Sace House, 17 Main Road, Lower Hacheston, Suffolk

Planning application: C/10/2670 HER Ref: HCH 033

Archaeological Monitoring Report

(© John Newman BA MIFA, 2 Pearsons Place, Henley, Ipswich, IP6 0RA)

(April 2011)

(Tel: 01473 832896 Email: johnnewman2@btinternet.com)

Site details for HER

Name: Sace House, 17 Main Road, Lower Hacheston, Suffolk, IP13 0AB

Client: Mr A Clarke

Local planning authority: Suffolk Coastal DC

Planning application ref: C/10/2670 (pt)

Development: Erection of extensions to rear of existing property (small front extension under the same application to follow in 2012)

Date of fieldwork: 14-16 March, 2011

HER Ref: HCH 033

OASIS Ref: johnnewm1-97671

Grid ref: TM 3104 5674

Contents

Summary

- 1. Introduction & background
- 2. Monitoring methodology
- 3. Results
- 4. The Finds (Stephen Benfield)

Table 1: Roman pottery fabric quantities

Table 2: Roman pottery by fabric type

- 5. Conclusion
- Fig. 1 Site location

Fig. 2 Monitored foundation trenches & modern features

List of appendices

Appendix I – Images of monitoring

Appendix II - Brief & Specification

Summary: Hacheston, Sace House, 17 Main Road, Lower Hacheston (HCH 033, TM 3104 5674) monitoring of foundation trenches for a large extension within the general area of the small Roman town did not reveal any archaeological features of any age though a number of Roman period pottery sherds were recovered from the substantial subsoil deposits (John Newman Archaeological Services for Mr & Mrs A Clarke).

1. Introduction & background

1.1 Mr A Clarke commissioned John Newman Archaeological Services (JNAS) to undertake the archaeological monitoring of ground works required under the condition for a programme of archaeological works of the planning decision notice for application C/10/2670. The monitoring requirements were set out in a Brief and Specification set by Ms J Plouviez of the Suffolk CC Archaeological Service to satisfy this condition (Appendix II). This development concerns the erection of a large extension to the rear and a small extension to the front of Sace House, 17 Main Road, Lower Hacheston, (see Fig. 1). This report concerns the ground works for the larger rear extension; the smaller front extension will be constructed at a date yet to be confirmed.

1.2 Hacheston is a relatively large parish to the north-east of Wickham Market and it is separated from this small town by the River Deben which forms the respective parish boundary. The main part of Hacheston is strung out along the village street with the parish church located towards its southern end. However Lower Hacheston is a separate hamlet located in the southern part of the parish, some 2km south of the parish church and close to the bridge over the River Deben carrying the road out of Wickham Market, through Lower Hacheston, and towards the nearby Fiveways junction. Sace House lies on the northern side of this main road, c450m east of the bridge over the river and c200m west of the Fiveways junction on level ground and close to the 15m OD contour with open, arable ground to the north of the property. The drift geology in the area is predominantly composed of glaciofluvially derived sands and gravels giving rise to light, well drained soils. At the time of the monitoring the proposed development area was largely open, soft, ground being garden to Sace House with one or two small outbuildings already demolished down to shallow raft foundations. The main part of the proposed extension area therefore had seen little previous ground disturbance though a complex of existing septic tanks are located to the north of the house and drain runs clearly run between this area and the house. Sace House appears to be of mid 20th century date.

1.3 Archaeological interest in the application to extend Sace House substantially with c100m of footing trenches was generated by its location within the general area covered by a large Roman period settlement (HER- HCH 001) which is centred approximately on the Fiveways junction and which has been identified as a small Roman town. This small Roman town has been partially investigated (Blagg et al, 2004) during the construction of the nearby A 12 bypass in the early 1970s with a smaller excavation revealing Roman cremation burials, an early Saxon burial and early Saxon settlement evidence (HER- HCH 013) at Gallows Hill to the north in the 1980s. Casually recovered scatters of Roman and Saxon ceramic and metal finds indicate a settlement area covering several hectares around Fiveways and an amateur investigation in 1974 identified a Roman period pottery kiln (ibid. Fig 2 m) close to Sace House.

