Louth Local Authorities
Viewing purposes only.

APPENDIX F

Archaeology, Architecture and Cultural Heritage

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:37

18. CULTURAL HERITAGE
Local History, Archaeology and Architectural Heritage

18.1 Introduction

Cultural Heritage (Physical), in respect of a project, is assumed to include all humanly created features on the landscape, including portable artefacts, which might reflect the prehistoric, historic, architectural, engineering and/or social history of the area. The Cultural Heritage of the area of the proposed development was examined through an Archaeological, Architectural and Historical study. The Archaeological and Architectural studies involved a documentary/cartographic search and field inspection of the area, while the Historical study involved a documentary search.

18.1.1 Methodology

The Archaeological, Architectural and Cultural Heritage components of the study comprise the results of a survey and evaluation of selected sites of archaeological, architectural and historical potential within, and in the immediate environs of, the proposed development area. The work consists of the results of a paper survey, field inspection and programmes of archaeological investigations.

(i) Paper Survey

As part of a documentary/cartographic search, the following principal sources were examined from which a list of sites and areas of Cultural Heritage interest/potential was compiled:

- Record of Monuments and Places – Co. Louth
- Archives of the Archaeological Survey of Ireland.
- Records of the National Museum of Ireland.
- Annual Archaeological Excavation Bulletin (up to 2004).
- Stereoscopic photographic coverage carried out by the Geological Survey of Ireland.
- NIAH Survey of the Architectural Heritage of County Louth.
- Documentary and cartographic sources in Louth County Library.
- Louth County Development Plan 2003-2009.
- Dundalk and Environs Development Plan 2003-2008.
- Mullagharlin Framework Plan 2007.

(ii) Field Inspection

From the preceding paper survey, a list of cultural heritage sites/sites of cultural heritage potential was compiled for inspection. The subject lands and a 250m area surrounding the boundaries of such lands was assessed for the presence of archaeological monuments by reference to map and aerial photographic sources. A preliminary field survey of the subject lands was undertaken in mid-April 2008.

An attempt was also made to identify previously unrecorded sites of cultural heritage potential within, and in the immediate environs of, the proposed development area.

Sites of cultural heritage potential identified on the basis of the paper survey were inspected in an attempt to confirm their locations on the ground and to determine, if possible, their likely extent.
The Archaeological, Architectural and Cultural Heritage Assessment components of the study comprise the results of a survey and evaluation of selected sites of archaeological, architectural and historical potential within, and in the immediate environs of, the proposed development area. The work consists of the results of a desk survey and field inspection of the site and immediate surrounds.

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For inspection purposes only.
Louth County Council
Planning Authorities
Copyright Purposes Only.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:37

(iii) Archaeological Investigations

The overall subject site was subjected to an archaeological geophysical survey in March 2004. This work formed part of a wider study of lands earmarked for development by IDA Ireland. This report is reproduced as Appendix 18.1 and is summarised below in Section 3.XX. An additional geophysical survey was undertaken in June 2008 in order to determine the location of a previously documented possible souterrain monument with the subject lands (Site CH-1 below; Section 3.1). The results of this work are summarised below in Section 3.1 and the report is reproduced in Appendix 18.2. Furthermore, a programme of intrusive archaeological testing was carried out within the boundaries of the site in June 2008, the primary aims of which were to determine the archaeological potential of the geophysical anomalies detected in the 2004 survey. The results of the testing programme are contained in Appendix 18.3.

18.1.2 Assessment of Impacts

The following table (based on NRA, 2003, 21) provides the baseline criteria used to describe the impacts that the proposed development will have on Cultural Heritage Sites.

	Direct	Indirect
Severe	Cultural Heritage site is within a proposed development area. Construction work will entail the removal of part or the entire cultural heritage site.	Cultural Heritage site is within a proposed development area. Construction works will entail the destruction of the visual context of the site or isolate it from associated groups or features.
Potentially Severe	Cultural Heritage site is adjacent to a proposed development area. There is potential for related remains being affected by development works.	Cultural Heritage site is adjacent to a proposed development area. Construction works will greatly injure the visual context of the site or isolate it from associated groups or features.
Moderate	Existing access to a cultural heritage site will be severed. Development works will affect the context of a cultural heritage site.	N/A
No Predicted	The proposed development will have no predicted impact.	N/A

18.1.3 General Receiving Environment

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For inspection purposes only.
Search Viewing Purposes Only

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:37

18.2 Local History

18.2.1 Receiving Environment

County Louth is the most north-westerly county of the Republic of Ireland, bounded by Meath to the south and southwest, Monaghan to the northwest, and Armagh and Down to the north. Louth is the smallest county in Ireland, comprising 203, 374 acres in an area of 317.77 square miles. The general region has historically been seen as guarding the gateway to Ulster: the 'gap of the north' was a historic pass into Ulster through the hills and mountains of south Armagh.

