

Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Revision ~~A~~B (Tracked)

Prepared by Lanpro Services

~~January~~February 2026

PINS reference: EN010170

Document reference: ~~EX4~~CR2/GH6.3.12.6_~~AB~~

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)



Schedule of Changes

Revision	Section Reference	Description of Changes	Reason for Revision
A	[cover]	Updated to Revision A	As required for submission at Deadline 4.
	[throughout]	Updates to document references	As required for submission at Deadline 4.
	[throughout]	Minor wording amendments to clarify and strengthen the methodology, provide greater certainty on mitigation measures, sequencing and decision-making, and to address comments raised by Historic England.	As required for submission at Deadline 4 following feedback in Issue Specific Hearing 1.
<u>B</u>	<u>[cover]</u>	<u>Updated to Revision B</u>	<u>As required for submission at Deadline 5 and with the Change Application</u>
	<u>[throughout]</u>	<u>Updates to document references</u>	<u>As required for submission at Deadline 5 and with the Change Application</u>
	<u>Table 6.1.1</u>	<u>Update to Table 6.1.1 in line with the Cabling Technical Addendum [CR2/GH8.4.2] and Change Application [CR2/GH9.6], as agreed with Historic England, Northamptonshire County Archaeologist and Milton Keynes City Archaeologist.</u>	<u>As required for submission at Deadline 5 and with the Change Application</u>
	<u>[Section 7.3]</u>	<u>Minor wording amendments to provide greater certainty on mitigation measures regarding cabling requirements identified within areas of mitigatory planting, as agreed with Historic England and Northamptonshire County Archaeologist.</u>	<u>As required for submission at Deadline 5 and with the Change Application</u>
	<u>Figures</u>	<u>Updates to figures to reflect changes to text. FF19-01 and FF27-01 changed to Directional Drilling or Strip, Map and Sample. GF3-02 and GF3-04 changed to strip, map and sample.</u>	<u>As required for submission at Deadline 5 and with the</u>



			Change Application
--	--	--	------------------------------------



Contents

Schedule of Changes	1
Contents	2
List of Figures	5
1 Introduction	6
2 Site Location and Description	8
2.1 Site Location	8
2.2 Geology and Topography	9
3 Archaeological Baseline	10
3.1 Introduction	10
3.2 Sites A and A.2 (Figure 2)	10
3.3 Site B (Figure 3)	12
3.4 Sites C to E (Figure 4 and 5)	14
3.5 Site F (Figure 7)	16
3.6 Site G (Figure 8)	18
3.7 BESS Site (Figure 6)	19
3.8 Cable Route Corridor (Figure 9-13)	21
4 Research Aims	22
4.1 Aims and Objectives	22
4.2 Research Framework	23
5 Standards and Guidance	29
6 Scope of Mitigation Fieldwork	30
7 Fieldwork Methodology	40
7.1 Personnel	40
7.2 Project Initialisation	40
7.3 Preservation <i>in situ</i>	40
7.4 Mechanical Excavation	41
7.5 Strip, Map and Sample Excavation	42
7.6 Archaeological Monitoring	43
7.7 Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required	44
7.8 Hand Excavation and Recording	45
7.9 Finds Recovery	46
7.10 Paleoenvironmental Sampling	47
7.11 Human Remains	47
7.12 Strategy Review	48
7.13 Unexpectedly Significant or Complex Discoveries	49
8 Post-Excavation Assessment	50
8.2 Finds Processing	50
8.3 Environmental Sample Processing	50
8.4 Human Remains Processing	51
8.5 Conservation	51
8.6 Assessment Report	52
9 Post-Excavation Analysis	54



<u>10</u>	<u>Decommissioning</u>	<u>56</u>
<u>11</u>	<u>Archiving and Data Management</u>	<u>57</u>
11.1	Archive Content	57
11.2	Data Management	58
<u>12</u>	<u>Public Outreach and Engagement</u>	<u>59</u>
<u>13</u>	<u>Staffing</u>	<u>60</u>
<u>14</u>	<u>Project Timetable</u>	<u>61</u>
<u>15</u>	<u>Monitoring</u>	<u>62</u>
<u>16</u>	<u>Communication</u>	<u>63</u>
<u>17</u>	<u>Copyright and Publicity</u>	<u>64</u>
<u>18</u>	<u>Insurance</u>	<u>65</u>
<u>19</u>	<u>Health and Safety</u>	<u>66</u>
<u>20</u>	<u>References</u>	<u>68</u>
<u>Figures</u>		<u>72</u>



~~Issue Sheet~~



Schedule of Changes	1
Contents	3
List of Figures	9
1 Introduction	10
2 Site Location and Description	12
2.1 Site Location	12
2.2 Geology and Topography	13
3 Archaeological Baseline	14
3.1 Introduction	14
3.2 Sites A and A.2 (Figure 2)	14
3.3 Site B (Figure 3)	16
3.4 Sites C to E (Figure 4 and 5)	18
3.5 Site F (Figure 7)	20
3.6 Site G (Figure 8)	22
3.7 BESS Site (Figure 6)	23
3.8 Cable Route Corridor (Figure 9-13)	25
4 Research Aims	26
4.1 Aims and Objectives	26
4.2 Research Framework	27
5 Standards and Guidance	33
6 Scope of Mitigation Fieldwork	34
7 Fieldwork Methodology	44
7.1 Personnel	44
7.2 Project Initialisation	44
7.3 Preservation <i>in situ</i>	44
7.4 Mechanical Excavation	45
7.5 Strip, Map and Sample Excavation	46
7.6 Archaeological Monitoring	47
7.7 Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required	48
7.8 Hand Excavation and Recording	49
7.9 Finds Recovery	50
7.10 Paleoenvironmental Sampling	51
7.11 Human Remains	52
7.12 Strategy Review	52
7.13 Unexpectedly Significant or Complex Discoveries	53
8 Post-Excavation Assessment	54
8.2 Finds Processing	54
8.3 Environmental Sample Processing	54
8.4 Human Remains Processing	55
8.5 Conservation	55
8.6 Assessment Report	56
9 Post-Excavation Analysis	58



10	Decommissioning	60
11	Archiving and Data Management	61
11.1	Archive Content	61
11.2	Data Management	62
12	Public Outreach and Engagement	63
13	Staffing	64
14	Project Timetable	65
15	Monitoring	66
16	Communication	67
17	Copyright and Publicity	68
18	Insurance	69
19	Health and Safety	70
20	References	72
	Figures	76



Issue Sheet

Report Prepared for: Green Hill Solar

Farm Examination – Deadline ~~4~~5

Green Hill Solar Farm: Archaeological Mitigation Strategy Revision ~~A~~B

Prepared by

Name: Natalie Wood BA (hons) MCIfA

Job title: Principal Historic Environment
Consultant

Approved by

Name: Alice James BA (hons) MSc MCIfA

Job title: Technical Director (Historic
Environment)

Revision	Date	Prepared by	Approved by
Original	01/05/2025	NW	AJ
Revision A	14/01/2026	NW	AJ
<u>Revision B</u>	<u>17/02/2026</u>	<u>NW</u>	<u>AJ</u>



List of Figures

- Figure 1. General location of proposed archaeological mitigation areas
- Figure 2. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill Site A and A.2 and cable route
- Figure 3. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill Site B and cable route
- Figure 4. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill Site C to D and cable route
- Figure 5. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill Site E and cable route
- Figure 6. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill BESS site and cable route
- Figure 7. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill Site F and cable route
- Figure 8. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill Site G and cable route
- Figure 9. Proposed cable route mitigation areas CR1a.3 and CR1a.7
- Figure 10. Proposed cable route mitigation areas CR1a.12, CR1a.16, CR1a.19, CR1b.17, CR2a.5 and CR2a.6
- Figure 11. Proposed cable route mitigation areas CR5a.6, CR5a.7, CR5a.12, CR5a.18, CR5a.23 and CR5a.25
- Figure 12. Proposed cable route mitigation areas CR6.5, CR6.18, CR6.21 and CR7.11
- Figure 13. Proposed cable route mitigation areas CR9a.6 and CR9a.7



1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) has been prepared by Lanpro Services Ltd on behalf of Green Hill Solar Farm ('the Applicant').
- 1.1.2 The AMS details the overarching methodology for undertaking a programme of archaeological mitigation within the proposed Green Hill Solar Farm area ('the Scheme') in support of an application for a Development Consent Order (the DCO). Project Designs ('Written Schemes of Investigation') will be appended to this AMS for each phase of works.
- 1.1.3 The AMS will be updated following the completion of the archaeological fieldwork and site work elements of the programme of archaeological evaluation which will inform decisions on the need for any further archaeological mitigation in areas of the Scheme not trenched during the pre-application evaluation works. Should this be required, the scope of any additional archaeological mitigation will be detailed in approved Written Schemes of Investigation(s) (WSIs) in line with the mitigation methodology detailed in Section 6, and these will be attached as addendum to this overarching AMS.
- 1.1.4 The Scheme will comprise the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of a solar photovoltaic (PV) electricity generating facility and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with a total capacity exceeding 50 megawatts (MW). The Scheme comprises nine Sites which are connected by a Cable Route Corridor to the Point of Connection at Grendon National Grid Substation.
- 1.1.5 The Scheme sites ('the Sites') are described in detail in **Chapter 3** of the Environmental Statement (ES) and descriptions of the Scheme proposals are provided in **Chapter 4** of the ES ('Scheme Description').
- 1.1.6 This AMS has been informed by the results of several previous stages of archaeological desk-based assessment (**ES Appendix 12.2**; Lanpro 2025a, 2025b; 2025c; 2025d; 2025e, 2025f), aerial photographic and LiDAR interpretation (**ES Appendix 12.3**; Deegan 2025), a geophysical survey (**ES Appendix 12.4**; ASWYAS 2023, 2024a, 2024b; 2024c; 2024d, 2024e, 2025), and an extensive programme of evaluation trenching (**ES Appendix 12.5**; CFA 2025a, 2025b; 2025c; 2025d;). These have been produced to support the ES and are appended to that document in the following Appendices to Chapter 12 ('Cultural Heritage') **[APP-049]**. This document should be read together with the supporting documents:
- **ES Appendix 12.2** Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments (DBAs) **[APP-121 to APP-127]**
 - **ES Appendix 12.3** Aerial Photographic and LiDAR mapping and interpretation **[APP-128]**
 - **ES Appendix 12.4** Archaeological Geophysical Survey Reports **[REP1-059 to REP1-078]**
 - **ES Appendix 12.5** Archaeological Evaluation (Interim) Reports **[APP-139 to APP-145]**



- 1.1.7 This AMS also takes into account the results of consultation and engagement undertaken with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) and Historic England, throughout these stages of work, including regular meetings undertaken to monitor the progress of the evaluation trenching.
- 1.1.8 The proposed mitigation strategy detailed in this AMS provides for a programme of 'strip, map and sample', and archaeological monitoring, based on the location of identified archaeological remains where there is considered to be potential for such remains to be impacted by the Scheme. It also provides for preservation of archaeological remains *in situ* where possible through the use of non-intrusive construction methodology (such as surface mounted pre-cast concrete ground anchors which is a standard accepted approach to removing the impact of solar mounts upon potential archaeological sub-surface remains (BRE 2013, 13)), and the removal of specific areas of the Scheme from any proposed development work.



2 Site Location and Description

2.1 Site Location

2.1.1 The proposed Green Hill Solar Farm comprises nine sites (Sites A, A.2, B, C, D, E, F, G and BESS; Figure 1). Eight of the sites are located between Northampton and Wellingborough in Northamptonshire (Sites A to F and BESS). Site G is located to the north of Lavendon in Buckinghamshire. Collectively the sites cover approximately c.1200ha.

2.1.2 The sites are surrounded by several rural settlements. From north to south: Site A is located central to Mawsley, Old and Walgrave; Site A.2 is located to the east of Walgrave, Site B is located between Holcot and Moulton, Site C is located to the north-east of Sywell; Site D is located to the north of Mears Ashby, Site E is located between Mears Ashby, Wellingborough and Earls Barton; the BESS site is located to the north of Grendon; Site F is located between Grendon, Easton Maudit and Bozeat; and Site G is located to the north of Lavendon.

2.1.3 Details of the size, location, historic and modern parishes and current land-use for each of the sites in provided in Table 2.1.1 below:

Table 2.1.1: Details of the sites within the Scheme

Site	Area (ha)	Centroid	Historic Parish	Modern Parish	Current land use
A	174	480332.9 273527.8	Wold and Walgrave	Old CP and Walgrave CP	Arable / Pasture
A.2	65	482245.3 272911.8	Wold and Walgrave	Old CP and Walgrave CP	Arable
B	65	479327.1 268435.4	Moulton and Holcot	Holcot CP	Arable
C	56	483473.6 268404.2	Mears Ashby and Sywell	Mears Ashby CP and Sywell CP	Arable
D	42	484263.3 267850.5	Mears Ashby	Mears Ashby CP	Arable
E	309	484817.6 266236.8	Mears Ashby, Earls Barton and Wilby	Mears Ashby CP and Wilby CP	Arable
F	276	489291.8 258922	Grendon, Bozeat and Easton Maudit	Bozeat CP and Easton Maudit CP	Arable / Pasture
G	171	490595.7 255233.1	Lavendon and Warrington	Lavendon CP and Warrington CP	Arable
BESS	43	486923.2 261275.3	Grendon and Castle Ashby	Grendon CP	Arable



2.2 Geology and Topography

- 2.2.1 There are ten different geological formations recorded within the Scheme: Northampton Sand Formation (Ironstone, ooidal), Whitby Mudstone Formation (Mudstone), Wellingborough Limestone (Limestone and mudstone), Stamford Member (Sandstone and siltstone, interbedded), Rutland Formation (Mudstone), Blisworth Limestone Formation (Limestone), Wellingborough Limestone Member (limestone and mudstone, interbedded), Cornbrash Formation (Limestone), Kellaways Clay Member (Mudstone) and Kellaways Sand Member (Sandstone and siltstone, interbedded) (BGS 2025).
- 2.2.2 Large areas of Oadby Member (Diamicton) superficial deposits are present across the Scheme. Alluvium, consisting of clay, silt, sand and gravel occurs adjacent to extant watercourses. Small pockets of Mid Pleistocene Glaciofluvial Deposits (sand and gravel), Milton Sand (Sand and gravel), Bozeat Till (Diamicton) and Ecton Member (Sand and gravel) are recorded within the Scheme, as well as occasional areas where no superficial deposits are recorded (BGS 2025).
- 2.2.3 Soils vary across the Scheme and are mapped as: Freely draining lime-rich loamy soils (Soilscape 5), freely draining slightly acid loamy soils (Soilscape 6), freely draining slightly acid but base-rich soils (Soilscape 7), slightly acid loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage (Soilscape 8), lime-rich loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage (Soilscape 9) and slowly permeable seasonally wet slightly acid but base-rich loamy and clayey soils (Soilscape 18) (Cranfield University 2025).
- 2.2.4 The topography undulates across the Scheme with a general downward slope to the River Nene, which is located between Site E and the BESS Site. The highest part of the Scheme is recorded at 135m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) and is located in the north of Site A.2. The lowest point of the Scheme is recorded at 45m aOD and is located in the east of the BESS Site.
- 2.2.5 Details of the geology, soil morphology and topography for each of the sites is provided in **Appendix 12.2 [APP-121 to APP-127]**.



