



Beyond Bede: the Lost Monastery of St Æbba

Project Proposal for a Community- Based Archaeological Investigation

Rosanna Ring, Lisa Westcott Wilkins and Brendon
Wilkins

Beyond Bede: the Lost Monastery of St Æbba

**Project Proposal for a Community-Based
Archaeological Investigation**

2017

Compiled by:

Rosanna Ring, Lisa Westcott Wilkins and Brendon Wilkins

with contributions by

Manda Forster, Maiya Pina-Dacier

DigVentures

The Studio
26 Newgate
Barnard Castle
County Durham
DL12 8NG

hello@digventures.com

0333 011 3990

@thedigventurers



DigVentures Project Manager

Brendon Wilkins
DigVentures Ltd (Northern Office)
The Studio
26a Newgate
Barnard Castle
County Durham
DL12 8NG

Purpose of document

This document has been prepared as a Project Proposal for a community-based research investigation of Glebe Field, near Coldingham Priory. DigVentures accepts no responsibility or liability for any use that is made of this document other than for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared.

Document Control Grid

Title:	Beyond Bede: the Lost Monastery of St Æbba Project Proposal for a Community-Based Archaeological Investigation
Author(s):	Rosanna Ring, Lisa Westcott Wilkins & Brendon Wilkins
Origination date:	17/04/2017
Circulation:	Stakeholders and DV specialist team
Reviewed by:	Amanda Forster PhD MCIfA
Approval:	Lisa Westcott Wilkins



Social Value Act

DigVentures is a social enterprise dedicated to designing and delivering publicly focussed archaeology projects. We are constituted as a limited company, with a constitution reflecting the wider social, economic and environmental benefits of the projects we deliver. We will create one full-time community archaeologist role and several student placement positions for the duration of the project, and intend to train 200 people in archaeological and digital recording skills during the course of this field project.

Carbon Footprint

A printed copy of the main text in this document will result in a carbon footprint of 99g if 100% post-consumer recycled paper is used and 126g if primary-source paper is used. These figures assume the report is printed in black and white on A4 paper and in duplex.

DigVentures is aiming to reduce its per capita carbon emissions.

Copyright

© DigVentures Limited 2017



Executive summary

This document has been compiled in advance of an intended archaeological investigation of Glebe Field near Coldingham Priory, to be undertaken by DigVentures in partnership with the Friends of Coldingham Priory. The first season of fieldwork is planned for Autumn 2017, this will focus on a programme of remote sensing, 3D photogrammetry survey, and targeted trenching. The second season is planned for Summer 2018, and will feature a follow-up full scale trench excavation of a target area identified during the 2017 evaluation. The approach to this work is evidenced through the following MoRPHE compliant document, outlining key archaeological research questions, roles, procedures, stages and outputs.

Project background and research priorities	Detailed in Part 1 – this document
Methodology	Detailed in Part 2 – this document, with detailed method statement in Appendix 3
Relevant experience of project team	Detailed in Appendix 1
Organisational capability/quality assurance	Detailed in Part 2; See also ClfA RO reference (ID No. 102)

Table of Contents

1	BACKGROUND	8
1.1	INTRODUCTION	8
1.2	PROJECT OVERVIEW	8
1.3	RESEARCH CONTEXT	9
1.4	PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK	10
1.5	FIELDWORK PROPOSALS – 2017/2018	10
2	RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	10
2.1	BACKGROUND	10
2.2	AIM 1 – TO INVESTIGATE AND IDENTIFY ANOMALIES PRESENT IN 2014 GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY RESULTS, AND ASSESS THE CONDITION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS ON THE SITE.	11
2.3	AIM 2 – CHARACTERISE THE RESULTS OF THE TEST-PIT SURVEY, REFINING THE CHRONOLOGY AND PHASING OF THE SITE WITH A PROGRAMME OF TRENCHING	11
2.4	AIM 3 – UNDERSTAND THE PALAEOENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AT THE SITE	11
2.5	AIM 4 - MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS, ANALYSIS AND PUBLICATION	11
3	BUSINESS CASE	12
3.1	SHAPE SUB-PROGRAMME	12
3.2	RESEARCH FRAMEWORKS	13
4	PROJECT SCOPE	13
4.1	INTRODUCTION	13
5	INTERFACES	13
6	COMMUNICATIONS	14
6.1	PROJECT TEAM AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES	14
6.2	PROJECT MANAGEMENT	14
6.3	COMMUNICATIONS AND ARCHIVE	15
6.4	OUTREACH AND EDUCATION	15
6.5	DISSEMINATION	16
7	PROJECT REVIEW	16
8	HEALTH AND SAFETY	17
9	PROJECT TEAM STRUCTURE	18
9.1	TEAM STRUCTURE AND KEY RESPONSIBILITIES	18
10	METHODOLOGY	19



10.1	INTRODUCTION	19
10.2	STAGE 2 – ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK – FIRST SEASON AND SECOND SEASONS	19
10.3	STAGE 3 – ASSESSMENT REPORT AND UPDATED PROJECT DESIGN	19
10.4	STAGE 4 – FURTHER WORK, ANALYSIS AND PUBLICATION	19
11	STAGES PRODUCTS AND TASKS	20
11.1	METHODOLOGICAL LINKAGES	20
11.2	TASK LIST BY PERSON DAYS AND TEAM MEMBER	21
12	OWNERSHIP	22
13	RISK LOG	22
14	BUDGET	22
15	PROJECT GANNT CHART	22
16	BIBLIOGRAPHY	22
17	APPENDICES	25
17.1	APPENDIX 1 – CORE TEAM CVS	25
17.2	APPENDIX 2 – METHOD STATEMENTS	26
	REMOTE SENSING	26
	TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY AND GIS MODELLING	26
	ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION	27
	INTERVENTIONS	27
	BACKFILLING	28
	PALAEOENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLING	28
	BULK SAMPLING STRATEGY	28
	ZOOARCHAEOLOGY	29
	HUMAN OSTEOARCHAEOLOGY	30
	FINDS	31
	CONSERVATION	31
	SCIENTIFIC DATING	31
	SYNTHESIS AND DATA INTEGRATION	31
17.3	APPENDIX 3 – RISK LOG	32

Figures and plates



Beyond Bede: the Lost Monastery of St Æbba Community-Based Archaeological Investigation

PART I: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT *Summary Description*

This document outlines proposals for a community-based field investigation scheduled to take place over 18 months between Autumn 2017 and December 2018. This document explains how DigVentures will coordinate the investigation, taking a creative approach to community participation, using digital technology to help create an access step-change for learning and engagement. This open, digital approach is designed to expand opportunities for community involvement, fulfilling the project's overarching vision to increase awareness of the local historic landscape, build local skills capacity and assemble a committed group of advocates to help support the local heritage scene over the long term.

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This document is a project proposal for delivery of a community-based archaeological investigation of Glebe Field, near Coldingham Priory (hereafter 'the Site'). Its purpose is to define how DigVentures intends to deliver a project that exceeds the quality expectations of the Heritage Lottery Fund (project sponsors), landowners (Church of Scotland) and all other stakeholders (Including Scottish Borders Council and the Friends of Coldingham Priory charity).