In the early historic period, the region of North Louth formed part of the kingdom of the *Conaille*, a territory described in the seventh century *Life of St Darerca* as consisting of the sub-kingdoms of *Muirtheimne* and *Cúailnge* in north Louth and *Cobha* in the western parts of Co. Down (Thornton, 1997). By the seventh century the ancient kingdom had been reduced to the territories of *Magh Muirtheimne* and possibly *Cúailnge*, in what is now north Louth and south Armagh, to form the kingdom of the *Conaille Muirtheimne*. The first of the kings of this new kingdom to be mentioned in the annals, *Uarcraidne ua Ossèni*, is recorded as having been killed in the battle of *Imlech Pich* in 688. After a battle at Faughart in 735, the *Conaille* clearly emerged as an autonomous kingdom. The death of the king *Sloighedhech* in 789 marks the beginning of a succession of kings of *Conaille Muirtheimne* who can be traced until 1107 when Fergus, the son of the last king of the *Conaille*, was killed in a battle between *Uí Méith* and *Uí Bresail Macha,* two of the sub-kingdoms of the *Airgialla* (O'Sullivan 2006, 1). The ancient kingdom was annexed by the O'Carroll kingdom of the Airgialla of Monaghan and Armagh, later anglicised as Uriel or Oriel.

Following the Anglo-Norman invasions and subsequent settlement, native Irish territories in the region were consolidated into County Louth in 1233. The circumstances surrounding the initial occupation by the Anglo-Normans of the region are shrouded in uncertainty and even contradiction. When King Henry II's son John came to Ireland in 1185 his seneschal was Bertram de Verdon, who remained in Ireland after the prince returned to England. In the succeeding years it is likely that de Verdon conducted negotiations with Murchadh O'Carroll, king of Airgialla, who was then in retirement in Mellifont Abbey. This may explain why, immediately upon Murchadh's death in 1189, john made his grant to Bertram de Verdon of four cartreds of land in Uriel and a half cantred in Louth. Before he left Ireland in 1188, however, de Verdon confirmed a grant that he had already made to St. John the Baptist's Church of 'all the tithes and all ecclesiastical benefices of my whole land at Dundalk including the lands of the burgages' (McNeill, 1923, 166-8; 1924, 270-75). The reference to the 'lands of the burgages' implies that a town had already been established at Dundalk by this time. This was originally established at Castletown, and by the middle of the thirteenth century the present town had emerged.

The town of Louth was an important medieval borough in the thirteenth century, containing an Augustinian abbey from 1148. However, a short time after the 'new town' of Dundalk was established in the mid-thirteenth century, the walled royal borough became the county town and secured the northern edge of the English Pale during the Middle Ages. With Ardee, it was frequently attacked by the Irish of south Ulster. The countryside was part of a fortified marchland, where society and economy were quite unstable, reflected today in the remains of medieval mottes, castles and tower-houses. In that regard, it is noted that there is a motte-and-bailey site (Ref: LH012-025) and a sixteenth century castle site (Ref: LH012-022) located *c.* 450 and 400m respectively to the south of the subject lands. The introduction of the linen trade by the Earl of Clanbrassil in the eighteenth century was the start of Dundalk's industrial development. Brewing has been important for more than three-hundred years, while P.J. Carroll's tobacco works has operated since 1824. Dundalk's industrial core was the locomotive works of the Great Northern Railway (1881-1958), which at one time employed more than 1,300 people. Industrial decline in the 1960s was accentuated by the town's uneasy location with respect to the border with Northern Ireland. However, recent renewal and developments have taken place, and the establishment of

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For inspection purposes only.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

Dundalk Institute of Technology has provided third-level education since 1970, training a local work force for employment in new industries.

The subject lands are located in the townland and civil parish of Haynestown and in the barony of Upper Dundalk. The derivation of the name Haynestown is unclear. It may derive from the Irish *Baile na h-Éin* – 'the town/settlement of the birds' or from *Baile Tháin* – 'the town/settlement of the flock'. Lewis (1837) notes that the name Haynestown was also spelt Heynstown or Hainstown and that the parish contained 442 inhabitants at that time. The Ordnance Survey notebooks of the same period note that the lands were chiefly under tillage and that there was an abundance of 'good building stone'. The chief demesnes within the parish in the early nineteenth century were Prospect, the seat of W.H. Richardson, Esq., and Clermont Park of Thomas Fortesque. Most of this latter demesne was located within the townland of Haynestown, with a small area located in Haggardstown and had been controlled by the Fortesque family from *c.* 1724. In 1777, William Henry Fortesque was created earl of Clermont and his demesne extended to *c.* 800 acres, centred at Clermont Park to the south of the subject development area. The lands reverted to Sir Thomas Fortesque of Dromiskin in 1833 (Smith, 1997). In general, all the remaining lands in the parish were controlled by Robert, Earl of Roden.

The Ordnance Survey Map of 185 (Fig. 18.1) indicates that the subject development area formed parts of four fields at this time, with a residence and associated farm buildings located in the central northern area of the site. This is named *Haynestown Cottage* on the Ordnance Survey Map of 1907-8 (Fig. 18.2), by which time the subject lands are set out in six individual field plots and the farmyard enlarged. In addition, this map also indicates that the route of the *Dublin Amiens Street to Belfast Great Victoria Street and Ardee Branch* Great Northern Railway line forms the north-western corner of the subject lands. This section of the railway line, from Newfoundwell (Drogheda) to Dundalk, was opened in February 1849 by the Dublin & Belfast Junction Railway Company and is still in use.

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

18.2.3 Potential Impact of the Proposal

Pre-Development / Site Preparation Phase

Changes to the existing topography by developments of this kind can have the ability to remove the 'sense of place' to areas where previous historical events took place. Furthermore, the securing of boundaries and extinguishing of 'rights of way' can also impact on places of historical activity.

