former channel is now a distinctive large, flat area of reclaimed marshland, with a network of drainage ditches crossing expansive open



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk



agricultural land. Although this landscape is different from that during the Roman period, it is possible to stand on either side of the valley and look across the former channel to the rising ground beyond, and understand the topography of the landscape and the strategic position that Richborough held. The lack of vegetation or trees within the former waterway, including the proposal site, also contributes to the legibility of the channel in the landscape today. This is particularly evident from the elevated amphitheatre where views to the south and west are extensive.

The low-lying ground of the adjacent valley, which was formally a water channel, and the raised earthworks of the amphitheatre, means the structure would have been (and still is) very visible on approach to Richborough from the south and west (see verified view D), and from some distance afar on the opposite side of the valley. An alien and perhaps, therefore, simultaneously impressive, intriguing, and intimidating presence to the native population at that time.

The former Wantsum Channel, including the proposal site, therefore makes a very important contribution to the ability to appreciate significance of the scheduled Fort.

The landscape setting of Richborough, including the proposal site, also holds important potential for archaeological remains including palaeoenvironmental features associated with the Wantsum Channel and evidence of a Roman Road. Geophysical survey indicates a principal street within Richborough connects with Watling Street, curves past the amphitheatre, and projects south-west i.e., towards the application site. Excavation in the valley within the former channel has also identified further parts of a Roman road on this alignment, suggesting a road, potentially with a causeway or crossing point, which would have connected with Richborough, passes through the application site.

Archaeological remains could significantly increase understanding of the landscape context of Richborough. As such, the archaeology here may be of an elevated significance because of its relationship with the scheduled monument.

Impact

The proposed solar farm would cause harm to the significance of Richborough Roman site, by reducing the contribution that its setting makes, and by reducing the ability to appreciate the site in its landscape context.

This is most evident in regard to changes in the landscape of the former Wantsum channel, visible from the amphitheatre, and also potentially through destruction of, and setting impacts to, archaeology that may be associated with the monument. This harm would, in our view, be greater than that indicated in the environmental statement.

The installation of the solar farm would result in marked change to the character of the



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk





landscape to the south of Richborough bluff. The landscape represents the now silted channel of the Wantsum and is recognisable as such because of its extensive and distinctive open flat character, with networks of waterways alluding to its watery past. The addition of the solar panels and infrastructure would compromise an appreciation that this was formally a water channel surrounding the fort, by filling the area with modern infrastructure that covers the features that create its landscape character.

In moving through this flat landscape, with the solar panels in place, it would also be much more difficult to appreciate the character and topography of the former channel, with the panels obscuring views across the former water channel, and also views looking up to Richborough Bluff. This is clearly demonstrated by verified views D fig 11 and 12.

This is harmful to the interpretation and appreciation of Richborough Roman site as a former island built on a high point for strategic reasons, and protected in part by the water of the Wantsum channel, because understanding that it was located on an island surrounded by water at the time of the Roman invasion is key to understanding the significance of the site and its important strategic location.

The amphitheatre appears to have been intentionally placed on the highest available ground in the Early Roman period when there would have been few other constraints for its location. This suggests intentional positioning; it would have been in a position of status, commanding impressive uninterrupted views across the Wantsum for those experiencing it, and being highly visible when being approached from the south and west, presumably along the Roman road network identified in the valley floor.

The solar arrays would make it harder to understand the character and topography of the landscape below. The panels would occupy a large part of the valley floor making the former channel appear narrower, and the proposed planting would not only be uncharacteristic to this open landscape, but would foreshorten the view considerably, making it difficult to appreciate the width of the former channel and the way the land rises beyond. This is demonstrated in the ES verified views A fig 2 and 3, B fig 5 and 6, and C fig 8 and 9.

The amphitheatre is particularly affected, as the ability for a modern visitor to the monument to look across the former channel on either side of the valley, and understand its importance in relation to Richborough, would be harmed by the proposals.

We do not therefore agree with the applicant's assessment that the effect on the setting of Richborough would be minor adverse (ES Table 10.7).

Additionally, the installation of the solar arrays could impact on archaeological deposits that are either related to the Roman occupation of Richborough, or which could



significantly contribute to our understanding of its landscape context. Tree planting for mitigation would increase the impact. We do not agree with the applicant's assessment that the proposed development site is of low archaeological potential (ES chapter 6.83), and that no significant residual effects have been identified in regard to the construction phase (ES chapter 6.104).

In particular we note the Roman road which may continue through the proposal area. Preserving the Roman road in a 'corridor' within the proposed development (as suggested in ES Table 10.1) may help to preserve archaeological deposits but would not address issues in relation to its setting.

Policy

1. National Planning Policy Framework:

Para 201 notes that Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Para 205 says that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Para 206 is clear that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

2. Planning Practice Guidance

PPG acknowledges that development of large scale solar farms in rural environments can have a negative impact. It says that great care should be taken to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including impacts on views important to the heritage assets setting.

Position



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk



The proposed solar farm would harm the significance of Richborough Roman site, which is an exceptionally important site in our national story.

The proposals would erode the ability to appreciate Richborough's significance, which its landscape setting currently supports, and have the potential to destroy archaeology associated with the site. This harm would be greater than that indicated in the environmental statement.

The impact to the visitor experience at Richborough and the landscape context of the amphitheatre to support that, has also been poorly represented in the application.

We have concerns regarding the applicant's assessment of levels of harm and impact, and the lack of recognition in the ES of the contribution the landscape of the former Wantsum Channel makes to the significance of Richborough Roman site.

We think that solar infrastructure anywhere in the proposal area raises concern and mitigation would not help to sufficiently overcome those concerns. In the case of tree planting as visual screening, it would in fact, increase the level of harm.

Given the remarkable historic significance of Richborough, the harm that these proposals would cause, and the planning policy context, Historic England considers this proposal to be poorly conceived. While we are supportive of the aspiration to provide low carbon energy, we object to these proposals which have not sought to avoid or minimise harm to heritage of the highest significance.

In the language of the NPPF we consider the level of harm to Richborough's significance would be less than substantial, and approaching, but not at, the upper end of the scale. We do not therefore agree with the applicants ES that identifies the harm as minor (adverse) harm, which might translate to a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the Roman site.

An accurate level of harm would need to be identified in the ES, that harm demonstrably avoided and minimised, and residual harm clearly and convincingly justified. It would not otherwise be possible to progress to the final step of weighing residual harm against any proposed benefits of the application.

Recommendation

Historic England objects to the application on heritage grounds.

It causes notable heritage harm to assets of the highest order. Harm has not been demonstrably avoided or minimised, and clear and convincing justification for it has not been given.

Your authority should take these representations into account in determining the



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk





Historic England

application. If you propose to determine the application in its current form, please inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity.

Please contact me if we can be of further assistance.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Inspector of Ancient Monuments

E-mail: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.



Environment, Planning & Enforcement

Invicta House
County Hall
MAIDSTONE
ME14 1XX

Phone: [REDACTED]
Ask for: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk

08 February 2024

Your Ref: DOV/23/01363

[REDACTED]
Planning Section
Dover District Council
White Cliffs Business Park
DOVER
CT16 3PJ

SENT BY EMAIL

Re: DOV/23/01363

Location: Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash, Canterbury, Kent

Proposal: Construction of a solar farm with associated access and infrastructure

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for consulting KCC Heritage Conservation on the above planning application. Our advice is principally concerned with two aspects of the scheme, namely 1) its impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets, most notably the important Roman site at Richborough; and 2) the direct impacts of the proposals on buried archaeological remains.

Attached to this letter are detailed comments on the site's archaeological background; on the impact of the proposed development on the setting of heritage assets; and on the direct impacts on buried archaeological remains. These detailed comments support and should be read in conjunction with our advice below.

Summary

The proposed solar farm lies close to the scheduled Roman site of Richborough, which includes the grade I listed 'Richborough Castle'. Richborough is a site that is of exceptional importance in understanding the complete story of Roman Britain. It is here that the emperor Claudian is believed to have landed his troops during his invasion of Britain in AD 43, and it is at sites such as Richborough that the

withdrawal of the last vestiges of Roman administration in *circa* AD 410 can be observed.

We do not agree with the applicant's conclusions about the degree of harm that the proposed solar farm would cause to the heritage significance of Richborough. The applicant suggests that the proposals will result in a minor-adverse impact to the scheduled Roman. In reaching such a conclusion the applicant has not adequately taken into account the contribution that the landscape of the former Wantsum Channel makes to our understanding and appreciation of Roman Richborough.

Furthermore, we also do not agree with the applicant's assessment of the effects of the development on buried archaeology. Nor do we agree with their recommendations for how this might be addressed and mitigated. We suggest that there is a clear need for further information on buried archaeology to inform decision-taking. We therefore recommend that further intrusive evaluation works are required before the application is determined.

Advice

The proposed solar farm is located in an area that is archaeologically complex and sensitive. It lies within the former Wantsum Channel and to the south of the important Roman site of Richborough. The proposed development will be harmful to the setting of this nationally important Roman site, and we advise that this harm will be significantly greater than is suggested in the Environmental Statement (ES) that accompanies the application.

The landscape context of Richborough is highly important as it enables us to understand why the Romans first landed here in AD43 and subsequently why Richborough developed into an important town and port of entry to the province. The proposed development will affect the ability to understand and appreciate Richborough's landscape context and therefore will cause harm to its significance.

We also advise that the site's archaeological potential is greater than is stated in the ES. The proposed development has the potential to impact a range of buried archaeology, including waterlogged organic remains and other palaeoenvironmental features associated with the former Wantsum Channel. The archaeology of the site has the potential to significantly further our understanding of the landscape context of Richborough island and the nationally important Roman site that developed there.

Recommendations

1) The impact of the scheme on the setting of the Roman site of Richborough is a major consideration. We recommend that the views of Historic England are sought on the impact of the proposals on the setting of the scheduled monument. We think the harm to the monument is serious.

2) Richborough is managed as a visitor site by English Heritage. The managed site includes the Roman amphitheatre which lies on high ground overlooking the

proposed solar farm. We think the proposals will harm the experience of visitors to the amphitheatre. We therefore recommend that English Heritage is consulted on the scheme.

3) The proposed development may also affect the setting of nearby listed buildings and we recommend that the views of your council's conservation officer are sought on this aspect.

4) Three possible *tumuli* (burial mounds) have been identified a short distance north of the proposed development site. The identification and date of these potential barrows is uncertain and insufficient information is currently provided to understand how the proposed scheme will impact their setting. In a worst-case scenario we advise the proposed development could result in harm to the setting of archaeological remains of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument.

5) Further information in the form of a field evaluation is required **prior to the determination of the planning application** so that the significance of buried archaeological remains can be properly understood and taken into account. The evaluation should make use of a range of investigative techniques, potentially including ERT survey, borehole/auger survey, trial trenching and deposit modelling.

6) Because of the potential for waterlogged organic archaeological remains and palaeoenvironmental features further information on the potential impacts of the development on the site's water-environment is needed to ensure the ongoing-preservation of any such deposits.

7) Further information on the detailed design measures proposed at the decommissioning phase is needed so that archaeological impacts can be understood and measures to minimise and avoid harm can be agreed.

I trust that the above comments are helpful and would be pleased to discuss further as required.

Yours sincerely

██████████
Senior Archaeological Officer
Heritage Conservation

Cc

██████████, *Properties Curator (South), English Heritage*
██████████, *Principal Heritage Officer, Dover District Council*
██████████, *Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Historic England*
██████████, *Casework Officer, Council for British Archaeology*

KCC Heritage Conservation – detailed comments on application:

**DOV/23/01363 | Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash, Canterbury, Kent |
Construction of a solar farm with associated access and infrastructure**

Archaeological Background

The proposed development lies on reclaimed land within the former Wantsum Channel. Historically this was a major waterway which separated the Isle of Thanet from 'mainland' Kent. The history and development of the Wantsum Channel is complex; it was an open, navigable waterway in the later Prehistoric and early Roman period but subsequently silted up before being reclaimed for agriculture. The present landscape is a product of millennia of coastal change and landscape evolution.

Within the channel are various 'islands' which acted as foci for past human activity. Richborough is perhaps the most well-known of these islands, but others include Boxlees Hill and Weatherlees Hill, both of which lie on the Thanet side of Richborough island. Within the proposed development site, a raised 'spit' of land extends northwards from Little East Street Farm towards the Goshall Stream and may have similarly acted as a focus for human activity.

Analysis of archaeological sites and findspots recorded in the Kent HER show how the channel edge and islands and promontories acted as foci for human activity in the later Prehistoric and Romano-British periods, with the channel being a valuable resource in its open, marshland and reclaimed states. Drier conditions and lower sea-levels in the late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age led to increased human activity within the Wantsum Channel and the adjoining Lydden Valley. This is evidenced by the identification of buried land surfaces and artefacts of these periods recorded within and sealed by alluvium to the southeast and west of Sandwich. By the Late Bronze Age, the sea-level had risen which resulted in the flooding of the earlier land surfaces. As such the proposed development site might contain former prehistoric land surfaces and occupation activity lying buried in organic-rich deposits within the alluvium of the Wantsum Channel.

Richborough (known to the Romans as *RVTVP(A)E*) was located on an island at the eastern mouth of the channel, and it is here, within the sheltered anchorage of the Wantsum Channel, that the emperor Claudius is believed to have landed his troops during his invasion of Britain in AD 43. The southern edge of Richborough island lies about 90m north of the application site at its nearest point.

Following the invasion, Richborough would develop into a major port of entry to the new province. A great monumental arch (one of the biggest in the Roman empire) was erected here by Domitian around AD 85 to celebrate the conquest of Britain. Early structures at the wider Richborough site include a pair of temples, erected in the first or perhaps second century AD. Also constructed early in the town's

development, perhaps by military authorities, was an amphitheatre, built to provide entertainment for those living in or passing through the port town.

