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SUMMARY

Planning permission has been granted by Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council for the demolition of Brownhill School, Rochdale (NGR SD 89343 14139) and the construction of a replacement school on the site (planning ref: 10/D53829). One of the planning conditions was to undertake a programme of archaeological work prior to development. The Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (GMAU) was consulted and a formal brief for the programme of evaluation work was issued, comprising a desk-based assessment in the first instance, the results of which would be used to inform the subsequent excavation of eight trial trenches. Consequently, Capita Symonds commissioned Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) to undertake a desk-based assessment of the site to assess the potential impact of the proposed redevelopment on the archaeological resource. This was carried out by in November and December 2011.

Based on the results of the desk-based assessment and the requirements of the GMAU brief, the eight trial trenches consisted of: Trenches 1 and 2 targeting Brownhill House, a former hall referred to in documents from the seventeenth century that was demolished in the early 1960s; Trench 3 in the area of the multi-use games area (MUGA); and Trenches 4 to 8 within the footprint of the proposed school, currently the playing field. However, consultation with GMAU led to the omission of Trenches 1 to 3 as these areas would not be impacted upon by the proposals for the development. In light of this, only Trenches 4 to 8 were excavated.

In total, four drainage features within Trenches 4, 6 and 7, and a linear clay feature within Trench 8 were located during the excavation of the trial trenches. The linear feature, 801 in Trench 8, corresponded with the position and alignment of either a former path or the boundary of a small enclosure, both of which were depicted on the 1893 Ordnance Survey map of the area. It was unresolved as to whether this clay could have formed the substrate upon which the path was constructed, or up-cast material sediment from a bank and ditched boundary.

All of these features are thought to be associated with the seventeenth to nineteenth century landscaping of the grounds to the south of Brownhill House, formerly situated to the north of the school, and are of low archaeological significance. Consequently, no further archaeological work is recommended.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 **CIRCUMSTANCES OF PROJECT**

1.1.1 Planning permission has been granted by Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council for the demolition of Brownhill School, Rochdale (NGR SD 89343 14139) and the construction of a replacement school on the site of the playing fields (planning ref: 10/D53829). One of the planning conditions was to undertake a programme of archaeological investigation prior to development, to assess the potential impact of the proposed redevelopment on the archaeological resource. The Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (GMAU) was consulted and a formal brief for the programme of work was issued (*Appendix 1*). This included a two-staged approach comprising a desk-based assessment and archaeological trial trenching. Consequently, Capita Symonds commissioned Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) to undertake the work commencing with a desk-based assessment of the site completed in December 2011 (OA North 2011). Based on the results of this work, GMAU recommended a programme of archaeological trial trenching, originally consisting of eight trenches, two of which (Trenches 1 and 2) targeted Brownhill House, a former hall referred to in documents from the seventeenth century that was demolished in the early 1960s (*op cit*, 19). However, Trenches 1 to 3 were positioned within an area that later became apparent would not be impacted upon by the development. It was, therefore, agreed with GMAU that only Trenches 4 to 8, targeting the footprint of the new school, would be excavated. The trial trenching fieldwork was carried out in February 2012.

1.1.2 This report sets out the results of the trial trenching in the form of a short document, outlining the findings, followed by an assessment of the impact of the proposed development on any archaeological remains.

1.2 **LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY**

1.2.1 Rochdale lies in the north-eastern part of the modern county of Greater Manchester, some 12km from the border with Yorkshire. Brownhill School is situated to the north of Rochdale town centre (Fig 1; NGR SD 89343 14139). The site is bounded to the west by Falinge Park, to the north by houses on Brownhill View, to the east by Heights Lane, and to the south by housing off Heights Lane, Stanley Street and Sheriff Street.

1.2.2 Heights Lane is positioned on a hill, which climbs northwards out of Rochdale. The proposed redevelopment area, therefore, slopes northwards from approximately 140m OD to 160m OD. On the west side of the school, the ground noticeably slopes downwards towards Falinge Park.

1.2.3 The underlying solid geology consists of the Pennine Lower Coal Measures (Westphalian A) and millstone grit of the Carboniferous period. The predominant drift geology comprises glacial sands and gravels, with some alluvium (http://www.bgs.ac.uk/geoindex/beta. html).
1.3 **HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND**

1.3.1 *Introduction*: the following section presents a summary of the historical and archaeological background of the general area, drawn from the previous desk-based assessment (OA North 2011). It is presented by historical period, and has been compiled in order to place the findings of the trial trenching within a wider archaeological context.

1.3.2 *Prehistoric and Roman periods*: various remains of prehistoric date have been identified in the general area, particularly in the upland areas (Fishwick 1889). The discovery of remains from these periods within Rochdale, however, is severely limited, although several Roman coins have been found on the periphery of the urban area (Lewis 1848). The sparsity of archaeological evidence predating the medieval period in Rochdale is likely to be due to the level of redevelopment of the town during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Pearson *et al* 1985).

1.3.3 There are no known sites for these periods within the immediate vicinity of the school.

1.3.4 *Medieval period*: evidence for early medieval activity in the region as a whole is drawn largely from place-names (Newman 1996), although there is little firm evidence for activity in Rochdale during this period. Rochdale was recorded in the Domesday Survey of 1086 under Recedham Manor. It was held by Gamel, one of the 21 thegns of Salford Hundred, whose holding was assessed as two hides or 12 plough-lands (Morgan 1978). It has been suggested that the parish of Rochdale at this time may have been co-extensive with the manor of Rochdale (Lewis 1848). There seems to have been only one manor properly so called, and the Holts of Stubley were the principal resident family. Most of the land, however, was held by the Abbey of Whalley, and other ecclesiastical bodies; Rochdale was one of the largest ecclesiastical parishes in England, comprising several townships (Farrer and Brownbill 1911).

1.3.5 At the centre of the parish of Rochdale was the church of St Chad’s; it is of note that the church served an enormous parish, rather than a substantial town (Hartwell *et al* 2004, 585). The oldest part of the existing church of St Chad, which occupies high ground on the south side of the town overlooking the river, dates to the thirteenth century (*op cit*, 588). However, there is some evidence to suggest that an earlier church occupied the same site, and fragments of Norman masonry are said to have been discovered during renovation in 1815 (Fishwick 1889, 12).

1.3.6 By 1212, the whole manor had been assigned to the Lord of Clitheroe, and was held by Roger de Lacy, and several under tenants. By 1251, Rochdale had become important enough to have been granted a charter for a weekly market, which was held on Wednesdays, and an annual fair on the feast of St Simon and St Jude in October. It was probably during this period that a borough was also created (Farrer and Brownbill 1911), although the town continued to be governed through the manor court until 1825, when a Police Act was finally obtained (Fishwick 1889).

