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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This document sets out details of a *Written Scheme of Investigation* (WSI), prepared by Cotswold Archaeology (CA), for an archaeological watching brief at the proposed site for a tunnel segment manufacturing and transhipment facility at Chatham Docks, Medway, Kent (centred on NGR: TQ 7697 6977; Fig 1). The work, which has been commissioned by Dragados-Sisk JV, forms part of a programme of archaeological investigation, an earlier stage of which was the preparation of an archaeological desk-based assessment (CA 2011).

1.2 The desk-based assessment together with this WSI are submitted in support of the planning application for the change of use of a facility for the manufacture of tunnel lining segments, and associated works that will include the construction of a water treatment plant and associated drainage trenches. In response to consultation, Ben Found, Kent County Council’s Planning Archaeologist, requested mitigation works, in the form of a watching brief, to investigate any archaeological remains that may be present on the site.

1.3 The preparation of this WSI has been guided by the *Standard and Guidance for an Archaeological Watching Brief* (Institute for Archaeologists 2008), the *Management of Archaeological Projects 2* (English Heritage (EH) 1991) and the *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE): Project Managers Guide* (EH 2006), and other relevant standards and guidance listed in Appendix B.

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1 The site, which covers an area of approximately 0.76ha, is located to the north of Pier Road (A289), approximately 2km north-east of Chatham town centre and 1km south of the River Medway (Fig. 1). It comprises a single industrial unit and a large area of hard standing, approximately 100m to the south-west of Basin No. 3. The bedrock geology comprises Upper Chalk, which is overlain by superficial deposits of river gravels and alluvial sediments (including peat) deposited by the River Medway (BGS 2011). Alluvium has been recorded to a depth of 15m bgl by previous palaeoenvironmental investigations to the north of the site.
2.2 The northern boundary of the site extends along an area of hardstanding to the north of the single industrial unit within the site. The eastern site boundary extends across an area of hardstanding dividing the site from further industrial units. The southern boundary is formed by a brick wall which separates the site from Pier Road (A289). The western boundary extends across a further area of hard standing and divides the site from a narrow emergency access lane.

2.3 The site was formerly located on the banks of the River Medway and the alluvial silts within the site have the potential to seal deposits of archaeological and palaeoenvironmental significance. Highly significant palaeoenvironmental and prehistoric remains have been recorded at the eastern approach to the Medway Tunnel, 450m west of the site, and there is some potential for similar deposits to exist within the site. However, no such deposits have been recorded within the site and extensive deposits of modern made ground are likely to overlie (and probably truncate) these natural silts.

2.4 Brompton Lines, the 18th and 19th-century defences to Chatham Docks, formally extended into the eastern part of the site. These defences were removed during the construction of the Victorian basins at St Mary’s Creek. It is likely that any remains of this feature would have been significantly impacted upon by the later construction of the soldiers bathing pool in this location. The bathing pool itself was removed during the early 20th century to accommodate military structures. Any archaeological remains relating to this feature are considered likely to comprise heritage assets of historical interest of negligible significance.

2.5 The site has been subject to extensive modern development during the 19th and 20th centuries, primarily associated with the expansion of the military dockyards, and deep deposits of modern made ground are recorded in the vicinity of the site. Furthermore, successive phases of 20th-century construction are likely to have impacted upon any potential archaeological remains located within the site.

2.6 The proposed water treatment plant in the western part of the site requires an excavation 3m deep, and is likely to extend beyond the depth of made ground. There are no recorded heritage assets in the vicinity of this plant, although there is some potential for palaeoenvironmental and prehistoric archaeological deposits to occur at this depth. The depth of the proposed drainage trenches does not extend
beyond 0.5m depth and as such may be confined to the modern made ground deposits.

2.7 A single extant building in the northern part of the site is considered to be heritage asset of historic interest of local significance due to its association with wartime activity at Chatham Docks. This structure appears to have been subject to later 20th-century modification and is not considered to be of such significance as to preclude or influence development. The remaining structures within the site relate to later 20th-century industrial activity and are not considered to be heritage assets.

2.8 The site is located within the buffer zone of the Chatham Docks Tentative World Heritage Site. The extant buildings within the site are not considered to contribute to the significance of the Tentative World Heritage Site.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 The archaeological watching brief will identify, record and investigate, so far as is reasonably practicable, any archaeological features, deposits or finds revealed during construction works for the new development.