The amphitheatre is located on the southern edge of Richborough island, on one of its highest points, atop a bluff and overlooking the Wantsum Channel. It survives as a notable and distinctive earthwork and was one of the first Roman amphitheatres to be identified in the country. The top of the amphitheatre's earthworks are at about 19.5m aOD and it is notably elevated above the area of the former Wantsum Channel which generally lies at about 2.0 to 2.5m aOD. As such the amphitheatre site had – and still has – extensive views across the area of the proposed solar farm.

Recent archaeological investigation of the amphitheatre suggests that it was an early structure, built before the town of Richborough had significantly developed. Thus, the amphitheatre's position on a high point at the southern edge of Richborough island wasn't dictated by the presence of existing settlement but instead seems to have been deliberately chosen.

In the second century AD Roman Richborough flourished as stone buildings were constructed, roads re-laid and the port and its associated settlement (*vicus*) expanded, eventually covering a substantial part of Richborough island. The scheduled monument therefore covers only part of this extraordinary Roman site.

Recent excavations at the amphitheatre site suggest that activity occurred across the full extent of the town into the late fourth and early fifth centuries, i.e. until the very end of the Roman period.

In the third century AD the Roman military increased their presence at the site, initially by fortifying the monumental arch, and latterly through the construction of a major stone-built fort (now known as Richborough Castle and grade I listed). This fort was one of a series built in southern and eastern England that are collectively known as the Forts of the Saxon Shore. The fort's massive stone walls and defensive ditches are the most visible element of Roman occupation at Richborough.

The fort at Richborough continued to be used as a base for the *Legio II Augusta* until their withdrawal to Gaul in AD 406. Evidence shows that Richborough was one of the last places in Britain to be supplied with Roman coinage. There is evidence for some occupation following the army's withdrawal continuing into the later fifth and sixth centuries AD, but unlike other major Roman settlements in Kent only limited occupation continues into the post-Roman periods. Amongst the later features at the site is a small Christian Chapel that was constructed at Richborough in the later Anglo-Saxon period. The Chapel is dedicated to St Augustine who landed in East Kent in 597 AD.

In its later history the Wantsum Channel suffered from the formation of shingle spits within its southern mouth. The development of these spits and shingle banks affected the flow of water such that by the end of the fourth century AD the channel had begun to silt, and marshland develop. This process was exacerbated by reclamation works carried out by the Monks of St Augustine's Abbey in the twelfth

and thirteenth centuries. By the later medieval period, the landscape of the former channel had evolved yet further, with marshland having largely been reclaimed and developed to form an extensive tract of drained grazing pasture. This reclaimed marshland can be seen in the low-lying, open landscape of the proposed development site.

Impact of the proposed development on the setting of heritage assets

The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) which in turn is informed by several technical studies. Chapter 7 of the ES addresses the impact of the scheme on Landscape and Views and names (ES para 7.53) various designated heritage assets whose setting might be affected by the proposed development. Further consideration of the impact of the scheme on built heritage assets is provided in Chapter 10, whilst Chapter 6 (Archaeology) considers the impact of the scheme on non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest.

In our advice below we focus on the impact of the development on the setting of Roman Richborough and other archaeological remains. The ES also identifies a selection of grade II listed buildings whose setting might potentially be affected. We recommend that advice is sought from your council's conservation officer on the effect of the scheme on these assets.

Roman Richborough and its setting

The Roman site of Richborough is of very high significance and includes elements designated at the highest level. The Saxon Shore fort, Roman port and associated remains at Richborough are designated together as a scheduled monument (NHLE entry 1014642) which extends over an area of some 40 hectares and includes the site of the Roman amphitheatre. The scheduled monument lies about 160m north of the proposed development site at its closest point. Richborough Castle is also a grade I listed building (NHLE entry 1363256).

The Roman site of Richborough is situated on an area of raised ground that was once an island within the Wantsum Channel. The Wantsum Channel is now silted up but is still discernible today as an extensive and distinctive low-lying landscape. Because of its elevated position Richborough commands views across the former Wantsum Channel. This is especially the case from the site of the Roman amphitheatre which sits at the highest point on the southern edge of the island.

Verified viewpoint C is taken from within the scheduled monument on the south side of the amphitheatre, looking across the former Wantsum Channel. Verified viewpoint D supplies a counterview, looking north from the far bank of the former channel. From this southerly direction the raised bluff of Richborough island can be clearly and readily identified. The proposed development site falls between these two viewpoints within the Goshall Valley, part of the Ash Levels landscape character area (LCA), which is described in the Dover District Landscape Character Assessment as "*a distinctive large scale, flat and low-lying area of arable and*

pasture grazing. The landscape is reclaimed grazing marsh and retains marshland qualities including drainage ditches and an open expansive character".

This character is clearly discernible in the baseline (as existing) image at verified viewpoint C where the extensive, cohesive and distinctive nature of this low-lying flat landscape can be clearly seen, and the extent of the former Wantsum Channel can be appreciated and understood. As such we do not agree with the applicant's description of the landscape here as "*little more than a post-medieval agricultural valley landscape*" (ES para 6.80).

Views across the former channel are important in understanding the landscape context of Roman Richborough and its strategic topographical position on an island in what was once an extensive sea channel. This appreciation of Richborough's position on a raised island is crucial to understanding why the Roman invasion of AD 43 landed here, and why Richborough subsequently developed into an important port of entry and gateway to the newly conquered province. As such we judge that the landscape setting of Richborough makes a considerable contribution to the significance of the place.

The verified views provide accurate visual representations of how the proposed development will look at year 1 and again at year 15 when landscape planting has become established. The year 1 image from viewpoint C demonstrates how the proposed solar farm will sit as an alien and visually intrusive element in the landscape. It will take in a large part of the visible open, low-lying landscape and will diminish the ability to appreciate the extent of the former sea channel.

The year 15 image shows how the proposed landscape planting will largely mask the panels of the solar farm. However, the planting also has the effect of foreshortening the view, such that the former channel is no longer appreciable as "*a distinctive large scale, flat and low-lying area of arable and pasture grazing*" but is instead reduced to a narrow strip of land between the planting and the bluff edge, where the scale of the former channel can no longer be properly appreciated. In the corresponding view looking north towards Richborough island the raised bluff is entirely obscured by the arrays.

We suggest that the applicant's setting assessment has not adequately considered the contribution that the distinctive and expansive low-lying reclaimed marshes of the Wantsum Channel makes to the significance of Richborough. The applicant's assessment has largely separated consideration of the impact of the scheme on landscape character (in ES Chapter 7) from the impact on views from Richborough scheduled monument (in ES Chapter 10) but has not properly taken into account the contribution that the landscape setting makes to the significance of the monument. The two cannot be separated because it is the very character of the surrounding landscape which helps visitors to Richborough understand and appreciate the strategic position of Richborough on a raised island within the former channel.

The significance of the Wantsum to Roman Richborough is acknowledged elsewhere in the ES which notes that "*the Wantsum Channel itself is of key importance within*

the Roman landscape" (ES 6.52). Therefore, the ability to understand the extent of the former channel (as reflected in the extensive low-lying reclaimed marshland) must contribute to the significance of the site. The marked difference between Richborough 'island' and the low-lying reclaimed marshland of the former sea channel forms part of the experience of Richborough. This is clear at the amphitheatre site where views over the former channel are extensive.

We therefore suggest that **the construction of the proposed solar farm would be harmful to the significance of the scheduled monument of Richborough** and advise that this harm is greater than the minor (adverse) harm indicated in the ES.

Additionally, we note that the Roman amphitheatre which overlooks the application site is located at one of the highest points on Richborough island. Archaeological evidence indicates the construction of the amphitheatre here was intentional and not dictated by existing settlement constraints. Elsewhere, such as at London and other urban centres, amphitheatres were constructed to take advantage of existing natural depressions or dry valleys which could be shaped to form the arena. This does not apply to Richborough, and further consideration might be given to whether the landscape setting influenced the location of the amphitheatre.

The setting of other heritage assets

The ES identifies in Chapter 6 Archaeology the presence of three possible *tumuli* (burial mounds) which are located some 135m from the application site. The ES considers that these mounds must be of Anglo-Saxon date or later as the Wantsum was an open channel in the Prehistoric period. We suggest that this over-simplifies the situation and that the potential barrows lie within an area where conditions may have fluctuated between tidal and marshland up to about the second millennium BC, from when the Wantsum would have been an open navigable body of water. There are several known examples of low-lying barrows in alluvial/channel edge locations of Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age date and seemingly associated with watercourses or inlets. We do not agree therefore with the assertion in the applicant's Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) that such a location would be "uncharacteristic" for barrows of Neolithic or Bronze Age date (AIA 9.6.9).

Archaeological works carried out in advance of the Thanet Supply Main scheme some 250m from the possible barrows has demonstrated the presence of archaeological horizons buried at depth beneath alluvial and marsh reclamation deposits. The possibility that these mounds are the tops of barrows of Late/Neolithic or Bronze Age date, otherwise largely buried by alluvium, cannot yet be discounted.

The ES acknowledges that these receptors are potentially of high significance (ES para 6.72), but their precise character and significance is not currently understood. This is agreed. Because they are not properly understood it is not sound to assume that setting does not contribute to their significance, and therefore we do not agree with the conclusion of the ES that the proposed development would at worst result in a negligible impact (ES 6.101). Because these barrows are not adequately understood, it remains possible that the proposed development could result in a moderate or even major impact on setting of archaeological assets that are

potentially of high importance (equivalent to a scheduled monument). We therefore advise that **in any worst-case scenario the environmental effect of the proposed development on the setting of the possible barrows would be major or major-moderate.**

Policy

The NPPF notes the environmental benefits associated with the production of energy from renewable sources. It highlights (NPPF 157) how the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future and should support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. The NPPF explains that applications should be approved where impacts are acceptable for the proposed location (and by inference that applications in unacceptable locations – or in locations that cannot be made acceptable – should be refused).

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides further advice on judging whether a location is acceptable or not. The PPG acknowledges that development of large-scale solar farms in rural environments can have a negative impact. It highlights that when considering large-scale solar farms great care should be taken to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including impacts on views important to a heritage asset's setting. It notes that – depending on the scale, design and prominence of a scheme – the impact of large-scale solar farms on the setting of heritage assets can be considerable and may result in substantial harm (Paragraph 013 Reference ID: 5-013-20150327).

Paragraph 195 of the NPPF explains that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. NPPF 205 states that “*great weight*” should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and that the more important the asset the greater the weight should be. Richborough is undoubtedly a heritage asset of the greatest importance. The possible barrows might also be assets whose importance is equivalent to a scheduled monument whereby footnote 72 of the NPPF would apply (albeit this is as yet uncertain). NPPF 206 goes on to explain that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (including harm from development within an asset's setting) should require clear and convincing justification.

Using the assessment criteria detailed in the ES we judge that the impact of the proposed development on the setting of Roman Richborough will as a minimum lead to “*the alteration to a key element of the baseline conditions and that post development the setting of the baseline will be materially changed*”. This would be a moderate magnitude adverse effect. Roman Richborough is a site of high importance and therefore, following the matrix for assessing the significance of an environmental effect the impact on Roman Richborough must be **major-moderate adverse**. We think in a worst-case scenario a major-moderate or even major adverse effect could apply to the ‘barrows’ also.

In considering the level of harm the NPPF refers to substantial harm, less than substantial harm and no harm. There is no direct translation from the significance of an environmental effect in EIA terminology to substantial or less than substantial

harm as described in the NPPF. As a minimum we suggest that a major-moderate adverse effect must fall at the very upper end of the less than substantial harm spectrum and that this harm should be given great weight in any planning judgement. We strongly recommend that the views of Historic England are sought on the impact of the proposals on the setting of the scheduled monument at Richborough and whether this amounts to substantial or less than substantial harm.

Direct impacts on buried archaeological remains

Nature of the direct impacts

As well as impacting the setting of nearby heritage assets the construction (and decommissioning) of the proposed solar farm will directly affect any buried archaeological remains present within the footprint of the proposed development. These direct impacts will result from construction activities for the installation of the arrays; construction of access tracks, substation, transformer stations and monitoring cabin; installation of cabling (including grid-connection), fencing and CCTV cameras. Impacts may also arise from construction enabling works such as the installation of compound and lay-down areas, the formation of construction access tracks and through any temporary drainage infrastructure. Additionally, the creation of drainage ditches, scrapes, swales and reed beds as well as landscape planting will also have a direct impact during their formation. Landscape planting might also impact archaeology during the operational phase through root growth which could damage buried archaeology directly and through water uptake which could result in the localised drying-out of waterlogged deposits.

Chapter 6 of the ES considers how the proposed development might affect the site's archaeological interest and this chapter is supported by the AIA (which forms ES Appendix 6.2). The application is also accompanied by a report detailing the results of a geophysical survey (magnetometry). The ES suggests that the proposed development site is "*of low archaeological potential*". We think that this is incorrect. The proposed development covers a large area, and the archaeological potential of the site will vary, but parts of the site clearly have a significantly greater potential than the ES suggests.

The character of the archaeology

The ES suggests that the site would have lain in open water in the Prehistoric period. The development of the Wantsum Channel in the Prehistoric period is more complex and there will be times (because of climatic differences and changes in relative sea-levels) when the channel would have been dryer and accessible and buried ancient land-surfaces and archaeological remains might be preserved within the alluvial sequence. This has been demonstrated by archaeological works carried out for the Thanet Main Supply scheme which passed to the north of the application site. Here archaeological remains were preserved beneath later alluvium at a depth of about 1m. Because of the depth that they are buried it is unlikely that such features would be revealed through magnetometry and therefore the geophysical survey carried out

across the proposed development site is unlikely to be useful in identifying archaeological features of land-surfaces buried under later alluvium.

