

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Client	Planning	Heritage Advisory Region	NGR OS Grid Reference
	Region		(Ordnance Survey)
St Mary`s PCC	N/a	Diocese of Manchester	NGR SD 79683 07580
Site Location	Project	Site Code	Planning Application
	Code		Number
St Marys	STMR-A	BEAR18-STMR-A	N/a
Radcliffe			
Project Detail	Site Status	Compiled by	OASIS Number
Archaeological	Grade 1	Martin Sowerby Programme	N/a
Watching Brief	Listed	Manager	

Contents

Ρ	RO	DJECT CONTROL	2
S	UM	MMARY	3
1	F	PROJECT INTRODUCTION	4
	1.1	.1 Scope of Works	4
	1.2	.2 The Business Case	4
	1.3	.3 Method Statement (MS)	4
	1.4	.4 Project Aims and Objectives	4
	1.5	.5 Project Methodology	4
	1.6	.6 Project Archive	4
2	5	SITE BACKGROUND	6
	2.1	.1 Project Location	6
	2.2	.2 Land Use and Management	6
	2.3	.3 Topography and Geology	6
3	,	ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF	7
4	,	ARTEFACTUAL EVIDENCE	10
5	[DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	11
6	E	BIBLIOGRAPHY	12
7	1	APPENDIX 1 ILLUSTRATIONS	13
8	F	PROJECT CLOSE-OUT	14

PROJECT CONTROL

Contacts:

Project Manager	Client
Name: Martin Sowerby Company: BEAR Archaeology Telephone: Restricted Email: info@abacusarchaeology.co.uk	Name: St Marys PCC Telephone: Restricted Email: Restricted
Agent/Planning Consultant	
Name: John Barnes Company: JABA Ltd Telephone: Restricted Email: Restricted	

Document Control:

Version	Date	Comments
P1	12 th September 2018	Client Issue

Related Report Documents:

Title	Version, Date	Owner

This document will be distributed to:

Name	Position	Email address
John	Architect	Restricted
Barnes		
St Mary`s PCC	Treasurer	Restricted

Glossary:

Acronym	Definition
LPA	Local Planning Authority
CIfA	Chartered Institute for Field Archaeologists
BGS	British Geological Society
PM	Project Manager
SQEP	Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person
DC	Document Control
EHS&Q	Environmental Health Safety and Quality
LFE	Learn From Experience
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control
R2A2	Roles, Responsibilities, Accountabilities and
	Authorities

Summary

During October 2018 Bear Archaeology undertook an archaeological watching brief within the late medieval church tower of St Mary and St Bartholomew, Radcliffe, Manchester. The church designated as a Grade I structure; thus, the church is recognised as having particular historic merit and is of national importance. The scope of the project was to monitor groundworks during the removal of a flagged floor within the footprint of the tower which was damaged by flooding in 2015.

The manor of Radcliffe is mentioned in the Domesday Survey of 1086 as a royal manor, although the church is not mentioned until the early thirteenth century. The earliest structural element within the church is the northern and southern corners of the western end of the nave chancel piers and arch. The medieval tower was largely rebuilt in the mid seventeenth century. The nave, chancel and transepts were extensively modified and extended in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The watching brief revealed an earlier flagged surface, parts of which were overlaid by the later flagged floor. Both surfaces overlaid construction rubble and a buried soil horizon. The natural subsoil was exposed which was undisturbed. Therefore, no archaeological or historical finds or feature were recovered/exposed during the archaeological project.

1 Project Introduction

1.1 Scope of Works

1.1.1 The scope of the project was to monitor all groundwork activities during the removal of the floor within the tower of St Marys Parish Church.

1.2 The Business Case

1.2.1 The programme of archaeological fieldwork requested by JABA Architects acting on behalf of St Marys Parochial Parish Council (PCC). The archaeological fieldwork will be in the form of an archaeological watching brief that would be carried out alongside the main construction works. The benefit of the watching brief would be to inform the PCC and agent of the nature/form of any archaeological/historical finds and features, or lack thereof.

