

Minutes

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT FORUM

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BUCKINGHAMSHIRE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT FORUM HELD ON WEDNESDAY 30 SEPTEMBER 2009 IN MEZZANINE ROOM 2, COUNTY HALL, AYLESBURY, COMMENCING AT 2.30 PM AND CONCLUDING AT 4.17 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Members

Mr C Cashman
Mr R Evans
Mr M Farley
Sir J Horsbrugh-Porter
Mrs B Jennings
Mrs V McPake
Mr R Pushman (Chairman)

Organisation

Aylesbury Vale District Council
Diocese of Oxford
Bucks Archaeological Society
Chiltern District Council
Buckinghamshire County Council
Milton Keynes Council
Buckinghamshire County Council

Officers

Mr M Andrew
Mr N Crank
Ms J Foster
Mr S Kidd
Ms K MacDonald
Mr B Thorn
Ms J Wise

Organisation

Wycombe District Council
Milton Keynes Council
Aylesbury Vale District Council
Buckinghamshire County Council
Buckinghamshire County Council
Bucks County Museum
Buckinghamshire County Council

1 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED

That Mr R Pushman be elected as Chairman of the Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum for the ensuing year.

Mr R Pushman in the Chair.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Apologies were received from Gary Marshall, Sue Polhill and Chris Welch.

The Chairman advised the Forum that County Councillor Francis Robinson did not stand



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



for re-election at the County Council elections held in June, which resulted in a County Councillor vacancy on the Forum. The Chairman welcomed County Councillor Brenda Jennings as the new Member of the Forum.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Brenda Jennings declared a personal interest as she was a Member of the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society.

Richard Pushman declared a personal interest as he was a Member of the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society.

4 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 March 2009 were confirmed.

5 MATTERS ARISING

Sandy Kidd advised that at the previous meeting he had asked if Members would like to receive a presentation on the Solent-Thames Research Frameworks Project. The Officer advised that this project was not moving forward at the moment and suggested that this item be deferred to another meeting of the Forum subject to the progress of the project.

The Forum AGREED to defer the item to a future meeting.

6 PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 15: CONSULTATION

Members had received a report from Sandy Kidd, County Archaeologist.

The Officer advised that the proposed new Planning Policy Statement 15 (PPS 15) is a key element of the non-statutory reforms and that it was accompanied by a draft Practice Guide issued by English Heritage. He said that the overall purpose of the PPS 15 aims to provide a more strategic and focussed national policy framework. Its key features include:

- Updates policy to reflect changes to the planning system.
- An emphasis on recognising and protecting what is deemed 'significant' about heritage assets and retaining existing levels of protection. Developers will be expected to assess 'significance' before submitting applications.
- Places greater emphasis on locally significant assets and consulting the local community
- Aims for closer integration with other objectives of the planning system; notably place-shaping, economic regeneration and addressing climate change.

The Forum was advised that there are 'demolition tests' to see if removal of an asset is justified. Resource implications and difficulties for some two tier authorities were also highlighted. The Officer advised the Forum that a fully integrated HER would cost approximately £60k to set up and approximately £10k a year to maintain.

The Officer tabled a report at the meeting 'Draft Buckinghamshire County Council PPS 15 Consultation response'. The Forum discussed the suggested responses and made the following comments:

- Members commented that point 5 and 7 were important and that they were glad those responses had been included.
- Milton Keynes will be submitting a response. The Cabinet Member for Milton Keynes commented that the Home and Communities Agency (HCA) can give planning permission. She said that would like the principles to apply to a government quango as outline planning permissions are often out of their hands.
- Buckinghamshire Archaeology Society will also be making a submission.

Sandy Kidd said he would prepare some comments and include a general comment with key points to look at. Julia Foster said AVDC will be responding with reference to the Historic Buildings side. Sandy Kidd invited Members to forward comments on the key points or on the Historic Buildings aspect.

It was noted that a response will be sent from Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire County Council, Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum and other district councils.

The Forum commented on matters of interest and concern and authorised the Chairman to submit comments to DCLG and English Heritage reflecting those concerns.