There are no historic events associated within the proposed development area that require consideration in the undertaking of the overall design and boundaries of the development.

Operational Stage

Potential adverse impacts with respect to historical events are not anticipated during the operational lifetime of the development.

'Do-Nothing' Scenario

In historical terms, the site will remain as it is and no impacts will occur.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

18.2.4 Remedial or Reductive Measures

Pre-Development / Site Preparation Stage

It is not considered that potential adverse impacts with respect to events of historical interest will occur as a result of the development of the site. Consequently, no remedial measures are deemed necessary.

Operational Phase

Potential adverse impacts with respect to events of historical interest are not anticipated during the operational lifetime of the development. Therefore no remedial measures are deemed necessary.

18.2.5 Predicted Impact of the Proposal

Pre-Development / Site Preparation Stage

There are no predicted adverse impacts with respect to historical events associated with the proposed development.

Operational Phase

There are no predicted adverse impacts with respect to historical events once the development has become operational.

'Worst Case' Scenario

No 'worst case' scenario is envisaged.

18.2.6 Monitoring

It is not envisaged that monitoring measures are required.

18.2.7 Reinstatement

It is not envisaged that reinstatement measures are required.

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
South Local Authorities Planning Purposes Only

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

18.3 Archaeology

18.3.1 Receiving Environment

The area examined included the proposed development site, as well as an area of c. 250m surrounding the defined boundaries of the site, where possible.

The area under assessment is part of a landscape which is rich in historical and archaeological material. The general region has attracted settlement from early times as evidenced by the presence of monuments dating back to the prehistoric period. Continuity of settlement is illustrated by artefacts dating to the Bronze Age and by identified monuments ranging from Neolithic to Medieval and Post-Medieval remains.

The siting preferences of particular monument types are well documented. Broadly speaking, the general landscape of the proposed development area offers a potential setting for the discovery of archaeological sites and remains, as follows:

- The general rolling nature of the landscape is a favoured position for the location of prehistoric burial sites, ringforts and enclosure sites in the general region surrounding the subject development lands.

- The location of the lands close to the medieval manor of Dundalk and its location close to the northern medieval Pale region increases the possibility that artefacts from this period may exist within the topsoil layers of the subject lands.

There is one previously recorded monument, identified on the basis of the Paper Survey, located within the subject development lands. The location of this site is illustrated in Fig. 18.3, and is described as follows:

SITE CH-1
Townland: Haynestown
Classification: Souterrain
SMR No.: LH012-055
N.G.R. No.: 304162 303002
Protection: RMP

Description
The monument is situated on a slight rise in the land surface close to a field boundary in the southern western area of the subject lands. The lintels of a drystone-built passage were uncovered during ploughing at a depth of *c.* 0.1m below the surface. There are no records of the structure being opened and surveyed (Buckley & Sweetman, 1991, 124). An attempt to determine the extent of the monument was undertaken in 2004, when it was included in a geophysical survey programme – see Appendix 18.1. However, as discussed below, this proved to be unsuccessful. An additional geophysical survey, using Electrical Resistivity methods, was undertaken in June 2008. The results of this survey are reproduced in Appendix 18.2. The location of the souterrain was determined by this survey, which indicates that the feature is generally orientated north-south (Fig. 18.5). It is *c.* 12m long and up to 5m wide (probably including the side walls and trench 'cut') and may include two possible chambers. The geophysical survey also indicates that the feature may extend south of an existing field boundary, although the detected anomaly towards the south of the feature is most likely that of shallow bedrock. Indeed, the subsequent programme of archaeological testing in the area to the west of the feature (Appendix 18.3) uncovered the surfaces of bedrock at very shallow depths. Such shallow depth bedrock surfaces appear to be quite common in the area as a whole.

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
Louth County Council
Planning Authority

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

There are five recorded monuments/areas of archaeological activity located to the north-west of the subject lands, all of which are situated on the western side of the railway line. The locations of these sites and features are illustrated in Fig. 18.3, and they are described as follows:

SITE CH-2
Townland: Haynestown
Classification: Earthwork
SMR No.: LH012-004
N.G.R. No.: 304078 303593
Protection: RMP

Description
This site was originally identified as a cropmark forming a *c.* 50m arc (NE-SW) on an aerial photograph (Ref: CUCAP, AYM 61). The feature is located at the summit of a low hill and *c.*120m to the north-west of the boundaries to the subject site.

SITE CH-3
Townland: Haynestown
Classification: Corn Drying Kiln; Earthwork
SMR No.: LH012-083; LH012-084
N.G.R. No.: 204120 303676
Protection: RMP

Description
Archaeological investigations undertaken in 1992 at the hill slopes to the north of CH-2 initially uncovered a dark humic deposit with animal bone inclusions. Extensions to the original test trenches revealed evidence of a stone structure. This was represented by a series of large stone lintels, some of which were displaced. A gap in the roof of the structure revealed that the walls were of drystone construction and it was suggested by the excavator that the feature might be a souterrain (Keeley, 1993, 46). However, a more detailed investigation undertaken in 1993 (O'Sullivan, 1994, 57-8) revealed that it was a corn-drying kiln (Ref: LH012-083) attached to a storage shed. The wattle screens used in the drying process were found in carbonised form on the floor of the storage shed. In addition, carbonised seeds from a variety of crops and weeds were also preserved. A substantial ditch (Ref: LH012-084) ran downhill from the mouth of the kiln, and two adult human skeletons were found in the associated fill material. A rounded flint scraper (Ref: NMI 98E0098-12) was also found within this fill material. These features are located *c.* 200m from the boundaries of the subject development lands.

