

CABINET

9 September 2015

SILVER HILL – NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING ARCHAEOLOGY AND OTHER IMPLEMENTATION STAFFING ISSUES

REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR

Contact Officer: Steve Tilbury Tel No: 01962 848256

RECENT REFERENCES:

None.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The report considers the Notice of Motion proposed by Cllr Warwick at the Council meeting on 23 July 2015 which was referred to Cabinet for consideration. It also considers related staffing issues related to the implementation of the Silver Hill project.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1 That Cabinet does not support the Notice of Motion because it is based upon an incorrect presumption that the arrangements for managing archaeological investigations through the planning process for Silver Hill are in some way deficient when this is not the case.
- 2 That recognising the significant and unusual volume of development activity that may be taking place in Winchester over the next three years, Cabinet determines whether additional resources should be allocated to the Historic Environment team to provide additional capacity for the supervision and management of archaeological investigations and public engagement.
- 3 That Cabinet determines whether a detailed report on the additional resources required for the implementation of the Silver Hill project should be prepared.

## CABINET

9 September 2015

### SILVER HILL – NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING ARCHAEOLOGY AND OTHER IMPLEMENTATION STAFFING ISSUES

#### REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR

#### DETAIL:

##### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 At the Council meeting on 23 July 2015 the following Notice of Motion was proposed by Cllr Warwick and seconded by Cllr Burns. It was agreed by the Mayor that it should be referred to Cabinet for consideration and report back to Council:

“That this Council, having regard for the potential national significance of the archaeological remains within the Silver Hill site, requests that Cabinet secures the services of an independent archaeological expert to consider all aspects of the mitigation works proposed by Henderson, prior to any excavation works being carried out. Further that the independent expert’s report is disclosed to the public.”

Points made at Council for consideration of cabinet are set out in the Minute Extract in Appendix A. This report considers the matters raised in the Notice of Motion and other matters relating to staffing during the implementation of the Silver Hill scheme.

##### 2 Silver Hill Archaeology

- 2.1 Consideration of both the Silver Hill planning applications has followed the normal process in relation to archaeology in accordance with the Council’s Local Plan policies, Planning Policy Guidance (extant in 2009) and the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance in relation to the 2014 scheme.
- 2.2 The 2009 planning consent is linked to a Section 106 agreement which includes details provisions on archaeology. Under the 106 agreement, the developer must submit various archaeological documents in draft form to the Council for its approval before work commences:-
- Archaeological Evaluation Strategy;
  - Archaeological Research Framework;
  - Foundations Design and Services Routing Framework;

- Archaeological Mitigation Strategy;
- Archaeological Public Outreach Strategy;
- Publication and Dissemination Strategy.

Once approved, the development must be carried out, and subsequently occupied, in compliance with the terms of the approved documents.

- 2.3 One of the required documents is an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy. This must be in accordance with the Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy which was agreed at the time of the 2009 planning application (and again in 2014) and appended to the Section 106 agreement. A copy of the Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy is attached as Appendix B to this report.
- 2.4 The Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy sets out how the site will be investigated prior to development and how any archaeology discovered on the site will be documented, preserved in situ if possible and removed for preservation and study where necessary. At the planning stage, mitigation strategies are usually based on desk top research and data already held for a site and adjacent sites and are appraised by professionals within the City Council as part of the planning process. Winchester City Council is one of the few district councils which still retains in-house expertise in archaeology and does not rely for advice on other local authorities or consultants. Historic England (formerly English Heritage) has been consulted and is supportive of the approach adopted. They will also have a continuing role in monitoring the outcome of the on site investigations and determining what measures are required as a result of any finds made.
- 2.5 There is nothing unusual or deficient in the fact that extensive on site excavations have not taken place before planning consent is granted. This will be the next stage of the investigatory process.
- 2.6 The Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy recognises that the area is likely to be rich in archaeology and that it will require extensive investigation and documentation. As with other costs incurred in respect of the development, archaeology costs will be paid by the developer and included in the Development Account for Silver Hill, in order to determine the amount of profit from the development, and any overage due to the Council. Developers and their consultants are familiar with the requirement to adjust their designs to take account of archaeological findings and modern construction methods make this somewhat easier than it once was. Members will be aware that many of the largest construction and infrastructure projects take place in central London where archaeology is always a major consideration.
- 2.7 Another of the documents to be submitted for the Council's approval is a Publication and Dissemination Strategy. Following approval, this will have to be implemented, and therefore this would deal with publication of the results of the archaeological works which are carried out on the site.

- 2.8 All the obligations for meeting the requirements for investigating, reporting and taking account of archaeological findings lie with the developer and they will be overseen by the Council's Historic Environment staff and Historic England as they proceed.
- 2.9 There is, therefore, no need or requirement for any independent expert advice regarding the mitigation works proposed by the developer.
- 2.10 However, the archaeological investigations and follow up will be extensive and it would be surprising if the material and information it generates is not of very considerable interest. It is also likely that other development projects, such as Station Approach, will be under consideration or on site during the Silver Hill construction process. This will place a strain on the resources of the Council's Historic Environment Team whilst other more routine work also continues at a high level.
- 2.11 It is therefore suggested that whilst there is no requirement for independent expertise in the way suggested by the Notice of Motion, Cabinet may wish to consider whether a short term addition to the staffing of the Historic Environment Team would be beneficial both to the Council and to the development process on this and other sites. This additional capacity could be limited to two years and would also assist with other projects.
- 2.12 The most appropriate way in which to use this additional resource would be to backfill within the Historic Environment Team allow the existing experienced Historic Environment Officer (Archaeology) to allocate her time solely to Silver Hill and other major projects.