3 Archaeological Baseline

3.1 Introduction

- 3.1.1 The information provided below is a summary of the baseline collated for the archaeological desk-based assessments for Sites A-G (Lanpro 2025a-f), as well as the results of geophysical (gradiometer) surveys (ASWYAS 2023; 2024a; 2024b; 2024c; 2024d; 2024e) and the results of air photo and LiDAR interpretation (Deegan 2025).

3.2 Sites A and A.2 (Figure 2)

Designated Heritage Assets

- 3.2.1 Green Hill Sites A and A.2 do not contain any designated Heritage Assets.
- 3.2.2 In the wider search area there are 28 Listed Buildings (two Grade I and 26 Grade II). There are two Scheduled Monuments within the 1km search area: 'Walgrave moated site' (NHLE 1011036) is located c.500m south of Sites A and A.2 and 'Walgrave Medieval village' (NHLE 1418583) is located c.885m south of the Site A.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

- 3.2.3 The Northamptonshire HER records 130 'monument' entries within the 1km search area, eight of which are recorded as being within (or partially within) Sites A and A.2. The records relate to possible prehistoric enclosures identified from cropmarks on aerial photographs, an Iron Age coin and the Jurassic Way which runs to the east of Site A.2, following the route of the modern Kettering Road (A43). The Northampton to Kettering Turnpike extends along the eastern edge of Site A.2 in Field A.2F1.

Geophysical Survey

- 3.2.4 Geophysical survey of Sites A and A.2 has detected magnetic anomalies associated with an agricultural landscape, including former field boundaries, medieval/post-medieval ridge and furrow cultivation, modern ploughing and land drains.
- 3.2.5 Most anomalies in Sites A and A.2 were agricultural, including former field boundaries, ridge and furrow cultivation, modern ploughing, and land drains. However, concentrations of anomalies in Fields AF1 and AF11 are likely related to prehistoric and Roman settlement activity. In Field AF1, a cluster of ring ditches, linear ditches and enclosures correspond with prehistoric cropmarks. Field AF11 contains a large rectangular enclosure, as well as smaller enclosures and possible ring ditches. Field AF15 has two possible ring ditches within an enclosure and a larger rectangular enclosure to the south. In Field AF16, two parallel ditches may relate to a buried feature continuing beyond the study site. A possible rectilinear enclosure and ring ditch were identified in Field AF20. In Site A.2F1, anomalies form part of a large enclosure with smaller enclosures inside, and in A.2F4, a ring ditch, 'D-shaped enclosure, and possible trackway are present. Several uncertain anomalies were identified, including a depression in Field AF4, pit-like responses in Field AF5, and parallel trends in Field AF9.



Some weak anomalies in Fields AF18 and AF26, and linear features in AF25, may relate to land drains.

Air Photo and LiDAR

- 3.2.6 The Environment Agency's National LiDAR Programme Digital Terrain Model (DTM) and Digital Surface Model (DSM) data, at 1m resolution, together with a full range of vertical air photo and digital orthophotography, were used to inform a detailed programme of aerial interpretation of the study site (Deegan 2025). The results are summarised below.
- 3.2.7 Site A shows no evidence of Neolithic or Bronze Age features but includes possible Iron Age or Roman enclosures in AF1 and AF11. Widespread medieval and post-medieval cultivation is evident. Ridge and furrow patterns and plough headlands are recorded across numerous fields, but have since been levelled. LiDAR imagery reveals slight lynchets along former field boundaries in AF1, AF11, and AF23, as well as earthwork banks in AF11, AF14, AF15, AF16, AF17 and AF18, which may represent additional lynchets or plough headlands. Post-medieval quarrying activity is indicated by depressions in AF1, AF9, AF10, AF11 and AF29 along with evidence of stream management and possible haystack platforms.
- 3.2.8 Site A.2 shows no evidence of Roman or earlier features, however, there is evidence of medieval and possibly early post-medieval cultivation, including plough headlands and ridge and furrow in all the fields. While some ridge and furrow survived as earthworks into the 1940s, all plough ridges have now been levelled. LiDAR imagery reveals a network of low, well-spread plough headlands in A.2F3 and A.2F4, with some areas showing plough furrows running over the headlands instead of terminating on either side.

Evaluation trenching

- 3.2.9 Areas assessed to have archaeological potential, based on consideration of all available archaeological data, were targeted with evaluation trenches in Site A and A.2 Field AF4, both to 'ground truth' the results of previous surveys and to provide samples of 'blank' areas, in which archaeological remains had not been identified by non-intrusive methods. Overall, there was a strong correlation between the results of the geophysical survey, aerial photographic and LiDAR interpretation, and the results of the evaluation.
- 3.2.10 Within Site A, 97 trenches were excavated, and archaeological remains and features were recorded within 17 trenches (**ES Appendix 13.4**; CFA 2025b).
- 3.2.11 In Field AF9, a north-west to south-east orientated gully in Trench 3 contained pottery dating from the Late Iron Age to the early 2nd century. In Field AF15, a cluster of activity in the north-western corner was confirmed by excavation, aligning with geophysical survey features such as rectilinear ditches and gullies, possibly indicating a settlement area. A gully in Trench 1, interpreted as a ring ditch, was truncated by a furrow, limiting its visibility. In Field AF16, curvilinear ring ditches and linear ditches were recorded in Trenches 5 and 13, aligning with geophysical survey results. Two parallel ditches in Trench 12 may indicate a trackway. In Field AF20, north to south linear ditches in Trenches 13 and 17



matched features from the geophysical survey, with additional ditches in Fields 15, 16 and 20 corresponding to historic ridge and furrow. Features of unknown origin were found in Trenches 3, 5, 8 and 18. Pottery from a pit in Trench 16 dates to the prehistoric period, while pottery in Trench 8 dates to the 2nd century. In Field AF23, linear trends in Trench 1 may be part of an enclosure ditch, with pottery spanning from the prehistoric (likely Iron Age) to early Roman periods.

- 3.2.12 Within Site A.2 Field 4, 42 trenches were excavated, and archaeological remains and features were recorded within 15 trenches (**ES Appendix 13.4**; CFA 2025a).
- 3.2.13 In Field A.2F4, features identified by trial trenching align with geophysical survey results, suggesting settlement and agricultural activity from the Late Iron Age to Roman period. A curvilinear ditch in Trench 2 and potential boundary or enclosure ditches in Trench 11 were recorded. A faint rectilinear or D-shaped enclosure, recorded by the geophysical survey at the eastern end of Field AF29, was confirmed through excavation in Trenches 33, 34, and 42, with associated peripheral features in Trenches 23, 24, and 32. Prehistoric pottery was found in Trench 34. Furrows in Trenches 1, 4, and 35 may be part of a ridge and furrow system, while a 19th-20th century field boundary was noted in Trench 18. Features of unknown origin were found in Trenches 15, 17 and 20, with Roman pottery recovered from Trench 17.

Multispectral Survey

- 3.2.14 Multispectral survey was completed in Fields AF4 to AF29 and A2F1 to A2F4.
- 3.2.15 Linear and rectilinear cropmarks were identified in Fields AF4, AF9, AF11, AF14 and AF29 that were interpreted as having an archaeological potential.
- 3.2.16 Trenching undertaken in Field AF29 did not identify any buried archaeological features that corresponded with the cropmark identified from the multispectral survey.
- 3.2.17 Survey results also identified numerous linear anomalies caused by agricultural activity including ridge and furrow and field boundaries.

3.3 Site B (Figure 3)

Designated Heritage Assets

- 3.3.1 Green Hill Site B does not contain any designated Heritage Assets.
- 3.3.2 In the wider 1km search area there are 12 listed buildings (one Grade I and 12 Grade II). Most of these are within the village of Holcot. Three Grade II Listed Buildings are located to the south of Site B; 'Overstone Old Rectory' (NHLE 1075355), 'Rectory Farmhouse' (NHLE 1025896), and 'The Old Farmhouse and attached Stables' (NHLE 1354758).

Non-designated Heritage Assets

- 3.3.3 The Northamptonshire HER records 145 'monument' entries within the 1km search area, two of these are partially within Site B in Field BF5, comprising undated possible enclosures and ditches and probable medieval or post-medieval plough headlands identified during from an aerial survey.



Geophysical Survey

- 3.3.4 An archaeological geophysical (magnetometer) survey was undertaken across the study site in April 2024. The geophysical survey detected magnetic anomalies of agricultural origin, comprising former field boundaries, medieval/post-medieval ridge and furrow cultivation, modern ploughing and land drains. Likely archaeological anomalies were recorded within the south of Field BF2 in the form of discrete linear and curvilinear features which may form enclosures of a possible prehistoric/Roman date. Likewise, within the south of BF3, possible archaeological anomalies in the form of linear features of a possible enclosure was recorded. Geological responses reflect either the topography of the site, a former water course or natural variations. Magnetic disturbance can be attributed to adjacent tracks and metal fencing with smaller areas corresponding to infilled ponds or former fencing (ASWYAS 2024b).

Air Photo and LiDAR

- 3.3.5 Within Site B, no features of Roman or earlier date have been identified as part of the air photo and LiDAR assessment (Deegan 2025). Medieval and possibly early post-medieval cultivation is, however, visible throughout the site, including ridge and furrow and plough headlands, which have been levelled. LiDAR imagery also reveals plough headlands and areas where plough furrows cut across them. The trackway from Tithe Farm, and the drainage ditch in BF2, are likely of late post-medieval origin.

Evaluation trenching

- 3.3.6 Areas assessed to have archaeological potential, based on consideration of all available archaeological data, were targeted with evaluation trenches in Site B both to 'ground truth' the results of previous surveys and to provide samples of 'blank' areas, in which archaeological remains had not been identified by non-intrusive methods.
- 3.3.7 Within Site B, 61 trenches were excavated, and archaeological remains and features were recorded within 17 trenches (**ES Appendix 13.4**; CFA 2025c).
- 3.3.8 In Field BF2, a ditch in Trench 7 may form part of a longer curvilinear feature identified by geophysical survey, while a possible rectilinear enclosure or set of parallel ditches in the south-western corner were confirmed in Trenches 12 and 23, with Roman grey ware pottery found in Trench 23. A complex series of linear features, possibly an enclosure, was confirmed in Trenches 27-30. In Field BF3, scattered features in Trenches 2, 3, and 4 indicate dispersed activity extending from BF2. Furrows in Trench 7 may be remnants of an older ridge and furrow system, and a north-south ditch in Trench 27 could be part of a possible rectilinear enclosure extending beyond the field.

Multispectral Survey

- 3.3.9 Multispectral survey was completed across all fields within Site B. Cropmarks were identified in the north-east of Field B1 that were interpreted as possibly being caused by enclosures.



- 3.3.10 A further rectilinear cropmark was identified in Field BF3 as having a possible archaeological origin. Trenching undertaken in Field BF3 did not identify buried archaeological features that corresponded with the cropmark identified from the multispectral survey.
- 3.3.11 Survey results also identified numerous linear anomalies caused by agricultural activity including ridge and furrow and headlands.

3.4 Sites C to E (Figure 4 and 5)

Designated Heritage Assets

- 3.4.1 There are no designated heritage assets with Green Hill Sites C, D and E.
- 3.4.2 There are 54 Listed Buildings within the 1km search area, including one designated at Grade I (Church of All Saints, Earls Barton) and two at Grade II* (Church of All Saints, Mears Ashby and Mears Ashby Hall). In addition, there is one Scheduled Monument, comprising Earls Barton motte castle (NHLE 1009510), which is located c.860m to the south of the access route into Option Area E.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

- 3.4.3 There are 115 Northamptonshire HER records located within (or partially within) Sites C, D and E, comprising seven within Site C, of prehistoric worked flint, Roman pottery, a possible prehistoric and Roman site, areas of Iron Age activity, a possible medieval / post-medieval ditch and bank and a medieval pottery scatter.
- 3.4.4 There are two records within Site D, relating to medieval to post-medieval water management.
- 3.4.5 There are 103 HER records within Site E, comprising a Bronze Age barrow, prehistoric enclosures, Iron Age pits and ditches, prehistoric to Romano-British settlements, Romano-British enclosures and trackways, earthworks of a medieval windmill, and undated ditches and enclosures. There are post-medieval structures and WWII searchlight also listed.

Geophysical Survey

- 3.4.6 Geophysical survey in Sites C, D and E (ASWYAS 2024c) has detected magnetic anomalies associated with an agricultural landscape, including former field boundaries, medieval/post-medieval ridge and furrow cultivation, modern ploughing and land drains. Numerous palaeochannels have also been mapped across Site E, many of which respect natural topographical depressions.
- 3.4.7 In Site C, various archaeological features were identified, suggesting late prehistoric and Romano-British settlement activity. In Field CF1, conjoined enclosures, linear ditches, and a ring ditch with a possible entrance were found, alongside a modern service trench. Survey in Field CF2 revealed rectilinear and curvilinear enclosures, possibly indicating settlement, and Field CF4 contained a small rectilinear enclosure with a possible entrance. In Field CF5, curvilinear ditches were recorded, which potentially form part of Iron Age settlement, linked to the nearby CF10 site. The survey in Field CF6 revealed a sub-square



enclosure and parallel ditches, possibly Romano-British and related to a vineyard. Fields CF8 and CF10 both contained linear features connected to Iron Age settlements, with additional linear trends possibly of similar or later origin.

3.4.8 In Site D, former field boundaries were recorded within Fields DF2 and DF3. Anomalies of an unknown origin were identified in Fields DF1 and DF2, and generally these were composed of very weak increases in magnetic value and align with anomalies related to agricultural activity.

3.4.9 In Site E, geophysical survey mapped a series of contiguous enclosures, as well as rectilinear, linear, curvilinear and sub-circular anomalies that are indicative of likely prehistoric and/or Roman settlement activity. Further anomalies of a likely archaeological origin have been identified to the north of Mears Asby Road in Fields EF4 and EF9.

Air Photo and LiDAR

3.4.10 The air photo and LiDAR assessment (Deegan 2025) identified various archaeological features across multiple fields. In Field CF4, faint cropmarks of an Iron Age/Roman enclosure and a ditch containing Late Iron Age pottery were found, potentially linked to nearby settlement activity. Post-medieval quarry pits were noted in Fields CF3 and CF4, and uncertain ditches were identified in Fields CF2 and CF3. Site D showed no significant features. In Field EF9, several small enclosures were identified, along with a curving ditch. Iron Age/Roman enclosures were found in Fields EF16, EF19, and EF22, with additional features in EF23, EF24, EF25, and EF28. A potential Bronze Age round barrow was recorded in Fields EF30 and EF33, with associated Iron Age/Roman trackways and enclosures. Post-medieval quarrying was observed in Fields EF26 and EF33. World War II features, such as goods/ammunition stores and a possible searchlight/anti-aircraft battery, were identified in Fields EF5, EF9, and EF20. Other features were related to modern or agricultural activities, including ridge and furrow, plough headlands, and post-medieval structures.