Elsewhere in the Wantsum Channel the presence of islands and peninsulas have been proven to act as a focus for Prehistoric and later activity. LiDAR and topographical data indicate that there is a raised projecting spur of land within the centre of the proposed development site. This is an area where activity might be expected. On and around the margins of this higher ground, as well as along the channel edge, we suggest the archaeological potential is significantly raised. In these areas evidence for the exploitation of the marshland and open channel might be expected. Here, because of the waterlogged ground conditions, organic remains that might not otherwise survive could be preserved. The ES identifies the potential for *“evidence for wetland exploitation such as fish traps, boats, wooden jetties, and hides and traps for wild fowling may survive as buried finds/features”* (ES para 6.66).

Additionally, the waterlogged soils, are favourable for the preservation of organic material of palaeoenvironmental interest. These have the potential to provide information that a) sets an environmental framework to provide a landscape and ecological context for recorded human activities, b) illustrates the impact of human activity on the vegetational environment of the Wantsum Channel and c) demonstrates locally how plants and animals were responding to environmental change (including fluctuations between marine and freshwater dominated environments). This preserved paleoenvironmental record, including evidence for marine transgression and regression, could contribute to our understanding of regional effects on historic climate and relative sea level changes.

The sedimentary sequences that evidence the development of the Wantsum Channel and the palaeoenvironmental indicators that they contain are of at least regional importance and their significance might be higher where they can advance understanding of the landscape development and context of the nationally important Roman site of Richborough. The ES states that for both palaeoenvironmental and organic archaeological receptors the development could result in a **major adverse effect** (ES para 6.68).

The ES also notes that the extent and character of palaeoenvironmental and organic archaeological remains is unknown. This is because of the lack of intrusive archaeological/geoarchaeological or geotechnical investigation (ES para 6.75). This is not a satisfactory position, given the potential for a major adverse effect. We think **this issue needs to be addressed through further intrusive investigation before the application is determined.**

Similarly, we judge the archaeological potential for remains of Romano-British date to be greater than the application suggests. To the north of the application site geophysical survey within the scheduled monument at Richborough has revealed part of the layout of the Roman town. A notable feature is a principal street that heads south from Watling Street before curving around the northern side of the amphitheatre. The projected line of this road then heads south-westwards towards the application site. Excavations for the Thanet Supply Main (some 330m to the

north of the proposed solar farm site) revealed a section of road on the projected alignment.

About 750m to the south of the proposed development site archaeological excavations at Each End, Ash revealed further evidence for Roman occupation, including a section of Roman road projecting towards the solar farm site. The projected line of this Roman road heads towards the abovementioned spur/peninsula of raised land located within the application site and projecting into the former Wantsum Channel. The presence of a Roman road heading towards the site from the south-west and again from the north-east strongly indicates that this route continues through the application site. The nature of this route remains uncertain and could have taken the form of a ferry crossing or causeway across the Wantsum.

The ES suggests that the route must have taken the form of a ferry crossing because the Wantsum Channel was open during the Roman period. If this is the case, then some form of landing-stage or wharf might be expected. English Heritage's 'Richborough Environs Project' identified two rectangular enclosures or inlets about 300m to the north of the application site and suggests these "*may have been the location of a beaching or crossing point*" in the Roman period. The topography of the channel indicates that any corresponding southern landing point would likely lie within the proposed development site. Notably, archaeological investigation of the road to the north indicated that it remained in use into the late fourth century AD. The ES identifies that the channel south of Richborough island may have already silted-up and substantially narrowed by this date (ES para 6.53) and this may have affected the nature of the crossing here, meaning that a causeway or trackway might be more viable in the later-Roman period. Such a feature may not be visible on geophysical survey depending on its construction and the depth of overlying later alluvium.

The mitigation suggested in the Environmental Statement

The ES states that the proposed development site is of low archaeological potential (ES para 6.83). This is not agreed. As demonstrated above the archaeological potential of the site varies but we suggest the site has a good potential for buried archaeology on the raised spur/peninsula of higher ground within the centre of the site. That no archaeological features were shown on the geophysical survey here might be a result of masking by later alluvium.

We also suggest that the archaeological potential is significantly raised in channel edge areas, for example about the margins of the raised spur/peninsula and in the southern part of the site both east and west of Little East Street Farm. In these locations archaeology buried beneath the alluvium could include preserved organic remains, potentially including structures of Prehistoric and Romano-British date. Applying a blanket level of potential across a site as the ES attempts to do is not reasonable or realistic.

The ES acknowledges that the potential for palaeoenvironmental and organic archaeological remains to exist locally across the proposed development site (ES para 6.65). It explains that the extent, character and significance of such remains is

currently undefined because no intrusive investigation has taken place (ES para 6.75). It also recognises that where present such remains could be of high significance (ES para 6.46).

Because their survival is dependent on their waterlogged state the on-going preservation of such organic archaeological remains and palaeoenvironmental indicators is susceptible to changes to the water-environment. This is acknowledged in the ES which states that “*organic archaeological remains... are sensitive to change and require a stable and wet environment for preservation*” (ES para 6.66). The ES also notes that such remains “*could suffer total loss in the event that the introduction of the panels results in a change in these levels*”. The ES does not definitively state whether such changes will occur but notes the installation of the panels has the potential to do so. Given the extent of the array it is possible that such an impact could be widespread. The proposed landscape (willow-carr) planting also has the potential to locally impact the water-table through water-uptake.

The ES identifies that preventing changes to the levels of water is an important consideration (ES 6.75) but no mitigation measures to achieve this are put forward.

We recommend that further intrusive investigation is required to adequately understand the potential for important palaeoenvironmental and organic archaeological remains within the development site. Without such intrusive investigation the effect of the development on the site’s archaeological interest cannot be adequately defined and measures to minimise or avoid harm cannot be agreed. We therefore recommend that **further information in the form of a field evaluation is needed prior to determination of the planning application**. This is important because the ES acknowledges that these remains could be of high significance and because the proposed development could lead to their total loss (ES para 6.68).

We note that the ES identifies (para 6.83) that archaeological remains may be present whose significance is such that preservation in situ is needed (i.e. harm or loss to these assets needs to be avoided). The ES suggests that such preservation might be achieved by alternative foundation design (the use of surface mounted concrete shoes) and through the exclusion of development from parts of the site.

Areas where development might need to be excluded are not – and cannot – currently be defined. This is because no intrusive field evaluation works have been carried out. The ES suggests such field evaluation could be carried out following the granting of planning permission and be secured by condition. We cannot see how this would allow for exclusion of areas from development. The application under consideration is for full (detailed) planning permission. Therefore, if exclusion might be required as a mitigation response this needs to be determined before the design is fixed and plans approved.

We also note that the ES identifies that the removal of the arrays at the decommissioning stage might have a greater impact than their original construction. The ES identifies that removal of piles without the implementation of additional

mitigation measures will result in further harm to the archaeological resource (ES para 6.82). The ES subsequently explains that “no additional mitigation measures [during the decommissioning phase] have been identified” (ES para 6.87). Instead, it suggests that detailed design proposals for the careful removal of piles could be used to minimise impacts. However, no details of such detailed design proposals are given. We recommend that they need to be clearly set out and understood at this stage, otherwise how can they be agreed and conditioned?

Policy

The NPPF identifies that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (NPPF 195).

NPPF 209 explains that the effect of the development on non-designated heritage assets should be taken into account when determining planning applications. In doing so the scope of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset will need to be considered. In our comments above we have advised that the archaeological potential of the site is greater than is suggested in the ES.

Footnote 73 of the NPPF states that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be treated as if they were designated. If the three mounds to the north of the application site identified as possible *tumuli* were confirmed as upstanding burial mounds, then these would be of a level of significance that footnote 73 would apply.


The ES has assigned a low potential to the overall site. It does acknowledge that there may be areas within the site that contain archaeological remains of high importance, but the location and extent of such remains (if present) is not fully understood.

NPPF 200 states that applicants should be required to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, including any contribution made by their setting. It goes on to note that the information should be sufficient to understand the impact of a proposal on the significance of affected heritage assets.

The ES itself identifies that archaeological remains may be present whose level of significance is such that they require preservation *in situ*, and this may necessitate excluding parts of the site from development. Because no intrusive field evaluation works have been carried out the location and extent of any such archaeology cannot be defined. As such the present application does not contain sufficient information to understand the significance of heritage assets present or how these might be affected by the proposals.

NPPF 200 acknowledges that for heritage assets with archaeological interest a desk-based assessment should be submitted. It notes that this may not be sufficient on its own to adequately understand the significance of any archaeological remains present or the impact that might arise from the development proposal. The NPPF therefore states that where necessary a field evaluation should be submitted. No

field evaluation has been submitted and we advise that one should be provided before the application is determined. We would be pleased to discuss the scope of such a field evaluation with the applicant.



ENGLISH
HERITAGE

Dover District Council
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent CT16 3PJ

14 February 2024

SENT BY EMAIL

Application - DOV/23/01363

Location - Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash,

Proposal - Construction of a solar farm, with associated access and infrastructure for an operational period of 40years

Dear Dover District Council,

I am writing regarding the above planning application and its potential impact on Richborough Roman Fort.

The English Heritage Trust is responsible for the management and care of the publicly accessible parts of the Richborough Scheduled Ancient Monument, specifically Richborough Roman Fort and the Richborough amphitheatre. These have been in the care of English Heritage and its predecessor organisations since the early twentieth century, and have very recently been the subject of re-presentation, with renewed emphasis placed on the significance of Richborough as the probable location of the Claudian invasion in AD 43, and its subsequent role as one of the principal entrance points into Britannia. As part of this scheme, public access to the amphitheatre was established for the first time. Archaeological investigation of the amphitheatre underlined its exceptional heritage value, identifying the survival of buried features which indicated phasing in the structure and suggesting that its origins may lie with the early period of Roman occupation.

The proposed construction of a solar farm at Goshall Valley, East Street, Ash has implications for the historic environment within and adjacent to the proposed development area. We have restricted our comments to aspects of the scheme with the potential to have an impact on the property in our care, leaving the wider historic environment issues to Historic England and Kent County Council Heritage Conservation, noting that any archaeological evidence within the development site may have implications for understanding of Richborough's history.

Richborough's amphitheatre is the element of the English Heritage property that is closest to the development site, and the part whose setting is at highest risk of harm. We agree with the applicant's assessment that the sensitivity of views from the Richborough amphitheatre is high and that that the proposed development site "forms part of the wider landscape setting of the monument which is

✉ 6th Floor, 100 Wood Street, London, EC2V 7AN

🌐 english-heritage.org.uk

The English Heritage Trust is a charity, no. 1140351, company, no. 07447221, registered in England & Wales.
Registered office The Engine House, Fire Fly Avenue, Swindon SN2 2EH



Accredited
Until 2022



primarily agricultural in character” and that the site contributes to the heritage significance of the monument by contributing “to the ability to appreciate the [monument’s] strategic importance as part of the historic coastal landscape in this location and the prominence they once held within the wider landscape.” [Environmental Statement, 10.57.] Richborough was an island within the Wantsum Channel at the time of the Roman invasion, and the ability to understand this by comparing the current open low-lying ground of the former water channel with Richborough’s elevated position makes a very important contribution to the monument’s setting, especially the amphitheatre.

We think that the claim in paragraph 10.55 of the Environmental Statement that designed views from Roman Richborough would have focussed on areas to the north and east of the monument places too much emphasis on the shore fort and not enough on the amphitheatre and the southern end of the monument. (Paragraph 3.4.24 of the applicant’s Built Heritage Technical Appendix makes a similar claim about Roman views but only for the shore fort.) There is little way of knowing how views from the southern end of Roman Richborough were designed to work, but given the location of the amphitheatre immediately adjacent and overlooking the Wantsum Channel it seems unsafe to suppose that its relationship with the area to the south was disregarded. Its location may have been designed to take advantage of its elevated position to make it a prominent feature for those travelling through the Wantsum Channel.

Although the contribution made by the development site to the setting of the amphitheatre is noted in the application, no specific measure of this contribution is provided within the assessment. However, in considering the impact of the proposals, it is said that the site makes a limited contribution to the heritage significance of the monument [Built Heritage Technical Appendix, 4.3.3]. We suggest that this contribution is at the very least of moderate importance for the reasons set out above.

We acknowledge and welcome mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the proposals, especially the creation of a nature restoration buffer between the solar farm and the land to the northeast. This has undoubtedly reduced the potential harm of the application on the setting of the amphitheatre. But we remain concerned by the residual potential harm associated with the scheme. Despite the mitigation measures integrated into the design, in the early years of the operational phase the visibility of the solar array will result in a significant modification to the landscape, and we think the magnitude of impact on the amphitheatre’s setting will be far more than the minor one suggested by the applicant. The new infrastructure will be prominent in views from the banks of the amphitheatre, and the applicant’s visualisations suggest that in north-south views across the earthworks the solar array will be visually immediately juxtaposed with the crest of its southern banks. Provided the landscape strategy matures as proposed, in particular the screening by new planting, then the harm to the amphitheatre’s setting arising from direct visibility of infrastructure from within the monument will be reduced by the mid-point of the solar farm’s operation. However, the mitigation measures would come at some cost to landscape character as they would entail further parcelling of the once open ground of the former Wantsum Channel through the introduction of planting. Easy and instinctive understanding of Richborough’s historic setting space depends on being able to ‘read’ the former waterway, and the further subdivision of the development site will erode this quality, thus harming the significance of the scheduled ancient monument.



