



# The Sizewell C Project

## 6.14 Environmental Statement Addendum Volume 3 Environmental Statement Addendum Appendices Chapter 2 Main Development Site

Appendix 2.11.A: Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation -  
Tracked Changes Version

---

Revision: 3.0  
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(a)  
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

---

September 2021

Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



## CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1	Scope.....	1
2	ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND .....	<del>12</del>
2.1	Chronological summary .....	<del>12</del>
3	RESEARCH CONTEXT .....	<del>78</del>
4	DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESPONSE.....	<del>13</del> <del>14</del>
5	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESPONSE.....	<del>14</del> <del>15</del>
5.1	General principles .....	<del>14</del> <del>15</del>
5.2	Proposed methodology and application.....	<del>15</del> <del>16</del>
5.3	Standards for archaeological work.....	<del>19</del> <del>21</del>
5.4	Procedures in respect of statutorily designated remains .....	<del>28</del> <del>29</del>
5.5	Finds Processing .....	<del>29</del> <del>30</del>
5.6	Post-excavation work, reporting and dissemination .....	<del>29</del> <del>31</del>
6	HEALTH, SAFETY, SECURITY AND ENVIRONMENT .....	<del>37</del> <del>39</del>
7	MONITORING .....	<del>38</del> <del>40</del>
8	PUBLIC OUTREACH.....	<del>38</del> <del>40</del>
	REFERENCES .....	<del>40</del> <del>42</del>

## TABLES

Table 3.1: Archaeological research agenda .....	<del>9</del> <del>10</del>
---	----------------------------

## ANNEXES

- Annex 2.11.A.1 Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England
- Annex 2.11.A.2 Requirements for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation
- Annex 2.11.A.3 Requirements for Archaeological Excavation
- Annex 2.11.A.4 Requirements for a Geophysical Survey
- Annex 2.11.A.5 Additional Requirements for a Palaeoenvironmental Assessment

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Scope

1.1.1 This document sets out the archaeological response to the disturbance of remains resulting from work carried out at the Sizewell C main development site, and associated development sites. This will be collectively referenced as the Sizewell C Project.

1.1.2 It is intended to provide an introduction to the overall scheme, archaeological background, and regional research agenda, as well as setting out the overarching procedures and standards for archaeological works.

1.1.3 [Level 1 control documents will either be certified under the DCO at grant or annexed to the Deed of Obligation \(DoO\). All are secured and legally enforceable. Some Level 1 documents are compliance documents and must be complied with when certain activities are carried out. Other Level 1 documents are strategies or draft plans which set the boundaries for a subsequent Level 2 document which is required to be approved by a body or governance group. The obligations in the DCO and DoO set out the status of each Level 1 document.](#)

1.1.4 [This document is a Level 1 document. Requirement 3 of the draft DCO \(dDCO\) provides that no part of the terrestrial works associated with the Sizewell C Project may be carried out until a site-specific written scheme of investigation \(WSI\) for each phase of archaeological investigation relating to that part has, following consultation with Historic England, been submitted to and approved by Suffolk County Council. It further provides that no later than one year following the approval of the final site-specific post excavation assessment, an archaeological updated project design for all sites must be submitted to Suffolk County Council for approval. Both the site-specific written scheme of investigation\(s\) and the archaeological updated project design must be produced in general accordance with this document. Further, archaeological method statements must also be submitted to and approved by SCC prior to archaeological works being carried out. The terrestrial works must be carried out in accordance with the detailed site-specific WSIs and accordance with this this Overarching WSI.](#)

1.1.5 [Where further documents or details require approval, this document states which body or governance group is responsible for the approval and/or must be consulted. Any approvals by Suffolk County Council will be carried out in accordance with the procedure in Schedule 23 of the dDCO. Any updates to these further documents or details must be approved by the same body or governance group and through the same consultation and procedure as the original document or details.](#)

- 1.1.6 For the purposes of this document the term ‘SZC Co.’ refers to NNB Nuclear Generation (SZC) Limited (or any other undertaker as defined by the dDCO), its appointed representatives and the appointed construction contractors.
- 1.1.7 ~~Individual Site-specific~~ written schemes of archaeological investigation (WSIs) will must be produced for each site on the basis of geophysical survey and ~~/or~~ evaluation trial trenching ~~completed. Where required, for example where it has not been practicable to complete surveys in advance of the Development Consent Order (DCO), additional site-specific WSIs w1.1.3 will be provided setting out proposals for evaluation survey. All site specific WSIs will be supplemented by the contractor’s method statements once completed. Where geophysical survey and/or evaluation trial trenching has not been carried out prior to the end of the examination, a site-specific WSI for the evaluation phase must be submitted to and approved by SCC.~~
- 1.1.8 ~~1.1.4~~ Any preserved peats within the Sizewell C Project area are the subject of a **Peat Strategy**, ~~provided in Appendix 16G of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3 165G(A)) (also secured by Requirement 3 of the dDCO) and therefore~~, and are not discussed further in this document.

## 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Chronological summary

- 2.1.1 The historical and archaeological background of sites incorporated within the proposed Sizewell C development have been documented in previous Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (DBAs). Many sites have also been subject to geophysical surveys and archaeological evaluations, a summary of which with relevant points are set out within this section. As other fieldwork evaluation reports are finalised, these will be referenced in the site-specific WSIs.
- 2.1.2 It is important to note, in terms of providing a chronological summary, that there has been very little systematic archaeological investigation in the area before the Sizewell C Project. This means that the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER) data almost certainly underrepresents the true nature and extent of the archaeology present. This is supported by the archaeological evaluations conducted at the sites listed below, which have identified remains beyond what might have been initially indicated by pre-existing HER data.
- 2.1.3 For a more detailed summary of individual sites, refer to the completed DBAs:

- Main [Development Site](#) (Ref. 1.1) [\[APP-273\]](#);
- Rail Route Options (Ref. 1.2) [\[APP-561\]](#);
- [\(Southern Park and Ride\) Wickham Market](#) (Ref. 1.3) [\[APP-400\]](#);
- [\(Northern Park and Ride\) Darsham](#) (Ref. 1.4) [\[APP-369\]](#);
- Two Village Bypass (Ref. 1.5); [\[APP-433\]](#);
- A12/B1122 Yoxford Roundabout (Ref. 1.6) [\[APP-500\]](#);
- Sizewell Link Road and Theberton Bypass (Ref. 1.7) [\[APP-468\]](#); and
- Freight Management Facility (Ref. 1.8) [\[APP-529\]](#).

2.1.4 Also refer to the archaeological evaluation reports [\(or as updated following the end of the examination\)](#):

- Main Development Site [Evaluation Report](#) (interim) (Ref. 1.9 and 1.13) [\[APP-274\]](#) and [Evaluation Fieldwork Report Addendum - MDS3 and MDS4](#) (Ref 1.34) [\[REP3-017\]](#);
- Pillbox Field [Evaluation Report](#) (Ref. 1.10) [\[APP-274\]](#);
- Land ~~to the~~ East of Eastlands ~~Trading Industrial~~ Estate [Evaluation Report](#) (Ref. 1.11) [\[APP-274\]](#);
- [\(Northern Park and Ride\) Darsham Evaluation Report](#) (Ref. 1.12) [\[APP-369\]](#);
- [\(Southern Park and Ride\) Wickham Market Evaluation Report](#) (Ref. 1.14) [\[APP-400\]](#);
- [Two Village Bypass Evaluation Report](#) (Ref. 1.35) [\[AS-247\]](#);
- [A12/B1122 Yoxford Roundabout Evaluation Report](#) (Ref. 1.36) [\[AS-253\]](#);
- [Sizewell Link Road Evaluation Report](#) (Ref 1.37) [\[APP-468\]](#) and [addendum](#) (Ref 1.38) [\[REP3-021\]](#);
- [Freight Management Facility Evaluation Report](#) (Ref. 1.39) [\[AS-255\]](#); and
- [Green Rail Route Evaluation Report](#) (Ref 1.40) [\[AS-260\]](#).

a) Prehistoric

- 2.1.5 Within the proposed Sizewell C Project there is a potential for prehistoric remains to be present. These mainly relate to Iron Age occupation and reflect scattered remains of possible agricultural activity.
- 2.1.6 Previously observed evidence of prehistoric activity has been concentrated to the east and south-east of these sites, on the well-drained Sandlings soils, and the wetland margins of the coastal marshes of the main development site. It is not clear whether this evidence suggests a genuinely reduced archaeological potential, or the relative absence of past fieldwork, and the reduced visibility of some prehistoric remains in clay soils.
- 2.1.7 To date, there are no records of archaeological material dating from the Palaeolithic or Mesolithic period, within the proposed Sizewell C development, though Mesolithic peats have been identified in the infilled former river channel, which runs to the west and north of the existing Sizewell A and B sites.
- 2.1.8 A Neolithic axe head has been found in the well-drained Sandlings soil within the main development site, and another on Sizewell beach. Neolithic peats have been identified in the infilled former river channel which runs to the west and north of the existing Sizewell A and B sites. No stratified or settlement remains dating from this period have yet been observed.
- 2.1.9 At the Sizewell C main development site, Bronze Age activity is also scarce. HER for the main development site is restricted to two cinerary urns from Leiston, and a possible round barrow recorded at the southern end of the parkland around Theberton House.
- 2.1.10 Potential (and known sites) for occupation and agricultural activity of Iron Age date is indicated by data recorded on the Suffolk HER and evaluations undertaken so far. Trial trenching at the main development site (Ref. 1.13), revealed Iron Age ditches and pits in several fields, representing a low-density spread of enclosures and settlement across the landscape.
- 2.1.11 Trial trenching at Wickham Market (Ref. 1.14) revealed cremations dating to the Iron Age, as well as a pre-Romano-British field system. These findings correlate with earlier excavations in the 1970s, which found evidence of a Late Iron Age settlement pre-dating the Romano-British activity at Lower Hacheston (Ref. 1.15).
- 2.1.12 The contextual evidence suggests that there is the potential for Iron Age agricultural settlement at elevated sites within the main development sites and along the flank of the ridge above the river valley at Link Road. The nature and location of other prehistoric activity remains difficult to predict with any confidence.