Evaluation trenching

3.4.11 Within Site C, 50 trenches were excavated, and archaeological remains and features were recorded within 19 trenches (**ES Appendix 13.4**; CFA 2025d).

3.4.12 In Field CF1, an enclosure complex with possible ring ditches was confirmed, dating to the early Roman period, though an Iron Age origin cannot be ruled out. A second enclosure with a Late Neolithic to Late Bronze Age ring ditch was also found. In Field CF2, complex ditches suggesting settlement activity were identified, with pottery dating to the late Iron Age and Roman periods. In Field CF5, ditches formed a possible small rectilinear enclosure, likely associated with nearby settlement evidence. Field CF6 contained a square enclosure with early Roman pottery, along with an irregular ditch interpreted as a furrow.

3.4.13 Within Site E, 246 trenches were excavated, and archaeological remains and features were recorded within 87 trenches (**ES Appendix 13.4**; CFA 2025e).

3.4.14 In Field EF4, two Iron Age enclosures were found, with features likely related to livestock containment. In Field EF14, small enclosures with a meandering ditch



were present, dating to the late Iron Age with some Roman pottery. Field EF15 contained dense Romano-British enclosures, with finds including Roman pottery and a decorated sherd of plate. In Field EF16, a series of rectilinear enclosures with Iron Age pottery was discovered, with Roman pottery isolated to a few features. Field EF17 contained both Iron Age and Roman features, including concentric ring ditches and square enclosures. Limited features were found in Field EF18, with evidence suggesting Iron Age activity. In Field EF21, Roman pottery was found with external boundary ditches and a kiln fragment. Field EF22 showed a mix of Roman and Iron Age features, with Iron Age ditches in some trenches and Roman-era cultivation furrows in others. In Field EF23, Iron Age square enclosures were identified, with evidence suggesting domestic use. Field EF24 contained both Iron Age ring ditches and Roman rectangular enclosures. In Field EF28, small to medium-sized ditches formed a field system, likely for crop cultivation. Evidence of a Roman farmstead was found in the southern end of the field. Field EF31 contained Roman ditches forming a field system and Iron Age features in the south. Lastly, Field EF33 revealed Iron Age features, including drainage ditches and habitation evidence.

Multispectral Survey

- 3.4.15 Multispectral survey was completed across Fields CF1-CF8, DF1, DF2, EF5, EF6 and EF13 – EF33.
- 3.4.16 Cropmarks were identified in the south of Green Hill Site E that corresponded with buried archaeological features recorded on the HER and further mapped by the geophysical survey (see section above).
- 3.4.17 Survey results also identified numerous linear anomalies caused by agricultural activity including ridge and furrow and headlands.

3.5 Site F (Figure 7)

Designated Heritage Assets

- 3.5.1 There are no designated heritage assets within Site F.
- 3.5.2 There are 51 Listed Buildings within the 1km search area, including two designated at Grade I (Church of St Peter and St Paul, Easton Maudit and Church of St Mary, Bozeat) and two at Grade II* (Church of St Mary, Grendon and 22, High Street, Easton Maudit). Easton Maudit Conservation Area (which contains 11 Listed Buildings) abuts the south-eastern corner of field FF16. In addition, there is one Scheduled Monument, comprising 'Site revealed by aerial photography N of Easton Lodge' (NHLE 1003876), which is located c.25m to the south of field FF32.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

- 3.5.3 There are 48 HER records located within (or partially within) Site F. These comprise Iron Age/Romano-British settlement activity including enclosures, ditches and trackways, a 3rd century stone footed circular building, a Roman villa at Easton Maudit, a possible Saxon sunken-featured building, as well as Anglo-Saxon pottery and inhumations.



Geophysical Survey

- 3.5.4 Geophysical surveys across various fields (FF1, FF5, FF7, FF8, FF9, FF10, FF11, FF13, FF14, FF19, FF21, FF26, FF27, FF32) have revealed significant archaeological features, indicating extensive prehistoric and Roman activity (ASWYAS 2024d). These include rectilinear and circular anomalies likely representing enclosures, trackways, and settlement remains, with some features possibly dating to the Iron Age or Romano-British period. Additional evidence includes medieval/post-medieval ridge and furrow cultivation, former field boundaries, and field drains.

Air Photo and LiDAR

- 3.5.5 Aerial imagery across Fields FF10, FF11, FF13, FF19, FF21 and FF27 have revealed various archaeological features (Deegan 2025). These include a small rectilinear Roman building in FF10, three possible Bronze Age round barrows in FF11, and Iron Age/Roman enclosures in FF13 and FF21. In FF19, cropmarks suggest a Neolithic or Bronze Age curvilinear enclosure. The Easton Maudit Roman Villa in FF27 shows visible features such as a central range and two circular structures. Additional finds include poorly defined cropmarks, short ditches of uncertain date, and evidence of agricultural activity, such as ridge and furrow, field boundaries and land drains. Post-medieval activity is seen in quarrying, a windmill in FF16, and a trackway in FF33.

Evaluation trenching

- 3.5.6 Within Site F, 291 trenches were excavated, and archaeological remains and features were recorded within 83 trenches (**ES Appendix 13.4**; CFA 2025f).
- 3.5.7 Field FF1 contained a late Iron Age to early Romano-British enclosure with associated pottery. In Field FF4, a possible drainage channel was recorded, while Field FF5 produced a ditch and pits containing handmade Iron Age pottery. Field FF7 included ditches linked to peripheral activity from an enclosure complex on the boundary with Field FF11. Field FF10 showed dense occupation, especially in the north-west, with sub-rectangular enclosures and a large ring ditch dating from the 2nd to mid-4th century AD, though a Saxon date could not be ruled out. A well-preserved burial-oriented north-west–south-east was also found in the field's southeast corner. Field FF11 contained early Roman ditches, pottery, a brooch, and a possible cremation pit or butsum. Field FF15 included large features interpreted as former extraction pits. In Field FF19, a burial, multiple pits and ditches, and a large circular feature with Iron Age pottery were recorded; enclosures to the east included possible human remains, suggesting a barrow. Field FF21 showed late Iron Age to early Roman activity through ditches and pits. Field FF26 had extensive enclosure remains along its southern edge. In Field FF28, a large curvilinear ditch of probable late Iron Age to early Roman date was recorded. Pits and ditches were identified in Field FF32, while Field FF33 contained features likely representing former agricultural boundaries.

Multispectral Survey

- 3.5.8 Multispectral survey was completed across Fields FF1, FF2, FF5 to FF35.



- 3.5.9 Multispectral survey of Site F identified possible Iron Age/Roman square enclosures in FF17 and a probable rectilinear enclosure, field boundaries and pits in FF13, alongside a possible prehistoric trackway (with further trackway remains and a medieval/post-medieval field boundary in FF5 and FF11). Trenching undertaken in Field FF15 did not identify buried archaeological features that corresponded with the cropmark identified from the multispectral survey.
- 3.5.10 Survey results also identified numerous linear anomalies caused by agricultural activity including ridge and furrow, headlands and field boundaries.

3.6 Site G (Figure 8)

Designated Heritage Assets

- 3.6.1 Site G does not contain any designated Heritage Assets.
- 3.6.2 In the wider 1km search area there are 21 Listed Buildings, one of which is the Grade I Listed Church of St Michael (NHLE 1312619). There are three Scheduled Monuments within 1km of Site G; Lavendon Castle: a motte and bailey and associated enclosures at Castle Farm (NHLE 1009542), The Bury: a ringwork and associated earthworks 100m north of Lavendon Church (NHLE 1011295) and 'Lavendon Abbey: the site of a Premonstratensian abbey, fishponds and field system at Lavendon Grange' (1011309).

Non-designated Heritage Assets

- 3.6.3 There are 31 HER records located within (or partially within) Site G. These comprise Iron Age to Roman activity in the form of cropmarks of enclosures, ditches and trackways, areas of slag, Roman pottery, a Roman kiln, medieval ridge and furrow and plough headlands, a 19th century farmstead and a Second World War Practice Bombing Range.

Geophysical Survey

- 3.6.4 In Fields GF1, GF2, GF3, GF4, GF6, GF10, GF11, and GF12, various archaeological and geological features have been identified through geophysical survey (ASWYAS 2024e). Linear and curvilinear anomalies in GF1 may indicate potential archaeological remains, while several Iron Age and Roman features, such as enclosures and trackways, were confirmed in Fields GF3 and GF6. Unidentified bomb craters and possible unexploded ordnance from a Second World War bombing range are present in GF7, GF8 and surrounding areas. Agricultural features, including ridge and furrow, and field boundaries, are visible across multiple fields, with some elements corresponding to medieval/post-medieval activity. Some anomalies, particularly in GF12, are likely of geological origin.

Air Photo and LiDAR

- 3.6.5 Enclosures have been identified within Site G through aerial photo assessment, possibly dating to the Iron Age or Roman period, and are spread across Fields GF3, GF10, GF11 and possibly GF7 (Deegan 2025). A hollowed trackway in GF1, resembling a Roman road, aligns with a low embankment extending into GF3, though it is indistinguishable from medieval or post-medieval plough



headlands. Ridge and furrow earthworks were present in several fields until the late 1940s but have since been levelled. Post-medieval field boundaries and lynchets are visible in various fields, with some possibly predating historical maps. Additionally, the disturbance at the former Tinnick Farm site in Field GO6 is noted from LiDAR data.

Evaluation trenching

- 3.6.6 Within Site G, 189 trenches were excavated, and archaeological remains and features were recorded within 79 trenches (**ES Appendix 13.4**; CFA 2025g).
- 3.6.7 In Field GF1, Late Iron Age to Roman activity was evidenced by ditches and pits. Field GF3 contained an Iron Age to Roman sub-circular ditch and a series of ditches possibly related to former field boundaries. Field GF6 revealed a ring ditch and a rectangular enclosure, both associated with Iron Age to Roman pottery, along with other related features containing pottery and animal bones of similar date. Field GF10 primarily showed signs of agricultural use, but also included several ditches and a kiln with Romano-British dating, and one ditch dated to the Iron Age. In Field GF11, ditches and pits indicated Romano-British occupation from the 2nd century BC; a skeleton was found near one ditch, along with a possible ring ditch. Field GF12 contained a ditch with Iron Age dating and four intercutting ditches suggesting a continuation of the Romano-British occupation seen in GF11.

Multispectral Survey

- 3.6.8 Multispectral survey was completed across Fields GF1-GF2, GF6-GF9, GF11-GF13, GO1 and GO4- GO6.
- 3.6.9 Multispectral survey of Site G identified a possible rectilinear enclosure in GF13, a potential ring ditch or small enclosure with associated pits and linear features of uncertain date in GF11–GF12, and several post-medieval field boundaries in GF6 and GF11–GF13. Groups of pits in GF7 likely relate to a WWII bombing range.
- 3.6.10 Survey results also identified numerous linear anomalies caused by agricultural activity including ridge and furrow, field boundaries and land drains.

3.7 BESS Site (Figure 6)

Designated Heritage Assets

- 3.7.1 Green Hill BESS Site does not contain any designated Heritage Assets.
- 3.7.2 The Grendon Conservation Area is located c.530m to the south-east of the BESS Site at its nearest point. There are 29 Listed Buildings within the 1km search area, and all but one are within the village of Grendon, including two listed at Grade II* and 26 at Grade II.
- 3.7.3 The northern extent of the Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Castle Ashby (NHLE 1000385) occupies much of the south-western part of the 1km search area, and the north-eastern edge of the park is c.30m from the south-western edge of the BESS Site. There is one Grade II Listed building within the RPG at Castle Ashby that is also within the 1km search area, comprising the



Station Lodge (NHLE 1294156) at the northern entrance to the park, c.108m to the west of the access into the BESS Site off Station Road.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

- 3.7.4 There are 10 HER records within (or partially within) the BESS Site. These include five heritage assets that were recorded prior to gravel extraction in 2004-5, comprising a single sherd of prehistoric pottery, a 10m diameter ring ditch enclosure dated to the Early Bronze Age, a small shallow pit which contained burnt bone, an undated pit, and a possible medieval trackway. The polygon surrounding a Middle to Late Iron Age trapezoidal enclosure excavated ahead of gravel extraction in 1974-5 also partially extends into the BESS Site although this is beyond the area investigated.
- 3.7.5 Further records relate to a recent trackway, a block of ridge and furrow earthworks, the remains of the deserted medieval settlement of Cotton, a sub-circular enclosure, a Second World War searchlight battery and a field barn depicted on early 19th century mapping.

Geophysical Survey

- 3.7.6 The results of the geophysical survey (ASWYAS 2023) largely relate to agricultural activity, including former field boundaries, medieval/post-medieval ridge and furrow cultivation and modern ploughing. Linear and curvilinear anomalies were identified within the southern part of the BESS Site, which are of an unknown origin, although they could be associated with agricultural activity.
- 3.7.7 Towards the south-west of the BESS Site, ferrous anomalies and magnetic disturbance were identified which are interpreted as relating to an infilled pond, and close to the northern boundary of the BESS Site a diffuse area of modern building material and rubble caused magnetic disturbance. It is noteworthy that this is in the vicinity of the site of the 19th century field barn depicted on historic mapping which appears to have been used as the site of a searchlight battery during Second World War (HER 9201/0/1). Other areas of magnetic disturbance were identified as being caused by an electricity pylon and overhead power lines, and along the limits of survey areas due to interference from metal fencing, adjacent roads, and the existing substation. Significant magnetic disturbance interpreted as being of geological origin was detected following the eastern boundary of the BESS Site, following the course of a brook which flows around the eastern edge of the field which could indicate a palaeochannel. Agricultural anomalies associated with medieval or post-medieval ridge and furrow ridge and furrow, and two former field boundaries were also identified.
- 3.7.8 Within the BESS Site, no anomalies were identified that were considered to be of archaeological interest. Instead anomalies were considered to be caused by agricultural activity associated with medieval or post-medieval ridge and furrow.

Multispectral Survey

- 3.7.9 Multispectral survey was completed across the BESS site. Survey results identified anomalies caused by agricultural activity such as ridge and furrow.



3.8 Cable Route Corridor (Figure 9-13)

Designated Heritage Assets

- 3.8.1 There are no designated heritage assets within the Cable Route Corridor.
- 3.8.2 Within the 250m search area, there are three Grade II Listed Buildings. Station Lodge (NHLE 1294156) is located adjacent to the Cable Route Corridor, to the south-west of Station Road. Doddington Barn (NHLE 1293977) is situated c.45m to the east of the Cable Route Corridor, near the A45. The Easton Maudit Conservation Area lies to the east of the Cable Route Corridor. The Old Vicarage (NHLE 1040782) is located within the conservation area and is c. 240m east of the Cable Route Corridor.
- 3.8.3 The northern extent of the Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Castle Ashby (NHLE 1000385) is adjacent to the Cable Route Corridor that runs to the west and south-east of the BESS site.
- 3.8.4 There are no Scheduled Monuments or registered battlefields within the 250m search area.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

- 3.8.5 There are 95 Northamptonshire HER records and one Milton Keynes HER record located within the Cable Route Corridor, the NRHE also contains entries for nine of these records.
- 3.8.6 The Northamptonshire HER records 238 'monument' records within the 250m search area, for which the NRHE also contains entries for 27 of them. In addition, the NRHE contains entries for a further six 'monuments' within the 250m search area that are not recorded on the HER. There are 37 PAS records within the 250m search area, four of which were located in the Cable Route Corridor.