1.1.2 The project is being managed according to Historic England's MoRPHE project model (Management of Archaeological Research Projects in the Historic Environment). This document defines that process, and is divided into two parts: 'Part 1: Description of the Project' provides the project context, including a brief summary of proposed methodology, key sources and activities required to support the delivery of the proposal outcomes. 'Part 2: Resources and Programming' identifies responsibilities of individual project staff members, outlines completion dates for specific tasks, with all costs itemised for transparency. A detailed Project Activity Plan has also been provided as a separate document to assist with project tracking, and evaluation of social and community outcomes.

1.2 Project Overview

1.2.1 The 'Beyond Bede' project is proposed as a multi-staged research project, encompassing an evaluation and assessment stage, followed by final analysis and publication. The first execution stage is scheduled to take place in Autumn 2017, with a series of non-intrusive surveys and trial trenching, following which a target area will be determined for a full-scale community excavation in Summer 2018. The overarching aim of this work is to characterise the scale, depth, and density of archaeological remains, particularly pertaining to the early-medieval history of the Site, and focused on locating the original 7th century monastery. An interactive digital archive of the excavation data will be created, along with metrically accurate 3D terrain models situating the site in its landscape context. The principle driver for this research project



is to provide information that will contribute to understanding of the Site's early-medieval history, as well as inform future management of the Site (see Section 3, Business Case, below).

1.3 Research Context

- 1.3.1 The village of Coldingham in the Scottish Borders is widely thought to house the remains of an influential Anglo-Saxon monastery, founded by St Æbba between the late 6th and early 7th century AD. Æbba was the sister of Oswald, King of Northumbria (and founder of the eminent Anglo-Saxon monastery at Lindisfarne), and Æbba's monastery is known to have been visited by St Cuthbert, Bishop of Lindisfarne, and is listed among the possessions of the See of Lindisfarne in AD854. The monastery is recorded by Bede as being a 'double house' occupied by both male and female residents (HE IV.19–25), and was also home to at least one other member of Anglo-Saxon royalty, Etheldreda, wife of King Ecgfrith of Northumbria and Æbba's niece. Though the status of the monastery is unclear, the royalty resident within the community, coupled with its close ties to Lindisfarne, would have undoubtedly ensured a great deal of wealth and influence was afforded to the monastery (Archaeology Services Durham, 2014). The life of St Æbba's, however, was a relatively short one, Bede tells us that it was burnt to the ground shortly after Æbba's death sometime around AD680, and was abandoned by most of its inhabitants (HE IV.19–25). According to Symeon of Durham, a skeleton community persevered there though until AD870 when it was reportedly torched by the Danes (Anderson 1908, 60).
- 1.3.2 Surprisingly, despite numerous historical references to the monastery, no confirmed archaeological evidence for it has ever been found, and its exact location remains unclear. Historically, the monastery is called *Colodaesburg* in Anglo-Saxon, and *Urbs Coludi* in Latin by Bede, both of which refer to a fortification. Previous archaeological work carried out at fortified sites in the area at St Abb's and Kirk Hill, have, however, found little Anglo-Saxon remains. A 1782 map of the area by John Ainslie (which can be viewed here: <http://bit.ly/2pwMftV>) also marks land surrounding Kirk Hill, 3km north-east of Coldingham, as the 'ruins of the town of St Abbs', possibly referring to an early-medieval settlement. Again however, excavations have not been able to produce evidence for this.
- 1.3.3 With known fortified sites in the area showing little to no evidence for the monastery, attention has turned to the area immediately surrounding the later medieval priory within Coldingham itself. As it was common practice to rebuild monasteries on or near to the site of a previous complex (as at Durham, Tynemouth, Jarrow and Monkwearmouth), it is possible that the Anglo-Saxon monastery lies close to these standing remains (Archaeological Services Durham, 2014). Recent archaeological interventions in the area have now produced convincing evidence to support this theory, including the presence of 7th century burials at nearby St Michael's Knowe, 7th-8th century ditches crossing Abbey Yards Field immediately to the north of the later medieval priory, and potential Anglo-Saxon structures identified in a 2015 geophysics survey of Glebe Field, located directly adjacent to the priory. This new project at Coldingham seeks to further investigate these geophysics results in Glebe Field to define the nature of these anomalies, and establish whether they relate to the original Anglo-Saxon monastery.



1.4 Previous Archaeological Work

- 1.4.1 Modern work to establish the location of St Æbba's monastery has, until recently, focused on St Abb's Head and Kirk Hill, both fortified sites to the north-east of Coldingham. However, little archaeological evidence for Anglo-Saxon archaeology has been found.
- 1.4.2 In 1994, archaeological monitoring at St Michael's Knowe (immediately north east of Glebe Field) established the presence of adult and child burials 200m north east of the east end of Coldingham Priory, and therefore were not believed to be connected with the later medieval priory. An Anglo-Saxon date for these burials has not been discounted (Stronach 2005, 399).
- 1.4.3 In 1998, a geophysical survey of Glebe Field revealed evidence of a penannular enclosure, interpreted as prehistoric in date though it could also relate to medieval activity. A further geophysical survey was undertaken in Abbey Yards Field (immediately west of Glebe Field) in 1999, which suggested the possible presence of a prehistoric enclosure (Johnson 1999).
- 1.4.4 Excavations to the north of Abbey Yards Field in 2000 revealed three co-axial ditches, the earliest of which was radiocarbon dated to the 7th or early 8th centuries AD. These excavations also found a later medieval phase of burials, and evidence of industrial activity. Further work in 2002 uncovered several more inhumations (Stronach 2005).
- 1.4.5 In 2014, Archaeological Services Durham carried out an extensive geophysics survey of Glebe Field, and revealed many anomalies suggesting successive phases of activity. Several probable boundaries and enclosures were identified, along with the remains of a ditch to the north west of the field that is almost certainly a continuation of the early-medieval ditches identified in Abbey Yards Field. Anomalies to the north of Glebe Field may also reflect stone footings (Archaeological Services Durham, 2014).

1.5 Fieldwork Proposals – 2017/2018

- 1.5.1 The 'Beyond Bede' project seeks to explore the evidence in further detail, investigating potential Anglo-Saxon structures identified in the geophysical surveys of Glebe Field, Coldingham Priory, in order to characterise the scale, depth, and density of archaeological remains. The project aims to define the nature of these anomalies, and establish whether they relate to the original Anglo-Saxon monastery. Over an 18-month period, a test pit investigation and remote sensing survey will be undertaken in 2017, followed by a full-scale community excavation in 2018, with all excavation and recording carried out by community participants. The principle driver for this research project is to provide information that will contribute to the understanding of the Site's early-medieval history, as well as inform future management of the Site

2 RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 Background

- 2.1.1 This project model is framed as overarching aims and key questions/objectives that provide a framework for the methods, stages, products and tasks set out in Part 2 of the Project Design below.



