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SUMMARY

Barnes Village Ltd has obtained planning permission to redevelop the former Barnes Hospital and its associated grounds in Cheadle, near Stockport (NGR 385232, 388955). The development proposal allows for the refurbishment of the hospital building, which is afforded statutory designation as a Grade II listed building, together with the erection of new housing. The new build will comprise housing within the grounds encompassing the hospital building. The proposed construction works will necessitate considerable earth-moving works, which have some potential to damage or destroy buried archaeological remains.

A desk-based study carried out to support the planning application concluded that the site has some potential to contain buried remains of archaeological interest, including the projected line of the Roman road from Cheadle to Buxton, which takes a course across the north-eastern corner of the site. In addition, artefacts of prehistoric, Roman, and early medieval date have been discovered within the immediate vicinity, raising the possibility that other buried artefacts of archaeological interest may survive within the site boundary.

In the light of these conclusions, the Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS), which provides archaeological advice to Stockport Council, recommended that a programme of archaeological investigation of the site was merited in advance of development, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph 128. In September 2015, Oxford Archaeology North was commissioned by Reis Construction, acting on behalf of Barnes Village Ltd, to undertake the specified programme of archaeological evaluation. In total, 12 trenches were excavated across the study area, coupled with a walk-over survey in the area of the northern field prior to excavations.

Although the walk-over survey revealed significant quantities of dispersed later nineteenth- and twentieth-century pottery and ceramic building materials, none of the trenches revealed archaeological features pre-dating the modern period. The survival of a thick layer of subsoil in the northern field suggests human activity in this area has been confined to agriculture. The area to the south of the hospital appears to have been subjected to heavy disturbance and levelling associated with the demolition of later nineteenth- and twentieth-century structures, although the presence of a thin layer of subsoil may have represented the vestiges of an agricultural horizon.

The results obtained from the evaluation trenching concluded that there is little potential for significant archaeological remains to survive in-situ, and is thus unlikely that any earth-moving works associated with the proposed development would have a negative impact on the buried archaeological resource. It is considered unlikely that any further intrusive investigation of the site is merited.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF PROJECT

1.1.1 Barnes Village Ltd has obtained planning permission to redevelop the former Barnes Hospital and its associated grounds in Cheadle, near Stockport. The development proposal allows for the refurbishment of the hospital building, which is afforded statutory designation as a Grade II listed building, together with the erection of new housing. The new build will comprise housing within the grounds encompassing the hospital building. The proposed construction works will necessitate considerable earth-moving works, which have some potential to damage or destroy buried archaeological remains.

1.1.2 The archaeological potential of the site has been highlighted by a desk-based assessment produced by Oxford Archaeology North (OA North 2014). This study concluded that the site has some potential to contain buried remains of archaeological interest, including the projected line of the Roman road from Cheadle to Buxton. In addition, artefacts of prehistoric, Roman, and early medieval date have been discovered within the immediate vicinity, raising the possibility that other buried artefacts of archaeological interest may survive within the site boundary. In the light of these conclusions, the Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS), which provides archaeological advice to Stockport Council, recommended that a programme of archaeological investigation of the site was merited in advance of development, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.1.3 In response to this recommendation Reis Construction, acting on behalf of Barnes Village Ltd, commissioned OA North to carry out a programme of archaeological evaluation. This comprised the mechanical excavation of 12 trenches within the study area, which aimed to establish character, extent, date and significance of the below-ground archaeological resource. The evaluation trenching and walk over survey was carried out in September 2015.

1.2 LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

1.2.1 The study area (centred on NGR 385232 388955) lies c. 1km to the north-west of Cheadle town centre, and 4km to the west of Stockport (Fig 1). The area forms part of the county of Greater Manchester, although the boundary with the adjacent county of Cheshire lies a short distance to the south. Barnes Hospital is almost entirely encompassed by major transport routes, with Junction 4 of the M60 situated immediately to the south-east, and Junction 3 to the south-west. The southern boundary of the site is formed by a former railway embankment (Plate 1).

1.2.2 The study area occupies land at a height of approximately 44m above Ordnance Datum, and lies between the river Mersey and the Micker Brook. The surrounding ground levels fall northwards and eastwards towards these watercourses.
1.1.1 The solid geology of the area comprises the Sherwood Sandstone Group, which is overlain by glacial boulder clay (Hall et al 1995, 8). The course of the Micker Brook to the east of the study area is associated with a ribbon of alluvium, whilst river terrace gravel deposits lie within the wider valley of the river Mersey to the north. The drift geology to the west and east of the study area is characterised by a tract of fluvio-glacial gravel, together with glacial sand and gravel.