ENGLISH
HERITAGE

For these reasons, we think the harm to the setting of the amphitheatre, and therefore the significance of the scheduled ancient monument, will be greater than identified in the application due to the change in the character of the landscape. Using the applicant's Effect Significance Matrix, we would assess this as a major adverse impact [Environmental Statement , table 10.4] and request that this is taken into account when the acceptability of the proposed scheme is being considered.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]
Senior Properties Curator (South)

Cc

[REDACTED] Principal Heritage Officer, Dover District Council
[REDACTED] Senior Archaeological Officer, Kent County Council Heritage Conservation
[REDACTED] Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Historic England

CONSULTATION MEMO

Proposal: Goshall Valley East Street Ash – 23/01363 – Construction of a solar farm

Assessment

The Built Heritage Technical Assessment (Appendix 10.1) and Heritage Chapter 10, identifies relevant heritage assets potentially affected by the proposed development within a 1 km study area. I have reviewed this on site and have considered only those heritage assets noted in the assessment that are likely to experience an impact as a result of the development. At the time of the site visit an additional heritage asset was identified which has not been included and, in my view, requires consideration. I comment as follows:

Viewed from within the Scheduled Monument Roman Amphitheatre at Richborough, looking southwest towards the development site, the church of the Grade I listed Church of St Nicholas in the Village of Ash is clearly visible on the horizon. The church is of high significance and designated as being of national importance.

It has also been identified with other churches within the Dover District Heritage Strategy as:

- Contributing to the aesthetic appeal of the historic landscape and the rural environment.
- The spires of rural churches can often be seen over long-distances and are recognised and valued local landmarks.
- A highly visible focal point in this countryside, landscape.



The prominence of this listed building is a key aspect of its significance, and it is the only feature projecting on the horizon that can be seen from this important site. Naturally this means that it draws the eye as a point of interest. As the development will be to the foreground it is likely in my view that it will interrupt the view of the church tower and will therefore have an impact on the experience of the listed building.

In my view, due to the long distances, undulation of the land and proposed mitigation for the development site which includes increased vegetation with a landscape buffer, any harm to the significance of the listed building will be the low end of less than substantial.

Goss Hall and associated barns are grade II listed and form a historic farmstead on an ancient manorial site. The historic farmyard appears to survive intact with walls and outbuildings which give a sense of enclosure. Goss Halls wider landscape setting is rural and agricultural, and this adds to its significance as a historic farmstead. The assessment considered the proposed development would have a 'negligible' impact, with the proposed access road located 80m to the northeast of these listed buildings.

In my view it is unclear if this is correct based on the information submitted. The Landscape Strategy Plan does not show any boundary treatment such as fencing and access gates for the temporary access road; if this is correct then there will be no impact on the setting of Goss Hall as a result of the access route.

The Goss Hall site and its agricultural setting is widely visible from the junction between Copper Street Drove and East Street looking northwest (just off the A257) .



As part of the proposed development the submitted transport statement states the site requires a temporary access route for construction and decommissioning to alleviate possible traffic congestion around the tight bends within the vicinity of Goss Hall.

The drawings within the transport statement show the preliminary layout only. With no detailed design illustrated to fully assess the potential impact on the setting of Goss Hall Farm. As a temporary access the expectation would be for the landscape to be return to its existing appearance as agricultural land, as it helps to maintain the strong historic and functional relationship the farm has with the surrounding landscape. This would then hopefully result in the development works forming limited harm to this setting for only a temporary period of time.

Recommendation



Notwithstanding the comments above relating to the Church of St Nicholas, the overall level of harm to listed heritage assets, that are expected to experience an impact, is likely to be at the low end of less than substantial within the study area. This may further reduce over time with the proposed mitigation for the development site, which includes increased vegetation with a landscape buffer.

Little South - Heritage

Location: Microsoft Teams

Date: 21 March 2024 – 2pm

Attendees:

  Historic England
Dover District Council
Dover District Council
Statkraft
Stantec Planning
Stantec Planning
Stantec Heritage
Stantec Landscape
Foundations Heritage

Item
1. Introductions
2. Purpose of Meeting
3. Proposals – scheme evolution
4. Heritage Matters
5. Landscape Matters
6. Historic England - clarification
7. Proposed next steps

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Little South - Planning Meeting
Date: 28 March 2024 12:05:52

Hi [REDACTED]

Can we go with 2pm on 2nd please? I will send an invite now.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2024 5:21 PM
To: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Cc: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Subject: Re: Little South - Planning Meeting

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. I am available most times on Wednesday 27th, from 3:30pm on Thursday 28th or most days/times next week other than 10-12 on Tuesday 2nd. Please let me know if any of these times are convenient?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Senior Planning Officer
Dover District Council
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ
Email: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk
Web: [dover.gov.uk](https://www.dover.gov.uk)
Phone: [REDACTED]



Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Sent: 25 March 2024 17:05
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Cc: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Subject: Little South - Planning Meeting

Hi [REDACTED]

Following on from the HE meeting last week, would it be possible to arrange a meeting to chat through the feedback and our next steps?

Could you let me know any slots that would be convenient for you?

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Director, Planning

Mobile: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@stantec.com

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome precauciones adicionales.

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the

Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

From: [redacted]@kent.gov.uk
To: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?
Date: 16 September 2024 10:56:00
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)
[image019.png](#)

Hi [redacted]

Could we say 11:30 on Friday 20th? If you could let me know details of parking/where to meet and any site-specific PPE requirements that would be appreciated.

Many thanks,

[redacted] | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: [redacted] | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 2:06 PM
To: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

11.00 or 12.00 is good for me



[redacted] Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA
Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Heisby | WA6 0AR
t [redacted] | m [redacted]
www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East Building 68C West Park Silsoe Bedfordshire MK45 4HS t 01525 861 578	Headland Archaeology Midlands & West Unit 1 Clearview Court Twyford Rd Hereford HR2 6JR t 01432 364 901	Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North Units 23-25 Acorn Business Centre Balme Road Cleckheaton BD19 4EZ t 0127 493 8019	Headland Archaeology North West RSK Fourways House 57 Hilton St Manchester M1 2EJ t 0161 236 2757	Headland Archaeology Scotland 13 Jane St Edinburgh EH6 5HE t 0131 467 7705
---	---	--	---	--

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 1:07 PM
To: [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Many thanks for confirming [redacted] It does seem like Friday would be the best day.

I am not sure what time you will be available [redacted]

I can be around all day but I know [redacted] will be making his way from further afield so I expect he won't be able to be there very early, and afternoon may be better if possible?

[redacted]



[redacted] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant
Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Funnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB



www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire | MK45 4HS
t [01525 861 578](tel:01525861578)

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t [01432 364 901](tel:01432364901)

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t [01274 938 019](tel:01274938019)

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t [0161 236 2757](tel:01612362757)

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t [0131 467 7705](tel:01314677705)

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:36 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@kent.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@statkraft.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@statkraft.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear all,

It sounds like it would make more sense to visit on the Friday (without me). I'm sorry I can't make it but I will be available for a chat if any questions arise on site.

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]



Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.
Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:23 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@kent.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@statkraft.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@statkraft.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

-- WARNING: This is an external message. Please use caution when replying, opening attachments or clicking on any links in this e-mail.--

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your review, your time on this is much appreciated. I'll make those changes to the WSI.

For clarification, your comments are addressed below.

- We will adjust WSI to allow for an additional contingency trench 30 x 1.8m in the area of Tr1/2 and also at Tr7-8, with flexibility to adjust location of Tr8. All subject to x-ref to services etc. With the purpose of characterising and better understanding any remains exposed in the initial trenches.
- The sondages will be excavated using a machine at the end of the evaluation trenches. The section will be hand-cleaned to a depth of 1.2m (subject to safe access). Column samples and bulk samples can be taken from deposits of potential within this zone. Beyond that depth the excavations will be observed but not entered for health and safety reasons as the sondages extend to a maximum depth of 4 m. The objective will primarily be to identify deposits of palaeoenvironmental interest, and any structural evidence (timbers, boats, quayside facilities, artefacts). Bulk samples only can be recovered from these deposits using the machine since the excavations will not be safe to enter. Where deposits are identified of interest, they could be subject to a future programme of geoarchaeological boreholes- modelling of the geoarchaeology of the channel could be a mitigation measure?
- The geotechnical test pits- soakaway test pits were excavated several weeks ago. They had an archaeologist present. No archaeological deposits, structures or artefacts were identified. The methodology can be updated, but the work has been executed already. The information will be integrated into the evaluation report. In summary topsoil over clay-rich deposits.

If [REDACTED] wants to visit on Thursday, she is welcome- there is a greater likelihood of the trenches all being open by Friday and would recommend that as the day to visit.

Kind regards,



part of the **RSK** Group



██████████ Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | West Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 01274 993 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: ██████████@kent.gov.uk; ██████████@kent.gov.uk
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 4:31 PM
To: ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com; ██████████@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: ██████████@statkraft.com; ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com; ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com; ██████████@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear ██████████ & ██████████

Thank you for sending over a draft copy of the proposed WSI for trial trenching. I offer the following comments.

In terms of the number and position of the proposed trenches these look broadly reasonable. I suggest however that if archaeology is present in the area of TR1 and TR2 (positioned on the channel edge) then it may be necessary to carry out additional trenching to understand more fully the character and extent of any remains present. I suggest that additional contingency trenching is allowed for in these areas. Similarly, for TR8, it may be necessary to adjust the position of this trench to take account of the results of the trenching (TR3 – 7) along the ‘raised spur’ of land. So, for example, if the line of the Roman road is evidenced in TR3 – 7 the position of TR8 may need to be adjusted to pick up the projected alignment. Again, I would suggest that some contingency trenching is allowed for here if significant waterlogged timber remains might survive.

Para 2.1.10 notes that test-pits (sondages) are to be excavated into the ends of selected trenches. I would expect to see detail of these sondages in the scope of works section (6.1) and the methodology for their excavation described in Section 7 in greater detail than the brief mention at 7.1.16 – where will sondages be excavated, how will they be excavated and recorded?

Para 7.1.8 notes that the watching brief does not allow for the excavation of in-situ archaeology – does this mean that if archaeology is encountered it is to be left undisturbed and the geotechnical test-pit abandoned/relocated. If so, then this should be explicitly stated. Otherwise, if in-situ archaeology is to be disturbed by the geotechnical test-pits then there needs to be provision for the investigation and recording of such archaeology before it is disturbed/lost.

On the basis that the above comments will be addressed then I would be happy to agree the WSI.

In terms of a site visit I am available either on Friday 20th or Thursday 19th. I understand that ██████████ is only available on the 19th. If we went with the 19th, then I can only make the morning (meeting on-site at about 11am would suit) – do you think you will have all the trenches cut by then?

Many thanks,



██████████ | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: ██████████ | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 3:09 PM
To: ██████████@kent.gov.uk; ██████████@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: ██████████@statkraft.com; ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com; ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com
Subject: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Hi ██████████ and ██████████

Further to our draft WSI for the trial trenching at Little South Solar, we have agreed a start date with the landowner and plant hire company (Wednesday

18th of September). This accommodates the planting schedule of the landowner who is keen for us to be finished as soon as possible.

I appreciate the WSI has been with you for a little while: we would welcome your comments on it in the meantime but will assume that you are happy with it if we don't hear from you before the commencement of work on site. The WSI is based on our discussion of the EM and ERT surveys and best locations to target as well as the county-specific guidelines you shared with us.

A member of the team inspected soak-away test pits recently and noted sequences of clay-rich deposits immediately beneath the ploughsoil. No sign of any peat or organic-rich deposits in the top 2m (yet). Conversations with the landowner have been interesting- he has land elsewhere which is rich in Romano-British finds, but he says the solar development site is "sterile"- detectorists have found nothing there. The trenching may tell another story!

We would also welcome you to site to inspect the open evaluation trenches.

We think that Friday (20th September) would probably be the best day to visit – say 11.00am? But we can also accommodate you on Thursday the 19th if that is more convenient. We plan to work into the weekend and wrap up the recording then if possible.

If you have any queries, feel free to get in touch.

Many thanks for your help navigating the archaeological requirements,

Best wishes,



██████████ Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA

Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t ██████████ | m ██████████

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | West Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire | MK45 4HS
t [01525 861 578](tel:01525861578)

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t [01432 364 901](tel:01432364901)

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t [01274 938 019](tel:01274938019)

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t [0161 236 2757](tel:01612362757)

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t [0131 467 7705](tel:01314677705)

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk; [redacted]; [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: Mark Adams; Rachel Morgan
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?
Date: 16 September 2024 15:15:03
Attachments: [image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image013.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image019.png](#)
[image025.png](#)
[image026.png](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image021.png](#)
[image023.png](#)
[image027.png](#)
[image028.png](#)
[image029.png](#)
[image030.png](#)
[image031.png](#)
[image032.png](#)
[image034.png](#)

Hi [redacted]

Yes I can confirm 11:30 works well for me.

[redacted]



[redacted] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Fumival Street | London | EC4A 1AB

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | West Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Cleanview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 0127 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted]@statkraft.com>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 3:01 PM
To: [redacted]@kent.gov.uk; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com> [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?


Hi [redacted]

Many thanks for confirming. 11:30 works for me and I think [redacted] has also confirmed that this time would work for him too.

I suggest we meet at the access gate off East Street. It's the best option for cars and there is plenty of space to park just inside the site (as shown on the aerial photo below).

In terms of PPE, I would suggest the usual hi-vis, steel toe-capped boots and hard hat.

[redacted] – does that sound ok to you?



Many thanks

Senior Project Manager, European Wind and Solar

Mobile [redacted] @statkraft.com

Statkraft UK LTD (Reg. No. 05742795)
22 Bishopsgate, London, EC2N 4BQ (Reg. Address)
The Garment Factory, 10 Montrose Street, Glasgow G1 1RE
www.statkraft.co.uk



From: [redacted]@kent.gov.uk [redacted]@kent.gov.uk
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 10:56 AM
To: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

You don't often get email from [redacted]@kent.gov.uk. Learn why this is important

Hi [redacted]

Could we say 11:30 om Friday 20th? If you could let me know details of parking/where to meet and any site-specific PPE requirements that would be appreciated.