b) Romano-British

- 2.1.13 The Romano-British finds recorded within the main development site are largely chance finds, and very few definitive stratified features dating to this period are known within the site boundary. However, an area of Romano-British settlement activity was identified during evaluation trenching in East Lawn in 2019. The recovery of ceramic building material and wall plaster suggests proximity to a substantial domestic structure, although no *in situ* remains or structures were identified.
- 2.1.14 The associated development sites at Yoxford and Wickham Market are close to settlements thought to have originated in the Romano-British period.
- 2.1.15 It is conjectured that the Romano-British settlement at *Sitomagus* was located near Yoxford: the A1120, which enters the village of Yoxford from the north west, runs, in part, along stretches of Romano-British road. It is possible that Yoxford may have been located at the junction of several Romano-British roads, close to the fording of the River Yox. These inferences are by no means secure and no evidence for activity of this date was observed in evaluation trenching at Yoxford.
- 2.1.16 Elements of a Romano-British settlement were partially excavated in 1973-4 in advance of the construction of the A12 Wickham Market bypass (Ref.1.15). Cropmarks visible on aerial photography and subsequent geophysical survey suggest that further remains of this settlement, comprising enclosures and building plots, are in the fields immediately to the south-western part of the Wickham Market park and ride site.
- 2.1.17 Settlements dating to the Romano-British period are usually readily apparent on geophysical survey and aerial photography, and are frequently evidenced by discernible surface scatters of artefactual material in arable land. However, localised sand deposits overlying the buried cultural layers masked the East Lawn structural remains in the geophysical survey. There is therefore a clear potential for further remains dating to the Romano-British period to be present at the Site.

c) Early-medieval

- 2.1.18 Sites of this period are difficult to identify owing to the relative lack of artefactual material, and the characterisation of rural settlement with dispersion and mobility. Significantly, sites related to the earlier part of this period have limited correlation with their Romano-British predecessors, or later medieval successors, and are often situated some distance from the known historic village centres.
- 2.1.19 At LEEIE, two sunken-featured buildings were identified in the north of the site, along with several post-holes that may have been the remains of

further post-built structures. This early-medieval activity was focused on either side of a palaeochannel, still visible as a depression in the landscape.

2.1.20 Apart from the concentration of material and features discovered at LEEIE, there is no observed early medieval activity within the proposed Sizewell C development.

2.1.21 The villages of Leiston, Wickham Market, Yoxford and Theberton are all recorded in the Domesday survey of 1086. The settled manorial geography, which formed the basis for the medieval settlement pattern of the area, appears to have been established in part during the early-medieval period, and it is anticipated that sites relating to the later part of this period would be located in close proximity to the later settlement centres.

#### d) Medieval

2.1.22 In contrast with prehistoric, Roman and early-medieval contexts, a large amount of archaeological evidence relating to the medieval period has been observed in the vicinity of several sites within the proposed Sizewell C Project, and there is a relatively clear understanding of land use and settlement geography in this period. This is principally focused on five specific locations; the two sites of Leiston Abbey and the medieval villages of Sizewell, Leiston and Theberton.

2.1.23 Leiston Abbey was originally founded in 1182, approximately 1km north of the main development site. Due to coastal erosion, and following unsuccessful attempts at land reclamation, the Abbey was relocated in 1363 from its original site on the shore of the estuary to a more favourable location inland, approximately 200m west of the main development site.

2.1.24 Although the monastic sites would have comprised relatively small and tightly grouped complexes that did not extend onto the proposed development sites, these areas would have included elements of the wider monastic landholdings. Similarly, although the nearby villages of Leiston and Theberton would not have extended onto the proposed development sites, elements of agricultural landscapes primarily in the form of grazing land associated with these villages may be present.

2.1.25 The village of Sizewell was substantially larger in this period than at present, and the full extent of the village and its associated agricultural landscape has been reconstructed through detailed documentary survey. Pillbox Field appears to encompass fields associated with the former medieval village (Ref. 1.10).

2.1.26 An excavation undertaken in advance of the Greater Gabbard onshore works, to the south and west of Pillbox Field in the main development site, recorded a medieval site including ovens and associated structures (granaries), and possible fishing equipment, representing the periphery



either of an ‘industrial suburb’ or the medieval centre of Sizewell. A trackway associated with this settlement was observed in Pillbox Field, which forms part of the land within the Sizewell B Relocated Facilities application.

- 2.1.27 Sub-rectangular enclosures were found in several discrete areas during the recent evaluation at the main development site. Near the enclosures were further large pits and possibly clay-built ovens/kilns. A series of possible medieval driveway tracks were also found at Long Walk, likely re-cut over several phases, linking two clear deposits of burnt clay containing medieval pottery.
- 2.1.28 At associated development sites, the study area of the two village bypass includes the medieval settlements at Farnham and Stratford St Andrew, as well as a medieval square moat filled with water, recorded in the HER at the south edge of the bypass site.
- 2.1.29 At Theberton, several records of artefact scatters and chance finds dating to the medieval period are known within the study area around the proposed bypass.
- 2.1.30 The archaeological evidence illustrates that medieval settlement remained relatively dispersed in the area. Recent evaluation results at the main development site suggest scattered agricultural and industrial activity, rather than discrete settlements which were focused on settlement cores that persist as modern villages. It is likely, therefore, that outlying medieval farmsteads or activity areas, associated with the hinterland of the two Abbeys and nearby villages, may be present in other areas of the proposed Sizewell C development.

e) Post-medieval

- 2.1.31 The basic settlement geography of the proposed Sizewell C Project, established in the medieval period, remained relatively consistent during the post-medieval period. Many of the post-medieval historic records for the Sizewell C Project reflect the agricultural nature of the area at the time.
- 2.1.32 For instance, in 1831, in the villages of Farnham and Stratford St Andrew, over half the population were employed in agriculture, with the population falling in number over the next couple of centuries. The only principal change in this period was in terms of the use and demarcation of land, with the steady enclosure and ‘improvement’ of lands within the Sandlings and marshland to provide more productive land.
- 2.1.33 Heritage assets within the main development site dating from this period primarily comprise agricultural features and buildings, including those associated with the drainage and improvement of the marshes. These include features such as marl pits and enclosure period field boundaries. Assets also include extant farmsteads and evidence of quarrying.

2.1.34 Mapping evidence does not suggest the presence of any significant post-medieval sites within the Sizewell C Project, other than a series of farmsteads, which are largely still extant. It is not anticipated that there would be significant post-medieval remains present within the sites included in the Sizewell C Project, although elements of dispersed farmsteads or industrial sites may be present.

f) Modern

2.1.35 During the modern period, several sites encompassed by the proposed Sizewell C Project experienced continuity of settlement and agricultural land use.

2.1.36 There are extensive records of the defensive works and activities undertaken within the main development site, as part of the defence of the east coast of England during the Second World War (WWII). A complex of WWII emplacements is known to the north of Sizewell B, comprising a variety of earthworks and structures, and which formed part of the wider coastal anti-invasion defences.

2.1.37 Key sites of this type and period can be confidently located, as they either survive as visible features, or are recorded on aerial photographs or in documentary records. Many of these sites have been demolished, leaving fragmentary sub-surface remains, while others (particularly entrenchments), may include more extensive below-ground remains.

2.1.38 It is likely that the elements of the coastal ‘crust’ (the heavily fortified defensive line along the coast), are present within the eastern part of the main development site, but that the area inland was never fortified to the same extent as the coastal strip. There may be military features associated with RAF Leiston within the green rail route and Sizewell link road site boundaries, although this seems unlikely given the distance between these sites and the former airfield.

### 3 RESEARCH CONTEXT

3.1.1 As mitigation by investigation and recording primarily mitigates loss of archaeological significance, it is important to set the results of any archaeological fieldwork into a wider framework for archaeological research and investigation, in order to advance understanding of the historic environment and the lives of human communities in the past.

3.1.2 Overarching research agendas for the East of England set out key themes that archaeological investigation can inform. The publication of ‘Research and Archaeology Revisited’ (Ref. 1.16) augments the regional research framework for the East of England, originally published as a Research Agenda and Strategy in 2000 (Ref. 1.17). The regional research framework

for the eastern counties is continuously under review, and several chapters from the latest draft research agenda (Ref. 1.18) have also been included to provide an updated reference. **Table 3.1** maps the archaeological remains anticipated to be present within the site against these identified research agendas.

- 3.1.3 Individual site-specific WSIs provide further detail and set out how the research potential of individual sites will be realised against the East of England research agendas.