2. Monitoring methodology

2.1 Due to the location of Sace House within the general area of an extensive Roman period settlement and potentially close to a previously identified pottery kiln the site monitoring was specified as a continuous attendance as the foundation trenches were excavated. This continuous attendance was carried out between 14th

and 16th March, 2011, with both a wheeled machine and a mini-digger operating on the first day and the latter machine completing the works on the subsequent days. In addition to the excavation of the foundation trenches the mechanical removal of up to 400mm of overburden across the eastern half of the footprint and grading down to a depth of 200mm over the south western part for the over-site was also monitored. As the trenches were excavated indistinct areas on the sides and base were hand cleaned for clarity and the upcast spoil was closely examined for finds as it was stockpiled nearby before removal from the site. During the monitoring a series of digital images were taken to record exposed soil profiles and stripped areas (see Appendix II).

3. Results

3.1 A total length of 88m of 600mm wide and 1000mm deep foundation trench was examined for archaeological features and finds for the main extension to Sace House which extended to the north and north west of the existing house in an L shaped footprint (see Fig. 2). As noted above a small extension under the same planning application to be built on the south western corner of Sace House will form a later phase of works at the site.

3.2 The foundation trenches revealed a varying depth of overburden across the extension footprint below the uniform 250mm depth of topsoil and above the naturally occurring drift deposit in this area which proved to be a yellow silty sand with small to medium flints. To the north of the existing house at the eastern end of the footprint the soil profile exposed in the trench sides revealed 700mm of a uniform, mid brown sandy subsoil below the topsoil cover. This substantial subsoil deposit extended across the central and north western part of the footprint making up the major part of the footprint where it decreased to a layer 300/400mm thick below the topsoil. A small area in the central part of the footprint did not have any topsoil cover as it had formed the site of a small garage with a thin and insubstantial asphalt base above the 600/700mm depth of subsoil. Archaeological features were not visible in the subsoil deposit, either in section in the footprint area.

3.3 The only features noted during the site monitoring proved to be of modern date and which relate to the existing house which is of mid 20th century date (see Fig. 2). Directly to the north of the existing house a square, brick built, well and a circular, also brick built, soak away were revealed with piping linking both to the house. The only other feature was a deep soak away pit towards the north western corner of the footprint which contained modern debris and was related to drainage pipes that were occasionally seen during the excavation of the foundation trenches.

3.4 While no archaeological features of any antiquity were revealed the close examination of the upcast spoil did enable the recovery of a small group of unstratified pottery sherds (0001) from the uniform subsoil deposits at the site with the majority of these sherds coming from the eastern part of the footprint. The only other finds seen in the spoil were of recent date and were not collected.

4. The Pottery (Stephen Benfield)

4.1 In total there are sixteen sherds of Roman pottery with a combined weight of 330 g (Table 2). The average sherd weight is 20.6g. All of the pottery was recovered from subsoil (0001) and consists entirely of coarsewares. The pottery fabrics were recorded using the Suffolk pottery fabric series (unpublished). The fabrics and quantity of pottery recorded for each fabric type are listed in Table 1. A large quantity of pottery from the Roman-British settlement at Hacheston has been published previously (Blagg et al, 2004).

Fabric name	Code	No	%	Wt(g)	%	Ave. sherd wt(g)
Miscellaneous buff wares	BUF	1	6.2	5	1.5	5.0
Romanising coarse ware	RCW	6	37.5	213	64.5	35.5
Black surface wares	BSW	4	25.0	26	7.9	6.5
Miscellaneous sandy grey wares	GX	5	31.3	86	26.1	17.2
Total		16	100	330	100	