1.3 HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

1.3.1 Roman period: whilst there are tantalising indications of Cheadle having been a focus for Roman activity in the area, firm evidence is lacking and represents an archaeological research objective of high local importance. Physical remains dating to this period comprise clusters of Roman finds that have been discovered in the immediate vicinity of Barnes Hospital. In particular, two Roman coins were found in 1972 at Red Rocks, on the west bank of the Micker Brook. The coins are thought to have dated to the fourth century, and were probably issues of Constantius II. Another two coins were found a short distance to the north-east in 1981. These findspots lie close to a shallow point on the Micker Brook, raising the possibility that this had been an ancient ford, or crossing point, adjacent to the projected line of the Roman road. Another Roman coin was discovered to the south of the Barnes Hospital in 1948; this coin was dated to the reign of Galerius (AD 305-11). In addition, three coins were recovered from a building site at the corner of Massie Street and High Street in Cheadle in 1939 (Redhead and Miller 2014).
1.3.2 There is also some indication that Cheadle lies on the route of a Roman road to Buxton. The existence of this road was inferred in the nineteenth century from ‘Street Lane’, which is known presently as Cheadle Road. Some weight to this interpretation was provided by the discovery in the 1880s of a surface composed of compacted gravel. The surface was discovered on Ack Lane East in Bramhall, situated to the south-east of Cheadle, and on the same alignment as Cheadle Road. Further to the south-east, recent excavation at Walnut Tree Farm in Woodford revealed another section of a gravel road, which had a width of 7.5m and a cambered surface, typical of Roman construction. In addition, it is possible that a second Roman road, running south of the Mersey and perhaps linking with the Manchester to Chester Road, also passed through Cheadle (Arrowsmith 1997, 15).

1.3.3 In 2005, two sherds of pottery that were identified provisionally as being of a Roman date were recovered from an archaeological evaluation of land to the rear of the White Hart pub in Cheadle. Whilst the evaluation did not provide any direct evidence for Roman activity in the area, it was concluded that the site may have been used as agricultural land since the Roman period (UMAU 2005, 13).

1.3.4 **Early Medieval Period:** evidence for early medieval activity in north-west England is sparse, perhaps reflecting constant invasion by the Danes after AD 870 (Thomson 1967). Similarly, the character of occupation in Cheadle following the collapse of formal Roman administration in the early fifth century remains entirely obscure, although it has been suggested that St Chad preached in the area during the seventh century (Clarke 1972, 1).

1.3.5 Physical remains from this period are best represented in Cheadle by fragments of at least two stone crosses that were discovered in the immediate vicinity of the study area; one of the fragments is displayed currently in a glass case in St Mary’s Church Cheadle. There are conflicting accounts of the circumstances of the discovery of the cross fragments. Earwaker (1878, 185) attributes the discovery to some workmen who were excavating a large brickfield opposite Barnes Convalescent Hospital in 1875 and unearthed the remains of one, if not more, stone crosses at a shallow depth. Having left the fragments lying on the ground, they were recovered by Mrs Bangay, the wife of Dr Bangay of Cheadle, who removed them to her house. Earwaker locates the field in which the cross fragments were unearthed as that marked ‘Brickfield’ No 54 on the 1872 Ordnance Survey map (Bailey 2011).

1.3.6 Moss (1894, 7-8) described the site of discovery as ‘the corner of a field perhaps 300 yards west or slightly to the north of west of the tower of the church and on the opposite high bank of the little river’. Moss, however, was less positive about Dr Bangay’s involvement, asserting that the stones had first been recognised by ‘the well-known local antiquary, Mr Bailey, who made them out to be two crosses’ and that Bangay had subsequently paid the men and removed the more complete cross; ‘the other and much older cross was imperfect; it also was taken away with what was probably an upright stone shaft’ (quoted in Bailey 2011). A further account suggests that the cross fragments were discovered during the construction of the Barnes Hospital in 1875 (Squire 1976, 1).
1.3.7 The cross in St Mary’s Church is thought to date to the later part of the tenth or eleventh century, although it could possibly be even earlier (Redhead and Miller 2014). The cross comprises fan-shaped arms, central bars, and a carved shaft.

Plate 2: The cross in St Mary’s Church
1.3.8 **Medieval Period:** Cheadle is recorded in the Domesday Survey of 1086 as ‘Cedde’, which may be translated as ‘clearing in a wood’. The detail of the survey indicates that there were only about ten households in the area. It was held by Gamel, a free Saxon under Hugh d’Avranches, First Earl of Chester; it was about three miles long and half as wide, containing both wooded and open land, with areas enclosed for hunting purposes.

1.3.9 By the mid-twelfth century, the manor of Cheadle was held by a family of that name. By June 1294, Geoffrey de Chedle was lord of the manor, which was valued at about £20 per annum. A church of wooden construction is thought to have been built by that date, on the site on High Street occupied currently by St Mary’s Church (Clarke 1972, 5). The estate passed to Matilda de Chedle in the early 1320s, who held it until her death in 1326 (Squire 1976, 1). As there were no male heirs the manor, it was divided between her daughters, Clemence and Agnes. Agnes inherited the northern half (which would later become the modern-day Cheadle), and Clemence inherited the southern half (latterly Cheadle Hulme). The two areas became known as ‘Chedle Bulkeley’ and ‘Chedle Holme’ respectively.