### 3 Silver Hill/Major Projects Implementation

- 3.1 At the Council meeting on 15 July when it considered report CAB2700 on Silver Hill implementation, Council recommended:

*“That Cabinet should appoint a dedicated implementation officer to the Silver Hill project with suitable experience, skills and training to manage the Council’s contribution to the scheme.”*

At the subsequent Cabinet meeting on 16 July 2015, Cabinet supported this objective and the purpose of this section of the report is to propose a way forward to achieve it.

- 3.2 The pre-construction and construction phase of the Silver Hill scheme has complex project management requirements which are mainly for the developer to manage, but these will have implications for the operation of services within the city centre arising from such things as demolitions, construction access, temporary road closures, security, signage, the opening and closing of premises and so on.
- 3.3 Managing these will require additional decision making, liaison between professional teams, excellent communication with adjacent property owners

and the public. There will be a justified expectation that the Council is fully 'on top' of all these issues and that it can provide timely answers to all of the many enquiries and problem solving requests which are raised. It may be difficult to meet this expectation whilst a relatively small number of staff are also attending to other projects and day to day issues.

- 3.4 There are also numerous requirements within the Development Agreement for the submission of financial and technical information by the developer to the Council (and vice versa) which have to be documented, directed to the correct decision making process and assessed in a timely fashion. Whilst the Council can provide or commission the advice it requires the management of a steady flow of information traffic is, in itself, a demanding task and not best undertaken by managers with numerous other competing time obligations.
- 3.5 Cabinet is therefore asked to consider whether further consideration should be given to the appointment of a fixed term Implementation Officer for the Silver Hill project. The purpose of the post would be to act as the main contact for the exchange of technical information as required by the Development Agreement, to ensure timely provision and processing of financial information to the Council, to check and chase progress on project milestones, to maintain a constant information feed for the press, public and elected Members on the progress of the development, and to assist planning officers with the discharge of conditions and compliance with planning requirements, and similar matters. It is important to make clear that this role is not a project manager for the construction process – that task lies with the developer. Nor is the Implementation Officer the technical advisor to the Council on financial, construction or property questions. Their task is to ensure that the obligations owed to the Council and by the Council in relation to the project are met in a timely fashion and by those with the appropriate expertise.
- 3.6 If Cabinet considers that it would wish to give detailed consideration to such an appointment then the details of the post and its role within the project team structure will be reported to a further meeting of Cabinet.

#### OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

#### 4 COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND PORTFOLIO PLANS (RELEVANCE TO):

- 4.1 The successful implementation of the Silver Hill project is one of the most significant projects for the City Council over the next five years and contributes to a range of strategic priorities, including economic prosperity, housing delivery and public transport initiatives.

#### 5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The resource requirement for the additional archaeology support is difficult to predict since it will, in part at least, depend on the nature and quantity of the

material which is revealed from site investigations. The requirement for Silver Hill is likely to be relatively short term since the archaeological investigations should be complete within a few months, although the research and writing up of findings will continue in line with the requirements of the planning consent.

- 5.2 It is likely that a full time appointment would have the capacity to support other projects and this could be invaluable as developments such Station Approach also have highly significant archaeological context which requires professional attention. An appointment would need to be made promptly as work on site could begin in the very near future.
- 5.3 It is therefore suggested that were Cabinet to support this additional capacity being provided it would be appropriate to make a fixed term appointment, initially for two years, of an additional post within the Historic Environment Team at an estimated grade of scale 5. This would have a total cost of £approximately £82,000 which could be funded by way of a virement from the Flexible Resource Management savings in the year to date.
- 5.4 The post would require a temporary addition to the staff establishment and the approval of Personnel Committee.

## 6 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 6.1 In relation to the issues around archaeology there is considered to be very limited risk that the developer will fail to comply with their obligations under the planning consent. There is some risk that the Council may not be able to fulfil its requirements to give timely advice and to reach conclusions on questions put to it by the developer due to a shortage of resources. A greater risk is that public understanding of the archaeological works and the expectation of easy access to information will not be met due to time pressures. All of these risks will be reduced if additional staff time is provided.
- 6.2 The flow of information between the Council and the developer as the Silver Hill development progresses will be substantial and where it relates to financial and legal obligations it will be highly significant. There will also be many issues affecting the management of a major development within the city centre which businesses and members of the public will reasonably expect the City Council to actively engage with and where necessary take control of. Having an Implementation Officer post to coordinate these issues would reduce the strain on other parts of the organisation at time when it will be under great pressure elsewhere

### BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Extracts from Section 106 agreement dated 28 January 2009

Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy annexed to Section 106 agreement.

APPENDICES:

Appendix A – Minute Extract from Council regarding Notice of Motion by Councillor Warwick – 15 July 2015

Appendix B – Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy annexed to Section 106 agreement.

**Minute Extract from the Council meeting 15 July 2015 (meeting adjourned to 23 July 2015)**

The following Notice of Motion had been submitted by Councillor Warwick.

