



John Macholc
Head of Planning Services
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
BB7 2RA

Phone: 07847 200073

Email: Lancashire.archaeology@gmail.com

Your ref: 3/2018/0754

Date: 3rd January 2019

FAO H McCartney

Dear Mr Macholc,

Planning Application 3/2018/0754: Creation of a new off-road, multi-use gravel track 2.5m wide between the villages of Downham and Chatburn. The one kilometre connection would accommodate walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and those with mobility issues including chair users. Field boundary alongside Chatburn Road Downham BB7 4DL

The above application is for a new hard-surfaced path along the north side of Chatburn Road east of the A59 to the houses and café at Greendale View, continuing after the houses to the junction with Green Lane and a short distance alongside that road, before crossing the lane and the field to its southeast to re-join Chatburn Road opposite Downham Hall Home Farm. Whilst we would not object in principal to the establishment of a new path here, it is notable that the proposal is not accompanied by a Heritage Statement (HS), despite the proposed path crossing the course of the Roman Road from Ribchester to Elslack as shown on the application location plan.

The line of this section of the Roman road is well-established and can be followed as an earthwork in Downham Park on the south side of Chatburn Road and running from the Green Lane/Chatburn Road junction slightly north of east into Town End Croft Wood and beyond. This line is described in both Ivan Margary's *'Roman Roads in Britain'* (1957, Vol. 2 pp.104-6) and Philip Graystone's *'Walking Roman Roads in the Fylde and Ribble Valley'* (1996, pp.80-2). The section to be crossed by the proposed path is recorded on the Lancashire Historic Environment Record (HER) as PRNs 15518 and 26145, it is also shown as an earthwork on modern OS vector mapping. The visible earthwork is likely to be the 'agger' or raised mound of the road, flanked by roadside drainage ditches. It is also possible that further parallel ditches, one to each side of the road line, existed to delineate a wider 'road zone' – examples of this have been found alongside other Roman roads in the county. The construction of this part of the path (Section 1) is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the remains of the Roman road and to require some archaeological mitigation and/or a change in construction technique.

In addition to the impact on the Roman Road, the proposed path has the potential to impact on at least three other heritage assets noted on the HER. These include the (approximate) site of a Roman coin hoard, noted by the former county archaeologist, Ben Edwards, at SD 775 442 (north side of Chatburn Road, near the A59 – PRN2217). This findspot is poorly documented and, whilst believable, would not be a significant constraint to the proposed path although construction in this area should be monitored in case further coins appear.

The second site is what has been reported as the possible site of late medieval archery butts at SD 77944435 (north side of Chatburn Road, to the east of Greendale View – PRN34953) reported to be shown on a map of 1595 in the National Archives (ref DL/4/37/46) relating to a legal dispute between Richard Assheton and 'a man from Clitheroe'. It is described as: "*two semi-circular stone features facing each other west of Downham ... erected in accordance with the Statute for the Maintenance of Artillery [of] 1541/2*". The researcher then states that a "*shallow tree-filled depression about 30m long running alongside the road*" may represent the remains of this feature. This may be the case, but it is also possible (and perhaps more likely) that the hollow is part of an older line of Chatburn Road, abandoned at some point for the present routeway, or an over-large roadside ditch (or quarry scoop, below). This depression would appear to be directly impacted by the proposed path on the east side of Greendale, although the level of impact is difficult to establish as the hollow has not been mapped. The significance of this impact is unknown, and would depend upon whether the hollow is the remains of the medieval butts (which are rare) or a former line of a road or ditch (probably post-medieval and not particularly rare). Mitigation, if the hollow is to be damaged by the proposed path, is likely to involve a rapid survey record and a watching brief.

The third site is the area of limestone quarrying and lime burning which was the subject of the 1595 dispute and another in 1593. This is described as north of the present Chatburn Road, almost at Chatburn, with the approximate NGR of SD 776443. At this date lime burning will have been in small clamp kilns, cut into the ground, rather than the later stone-built kilns which are a reasonably familiar sight in the area. At least one (and possibly more) such kiln has been recorded a little to the northeast on Downham Green. In the vicinity of this NGR is an area of uneven ground, shown in a photograph on the 'details' sheet with the title "*Re-profile (cut and fill) for 70m length*". The photograph suggests that this feature may be a former quarry but it may be something else – it is even possible that this was a quarry for stone for the adjacent Roman road. The sharpness of the earthworks would perhaps suggest that it is of fairly recent date, but it could potentially be Roman or late medieval, with some later re-working e.g. for walling stone. If of early date this feature could be important, although a post-medieval walling-stone quarry would be of negligible significance. This site needs to be checked and its origins and date established. If necessary an appropriate scheme of mitigation will need to be agreed.

There are other known heritage assets in the immediate area, some of which are designated (e.g. the Listed milestone at the junction of Chatburn Road and Green Lane), but the scheme as proposed does not seem likely to impact them.

We would therefore make the following recommendations:

- 1 The whole line of the proposed path should be walked by an appropriately qualified and experienced archaeologist and the probable impact of the scheme on known and unknown heritage assets established and the significance of that impact assessed. This will need to include some documentary research, including consulting the HER.
- 2 Unless all remains can be shown to have already been destroyed, the section of path that crosses the Roman road should be redesigned to minimise ground disturbance and thus damage to the remains.
- 3 A formal scheme of impact mitigation should be developed and agreed with the Council. As a minimum this should include an archaeological watching brief during ground disturbance and the creation of a formal report for submission to the Historic Environment Record, but it may also include survey of the extant earthworks, alterations to the route or other works.
- 4 The agreed scheme of mitigation should be implemented as part of the development scheme.

The council may also wish to consider if an information board should also be erected as part of the scheme, perhaps describing the Roman road and the medieval lime burning and other nearby heritage features.

Items 1 and 2 above should be undertaken prior to any planning consent being granted. It would be preferable for item 3 also to be completed, so that only a condition requiring the implementation of the agreed scheme would be necessary on any consent granted.

It would, however, be possible for items 3 and 4 to be made subject to a 'scheme of archaeological works' planning condition and we would be happy to advise on the wording of such a condition if that was preferred.

This advice is provided in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (MoHCLG 2018), in particular: "*In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting...*" (189), "*The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application...*" (197) and "*Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible*" (199).

Please note that the above comments have been made without the benefit of a site visit.

Yours sincerely

Peter Iles