



UNIVERSITY OF
LEICESTER

Archaeological Services

Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Field Evaluation & building recording

Site: Land at Laurel House, 2 Main Street, Bagworth, Leicestershire, LE67 1DN

NGR: SK 44741 07969

Client: Spacecom Ltd

Planning Authority: Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

Planning Ref: 19/01130/OUT / 22/00353/REM

ULAS Job No: 23-208

Acc No/Site Code: X.A32.2023

Filename/Version	Checked/Amended by	Date	Notes
23-208_WSI_Draftv1	G. Speed	27/03/2022	Draft – to client & LCC Planning Archaeologist
23-208_WSI	G. Speed	30/03/2022	Revised – to client & LCC Planning Archaeologist

University of Leicester
Archaeological Services
University Rd., Leicester, LE1 7RH
Tel: (0116) 2522848 Fax: (0116) 2522614

*No part of this report may be copied or reproduced by any means without permission.
ULAS accepts no responsibility or liability for this document to anyone other than the party by whom it was commissioned.*

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
	<i>Definition and scope of the project.....</i>	<i>1</i>
2.	Background.....	1
	<i>Context of the Project.....</i>	<i>1</i>
	<i>Topography and Geology.....</i>	<i>1</i>
	<i>Historical and Archaeological Background.....</i>	<i>3</i>
3.	Aims and Objectives.....	6
	<i>Research Objectives.....</i>	<i>6</i>
4.	Constraints.....	6
5.	Methodology.....	7
	<i>Trial Trench Evaluation.....</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>Historic Building Recording.....</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>Contingency Provisions.....</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>Monitoring.....</i>	<i>10</i>
6.	Finds.....	10
	<i>Treasure.....</i>	<i>10</i>
	<i>Human Remains.....</i>	<i>11</i>
7.	Environmental Samples.....	11
	<i>Scientific Dating.....</i>	<i>12</i>
8.	Timetable and Personnel.....	12
9.	Post Excavation Analysis and Reporting.....	12
	<i>Publication and dissemination of results.....</i>	<i>13</i>
10.	Public Engagement and Publicity.....	13
11.	Health and Safety.....	14
12.	Insurance.....	14
13.	Quality Assurance.....	14
14.	Staff Training and CPD.....	14
15.	Bibliography.....	14

Figures

Figure 1:	Location of site.....	2
Figure 2:	Existing site plan (provided by client).....	3
Figure 3:	Trench plan with proposed new building outlined, and earlier buildings shown on 1886 map (grey).....	5
Figure 4:	Proposed Trench plan.....	7

Written scheme of investigation for Archaeological Field evaluation

1. Introduction

Definition and scope of the project

- 1.1 This document is a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological evaluation on land at Laurel House, 2 Main Street, Bagworth, Leicestershire (SK 44741 07969), in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): Section 16 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment (MHCLG 2021) and will be submitted to the Planning Archaeologist for approval prior to any archaeological work taking place. The work is required for Condition 12 of 19/01130/OUT *‘No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work (commencing with an initial phase of trial trenching incorporating a record of the significant structural features) has been undertaken’*.
- 1.2 This WSI was commissioned by Spacecom Ltd. The fieldwork specified below is intended to provide preliminary indications of the character and extent of any heritage assets in order that the potential impact of the development on such remains may be assessed by the Planning Authority. It addresses the requirements of the Local Planning Authority for a scheme of work comprising archaeological evaluation.
- 1.3 The work will comprise of x5 trenches, each around 20m in length. These target areas to be particularly affected by the new proposed works (Figure 5). A Historic England Level 1 survey will be undertaken of the dry stone wall in the southern part of the site.

2. Background

Context of the Project

- 2.1 The proposed development area (PDA) lies on the main street on the western edge of the core of Bagworth village, and is formerly a farmyard (Fig. 1, (<https://what3words.com/lifeboats.ghosts.rubble>)).
- 2.2 The site comprises c.0.32 ha of land, at a height of c. 168m O.D.
- 2.3 Planning proposals are for a residential. The site has previously been subject to an archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (Brown 2016). The DBA results indicated that the site lies within the historic core of the village, indicating moderate potential for medieval and post-medieval remains. The modern farm and associated buildings are likely to have disturbed much of the area, although the remains of the earlier farm buildings may still exist. The remains of a dry-stone wall of uncertain age on the site may represent an earlier boundary. Due to this an archaeological trial trench is required to clarify the presence or absence of archaeological remains within the site (as per letter from LCC Senior Planning Archaeologist to the local planning authority 11/11/2019). This will allow the Planning Authority to assess the potential impact of the new development may have on any underlying archaeological deposits, and to confirm if any further archaeological works would be required.