Table 1: Roman pottery fabric quantities

Fabric Code	No	Wt(g)	Eve	Form	Abr	Notes	spot date
BUF	1	5			*	body sherd, sandy orange-brown fabric with plate mica	1-2/3C?
RCW	1	79		large jar	*	base, sparse fine red grog and black burnt organic inclusions, black surface	M-L1C
RCW	1	37				body sherd, sparse red and pale grog, black burnt organic inclusions, black surface	M-L1C
RCW	2	14		jar/bowl		prob SV but not join, base sherds, black burnt organic inclusions, black surface	M1-E/M2C
RCW	1	70				body sherd, dense black burnt organic inclusions	M1-E/M2C
RCW	1	13			*	body sherd, sandy fabric with black burnt organic inclusions	M1-E/M2C
BSW	4	26			*	body sherds prob from 4 different pots	Rom
GX	4	76				body sherds prob from 4 different pots	Rom
GX	1	10		dish/bowl	*	base, chamfer edge, prob from a BB type dish/bowl	M2-4C

Table 2: Roman pottery by fabric type (Note: SV = same vessel)

4.2 Although the pottery was recovered entirely from subsoil (0001) and some sherds are small and abraded, the size and condition of a number of them suggests that at least some have not been subject to significant post-depositional disturbance.

The average sherd weight is quite high (20.6g) and a few of the body sherds are of good size. One or two sherds are quite abraded, notably a Buff fabric sherd (Fabric BUF) and a possible Black-burnished ware type dish/bowl base sherd (Fabric GX); however, many show moderate to low levels of abrasion. Also, while almost all the sherds recovered are probably from different vessels, there are two base sherds which appear to be from the same pot (jar/bowl) in Fabric RCW. The breaks on these two sherds are old and slightly abraded, but they do not appear to join together which again may indicate minimal disturbance since deposition.

The absence of any fine wares and the general lack of diagnostic pieces such as rim sherds among the small assemblage makes dating difficult. There is one piece from the base of a dish or bowl in Fabric GX which has a chamfered edge. This almost certainly represents a Black-burnished ware type vessel and as such can be dated to the period of the mid 2nd century or later. However, most of the dating relies on the fabric types present.

A single Buff fabric sherd (Fabric BUF) is probably more likely to date to the period of the mid 1st-2nd/early 3rd century rather than later. The remainder of the sherds are greywares. A number of the greyware sherds contain fragments of black, burnt organic material. Two of these, while of Roman type, also contain some sparse fine grog. While belonging to the broad fabric category of Black surface wares (Fabric BSW), because of the fabric inclusions all of these sherds have been classified as Romanising coarse wares (Fabric RCW). The fabric suggests that they probably date to the period of the mid 1st-early/mid 2nd century. The two sherds with some grog-temper can probably be dated to the mid-late 1st century. It is noted that grog or clay pellets occur in the fabric of some sherds from a local kiln site, the vessel forms of which suggest they are of 2nd-3rd century date (Seeley 2004, 181 & fig 119 nos. 11 & 16). Given this a later dating may be possible, although burnt organic inclusions are not recorded among the kiln fabrics. Overall Fabric RCW makes up 37% of the pottery by sherd number and 64% by weight. It can be noted that this fabric type has a significantly higher average sherd weight (35.5g) than the other fabric types (Table 1). The remainder of the greywares, which make up 56% of the pottery by sherd number and 34% by weight, consist of other Black surface wares (Fabric BSW) or Miscellaneous sandy grey wares (Fabric GX). Apart from a sherd from a probable Black-burnished ware type vessel (dated above) the sherds in these two fabric types can only be broadly dated as Roman.

5. Conclusion

5.1 While the monitoring of the foundation trenches did not record any archaeological features the recovery of a moderately large group of pottery sherds from the subsoil on the site is indicative of the location of Sace House within the overall area of a substantial rural Roman settlement. That a number of the sherds are relatively unabraded and two may well come from the same vessel also points to the original deposit of these finds close to where they were recovered. Substantial deposits of subsoil, some of which could be defined as a 'dark earth type soil', were also recorded during the archaeological excavations carried out in the early 1970s on the area of the A 12 Wickham Market by-pass to the east (Blagg et al 2004, 10) though whether the deposits at Sace House result from intense Roman period activity is unclear as they do not appear to be a classic 'dark soil' with dense concentrations of midden, or contemporary rubbish, type material.