Many thanks,

[redacted] | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: [redacted] | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 2:06 PM
To: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

11.00 or 12.00 is good for me



[redacted] Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA
Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t 01612362757 | m 07753895123
www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East Building 68C | Wrest Park Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS t 01525 861 578
Headland Archaeology Midlands & West Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd Hereford | HR2 6JR t 01432 364 901
Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ t 01274 493 8019
Headland Archaeology North West RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St Manchester | M1 2EJ t 0161 236 2752
Headland Archaeology Scotland 13 Jane St Edinburgh | EH6 5HE t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945. Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 1:07 PM
To: [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK

Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Many thanks for confirming [REDACTED] It does seem like Friday would be the best day.

I am not sure what time you will be available [REDACTED]

I can be around all day but I know [REDACTED] will be making his way from further afield so I expect he won't be able to be there very early, and afternoon may be better if possible?

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant
Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB
www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East Building 68C Wrest Park Silsoe Bedfordshire MK45 4HS t 01525 861 578	Headland Archaeology Midlands & West Unit 1 Clearview Court Twyford Rd Hereford HR2 6JR t 01432 364 901	Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North Units 23-25 Acorn Business Centre Balme Road Cleckheaton BD19 4EZ t 0127 493 8019	Headland Archaeology North West RSK Fourways House 57 Hilton St Manchester M1 2EJ t 0161 236 2757	Headland Archaeology Scotland 13 Jane St Edinburgh EH6 5HE t 0131 467 7705
--	---	--	---	--

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:36 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@kent.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@statkraft.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@statkraft.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear all,

It sounds like it would make more sense to visit on the Friday (without me). I'm sorry I can't make it but I will be available for a chat if any questions arise on site.

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]



Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.
Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:23 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@kent.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@statkraft.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@statkraft.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

-- WARNING: This is an external message. Please use caution when replying, opening attachments or clicking on any links in this e-mail.--

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your review, your time on this is much appreciated. I'll make those changes to the WSI.

For clarification, your comments are addressed below.

- We will adjust WSI to allow for an additional contingency trench 30 x 1.8m in the area of Tr1/2 and also at Tr7-8, with flexibility to adjust location of Tr8. All subject to x-ref to services etc. With the purpose of characterising and better understanding any remains exposed in the initial trenches.
- The sondages will be excavated using a machine at the end of the evaluation trenches. The section will be hand-cleaned to a depth of 1.2m (subject to safe access). Column samples and bulk samples can be taken from deposits of potential within this zone. Beyond that depth the excavations will be observed but not entered for health and safety reasons as the sondages extend to a maximum depth of 4 m. The objective will

primarily to be to identify deposits of palaeoenvironmental interest, and any structural evidence (timbers, boats, quayside facilities, artefacts). Bulk samples only can be recovered from these deposits using the machine since the excavations will not be safe to enter. Where deposits are identified of interest, they could be subject to a future programme of geoarchaeological boreholes- modelling of the geoarchaeology of the channel could be a mitigation measure?

- The geotechnical test pits- soakaway test pits were excavated several weeks ago. They had an archaeologist present. No archaeological deposits, structures or artefacts were identified. The methodology can be updated, but the work has been executed already. The information will be integrated into the evaluation report. In summary topsoil over clay-rich deposits.

If [REDACTED] wants to visit on Thursday, she is welcome- there is a greater likelihood of the trenches all being open by Friday and would recommend that as the day to visit.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 0127 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 4:31 PM
To: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear [REDACTED] & [REDACTED]

Thank you for sending over a draft copy of the proposed WSI for trial trenching. I offer the following comments.

In terms of the number and position of the proposed trenches these look broadly reasonable. I suggest however that if archaeology is present in the area of TR1 and TR2 (positioned on the channel edge) then it may be necessary to carry out additional trenching to understand more fully the character and extent of any remains present. I suggest that additional contingency trenching is allowed for in these areas. Similarly, for TR8, it may be necessary to adjust the position of this trench to take account of the results of the trenching (TR3 – 7) along the 'raised spur' of land. So, for example, if the line of the Roman road is evidenced in TR3 – 7 the position of TR8 may need to be adjusted to pick up the projected alignment. Again, I would suggest that some contingency trenching is allowed for here if significant waterlogged timber remains might survive.

Para 2.1.10 notes that test-pits (sondages) are to be excavated into the ends of selected trenches. I would expect to see detail of these sondages in the scope of works section (6.1) and the methodology for their excavation described in Section 7 in greater detail than the brief mention at 7.1.16 – where will sondages be excavated, how will they be excavated and recorded?

Para 7.1.8 notes that the watching brief does not allow for the excavation of in-situ archaeology – does this mean that if archaeology is encountered it is to be left undisturbed and the geotechnical test-pit abandoned/relocated. If so, then this should be explicitly stated. Otherwise, if in-situ archaeology is to be disturbed by the geotechnical test-pits then there needs to be provision for the investigation and recording of such archaeology before it is disturbed/lost.

On the basis that the above comments will be addressed then I would be happy to agree the WSI.

In terms of a site visit I am available either on Friday 20th or Thursday 19th. I understand that [REDACTED] is only available on the 19th. If we went with the 19th, then I can only make the morning (meeting on-site at about 11am would suit) – do you think you will have all the trenches cut by then?

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: [REDACTED] | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: [redacted] <[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 3:09 PM
To: [redacted] <[redacted]@kent.gov.uk>; [redacted] <[redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Cc: [redacted] <[redacted]@statkraft.com>; [redacted] <[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted] <[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Subject: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Hi [redacted] and [redacted]

Further to our draft WSI for the trial trenching at Little South Solar, we have agreed a start date with the landowner and plant hire company (Wednesday 18th of September). This accommodates the planting schedule of the landowner who is keen for us to be finished as soon as possible.

I appreciate the WSI has been with you for a little while: we would welcome your comments on it in the meantime but will assume that you are happy with it if we don't hear from you before the commencement of work on site. The WSI is based on our discussion of the EM and ERT surveys and best locations to target as well as the county-specific guidelines you shared with us.

A member of the team inspected soak-away test pits recently and noted sequences of clay-rich deposits immediately beneath the ploughsoil. No sign of any peat or organic-rich deposits in the top 2m (yet). Conversations with the landowner have been interesting- he has land elsewhere which is rich in Romano-British finds, but he says the solar development site is "sterile"- detectorists have found nothing there. The trenching may tell another story!

We would also welcome you to site to inspect the open evaluation trenches.

We think that Friday (20th September) would probably be the best day to visit – say 11.00am? But we can also accommodate you on Thursday the 19th if that is more convenient. We plan to work into the weekend and wrap up the recording then if possible.

If you have any queries, feel free to get in touch.

Many thanks for your help navigating the archaeological requirements,

Best wishes,

[redacted]



[redacted] Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA

Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t 01612362757 | m 07753895123

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 0127 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?
Date: 12 September 2024 09:35:57
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@historicengland.org.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear all,

It sounds like it would make more sense to visit on the Friday (without me). I'm sorry I can't make it but I will be available for a chat if any questions arise on site.

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]



Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.
Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Sign up to our newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:23 AM
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

-- WARNING: This is an external message. Please use caution when replying, opening attachments or clicking on any links in this e-mail.--

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your review, your time on this is much appreciated. I'll make those changes to the WSI.

For clarification, your comments are addressed below.

- We will adjust WSI to allow for an additional contingency trench 30 x 1.8m in the area of Tr1/2 and also at Tr7-8, with flexibility to adjust location of Tr8. All subject to x-ref to services etc. With the purpose of characterising and better understanding any remains exposed in the initial trenches.
- The sondages will be excavated using a machine at the end of the evaluation trenches. The section will be hand-cleaned to a depth of 1.2m (subject to safe access). Column samples and bulk samples can be taken from deposits of potential within this zone. Beyond that depth the excavations will be observed but not entered for health and safety reasons as the sondages extend to a maximum depth of 4 m. The objective will primarily be to identify deposits of palaeoenvironmental interest, and any structural evidence (timbers, boats, quayside facilities, artefacts). Bulk samples only can be recovered from these deposits using the machine since the excavations will not be safe to enter. Where deposits are identified of interest, they could be subject to a future programme of geoarchaeological boreholes- modelling of the geoarchaeology of the channel could be a mitigation measure?
- The geotechnical test pits- soakaway test pits were excavated several weeks ago. They had an archaeologist present. No archaeological deposits, structures or artefacts were identified. The methodology can be updated, but the work has been executed already. The information will be integrated into the evaluation report. In summary topsoil over clay-rich deposits.

If [REDACTED] wants to visit on Thursday, she is welcome- there is a greater likelihood of the trenches all being open by Friday and would recommend that as the day to visit.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire | MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 01774 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2752

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk <[REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 4:31 PM
To: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear [REDACTED] & [REDACTED]

Thank you for sending over a draft copy of the proposed WSI for trial trenching. I offer the following comments.

In terms of the number and position of the proposed trenches these look broadly reasonable. I suggest however that if archaeology is present in the area of TR1 and TR2 (positioned on the channel edge) then it may be necessary to carry out additional trenching to understand more fully the character and extent of any remains present. I suggest that additional contingency trenching is allowed for in these areas. Similarly, for TR8, it may be necessary to adjust the position of this trench to take account of the results of the trenching (TR3 – 7) along the 'raised spur' of land. So, for example, if the line of the Roman road is evidenced in TR3 – 7 the position of TR8 may need to be adjusted to pick up the projected alignment. Again, I would suggest that some contingency trenching is allowed for here if significant waterlogged timber remains might survive.

Para 2.1.10 notes that test-pits (sondages) are to be excavated into the ends of selected trenches. I would expect to see detail of these sondages in the scope of works section (6.1) and the methodology for their excavation described in Section 7 in greater detail than the brief mention at 7.1.16 – where will sondages be excavated, how will they be excavated and recorded?

Para 7.1.8 notes that the watching brief does not allow for the excavation of in-situ archaeology – does this mean that if archaeology is encountered it is to be left undisturbed and the geotechnical test-pit abandoned/relocated. If so, then this should be explicitly stated. Otherwise, if in-situ archaeology is to be disturbed by the geotechnical test-pits then there needs to be provision for the investigation and recording of such archaeology before it is disturbed/lost.

On the basis that the above comments will be addressed then I would be happy to agree the WSI.

In terms of a site visit I am available either on Friday 20th or Thursday 19th. I understand that [REDACTED] is only available on the 19th. If we went with the 19th, then I can only make the morning (meeting on-site at about 11am would suit) – do you think you will have all the trenches cut by then?

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: [REDACTED] | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 3:09 PM
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com
Subject: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Hi [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Further to our draft WSI for the trial trenching at Little South Solar, we have agreed a start date with the landowner and plant hire company (Wednesday 18th of September). This accommodates the planting schedule of the landowner who is keen for us to be finished as soon as possible.

I appreciate the WSI has been with you for a little while: we would welcome your comments on it in the meantime but will assume that you are happy with it if we don't hear from you before the commencement of work on site. The WSI is based on our discussion of the EM and ERT surveys and best locations to target as well as the county-specific guidelines you shared with us.

A member of the team inspected soak-away test pits recently and noted sequences of clay-rich deposits immediately beneath the ploughsoil. No sign of any peat or organic-rich deposits in the top 2m (yet). Conversations with the landowner have been interesting- he has land elsewhere which is rich in Romano-British finds, but he says the solar development site is "sterile"- detectorists have found nothing there. The trenching may tell another story!

We would also welcome you to site to inspect the open evaluation trenches.

We think that Friday (20th September) would probably be the best day to visit – say 11.00am? But we can also accommodate you on Thursday the 19th if that is more convenient. We plan to work into the weekend and wrap up the recording then if possible.

If you have any queries, feel free to get in touch.

Many thanks for your help navigating the archaeological requirements,

Best wishes,



part of the **RSK** Group



██████████ Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA

Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t ██████████ | m ██████████

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire | MK45 4HS
t [01525 861 578](tel:01525861578)

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t [01432 364 901](tel:01432364901)

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t [01274 938 019](tel:01274938019)

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t [0161 236 2757](tel:01612362757)

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t [0131 467 7705](tel:01314677705)

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?
Date: 13 September 2024 13:06:58
Attachments: [image018.png](#)
[image019.png](#)
[image021.png](#)
[image023.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image022.png](#)
[image023.png](#)
[image025.png](#)

Many thanks for confirming [REDACTED] It does seem like Friday would be the best day.

I am not sure what time you will be available [REDACTED]

I can be around all day but I know [REDACTED] will be making his way from further afield so I expect he won't be able to be there very early, and afternoon may be better if possible?

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire I MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 01277 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:36 AM
To: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear all,

It sounds like it would make more sense to visit on the Friday (without me). I'm sorry I can't make it but I will be available for a chat if any questions arise on site.

Best wishes,
[REDACTED]



Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.
Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:23 AM
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

-- WARNING: This is an external message. Please use caution when replying, opening attachments or clicking on any links in this e-mail.--

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your review, your time on this is much appreciated. I'll make those changes to the WSI.

For clarification, your comments are addressed below.

- We will adjust WSI to allow for an additional contingency trench 30 x 1.8m in the area of Tr1/2 and also at Tr7-8, with flexibility to adjust location of Tr8. All subject to x-ref to services etc. With the purpose of characterising and better understanding any remains exposed in the initial trenches.
- The sondages will be excavated using a machine at the end of the evaluation trenches. The section will be hand-cleaned to a depth of 1.2m (subject to safe access). Column samples and bulk samples can be taken from deposits of potential within this zone. Beyond that depth the excavations will be observed but not entered for health and safety reasons as the sondages extend to a maximum depth of 4 m. The objective will primarily be to identify deposits of palaeoenvironmental interest, and any structural evidence (timbers, boats, quayside facilities, artefacts). Bulk samples only can be recovered from these deposits using the machine since the excavations will not be safe to enter. Where deposits are identified of interest, they could be subject to a future programme of geoarchaeological boreholes- modelling of the geoarchaeology of the channel could be a mitigation measure?
- The geotechnical test pits- soakaway test pits were excavated several weeks ago. They had an archaeologist present. No archaeological deposits, structures or artefacts were identified. The methodology can be updated, but the work has been executed already. The information will be integrated into the evaluation report. In summary topsoil over clay-rich deposits.