1.3.10 The manor was situated in the Hundred of Macclesfield, and comprised the townships of Cheadle Bulkeley, Cheadle Moseley, and Handforth, incorporating a cumulative total of 6230 acres; the township of Cheadle Bulkeley comprised 2100 acres, whilst Cheadle Moseley occupied 2350 acres (Bagshaw 1850, 168). The medieval economy was based firmly on agriculture, and particularly the raising of beef and dairy cattle, and other livestock including sheep, pigs and poultry (Hilton nd, 127). The earliest reference to a corn mill in Cheadle is provided by a charter dated c 1185-1200 (Barraclough 1957, 31).

1.3.11 The location of the twelfth-century mill is not entirely certain, although it is believed to have occupied the same site as the later Higher Mill (Arrowsmith 1997, 55). Cheadle Lower Mill was the manorial mill of Cheadle Bulkeley; Lower Mill was ‘doubtless on the site of the old mill of the Bulkeley’s mentioned in 1349 as being worth 13s 4d per annum’ (Moss 1970, 139-40). Whilst this mill was almost certainly situated on the Micker Brook in the immediate vicinity of the present study area, its exact location remains uncertain. The recent excavation of the Cheadle Bleach Works revealed structural remains that could be identified firmly with the documented post-medieval corn mill, although no evidence for its medieval predecessor was encountered (OA North 2008).

1.3.12 Physical evidence for medieval activity in close proximity to the study area is provided by a bronze ring of a probable fourteenth-century date, which was discovered in a field on the west side of the Micker Brook at the end of Mill Lane in 1980, and a sherd of medieval pottery recovered from an archaeological excavation to the rear of the White Hart in 2005 (UMAU 2005).
1.3.13 Other known archaeological sites of medieval origin within a 500m radius of the study area include a sundial situated to the north-east of St Mary’s Church, which may have originated as a medieval stone cross shaft. In addition, ridge and furrow marks can be seen in a field immediately to the south-east of the study area on aerial views. Whilst the ridge and furrow cannot be dated firmly, it could potentially be of later medieval date.

1.3.14 Post-medieval and Industrial Period: at the beginning of the post-medieval period, the general area remained sparsely populated with isolated halls and farmsteads. Only part of the land was cultivated, the rest mostly moor land, swamp and thicket (Wharfe 1974, 28). Large areas continued to be held as forest, including potentially good agricultural land. The wetlands of the region were for the most part undrained and uncolonised, the land lay unenclosed and settled by only seasonally occupied houses or huts (McNeil and Newman 2004, 4). The main characteristics of the region during this time were undeveloped wastelands and expansion of settlement into them (ibid).

1.3.15 The economy of Cheadle continued to be based largely on agriculture through the post-medieval period, although handloom silk weaving emerged as an important industry locally during the eighteenth century (Hilton nd, 129). The parish church of St Mary was largely erected during the early sixteenth century, although it is known to have been situated on a medieval site. The church was largely rebuilt in 1813-17, with only the chancel from the medieval church surviving (Chivers 1993, 3).

1.3.16 After the death of James Viscount Bulkeley, the manor was sold under an Act of Parliament in 1756 to the Rev Thomas Egerton and, in 1806, it was conveyed to John Worthington (Pigot and Co 1828, 13-4). Burdett’s Map of Cheshire, published in 1777, shows that Cheadle was the second largest settlement in the borough after Stockport (Section 3.2.1). The detail of the map appears to show a pattern of settlement based largely on scattered farmhouses and hamlets (Arrowsmith 1997).

1.3.17 A significant alteration to the landscape in the vicinity of the study area during the nineteenth century was construction of the railway. This line was opened in 1862, taking a route along the southern boundary of the study area. A private siding was laid subsequently to serve Barnes Hospital.

1.3.18 Barnes Convalescent Hospital: it had been decided in 1865 by the Manchester Infirmary Trustees to build a convalescent home some distance away from the industrial pollution of the city. Robert Barnes heard of this, and donated £10,000, adding a further £16,000 subsequently. A site at Cheadle was bought from the trustees of Sir L Bamford Hesketh for £3190. The foundation stone was laid on 29 July 1871 by Hugh Birley MP. The building was finished in 1875, and opened in the October of that year. During the construction programme, a railway siding was laid for use by the contractors. During the construction of this line, a bed of natural fine clay was exposed, which was used to make bricks for the construction of the hospital building. The total cost of the hospital came to £52,000 (Simmonds 1993, 2). A photograph of the hospital shortly after it had been completed was printed in Manchester Faces and Places in 1889 (Plate 3).
1.3.19 An account published by JG Hammond in 1898 noted that ‘the Home occupies a pleasant situation in its own grounds at Cheadle… the estate comprising about 46 acres of land, part of which, in close proximity to the building, has been tastefully laid out for the use and benefit of the patients, while the remainder is pasture land, and is let for farming purposes’ (quoted in Simmonds 1993).

![Plate 3: Photograph of the front (south-east-facing elevation) of Barnes Convalescent Hospital published in ‘Manchester Faces and Places’, 1889](image)

1.3.20 In 1925, Barnes was used largely as a relief hospital for medical and surgical patients at Manchester Royal Infirmary. During the Second World War, the hospital was used as a convalescent home for wounded soldiers (Redhead and Miller 2014).