- 2.2 Aim 1 – To investigate and identify anomalies present in 2014 geophysical survey results, and assess the condition of archaeological remains on the Site.**
- 2.2.1 This aim will entail remote sensing and laying test-pits across the Site on potential features identified through previous geophysical survey results, to understand and characterise the nature of the archaeological remains present. The results from this will enable us to determine likely features relating to the early-medieval occupation of the Site, and will be used to inform decisions on carrying out a full-scale excavation. These specific questions will be addressed:
- Q1. Do the anomalies identified represent archaeological features?
 - Q2. Can we characterise and date any archaeological features found?
 - Q3. At this stage, can we identify the location of early monastery's structural remains?
- 2.3 Aim 2 – Characterise the results of the test-pit survey, refining the chronology and phasing of the site with a programme of trenching**
- 2.3.1 In the light of the evidence base collated for Aim 1, this aim will be addressed with targeted trenches to addressing the following questions:
- Q4. What can we say about the scale and nature of any structural remains?
 - Q5. Can we determine any horizontal phasing between features?
- 2.4 Aim 3 – Understand the palaeoenvironmental conditions at the site**
- 2.4.1 This aim will be achieved with an assessment of the samples as defined and recovered in Aim 2, using appropriate palaeoenvironmental and archaeological techniques to establish preservation and significance.
- Q6: What is the current state of the archaeological and palaeoenvironmental material across the site?
 - Q7: Can the palaeoenvironmental data recovered from sampling in the trenches inform us about farming, food processing, industrial or medical activities?
 - Q8: Can we assess the state to which the archaeological and palaeoenvironmental resource at Coldingham Priory is being successfully preserved in situ?
- 2.5 Aim 4 - Making recommendations, analysis and publication**
- 2.5.1 This aim will require all data from Aims 1-3 to be collated, with an integrated analysis of the archaeological and palaeoenvironmental resource at the Site. An Updated Project Design will then be produced with management recommendations to research, conserve or enhance the heritage significance of the Site.
- Q10: What can an integrated synthesis of the results of this work with previous remote sensing and building survey tell us about the Site?
 - Q11. How well do deposits and any artefacts survive, and how deeply are they buried?
 - Q12: Can we increase our understanding of the local environment in the early-medieval period?
 - Q13: Formulate recommendations for further archaeological and palaeoenvironmental analysis at Coldingham Priory based on Aims 1-3, and



implement a programme to publish and disseminate the results or continue fieldwork into additional seasons.

3 BUSINESS CASE

3.1 Shape Sub-Programme

3.1.1 The project has been designed in accordance with priorities articulated in Historic England's Action Plan 2015-18 (informing Heritage 2020, the successor to the National Heritage Protection Plan) and detailing how heritage organisations will work together to benefit the historic environment. In addition to these priorities, the project drivers can also be articulated in accordance with the fundamental principles of SHAPE (Strategic framework for the Historic Environment Activities and Programmes in Historic England, 2008).

3.1.2 In line with the Historic England working practice and the fundamental principles of SHAPE (Strategic framework for the Historic Environment Activities and Programmes in English Heritage, 2008) to understand, manage, and promote archaeology, the project has a primary driver (SHAPE sub-programme number 11111.130) in addition to other research outcomes that will address other Historic England and sector priorities, delivering significant value added benefit.

3.1.3 The main aim of the project is therefore to increase our understanding of the character of the Site:

- SHAPE sub-programme number 11111.130: development of a sound evidence base for specific locales and historic assets in order to ensure appropriate management information is available and effective communication possible to community.

3.1.4 This research also has the potential to generate insight and recommendations with a local and national applicability, assisting the Client and Statutory Stakeholders in establishing best practice conservation and management measures.

- SHAPE sub-programme number 31521.110: building heritage issues into wider change-management considerations, taking account of conservation principles and heritage legislation whilst efficiently reducing management burden for given areas.

3.1.5 As a consequence of the innovative digital and cross-platform approach, in addition to the unique way that the 'Beyond Bede' project is community funded and staffed, there is a significant 'value added' dimension to this project:

- SHAPE sub-programme number 12212.110: developing wider understanding of the value of the historic environment; enhancing lifelong learning, encouraging support and enthusiasm for all aspects of heritage whilst contributing to quality of life.
- SHAPE sub-programme number 51311.110: increasing public awareness, building direct support and engaging enthusiasm from which multiple benefits flow; encouraging knowledge transfer through enjoyment.



- SHAPE sub-programme number 51332.110: high-profile outreach hitting potentially millions of people. Targeted to raise key issues or encourage wider understanding.

3.2 Research Frameworks

3.2.1 The key research agendas relating to Coldingham are the ‘Scottish Archaeological Research Framework Medieval Scotland: A Future for it’s Past’ (Hall and Price (eds) 2012) and the government’s ‘Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland’ (APS Group Scotland, 2014). These documents have been summarised into several period-based research priorities as the basis for further consultation with the wider specialist team following the Aims and Objectives defined in Section 2.

4 PROJECT SCOPE

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This Project Design covers the first Execution Stage, designed to ensure that appropriate management information is available to decision makers and that this is communicated as effectively as possible to the wider community (SHAPE sub-programme number 11111.130: development of a sound evidence base for specific locales and historic assets).

4.1.2 The purpose of this work will be to contribute to the future management, research and protection of the Site, with an aerial photogrammetry survey, remote-sensing, test-pits and later full-scale trench excavation.

5 INTERFACES

5.1.1 This project will interface with a series of other projects, stakeholders, and initiatives, summarised in the table below:

Interfaces	Description
<i>Remote sensing Team</i>	Initial geophysical survey has been carried out by Archaeological Services Durham. This will be supported with an aerial photogrammetry survey by Adam Stanford (Easter Island Project; Stonehenge Riverside Project; Marden Henge Project) ensuring that this multidisciplinary approach remains at the forefront of current remote sensing research.
<i>Academic Advisory Board</i>	An academic advisory group of subject area experts (in Early Ecclesiastical and Monastic Archaeology) is being formed to ensure that the project remains pertinent to relevant research questions and agendas, interfacing with other teams working in similar landscapes in the UK. This will be headed-up by Dr David Petts, Dr Chris Bowles (Scottish Borders Council) and is also expected to include colleagues from Durham University currently active in Early Medieval studies.
<i>Core Project Team</i>	The core project team and specialist staff have consulted widely during the project planning and will continue to build on this as the project develops, forging strong links with local, national and international professionals and institutions actively engaged in a broad range of



Interfaces	Description
	ecclesiastical sites. The core team is currently digging an Early Medieval monastic site at Lindisfarne, and will bring the
<i>Local Stakeholders</i>	The key local stakeholders are the Friends of Coldingham Priory charity, Scottish Borders Council and the landowner – Church of Scotland.

Table 1 - Interfaces

6 COMMUNICATIONS

6.1 Project Team and Management Responsibilities

6.1.1 The Project will be funded through a mix of crowdfunding and grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund (Project Sponsors). Project Assurance will therefore be allocated to the Project Executive (Lisa Westcott Wilkins, DigVentures, and a grants officer appointed by the HLF) who will monitor compliance against the deliverables detailed in this document.