1.3.7 The focus of the medieval activity in the area remains uncertain, and the pattern of settlement may have comprised a spread of innumerable folds,
representing little clusters of agricultural and proto-industrial buildings (Hartwell et al 2004, 585). Whilst it is tempting to suggest that the centre of the medieval town probably lay on the south side of the river, in proximity to St Chad’s church, firm evidence is lacking.

1.3.8 A probable medieval settlement around the edges of Cronkeyshaw Common to the east of the proposed redevelopment area is shown on Yates’ map of 1786. It includes ‘Foxholes House’, and settlement around Shawclough Road and north of Bentmeadows and Mizzy Road.

1.3.9 Post-medieval and Industrial periods: in 1582, Camden described Rochdale as ‘a market town well frequented’ (Fishwick 1913). Manufacturing and mining industries became of increasing importance to the local economy during this period. The confiscation of the lands that had belonged to Whalley Abbey, and the general suppression of religious houses following the Dissolution of the Monasteries, produced a new strain of landlords, whose number was increased by the sale of Byron estates in the early part of the seventeenth century. The town certainly began to expand significantly during the 1600s, indicated to some degree by the Hearth Tax Returns; in 1666, 228 hearths were recorded for Rochdale (ibid).

1.3.10 Celia Fiennes, writing in c 1700, described Rochdale as ‘a pretty neat town, built all of stone’, whilst some 25 years later Defoe considered it ‘a good market town, and of late much improved in the woollen manufacture, as are also the villages in its neighbourhood’ (Furbank et al 1991). By the end of the eighteenth century, Rochdale had developed a formidable reputation as a centre for the production of woollen cloth, and the town benefited from a lucrative export trade in woollen goods to Holland, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Russia and Germany (Aiken 1795, 248). Rochdale also became an important centre for the cross-Pennine trade in woollen cloth, represented by the numerous merchant’s houses, warehouses and inns that were established in the town during the late 1700s to service this trade.

1.3.11 Rochdale rapidly became a boomtown of the Industrial Revolution, and amongst the first ever industrialised towns. The Rochdale Canal, one of the major navigable broad canals of Great Britain, was a highway of commerce during this time used for the haulage of cotton, wool, and coal to and from the area. The canal was opened between Rochdale and Manchester by 1799, and was completed as the first trans-Pennine route in 1804 (Hadfield 1994). The growth of the population as Rochdale became a manufacturing centre led to the enlargement of the parish church; and the building of new ones: St Mary’s, Wardleworth, was consecrated in 1744; St James’s, Wardleworth, in 1821; St Clement’s, Spotland, in 1835; and Christ Church, Healey, in 1850 (Farrer and Brownbill 1911).

1.3.12 Rochdale rose to prominence during the nineteenth century as an important centre for the production of cotton goods, whilst maintaining a strong woollen industry, focusing in particular on the manufacture of flannel and baize. New cotton mills were established along the River Roch and, with the advent of steam power, throughout the town along the river valleys and canal banks. However, the town enjoyed a ‘golden age’ during the Cotton Famine of the 1860s, when woollens became once more price-competitive with cotton goods; the population of the town increased by over 60% during this period.
(Williams with Farnie 1992, 43; Pigot 1822). The socio-economic change brought by the success of Rochdale’s textile industry in the nineteenth century led to its rise to borough status and it remained a dominant settlement in its region; a charter granted to the town in 1856 made Rochdale a Municipal Borough (Williams with Farnie 1992).

1.3.13 Within the immediate vicinity, two post-medieval standing stones are located c. 130m to the south of the school, and Brownhill House which dates from at least the early seventeenth century stood in the northern part of the school grounds (see 1.3.14 onwards, below). Falinge Hall, also known as Mount Falinge, situated to c. 100m east of Brownhill School, dates to the late eighteenth century, and was built by James Royds. In 1894 the Mount Falinge estate, including the hall, which was by then in a dilapidated condition, was given to the Corporation of Rochdale. The grounds were landscaped by Thomas Mawson and opened as a public park in 1906, located immediately to the east of the bounds of Brownhill School, with the main entrance (listed building no. 358890) located c. 100m to the south of the school.

1.3.14 Brownhill: Brownhill House was in the township of Spotland, to the north of the centre of Rochdale. The first known occupant of the house was Randall Hamer who died in 1620 leaving his estate to his wife and children (Fishwick 1889, 507). However, by the time of the 1626 manor survey, the estate was owned by Robert Holt, with the Hamers as tenants (ibid; Walker and Tindall 1985, 130). Brownhill house was one of several halls or houses in the local area mentioned in the 1626 manor survey (Walker and Tindall 1985, 127-38).

1.3.15 It should be noted here that there is an extant datestone from the house in the grounds of the school. The stone reads ‘1633 IBIB’, which does not fit in with the manor survey of 1626 or the 1620 will of Randall Holmes. It is not known whom the initials IBIB stand for.

1.3.16 The Hamers were still tenants of Brownhill in 1641, but by 1684 the house was owned and occupied by the Holme family (Fishwick 1889, 507). The house passed down this family until it was purchased by James Royds at an unknown date, although he is known to have been living there by 1794 (op cit, 507-508).

1.3.17 In 1828 Butterworth described Brownhill as ‘a low and ancient pile of building, the property of James Royds’ (Butterworth 1828, 192). The Royds continued their occupation of the house until the closing years of the nineteenth century (Brownhill file, Touchstones, Rochdale).

1.3.18 In 1923 Brownhill and its grounds of 2½ acres was purchased by the Rochdale Corporation for £2000 (Council Minutes 10/08/1923; Rochdale Observer 2/12/1922). The site was to be an open-air school and would utilise the house for cooking, dining and administration, whilst a new three-roomed school house was built in the paddock of the house (Rochdale Observer 2/12/1922; Brownhill file, Touchstones, Rochdale). The open-air school was opened in March 1925, and two rooms were added to the new building in 1927 (Rochdale Observer 7/3/1925; Brownhill file, Touchstones, Rochdale).

1.3.19 An undated description of Brownhill (post-dating its 1925 conversion to the school) states that the main entrance to the house was towards its east side, in an angled wall of the building. This was thought to be the oldest part of the
building and the 1633 datestone was positioned across it. The oak room (Plate 4) was also located in this part of the building (Brownhill file, Touchstones, Rochdale). There are stories of a stone-lined passage, which led from the oak room to an underground tunnel connected to the town centre. The passage is said to have been discovered during the demolition of the house and the construction of the current school buildings in the early 1960s (http://www.brownhill.rochdale.sch.uk/Brownhill%20History.htm). There are also said to have been cellars under the house, which contained wells (c 175’ deep) for drawing drinking water. Stables with servants quarters above were positioned to the rear (north) of the house, which were later turned into the school kitchens (ibid). The construction of the house was quite unusual, in that its walls were not set at right-angles to each other, which meant that none of the rooms was square. In addition, nearly every floor had a step in it, so that each room had floor height differences within it (Brownhill file, Touchstones, Rochdale).