Topography and Geology

- 2.4 Bagworth lies in the Hinckley and Bosworth district of Leicestershire, nine miles west of Leicester, in the civil parish of Bagworth and Thornton. The assessment area lies on the south side of the Main Street in the centre of Bagworth, close to the T-junction with Station Road. It lies on the western edge of the historic core of the village (Fig. 1)

The site consists of open space, formerly consisting of farm buildings (two large barns, smaller sheds and offices), with tarmac and concrete surfaces with grass areas. The land extends southwards, gently sloping down beyond the buildings to the field south of the site and to the west where there is an area of scrub land that has subsided due to mining activities in the 1970's. To the south of the site lies a mixture of pasture and arable fields. To the west of the site are a few buildings and beyond, an area of woodland and scrub.

- 2.5 The British Geological Survey website indicates that the underlying bedrock geology as Edwalton Member Mudstone bedrock with Glaciofluvial deposits and Mid Pleistocene sand and gravel (Fig. 2).
- 2.6 The Soilscape website indicates that the soils, will be slowly permeable seasonally wet acid loamy and clayey soils, (Soilscape 17: <http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscape/>).



Figure 1: Location of site
Contains OS data © Crown copyright [and database right] 2023



Figure 2: Existing site plan (provided by client)

Historical and Archaeological Background

- 2.8 A Desk-Based Assessment of the site was undertaken previously (Brown 2016), the following is a summary of the results.

Historical Background

- 2.9 The place name of Bagworth is likely to be Anglo-Saxon in origin and is derived from the personal name 'Bag' or 'Bæcge' and the Old English word meaning enclosure. It is listed in the Domesday survey as 'Bageworde' (Morris 1979).
- 2.10 Two collieries were established in the village in 1830 (Nichols 1815.). After the sinking of the mines the village developed quickly, by the 1950s the village was showing signs of decay due to subsidence, and there was a decline in the population. The Desford Colliery was closed in 1984, and Bagworth pit in 1991.

Archaeological Background

- 2.11 There are no Scheduled Monuments, World Heritage Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens or battlefields located within 1km of the assessment area. The Historic Environment Record (HER) for Leicestershire and Rutland record several known archaeological sites in the vicinity of the assessment area:
- 2.12 *Prehistoric:* A findspot of a flint core and flake dated to the Late Mesolithic or Early Neolithic (10000 BC to 3001 BC) is located at Laurel Farm itself (MLE8348). A possible Palaeolithic flint was recorded from south of Bagworth New Wood to the east (MLE9284).

- 2.13 *Roman*: The solitary find from the Romano-British period is represented by a lead weight found near the Barlestone Road (MLE9287), c.600m west of the site.
- 2.14 *Anglo-Saxon*: In Cossington to the south, a late Saxon strap end (MLE6102) was found in this field via metal detecting in the early 1990s. The site at Cossington was excavated in 1999, an Anglo-Saxon cemetery was discovered, found to be re-using a Bronze Age barrow. 51 fragments of metalwork were recovered including spears, knives and a shield boss (MLE9066).
- 2.15 *Medieval to Post-medieval*: The application area is located within the historic settlement core of the village (MLE2699) and most of the sites on the HER relate to the medieval and post-medieval periods. A solitary piece of early medieval pottery has been discovered close to the application area, c.100m south of (MLE9288).

The nearby Holy Rood church (MLE18309) has Saxo-Norman origins. Only the arch remains of the original external structure (MLE2697), although the church also contains a medieval wooden screen (MLE6782).

Earthworks associated with the medieval village are located around Manor Farm (MLE2696), outside the modern village, 200m to the east of the site.

Bagworth Park lies to the east of the village (MLE2695). This was a medieval deer park which belonged originally to the Bishop of Durham, passing in the 15th century to Lord Hastings. Nichols describes it as ‘of old times very large and extensive’ estimating it at some 400 acres and in use as a deer park until around 1622.