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For inspection purposes only.

SITE CH-4
Townland: Haynestown
Classification: Ring Barrow
SMR No.: LH012-082
N.G.R. No.: 304074 303693
Protection: RMP

Description
Archaeological investigations at the northern base of the hillock on which Site CH-2 is located uncovered the remains of a ring barrow. The ditch of the feature had been filled and partially re-cut at least once. The fill was considerably burnt and it contained cremated bone, slag, pieces of metal artefacts, a bead, sherds of flat-bottomed pottery, flint flakes and some water-rolled stones. Subsequent activity associated with cultivation had sheared off the central area, leaving only the base of a fire-reddened pit in the middle. A platform associated with postholes lay beside the ring barrow, and an undecorated blue glass bead was found on its surface. Both the ring barrow and platform appear to have been contemporary (O'Sullivan, 1994, 57-8). The feature was located *c.* 220m from the boundaries of the subject development lands.

SITE CH-5
Townland: Haynestown
Classification: Miscellaneous
SMR No.: LH012-064
N.G.R. No.: see below for individual features
Protection: RMP

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

Description
Archaeological investigations undertaken by O'Sullivan in 1993 (194, 57-8) revealed a number of subsurface archaeological features, including ditches, pits and postholes (Ref Nos: LH012-064001; NGR: 304024 303697; & LH012-064002; NGR: 303952 303769. In addition, a number of artefacts, including round-ended scrapers and flint fragments were recovered from the ploughsoil. Investigations of two burnt spreads (Ref Nos: LH012-064003; NGR: 304023 303806; & LH012-064004; NGR: 303789 303718) were also undertaken.

18.3.2 Results of Previous Archaeological Investigations with subject lands

The subject lands were subjected to an Archaeological Geophysical Survey undertaken in March 2004 by Earthsound Archaeological Geophysics. This survey was commissioned as part of a non-intrusive Archaeological Assessment, prepared by Irish Archaeological Consultancy Ltd., of two separate land plots owned by IDA Ireland. The report is reproduced in Appendix 18.1.

The lands were initially subjected to a Fluxgate Gradiometer scan. However, this was subsequently abandoned in favour of a Magnetic Susceptibility survey, due to geological interferences. The results of this magnetic susceptibility survey are illustrated in Fig. 18.4. A total of fourteen anomalies (M1-M14) were detected, of which eight were considered to be of either archaeological potential or required additional investigation. These were described in the Geophysical Report as follows:
M1 - This anomaly comprised an expanse of enhanced susceptibility readings. The elongated tendrils to the NE indicate that the anomaly had possibly been spread by agricultural activities such as ploughing. The anomaly was subsequently further investigated as Detailed Survey Area 1.

M2 - This anomaly was slightly weaker than M1 and its true nature was difficult to interpret due to its location at the edge of a field. Consequently, it was further investigated as Detailed Survey Area 2.

Both M1 and M2 are located at opposing sides and at the base of a large hillock. There was no indication in the magnetic susceptibility data for any possible features of archaeological potential on the plateau of the hill.

M5 – This anomaly coincides with an oval depression in the field. The increased enhancement levels may represent archaeological remains, modern burning or geology. The anomaly continues to the south as M6.

M6 – This anomaly is located in an area between two topographical ridges. The strength of the anomaly suggested that it might derive from a subsurface archaeological feature and it was subsequently further investigated as Detailed Survey Area 3.

M9 – This anomaly is a wide area of enhancement which extends into the filed to the south. The geophysical data from this area, which includes SITE CH-1 (Possible Souterrain), suggest the presence of a large number of possible archaeological features. Consequently, the area was further investigated as Detailed Survey Area 4. In addition, it is noted that the extent of SITE CH-1 was not established by this phase of geophysical investigation.

M10 – This anomaly comprises an area of high enhancement situated close to an entrance to three fields. While such enhancement might be the result of livestock activity, the archaeological potential could not be ruled out. Consequently, the area was further investigated as Detailed Survey Area 6.

M13 – This anomaly, which is located on the plateau of a small hillock, comprised an area of moderate enhancement with occasional areas of strong enhancement. The geophysical data is suggestive of subsurface archaeological activity and the area was subsequently further investigated as Detailed Survey Area 5.

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

M14 – This comprised an elongated area of strong and very strong enhancement extending between tow fields. The anomaly appears to extend into an adjacent residential estate to the SW. The anomaly, which is aligned on a slope, was suggestive of archaeological activity. Consequently, it was subject to further investigation as Detailed Area 5.

Following completion of the overall magnetic susceptibility survey, specific areas were subjected to additional detailed fluxgate gradiometer surveys. A large number of plough furrows were detected across the subject development lands running in an E-W direction, as illustrated in Fig. 5. The results of the detailed area surveys (DAS) are summarised as follows:

DAS 1 – A curvilinear feature (G1), broadly aligned N-S was detected. The geophysical data indicates that this may be a ditch feature and of archaeological potential. Other features (G2 and G3) are more suggestive of geological anomalies.