“That this Council, having regard for the potential national significance of the archaeological remains within the Silver Hill site, requests that Cabinet secures the services of an independent archaeological expert to consider all aspects of the mitigation works proposed by Henderson, prior to any excavation or construction works being carried out. Further, that the independent expert’s report is disclosed to the public.”

As part of her presentation of the Motion, Councillor Warwick highlighted the following:

- Prior to its construction in the late 1980s, only approximately one-quarter of the Brooks Centre site in Winchester had been excavated. A significant quantity of archaeological remains had been subsequently destroyed by the building of the underground car park.
- In 1990, Planning Policy Guidance 16 made it a requirement for developers to make provision for investigation of archaeological remains.
- A 2006 Arup Report highlighted the potential impact of the development of the Silver Hill site on archaeological remains that were likely to be of significant heritage value.
- Little was known about what was beneath the bus station site, as this has been largely undisturbed since approximately 1935. There was anecdotal evidence of a Roman Forum having been situated somewhere close to the Cathedral and therefore there could well be other significantly important remains within the vicinity of the Silver Hill site.
- The Section 106 Agreement for the Silver Hill development must include full public engagement with regard to archaeological investigations. All works must be fully funded by the developer, with any significant remains protected. All aspects of the investigations must be overseen by an independent expert.

Councillor Warwick asked that the matter be treated as urgent and should be subject to a full debate and decision at this meeting. However, the Mayor ruled that it was not urgent that a decision needed to be made at this meeting. It was more appropriate to follow the usual procedure for a Notice of Motion to refer the matter to Cabinet for a report under Council Procedure Rule 9, so that Members would



have the full information on the matter when it came back to Council for consideration.

The Motion was seconded by Councillor Burns.

Council discussed the motion and attention was drawn to possibility of nationally important archaeological remains being found at the Silver Hill development site. Existing measures of mitigation and protection, to be funded by the developer, were discussed and relevant aspects within the Section 106/ planning permission for the development were referred to. This would include public engagement as part of the process.

A Member drew suggested that the Silver Hill site was likely to be comprised of sedimentary and alluvial deposits which may not be able to sustain regular building foundations. Therefore, there was a possibility that stronger, deeper foundations and piling may be required which may potentially destroy any archaeological remains that had been initially intended to be preserved in situ.

The provision for careful monitoring of the archaeological investigations at the site as provided for in the S106 Agreement was noted and it was suggested that some external expertise may of assistance, but this should not compromise or delay the stringent measures as set out in the existing Section 106 Agreement.

RESOLVED:

That the Notice of Motion be referred to a future meeting of Cabinet for further investigation and report back to Council.

his  
ased in  
ment is  
controlled  
ent  
nd coasta  
gland)  
l) in one  
visions of  
s  
nd  
ken.

## ANNEX D

### Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy

**SILVERHILL RENAISSANCE PROJECT,  
WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE**

**OUTLINE ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION  
STRATEGY**

---

**FINAL VERSION FOR SUBMISSION**

**APRIL 2006**

**RPS Planning, Transport and Environment**

Mallams Court  
18 Milton Park  
Abingdon  
Oxon OX14 4RP

**Tel** 01235 821888  
**Fax** 01235 820351  
**Email** [rpsox@rpsplc.co.uk](mailto:rpsox@rpsplc.co.uk)

---

# **SILVERHILL RENAISSANCE PROJECT, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE**

## **Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy**

### **Introduction**

The baseline review of archaeological resources and potential undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment has identified the main chronological periods for which remains can be anticipated to be present within the proposal site.

This current document does not present the detail of that baseline review and the subsequent assessment of potential impacts, and must be read in conjunction with the Environmental Statement and the appropriate Technical Appendix (the Desk-based Assessment of Archaeological Potential).

This Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy contains a brief summary of the baseline review of archaeological resources and potential, and puts forward a description of the approach that has been taken thus far and will continue to be pursued regarding the mitigation of the impact of the proposed development on the known and potential archaeological resources.

It is anticipated that this document will be subject to further revision and amendment as the proposed development scheme progresses, as the preferred methodologies respond to individual circumstances as they arise. The programme of mitigation is seen as an iterative process whereby each stage of work is informed by the results of previous stages.

The strategy has been informed by a number of written sources relating to the implementation of archaeological mitigation on deeply stratified urban sites, and by discussions within the design team and with a number of archaeological practitioners. Written sources are identified in Appendix 1, and some of these sources are referred to directly within the text of this document.

### **Summary of known and potential archaeological resource base**

The archaeological resources at the proposal site, both known and predicted, are to be regarded as of major heritage value. There has been a high density of discoveries reported in the Winchester City Council's archaeological database, and there have been several very large previously excavated sites within the proposal site and nearby. The discoveries resulting from these excavations were, and remain, important at the national level, and the innovative excavation processes employed significantly contributed to the development of 'modern' urban archaeology.

However, in the eastern half of the proposal site, despite an open character and with several modern buildings there, there is at present a paucity of good quality information relating to the archaeological deposits that may be present.

The baseline study shows that most data is related to the central and western part of the proposal site. Relatively less is known about the archaeology in the eastern part of the proposal site. This reflects on the lack of ground-penetrating work in the Bus Garage, an area that has been a stable landscape for many decades, and an almost complete absence of archaeological fieldwork at the time when the present buildings in this area were constructed. However, there are two historic watercourses in the eastern part of the proposal site that should also be regarded as integral components of the historic landscape.

