

***ASSOCIATION OF  
DIOCESAN AND CATHEDRAL  
ARCHAEOLOGISTS***

*Guidance Note 1*

**Archaeological  
requirements  
for works affecting  
cathedrals, churches,  
precincts and churchyards**

ADCA 2004 (*revised 2013*)

**ADCA disbanded in 2013, transferring its assets  
to the Society for Church Archaeology,  
whose web-site is at  
<http://www.archaeologyuk.org/socchurcharchaeol/>**

# Contents

Preface	4
Introduction	5
The archaeology of churches and churchyards	5
The role of archaeological investigation in project processes	6
Standards for archaeological briefs and specifications	7
Pre-consent investigation for project preparation	8
Post-consent investigation for decision-making	9
Opportunities for investigation and recording	10
Post-consent investigation recording in mitigation of impact	10
Post-investigation assessment, report preparation and archiving	10
Archaeological skills and contractors	11
Appendix 1 – Archaeological requirements for types of works	13
A    Repairs	13
B    Services, mechanical and electrical; drainage	15
C    Churchyard	17
D    Development	17
E    Human Remains	19
Appendix 2 - Guidance to Diocesan Chancellors from the Court of Arches	21
Appendix 3 – Further Reading	21

## **Preface**

*This guidance promotes a consistent approach to the main types of works upon which advice is given by Diocesan Archaeological Advisers to Diocesan Advisory Committees (DACs) and by Cathedral Archaeologists to Cathedral Chapters and Fabric Advisory Committees (FACs). It stands between shorter guidance notes on the ChurchCare website prepared by the Cathedrals and Church Buildings Division of the Church of England and longer more specific papers on matters such as pews and human remains prepared by others.*

*It aims to clarify best practice without introducing any new requirements. It seeks to support the regulatory authorities by indicating what information and action is expected from parishes and cathedrals while they devise and commission works.*

*This guidance was prepared and updated by David Baker, informed by membership of St Albans DAC, Rochester FAC and CFCE but not writing in those capacities. The original version published by the former Association of Diocesan and Cathedral Archaeologists (ADCA) drew upon notes for parish churches prepared by Kate Clark for English Heritage in the late 1990s and documents produced for the dioceses of Peterborough and Bristol. This revision, prepared in the last year of ADCA's existence, reflects continuing experience, new frameworks and other guidance post-dating 2004, together with helpful comments from Carol Pyrah.*

*The original version benefited from consultation with English Heritage, the Institute for Archaeologists, the Institute of Historic Building Conservation, the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers, the Cathedrals and Church Buildings Division of the Church of England, the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England, the Ecclesiastical Architects and Surveyors Association, the Cathedral Architects Association, the Society for Church Archaeology, and several interested individuals. This consultation has not been repeated due to the demise of ADCA and the relatively minor nature of the changes, covering matters mostly well-known in conservation circles.*

# Archaeological requirements for works on churches and churchyards

## Introduction

1 Our parish churches and cathedrals are witnesses to centuries of worship, architectural skill and community history. They carry a range of significances for users, visitors and the wider population. Proposals for conserving and developing this richly varied inheritance can range widely in scale and scope, according to the needs and character of each place. Proposals with archaeological implications can be grouped into general categories, providing similar opportunities for research that increases knowledge about the building and site, and requiring similar approaches to the mitigation of potential impacts upon what is affected. This document describes the overall approach and offers a framework for identifying what each category of works may involve.

2 This guidance stands behind advice given by Diocesan Archaeological Advisers (DAA) and Cathedral Archaeologists (CA) in England and Wales on proposals for works and in the briefing material they issue for investigation and recording, either to obtain information for submission with formal applications or as a condition of permission for the works themselves. It has been commended to diocesan and cathedral authorities in support of their responsibilities and policies for church archaeology. It is also procedural guidance for parishes and chapters commissioning works, and can help their professional advisers and contractors manage projects by clarifying programming and costs.

3 The main body of the document outlines the role of archaeological investigation in conserving and altering historic ecclesiastical buildings. The term ‘church’ is used generically for parish church and cathedral, while noting that the greater churches are mostly larger and more complex than the smaller cathedrals. The term ‘churchyard’ is used generically for churchyard and precinct, while recognising that both can include other elements in addition to a burial ground; indeed, cathedral precincts are often large and complex historic entities for which it is difficult to predict all potential archaeological circumstances in a summary guidance document. **Appendix 1** deals in more detail with various classes of works. **Appendix 2** contains the Guidance issued by the

Court of Arches for Diocesan Chancellors in January 2013, embodying the concepts of ‘harm’ and ‘benefit’, whose assessment usually requires an archaeological understanding in the broadest sense of what is affected by a proposal. Publications cited in **Appendix 3** cover general approaches, standards, procedures and technical practices.

4 Policies for resolving tensions between ecclesiastical uses and conservation interests are outside the scope of this document. It starts from the position that the appropriate archaeological investigation at the right time is part of the solution, not the problem; work done at an early stage in the preparation of a project can positively inform proposals. It assumes secular planning processes and the exempt ecclesiastical systems will adopt similar approaches to conflict resolution, exploring alternative approaches, and striving to balance the potential benefits of a proposal and any unavoidable harm its execution might cause. In relatively rare cases of irresolvable conflict between preserving properly evaluated buried archaeological deposits and clear use-related benefits for above-ground historic structures, the improved integration of archaeological aspects into the exempt controls exercised by the Church of England can now ensure appropriate investigation and recording.

## The archaeology of churches and churchyards

5 Archaeology is the study of past human activity, achieved through research into its surviving physical evidence, records of evidence that no longer exists and other historical documentation. In managing and conserving heritage assets generally, an archaeological approach ensures that an appropriate and proportionate level of understanding informs decision-making, and that a similar level of analytical investigation and recording accompanies the work itself, whether below or above ground. Scope for collaboration with colleague disciplines and other skills exists in archaeological dimensions to the study of architecture, art-history, landscape, flora, fauna and human beings themselves. These can be applied to five main aspects of churches:

- (a) **existing buildings** and associated structures – ‘buildings archaeology’ or buildings analysis, including the archaeological dimension of spatial qualities and architectural design
- (b) **ruins and sites** of former churches or parts of them now superseded, together with all other below-ground archaeological evidence for associated, preceding and subsequent human activities on or near the site
- (c) **contents** of buildings, including fixtures and fittings, tombs, monuments, burials and movable items of value, for their intrinsic aesthetic and cultural significance and associations with a place
- (d) the **churchyard** or **precinct**, its separate buildings, graves, monuments, surfaces, walls and boundaries, as evidence for the development of the site, past burial practices, as funerary art, for local and natural history and human biological history interest;
- (e) the **setting and context** of church and churchyard, visually as part of landscape or townscape, and historically in terms of settlement plan and the wider settlement pattern, for what these can tell about continuity of religious use in places, and how the church and its activities have related to the community down the ages.