There are a number of other sites further afield. To the north-east is the post-medieval house, Bagworth Moats (MLE9976), the site of a medieval moated house (MLE2688) and fishponds to the west and south-east (MLE2690, MLE17452). The moat and fishponds are designated Scheduled Monuments (SM Ref. 1010485).

Close by a cannon ball was found (MLE7350). An old farmhouse - The Hollow - (MLE11708) lies just to the east and the site of a windmill lies to the south-east (MLE2680).

- 2.16 At the southern edge of the site is a dry stone wall, seen running east-west and then curving to the north behind a modern barn. It appears to have been built in two phases, with the curving wall running north being older. The east-west portion of the wall is in poor condition and the top course is capped in places by concrete. The date of this is uncertain, but likely to be of post-medieval – modern.
- 2.17 *Cartographic Evidence*: the earliest available usable map of the area is an 1814 Surveyor’s drawing showing dense settlement in the village core and the area adjacent to Laurel House to the east, but only patchy settlement immediately to the west of the house. The 1838 tithe map does not show the area in any detail.

The map of 1886 shows the original Laurel Farm and buildings, with garden/orchard to the south and just to the west of the site, a small pond. None of the buildings shown exist today. The 1903 map shows no change in the layout of the farm and its buildings from the 1886 map. By 1956 the southern-most buildings of the farm complex had changed in outline and a telephone exchange and some water tanks had been built outside the western boundary of the site, but the farm otherwise remained substantially the same. The modern buildings were constructed in 1982. The approximate location of the buildings shown on the 1886 map are shown below, in relation to the proposed new buildings, and trial trenches.



Figure 3: Trench plan with proposed new building outlined, and earlier buildings shown on 1886 map (grey)

3. Aims and Objectives

3.1 The main objectives of the archaeological work are:

- To identify the presence/absence of any archaeological deposits.
- To establish the character, extent and date range and significance of any surviving archaeological deposits.
- To establish the ecofactual and environmental potential of any archaeological deposits and features encountered.
- To provide sufficient information on the archaeological potential of the site to assess the impact of the proposed development on cultural heritage and to help formulate a mitigation strategy
- To record any archaeological deposits and produce an archive and report of any results.

3.2 The results of the evaluation will provide information in order for the local planning authority to make informed recommendations and to identify an appropriate mitigation strategy for the proposed development.

Research Objectives

3.3 While the nature, extent and quality of archaeological remains within the areas of investigation for the project remain unknown until archaeological work is undertaken, it is possible to determine some initial objectives derived from *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda* (Cooper 2006) and *East Midlands Heritage: An Updated Research Agenda and Strategy for the Historic Environment of the East Midlands* (Knight et al 2012).

3.4 The evaluation may contribute towards research into the origins and development of post-medieval and modern settlement patterns, landscape, and society. Environmental evidence could provide information on local environmental conditions as well as settlement activity, craft, industry and land use. Artefacts can assist in the development of a type series within the region and provide evidence for evidence for craft, industry and exchange across broad landscape areas.

3.5 There is moderate potential for archaeology within the study area. In particular post-medieval and modern remains have been found in the vicinity. The evaluation therefore has the potential to contribute to the following research aims <https://researchframeworks.org/emherf/> :

- *Post-medieval (AD 1450-1749)* (8.4 Rural settlement patterns and building traditions)
- *Modern (AD 1750-1899)* (9.2 Buildings in town and countryside, 9.6 Agriculture, 9.7 The growth of industry)

3.6 These research aims have been identified based on the current state of knowledge within the area of the scheme. The research aims will be re-assessed and updated during the course of the fieldwork.

4. Constraints

4.1 Access is via the main road. There are no known ecological constraints. There are no known underground or overhead services present. See separate RAMS.

5. Methodology

- 5.1 All work will be carried out in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation* (2020) and adhere to their *Code of Conduct* (2021).
- 5.2 Any significant variations to the proposed methodology set out below will be discussed and agreed with the planning archaeologist and client in advance of implementation.
- 5.3 The accession number (X.A32.2023) will be used to identify all records and artefacts.
- 5.4 Prior to machining of the trenches, general photographs of the site will be taken.

Trial Trench Evaluation

- 5.5 Evaluation trenches will be set out on OS National Grid (NGR) co-ordinates using an appropriate methodology. The position and size of trenches may be adjusted on site to account for constraints, with the approval of the planning archaeologist.
- 5.6 The work will comprise of x5 trenches, each around 20m in length. These target areas to be adversely affected by the proposed new development. (Figure 4).



