

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

*Guidance Note 1*

**Archaeological  
requirements  
for works on  
churches  
and  
churchyards**

ADCA 2004

**More information about ADCA can be found on its web-site at**

**<http://www.britarch.ac.uk/adca/index.html>**

# Contents

Preface	4
Introduction	5
Archaeological aspects of churches and churchyards	5
Contexts for archaeological works	6
Specifying archaeological work	7
Project preparation	7
Post-consent recording for decision-making	8
Opportunity recording	9
Post-consent recording as mitigation of impact	9
Post-excavation assessment, report preparation and archiving	9
Archaeological skills and contractors	10
Appendix 1 – Archaeological requirements for types of works	11
A    Repairs	11
B    Services, mechanical and electrical; drainage	13
C    Churchyard	15
D    Development	15
E    Human Remains	16
Appendix 2 – Report of the Working Group on Human Remains	19
Appendix 3 – Further Reading	21

## **Preface**

*This guidance promotes a consistent approach to the main types of works upon which ADCA members advise Diocesan Advisory Committees (DACs), Cathedral Chapters and Fabric Advisory Committees (FACs).*

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

*The guidance has been prepared for ADCA by David Baker (Diocesan Archaeological Adviser, St Albans), drawing upon notes for parish churches prepared by Kate Clark for English Heritage in the late 1990s. It has also benefited from documents produced for the dioceses of Peterborough and Bristol. It will be kept under review in the light of experience.*

*ADCA is grateful for consultation responses from its membership, English Heritage, the Institute of Field Archaeologists, the Institute of Historic Building Conservation, the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers, the Council for the Care of Churches, the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England, the Ecclesiastical Architects and Surveyors Association, the Cathedral Architects Association, the Society for Church Archaeology, and several interested individuals.*

# Archaeological requirements for works on churches and churchyards

## Introduction

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

2 The members of ADCA are mostly Diocesan Archaeological Advisers (DAA) and Cathedral Archaeological Consultants (CAC) in England and Wales. This guidance stands behind the advice they give on proposals and the briefing material they issue for investigation and recording, either to obtain information for submission with formal applications or as a condition of permission for the works themselves. ADCA commends this guidance to diocesan and cathedral authorities in support of their responsibilities and policies for church archaeology. It is also procedural guidance for parishes and chapters commissioning works, and can help their professional advisers and contractors manage projects by clarifying programming and costs. It complements *Revealing the past, informing the future*, guidance for parishes recently issued by the Council for the Care of Churches (Elders 2004).

3 The main body of the document outlines the role of archaeological investigation in conserving and altering historic ecclesiastical buildings. The term ‘church’ is used generically for parish church and cathedral, and ‘churchyard’ for churchyard and precinct. **Appendix 1** deals in more detail with various classes of works. **Appendix 2** reproduces the Executive Summary and Recommendations from the Human Remains Working Group that reported in 2004. Publications cited in **Appendix 3** cover general approaches, standards, procedures and technical practices. It should be noted that cathedral precincts are often large and complex historic entities for which it is difficult to predict all

potential archaeological circumstances below and above ground in a summary guidance document. There, as indeed generally, the normal standards and expectations associated with secular controls over work in such historic places are applicable.

4 Policies for resolving conflicts that arise between ecclesiastical uses and conservation interests are outside the scope of this document. It starts from the position that the appropriate archaeological work done at the right time is part of the solution, not the problem. In this respect and generally, its approach aims for parity between secular planning processes and ecclesiastical systems.