If [REDACTED] wants to visit on Thursday, she is welcome- there is a greater likelihood of the trenches all being open by Friday and would recommend that as the day to visit.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



part of the **RSK** Group



[REDACTED] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 0127 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 4:31 PM
To: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear [REDACTED] & [REDACTED]

Thank you for sending over a draft copy of the proposed WSI for trial trenching. I offer the following comments.

In terms of the number and position of the proposed trenches these look broadly reasonable. I suggest however that if archaeology is present in the area of TR1 and TR2 (positioned on the channel edge) then it may be necessary to carry out additional trenching to understand more fully the character and extent of any remains present. I suggest that additional contingency trenching is allowed for in these areas. Similarly, for TR8, it may be necessary to adjust the position of this trench to take account of the results of the trenching (TR3 – 7) along the 'raised spur' of land. So, for example, if the line of the Roman road is evidenced in TR3 – 7 the position of TR8 may need to be adjusted to pick up the projected alignment. Again, I would suggest that some contingency trenching is allowed for here if significant waterlogged timber remains might survive.

Para 2.1.10 notes that test-pits (sondages) are to be excavated into the ends of selected trenches. I would expect to see detail of these sondages in the scope of works section (6.1) and the methodology for their excavation described in Section 7 in greater detail than the brief mention at 7.1.16 – where will sondages be excavated, how will they be excavated and recorded?

Para 7.1.8 notes that the watching brief does not allow for the excavation of in-situ archaeology – does this mean that if archaeology is encountered it is to be left undisturbed and the geotechnical test-pit abandoned/relocated. If so, then this should be explicitly stated. Otherwise, if in-situ archaeology is to be disturbed by the geotechnical test-pits then there needs to be provision for the investigation and recording of such archaeology before it is disturbed/lost.

On the basis that the above comments will be addressed then I would be happy to agree the WSI.

In terms of a site visit I am available either on Friday 20th or Thursday 19th. I understand that [REDACTED] is only available on the 19th.

If we went with the 19th, then I can only make the morning (meeting on-site at about 11am would suit) – do you think you will have all the trenches cut by then?

Many thanks,

█

█ | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: █ | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: █ <█@headlandarchaeology.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 3:09 PM

To: █ <█@kent.gov.uk>; █ <█@HistoricEngland.org.uk>

Cc: █ <█@statkraft.com>; █ <█@headlandarchaeology.com>; █ <█@headlandarchaeology.com>

Subject: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Hi █ and █

Further to our draft WSI for the trial trenching at Little South Solar, we have agreed a start date with the landowner and plant hire company (Wednesday 18th of September). This accommodates the planting schedule of the landowner who is keen for us to be finished as soon as possible.

I appreciate the WSI has been with you for a little while: we would welcome your comments on it in the meantime but will assume that you are happy with it if we don't hear from you before the commencement of work on site. The WSI is based on our discussion of the EM and ERT surveys and best locations to target as well as the county-specific guidelines you shared with us.

A member of the team inspected soak-away test pits recently and noted sequences of clay-rich deposits immediately beneath the ploughsoil. No sign of any peat or organic-rich deposits in the top 2m (yet). Conversations with the landowner have been interesting- he has land elsewhere which is rich in Romano-British finds, but he says the solar development site is "sterile"- detectorists have found nothing there. The trenching may tell another story!

We would also welcome you to site to inspect the open evaluation trenches.

We think that Friday (20th September) would probably be the best day to visit – say 11.00am? But we can also accommodate you on Thursday the 19th if that is more convenient. We plan to work into the weekend and wrap up the recording then if possible.

If you have any queries, feel free to get in touch.

Many thanks for your help navigating the archaeological requirements,

Best wishes,

█



part of the **RSK** Group



█ Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA

Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t █ | m █

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t [01525 861 578](tel:01525861578)

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t [01432 364 901](tel:01432364901)

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t [0127 493 8019](tel:01274938019)

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t [0161 236 2757](tel:01612362757)

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t [0131 467 7705](tel:01314677705)

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?
Date: 13 September 2024 14:06:23
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image005.png
image006.png
image007.png
image008.png
image009.png
image010.png
image012.png
image014.png
image015.png
image017.png
image018.png
image019.png
image021.png

You don't often get email from [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

11.00 or 12.00 is good for me

 part of the RSK Group 	[redacted] Director of Consultancy BA MA PhD MCIFA	 ISO 9001	 ISO 14001	 ISO 45001
	Headland Archaeology North West 172 Chester Road Helsby WA6 0AR t [redacted] m [redacted] www.headlandarchaeology.com			
Headland Archaeology South & East Building 68C Wreast Park Silsoe Bedfordshire MK45 4HS t 01525 861 578	Headland Archaeology Midlands & West Unit 1 Clearview Court Twyford Rd Hereford HR2 6JR t 01432 364 901	Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North Units 23-25 Acorn Business Centre Balme Road Cleckheaton BD19 4EZ t 0127 493 8019	Headland Archaeology North West RSK Fourways House 57 Hilton St Manchester M1 2EJ t 0161 236 2757	Headland Archaeology Scotland 13 Jane St Edinburgh EH6 5HE t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 1:07 PM
To: [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Many thanks for confirming [redacted]. It does seem like Friday would be the best day.

I am not sure what time you will be available [redacted].

I can be around all day but I know [redacted] will be making his way from further afield so I expect he won't be able to be there very early, and afternoon may be better if possible?

[redacted]

 part of the RSK Group 	[redacted] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant	 ISO 9001	 ISO 14001	 ISO 45001
	Headland Archaeology Midlands & West 2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Fumival Street London EC4A 1AB www.headlandarchaeology.com			
Headland Archaeology South & East Building 68C Wreast Park Silsoe Bedfordshire MK45 4HS t 01525 861 578	Headland Archaeology Midlands & West Unit 1 Clearview Court Twyford Rd Hereford HR2 6JR t 01432 364 901	Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North Units 23-25 Acorn Business Centre Balme Road Cleckheaton BD19 4EZ t 0127 493 8019	Headland Archaeology North West RSK Fourways House 57 Hilton St Manchester M1 2EJ t 0161 236 2757	Headland Archaeology Scotland 13 Jane St Edinburgh EH6 5HE t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:36 AM
To: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear all,

It sounds like it would make more sense to visit on the Friday (without me). I'm sorry I can't make it but I will be available for a chat if any questions arise on site.

Best wishes,



Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com)>

Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:23 AM

To: [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@kent.gov.uk](mailto:[redacted]@kent.gov.uk)>; [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>

Cc: [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@statkraft.com](mailto:[redacted]@statkraft.com)>; [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>

Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

-- WARNING: This is an external message. Please use caution when replying, opening attachments or clicking on any links in this e-mail.--

Dear [redacted]

Many thanks for your review, your time on this is much appreciated. I'll make those changes to the WSI.

For clarification, your comments are addressed below.

- We will adjust WSI to allow for an additional contingency trench 30 x 1.8m in the area of Tr1/2 and also at Tr7-8, with flexibility to adjust location of Tr8. All subject to x-ref to services etc. With the purpose of characterising and better understanding any remains exposed in the initial trenches.
- The sondages will be excavated using a machine at the end of the evaluation trenches. The section will be hand-cleaned to a depth of 1.2m (subject to safe access). Column samples and bulk samples can be taken from deposits of potential within this zone. Beyond that depth the excavations will be observed but not entered for health and safety reasons as the sondages extend to a maximum depth of 4 m. The objective will primarily be to identify deposits of palaeoenvironmental interest, and any structural evidence (timbers, boats, quayside facilities, artefacts). Bulk samples only can be recovered from these deposits using the machine since the excavations will not be safe to enter. Where deposits are identified of interest, they could be subject to a future programme of geoarchaeological boreholes- modelling of the geoarchaeology of the channel could be a mitigation measure?
- The geotechnical test pits- soakaway test pits were excavated several weeks ago. They had an archaeologist present. No archaeological deposits, structures or artefacts were identified. The methodology can be updated, but the work has been executed already. The information will be integrated into the evaluation report. In summary topsoil over clay-rich deposits.

If [redacted] wants to visit on Thursday, she is welcome- there is a greater likelihood of the trenches all being open by Friday and would recommend that as the day to visit.

Kind regards,



part of the **RSK** Group



[redacted] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 0127 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2752

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@kent.gov.uk](mailto:[redacted]@kent.gov.uk)>

Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 4:31 PM

To: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com> [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear [REDACTED] & [REDACTED]

Thank you for sending over a draft copy of the proposed WSI for trial trenching. I offer the following comments.

In terms of the number and position of the proposed trenches these look broadly reasonable. I suggest however that if archaeology is present in the area of TR1 and TR2 (positioned on the channel edge) then it may be necessary to carry out additional trenching to understand more fully the character and extent of any remains present. I suggest that additional contingency trenching is allowed for in these areas. Similarly, for TR8, it may be necessary to adjust the position of this trench to take account of the results of the trenching (TR3 – 7) along the 'raised spur' of land. So, for example, if the line of the Roman road is evidenced in TR3 – 7 the position of TR8 may need to be adjusted to pick up the projected alignment. Again, I would suggest that some contingency trenching is allowed for here if significant waterlogged timber remains might survive.

Para 2.1.10 notes that test-pits (sondages) are to be excavated into the ends of selected trenches. I would expect to see detail of these sondages in the scope of works section (6.1) and the methodology for their excavation described in Section 7 in greater detail than the brief mention at 7.1.16 – where will sondages be excavated, how will they be excavated and recorded?

Para 7.1.8 notes that the watching brief does not allow for the excavation of in-situ archaeology – does this mean that if archaeology is encountered it is to be left undisturbed and the geotechnical test-pit abandoned/relocated. If so, then this should be explicitly stated. Otherwise, if in-situ archaeology is to be disturbed by the geotechnical test-pits then there needs to be provision for the investigation and recording of such archaeology before it is disturbed/lost.

On the basis that the above comments will be addressed then I would be happy to agree the WSI.

In terms of a site visit I am available either on Friday 20th or Thursday 19th. I understand that [REDACTED] is only available on the 19th. If we went with the 19th, then I can only make the morning (meeting on-site at about 11am would suit) – do you think you will have all the trenches cut by then?

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: [REDACTED] | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 3:09 PM
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com>; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Subject: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Hi [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Further to our draft WSI for the trial trenching at Little South Solar, we have agreed a start date with the landowner and plant hire company (Wednesday 18th of September). This accommodates the planting schedule of the landowner who is keen for us to be finished as soon as possible.

I appreciate the WSI has been with you for a little while: we would welcome your comments on it in the meantime but will assume that you are happy with it if we don't hear from you before the commencement of work on site. The WSI is based on our discussion of the EM and ERT surveys and best locations to target as well as the county-specific guidelines you shared with us.

A member of the team inspected soak-away test pits recently and noted sequences of clay-rich deposits immediately beneath the ploughsoil. No sign of any peat or organic-rich deposits in the top 2m (yet). Conversations with the landowner have been interesting- he has land elsewhere which is rich in Romano-British finds, but he says the solar development site is "sterile"- detectorists have found nothing there. The trenching may tell another story!

We would also welcome you to site to inspect the open evaluation trenches.

We think that Friday (20th September) would probably be the best day to visit – say 11.00am? But we can also accommodate you on Thursday the 19th if that is more convenient. We plan to work into the weekend and wrap up the recording then if possible.

If you have any queries, feel free to get in touch.

Many thanks for your help navigating the archaeological requirements,

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]



part of the **RSK** Group



██████████ Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA

Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t ██████████ | m ██████████

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire | MK45 4HS
t [01525 861 578](tel:01525861578)

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t [01432 364 901](tel:01432364901)

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t [0127 493 8019](tel:01274938019)

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t [0161 236 2757](tel:01612362757)

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t [0131 467 7705](tel:01314677705)

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted] <[redacted]@kent.gov.uk>; [redacted] <[redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?
Date: 17 September 2024 12:52:44
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image013.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image019.png](#)
[image021.png](#)
[image022.png](#)
[image024.png](#)
[image025.png](#)
[image026.png](#)

You don't often get email from [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

All sounds sensible to me.



[redacted] Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCIFA

Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t [redacted] | m [redacted]
www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 0127 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted] <[redacted]@statkraft.com>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 3:01 PM
To: [redacted] <[redacted]@kent.gov.uk>; [redacted] <[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted] <[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted] <[redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Cc: [redacted] <[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted] <[redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Hi [redacted]

Many thanks for confirming. 11:30 works for me and I think [redacted] has also confirmed that this time would work for him too.

I suggest we meet at the access gate off East Street. It's the best option for cars and there is plenty of space to park just inside the site (as shown on the aerial photo below).

In terms of PPE, I would suggest the usual hi-vis, steel toe-capped boots and hard hat.

[redacted] – does that sound ok to you?



Many thanks

[redacted]

Senior Project Manager, European Wind and Solar

Mobile: [redacted] @statkraft.com

Statkraft UK LTD (Reg. No. 05742795)
22 Bishopsgate, London, EC2N 4BQ (Reg. Address)
The Garment Factory, 10 Montrose Street, Glasgow G1 1RE
www.statkraft.co.uk



From: [redacted]@kent.gov.uk [redacted]@kent.gov.uk
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 10:56 AM
To: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com;
[redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

You don't often get email from [redacted]@kent.gov.uk. Learn why this is important
Hi [redacted]

Could we say 11:30 on Friday 20th? If you could let me know details of parking/where to meet and any site-specific PPE requirements that would be appreciated.