Figure 4: Proposed Trench plan.

- 5.7 Excavation will be carried out with a machine appropriate for the work fitted with a flat-bladed bucket to expose the underlying strata.
- 5.8 Topsoil and overburden will be removed carefully in level spits, under continuous archaeological supervision. The trenches will be excavated down to the top of archaeological deposits or natural undisturbed ground, whichever is reached first. All excavation by machine and hand will be undertaken with a view to avoid damage to archaeological deposits or features which appear worthy of preservation in situ or more detailed investigation than for the purposes of evaluation. Where structures, features or finds appear to merit preservation in situ, they will be adequately protected from deterioration.
- 5.9 All exposed features will be investigated (unless otherwise agreed with the Planning Archaeologist). Archaeological deposits will be recorded in plan and excavated using standard ULAS procedures.
- 5.10 As a minimum discrete features will be half-sectioned where possible; a 1m wide section of each linear feature will be excavated.
- 5.11 The ULAS recording manual will be used as a guide for all recording. Individual descriptions of all archaeological strata and features excavated or exposed will be entered onto pro-forma recording sheets.
- 5.12 A site plan will be prepared showing the location of the areas examined in relationship to the overall investigation area and Ordnance Survey National Grid. Measured drawings of all archaeological features will be prepared and tied into the overall site plan. The relative height of all principal strata and features will be recorded and tied into OD heights.
- 5.13 Excavated trench locations will be recorded by an appropriate method and be tied in to the Ordnance Survey National Grid.
- 5.14 A photographic record of the investigations will be prepared, illustrating in both detail and general context the principal features and finds discovered and their location and context. The photographic record will also include overall site and working shots to illustrate more generally the nature of the archaeological operation mounted.
- 5.15 A photographic record of the investigations will be prepared. This will include photographs illustrating in both detail and general context the principal features and finds discovered. The photographic record will also include 'working shots' to illustrate more generally the nature of the archaeological work.
- 5.16 All photographs (except general or publicity shots) will be taken with a high resolution digital camera and will include a suitable scale bar, north arrow and information to identify the site and where appropriate the context.
- 5.17 The photographic record will follow the standards set out in Historic England 2015, *Digital Image Capture and File Storage* and the standards required by Archaeology Data Service (ADS) for storage and archiving <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/advice/Downloads.xhtml>
- 5.18 This record will be compiled and checked during the course of the excavations, and all site records and finds will be kept securely.
- 5.19 After completion of the trenching, following prior agreement with the Planning Archaeologist, excavated trenches will be backfilled with the excavated arisings.

Historic Building Recording

- 5.20 At the southern edge of the site was, until recently, a dry stone wall, originally running east-west and then curving to the north behind a modern barn. A retrospective Historic Building Record will be undertaken, utilising archive photos, and inspection of the remaining stone.
- 5.21 All work will be carried out in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for the Archaeological Investigation and Recording of Standing Buildings or Structures (2020) and Code of Conduct (2021). Any significant variations to the proposed methodology set out below will be discussed and agreed with the planning archaeologist and client in advance of implementation.
- 5.22 Historic England's guidelines *Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice* (2016) has been used as a basis for defining levels of recording. The Historic Building Record undertaken for this project will be a Level 1 survey. Level 1 is essentially a basic visual record, supplemented by the minimum of information needed to identify the building's location, age and type.
- 5.23 Drawings: Likely to include:
- Plan showing location of the former wall.
 - A site plan relating the building to other structures and to any related topographical and landscape features.
 - A plan or plans identifying the location and direction of accompanying photographs.
- 5.24 Photos. Likely to include:
- General views of the wall (archive photos) along with current views.
 - The wall external appearance, an overall impression of its size and shape.
 - Any dates or other inscriptions; any signage, makers' plates or graffiti which contribute to an understanding of the building. A transcription should be made wherever characters are difficult to interpret.
 - Copies of maps, drawings, views and photographs, present in the building and illustrating its development or that of its site.
- 5.25 Written account. Likely to include:
- The precise location of the wall as an address and in the form of a National Grid reference.
 - A note of any statutory designation (that is, listing, scheduling, Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, conservation area). Information on statutory designations can be found on the Historic England website. Non-statutory designations (local lists) may be added.
 - The date when the record was made, the name(s) of the recorder(s) and the location of any archive material.
 - An account of the wall's overall form (structure, materials, layout) and of its successive phases of development, together with the evidence supporting this analysis.
 - An account of the wall's past and present use, and of the uses of its parts, with the evidence for these interpretations.
 - Any evidence for the former existence of demolished structures associated with the wall.
 - An outline of the significance of the wall. This can seek to identify both the significance of different features or phases of development in the building relative to each other, and also set important aspects of the building in a regional or national context.
 - Full bibliographic and other references, or a list of the sources consulted