1.3.21 The hospital closed in September 1999, and it the same year it was afforded statutory designation as a Grade II listed building. The site was sold in 2001 (Stockport Express, 28 February 2001), and was owned for several years by Realty Estates (Stockport Express, 4 December 2002). It was purchased subsequently by Benmore, an Irish property development group, which proposed a residential development around the hospital building. However, these plans did not materialise, and the site was purchased recently by a group of four local businessmen.
2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 At the request of Kevin Watters of Reis Construction, a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was prepared by Oxford Archaeology North, in consultation with GMAAS (Appendix 1). The WSI was adhered to in full, and the work was consistent with the relevant Chartered Institute for Archaeologists’ and Historic England guidelines.

2.2 WALK-OVER SURVEY

2.2.1 Prior to the excavation of the evaluation trenches a walk-over survey was conducted across the partially stripped fields to the north of the hospital. The survey involved the visual inspection of the ground surface in 5m transects across the length of the field, noting any artefactual densities that may indicate the location of features, and inform the subsequent positioning of evaluation trenches.

2.3 EVALUATION TRENCHING

2.1.1 The topsoil was removed by machine (fitted with a toothless ditching bucket) under archaeological supervision to the surface of the first significant archaeological deposit. This deposit was 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 were investigated and recorded.

2.1.2 All trenches were excavated in a stratigraphical manner. The trench locations were determined on the ground and positioned in areas deemed likely to encounter archaeological deposits. The position of the trenches were located accurately using a differential Global Positioning System (dGPS), with topographical altitude information for each area provided by the client and established with respect to Ordnance Survey datum.

2.1.3 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 digital photographs). Primary records were available for inspection at all times.

2.4 ARCHIVE

2.2.2 A full professional archive has been compiled in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation, and in accordance with current CIfA and Historic England guidelines (English Heritage 2006). The paper and digital archive will be deposited in the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record on completion of the project.
3. FIELDWORK RESULTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 A total of 12 trenches were excavated during the course of the evaluation (Fig 2), in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation (Appendix 1). Each trench had a length of 20m and a width of 2m, except trenches 5 and 6, which measured 10m and 5m long respectively. A summary of the results obtained from each trench is presented below.

3.2 TRENCH 1

3.2.1 Trench 1 was placed on an east/west alignment, to the south of the main entrance to the site in the south-western corner of the site (Fig 2). The undisturbed natural geology was encountered at a depth of 0.4m below the present ground surface, and comprised mid-orangey-yellow heavy clay with patches of gleying.

3.2.2 The natural geology was overlain by a thin deposit of mid-yellowish-brown clay silt subsoil, up to 0.10m thick, and with rare sub-angular stones a maximum of 10mm in size (Plate 4). At the eastern end of the trench two inter-cutting ceramic field drains had been cut into the natural geology through the subsoil and above this lay a deposit of heavily disturbed loose dark grey brown silt, containing significant quantities of modern demolition rubble. This deposit covered the full length of the trench, and had itself been overlain by a modern layer of gravel and terram matting.

3.2.3 No features of archaeological significance were cut into any of these deposits, and the only artefacts were of a nineteenth-century date or later.

3.3 TRENCH 2

3.3.1 Trench 2 was placed to the south of Trench 1, within the south-western corner of the site, and was aligned broadly east/west (Fig 2). The natural geology was exposed at a depth of 0.30-0.40m below the present ground level, and was identical in character to that described in Trench 1.

3.3.2 Towards the western end of the trench a modern drain, backfilled with gravel, crossed the width of the trench. A small sub-circular depression or pit was recorded to the west of the drain, measuring 0.37m in diameter. Excavation revealed it to be only 0.04m in depth, and filled with dark greyish-brown silt containing modern demolition rubble. The pit and natural geology were sealed by the same loose dark grey brown silt deposit identified in Trench 1 but, despite the proximity of the two trenches, there was no evidence for a subsoil in this location.

3.3.3 No archaeological features were encountered
Plate 4: Trench 1 looking east, 2m scale

Plate 5: Trench 1, south-facing section, 1m scale
Plate 6: Trench 2, facing west, 2m scale

Plate 7: Trench 2, south-facing section, 1m scale
3.3 **TRENCH 3**

3.3.1 Trench 3 was aligned broadly north/south, and lay a short distance to the west of trenches 1 and 2 (Fig 2). Its position was adjusted slightly further to the south than originally intended to avoid the line of a gas main, which once supplied the hospital.

3.3.2 Deposits of mid-orangey-yellow heavy clays with patches of grey gleying were again encountered just 0.30m below the present ground surface, and a ceramic field drain had been cut into the natural, crossing the northern end of the trench. Both the drain and natural clay were covered by the same loose dark greyish-brown silt that had been recorded in both trenches 1 and 2 and contained significant quantities of modern demolition waste. The soil increased in thickness to the south up to a maximum of 0.60m, reflecting a slight rise in the ground surface in this direction and in places this demolition waste had been pressed into the top of the underlying natural clays.