DAS 2 – A possible ditch feature (G4), of archaeological potential, and *c.*64m long in an E-W orientation was detected in this area.

DAS 3 – No anomalies of archaeological potential were detected in this area.

DAS 4 – This area included the possible souterrain (SITE CH-1) although it was not detected by the survey. A number of possible anomalies were detected to the south of G9 – a geological feature. Such small anomalies may represent iron-working debris, and thus of archaeological potential, although natural features have not been ruled out. G10 may represent a series of archaeological ditches, while G11 may represent subsurface wall remains.

DAS 5 – Two anomalies were detected in this area, one of which, G13, may represent the remains of a right-angled ditch and, consequently, may be of archaeological potential.

DAS 6 – No anomalies of archaeological potential were detected in this area.

DAS 7 - Two anomalies in this area, G15 and G16 may represent the remains if subsurface enclosures or former field systems, the internal areas of which may be formed by general occupation debris. In addition, a number of smaller anomalies, possibly representing ditches or stone structures were also detected in this area.

An additional geophysical survey, using Electrical Resistivity methods, was undertaken in the vicinity of Site CH-1 in June 2008. A copy of the report is contained in Appendix 18.2. The primary aims of this survey were to determine the location and, if possible, the extent of the possible souterrain – Site CH-1. As discussed above in Section 18.3.1, the souterrain location of the souterrain feature was detected, as illustrated in Fig. 18.5. In addition, a possible enclosure feature, measuring 26m x 17m, was also detected during the course of this survey. This feature is situated *c.* 13m to the east of the souterrain feature. However, the archaeological potential of this feature was not determined and, given the dry soil conditions that prevailed at the time of the survey coupled with the results of the intrusive investigation undertaken elsewhere across the site, it is considered more likely that this anomaly may be of a geological origin. The location of this feature is illustrated in Fig. 18.3 as Site CH-8.

A programme of Archaeological Testing was undertaken at the site in June 2008. The primary aim of these investigations was to determine the archaeological potential of the geophysical anomalies detected in 2004. The results of the testing programme are presented in Appendix 18.3. In summary, a total of 20 test trenches were excavated by mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket, following which the sides and bases were further investigated by hand. In addition, all the earth spoil from the trenches was raked through in an attempt to retrieve artifactual material. No subsurface features of archaeological interest were uncovered, indicating that the

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

geophysical anomalies all have geological origins. The only artefact of archaeological interest was a lump of waste iron smelted slag found in the topsoil and not related to any detected archaeological feature or activity.

18.3.4 Potential Impact of the Proposal

Pre-Development/Site Preparation Phase

There are one Recorded Monument (Site CH-1; Souterrain) located within the subject development lands.

A number of geophysical anomalies were initially detected during a survey undertaken in March 2004. Such anomalies were subsequently investigated by means of a programme of archaeological test trenching in June 2008 and nothing of archaeological interest/potential was uncovered. Consequently, it is considered that such anomalies may have geological origins.

An additional geophysical survey, using Electrical Resistivity methods, was undertaken at the site in June 2008. This was primarily used to determine the exact location of the souterrain feature. However, a further potential feature, of possible archaeological interest (Site CH-8; possible enclosure) was detected *c.* 13m to the east of the souterrain.

Both the souterrain (Site CH-1) and the possible enclosure site (Site CH-8) are situated in an area proposed for landscaping. However, without the adoption of a suitable mitigation strategy, there is a possibility that these subsurface remains may be disturbed, either as a result of ground reduction works or by construction machinery travelling over the features. The latter is particularly relevant with respect to Site CH-1. In addition, ground reductions associated with a development of this kind generally have the ability to uncover and disturb hitherto unrecorded subsurface features, deposits, structures and artefacts of archaeological interest and potential. Without specific mitigation strategies, such subsurface archaeological features which might exist within the boundaries of the subject lands would be disturbed and destroyed and not identified and recorded.

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For inspection purposes only.

Operational Phase

There are no extant previously identified monuments or features of archaeological potential located within, or in the general environs of, the subject development corridor. Consequently, potential indirect adverse impacts with respect to the existing views or settings of monuments and areas of archaeological heritage interest are not anticipated during the operational phase of the proposed development.

'Do-Nothing' Scenario

In terms of Archaeological Heritage, the site will remain as it is and no impacts will occur.

18.3.5 Remedial or Reductive Measures

Pre-Development / Site Preparation Phase

As noted above in Sections 18.3.1 and 18.3.4, there is one Recorded Monument (Site CH-1; souterrain) and one possible archaeological feature (Site CH-8; possible enclosure) located within the subject development lands. Both of these features are situated in close proximity to each other. Although there are located within a proposed green/landscape area, there is a possibility that, without the adoption of a suitable mitigation strategy, they might be accidentally damaged as a result of the proposed construction works. Although there are a number of additional archaeological

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

sites located in the environs of, and outside the boundaries to, the development lands, these have for the most part been previously excavated or are not extent.

Furthermore, there is a possibility that undocumented sub-surface archaeological features and material might exist within the boundaries of the overall development lands. In addition, it is the policy of the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government that developments of this scale should be subjected to some manner of archaeological intervention (Dept. of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht & the Islands, 1999). Consequently, it is recommended that the following general mitigation strategies should be considered with regard to the overall development of subject lands.