6 The primary purpose of archaeological investigation is to increase knowledge and understanding, through investigation and research, thereby contributing to repairs, academic studies, formal education and personal or community interest. English Heritage’s ‘Conservation Principles’ (2009) cites four main sets of values attached to a place or historic asset. The strongest contribution of archaeology is to *evidential* value, the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity. It also underpins *historical* value, the ways - usually illustrative or associative - in which a place can connect past people, events and aspects of life with the present. It often underlies *aesthetic* value, the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place and its spatial qualities, and *communal* value, the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

7 Archaeological investigation ought to take place within a regularly reviewed framework for justifying and facilitating research, incorporating an understanding of the significance of the church or cathedral and churchyard or precinct in question. The regional research frameworks that have developed in the last decade should provide a context for work at diocesan level, and each cathedral should consider developing its own individual research strategy. Individual churches and cathedrals should have Statements of Significance, Conservation Statements or Conservation Management Plans that incorporate a research strategy.

### **The role of archaeological investigation in project processes**

8 Investigation and recording follows from the recognition that heritage assets with archaeological interest are an irreplaceable resource requiring conservation in a manner appropriate to their significance, for the public benefit of present and future generations. This recognition is a crucial factor in the often complex process of designing and planning works, when archaeological investigation and recording at an early stage can positively inform the scope for change and assist in the design process. It can identify potentially damaging impacts in order to explore the scope for averting them by redesign or by achieving the objective in a different way or at an alternative location. The impossibility of alternative and unavoidable impacts must be convincingly demonstrated rather than merely asserted.

9 Archaeological investigation and recording may have an important role to play at four main stages of preparing and implementing a scheme, whether covered by the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991 (CCEJM) / the Care of Cathedrals Measure 2011 (CCM) or secular planning controls, or by both systems. These stages reflect the expectations of the DAA / CA about the sufficiency of content in formal applications, and the advice they may give about placing conditions upon consents, liaising with the local planning authority in appropriate cases.

10 Archaeological investigation can contribute to the **preparation of a proposal**, before formal consents are sought, especially over understanding and evaluating the significance of a heritage asset. Pre-application discussions leading to pre-consent assessments or evaluations can positively aid and

inform design options, as well as identify archaeological issues (together with the means and likely costs of resolving them).

11 Project preparation may identify a need for **post-consent analytical investigation and recording as part of the consented works**, usually required as a condition. Its purpose is to obtain hitherto inaccessible information for making detailed decisions about the extent of repair and the techniques to be used, or the final design of alterations. Post-opening-up recording should be fully integrated into the works programme, as part of routine project teamwork.

12 Repair or construction work in progress may create **defined opportunities to investigate and record temporarily exposed fabric**, adding to the record of the building. These should be proportionate, justified by their potential to facilitate future maintenance and diagnosis of structural problems, and improve understanding of its history. Ensuring time and resources for 'opportunity' work requires intelligent anticipation and forward planning.

13 As a last resort, archaeological work may be needed **to record important fabric or deposits before unavoidable destruction** (or before it is permanently concealed by the proposed works), thereby mitigating the loss by replacing the surviving evidence with information from properly designed investigations. If it is physically impossible for this investigative recording to be done before the main contractor takes over the site, it must be programmed with sufficient time into the actual project itself.

14 Any intrusive investigative archaeological work will require a formal consent under the CCEJM or the CCM, either by itself or as part of a larger project. Separate Scheduled Monument Consent may also be required in some cases. In order to commend proposals for pre-consent evaluation fieldwork, the DAA / CA should approve a detailed specification of work to be done by an individual or organisation of proven relevant experience and competence. Post-consent work is likely to be secured by a version of the standard condition used in the secular planning system: 'No works shall take place until the petitioner has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the DAC / CFCE / FAC'.

15 Dealing properly with archaeological aspects, as with any other aspect of a project, requires awareness on the part of architects and parishes / chapters of what needs to be done at what stage. If these matters are excluded from initial consultations and design options, there will be a risk of delays and extra costs involved in redesign arising from archaeological comments at the stage of formal advisory consideration. Policies adopted by DACs and Chapters can ensure that all schemes do incorporate all necessary proposals for mitigating archaeological impacts. No scheme should ever be approved on the illogical basis that the archaeological mitigation needed to inform the decision can be worked out after that decision has been made.

16 Fears of unexpected discoveries are frequently voiced, but experience shows they can be exaggerated. Archaeology's 'unknown' factor is best managed by early consultation to clarify what types of work may be needed at what stage of a project, using guidance such as this document. Most problems that do arise are caused by a combination of not understanding the relevance of archaeology, failing to treat it as an integral part of the task, and wrongly assuming that any destruction is acceptable as long as a record is made beforehand.

### **Standards for archaeological briefs and specifications**

17 Like other kinds of works, archaeological investigation of churches and churchyards must be properly specified so that there is clarity about what is to be done for what reasons and at what costs, and so that the works can be monitored for compliance with stated requirements. This is the mark of a professional approach, whoever does the work, whether full-time archaeological contractors or voluntary organisations of proven competence in church archaeology.

18 On work of any complexity the DAA / CA will have issued or approved a Brief, and agreed a Project Design (PD) and / or Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) prepared by the archaeological organisation doing the work. This should be submitted in support of the application to carry out the main scheme of work, or, in some cases, the preliminary evaluation (see below). The documentation must demonstrate an appropriate level of understanding about the particular church or churchyard, how archaeological requirements

relate to the work in hand, what questions the archaeological work is intended to answer, and what particular methods need to be employed. Whilst a Brief will always be required, on relatively simple tasks a full PD / WSI may not be needed, providing there is a written understanding of what has to be done for what reasons, sufficient to provide certainty and control.

19 In cases requiring both planning permission and a faculty or approval under the CCEJM / CCM, there should be careful liaison with the local authority archaeologist over issue of the Brief and approval of the PD / WSI. The same applies in cases where Scheduled Monument Consent is also required. Preliminary meetings should involve all interested parties in order to progress the development of a project efficiently and avoid going over the same ground twice; a strategy of trying to 'pick off' consultees one by one almost always complicates and protracts matters. Where possible and practicable those responsible for secular and ecclesiastical controls over archaeological matters should seek to coordinate and simplify their requirements for the applicant so that only one set of documentation has to be provided.

20 The Institute for Archaeologists has published *Standards and guidance* covering desk-based assessment, field evaluation, excavation, the investigation and recording of standing buildings, watching briefs and archaeological finds work. Its *Code of conduct* also includes obligations to safeguard the archaeological resource from adverse impacts. The *Standards* and *Code* are overarching statements about principles and generally applicable considerations and requirements, but are not intended to define programmes of works for individual churches and churchyards. They provide a framework with which all archaeological work should comply: competent archaeological contractors will supplement them to reflect particular works and what they may affect.

### **Pre-consent investigation for project preparation**

21 Planning a project for repair, alteration or construction initially involves identifying requirements for a wide range of information before a proposal can be properly defined. Archaeological information is one such class, and should be collected with other classes at the outset so that it can inform the design of the project, rather than be

left until a project is otherwise clarified. Mitigation of impacts on significant archaeological evidence can then run with the flow of project development rather than risk becoming a disruption to that flow through not having been considered at the appropriate time. Three stages might be identified:

- investigating to collect information that will help understand significance and inform proposals that can mitigate adverse impacts through design
- defining research aims for work mitigating unavoidable adverse impacts through investigation and recording
- implementing investigation and recording before and / or during works as appropriate.