3.3.3 No archaeological features were encountered in the trench.
3.4 **Trench 4**

3.4.1 Trench 4 was located in the south-eastern corner of the site, on an area of grass land to the east of the original hospital building, and lay upon a broadly east/west alignment (Fig 2). Natural clays were encountered at a depth of 0.30m beneath the present ground surface, and three ceramic field drains were recorded cutting the natural across the centre of the trench. Two of the drains were aligned approximately east/west and, unusually, each cut contained two parallel drains. The third was aligned north/south, and contained just a single drain. All three drains and the natural clays were sealed beneath a layer of mid-yellowish-brown clay silt, containing fragments of modern demolition waste and rare sub-angular stones up to 10mm in size.

3.4.2 No archaeological features were encountered.

3.5 **Trench 5**

3.5.1 Trench 5 was placed in the south-eastern corner of the site, just a short distance to the south of Trench 4, and west of the footbridge crossing the slip road for the west-bound carriageway of the M60 motorway. It was aligned broadly north/south, and was the only trench with a length of 10m.

3.5.2 Natural clay was identified at a depth of only 0.40m below the modern ground surface, and was covered by a deposit of mid-yellowish-brown clay silt, identical to that described within Trench 4.

3.5.3 No archaeological features were identified within the trench.
Plate 12: Trench 5, facing north, 2m scale

Plate 13: Trench 5, west-facing section, 1m scale
3.6 **TRENCH 6**

3.6.1 Trench 6 lay within the south-eastern corner of the site to the south-west of trenches 4 and 5, and was located upon a broadly east/west alignment (Fig 2). It was the only trench with a length of 5m, allowing it to be placed in the southern portion of the grassed area, and its excavation revealed natural clays at a depth of 0.36m. The cut of a modern drain was identified at the western end of the trench, backfilled with gravel, and both the drain and natural clay was covered to the present ground surface by a layer of mid-yellowish-brown clay silt, containing fragments of modern demolition waste and rare sub-angular stones up to 10mm in size.

3.6.2 No archaeological features were identified within the trench.

*Plate 14: Trench 6, facing west, 2m scale*
3.7 TRENCH 7

3.7.1 Trench 7 was located to the north of the hospital building, within the south-eastern corner of the area known as the lower field (Fig 2). This area had been partially stripped of topsoil prior to the present survey to an average depth of 0.2m, and was the subject of a walk-over survey prior to the excavation of the trenches.

3.7.2 Trench 7 was aligned east/west, and its location was moved slightly further to the north than originally designed to avoid an area of rubble spoil, which covered the southern end of the site. Its excavation revealed mid-orangey-yellow coarse sandy clay, with occasional patches of grey gleying and alluvial gravels at a depth of 0.65m.

3.7.3 The natural geology was sealed beneath a deposit of mid-brownish-yellow clay silt subsoil with very rare sub-angular and sub rounded stone up to 10mm in size. The subsoil reached a maximum thickness of 0.4m, and was overlain by mid-yellowish-brown topsoil to a maximum depth of 0.25m. The topsoil contained occasional sub angular to sub-rounded stones up to 0.20m in size and included fragments of nineteenth century and later pottery and ceramic building material throughout.

3.7.4 No archaeological features were identified within the trench.
Plate 16: Trench 7, facing east, 2m scale

Plate 17: Trench 7 north-east-facing section, 1m scale
3.8 **TRENCH 8**

3.8.1 Trench 8 was placed a short distance to the north west of Trench 7, and placed on a north-east/south-west alignment (Fig 2). It was located slightly further to the north-east than originally designed to avoid an area of flooding and also to incorporate a linear feature which had been noted during the walk-over survey.

3.8.2 The excavation of the trench revealed natural clays sands and gravels identical to that recorded in Trench 7 at a depth of 0.68m. The natural was covered by a layer of mid-brownish-yellow clay silt subsoil, identical to that described in Trench 7, to a maximum thickness of 0.5m. A ceramic field drain had been cut into the subsoil on a north-east/south-west alignment, and the cut backfilled with a mixture of subsoil and topsoil. The field drain and subsoil was overlain by the surviving lower portions of the mid-yellowish-brown topsoil to a thickness of up to 0.15m.

3.8.3 No archaeological features were encountered.

*Plate 18: Trench 8, facing north-east, 2m scale*
3.9  TRENCH 9

3.9.1 Trench 9 was placed to the north of Trench 8, along the north-eastern boundary of site (Fig 2). It was aligned broadly north/south, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.65m, where undisturbed natural soils were encountered. The natural was similar to that described in Trench 7, with mid-orangey-yellow coarse sandy clays, but in this case included a band of alluvial gravels across the centre of the trench. A sondage excavated into the gravel band showed it to have irregular edges and be entirely sterile of archaeological material, confirming it to be of natural origin. A layer of mid-yellowish-brown clay silt overlay the natural to a depth of 0.45m, which in turn was covered by 0.20m of mid yellow brown clay silt topsoil.

3.9.2 No archaeological features were encountered.

3.10  TRENCH 10

3.10.1 Trench 10 lay to the west of Trench 8, and was aligned approximately north/south. Its final location was adjusted further to the east to avoid a large spoil heap and area of flooding. Excavation revealed natural coarse sands and gravels at a depth of 0.6m, overlain by a layer of mid-yellowish-brown clay silt subsoil 0.4m thick. A mid-yellowish-brown clay silt topsoil, 0.20m thick covered the trench to the present ground surface.