1. Prior to the commencement of any site development works, an archaeologist should be appointed to undertake the following measures.

2. A buffer area, incorporating the locations of Sites CH-1 and CH-8, should be established in advance of site preparation works. The buffer area should extend from the western edge of the proposed access road to the east and from the eastern edge of the proposed access road to the west of the subject sites. In addition, it should extend no less than 20m north of the northern edges of the subject sites and not less than 10m south of the adjacent existing field boundary. The buffer area should be established by means of post-and-rail fencing and no construction materials, including general spoil, etc. should be stored within the buffer area. The levels within the buffer area should be raised by at least 300mm by the importation of topsoil, and the creation of landscaped mounds should be considered. This will ensure that no possible damage is caused to the subsurface remains by subsequent landscaping and maintenance works. The field boundary to the south should be removed only from the south and no construction machinery should track across the buffer area to the north of the field boundary. Both the removal of the adjacent field boundary and the raising of the levels should be monitored by an archaeologist. Furthermore, only shallow-rooted plants should be sown in the areas of the subsurface remains.

3. All topsoil stripping / general ground surface reductions down onto the surface of the underlying sterile geological subsoils required of the development should be monitored, on a full-time basis, by a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist. (Note: Although it is not a legal requirement for an archaeologist to obtain an excavation licence from the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, is suggested that such a licence be obtained. This would allow the archaeologist to investigate, almost immediately, any features of archaeological potential that might be uncovered during the course of the development works, and thus minimising any potential delays to the project. In addition, it is recommended by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government that archaeologists involved in the monitoring of large-scale developments obtain an excavation licence prior to the commencement of such works (Dept. of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands, 1999, 28-9).

4. In the event of archaeological material being uncovered during the course of such monitoring, the archaeologist shall be empowered to have works ceased in the vicinity of such material pending the receipt of advise from the Heritage and Planning Division of the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (National Monuments Section). Likewise, should archaeological artifactual material be uncovered/recovered during such works, the requirements of the National Museum of Ireland with regard to such items should be implemented.

5. Following completion of all monitoring, and other possible archaeological investigations, the archaeologist shall prepared a report for submission to both the Planning Authority and the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government.

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For inspection purposes only.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

Operational Phase

No remedial measures are deemed necessary.

18.3.6 Predicted Impact of the Proposal

Pre-Development / Site Preparation Phase

The requirement for an archaeologist to establish the buffer area around Sites CH-1 and CH-8, and to be present during all programmes of topsoil stripping / general ground surface reduction works will ensure that in the event of archaeological features being uncovered, appropriate measures can be implemented in consultation with the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government. Likewise, should archaeological artifactual material be recovered during the course of such works, the requirements of the National Museum of Ireland, with regard to such items, can be implemented.

Operational Phase

There are no predicted impacts.

'Worst Case' Scenario

A 'worst-case scenario' with respect to archaeological heritage would arise where the development was permitted to commence without any archaeological mitigation requirements being included in the Grant of Planning, without the implementation of any archaeological mitigation strategy that might be included in a Grant of Planning, without the establishment of a buffer area around Sites CH-1 and CH-8, without the appointment of an archaeologist to undertake monitoring and/or without the attendance of such appointed archaeologist. In such scenarios, features or artefacts of archaeological interest uncovered during the process of topsoil stripping/general ground reduction works would, most likely, not be identified and recorded.

18.3.7 Monitoring

Monitoring of all topsoil stripping/general ground reductions onto the surface of the underlying subsoils should be monitored by a suitably qualified archaeologist.

18.3.8 Reinstatement

It is not envisaged that reinstatement measures are required.

Kilkenny County Council
Viewing Planning Documents
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For inspection purposes only.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

18.4 Architectural Heritage

18.4.1 Receiving Environment

There are no protected structures within the meaning of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 situated within the boundaries of the proposed development lands.

There is one structure listed in the County Development Plan – Record of Protected Structure as being situated within 250m of the boundaries to the subject lands. In addition, an additional structure of Architectural Heritage interest, identified by the NIAH, is likewise located within the defined study area outside the site boundaries. The locations of these structures are illustrated in Fig. 3, and they are described as follows:

SITE CH-6
Location: Haynestown
Classification: Gate Lodge

RPS No: Lhs 012-013
NIAH No.: 13901216
N.G.R. No.: 304197 302727

Description
Clermont Lodge is a detached three-bay single-story former gate lodge with attic. It was constructed *c.* 1820 and is now in use as a private dwelling. The structure incorporates a pitched slate roof, a rendered chimneystack and uPVC rainwater gods. The walls are of painted roughcast-render, with square-headed window openings, smooth rendered reveals, painted stone sills, painted smooth rendered hood-mouldings and painted timber multi-pane casement windows. The square-headed door opening has a painted smooth rendered hood-mould and incorporates a painted timber sheeted door. The structure is set back slightly from the road to the south of the subject lands and is bounded by a roughcast-rendered wall, with entrance gateway to west. The structure is rates of Regional Importance by the NIAH.



Plate 18.1 SITE CH-6 West facing elevation

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For any other use please contact the copyright owner.
Data Protection Acts
Local Authorities only!