Many thanks,
[redacted]

[redacted] | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: [redacted] | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 2:06 PM
To: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

11.00 or 12.00 is good for me



[redacted] Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA
Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t [redacted] | m [redacted]
www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East Building 68C West Park Silsoe Bedfordshire MK45 4HS t 01525 861 578	Headland Archaeology Midlands & West Unit 1 Clearview Court Twyford Rd Hereford HR2 6JR t 01432 364 901	Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North Units 23-25 Acorn Business Centre Balme Road Cleckheaton BD19 4EZ t 0127 493 8019	Headland Archaeology North West RSK Fourways House 57 Hilton St Manchester M1 2EJ t 0161 236 2757	Headland Archaeology Scotland 13 Jane St Edinburgh EH6 5HE t 0131 467 7705
---	---	--	---	--

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 1:07 PM
To: [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk; [redacted]@kent.gov.uk; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com; [redacted]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Many thanks for confirming [redacted] It does seem like Friday would be the best day.

I am not sure what time you will be available [REDACTED]

I can be around all day but I know [REDACTED] will be making his way from further afield so I expect he won't be able to be there very early, and afternoon may be better if possible?

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 0127 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:36 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@statkraft.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear all,

It sounds like it would make more sense to visit on the Friday (without me). I'm sorry I can't make it but I will be available for a chat if any questions arise on site.

Best wishes,
[REDACTED]



Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.
Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:23 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@statkraft.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

-- WARNING: This is an external message. Please use caution when replying, opening attachments or clicking on any links in this e-mail.--

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your review, your time on this is much appreciated. I'll make those changes to the WSI.

For clarification, your comments are addressed below.

- We will adjust WSI to allow for an additional contingency trench 30 x 1.8m in the area of Tr1/2 and also at Tr7-8, with flexibility to adjust location of Tr8. All subject to x-ref to services etc. With the purpose of characterising and better understanding any remains exposed in the initial trenches.
- The sondages will be excavated using a machine at the end of the evaluation trenches. The section will be hand-cleaned to a depth of 1.2m (subject to safe access). Column samples and bulk samples can be taken from deposits of potential within this zone. Beyond that depth the excavations will be observed but not entered for health and safety reasons as the sondages extend to a maximum depth of 4 m. The objective will primarily be to identify deposits of palaeoenvironmental interest, and any structural evidence (timbers, boats, quayside facilities, artefacts). Bulk samples only can be recovered from these deposits using the machine since the excavations will not be safe to enter. Where deposits are identified of interest, they could be subject to a future programme of geoarchaeological boreholes- modelling of the geoarchaeology of the

channel could be a mitigation measure?

- The geotechnical test pits-soakaway test pits were excavated several weeks ago. They had an archaeologist present. No archaeological deposits, structures or artefacts were identified. The methodology can be updated, but the work has been executed already. The information will be integrated into the evaluation report. In summary topsoil over clay-rich deposits.

If [REDACTED] wants to visit on Thursday, she is welcome- there is a greater likelihood of the trenches all being open by Friday and would recommend that as the day to visit.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



part of the **RSK Group**



[REDACTED] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 01274 93 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 4:31 PM
To: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear [REDACTED] & [REDACTED]

Thank you for sending over a draft copy of the proposed WSI for trial trenching. I offer the following comments.

In terms of the number and position of the proposed trenches these look broadly reasonable. I suggest however that if archaeology is present in the area of TR1 and TR2 (positioned on the channel edge) then it may be necessary to carry out additional trenching to understand more fully the character and extent of any remains present. I suggest that additional contingency trenching is allowed for in these areas. Similarly, for TR8, it may be necessary to adjust the position of this trench to take account of the results of the trenching (TR3 – 7) along the 'raised spur' of land. So, for example, if the line of the Roman road is evidenced in TR3 – 7 the position of TR8 may need to be adjusted to pick up the projected alignment. Again, I would suggest that some contingency trenching is allowed for here if significant waterlogged timber remains might survive.

Para 2.1.10 notes that test-pits (sondages) are to be excavated into the ends of selected trenches. I would expect to see detail of these sondages in the scope of works section (6.1) and the methodology for their excavation described in Section 7 in greater detail than the brief mention at 7.1.16 – where will sondages be excavated, how will they be excavated and recorded?

Para 7.1.8 notes that the watching brief does not allow for the excavation of in-situ archaeology – does this mean that if archaeology is encountered it is to be left undisturbed and the geotechnical test-pit abandoned/relocated. If so, then this should be explicitly stated. Otherwise, if in-situ archaeology is to be disturbed by the geotechnical test-pits then there needs to be provision for the investigation and recording of such archaeology before it is disturbed/lost.

On the basis that the above comments will be addressed then I would be happy to agree the WSI.

In terms of a site visit I am available either on Friday 20th or Thursday 19th. I understand that [REDACTED] is only available on the 19th. If we went with the 19th, then I can only make the morning (meeting on-site at about 11am would suit) – do you think you will have all the trenches cut by then?

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: [REDACTED] | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 3:09 PM

To: [redacted]@kent.gov.uk>; [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@statkraft.com>; [redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>; [redacted]
[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com>

Subject: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Hi [redacted] and [redacted]

Further to our draft WSI for the trial trenching at Little South Solar, we have agreed a start date with the landowner and plant hire company (Wednesday 18th of September). This accommodates the planting schedule of the landowner who is keen for us to be finished as soon as possible.

I appreciate the WSI has been with you for a little while: we would welcome your comments on it in the meantime but will assume that you are happy with it if we don't hear from you before the commencement of work on site. The WSI is based on our discussion of the EM and ERT surveys and best locations to target as well as the county-specific guidelines you shared with us.

A member of the team inspected soak-away test pits recently and noted sequences of clay-rich deposits immediately beneath the ploughsoil. No sign of any peat or organic-rich deposits in the top 2m (yet). Conversations with the landowner have been interesting- he has land elsewhere which is rich in Romano-British finds, but he says the solar development site is "sterile"- detectorists have found nothing there. The trenching may tell another story!

We would also welcome you to site to inspect the open evaluation trenches.

We think that Friday (20th September) would probably be the best day to visit – say 11.00am? But we can also accommodate you on Thursday the 19th if that is more convenient. We plan to work into the weekend and wrap up the recording then if possible.

If you have any queries, feel free to get in touch.

Many thanks for your help navigating the archaeological requirements,

Best wishes,

[redacted]



[redacted] Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA

Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t [redacted] | m [redacted]

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire | MK45 4HS
t [01525 861 578](tel:01525861578)

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t [01432 364 901](tel:01432364901)

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t [0127 493 8019](tel:01274938019)

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t [0161 236 2757](tel:01612362757)

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t [0131 467 7705](tel:01314677705)

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Little South Solar Farm
Date: 18 September 2024 09:17:10
Attachments: [Outlook-0jkrnydt.dat](#)
[Outlook-b32bsd3.dat](#)

Dear [REDACTED]

Further to your email, I have been copied into correspondence and understand [REDACTED] will be visiting the site this week. Please let me know if there are any further issues contacting him.

I understand the additional archaeological information/results will be included as part of the updated EIA when available. Having reviewed Chapter 9 water environment document, I note the comments at paragraph 9.39 that as the development is essential infrastructure and within flood zones 1 and 2, the sequential test is not required. My understanding is that the 'essential infrastructure' relates to the exceptions test rather than the sequential test. Will comparator sites be included in the updated information provided?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Principal Planning Officer

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk

Web: dover.gov.uk

Phone: [REDACTED]



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: 11 September 2024 09:20
To: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Subject: Re: Little South Solar Farm

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. I contacted [REDACTED] yesterday to chase for an urgent response on the

WSI - please let me know if there is still no response from him.

Kind regards,

██████████



██████████
Principal Planning Officer

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: ██████████@DOVER.gov.uk

Web: dover.gov.uk

Phone: ██████████



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: ██████████@stantec.com>

Sent: 10 September 2024 12:25

To: ██████████@DOVER.GOV.UK>

Cc: ██████████@DOVER.GOV.UK>; ██████████

██████████@stantec.com>

Subject: Little South Solar Farm

Dear ██████████ and ██████████

I hope you're well. After our meeting last month in which ██████████ laid out what he wished to occur in terms of trial trenching at Little South, Headland Architecture prepared a Written Scheme of Investigation and sent this to ██████████ for agreement.

██████████ implied at the meeting that he would be able to sign this off quite quickly but frustratingly he has not responded for quite some time despite several calls and emails, and therefore there are now delays being caused and the window of opportunity in terms of weather and cropping is reducing.

Please could you urgently ask ██████████ to respond to Headland and agree the WSI?

The team have stated that if they do not hear quickly, they believe it is reasonable for them to go ahead with the work anyway given that he agreed the key aspects of it in principle in the meeting – and that if he had concerns, he has had plenty of time to raise them. Do you have any concerns about them taking that approach?

Kind regards

██████████

[Redacted]

Planning Associate

Direct: + [Redacted]
Mobile: + [Redacted]
[Redacted]@stantec.com

Please note: I work part time - I do not work Wednesday afternoons or Fridays.

Stantec
3rd Floor, 50-60 Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JH



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Farm
Date: 18 September 2024 09:26:21

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email – yes, [REDACTED] is visiting this week whilst they're doing trial trenching, I believe, so that is now all sorted, thanks for helping with that.

On your second point, let me get back to you. I will speak to the consultants who prepared the FRA and the ES chapter and I will get to the bottom of that.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Associate

Direct: + [REDACTED]

Mobile: + [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@stantec.com

Please note: I work part time - I do not work Wednesday afternoons or Fridays.

Stantec
3rd Floor, 50-60 Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JH



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 9:17 AM
To: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Subject: Re: Little South Solar Farm

Dear [REDACTED]

Further to your email, I have been copied into correspondence and understand [REDACTED] will be visiting the site this week. Please let me know if there are any further issues contacting him.

I understand the additional archaeological information/results will be included as part of the updated EIA when available. Having reviewed Chapter 9 water environment document, I note the comments at paragraph 9.39 that as the development is essential infrastructure and within flood zones 1 and 2, the sequential test is not required. My understanding is that the 'essential infrastructure' relates to the exceptions test rather than the sequential test. Will comparator sites be included in the updated information provided?

Kind regards,



Principal Planning Officer

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.gov.uk](mailto: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk)

Web: dover.gov.uk

Phone: [REDACTED]



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED] [@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>

Sent: 11 September 2024 09:20

To: [REDACTED] [@stantec.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@stantec.com)>

Subject: Re: Little South Solar Farm

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. I contacted [REDACTED] yesterday to chase for an urgent response on the WSI - please let me know if there is still no response from him.

Kind regards,



Principal Planning Officer

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.gov.uk](mailto: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk)

Web: dover.gov.uk

Phone: [REDACTED]



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Sent: 10 September 2024 12:25
To: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Cc: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Subject: Little South Solar Farm

Dear [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

I hope you're well. After our meeting last month in which [REDACTED] laid out what he wished to occur in terms of trial trenching at Little South, Headland Architecture prepared a Written Scheme of Investigation and sent this to [REDACTED] for agreement.

[REDACTED] implied at the meeting that he would be able to sign this off quite quickly but frustratingly he has not responded for quite some time despite several calls and emails, and therefore there are now delays being caused and the window of opportunity in terms of weather and cropping is reducing.

Please could you urgently ask [REDACTED] to respond to Headland and agree the WSI?

The team have stated that if they do not hear quickly, they believe it is reasonable for them to go ahead with the work anyway given that he agreed the key aspects of it in principle in the meeting – and that if he had concerns, he has had plenty of time to raise them. Do you have any concerns about them taking that approach?

Kind regards

[REDACTED]


[REDACTED]

Planning Associate

Direct: + [REDACTED]
Mobile: + [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@stantec.com

Please note: I work part time - I do not work Wednesday afternoons or Fridays.

Stantec
3rd Floor, 50-60 Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JH



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome precauciones adicionales.

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Farm
Date: 19 September 2024 15:49:13

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you again for your email. We have reviewed everything and agree that yes, it is appropriate for us to provide sequential information with to allow for site comparison and so we will prepare and ensure that's included in our next submission. Thank you for flagging that gap.

Would it be helpful for us to have a call at some point in the next week or two to cover what we are intending to submit, before we submit the items, so that we can cover anything missing before we do submit?

Let me know,

Kind regards


[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Planning Associate

Direct: + [REDACTED]
Mobile: + [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@stantec.com

Please note: I work part time - I do not work Wednesday afternoons or Fridays.

Stantec
3rd Floor, 50-60 Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JH



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 9:17 AM
To: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>
Subject: Re: Little South Solar Farm

Dear [REDACTED]

Further to your email, I have been copied into correspondence and understand [REDACTED] will be visiting the site this week. Please let me know if there are any further issues contacting him.

I understand the additional archaeological information/results will be included as part of the updated EIA when available. Having reviewed Chapter 9 water environment document, I note the comments at paragraph 9.39 that as the development is essential infrastructure and within flood

zones 1 and 2, the sequential test is not required. My understanding is that the 'essential infrastructure' relates to the exceptions test rather than the sequential test. Will comparator sites be included in the updated information provided?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Principal Planning Officer

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk

Web: dover.gov.uk

Phone: [REDACTED]



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

Sent: 11 September 2024 09:20

To: [REDACTED]@stantec.com>

Subject: Re: Little South Solar Farm

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. I contacted [REDACTED] yesterday to chase for an urgent response on the WSI - please let me know if there is still no response from him.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Principal Planning Officer

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Email: [REDACTED]@DOVER.gov.uk

Web: dover.gov.uk

Phone: [REDACTED]



Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@stantec.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@stantec.com)>
Sent: 10 September 2024 12:25
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>; [REDACTED] <caitlin.holton@stantec.com>
Subject: Little South Solar Farm

Dear [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

I hope you're well. After our meeting last month in which [REDACTED] laid out what he wished to occur in terms of trial trenching at Little South, Headland Architecture prepared a Written Scheme of Investigation and sent this to [REDACTED] for agreement.

[REDACTED] implied at the meeting that he would be able to sign this off quite quickly but frustratingly he has not responded for quite some time despite several calls and emails, and therefore there are now delays being caused and the window of opportunity in terms of weather and cropping is reducing.

