|  |
| --- |
|  |

<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 2019**

**<Consultation Name>**

<*Proposal Description*>

**Recommend Pre-Determination Archaeological Assessment/Evaluation**

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

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

Assessment of Significance and Impact

**EITHER** if there is no related Archaeological Priority Area:

The planning application lies in an area of archaeological interest.

**OR** if there is a related archaeological priority area:

The planning application lies in an area of archaeological interest (Archaeological Priority Area) identified in the Local Plan: <Associated Heritage Assets and Areas: Heritage Area/Heritage Area Names/Heritage Area Name>]

<Assessment of Significance>

Planning Policies

NPPF Section 16 and the London Plan (2017 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 189 says applicants should provide an archaeological assessment if their development could affect a heritage asset of archaeological interest. A field evaluation may also be necessary.

NPPF paragraphs 193 - 194 place great weight on conserving designated heritage assets, including non-designated heritage assets with an archaeological interest equivalent to scheduled monuments. Non- designated heritage assets may also merit conservation depending upon their significance and the harm caused (NPPF paragraph 197). Conservation can mean design changes to preserve remains where they are.

NPPF paragraphs 185 and 192 and London Plan Policy HC1 emphasise the positive contributions heritage assets can make to sustainable communities and places. Applicants should therefore expect to identify appropriate enhancement opportunities.

If preservation is not achievable then if you grant planning consent, paragraph 199 of the NPPF says that applicants should record the significance of any heritage assets that the development harms.

Recommendations

Having looked at this proposal and at the Greater London Historic Environment Record but I need more information before I can advise you on the effects on archaeological interest and their implications for the planning decision. If you do not receive more archaeological information before you take a planning decision, I recommend that you include the applicant’s failure to submit that as a reason for refusal.

Because of this, I advise the applicant completes these studies to inform the application:

<*Mitigation Type*>

<Mitigation>

I will need to agree the work beforehand and it should be carried out by an archaeological practice appointed by the applicant. The report on the work must set out the significance of the site and the impact of the proposed development. I will read the report and then advise you on the planning application.

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 Advisor

Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service

London and South East Region