1.3.20 The irregular plan of the house, and the reported differences in floor heights would appear to suggest that there were several phases of building to the house. Documentary evidence indicates that the 1633 datestone was not to commemorate the initial building of the house, and therefore must refer to a later addition, or an event, such as a marriage, which was important to the owners of the house at the time. It should also be noted that IBIB may not necessarily be initials but could be a reference to something else, the meaning of which is lost.

1.3.21 The house was demolished in the early 1960s, at the same time as the construction of the current school buildings at Brownhill (http://www.brownhill.rochdale.sch.uk/Brownhill%20History.htm).

1.3.22 The map regression detailed in desk-based assessment (OA North 2011) identified an embankment along the southern boundary of the school grounds, depicted on the Ordnance Survey (OS) maps of 1910 and 1960. Buildings marked as school buildings are first depicted in the 1930 OS map, with subsequent editions depicting the redevelopment of the school in the 1960s.
2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 Following the issue of a formal brief by GMAU (Appendix 1), a project design was submitted to the client by OA North. This was later revised, following consultation with GMAU, to reflect the omission of Trenches 1-3 in the areas where there would be no intrusive work during the development (Appendix 2). These two documents were adhered to, and the work was consistent with the relevant Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) and English Heritage guidelines (IfA 2008a, 2008b, 2011; English Heritage 2006).

2.2 EVALUATION TRENCHING

2.2.1 In total, five trial trenches, measuring 10m in length and 1.6m wide, were excavated (Trenches 4 to 8). The topsoil was removed utilising a backhoe loader mechanical excavator (fitted with a 1.6m wide toothless ditching bucket) under archaeological supervision to the surface of the first significant archaeological deposit or the glacial till. This deposit was cleaned by hand, using hoes, shovel scraping, and/or trowels depending on the subsoil conditions, and inspected for archaeological features. All features of archaeological interest were investigated and recorded.

2.2.2 All trenches were excavated in a stratigraphical manner. Trenches were located by use of a differential Global Positioning System (dGPS), and altitude information has been established with respect to Ordnance Survey Datum.

2.2.3 All information identified in the course of the site works was recorded stratigraphically, using a system adapted from that used by the former Centre for Archaeology of English Heritage, with an accompanying pictorial record (plans, sections, and monochrome contacts/digital photographs). Primary records were available for inspection at all times.

2.2.4 Results of all field investigations were recorded on pro forma context sheets. The site archive includes both a photographic record and accurate large-scale plans and sections at an appropriate scale (1:50, 1:20 and 1:10). All artefacts were recorded using the same system, and will be handled and stored according to standard practice (following current IfA guidelines).

2.3 FINDS

2.3.1 The recovery of finds and sampling programmes were carried out in accordance with best practice (following current IfA guidelines (2008b)), and subject to expert advice in order to minimise deterioration. All artefacts recovered from the evaluation trenches were retained.
2.4 ARCHIVE

2.4.1 A full professional archive has been compiled in accordance with the project design (Appendix 2), and in accordance with current IfA and English Heritage guidelines (English Heritage 2006). The paper and digital archive will be deposited with the Greater Manchester HER. The material archive was not worthy of deposition and has been discarded.
3. FIELDWORK RESULTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 In total, eight trial trenches were intended to be excavated, but Trenches 1 to 3 were positioned within areas that are intended to be retained and thereby not impacted upon by the proposed development (Fig 2). Therefore, only Trenches 4 to 8 were excavated in the playing field to the south of the present school, which targeted the area of impact within the footprint of the proposed school, and were outwith any of the sites of archaeological interest identified in desk-based assessment (OA North 2011). All five trenches measured 10m in length and 1.6m wide. A summary of the results is presented below, with detailed context descriptions provided in Appendix 3, and a catalogue of the finds in Appendix 4.

3.2 RESULTS

3.2.1 Trench 4: was excavated on the western side of the playing field, on an east/west alignment (Fig 3; Plate 1). It was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.8m.

3.2.2 Culvert 403 was located on a north-east/south-west alignment at the western end of the trench (Fig 3; Plate 2), and truncating the glacial till, 402. Overlying this was 0.2m of subsoil, 401, and 0.4m of turf and topsoil, 400. However, upon exposing the capping stones of the culvert the area rapidly flooded. The trench was quickly recorded and backfilled to prevent further flooding.

Plate 1: Trench 4, looking west
3.2.3 At the eastern end of the trench, running parallel to 402, was a second culvert, 403 (Fig 3; Plate 3). It was constructed with sandstone capping stones and base, with two courses of red brick forming its sides. The culvert was built within construction cut 406, with sediment 405 backfilling the structure. The drain was evidently still running, and any disturbance of it by the excavation was reinstated prior to the trench being backfilled.
3.2.4 **Trench 5:** was positioned to the south-east of Trench 4 in the western half of the playing field, on a north-east/south-west alignment. It was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.6m (Fig 3; Plate 4) to the underlying glacial till, **502**. Overlying this was 0.34m of subsoil, **501**, which lay beneath 0.26m of turf and topsoil, **500**. No archaeological deposits were located within the trench.

Plate 4: Trench 5, looking north-east

Plate 5: Trench 6, looking east
3.2.5 **Trench 6:** was excavated in the central part of the playing field, to the east of Trench 5, on an east/west alignment, to a maximum depth of 0.62m (Fig 3; Plate 5) to the underlying glacial till, **603**. Overlying this was layer **602**, which was 0.14m thick and represented the interface between the glacial till and the overlying subsoil, **601**, that measured 0.22m thick. Above this was 0.27m of topsoil, **600**. Cutting across the trench on a north-west/south-east alignment was a narrow stone culverted field drain, **604**, which was still in use and was, therefore, left *in situ*.

3.2.6 **Trench 7:** was excavated in the eastern side of the playing field on a north-west/south-east alignment, and excavated to a maximum depth of 0.9m (Fig 3; Plate 6) down to the underlying glacial till, **705**. Above this was 0.28m of subsoil, **702**, which was overlain by 0.14m of layer **701**, a mix of topsoil and sand, that was most likely residual building material from the construction of the minibus garage positioned directly to the north of the trench. This all lay beneath 0.18m of topsoil, **700**.