**Table 1: Resource Evaluation by Period**

Period	Resources	Value
Prehistoric	Soils, ecofacts and some artefacts possible throughout the proposal site.	Moderate to High
Roman	Soil formations, structural remains of buildings, roads, land management and occupation, and with associated artefacts and ecofacts.	High
Early-Mid Saxon	Soil formations, structural remains of buildings, burials, land management, and with associated artefacts and ecofacts.	High
Late Saxon/Early-medieval-medieval	Soil formations, structural remains of buildings, burials, roads, land management, water management and industry, and with associated artefacts and ecofacts.	High
Post-medieval	Soil formations, structural remains of buildings, burials, roads, land management, water management and industry, and with associated artefacts and ecofacts.	Moderate
Industrial	Soil formations, structural remains of buildings, roads, land management, water management and industry, and with associated artefacts and ecofacts.	Low to Moderate
Modern	Soils, structural remains and standing buildings	None
Overall Archaeological value	Full sequence of human occupation within one of the premier historic cities of England. There is likely to be minimal amounts of formation truncation and the environmental preservation conditions will be excellent.	High to Very High

The potential value of the site is indicated by:

1. The major excavation programme at Lower Brook Street carried out in the 1960s-70s for the Winchester Excavations Committee. This occurred partially on the

- west side of the proposal site but the excavations did not remove all resources within the excavated areas.
2. More recent excavations in advance of the construction of 'The Brooks' retail centre, located immediately to the west of the proposal site, contributing significantly to the understanding of Roman and medieval occupation on the edge of the Itchen floodplain.
  3. The work of Derek Keene for the Winchester Excavations Committee in deciphering and analysing the unusually large collection of historic documents related to Mid Saxon – medieval occupation of Winchester.

## General Approach to the Archaeological Mitigation

### *General*

The key underlying principle of the archaeological mitigation strategy is the preservation *in situ* of significant archaeological remains (i.e. left in the ground and undisturbed). This approach is in line with national guidance on archaeology and planning as expressed in Planning Policy Guidance 16 (PPG16, DoE 1990), and ensures compliance with local plan policy.

The societal value of archaeological remains lies in the information that can be extracted from these remains as a result of detailed examination, and in the presentation of this information at both an academic and a 'popular' level. The guidance given in Paragraph 13 of PPG16 makes it clear that the presumption for the preservation *in situ* of significant archaeological remains is aimed at the retention of such deposits for potential future examination at a time when new scientific techniques are likely to be available. The rate of development in archaeological science over the last few decades makes it highly probable that further significant techniques and methodologies for the analysis of data will be accessible over the medium term. This aim of preservation *in situ* is therefore intrinsically linked to the concept of sustainability which underpins all aspects of the proposed development.

Work undertaken thus far has been aimed at the identification of the nature, location and significance of the archaeological resource base within the proposal site. This work has been desk-based, but additional work to be undertaken prior to determination of the planning application will include purposive intrusive fieldwork that will provide further information regarding the resource base. This will enable the further development of the mitigation strategy.

## Fundamental Design Principles

The presence of significant archaeological deposits extending across the whole of the proposal area has been taken into account throughout the development of the scheme proposals, and has led to the establishment of a number of fundamental principles:

1. *Reduce to an absolute minimum the requirement for extensive subsurface structures* – this is reflected in the almost total absence of basements in the proposed development. There is only one proposed basement area, and this represents the deepening of an existing sub-basement, construction of which will

have already resulted in the removal of a great part of the sequence of archaeological deposits in that area. The only other subsurface structures that may penetrate archaeological deposits will be lift sumps and services. The scheme design has attempted to keep lift sumps to a minimum, both in terms of number and depth, and also to keep service locations within roadways wherever possible.

2. *Use piled foundations rather than pad or strip footings* – for basic structural engineering requirements, all of the new buildings will need to be founded into solid ground and will therefore need to penetrate through the softer (archaeological) deposits in order to reach the chalk bedrock. Piled foundations will have far less impact than pad or strip footings.
3. *Minimise the amount of piling required* – this has been the subject of detailed discussions and documentary survey.
  - The initial approach was to investigate the possibility of reusing existing piles that are supporting the current structures on the site. This has been found to be unachievable for three main reasons: there are few details of the current piles both in terms of location and loading capacities; no warranties would be available for a structure based on reused piles as a result of the lack of information; and the probable current pile layouts are almost certainly unsuitable for the proposed structures. This latter point is critical in terms of protection of the archaeological resource as it would lead to the need for the insertion of substantial transfer beams that would need to be set below ground and therefore have a substantial impact on buried remains.
  - The next stage was to examine the possibility of boring out the existing piles and reusing the pile locations. Again, the lack of information regarding the foundations of the current buildings is critical; the pile layout would not be revealed until demolition has taken place, and, as with the strategy of reusing the current piles, there would almost certainly be a requirement for substantial transfer beams set below ground.
  - The agreed final approach to the development of a minimised piling strategy was to identify a form of overall structural design that is based on the principle of using fewer, larger piles supporting single columns rather than a greater number of smaller piles, or columns founded on several smaller piles. The concept of 'one column, one pile', is followed throughout the scheme proposal. The piles will be widely spaced, and any clustering will be limited to the 'cores' of the major new buildings. These 'cores' usually correspond with the location of lift sumps.
4. *Optimise the pile design and piling methodology* – following from the adoption of the 'one column, one pile' strategy there were further detailed discussions regarding the design of individual piles and the methodology that will be used in the piling programme. Following pile probing, all piles will be bored through the upper, softer levels and a steel liner will be inserted in this part of the deposit sequence. If any vibropiling is subsequently required in order to foot the pile

adequately in the solid chalk, the presence of the steel liner will ensure that there will be no vertical displacement of archaeological deposits outside the pile. Once the pile has been successfully constructed, the steel liner will be removed in order to remove any potential changes to the conductivity of the deposits.

