

Archaeology, Conservation and the Historic Environment	
Summary of Comments Received (respondent ref in brackets)	Council's Response
Overall approach	
Agreed (2)	This support for the overall approach taken is welcomed
Compliance with government guidance	
Contributions to the restoration/enhancement of Conservation Areas, parks, gardens battlefields, historic features and the wider historic landscape should only be sought where a definite impact can be anticipated from the specific development (12) PPG15 makes no mention of developer funding in relation to these issues and puts the onus on the Council (12)	Each application will be individually assessed to ascertain the impacts it creates in accordance with the Council's strategic policy framework. Contributions sought will relate to the proposed development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PPG16 does not suggest that the developer should bear costs associated with display, exhibition or the SMR. There is nothing in PPG16 or the Council's own policies which suggests developers should contribute to museum costs (12) ▪ The implication that a developer may be asked to contribute to an artefact roadshow including publicity & interpretation material is a step too far when considered within the limitations of Circular 1/97 (3) 	See above. In addition, paragraph 26 of PPG16 notes that agreements covering excavation, recording and publication may take different forms.
PPG16 does not require 'full evaluation' of the potential impact of development prior to determination, it requires an 'archaeological field evaluation' (12)	Text has been changed to read 'full evaluation' to 'an appropriate evaluation' in paragraph 4.1.
Stating that there is a need to agree work in advance with the District Council goes beyond PPG16 (12)	This approach is seen as sensible, practical and may assist the developer in avoiding unnecessary expense. Text has been amended to replace 'must always be' with 'should' in paragraph 4.3.
Paras 3.2, 4.2 and 5.1 should make reference to the tests required in Circular 1/97 (14)	The Council considers that the draft SPG fully complies with Circular 1/97 and that it is not necessary to keep referring to the test required in Circular 1/97 in this Topic Paper. Revised paragraph 3.4 of the Core Guidance states that contributions sought will be necessary, relevant to planning, related directly to the proposed development,

Archaeology, Conservation and the Historic Environment	
Summary of Comments Received (respondent ref in brackets)	Council's Response
	fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and otherwise reasonable.
<u>Condition v obligation</u>	
Archaeological and heritage issues are normally dealt with by condition rather than through obligations (12)	Paragraphs 3.2, 4.2 and 5.1 of this Topic Paper note that obligations will be only be used where works cannot be secured through planning conditions.
Example given in para 4.2 would normally be conditioned and the LPA would not be involved in the costs(12)	See above
<u>Other</u>	
The retention/refurbishment of historic (if not listed) buildings should be strengthened in the planning process to retain the character of an area (2)	This comment is noted but relates to issues outside the scope of this particular SPG.