7 HERITAGE AT RISK: UPDATE

Members had received a report from Sandy Kidd, County Archaeologist.

The report updated the Forum on the outcome of English Heritage's Heritage at Risk survey of 2008.

The report updated the Forum on the current situation in Buckinghamshire compared to the averages for the South East and England. The report supplements the information received by Members at the March meeting as the list of specific at risk assets was confidential at the time of the last meeting but is now available. Members were invited to note the conclusions of the survey.

Members discussed the Heritage at Risk 2009 survey. A Member commented that they were unable to ascertain from English Heritage regarding what criteria they were looking for when conservation areas were deemed to be 'at risk'. Another Member commented that some Council's were not aware that the survey was to be published.

RESOLVED

The Forum NOTED the report.

8 BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGICAL OFFICER'S REPORT

The Forum received the report of the County Archaeologist, Sandy Kidd on the work of the County Archaeological Service since the last meeting of the Forum.

The Officer highlighted that after a dip last year there had been a noticeable return in case work, which was close to normal levels of activity.

The Buckinghamshire HER website came second in a national web-based poll of online historic environment records. The site has approximately 4000 users a year compared to approximately 150 personal visits to see the HER a year. The high numbers of website users highlights the value of the website.

The service has handled a large number of planning applications mainly within the Aylesbury Vale area.

Members discussed the completed restoration of Brill Windmill and the Officer highlighted that a group has been convened to help raise funds for restoration of Coombe Hill Monument. The Langley Park Restoration Project is well underway focussing on works to the Rhododendron Garden, new paths and the Lake.

RESOLVED

The Forum NOTED the report and AGREED the proposed actions.

9 COUNTY MUSEUM REPORT

Members had received the report of Ros Tyrell, Finds Liaison Officer.

Members discussed the report and how they could advertise the County Museum better and to increase awareness of all County Councillors of the Service. Brett Thorn advised that as part of promoting the museum, tours including behind the scenes tours were organised. Members discussed the possibility of holding an exhibition at the museum which County Councillors could be invited to. It was agreed that this be considered later in the future directions/Initiatives agenda item.

A Member thanked Ros Tyrell for their time and commitment to Treasure Finds.

The Forum was advised that the Portable Antiquities Scheme is 90% funded nationally and that the Finds Liaison Officer is 90% funded by the British Museum.

The report from Brett Thorn, Keeper of Archaeology, Buckinghamshire County Museum was tabled at the meeting.

The report advised that the museum is currently planning a major archaeological exhibition for 2010, to run from March to July. We are hoping to borrow from the British Museum some key items from the county, some of which have never been displayed here, including part of the Taplow Anglo-Saxon burial, the very fine Roman glass from Radnage, and the hoard of Late Bronze Age gold torcs from Milton Keynes.

RESOLVED

The Forum NOTED the reports.

10 MILTON KEYNES ARCHAEOLOGICAL OFFICER'S REPORT

Members had received a report from the Archaeological Officer, Conservation and Archaeology, Milton Keynes.

The Officer informed the Forum of the name change of the service from Design and Conservation to Conservation and Archaeology.

The report, which included photographs, highlighted three excavations: Manor Farm Quarry, Wolverton, Passenham Quarry, Calverton and Brooklands, Broughton.

The Officer highlighted that the 'Cursus' at Wolverton was the first for the County. A

Member enquired what a cursus was and the Officer informed that it was two parallel ditches, which were over 300m. There is much mystery around cursus and it is not known what they were used for. It was commented that this is Buckinghamshire's first link to Stonehenge. Samples for radiocarbon and Optically Stimulated Luminescence dating have been taken.

The Passenham Quarry, Calverton excavations have focussed on the continuation of the Iron Age pit alignment alongside the discovery and excavation of a substantial stone-built Romano-British 2nd C AD mortuary structure which was filled with cremated remains.

In Broughton excavation of five areas as part of the Brooklands expansion area has revealed early Iron Age to late Romano-British occupation.

The Officer advised that Milton Keynes Council has been awarded a grant from English Heritage to enable the HER records to be made available online via the national Heritage Gateway web portal before the end of the year.