## Archaeological aspects of churches and churchyards

5 Archaeology is the study of past human activity, achieved through its surviving physical evidence, records of evidence that no longer exists and other historical documentation. Traditional digging is only one of its techniques. It collaborates with other disciplines: there are archaeological dimensions to the study of architecture, art-history, landscape, flora, fauna and human beings themselves. It can be applied to five main aspects of churches:

- (a) **existing buildings** and associated structures in the churchyard
- (b) **ruins and sites** of former churches or parts of them now superseded, together with all other below-ground archaeological evidence for associated, preceding and subsequent human activities on or near the site
- (c) **contents** of buildings, including fixtures and fittings, tombs, monuments, burials and movable items of value, for their intrinsic aesthetic and cultural significance and associations with a place
- (d) **the churchyard**, its graves, monuments, walls and boundaries, as evidence for past burial practices, as funerary art, and for local and natural history and human biological history interest

(e) the **setting and context** of church and churchyard, visually as part of landscape or townscape, and historically in terms of the settlement plan and the wider settlement pattern, for what these can tell about continuity of religious use in places, and how the church and its activities have related to the community down the ages.

6 The primary purpose of archaeological work is to increase knowledge and understanding, through investigation and research that can contribute to repairs, academic studies, formal education and personal or community interest. Work ought to take place within a regularly reviewed research strategy for each region or diocese, and to address issues based upon an understanding of the significance of the church and churchyard in question. The Council for the Care of Churches has issued advice to dioceses on preparing Statements of Significance for parish churches to accompany Statements of Needs when formulating proposals (2002). Advice on the requirement to prepare Conservation Plans and Statements for cathedrals has been issued jointly by the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England and the Association of English Cathedrals (2002).

### Contexts for archaeological works

7 Archaeological investigation and recording follows from the presumption in favour of preserving important archaeological evidence, beneath the ground and in standing structures. Preservation is justified by its intrinsic significance and interest for present and future generations. This presumption is a crucial factor in the often complex process of designing and planning works. Potentially damaging impacts should be identified in order to explore the scope for averting them by redesign; if this proves impossible rather than merely inconvenient, it must be demonstrated that they are truly unavoidable.

8 Archaeological investigation and recording may have an important role to play on four main occasions during the preparation and implementation of a scheme, whether covered by faculty jurisdiction / the Care of Cathedrals Measure 1990 (CCM) or secular planning controls, or by both systems. These reflect the expectations of the DAA / CAC about the content of applications, and the advice they may give about placing conditions upon consents, liaising with the local planning authority in appropriate cases.

9 Archaeological work can contribute to the **preparation of a proposal**, before formal consents are sought. Pre-consent assessments or evaluations can identify archaeological issues together with the means and likely costs of resolving them.

10 Project preparation may identify a need for **analytical recording after consent has been obtained and works have begun**. Its purpose is to obtain hitherto inaccessible information for making decisions about the extent of repair and the techniques to be used, or the detailed design of alterations. Post-opening-up recording should be fully integrated into the works programme, as part of routine project teamwork.

11 Repair or construction work in progress may create **defined opportunities to record temporarily exposed fabric**, adding to the record of the building. This can facilitate future maintenance and diagnosis of structural problems, and improve understanding of its history. Ensuring time and resources for 'opportunity' recording requires intelligent anticipation and forward planning.

12 As a last resort, archaeological work may be needed **to record important fabric or deposits before unavoidable destruction** (or before it is concealed by the proposed works), thereby mitigating the loss by replacing the surviving evidence with information from properly designed investigations. If this investigative recording cannot be done before the main contractor takes over the site, it must be programmed into the actual project and given sufficient time.

13 Any intrusive investigative archaeological work will require a formal consent under faculty jurisdiction or the CCM, either by itself or as part of a larger project. In order to commend proposals for pre-consent evaluation fieldwork, the DAA / CAC will need to have approved a detailed specification of work to be done by someone of proven relevant experience and competence. Post-consent work is likely to be secured by a version of the standard condition used in the secular planning system: 'No works shall take place until the petitioner has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the DAC / CFCE / FAC'.

