
Response to Archaeological Consultation regarding Planning Applications P-19-059 and P-19-060.

I am writing to provide further information regarding the proposed Archaeology Condition for the excavation-related works for the proposed Staff Dwelling (Application P-19-060) and 2x Shepherds Huts (Application P-19-059).

We are aware of the areas of archaeological interest in sites close to the Vineyard and we would not wish to risk disturbing or damaging archaeology in the proposed dig locations through undertaking works without due care and attention. We are self-funding the project however, and with limited budget we would like to ensure that the requirement for a WSI and Watching Brief is informed by the recent history and current condition of the site. This letter is therefore presented to provide further information to request confirmation or otherwise revision of the recommendation for the Condition based on your considered opinion.

The current owners of the Vineyard – Val and Graham Thomas – have worked the Vineyard for the last 23 years and the land was previously run as a flower farm by Val's father. The current owners therefore have a good knowledge of the works undertaken on the Vineyard in the past 40-50 years.

Due the agricultural management of the site, they confirm that the land has been well dug over and ploughed for the cultivation of flowers and vines up to a depth of 2ft in recent times. This would indicate that the soil horizon which would be disturbed for 225mm concrete raft foundations (for the dwelling) or concrete pads (for the Shepherds Hut) are likely to have been significantly disturbed through agricultural management to a greater depth in the recent past. Any trenching would be within this 2ft soil horizon also; however the soakaway for the Shepherds Huts, whilst limited to just a couple of square metres in area, is however likely to run slightly deeper to around 1m.

The land in question is blown sand – this is identified in the BGS maps of the Islands and confirmed by Val and Graham – an example image below illustrates the soil conditions in the land in question.

In terms of recent development in similar areas of the Island, the erection of a Staff Dwelling at Adam's Fish and Chip Shop (P-17-080) was initially subject to a recommendation for the same condition, but this was subsequently withdrawn when the applicant provided additional information on the underlying geology and recent working of the site. I have attached this response as an appendix for ease of reference. The location of this dwelling – now completed – is approximately 90m to the west of the proposed location of the proposed Staff Dwelling within the vineyard, and in a functionally equivalent location in relation to the shoreline. Comparison of photographs indicate that the underlying soil conditions are very similar if not equivalent.

Other developments within the Vineyard in the last 20 years have not been subject to archaeology conditions – these include the installation of foundations for the shop and tractor shed; the 'electric' shed; the septic tank; and the well/bore hole which are considered to be of equal or greater potential impact. These developments were undertaken carefully and no signs of archaeological interest were noted.

If, upon consideration of the above, you would consider that the proposed condition remains proportionate and appropriate to the risk of archaeology being present, then we would be happy to accept this as part of and permission granted. However if this additional information would indicate that the risk of disturbing or damaging areas of archaeological interest is lower, then we would request that a formal condition is not placed upon any determination, though we would proceed with all works with due care and attention regardless and cease works if any suspicions were raised.

Yours sincerely,

James Faulconbridge



Photograph 01 – showing the soil profile for the first 2ft at the proposed site of the Staff Dwelling on the Vineyard.

Appendix 1

-

Applicant Response to Archaeological Consultation for Planning Application P-17-080

P17 080



Response to Cornwall archaeological unit; re proposed condition.

We wish to object to the proposed archaeology condition as we have carefully designed the foundations and chosen the site so as not to disturb any remains. Literally we wish to skim of the turf and fill the hole made by the existing septic tank which we propose to move further down the existing drain pipe line in the next field.

When we excavated for the septic tank in 2009, it was clean blown sand dune down to two meters +, (a pile of which is still on site). The service trench is also mainly through top soil (more sand with grass in it) graded from the chip shop site.

We appreciate that the CAU has no way of knowing the ground conditions so (if absolutely essential) suggest that a qualified archaeologist simply watch such excavations as there are and report only IF there are any findings?

Although cost is not a planning consideration, this development is only possible by doing all the construction work ourselves for cost of materials and a very short window of opportunity exists over the winter months before an early Easter start to next season. Unlike a holiday let, there is no significant income from this development, even to offset council tax, rent & insurance costs. Extra cost and delays in reporting will make it all but impossible.

Adam Morton.



Soil conditions on chip shop site 2009



RECEIVED BY THE
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
11 OCT 2017

Soil excavated from the septic tank hole on proposed site 2009



Sample of soil on site (same as chip shop site)