SITE CH-7
Location: Haynestown
Classification: House

RPS No: N/A
NIAH No.:13901217
N.G.R. No.: 303938 303229

Description
This structure comprises a detached three-bay two-storey house and was constructed in *c.* 1910. It is L-shaped in plan with gables to south and east elevations; two-storey return and single-storey lean-to to west; square-plan single-storey flat-roofed entrance porch to east elevation at angle of "L". It has a pitched slate roof; clay crested ridge tiles, red brick corbelled chimneystacks, decorative painted bargeboards, moulded cast-iron gutters on painted timber eaves boards and square-profile cast-iron downpipes. The walls incorporate painted roughcast rendering, with a painted smooth plinth and smooth rendered block-and-start quoins square-headed window openings, paired to ground floor and east gable, lugged-and-kneed moulded smooth render surrounds with painted sills and painted timber casement windows with stained glass overlights. There is a round-headed opening to porch with a painted lugged-and-kneed moulded smooth render surround, prominent keystone detail; square-headed door opening with multiple-pane overlight, sidelights and a painted timber and glazed door, with encaustic tiled floor to porch. The house, which is located on the western side of the railway line to the north-west of the subject site is set back from a road in its own grounds. There is a complex of rubble stone outbuildings to southwest, with a garden area to the east. It also incorporates an entrance gateway to north-east, with rendered gate piers and quadrant walls and wrought-iron gates. The structure is rated of Regional Interest by the NIAH.



Plate 18.2 SITE CH-7 East-facing elevation

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For inspection purposes only.
Local Authorities
Planning purposes only.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

18.4.3 Potential Impact of the Proposal

Pre-Development / Site Preparation Phase

During the pre-development/site preparation phase of a project, the potential direct impacts on buildings and structures of architectural interest from a development of this kind include:

- The demolition or loss of a structure or site of architectural interest.
- The severance of other linked features such as gardens, paddocks or outbuildings.
- Alteration of the original landscape of the building or site.

There are no buildings of architectural heritage interest located within the subject development lands. Although there are two structures of Architectural Heritage interest, one of which is a Protected Structure (Sites CH-6 and CH-7) located within the defined study are, both are situated outside and across the road from the subject development lands. In addition, both are visually protected by existing planted boundaries. In addition, the existing boundaries to the site will be supplemented with additional planting, inside which will be areas of grass land. Consequently, these structures will not be impacted by the proposed works. Therefore the development, as proposed, will cause No Predicted Direct Impacts with respect to structures of Architectural Heritage Interest.

Operational

During the operational phase of a project, the potential indirect impacts from a development of this kind include:

- Increased visual intrusion.
- Increased noise and vibration disturbance.
- Loss of amenity, especially where open to the public.

It is not considered that the development proposals under discussion have the ability to cause any indirect/visual impacts to any structures of architectural heritage interest upon completion and operation of the upgraded road.

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use. For inspection purposes only.

18.4.4 Remedial or Reductive Measures

Pre-Development / Site Preparation Phase

The development will not cause any impacts with respect to structures of architectural heritage interest. Consequently, no pre-development remedial or reductive measures are required.

Operational Phase

It is not envisaged that any structures of architectural heritage interest will be adversely impact upon during the operational phase of the proposed development. Consequently, no remedial or reductive measures are proposed.

18.4.5 Predicted Impact of the Proposal

Pre-Development / Site Preparation Phase

There are no predicted adverse impacts on any structures of architectural heritage.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

Operational Phase

There are no predicted adverse impacts with respect to the architectural heritage of the environs of the project area during the operation phase of the development.

18.4.6 Monitoring

It is not envisaged that monitoring measures are required.

18.4.7 Reinstatement

It is not envisaged that reinstatement measures are required.

Louth Local Authorities
Viewing purposes only.
For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

18.5 REFERENCES/LIST OF CONSUTED DOCUMENTARY SOURCES

Barry, T.B. 1987. *The Archaeology of Medieval Ireland.* Routeledge, London and New York.

Bassett, G.H. 1886. *Louth County, guide and directory.* Dublin.

Bateman, J. 1883. *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland.* Harrison, London.

Bence-Jones, M. 1988. *A Guide to Irish County Houses.* Constable, London.

Buckley, V.M. 1986. *Archaeological Inventory of County Louth.* Stationary Office, Dublin.

Buckley V. M. & Sweetman, P. D. 1991. *Archaeological Survey of County Louth.* Stationery Office, Dublin.

Byrne, J. 2004. *Byrne's Dictionary of Irish Local History – from earliest times to c. 1900.* Mercier Press, Cork.

Craig. M. 1982. *The Architecture of Ireland from the earliest times to 1880.* Eason & Son, Dublin.

Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands. 1999. *Framework and Principles for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage*. Stationery Office, Dublin.

Edwards, N. 1990. *The Archaeology of Early Medieval Ireland*. Batsford Ltd., London.

Flanagan D & L. 1994. *Irish Place Names.* Gill & Macmillan, Dublin.

Gosling P. 1993. *From Dún Delca to Dundalk.* Monaghan.

Halpin, A. & Newman, C. 2006. *Ireland – An Oxford Archaeological Guide to Sites from Earliest Times to AD 1600.* Oxford University Press.

Harbison, P. 1992. Guide to the National and Historic Monuments of Ireland. Gill & Macmillan, Dublin.