![Plate 6: Trench 7, looking south-east](image)

3.2.7 Cutting across the trench on a north-east/south-west alignment was culvert **703**, built within construction cut **704** (Plate 7). It was built utilising roughly-hewn sandstone, and was evidently still active. The culvert was left *in situ* after recording, with any disturbance of it reinstated prior to backfilling. One fragment of late seventeenth to nineteenth century pottery was recovered from within the culvert.
3.2.8 Trench 8: was situated on the central southern part of the playing field (Fig 3; Plate 8). It was excavated on a north/south alignment, to a maximum depth of 0.8m down to the underlying glacial till, 804. A sondage was excavated at the northern end of the trench to test the till. The till was overlain by 0.23m of subsoil, 803, and then 0.24m of turf and topsoil, 800.

3.2.9 At the southern end of the trench was a linear feature comprising a layer of re-deposited glacial till, 801 within cut, 802. It measured 1.0m wide and 0.28m deep, and was positioned between the topsoil, 800, and subsoil, 803 (Fig 3; Plate 9) on a north-east/south-west alignment. At the time of excavation it was thought most likely to be a modern feature. However, its position and
orientation matches that of an enclosure boundary or a path, depicted on the 1893 OS map of the area (OS 1893; Fig 4). It may, therefore, be interpreted either as a substrate upon which the path was constructed, the surface of which has been lost due to it being truncated, or up-cast sediment from a bank and ditch boundary forming the enclosure. However, no evidence of a corresponding quarry ditch was found within the trench, although it could feasibly exist beyond it.

Plate 9: Layer 801, looking west

3.3 FINDS

3.3.1 In all, 14 fragments of artefacts were recovered during the investigation. Their distribution is shown below (Table 1). All were well-preserved, with little abrasion, although the fragments were medium to small in size. The assemblage comprised ceramic vessel and clay tobacco pipe fragments, suggesting a broad early-eighteenth to nineteenth-century date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>Tobacco pipe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>702</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>unstratified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Distribution of artefacts and ecofacts by trench and context
3.3.2 Pottery from the topsoil (600) in Trench 6 was probably the earliest of the finds, with fragments of Westerwald stoneware and of tin-glazed ware possibly dating as early as the mid-late seventeenth-century, although both continued in use throughout the eighteenth century. Black-glazed redwares from the same topsoil layer, cannot be dated with certainty, but are likely to be of later nineteenth-century date.

3.3.3 Pottery from topsoil 700 in Trench 7 comprised a single fragment of white salt-glazed stoneware, typical of the eighteenth century. A fragment of black-glazed redware retrieved from within the culvert 703 cannot be dated with complete certainty. However, it appears to be from the earlier part of its date range, dating perhaps to a period from the mid-late seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth century, although it could be more recent. Small and abraded fragments of clay tobacco pipe stem both from subsoil 702 and unstratified all have a large diameter bore, placing them in the seventeenth – eighteenth centuries.

3.3.4 The three fragments of pottery from Trench 8 (topsoil 800) were all transfer-printed refined white earthenwares, and thus unlikely to predate c 1800, and seem most likely to be of nineteenth rather than twentieth-century date.
4. CONCLUSION

4.1 DISCUSSION

4.1.1 In total, four drainage features within Trenches 4, 6 and 7, and a linear clay feature within Trench 8 were located during the excavation of the trial trenches. All of these features are thought to be associated with the seventeenth to nineteenth century landscaping of the grounds to the south of Brownhill House, formerly located in the northern part of the school grounds (Fig 4). Sherds of pottery recovered from the soil horizon are also of this period.

4.1.2 Culverts 403 and 404, in Trench 4, together with 703, in Trench 7, and the smaller field drain, 604, in Trench 6 are evidently still currently draining the land. As such, any disturbance of these culverts was reinstated after investigation.

4.1.3 The linear clay feature, 801, in Trench 8 corresponds with the position and alignment of either a former path or the boundary of a small enclosure, both depicted on the 1893 OS map of the area (Fig 4). It was unresolved as to whether this clay could have formed the substrate upon which the path was constructed, or up-cast sediment from a bank and ditched boundary.

4.1.4 The features found are of low archaeological significance and, therefore, no further archaeological work is recommended.
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APPENDIX 1: PROJECT BRIEF
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council has granted planning consent for the demolition of the existing school and the construction of a replacement school at Brownhill School, Heights Lane Rochdale. Condition 8 of the consent requires that before development proceeds a programme of archaeological work should be undertaken.

Fig.1: Location and extent of application site (outlined in red, north to top of map extract)

1.2 A conditioned programme of archaeological works is usually phased. The initial phase will be the production of an archaeological desk-based assessment. This will be followed by a phase of field evaluation informed by the results of the desk-based study. The evaluation provides vital information on the presence/absence of below ground remains, their condition, extent and depth. Taken together the results of the documentary research and evaluation allow an informed judgement to be offered regarding the significance of the remains and the impact of the proposed development upon that significance (PPS5). Depending upon the results of the desk-based study and the evaluation recommendations may then be drawn-up for mitigating the development impact. Mitigation responses might typically include selective open-area excavation and/or a watching brief.

2.0 Background

2.1 The Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record (HER) has a record for the site of a hall which is partly within the development site. This notes briefly that there is
documentary evidence that there was a hall on the site in 1626, when it is owned by Robert Holt, according to the manor survey, and probably as far back as 1620 as the will of Randall Hamer is written at 'Brownhill'. A dated lintel of 1633 is preserved within the school grounds. The house becomes one of the dwellings of the locally significant Royds family in 1794. Brownhill was purchased by Rochdale Corporation in 1922 and the building was adapted for its new purpose.

The building was demolished subsequently, in 1962, and the northern portion of the remains are now under Brownhill View. However, the southern portion of the site is within the redline area for the current application.

The current school have shown interest in this and they have gathered some information about this on their website:

(http://brownhill.rochdale.sch.uk/Brownhill%20History.htm acc 21/12/2010).

This contains a description of the former hall building, in considerable detail, and its demolition and the discovery of well-preserved deposits, finds and a tunnel allegedly leading to the centre of Rochdale.

3.0 Method: DBA

3.1 The DBA will draw together and consider all available cartographic, photographic, historical documentary and index records that relate to the site.

3.2 Rochdale Local Studies library should certainly be consulted for potential sources of information (i.e. directories, rate valuation books).

3.3 Where available, geotechnical data for the site should be consulted.

3.4 The analysis of the cartographic evidence should include a mapped chronological regression of the development of the site reproduced at sufficiently large a scale for detailed features to be recognisable.

