



ENGLISH HERITAGE

# English Heritage Advisory Committee (EHAC)

**Open minutes of the 21st meeting held at 10:30am on  
Friday 3 February 2006 at 23 Savile Row, London W1**

**EHAC members present:**

Mr Les Sparks OBE – Acting Chair  
(Items 1-2, 4-8, 10-13)  
Ms Elizabeth Williamson - Acting Chair  
(Items 3,9)  
  
Mr David Baker OBE  
Professor Timothy Champion  
Mrs Bridget Cherry OBE  
Professor Barry Cunliffe CBE  
Dr Jane Grenville (Items 1-7)  
Mr Nick Johnson  
Ms Helen Maclagan (Items 7-13)  
Mr Julian Munby  
Mr Barry Shaw MBE (Items 1-7,9)  
Professor Gavin Stamp  
Mr Peter Studdert  
Mr Paul Walshe  
Mr Charles Wilson  
Dr Stuart Wrathmell

**LAC members present:**

Mr John Allan (Items 1&2)  
Mr Alan Baxter (Items 1&2)  
Mrs Joyce Bridges CBE (Items 1&2)  
Dr Hazel Conway (Items 1-3)  
Mr Ken Dytor (Items 1&2)  
Mr Andrew Karski (Items 1&2)  
Mr Graham Morrison (Items 1&2)  
Ms Taryn Nixon (Items 1&2)  
Mr Giles Quarme (Items 1&2)  
Mr Peter Stewart (Items 1&2)

**Staff present:**

Mr Steve Bee – Director of Planning and  
Development (Items 2, 7-10)  
Mr David Burgh – Secretariat Manager  
(Items 1-2)  
Ms Vida Cody – Committee Administrator

Mr Philip Davies – Planning and  
Development Director, South (Items 1,2)  
Mr James Edgar – Team Leader, East  
Midlands (Item 9)  
Mr Keith Emerick – Inspector of Ancient  
Monuments (Items 7-8)  
Mr Ian George – EHAC Coordinator  
Mr Nigel Hewitson – Legal Director (Items  
1-7)  
Dr Edward Impey - Director, Research and  
Standards (Items 3-9)  
Ms Maddy Jago – Planning and  
Development Regional Director, Yorkshire  
(Items 7-8)  
Ms Deborah Lamb - Director, Policy and  
Communications  
Mr Duncan McCallum – Policy Director  
Ms Lindsey Martel – Casework Officer  
(Items 7-8)  
Mr Adrian Olivier – Strategy Director  
Mr Mark Pemberton – Director of Properties  
and Outreach (Items 10-11)  
Mr Paddy Pugh – Head, Regional Advice,  
London Region (Items 1-2)  
Mr Neil Redfern - Inspector of Ancient  
Monuments (Items 7-8)  
Ms Rebecca Simpson – Commission  
Secretariat (Items 1-2)  
Mr Anthony Streeten - Planning and  
Development Regional Director, East  
Midlands (Item 9)  
Mr David Stuart – Historic Areas Advisor  
(Items 1-3)  
Mr David Tomback – Director, Development  
Economics (Items 1-2)  
Mr Charles Wagner – Head of Planning and  
Regeneration Policy (Items 1-2)  
Ms Jenifer White – Senior Landscape  
Advisor (Item 10)

**Observers:**

Dr Ian Dungavell – Joint Committee of  
National Amenity Societies (Items 1-7, 9)  
Ms Sarah Jackson – CABE (Items 1&2)  
Ms Esther Kurland – CABE (Items 1&2)  
Mr Fred Manson OBE – CABE (Items 1&2)  
Ms Selina Mason – CABE (Items 1&2)  
Ms Amanda Mathews – Countryside  
Agency  
Mr Pankaj Patel – CABE (Items 1&2)  
Mr Sunand Prasad – CABE (Items 1&2)

## **Item 1 – Apologies, Announcements, Declarations of Interest**

### Apologies

- 1.1 EHAC apologies for absence were received from Dr Martin Bell, Professor Keith Branigan, Mr Rodney Melville and Mr William Du Croz (English Nature).
- 1.2 LAC apologies for absence were received from Mr Manish Chande and Mr Ptolemy Dean.
- 1.3 CABE apologies for absence were received from Mr Paul Finch, Mr Glenn Howells and Mr Robin Nicholson.
- 1.4 Staff apologies were received from Mr Christopher Scull and Dr Simon Thurley.