Contingency Provisions

- 5.26 While ULAS attempts to foresee and make allowances for all possible site-specific constraints, there may on occasion be unusual circumstances which have not been

included in the programme or quote, which may entail additional costs and/or time for the client. These could include: unavoidable delays due to bad weather, vandalism, poor ground conditions, areas requiring shoring or stepping, unknown contamination or services, further work required by the Planning Archaeologist (e.g., extensions to trenches, extra trenches or changes to excavation sample sizes) or significant archaeological deposits that may require specialist input.

- 5.27 In the event of potentially significant archaeological deposits being found or further work being required for which the resources allocated are not sufficient or which are of sufficient significance to merit an alternative approach the archaeologist will inform the client, the planning archaeologist and the planning authority in order for detailed discussion between all relevant parties to take place. Following assessment of the archaeological remains ULAS shall, if required, implement an amended scheme of investigation on behalf of the client as appropriate.

Monitoring

- 5.28 Notification of the start of the site works will be made to the Planning Archaeologist prior to commencement of the archaeological work in order that monitoring arrangements can be made. All monitoring shall be carried out in accordance with the *CIfA Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation* (2020).
- 5.29 Internal monitoring procedures will be undertaken including visits to the site by the project manager. These will ensure that project targets are met and professional standards are maintained. Provision will be made for external monitoring meetings with the Planning Archaeologist, Planning Authority and the Client, if required, subject to the health and safety requirements of the site.

6. Finds

- 6.1 All finds and samples will be bagged separately, marked with the accession number/site code and related to the context record. All artefacts will be recovered and retained for processing and analysis in accordance with *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (CIfA 2020).
- 6.2 All identified finds and artefacts are to be retained, although certain classes of building material will, in some circumstances, be discarded after recording with the approval of the Planning Archaeologist.
- 6.3 All objects or remains of archaeological interest, discovered in or under the Site during the carrying out of the project by ULAS or during works carried out on the Site by the Client other than articles subject to the Treasure Act, shall be deemed to be the property of ULAS provided that ULAS after due examination shall transfer ownership of all Archaeological Discoveries unconditionally to the appropriate authority for storage in perpetuity.

Treasure

- 6.4 In the event of discovery of artefacts that might constitute Treasure under the definition of The Treasure Act 1996 and its revisions (Treasure (Designation) Order 2002), these will be excavated and removed to a safe place. The client, Coroner, the Planning Archaeologist and the Finds Liaison Officer (FLO) will be informed immediately. A treasure receipt will be completed and submitted to the Coroner's Office and the FLO within 14 days.

Human Remains

- 6.5 If human remains are encountered they will be left in situ. ULAS will inform the client and the Planning Archaeologist immediately. If excavation of human remains is required ULAS will obtain a Ministry of Justice License (Section 25 of the Burial Act 1857). All excavation and post-excavation will also be in accordance with the standards set out in CIfA *Technical Paper 7: Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human remains* (Brickley and McKinley 2004) and *Updated Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains* (CIfA 2017). The final placing of human remains following analysis will be subject to the requirements of the Ministry of Justice License.