Please could you urgently ask [REDACTED] to respond to Headland and agree the WSI?

The team have stated that if they do not hear quickly, they believe it is reasonable for them to go ahead with the work anyway given that he agreed the key aspects of it in principle in the meeting – and that if he had concerns, he has had plenty of time to raise them. Do you have any concerns about them taking that approach?

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Associate

Direct: + [REDACTED]
Mobile: + [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@stantec.com

Please note: I work part time - I do not work Wednesday afternoons or Fridays.

Stantec
3rd Floor, 50-60 Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JH



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at www.dover.gov.uk/privacy explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome

precauciones adicionales.

Disclaimer: The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. This communication may come from a variety of legal entities within or associated with the Stantec group. For a full list of details for these entities please see our website at www.stantec.com. Where business communications relate to the Stantec UK Limited entity, the registered office is Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1JU Tel: 01494 526240 and the company is registered in England as registration number 01188070.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?
Date: 24 September 2024 17:54:19
Attachments: [image009.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)
[image019.png](#)
[image021.png](#)
[image022.png](#)
[image024.png](#)

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for attending site last Friday to view the evaluation trenches. It was great to be able to meet you in person and get your advice on the progress of the work and the opening up of trenches 1-8 of 10.

To briefly confirm our findings so far, as all trenches have now been opened. Some pot and animal bone has been recorded in newly opened trenches 3 and 4 in the southern part of the central portion of the site but there is currently no evidence of the potential Roman Road running through the centre of the site. However as you know at least two likely Romano-British cremation burials were revealed at the eastern end of Trench 5 and a small child's bracelet that appears to be of similar date. You suggested we expand the excavation on either side of the trench to explore whether further burials might be found and get some idea of the nature and the extent of deposition in the area. Initial estimations are that around 7 pots and up to 3 separate cremation burials are present in total.

We have now applied to the MOJ for a licence to exhume these burials and I hope you agree with our suggested approach, which is to carefully lift one, preferably in association with dateable pottery and send it for analysis by our team. We would then lay Terram down on top and carefully backfill the trench. The landowner John Smith is aware of these finds and is currently happy for them to be deposited in a suitable museum once they have been examined.

Work continues this week with the excavation of a sondage in the west of the site and of a potential Palaeochannel in the north of the site, as well as hand cleaning of the area around the cremations. All trenches will then be recorded and backfilled. I hope to be able to update you on the interim results asap.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



part of the **RSK** Group



[REDACTED] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB
m 07389 706290

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | West Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 0127 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk <[REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 4:31 PM
To: [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear [REDACTED] & [REDACTED]

Thank you for sending over a draft copy of the proposed WSI for trial trenching. I offer the following comments.

In terms of the number and position of the proposed trenches these look broadly reasonable. I suggest however that if archaeology is present in the area of TR1 and TR2 (positioned on the channel edge) then it may be necessary to carry out additional trenching to understand more fully the character and extent of any remains present. I suggest that additional contingency trenching is allowed for in these areas. Similarly, for TR8, it may be necessary to adjust the position of this trench to take account of the results of the trenching (TR3 – 7) along the 'raised spur' of land. So, for example, if the line of the Roman road is evidenced in TR3 – 7 the position of TR8 may need to be adjusted to pick up the projected alignment. Again, I would suggest that some contingency trenching is allowed for here if significant waterlogged timber remains might survive.

Para 2.1.10 notes that test-pits (sondages) are to be excavated into the ends of selected trenches. I would expect to see detail

of these sondages in the scope of works section (6.1) and the methodology for their excavation described in Section 7 in greater detail than the brief mention at 7.1.16 – where will sondages be excavated, how will they be excavated and recorded?

Para 7.1.8 notes that the watching brief does not allow for the excavation of in-situ archaeology – does this mean that if archaeology is encountered it is to be left undisturbed and the geotechnical test-pit abandoned/relocated. If so, then this should be explicitly stated. Otherwise, if in-situ archaeology is to be disturbed by the geotechnical test-pits then there needs to be provision for the investigation and recording of such archaeology before it is disturbed/lost.

On the basis that the above comments will be addressed then I would be happy to agree the WSI.

In terms of a site visit I am available either on Friday 20th or Thursday 19th. I understand that [redacted] is only available on the 19th. If we went with the 19th, then I can only make the morning (meeting on-site at about 11am would suit) – do you think you will have all the trenches cut by then?

Many thanks,

[redacted]

[redacted] | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: [redacted] | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com)>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 3:09 PM
To: [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@kent.gov.uk](mailto:[redacted]@kent.gov.uk)>; [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:[redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk)>
Cc: [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@statkraft.com](mailto:[redacted]@statkraft.com)>; [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com)>; [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@headlandarchaeology.com](mailto:[redacted]@headlandarchaeology.com)>
Subject: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Hi [redacted] and [redacted]

Further to our draft WSI for the trial trenching at Little South Solar, we have agreed a start date with the landowner and plant hire company (Wednesday 18th of September). This accommodates the planting schedule of the landowner who is keen for us to be finished as soon as possible.

I appreciate the WSI has been with you for a little while: we would welcome your comments on it in the meantime but will assume that you are happy with it if we don't hear from you before the commencement of work on site. The WSI is based on our discussion of the EM and ERT surveys and best locations to target as well as the county-specific guidelines you shared with us.

A member of the team inspected soak-away test pits recently and noted sequences of clay-rich deposits immediately beneath the ploughsoil. No sign of any peat or organic-rich deposits in the top 2m (yet). Conversations with the landowner have been interesting- he has land elsewhere which is rich in Romano-British finds, but he says the solar development site is "sterile"- detectorists have found nothing there. The trenching may tell another story!

We would also welcome you to site to inspect the open evaluation trenches.

We think that Friday (20th September) would probably be the best day to visit – say 11.00am? But we can also accommodate you on Thursday the 19th if that is more convenient. We plan to work into the weekend and wrap up the recording then if possible.

If you have any queries, feel free to get in touch.

Many thanks for your help navigating the archaeological requirements,

Best wishes,

[redacted]



[redacted] Director of Consultancy
BA MA PHD MCifA
Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t [redacted] | m [redacted]
www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire | MK45 4HS
t [01525 861 578](tel:01525861578)

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t [01432 364 901](tel:01432364901)

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t [01274 938 019](tel:01274938019)

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t [0161 236 2752](tel:01612362752)

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t [0131 467 7705](tel:01314677705)

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching
Date: 27 September 2024 15:59:04
Attachments: [image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

Dear [REDACTED]

A summary of progress as promised as site works and backfilling have been completed today:

- Key results include
 - No Roman Road
 - At least two cremations, with the possibility of multiple interments in discreet cuts. Romano-British date. Small jet/shale bracelet suggests a child's grave.
 - A single cremation lifted in urn/pot for excavation in lab by human bone specialist.
 - Other exposed remains cleaned, planned, surveyed, and photographed. Covered with geotextile (with landowner's consent) to act as a marker in future, gently back-filled.
 - Peat deposit identified in trench 1 at the end of trench within channel- sampled for processing
- Post ex work will commence next week. Likely to be an interim statement pending any specialist reports being completed- the key information to inform determination will be in the interim report (nature, date, significance of remains).

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED] Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB
m [REDACTED]

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 01274 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2024 5:54 PM
To: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@headlandarchaeology.com; [REDACTED]@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@statkraft.com; [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for attending site last Friday to view the evaluation trenches. It was great to be able to meet you in person and get your advice on the progress of the work and the opening up of trenches 1-8 of 10.

To briefly confirm our findings so far, as all trenches have now been opened. Some pot and animal bone has been recorded in newly opened trenches 3 and 4 in the southern part of the central portion of the site but there is currently no evidence of the potential Roman Road running through the centre of the site. However as you know at least two likely Romano-British cremation burials were revealed at the eastern end of Trench 5 and a small child's bracelet that appears to be of similar date. You suggested we expand the excavation on either side of the trench to explore whether further burials might be found and get some idea of the nature and the extent of deposition in the area. Initial estimations are that around 7 pots and up to 3 separate cremation burials are present in total.

We have now applied to the MOJ for a licence to exhume these burials and I hope you agree with our suggested approach, which is to carefully lift one, preferably in association with dateable pottery and send it for analysis by our team. We would then lay Terram down on top and carefully backfill the trench. The landowner John Smith is aware of the these finds and is currently happy for them to be deposited in a suitable museum once they have been examined.

Work continues this week with the excavation of a sondage in the west of the site and of a potential Palaeochannel in the north of the site, as well as hand cleaning of the area around the cremations. All trenches will then be recorded and backfilled. I hope to be able to update you on the interim results asap.

Kind regards,



██████████ Archaeology and Built Heritage Consultant

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
2nd Floor Chancery Exchange 10 Furnival Street | London | EC4A 1AB
m ██████████

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire MK45 4HS
t 01525 861 578

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t 01432 364 901

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t 0127 493 8019

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t 0161 236 2757

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t 0131 467 7705

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: ██████████@kent.gov.uk <██████████@kent.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 4:31 PM
To: ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com; ██████████@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: M ██████████@statkraft.com; ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com; ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com; ██████████@DOVER.GOV.UK
Subject: RE: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Dear ██████████ & ██████████

Thank you for sending over a draft copy of the proposed WSI for trial trenching. I offer the following comments.

In terms of the number and position of the proposed trenches these look broadly reasonable. I suggest however that if archaeology is present in the area of TR1 and TR2 (positioned on the channel edge) then it may be necessary to carry out additional trenching to understand more fully the character and extent of any remains present. I suggest that additional contingency trenching is allowed for in these areas. Similarly, for TR8, it may be necessary to adjust the position of this trench to take account of the results of the trenching (TR3 – 7) along the 'raised spur' of land. So, for example, if the line of the Roman road is evidenced in TR3 – 7 the position of TR8 may need to be adjusted to pick up the projected alignment. Again, I would suggest that some contingency trenching is allowed for here if significant waterlogged timber remains might survive.

Para 2.1.10 notes that test-pits (sondages) are to be excavated into the ends of selected trenches. I would expect to see detail of these sondages in the scope of works section (6.1) and the methodology for their excavation described in Section 7 in greater detail than the brief mention at 7.1.16 – where will sondages be excavated, how will they be excavated and recorded?

Para 7.1.8 notes that the watching brief does not allow for the excavation of in-situ archaeology – does this mean that if archaeology is encountered it is to be left undisturbed and the geotechnical test-pit abandoned/relocated. If so, then this should be explicitly stated. Otherwise, if in-situ archaeology is to be disturbed by the geotechnical test-pits then there needs to be provision for the investigation and recording of such archaeology before it is disturbed/lost.

On the basis that the above comments will be addressed then I would be happy to agree the WSI.

In terms of a site visit I am available either on Friday 20th or Thursday 19th. I understand that ██████████ is only available on the 19th. If we went with the 19th, then I can only make the morning (meeting on-site at about 11am would suit) – do you think you will have all the trenches cut by then?

Many thanks,



██████████ | Senior Archaeological Officer | Heritage Conservation | Kent County Council | Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX |

Telephone: ██████████ | www.kent.gov.uk |

Please help save paper by NOT printing this email unless absolutely necessary.

From: ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 3:09 PM
To: ██████████@kent.gov.uk; ██████████@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Cc: ██████████@statkraft.com; ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com; ██████████@headlandarchaeology.com

Subject: Little South Solar Evaluation Trial Trenching: start date and site visit?

Hi [redacted] and [redacted]

Further to our draft WSI for the trial trenching at Little South Solar, we have agreed a start date with the landowner and plant hire company (Wednesday 18th of September). This accommodates the planting schedule of the landowner who is keen for us to be finished as soon as possible.

I appreciate the WSI has been with you for a little while: we would welcome your comments on it in the meantime but will assume that you are happy with it if we don't hear from you before the commencement of work on site. The WSI is based on our discussion of the EM and ERT surveys and best locations to target as well as the county-specific guidelines you shared with us.

A member of the team inspected soak-away test pits recently and noted sequences of clay-rich deposits immediately beneath the ploughsoil. No sign of any peat or organic-rich deposits in the top 2m (yet). Conversations with the landowner have been interesting- he has land elsewhere which is rich in Romano-British finds, but he says the solar development site is "sterile"- detectorists have found nothing there. The trenching may tell another story!

We would also welcome you to site to inspect the open evaluation trenches.

We think that Friday (20th September) would probably be the best day to visit – say 11.00am? But we can also accommodate you on Thursday the 19th if that is more convenient. We plan to work into the weekend and wrap up the recording then if possible.

If you have any queries, feel free to get in touch.

Many thanks for your help navigating the archaeological requirements,

Best wishes,

[redacted]



[redacted] Director of Consultancy
BA MA PhD MCifA

Headland Archaeology North West
172 Chester Road | Helsby | WA6 0AR
t [redacted] | m [redacted]

www.headlandarchaeology.com



Headland Archaeology South & East
Building 68C | Wrest Park
Silsoe | Bedfordshire | MK45 4HS
t [01525 861 578](tel:01525861578)

Headland Archaeology Midlands & West
Unit 1 | Clearview Court | Twyford Rd
Hereford | HR2 6JR
t [01432 364 901](tel:01432364901)

Headland Archaeology Yorkshire & North
Units 23-25 | Acorn Business Centre | Balme Road
Cleckheaton | BD19 4EZ
t [01274 938 019](tel:01274938019)

Headland Archaeology North West
RSK Fourways House | 57 Hilton St
Manchester | M1 2EJ
t [0161 236 2757](tel:01612362757)

Headland Archaeology Scotland
13 Jane St
Edinburgh | EH6 5HE
t [0131 467 7705](tel:01314677705)

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd is a company registered in Scotland under number 342945.
Registered office: 65 Sussex Street, Glasgow, G41 1DX.

Confidentiality Note: The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this email is prohibited and may be unlawful.