4. FIELD METHODOLOGY

4.1 The watching brief will comprise the observation by an experienced archaeologist of all intrusive groundworks. Non-archaeologically significant deposits will be removed by the contractors under archaeological supervision. Where mechanical excavators are used, these will be equipped with a toothless bucket, although a toothed bucket may be used to break up modern surfaces or made ground.

4.2 If archaeological deposits are encountered they will be planned and recorded in accordance with CA’s *Technical Manual 1: Fieldwork Recording Manual* (CA 2007). Each context will be recorded on a *pro-forma* context sheet by written and measured description; principal deposits will be recorded by drawn plans (scale 1:20 or 1:50, or electronically using Leica 1200 series GPS as appropriate) and drawn sections (scale 1:10 or 1:20 as appropriate). Should detailed feature planning be undertaken using GPS, this will be carried out in accordance with *Technical Manual 4: Survey Manual* (CA 2011). Photographs (black and white negative and digital colour) will be taken as appropriate. All finds and samples will be bagged separately and related to
the context record. All artefacts will be recovered and retained for processing and analysis in accordance with *Technical Manual 3: Treatment of Finds Immediately after Excavation* (CA 1995).

4.3 Due care will be taken to identify deposits which may have environmental potential, and where appropriate, a programme of environmental sampling will be initiated. Samples will be taken, processed and assessed for potential in accordance with *Technical Manual 2: The Taking and Processing of Environmental and Other Samples from Archaeological Sites* (CA 2003).

4.4 In the event of archaeological deposits being found for which the resources allocated are not sufficient to support treatment to a satisfactory and proper standard or which are of sufficient significance to merit an alternative approach such as contingency excavation or physical preservation, the client and the KCC Planning Archaeologist will be contacted immediately. Destructive work in that area will cease until agreement has been reached on an appropriate archaeological response. Where excavation of human remains is required, this will be conducted following the provisions of the Coroners Unit in the Ministry of Justice, and will include notification to the local Environmental Health Officer.

4.5 CA will comply fully with the provisions of the Treasure Act 1996 and the Code of Practice referred to therein. A metal detector will be used to maximise the recovery of archaeologically significant metal objects.

5. **STAFF AND TIMETABLE**

5.1 The project will be under the management of Simon Carlyle MIfA, Project Manager, CA. The archaeological watching brief will be undertaken by a supervisory member of CA’s fieldwork team, assisted by CA Archaeologists as required. Details of the qualifications and experience of the individuals to be deployed on the project can be provided on request.

5.2 The Project Manager will be responsible for the overall management of the watching brief; day-to-day responsibility will rest with CA’s site supervisor throughout the duration of the project.
5.3 The duration of the fieldwork for the watching brief will be dependent upon the contractor’s programme.

5.4 Specialists who will be invited to advise and report on specific aspects of the project as necessary are:

- Ceramics: Ed McSloy (CA)
- Metalwork: Ed McSloy (CA)
- Flint: Ed McSloy (CA)
- Animal bone: Jonny Geber (CA)
- Human bone: Jonny Geber (CA)
- Environmental remains: Sarah Cobain (CA)
- Conservation: Wiltshire Conservation Service
- Geo-archaeology: Dr Keith Wilkinson (ARCA)

5.5 Depending upon the nature of the deposits and artefacts encountered it may be necessary to consult other specialists not listed here. A full list of specialists currently used by Cotswold Archaeology is contained within Appendix A.

6. ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

6.1 Following completion of fieldwork, all artefacts and environmental samples will be processed, assessed, conserved and packaged in accordance with CA Technical Manuals and the relevant recipient museum guidelines.

6.2 An illustrated report will be compiled on the results of the fieldwork and assessment of the artefacts and palaeoenvironmental samples. Copies of the report will be distributed to the client and Ben Found (KCC). The required number of hard copies and a digital copy of the evaluation report will be made available to KCC’s Historic Environment Record (HER).

6.3 Should no further work be required, an ordered, indexed, and internally consistent site archive will be prepared and deposited in accordance with Archaeological Archives: A Guide to Best Practice in Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Curation (Archaeological Archives Forum 2007).
6.4 As the limited scope of this work is likely to restrict its publication value, it is anticipated that at most a short note only will be published in an appropriate local archaeological journal. A summary of information from the project will also be entered onto the OASIS online database of archaeological projects in Britain.