A Member enquired how the Council was managing the HER since the previous officer had retired. The Officer advised that there was a backlog but that this had been mitigated to some extent due to the poor economic situation reducing the number of fieldwork reports submitted.

The Officer informed the Forum that Milton Keynes Council had organised an Archaeology Day and invited Members of the Forum to attend.

RESOLVED

The Forum NOTED the report.

11 NATIONAL TRUST REPORT

Gary Marshall, National Trust Archaeologist, Thames and Solent Region was unable to attend the meeting. A report was tabled at the meeting.

RESOLVED

The Forum NOTED the report.

12 CONSERVATION OFFICER'S REPORTS

Aylesbury Vale

The conservation area review priority list has been amended. Settlements have been identified in the Core Strategy and district wide management plan, which has been completed but not yet published.

Aylesbury Vale Conservation Officer Anne Davies is currently off sick and is unlikely to return before the end of October 2009.

Rookery Farm, Ludgershall.

An application was submitted to demolish the listed building. The Council did not feel the building justified demolition and the application was refused. The decision was appealed and went to a public enquiry. As a result the appellants withdrew the appeal and the Council are now working with the owners to save the building.

Woolpack Public House

Officers worked with the owners and encouraged them to use professional advisors for the restoration. The public house is aiming to re-open at the end of October 2009. It was noted that the building has 16th Century origins and that the fire destroyed much of the ground floor area and the adjacent thatched building.

Buildings at risk officer, (Lorraine Carter)'s contract has expired.

Chiltern

Within Chesham conservation area Officers are currently dealing with a planning application for a casino in a grade II listed building.

Wycombe

Two buildings have been added to the register of listed buildings. Both buildings are modern; Lyde End, which was designed by Paul Collinge and a modernistic church in the grounds of Fawley Court.

Permission has been granted to restore High Wycombe Station to its original Brunel designed form.

The Council have received a letter from British Telecom (BT) informing them that BT are handing over responsibility of the boxes to Parish Councils with the District Councils as administrators and facilitators. The Council are in the process of identifying iconic phone boxes and in discussions with the Parish Councils regarding taking over the phone boxes.

13 EMERGENCY RECORDING FUND:

Members had received the report by Sandy Kidd on the Emergency Archaeological Recording Fund.

The Officer advised that he would need to confirm the position of the Fund at the next meeting.

RESOLVED

The Forum NOTED the report.

14 FUTURE DIRECTIONS/INITIATIVES

The Forum had received the report of the County Archaeologist, the purpose of which was to inform the Forum on the English Heritage guidance on Overview and Scrutiny and consider its future priorities.

Members discussed the following:

- Possibility to tie in with an exhibition at the museum
- How the profile of the historic environment could be raised and how is the authority purporting to deal with key historic assets for the future.

Sandy Kidd suggested that Members think of some ideas for a conference, which may include short talks, issues around conservation and consider other issues around how we address the Historic Protection Reform assuming the introduction of Policy Practice Statement 15 (PPS 15) and for these to be discussed at the next meeting of the Forum.

Implications of addressing PPS 15 was also raised and how to implement this as a whole in a two tier area. It was highlighted that this requires a joined up approach between County and District Councils. Members were asked to consider this issue and feedback any comments to Sandy Kidd.

The Chairman advised that in his role as Chairman of Buckinghamshire County Council he holds a series of receptions and suggested this may be an opportunity to exhibit some display boards such as for the County Museum, or the possibility to display in the main reception at County Hall. Members were advised to contact Joe Bradshaw, Executive Assistant to the Chairman of Buckinghamshire County Council.

RESOLVED

The Forum NOTED the report.

15 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The possibility of holding a future meeting at Bletchley Park was discussed.