6.1.2 The project team have all worked closely together before (at Flag Fen 2012, and Leiston Abbey 2013, 2014, 2015, Bolton-le-Sands 2016 and Spodden Valley 2016). Brendon Wilkins (Project Director) will undertake day-to-day Project Management supported by Chris Casswell (Co-Director) and Nigel Steel (Project Support). There will be six core DigVentures archaeological staff on site throughout the fieldwork, and all will be retained throughout the post-excavation phase of the project. All core staff are employed in line with ClfA guidelines, and are practicing field archaeologists of good standing at ACIfA level or above. The Expert team will be drawn from various university departments and laboratories with a considerable range of experience in the undertaking and delivery of similar research projects. This includes Hugo Anderson-Whymark (Chipped Stone); Paul Blinkhorn (Ceramics); Sara Brown (Conservation); Lisa Gray (Palaeoenvironmental); Richard Madgwick (Zooarchaeology); Keith Wilkinson (Geoarchaeology); Stuart Noon (Small Finds); Natasha Powers (Human Remains); Phil Mills (CBM); Adam Stanford (Photogrammetry); and Jonathan Madden (Topographic Survey).

6.2 Project Management

6.2.1 DigVentures operates a computer-assisted project management system. Projects are undertaken under the direction of the Projects Director who is responsible for the successful completion of all aspects of the project. All work is monitored and checked whilst in progress on a regular basis, and the Project Director/Programme Manager checks all reports and other documents before being issued. A series of guideline documents or manuals form the basis for all work.

6.2.2 The Project Manager is a full member and elected councillor of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (MCIfA). DigVentures is an ClfA Registered Organisation (No. 102), and fully endorses the Code of Conduct, the Code of Approved Practice for the Regulation of Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology, and the Standards and Guidance documents of the Institute for Archaeologists. All DigVentures staff are employed in line with the Institute's Codes and will usually be members of the Institute.



6.3 Communications and Archive

- 6.3.1 The Project Director will produce Monthly Status Reports for the Project Executive and Project Team throughout this Execution Stage up to the review of the Assessment Report/UPD (Review Point 4). This will present an overview of progress, list tasks completed or part completed, including any on-going work and issues affecting progress.
- 6.3.2 The Project Manager will be responsible for ensuring that the project runs to schedule, keeping track of key resources (notably staff time) on the basis of weekly Work Records. The Project Team will have a project meeting at each milestone described on the Gantt chart to ensure that all major tasks are briefed/debriefed as necessary. Provision will be made for the project in 'Basecamp', which is a web-based project communication package used by DigVentures, enabling project participants to generate and record notes, tasks, milestones and other project-related communication.
- 6.3.3 The project archive will be prepared in accordance with DigVentures guidelines for Archive Preparation, following Appendix 1, P1 of MoRPHE PPN 3 (Historic England 2011), fulfilling the Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long term storage (UKIC 1990). All reports produced by the project will be openly and freely disseminated through County Council Historic Environment Record, Archaeological Data Service, OASIS portal and Scribd website. Copyright on all reports submitted will reside with DigVentures, although a third party in-perpetuity licence will automatically be given for reproduction of the works by the originator, subject to agreement in writing with Historic Scotland.

6.4 Outreach and Education

- 6.4.1 The community-based and outreach aspects of the project have been devised as a separate activity plan, and presented as a funding application to the Heritage Lottery Fund. This is a digital archiving, education and outreach initiative, aiming to co-create a digital record of the significant archaeological remains hosted on a dedicated microsite. The requirements of this are covered by a separate digital design brief and community activity plan viewable on request.
- 6.4.2 The 'Beyond Bede' project will also include a dedicated educational programme and public event programme designed with the ultimate aim to increase local awareness of the site and amplify this with a coordinated social media strategy. This will be measured with an audience evaluation of all site visitors to establish baseline data and assist with future management strategies and promotion.
- 6.4.3 DigVentures are collaborating in the Scottish Borders Heritage Festival in September 2017, and will deliver two 'Dig Camp' parent and child activity programmes whilst on site. A dedicated welcome tent will be erected on site, and will be permanently staffed by DigVentures throughout the dig. Special activities and trench tours will be offered, as well as a lunchtime chat with the archaeological team. This will be widely advertised locally on radio, newspapers and the parish council newsletter, and flyers will be distributed through the existing networks as well as in pubs, shops, businesses and venues.
- 6.4.4 As a crowdfunded and crowdsourced archaeological project, every aspect of the project is cognisant of a wider outreach agenda. Engagement will be both on and



offline, with a digital platform (called 'The Site Hut') developed to engage a new local and global audience, inviting external communities (and those not usually engaged with archaeology) to take an active role in knowledge production. Digital Humanities Specialist working in conjunction with the project team (and under the direction of Claire Bailey-Ross) will critically assess the breadth, depth and diversity of engagement, with a quantitative and qualitative study. This will be undertaken with a visitor survey conducted throughout the field season, targeting both excavation participants and casual visitors.

6.4.5 All major social media channels will be used to amplifying daily blog content. A digital video specialist will be on site throughout the excavation, and live footage will be broadcast using Facebook Live. The project will feature nightly lectures open to the public where the day's findings will be discussed, followed by presentations by members of the on-site specialist team. These will also be filmed and broadcast live, with the recorded archive made available on the project website.

6.5 Dissemination

6.5.1 Rapid dissemination of the results to, and involvement of, stakeholders of the project is vital throughout. This will take place through multiple channels, addressing a multitude of established and new audiences. Dissemination outlined below will all be undertaken during 2017/2018, and will include, but not be limited to:

- Dedicated website with daily news updates on a blog and all major social media channels (Facebook, Twitter, Google+, Flickr and Instagram) amplified through third-party coverage by the networked blogging community: see <http://digventures.com/Lindisfarne/>
- A dedicated interactive digital archive of excavation data.
- Daily broadcast quality video feature released on YouTube throughout excavation stage: e.g. <http://digventures.com/Lindisfarne/timeline/types/videos/>
- Follow up feature articles in Current Archaeology
- Conference presentation (CIfA/EAA)
- Wide circulation of Assessment and Final Report, Updated Project Design and links to the OASIS record: Oasis ID:
- Site publication in an appropriate local/national journal commensurate with the final results.
- Deposition of the Assessment Report with the East Riding of Yorkshire County Records Office HER.
- Public Seminar hosted in or near to Coldingham presenting the final results (Spring/Summer 2019).

7 PROJECT REVIEW

7.1.1 The project will be continually reviewed by the Project Executive and Project Manager, with a formal review undertaken at the end of each Stage as follows:

Stage	Description	Review Point	Completion Date
Initiation	Consideration of Project Proposal	RV1 – Assemble Project Team and liaise with all stakeholders	Completed – Summer 2017



Stage	Description	Review Point	Completion Date
Stage 1	Project Start-up, finalising Project Design and definition of scope	RV2 – Sign-off on MoRPHE Project Design, and liaison with stakeholders and landowners	Completed – Summer 2017
Stage 2	Archaeological Fieldwork – First and Second Seasons	RV3 – assemble site archive and distribute pertinent data to specialists	Proposed – Autumn 2017 and Summer 2018
Stage 3	Assessment Report & Updated Project Design	RV4 – critically review findings, making recommendations for further work or closure	Proposed – Autumn 2018
Stage 4	Analysis & Publication	RV5 – final publication sign-off, and prepare archive for accession	Proposed – Autumn 2018
Closure			December 2018

Table 2 – Project Review Stages

- 7.1.2 It is anticipated that each of the Review Points will be conducted internally on the basis of deliverables (draft reports etc.) submitted by DigVentures. The Project Executive will undertake continuous review of the project through receipt of internal Highlight Reports and by Monitoring Meetings.