7. Environmental Samples

- 7.1 All environmental work will be undertaken in accordance with Historic England guidelines (*Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation*. 2011).
- 7.2 Although the environmental potential of the site is uncertain, if significant archaeological features are sample excavated, the following environmental sampling strategy will be adopted, following consultation with the ULAS Environmental Officer.
- A range of features to represent all feature types, areas and phases will be selected on a judgmental basis. The criteria for selection will be that deposits are datable, well-sealed and with little intrusive or residual material.
 - Any buried soils or well-sealed deposits with concentrations of carbonised material present will be intensively sampled taking a known proportion of the deposit.
 - Spot samples will be taken where concentrations of environmental remains are located.
 - Waterlogged remains, if present, will be sampled for pollen, plant macrofossils, insect remains and radiocarbon dating provided that they are uncontaminated.
 - Waterlogged remains, if present, will be sampled for pollen, plant macrofossils, insect remains and radiocarbon dating provided that they are uncontaminated.
- 7.3 All collected samples will be labelled with the accession number/site code, context and sequential sample numbers.
- 7.4 Appropriate contexts (i.e. datable) will be bulk sampled (50 litres or the whole context depending on size) for the recovery of carbonised plant remains and insects.
- 7.5 Recovery of small animal bones, bird bone and large molluscs will normally be achieved through processing other bulk samples or 50 litre samples may be taken specifically to sample particularly rich deposits.
- 7.6 Wet sieving with flotation will be carried out using a sieving tank with a 0.5mm mesh and a 0.3mm flotation sieve. The small size mesh will be used initially as flotation of plant remains may be incomplete and some may remain in the residue. The residue >0.5mm from the tank will be separated into coarse fractions of over 4mm and fine fractions of >0.5-4mm. The coarse fractions will be sorted for finds. The fine fractions and flots will be evaluated and prioritised; only those with remains apparent will be sorted. The prioritised flots will not be sorted until the analysis stage when phasing information is available. Flots will be scanned and plant remains from selected contexts will be identified and further sampling, sieving and sorting targeted towards higher potential deposits.

- 7.7 Where evidence of industrial processes are present (e.g. indicated by the presence of slag or hearth bases), samples will be taken for the analysis of industrial residues (e.g. hammer scale).

Scientific Dating

- 7.8 Due care will be taken to identify deposits and structures which may have potential for scientific dating. Suitable samples for radiocarbon dating will be subsampled from the processed and identified plant remains in the bulk samples and monolith sample (if taken) as deemed appropriate. Consideration will also be given to the use of Dendrochronology, Archaeomagnetic dating, Thermoluminescence and Optical Luminescence Dating (TL and OSL). Specialists will be consulted in this regard and where deemed appropriate to provide advice and where necessary supervise sampling, take readings and undertake post-excavation reporting.

8. Timetable and Personnel

- 8.1 The start date is April 2023, subject to approval of the WSI.
- 8.2 This project will be under the management of Dr Gavin Speed (MCIfA). The Project Manager will direct the overall conduct of the evaluation as required during the period of fieldwork. Day to day responsibility will rest with the Site Supervisor who will be on-site throughout the project.
- 8.3 The site supervisor will carry out the post-excavation work, with time allocated within the costing of the project for analysis of any artefacts found on the site by the relevant in-house specialists at ULAS.
- 8.4 ULAS uses in-house and external specialists for post-excavation work as follows:

Environmental analysis and reporting:	Rachel Small MA Will Johnson MA
Prehistoric and Roman Pottery:	Nicholas Cooper BSc, Dip post-ex, FSA, MCIfA Elizabeth Johnson BSc MA (Roman pottery) member SGRP
Post-Roman Pottery:	Paul Blinkhorn BA (external)
Animal bone	Jennifer Browning BA, MA, MCIfA (Animal Bone) Rachel Small MA Will Johnson MA
Human bone	Jennifer Browning BA, MA, MCIfA Rachel Small BSc York Osteological Unit (external)
Small Finds	Nicholas Cooper BSc, Dip post-ex, FSA, MCIfA
Industrial residues and building materials	Heidi Addison BA
Wood/Geoarchaeology	Matthew Beamish, MA (cantab), MCIfA Wood: Michael Bamforth (External) Geoarchaeology: Andrew Howard

9. Post Excavation Analysis and Reporting

- 9.1 Following completion of fieldwork, all artefacts and samples will be processed, assessed, conserved and packaged in accordance with CIfA (2020b), ULAS procedures and the relevant Museums for transferring archaeological archives (Leicestershire County Council 2018).

9.2 A draft report in will usually follow within six weeks. The report will include:

- A non-technical summary
- The aims and methods adopted in the course of the evaluation.
- A description of the nature, extent, date, condition and significance of all archaeological deposits recorded during groundworks
- The anticipated degree of survival of archaeological deposits.
- The anticipated archaeological impact of the current proposals.
- Appropriate illustrative material including maps, plans, sections, drawings and photographs.
- A summary of artefacts, specialist reports and a consideration of the evidence within its local, regional, national context.
- An index of the contents and location of the archive.
- Bibliography.