16 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Forum is to be held on Wednesday 10 March, 2.30pm, Mezzanine Room 2, County Hall, Aylesbury

- Wednesday 22 September, 2.30pm, Mezzanine Room 1

CHAIRMAN

DRAFT BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL PPS 15 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Suggested responses in italics

Questions on which we would particularly like your views:

1. Does the PPS strike the right balance between advocating the conservation of what is important and enabling change?
Broadly yes, although it is hard to be certain how the new terminology of 'significance' will work out in practice and see comments on climate change below. We are concerned that HE 9.7 gives no indication as to the weight to be given to private benefits when deciding whether harmful development should be permitted. We are also concerned that the emphasis on 'assets' with specific 'interests' could be too reductive to adequately capture sense of place - we therefore suggest that HE9.6 be revised to state that Design and Access Statements should take account of the historic character of the locality, and that this should be given particular weight where development lies within, or affects the setting of, a protected landscape, conservation area, or other designated heritage asset.
2. By adopting a single spectrum approach to historic assets, does the PPS take proper account of any differences between types of asset (eg. are archaeological assets adequately covered)?
No, the emphasis on use under HE9.8 could be a problem for archaeological sites (including ruins). The location of such assets within 'green infrastructure' could be encouraged to enable their retention within a socially useful land use.
3. In doing so, does the PPS take appropriate account of the implications of the European Landscape Convention, and of the cultural dimensions of landscapes designated as National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty?
No, there is insufficient indication on how historic landscape character (as opposed to individual component assets) ought to be addressed and the weight to be accorded to it in different locations. We suggest that whilst desirable regional level characterisation (HE2.1) will be too high level for many purposes and should occur also at local level in HE3. HE2 and HE3 should also enjoin plan-making bodies to ensure that the historic environment informs Landscape Character Assessment and that especial weight should be given to conserving the historic character of protected landscapes. Reference could also be made in HE10.4 and 10.5 to historic assets and the character of protected landscapes. Such changes would need to be followed through in the Practice Guide.
4. Are the policies and principles set out in the PPS the key ones that underpin planning policy on the historic environment, or should others be included?
Yes, we support the general approach of the PPS.
5. Do you agree that it is the "significance" of a historic asset that we are trying to conserve?
Yes, we believe the approach is essentially correct. However, there are concerns that this could lead to dangerously reductive analyses, especially with respect to landscapes or townscape. We need to beware of 'not seeing the wood for the trees' by losing the concept of historic character. There is a concern that English Heritage's Conservation Principles uses a values-based terminology, which is different to the interest-based terminology used in the PPS and could lead to confusion – this apparent discrepancy needs to be clarified..
6. Does the PPS comply with devolutionary principles with regard to what is expected at regional and local levels?

Our main concern is the lack of indication in the PPS or the Practice Guide as to where responsibilities for specialist historic environment services lie within 2-tier local government. For example, it seems to be assumed that upper tier authorities will operate and fully fund HER, despite the fact that most of the plan-making and development control decisions they inform reside at district level. Similarly, archaeological advice usually resides at the upper-tier, again often without SLA funding from the main recipient authorities of that advice. Clear guidance is urgently required if implementation is not to be marred by unhelpful differences of opinion between the tiers.

7. Does the PPS strike the right balance between the objectives of conserving what is significant in the historic environment and mitigating the effects of climate change?

This is not at all clear. Changes which do not harm an asset's significance should be encouraged but for designated assets we suggest that there should normally be a presumption against harmful changes. Weight should be given to the carbon cost of demolition and replacement of an historic building compared to its retention and modification. Regularly updated technical guidance on best practice will be important in this rapidly changing field.

8. Does the PPS make it clear to decision-makers what they should do, and where they have more flexibility? Are there any risks or benefits you would like to highlight for the historic environment sector?

Broadly yes but:

We think HE9.7 needs clarification with respect to the weight to be given to private benefits.

We presume only one of the three tests set out in HE9.8 needs to be met but this could be made explicit. We suggest that HE9.8(ii) could explicitly refer to testing whether preservation of an historic asset can be achieved within the development (e.g. for archaeology in green spaces or, for buried remains, underneath new-build).

Under HE3 or HE4 we would welcome reference to the historic environment being a key component of green infrastructure and tourism policies and strategies.

We believe that HE13.1 is fundamentally incorrectly worded. If the ability to record evidence is not a factor in deciding whether consent should be given if an asset is to be destroyed then, following DOE circular 11/95, a recording condition could be held to fail the 'need' test. We also believe recording can be justified where harm short of outright destruction is to occur (or we risk repeating Shimizu-like debates in a new arena). We suggest instead that the second sentence be revised to read: 'Consent should not therefore be granted for development that would harm a heritage asset simply because a record could be made.'