3.5 The assessment should include the results of a detailed walkover survey. Particular attention should be given to recognising and mapping the location and extent of evidence for changes in ground levels and indications of the survival of below-ground remains.

3.6 A representative series of photographs should be included and the reference number, position and direction of all photographs should be clearly located on a plan or plans in the report.

3.7 Where information obtained through oral accounts or discussions is to be used to interpret the development of site, transcripts of such accounts or discussions should be included in the report.

3.8 All archaeological fieldwork should be carried out to acceptable archaeological standards. The contractor will be expected to abide by the Code of Practice of the Institute of Field Archaeologists.

4.0 Method: Evaluation

4.1 There should be an archaeological evaluation. Machine assisted trenching undertaken under close archaeological supervision should be used to identify and characterise archaeological evidence surviving across the site. The evaluation should seek to establish what the degree of preservation/ destruction is and how heritage assets will be affected by the present development. Trenching should target those potential heritage assets identified in the DBA whilst also providing a view of archaeological potential across the site.

4.2 The site contains two areas of archaeological interest. For initial costing purposes and using a toothless ditching bucket no less than 1.6m wide the evaluation should provide for a minimum of 2 x 10m trenches for the north of the site where the remains of Brownhill may be discovered during works for the access road and car parking and
for 6 x 10m trenches for the south of the site where the new build school is to be built, with a contingency of 1 x 10m trench. *A written scheme of investigation covering the evaluation phase should be prepared and submitted for agreement in advance.*

4.3 Informed by the results of the evaluation trenching a decision will then be taken regarding the need for further excavation to record evidence that may be destroyed by the proposed development. At this stage it is not possible to predict if there will be a requirement for an open area excavation or a watching brief. Any subsequent mitigation resulting from the evaluation phase will need to be costed and agreed separately.

4.4 It should be assumed that the evaluation will need to be reported separately from any subsequent mitigation. However, should the client decide that any open area excavation should continue on from the evaluation without delay (no more than two weeks) and using the same contractor then, subject to agreement with Rochdale MBC, the evaluation and open area excavation results could be presented as part of one final report.

4.5 The appointed archaeologist should inform the client as soon as is possible of any previously unbudgeted post-excavation costs that are likely to arise, and agree and secure the necessary funding for such work.

**5.0 Health and Safety**

5.1 Those visiting and working on the site will naturally operate with due regard to health and safety regulations.

5.2 The appointed archaeologist should undertake a site risk assessment.

**6.0 Monitoring**

6.1 The work should be undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced staff. Details of staff and their relevant experience should be supplied in the WSI to the Assistant County Archaeologist and agreed prior to the commencement of the project.

6.2 The Assistant County Archaeologist will require at least one week’s advanced notice of the commencement of field recording, and may wish to visit the site and monitor the work.

**7.0 Report Preparation**

7.1 Bound copies of the DBA, evaluation and any subsequent mitigation report (see 4.4) should be provided for the interested parties including the client, the local planning authority, GMAU, and Rochdale Local Studies Library.

7.2 A digital copy of the reports including illustrations and photographs (PDF Format) should be submitted to GMAU on CD (with the project title, date and author noted on the CD) for inclusion in the HER.

7.3 The evaluation report should include as a minimum,

- Non-technical summary
- Introductory statement
- Aims and purpose of the project
- Methodology
- Detailed account of the work and its results.
- Conclusion, including a confidence statement
- Supporting drawn site illustrations at appropriate scales (site plan, evaluation trench locations, plans of deposits and features, site sections [to include deposit relationships to ground surface], feature plans and sections) *Note: all CAD sections and plans must include a drawn scale*
- Selected site photographs (laser printer quality)
• Drawn finds illustrations – of representative and/or key finds to support the interpretation of date/site function – at appropriate scales
• Supporting data – including a basic quantification of artefacts, ecofacts and structural data tabulated and full specialist reports in appendices.
• Index to archive and details of archive location
• References
• Copy of this brief
• An electronic copy of the report (PDF) should be submitted to the HER in addition to the printed text.

8.4 Where the work is undertaken in fulfilment of a condition of planning consent, discharge of the relevant condition will only normally be recommended by the Assistant County Archaeologist once all reports on the conditioned programme of archaeological work have been submitted and accepted.

8.0 Submission and Deposition of Project Archive

8.1 From the outset of the project arrangements should be made for the archive, consisting of record sheets, original drawings, drawn plans, photographs, notes, copies of the all reports along with an index to the archive to be deposited with the appropriate archive repository.

9.0 Publicity

9.1 The results of the work should be made public. This may, dependant upon the results of the project, take the form of a full definitive report or a short summary published in an appropriate archaeological journal.
APPENDIX 2: PROJECT DESIGN

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Capita Symonds (hereafter the client), on behalf of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council (Rochdale MBC), has commissioned Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) to prepare a written scheme of investigation (WSI) regarding an archaeological investigation of the site of a proposed extension to the immediate south of Brownhill School, Heights Lane, Rochdale, Greater Manchester (centred on NGR SD 89343 14139, Plate 1). Rochdale MBC has been granted planning permission to demolish the existing school in order to construct a replacement on the same site. Condition 8 of the planning consent relates to the requirements for an archaeological investigation following the submission and approval of a WSI by the local planning authority. To this end, a specification has been provided by the Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (GMAU), to which the following WSI has been prepared.

Plate 1: Plan showing existing school buildings together with the proposed replacement building to the south

1.1.2 Brownhill School is situated to the north of Rochdale town centre. It is bound to the east by Heights Lane, to the south by residential development, and to the north by Brownhill View and the Rochdale Healthcare Trust. To the west is Falinge Park, which is listed grade II (no. 1001521) on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, and within it stands the grade II listed Falinge Hall facade and pavilions (LB no. 1055837). Partly within the outlined development area, and across the present Brownhill View to the north, was a hall that dated to at least 1626. When the Brownhill estate was purchased by Rochdale Corporation in 1922 it was adapted to a
school. The building was demolished in 1962, with potential for surviving below ground remains being situated within the northern area of the outlined development site.

1.1.3 Given the potential for the development to encounter archaeological remains, the GMAU brief has requested that the outlined development site be subject to a programme of archaeological evaluation prior to any construction works commencing on site. Evaluation, in this case comprising a desk-based assessment and trial trenching, is part of an iterative process to investigate the archaeological potential of the site and, should any features, deposits or finds of archaeological significance be found, this may lead to the implementation of a mitigation strategy, for example by design and/or open-area excavation or watching brief, and a subsequent appropriate post-exavagation phase (as detailed in Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS 5): Planning for the Historic Environment (DCLG 2010)).

