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<Name of person consulting>

<Address of consulting organisation>

Your Ref: <Reference>

Our Ref: <Primary Reference Number>

Contact: <Casework Officer>

Direct Dial: <Casework Officer Number>

Email: <Casework Officer Email>

<Completion Date>

Dear <Contact Name>,

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)**

**NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK 2021**

**<Consultation Name>**

<*Proposal Description*>

**Recommend Archaeological Condition(s)**

Thank you for your consultation received on <Log Date>.

The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) gives advice on archaeology and planning. Our advice follows the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the GLAAS Charter.

Assessment of Significance and Impact

<Archaeological Priority Area>

<Assessment of Significance>

Planning Policies

NPPF Section 16 and the London Plan (2021 Policy HC1) recognise the positive contribution of heritage assets of all kinds and make the conservation of archaeological interest a material planning consideration. NPPF paragraph 194 says applicants should provide an archaeological assessment if their development could affect a heritage asset of archaeological interest.

NPPF paragraphs 190 and 197 and London Plan Policy HC1 emphasise the positive contributions heritage assets can make to sustainable communities and places. Where appropriate, applicants should therefore also expect to identify enhancement opportunities.

If you grant planning consent, paragraph 205 of the NPPF says that applicants should record the significance of any heritage assets that the development harms. Applicants should also improve knowledge of assets and make this public.

Recommendations

I advise that the development could cause harm to archaeological remains and field evaluation is needed to determine appropriate mitigation. However, although the NPPF envisages evaluation being undertaken prior to determination, in this case consideration of the nature of the development, the archaeological interest and/or practical constraints are such that I consider a two-stage archaeological condition could provide an acceptable safeguard. This would comprise firstly, evaluation to clarify the nature and extent of surviving remains, followed, if necessary, by a full investigation.

I therefore recommend attaching a condition as follows:

Condition No demolition or development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

1. The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
2. Where appropriate, details of a programme for delivering related positive public benefits
3. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the stage 2 WSI.

Informative Written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England’s Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

This pre-commencement condition is necessary to safeguard the archaeological interest on this site. Approval of the WSI before works begin on site provides clarity on what investigations are required, and their timing in relation to the development programme. If the applicant does not agree to this pre-commencement condition, please let us know their reasons and any alternatives suggested. Without this pre-commencement condition being imposed the application should be refused as it would not comply with NPPF paragraph 205.

I envisage that the archaeological fieldwork would comprise the following:

<Mitigation>

You can find more information on archaeology and planning in Greater London on our website.

This response relates solely to archaeological considerations. If necessary, Historic England’s Development Advice Team should be consulted separately regarding statutory matters.

Yours sincerely

<Casework Officer>

Archaeology Adviser

Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service

London and South East Region