Keeley, V.J. 1993. 'Haynestown' in *Excavations 1992,* p. 46.

Lewis, S. 1839. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ireland.* 2 Vols. S. Lewis & Co., London.

McNeill, C. 1923. 'The De Verdons and the Draycotts', *C.L.A.H.J.,* v. No. 3, pp. 166-72.

1924. 'Some early documents relating to English Uriel and towns of Drogheda and Dundalk – I. the Draycott family; II. The grants to the hospital of St. John, Thomas Street, Dublin', *C.L.A.H.J.,* v, No. 4, pp. 270-277.

National Roads Authority. 2003. *Archaeological Guidelines for Reporting on Constraint, Route Selection, Environmental Impact Assessment on Archaeological Aspects of NRA Road Schemes*. Draft Consultation Document.

2005a. *Guidelines for the Assessment of Archaeological Heritage Impacts of National Road Schemes.*

2005b. *Guidelines for the Assessment of Architectural Heritage Impacts of National Road Schemes.*

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

Ó Ríordáin, B. & Waddell, J. 1993. *The Funerary Bowls and Vases of the Irish Bronze Age*. Galway University Press/National Museum of Ireland.

Ó Ríordáin, S.P. 1979. *Antiquities of the Irish Countryside*. Lilliput Press.

O'Sullivan, H. 2006. *Dundalk – Irish Historic Towns Atlas No. 16.* Royal Irish Academy, Dublin.

O'Sullivan, M. 1994. 'Haynestown' in *Excavations 1993,* pp. 57-8.

Rothery, S. 1997. *A Field Guide to The Buildings of Ireland.* Lilliput Press.

Rynne, C. 2006. *Industrial Ireland, 1750-1930. An Archaeology*. Collins Press, Cork.

Smith, B. 1989. 'The Bruce Invasion and County Louth, 1315-18', in *C.L.A.H.J.,* xxii, No. 1, pp. 7-15.

Swift, M. 1999. *Historical Maps of Ireland.* Parkgate Books, London.

Thornton, D.E. 1997. 'Early Medieval Louth: the kingdom of Connaille Muirteimne' in *C.L.A.H.J.,* xxiv, No. 1, pp. 139-50.

Waddell, J. 1990. *The Bronze Age Burials of Ireland*. Galway University Press.

Williams, J. 1994. *A Companion Guide to Architecture in Ireland 1837-1921.* Irish Academic Press.

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
Louth Local Authorities
Viewing purposes only.

EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38

APPENDIX 17.3

SUMMARY REPORT ON PROGRAMME OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING

1. Introduction

The subject lands were subjected to an Archaeological Geophysical Survey undertaken in March 2004 by Earthsound Archaeological Geophysics. This survey was commissioned as part of a non-intrusive Archaeological Assessment, prepared by Irish Archaeological Consultancy Ltd., of two separate land plots owned by IDA Ireland.

The lands were initially subjected to a fluxgate gradiometer scan. However, this was subsequently abandoned in favour of a magnetic susceptibility survey, due to geological interferences. The resulting report of such geophysical investigations is reproduced in Appendix 17.1 and is summarised in Section 17.3.2 of the main report.

A total of fourteen anomalies (M1-M14) were detected, of which eight were considered to be of either archaeological potential or required additional investigation. Following completion of the overall magnetic susceptibility survey, specific areas were subjected to additional detailed fluxgate gradiometer surveys. In general, large number of plough furrows was detected across the subject development lands running in an E-W direction. In addition, the results of the detailed area surveys (DAS) indicated that there were a number of subsurface anomalies of archaeological potential situated within the subject lands and it was suggested that such should be investigated by means of intrusive archaeological testing.

The results of the Geophysical Survey were discussed with Mr. Victor Buckley, Senior Archaeologist, National Monuments Service, DoEHLG and it was agreed that it would be prudent to undertaken a programme of archaeological testing of the detected anomalies as part of the preparation of the EIS. Such testing was subsequently undertaken in early June 2008 under Licence No. 08E0486 from the DoEHLG.

2. Aims & Methodology

The primary aim of the programme of intrusive archaeological testing was to determine the archaeological potential of magnetic anomalies detected during the Geophysical Survey undertaken in 2004.

A total of twenty trenches were excavated by machine fitted with a toothless ditching/grading bucket, following which the sides and bases were cleaned and investigated by hand. In addition, all the spoil from the trenches was raked through in an attempt to determine the artefact-bearing capacity of the topsoil and to retrieve any artefacts that might be contained within the body of this material.

The locations of the trenches are illustrated in Fig. ATT-1.

3. Results of Testing

Five separate areas of the site were subjected to testing. These coincided with the geophysical anomalies of archaeological potential detected in areas DAS 1, DAS2, DAS 4, DAS 5 and DAS 7.

Trenches TT-1 to TT-7
These were excavated in geophysical areas DAS-1 and DAS-2.

> **DAS 1** – A curvilinear feature (G1), broadly aligned N-S was detected. The geophysical data indicates that this may be a ditch feature and of archaeological potential. Other features (G2 and G3) are more suggestive of geological anomalies.
>
> **DAS 2** – A possible ditch feature (G4), of archaeological potential, and *c.*64m long in an E-W orientation was detected in this area.

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.
For inspection purposes only.
EPA Export 01-07-2020:05:11:38