Table 3.1: Archaeological research agenda

Anticipated Remains	Mapping To East Of England (2011)	Mapping To DRAFT East Of England (2018)
<p>Artefactual material associated with the Mesolithic and Palaeolithic.</p>	<p>Develop predictive model for identifying potentially important Mesolithic sites, such as the collation of existing regional data.</p>	<p>Recognising that important in situ Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic scatters continue to be recovered beneath colluvial deposits, and within sub-soil layers, highlighting need for affective modelling and sampling of deposits encountered during evaluation phases.</p> <p>Intensive sampling and sieving through excavation of ploughzone sites, where Palaeolithic and Mesolithic lithic material often exists as a component of multi-period assemblages.</p>
<p>Features associated with Neolithic occupation.</p>	<p>Applying methods which enable the testing of the plough soil in this region, given the plough damage to Neolithic sites.</p> <p>Further analysis of the human impact on the natural landscape, including changing patterns of alluviation, woodland management and clearance.</p> <p>Strengthening palaeoenvironmental sampling strategies in Neolithic deposits; such as 100% floatation of well-sealed pits to maximise the chance of recovering macrobotanical evidence.</p>	<p>Understanding the variability between Neolithic pit sites, enclosures and other monuments, and surface spreads and ploughzone scatters, to ensure a more focused approach.</p> <p>Examining landscape change, especially the extent of both the Early Neolithic woodland clearance and Later Neolithic woodland regeneration.</p>

Anticipated Remains	Mapping To East Of England (2011)	Mapping To DRAFT East Of England (2018)
<p>Features associated with Later Prehistoric occupation.</p>	<p>Analysing Bronze Age artefacts and monuments to determine the extent and reasons for the marked divide between northern and southern parts of the region during the second millennium BC; regionalisation of settlement patterns and field systems requires further study.</p> <p>Examining the Bronze Age – Iron Age transition, in relation to the abandonment of many late Bronze Age field systems and contraction in settlements and populations in the region.</p> <p>Utilising great potential for investigating relationship between Iron Age field systems and long-distance trackways, with settlements and enclosures.</p>	<p>Analysing the shifting contexts of monumentality, from Early Bronze Age emphasis on circular monuments, to creation of landscape-scale structures in Middle/Late Bronze Age.</p> <p>Examining the connection between adjacent Iron Age sites thought to be contemporary; how did they relate physically, socially and economically?</p> <p>Further study of how Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age agrarian regimes on clayland sites complement or contrast with those situated on other geologies.</p>
<p>Features associated with Later Prehistoric ritual, funerary activity.</p>	<p>Developing our understanding of Bronze Age burial practices, including the relationship between settlement and burial sites.</p> <p>Analysing the chronology, distribution and range of Iron Age burial types. Are cremation burials and the pyre goods an indication of social hierarchies?</p>	<p>Looking at to what extent different burial traditions can be identified, and if they vary over space and time across this region.</p> <p>Examining Late Bronze Age cremations to see if changes in practice can be recognised over time.</p>
<p>Features associated with Romano-British settlement and agriculture.</p>	<p>Analysing the form of Roman buildings in the region to see if functions can be attributed to them.</p> <p>Assessing whether there are chronological, regional or landscape variations in Roman settlement location, density or type. Can we identify continuity as well as new settlement structures?</p>	<p>Recognising that some landscapes were packed with Roman farmsteads, assessing to what degree the land was ‘managed’, and their practices sustainable?</p>

Anticipated Remains	Mapping To East Of England (2011)	Mapping To DRAFT East Of England (2018)
	Examining the economic and social impact of the early Roman military on the region.	Recognising that insufficient attention has been paid to what processes and stock facilities occurred in the Roman fields in the region.
Features associated with early-medieval settlement and burial activity.	<p>Utilising aerial photography of known Anglo-Saxon sites as a template for identifying settlement patterns.</p> <p>Further investigation applied to Anglo-Saxon fieldscapes; to what extent are Roman field systems used? What is the evidence for open field systems in the region during the Anglo- Saxon period?</p> <p>Establishing detailed environmental sampling strategies in understanding the role of water management – i.e. reclamation of coastal marshes and the creation of water meadows.</p>	<p>Utilising Geographical Information Systems as a core landscaping studies tool to understand the transition between the dispersed, transitory settlements of the Early Anglo-Saxon period, and the more settled, nucleated and increasingly regularly laid out settlements of the Middle and Later Anglo- Saxon periods.</p> <p>Focusing on the excavation and analysis of good animal bone assemblages, and charred cereal deposits in ascertaining different Anglo-Saxon agricultural practices, crops grown, animals reared, and products obtained.</p>
Features associated with medieval agriculture and settlement.	<p>Investigating further the role of water management and land reclamation during this period.</p> <p>Recognising that much of the region has a primarily dispersed settlement pattern during the Medieval period; obtaining more data will add to our understanding of the way settlements appear, grow, shift and disappear.</p> <p>Seeing that more work is required to establish what form Medieval farms and field systems took.</p>	<p>Establishing the need to study Medieval settlement change, evolution and abandonment, especially with reference to greens and green-side settlements.</p> <p>Recognising that more research is required to establish more conclusive evidence for the origins and development of the church and church-and-hall complexes.</p> <p>Further exploration is needed into the origins of the dispersed settlement patterns, and its</p>

Anticipated Remains	Mapping To East Of England (2011)	Mapping To DRAFT East Of England (2018)
		implications for social organisation and landscape development.
Features associated with post-medieval agriculture and settlement.	Further study of the growth and impact of settlements on the post-medieval landscape, including effects on agricultural production. Improved research into the role of water management and land reclamation, which is a dominant theme of the post- medieval landscape in this region.	Any study of farm buildings should consider how they have been used and their relationship to the farmstead and the wider landholding. Acknowledge that well-preserved 18th and 19th Century structures are rare in this region, and the opportunity to investigate them should be taken, especially if artefact assemblages are also present.
Features associated with WWII coastal defences.	Develop a good model for understanding how fixed defences operated within the landscape. More opportunities should be sought to broaden an appreciation of recent military heritage through collaborations with artists and oral testimony projects. The effect on the historic environment and communities of the decline, or abandonment of military sites should be considered.	N/A



## 4 DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESPONSE

- 4.1.1 Any works that disturb the ground, such as groundworks associated with construction of the new nuclear power station and associated developments, ecological mitigation measures etc. have potential to damage or destroy archaeological features, structures and deposits that may be present. Archaeology is a non-renewable resource. Where impacts cannot be avoided through exclusion from the project area or design modification, a programme of archaeological works (appropriate to the significance of the archaeological remains) is required to mitigate impact through thorough investigation and recording of the archaeology that will be damaged or destroyed.
- 4.1.2 Desk-Based studies have established that the land affected by Sizewell C project has archaeological potential, indicated by data held on the County Historic Environment Record, and information from Historic Mapping and Aerial photography.
- 4.1.3 For each area of land affected by the development, evaluation of the archaeological potential will be undertaken, to establish the presence/absence, character and significance of archaeological remains.
- 4.1.4 The principal investigation methods to undertake this evaluation phase are:
- Geophysical Survey
  - Evaluation Trenching
  - Rapid Identification Earthwork Survey
- 4.1.5 For much of the land affected by the Sizewell C project, this phase of fieldwork has been completed. However, there are areas of land for which these works are still outstanding and will need to be undertaken post determination of the DCO.
- 4.1.6 The results of the archaeological evaluations will inform a programme of archaeological mitigation. The purpose of which is to construct a detailed record of the archaeological remains that will be lost or damaged as a result of the Sizewell C project. The principal investigation methods to undertake this Mitigation phase are:
- Set Piece Excavation
  - Strip, Map and Sample Excavation





- Archaeological Monitoring

4.1.7 The mitigation method used for each area of archaeological interest will reflect the archaeological potential identified at evaluation and the level of impact. The type of investigation initiated may change if significant archaeological remains, not indicated at evaluation, are identified during the mitigation works, e.g. Archaeological Monitoring may be upgraded to Set Piece Excavation, if important sites or features are identified.

4.1.8 The detail of evaluation and mitigation proposals, including the most appropriate methodology, and the exact extent of any intervention ~~will~~ must be agreed with the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) archaeologist, and ~~will be~~ set out within the site specific WSIs. ~~All site specific WSIs will be supplemented by the contractor's method statements (pursuant to Requirement 3 of the dDCO). Detailed archaeological method statements must be agreed with SCC before any archaeological works are carried out. Site specific WSIs and archaeological method statements must be implemented as approved unless otherwise agreed with SCC.~~

## 5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESPONSE

### 5.1 General principles

5.1.1 Archaeological work is intended to:

- mitigate loss of archaeological interest of at-risk heritage assets; and
- inform planning of non-archaeological (i.e. avoidance and design) mitigation.

5.1.2 All archaeological mitigation will be proportionate to the significance and extent of the potential effects on archaeological remains, and will be designed to address the specific research agenda set out at **section 3**.

5.1.3 The following professional standards will apply:

- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014 Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation (Ref. 1.19);
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014 Guidelines for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials (Ref.1.20);
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014 Code of Conduct (Ref.1.21);



- Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England provided in **Annex 1**;
- SCCAS Fieldwork Guidance Documents provided in **Annex 2a-d**; and
- Historic England 2019 Piling and Archaeology (Ref.1.33)

5.1.4 The above are current guidance and standards documents, and should updated guidance and standards be issued during the course of the project, that will also be followed.

