**Kent International Gateway – Archaeology Note**

**Notes re KIG 7.4 Appendix 3**

1.1 Mr Chadwick in Appendix 3 paragraph 2 states that the archaeological desk and fieldwork undertaken on behalf of KIG has broadly followed the staged approach advocated by KCC. The KCC approach and the justification for that approach is set out in paragraphs 5.39 to 5.45 of my evidence (KCC 2.1). Paragraphs 6.75 to 6.81 summarise my views on the approach taken by the appellant and the extent to which this differs from the KCC approach is explained.

1.2 I agree that the scale of geophysical (magnetometer) survey work has exceeded the pilot that we had specified. Our intention was that a smaller, controlled sample of the site would be surveyed to test the reliability of the technique and the applicability of further geophysics work (KCC 2.3 Appx 3 para 4.3). This approach is that which had been recommended by Dr Linford and the further geophysical work could have included alternative geophysical techniques such as targeted Earth Resistance survey (KCC 2.1 paras 6.21 – 6.22).

1.3 In paragraph 3, Mr Chadwick lists the items of work covered in the KCC Specification and the work that has been done in response.

1.4 In relation to a desk-based assessment reference is made to the study by WSP in October 2005 (KCC 2.3 Appx 5) and the CgMs Deposit Model (CD 3.30 Appx 4). Section 6 of my evidence (KCC 2.1) includes my consideration of these documents (paras 6.43 – 6.57 & 6.71 – 6.74) respectively. I have explained the difficulty in following the Baseline Conditions for the study of this site in 6.62 of my evidence. Furthermore note should be taken that the October 2005 study had not been provided to the County Council until requested on the 9th September 2009 (see KCC 2.1 para 6.7.1). I would also draw attention to the weight Mr Chadwick would like me to give to the desk study in his covering email (KCC 2.3 Appendix 4).

1.5 With respect to the site walkover, those described by WSP in 2007 (CD 3.1 para 13.4.23) are not evidently comprehensive as I note in my evidence (KCC 2.1 para 6.7). Nor is a comprehensive walkover described in the CgMs Archaeology SES (CD 3.30). Certainly no walkover as set out in the KCC specification has been carried out.

1.6 I have dealt with the topographic model in my evidence (KCC 2.1 paras 6.43 – 6.57).

1.7 The impact assessment of settings are dealt with by Mr Parkinson on behalf of MBC. A note on the assessment of the impact on the setting on Thurnham Castle has been submitted as a note to the inquiry (KCC 2.7).

1.8 A detailed magnetometer survey has been carried out, but note paragraph 1.1 above.

1.9 I agree that the metal detecting, fieldwalking and topsoil test pitting works have not been carried out.

1.10 The trial trenching works referred to are extremely limited in their scope and only target against a number of geophysical anomalies.

1.11 In paragraph 4 Mr Chadwick refers to the Portable Antiquities Scheme and that it was not included as a source in the original specification. The national database for the scheme is developing and information is available through the Finds Liaison Officers employed through the scheme. The fact that the original specification included metal detecting should have suggested that this database would be a useful source.

1.12 I note Mr Chadwick's reservations on the value of the data. Kent County Council has worked hard with detectorist groups and individuals to report their finds and to log the location of their findings as accurately as possible. Many detectorists have a very good knowledge of where they have made their discoveries as they go back to the same spot regularly to detect. I have checked the accuracy of the records to the north of the scheme and find that they are generally well located, many to an accuracy of 50m. One record just to the north of the western end of the KIG site included quantities of prehistoric pottery found at the same time as detecting. My evidence has described how this data can be used to understand the background potential of the area (KCC 2.1 paras 4.13 – 4.15).

1.13 With regard to paragraph 5 I am unclear as why Mr Chadwick is making this point. Our approach has been to specify a number of surveys to assist in reduction of the trenching sample.

1.14 With regard to paragraph 6 I contest that the Appellant's approach will give a sufficient degree of confidence as I have set out in Section 6 of my evidence.

1.15 With regard to paragraph 7 I have contested the reliability of the geophysics results and the influence of the subsoil on the results (KCC 2.1 paras 6.15 – 6.33 & 6.79). There has not been sufficient testing of the results of the geophysics work to be able to confirm this one way or the other. No archaeological features were found in Trench 1 to confirm that the geophysics had picked up features masked by colluviums. Paragraph 6.12 of my evidence (KCC 2.1) and Figure 8 (KCC 2.2) explain the depths of subsoil observed by Archaeology South East and the locations of those observations.

1.16 In paragraph 8, Mr Chadwick implies that I am expecting 'metres of hillwash' based on my paragraph 4.20 (KCC 2.1). This paragraph relates to a site on the scarp slope of the downs. I have set out in paragraph 6.12 the degree of subsoil that has been identified to date. The question remains as to what extent these depths would have affected the response of archaeology to the geophysics.

1.17 Mr Chadwick in paragraph 9 refers to an 'iterative' use of the Archaeological Deposit Model. While I accept that this has been referred to for the targeted trial trenching, it has not been referred to by Durham University in their works.

1.18 Mr Chadwick in his paragraph 10 concentrates on my paragraph 6.39 but misunderstands the point that I have made. My intention as can be seen in the preceding paragraph (KCC 2.1 para 6.38), was to explain how it would have been helpful if the Wessex Archaeology report had discussed the relationship of the geophysics to their trenching results – part of the 'iterative' approach that we have been seeking. He also draws reference to Durham University's response on the point (KIG 7.4 Appx 2 para 6.30). I have not stated that I would expect a 1:1 relationship from geophysics and agree that geophysics is unlikely to identify every single feature. Durham recognise a plotting error has been made in the field for containing Trench 5. They claim that there has been no similar error over the rest of the site though I would suggest that we do not have the evidence to confirm this.

1.19 I have dealt with the issue in paragraph 11 in my Rebuttal Proof (KCC 2.4 para 3.7).