### Announcements

- 1.5 A welcome and thanks were extended to LAC and CABE for joining the meeting for the item on EH/CABE joint guidance on tall buildings.
- 1.6 Dr Ian Dungavell was welcomed to his first EHAC meeting as an observer.

### Declarations of Interest

- 1.7 Les Sparks declared an interest in Nottingham Trent University (item 9) as an advisor to the City Council and, whilst having no involvement in Bournemouth (item 3), he is currently advising the developer's planning consultants on another project. Elizabeth Williamson agreed to chair both items.
- 1.8 Ian Dungavell declared an interest in Nottingham Trent University (item 9) as Director of the Victorian Society, an organisation that had objected to the University's proposals.

## **Item 2 – Tall Buildings Guidance (EHAC 2006/1)**

- 2.1 In March 2003, English Heritage and CABE had jointly published *Guidance on Tall Buildings*. The document was used by local authorities and referred to at Public Inquiries. As the number of tall building applications had since significantly increased, in London and elsewhere, it had been thought timely to update and strengthen the guidance.
- 2.2 London was taken as the starting point for discussion. Tall buildings would undoubtedly have a profound effect on the historic environment,

especially the skyline and on the nature and meaning of place. Their impact would be over a long distance with sometimes unexpected consequences. The subject was central to EH concerns. London had grown in a largely unplanned fashion and is constantly changing. This has resulted in accidental juxtapositions that contribute to the city's identity. While tall buildings could add to the drama of the city, the scale and siting of recent proposals gives cause for concern. Although the London Plan set out broad locations for tall buildings, the boroughs had still to draw up detailed frameworks. In addition, the Mayor's draft Strategic Views Management Framework was still only at consultation stage. This meant that there lacked a clear planning framework for tall buildings and an increasing number of opportunistic proposals were coming forward.

2.3 A number of high profile London cases were causing press interest. Traditionally, tall buildings tended to be commercial developments concentrated in business clusters but a recent trend was for residential towers that were more sporadic and spaced apart. EH had not been able to persuade the Secretary of State to give the protection of the historic environment sufficient weight in recent planning decisions. Some recent cases were highlighted, including:

i) *Heron Tower*

The Secretary of State had granted permission for the Heron Tower. EH had objected to the impact on St Paul's, especially from Waterloo Bridge and the Somerset House terrace and had asked for the application to be called in. The Secretary of State had considered that the harm was not sufficient to refuse the application.

ii) *London Bridge Tower ("Shard of Glass")*

This case had been called in on the recommendation of EH and CABE. EH had concerns about the impact on views, especially of the Tower of London. The Secretary of State had agreed with the Inspector's recommendations that the high quality of the design was such that it outweighed any harm and he granted consent.

iii) *Vauxhall Tower*

This was an appeal against the refusal by the London Borough of Lambeth for an application for a residential tower. EH concerns centred on the impact on the Westminster World Heritage Site and Whitehall Conservation Area. The Secretary of State disagreed with the Inspector's recommendation to refuse and granted consent. He considered that the harm to the World Heritage Site was outweighed by the regeneration and housing benefits of the proposal.

iv) *Potters Field*

The Secretary of State had recently allowed an appeal for a five tower development of 12-19 storeys. He considered that there was no harmful impact on Tower Bridge or on the strategic view of St Paul's from Blackheath. It was noted that UNESCO had voiced concern over the impact of Potters Field and the London Bridge Tower on the Tower of London World Heritage Site.

v) *DIFA Tower, Bishopsgate*

EH had objected to the proposal for a 63 storey tower, especially the impact on the view from St James' Park. EH had been ready to request a call in but the proposal had been changed and the height reduced. A new application had been lodged which was currently before EH.

- 2.4 At an initial meeting with CABE, it had been agreed that most of the text in the guidance document was sound but that it might be directed more at local authorities and how they should manage cases as they arise. Suggestions for change included introducing PPS 1 to strengthen the sections on setting and context and emphasising the World Heritage Sites more. The problem over skyline and identity might also be considered. CABE suggested that the increased emphasis on spatial planning needed to be included and that there should be clear guidance for developers.
- 2.5 It was noted that there had been a number of tall building applications outside London and that the skills required to manage these were not necessarily in place. It was encouraging that some local authorities had strategies already but it would be helpful to have an overview of them all in order to decide what a generic policy should look like.
- 2.6 It was suggested that the difference between the long term future of residential and commercial blocks needed considering, particularly as residential property was likely to involve long leases which would make future demolition difficult. The comment was also made that the nature and meaning of cities had not yet been taken into account. In the case of the London Bridge Tower, there had been no reference to the meaning of the London Bridge area. It was vital to recognise that a tall building would change the nature of an area forever if placed somewhere out of character and with no previous status. The significance of the Thames should not be overlooked and it was vital to have an overall strategy rather than decisions being taken by individual boroughs.
- 2.7 It was agreed that the guidance should be accompanied by an implementation strategy and that it would be helpful to have examples in the checklist. A balance had to be struck between economic and

social issues and the impact on the historic environment. More detail on sustainability would also be helpful.