5.1.5 SZC Co. is responsible for compliance with all measures set out in this oWSI and subsequent site-specific WSIs and archaeological method statements agreed with SCC. However, for clarity, this oWSI sets out which activities SZC Co. will require of its archaeological contractor and other contractors in order to comply with these documents; this does not diminish SZC Co's responsibility under these documents which are secured pursuant to Requirement 3 of the dDCO

5.1.6 ~~5.1.5~~In all cases Prior to archaeological works being carried out, the archaeological contractor ~~will~~must develop ~~a~~a detailed archaeological method statement statements for approval by SCCAS, setting out how the standards set out below will be applied to those works to meet the research agenda set out in the relevant site-specific WSI and addressing any site-specific archaeological issues (pursuant to Requirement 3 of the dDCO).

## 5.2 Proposed methodology and application

### a) Rapid Identification Survey

5.2.1 Rapid Identification Survey will be undertaken where reasonably practicable in areas which could not be evaluated ~~pre-determination~~before the end of the examination of the DCO due to the presence of tree cover after felling of trees, and clearance of undergrowth but in advance of any grubbing, or grinding out of stumps.

### b) Geophysical Survey

5.2.2 Geophysical survey will be carried out where reasonably practicable in areas where no prior archaeological survey or investigation has been undertaken, unless otherwise set out in a site-specific WSI or agreed with the SCCAS archaeologist.

5.2.3 Geophysical survey will comprise the archaeological magnetometry survey of identified areas in order to identify geomagnetic anomalies of



potential archaeological origin. This survey would aim to cover the developable extent of these areas, but ~~would~~will exclude any confirmed safeguarded areas, areas of demonstrable past disturbance (e.g. hardstandings and modern building footprints), and any areas where safe access cannot be confirmed.

- 5.2.4 Geophysical work and reporting will be carried out in line with the standards set out at **sections 5.3** and **5.5**; the SCCAS and regional standards at **Annex 1 & 4** of this appendix; the EAC Guidelines for the Use of Geophysics in Archaeology (Ref. 1.22) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for archaeological geophysical survey (Ref. 1.23).

c) Evaluation trenching

- 5.2.5 This will be carried out in areas where evaluation has not been practicable in advance of the end of the DCO being granted examination, and provision ~~will~~must be made in the site-specific WSI for further trenching as appropriate in accordance with Requirement 3 of the dDCO.

- 5.2.6 Evaluation trenching will comprise the excavation of up to a 5% area sample, agreed on a site by site basis, using 30m by 2m trenches unless otherwise agreed with SCCAS. Any sampling strategy will have regard to the results of geophysical survey or walkover and to the extent of prior disturbance.

- 5.2.7 The area sample to be investigated in formerly wooded areas subject to Rapid Identification Survey will be agreed with SCCAS, through the site-specific WSIs, and will have regard to the visibility of archaeological remains, the extent of prior disturbance, including that observed in other woodland areas on-site, and the results of archaeological evaluation in adjacent fields.

- 5.2.8 The purpose of the evaluation is to identify and characterise the nature, extent and significance of specific archaeological foci, within an extensive area. This information will be used to allow more detailed proposals for mitigation to be developed.

- 5.2.9 Archaeological evaluation trenching and recording will be carried out to the standards set out at **sections 5.3** and **5.5**, and in accordance with the SCCAS and regional standards at **Annex 1 & 2** of this appendix.



d) Archaeological monitoring (watching brief)

5.2.10 Archaeological monitoring (watching brief) will ~~be used to:~~

- be used to provide opportunities for archaeological investigation, and recording in circumstances where investigation would otherwise be impracticable;
- be used where archaeological remains of limited value or extent are suspected within a working area; and
- ~~it will~~ comprise an archaeologist being present, either continuously or on an agreed schedule of inspection-based visits, during intrusive groundworks so that the presence, or absence, of archaeological remains could be confirmed, and any such remains be appropriately recorded.

5.2.11 The risk that archaeological remains might be present will be well-established on the basis of previous stages of evaluation, and/or mitigation works, and the areas identified within the individual site WSIs. Any site-specific requirements will be set out within the ~~individual site~~ site-specific WSIs

5.2.12 The need to monitor construction works will be predictable, and appropriate arrangements for SCCAS inspection visits will be acceptable in most instances.

5.2.13 Where archaeological deposits are encountered, sufficient excavation will take place to allow appropriate records to be compiled, as might be reasonably achieved. Provision will be allowed for access in keeping with health and safety considerations.

5.2.14 Should extensive and/or important/well preserved remains be found, which cannot be addressed within the scope of a watching brief, the requirements for any further excavation will be discussed with the ~~client and the~~ SCCAS archaeologist.

5.2.15 Archaeological monitoring and recording will be carried out to the standards set out at **sections 5.3** and **5.5** and in accordance with the SCCAS and regional standards at **Annex 1 - 5** of this appendix.

e) Strip, map and sample

5.2.16 Strip, map and sample mitigation will be undertaken to identify specific archaeological foci within an extensive area of potential, or to expose the spatial characteristics of extensive archaeological landscape elements,



such as field systems, prior to selecting locations for targeted sample excavation. This work is to be undertaken within a framework of evidence-based research objectives.

- 5.2.17 Following initial machine overburden strip (which will be directed and monitored by the archaeological contractor), the area ~~should~~will be examined, and a plan of identified and potential archaeological features and deposits prepared at an appropriate scale. This will inform proposals for sample excavation, to be agreed with the SCCAS archaeologist.
- 5.2.18 Where necessary to allow construction works to continue, the release of a part of an area may be agreed with the SCCAS archaeologist once an appropriate agreed level of investigation has been completed. In this situation, areas which have not been released will be clearly demarcated.
- 5.2.19 Key stages in strip-map-and-sample are:
- careful overburden strip of topsoil and subsoil, using a back-acting excavator, to the archaeological horizon;
  - immediate planning (mapping) of the area while the uncovered surface is fresh. The area should be subsequently checked to see if weathering reveals further features and the plan updated as appropriate; and
  - sampling, concentrating on established a relative chronology through feature intersections investigations, and by attempting to establish a more precise chronology.
- 5.2.20 Areas for strip, map, and sample will be identified following geophysical survey, and/or evaluation trenching, and will be agreed with SCCAS. Individual areas and the justification for their selection will be set out within the individual site WSIs.
- 5.2.21 Following the planning stage, an appropriate sample of identified features will be investigated. Key areas and nodes will be investigated in sufficient detail to understand them both in respect of themselves and also in relation to their surroundings. This work will be focused on adding to the spatial, chronological, functional and environmental context of the investigated area drawing on the standards set out in **section 5.3**, and in accordance with the SCCAS and regional guidance provided in **Annex 1 & 3** of this appendix. Any site-specific variations will be set out within the individual site WSIs, and ~~f~~l or agreed with the SCCAS archaeologist.
- 5.2.22 This requirement to sample and record identified features will be continually monitored during the course of fieldwork, and amended according to its



effectiveness in meeting research objectives. In particular, consideration of strip, map, and sample operations will be discussed with the SCCAS archaeologist, with a view to extending these operations where significant archaeological remains have been observed, or scaling back operations where the potential presence of archaeological features is demonstrably low, based on:

- identified prior truncation/disturbance;
- absence of observed features; or
- confirmation of prior survey results which suggest poor survival of archaeological features.

5.2.23 Any decision to scale back the scope of strip, map, and sample mitigation will only be undertaken after agreement of the SCCAS archaeologist has been confirmed.

5.2.24 Following completion of archaeological investigation to the satisfaction of the SCCAS archaeologist, the relevant area, or agreed parts thereof, will be released to the main contractor so that construction works may proceed.

f) **Set-piece excavation**

5.2.25 Set-piece excavation will be undertaken where evaluation has identified the extent, and character of significant archaeological remains, allowing for a definitive investigation area, sampling and finds recovery policy to be defined.

5.2.26 The individual defined areas identified for set-piece excavation will be set out in the relevant individual site WSI. This will include provision to extend areas if important archaeology continues beyond the defined extent.

5.2.27 Set-piece excavation and recording will be undertaken to the standards set out at **section 5.3**, and in accordance with the SCCAS and regional excavation standards set out at **Annex 1 & 3** of this appendix. Any site-specific sampling requirements will be set out within the individual site WSIs.

g) **Archaeological buildings recording**

5.2.28 Where historic buildings within the site are to be retained, it is proposed that recording to Level 2 as set out in Historic England 2016 Understanding Historic Buildings (Ref. 1.24) will be carried out to ensure that the appearance of the structures in their present setting can be recorded.



5.2.29 Where historic buildings are to be demolished or altered, it is proposed that recording to level 3 or 4 as set out in Historic England 2016 Understanding Historic Buildings will be undertaken. The level or recording will be at a level ~~in~~ appropriate to their significance, and determined in consultation with SCCAS, the East Suffolk conservation officer and ~~or~~ Historic England.

### 5.3 Standards for archaeological work

5.3.1 The standards set out below draw upon, and should be used in conjunction with, the SCCAS fieldwork requirement documents, and the national and regional excavation standards provided in **Annex 1 - 5** of this appendix.

5.3.2 A parish code number will be obtained from the County HER in advance of each phase of the works, and a unique site code will be assigned as agreed with SCCAS. All parts of Site Archive, including finds, samples, plans, photographs, and excavation paperwork will be marked with this number. It will be printed on the cover of all reports and used as the accession number for deposition of the archive.