8 HEALTH AND SAFETY

- 8.1.1 DigVentures shall undertake the works in accordance with Historic Environment Scotland's Health and Safety requirements and Health and Safety Plan. This document should take account of any design information pertaining to above ground hazards such as buildings and structures and below ground hazards such as services, utilities and infrastructure.
- 8.1.2 DigVentures will ensure that all work is carried out in accordance with its company Health and Safety Policy, to standards defined in The Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974, and The Management of Health and Safety Regulations 1992, and in accordance with the SCAUM (Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers) health and safety manual Health and Safety in Field Archaeology (1996).



Beyond Bede: the Lost Monastery of St Æbba
Community-based Archaeological Investigation

PART 2: RESOURCES AND PROGRAMMING

9 PROJECT TEAM STRUCTURE

9.1 Team Structure and Key Responsibilities

9.1.1 DigVentures' Project Team will be as follows. A summary CV, setting out the skills and expertise of each team member is set out in Appendix 1, with CVs for the wider specialist team available on request. Expert ecofactual and artefactual support will be provided by a range of partner organisations as needed, and Durham University in particular.

Name	Initials (see resources and programming)	Project Role	Key Responsibility
Lisa Westcott Wilkins	LWW	Project Executive	Overall project responsibility, budget responsibility and project assurance
Brendon Wilkins DigVentures	BW	Projects Director	Archaeological co-direction (on and off-site), liaison with project team, partners and Stakeholders
Chris Casswell DigVentures	SN	Co-Director	Archaeological co-direction (on and off-site), liaison with project team, partners and Stakeholders
Manda Forster DigVentures	MF	Programme Manager	Quality Assurance, post-excavation management
Nigel Steel DigVentures	NS	Community Archaeologist	On-site field-work, and post-excavation assessment
Mayia Pina-Dacier DigVentures	MPD	Community Manager	On-site field-work, and assessment
Anna Van Nostrand DigVentures	ANV	Community Archaeologist	On-site field-work, and responsible for field school
Rosanna Ring DigVentures	RR	Community Archaeologist	On-site field-work, and post-excavation assessment
Johanna Ungemach	JU	Community Archaeologist	On-site field-work, and post-excavation assessment
Adam Stanford Aerial-Cam	AS	Expert – Photography	Aerial photography

Table 3 – Project Team Structure



10 METHODOLOGY

10.1 Introduction

10.1.1 The methods reflect the project Stages set out in Section 7 above. A task list, with allocation of staff time and team member is set out in Section 11 below, along with a GANTT chart in Section 15, setting out a provisional programme. Detailed method statements relating the specific techniques or approaches detailed below to their constituent research questions can be found in Appendix 3 at the end of this document.

10.2 Stage 2 – Archaeological Fieldwork – First Season and Second Seasons

10.2.1 Stage 2 (scheduled for Autumn 2017 and Summer 2018) will comprise the fieldwork required to meet Aims 1 and 2, and will entail a combination of remote sensing (3D photogrammetry survey), test-pitting, and targeted trenching. It will aim to answer the following research questions which helped to guide fieldwork during the first three stages of the project:

- Q1. Do the anomalies identified represent archaeological features?
- Q2. Can we characterise and date any archaeological features found?
- Q3. At this stage, can we identify the location of early monastery's structural remains?
- Q4. What can we say about the scale and nature of any structural remains?
- Q5. Can we determine any horizontal phasing between features?

10.3 Stage 3 – Assessment Report and Updated Project Design

10.3.1 This Stage will address Aim 3, culminating in Review Point 4, and focusing on answering the following research questions:

- Q6: What is the current state of the archaeological and palaeoenvironmental material across the site?
- Q7: Can the palaeoenvironmental data recovered from sampling in the trenches inform us about farming, food processing, industrial or medical activities?
- Q8: Can we assess the state to which the archaeological and palaeoenvironmental resource at Coldingham Priory is being successfully preserved in situ?

10.4 Stage 4 – Further work, Analysis and Publication

10.4.1 Addressing Aim 4, this is the main reporting and recommendation Stage of the project, culminating in Review Point 5 and focussing on the following research questions

- Q10: What can an integrated synthesis of the results of this work with previous remote sensing and building survey tell us about the Site?
- Q11. How well do deposits and any artefacts survive, and how deeply are they buried?
- Q12: Can we increase our understanding of the local environment in the early-medieval period?
- Q13: Formulate recommendations for further archaeological and palaeoenvironmental analysis at Coldingham Priory based on Aims 1-3, and implement a programme to publish and disseminate the results or continue fieldwork into additional seasons.



11 STAGES PRODUCTS AND TASKS

11.1 Methodological Linkages

11.1.1 It is anticipated that the fieldwork will also be undertaken in four stages. These are set out in the table below and are set against the project aims and questions that will be met at each stage, the products that will be produced and the tasks undertaken. For transparency, task numbers are linked directly to the project GANNT chart (for full sequence including milestones see chart in Section 15) and this is linked to the Project Budget in Section 14 below).

Stage	Description	Project Aims/Questions	Products	Task & ID Number
Stage 1	Project Design	Aim 1-4 Q1-9	1. Assessment Report 2. Finalised UPD & Risk Log 3. Educational Plan & Information Pack 4. Digital Communication Plan 5. Risk Assessment & Health and Safety Plan	3. Consult with wider project team and stakeholders to define milestones and delivery timetable. 4. Core Archaeology Team Meeting. 5. Design project database. 6. RV2 – Sign Off on MoRPHE
Stage 2	Archaeological Fieldwork	Aim 1 Q1-3 Aim 2 Q4-7	6. Field Archive 7. Remote Sensing Archive 8. 3D Survey Archive	8. Site Preparation 9. Fieldwork (remote sensing & excavation) 10. RV3 – assemble site archive & distribute to specialists
Stage 3	Assessment Report & Updated Project Design	Aim 3 Q4-6 Aim 4 7-9	9. Stratigraphic & Assessment Report	13. Specialist finds and palaeoenvironmental assessments 14. Integrated assessment report 15. RV4 – recommendations for further work
Stage 4	Analysis and Publication	Aim 1-4 Q1-14	10. Final report (or UPD) 11. Publication (or UPD) 12. Completed and accessioned archive	18. Specialist analysis 19. Finalise report and publication 20. Prepare data and archive for deposition.



Stage	Description	Project Aims/Questions	Products	Task & ID Number
				21. RV5 – final sign-off 22. Closure

Table 4 – Project stages, products and tasks

11.2 Task list by Person Days and Team Member

11.2.1 DigVentures projects are managed according to the English Heritage MoRPHE project model (Management of Archaeological Research Projects in the Historic Environment) based on a PRINCE2 framework. This is further detailed in the project GANNT chart (Section 15), including project milestones, and linked by Stage with the project budget (Section 14).