2.8 It was acknowledged that EH and CABE may at times differ in their views and come from different angles but that it was essential for the document to be subscribed to by both parties. Pressure for tall buildings was very strong and was ever more powerful once coupled with housing needs and the views of the Mayor. It was important therefore to work together and consider other areas such as values and how the public perceive the city.

**2.9 The Committee agreed that:**

- i) the guidance needed strengthening regarding skylines**
- ii) the character and meaning of cities was important**
- iii) it should be clearer who the audience was**
- iv) the checklist was useful in guiding local authorities**
- v) successes and failures should be reviewed**
- vi) an implementation strategy should go alongside the guidance**
- vii) the different effects of profiles and silhouettes should be considered and the impact of buildings at night**
- viii) the difficulties of replacing or removing residential towers needed further consideration**
- ix) the significance of the Thames and its neighbouring boroughs was important**
- x) better photo montages were needed**
- xi) the guidance should be set in the context of socio-economic issues**
- xii) sustainability and longevity were important**
- xiii) there is a need to reach the maximum amount of common ground between the two organisations and to recognise that the different remits are not a weakness.**

**Item 3 – Terrace Mount, Bournemouth (EHAC 2006/2)**

3.1 Elizabeth Williamson chaired this item as Les Sparks had declared an interest. He is currently advising the developer's planning consultants on another project, but not in Bournemouth.

3.2 The Committee was asked to consider a proposal for a residential and retail development on a site known as Terrace Mount. The main issue was the scale of the development and the impact on the Grade II\* registered Gardens, conservation areas and a number of Grade II listed buildings, the most significant being St Andrew's Church. The Lower and Central Gardens had been laid out in the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century and the town had developed around them. The Committee was made aware of several other major development proposals in the area.

- 3.3 A joint EHAC/HPGP site visit had taken place and one of the Parks and Gardens Panel was at the meeting and able to comment. (This item had also been presented at the HPGP meeting on 31 January.) It was reported that the 24 storey building would not sit on top of Terrace Mount but that a third of the site would be excavated to make way for it. The trees on the immediate boundary would remain but the building would be severely intrusive over the Gardens. No Environmental Impact Assessment had been made. The other three residential blocks proposed would be built on top of five current levels of car parking space. This raised concerns amongst members about the likely increase in traffic.
- 3.4 Those members of EHAC who had visited the site commented on the enormity of the proposals and agreed that the design of the tall building was extremely destructive and that the local impact would be very severe. The outline of St Andrew's Church (listed Grade II) would be eradicated. The hostility of the environment at ground level was of major concern.
- 3.5 One member had no objection to a landmark building in principle but commented that it should be nowhere near as tall as that proposed. This was not a view shared by others on the Committee who strongly agreed that a landmark building would not be acceptable. It was considered that the Gardens gave a sense of breadth, space and seclusion that would be diminished if the development were allowed to go ahead. The comment was made that parks and gardens are designated because they enrich the quality of our lives and that the full significance of parks and gardens in general needed to be stressed. There were fears that acceptance of a tall building for Bournemouth would set a precedent and would be an *ad hoc* decision, going against other advice given by EH.
- 3.6 The Committee agreed:**
- i) to support the region's recommendation that this application be refused**
  - ii) to support the grounds for refusal as follows: unacceptable impact on the setting of the Grade II\* registered Lower and Central Gardens in particular; unacceptable impact on the setting of conservation areas; unacceptable impact on listed buildings; unacceptable impact on the town as a whole**
  - iii) to support the need for a tall buildings policy in Bournemouth**
  - iv) that staff should ask the Council for a greater analysis of the wider environmental impacts and this should include both a transport study and a characterisation study amongst others**

- v) **NOT to support a landmark building in the location identified.**

**Item 4 – Open Minutes of the 20th meeting held on 17 November 2005 (EHAC 2006/3)**

- 4.1 The open minutes of the 20th meeting of EHAC held on 17 November 2005 were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