6.5 CA will make arrangements with the recipient museum for an accession number, the deposition of the site archive and, subject to agreement with the legal landowner(s), any artefacts.

7. HEALTH AND SAFETY

7.1 CA will conduct all works in accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and all subsequent Health and Safety legislation, and CA’s Health, Safety and Welfare Policy (2010). A risk assessment will be undertaken prior to commencement of fieldwork and submitted to the client for approval.

8. INSURANCES

8.1 CA holds Public Liability Insurance to a limit of £10,000,000 and Professional Indemnity Insurance to a limit of £5,000,000. No claims have been made, or are pending, against these policies in the last three years.

9. MONITORING

9.1 Notification of the start of site works will be made to Ben Found, KCC Planning Archaeologist, so that there will be opportunities to visit the site and check on the quality and progress of the work.

10. QUALITY ASSURANCE

10.1 CA is a Registered Organisation (RO) with the Institute for Archaeologists (RO Ref. No. 8). As a RO, CA endorses the Code of Conduct (IfA 2010) and the Code of Approved Practice for the Regulation of Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology (IfA 2008). All CA Project Managers and Project Officers hold either full Member or Associate status within the IfA.
10.2 CA operates an internal quality assurance system in the following manner. Projects are overseen by a Project Manager who is responsible for the quality of the project. The Project Manager reports to the Chief Executive who bears ultimate responsibility for the conduct of all CA operations. Matters of policy and corporate strategy are determined by the Board of Directors, and in cases of dispute recourse may be made to the Chairman of the Board.

11. REFERENCES
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### APPENDIX A: COTSWOLD ARCHAEOLOGY SPECIALISTS

#### Ceramics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Specialist(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic/Bronze Age</td>
<td>Ed McSloy (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Elaine Morris (University of Southampton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ros Cleal (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age/Roman</td>
<td>Ed McSloy (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Samian)</td>
<td>Peter Webster (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Amphorae stamps)</td>
<td>David Williams (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Paul Blinkhorn (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Timby (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval/post-medieval</td>
<td>Ed McSloy (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Clay pipe)</td>
<td>Duncan Brown (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reg Jackson (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Building Material</td>
<td>Ed McSloy (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Mills (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Garside-Neville (freelance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Finds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Specialist(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Finds</td>
<td>Ed McSloy (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Ed McSloy (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Palaeolithic)</td>
<td>Phil Harding, Wessex Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Stone</td>
<td>Fiona Roe (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptions</td>
<td>Roger Tomlin (Oxford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Ed McSloy (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hilary Cool (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Dungworth (English Heritage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coins</td>
<td>Ed McSloy (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Peter Guest (Cardiff University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Reece (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>Quita Mould (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>Penelope Walton Rogers (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron slag/metal technology</td>
<td>Dr Tim Young (Cardiff University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr David Dungworth (English Heritage)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Biological Remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Specialist(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal bone</td>
<td>Dr Sylvia Warman (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Bone (Cremations)</td>
<td>Harriet Jacklin (ULAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackie McKinley (Wessex Archaeology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sampling</td>
<td>Dr Sylvia Warman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Keith Wilkinson (ARCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollen</td>
<td>Nick Daffern (WHEAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diatoms</td>
<td>Nigel Cameron (UCL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charred Plant Remains</td>
<td>Wendy Carruthers (freelance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liz Pearson (WHEAS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wood/Charcoal  
Dana Challinor (freelance)  

Insects  
David Smith (Birmingham University)  
QUEST (Reading University)  

Mollusca  
Dr Keith Wilkinson (ARCA)  

Fish bones  
Hannah Russ (freelance)  
Philip Armitage  

**Geoarchaeology**  
Dr Keith Wilkinson (ARCA)  

**Scientific Dating**  

**Dendrochronology**  
Cathy Groves (ARCUS)  
Robert Howard (NTRDL Nottingham)  

**Radiocarbon dating**  
University of Waikato (New Zealand)  
Beta Analytic (USA)  
Rafter (New Zealand)  

**Archaeomagnetic dating**  
Don Tarling (Plymouth)  

**TL/OSL Dating**  
Phil Toms (University of Gloucestershire)  

**Conservation**  
Wiltshire Conservation Services
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