Task ID Number	Aims	Task Description	Performed by:	Person days	Start (no later than)
Stage 1: PD					
3	1	Consult with wider project team and stakeholders to define milestones and delivery timetable	BW, LWW, SN	1	July 2017
4	1	Core Team Meeting	BW, LWW,	0.25	July 2017
5	1	Design project database	BW, EG,	0.5	July 2017
6	1	RV2 – Sign Off on MoRPHE	Project Team	0.25	August 2017
Stage 2 Fieldwork					
8	1 & 2	Site Preparation	SN	2	Autumn 2017
9	1 & 2	Fieldwork (remote sensing & Excavation)	SN	12	Autumn 2017 and Summer 2018
10	1 & 2	RV3 – assemble site archive & distribute to specialists	Project Team	5	October 2018
Stage 3: Assessment					
13	3	Specialist finds and palaeoenvironmental assessments	Expert Team	10	November 2018
14	3	Integrated Report	BW, SN & Project Team	5	November 2018
15	3	RV4 – recommendations for further work	Project Team	1	November 2018
Stage 4: Analysis and Publication					
18	4	Specialist Analysis	BW, SN & Project Team	7	Oct-Nov 2018



Task ID Number	Aims	Task Description	Performed by:	Person days	Start (no later than)
19	4	Finalise report and publication	SN,	7	December 2018
20	4	Prepare data and archive for deposition.	TG	2	December 2018
21	4	RV5 – final sign-off	Project Team	1	December 2018
22	4	Closure	Project Team	1	Feb December 2018

Table 5 – Project Task List

12 OWNERSHIP

12.1.1 The Copyright on all reports submitted will reside with DigVentures, although a third party in-perpetuity licence will automatically be given for reproduction of all products, subject to agreement with Historic Environment Scotland. The original copyright holder will retain copyright in pre-existing data.

13 RISK LOG

13.1.1 A Risk Log is appended as Appendix 3 to this document.

14 BUDGET

14.1.1 The estimated budget for the project will be made available to stakeholders on a case by case basis.

15 PROJECT GANNT CHART

15.1.1 It is anticipated that the project will be completed in four stages. These are set out in the GANNT chart below; with specific task ID numbers and milestones linked to the project Aims and Objectives in Table 4, and the project budget in Table 6.

16 BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACAO, 1993. Model briefs and specifications for archaeological assessments and field evaluations, Association of County Archaeological Officers.

Anderson, A O 1908 Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers AD 500 to 1286. (Republished 1991) David Nutt, London

APS Group Scotland. 2014. Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland. Scottish Government.

Archaeological Services 2014 Glebe Field, Coldingham, Scottish Borders: Archaeological DBA. Unpublished report 3537, Archaeological Services Durham University

Archaeological Services 2014 Glebe Field, Coldingham, Scottish Borders: Geophysical Surveys. Unpublished report 3533, Archaeological Services Durham University

BADLG, 1986. Code of Practice, British Archaeologists and Developers Liaison Group



Brown, N and Glazebrook, J (eds). 2000. Research and Archaeology: a framework for the eastern counties, 2 Research Agenda (East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 8) (Norwich, Scole Archaeological Committee)

Chapman, H.P. & R. Van de Noort. 2001. High-resolution wetland prospection, using GPS and GIS: landscape studies at Sutton Common (South Yorkshire), and Meare Village East (Somerset). *Journal of Archaeological Science* 28, 365-75.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), rev. 2001 By-Laws, Standards and Policy Statements of the Institute of Field Archaeologists: Standards and guidance: Field Evaluation

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2001 By-Laws, Standards and Policy Statements of the Institute for Archaeologists, (rev. 2008), Standard and guidance: Excavation

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), supplement 2008, By-Laws, Standards and Policy Statements of the Institute for Archaeologists: Standards and guidance

Crutchley, S. 2010. The Light Fantastic. <http://www.dur.ac.uk/eh.rsa/pdf/light-fantastic.pdf>

Department of the Environment, 1990. Planning Policy Guidance 16, Archaeology and Planning

Finch, J. 2002. "Regionality and medieval landscapes" in D Perring (ed) *Town and Country in England: frameworks for archaeological research* (CBA Research report 134) (York), 107-15

Gaffney, Gater and Ovenden. 2002 *The Use of Geophysical Techniques in Archaeological Evaluations*, Institute of Field Archaeologists Paper No 6.

Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum (The Ecclesiastical History of the English People), vol IV, see McClure & Collins 1999.

Historic England, 1991. *Exploring our Past. Strategies for the Archaeology of England*, English Heritage

Historic England, 1997. *Sustaining the historic environment: new perspectives on the future*

Historic England, 2001. *Centre for Archaeology Guidelines: Archaeometallurgy*

Historic England, 2002. *Centre for Archaeology Guidelines: Environmental Archaeology: a guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation.*

Historic England, 2004. *Centre for Archaeology Guidelines: Human bones from archaeological sites: guidelines for producing assessment documents and analytical reports*

Historic England, 2006. *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide*

Historic England, 2012 *Management of Research projects in the Historic Environment. PPN 3: Archaeological Excavation – Annual Report May 2011-March2012*

Johnson, P, 1999 *Abbey Yards Field, Coldingham Priory*. Unpublished report 707, GUARD

Jones, D. (ed) 2008. *Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Excavation*



Lesick, K. B Kulle, C Cluney and M Peuramaki-Brown (eds). 2002. The Archaeology of Contact: Processes and Consequences. Proceedings of the 25th Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary. Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary. pp 316-321

Hall, M and Price, N (eds) 2012. 'Scottish Archaeological Research Framework Medieval Scotland: A Future for it's Past'. SCARF.

SHAPE 2008 – A Strategic Framework for Historic Environment Activities & Programmes in English Heritage

Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers, (1991 rev. 1997) Health and Safety in Field Archaeology, Manual

Stronach, S, 2005 The Anglian monastery and medieval priory of Coldingham: Urbs Coludi revisited. Proc Soc Antiq Scot 135, 395- 422

Tarlow, S and West, S (eds). 1999. The Familiar Past: archaeologies of later historical Britain (London, Routledge)

Walker, K. 1990 Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage, Archaeology Section of the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation.

Watkinson, D. and Neal, V. 1998 First Aid for Finds (3rd. edition), RESCUE and the Archaeology Section of the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation.

Wrathmell, S. 2003a. "Regional frameworks for medieval rural settlement" in Manby, T et al. (eds) (2003a) op. cit., 363-8

17 APPENDICES

17.1 Appendix 1 – Core team CVs



17.2 Appendix 2 – Method Statements

The methods for the proposed project will involve a combination of remote sensing, GIS modelling, archaeological excavation, sampling, palaeoenvironmental sampling and assessment. The methods are linked directly to the project aims and objectives (see Table 4) and detailed below.

Key Questions and Objectives	Photogrammetry and Digital Terrain Modelling	Test Pits	Earthwork Survey and GIS Modelling	Archaeological Excavation	Sampling	Environmental Assessment	Finds Assessment	Synthesis and Data Integration
Q.1	✓	✓						
Q.2		✓						
Q.3	✓	✓						
Q.4			✓					
Q.5			✓	✓				
Q.6			✓	✓				
Q.7			✓	✓	✓	✓		
Q.8				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Q.9					✓	✓	✓	
Q.10					✓	✓		
Q.11						✓		✓
Q.12						✓		✓
Q.13								✓

Table 6 – Linking methods with objectives

Remote Sensing

A comprehensive aerial survey will be undertaken on the landscape surrounding Coldingham Priory, producing a metrically accurate 3D digital surface model (DSM). The resulting DSM will be used to provide a landscape context to more detailed invasive and non-invasive work at the Site. The specific techniques and methodologies and reinstatement strategies relating to this intrusive work are detailed below.