9.3 A draft digital version of the report will be provided for the client, the Planning Archaeologist and the Local Planning Authority for approval. Once approved the final report will be deposited with the Historic Environment Record on the understanding that it will become a public document after an appropriate period of time.

9.4 An, indexed, site archive will be prepared and deposited with the agreed museum in accordance with *Archaeological Archives: A Guide to Best Practice in Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Curation* (Brown 2011), CIfA 2020, *Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of Archaeological Archives*, and the relevant museum guidelines (Leicestershire County Council 2018).

Publication and dissemination of results

9.5 The copyright of all original finished documents shall remain vested in ULAS and ULAS will be entitled as of right to publish any material in any form produced as a result of its investigations.

9.6 Arrangements will be made for an appropriate level of academic publication of the results of the excavations. As a minimum, a summary report will be published in the local journal (*Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society*). Where wider dissemination is appropriate and the significance of the results warrant, a full copy of the report in an appropriate format shall be submitted for publication in relevant academic journals.

9.7 ULAS supports the Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) project. An online OASIS form will be completed detailing the results of the project. Once a report has become a public document following its incorporation into the HER it will be uploaded onto the web-site.

10. Public Engagement and Publicity

10.1 The work is small scale and not anticipated to be suitable for public involvement or participation during the course of the fieldwork. However, the results will be made available via the ADS website, publication and if significant archaeological deposits are found talks and presentations to the local population can be provided.

10.2 ULAS shall acknowledge the contribution of the Client in any displays, broadcasts or publications relating to the site or in which the report may be included.

11. Health and Safety

- 11.1 All work will be conducted in accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and all subsequent Health and Safety legislation, University of Leicester Statement Of Safety Policy Health and Safety and Environmental policies as well as any Principal Contractor's policies or procedures. A site specific Risk Assessment and Method Statement (RAMS) will be formulated prior to commencement of fieldwork. This will be monitored on site and updated as necessary.
- 11.2 The safety of ULAS staff will take priority over the desire to record archaeological deposits.

12. Insurance

- 12.1 All ULAS work is covered by the University of Leicester's Public Liability, Professional Indemnity and Employers Liability Insurance as documented in the RAMS.

13. Quality Assurance

- 13.1 ULAS is a Registered Organisation (RO) with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. All ULAS Project Managers hold Member status and all ULAS Projects are overseen by the Project Manager who is responsible for the quality of the project.

14. Staff Training and CPD

- 14.1 All ULAS staff are subject to University of Leicester's Personal Development Discussion (PDD) strategy which reviews personal performance, identifies targets and areas for improvement and identified the need for appropriate. All members of staff are required to maintain a Personal Development Plan and log.

15. Bibliography

Archaeology Data Service <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/advice/Downloads.xhtml>

British Geological Survey: <https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/geology-of-britain-viewer/>

Brown, C. 2016, *An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment for land south and west of Laurel House, Bagworth*. ULAS Report 2016-108.

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2004, *Technical Paper 7: Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human remains*

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2017, *Updated Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains*

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2020a, *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials*.

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2020b, *Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of Archaeological Archives*

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2020c, *Standard and Guidance for Field Evaluation*

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2021, *Code of Conduct*

Cooper N (ed) 2006, *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda*

DCMS (Department for Culture, media and sport) 1996, *The Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice*.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/77532/TreasureAct1996CodeofPractice2ndRevision.pdf

Hartley, F., 1969 *The earthworks of south-east Leicestershire*.

Historic England, 2011. *Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation*.

Historic England 2015, *Digital Image Capture and File Storage*.

Knight, D., Vyner, B. and Allen, C. 2012, *East Midlands Heritage: An updated research agenda and strategy for the Historic Environment of the East Midlands*. University of Nottingham and York Archaeological Trust.

Leicestershire County Council, 2018, *The Transfer of Archaeological Archives to Leicestershire County Council Museum Collections*.

MHCLG (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) 2021, (Rev.), *National Planning Policy Framework*.

Nichols, J., 1811 - 1815 *History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester* (8 volumes)

OASIS <https://www.oasis.ac.uk/>

Soilscapes: <http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/>