3.10.2 No archaeological features were encountered.
Plate 20: Trench 9, facing north, 1m scale

Plate 21: Trench 9, west-facing section, 1m scale
Plate 22: Trench 10, facing south, 2m scale

Plate 23: Trench 10, west-facing section, 2m scale
3.11 TRENCH 11

3.11.1 Trench 11 lay in the north-eastern corner of the study area, and was aligned north-east/south-west (Fig 2). Coarse natural clays were revealed at a depth of between 0.65m and 0.70m below the present ground surface, and were covered by mid-brownish-yellow clay silt subsoil up to 0.50m thick. Mid-yellowish-brown clay silt topsoil, 0.20m thick, overlay the subsoil to the top of the trench.

3.11.2 No archaeological features were encountered.
3.12 TRENCH 12

3.12.1 Trench 12 lay a short distance to the north-west of Trench 11, and was moved slightly further to the east of its intended location to avoid an existing spoil heap. It was placed on an east/west alignment, and was excavated to a depth of 0.6m, where undisturbed natural clay was encountered. A sondage, excavated at the western end of the trench, established the continuation of the clays, along with thin bands of fine orange sands and gravels to a depth in excess of 1.1m. The natural geology was overlain by a deposit of mid-brownish-yellow subsoil, 0.50m thick, which in turn was covered by a mid-yellowish-brown clay silt topsoil of between 0.05 and 0.10m thick.

3.12.2 No archaeological features were encountered.
Plate 26: Trench 12, facing west, 2m scale

Plate 27: Trench 12, south-west-facing section, 1m scale
4. CONCLUSION

4.1 CONCLUSION

4.1.1 The walk-over survey conducted across the northern half of the site identified considerable quantities of dispersed later nineteenth and twentieth century pottery and ceramic building materials, but did not demonstrate any specific densities indicative of features of this date or earlier; none of the fragments of pottery were of archaeological interest, and were thus not retained. Similarly, there was no indication of any topographic features that might indicate early agricultural practices.

4.1.2 The excavation of trenches 7-12 revealed no archaeological features of any kind, and demonstrated the survival of a significant layer of subsoil across the entire area. Had any intensive human activity taken place within the field to the north of the hospital, physical evidence is likely to have survived in-situ beneath this layer of subsoil. The absence of any such evidence suggests this part of the site had been used for agricultural purposes for a considerable period of time prior to the construction of the Barnes Convalescence Hospital in 1875.

4.1.3 Trenches 1-6 in the southern half of the site demonstrated significant disturbance to the topsoil, indicative of levelling activity after the demolition of later nineteenth- and twentieth-century structures. The survival of a thin subsoil within Trench 1, however, suggests that archaeological features have not been lost through truncation, and that in all likelihood the area was also used for agriculture prior to the construction of the hospital.

4.1.4 It should be noted that the natural clays in the southern half of the site and adjacent to the brick fields noted on the nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey mapping are far more suitable for extraction and brick production than those in the northern half of the site.

4.1.5 The results obtained from the evaluation trenching have concluded that there is little potential for significant archaeological remains to survive in-situ, and is thus unlikely that any earth-moving works associated with the proposed development would have a negative impact on the buried archaeological resource. It is considered unlikely that any further intrusive investigation of the site is merited.
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ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION
WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

Proposals

The following Written Scheme of Investigation is offered in response to a request from Kevin Watters of Reis Construct for an archaeological evaluation in advance of a proposed development at Barnes Hospital in Cheadle, Stockport.
1. BACKGROUND

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF PROJECT

1.1.1 Barnes Village Ltd has obtained planning permission to redevelop the former Barnes Hospital and its associated grounds in Cheadle, near Stockport. The development proposal allows for the refurbishment of the hospital building, which is afforded statutory designation as a Grade II listed building, together with the erection of new housing. The new build will comprise housing within the grounds encompassing the hospital building. The proposed construction works will necessitate considerable earth-moving works, which have some potential to damage or destroy buried archaeological remains.

1.1.2 The archaeological potential of the site has been highlighted by a desk-based assessment produced by OA North in 2014. This study concluded that the site has some potential to contain buried remains of archaeological interest, including the projected line of the Roman road from Cheadle to Buxton, which takes a course across the north-eastern corner of the site. In addition, artefacts of prehistoric, Roman, and early medieval date have been discovered within the immediate vicinity, raising the possibility that other buried artefacts of archaeological interest may survive within the site boundary. Any such artefacts or associated remains would merit preservation by record where these will be directly affected by development.

1.1.3 In the light of these conclusions, the Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS), which provides archaeological advice to Stockport Council, recommended that a programme of archaeological investigation of the site is merited in advance of development, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph 128.