1.1.4 Following the results of the first phase of evaluation, the desk-based assessment (OA North 2011), the trenches were positioned in accordance with the position of the footprint of the building, and targeted the remains of Brownhill Hall to the north of the site. However, consultation with the client and GMAU has led to the removal of three of the trenches in areas where there is to be no disturbance to archaeological deposits (Trenches 1, 2 and 3, Fig A).

1.1.5 The proposed work will meet with the requirements and standards of the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) and, within the framework of MorRPHE (EH 2006), which represents a methodology, for fieldwork and post-excavation reporting. Should significant archaeological remains be identified it will be necessary to produce an updated project design for a programme of detailed archaeological excavation, archive processing, and post-excavation assessment, making allowance for any appropriate analysis and publication.

1.2 OXFORD ARCHAEOLOGY

1.2.1 Oxford Archaeology is an educational charity under the guidance of a board of trustees with over 35 years of experience in archaeology, and can provide a professional and cost-effective service. With three regional offices in Oxford (OA South), Cambridge (OA East), and Lancaster (OA North) we can deploy considerable resources with extensive experience to deal with any archaeological obligations clients may have.

1.2.2 OA North has considerable experience of sites of all periods, having undertaken a great number of small and large scale projects throughout Northern England during the past three decades. Evaluations, assessments, watching briefs and excavations have taken place within the planning process, to fulfil the requirements of Clients and planning authorities, to very rigorous timetables.

1.2.3 OA North has the professional expertise and resources to undertake the project detailed below to a high level of quality and efficiency. OA is an Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) registered organisation, registration number 17, and all its members of staff operate subject to the IfA Code of Conduct (2010).

2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 ACADEMIC AIMS

2.1.1 The main research aim of the archaeological work, given the nature of the development, would be, through a staged process of investigation, to establish and assess the impact on any heritage assets within or surrounding the site, and to identify appropriate mitigation of the impact. Significantly, the potential for the presence or absence of buried archaeological remains on the site in the areas to be affected by groundworks will require intrusive investigation, in terms of establishing its nature, date, extent, and significance, and in accordance with planning guidance PPS 5 (2010).
2.2 OBJECTIVES

2.2.1 The objectives of the investigation may be summarised as follows:

- the main objective would be to identify the known heritage assets and the potential for as yet unknown heritage assets (i.e. buried remains) in the study area,
- determine the presence or absence of any buried archaeological remains within the proposed development area, and investigate the nature, date, extent and significance of the features,
- assess the impact, directly and indirectly, of the proposed development on the heritage assets, to include (where appropriate) standing remains and below ground remains,
- to inform decisions regarding mitigation of the development on any surviving below ground remains or standing structures,
- ultimately, to compile an archival record of any archaeological remains within the proposed development area.

2.2.2 To these ends, the following programme of archaeological evaluation work is required in the first instance, in accordance with English Heritage (2006) and the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) (2008a, b and 2010) standards and guidelines. The first stage of work has been undertaken, the desk-based assessment, the results of which have been used to inform the next stage, the trial trenching fieldwork;

- **Desk-based assessment:** an assessment of available published and unpublished documents (to include maps, illustrations, and records) and site visit to observe and identify the archaeological potential,
- **Trial Trenching:** a programme of trial-trench evaluation to adequately sample the area of the proposed groundworks/area of disturbance;
- **Report and archive:** production of an illustrated report of the findings and assessment of impact of the proposals on the archaeological resource, for submission to the client, GMAU, and other relevant bodies, and preparation of archives of original records and finds for deposition, respectively, with the Greater Manchester Record Office and relevant museum.

3 HEALTH AND SAFETY

3.1 **Risk Assessment:** OA North provides a Health and Safety Statement for all projects and maintains a Company Safety policy. All site procedures are in accordance with the guidance set out in the Health and Safety Manual compiled by the Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers (1997). A written risk assessment will be undertaken in advance of project commencement and copies will be made available on request to all interested parties.

3.2 **Services and other constraints:** full regard will, of course, be given to all constraints (services etc) during the investigation, as well as to all Health and Safety considerations. As a matter of course the field team will use a Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) and Signal Generator prior to any excavation to test for services. However, this is only an approximate location tool. Any information regarding services, i.e. drawings or knowledge of live cables or services, within the study area and held with the client should be made known to the OA North project manager prior to the commencement of the investigation. If the client does not hold any service drawings, OA North can purchase these at cost on behalf of the client, although this may delay the commencement of the site work.

3.3 **Contamination:** any known contamination issues or any specific health and safety requirements on site should be made known to OA North by the client to ensure all procedures can be met, and that the risk is dealt with appropriately. Should any presently unknown contamination be discovered during excavation, it may be necessary to halt the works and
reassess the risk assessment. Should it be necessary to supply additional PPE or other contamination avoidance equipment this will be costed as a variation.

3.4 **Staff issues:** all project staff will be CSCS qualified, proof of which can be provided in the form of CSCS cards.

3.5 Staff welfare facilities will be provided and positioned on or adjacent to the site, in a location to be agreed with the client, which have been included in the costs.

3.6 **Fencing requirements:** it is assumed that there will be no public access to the site during the archaeological investigation. The archaeological groundworks area will be marked by barrier tape if necessary. Any other requirements for fencing at the client’s request (such as heras-type fencing) this will be charged as a variation.

3.7 **Insurance:** OA North has professional indemnity to a value of £2,000,000, employer’s liability cover to a value of £10,000,000 and public liability to a value of £15,000,000. Written details of insurance cover can be provided if required.

4 **METHOD STATEMENT**

4.1 **DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT**

4.1.1 **Introduction:** a desk-based assessment is usually undertaken as the first stage of a programme of archaeological recording, prior to further intrusive investigation in the form of trenching. It is not intended to reduce the requirement for evaluation, excavation or preservation of known or presumed archaeological deposits, but it will provide an appraisal of archaeological constraints and a guide to any requirement for further archaeological work.

4.1.2 This phase of work has been undertaken, the scope of which was detailed in the first issue of this WSI. Based on the results of this work, and the GMAU consultation, the positions of the five trial trenches have been established within the footprint of the proposed new build.

4.2 **TRIAL TRENCHING**

4.2.1 The programme of trial trenching will establish the presence or absence of any previously unsuspected archaeological deposits and, if established, will then test their date, nature, depth and quality of preservation. This will enable the outlined area to be adequately sampled. The following methodology is prepared in line with the GMAU brief.