Consideration was given to the idea of inserting another lining type in order to reduce the opportunities for transfer of chemicals (principally calcium precipitates) that may affect issues such as Redox potential or Ph in the deposits immediately adjacent to the pile (see *Instrumentation* below). However, those deposits are already calcium-rich as a result of their location within a chalk-based floodplain, and therefore rather than try to physically separate the pile from the deposits the geotechnical engineering team will instead optimise the concrete mix for the piles so that it will not affect the chemical make-up of the surrounding deposits.

One area where piling may vary from the principles described above is the perimeter wall required for the new basement in the proposed Block A. This may need to be constructed using a secant piled wall.

5. *Retention in situ of existing piles wherever possible* - although the current piles cannot be reused, inappropriate removal of these piles has the potential to further damage the archaeological deposits in the immediate vicinity of the pile. The development strategy will therefore be to retain the piles *in situ* wherever possible and simply cut the top off the pile at a level above the archaeological deposits. If piles do have to be removed in order for new piles (or other subsurface structures) to be inserted, then the methodology for the removal of the pile will be designed to minimise any potential impact on surrounding archaeological deposits.
6. *Maintain a constant review of the foundation design strategy as the scheme progresses* - much consideration has been given over the last fifteen or so years to the issue of introducing informed foundation designs into areas that contain significant archaeological deposits. Arup Geotechnics have been at the forefront of this, evidenced in the 1991 publication of the York Development and Archaeology Study, and subsequently in work presented at the Second Preserving Archaeological Remains In Situ (PARIS) Conference (Nixon 2004, particularly the papers by Richard Hughes *et al*). Arup Geotechnics forms a key part of the development team, and will work with the team's archaeological consultant to review and examine the foundation design for each proposed phase of the development. The strategy will continue to be based around the principles outlined above, i.e. fewer, larger piles, 'one column, one pile', bored piles rather than driven etc.

## Research Framework

The programme of archaeological mitigation will be undertaken within the context of an over-reaching archaeological research framework, to be agreed in advance with Winchester City Council. Some of the more important specific archaeological research objectives are defined below and many would be taken forward and added to in the agreed framework as work progresses on site:



1. Fixing the location of, and examining, former river channels and their past and present natural and man-made characteristics;
2. Providing data concerning the pre-settlement environment (prehistoric), based on an examination of soil formations and their ecological contents;
3. Examining evidence of land reclamation and treatment of water channels associated with the establishment of the early Roman town;
4. Locating and examining progressive phases of Roman occupation, and assessing these in relation to the results of previous archaeological excavation on and around the development site;
5. Examining evidence of post-Roman land use, when the general area appears to have been semi-derelict or totally abandoned. This would include recovery of 'Dark Earth' soils for laboratory analysis related to age, composition and likely causation;
6. Locating and examine progressive phases of mid-late Saxon, medieval and post-medieval occupation, and assessing these in relation to the results of previous archaeological excavations on and around the site, and historic documentation;
7. Understanding the ownership, arrangement of buildings and open spaces, and character of 'activities' within the complex medieval properties for which there are excellent documents;
8. Applying engineering skills to the examination of Roman to post-medieval structures, especially to foundation/wall construction and performance;
9. Locating evidence of Roman to post-medieval flooding and identifying evidence of how this has affected building technology in the vicinity;
10. Recovering modern artefacts in deep burial to establish their rate of degradation with time. Collection of data about interaction of modern construction materials with archaeological soils, for example resulting from chemical leaching-out of concrete. Examination of the impact of the construction of the present buildings at the site on the buried archaeological deposits.

### **Pre-determination fieldwork**

A programme of pre-determination fieldwork has been proposed, aimed at the provision of further information regarding the location and nature of significant archaeological remains.

This will take the form of a series of purposive exploratory boreholes that will penetrate through the archaeological deposits and retrieve appropriate samples of material. The aim of the borehole sampling is to provide adequate information regarding the vertical arrangement and likely date of deposits.

The Museum Service of WCC has previously produced a series of deposit-based contour models that seek to demonstrate the general topographic arrangement of the city at various times - Roman, Saxon, medieval etc. These are reproduced in the

Desk-based Assessment of Archaeological Potential, a document that formed a Technical Appendix to the Environmental Statement.

However, it is felt that if further information could be provided from within the development site, particularly the eastern part of the site, then the enhanced model would be a more reliable tool for the prediction of potential impacts. The enhanced model would also be beneficial to the local planning authority with regard to the consideration of future development proposals beyond the current site.

The proposed boreholes will be located in areas that are:

1. *Accessible at the pre-determination stage* - much of the development site will be acquired through Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO), some of which may need to be pursued through an inquiry process. Access for site survey work may not be possible on certain areas as it could be seen as presumptive in terms of the CPO process. In other areas access is prohibited by current land-use (buildings, roads, car parks, bus garage etc).
2. *Subject to impact by the proposed development* - areas that will not be impacted by the proposed development will not be examined unless there is good reason to do so. This is in line with the overall aim of preservation *in situ* of archaeological remains.