22 The first of these stages follows a generally applicable sequence of actions for identifying and dealing with the archaeological implications of proposals for works. Whilst it may involve some traditional archaeological excavation, it is as likely to require other investigative techniques such as building analysis, dendro-chronology, mortar or paint analysis: whatever is done will seek to answer targeted questions. An iterative and technically integrated process should be followed until a view can be formed about a proposal, that either

- (a) it is acceptable without modification, or
- (b) it requires amendments or the incorporation of adequate archaeological requirements to make it acceptable, or
- (c) it is so potentially damaging that it should not be pursued further.

23 The first action is *appraisal*, a rapid check for the possibility of significant archaeological implications, and, if any are identified, whether further work will be needed to define them properly. It requires clearly expressed proposals thought through to a consistent level of development and a good general understanding of what is already known about the church supported by a Statement of Significance.

24 Identified potential archaeological implications should then be clarified by means of a *desk-based assessment*. This is a thorough review of what is already known about the church and its archaeology. It draws upon all relevant readily available information but does not carry out any new research, either by fieldwork or in documentary sources. It concentrates upon the parts affected by the proposals and seeks to put them into an appropriate context, whether the



whole church building, the wider churchyard / precinct or the associated historic settlement. It relates the potential impacts of the proposal and opportunities for investigation and recording arising to existing research frameworks, whether generic or site-specific. The scope of the assessment should be agreed with the DAA / CA and may need to be defined in an issued or approved Brief. If it answers all outstanding questions, the report or an agreed summary should be included with the application.

25 If the completed assessment identifies important unanswered questions relevant to the proposed works, it becomes necessary to move on to the third action, **field evaluation**. This is a carefully specified and limited investigation aiming to produce new information, through some or all of documentary research, archaeological analysis of upstanding fabric, or trial excavations. The work will be defined by a brief that the DAA / CA has either issued or approved. It should provide information on how to mitigate impacts upon sensitive evidence, whether by redesign or recording in advance of destruction. The report or an agreed summary should be included with the application. In some cases where archaeological evidence is located by field evaluation but ultimately not regarded as an overriding constraint providing it is investigated and recorded in advance of destruction, further field evaluation may be necessary in order to define an effective project and secure estimates of cost.

26 There are safeguards for preventing this process from becoming over-formulaic or demanding more work than is actually necessary. It should always go through the sequence only as far as the case requires. Practically, the first two stages can sometimes be combined. Relatively few cases get to the third stage of evaluation, and that rarely involves extensive work. Each piece of work should always aim to answer questions focused on and defined jointly by the task in hand and the significance of what is affected. The report on the work will be a useful work of reference for the understanding and future management of the building and should be stored accessibly locally, preferably in a maintained information system covering church and churchyard / precinct.

27 The process should consider potential impacts not just upon the parts of the building directly affected by the proposal, but also indirectly upon the significance of the wider totality together with its setting and context. Depending upon the amount

of basic information already available about the church, this may involve some extra analytical recording or information-gathering, but it needs to be carefully controlled. An example might be a proposal to extend a much-altered compartment of a medieval church. The significance of what exists has to be established by detailed investigation to identify original and subsequent phases of work; that may require analytical recording to create and interpret new detailed drawings. Yet a rapid general expert review of the whole building and its context may be sufficient for understanding the place of the compartment in the sequence of development and the impact of the proposal on the whole church. If the works affect only one compartment, the costs of a new comprehensive and detailed survey for the whole building, however desirable, would have to be justified as a separate research project. Parishes should not be expected to pay for a detailed architectural history of the church or an archaeological assessment of the settlement or area within which the church stands unless such exercises are essential to inform the proposals in hand, though parishes without such information and able to afford it are encouraged to acquire it.

### **Post-consent investigation for decision-making**

28 The need for analytical investigation and recording after works have begun, in order to inform the detailed design of repairs, should have been identified through **assessment** or **evaluation**. This type of work is relatively rare in parish churches, and tends to be associated with large or specialised projects. It applies only to situations where it is physically impossible (rather than merely inconvenient) to obtain this information before making a formal application. An agreed brief should define the broad scope of work together with the formats and standards of recording. Archaeologists should form part of the team on site, feeding their results directly into the decision-making process managed by the project architect. The circumstances most frequently encountered are:

- (a) analytical recording of fabric inaccessible until scaffolding has been erected
- (b) analytical recording of fabric revealed after surfaces have been removed by initial opening-up works

- (c) excavation and recording of deposits and foundations under floors within buildings or externally against walls in order to help determine the reasons for above-ground structural faults and devise appropriate repairs.

### **Opportunities for investigation and recording**

29 Project preparation should have identified the scope for 'opportunity' recording. Common examples are the temporary uncovering of stonework, such as walling in the course of re-plastering, or foundations while creating or repairing a 'French' drain. Renewing a plastered ceiling can give an opportunity to record roof structures. Preparing for redecoration may identify wall-paintings that have to be taken into account, or if too fragmentary for preservation, need proper recording: these are matters for specialists.

### **Post-consent investigation and recording in mitigation of impact**

30 Needs for post-consent recording in advance of agreed destruction should be identified by pre-consent investigations. Enough information should have been gathered to prepare a brief that outlines questions and describes methods and standards of recording in sufficient detail for prices to be obtained; contingency sums may be appropriate. Normally, archaeological contractors respond to a brief with a Project Design and / or Written Scheme of Investigation indicating their methodology and response to the questions posed by the work. In the case of small-scale works and where there is already a good working relationship between a DAA / CA and a local archaeological contractor validated by a record of satisfactory work, costs may be reduced by requiring adherence to standard clauses in the brief rather than by responding with a full WSI. **Appendix 1** gives examples of frequently encountered types of works and some appropriate archaeological responses.

31 There is a widespread misconception that most archaeological needs can be met by a 'watching brief'. What should more accurately be called 'precautionary archaeological attendance' is appropriate only in cases where preliminary assessment has shown a relatively low level of archaeological sensitivity, and where the likely impact of works is intrinsically difficult to evaluate, such as shallow linear trenches across churchyards.

Too often, a 'watching brief' on works in progress is used as an inappropriate substitute for proper archaeological evaluation before approval is obtained. Unexpected discoveries then create strong pressures to restrict essential archaeological responses to what can be contained within fixed budgets and programmes that failed to envisage the need.

### **Post-investigation assessment, report preparation and archiving**

32 Briefs issued by DAAs and CAs and schemes of work approved by them will include provision for dealing with the results of fieldwork investigation and recording. Post-excavation work is an integral part of all projects, including pre-application evaluations, and should never be treated as an optional supplement. General standards and procedures issued by English Heritage and the Institute for Archaeologists (**Appendix 3**) cover the requirements. At the completion of fieldwork, the results are assessed, and an ordered archive of site records and finds is created for deposit in properly curated conditions, normally in the local registered museum. In larger and more complex projects, a draft research design for bringing out the significance of the results is agreed. A technical / academic report is prepared, describing the results and putting them adequately into context. It is distributed to the principal parties (usually at least the parish / cathedral, the architect, the DAA / CA, and the District Council if planning permission was also involved) and main depositories such as the local Historic Environment Record. Where results are of public interest it is good practice to produce more accessible popular versions on paper or website. Whilst free access to archaeological and historical information should always be encouraged, copyright in archaeological records should be retained by the Dean and Chapter or Parochial Church Council as appropriate.