4.2.2 **Trenching requirements:** the configuration of trenches has been informed by the desk-based assessment, and agreed with GMAU. However, the GMAU brief has requested, for initial costing purposes, that the site be investigated via a minimum of eight evaluation trenches, with a contingency of an additional trench depending on the results on site. Two of the original eight trenches targeted the area within the north of the site over the position of Brownhill Hall and the third is within the MUGA. However, it has been agreed with GMAU to remove these three trenches from the scope of works as these areas will not be disturbed by groundworks for the proposed access road and car parking. The remaining five trenches (Trenches 4-8) will be positioned within the footprint of the proposed new building (Plate 1). All of the trenches will measure 10 x 1.6m, and are intended to investigate an adequate sample of the proposed development area.

4.2.3 The methodology for the excavation of the trial trenches has been provided below.

4.2.4 **Access:** liaison for basic site access will be undertaken through the client. It is understood that there will be access for both pedestrian and plant traffic to the site.

4.2.5 **Methodology:** the modern ground surface will be removed by a JCB 3CX excavator or similar (fitted with a toothless ditching bucket) under archaeological supervision and, thereafter, excavation will proceed in level spits down to the surface of the first significant archaeological
or natural deposit, whichever is encountered first. This deposit will be cleaned by hand, using either hoes, shovel scraping, and/or trowels depending on the subsoil conditions, and inspected for archaeological features. All features of archaeological interest will be investigated and recorded unless otherwise agreed with GMAU. The trench will not be excavated deeper than 1-1.2m to accommodate health and safety constraints; any requirements to excavate below this depth will involve stepping out or battering of the trench sides, which will require the agreement of a variation to the costing.

4.2.6 The trench will be excavated in a stratigraphical manner, whether by machine or by hand, and will be located by the use of GPS equipment, which is accurate to +/- 0.25m, or using an EDM Total Station, based on a site grid related to the national grid obtained from any available client base mapping. Altitude information will be established with respect to Ordnance Survey Datum.

4.2.7 Any investigation of intact archaeological deposits will be exclusively manual. Selected pits and postholes will normally only be half-sectioned, linear features will be subject to no more than a 10% sample, and extensive layers will, where possible, be sampled by partial rather than complete removal. It is hoped that in terms of the vertical stratigraphy, maximum information retrieval will be achieved through the examination of sections of cut features. All excavation, whether by machine or by hand, will be undertaken with a view to avoiding damage to any archaeological features, which appear worthy of preservation in situ.

4.2.8 All information identified in the course of the site works will be recorded stratigraphically, using a system, adapted from that used by Centre for Archaeology Service of English Heritage, with sufficient pictorial record (plans, sections, and monochrome contacts) to identify and illustrate individual features. A Harris Matrix will be compiled during the fieldwork. Primary records will be available for inspection at all times.

4.2.9 Results of all field investigations will be recorded on pro forma context sheets. The site archive will include both a photographic record (black and white (35mm), and digital shots for illustration purposes) and accurate large scale plans and sections at an appropriate scale (1:50, 1:20 and 1:10). At least one long section of the trench will be recorded. All artefacts and ecofacts will be recorded using the same system, and will be handled and stored according to standard practice (following current IfA guidelines) in order to minimise deterioration.

4.2.10 Contingency plan: a contingency costing may also be employed for unseen delays caused by prolonged periods of bad weather, vandalism, discovery of unforeseen complex deposits and/or artefacts which require specialist removal, use of shoring to excavate important features close to the excavation sections etc. This has been included in the costings document and would be utilised in agreement with the client.

4.2.11 Environmental Sampling: environmental samples (bulk samples of 40 litres volume, to be sub-sampled at a later stage) will be collected from stratified undisturbed deposits and will particularly target negative features (gullies, pits and ditches). An assessment of the environmental potential of the site will be undertaken through the examination of suitable deposits by the in-house palaeoecological specialist, who will examine the potential for further analysis. The assessment would include soil pollen analysis and the retrieval of charred plant macrofossils and land molluscs from former dry-land palaeosols and cut features. In addition, the samples would be assessed for plant macrofossils, insect, molluscs and pollen from waterlogged deposits. The costs for the palaeoecological assessment are defined as a contingency and will only be called into effect if good deposits are identified.

4.2.12 Faunal remains: if there is found to be the potential for discovery of bones of fish and small mammals a sieving programme will be carried out. These will be assessed as appropriate by OA north’s specialist in faunal remains, and subject to the results, there may be a requirement for more detailed analysis. A contingency has been included for the assessment of such faunal remains for analysis.

4.2.13 Human Remains: any human remains uncovered will be left in situ, covered and protected. No further investigation will continue beyond that required to establish the date and character
of the burial. GMAU, the client, and the local Coroner will be informed immediately. If removal is essential the exhumation of any funerary remains will require the provision of a Home Office license, under section 25 of the Burial Act of 1857. An application will be made by OA North for the study area on discovery of any such remains and the removal will be carried out with due care and sensitivity under the environmental health regulations. Any delays caused by unforeseen and complex excavation of inhumations may be subject to a variation to the cost of the contract and will be agreed with the client.

4.2.14 **Treatment of finds:** all finds will be exposed, lifted, cleaned, conserved, marked, bagged and boxed in accordance with the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation (UKIC) *First Aid For Finds*, 1998 (new edition) and the recipient museum’s guidelines.

4.2.15 All identified finds and artefacts will be retained, although certain classes of building material can sometimes be discarded after recording if an appropriate sample is retained on advice from the recipient museum’s archive curator.

4.2.16 **Treasure:** any gold and silver artefacts recovered during the course of the excavation will be removed to a safe place and reported to the local Coroner according to the procedures relating to the Treasure Act, 1996. Where removal cannot take place on the same working day as discovery, suitable security will be employed to protect the finds from theft.

4.3 **Report**

4.3.1 Due to the iterative nature of the evaluation phase, each of the above elements is to be reported on separately; the desk-based assessment report having already been issued (OA North 2011). For the trial trenching phase, one copy of a written synthetic report will be submitted to the client, together with a digital copy on CD, within six to eight weeks of completion of the fieldwork, unless an alternative deadline is agreed with the client beforehand. Copies will also be forwarded to GMAU (including a pdf version for inclusion in the HER), the local planning authority, and Rochdale Local Studies library for reference purposes following agreement with the client.

4.3.2 The report will include;

- a site location plan related to the national grid
- a front cover to include the NGR
- a concise, non-technical summary of the results
- the circumstances of the project and the dates on which the fieldwork was undertaken
- description of the methodology
- a brief précis of the historical background of the study area from the desk-based assessment
- an interpretation of the results and their significance
- conclusion, including a confidence statement
- complete bibliography of sources from which data has been derived, and a list of any further sources identified but not consulted
- a statement of the impact of the proposals on the archaeological resource and, where appropriate, recommendations for further investigation or mitigation solutions
- appropriate plans showing the position of trial trenches, together with the position of features or deposits
• monochrome and colour photographs as appropriate
• a copy of this project design, and indications of any agreed departure from that design
• index to the archive.