Geophysical Survey

- 3.8.7 The results of the geophysical survey (ASWYAS 2025) identified several linear, rectilinear and curvilinear anomalies indicative of buried features associated with prehistoric, Iron Age, Roman and medieval activity, some of which correspond with HER records. These include probable enclosures and settlement features in Fields CR1a.3, CR1a.7, CR1b.17, CR2a.5, CR2a.6, CR6.5 and CR6.21 near Sites A, B, C, E and BESS (e.g. HER 8924, 5789, 7237, 3563, 6522), anomalies indicative of Iron Age–Roman settlements in Field CR%a.25, which is c. 180 m to the north-west of the deserted medieval settlement at Barton Thorpe (HER 2682). Anomalies of an uncertain origin were also identified that are likely to be agricultural or geological in nature. Ridge and furrow and former field boundaries were recorded, which align with medieval open field systems recorded on the HER (e.g. HER 2199, 5966, 8310, 6521).



4 Research Aims

4.1 Aims and Objectives

4.1.1 The overall aim will be to mitigate the impact of the Scheme on archaeological remains that may be affected. Where possible, there will be a preference to conserve buried archaeological deposits through mitigation by design which will preserve them in situ (either through removal of intrusive works from these areas of the Scheme or through non-intrusive construction methodologies such as concrete ground anchors). Where this is not achievable, mitigation by record will be undertaken in the form of archaeological excavation and/or archaeological monitoring.

4.1.2 This will be achieved through the following objectives:

- To establish the spatial extent, date, character, condition and significance of the archaeological activity in the proposed archaeological mitigation areas.
- To recover information relating to the nature and function of past human activity represented by the surviving archaeological remains.
- To identify areas where the conservation of archaeological features can be achieved by preservation in situ.
- Where preservation of archaeological features in situ cannot be achieved, to excavate and record identified archaeological features and deposits to a level appropriate to their extent and significance.
- To assess the potential for survival of environmental evidence.
- To interpret the nature of human activity within the Scheme and to place identified archaeological remains in their local, regional and national context as appropriate.
- Assess the site formation processes and the effects that these may have had on the survival and integrity of the archaeological features and deposits.
- Undertake sufficient post-excavation assessment to confidently interpret identified archaeological features.
- Undertake sufficient post-excavation analysis of artefacts and environmental samples to interpret their significance.
- Report and publish the results of the excavation and post-excavation analysis and place them within their local, regional and national context.
- Compile and deposit a site archive at a suitable repository and provide information for the Northamptonshire and Milton Keynes HERs to ensure the long-term survival of the excavated data.



4.2 Research Framework

- 4.2.1 The programme of archaeological mitigation will be carried out with the aim of addressing the general research parameters and objectives defined in the (Research Frameworks 2025a and 2025b).
- 4.2.2 Given the size of the Scheme, it is possible that evidence may be identified that can inform the objectives of the research agenda across a wide range of strategic objectives and periods.
- 4.2.3 Based on the extensive evidence identified by the assessments, surveys and evaluation trenching undertaken to inform the ES, it is considered that, at present, the archaeological mitigation has the potential to inform the strategic objectives outlined in Tables 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 below. These objectives will be reviewed and updated as the archaeological mitigation works proceed.
- 4.2.4 The programme of additional archaeological works will also take account of the national research objectives and themes outlined in the Historic England *Research Strategy* (2016) and *Research Agenda* (2017).

Table 4.2.1: East Midlands Relevant Regional Research Agenda strategic objectives

Strategic Objective	Research Agenda	Project Potential
6.3 Neolithic and Early to Middle Bronze Age		
3D: Assess the regional air photographic and lidar resource:	3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8	Air photo and LiDAR assessment has been undertaken within the Scheme. Ground truthing of the features identified, through excavation, could help understand the origin, character and date of such features.
3I: Investigate the development and intensification of agriculture	3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5	Evidence from archaeological evaluation works and paleoenvironmental assessment may have potential to provide evidence of animal domestication and cultivation.
6.4 Late Bronze Age and Iron Age		
4C: Characterise the LBA-EIA settlement resource and investigate intra-regional variability	4.2, 4.3, 4.6, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10	Evidence from archaeological evaluation works may contribute to the characterisation of LBA-EIA settlement. Its regional variability could be investigated at the



Strategic Objective	Research Agenda	Project Potential
		post-excavation analysis stage.
4E: Assess the evidence for the evolution of settlement hierarchies	4.4, 4.5, 4.9, 4.10	Evidence from archaeological evaluation works could contribute to the understanding of settlement hierarchies.
4F: Investigate intra-regional variations in development of fields and linear boundaries	4.2, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.10	The results of the non-intrusive archaeological evaluation have provided evidence for possible prehistoric field systems. Ground truthing of features, through evaluation trenching, could help in understanding the origin, character and date of such features. Regional variability could be investigated at the post-excavation analysis stage.
4G: Study the production, distribution, and use of artefacts	4.9, 4.10	Post-excavation analysis of excavated finds.
6.5. Romano-British		
5H: Investigate landscape context of rural settlements	5.4, 5.5	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could help develop further the understanding of the Roman agrarian landscape.
5I: Support research and publication of landscape synthesis	5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of the Roman period.
6.6 Early Medieval		
6A: Elucidate the chronology and demography of Roman to Anglo-Saxon transition period	6.1, 6.2, 6.4	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could contribute to the understanding of the transition between the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods.



Strategic Objective	Research Agenda	Project Potential
6.7 High Medieval		
7E: Investigate the morphology of rural settlements	7.2	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could help characterise medieval rural settlement.
7I: Investigate the development of the open-field system and medieval woodland management	7.2, 7.3, 7.7	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could help inform understanding of the development of the open-field system.
6.8 Post-Medieval		
8E: Identify agricultural improvements of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries	8.3, 8.4	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of post-medieval agricultural improvements.

Table 4.2.2: Solent Thames Relevant Regional Research Agenda strategic objectives

Research Agenda	Research Agenda	Project Potential
Neolithic and Early Bronze Age		
8.2 Chronology	8.2.2	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of Mesolithic and early Neolithic sites
8.3 Landscape and land use	8.3.2	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of Neolithic and early Bronze Age land management
8.4 Settlement	8.4.2 8.4.3	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of Neolithic and early Bronze Age settlement



Research Agenda	Research Agenda	Project Potential
Later Bronze Age and Iron Age		
10.2 Nature of the evidence	10.2.1 10.2.2	Extensive desk-based research has been compiled for the Scheme. Air photo and LiDAR assessment is being undertaken of the Scheme. Ground truthing of the features identified, through excavation, could help understand the origin, character and date of such features.
10.4 Landscape and land use	10.4.1 10.4.6	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of later prehistoric land management
10.5 Settlement	10.5.2 10.5.3 10.5.5 10.5.9 10.5.10 10.5.11 10.5.12	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of later prehistoric settlement
Romano Period		
12.2 Inheritance	12.2.1	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of the transitional period between later prehistoric and Roman settlement patterns
12.3 Environmental evidence	12.3.1 12.3.3	Archaeological evaluation could recover environmental information that enhances our knowledge of the landscape during the Romano-British period
12.4 Landscape and land use	12.4.5	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of land management during the Roman period.



Research Agenda	Research Agenda	Project Potential
12.6 Settlement	12.6.2 12.6.4 12.6.5	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of settlement during the Roman period.
Early Medieval		
14.2 Inheritance	14.2.2 14.2.3 14.2.4 14.2.5 14.2.6 14.2.7	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of the transitional period between Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement patterns
14.3 Chronology	14.3.1 14.3.5	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of the transitional period between Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement patterns
14.4 Landscape and land use	14.4.1 14.4.2 14.4.3 14.4.4 14.4.6	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of land management during the early medieval period.
14.5 Settlement	14.5.1 14.5.4 14.5.5	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of settlement during the early medieval period.
Later Medieval		
16.2 The nature of the evidence	16.2.1	Extensive desk-based research has been compiled for the Scheme. Ground truthing of the features identified could help understand the origin, character and date of such features.
16.4 Landscape and land use	16.4.1 16.4.2 16.4.4	Evidence from archaeological evaluation



Research Agenda	Research Agenda	Project Potential
		could inform understanding of land management during the later medieval period.
16.6 Settlement	16.6.1 16.6.3 16.6.6 16.6.8	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of settlement during the later medieval period.
Post-Medieval		
18.1 Nature of the evidence	18.1.1	Extensive desk-based research has been compiled for the Scheme. Ground truthing of the features identified could help understand the origin, character and date of such features.
18.3 Landscape and land use	18.3.2 18.3.4 18.3.10	Evidence from archaeological evaluation could inform understanding of land management during the post-medieval period.



5 Standards and Guidance

- 5.1.1 All archaeological mitigation works will be undertaken to fully meet the requirements of all nationally recognised guidance for such work, including standards laid down by the former English Heritage (now Historic England) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA).
- 5.1.2 The programme of archaeological mitigation and post-excavation work will be managed in line with the standards laid down in the Historic England guideline publication *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE): Project Managers Guide* (2015a) and the MoRPHE *Project Planning Note 3: Archaeological Excavation* (PPN3) (English Heritage 2008), as well as to meet the requirements of Paragraph 5.9.10 of NPS EN-1 (2023) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; Chapter 16: ‘*Conserving and enhancing the historic environment*’; revised 2024).
- 5.1.3 Guidance of particular relevance to the programme of works are:
- Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives (CIfA 2020a)
 - Standard and Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials (CIfA 2020b)
 - Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Code of Conduct (CIfA 2022)
 - Standard for archaeological monitoring and recording (CIfA 2023a)
 - Universal guidance for archaeological monitoring and recording (CIfA 2023b)
 - Standard for archaeological excavation (CIfA 2023c)
 - Universal guidance for archaeological excavation (CIfA 2023d)
 - Standard for archaeological field evaluation (CIfA 2023e)
 - Universal guidance for archaeological field evaluation (CIfA 2023f)
 - Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: PPN3: Archaeological Excavation (English Heritage 2008)



6 Scope of Mitigation Fieldwork

- 6.1.1 The programme of archaeological mitigation will comprise four main elements;
- Preservation *in situ*
 - Strip, Map and Sample Excavation
 - Archaeological Monitoring
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required
- 6.1.2 The form of mitigation has been determined based on an assessment of the potential for archaeological remains to survive within specific areas of the Scheme based on all archaeological information obtained during previous stages of archaeological investigation, together with the assessed potential character and significance of any such remains, and the potential impact that the Scheme could have on these. The detailed methodology for undertaking the various elements of the archaeological mitigation fieldwork is provided in Section 7 of this AMS. The mitigation work will be followed by a programme of post-excavation assessment, analysis, reporting, publication and dissemination (see Sections 8 and 9).
- 6.1.3 Archaeological mitigation strategies for specific areas are outlined in Table 6.1.1 below and the areas are marked on plan in Figures 1 to 13.

Table 6.1.1: Archaeological Mitigation Strategies

Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
Main Solar Sites:						
A	AF20	AF20	Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: P4	1.79
A	AF1	AF1-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development ^{*)})	HER: 5855; Geophysics: A1, A2	8.349
A	AF11	AF11-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development ^{†*)})	HER: None; Geophysics: A3, A4, A5 A6	3.41

^{*}Solar development includes solar panels and associated infrastructure. Where associated infrastructure (i.e., cabling) or ecological mitigation that involves ground disturbance is proposed, which would require archaeological mitigation, this is detailed in the table below under 'associated infrastructure'.

[†]Solar development includes solar panels and associated infrastructure. Where associated infrastructure (i.e., cabling) or ecological mitigation that involves ground disturbance is proposed, which would require archaeological mitigation, this is detailed in the table below under 'associated infrastructure'.



Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
A	AF23	AF23-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: None	0.481
A	AF16	AF16-03	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A9, F2, P2	0.736
A	AF16	AF16-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: P3	0.192
A	AF16	AF16-02	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: P3	0.203
A2	A2F1	A2F1-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: A10, P5	1.664
A2	A2F4	A2F4-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A12	1.076
A2	F4	A2F4-02	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	None; Geophysics: A11	0.084
B	BF3	BF3-01	Iron Age to Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: P3	0.272
B	BF2	BF2-01	Possible building of Roman date	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 5812/2; Geophysics: P2	0.542
B	BF2	BF2-02	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A1, A2, P1 and U1	2.028
C	CF6	CF6-01	Iron Age Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: P2	0.788



Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
C	CF5	CF5-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A5, P1	0.532
C	CF1	CF1-02	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 7902; Geophysics: A1	1.971
C	CF2	CF2-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: A3	2.334
C	CF1	CF1-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement Possible Late Neolithic to Late Bronze Age ring ditch	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 7902; Geophysics: A1, A2	0.511
C	CF4	CF4-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: A4	0.609
C	CF9 CF10	CF9-01	Probable late Iron Age settlement, south-east of Sywell Wood	Strip, Map and Sample	HER: 1524/0/1; Geophysics: U1	6.787
C	CF8	CF8-01	Probable late Iron Age settlement, south-east of Sywell Wood	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 1524/0/2; Geophysics: None	0.79
E	EF14	EF14-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A14, A15, A16	3.72
E	EF9	EF9-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: A6, A7, A8	4.461
E	EF13	EF13-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 1992/0/1; Geophysics: A12, A13	1.556
E	EF18	EF18-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 3871; Geophysics: A25, A26, P3	2.367



Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
E	EF19 EF20 EF25 EF26	EF19-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 1977, 1982, 3871; NRHE: 345497, 968643, 967829, 968645 and 345506); Geophysics: A20, A22, A23, A24, A25, A26, A27, P3, P4	26.885
E	EF16	EF16-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 1977; NRHE: 345463 and 345446, Geophysics: A17, A18, P3	3.255
E	EF28 EF29	EF28-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 1984; NRHE:968646; Geophysics: A32, A33, P6, A3, A27	6.062
E	EF30	EF30-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 1983, 9805; NRHE:345513; Geophysics: A35, A36, P9, P11, P8, P10	8.881
E	EF34	EF34-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 9073; Geophysics: A44, A45, A46, A47	8.265
E	EF4	EF4-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A9, A10, A11, FB14	2.524
E	EF17	EF17-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 3867; NRHE: 968654; Geophysics: A19	1.127
E	EF15	EF15-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 1977; NRHE: 345522; Geophysics: A17	0.849
E	EF13	EF13-02	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A13	0.831
E	EF21	EF21-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 1977; Geophysics: A21	1.405



Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
E	EF22	EF22-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A12, A29, A30	9.316
E	EF24	EF24-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A31, A32	4.436
E	EF23	EF23-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: HER: 5888/0/2 and 5888/0/3; Geophysics: A38, A9, U14	2.18
E	EF33	EF33-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A40, A41, A42	4.027
E	E32	E32-01	Iron Age Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 1983; Geophysics: A34, A37	3.112
E	EF28	EF28-03	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 1982; 1984, Geophysics: A32, A33, P6	1.742
E	EF33	EF33-02	Round barrow used as hundredal meeting place.	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER:1985/0/1; Geophysics: A43	0.145
E	EF31	EF31-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 6117; Geophysics: P6, A28, A33	8.741
E	EF31	EF31-02	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 6117; Geophysics: P6, A28, A33	1.164
E	EF28	EF28-02	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 1982; 1984, Geophysics: A32, A33, P6	0.933
F	FF13	FF13-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: 3290; Geophysics: A15	6.971



Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
F	FF19	FF19-01	Prehistoric Features (including burial)	In situ preservation (no solar development*) Strip, Map and Sample or In situ preservation trenchless cabling techniques (such as horizontal directional drilling (HDD)). In situ preservation (No solar panels or above ground infrastructure).	HER: None; Geophysics: A19, A20 and P7	2.042
F	FF1	FF1-01	Possible Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; NRHE: 347136; Geophysics: A1	2.592
F	FF5	FF5-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 3519/0/1 and 3274/0/3; NRHE: 968063 and 345188; Geophysics: A2, P1	1.343
F	FF10	FF10-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A7, A8, A9, A10 and A12	3.776
F	FF26	FF26-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 1406, 3278, 8091; Geophysics: A27	1.485
F	FF19	FF19-02	Prehistoric and Roman Features (including burial)	Strip, Map and Sample	HER: None; Geophysics: U7	7.736
F	FF16	FF16-01	Possible Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: U5	0.286
F	FF15	FF15-01	Possible Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A17	0.09
F	FF18	FF18-01	Possible Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: A3	0.444
F	FF18	FF18-02	Possible Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A3	0.856



Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
F	FF11	FF11-02	Possible Iron Age ring ditch	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: 5917; Geophysics: A14	0.087
F	FF15	FF15-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geo: A7, A8 and P1	1.43
F	FF9	FF9-02	Iron Age and Roman settlement	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: P2	0.923
F	FF8	FF8-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: A7	0.112
F	FF7 FF8 FF11	FF7-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: A3, A4, A5, A6 and A13	3.935
F	FF9 FF10 FF14	FF9-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (no solar development*)	HER: None; Geophysics: A11, A16 and P3	3.291
F	FF27 FF28	FF27-01	Iron Age and Roman settlement (Roman Villa)	In situ preservation (no solar development*) Strip, Map and Sample or In situ preservation trenchless cabling techniques (such as horizontal directional drilling (HDD). In situ preservation (No solar panels or above ground infrastructure).	HER 1406/0/24, 3278/1 and 8091/0/1; Geo: A25, A26, A28, A29, U9, P9	6.905
F	FF11	F11-01	Possible cremation site	Strip, Map and Sample	HER: 5917; Geophysics: None	0.031
F	FF11	FF11-03	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: None	0.459
G	GF1	GF1-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: MMK8125; Geophysics: None	1.561
G	GF6	GF6-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A5, A6	3.579



Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
G	GF3	GF3-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: MMK8030; NRHE: 1591427Geophysics: A2	0.956
G	GF3	GF3-02	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology) Strip, Map and Sample	HER: MMK8049; NRHE: 1591428Geophysics: A1	1.097
G	GF3	GF3-03	Iron Age Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: MMK8112; NRHE: 1591429, Geophysics: P1	0.522
G	GF10	GF10-01	Iron Age and Roman Features (kiln)	Strip, Map and Sample	HER: MMK8011; Geophysics: A7	0.788
G	GF11	GF11-01	Iron Age and Roman Features (including burial)	Strip, Map and Sample	HER: MMK8028 and MMK358; NRHE: 346960 and 1591432, Geophysics: A8, P2	2.125
G	GF6	GF6-02	Iron Age Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A4	1.235
G	GF3	GF3-04	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology) Strip, Map and Sample	HER: MMK8011 and MMK390; Geophysics: A1, A2	1.085
G	GF4	GF4-01	Possible Iron Age/Roman features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A4	2.721
G	GF12	GF12-02	Possible Iron Age/Roman features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: A9	0.579
G	GF12	GF12-01	Iron Age and Roman Features	In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)	HER: None; Geophysics: None	0.202
Greenhill BESS:						



Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
BESS	BESS1	BESS-01	Possible Iron Age/Roman features	Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required	HER: 6521, Geophysics: None	4.402
BESS	BESS2	BESS-02	Possible Iron Age/Roman features	Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required	HER: None, Geophysics: None	4.073
Cable Route Corridor:						
Cable Route Corridor	-	Full length of route excluding where crossing existing roads	Low archaeological potential	Archaeological Monitoring followed by targeted Strip, Map and Sample as required	-	-
Cable Route Corridor	CR1a.3 CR1a.7 CR5a.25 CR7.11 CR7.12 CR7.13	CR1a.3-01 CR1a.7-01 CR5a.25-01 CR7.11-01	Possible Iron Age/Roman features	Strip, Map and Sample or In situ preservation trenchless cabling techniques (such as horizontal directional drilling (HDD))	HER: 3557, 3563/2/4, 5889, 5898, 8924 ENN100358, ENN101426, and ENN101427 Geophysics: A1, P1, A2, P2, P4, U5, A6, U6, P6, P8, U8, A9, P9, A11, A12, A13, A14, A15, A16, P11, U11, U12, U13, P12	12.13
Cable Route Corridor	CR1a.12 CR1a.16 CR1a.19 CR2a.5 CR5a.6 CR5a.7 CR5a.12 CR5a.23 CR6.5 CR6.18 CR9a.6 CR9a.7	CR1a.12-01 CR1a.16-01 Cr1a.19-01 CR2a.5-02 CR5a.6-01 CR5a.7-01 CR5a.12-01 CR5a.23-01 CR6.5-01 CR6.18-01 CR9a.6-01 CR9a.7-01	Possible archaeological features	Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required	HER: 3568/1/1, 6519/0/1 and 6520/0/1; Geophysics: P3, P4, P5, P9, P10, P12, U4, U6, U7, U8, U10, U16, U17	14.37 9



Site	Field Nos.	Mitigation Area Ref.	Archaeological Potential	Mitigation Type	Other ref	Area (ha)
Cable Route Corridor	CR1b.17 CR2a.5 CR2a.6 CR6.21	CR1b.17-01 CR2a.5-01 CR2a.6-01 CR6.21-01	Iron Age/Roman features	In situ preservation trenchless cabling techniques (such as horizontal directional drilling (HDD)), or Strip, Map and Sample depending on final design	HER: 5789, 5866 6522/0/0 Geophysics: A4, A5, A6, A7, A10, U5	3.068
Access Routes	-	Full length of all access routes not following existing tracks	Low archaeological potential	Archaeological Monitoring followed by targeted Strip, Map and Sample as required	-	-
Associated Infrastructure:						
Substations	-	-	Low archaeological potential	Archaeological Monitoring	-	-
Construction Compounds	-	-	Low archaeological potential	Archaeological Monitoring	-	-
Construction Compound	CR5a.18	CR5a18-01	Possible Iron Age/Roman features	Strip, Map and Sample	HER: 3557 Geophysics: P7, A8	0.479
Construction lay-down areas	-	-	Low archaeological potential	Archaeological Monitoring	-	-
Directional drilling access pits	-	-	Low archaeological potential	Archaeological Monitoring	-	-
Intrusive landscape and ecological mitigation	-	-	Low archaeological potential	Archaeological Monitoring	-	-
Intrusive landscape and ecological mitigation	-	-	Archaeological potential	Strip, Map and Sample	-	-
Roads and Cables	-	-	Archaeological potential	Strip, Map and Sample or horizontal directional drilling (HDD)	-	-



7 Fieldwork Methodology

7.1 Personnel

- 7.1.1 The archaeological mitigation works, and post-excavation assessment and analysis of the results, will be undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced professional archaeological contractors, that will adhere to the ClfA Code of Conduct and all appropriate standards and guidance.
- 7.1.2 Details of the CVs of the appointed contractor's key personnel and specialists will be provided to the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) in advance of the commencement of fieldwork, following appointment of the archaeological contractor. The appointed archaeological contractor's Project Manager for the project must be able to demonstrate competence and experience of managing archaeological projects of a similar size, nature and complexity. The appointed archaeological contractor will ensure they have the required capacity to deliver the works.

7.2 Project Initialisation

- 7.2.1 The Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) will be informed at least one week in advance of the commencement of any fieldwork, or stages of fieldwork, within the Scheme.
- 7.2.2 Prior to the commencement of archaeological fieldwork, the appointed archaeological contractor will familiarise themselves with all existing documentation and reports relating to previous stages of archaeological investigation within the site, and any other relevant documents as necessary.
- 7.2.3 The appointed archaeological contractor will be provided with all available information relating to health and safety on the site, including any mapped utilities and any other constraints that may affect the mitigation works.
- 7.2.4 All works will be archived under the accession number obtained from the appropriate archives. The appointed archaeological contractors will complete all archive deposition forms as required.
- 7.2.5 Before fieldwork commences, an OASIS online record will be initiated, and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creator forms.

7.3 Preservation *in situ*

- 7.3.1 Where possible, areas of potentially extensive or significant archaeological remains will be preserved *in situ*.
- 7.3.2 There are ~~25~~[23](#) areas containing probable extensive remains identified by non-intrusive survey within the Scheme which will be excluded from intrusive development works such as solar mounted arrays and associated infrastructure or ecological and landscape mitigation areas (see Table 6.1.1 above and Figures 2 to 8). The management of these excluded areas is detailed in Table 3.6 of Construction Environmental Management Plan **[REP1-131]**.
- 7.3.3 A further 47 areas have been identified within the Greenhill Sites through non-intrusive investigations and confirmed by evaluation trenching (CFA 2025a; CFA



2025b; CFA 2025c; CFA 2025d; 2025e), as containing archaeological features. Although impacts on any such remains from the solar mounts would be limited, the potential for any impact will be mitigated through the use of non-intrusive construction methodology (such as surface mounted pre-cast concrete ground anchors, which is a standard accepted approach to removing the impact of solar mounts upon potential archaeological sub-surface remains (BRE 2013, 13)), or through locating piles to avoid archaeology or cause minimal disturbance. The use of a non-intrusive methodology will depend on the final design.

7.3.4 The choice of non-intrusive construction methodology will be guided by the density and nature of the archaeological remains. The final methodology for each area will be informed by the final Scheme design, the results of archaeological evaluation works and agreed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).

7.3.5 Trenchless cabling techniques (such as horizontal directional drilling (HDD)) will be employed beneath mitigation area CR1b.17, CR2a.5, CR2a.6 and CR6.21 of the Cable Route Corridor (see Figures 9 to 13). Extensive concentrations of archaeological features have been identified by geophysical survey. [Mitigation Areas FF19-01 and FF27-01 have been identified for either Strip, Map and Sample or in situ preservation using trenchless cabling techniques. Any HDD required for archaeological mitigation will be undertaken to a sufficient depth to avoid archaeological features.](#) Within CR1b.17 and CR6.21, the depth of the directional drilling will be a minimum of 2m in order to avoid any impacts to the known archaeological deposits, informed by trenching undertaken in 2021 (PCA 2021). Within CR2a.5 and CR2a.6, the depth of the directional drilling will be a minimum of 3m in order to avoid any impacts to the known archaeological deposits, as agreed with NNCC and informed by trenching undertaken in 2000 (BCAS 2000). [Archaeological monitoring of launch/landing pits will be undertaken where located in areas identified as having an archaeological potential.](#) If the final design does not allow for trenchless cabling techniques (such as HDD), a Strip, Map and Sample will be employed.

7.3.6 If mitigation by preservation in situ is deemed unsuitable for any areas with archaeological remains that require mitigation, strip map and sample will be considered as a suitable alternative in accordance with the final design.

7.4 Mechanical Excavation

7.4.1 Topsoil or overburden across the mitigation excavation areas (see Table 6.1.1 above) will be stripped using 360° tracked excavators fitted with a toothless, flat bladed, grading bucket, down to the first significant archaeological horizon or natural sub-soil.

7.4.2 All mechanical excavation will be undertaken under direct archaeological supervision, by a suitably experienced and qualified archaeologist, with one archaeologist responsible for monitoring each excavator.

7.4.3 All areas of excavation will be scanned with a Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) prior to ground works commencing. Necessary measures will be taken to avoid disturbing any services.



- 7.4.4 Mechanical excavators will work backwards from the starting point of the excavation to avoid tracking over stripped areas.
- 7.4.5 Mechanical excavators and other plant will not track or drive over an area that has been stripped until an archaeologist has confirmed that no archaeological remains are present, or that any features have been fully archaeologically recorded.
- 7.4.6 The stripped surface will be kept clean and free of loose spoil until fully archaeologically investigated and recorded.
- 7.4.7 If required, areas of archaeological remains will be fenced-off to prevent accidental damage.
- 7.4.8 Spoil from mechanical excavation will be scanned by eye and by metal detector to aid the recovery of finds.
- 7.4.9 Topsoil and subsoil will be stored separately. Excavated topsoil will be redeposited at a location to be determined in agreement with the principal contractor and the Applicants. All spoil will be stored and managed safely in line with the standards of the *Construction Code of Practice for Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites* (DEFRA 2009).
- 7.4.10 Where depth of excavation is required to be greater than 1m, suitable stepping will be employed.

7.5 Strip, Map and Sample Excavation

- 7.5.1 'Strip, Map and Sample' excavation will be employed where archaeological evaluation has identified potential archaeological remains.
- 7.5.2 There are 12 areas containing probable archaeological remains identified by non-intrusive survey within the Cable Route Corridor (see Figures 9 to 13) in which 'Strip, Map and Sample' excavation will be employed. This will be reviewed following the final design for the Scheme and trenchless cabling techniques (such as HDD) may be employed as a suitable alternative to Strip, Map and Sample (see Section 7.3).
- 7.5.3 Should archaeological remains be discovered that require additional archaeological mitigation, the AMS will be updated and the scope will be detailed in approved WSIs in line with the mitigation methodology, and these will be attached as addendum to this overarching AMS.
- 7.5.4 Following machine topsoil excavation, a pre-excavation plan of identified potential archaeological features will be produced. This plan will be used to agree an excavation sampling strategy with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s), in order to decide which features, require hand excavation and the 'sample' of how much of these features should be excavated.
- 7.5.5 An indicative sampling strategy is provided below, but if archaeological remains are identified of either a lesser or greater extent / significance than anticipated, this may be subject to a change in scope following liaison with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).



- 100% excavation of all stake-holes
- 100% excavation of all structural, funerary or ritual features
- 100% excavation of all post-holes and pits with a diameter of less than 0.4m
- 50% excavation of pits between 0.4m and 1.5m in diameter
- 25% excavation of pits with a diameter of over 1.5m. This will include a complete section across the pit to recover its full profile
- 10% excavation of all linear features, up to 5m in length
- Reduced percentage excavation of longer linear features, to be agreed with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s)

7.5.6 All archaeological features and deposits revealed will be cleaned and excavated by hand in an archaeologically controlled and stratigraphic manner, in order to establish their extent, form, date, function and relationship to other features. All features will be investigated to understand the full stratigraphic sequence down to naturally occurring deposits.