5.2 The primary aim of the monitoring was to confirm whether the kiln site recorded in 1974 (Blagg et al, 2004, Fig 2 m) was within the proposed extension footprint area. This did not prove to be the case and as Sace House is of an earlier, mid 20th century, date with little sign of any ground disturbance from the mid 1970s on its northern side it would seem more likely that the amateur investigation identified a kiln a little further to the north in the adjacent arable field. However it would still be prudent to monitor the planned small extension to the front of Sace House in due course as this will replace a conservatory which appears to be an addition to the original area of the house.

(Acknowledgements: JNAS is grateful to the site owners Mr & Mrs A Clarke and their sons and contractors for the close cooperation with regard to this site monitoring and to Stephen Benfield for the report on the finds).

References

Blagg, T., Plouviez, J., & Tester, A., 2004, *Excavations at a large Romano-British settlement at Hacheston, Suffolk, 1973-74*, East Anglian Archaeology 106

Seeley, F., 2004, 'The Hacheston kiln products' in Blagg, T., et al, *Excavations at a large Romano-British settlement at Hacheston, Suffolk, 1973-74*, East Anglian Archaeology 106, 176-185



Fig. 1: Site location (Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2008 All rights reserved Licence No 100049722)



Fig. 2: Monitored foundation trenches & modern features (Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2011 All rights reserved Licence No 100049722)

Appendix I – Images



Image 1: Brick built soakaway to north of house & c700mm subsoil



Image 2: North eastern corner of foundation trenches from south



Image 3: foundation trench in central area of extension



Image 4: western foundation trench from south



Image 5: foundation trench across western central part of extension from the north with modern soakaway pit in foreground



9–10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 2AR

Brief and Specification for Continuous Archaeological Recording

Sace House, 17 Main Road, Lower Hacheston, Suffolk (C/10/2670)

Although this document is fundamental to the work of the specialist archaeological contractor the developer should be aware that certain of its requirements are likely to impinge upon the working practices of a general building contractor and may have financial implications

1. Background

- 1.1 Planning permission has been granted by Suffol Coastal District Council (C/10/2670) for the erection of an extension at Sace House, 17 Main Road, Hacheston (TM 130 567).
- 1.2 The planning permission includes a condition (no.2) requiring an agreed programme of work to take place before development begins in accordance with PPS 5 *Planning for the Historic Environment* (Policy HE 12.3) to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.
- 1.3 This proposal lies in an area of archaeological interest recorded in the County Historic Environment Record as HCH 001, an extensive late Iron Age and Roman settlement, with scattered evidence for early Anglo-Saxon activity. No formal excavation has taken place in the immediate vicinity of the development, but records of a find of a Roman pottery kiln suggest that it lay in or adjacent to this property, and certainly close to Main Road (Blagg et al 2004, Fig 2, m). As well as other Roman finds, the field to the north also contains evidence for Anglo-Saxon burials and settlement (HCH 013). There is very high potential for encountering further heritage assets of archaeological interest at this location. Any groundworks associated with the proposed development has the potential to cause significant damage or destruction to any underlying heritage assets.
- 1.4 The proposed works will cause ground disturbance, c.100m length of new footings, that has potential to damage any heritage assets of archaeological importance that exists.
- 1.5 Assessment of the available archaeological evidence indicates that the relatively small area affected by the development can be adequately recorded by continuous archaeological monitoring and recording during all groundworks (**Please contact the developer for an accurate plan of the development**).
- 1.6 In accordance with the standards and guidance produced by the Institute of Field Archaeologists this brief should not be considered sufficient to enable the total execution of the project. A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) based upon this brief and the accompanying outline specification of minimum requirements, is an essential requirement. This must be submitted by the developers, or their agent, to the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (9–10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2AR; telephone/fax: 01284 352443) for approval. The work must not commence until this office has approved both the archaeological contractor as suitable to undertake the work, and the WSI as

satisfactory. The WSI will *provide the basis for measurable standards* and will be used to establish whether the requirements of the planning condition will be adequately met.