**Item 5 – Exempt Minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17 November 2005 (EHAC 2006/4/E)**

- 5.1 The exempt minutes of the 20th meeting of EHAC held on 17 November 2005 were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

**Item 6 – Matters Arising**

**Advisory Board for Redundant Churches (open minutes – item 6)**

- 6.1 The Chairman of the ABRC and Sir Neil Cossons had been in correspondence since the last meeting of EHAC. Independent advice was the issue at stake and its importance fully recognised. The Council for the Care of Churches (CCC) was reported to be changing the nature of its operations to take on an advisory role. Staff were confident that the problems anticipated would not materialise and that progress had been made. David Baker declared his interest as ABRC Chairman and stated that he did not agree but felt it inappropriate to comment further at the meeting.

**Item 7 – Ladybridge Farm, Thornborough Henges (EHAC 2006/5)**

- 7.1 The Committee were being asked to consider EH's response to a Minerals Planning application by Tarmac Northern Ltd to extend gravel extraction close to the henges and to support staff in their long term strategy for the management of the henges and the wider landscape. Thornborough is a high profile case, regionally and nationally, and comparisons are likely to be made with the work being carried out by EH at Stonehenge and at the Millfield Quarry site in Northumberland.
- 7.2 Thornborough is one of the top ten prehistoric landscapes in the country. Tarmac owns the land surface of Thornborough Moor, including the central and southern henges. The northern henge is owned by Mr Christopher Bourne-Arton and there is a site tenant at the central and southern henge: Mr Robert Staveley. Thornborough is

distinct from the other henge sites on the list prepared for the EHAC paper in that the degree of private ownership is an issue: the other sites have stable management regimes by virtue of their ownership by charitable and non-governmental bodies. Tarmac do not share the view of English Heritage on the way forward and have portrayed our position as wishing to “freeze” the landscape, whilst Mr Staveley wishes to continue arable farming.

- 7.3 At Ladybridge Farm, the proposal is for mineral extraction of the whole site and for two lakes to be placed there. Archaeological research carried out at Nosterfield Quarry has shown quite an intense level of prehistoric activity, which EH had considered would extend into Ladybridge Farm. Mike Griffiths Associates (MGA – archaeological consultants to Tarmac Northern Ltd) have carried out two archaeological evaluations which have identified an eastward projecting promontory of land. EH considers that the archaeological deposits discovered in the southern portion of Ladybridge Farm are of national importance and are further convinced that the larger archaeological landscape is also of national importance. Tarmac (and MGA) clearly state that they do not consider the deposits to be nationally important and their preferred mitigation response is that of preservation by record. However, they have stated that, should nationally important remains be discovered in the southern portion of Ladybridge Farm, they will seek preservation in situ. The mechanism to achieve this has not been made clear and its success as a strategy is unlikely as EH and MGA do not agree on the methods of establishing national importance.
- 7.4 Securing the nationally important archaeology is EH’s main concern. It was suggested to Tarmac that a revised proposal would be considered for Ladybridge Farm if the archaeological sensitivity was recognised in the southern third of the site. EH considers that the archaeology and the landscape are nationally important and therefore, by extension, also at Ladybridge Farm. The Farm cannot be separated from the monuments.
- 7.5 There followed some discussion about the scoring system used to define “Monument Interest Value” at Stonehenge and whether the same scoring system would satisfy an Inspector at Thornborough. At Stonehenge, the scoring system had looked at components of the landscape which had already been designated as nationally important and a World Heritage Site. It had not been intended that the particular scoring system should be used to define issues of national importance at Stonehenge or any other site. At Stonehenge, the scoring system started from the premise that all the monuments were of international importance and was used to define relevant importance in order to determine the most suitable alignment for the proposed road.
- 7.6 Consistency between the two sites was difficult as the concentration was on the physical condition of the archaeology. EH had specified that

the “MIV” scoring system should not be included in the methodology for the Ladybridge Farm evaluation. Following the advice of the Secretary of State at the DCMS, in her recent comments on Public Value, it was suggested that the public value interest of the monuments and wider landscape ought to be considered. The contextual importance of the landscape was the key to greater understanding.