#### a) Rapid Investigation Survey

5.3.3 Areas will be walked systematically on regular transects, typically at 25m intervals with the aim of identifying and recording any surviving earthwork features, or structural remains. Each feature or observation will be given a unique record number, and will be recorded in plan and by photography. A record will also be made of any artefactual material observed, although modern material ~~would~~ will not normally be retained.

#### b) Geophysical Survey

5.3.4 It is anticipated that the survey will be carried out using a Bartington Grad601-2, or equivalent instrument. Readings will be taken every 0.25m along lines 1m apart.

5.3.5 The survey will be carried out using a grid system accurately tied in with the Ordnance Survey (OS) National Grid. Any variations to the survey area set out within the individual WSIs caused by crop growth, or ground conditions will be agreed with SCCAS.

5.3.6 A record will be made of surface conditions, and of possible sources of modern geophysical interference that may have a bearing on subsequent interpretation of field data. Any areas where it is considered unsafe to work will be excluded from the survey.



- 5.3.7 If any problems are encountered during the geophysical survey these will be reported to the client.
- c) Machine overburden strip
- 5.3.8 For all areas identified as requiring intrusive archaeological work in the individual site WSIs, removal of topsoil, overburden, to the first significant archaeological horizon will be undertaken by a back-acting excavator fitted with a wide (1.8m) toothless ditching bucket, under the continuous supervision of the archaeology contractor with the authority to halt and direct machine excavation.
- 5.3.9 Spoil will be temporarily stockpiled on-site at an identified location, at a safe distance from the stripped areas, and other constraints, ~~to the satisfaction of the main contractor~~. Topsoil, subsoil, and archaeological deposits ~~should~~ will be kept separate during excavation, to allow for sequential backfilling of excavation. Topsoil ~~should~~ will be examined for archaeological material.
- 5.3.10 Areas stripped for, or under, archaeological investigation must be clearly marked and identified to construction contractors, so that the area is not tracked over, or otherwise disturbed, until the area is clear of archaeological remains, ~~the~~. The supervising site archaeologist will confirm to the contractors when an area has been released from archaeological control, and vehicles can track over the specified area.
- 5.3.11 The first significant archaeological horizon, and all subsequent archaeological deposits will be cleaned by hand. Excavation of any archaeological deposits identified will proceed by hand, to the standards set out below, unless specifically agreed with the SCCAS archaeologist, or to any site-specific requirements set out in the individual site WSIs. If colluvial or alluvial deposits are identified sealing earlier archaeological horizons, the potential for machine stripping of these deposits will be discussed with the SCCAS archaeologist, once any archaeological features cutting them have been fully excavated and recorded, and it has been established that these deposits are otherwise archaeologically sterile.
- 5.3.12 Following completion of archaeological investigation to the satisfaction of the SCCAS archaeologist, ~~and the main contractor~~, each trench, or excavation area, will be backfilled with the spoil and compacted by machine to level fill, ~~unless otherwise instructed by the main contractor~~ unless the area is required to be left open as part of further archaeological mitigation or construction works.





d) Hand excavation

5.3.13 There is the presumption that excavation of all archaeological deposits will be done by hand unless it can be shown there will not be a loss of evidence by using a machine.

5.3.14 Archaeological features will be hand cleaned prior to excavation, to provide accurate definitions. For linear features, such hand cleaning will be targeted at sample excavation points. Deposits interpreted as natural subsoil should be tested by hand, or machine excavation to determine the validity of this interpretation. Where features are interpreted as natural (e.g. tree throws), a percentage of these features, agreed with SCCAS archaeologist, will be hand excavated to establish the accuracy of the interpretation.

e) Evaluation trenching

5.3.15 In evaluation trenching, there is the presumption of the need to cause minimal disturbance to the site; and that significant archaeological features (e.g. building slots or postholes) should be preserved intact even if fills are sampled.

- For linear features, 1.00m wide slots (min.) ~~should~~ will be excavated across their width.
- For discrete features (e.g. pits), 50% of their fills ~~should~~ will be sampled.
- Any natural subsoil surface revealed ~~should~~ will be hand cleaned, and examined for archaeological deposits and artefacts. Sample excavation of any archaeological features revealed may be necessary in order to gauge their date and character.
- Where extensive occupation deposits or layers are identified, these will be sampled through the use of test pits, as agreed with the SCCAS archaeologist, to determine their date and character, and to determine whether earlier features are sealed by these deposits.

5.3.16 Metal detecting will be conducting during evaluation trenching by a named and experienced detectorist, before trenches are opened, during the excavation of features within the trenches, and of the spoil.

f) Excavation

5.3.17 Features will be excavated ~~according~~ in accordance with the following sampling strategy:



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – OVERARCHING  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- Features which are, or could be, interpreted as structural must be fully excavated.
- Post holes and pits must be examined in section. Full excavation may be appropriate for specific problem-solving, complex depositional sequences and finds recovery. Full excavation may also be appropriate if pits or postholes are small.
- Fabricated surfaces (e.g. yards and floors) must be fully exposed and cleaned, and representative sections excavated, to determine their construction and whether they seal earlier deposits. Where earlier features are suspected of underlying surfaces, the surface will be hand-lifted once it has been fully recorded. The collection of spatially distinct samples will be considered in order to investigate the use/function of an area and if different activity zones can be identified.
- All burial deposits and associated remains will be subject to 100% excavation and recorded in accordance with an agreed methodology. Spatially distinct samples from the head, torso and feet will be taken in accordance with guidance (Ref 1.25).
- Other features must be sufficiently examined to establish, where possible, their date function. In general 50% of the representative non-structural linear cut features; 10% of the fills of substantial linear features (e.g. ditches) in order to establish the feature's character, date and morphology and to provide information on activities taking place in close proximity to the feature. These samples may be varied with the agreement of SCCAS to reflect specific site conditions observed during excavation.
- Any stratified layers should be subject to hand excavation in 2.5m or 1.0m systematic, and gridded squares on the basis of the complexity and extent of the layers. The details of which will be agreed with SCCAS and set out within site-specific WSIs where required.
- Where complex sequences are observed during the excavation, an amended excavation strategy will be agreed with SCCAS.

5.3.18 The sampling excavation strategy will be reviewed continuously throughout the course of fieldwork and, if necessary, amended in order to take account of changing circumstances and understanding. Any changes or amendments will be agreed in advance of implementation with the SCCAS archaeologist and confirmed in writing. For any complex remains, a sampling strategy will be discussed and agreed with SCCAS.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**



- 5.3.19 Where insufficient dating material or information has been retrieved from a partially sectioned feature, further sampling may be undertaken, subject to consideration of residuality, or other factors that might limit the integrity of archaeological data, with reference to the research objectives, and in consultation and agreement with the SCCAS archaeologist. This may include bulk or column sampling for scientific dating, and/or environmental analysis (e.g. grain or faunal species) which may provide broad dates.
- 5.3.20 Guidelines for developing site-specific sampling strategies will be set out in the individual site WSIs. The sampling strategy will be kept under review during the excavation work, and will consider the following:
- a robust spatial framework of excavation to provide an understanding of the distribution of past activities across the investigation area, including any 'special' deposits and any patterning in artefact distribution. Such a framework will consider the inter-relationship of major features;
  - the investigation of the intersections of features of archaeological date to obtain a phasing of the site; and
  - structural remains and other areas of significant and specific activity (domestic, industrial, religious, hearths, 'special'/ patterned deposits etc.) will be excavated, and recorded to a degree whereby their extent, date form, function and relationship to other features and deposits can be established.
- 5.3.21 Metal detector searches must take place during excavation, including the scanning of areas before they are stripped. Detecting must be undertaken by named, experienced metal detector users, with the site specific WSI including reference to their relevant experience. Detecting equipment ~~should~~ will be high specification.
- g) Survey
- 5.3.22 Surveying will be done using a survey-grade GPS (e.g. Leica CS20/GS08 or Leica 1200).
- 5.3.23 The site grid will be accurately tied into the OS National Grid, and located on the 1:2500 or 1:1250 map of the area. Elevations will be levelled to the Ordnance Datum.



#### h) Recording

- 5.3.24 A full and proper record (written, graphic and photographic, as appropriate) will be made for all work in line with the standards set out in the SCCAS and regional guidance provided in **Annex 1 - 5**.
- 5.3.25 A register of all trenches, features, photographs, survey levels, small finds and human remains will be kept.
- 5.3.26 Unique context numbers will be issued for all features, layers and deposits. Each will be individually documented on a context sheet and drawn in section and plan.
- Plans of any archaeological features on-site are to be drawn at 1:20, or 1:50 depending on the complexity of the feature being recorded.
  - Sections should be drawn at 1:10, or 1:20 depending on the complexity of the feature being recorded.
  - All levels should relate to Ordnance Datum.
  - A photographic record of the work will consist of digital images (minimum file size of 6MP) taken on a high-resolution digital camera.
  - Photographs will include general site shots and photographs of specific features. Photographs will include a scale, north arrow, site code and feature number (where relevant), and will be listed on the photograph register.

#### i) Environmental sampling

- 5.3.27 The on-site sampling policy will be inclusive, as the significance of individual features may not be fully understood, until wider patterns of spatial distribution and phasing are understood. As set out in the general methods above, arrangements for the processing of bulk samples taken for the recovery of environmental materials should be confirmed. The minimum bulk sample size will normally be 40 litres or 100% of the deposit if the deposit does not amount to 40l, though the final sampling and discard policy for individual sites will be agreed in consultation with the ~~Sizewell C Project environmental specialist, the~~ SCCAS archaeologist, and the Regional Scientific Advisor, and set out within the site-specific WSI. Processing of samples should be undertaken while evaluation excavations are being undertaken in order that information can be fed back and inform the ongoing strategy.