1.3 Method Statement (MS)

1.3.1 Due to the nature of the project, no project was issued. Standard procedures/protocols for archaeological monitoring in consecrated ground was adopted for the project.

1.4 Project Aims and Objectives

1.4.1 The key objectives of the watching brief would be to determine the presence/absence of any archaeological deposits/features within the zone of the work Any features/finds of archaeological interest would be examined by hand to determine their extent, condition, function, relationships, character, quality of survival, importance, and date. This would be followed by an assessment of the potential and significance of any archaeological deposits and features within a local and regional context. During the close out an appropriate level of post-excavation examination/analysis and publication of results to agreed standards will be implemented.

1.5 Project Methodology

1.5.1 The archaeological fieldwork was carried out by all recent and appropriate standards and guidelines issued by English Heritage/Historic England and Chartered Institute for Field Archaeologists 1991 & 2006a; CIfA 2014). All archaeological work was undertaken using standard archaeological recording procedures and numbering systems based on the Museum of London Archaeological Recording Manual (MOLAS 1994).

1.6 Project Archive

1.6.1 The results of the fieldwork will form the basis of a full archive to professional standards, in accordance with current guidelines and standards namely the Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE), Historic England 2006 and finally Standards and Guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives (CIfA, 2014c).

Also, the Arts and Humanities Data Service (AHDS) online database project Online Access to the index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) will created as part of the proejct close-out and handover.

2 Site Background

2.1 Project Location

2.1.1 The Parish Church sits on the northern bank of the River Irwell, Radcliffe, Manchester centered on NGR SD 79683 07580.

2.2 Land Use and Management

2.2.1 Current use is a working Parish Church and associated graveyard.

2.3 Topography and Geology

2.3.1 The drift geology of the area comprises alluvial sands and gravels overlying Carboniferous Coal Measures (British Geological Survey of England and Wales). The solid geology consists of weak sandstones and mudstones.

3 Archaeological Watching Brief

- 3.1 **Introduction**: the archaeological fieldwork comprised the monitoring of the removal of the floor within the church tower.
- 3.2 15th October 2018: the flagstones had been removed before the watching brief commenced. The pale-yellow buff flags stones [100] were traditionally produced, hand fettled with sawn edges. They were laid on a compacted surface of sand mixed with Portland cement, which acted as a thin bonding agent 101. Below the bedding material, a layer/deposit of mixed rubble 102 was visible. It was 0.15m deep in section and contained fragments of lime mortar and likely formed during a phase of construction. This overlaid a dark brown, almost black organic layer 103, interpreted as a buried soil horizon. The subsoil **104** below, comprised compacted silty sand with occasional inclusions of small rounded stones. Along the eastern section of the trench, additional flagstones [105] may form an earlier floor which heads into the church. A stone-lined service duct was also present within the trench, containing the church central heating pipework. The duct was aligned north-south in a square cut [106], lined with dressed sandstone [107] and backfilled with loose demolition/construction rubble 108 (see Plates 1-4).



PLATE 1: Excavation area, facing east (Scale 2 x 2m)

Context	Туре	Form	Function	Finds	Description	Dimensions
100	Structure	Stone flags	Floor	N/a	pale-yellow buff flags stones. Traditionally produced, hand fettled with sawn edges	0.15-0.20m thick

101	Deposit	Foundation	Bedding for 100	None	Sand/ rubble mixed with modern bonding agent	0.17m in section
102	Deposit	Construction waste	N/a	None	fragments of lime mortar and likely formed during a phase of construction	0.15m
103	Layer	Buried soil horizon	N/a	None	Dark brown, almost black organic layer interpreted as a buried soil horizon.	0.10m
104	Layer	Subsoil	N/a	None	Compacted silty sand with occasional inclusions of small rounded stones	
105	Structure	Stone flags	Floor	N/a	pale-yellow buff flags stones. Traditionally produced, hand fettled with sawn edges	0.12m thick
106	Cut	Structural	Drain	N/a	Rectangular cut for the heating duct.	0.40m high
107	Structure	Culvert/duct	Conduit for the heating system	N/a	Red Sandstone, bonded with lime mortar	0.40m high
108	Deposit	Fill	Backfill of 107	None	Loose mixed rubble and limestone fragments	0.4om deep.