1.1.4 This Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been formulated in consultation with GMAAS, and provides for an appropriate scheme of initial archaeological investigation. It allows for a site walkover survey coupled with the excavation of a series of trial trenches. The trenches will be intended primarily to identify the projected course of the Roman road from Cheadle to Buxton, and any physical evidence for Early Medieval and post-Conquest remains. In the event of significant archaeological remains being discovered in the trenches, further archaeological investigation may be required. Any such additional works will be carried out in accordance with an Updated WSI.
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. We are the largest employer of archaeologists in the country (we currently have more than 300 members of staff), and can thus deploy considerable resources with extensive experience to deal with any archaeological obligations you or your clients may have. OA is an Institute for Archaeologists Registered Organisation (No 17). We have offices in Lancaster and Oxford, trading as Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) and Oxford Archaeology South (OA South) respectively, enabling us to provide a truly nationwide service. All work on the project will be undertaken in accordance with relevant professional standards, including:

- CIfA’s *Code of Conduct* (2012); *Code of Approved Practice for the Regulation of Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology* (2010); *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluations* (2010);
- English Heritage’s *Management of Archaeological Projects*, 1991;

2. **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

2.1 **ACADEMIC AIMS**

2.1.1 The main research aim of the investigation, given the commercial nature of the development, will be to establish the presence or absence of buried archaeological remains on the site and, if present, characterise the level of preservation and significance, and provide a good understanding of their potential.

2.2 **OBJECTIVES**

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

- to determine the presence, character, and extent of the projected course of the Roman road between Cheadle and Buxton;
- to determine the presence, character, and extent of any associated activity of Roman date;
- to determine the presence, character, and extent of any medieval activity on the site;
- to inform a decision as to whether further archaeological investigation will be required in advance of development ground works;
- to compile an archival record of any archaeological remains within the development area.
3. METHOD STATEMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 The northern part of the development area will be investigated initially via a walkover inspection survey. This will be coupled with the excavation of 12 trial trenches, varying in length from 20m to 5m (Figure 1). In the event of significant archaeological remains being discovered in the trenches, it is likely that further archaeological investigation will be required. Any such additional works will be carried out in accordance with an Updated Written Scheme of Investigation, which will be devised in consultation with GMAAS.

3.2 WALKOVER INSPECTION SURVEY

3.2.1 The walkover inspection survey will aim to identify and recover any artefacts visible on the existing ground surface. Any scatters of artefacts identified will be plotted on large-scale mapping of the site, and will be targeted subsequently for evaluation trenching.

3.3 EVALUATION

3.3.1 General Methodology: it is proposed that the site be investigated initially via 12 trenches. These will be located to provide an adequate sample of the development site, and will be targeted on those areas that do not appear to have been subject to any significant ground disturbance during the construction of the hospital complex in the late nineteenth century. The precise location of the trenches in the northern part of the site will be located in the light of the findings from the walkover inspection survey. In the event of few artefacts being recovered from the walkover survey, then the trenches in the northern part of the site will be placed in the locations shown on Figure 1.

3.3.2 Excavation of the modern ground surface to the top of the first significant archaeological level will be undertaken by a machine of appropriate power using a toothless ditching bucket. The work will be supervised closely by a suitably experienced archaeologist. Thereafter, any archaeological layers or structural remains will be cleaned manually to define their extent, nature, form and, where possible, date. If the excavation is to proceed below a depth of 1.2m, then the trenches will be widened sufficiently to allow the sides to be stepped in.

3.3.3 All information identified in the course of the site works will be recorded stratigraphically, using a system adapted from that used by the Centre for Archaeology Service of English Heritage. Results of the evaluation will be recorded on pro-forma context sheets, and will be accompanied with sufficient pictorial record (plans, sections and both black and white and colour photographs) to identify and illustrate individual features.
3.3.4 **Context Recording:** all contexts will be recorded using *pro-forma* sheets, and details will be incorporated into a Harris matrix. Similar object record and photographic record *pro-formas* will be used. All written recording of survey data, contexts, photographs, artefacts and ecofacts will be cross-referenced from *pro-forma* record sheets using sequential numbering.

3.2.2 **Photography:** a full and detailed photographic record of individual contexts will be maintained and similarly general views from standard view points of the overall site at all stages of the evaluation will be generated. Photography will be undertaken using high-resolution digital cameras. All frames will include a visible, graduated metric scale. Photographs records will be maintained on special photographic *pro-forma* sheets.

3.2.3 **Planning:** the precise location of the evaluation trenches, and the position of all archaeological structures encountered, will be surveyed by EDM tacheometry using a total station linked to a pen computer data logger. This process will generate scaled plans within AutoCAD, which will then be subject to manual survey enhancement. The drawings will be generated at an accuracy appropriate for 1:20 scale, but can be output at any scale required. Sections will be manually drafted as appropriate at a scale of 1:10. All information will be tied in to Ordnance Datum.

3.2.4 Human remains are not expected to be present, but if they are found they will, if possible, be left *in situ* covered and protected. If removal is necessary, then the relevant Home Office permission will be sought, and the removal of such remains will be carried out with due care and sensitivity as required by the *Burials Act 1857*.

3.2.5 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.

3.2.6 **Finds policy:** finds recovery and sampling programmes will be in accordance with best practice (following current Institute for Archaeologists’ guidelines) and subject to expert advice in order to minimise deterioration. OA North employs in-house artefact and palaeoecology specialists, with considerable expertise in the investigation, excavation, and finds management of sites of all periods and types, who are readily available for consultation. Finds storage during fieldwork and any site archive preparation will follow professional guidelines (UKIC).