33 Issues can arise over the proper curation of finds (other than human remains) made in the course of excavation projects. Such finds are the property of the parish / cathedral and cannot be given to the local registered museum without appropriate permissions. Yet most museums are unwilling to accept material as a loan. In order to deal with this difficulty, the archaeological contractor and the DAA / CA must first agree on the significance of what has been found. If, as is often the case, the material does not merit permanent curation, it can stay with the parish /

cathedral for retention or controlled disposal. If it does merit permanent curation or display, and the parish / cathedral can provide facilities to standards accepted by the local museum, then it should stay with the parish / cathedral; the museum and HER records would be annotated to that effect. If however the parish / cathedral does not wish to retain the material or is unable to curate it to acceptable standards, then the DAA / CA can arrange for a legal instrument prepared by the CCB which provides for the transfer of the material to the registered museum with reversion to the parish / cathedral in the hopefully unlikely event of the registered museum ceasing to exist.

34 It is always difficult to make financial provision for post-excavation work before the actual recording of site and / or building has taken place, and costs will vary according to the type of investigation involved. An experienced archaeologist will be able to offer a broad provisional estimate for incorporation into the project budget and review at the end of fieldwork. Those seeking an archaeological contractor through competitive tendering should be wary of unrealistically low bids which take risks with the amount of post-excavation that may be required to complete the task to professional standards. As a guideline, a 'normal' project, without unusual quantities of human remains or other specialised finds, would need 50% of the budget for excavation, 15% for post-excavation assessment and 35% for preparing the final report and appropriate publication. The DAA / CA will be able to advise whether proper provision has been made, appropriate to satisfy the scheme of work required as a condition on the consent for the works.

35 Archiving project records raises the issue of maintained information systems documenting past episodes of works and historical evidence. Such systems, like the Historic Environment Records maintained by local authorities, are intended to be comprehensive repositories that can be used for projects of conservation and development, research, interpretation and education. They should be the starting point for any such project, and the results of any work that generates new information should automatically be deposited in them. The process of assessing the archaeological implications of new projects will be greatly simplified for a diocese or cathedral that has access to a managed and retrievable information system recognised as comprehensively documenting past works and historical data.

## **Archaeological skills and contractors**

36 The DAA / CA is expected to operate on similar lines to the archaeological planning officer (the 'curator') in the secular system, issuing or approving briefs and agreeing project designs. This includes monitoring the quality of archaeological recording work, and liaising with church officers who have responsibility for ensuring that approved works are properly carried out. There is an issue about the extent to which it is possible for voluntary DAAs to monitor large projects entirely within the exempt jurisdiction and therefore without the parallel involvement of an employed local authority archaeologist.

37 The DAA / CA is able to suggest archaeologists known to have proved their experience and competence in church archaeology, but legal guidance from the Institute for Archaeologists advises against maintaining officially approved local lists. The various aspects of church archaeology involve different types of skills, especially for below-ground excavation and above-ground buildings analysis. It should not be assumed that any particular archaeologist or archaeological organisation has the skills required for the task just because they say they can do this type of work; such assertions should always be verified by reference to the results of previous projects undertaken by the same personnel. Competent archaeological contractors should be selected primarily for the skills and experience of named staff and their knowledge of local conditions. The Institute for Archaeologists publishes a list of its members and of organisations registered with it, all of whom have signed up to a Code of Conduct regulating archaeological work.

38 There can be advantages in organisational continuity of work on a cathedral or in a diocese. For a cathedral there can be the benefit of one organisation being able to participate more meaningfully in research dialogues by building up knowledge through a series of projects. For a diocese there can be the benefit of agreed responses to some of the more common types of work, reducing the regulatory burden on the usually voluntary diocesan archaeological consultant. Such arrangements must however always be for the benefit of the work to be undertaken and kept under review so that the client parish church or cathedral retains access to best value both archaeologically and financially, duly avoiding restriction of trade.

39 Exceptionally, a local archaeological society may have the skills and experience to undertake small-scale work, but the DAA / CA will need to be assured of the suitability of both society and task before any commitments are made. It is the quality of work that counts: however tempting to the client, it is irrelevant that it might be cheap or free. Indeed, parishes / cathedrals and their architects / surveyors are reminded that contractual arrangements with professionals give much greater control over the quality and progress of works in complicated programming arrangements. In this context, the overall responsibility of the architect / surveyor should be made clear to all those who carry out archaeological work. This also applies to arrangements about publicity arising from work that is sensitive for reasons of security or involving human remains.

40 Appointed architects or surveyors are not expected to carry out or directly supervise archaeological work themselves unless they personally have the appropriate training and experience (nor indeed should archaeologists stray beyond their professional competences). This applies particularly to above-ground analysis and recording of fabric which should only be undertaken by conservation architects or surveyors who have received specific training and developed their skills through experience. There are major differences in purpose and method between the drawings done to manage schemes generally and the detailed accurate work needed to analyse and interpret historic fabric. The work that should be done or managed by a DAA or CA ought to be defined in a role description; examples are available from CCB.

41 General contractors may carry out some aspects of work with low-risk archaeological implications and clearly understood arrangements for contacting the DAA / CA or a previously arranged nominated archaeologist, within the context of arrangements for 'precautionary archaeological attendance' (above, paragraph 31). This assumes a thorough advance briefing and secure arrangements for archaeological inspection of work in progress.

42 The cost of archaeological work is sometimes perceived as an issue by parishes and cathedrals, especially if the need for it has been identified unhelpfully late in the development of a project, despite DAC / FAC policies that see it as an integral part of the process. It can be useful for DAAs / CAs to incorporate in their briefs for tenders a reminder that required work is usually not part of a commercial enterprise and is often reliant upon grants and local fund-raising. It may also be helpful to ask archaeological contractors to account for their expenditure by including a log of site attendance and other time spent on post-excavation work as an Appendix to their report.

43 Health and Safety precautions form an integral part of all archaeological work, whether by DAAs / CAs in advising on proposals or by organisations carrying out work arising from advice given. With regard to site inspections and monitoring work on site, DAAs / CAs should ensure that they are aware of, and conform with, relevant Health and Safety legislation. They should also ensure that all issued Briefs and approved Project Designs or specifications contain appropriate references to safe working practices.

## Appendix 1: Archaeological requirements for types of works

This Appendix is ordered by the types of works that most frequently arise, in order to indicate the kinds of impact that may arise, and the kind of information the DAA / CA will expect to be provided about them. This necessarily focused and sometimes mechanistic approach must not lose sight of the larger picture. All archaeological work should be a response to a question whose answer can add to understanding of the significance of the site and / or building, and contribute to the effective management of change in the future. These questions will range from the large ones about constructional sequences to more opportunistic ones ensuring that the evidential value of fabric is fully explored and recorded. Wider contexts are provided in several general books on church archaeology, most recently Rodwell (2012).

Specialist conservation work on fixtures and fittings such as wall paintings, glass, pews, bells, organs etc. is outside the scope of these notes, so only passing references are made. It covers matters of interest to archaeologists, architects and specialist conservators, mainly from the viewpoint of archaeological assessment and recording as part of the overall conservation process. Each individual case will have its own characteristics and needs, and the approach outlined below is general, to be adapted as appropriate rather than applied uncritically by rote.