Table 1 Area A Context Description



Plate 2 General shot ground make-up, facing west (scale 2x2m)



Plate 3 Tower entrance, facing east (scale 2x2m)

4 Artefactual Evidence

- 4.1 **Finds:** no finds of architectural, historical and archaeological derivation were recovered during the archaeological fieldwork.
- 4.2 **Environmental Analysis:** no environmental samples were taken due to the lack of archaeological features.
- 4.3 **Human Remains:** no human remains were recovered.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Discussion: During October 2018 Bear Archaeology undertook an archaeological watching brief within the late medieval church tower of St Mary and St Bartholomew, Radcliffe, Manchester. The church designated as a Grade I structure; thus, the church is recognised as having particular historic merit and is of national importance. The scope of the project was to monitor groundworks during the removal of a flagged floor within the footprint of the tower which was damaged by flooding in 2015. Radcliffe Manor is cited in the Domesday Survey of 1086 as a royal manor, although the church is not mentioned until 1202. The earliest structural element within the church is the chancel arch and piers and the northern and southern corners of the western end of the nave. The medieval tower was largely rebuilt in c. 1665. The nave, chancel, and transepts were extensively modified and extended in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The watching brief revealed an earlier flagged surface, parts of which were overlaid by the later flagged floor. Both surfaces overlaid construction rubble and a buried soil horizon. The natural subsoil was exposed which was undisturbed.

5.2 Conclusion.

5.2.1 No archaeological or historical finds or features were recovered/exposed during the archaeological project.

6 **Bibliography**

British Geological Survey (2018). Geoindex, Online at http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/GeoIndex/default.aspx, accessed 17th February 2018.

BEAR Archaeology 2017. Method Statement, Unpublished Report

Brown, D H 2008 Archaeological Archives: A Guide to Best Practice in Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Curation

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014. Code of Conduct

ClfA 2008d Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation, and Research of Archaeological Materials. Reading: Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

English Heritage 2006a Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide

English Heritage 2002 Human Bones from Archaeological Sites: Guidelines for Producing Assessment Documents and Analytical Reports

English Heritage 1991 The Management of Archaeological Projects

UKIC (United Kingdom Institute for Conservation) 2001 Excavated Artefacts and Conservation (UKIC Guideline No 1)

UKIC (United Kingdom Institute for Conservation) 1984 Environmental Standards for Permanent Storage of Excavated Material from Archaeological Sites (UKIC Guideline No 3)

UKIC (United Kingdom Institute for Conservation) 1983 Packaging and Storage of Freshly Excavated Artefacts from Archaeological Sites (UKIC Guideline No 2)

Walker, K 1990 Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long-term Storage

Watkinson, D, and Neal, V 1998 First Aid for Finds (3rd edition)

Watt, S. 2011. The Archaeology of the West Midlands. Oxbow Books, Oxford.

Welsh Assembly Government (2016) Chapter 6: Conserving the Historic Environment' Planning Policy Wales 8th edition http://wales.gov.uk/topics/planning/policy/ppw/?lang=en

Welsh Assembly Government (2017) Technical Advice Note TAN 24: The Historic Environment http://gov.wales/topics/planning/policy/tans/tan-24/?lang=en

7 Appendix 1 Illustrations

8 Project Close-out

Project Close-Out

1 Project Close-Out and Archiving

- 1.1 This document forms part of BEAR Archaeology's Information Management Framework. It has been developed to provide an understanding of good information management practice, drawing upon recognised standards and best practices. The document provides principles for the management of information whether it originates or is retained in electronic or physical (principally paper-based) formats, or in a mixture of both. The project archive is currently held at the main office in Cumbria and will be ultimately deposited at a suitable repository TBC.
- 1.2 BEAR Archaeology will ensure all information assets and classes of records that are created and managed are identified and recorded, with ownership agreed and documented.