7.7 Three Committee members had visited the site and offered their comments. All agreed that the site and wider landscape were of World Heritage class, in the top league of prehistoric landscapes and that the northern henge is in exceptional condition. Three issues were key:

- i) how to define the archaeological significance of the landscape
- ii) the factor of minerals hope value at Thornborough (Nosterfield Quarry, Ladybridge Farm and Thornborough Moor are not “preferred” areas in the Minerals Local Plan)
- iii) the problem of class consent (Ladybridge Farm illustrates the limitations and difficulties of scheduling).

7.8 Members were extremely concerned about the piecemeal approach to what they considered an exceptional landscape and which had resulted in its gradual eating away. A broader vision was needed to make the landscape meaningful. The Thornborough area was thought to be a stunning example of a prehistoric and later landscape which includes several scheduled monuments and other distinctive landscape features. Not enough had been done to make people aware of its magnificence and outstanding importance. It was agreed that the overall vision and story had to be drawn out to show the integrity of the approach EH was taking. Tarmac’s inference is that unless the site is of national importance, scheduled or not, it would not be worth preserving. EHAC could not endorse that position.

7.9 **The Committee agreed that:**

- i) EH should continue its opposition to the Ladybridge Farm minerals planning application as currently proposed**
- ii) EH can confirm that the archaeological deposits at Ladybridge Farm are nationally important and should be preserved in situ**
- iii) The Stonehenge scoring system was designed solely for use in a particular context and does not have wider application**
- iv) EH should establish and clearly state its long term management objectives for Thornborough Henges and its environs.**

## **Item 8 – Fylingdales Moor (EHAC 2006/6)**

- 8.1 The Committee was given the background to the wildfire on Fylingdales Moor in 2003. The fire had burnt for four days and continued to smoulder some 15 days later. The moor has not had any grazing since World War II and is not actively managed as a grouse moor. An area of 2.5 square kilometres was burnt, resulting in the total loss of the vegetation. Three to four weeks after the fire, dust and ash were still blowing off the moor in dry conditions and silt washing off the moor in wet conditions.
- 8.2 Initial aerial photography taken by the English Heritage Aerial Survey Team highlighted the extent of archaeological features affected by the fire.
- 8.3 A partnership was developed between EH, the North York Moors National Park and English Nature to undertake emergency regeneration in a manner that did not impact on the archaeology revealed. A second phase of this work has been funded by a Defra Countryside Stewardship Scheme special project.
- 8.4 Prior to the fire, the area was noted for its rich concentration of archaeological features, 30 of which were designated as nationally important scheduled monuments. As part of the rapid recording exercise following the fire, a further 2,500 features were identified. In 2004 (a year after the fire), continuous wind and water erosion of the exposed peat and soil deposits led to the degradation of several monuments, highlighting the importance of early conservation and regeneration work to consolidate the ground surface (and monuments) of the moor.
- 8.5 The comment was made that wild fires would undoubtedly increase with climate change and that national guidance similar to that produced after building fires (Uppark, Hampton Court, Windsor Castle) was needed to inform management responses to such events.
- 8.6 The issue of controlled fires on moorland was raised as significant, notably as a management tool for preventing the wider impact of wildfires. A clear guidance on upland moorland management was needed and this needed to be integrated with other environmental concerns and stakeholders. Fylingdales clearly illustrated the importance of working in an integrated way with partners and the need to engage with the wider local community. A current proposal was noted for co-sponsored work on the environment in national parks, between the Countryside Agency and EH.
- 8.7 **The Committee supported staff in their management of the archaeology affected by the Fylingdales Moor wildfire and in their**

**continued partnership work to ensure the long term management of the archaeology on the Moor.**

**Item 9 – Nottingham Trent University (EHAC 2006/8)**

- 9.1 Elizabeth Williamson chaired this item as Les Sparks had declared an interest as advisor to the City Council. Members were reminded that the proposed redevelopment is in the context of the “Core Cities” agenda and that education is a key driver. The case is complex and the staff view is that a balance of interests has to be established.
- 9.2 Since EHAC had last considered this case in November 2005, an application had been submitted to upgrade the Arkwright Building to Grade II\*. Further research had been carried out by EH and on behalf of EH, on the building’s significance, from which it was felt that a very strong case for demolition would have to be made. The Conservation Strategy Report by Alan Baxter and Associates was not in accordance with the views of English Heritage or the Victorian Society.
- 9.3 One member commented that the research carried out by/for English Heritage had been thorough and helpful and that it both confirmed and raised the significance of the building. It was important to note that this was the first municipally-sponsored college and that it represents a unique historical record of civic responsibility and engagement. The survival of the interiors is very good and largely intact. The Conservation Strategy Report prepared by Alan Baxter and Associates was considered to make judgements about the significance that were contentious and questionable and in some cases factually inaccurate.
- 9.4 Few on the Committee were in dispute about the proposals for the Newton Building while many had concerns over the demolition of parts of the Arkwright Building and fully supported the judgement of staff about its historic significance. Mindful of the “big picture” and the merits of the scheme as a whole, members remain to be convinced that there is no case to be made for putting the building and courtyards to alternative use and thought that the merits of the proposed scheme had not been argued sufficiently. Low use rates had been calculated on current rates of teaching use but did not take into account other possible functions.
- 9.5 The comment was made that the Baxter report should be seen in the context of the request for upgrading the building to Grade II\*. The report showed the extent to which valuable architecture still exists and made the case stronger than ever that parts of the building should be retained. This was also the view of the Ancient Monuments Society in a letter tabled at the meeting.