14 Dealing properly with archaeological aspects, as with any other aspect of a project, requires

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

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

### Specifying archaeological work

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

17 On work of any complexity the DAA / CAC will have issued or approved a Brief, and agreed a Project Design (PD) prepared by the archaeological organisation doing the work; the whole comprises a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI). This should be submitted in support of the application to carry out the main scheme of work, or, in some cases, the preliminary evaluation (see below 19-24). The documentation must demonstrate an appropriate level of understanding about the particular church or churchyard, how archaeological requirements relate to the work in hand, what questions the archaeological work is

intended to answer, and what particular methods need to be employed. Whilst a Brief will always be required, on relatively simple tasks a full PD / WSI may not be needed, providing there is a written understanding of what has to be done for what reasons, sufficient to provide certainty and control. In cases requiring both planning permission and a faculty or approval under the CCM, there should be careful liaison with the local authority archaeologist over issue of the Brief and approval of the PD / WSI.

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

### Project preparation

19 The secular system has evolved a generally applicable sequence of stages for identifying and dealing with the archaeological implications of proposals for works. This should be followed until a view can be formed about a proposal, that either

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

20 The first stage is *appraisal*, a rapid check for the possibility of significant archaeological implications, and, if any are identified, whether further work will be needed to identify them properly. It requires clearly expressed proposals and a good general understanding of what is already known about the church.

21 Potential archaeological implications should be clarified by means of a *desk-based assessment*. This is a thorough review of what is already known about the church and its archaeology. It draws upon all relevant readily available information but does not carry out any new research, either by fieldwork or in documentary sources. It concentrates upon the parts affected by the proposals and seeks to put them into an appropriate context, whether the whole church building, the wider churchyard or the associated historic settlement. The scope of the assessment should be agreed with the DAA / CAC and may need to be defined in an issued or approved Brief. If it answers all outstanding questions, the report should be included with the application.

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

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

24 The three-stage process should consider potential impacts not just upon the parts of the

building directly affected by the proposal, but also indirectly upon the significance of the wider totality and its context. Depending upon the amount of basic information already available about the church, this may involve some extra analytical recording or information-gathering, but it needs to be carefully controlled. An example might be a proposal to extend a much-altered compartment of a medieval church. The significance of what exists has to be established by detailed investigation to identify original and subsequent phases of work; that may require analytical recording and new detailed drawings. Yet a rapid general expert review of the whole building and its context may be sufficient for understanding the place of the compartment in the sequence of development and the impact of the proposal on the whole church. If the works affect only one compartment, the costs of a new comprehensive and detailed survey for the whole building, however desirable, would have to be justified as a separate research project.

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

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

- (a) analytical recording of fabric inaccessible until scaffolding has been erected
- (b) analytical recording of fabric revealed after surfaces have been removed by initial opening-up works
- (c) excavation and recording of deposits and foundations under floors within buildings or externally against walls in order to help determine the reasons for above-ground structural faults and devise appropriate repairs.



## Opportunity recording

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

## Post-consent recording as mitigation of impact

27 Needs for post-consent recording in advance of accepted destruction should be identified by pre-consent investigations. Enough information should have been gathered to prepare a brief that describes methods and standards of recording in sufficient detail for prices to be obtained; contingency sums may be appropriate. On all but the smallest and simplest of projects, archaeological contractors should respond to the brief with a Project Design and / or Written Scheme of Investigation indicating their methodology and response to the questions posed by the work. **Appendix 1** gives examples of frequently encountered types of works and some appropriate archaeological responses.

28 There is a widespread misconception that most archaeological needs can be met by a ‘watching brief’. What should more accurately be called ‘precautionary archaeological attendance’ is appropriate only in cases where preliminary assessment has shown a relatively low level of archaeological sensitivity, and where the likely impact of works is intrinsically difficult to evaluate, such as shallow linear trenches across churchyards. Too often, a ‘watching brief’ on works in progress is used as an inappropriate substitute for proper archaeological evaluation before approval is obtained. Unexpected discoveries then create strong pressures to restrict essential archaeological responses to what can be contained within fixed budgets and programmes that failed to envisage the need.