- 1.7 Following approval of the WSI, our office will advise the Local Planning Authority that an acceptable scheme of work is in place, and therefore we (will) have no objection to the work commencing. Neither this specification nor the WSI, however, is a sufficient basis for the discharge of the planning condition relating to archaeological investigation (assuming planning permission is granted). Only the full implementation of the scheme, both completion of fieldwork and reporting based on the approved WSI, will enable SCCAS/CT to advise Suffolk Coastal District Council that the condition has been adequately fulfilled and can be discharged.
- 1.8 Before commencing work the project manager must carry out a risk assessment and liase with the site owner, client and the Conservation Team of SCCAS (SCCAS/CT) in ensuring that all potential risks are minimised.
- 1.9 All arrangements for the excavation of the site, the timing of the work, access to the site, the definition of the precise area of landholding and area for proposed development are to be defined and negotiated by the archaeological contractor with the commissioning body.
- 1.10 The responsibility for identifying any constraints on field-work (e.g. Scheduled Monument status, Listed Building status, public utilities or other services, tree preservation orders, SSSIs, wildlife sites &c., ecological considerations rests with the commissioning body and its archaeological contractor. The existence and content of the archaeological brief does not over-ride such constraints or imply that the target area is freely available.
- 1.11 Detailed standards, information and advice to supplement this brief are to be found in *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14, 2003.
- 1.12 The Institute for Archaeologists' *Standard and Guidance for an archaeological watching brief* (revised 2001) should be used for additional guidance in the execution of the project and in drawing up the report.

2. Brief for Archaeological Recording

- 2.1 To provide a record of archaeological deposits which are damaged or removed by any development [including services and landscaping] permitted by the current planning consent.
- 2.2 Any ground works, and also the upcast soil, are to be closely monitored during and after stripping in order to ensure no damage occurs any heritage assets. Adequate time is to be allowed for archaeological recording of archaeological deposits during excavation, and of soil sections following excavation.

3. Arrangements for Monitoring

- 3.1 To carry out the monitoring work the developer will appoint an archaeologist (the archaeological contractor) who must be approved by SCCAS/CT.
- 3.2 The developer or his contracted archaeologist will give SCCAS/CT five working days notice of the commencement of ground works on the site, in order that the work of the archaeological contractor may be monitored. The method and form of development will also be monitored to ensure that it conforms to previously agreed locations and techniques upon which this brief is based.

- 3.3 Allowance must be made to cover archaeological costs incurred in monitoring the development works by the contract archaeologist. The size of the contingency should be estimated by the approved archaeological contractor, based upon the outline works in this Brief and Specification and the building contractor's programme of works and time-table.
- 3.4 If unexpected remains are encountered SCCAS/CT must be informed immediately. Amendments to this specification may be made to ensure adequate provision for archaeological recording.

4. Specification

- 4.1 The developer shall afford access at all reasonable times to SCCAS/CT and the contracted archaeologist to allow archaeological monitoring of building and engineering operations which disturb the ground.
- 4.2 Opportunity must be given to the contracted archaeologist to hand excavate any discrete archaeological features which appear during earth moving operations, retrieve finds and make measured records as necessary. Where it is necessary to see archaeological detail one of the soil faces is to be trowelled clean.
- 4.3 All archaeological features exposed must be planned at a scale of 1:20 of 1:50 on a plan showing the proposed layout of the development, depending on the complexity of the data to be recorded. Sections should be drawn at 1:10 or 1:20 again depending on the complexity to be recorded.
- 4.4 A photographic record of the work is to be made of any archaeological features, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies/high resolution digital images.
- 4.5 All contexts must be numbered and finds recorded by context. All levels should relate to Ordnance Datum.
- 4.6 Archaeological contexts should, where possible, be sampled for palaeo-environmental remains. Best practice should allow for sampling of interpretable and datable archaeological deposits and provision should be made for this. Advice on the appropriateness of the proposed strategies will be sought from Helen Chappell, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling archaeological deposits (Murphy, P.L. and Wiltshire, P.E.J., 1994, *A guide to sampling archaeological deposits for environmental analysis*) is available for viewing from SCCAS.
- 4.7 All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed with SCCAS/CT during the course of the monitoring).
- 4.8 The data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent with, and approved by, the County Historic Environment Record.