Topographic Survey and GIS Modelling

Any additional topographical survey work will be carried out using a Trimble Real Time Differential GPS survey system. The Trimble VRS system is used in conjunction with a GPS Rover



unit. It allows for surveying without the use of a site specific fixed base station. This is achieved by connecting to Trimble’s network of fixed base stations by means of mobile phone communication. This method is highly efficient and accurate (+/- 2cm) when good signal is available. The survey data is exported from the data logger as a comma delimited file (csv) and a Trimble data collector file (dc). Either of these files can be imported into Trimble GeoSite Communicator, which recognises the feature code library and plots all strings, polygons and labels as intended. All survey and excavation data will be stored within a GIS environment, which will remain the principle conduit for all spatial data throughout the project.

Archaeological Excavation

Test pits followed by larger trenches will be excavated, with their final position refined, on the basis of remote sensing results:

Trench	Dimensions	Target & Location	Description
1	TBC		TBC
2	TBC		TBC
3	TBC		TBC
4	TBC		TBC
5	TBC		TBC
6	TBC		TBC

Table 7 – Trench target, location and description (TBC at Project Design Stage)

Interventions

All trenches will be cleaned by hand, planned and photographed prior to any further excavation. A representative section, not less than 1m in width, of the entire deposit sequence encountered will be recorded. If complex stratigraphy and/ or significant remains (e.g. structural remains, artefact scatters, remains clearly of a funerary nature etc.) are encountered, these may only be excavated to the minimum requirement in order to satisfy the project objective, to avoid compromising the integrity of remains that may be either (a) preserved in situ, or (b) excavated in detail during any next phase of research excavation. Interventions will focus on feature intersections in order to establish relative chronologies, and ‘clean’ sections to maximise retrieval of stratigraphically secure dating evidence and environmental samples.

Full written, drawn and photographic records will be made of each trench and test pit, even where no archaeological remains are identified. A plan at an appropriate scale (1:50 or 1:100) will be prepared, showing the areas investigated and their relation to more permanent topographical features, and the location of contexts observed and recorded in the course of the investigation. Plans, sections and elevations of archaeological features and deposits will be drawn as necessary at an appropriate scale (normally 1:20, or 1:10 for complex features). Drawings will be made in pencil (H6) on permanent drafting film and archived in a suitable depository.

Each trench or test pit, will be recorded using a Digital format created for Digital Dig Team, following the DigVentures single context recording system. Digital photography will be used for all photography of significant features, finds, deposits and general site working. The



photographic record will illustrate both the detail and the general context of the principal features and finds excavated, and the Site as a whole.

Backfilling

Turf will be carefully removed and stacked away from the trench edge, maintaining their integrity by ensuring that the turves are placed in a correct position (turf side up) and are watered frequently and monitored daily. Topsoil and subsoil will be removed and retained separately for reinstatement. Trenches will be backfilled immediately following excavation with subsoil followed by topsoil. The site will be visibly similar in appearance to its condition pre-excavation; there shall be no visible mounds of excavated soil around the site and turf shall be replaced and watered in.

Palaeoenvironmental Sampling

All deposits with good palaeoenvironmental potential will be sampled; bulk samples will be taken from the section as appropriate, under advice from the project specialist. Context specific samples will be taken by the most appropriate means (kubiena tins, contiguous columns, incremental block, bulk etc.) for multi-disciplinary analysis. All aspects of the collection, selection, processing, assessment and reporting on the environmental archaeology component of the evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with the principles set out in *'Environmental Archaeology: a guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation'* (Historic England 2011) and with reference to the Association for Environmental Archaeology's *'Working Paper No. 2, Environmental Archaeology and Archaeological Evaluations'* (1995).

Bulk Sampling Strategy

Bulk samples will usually be 60 litres in size, depending on the likely density of macrofossils. Ten litre samples will only be used for the recovery of plant macrofossils from waterlogged contexts. Samples will be stored in ten litre plastic buckets with lids and handles. A waterproof label will be fixed to the bucket and will record site code, context number and sample number and number of buckets in comprising the sample. A duplicate label will be retained inside the bucket. Samples will be protected from temperatures below 5° and above 25° Celsius and will be prevented from either wetting or drying out.

- Bulk samples selected for processing will be wet-sieved/floated and washed (by the excavation team at a suitable area close to the temporary headquarters) over a mesh size of 250 microns for the recovery of palaeobotanical and other organic remains, and re-floated to maximise recovery;
- Non-organic residues shall be washed through a nest of sieves of 10mm, 5mm, 2mm, 1mm and 250 micron mesh to maximise finds recovery;
- Both organic and non-organic residues shall be dried under controlled conditions;
- The dried inorganic fractions will be sorted for small finds or any non-buoyant palaeoenvironmental remains, and scanned with a magnet to pick up ferrous debris such as hammer scale;
- The dried organic fractions will be sorted under a light microscope to identify the range of species or other material on a presence/absence basis, the degree of preservation of the bio-archaeological material and the rough proportions of different categories of material present;
- In the event that waterlogged deposits are identified and sampled, further processing will be undertaken as appropriate and agreed, including paraffin flotation to recover insect remains. Any such remains will be scanned to identify and assess their potential;



- Selection of other types of sample for processing and the methods to be used for processing and assessment will be undertaken on the advice of the relevant specialist and will be agreed with the Consultant before implementation.

Contexts that are well stratified and potentially datable are all of value, so a systematic approach to selecting samples for processing and assessment will be taken. These will be divided into three categories:

- Category A (always sampled): contexts where the composition of the sediments is likely to inform us of the use of a particular structure or feature or if the deposits are waterlogged. These will include: *in situ* occupation deposits and fills/layers associated with particular activities; hearths; destruction deposits; basal pit/slot trench fills; waterlogged deposits, cesspits or latrines.
- Category B (always sampled, though discretion can be exercised by the trench supervisor): deposits identified as containing material that could yield information regarding their origin or the process that produced them. These will include: dumps, middens, upper pit fills with evidence for charred material, shell, bone and industrial waste.
- Category C: deposits containing material which is not necessarily related to the function of the feature to which they are related, but which can characterise deposits from different areas of the site. These will include: secondary and tertiary fills, postholes, levelling deposits, spreads etc.

Category A deposits should always be sampled, Category B deposits always sampled however, the supervisor's discretion may allow for a strategy such as 'scatter sampling' enabling exploration of variation within a deposit and Category C deposits sampled on a random basis (such as 1 in 5). These samples can help to characterise the background noise of a site, so as to highlight spatial or temporal trends and provide material that can be directly compared with those from Category A and B. All samples will be taken in large white 10 litre tubs, with labels placed inside with the deposit and attached to the bucket. All samples will be processed off site in a dedicated floatation and wet sieving area.