## Post-excavation assessment, report preparation and archiving

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

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

31 Archiving project records raises the issue of maintained information systems documenting past episodes of works and historical evidence. Such systems, like the Sites and Monuments Records / Historic Environment Records maintained by local authorities, are intended to be comprehensive repositories that can be used for projects of conservation and development, research, interpretation and education. They should be the starting point for any such project, and the results of any work that generates new information should automatically be deposited in them. The process of assessment will be greatly simplified for a diocese or cathedral that has a managed and retrievable information system recognised as comprehensively documenting past works and historical data. The feasibility of creating such systems, and how they might relate to existing secular ones, is under consideration, following the Church Heritage Record study (Baker and Chitty 2000).

### **Archaeological skills and contractors**

32 The DAA / CAC is expected to operate on similar lines to the archaeological planning officer (the 'curator') in the secular system, issuing or approving briefs and agreeing project designs. This includes monitoring the quality of archaeological recording work, and liaison with church officers who have responsibility for ensuring that approved works are properly carried out.

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

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

35 Appointed architects or surveyors are not expected to carry out or directly supervise archaeological work themselves unless they personally have the appropriate training and experience. This applies particularly to above-ground analysis and recording of fabric which should only be undertaken by conservation architects or surveyors who have received specific training and developed their skills through experience. There are major differences in purpose and method between the drawings done to manage schemes generally and the detailed accurate work needed to record and interpret historic fabric.

36 General contractors may carry out some aspects of work with low-risk archaeological implications and clearly understood arrangements for contacting the DAA / CAC or a previously arranged nominated archaeologist, within the context of arrangements for 'precautionary archaeological attendance' (above, paragraph 28). This assumes a thorough advance briefing and secure arrangements for archaeological inspection of work in progress.

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

# Appendix 1

## Archaeological requirements for types of works

The following list includes those types of works that most frequently arise, together with an indication of the kinds of impact they may cause, and the kind of information the DAA / CAC will expect to be provided about them. Specialist conservation work on fixtures and fittings such as wall paintings, glass, pews, bells, organs etc. is outside its scope, so only passing references are made. It covers matters of interest to archaeologists, architects and specialist conservators, mainly from the viewpoint of archaeological assessment and recording as part of the overall conservation process. Each individual case will have its own characteristics and needs, and the approach outlined below is general, to be adapted as appropriate rather than applied uncritically by rote.

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

### A *Repairs*

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

(a) Much of the history and structural sequence of a church can be ‘read’ from a careful study of its stonework. Early fabric often survives undetected until examined closely and methodically. Patterns of alterations and past repairs may hold critical information about the past and present behaviour of the structure. Mortar samples, stone types, mouldings and masons marks can be important sources of dating information. This information can easily be obscured or destroyed in the course of otherwise entirely beneficial repairs.

(b) The logic of these considerations is that ideally all historic churches should have a full set of detailed analytical drawings derived from rectified photography. These would be used for campaigns of repair, as a basic tool and a continuing record. In terms of the stages outlined above (paras 19-24), obtaining drawings amounts to *evaluation* following *assessment* that existing information is inadequate after *appraisal* has identified the task as one that requires it. In practice, cost usually rules out the possibility of obtaining a full set at one time when only part of a church is being repaired (though perhaps the pictures can be secured at one time and drawn up in stages later). More usually, the objective is achievable incrementally as an integral part of various campaigns of work.

(c) The use of rectified photography is increasing, but documentation of repairs too often does not exceed a few general photographs of the existing situation. There is a long-held belief that repair is a long-continuing series of

episodes best left to generalised specifications and detailed marking up on site by competent craftsmen; it is not perceived either as potentially destructive or having an intrinsic recording element. This skirts round three related issues:

- the need to understand in order to identify and specify appropriate repairs
- the difficulty of understanding anything complex without the discipline of analytical recording
- the need to leave future repairers a record of what was found and what was done to it.