4.3.3 A summary of the results produced from the archaeological investigation will be published in the CBA North West magazine, although a more detailed article will be provided should the results be of sufficient merit.

4.3.4 Confidentiality: all internal reports to the client are designed as documents for the specific use of the client, for the particular purpose as defined in the project brief and project design, and should be treated as such. They are not suitable for publication as academic documents or otherwise without amendment or revision.

4.4 ARCHIVE

4.4.1 The results of all archaeological work carried out will form the basis for a full archive to professional standards, in accordance with current English Heritage guidelines (2006). The project archive will include summary processing and analysis of all features, finds, which will be catalogued by context.

4.4.2 The deposition of a properly ordered and indexed project archive in an appropriate repository is essential and archive will be provided in the English Heritage Centre for Archaeology format and a synthesis will be submitted to the Greater Manchester HER (the index to the archive and a copy of the report). OA North practice is to deposit the original record archive of projects with the appropriate Record Office (in this instance, that at Manchester).

4.4.3 All artefacts will be processed to English Heritage standards and will be assessed by our in-house finds specialists. The deposition and disposal of any artefacts recovered in the evaluation will be agreed with the legal owner and an appropriate recipient museum. Discussion regarding the museum’s requirement for the transfer and storage of finds will be conducted prior to the commencement of the project, and GMAU will be notified of the arrangements made.

4.4.4 OASIS: an OASIS form will be completed as part of the works.

5 WORK TIMETABLE

5.1.1 Trial trenching: it is estimated that the proposed number of trenches currently would take a three person team approximately three days to complete.

5.1.2 Report and archive: approximately six to eight weeks will be required for the compilation of the report and archive following the completion of the fieldwork, unless more detailed excavation is required. In which case a rolling programme of fieldwork and post-excavation may be preferred by the client. An interim statement on any salient results can therefore be produced, if required. The archive will submitted within approximately six months.

6 STAFFING PROPOSALS

6.1 OA NORTH STAFF

6.1.1 The project will be under the overall charge of Emily Mercer (OA North project manager) to whom all correspondence should be addressed. Emily will ensure that the project design is implemented within the framework of the Aims and Objectives (Section 2, above), and the methodology adhered to. She will be responsible for all aspects of staff and resource logistics, ensuring the smooth running of the project programme, whilst liaising with the client and Assistant County Archaeologist with regard to progress, and will maintain relationships with other contractors.
6.1.2 The trial trenching will be undertaken by Andrew Bates (OA North project officer) who is experienced in such work and capable of carrying out projects of all sizes. Andrew will be assisted on site by Jon Onraet and Paul Dunn.

6.1.3 Health and Safety advice will be provided by Murray Cook (OA North Project Manager) who is NEEBOSH training.

6.1.4 Assessment of any finds from the excavation will be undertaken by OA North's in-house finds specialist Christine Howard-Davis (OA North Finds Manager). Christine has extensive knowledge of all finds of all periods from archaeological sites in northern England.

6.1.5 Assessment of any palaeoenvironmental samples will be undertaken by or under the auspices of Elizabeth Huckerby MSc (OA North project officer). Elizabeth has extensive knowledge of the palaeoecology of the North West through her work on the English Heritage-funded North West Wetlands Survey.
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## APPENDIX 3: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Context no</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Topsoil. A very dark grey fine sandy-silty-clay, 0.4m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Subsoil. A dark grey silty-clay, 0.2m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Culvert. The culvert was constructed of sandstone on a north-east/south-west alignment, covered over by a mid-orange-grey redeposited glacial till.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>Culvert. Comprised sandstone capping and base, constructed on a north-east/south-west alignment. The capping stones measured a maximum of 480mm by 330mm by 25mm in size. The sides were constructed of two courses of red brick measuring 220mm by 110mm by 67mm in size. The culvert contained running water, and was therefore left undisturbed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Fill of 406. Sediment back-filled over culvert 403. Comprised a coarse sandy-clay with occasional fragments of red brick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>Construction cut for 404. Cut measured 0.78m wide, excavated on a north-east/south-west alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Topsoil. A dark brown-grey silty-clay, 0.26m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>Subsoil. A mid-grey-brown silty-clay, 0.34m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Glacial till. A yellowish-brown clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Topsoil. A very dark grey fine sandy-silty-clay, 0.27m thick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>Subsoil. A mid-brown silty-clay, 0.22m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>Layer. A light grey silty-clay, 0.14m thick. The interface between the glacial till 603 and the subsoil 601.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>Glacial till. A yellowish-orange clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>Field Drain. A narrow culverted field drain of a sandstone construction measuring 0.47m wide. The culvert was still active, and flooded the area upon being disturbed. The culvert was left in situ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Topsoil. A very dark brownish-grey silty-clay, 0.18m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>Layer. A mid-brown sandy-silty-clay, 0.14m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>Subsoil. A light grey silty-clay, 0.28m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>Stone culvert. Comprised roughly-hewn stone measuring a maximum of 0.58m by 0.58m by 0.05m in size. Two courses of stone formed the sides of the structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>Construction cut for culvert 703, measuring 0.82m wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>Glacial till. A mid-orangey-brown clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Topsoil. A dark brown-grey silty-clay, 0.24m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Fill of 802. Re-deposited glacial till, comprised mid-orangey-yellow sandy-clay 0.23m thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Linear feature. It measured 1.0m wide and 0.23m deep, excavated on a east/west alignment, with a flat bottom and straight, near vertical, sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Subsoil. A mid-brown silty-clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>Glacial till. A yellowish-brown clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4: FINDS CATALOGUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two small body fragments of black-glazed redware with white internal slip; one body fragment of Westerwald stoneware; one small body fragment of tin-glazed ware</td>
<td>Late seventeenth-century and later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>One base fragment of engine-turned white salt-glazed stoneware, possibly a ‘second’</td>
<td>Mid - late eighteenth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Tobacco pipe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two small stem fragments, large bore</td>
<td>Seventeenth-eighteenth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Base fragment of black-glazed redware. Probably an early fabric</td>
<td>Late seventeenth - eighteenth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unstratified</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Tobacco pipe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>One small stem fragment, large bore</td>
<td>Seventeenth-eighteenth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unstratified</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>One body fragment of black-glazed redware, probably an early fabric; one body fragment of black-glazed redware, nineteenth-century fabric?</td>
<td>Late seventeenth - eighteenth century and later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Three small fragments of blue and white underglaze transfer-printed refined white earthenware</td>
<td>Nineteenth century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>