HE13.3 In the final sentence the words 'Where appropriate' imply there are situations where a condition might not be needed – we do not agree and suggest these two words are deleted. We also suggest that in practice fieldwork and post-excavation analysis and publication could take place alongside development. We therefore suggest the following amended wording: 'Local planning authorities should impose planning conditions or obligations to ensure such work is carried out to an appropriate standard and timetable.' A recommended condition would be helpful - this could be based on the model condition on PPG16 but we suggest that to give greater force to the requirement for publication the new model condition includes a specific timeframe for completion which can only be varied with the written consent of the LPA.

9. The draft PPS highlights the importance of ensuring that adequate information and evidence bases are available, so that the historic environment and the significance of heritage assets are fully taken into account in plan-making and decision-taking. At the same time we are concerned to ensure that information requirements are proportionate and do not cause unnecessary delays. Are you content we have the balance right? If not how would you like to see our policy adjusted? (Policies HE8 and HE9 are particularly relevant to this question.)

BCC supports the principle of well-informed evidence-based planning and therefore the greater emphasis given to Historic Environment Records (subject to concerns over resourcing – see Q11 below) and the need for developers to properly assess how heritage assets may be affected by their proposals, and identify appropriate design or mitigation response. However, whilst it is desirable that agreement should be reached on such matters before planning applications are submitted this will not always be achievable. We suggest that the practical meaning and wording need further consideration as follows;

HE7.2 – Hidden aspects of heritage, including but not exclusively buried archaeological remains, will not always be recorded at this stage (as is recognised in HE1.2 and 1.3). Also, the new holistic approach seems to get forgotten at this point. We suggest that the first sentence be reworded along the lines ‘Where a development site has clearly defined potential to include heritage assets but the location, interest or significance of those assets is inadequately understood, local planning authorities ... etc’. The basis for such judgments of potential could be expanded in the Practice Guide. The final sentence is supported but could be strengthened to say ‘ The scope of such assessments and evaluations should be agreed with the local authority in advance and a copy of the resultant reports deposited in the relevant historic environment record.’

HE7.1 and HE8.1- there is a question over how applicants establish whether a heritage asset is likely to be affected. We suggest that this should involve consultation of the historic environment record but that some sieving mechanism will be necessary to avoid HER’s being overwhelmed by a requirement to supply information for every planning application. This topic ought to be covered in the Practice Guide. A decision-making flow-chart would be helpful

HE8.3 - It is not realistic to depend solely on planning staff to judge the adequacy of technical historic environment assessments and evaluations whilst depending on expert assessment for validation would incur delays. Thus whilst we agree that clearly inadequately documented applications should not be validated there needs to be provision for the LPA to ask for further information after validation, and to refuse the application if this is not provided.

10. In your opinion is the PPS a document that will remain relevant for at least the next 20 years? Do you see other developments on the horizon that have implications for the policies set out in the PPS?

No, the PPS largely uses the philosophy and terminology of the draft heritage protection bill but perforce has to refer to existing heritage designations. It would be desirable to bring forward the new bill and review the PPS if new legislation is enacted.

11. Do you agree with the conclusions of the consultation stage impact assessment. In particular, have we correctly identified and resourced any additional burdens for local planning authorities? Is the impact on owners/developers correctly identified and proportionate to their responsibilities?

No, the cost of developing fully holistic integrated HER’s is not realistic. Information content needs to be enhanced, consultation demands will increase

and, for 2-tier authorities, shared IT networks and additional licences will be required. Even allowing for increased fee income we estimate the additional cost to Buckinghamshire's local authorities at c£60,000 set-up costs and c£10,000 per annum running costs. In practice we believe these costs could be spread over a several year transitional period. The government should look again at its cost assessment and make adequate financial provision for local government.

12. Do you think that the policy draft PPS will have a differential impact, either positive or negative, on people, because of their gender, race or disability? If so how in your view should we respond? We particularly welcome the views of organisations and individuals with specific expertise in these areas.
No.