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

(e) In *stonework repairs*, the date, significance and type of stone of what is to be replaced should be identified. Architects normally specify a full-size record of any moulded stone to ensure that the detail and profile are correct. Significant amounts of replacement, especially around openings, require stone-by-stone elevational drawings prior to work commencing, for marking up types, phasing and condition. If no detailed analytical drawing of the whole elevation is available, these insets should be located accurately on at least an outline elevation drawing of the wall or feature.

(f) With *structural repairs*, understanding the development of the building and past major repairs may contribute towards identifying the solution to a current

problem, as well as being interesting in their own right. Below-ground archaeological work may also help with diagnosis. Solutions involving underpinning, strengthening floors, removing earlier structural repairs or selective rebuilding of masonry will have impacts upon historic fabric or deposits; they may require recording before works start, and often during them. This applies particularly in situations where historic fabric is taken apart, repaired, and then put back together again.

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

## A2 Repairing or removing pews

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

(b) DACs frequently consider proposals to remove pews that have become surplus to the needs of modern sized congregations, in order to provide social spaces or other facilities. Far too often, the significance of the pews likely to be affected is the last question to be asked, when it should always be the first, because the answer may point towards one of several feasible options for providing the required space. In many cases the pews are relatively recent in date and of little merit, so change presents few difficulties. In some cases they are ancient examples of craftsmanship or part of a particularly strong, often Victorian, liturgical design. Resolving conflicts between the modern use of the building and the conservation of inherited woodwork is beyond the scope of this note, but decisions must always be informed by an understanding of the significance of what is affected, archaeologically – how and when it was made – as well as aesthetically – what it looks like to modern lay and expert eyes.

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

(a) Renewing floors in ancient buildings is always a potentially sensitive operation, requiring an archaeological understanding of what is affected. Are

the existing floor coverings significant, and, if so, is it realistic for them to be repaired rather than replaced? If replacement is essential, to what depth will the ground have to be disturbed, and how can this be minimised in sensitive locations?

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

(c) Normal *assessment* by the architect through lifting selected boards or slabs will help provide some answers. In cases where a new ground slab is to be laid the new formation level must be defined and an assessment made as to whether any archaeological deposits will be affected by the need to reduce the ground level.

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

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

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

## A4 Redecoration

(a) *Appraisal* and / or *assessment*, usually by a paint or wall-paintings specialist, will determine whether there are ancient surfaces or coverings, such as Victorian painting schemes or medieval wall-paintings, whose conservation or recording needs to be taken into account.

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

## A5 Glass

(a) The conservation of window glass *in situ* is a specialist matter, again involving a preliminary recording phase. Fragments of early medieval glass, sometimes relocated or assembled in a later restoration

are of interest, as is plain hand-made post-medieval glass; post-medieval and Victorian glass may be of significance for its design, technology or authorship.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(c) Lead roof coverings sometimes have graffiti on them that merit recording. In some cases, small sections

of particular interest should be preserved before removed material is recycled.

## **A8 Rainwater goods**

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

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

### **B1 Heating**

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

### **B2 Electricity**

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

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

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

(a) This frequently employed device for taking water away from the building and reducing rising damp was branded as destructive at an early stage in the

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

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

(c) In all cases *evaluation* for a new drain should include the test-pits usually required by the architect to allow inspection of the foundations; these will also sample adjacent stratigraphy. Where test-pits raise no further questions and suggest that the evidence revealed by excavation of the drain is likely to relate only to existing foundations and superstructure, no further evaluation is required. In other cases, a series of test-pits should be designed to evaluate the surviving evidence and inform the mitigation strategy, which is likely to be either preservation through redesign or recording as part of the scheme, or a combination of the two.

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

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

often provides a useful source of structural information for dealing with future maintenance problems.

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

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

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

(c) In most cases the general contractor can do the post-consent work subject to adequate briefing on the circumstances in which work must stop and the DAA / CAC or a designated archaeologist be notified, i.e. the discovery of wall foundations, vaults, articulated burials etc. According to the case, the DAA / CAC must decide whether to require a precautionary archaeological inspection of an opened trench before pipes etc are inserted, and whether holes cut through church walls need to be observed and recorded archaeologically.