Information regarding issues such as the depth of modern made ground will be of use for the assessment of the potential impact of ground reduction (for flood protection) and services (depth of intrusion into archaeological deposits), and will therefore inform the required mitigation.

The boreholes will be undertaken using a methodology that will enable the retrieval of cores that can then be sampled and subsequently processed for artefact retrieval. The depth of the boreholes will be determined by the lithostratigraphy encountered, but will seek to determine the thickness of any peats or silts that underlie the archaeological deposits.

A methodology for the programme of archaeological boreholes (including proposed locations) will be prepared by the development team and submitted to WCC for approval. Following the completion of the borehole programme, the development team will produce an enhanced archaeological deposit model for the proposal site. This will then be made available in the form of a document submitted in support of the planning application for the development.

It is possible that the material recovered from the archaeological boreholes will be used by the development team for other purposes, specifically for contamination testing in pre-identified areas. A combined archaeology/contamination programme reduces the need for penetrative works and is therefore in line with the overall aim of preservation *in situ* of archaeological remains.

The location of the boreholes will be accurately recorded and marked on the ground. If further site investigation is subsequently required for geotechnical purposes then these locations could be reused - again this would be in line with the overall aim of preservation *in situ* of archaeological remains.

Following assessment of the results of the borehole investigation, consideration will be given to the issue of undertaking further pre-determination archaeological investigations. Such work would again be constrained by accessibility, and the following question would be key to the discussion:

*What further information could be gained at this stage that would inform on the determination of the planning application?*

One area of potential further pre-determination fieldwork is the existing route of the western arm of the Abbey Mills Stream. This is currently culverted within much of the development site, predominantly beneath the buildings and hard-standings of the bus garage. The development scheme requires that the channel is moved slightly to the east and deculverted over most of its length within the site. Whilst this will require the construction of a new channel route that will itself lead to some archaeological mitigation, it is the current route that may need to be examined at an earlier stage.

This watercourse has been present for a considerable time, certainly several centuries, albeit that it may have been moved more than once in that period. However, there remains the possibility that behind the current concrete channel sides, and at the base (currently covered by gravels), are wooden structures associated with the watercourse. These could be integral to the channel (e.g. linings, sluices) or represent adjacent industrial and domestic structures that utilised the water flow.

The loss of the flow from the current channel, and/or the removal of elements of the channel structure, could represent impacts on archaeological remains. The vicinity of the channel therefore should be assessed with regard to the production of an options report on the potential treatment of the existing channel, and this is likely to require some ground-based investigation.

### **Phased Approach**

The development will be undertaken in a number of self-contained phases of demolition and construction, allowing for the continuation of key services (bus garage, health centre etc). The programme of archaeological mitigation will therefore be a phased one, responding to the impacts of each particular part of the scheme. This allows the archaeological mitigation process to be an iterative one whereby each phase of mitigation is informed by the previous phase(s).

This Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy document should therefore be seen as a flexible and adaptive initial stance, and will be subject to appropriate revision throughout the development programme. If possible improvements to the mitigation strategy are identified these can be considered and introduced.

For each phase of the development, one or more detailed Written Schemes of Investigation (WSIs) will be produced that will identify the proposed mitigation for that particular phase, along with a justification of why that mitigation has been selected. This document will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval prior to the commencement of any work on site. The WSI will include

details of the methodology for any proposed investigation, including outreach, post-investigation analyses and reporting.

The mitigation may include purposive archaeological evaluation, limited foundation redesign, detailed archaeological excavation, and archaeological watching briefs on selected site activities. Whilst no phase has yet been examined in detail (the overall phasing of the development scheme has not yet been finalised) or any WSI produced, a broad-brush strategy can be identified:

#### *Evaluations*

For any phase of the proposed development, a programme of evaluation may be developed according to resource potential, development impact, location, accessibility and other factors. Evaluation may include non-intrusive techniques such as geophysical survey, and/or intrusive techniques such as trial trenches, test pits or boreholes. The purpose of any evaluation would be to provide information that can lead to the development of a more appropriate mitigation strategy for that phase.

#### *Detailed Excavations*

The principal impacts on significant archaeological remains will result from the excavation of the single basement and any lift pits, and from insertion of piles, especially at building 'cores'.

It is proposed that a detailed archaeological excavation should be undertaken at the proposed location of the basement for Building A. Part of this area is already a sub-basement beneath the multi-story Friarsgate car park, but will be deepened by up to 2m. Within the eastern part of the existing sub-basement some of the upper archaeological levels have previously been examined during the Lower Brook Street excavation programme during the early 1960s. A considerable part of the former full sequence of archaeological deposits here will have been removed by the construction of the sub-basement, but some of the lower part of the sequence and the deeper features may have survived. The new basement measures approximately 900m<sup>2</sup>, and the whole of this footprint will be archaeologically excavated to the base of the archaeological deposits or to the base of formation level for the new basement, whichever is higher. This area may also be suitable for the investigation of the effects of previous construction (the sub-basement) on archaeological deposits.

It is proposed that the areas of the building 'cores' should be subject to detailed archaeological excavation wherever possible. The full areas have not yet been identified, but the concentration of piles in these 'cores' meant that the overall localised impact of piling is increased beyond the designed scheme objective of larger, widely spaced piles.