- 9.6 It was agreed that re-use of more of the central range should be encouraged and that the research carried out heightened the Committee's support for the building's historic significance.
- 9.7 **With one amendment to recommendations in the paper, the Committee:**
- a) **noted the report on the request to upgrade the Arkwright Building to Grade II\*;**
  - b) **supported the view of staff that English Heritage should recommend the granting of the listed building consent for the Newton Building and support proposals in the planning application as it relates to the Newton building and to the Central Court;**
  - c) **supported the view of staff that in the light of the paramount significance of the Arkwright Building the case for partial demolition has yet to be made; and**
  - d) **agreed that EH staff should determine whether the case for partial demolition of the Arkwright Building has been made in the light of any further evidence to be presented by the applicant, and advise the local planning authority accordingly.**

**\*Item 10 – Golf Guidance (EHAC 2006/7)**

- 10.1 The public consultation phase had ended and feedback had been positive. The final document would be accompanied by a leaflet setting out EH's position statement, concerns and principles for developing golf courses. Further information would be published on the web.
- 10.2 The boom years for golf course development peaked in the 1980s and the assumption is there are few planning applications. However, the new courses are still being constructed and others are being further developed and there is a concentration in historic landscapes. The impact of golf courses on the historic environment was first highlighted in *Heritage Counts*. One in twelve registered parks and gardens were affected by golf courses and EH's ConCase (planning application consultation management system) currently records 19 cases (as well as the high profile cases cited in the EHAC paper). On the average of a 50 hectare golf course, this number of applications for EH's consideration potentially affects 1000 hectares. These types of development not only affect the landscape setting but usually involve major invasive topographical and excavating works to create new levels and land forms, design orientation, buildings, roads and tracks, storage compounds, irrigation instalments and new management regimes. Further applications are likely to arise – diversification or expansion of golf club facilities and services, re-design and re-

modelling of boom era courses and developments in sport and equipment.

- 10.3 The new guidance also recognises the importance of golf as a sport and leisure activity, its role in regeneration schemes and the historic interest of some golf course designs.
- 10.4 Forty six responses had been received from the public consultation and there was overwhelming support from local planning authorities. Respondents liked the guidelines approach and it was hoped that this could be used as briefing for colleagues and guidance for cases that arise.
- 10.5 Members agreed that the guidance was an excellent document, well researched and much needed. It was suggested that the bullet points at the end of the document be made more obvious and that the criteria for assessment of proposals should not be overlooked. Leverage between the two was needed. It was agreed that, although there was more archaeology in the document than before and the consultation version had been checked by archaeologists, this may still have been distilled too much.
- 10.6 The Committee agreed that the guidance was an excellent piece of work and gave it its full support.**

### **Item 11 – Stonehenge (Oral)**

#### Visitor Centre

- 11.1 The planning application for the visitor facilities and access scheme had been refused but EH had submitted an appeal in November 2005. The First Secretary of State is to determine the appeal. It will go to Public Inquiry but no date has been set.

#### A303 Inquiry

- 11.2 EH is involved but is not leading the Inquiry. A public consultation was launched in January and will last 13 weeks. EH has to put forward its view on the options. A paper is being prepared for the March meetings of EHAC and Commission. Until a corporate position is agreed, EH considers the bored tunnel the best option.

### **Item 12 – Update on Previous Business (Oral)**

- 12.1 There were no updates on previous Committee business.

**Item 13 – Any Other Business (Oral)**

**Date of next meeting**

13.1 The next meeting of EHAC would take place on 2 March 2006 at 10:30am.

**Vida Cody  
Committee Administrator  
February 2006**