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

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

## C Churchyard

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

### C2 Churchyard walls

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

### C3 Loose moulded stones, gravestones, etc

(a) These can sometimes be found half-buried around the edges of churchyards, following old campaigns of repairs or clearances. They are vulnerable to damage or theft. After assessment, they should be recorded and, as appropriate, stored. In some circumstances there may be opportunities for re-erecting ones that are significant for their quality or local associations around the edge of the churchyard. Stones of merit or interest originally standing vertically should not be reused as paving material if they are in a material whose decay will thereby be hastened.

### C4 Monuments and gravestones

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

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

(c) More detailed advice, much of it generally applicable to England and Wales, can be found at [www.scottishgraveyards.org.uk](http://www.scottishgraveyards.org.uk)

## D Development

### D1 Reordering

(a) Because ancient churches have been altered through history according to changing liturgical requirements, existing arrangements may incorporate elements of historic or artistic interest, such as galleries, screens, pews, pulpits, fonts, floor levels and finishes, vestry cupboards and fittings. Some of these may have been created as part of the current scheme; others may have been retained from earlier ones, in primary or secondary positions.

(b) Substantial reordering in an historic interior is often a sensitive matter, involving some of the most difficult tensions between worship and conservation. Decisions are made by exploring options and balancing those considerations, but it is essential that those decisions are fully informed by a proper understanding of the historical significance of existing (or earlier) arrangements and their various elements. New evidence – that something is more or less important than previously thought – can be obtained from documentary research, architectural history and fabric analysis. This should be fed into the decision-making process, not obtained only as a reaction to a decision to seek change that may be hard to revisit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) *Appraisal* and / or *assessment* should ascertain

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

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

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

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

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

### **D5 Graveyard extensions**

(a) An undeveloped field near a historic church may contain archaeological deposits that have not been disturbed by the destructive effects of grave digging. Particularly where the original church occupies an already old site, there might be settlement or defensive earthworks or Roman or prehistoric remains. Proposals for new burial grounds need to take archaeological considerations into account, through field evaluations if the desk-top assessments show that the location is sensitive. Confirmed sensitivity will cause problems, because the proposed land-use is equally sensitive, especially for local people, and the cost of archaeological clearance is likely to be high, especially in relation to the income obtainable from use of the land for burials.

## **E Human remains**

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

(b) Constant reuse of churchyards for their principal purpose of burying the dead established the *de facto* practice of collecting together any bones encountered during grave-digging, whether or not articulated, and reintering them, usually in the same grave as the new burial. Neither Faculty nor Home Office licence is required as long as bones disturbed by grave-digging are replaced immediately within consecrated ground. Faculty is normally required for other works that might incidentally disturb burials, such as extensions to churches or bringing services across churchyards, but human remains have tended to be treated in the same way as for grave-digging. Today, there are increased sensitivities over the treatment of the remains of ancestors, archaeological procedures have developed, and there are the requirements of Health and Safety at Work. More systematic arrangements are now needed in order to avoid unacceptable situations, such as general



building contractors faced with the specialised work of archaeologists, and archaeologists with that of specialist contractors for exhuming recent burials.

(c) A Human Remains Working Group organised by English Heritage, the Council for the Care of Churches and the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England recently considered all aspects of archaeology and human remains, and produced a consultative report in 2004. This section of the guidance is consistent with its recommendations, reproduced in **Appendix 2**. The new report also confirms advice in Appendix 3 to the report 'Church Archaeology: Its Care and Management' by the Council for the Care of Churches' Archaeological Working Party (January 1999). It stated that "a body ... buried in consecrated ground ... comes under the protection of the Church." Also, that "human remains can provide, through recording and scientific scrutiny, information which contributes to the understanding of individual lives, regional experiences and general trends, both cultural and bio-medical." In the event of burials being disturbed, there are special requirements for proper handling with due care and decency and subject to environmental health requirements.