5. Report Requirements

5.1 An archive of all records and finds is to be prepared consistent with the principles of *Management of Archaeological Projects (MAP2*), particularly Appendix 3. This must be deposited with the County Historic Environment Record within three months of the completion of work. It will then become publicly accessible. It must be adequate to perform the function of a final archive for deposition in the County Historic Environment Record (the County Store) or museum in Suffolk.

- 5.2 The project manager must consult the County Historic Environment Record Officer to obtain an event number for the work. This number will be unique for each project or site and must be clearly marked on any documentation relating to the work.
- 5.3 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with *UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines*.
- 5.4 Every effort must be made to get the agreement of the landowner/developer to the deposition of the full site archive, and transfer of title, with the intended archive depository before the fieldwork commences. If this is not achievable for all or parts of the finds archive then provision must be made for additional recording (e.g. photography, illustration, scientific analysis) as appropriate.
- 5.5 The project manager should consult the intended archive depository before the archive is prepared regarding the specific requirements for the archive deposition and curation, and regarding any specific cost implications of deposition. The intended depository should be stated in the WSI, for approval. The intended depository must be prepared to accept the entire archive resulting from the project (both finds and written archive) in order to create a complete record of the project.
- 5.6 If the County Store is not the intended depository, the project manager should ensure that a duplicate copy of the written archive is deposited with the County HER.
- 5.7 If the County Store is the intended location of the archive, the project manager should consult the SCCAS Archive Guidelines 2010 and also the County Historic Environment Record Officer regarding the requirements for the deposition of the archive (conservation, ordering, organisation, labelling, marking and storage) of excavated material and the archive. A clear statement of the form, intended content, and standards of the archive is to be submitted for approval as an essential requirement of the WSI.
- 5.8 The WSI should state proposals for the deposition of the digital archive relating to this project with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS), and allowance should be made for costs incurred to ensure proper deposition (<u>http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/policy.html</u>).
- 5.9 A report on the fieldwork and archive, consistent with the principles of *MAP2*, particularly Appendix 4, must be provided. The report must summarise the methodology employed, the stratigraphic sequence, and give a period by period description of the contexts recorded, and an inventory of finds. The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its interpretation. The Report must include a discussion and an assessment of the archaeological evidence, including palaeoenvironmental remains recovered from palaeosols and cut features. Its conclusions must include a clear statement of the archaeological value of the results, and their significance in the context of the Regional Research Framework (*East Anglian Archaeology*, Occasional Papers 3 & 8, 1997 and 2000).
- 5.10 An unbound hardcopy of the report, clearly marked DRAFT, must be presented to SCCAS/CT for approval within six months of the completion of fieldwork unless other arrangements are negotiated with the project sponsor and SCCAS/CT.
- 5.11 Following acceptance, a single copy of the report should be submitted to SCCAS/CT. A single hard copy should be presented to the County Historic Environment Record as well as a digital copy of the approved report.
- 5.12 A summary report, in the established format, suitable for inclusion in the annual 'Archaeology in Suffolk' section of the *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology*, must be prepared and included in the project report.
- 5.13 Where appropriate, a digital vector trench plan should be included with the report, which must be compatible with MapInfo GIS software, for integration in the County Historic Environment Record. AutoCAD files should be exported and saved into a format that

can be can be imported into MapInfo (for example, as a Drawing Interchange File or .dxf) or already transferred to .TAB files.

- 5.14 At the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record <u>http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/</u> must be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators forms.
- 5.15 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to County Historic Environment Record. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report. A paper copy should also be included with the report and also with the site archive.

Specification by: Judith Plouviez, Archaeological Officer

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Conservation Team 9–10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 2AR *Tel.:* 01284 352448 *E-mail:* jude.plouviez@suffolk.gov.uk

Date:10 February 2011 Reference: /ArcSpecMon_SaceHouseHacheston_ (JP)_Feb2011.doc

This brief and specification remains valid for six months from the above date. If work is not carried out in full within that time this document will lapse; the authority should be notified and a revised brief and specification may be issued.

If the work defined by this brief forms a part of a programme of archaeological work required by a Planning Condition, the results must be considered by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council, who have the responsibility for advising the appropriate Planning Authority.