7.5.7 Any excavation, by machine or by hand, will be undertaken with a view to avoiding damage to any archaeological features or deposits which appear to be demonstrably worthy of preservation in situ. No machine excavation of archaeological deposits or features will be undertaken without agreement from the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).

7.5.8 There will be sufficient excavation to give clear evidence for the period, depth and nature of any archaeological deposit. The depth and nature of colluvial or other masking deposits will be established across the site.

7.5.9 During the Strip, Map and Sample excavation, where it has been established that areas of the site under investigation do not contain archaeological remains, these areas will be signed-off to allow for construction groundworks to proceed, following agreement with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).

7.5.10 Following excavation and recording of any archaeological remains, and with the agreement of the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s), the stripped area will either be backfilled or released for construction phase of the proposed development works in agreement with the client. The timing and approach to land reinstatement following completion of Strip, Map and Sample excavation, will be identified with consideration to the overall Scheme construction programme.

7.6 Archaeological Monitoring

7.6.1 Archaeological monitoring (a 'watching brief') will be undertaken on specific areas of groundworks where archaeological evaluation works have identified a negligible / low potential for archaeological remains to be present and where topsoil stripping is required as part of the construction process (e.g. battery storage areas, sub-stations, construction compounds, drilling access pits etc, the cable route, access roads where these require intrusive groundworks).



- 7.6.2 Where post-determination trenching has confirmed the absence of archaeological remains, archaeological monitoring will no longer be required in these areas.
- 7.6.3 All topsoil or overburden stripping across these areas will be undertaken using 360° tracked excavators fitted with toothless, flat bladed, grading buckets, down to the first significant archaeological horizon or natural sub-soil. All machine stripping will be undertaken in line with the methodology in paragraphs 7.4.1 to 7.4.10 of this AMS.
- 7.6.4 A suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist will monitor groundworks in the specified areas and record any features in line with the recording methodology for excavation detailed above. The archaeological monitoring of construction groundworks will include the following:
- archaeological inspection of overburden / topsoil removal
 - inspection of subsoil for archaeological features
 - excavation, recording and environmental sampling of features necessary to determine their date and character
- 7.6.5 The principal contractor, or any other groundworks contractors operating on site, will allow sufficient time for any archaeological features to be excavated, sampled and recorded to meet the requirements of this AMS.
- 7.6.6 Every effort will be made to implement the archaeological monitoring without affecting the construction timetable, however, some limited suspension of groundworks in specific areas of the Scheme under investigation may be required in order to record and sample any archaeological evidence uncovered (in line with the 'Strip, Map and Sample' methodology provided in this AMS). The length of stoppage time will be determined by the nature of archaeological features or deposits identified.
- 7.6.7 Where it can be demonstrated that survival conditions are such that archaeological potential is negligible, the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) will be informed and, as agreed, the archaeological monitoring suspended in specific areas.
- 7.6.8 The results of the archaeological monitoring will be fully integrated with results of the excavation stage and the overall post-excavation assessment and analysis.
- 7.7 Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required**
- 7.7.1 Trial trenching will be undertaken within areas of the Scheme that were not investigated during the initial archaeological evaluation trenching. If archaeological features requiring mitigation are encountered during trial trenching, subsequent measures may include either preservation in situ or preservation by record (i.e., Strip, Map and Sample or Archaeological Monitoring). Where additional mitigation is necessary, the scope will be detailed in approved WSIs in accordance with the mitigation methodology and attached as an addendum to this overarching AMS.



- 7.7.2 The archaeological evaluation will comprise the excavation of trenches measuring up to 50m by 2m. Topsoil across the trenches will be stripped using a mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless, flat bladed, grading bucket, down to the first archaeological horizon or natural sub-soil. All machine stripping will be undertaken in line with the methodology in paragraphs 7.4.1 to 7.4.10 of this AMS.
- 7.7.3 Any excavation, by machine or by hand, will be undertaken with a view to avoiding damage to any archaeological features or deposits which appear to be demonstrably worthy of preservation in situ. No machine excavation of archaeological deposits or features will be undertaken without agreement from the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).
- 7.7.4 All excavation by mechanical excavator will be undertaken under direct archaeological supervision, by a suitably experienced and qualified archaeologist, with one archaeologist responsible for monitoring each excavator. There will be sufficient excavation to give clear evidence for the period, depth and nature of any archaeological deposit. The depth and nature of colluvial or other masking deposits will be established across the site. The level of recording and sampling of individual features will follow the indicative strategy set out in Section 7.5.5, . The sampling approach will be under constant review with consideration to the nature of identified features and any variation from the strategy set out in Section 7.5.5 will be agreed in consultation with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).
- 7.7.5 Where archaeological evaluation has identified potential archaeological remains that require mitigation, additional 'Strip, Map and Sample' excavation or Archaeological Monitoring may be employed following discussion with the Archaeological Advisor(s).

7.8 Hand Excavation and Recording

- 7.8.1 All archaeological features and deposits revealed will be excavated by hand in an archaeologically controlled and stratigraphic manner, in order to establish their extent, form, date, function and relationship to other features.
- 7.8.2 All features will be investigated to understand the full stratigraphic sequence down to naturally occurring deposits. Where depth of excavation is required to be greater than safe working depth, suitable stepping will be employed.
- 7.8.3 Metal detector searches will take place at all stages of the mitigation fieldwork, over archaeological features and excavated spoil in accordance with the Historic England guidance *Our Portable Past. Guidance for Good Practice* (Historic England 2018a). Any metal finds will be located using survey-grade GPS and metal detectors will be set not to discriminate against iron. Metal detecting will also be conducted over the surface of all exposed features before the end of each working day as a countermeasure to 'nighthawking'.
- 7.8.4 The stripped surface will be kept clean and free of loose spoil until fully archaeologically investigated and recorded. Wherever possible, spoil arising during hand-cleaning and hand-excavation will be piled beyond the limits of excavation.



- 7.8.5 A full written, drawn and photographic record will be made of all features revealed during the course of the archaeological mitigation works.
- 7.8.6 All archaeological features or deposits encountered will be described fully on pro-forma individual context recording sheets, using standard methods of the archaeological contractor appointed.
- 7.8.7 Plans will be completed at a scale of 1:20 with a site plan at 1:100 (as appropriate), with section drawings at a scale of 1:10. All plans will be tied in with the Ordnance Survey National Grid with levels given to above OD using cm accurate survey grade GPS equipment.
- 7.8.8 A photographic record, utilising high resolution digital photography of a minimum of 12 megapixels and in RAW format, will be maintained during the course of the fieldwork and recorded in a photographic register. This will include:
- the site prior to commencement of fieldwork
 - the site during work, showing specific stages of fieldwork
 - the layout of archaeological features within the site
 - individual features and, where appropriate, their sections
 - groups of features where their relationship is important
- 7.8.9 All photography will follow industry best practice (Historic England 2015b). Images will be converted to uncompressed baseline v.6 TIFF for archiving. All images will have accompanying metadata specifying; photo ID, capture device, converting software, colour space, bit depth, resolution, date of capture, photographer, caption, and any alterations made to the image.

7.9 Finds Recovery

- 7.9.1 All identified finds will be collected and retained and bagged and labelled according to their context. Finds of significant interest will be given a 'special finds' number, and information on their location in three dimensions will be entered on a separate pro-forma sheet.
- 7.9.2 No finds will be discarded without assessment by an appropriate finds specialist, and/or the approval of the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).
- 7.9.3 It is anticipated that unstratified 20th and 21st century material will be noted, spot dated as required and discarded.
- 7.9.4 All finds and samples will be treated in a proper manner during the excavation stage. Finds will be exposed, lifted, bagged, conserved and stored in accordance with the guidelines set out in *the ClfA guidelines Standard and Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (2020b).
- 7.9.5 The provisions of the Treasure Act 1996 (as amended), and the Treasure (Designation) Order 2002 will be followed with regard to any finds that might fall within its purview. All finds of gold and silver, and associated objects, will be reported to the coroner according to the procedures under the Treasure Act 1996



(and the Act's amendment of 2003 to include prehistoric objects such as Bronze Age metalworking hoards and other non-precious metal items), after discussion with the Applicant, the landowner, the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) and the Finds Liaison Officer.

7.10 Paleoenvironmental Sampling

- 7.10.1 The paleoenvironmental sampling strategy will be identified prior to each stage of works with consideration to identifying a targeted approach that links to site-specific aims and objectives. The detailed scope of the strategy will be set out in approved WSIs. In line with English Heritage guidelines *Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation* (2011), the sampling strategy will be aimed at identifying:
- the nature of biological remains present
 - the preservation of identified remains
 - any patterns in concentration and distribution
 - the significance of identified remains
- 7.10.2 Soil samples will be taken from all suitable features or deposits for palaeoenvironmental sampling. This will comprise the removal of a bulk sample from every securely sealed and hand-excavated context, excepting those with excessive levels of residuality or those with minimal 'soil' content (such as building rubble).
- 7.10.3 Bulk samples will comprise representative 40 litre samples, or more if appropriate. Where a context does not yield 40 litres of material, smaller samples will be taken (generally the maximum amount of material that it is practicable to collect). Bulk samples will be used to recover a sub-sample of charred macroplant material, faunal remains and artefacts. Suitable deposits will also be sampled for industrial residues.
- 7.10.4 If buried soils or other deposits are encountered, column samples may be taken for micromorphological and pollen analysis. Environmental material will be stored in controlled environments and specialists will be consulted during the course of the work as necessary.
- 7.10.5 Depending on the nature of deposits being sampled, a qualified and experienced palaeoenvironmental specialist will be consulted. If required they will undertake site visits to discuss the sampling strategy and assist in any required fieldwork. The advice of the Historic England Regional Science Advisor will be sought as appropriate.
- 7.10.6 All environmental work will be undertaken in accordance with English Heritage guidelines *Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation* (2011).



7.11 Human Remains

- 7.11.1 The Ministry of Justice and the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) will be informed if human remains are found. The contractor will comply with all statutory consents and licences under the Disused Burial Grounds (Amendment) Act 1981 or other Burial Acts regarding the exhumation and interment of human remains.
- 7.11.2 If human remains are encountered, they will be cleaned with minimal disturbance, prior to recording and removal, following receipt of the required Ministry of Justice licence. The burials will only be lifted by, or under supervision of, suitably experienced specialist staff and in accordance with the Advisory Panel on the Archaeology of Burials in England (APABE) and English Heritage (EH) guidance *Science and the dead: A guide for the Destructive Sampling of Archaeological Human Remains for Scientific Analysis* (APABE/EH 2013) and *Guidance for Best Practice for the Treatment of Human Remains Excavated from Christian Burial Grounds in England (2nd Edition)* (APABE/ Historic England 2017) and the *Updated Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains* (Mitchell and Brickley 2017). If required a qualified and experienced osteoarchaeologist will undertake site visits to discuss the preservation in situ and recording and assist in the later removal of any human skeletal remains (Historic England 2018b). Assessment of excavated human remains will be undertaken in line with *Human Bones from archaeological sites: Guidelines for the production of assessment documents and analytical reports* (English Heritage 2004).
- 7.11.3 The archaeological contractor will comply with all reasonable requests of interested parties as to the method of removal, re-interment or disposal of the remains or associated items. Every effort will be made, at all times, not to cause offence to any interested parties.
- 7.11.4 If required a qualified and experienced osteoarchaeologist will undertake site visits to discuss the recording and assist in the removal of any human skeletal remains.

7.12 Strategy Review

- 7.12.1 The strategy for the archaeological fieldwork will be held under continuous review by the Applicant's archaeological consultant(s), and relevant stakeholders.
- 7.12.2 If archaeological remains are identified of either a lesser or greater extent / significant than anticipated, this may be subject to change in scope following liaison with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).
- 7.12.3 Where areas of the Scheme or parts of individual Sites have been shown to contain no archaeological remains following stages of archaeologically monitored top-soil stripping, or where specific areas of the Scheme have been fully archaeologically excavated, agreement will be sought with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) to allow for construction groundworks to proceed in these specific areas once the on-site archaeological works are complete. Post-excavation analysis and reporting will be undertaken following the conclusion of all site works.



- 7.12.4 Should the strategy be considered unsuitable at any time by the appointed archaeological contractor, an alternative strategy will be proposed for agreement with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).

7.13 Unexpectedly Significant or Complex Discoveries

- 7.13.1 Should unexpectedly extensive, complex or significant remains be uncovered that warrant, in the professional judgment of the archaeologists on site, more detailed recording or extensive excavation than is appropriate in the terms of this AMS, the scope of the AMS will be reviewed, in agreement with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).



8 Post-Excavation Assessment

- 8.1.1 Following completion of the archaeological fieldwork and site work sign off by the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s), areas will be released to allow construction groundworks to proceed.
- 8.1.2 Provision will be made for post excavation assessment, publication and archiving. The finds, soil samples and stratigraphic information will be assessed for their potential and significance for further analysis.
- 8.1.3 An assessment report on the fieldwork will be produced within an agreed timetable following the completion of the fieldwork, which will inform the production of an Updated Project Design (UPD) detailing the methodology for the analysis and publication stage if necessary (see Section 9).

8.2 Finds Processing

- 8.2.1 All finds will be treated in a proper manner during the post-excavation stage and to standards agreed in advance with the appropriate archives. Finds will be cleaned, conserved, marked, bagged and stored in accordance with the guidelines set out in the ClfA guidelines *Standard and Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (2020b).
- 8.2.2 In accordance with the procedures outlined in *Guidelines on the X-radiography of archaeological metalwork* (English Heritage, 2006b), x-radiography will be undertaken on metalwork where required to clarify object morphology, which has been obscured by the process of deterioration / burial.
- 8.2.3 All material will be packed and stored in optimum conditions, as described in *First Aid for Finds* (Watkinson and Neal 1998). Waterlogged organic materials will be dealt with in line with the Historic England guidance documents, *Waterlogged Organic Artefacts. Guidelines on their Recovery, Analysis and Conservation* (2018c) and *Waterlogged Wood. Guidelines on the recording, sampling, conservation and curation of waterlogged wood* (English Heritage 2010), as well as with consideration to the draft version of *Waterlogged Wood*, which is currently being consulted on (Historic England 2018d).
- 8.2.4 The finds assessment will be reported in the overall post-excavation assessment report and include proposals for full analysis to be incorporated into the UPD.
- 8.2.5 Finds for dating will be submitted to specialists promptly, so as to ensure that results are available to aid development of the UPD for the analysis stage.
- 8.2.6 For ceramic assemblages, recording will be carried out in a manner compatible with existing typological series in local pottery reference collections. Reporting on ceramic artefacts and pottery should follow the guidance given in *A Standard for Pottery Studies in Archaeology* (Barclay *et al.* 2016) and endorsed by the Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group, the Study Group for Roman Pottery, and the Medieval Pottery Research Group.