It is proposed that pile probing should be undertaken as an archaeological evaluation process, with the pile probing methodology being designed to produce information regarding the nature of the archaeological deposits on each pile location. *Where significant deposits and/or features are identified, and it is considered that the impact of the pile may significantly affect the overall integrity of the deposit and/or feature, and it is not reasonably practicable to redesign the pile in such a way as to avoid or significantly reduce the impact, then the pile location and the surrounding area will be subject to detailed excavation to an extent to be agreed prior to commencement.*

Such deposits may include mosaic floors; these are important from an art history perspective as well as an archaeological one. The presence of mosaic floors is highly likely (one was recorded in 1934 during works within the bus garage, but the location cannot be further defined), and although such floors will have probably suffered impacts from subsequent site activities including 20<sup>th</sup> century piling, any further loss could be wholly damaging to the chances of being able to reconstruct parts already lost.

Human remains would also be seen as significant. The presence of burials in any part of the development site cannot be ruled out completely, although it is considered unlikely that large cemeteries will be located within the proposal site. Small Saxon cemeteries of a few individuals may be found however, as was the case with the excavations along the western side of Lower Brook Street immediately to the north of the site.

One location within the development site that has an enhanced potential for the presence of human remains is the former church of St George at the south-western corner of Silver Hill and Cross Keys Passage (currently beneath the Silverhill Pharmacy). There are documentary records of late 15<sup>th</sup> century date referring to an individual wishing to be buried in a chapel within this church, although this is clearly not a definitive record of internment. The sites of former medieval churches in Winchester may possibly be linked to the location of earlier small-scale cemeteries. The location of the former church of St George may be subject to detailed archaeological excavation depending on the potential impact of the foundation design for the new structure here and the degree of survival of the remains of the former church.

If human remains are encountered elsewhere within the pile probing programme, and it is not reasonably practicable to redesign the pile in such a way as to avoid or significantly reduce the impact, then the pile location and the surrounding area will be subject to detailed excavation to an extent to be agreed prior to commencement.

One area worthy of further note within the proposal site is the former location of the city's fulling mill situated adjacent to the western branch of the Abbey Mill stream. This was built in 1401-2 and a mill-pond was constructed adjacent to the mill in order to increase the available head of water. The mill was built just as the fulling industry peaked in output terms, and the history of the mill is therefore one of almost continuous decline. It appears to have gone out of use before the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Single phase mills of this period are rare and it is likely that this one was well-constructed. There are no records of later substantial buildings in this area and the site now lies beneath the buildings that are part of the bus garage - these buildings are likely to be shallow-founded. Following demolition of these buildings a programme of evaluation should be undertaken in order to allow a detailed mitigation strategy to be developed.

### **Instrumentation**

It has been suggested that it might be beneficial to insert some instrumentation into the site in order to examine the *in situ* preservation conditions and short and long term

changes to them. Any part of the mitigation strategy regarding the short-, medium- or long-term monitoring of changes to sub-surface conditions should be seen in the context of providing information to further the understanding of preservation *in situ* strategies at a local, regional and national level rather than relating to any requirement for additional site-specific measures to be implemented.

It is not considered appropriate for there to be any post-development liabilities placed upon the scheme promoter to amend the built form of the scheme following its completion and occupation. This would be impractical. The provision of instrumentation should be seen in the light of the request made by Davis *et al* (2005, Volume 2, page 8) for an increase in the number of case studies involving the post-construction monitoring of sites where preservation *in situ* archaeological mitigation strategies have been implemented.

Potential parameters that could be measured include soil moisture content, temperature, Redox potential, Ph, conductivity and chemistry. Scheme design, particularly foundation design, has focused on reducing or avoiding any impacts that may produce changes in the parameters outlined above, and is therefore in line with the principle of preservation *in situ* of the deposits within the development site. However, the wider benefits of deposit monitoring are accepted and the design team is fully committed to exploring this issue further in consultation with WCC, English Heritage and other interested parties. Agreement has been reached with English Heritage to enter into further discussions once the scheme has received planning consent.

### Outreach

A key element of the archaeological mitigation strategy will be the development and implementation of a detailed outreach programme designed to engage all sectors of the local population. The residents of Winchester and the general vicinity have shown a clear interest in the past of this historic city, and recent archaeological work elsewhere within the former walled town has been closely followed.

The outreach programme will be drawn up by the development team with the input and agreement of WCC, and will be implemented by the development team and the archaeological contractor. Demonstrable experience and resourcing of the outreach programme will be a significant factor in the appointment of the archaeological contractor. Information regarding the progress and results of the on- and off-site archaeological works will be transmitted promptly through appropriate media.