Not all these works will apply to all churches and cathedrals. Medieval buildings are particularly sensitive on a wide range of matters. It should also be remembered that 19th and 20th century buildings on virgin sites without earlier settlement evidence may have their own archaeological significance in constructional matters, liturgical planning and fittings of art-historical interest.

### A *Repairs*

#### A1 **Repointing, stonework replacement and structural repairs to walling**

(a) Questions about the constructional sequence and history of a church can be answered by a careful study of its stonework; frequently early fabric survives undetected until examined closely and methodically. The past and present behaviour of the structure can be better understood by identifying patterns of alterations and past repairs. Dating information can be obtained from mortar samples, stone types, mouldings and masons marks. Such sources can too easily be obscured or destroyed in the course of otherwise entirely beneficial repairs.

(b) Ideally, all historic churches would have a full set of detailed analytical drawings derived from rectified photography, used for campaigns of repair, as a basic tool and a continuing record. More usually, the objective is achievable incrementally as an integral part of various campaigns of work.

(c) The use of rectified photography is increasing, but too often documentation of repairs does not exceed a few general photographs of the existing situation. This skirts round three related issues:

- the need to understand in order to identify and specify appropriate repairs
- the difficulty of understanding anything complex without the discipline of analytical recording

- the need to leave future repairers a record of what was found and what was done to it.

The availability of inexpensive digital photography should be exploited to maximise recording of repair projects, before and during works. It should not however be regarded as a cheap substitute for rectified photography which should be obtained whenever project circumstances require it and be included in requests for grants.

(d) *Repointing* can mask original or earlier pointing schemes which contain structural or historical information, such as the 'lifts' in the construction of a wall, the position of earlier openings, or whether changes in masonry represent an alteration or a repaired failure. The scope for the area to be repointed to increase understanding of the structural history should be assessed. If it is of any complexity, a detailed record drawing should be provided, including phasing information and giving the locations from where mortar samples have been taken.

(e) In *stonework repairs*, the date, significance and type of stone of what is to be replaced should be identified as part of best practice. Architects normally specify a full-size record of any moulded stone to ensure that the detail and profile are correct. Significant amounts of replacement, especially around openings, require stone-by-stone elevational drawings prior to work commencing, for marking up types, phasing and condition. If no detailed analytical drawing of the whole

elevation is available, these insets should be located accurately on at least an outline elevation drawing of the wall or feature.

(f) With *structural repairs*, understanding the development of the building and past major repairs may contribute towards identifying the solution to a current problem, as well as being interesting in their own right. Below-ground archaeological work may also help with diagnosis. Solutions involving underpinning, strengthening floors, removing earlier structural repairs or selective rebuilding of masonry will have impacts upon historic fabric or deposits; they may require recording before works start, and often during them. This applies particularly in situations where historic fabric is taken apart, repaired, and then put back together again.

(g) Depending upon circumstances, a different approach may be required for interior stonework. Those surfaces that have been fully stripped as part of earlier 'restoration' are effectively the same as external walling faces as far as archaeological analysis and recording is concerned. Where ancient or modern plaster has to be removed for repairs or alterations, there is usually a preliminary phase of archaeological *assessment* or *evaluation* by a specialist conservator to determine the significance of what is to be taken off or uncovered, including the presence / absence of wall paintings.

## A2 Repairing or removing pews

(a) Recording pews in their unrepaired state amounts to *appraisal* and / or *assessment* and such work undertaken by a specialist conservation woodworker should be a standard procedure. It can identify the extent to which old pews have been moved and reassembled or repaired in the past, often as part of 19<sup>th</sup> century reordering, and can help make decisions about whether past failed changes should be repaired as found or replaced with improved alterations.

(b) DACs frequently consider proposals to remove pews now surplus to the needs of smaller modern congregations in order to provide social spaces or other facilities. Far too often, the significance of the pews likely to be affected is the last question to be asked, when it should always be the first, because the answer may point towards considering alternative options for providing the required space. In many cases the pews are relatively recent in date and not of great merit, so change presents few difficulties. In some cases they are ancient examples of craftsmanship or part of a particularly strong, often Victorian, liturgical design. For 19th century pew sets, distinguishing between one-off architect designs, discerning choices from contemporary catalogues and a mix of incorporation and creation often requires a combination of archaeological and documentary research skills. Resolving conflicts between the modern use of the building and the conservation of inherited woodwork is beyond the scope of this note, but decisions must always be informed by

an understanding of the significance of what is affected, archaeologically – how and when it was made – as well as aesthetically – what it looks like to modern lay and expert eyes. This subject has received helpfully exhaustive treatment in a recent publication from the Ecclesiological Society (Cooper and Brown eds, 2011).

## A3 Repair or removal of pew platforms; repair or replacement of floor slabs

(a) Renewing floors in ancient buildings is always a potentially sensitive operation, requiring an archaeological understanding of what is affected. Are the existing floor coverings significant, and, if so, is it realistic for them to be repaired rather than replaced? If replacement is essential, to what depth will the ground have to be disturbed, and how can this be minimised in sensitive locations?

(b) *Appraisal* should determine whether the area in question is likely to be sensitive archaeologically in relation to the development of the church or the presence of burials. There is a high probability of sensitivity in any medieval building. Determining sensitivity also requires clarity about the proposed method of construction and its potential for disturbing deposits under pew platforms or existing surfaces.

(c) Normal *assessment* by the architect through lifting selected boards or slabs will help provide some answers. In cases where a new ground slab is to be laid the new formation level must be defined and an assessment made as to whether any archaeological deposits will be affected by the need to reduce the ground level. In appropriate cases non-invasive survey methods such as remote sensing through ground penetrating radar can usefully be applied.

(d) If the works will cut into deposits, *evaluation* in the form of trial trenches or pits may be difficult before a sufficient area can be cleared at the start of the main contract. In such cases, sufficient time and contingency sums should be included to cover archaeological requirements.

(e) Ground reduction other than the removal of recent loose surface material under pew platforms should be carried out by archaeologists, who should also be prepared to deal with burials. In carefully defined cases it may be possible to leave ground reduction to an experienced and properly briefed main contractor where

- ground reduction is minimal
- adequate evaluation has been possible
- arrangements exist for calling-out archaeologists if stonework or burials are found, and for inspecting and / or recording the excavated area.

## A4 Redecoration

(a) *Appraisal* and / or *assessment*, usually by a paint or wall-paintings specialist, will determine whether there

are ancient surfaces or coverings, such as Victorian painting schemes, post-medieval texts or medieval wall-paintings, whose conservation or recording needs to be taken into account.

(b) In plaster replacement, as part of dealing with problems of rot or rising damp, opportunities should be taken for recording temporarily revealed stonework.

## **A5 Glass**

(a) The conservation of window glass *in situ* is a specialist task, again involving a preliminary recording phase. Fragments of early medieval glass, sometimes relocated or assembled in a later restoration are of interest, as is plain hand-made post-medieval glass; post-medieval and Victorian glass may be of significance for its design, technology or authorship. Attention to the glass itself should not neglect the study and recording of the lead cames and ferramenta holding it in place.

