

To: Archaeology - Hampshire County Council      Date: 26th February 2024  
From: Southern Team      Tel: 01264 368978

**PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION**

Please complete and return to the case officer by **7 March 2024**

If no response is received by this date it will be taken that you have no comments to make.

**Case Officer:** Mr Paul Goodman  
**Application No:** 24/00458/SCRS  
**Proposal:** Request for Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion under Regulation 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 for installation and implementation of a portable water transfer scheme  
**Location:** Reservoir, Upper Toothill Road, Rownhams, NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS  
**TPO:** Yes/No  
**Conservation Area:** Yes/No      **Listed Building**      Yes/No  
**Development Type:** Non Planning Submissions

**Case Officer Comments:**

---

**Response on application as submitted**

**No Objection**       **No Comment**       **Objection**   
(subject to conditions)      (specify planning reasons for refusal)

**Conditions/Reasons for refusal:**

**Other comments:**

Thank you for your consultation regarding the EIA screening opinion. I would refer you to chapter 5 of the Screening Report, the archaeological desk based assessment submitted and the geophysical survey results submitted, each of which I would endorse to you.

The development will not directly impact any Scheduled Monuments and impacts on the setting of the monuments will be 'slight and temporary' during the construction phase (DBA 12.4) (SCR 5.1.1 and 5.2). There is the potential for the works to disturb archaeological remains (SCR 5.1) and this is described in detail in the Desk Based Assessment. However no insurmountable or significant archaeological constraints have been identified. It is proposed to mitigate the direct impact on archaeological remains (SCR 5.2 and 5.3) (DBA section 12). This mitigation has been discussed in draft with me as the County Archaeologist (and Test Valley Borough Council's archaeological advisor)

(SCR 5.4) (DBA 12) and I am happy to endorse the mitigation that has been proposed.

An iterative approach is being suggested. A preliminary geophysical survey has been carried out and the results are presented with this screening request. The results have identified some archaeological potential but no archaeological remains which appear to be insurmountable or significant enough to defect the proposed pipeline. A preliminary trial trenching proposal has been put forward (SCR 5.3) (DBA 12.2). In light of the results of this and the geophysical results some areas will be identified as meriting prior archaeological excavation. In other areas a watching brief may be maintained and might trigger some further excavation (DBA 12.5). No mitigation is proposed where the pipeline will run in an existing highway. Where historic hedgerows are impacted there will be some record made and any associated bank will be reinstated afterwards. I would endorse this approach.

I am happy that archaeological matters are, to date, being addressed in an appropriate manner and take reassurance from the provisions of the submission that the archaeological advisors of Test Valley Borough Council and Winchester City Council will continue to be consulted.

I would refer you to para 5.5 of the screening opinion report that

“Having regard to the selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the EIA Regulations 2017 and the location and nature of the Proposed Scheme, with predominately buried pipeline and careful siting and selection of construction techniques and embedded mitigation, it is considered that the Proposed Scheme is unlikely to have significant effects on the environment in relation to cultural heritage and archaeology within the meaning of the EIA Regulations 2017. This is based on the information presented and the implementation of the mitigation as set out above”.

I would agree. Whilst it is important that the impact of the development on archaeological remains is appropriately addressed and mitigated I do not feel that the impact will be a ‘significant effect’ within the EIA definition.

Yours sincerely

**Consultee Name:** David Hopkins (County Archaeologist)  
**Date of reply:** 27/2/2024