Potential outreach opportunities so far identified include:

- Public viewing galleries to be installed wherever possible when detailed area excavations are being undertaken. The viewing galleries would incorporate signage encompassing textual commentary with appropriate graphic and photographic aids to interpretation, and possibly digital displays;
- Guided tours of detailed excavations for pre-arranged groups, including weekend access. Potentially interested groups would be identified and contacted in advance, and would include local societies, schools, colleges

and youth organisations including the local branch of the Young Archaeologists Club;

- Advance liaison with local schools (primary and secondary) to establish potential links with National Curriculum activities. The development site has the potential to provide information that relates directly to certain parts of the National Curriculum (Romans, Saxons etc). Children even at a pre-school stage have an interest in archaeology, engendered to a great extent by the increased exposure of this subject on television;
- Advance liaison with tertiary educational establishments and groups. This would include not just the major local colleges (Winchester College, Peter Symonds etc) and the archaeology department at University College, Winchester, but also adult education establishments such as the Workers' Education Association and the University of the Third Age;
- Press statements for all media types. This will ensure the rapid dissemination of appropriate information to a wider audience, and will raise the profile of the archaeological heritage of Winchester and also of the opportunities provided by this development;
- Dedicated website to be hosted by the development team or by the archaeological contractor, with direct links from the WCC and other appropriate website. The internet has become the primary information source for a great part of society, and will in particular enable the information to be made available at an international scale;
- Display of information relating to discoveries (including artefacts) to be placed at suitable locations. Recently similar displays regarding current archaeological investigations in Winchester have been shown at the Guildhall and the Museum, but other appropriate venues would also be considered;
- Public participation in some site-based activities. This feasibility of public participation will be examined as each stage of the programme of archaeological mitigation is designed and agreed. Any element of public participation needs to consider issues such as access, health and safety, and the overall progress of the development programme;
- Permanent information sources to be placed within the new development. There are various options regarding the permanent display of information, and issues such as location, appearance, management and maintenance would all need to be assessed. Examples of permanent displays at other locations will be examined.

### **Publication**

The prompt publication of the results of the programme of archaeological mitigation is seen as integral to the mitigation programme itself, and the budget allocated to

archaeological mitigation includes a substantial sum for analysis and publication. A timetable for publication will form part of the contract for archaeological works and will be rigidly monitored by the development team.

The process leading to publication will be the established 'best practice' route identified in Management of Archaeological Projects Version 2 (MAP2, English Heritage 1991). Fieldwork will be followed by the production of an assessment report that summarises the results of the fieldwork, quantifies and qualifies the data recovered from the site, and proposes a programme of appropriate further analyses leading to the production of a detailed publication in a suitable format. This proposal will be discussed with, and agreed by, the archaeological advisors to Winchester City Council.

The selection process leading to the appointment of an archaeological contractor will include particular focus on the demonstrable track record of prompt and suitable publication. This will include the opportunity for the potential contractors to show commitment and innovation with regard to the identification of suitable publication formats. It is appropriate to seek to provide publication of results in a more populist and accessible format in addition to the detailed academic discourse that is traditionally produced.



**Appendix 1 - Written Sources examined during the development of this strategy**

- Ashurst, J, Balaam, N and Foley, K 1989 'The Rose Theatre: overcoming the technical preservation problems', *Conservation Bulletin* 9, 9-10
- Barber, B 2002 'Saving the Globe?: part 2: The preservation of the monument', *London Archaeologist* 9 (12), 323-9
- Biddle, M 1989 'The Rose reviewed: a comedy (?) of errors', *Antiquity* 63, 753-60
- Biddle, M 1994 *What future for British archaeology*, Oxford, Oxbow Lecture 1
- Biddle, M 2005a *Winchester and after*, opening address at ABC 2005, the annual conference of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (summary @ <http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/inPages/docs/conference/Biddle.doc>)
- Biddle, M 2005b Discussant, in *Current Archaeology* 200, 442-3
- Corfield, M, Hinton, P, Nixon, T, and Pollard, M (eds) 1998 *Preserving archaeological remains in situ: Proceedings of the 1<sup>st</sup> (PARIS) conference 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> April 1996*, London, Museum of London Archaeology Service
- Darvill, T and Gerrard, C 1994 *Cirencester: town and landscape: an urban archaeological assessment*, Cotswold Archaeological Trust, Cirencester
- Davis, M J, Gdaniec, K L A, Brice, M and White, L 2004 *Mitigation of Construction Impacts on Archaeological Remains*, English Heritage
- DoE 1990, *Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning*
- English Heritage, *Piling and Archaeology: Guidance Notes*, 2<sup>nd</sup> draft, August 2005
- McGill, G 1995 *Building on the past: a guide to the archaeology and development process*, London
- Miller, P 1994 'Dig or pile?', *Planning Week* 2 (43), viii-ix
- Nixon, T (ed.) 2004, *Preserving archaeological remains in situ? Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> (PARIS) conference 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> September 2001*, London, Museum of London Archaeology Service
- O'Sullivan, H 1996 '82-90 Park lane, Croydon: a planning case-study', *London Archaeologist* 7 (16), 424-31
- Ove Arup & Partners, 1991 *York Development and Archaeology Study*, York City Council and English Heritage
- Oxley, J 1993 'Everything (??) you wanted to know about mitigation strategies but were too afraid to ask...' *The Field Archaeologist* 19, 383

Reynolds, P 1996 'Pile system cuts heritage costs', *Contract Journal* 344, 21

Rowsome, P 1996 'The Billingsgate Roman house and bath: conservation and assessment', *London Archaeologist* 7 (16), 415-23

Wainwright, G J 1989 'Saving the Rose', *Antiquity* 63, 430-5

Wainwright, G J 1989 'Archaeology in towns', *Conservation Bulletin* 9, 1-2

Welch, M 1997 'The Anglo-Saxon cemetery at 82-90 Park Lane, Croydon, Surrey: excavation or preservation?' *London Archaeologist* 8 (4), 94-7