DRAFT

Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum – September 2009

County Museum Report

Since the last meeting of the forum, the intention to deposit 45 site archives have been notified to the County Museum, 11 of which are from the Milton Keynes Council area (see below).

The museum is currently planning a major archaeological exhibition for 2010, to run from March to July. This will be linked to the publication of a book “An illustrated history of Early Buckinghamshire”, being published by the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society. The intention is to encourage archaeological interest in a wide audience – with both the book and exhibition being designed to be easily accessible and of popular interest – accurate without being too academic. We are hoping to borrow from the British Museum some key items from the county, some of which have never been displayed here, including part of the Taplow Anglo-Saxon burial, the very fine Roman glass from Radnage, and the hoard of Late Bronze Age gold torcs from Milton Keynes. As another part of the exhibition, we will be offering local groups and societies an opportunity to showcase their recent work and projects, by providing them with some display space. This will also help visitors to the exhibition find out how they can get involved in local archaeology.

We have also acquired a few interesting individual finds over the last 6 months. A hoard of late iron age metalwork, relating to a possible Solar Cult site at Wavendon gate in Milton Keynes was found over 20 years ago, but although it was published, it remained in private hands. It was recently sold to a dealer, who contacted us to see if we were interested in it, and Milton Keynes Council raised the money buy it, so it is now in the museum collection, as part of our Service Level Agreement, where we curate their archaeological material. A more modest, but still very interesting piece is an enamelled roman brooch in the shape of a fly, found at Haddenham by a metal detectorist, and donated to the museum.

Sites notified to the County Museum, March-September 2009

Accession

Number	Contractor	Site
2009.30	John Moore Heritage Services	evaluation at 7-9 Temple Street, Brill ; watching brief and photographic record at Home's Kiln, The Crossroads, Brill;
2009.31	Foundations Archaeology	
2009.32	Northamptonshire Archaeology	watching brief on land at Broughton Bridge;
2009.33	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	evaluation at Village Farm, Boarstall;
2009.34	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	evaluation at 30-48 Castle Street, High Wycombe;
2009.35	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	watching brief at Aylesbury Masonic Hall;
2009.36	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	evaluation at Mallards Court, Stokenchurch;
2009.37	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	evaluation at St Nicholas Church, Cuddington; fieldwalking at M25 widening, section 1, pond 3, Gerrards Cross;
2009.39	Oxford Archaeology	excavation, strip, map and sample at M25 widening, section 1, Denham pond 2, Denham;
2009.40	Oxford Archaeology	
2009.41	Oxford Archaeology	evaluation at Home Close, Sheep Street, Winslow;
2009.42	Archaeological Services Ltd	watching brief at Castle Farm, Lavendon;
2009.43	Archaeological Services Ltd	evaluation at Lavendon Road Farm, Olney;
2009.44	Archaeological Services Ltd	evaluation at Sherington Manor, Sherington; watching brief at Manor Cottage, High Street, Haversham;
2009.45	Archaeological Services Ltd	evaluation at Horseshoe Farm, North End, Ravenstone;
2009.46	Archaeological Services Ltd	