Client	St Mary`s PCC
Planning Region	Lancashire
Heritage Advisory Region	Greater Manchester
NGR OS	SD 79683 07580
Site Location	Radcliffe, Bury, Manchester
Project Code	STMR-A
Site Code	BEAR18-STMR-A
Planning Application Number	None
Project Detail	Archaeological Watching Brief
Site Status	Grade 1 Listed
Project Manager	Martin Sowerby
OASIS Number	OASIS ID: TBC
Archive Number	TBC
OS Licence	TBC

2. Metadata

2.1 Metadata is the information BEAR Archaeology use to help us retrieve and interpret information. Metadata describes the 'original data,' it represents, explains, locates or otherwise makes it easier to recover, use, or manage information resources generated by the project.

There are three main requirements of metadata:

- Resource discovery By using appropriate metadata, users can browse their way through content, or they can carry out specific searches, e.g., a large volume of site records generated, such as contexts sheets;
- Organising repository content If we do not associate metadata with items in a repository, they will become difficult to retrieve as more items are added, for example, digital photography (photographs) are a valuable resource, but the images become worthless if they cannot be interested later through use of descriptive metadata.
- Retention= and Preservation Information, such as how and why documents were created and by who, site, location, etc., aids long-term preservation.

2 Digitisation and Preservation

2.1 Information generated by the project has been stored in an appropriate medium, considering operational needs, retention periods and costs. Where the retention of

physical records has been deemed to be a high risk, digital surrogates for ongoing access and management throughout the Information Lifecycle. BEAR Archaeology adopts the following guidance for the project archive.

- Storage facilities are fit for purpose;
- All electronic information resources are routinely backed up and safeguarded from hardware and software failures;
- Electronic information is reviewed periodically and, where necessary, be migrated so that it does not become inaccessible through obsolete technology. Any migrated information is thoroughly checked to ensure content has not been altered or lost.
- 3. Electronic email (email)
- 3.1 As with any other record (paper & Electronic) the length of retention is determined by the subject matter or business purpose.
 - Messages regarding the project have been regularly reviewed and deleted to prevent requirements for server space increasing unnecessarily;
 - Emails are not used as additional filling areas, emails created, received and used in the pursuit of the project has been treated like any other information resource and record.
- 4. Physical Records Storage
- 4.1 Project records have been stored in a fit-for-purpose storage facility and have been indexed, files, stored, monitored and maintained allowing full retrieval when necessary/required. The physical records generated by the project are highlighted below.

Туре	Description	Format	Storage	Number
Site	Site documentation	Microsoft Word and	Physical	8 sheets of A4
Documentation	generated	PDF (printed)	archive	
Site Drawings	Drawings and	Permatrace Pre-cut	Physical	Two sheets of
	sketches of	A4 sheets of 75-	archive	A4
	archaeological	micron Double-Matt		
	features	Manual Drafting		
		Film. Archival		
		quality, and		
		dimensionally		
		stable.		
Final Site	Site Report	Microsoft word	Physical	17 pages
Report		printed and bound	archive	

5 Digital, Print Photographs and Videos

5.1 All images generated have an identifier associated with it. The identifier is an alpha-numeric string containing a file extension (i.e.) for digital/video JPEG/WMV and print colour/B&W. Who took the image, where it was created, how it was created, the content of the image, etc. will all be contained within the metadata profile of the image. BEAR Archaeology's strategy will be to generate standard metadata profiles for individual content types, including photographic and video images. These content types will include the metadata elements needed for resource discovery, management and, ultimately, disposition.

Туре	Description	Format	Storage	Image Value
Digital Nikon	General photographs	JPEG and RAW	SanDisk	36 images
D7500	of the site		Extreme	
			64G	
Minolta X300	General shots of site	Black and White	Archive	36 Images
& Saitex				
28mm F2.8				
Canon AE1 &	General shots of site	Colour Slide	Archive	36 Images
50mm F1.8 FD				
& 155A Flash				
Canon AE1 &	General Shot of site	Colour Print	Archive	36 Images
50mm F1.8 FD				
& 155A Flash				