Zooarchaeology

If large deposits of bone or marine shell are encountered advice of the project Zooarchaeologist will be sought as regards further sampling. If large deposits of bone or marine shell are encountered the project Zooarchaeologist advice will be sought as regards further sampling. If articulated groups of bones are encountered (as found in previous excavations. they will be surveyed, recorded *in situ*, (including digital photography and planning), and then excavated to retain the group's integrity. Bones from each articulated limb will be bagged separately. If inhumations or cremation burials are encountered and excavated the surrounding soil will be sampled to retrieve any loose teeth or bone fragments.

All hand collected animal bones and bones from processed samples will be assessed, following Historic England's Environmental Archaeology guidelines (2011). If warranted by the size of the recovered assemblage, it will be assessed using two different quantification methods to determine the most suitable for full analysis, taking into account methods used in comparative assemblages. The assessment will not distinguish between certain taxonomic groups; full speciation will be carried out as part of the analysis, using a vertebrate comparative collection. In addition to quantification of domestic species and occurrence of wild species, the assessment



will consider the number of articulated bone groups, and the prevalence of aging, sexing and osteometric data available for full analysis, following standard published conventions. The assessment report will comment on the potential of the assemblage, particularly in the context of the excavation's research questions and current understanding of comparative assemblages. It will also provide recommendations for any necessary future analysis.

Human Osteoarchaeology

In the event of the discovery of human remains (inhumations, cremations and disarticulated fragments) they will be left *in situ*, covered and protected, until Chris Bowles (SBC) and Historic England have been informed. If a decision is taken to remove them, they will be fully recorded and excavated in compliance with the relevant Ministry of Justice Licence. A copy of the Ministry of Justice licence will be supplied to Natural England for logging onto the agri-environment agreement documents. The excavation of human remains will be carried out in accordance with the procedures detailed in the document *Excavation and post-excavation treatment of cremated and inhumed human remains* (McKinley and Roberts 1993, ClfA Technical Paper 13). Significant assemblages of human remains will be subject to an assessment of DNA preservation to establish potential familial relationships.

Inhumations will be scanned with a metal detector prior to excavation, and the position of possible metallic grave goods will be noted. Wherever possible, each burial will be excavated within a single working day, particularly with regard to visible grave goods. To minimise unauthorised disturbance of human remains, partially exposed remains will be covered overnight, though in such a way as to not draw undue attention, using loose excavated spoil.

Excavation of inhumations will be undertaken using a trowel, plasterer's leaf, plastic spoon and paintbrush as appropriate depending on the condition of the bones. When lifted the bones will be bagged by skeletal area (skull, axial, upper and lower limbs) with separate bags for the left and right side. A standard series of samples will be taken from each inhumation burial to ensure full recovery of any remaining osseous tissues or small artefacts. Once human remains are removed from inhumation graves, any soil residue remaining at the base of the grave will be retrieved for bulk processing.

Inhumations and cremations will be drawn at a scale of 1:10 and photographed prior to lifting. They will be recorded on Skeleton Record Sheets that form an integral part of the site *pro forma* recording system. The recording will include condition, completeness, articulation, orientation and posture.

Fragile objects found within graves will be lifted with appropriate care and handling to minimise breakage. This may include subsequent controlled excavation under laboratory conditions. A trained conservator will be employed on the site if necessary. All cremation burials and cremation-related contexts will be excavated and sampled in quadrants to ascertain the distribution of any archaeological components within the fills, with division into spit also if appropriate. Cremation-related features other than burials may be subject to more detailed sub-divisions, the appropriate strategy being developed by a specialist as the size and nature of the remains becomes clear.

Undisturbed and slightly disturbed, but largely intact, urn cremation burials will be lifted *en masse* for excavation under laboratory conditions. The urns will be wrapped in crepe bandages and securely boxed for transportation. Where a vessel has been crushed, thereby disrupting any original internal deposition of the cremated remains, it will be lifted *en masse* after separate recovery of displaced sherds. All cremation-related contexts will be subject to whole-earth recovery from the point at which any cremated bone or other pyre debris is observed. If deposits



of placed human bone are encountered in features, these may be excavated in spits if appropriate. The soils from these features will be bulk sampled.

Finds

All finds will be treated in accordance with the relevant guidance given in the Institute of Field Archaeologist's *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation* (2008), excepting where statements made below supersede them. All artefacts will be retained from excavated contexts, except features or deposits undoubtedly of modern date. In these circumstances, sufficient artefacts will only be retained to elucidate the date and function of the feature or deposit.

All artefacts from the excavation will, as a minimum, be washed, marked, counted, weighed and identified. Any stratified ironwork will be X-rayed and stored in a stable condition along with other fragile and delicate material. The X-raying of objects and other conservation needs will be undertaken by appropriately qualified conservation specialists. Suitable material, primarily the pottery and non-ferrous metalwork, will be scanned to assess the date range of the assemblage.

Conservation

If Artefacts will be recovered as a matter of routine during the excavation. When retrieved from the ground finds will be kept in a finds tray or appropriate bags in accordance with *First Aid for Finds*. Where necessary, a conservator may be required to recover fragile finds from the ground depending upon circumstances.

After the completion of the fieldwork stage, a conservation assessment will be undertaken which will include the X-radiography of all the ironwork (after initial screening to separate obviously modern debris), and a selection of the non-ferrous finds (including all coins). A sample of slag may also be X-rayed to assist with identification and interpretation. Wet-packed materials, including glass, bone and leather will be stabilised and consolidated to ensure their long-term preservation. All finds will be stored in optimum conditions in accordance with *First Aid for Finds* and *Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long-Term Storage* (Walker, 1990). The conservation assessment report will include statements on condition, stability and potential for further investigation (with conservation costs) for all material groups. The conservation report will be included in the updated project design prepared for the analysis stage of the project.

Scientific Dating

Radiocarbon dating will be appropriate for clarifying and linking aspects of archaeological and environmental chronologies, and a strategy for this will be agreed following discussion with SBC and the relevant specialists following assessment.

Synthesis and data integration

Radiocarbon The results of the project will be integrated and synthesised with those from the previous investigations if and when data from previous excavations is made available (see Section 1.3), and other relevant work within the region and further afield. This will include a literature review of other pertinent sites.



17.3 Appendix 3 – Risk Log

Risk number	1	2	3	4
Description	Inclement Weather - Prolonged periods of Rain	Exceptional Weather (Drying exposed Archaeology)	Absence of Core Team Member	Absence of Specialist Team Member
Probability	Medium	Medium-low	Low	Low
Impact	Delay programme of work	Slow progress	Delay programme of work	Delay programme of work
Countermeasures	Provision of Indoor Archiving Tasks + Flexible programme	Provision of Water Bowser + Spray	Reallocation of responsibilities or appointment of alternative	Reallocation of responsibilities or appointment of alternative
Estimated time/cost	3 Days	None	Minimal if done by adjustment	Minimal if done by adjustment
Owner	BW/LWW	BW/LWW	BW/LWW	BW/LWW
Risk number	5	6		
Description	Equipment Theft/Breakages	Serious Site Injury		
Probability	Medium	Medium		
Impact	Delay programme of work	Delay programme of work		
Countermeasures	Secure Lock-up for all digital equipment	Detailed H&S Risk Assessment + daily safety briefing		
Estimated time/cost	3 days	3 days		
Owner	BW/LWW/	BW/LWW/		