(b) Fragments of window glass may be found in the course of excavation associated with some of the works described in this paper. Removal from what has become a relatively stable environment in the ground will accelerate decay processes. Projects should make due provision for conservation, whether the finds are to be deposited in the local museums or securely displayed in the church itself.

## **A6 Bells and bell-frames; organs**

(a) As with any other historic fabric above or below ground, the historic significance of both bells and bell-frames should be ascertained before rather than after proposing repairs, replacements or augmentations. Investigation and recording is usually a matter for a specialist.

(b) Useful guidance is available in Christopher Pickford's *Bell-frames, a practical guide to inspection and recording* (1993) and the CCB's *Code of Practice for the conservation and repair of bells and bell-frames* (1993).

(c) The pipework, machinery and the cases of organs can be of historical and archaeological significance, and this should be considered when repairs or changes are contemplated, again by specialists.

## **A7 Timber repairs to roof structures**

(a) The roof structure and / or its coverings may be of historic interest. Where the structure is concealed by ceilings as well as roof coverings, or is otherwise inaccessible, its significance may not be ascertainable by *appraisal* and / or *assessment* until access has been provided or coverings removed. Spires with early timber structures are a rare but important example.

(b) Repair strategies for structures and materials of historic interest should be based upon minimal replacement. Determining the significance and condition of an otherwise unrecorded roof may require *evaluation* in the form of a detailed drawn record by a specialist buildings analyst, including what can be seen of joints, and in some cases using dendrochronology (tree-ring dating) if the case justifies it. That record will be of long-term value in maintaining the roof. Detailed recording is needed before specific repairs and replacements, tied into an overall plan. Allowance should be made for such recording work in the time and costs allocated for a repair scheme.

(c) Lead roof coverings sometimes have graffiti or other unusual features that merit recording and possibly preservation. In some cases, small sections of particular interest are removed before recycling and displayed in the building.

## **A8 Rainwater goods**

(a) Early lead hoppers, distinctive cast iron rainwater goods and other historically interesting examples need identifying, perhaps in a photographic record when the roof is accessible or as part of a quinquennial inspection. Detailed recording where appropriate should precede major repairs or unavoidable replacements.

## **B Services, mechanical & electrical; drainage**

### **B1 Heating**

(a) Existing systems, including iron grilles, fixtures or ornate radiators, may be Victorian or part of the historic interest of the building in their own right, to be retained if possible or recorded before removal. New systems should be of a type and a design that maximises effectiveness and economy while minimising disturbance of upstanding fabric and buried archaeological deposits. Where existing runs cannot be used and new ones have to be created, archaeological *assessment* or *evaluation* may have to precede the finalisation of the design to establish whether significant deposits or masonry survive and whether redesign can avoid them or minimise damage. This includes runs for gas supplies across the churchyard (see drainage below) and their entry point into the church as well as runs within it. Records made of deposits encountered by new service runs will be useful reference material for future management.

(b) Proposals for under-floor heating require careful overall scrutiny for their cost-effectiveness, future maintenance risks and potential archaeological impacts. Particularly when associated with de-pewing and removal of pew platforms in a medieval church, it is important to follow the sequence of appraisal, desk-

based assessment and evaluation. This may involve the use of ground radar supported by test pits in areas of proposed ground disturbance, in order to determine the feasibility of this form of heating and the extent to which potential archaeological impacts will need to be mitigated by redesign and / or recording. It is important to locate any vaults concealed by 19th century reflooring so that they can be recorded, their contents be treated with due respect and costs arising be incorporated in budgets.

## **B2 Electricity**

(a) Similar considerations apply with particular reference to cable runs attached to masonry or cut into plaster, whose significance should be properly assessed before they are designed, so that physical and visual damage can be avoided. This may involve specialist wall paintings conservators.

(b) Cable runs in churchyards for floodlighting should be treated as in B4 below.

## **B3 Drainage: the perimeter or 'French' drain**

(a) This frequently employed device for taking water away from the building and reducing rising damp was branded as destructive at an early stage in the development of church archaeology. A trench dug round an ancient building will divorce the structure from its context of related archaeological deposits, as well as damaging evidence for earlier phases of the same building or for earlier buildings on the same site. Fortunately, experience has shown that, in most cases, what otherwise helps preserve the building and make it more usable is not always so destructive. Sometimes the drain was originally dug as part of 19th or 20th century repairs; the damage has already been done and will not be significantly increased by renewal of a failed device. More often, the building has developed by adding or extending compartments, so the ground immediately adjacent to this expanded footprint is not of the greatest sensitivity.

(b) None of these considerations remove the need to approach proposals for perimeter drains with a presumption that they are potentially sensitive archaeologically. *Appraisal* and / or *assessment* should seek to determine whether the church plan / footprint appears to be at its fullest expansion, and whether there is any evidence for truncations of the existing building or for earlier buildings on the same site.

(c) In all cases *evaluation* for a new drain should include the test-pits usually required by the architect to allow inspection of the foundations; these can also sample adjacent stratigraphy. Where test-pits raise no further questions and suggest that the evidence revealed by excavation of the drain is likely to relate only to existing foundations and superstructure, no further evaluation is required. In other cases, a series of test-pits

should be designed to evaluate the surviving evidence and inform the mitigation strategy, which is likely to be either preservation through redesign or recording as part of the scheme, or a combination of the two.

(d) For post-consent archaeological work, in cases where proper evaluation has shown that the evidence of interest is limited to existing footings, a general contractor can excavate the drain. This assumes a clear briefing about the circumstances for notifying the DAA / CA and calling out an appointed archaeological contractor, together with secure arrangements for archaeological monitoring. After the drain is excavated the archaeological contractor will clean what has been exposed, recording footings and deposits in detail at points of particular significance. In other cases where wider archaeological sensitivity has been confirmed by evaluation, an archaeological contractor should excavate the drain to the architect's specification under an archaeological brief provided by the DAA / CA.

(e) In all cases, the below-ground evidence of the footings represents an opportunity for recording what will shortly be concealed again. This should involve correlating below-ground evidence with what is visible in the upstanding walls above. It usually increases understanding about the evolution of the building, and can provide a useful source of structural information for dealing with future maintenance problems.

## **B4 Other churchyard drainage or service runs**

(a) These works often present the greatest difficulty. While they can affect ground that is potentially sensitive archaeologically, their scope for providing information can be uncertain or limited. This makes *appraisal* and / or *assessment* all the more important, to determine whether the ground affected is 'ancient' burial ground or a more recent extension of graveyard, or if it contains significant archaeological remains, and to clarify the depth and width of disturbance and impact of entry / exit points through church walls. It is also important to ensure that archaeological responsibilities cover the whole task, including trenching to connect to services outside the churchyard.

(b) Trial pits for *evaluation* should only be required in cases where there is archaeological potential other than previous unspecified burying. Examples are where previous exposures have shown that burials are likely to be encountered, the site of demolished chapels or monastic ranges, or where the configuration of the stonework at the point of connection into the church has potential sensitivity or raises unresolved questions.