8.3 Environmental Sample Processing

- 8.3.1 The processing of all palaeoenvironmental samples will be undertaken in line with the requirements of the English Heritage publications *Archaeological Science at*



PPG16 Interventions: Best Practice Guidance for Curators and Commissioning Archaeologists (2006a) and *Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods from sampling and recovery to post-excavation* (2011).

- 8.3.2 The samples will be processed, and ecofacts collected and assessed with regard to the potential for detailed analysis of pollen, charred plant macrofossils, land molluscs, faunal remains (including small mammals and fish) and soil micromorphology. Samples suitable for radiocarbon, or other dating methods, will also be identified. The environmental assessment will be reported within the overall post-excavation assessment report and include proposals for full analysis to be incorporated into the UPD. Unprocessed sub-samples will be stored in conditions specified by the appropriate specialists.
- 8.3.3 Samples for dating will be submitted to specialists promptly, so as to ensure that results are available to aid development of the UPD for the analysis stage.

8.4 Human Remains Processing

- 8.4.1 If discovered, human remains will be processed following national standards and guidance, including Human Bones from Archaeological Sites: Guidelines for Producing Assessment Documents and Analytical Reports. Centre for Archaeology Guidelines (English Heritage 2004), Updated Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains (Mitchell and Brickley 2017), and Guidance for Best Practice for the Treatment of Human Remains Excavated from Christian Burial Grounds in England (2nd edition) (APABE/Historic England 2017). Processing will be undertaken by experienced specialists trained in the identification of human remains and who are familiar with delicate areas of the skeleton that need careful preservation, important areas required for an individual identification (e.g. age and sex), as well as potentially pathologically altered bones.
- 8.4.2 Where specialist processing may be required, for example where samples may be required for DNA analysis, specialist advice will be sought to minimise potential contamination. The human remains will be placed in breathable bags and labelled and boxed protected by polyethylene 3mm foam sheeting and in line with any specific archive requirements.
- 8.4.3 Cremation burials will be processed by removing the fill of the vessel in 5 to 10mm spits, recording the distribution and density of the bone per spit following guidance by Mitchell and Brickley (2017). Fills will be wet sieved over a 1mm mesh with retrieval of burnt bone, pyre debris such as charcoal and botanical remains, and the remains air-dried and hand-sorted.

8.5 Conservation

- 8.5.1 If required at the assessment stage or earlier, conservation will be undertaken by approved conservators in line with the *First Aid for Finds* guidelines (Watkinson and Neal 1998). Material considered vulnerable will be selected for stabilisation after specialist recording. Where intervention is necessary, consideration must be given to possible investigative procedures (e.g. glass composition studies, residues in or on pottery, and mineral-preserved organic material).



8.6 Assessment Report

8.6.1 The results of the fieldwork and post-excavation assessment stage will be presented in an integrated assessment report to allow an informed decision to be made on the future analysis and publication of the project.

8.6.2 As a minimum the assessment report shall contain the following information:

- A title page, with the name of the project, the name of the author(s) of the report, the title of the report and date of the report
- A non-technical summary of the scope, methodology and results of the work
- Introduction which includes site code/project number, planning reference number and dates when the fieldwork took place, grid reference
- Description of the aims, methodology and extent of fieldwork completed
- Factual assessments of stratigraphic, artefactual and environmental evidence
- Factual assessment of stratigraphic evidence to include interpretation, covering phasing of the site sequence and integrating spot-dating of ceramics or other material
- Factual assessment of the artefactual evidence, where applicable including inspection of X-radiographs of all iron objects, a selection of non-ferrous artefacts (including coins) and a sample of any industrial debris relating to metallurgy
- Factual assessment of the environmental evidence
- An assessment of the archaeological potential of the stratigraphic, artefactual and environmental records
- Proposals for the selection of samples or sub-samples for further analysis and reporting
- Identification of interim and long-term conservation and storage requirements.
- Updated Project Design (UPD) detailing proposed programme for analysis and publication
- Proposed format for analysis reporting and publication of the results
- Conclusions
- Details of archive location and destination (with accession number(s)), together with a catalogue of what is contained in that archive
- Copy of the OASIS entry form and any entry updates
- Appendices, illustrations and figures, as appropriate
- References and bibliography of all sources used



- 8.6.3 Copies of the draft assessment report will be provided in both MS Word and PDF formats and submitted to the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) for comment.
- 8.6.4 All survey data will be provided in PDF/A format at a suitable scale, together with AutoCAD DWG files or Esri Shapefiles, as required.
- 8.6.5 A digital copy of the final assessment report will be provided to in PDF/A format to:
- The Applicants
 - Northamptonshire HER
 - Milton Keynes HER
 - Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) for dissemination to the Local Planning Authority
 - Historic England Regional Science Advisor
- 8.6.6 Digital copies of the final assessment report will also be submitted to OASIS and ADS to allow the results to be accessible on-line to the wider archaeological community and general public.
- 8.6.7 The assessment report will be used to inform the scope of UPD detailing the methodology for further analysis and dating of artefacts, soil samples and stratigraphic information. This will include a selection strategy in order to establish what records and finds will be retained as part of the final archaeological archive, in line with ClfA guidance (ClfA 2020a).



9 Post-Excavation Analysis

- 9.1.1 The scope of work for the analysis stage will be detailed in the UPD and a detailed publication quality report produced following the results of the analysis as required.
- 9.1.2 The analysis stage will also draw on the results of all previous archaeological investigations within and adjacent to the Scheme, to produce a coherent and comprehensive record of the archaeological resource.
- 9.1.3 The following is provided as a guide to the potential content of the analysis report, but this will be reviewed within the UPD as necessary. As a minimum, the analysis report shall contain the following information:
- A title page, with the name of the project, the name of the author(s) of the report, the title of the report and date of the report
 - A non-technical summary of the scope, methodology and results of the work
 - Introduction which includes site code/project number, planning reference number, dates when the fieldwork took place, grid reference
 - A description of, and a background to, the works and its aims and objectives
 - A description of the site location and the archaeological and historical context for the area
 - An account of the methods and results of the fieldwork, describing both structural data and associated finds and/or environmental data recovered
 - The results and interpretation of specialist analysis of stratigraphic records, artefacts, environmental and scientific samples, as necessary and based upon the requirements identified at the assessment stage and detailed in the UPD
 - An analysis of the archaeological significance of the deposits identified, in relation to other sites in the region.
 - Details of archive selection strategy
 - Conclusions
 - Details of archive location and destination (with accession number) together with a catalogue of what is contained in that archive
 - Appendices and figures, as appropriate, including a copy of the updated project design; and References and bibliography of all sources used
- 9.1.4 Digital copies of the report will be provided in draft form in MS Word and PDF format to the Applicant and the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s). Two iterations of the draft analysis report based on consultee and Applicants comments will be allowed for.
- 9.1.5 The appointed archaeological contractor shall rectify any defects and make any amendments as identified by Lanpro, the Applicants and the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) and shall subsequently



submit the final report within an agreed programme, following receipt of any comments.

- 9.1.6 Final copies of the analysis report (in PDF/A format) will be produced, and submitted to the following, together with all other digital information in industry standard formats as required:
- Northamptonshire HER
 - Milton Keynes HER
 - Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) to distribute to the Local Planning Authority
 - Historic England Regional Science Advisor
- 9.1.7 Digital copies of the final analysis report and the digital archive will be submitted to OASIS and ADS to allow the results of the work to be accessible on-line to the wider archaeological community and general public.
- 9.1.8 The preparation of a publication report for an appropriate journal (or in another agreed form) will be required if the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) considers the results significant enough to warrant dissemination to a wider audience.
- 9.1.9 Provision will be made for publicising the results of the work locally, e.g. by presenting a paper at Milton Keynes and/or N Northamptonshire Archaeology Days, talking to local societies etc.



10 Decommissioning

- 10.1.1 A Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be agreed with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) prior to decommissioning, which will be sufficient to safeguard any archaeological remains during the decommissioning phase.



11 Archiving and Data Management

11.1 Archive Content

- 11.1.1 The appointed archaeological contractor will contact the appropriate archives in advance of commencing any fieldwork to determine the preparation, and deposition of the archive and finds, and agree any accession numbers for all archaeological works.
- 11.1.2 The archives will be prepared in accordance with the ClfA guidelines detailed in *Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives* (ClfA 2020c), *Northants Archaeological Resource Centre Archaeological Archives Standard* (2023) and *Milton Keynes Museum Procedures for the Deposition of Archaeological Archives* (2022).
- 11.1.3 The preparation of the archives will also be informed by the *Guidelines for the preparation of Excavation Archives for long-term storage* (United Kingdom Institute for Conservation, 1990), *Standards in the museum care of archaeological collections* (Museums and Galleries Commission 1994), and in accordance with the relevant archive's deposition guidelines. Provision will be made for the stable storage of paper records and their long-term storage.
- 11.1.4 The landowner will be encouraged to transfer ownership of the finds to the relevant archive. The archive will be presented to the relevant archive within six months of completion of all fieldwork, unless alternative arrangements have been agreed in writing with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).
- 11.1.5 Adequate resources will be provided during fieldwork to ensure that all records are checked and internally consistent. Archive consolidation will be undertaken immediately following the conclusion of fieldwork and will include the following work:
- the site record will be checked, cross-referenced and indexed as necessary
 - all retained finds will be cleaned, conserved, marked and packaged in accordance with the requirements of the relevant archive
 - all retained finds will be assessed and recorded using pro forma recording sheets, by suitably qualified and experienced staff. Initial artefact dating will be integrated within the site matrix
 - all retained environmental samples will be processed by suitably experienced and qualified staff
- 11.1.6 The archive will consist of paper records and digital data, as well as finds and samples as selected. Not all material collected or created during the course of the works will require preservation in perpetuity, and the final contents of the archive will be subject to selection prior to the accession of the archive to the relevant archive, in line with a Selection Strategy agreed with the Applicant and the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).
- 11.1.7 The selected contents of the archive will be appropriate to establish the significance of the results of the project and support future research, outreach,



engagement, display and learning activities. Selection will be focused on selecting what is to be retained to support these future needs. Methods for disposing of de-selected material will be agreed with the landowner and other relevant stakeholders.

11.1.8 A copy of the digital archive will be submitted to the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) on completion of all work, for integration into the **appropriate** HER.

11.1.9 An OASIS form will be completed for the project and an electronic copy of the final report and the digital archive deposited with the ADS.

11.2 Data Management

11.2.1 A Data Management Plan will be created and managed by the appointed archaeological contractor on commencement of the Scheme, which will outline the strategy for the sharing and preservation of the project's digital data.

11.2.2 The Data Management Plan will be produced in line with ClfA standards (2020a) and guidance produced by the ADS (2014), and will include:

- Details of data that will be generated during the work
- Type of file formats to be used (e.g. .doc, .pdf, .dwg, .shp, etc.)
- Methods of data collection or capture (e.g. GPS/Total Station/digitising from hard copies)
- File naming conventions (e.g. ADS naming conventions)
- Metadata, standards and quality assurance measures
- Plans for sharing data
- Ethical and legal issues or restrictions on data sharing (e.g. client confidentiality etc.)
- Copyright and intellectual property rights of data
- Data storage and back-up measures
- Data management roles and responsibilities
- Costing or resources needed (ADS archiving costs etc.)

11.2.3 The digital archive will be produced using industry standard file formats, with a clear file structure that allows these to be easily shared with all stakeholders and allows the data to continue to be preserved and shared with the public through, for example, the HERs.

11.2.4 The data comprising the digital archive will comply with the English Heritage (now Historic England) guidance on historic environment data standards, *MIDAS Heritage; the UK Historic Environment Data Standard* (English Heritage 2012).

It is anticipated that the repositories to which the digital archive are submitted (i.e. HER/local museum/archive) will have in-house Data Management Plans to allow for the long-term preservation of the digital archive data, including plans for data back-up and migration to new digital formats as these emerge.



12 Public Outreach and Engagement

- 12.1.1 It is recognised that community engagement both fosters public understanding and support for the historic environment and adds value to archaeological work.
- 12.1.2 A programme of public outreach and engagement will be developed during the archaeological mitigation and post-excavation stages of the project, depending on the character and form of any archaeological remains encountered, in liaison with the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s), Historic England and/or any other interested community groups.
- 12.1.3 The programme of public outreach and engagement could include, for example, provision of talks and presentations, guided walks, arranging conferences, exhibitions, open days and living history events, providing school project work and learning resources, offering work experience and volunteering opportunities, and supporting community archaeology projects.



13 Staffing

- 13.1.1 A suitably qualified and experienced archaeological clerk of works will be responsible for overseeing the archaeological mitigation works as detailed in the AMS.
- 13.1.2 All archaeological fieldwork and post-excavation works will be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced professional archaeological contractor, that will adhere to the ClfA Code of Conduct and all appropriate standards and guidance.
- 13.1.3 Details of the CVs of key personnel and specialists will be provided to the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) in advance of the commencement of fieldwork, following appointment of the archaeological contractor. The appointed archaeological contractor's Project Manager for the project must be able to demonstrate competence and experience of managing archaeological projects of a similar size, nature and complexity.
- 13.1.4 Assessment and analysis of finds, environmental samples and human remains will be undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists.



14 Project Timetable

- 14.1.1 WSIs will be produced and approved by the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) prior to the commencement of archaeological fieldwork. Following approval of the WSIs, a timetable for the programme of archaeological mitigation fieldwork and post-excavation assessment reporting will be agreed between the appointed archaeological contractor, the Applicant, and the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) prior to the commencement of fieldwork. The appointed archaeological contractor will ensure they have the required capacity to deliver the works.
- 14.1.2 The Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) will be informed of the proposed start date for the project as soon as practicable, and at least one week before commencement of fieldwork.
- 14.1.3 The full programme of archaeological mitigation will be established following the trial trenching.
- 14.1.4 The appointed archaeological contractor will provide at least weekly progress reports on the progress of fieldwork via email to Lanpro, and regular site meetings will be held between the archaeological contractor, Lanpro, the principal contractor, the Applicant and the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s).
- 14.1.5 A draft assessment report will be provided to the Applicant and the Archaeological Advisor to the relevant Local Planning Authority within an agreed timeframe following completion of fieldwork, with a final version to be submitted to the Applicant and the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) following receipt of any comments within the agreed timeframe.
- 14.1.6 A draft analysis report will be submitted to Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) within a programme agreed in the UPD, informed by the results of the post-excavation assessment. This will be followed by a final report following any comments, and the publication of the results of the report in a suitable format.



15 Monitoring

- 15.1.1 The Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) will monitor the implementation of the archaeological mitigation works and evaluate the scope and progress of the work against the methodology detailed in the AMS.



16 Communication

- 16.1.1 The appointed archaeological contractor will provide at least weekly updates to Lanpro via email and/or telephone. Any issues that arise on site or during the post-excavation stages should first be addressed by the archaeological contractor directly to Lanpro, who will then liaise with the Applicant, Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) and any other stakeholders in order to resolve the matter.
- 16.1.2 In the event of issues arising regarding the implementation of this AMS, or the scope or methodology of the excavation, these will be resolved in the first instance by contacting Lanpro who will liaise with the Applicant and Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) to determine a solution. Should the issue not be resolved remotely a meeting will be held between key stakeholders to facilitate discussion of the issues and identification of a suitable strategy for progress to be agreed by all parties.