- 5.3.28 Archaeological deposits will be sampled systematically in bulk samples. All samples will be collected from the fills of cut features, and from any other securely stratified deposits that have the potential to provide environmental or economic information, such as occupation layers or material accumulating on use surfaces. Particular emphasis will be placed on contexts that may supply material suitable for scientific dating of potential early medieval and prehistoric features. Decisions on sampling must also take account of stratigraphic factors, and consider the opportunity to employ chronological, and spatial controls, in the recovery of samples in order to generate environmental information of sufficient quality to meet the research objectives.
- 5.3.29 Provision will be made for column and other appropriate samples to be taken for geoarchaeological assessment, and analysis as appropriate and in line with technical guidance including Historic England guidance (Ref.1.25). Due consideration will be given to the collection of samples suitable for microfossil analysis, and other specialised analysis from suitable deposit sequences, that might inform the pattern of changing environmental conditions over time. Waterlogged and cess deposits will be specifically sampled for microfaunal and invertebrate analysis. Bulk samples will also be taken from any waterlogged deposits present for assessment of organic remains. Any organic artefacts that are retrieved during the excavation will be stored in appropriate conditions, and assessed by a qualified archaeological conservator.
- 5.3.30 Industrial residues and waste from craft, and manufacturing processes will also be routinely sampled in line with guidance provided by Historic England (e.g. Ref. 1.26).
- 5.3.31 If required, a detailed site-specific sampling policy in line with the SCCAS regional, and national guidance will be set out in the individual site-specific WSI in consultation with the Historic England Regional Advisor for Archaeological Science (East of England). This will detail specific categories of material that are of interest for the individual sites, and identify a programme of work to support the research objectives. Revised as appropriate throughout the excavation and post-excavation phases.
- j) **Artefact recovery and conservation**
- 5.3.32 The recovery of material that can adequately date major archaeological phases is a key requirement. It is recognised that the incidence of artefacts may limit the quality of datable assemblages, and measures for scientific dating are also set out below. However, artefacts remain a key source of dating information.



- 
- 5.3.33 All finds will be collected and processed, unless variations are agreed with the SCCAS archaeologist during the course of excavation.
- 5.3.34 Ceramic finds should be processed, and initial assessment undertaken for dating and significance, concurrently with the excavation, to allow immediate assessment and input into decision-making.
- 5.3.35 Bulk finds such as pottery and animal bone will normally be collected by context. Where it is appropriate and following additional instruction, enhanced recovery techniques and sampling strategies for the recovery, and recording of waterlogged wood and timber, will be set out in respect of specific sites in the individual site WSIs as appropriate.
- 5.3.36 Finds will be temporarily stored on-site and removed from site to a secure location as required. Waterlogged organic finds, such as wood and leather, should be removed from site on the day that they are excavated and transferred to a suitable location with facilities to maintain them without degradation of the material.
- 5.3.37 Finds and samples will be exposed, lifted, cleaned (with the exception of organic remains, which will be considered on a case-by-case basis), conserved, marked, bagged, boxed and stored in line with the standards in:
- Watkinson & Neal (1988) First Aid for Finds (Ref. 1.27);
  - Chartered Institute for archaeologists (2014) Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials (Ref. 1.28);
  - English Heritage (1995) A Strategy for the Care and Investigation of Finds (Ref. 1.29);
  - Historic England (2017) Organic Residue Analysis and Archaeology: Guidance for Good Practice (Ref. 1.30); and
  - The requirements of the recipient museum (the receiving museum will be identified in the relevant site-specific WSI).
- 5.3.38 A discard policy acceptable to the SCCAS Archive will only be implemented following quantification, assessment, and recommendation from artefactual and environmental specialists. Certain classes of material, such as post-medieval pottery and building material, may be discarded after recording if a representative sample is kept, but no finds will be discarded without the prior approval of the SCCAS archaeologist and the SCCAS Archive.



5.3.39 Where finds require conservation, this will be done in accordance with the guidelines of the Institute for Conservation.

k) Scientific dating

5.3.40 Achieving coherent intra and inter-site chronologies across all phases of activity is a key objective, as this may help resolve problems in the identification of cultural activity during period when ceramics were not generally available to communities, or where features do not contain readily datable artefacts. A strategy for the selection of samples for scientific dating will be set out for each site in the relevant site-specific WSI, taking into consideration statistical procedures designed to enhance the accuracy of site chronologies.

5.3.41 Samples of material suitable for scientific dating techniques including AMS C14 dating, archaeomagnetism (for example, charred seeds or in situ burnt clay from appropriate contexts), or thermoluminescence will be collected where available in accordance with individual site WSIs. Where a specialist may be required to visit the site and collect samples this will be identified at the earliest opportunity.

5.3.42 Scientific dating will be a significant consideration during the post-excavation assessment and will inform the updated project design provided in section 5.5.13. The assessment of the chronology within a Bayesian framework should be considered if significant remains or sequences are identified.

5.3.43 Scientific dating, undertaken concurrent with the excavation fieldwork, may be required to inform levels of sampling of certain features or structures, such as wooden trackways. If there is the potential for significant waterlogged wooden remains to be found, a wood specialist may be required on site to ~~records~~record and sample remains and dendrochronology specialists be used to support the dating of remains where necessary.

## 5.4 Procedures in respect of statutorily designated remains

a) Human remains

5.4.1 [The process for removal of human remains is set out in Article 76 of the dDCO.](#) In the event of archaeological human remains being encountered they will be left in situ, covered and protected and the Coroner, and the Suffolk County archaeologist will be informed. Human remains will be left in situ during evaluation work, unless considered at risk or there is value in lifting the human remains to guide future mitigation. During the mitigation



phase of works, it is expected that all human remains will be fully excavated, and that this will be done at the earliest opportunity following their discovery.

5.4.2 The Archaeological Contractor will arrange receipt of the appropriate documentation and License from the Department of Justice, to enable the legal removal of any human remains encountered in the works. The Archaeological Contractor is to comply with the conditions of any issued License.

5.4.3 If removal is agreed, all subsequent work will comply with relevant regulations (including local authority environmental health regulations) and technical guidance (e.g. Ref. 1.31) .

5.4.4 The Archaeological Contractor will have available within the team, or on call, an appropriately qualified and experienced osteo-archaeologist, to supervise the excavation and removal of human remains from the site. The Archaeological Contractor will use an appropriately qualified and experienced archaeological conservator to assist where appropriate in the lifting of human remains, and grave goods/cremation vessels.

b) Protected military remains

5.4.5 The Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 applies to any aircraft which have crashed while in military service, and to certain wrecks of vessels which were wrecked while in military service. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 makes it an offence to disturb, move, or unearth military remains which have been designated.

5.4.6 There are no designated protected areas or controlled sites within the site boundary, and there are no records of military vessels or aircraft having been lost within the site boundary.

5.4.7 Where remains are observed during archaeological investigation or construction work, intrusive work ~~should~~will cease, and the site be secured while consultation with the Ministry of Defence is undertaken.

c) Treasure

5.4.8 Any items which are recovered which could be deemed as treasure will be subject to the provisions of the Treasure Act 1996, and the Treasure (Designation) Order 2002. Such material ~~shall~~will normally be removed from site to a secure location, to be stored in appropriate conditions, at the end of the working day on which it is found. In addition to the statutory authorities, the relevant Portable Antiquities Officer ~~should~~will be informed.





## 5.5 Finds Processing

5.5.1 All finds processing, conservation work and storage of finds must be carried out in compliance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Guidelines for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials (Ref. 1.27). Samples ~~should~~ will be processed in a timely manner and finds ~~should~~ will not be left unprocessed on site during the completion of the fieldwork.

5.5.2 The deposition and disposal of artefacts must be agreed with the legal owner and the SCCAS Archive prior to the work taking place.

5.5.3 All retained artefacts must be cleaned and packaged in accordance with the requirements of the recipient museum. Further guidance is set out at Section 5.3.36.

## 5.6 Post-excavation work, reporting and dissemination

5.6.1 The requirements for post-excavation work, reporting and dissemination are secured pursuant to Requirement 3(6) of the dDCO. This section provides more detail on how that paragraph will be complied with.

### a) Site Archive

5.6.2 ~~5.6.2~~ Before the commencement of fieldwork, contact ~~should~~ will be made with the landowners and Suffolk County Council Archaeological Services (SCCAS) Archive to make the relevant arrangements. Details of land ownership ~~should~~ will be provided by ~~the developer~~ SZC Co.

5.6.3 ~~5.6.3~~ The archaeological contractor will specify the SCCAS Archive, and confirm that arrangements for receipt of archaeological material, and site archives, have been agreed before the commencement of fieldwork.

5.6.4 ~~5.6.4~~ The archive and the finds must be deposited in the SCCAS Archive within six months of completion of the post-excavation work and report (Ref. 1.32).

5.6.5 ~~5.6.5~~ The SCCAS archaeologist will require confirmation that the archive has been submitted in a satisfactory form.