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

(e) In order to identify whether certain kinds of proposal are likely to encounter burials in churchyards or within churches, the archaeological approach to ground disturbance in potentially sensitive areas should be adopted, with its stages of *appraisal*, *assessment* and field *evaluation*. In many cases this will involve trial trenches along the lines of proposed strip footings or deeply inserted services or across areas to be lowered significantly in order to form ground slabs. Evaluation excavation will normally stop at the top of any undisturbed human remains, identifying their existence and location, but not removing them; it can, of course, remove disarticulated bones. The discovery of human remains whose disturbance ought if at all possible to be avoided will raise the question of whether the proposed structure should be sited elsewhere, or whether the foundation design can be modified to minimise or avoid

damage altogether. Budgets and programmes can then be adjusted accordingly.

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

(g) In most cases, retention of remains for further study or even as a research reference collection will apply only to large coherent groups and exceptional individual burials. Reburial would normally follow after completion of research, though proposals in the EH / CCC / CFCE Working Group report (**Appendix 2**) envisage the development of above-ground storage facilities, satisfying reburial in a consecrated place and keeping future research options open.

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



## Appendix 2

### Report of the English Heritage / Council for the Care of Churches / Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England Working Group on Human Remains

#### Executive Summary

The treatment of human remains is one of the most emotive and complex areas of archaeological activity. Feedback from archaeologists, parishes and clergy has indicated a clear need for guidance in this area. In 2001 a working group was convened jointly by English Heritage and the Church of England in order to address the issues. The working group's remit concerned burials from Christian contexts (AD 7<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> cent) in England. This provides a coherent context to which a consistent theological framework could be applied in order to help inform ethical treatment and for which reasonably specific guidance might be given.

The working group comprised 18 members, organised into three panels, who were asked to address legal issues, theology and ethics, and scientific / technical matters respectively. Coordination between the three panels was handled by the convenors and by means of meetings of the entire group. The working group report is a synthesis of the results of the group's deliberations. It aims to provide reasonably comprehensive guidelines covering treatment of human remains and associated artifacts and grave markers at all phases of an archaeological fieldwork project, including decisions concerning whether remains should be retained long-term for scientific study or reburied following completion of the analysis phase of the fieldwork project. The target audience is primarily archaeologists, museum staff, parochial church councils and clergy.

The **principal assumptions** underpinning the working group's deliberations were:

- That human remains should always be treated with dignity and respect
- Burials should not be disturbed without good reason. However it was noted that the demands of the modern world are such that it may be necessary to disturb burials in advance of development
- Human remains are an important source of scientific information
- There is a need to give particular weight to the feelings and views of living family members when known
- There is a need for decisions to be made in the public interest, and in an accountable way.

The working group's **main recommendations** are:

#### 1. Continuing burial:

- a. Digging any fresh graves in parts of an established burial ground thought to be an area of archaeological significance should be avoided, unless all graves in the area are first excavated archaeologically.

- b. Archaeological monitoring of grave digging in churchyards and cemeteries is otherwise not something that can reasonably be required on a routine basis.

#### 2. Development of burial grounds:

- a. If burial grounds, or areas within burial grounds, which may contain interments more than 100 years old have to be disturbed, whether for minor building work or larger scale development, to a depth that is likely to disturb burials, the relevant areas should be archaeologically evaluated. Any subsequent exhumations should be monitored, and if necessary carried out, by archaeologists.
- b. The developer, whether a religious or a secular organisation, should be responsible for the cost, including study of excavated remains and their reburial or deposition in a suitable holding institution.

#### 3. Research excavation:

- a. Research excavation of unthreatened burial grounds or areas of burial grounds is only acceptable if interments are more than 100 years old, and the proposed work is acceptable to the living close families of those who are buried, if known.
- b. Research excavations must always take place within established research frameworks. Specific research aims must also be identified and adequately justified.
- c. The project budget should include sufficient provision to cover not only excavation costs but also the study of all recovered remains and their reburial or deposition in a suitable holding institution.