3.3 **Health and Safety**

3.3.1 Full regard will be given to all constraints during the course of the project. OA North provides a Health and Safety Statement for all projects and maintains a 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.
3.3.2 OA North undertakes to safeguard, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety and welfare of its staff and of others who may be affected by our work. OA North will also take all reasonable steps to ensure the health and safety of all persons not in their employment, such as volunteers, students, visitors, and members of the public (this includes trespassers).

3.3.3 OA North is fully familiar with and will comply with all current and relevant legislation, including, but not limited to:

- The Health and Safety at Work Act (1974);
- Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations (1999);
- Manual Handling Operations Regulations 1992 (as amended in 2002);
- The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations (2007);
- The Control of Asbestos Regulations (2006);
- The Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations (1992);
- Construction (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations (1996);
- The Health and Safety (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations (2002);
- The Work at Height Regulations (2005);
- The Control of Substances Hazardous to Health Regulations (2002);
- The Health and Safety (First-Aid) Regulations (1981);
- The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order (2005);
- The Provision and Use of Work Equipment Regulations (1998);

3.3.4 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.

3.4 OTHER MATTERS

3.4.1 **Project Monitoring:** the aims of monitoring are to ensure that the archaeological works are undertaken within the limits set by the Written Scheme of Investigation, and to the satisfaction of the curatorial archaeologist at the Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS). The curatorial archaeologist will be given at least five days’ notice of when work is due to commence, and it is anticipated that there will be at least one formal monitoring meeting during the course of the archaeological investigation.

3.5 POST-EXCAVATION AND REPORT PRODUCTION

3.5.1 **Report:** a report will be produced within four working weeks of the completion of the fieldwork, and will include:

- a summary statement of the findings;
- the background to the evaluation, including location details;
- an outline of the methodology of the evaluation;
- a description of the site’s setting, including topography and geology;
- an account of the documented historical background to the site;
• a summary, assessment, and interpretation of the results;
• an assessment of any finds and samples recovered from the trenches;
• a description of the significance of the site in its local and regional context;
• recommendations for any further archaeological investigation that is considered merited to mitigate the impact of the development works;
• a catalogue of archive items, and details of the final deposition of the project archive.

3.5.2 Archive: the results of the archaeological investigation will form the basis of a full archive to professional standards, in accordance with current English Heritage guidelines (The Management of Archaeological Projects, 2nd edition, 1991) and the Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long Term Storage (UKIC 1990). The project archive represents the collation and indexing of all the data and material gathered during the course of the project. The deposition of a properly ordered and indexed project archive in an appropriate repository is considered an essential and integral element of all archaeological projects by the IfA in that organisation’s code of conduct. As part of the archiving process, the on-line OASIS (On-line Access to Index of Archaeological Investigations) form will be completed.

3.5.3 The paper and finds archive for the archaeological work undertaken at the site will be deposited with the Museum of Science and Industry in Manchester. The archive will be deposited with the museum within six months of the completion of the fieldwork. Except for items subject to the Treasure Act, all artefacts found during the course of the project will be donated to the museum.

4. WORK TIMETABLE

4.1 A one-day period should be allowed to carry out the walkover inspection survey. A further one-week period should be allowed to excavate and record the evaluation trenches. On the first day of the fieldwork, OA North will accurately locate through measured survey the exact position of the trenches to be excavated. The trench locations will then be scanned for live services with a CAT prior to any mechanical excavation.

4.2 In the event of significant archaeological remains being discovered in the evaluation trenches, a programme of further investigation may be anticipated. The time required for any additional investigation cannot be determined until the results of the evaluation are known.

4.3 A report will be submitted within four weeks of the completion of the fieldwork.
5. STAFFING PROPOSALS

5.1 The project will be under the overall charge of Ian Miller BA FSA (OA North Senior Project Manager) to whom all correspondence should be addressed. Ian has over 20 years experience of commercial archaeology, and has a particular interest in the archaeology of the Industrial Period, and particular that of Greater Manchester and Lancashire. His role will be to ensure that the Written Scheme of Investigation is implemented within the framework of the Project Objectives. He will be responsible for all aspects of staff and resource logistics, ensuring the smooth running of the project programme. He will liaise with the Client and GMAAS with regard to progress, and will maintain relationships with other contractors.

5.2 The fieldwork is likely to be undertaken by Graham Mottershead BA (OA North Project Supervisor). Graham is an highly experienced field archaeologist, with over 20 years continuous experience of field archaeology. It is not possible to provide details of specific technicians that will be involved with the fieldwork at this stage, but all shall be suitably qualified archaeologists with proven relevant experience. It is anticipated that up to two technician will be required for the initial stage of the fieldwork.

5.3 Assessment of any finds recovered from the evaluation will be undertaken by OA North's in-house finds specialist Christine Howard-Davis BA (OA North Finds Manager). Christine has extensive knowledge of all finds of all periods from archaeological sites in northern England, and is a recognised expert in the analysis of post-medieval artefacts.
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