### b) Reporting

5.6.6 ~~5.6.6~~ Reports will be produced for all archaeological survey and fieldwork undertaken. The type of report produced will reflect the nature of the investigations, as detailed below. Reports must also be produced for all archaeological investigations undertaken.



i. Rapid Identification Survey

[5.6.7](#) ~~2.2.1~~ The reporting of the Rapid Identification Survey will comprise a plan of the survey areas noting any archaeological features, areas of disturbance, or findspots observed during the survey.

[5.6.8](#) ~~2.2.2~~ This plan will be supported by summary text describing each observation noted on the survey plan, and setting out any additional evidence that has supported interpretation of these observations, before setting out a summary of the anticipated presence of archaeological remains within the survey area, and recommendations for further archaeological works. Site photographs will be used to illustrate each identified feature or observation as appropriate.

[5.6.9](#) ~~2.2.3~~ Appropriate supporting evidence ~~would~~ will typically include, but is not limited to Light Detection and Ranging digital terrain models, results of archaeological trenching or geophysical survey in adjacent fields and historic mapping.

[5.6.10](#) ~~2.2.4~~ Any further archaeological works ~~would~~ will be carried out under the standards set out within this overarching WSI.

ii. Geophysical Survey

[5.6.11](#) ~~2.2.5~~ The interpretation of the survey data will be undertaken by an experienced archaeological geophysicist. This individual will also be knowledgeable of the prevailing ground conditions within the survey area that could affect the interpretation.

[5.6.12](#) ~~2.2.6~~ The draft report on the results of the geophysical survey, including results (to include full description, assessment of condition, quality and significance of results identified); general and detailed plans showing the location of the surveyed area accurately positioned on an OS map base (to a known scale); colour/grey scale plots; an interpretative plot; and an assessment of potential will be made available to the SCCAS archaeologist within 2 weeks of the completion of Geophysical surveys. This is to allow for trench plans for archaeological trial trenching to be developed and agreed with SCCAS.

[5.6.13](#) ~~2.2.7~~ A single hard copy and a digital version of the revised report will be submitted within one week of the receipt of comments on the draft report.

[5.6.14](#) ~~2.2.8~~ A project CD will be submitted containing image files in JPEG or TIFF format, digital text files in Microsoft Word format, and illustrations in an up to date AutoCAD format. A fully collated version of the report will be included in PDF format.



- [5.6.15](#) ~~2.2.9~~A hard copy of the report will be lodged with the SCCAS, upon completion.
- [5.6.16](#) ~~2.2.10~~The contractor will submit a digital version of the report with Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations at <http://www.oasis.ac.uk/>. A copy of the full summary sheet shall be included as an appendix to the report.
- [5.6.17](#) ~~2.2.11~~The archiving of data associated with geophysical survey will follow the advice provided in Geophysical Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice (Ref 1.22).
- [5.6.18](#) ~~2.2.12~~The archive will consist of the report, within which documentary and raw and processed digital data records generated during the fieldwork, will be presented. This will include a georeferenced .dxf or GIS shapefile copy of the interpretation of the results for the Suffolk Historic Environment Register.
- [5.6.19](#) ~~2.2.13~~This report will be part of the larger project archive
- iii. Trial Trenching
- [5.6.20](#) ~~2.2.14~~Where trial trenching is undertaken, an initial assessment of the results of the works will be undertaken, and an interim report will be made available to the SCCAS archaeologist within two weeks of completion of trenching.
- [5.6.21](#) ~~2.2.15~~The purposes of the interim report are to:
- confirm the completion of fieldwork;
  - provide an indicative timetable for detailed post-excavation assessment and reporting; and
  - signpost any project findings to inform research and development management pending the production of the full report.
- [5.6.22](#) ~~2.2.16~~This interim summary reporting will incorporate the following:
- mapping of the results of the works undertaken;
  - key findings set out as bullet points highlighting any key observations and implications for the agreed Research Agenda;
  - an updated project design with indicative timetable compiled and agreed for post-excavation assessment and full reporting; and



- indicative scope of Post Excavation Assessment.

- 5.6.23 ~~2.2.17~~ It is intended that the interim report presents only a very brief synthesis of the results of the fieldwork to allow for early dissemination of summary results and project planning. Tables or bullet points ~~should~~ will be used to provide a concise but intelligible summary. Detailed plans and maps or analysis of stratigraphic, artefactual or ecofactual material ~~should~~ will not be included.
- 5.6.24 ~~2.2.18~~ Full and detailed reporting of the results of the trial trenching ~~should~~ will be produced within six weeks of the completion of fieldwork, except where agreed otherwise by the SCCAS archaeologist (e.g. where further works are carried out immediately and reporting of trial trenching is more logically deferred to the production of the final reporting of archaeological fieldwork).
- 5.6.25 ~~2.2.19~~ A draft of the full illustrated report will be compiled on the results of the fieldwork and assessment of the artefacts, palaeoenvironmental samples etc. The report will include: a non-technical summary; an introduction to the project; an archaeological and historical background; an objective text account of the archaeological results, supported by tabulated data that enables appropriate re-assessment of the results by other parties without recourse to the project archive; a quantification and assessment of the finds and environmental materials; and an interpretative conclusion regarding the archaeological content of the site. The report will include appropriate illustrations of the site, its context and individual trenches, features and contexts where appropriate.
- 5.6.26 ~~2.2.20~~ A single hard copy, and a digital version of the revised report will be submitted upon receipt of comments on the draft report.
- 5.6.27 ~~2.2.21~~ A project CD will be submitted containing image files in JPEG or TIFF format, digital text files in Microsoft Word format, and illustrations in an up-to-date AutoCAD format. A fully collated version of the report will be included in PDF format.
- 5.6.28 ~~2.2.22~~ A hard copy of the report will be lodged with the SCCAS upon completion.
- 5.6.29 ~~2.2.23~~ The contractor will submit a digital version of the report with Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations at <http://www.oasis.ac.uk/>. A copy of the full summary sheet shall be included as an appendix to the report.
- 5.6.30 ~~2.2.24~~ The archive will consist of the report, within which documentary and raw and processed digital data records generated during the



fieldwork, will be presented. This will include a georeferenced .dxf or GIS shapefile copy of the interpretation of the results for the Suffolk Historic Environment Register.

[5.6.31](#) ~~2.2.25~~ This report will be part of the larger project archive.

c) Post-excavation assessment

i. Purpose

[5.6.32](#) ~~5.6.7~~ The intention of carrying out a Post Excavation Assessment is to provide a summary of the results of the fieldwork and material recovered during the excavation, to consider the archaeological potential of an area and its ability to address specific archaeological questions, and to allow costed recommendations to be made for further investigation of artefacts and environmental material recovered during excavation and the final reporting, which will be carried out following the completion of all of the archaeological fieldwork.

[5.6.33](#) ~~5.6.8~~ The Post Excavation Assessment is intended to be a summary document rather than a detailed record. However, the level of reporting will provide sufficient detail to allow recommendations to be made, fully costed and justified.

[5.6.34](#) ~~5.6.9~~ Where works are carried out by multiple archaeological contractors, arrangements for coordination of separate Post Excavation Assessments, or production of a single collated Post Excavation Assessment must be agreed with the SCCAS archaeologist in advance of fieldwork commencing.

[5.6.35](#) ~~5.6.10~~ Excavation plans for each Site will be supplied to SCCAS in a georeferenced GIS compatible format, e.g. shapefiles.

[5.6.36](#) ~~5.6.11~~ Drafts of the PXA will be provided for review by SCCAS, followed by a single hard master-copy, and a digital version of the final report, which will be submitted after the receipt of comments on the draft reports. The PXA will also include a completed OASIS form appended.

[5.6.37](#) ~~5.6.12~~ The PXA will be provided to SCCAS for review no later than three years from the completion of all archaeological fieldwork unless otherwise agreed with SCCAS.

ii. Form

[5.6.38](#) ~~5.6.13~~ The Post Excavation Assessment will comprise:

- introduction:



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – OVERARCHING  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 
- scope of the Sizewell C Project;
  - circumstances and dates of fieldwork and previous work; and
  - comments on the organisation of the report.
  
  - original research aims;
  - summary of the documented history of the site(s);
  - interim statement on the results of fieldwork;
  - summary of the site archive and work carried out for assessment:
    - site records: quantity, work done on records during post-excavation assessment;
    - finds: factual summary of material and records, quantity, range, variety, preservation, work done during post-excavation assessment. All artefacts must be fully quantified by context, material type and date, and presented in a tabular format;
    - environmental material (recovered by hand): factual summary of quantity, range, variety, preservation, work done on the material during the Post Excavation Assessment , including quantification by context and material type in tabular format, of human and animal bone, shell, wood etc.
    - environmental material (recovered through sampling): factual summary of quantity, range, variety, preservation, work done on the material during the Post Excavation Assessment , including quantification by context, sample number, and type of sample (e.g. bulk, dendrochronological, monolith) in tabular format. The percentage of each sample that has been a) processed and b) analysed must be described; and
    - documentary records: list of relevant sources discovered, quantity, variety, intensity of study of sources during post-excavation assessment.
  - potential of the Data:
    - an appraisal of the extent to which the site archive might enable the data to meet the research aims of the Sizewell C Project, sub-divided according to the research aims of the Sizewell C Project rather than the form of the data;

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**



- a statement of the potential of the data in developing new research aims, to contribute to other projects and to advance methodologies; and
- summary statement of the significance of the data.
- additional information will normally include:
  - supporting illustrations at appropriate scales;
  - sufficient supporting data, tabulated or in appendices, and/or details of the contents of the Sizewell C Project archive, to permit the interrogation of the stated conclusions; and
  - index, references and disclaimers.

d) Archaeological Updated Project Design (UPD)

i. Purpose

5.6.39 ~~5.6.14~~ An Archaeological Updated Project Design for the whole Sizewell C archaeological project will be prepared on completion of the Post-Excavation Assessments, providing a scope and programme for the analysis, reporting, publication and dissemination of the findings (in accordance with Requirement 3 of the dDCO). It will bring together the results of all stages of the archaeological project, and provide a framework for further investigation of the material recovered and results.