#### 4. Excavation, study and publication:

- a. Archaeological excavation, study and publication of burials should conform to the standards and procedures set out in the body of this report.
- b. When a skeleton lies only partly within an area under excavation it should not normally be 'chased' beyond it. However, if the burial is deemed osteologically or archaeologically important, the skeleton should be followed under the baulk so that it may be lifted in its entirety, provided this will not result in disturbance of further burials. If it is not deemed of value to lift the burial then the exposed remains should be reinterred in the trench.
- c. Destructive analysis of human remains is acceptable provided that permission is given by the living close family of the individual involved if known, and that research aims are identified and adequately justified.
- d. Excavations conducted for the purposes of evaluation of a site should stop if articulated human remains are encountered; they should not be lifted.

## **5. Reburial and deposition:**

- a. If living close family members are known and request it, excavated human remains should be reburied.
- b. Excavated human remains shown after due assessment to have limited future research potential should be studied and then reburied.
- c. Reburial should normally be by inhumation rather than by cremation
- d. When excavated human remains are more than 100 years old and have significant future research potential, deposition in a suitable holding institution should be arranged. Redundant churches or crypts (as already done in some cases) provide an acceptable compromise between the desirability of deposition in a consecrated place and the desirability of continued research access. A working party, to succeed the Human Remains Working Group, should be set up to pursue this, looking in particular at funding and at establishing proper working practices.

## **6. Advisory committee:**

- a. A standing committee should be set up jointly by English Heritage and the Church of England to serve as a national advisory body on church archaeology and human remains from Christian burial grounds in England. This committee will take forward the issues raised in this document and will complement any human remains committees which may be set up as a response to the findings of the DCMS human remains working group.

## **7. Wider Implications**

- a. The working group recognises that many of the issues raised here may have more general applicability to human burials excavated from English sites. It is hoped that this document may stimulate debate which may lead to formulation of policy for dealing with human remains from a wider range of contexts.
- b. The working group recognises that many of the issues raised here would benefit from further consideration in the broader context of dealing with human remains.

## Appendix 3

### Further reading

DoE 1990. Planning Policy Guidance note 16 (PPG16) 'Archaeology and Planning'.

Care of Cathedrals Measure 1990

Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991.

English Heritage 1991. 'Management of Archaeological Projects [MAP2]

Council for the Care of Churches 1993. Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure: Code of Practice.

ACAO / ALGAO 1993. 'Model Briefs and Specifications for Archaeological Assessments and Field Evaluations'.

DoE / DNH 1994. Planning Policy Guidance note 15 (PPG15) 'Planning & the Historic Environment'.

Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England 1994. Guidance Note No 5: Cathedrals and Archaeology, A Guide to Good Management.

Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers 1997. 'Analysis and Recording for the Conservation and Control of Works to Historic Buildings'

Cathedrals Measure 1999.

Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England 1999. The Care, Conservation and Development of Cathedrals

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

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

Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England and Association of English Cathedrals 2002. Advisory Note 4: Conservation Plans for Cathedrals.

Council for the Care of Churches 2002. Statements of Significance and Need – Guidance for Parishes.

English Heritage 2003. 'New Work in Historic Places of Worship'.

Elders, Joseph 2004. 'Revealing the past, informing the future – a guide to archaeology for parishes.' Council for the Care of Churches

#### IFA documents:

IFA Code of Conduct revised edition Sept 2002

IFA Code of approved practice for the regulation of contractual arrangements in field archaeology, revised edition September 2002

IFA Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessment, revised edition September 2001

IFA Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation, revised edition September 2001

IFA Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation, revised edition September 2001

IFA Standard and guidance for archaeological watching brief, revised edition September 2001

IFA Standard and guidance for the archaeological investigation and recording of standing buildings and structures revised edition September 2001

IFA Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials, revised edition September 2001