(c) In most cases the general contractor can do the post-consent work subject to adequate briefing on the circumstances in which work must stop and the DAA / CA or a designated archaeologist be notified, i.e. the discovery of wall foundations, vaults, articulated burials etc. According to the case, the DAA / CA must decide



whether to require a precautionary archaeological inspection of an opened trench before pipes etc are inserted, and whether holes cut through church walls need to be observed and recorded archaeologically.

(d) In (rare) cases of known potential sensitivity where redesign is not an option, the trench should be dug by an archaeological contractor or an archaeologist should be in attendance throughout digging. Where the design solution is a mole drain, minimally disruptive, usually shallow and through soft ground, no archaeological work is needed.

(e) Cess-pits, major soakaways and the runs to them from perimeter or 'French' drains are usually deep machine-excavations. Archaeological attendance is normally required, even if only to observe and record human remains (see below).

(f) 'Trench-arch' drains are a shallow and relatively non-destructive alternative to deep cess-pits / soakaways, and appropriate for cases where a low level of usage is anticipated. Their employment should be encouraged as a way of mitigating potential impacts on earlier churchyard burials.

## **C Churchyard**

**C1** Drainage and development works can affect churchyards; see also human remains. Though shallow ground disturbance from landscaping, renewing or laying paths and tree-planting is usually not archaeologically sensitive in ancient churchyards without evidence of former buildings or earlier occupation, each case should be examined in its particular circumstances.

### **C2 Churchyard walls**

Their overall plan, elevation / section and use of materials may be significant, indicating phases of construction or major churchyard extensions. Masonry from earlier structures or repairs to the church may be incorporated. Before repairs or rebuilding the character and quality of the wall should be carefully assessed and recorded so that it can form the basis of a detailed specification on coursing, pointing etc. This is particularly important for extensive walls of consistent character and appearance likely to be repaired in phases by different contractors.

### **C3 Loose moulded stones, gravestones, etc**

These can sometimes be found half-buried around the edges of churchyards, following old campaigns of repairs or clearances. They are vulnerable to damage or theft. After assessment, they should be recorded and, as appropriate, stored. In some circumstances there may be opportunities for re-erecting ones that are significant for their quality or local associations around the edge of the

churchyard. Stones of merit or interest originally standing vertically should not be reused as paving material if they are in a material whose decay will thereby be hastened.

## **C4 Monuments and gravestones**

(a) These can be important works of art or good examples of their kind and date as well as commemorative sources of information. Part of their value is its location: each adds significance to the other. Local groups of people can undertake graveyard recording using one of the established systems.

(b) Removal of good monuments or gravestones should usually be resisted, and proposals on grounds of Health and Safety should always have demonstrated that the option of stabilisation is genuinely impracticable. Recording of any inscriptions and their locations in the churchyard should always precede piecemeal clearance of kerbstones, making a publicly available record of the position of all gravestones together with transcriptions.

## **D Development**

### **D1 Reordering**

(a) Because ancient churches have been altered through history according to changing liturgical requirements, existing arrangements may incorporate elements of historic or artistic interest, such as galleries, screens, pews, pulpits, fonts, floor levels and finishes, vestry cupboards and fittings. Some of these may have been created as part of the current scheme; others may have been retained from earlier ones, in primary or secondary positions. The overall significance of what now exists needs to be understood so that the impact of changes to any of its elements can be properly appreciated.

(b) Substantial reordering in an historic interior is often a sensitive matter, involving some of the most difficult tensions between worship and conservation. Decisions are made by exploring options and balancing those considerations, but it is essential that those decisions are fully informed by a proper understanding of the historical significance of existing (or earlier) arrangements and their various elements. New evidence – that something is more or less important than previously thought – can be obtained from documentary research, architectural history and fabric analysis. This should be fed into the decision-making process rather than obtained following a decision that may be hard to revisit.

### **D2 Insertion of partitioned facilities – toilet, kitchen etc**

(a) *Appraisal* and / or *assessment* will determine the apparent archaeological sensitivity of the area chosen

and may, with or without *evaluation*, influence the design of the facilities. If *evaluation* of proposed ground disturbance – partition footings and water / drainage runs – is physically impossible before works commence due to current uses and hard surfaces, sufficient time must be allowed in the main contract at the outset for such work and dealing with its consequences. Assertions by proposers of schemes that pre-consent evaluation is impossible should always be examined critically, and a distinction made between cases where this is true and those where proper procedures for assessing environmental impacts are being ignored.

(b) Any significant ground disturbance should be carried out by archaeologists, and provision should be made for encountering burials.

### **D3 Major schemes within churches: immersion fonts, underground rooms, etc**

(a) If these are likely to involve significant ground disturbance to the extent that the church will have to be closed for the duration of works, then it will be reasonable to require an equally disruptive *evaluation* project. In a scheme otherwise acceptable in principle, this would have the function of clarifying archaeological issues in order to ensure that

- the detailed design took them fully into account
- preservation was maximised
- recording in advance of destruction addressed clearly defined research questions
- recording was properly integrated into the development programme.

### **D4 Extensions and new buildings in churchyards and precincts**

- (a) *Appraisal* and / or *assessment* should ascertain
- whether the site is archaeologically sensitive in relation to below-ground deposits, structures or burials
  - how the church building itself would be affected at any point of attachment
  - the extent to which the historic setting of the church might be affected by the scale and design of the new structure proposed.

These matters may affect the choice of site and the design of the building, issues of concern to the local planning authority whose permission will also be needed, and whose requirements will take the leading role.

(b) *Evaluation* by a combination of test pits and trial trenches will usually be required. If there is more than one candidate site, and any of them is assessed as archaeologically sensitive, the evaluation fieldwork should contribute to the choice, rather than follow on after it has been made. Its purpose is to identify the nature of the buried deposits and structures, and the strength of the constraint they represent, whether this

requires re-siting the development, redesigning the ground-works or recording in advance of destruction.

(c) In cases where the only ascertainable sensitivity is burials, which may go back to medieval or even late Saxon times, evaluation will be necessary in order to test how much disturbance the development is likely to cause. Any skeleton that cannot be avoided will require proper treatment both archaeologically and from the viewpoint of respectful handling of human remains (see below 'Human remains'). The results of such evaluation may however influence the design of the ground-works if they show that many burials will be encountered, so that, for example, short-bore piles are substituted for conventional strip-footings.

(d) Particular care must be taken over development or works of repair in cathedral precincts, especially those that were originally monastic foundations. It is beyond the scope of this document to enumerate all possible eventualities, but matters can be usefully controlled through a good Conservation Statement or Conservation Management Plan in conjunction with the established investigative procedures that form part of the secular planning process.

(e) In cases where a large new structure is to be placed over archaeologically sensitive ground, such as the site of former monastic claustral buildings associated with a church retained in parochial use, a view should be taken about proposed mitigation strategies. There may be instances where the total excavation and understanding of the affected part of the site is preferable to a series of recorded wall foundation runs, pile pits and drainage runs which damage but do not enlighten about the whole. In substantial construction projects the cost of a total approach may be a single figure percentage, capable of securing grants and boosting local interest in the project.