2009.47	Archaeological Services Ltd	watching brief at The Moat House, Bradwell Village;
2009.48	Foundations Archaeology	evaluation at The Old Football Ground, Buckingham Road, Aylesbury;
2009.49	Oxford Archaeology East	evaluation and watching brief on Buckingham to Brackley water pipeline - Bucks section only ;
2009.50	Pre-Construct Archaeology	large evaluation at Fleet Marston ;
2009.70	Oxford Archaeology	watching brief at 91 Bishopstone, Orchard Cottage;
2009.71	Oxford Archaeology	excavation at M25 pond 4 widening, Chalfont St Peter;
2009.72	Albion Archaeology	watching brief and trenching at Aylesbury Crown Court;
2009.73	John Moore Heritage Services	watching brief at Penn Cottage, 20 Church Street, Brill;
2009.74	Northamptonshire Archaeology	trenching at Beeches Nursery, Radclive;
2009.81	Robinson, Lyn	systematic fieldwalking around Maids Moreton, 2002-2004, by local volunteer group
2009.100	Northamptonshire Archaeology	watching brief at Langley Park, Wexham;
2009.101	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	watching brief at Aylesbury Methodist Church, Buckingham Street ;
2009.102	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	watching brief at Market Hill, Whitchurcht ;
2009.103	Cotswold Archaeology	watching brief and building recording at The Woolpack pub, Stoke Mandeville;
2009.104	Oxford Archaeology	watching brief and building survey at Manor Farm, Lower Winchendon;
2009.105	Archaeological Services Ltd	strip, map, and record at Biggen Field, Granborough ;
2009.139	Albion Archaeology	evaluation and field walking at Berryfields east site, Quarrendon;
2009.140	John Moore Heritage Services	evaluation at Marshe Mead Farm, Cuddington Road, Dinton;
2009.141	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	watching brief at Victoria House, Elm Road, Penn;
2009.143	John Moore Heritage Services	excavation at Berry Cottage, 15 Townsend, Haddenham ;
2009.155	Oxford Archaeology	building survey at Chalfont Viaduct, Gerrards Cross ;
2009.156	Northamptonshire Archaeology	evaluation at The Old Forge, North Marston ;
2009.157	John Moore Heritage Services	The Cottage, Frieth Hill, Frieth, West Wycombe;
2009.158	Archaeological Services Ltd	watching brief at Sunnyside Cottage, Bay Lane, Ravenstone;
2009.159	Archaeological Services Ltd	watching brief at All Saints Church, Milton Keynes Village;
2009.160	Archaeological Services Ltd	watching brief at Laurel Farm, Boulter End Lane, Wheeler End;
2009.161	Archaeological Services Ltd	watching brief at 58 High Street, Stony Stratford;
2009.162	Archaeological Services Ltd	watching brief at Old Mill View, 7 Mill Road, Haversham;
2009.163	Archaeological Services Ltd	watching brief at Fire Station, High Street, Great Missenden ;

The National Trust

Report to Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum

30th September 2009

Cliveden

At the invitation of the National Trust Marlow Archaeological Society have recently completed excavations over the site of an enigmatic brick structure on the Green Drive at Cliveden. The Green Drive is a tree-lined avenue running north-south along the eastern side of the estate separating the gardens developed by Lord Orkney in the early 18th century from Taplow Common. Part of the drive runs through an artificial cutting and the formation of the cutting has cut through the brick structure in question. It consists of a substantial wall 0.75 ms thick and 34 ms in length, formed of what appears to be 17th century brick resting on rough coursed chalk block foundations. There are side walls defining several rooms on the west side of the structure, one of which appears to incorporate a fireplace. There is also evidence of what may be a cellar. The identity of this structure remains a mystery but the nature of the brick suggests an early 17th century date for its construction. It could be a lodge on a drive to the house built by the Duke of Buckingham c.1670, however, it appears to be older, and could even mark the site of the house occupied by the previous owners of Cliveden, the Manfields. The excavations have been carried out to a very high standard and the Trust are extremely pleased with the contribution from Marlow Archaeological Society.

Stowe New Inn

Northamptonshire Archaeology are about to commence phase II recording works on the buildings prior to the major restoration program commencing in 2010. Watching briefs will also be maintained during the works and to ground works for services and for creating the overflow car park.

Stowe Grotto

Excavations for installing an electrical supply to the Grotto are due to be undertaken in October 2009 and a watching brief will be maintained over these excavations. The Grotto is the Trust's current restoration project at Stowe, which will see the recreation of the marble basins and associated water system, the reintroduction of a statue of Venus and the reinstatement of the 1789s decorative scheme.

Ashridge

A landscape survey report has recently been completed for Ivinghoe Beacon and the Coombe on the Ashridge estate. This is one of ten survey reports covering character areas for the Trust's estate based on historic management units. A report prepared by Northamptonshire Archaeology covering the Pitstone and Ivinghoe Commons is due for completion in October 2009. A report covering Pitstone Green Farm was completed earlier this year.

Boarstall Tower

The report covering the excavations undertaken in July 2009 is due for completion by the end of 2009.

Gary Marshall, 24/9/2009