



Historic England

David Levy and Stephen Eades
Directors, Marinet Limited
Cedar Lodge
Allington
Chippenham
Wilts SN14 6LW

Our ref:

Your ref:

Telephone 07798 653897

(Correspondence by email only)

26th June 2017

Dear Mr Levy and Mr Eades,

Goodwin Sands Dredging Licence Application

Thank you for your letters, dated 4th and 6th June 2017, regarding the proposed dredging project within the Goodwin Sands. In your letters to my colleague Dr Joe Flatman and I you asked a number of questions for which I provide this response.

1) The depth of the penetration of the magnetometer survey will depend on how the survey was conducted and sea conditions at the time. We therefore have no other comment to offer at this stage while we await delivery to us of the archaeological interpretation report of the acquired data.

2) Further information regarding the archaeological interpretation of surveys commissioned by Dover Harbour Board which were used to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Environmental Statement¹, are detailed within Appendix 14.2 (Wessex Archaeology – *Goodwin Sands Archaeological Review of Geophysical Data*, Ref: 111510.01, dated April 2016). For example, Figure 4 within this appendix provides an illustration of a buried palaeo-channel identified from Sub-Bottom Profiler (SBP) data.

¹ Goodwin Sands Aggregate Dredging Environmental Statement, Volume II - EIA Outcome. Prepared for Dover Harbour Board by Royal HaskoningDHV. Reference: I&BPB2107R001D01; Revision: 01/Final, dated 16 May 2016



Historic England, Eastgate Court, 195-205 High Street, Guildford GU1 3EH
Telephone 01483 25 2020 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



3) We understand that the recent marine magnetometer survey commissioned by Dover Harbour Board included other geophysical techniques such as Multi Beam Echo Sounder and Side Scan Sonar. For further information we must direct you to Dover Harbour Board as they commissioned the survey.

4) The use of a control in marine geophysical survey is mentioned in our published guidance² and the archaeological interpretation report to be provided to us for comment by Dover Harbour Board should explain how data was acquired and the mechanisms employed to determine the quality of those data.

In reference to your estimation of wreck (vessel and aircraft) that might be encountered within the Goodwin Sands, we will adopt a risk-based approach in terms of the following factors: the depth of dredging proposed in reference to sedimentary dynamics and geomorphological functioning to differentiate areas of tidally mobile sand from more stable sedimentary sequences; the location of the proposed dredging area in reference to records of losses as might be associated with aircraft or historic anchorages and navigation routes through the Goodwin Sands; and our review of an archaeological interpretation report prepared by a professional and experienced contractor that can demonstrate compliance with established good practice for the sector³.

Yours sincerely,



Christopher Pater
Head of Marine Planning

Cc Joe Flatman (Head of Listing Programmes, Historic England)

² Plets R, Dix J and Bates R. (2013) *Marine Geophysics Data Acquisition, Processing and Interpretation – Guidance Notes*, published by English Heritage (product code: 51811)

³ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists – professional status information: <http://www.archaeologists.net/>