### **D5 Graveyard extensions**

(a) An undeveloped field near an historic church may contain archaeological deposits undisturbed by the destructive effects of grave digging. Particularly where the original church occupies an already old site, there might be settlement or defensive earthworks or Roman or prehistoric remains. Proposals for new burial grounds need to take archaeological considerations into account, through field evaluations if the desk-top assessments show that the location is sensitive. Confirmed sensitivity will cause problems, because the proposed land-use is equally sensitive, especially for local people, and the cost of archaeological clearance is likely to be high, especially in relation to the income obtainable from use of the land for burials.

(b) Pressure on graveyard space is now focusing attention on the reuse of parts of old graveyards with only burials of over a century ago, or no markers at all due to 1960s clearances. Whilst burying again in such areas is likely to disturb earlier and usually shallower inhumations, it is usually unrealistic to expect archaeological recording.

## **E Human remains**

(a) Any significant ground disturbance inside a church or within its churchyard (or outside its present limits if these have moved or contracted) may encounter human remains in soil conditions not hostile to the survival of bones. Many churchyards have been cleared of monuments, and not all have a plan of even relatively recent graves, so there may be uncertainty about what might be found in an ancient churchyard. Those of the last 150 years are likely to be deeper than earlier ones, but may not have destroyed their predecessors.

(b) Constant reuse of churchyards for their principal purpose of burying the dead established the *de facto* practice of collecting together any bones encountered during grave-digging, whether or not articulated, and reintering them, usually in the same grave as the new burial. No formal authorisation is required as long as bones are replaced immediately within consecrated ground. Faculty is normally required for other works that might incidentally disturb burials, such as extensions to churches or bringing services across churchyards, but human remains have tended to be treated in the same way as for grave-digging. Today, there are increased sensitivities over the treatment of the remains of ancestors, developed archaeological procedures, and requirements of Health and Safety at Work. More systematic arrangements are now needed in order to avoid unacceptable situations, such as general building contractors faced with the specialised work of archaeologists, and archaeologists with that of specialist contractors for exhuming recent burials.

(c) The Advisory Panel on the Archaeology of Burials in England (APABE) has published detailed 'Guidance for Best Practice for Treatment of Human Remains Excavated from Christian Burial Grounds in England' (2006). It states that "a body ... buried in consecrated ground ... comes under the protection of the Church." Also, that "human remains can provide, through recording and scientific scrutiny, information which contributes to the understanding of individual lives, regional experiences and general trends, both cultural and bio-medical." In the event of burials being disturbed, there are special requirements for proper handling with due care and decency and subject to environmental health requirements.

(d) Digging new graves or creating a new area for cremated remains in ancient churchyards does not normally require any archaeological involvement. The evidence from partly disturbed earlier burials will usually be insufficient to be of interest. The exception is where the churchyard overlies a site of known importance, such as the remains of monastic buildings. In such cases an appropriate local policy needs to be adopted in order to minimise damage and maximise recovery of information.

(e) In order to identify whether certain kinds of proposal are likely to encounter burials in churchyards or within churches, the archaeological approach to ground disturbance in potentially sensitive areas should be adopted, with its stages of *appraisal*, *assessment* and field *evaluation*. This may involve trial trenches along the lines of proposed strip footings or deeply inserted services or across areas to be lowered for ground slabs. Evaluation excavation will normally stop at the top of articulated human remains, identifying their existence and location, but not removing them. The discovery of human remains will raise the question of whether the proposed structure should be sited elsewhere, or whether the foundation design can be modified to minimise or avoid damage altogether. Budgets and programmes can then be adjusted accordingly.

(f) Where large-scale ground disturbance is unavoidable and a large area of burials has to be removed, the requirements of due respect and care and of archaeological research jointly apply, together with the need to inform the appropriate authorities. Carefully designed further evaluation excavation may be needed in order to define the scale of the archaeological project. The brief for the main work should clearly state the scope of the works and recording standards (with reference to appropriate procedures as outlined in nationally or locally approved documents) that would apply to a pre-planned programme carried out by qualified specialists, whether archaeologists or professional exhumation contractors as appropriate. Normal archaeological procedures for identifying, cleaning and recording burials will ensure due care and respect. It will also ensure enough information is obtained to decide whether the composition of the group and any associated evidence merits further analysis in a 'post-excavation' stage of work. Occasionally this will involve taking samples for scientific analysis or dating purposes, an invasive procedure that must always be justified against a clear research design.

(g) In most cases, retention of remains for further study or even as a research reference collection will apply only to large coherent groups and exceptional individual burials. Reburial would normally follow after completion of research, though proposals

(h) In the context of parish churches and faculty jurisdiction, Chancellors have requirements for the proper handling and ultimate reburial of human remains. It is therefore important for suitably advised petitioners to identify and propose appropriate treatment of excavated human remains together with a timetable. This would enable a Chancellor, if so minded, to permit a realistic programme of work together with any necessary safeguards to ensure agreed deadlines are met. Otherwise, for lack of specific proposals, a Chancellor may have to impose deadlines. This might increase costs or even set up a conflict with the purposes of the scheme of archaeological works already required by proviso on the main faculty.

## Appendix 2: Guidance from the Court of the Arches (January 2013)

The Court of Arches has revised its guidance on the balancing exercise that diocesan chancellors undertake. Previously the court had approved the ‘Bishopsgate questions’ which looked at the tests of necessity and whether there would be an adverse effect on the character of the church as one of architectural or historic interest. The following new framework has been proposed:

1. Would the proposals, if implemented, result in harm to the significance of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest?
2. If the answer to question (1) is “no”, the ordinary presumption in faculty proceedings “in favour of things as they stand” is applicable, and can be rebutted more or less readily, depending on the particular nature of the proposals.

3. If the answer to question (1) is “yes”, how serious would the harm be?
4. How clear and convincing is the justification for carrying out the proposals?
5. Bearing in mind that there is a strong presumption against proposals which will adversely affect the special character of a listed building, will any resulting public benefit (including matters such as liturgical freedom, pastoral well-being, opportunities for mission, and putting the church to viable uses that are consistent with its role as a place of worship and mission) outweigh the harm? In answering question (5), the more serious the harm, the greater will be the level of benefit needed before the proposals should be permitted. This will particularly be the case if the harm is to a building which is listed Grade 1 or 2\*, where serious harm should only exceptionally be allowed.

## Appendix 3: Further reading

Association of County Archaeological Officers (now ALGAO) 1993.

‘Model Briefs and Specifications for Archaeological Assessments and Field Evaluations’.

Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers 1997.

‘Analysis and Recording for the Conservation and Control of Works to Historic Buildings’

Care of Cathedrals Measure 2011

Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991.

Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure: Code of Practice 1993

Clark, Kate 2001. *Informed Conservation: understanding historic buildings and their landscapes for conservation*. English Heritage

Cooper, T and Brown S, eds 2011. *Pews, Benches and Chairs. The Ecclesiological Society*.

English Heritage 2012. ‘New Work in Historic Places of Worship’

Faculty Jurisdiction (Care of Places of Worship) Rules 2000.

Guidance notes on the ChurchCare website prepared by the Cathedrals and Church Buildings Division of the Church of England (<http://www.churchcare.co.uk/cathedrals> and [/churches](http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches))

Institute for Archaeologists, Codes, Standards and Guidance at <http://www.archaeologists.net/codes/ifa>

Rodwell, Warwick 2012. *The Archaeology of Churches*.