17 Copyright and Publicity

- 17.1.1 Copyright of the documentation prepared by the appointed archaeological contractor and specialist sub-contractors should be the subject of additional licences in favour of the Applicant, the Northamptonshire and Milton Keynes HERs and the Archaeological Advisor(s) to the relevant Local Planning Authority(s) to use such documentation for their commercial, statutory or educational functions, and to provide copies to third parties as required.
- 17.1.2 Under the *Environmental Information Regulations* (EIR 2004), information may need to be disclosed, except where an exception under these Regulations applies.
- 17.1.3 It is recognised that the Scheme may identify remains which are of interest to the public and these may be publicised through appropriate media. Any publicity for the Scheme proposed by the archaeological contractor should be approved by the Applicant. The appointed contractor will not issue any information on the work through media, internet or social media without prior agreement of the Applicant.
- 17.1.4 Care will be taken to ensure that any publicity does not compromise the security of archaeological remains that may have been identified or recovered.



18 Insurance

18.1.1 The appointed archaeological contractor will hold Employers Liability Insurance, Public Liability Insurance and Professional Indemnity Insurance to at least the following amounts;

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| • Public Liability | £10,000,000 |
| • Employer's Liability | £5,000,000 |
| • Professional indemnity (for any single claim) | £10,000,000 |



19 Health and Safety

- 19.1.1 The management of all health and safety, and welfare provision, on site during the excavation phase will be the responsibility of the principal contractor or the appointed archaeological contractor, depending on the stage and nature of the work being undertaken.
- 19.1.2 All works will be undertaken by the principal contractor or appointed archaeological contractor in compliance with the Health and Safety at Work Act (1974) and all applicable regulations and Codes of Practice.
- 19.1.3 All archaeological staff will undertake their operations in accordance with safe working practices. At least one First Aider will be present on site at all times.
- 19.1.4 A site-specific risk assessment and method statement (RAMS) will be produced by the appointed archaeological contractor, prior to the commencement of work on site.
- 19.1.5 Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be provided to all staff by the archaeological contractor, including hi-visibility coats/vests, hard hats, safety boots and gloves, as well as safety glasses if required.
- 19.1.6 All staff will receive a health and safety induction prior to starting work on site to be provided by the principal contractor and/or the appointed archaeological contractor.
- 19.1.7 Regular audits of health and safety practices will be carried out during the course of the project by the archaeological contractor in consultation with the site workforce.
- 19.1.8 Toolbox talks on health and safety issues will be conducted at minimum weekly intervals and/or after changes in working practices or identification of new threats/risks. The risk assessment will be updated and control measures will be implemented as required in response to specific hazards.
- 19.1.9 Safe working will take priority over the desire to record archaeological features or remains, and where it is considered that recording is dangerous, any such features will be recorded by photography at a safe distance.
- 19.1.10 All areas of excavation will be scanned with a Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) prior to ground works commencing. Necessary measures will be taken to avoid disturbing any services.
- 19.1.11 Where open excavations are left unattended overnight, these will be surrounded by suitable safety / security fencing, to be fitted with suitable warning signage. The responsibility for site security / safety fencing will lie with the lead contractor on site (i.e. either the Principal Contractor or the appointed archaeological contractor, depending on the nature and stage of work).
- 19.1.12 Plant operators will be required to produce evidence of qualification within an industry accepted registration scheme. Sub-Contractors health and safety performance will be kept under review and action taken if necessary.



- 19.1.13 All spoil will be stored and managed safely in line with the standards of the Construction Code of Practice for Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites (DEFRA 2009).



20

References

- ADS 2014, 'Data Management and Sharing Plans', v. 2 (last accessed 30th January 2025)
- APABE / English Heritage 2013, Science and the dead: A Guide for the Destructive Sampling of Archaeological Human Remains for Scientific Analysis, Advisory Panel on the Archaeology of Burials in England and English Heritage
- APABE / English Heritage 2017, Guidance for Best Practice for the Treatment of Human Remains Excavated from Christian Burial Grounds in England (2nd edition), Advisory Panel on the Archaeology of Burials and England (APABE) and Historic England
- ASWYAS 2023. Green Hill Solar Project BESS, Northamptonshire: Geophysical Survey. Unpubl. ASWYAS report no. 4072.
- ASWYAS 2024a. Green Hill Solar Project Area A, Northamptonshire: Geophysical Survey. Unpubl. ASWYAS report no. 4163.
- ASWYAS 2024b. Green Hill Solar Project Area B, Northamptonshire: Geophysical Survey. Unpubl. ASWYAS report no. 4134
- ASWYAS 2024c. Green Hill Solar Area C, D and E, Northamptonshire: Geophysical Survey. Unpubl. ASWYAS report.
- ASWYAS 2024d. Green Hill Solar Project Area F, Northamptonshire: Geophysical Survey. Unpubl. ASWYAS report.
- ASWYAS 2024e. Green Hill Solar Project Area G, Buckinghamshire: Geophysical Survey. Unpubl. ASWYAS report no. 4179
- ASWYAS 2025. Green Hill Solar Project Cable Route, Buckinghamshire: Geophysical Survey. Unpubl. ASWYAS report no. 4301
- Barclay, A., Knight, D., Booth P. and Evans, J. 2016, A Standard for Pottery Studies in Archaeology
- BCAS 2000, Runway Enhancements at Sywell Aerodrome, Sywell, Northamptonshire. Archaeological Evaluation Report. 2000/09
- BGS 2025, British Geological Survey, <https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/bgs-geology-viewer/> (last accessed 30th January 2025)
- BRE 2013, Planning guidance for the development of large-scale ground mounted solar PV systems, Building Research Establishment Trust
- CFA 2025a, 'Green Hill Solar Farm Site A.2 Northamptonshire Interim Report. Archaeological Evaluation', report no. 4573
- CFA 2025b, 'Green Hill Solar Farm Site A Northamptonshire Interim Report. Archaeological Evaluation', report no. 4575
- CFA 2025c, 'Green Hill Solar Farm Site B Northamptonshire Interim Report. Archaeological Evaluation', report no. 4576
- CFA 2025d, 'Green Hill Solar Farm Site C Northamptonshire Interim Report. Archaeological Evaluation', report no. 4574



CFA 2025e, 'Green Hill Solar Farm Site E Northamptonshire Interim Report. Archaeological Evaluation', report no. 4577

CFA 2025f, 'Green Hill Solar Farm Site F Northamptonshire Interim Report. Archaeological Evaluation', report no. 4578

CFA 2025g, 'Green Hill Solar Farm Site G Northamptonshire Interim Report. Archaeological Evaluation', report no. 4640

ClfA 2020a, Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives

ClfA 2020b, Standard and Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials

ClfA 2022, Code of Conduct

ClfA 2023a, Standard for archaeological monitoring and recording

ClfA 2023b, Universal guidance for archaeological monitoring and recording

ClfA 2023c, Standard for guidance for archaeological excavation

ClfA 2023d, Universal guidance for archaeological excavation

ClfA 2023e, Standard for archaeological field evaluation

ClfA 2023f, Universal guidance for archaeological field evaluation

Cranfield University 2025. The Soils Guide. Available: www.landis.org.uk. Cranfield University, UK.

Deegan, A. 2025, 'Air Photo and LiDAR Mapping and Interpretation for the Green Hill Solar Farm, Northamptonshire and Milton Keynes', project no. 2425003

DEFRA 2009, Construction Code of Practice for Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites

EIR 2004, Environmental Information Regulations

English Heritage 2004, Human Bones from Archaeological Sites: Guidelines for Producing Assessment Documents and Analytical Reports

English Heritage 2006a, Archaeological Science at PPG16 interventions: Best Practice Guidance for Curators and Commissioning Archaeologists

English Heritage, 2006b. Guidelines on the X-radiography of archaeological metalwork

English Heritage 2008a, Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE). PPN 3: Archaeological Excavation

English Heritage 2010, Waterlogged Wood. Guidelines on the recording, sampling, conservation and curation of waterlogged wood

English Heritage 2011, Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods from sampling and recovery to post-excavation

English Heritage 2012b, MIDAS Heritage; the UK Historic Environment Data Standard



Historic England, 2015a, Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment. The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide

Historic England, 2015a, Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment. The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide

Historic England 2015b, Digital Image Capture and File Storage. Guidelines for Best Practice

Historic England 2016, Research Strategy

Historic England 2017, Research Agenda

Historic England 2018a, Our Portable Past. Guidance for Good Practice

Historic England 2018b, The Role of the Human Osteologist in an Archaeological Fieldwork Project

Historic England 2018c, Waterlogged Organic Artefacts. Guidelines on their Recovery, Analysis and Conservation

Historic England 2018d (consultation draft), Waterlogged Wood Historic England Draft Guidelines on the Excavation, Recording, Sampling and Conservation of Waterlogged Wood

Lanpro 2025a. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment: Green Hill Solar Farm – Site A.

Lanpro 2025b. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment: Green Hill Solar Farm – Site B.

Lanpro 2025c. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment: Green Hill Solar Farm – Sites C, D and E.

Lanpro 2025d. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment: Green Hill Solar Farm – Site F.

Lanpro 2025e. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment: Green Hill Solar Farm – Site G.

Lanpro 2025f. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment: Green Hill Solar Farm – Battery Energy Storage Facility (BESS).

Milton Keynes 2022, Museum Procedures for the Deposition of Archaeological Archives

Mitchell, P.D. and Brickley, M. 2017, Updated Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

MOLAS 1994, Archaeological Field Manual

Museums and Galleries Commission 1994, Standards in the museum care of archaeological collections

Northants Archaeological Resource Centre 2023, Archaeological Archives Standard

NPPF 2024, National Planning Policy Framework (revised December 2024)



PCA 2021, The Overstone Leys Main, Replacement Scheme. Northamptonshire. Archaeological Evaluation Report. R14402


Research Frameworks 2025a, East Midlands Historic Environment Research Framework, online resource, [REDACTED] (last accessed 30th January 2025)

Research Frameworks 2025b, Solent Thames Research Framework, online resource, [REDACTED] (last accessed 30th January 2025)

Watkinson, D. And Neal, V. 1998, First Aid for Finds



Figures




Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 1. General location of proposed archaeological mitigation areas


- Legend:
- Green Hill Site boundary
 - Archaeological Mitigation Area


Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:80000 @ A3





Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 2. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill Site A and A.2 and cable route

- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation
 - In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)
 - In situ preservation (no solar development)
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Directional Drilling or Strip, Map and Sample
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required


Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:

- Bank (earthwork)
- Ditch

Geophysical Survey Features:


- Archaeological anomaly
- Possible archaeological anomaly


Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:12000 @ A3






Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 3. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas
within Green Hill Site B and cable route


- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation**
 - In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)
 - Directional Drilling or Strip, Map and Sample
 - Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:**
 - Bank (earthwork)
 - Ditch
 - Geophysical Survey Features:**
 - Archaeological anomaly
 - Possible archaeological anomaly



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid
Scale: 1:9000 @ A3

0 1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 m






Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 4. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas
within Green Hill Site C to D and cable route


- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation
 - In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)
 - In situ preservation (no solar development)
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Directional Drilling or Strip, Map and Sample
 - Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:
 - Bank (earthwork)
 - Ditch
 - Geophysical Survey Features:
 - Archaeological anomaly
 - Possible archaeological anomaly


Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:9000 @ A3





Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy


Title:
Figure 5. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill Site E and cable route

- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary

 - Mitigation**
 - In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)
 - In situ preservation (no solar development)
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required


- Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:
- Bank (earthwork)
 - Ditch

- Geophysical Survey Features:
- Archaeological anomaly
 - Possible archaeological anomaly



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid
Scale: 1:16000 @ A3






Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 6. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas
within Green Hill BESS site and cable route


- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation**
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Directional Drilling or Strip, Map and Sample
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required
 - Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:**
 - Bank (earthwork)
 - Ditch
 - Geophysical Survey Features:**
 - Archaeological anomaly
 - Possible archaeological anomaly


Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:14000 @ A3





Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 7. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas
within Green Hill Site F and cable route

- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation
 - In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)
 - In situ preservation (no solar development)
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Directional Drilling or Strip, Map and Sample
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required


Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:

- Bank (earthwork)
- Ditch

Geophysical Survey Features:


- Archaeological anomaly
- Possible archaeological anomaly


Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:16000 @ A3






Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 8. Proposed archaeological mitigation areas within Green Hill Site G and cable route


- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation**
 - In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required
 - Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:**
 - Bank (earthwork)
 - Ditch
 - Geophysical Survey Features:**
 - Archaeological anomaly
 - Possible archaeological anomaly



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid
Scale: 1:10000 @ A3

0 1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 m






Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 9. Proposed cable route mitigation areas
CR1a.3 and CR1a.7


- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation
 - In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)
 - In situ preservation (no solar development)
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:
 - Bank (earthwork)
 - Ditch
 - Geophysical Survey Features:
 - Archaeological anomaly
 - Possible archaeological anomaly


Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:5000 @ A3





Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy


Title:
Figure 10. Proposed cable route mitigation areas
CR1a.16, CR1a.19, CR1b.17, CR2a.5 and CR2a.6

- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation
 - Directional Drilling or Strip, Map and Sample
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required

- Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:
- Bank (earthwork)
 - Ditch


- Geophysical Survey Features:
- Archaeological anomaly
 - Possible archaeological anomaly


Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:10000 @ A3





Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy


Title:
Figure 11. Proposed cable route mitigation areas
CR5a.6, CR5a.7, CR5a.12, CR5a.18, CR5a.23 and
CR5a.25

- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation**
 - In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)
 - In situ preservation (no solar development)
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required

- Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:
- Bank (earthwork)
 - Ditch


- Geophysical Survey Features:
- Archaeological anomaly
 - Possible archaeological anomaly


Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:12000 @ A3





Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 12. Proposed cable route mitigation areas
CR6.5, CR6.18, CR6.21 and CR7.11

- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required


Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:

- Bank (earthwork)
- Ditch

Geophysical Survey Features:


- Archaeological anomaly
- Possible archaeological anomaly


Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:12500 @ A3






Green Hill Solar Farm

Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

Title:
Figure 13. Proposed cable route mitigation areas
CR9a.6 and CR9a.7

- Legend:
- Green Hill site boundary
 - Mitigation**
 - In situ preservation (non-intrusive construction methodology)
 - Strip, Map and Sample
 - Trial trenching followed by subsequent mitigation as required
 - Ap and LIDAR Survey Features:**
 - Bank (earthwork)
 - Ditch
 - Geophysical Survey Features:**
 - Archaeological anomaly
 - Possible archaeological anomaly

Data: © Lanpro, 2026; IGP, 2026
Base Maps: © Crown copyright and database rights 2026. Ordnance Survey
AC0000862729



Co-ordinate system: OSGB36 / British National Grid

Scale: 1:10000 @ A3