5.6.40 ~~5.6.15~~ A draft of the UPD will be provided for review by SCCAS, followed by a single hard master-copy, and a digital version of the final report, which will be submitted after the receipt of comments on the draft report. The UPD will also include a completed OASIS form appended.

ii. Form

5.6.41 ~~5.6.16~~ The UPD will include:

- Proposals for the further recording, analysis or other work required on the stratigraphic data, artefacts and ecofacts;
- Sufficient supporting data, tabulated or in appendices, and/or details of the contents of the Sizewell C Project archive, to permit the interrogation of the stated conclusions; and
- Proposed discard strategy;



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – OVERARCHING  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- Proposals for scientific dating (potentially an initial suite of dates and a second after provisional results from the artefact and ecofact analysis are received);
- Proposals for a Bayesian analysis to refine chronologies, with regard to the selection of contexts and samples for scientific dating.
- Proposals for comparative analysis of the geophysical survey and excavation results, particularly correlations of results by: size/type of features; archaeological period; and underlying geology and soil types;
- Proposals for further research;
- Proposals for final reporting and publication, including format/medium and a synopsis of the content;
- Proposals for any further work required on the project archive, such as consolidation or conservation;
- Task lists, programme, costings and timescale for the proposed further work, to include publication (both academic and popular) and archive deposition;
- Details of the proposed project team;
- Proposals for continuing liaison and communication with SCCAS during the remaining post-excavation process.

e) **Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations**

**5.6.42** ~~5.6.17~~ The overall aim of the Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations project is to provide an online index to the mass of archaeological grey literature that has been produced as a result of the advent of large-scale developer funded fieldwork.

**5.6.43** ~~5.6.18~~ The archaeological consultant or contractor must therefore complete the Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations form (available at <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/>)- in respect of the scope of works set out in each site-specific WSI.

**5.6.44** ~~5.6.19~~ Once a report has become a public document by submission to or incorporation into the Suffolk HER, Suffolk HER will validate the Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations form thus placing the information into the public domain on the Online Access to the Index of

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED





Archaeological Investigations website. The archaeological contractor must indicate that they agree to this procedure within the method statement submitted to SCCAS.

f) Publication

5.6.45 ~~5.6.20~~ Formal publication of the results of some or all of the fieldwork is likely to be required. The results of the works will be reviewed and decisions taken on the scope and level of any publication(s) following the submission of the Post Excavation Assessment reports and review. This will consider the most appropriate route for dissemination, and the scope of any dissemination, including consideration of whether thematically or chronologically related sites should be reported together. Details of publication will be addressed in the UPD.

5.6.46 ~~5.6.21~~ The PXA and UPD ~~shall~~ will make recommendations for an appropriate level of reporting for all excavated remains to ensure that aspects of a site which are not deemed appropriate for publication are fully reported as grey literature.

5.6.47 ~~5.6.22~~ Provision will also be made to contribute to the annual summaries in the Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History (PSIAH).

## 6 HEALTH, SAFETY, SECURITY AND ENVIRONMENT

6.1.1 Health and Safety will take priority over all other requirements. A conditional aspect of all archaeological work is both safe access to the area of work, and a safe working environment. All relevant health and safety legislation, regulations, and codes of practice ~~should~~ will be respected and adhered to. Site-specific risk assessments will be carried out in respect of each element of the mitigation fieldwork prior to commencement of the fieldwork, and copies sent to the representatives of the client for approval.

6.1.2 Where conflict between Health and Safety and progressing the archaeological ~~project~~ investigations is identified, every effort will be made by ~~the client~~ SZC Co., in discussion with ~~the archaeological contractors and~~ SCCAS, to identify a safe way of completing the archaeological investigations to appropriate standards.

6.1.3 The Sizewell C Project will be carried out in accordance with safe working practices and under the defined Health, Safety and Environmental Policy.

6.1.4 Copies of the successful contractor's insurance policies will be required in advance by ~~the client or their nominated representative~~ SZC Co.



- 6.1.5 The appointed ~~contractor/s~~ archaeological contractor will take responsibility for securing the excavation areas (e.g. by fencing), provision of welfare, backfilling and reinstatement of the excavation areas and the removal of materials brought onto the site during the excavation.
- 6.1.6 Service plans will be supplied by the appointed principal contractor. Any archaeological intervention must respect all requirements for safe stand-off distances, and working practices in regard of these features.
- 6.1.7 Any specific site security requirements will be set out within the individual site WSIs, ~~and these will be discussed and agreed with the client and main works contractors.~~

## 7 MONITORING

- 7.1.1 The SCCAS archaeologist must be informed of the start date and timetable in advance of any work commencing.
- 7.1.2 Reasonable access to the site must be afforded to the SCCAS archaeologist, or their nominee at all times, for the purposes of monitoring the archaeological excavations.
- 7.1.3 Regular communication between the archaeological contractor, the SCCAS archaeologist, ~~client SZC Co~~ and other interested parties must be maintained to ensure the Sizewell C Project aims and objectives are achieved.

## 8 PUBLIC OUTREACH

- 8.1.1 It is recognized that the archaeological works will generate significant public interest. In response to this a programme of public outreach will be instigated.
- 8.1.2 A detailed scope for outreach will be ~~agreed with SCCAS~~ set out in the site-specific WSIs which must, after consultation with Historic England, be submitted to and approved by SCC pursuant to Requirement 3 of the dDCO, in advance of the commencement of the archaeological mitigation works, and ~~may will~~ include some or all of the following, as appropriate:
- A regularly updated social media presence reporting the important discoveries and promoting specific engagement events (e.g. talks, open days etc.) at an appropriate stage;
  - Press releases to local media where particularly significant remains are identified or where specific events are to be promoted and can appropriately be communicated. These would be coordinated and



issued through the wider Sizewell C Project communications programme.

- A series of publicly accessible talks, provided by the archaeological fieldwork contractor(s) to local interest groups, such as schools, Parish groups/councils, discussing the excavations, as they progress;
- An invitation to specialist broadcast media production(s), for example BBC *Digging for Britain* to cover key findings or major set piece excavations in order to reach a national audience;
- A publicly accessible conference to be held at a suitable local venue, following the completion of fieldwork and post-excavation assessment, to bring together the most significant results of the archaeological project for a general audience;
- Where reasonably practicable in a safe manner, open days. This would be most relevant to the larger set-piece excavations; and
- Production of popular publications (additional to the formal publication of results) describing the significant discoveries for a general audience. Any popular publications will be linked to school curriculum at KS2, KS3, KS4.

[8.1.3 The freight management facility site-specific WSI will set out specific proposals for further engagement focused on the Seven Hills barrow cemetery \(which includes SM 1011339, SM 1011340, SM 1011341, 1011342, SM 1011343, SM 1011344\). This will include proposals for academic and popular publication of the results of the freight management facility excavations in the context of the wider group of barrows in addition to other forms of engagement as noted above. The site-specific WSI must, after consultation with Historic England, be submitted to and approved by SCC pursuant to Requirement 3.](#)



---

## REFERENCES

- 1.1 AMEC, 2015. UK EPR Sizewell C Main Site: Updated Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment
- 1.2 AMEC, 2015. UK EPR Sizewell C Main Site: Rail Route Options Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment
- 1.3 AMEC, 2016. UK EPR Sizewell C Associated Development: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment for a Proposed New Park and Ride at Wickham Market, Suffolk
- 1.4 Wood, 2018. Darsham Park and Ride: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment
- 1.5 Wood, 2018. Two Village Bypass: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
- 1.6 Wood, 2018. A12/B1122 Yoxford Roundabout: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
- 1.7 Wood, 2018. Sizewell Link Road and Theberton Bypass: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
- 1.8 Wood, 2018. Freight Management Facility: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
- 1.9 Cotswold Archaeology, 2019. Main Development Site, Sizewell C, Suffolk: Interim Fieldwork Summary
- 1.10 Cotswold Archaeology, 2016. Pillbox Field, Sizewell C, Suffolk: Archaeological Evaluation
- 1.11 Cotswold Archaeology, 2018. Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate, Leiston, Suffolk: Archaeological Evaluation
- 1.12 Cotswold Archaeology, 2019. Darsham Park and Ride, Sizewell C, Suffolk: Archaeological Evaluation
- 1.13 Cotswold Archaeology. 2017. Main Development Site, Sizewell C, Suffolk: Archaeological Evaluation
- 1.14 Cotswold Archaeology. 2016. Wickham Market, Sizewell C, Suffolk: Archaeological Evaluation
- 1.15 EAA, 2004 (Blagg, Plouviez & Tester, 2004. 'Excavations at a large Romano-British Settlement at Hacheston, Suffolk, 1973-4', *East Anglian Archaeology 106*)



- 1.16 Maria Medlycott (ed.). (2011). Research and Archaeology Revisited: a revised framework for the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 24. [http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap24/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap24/). [Accessed March 2019]
- 1.17 Nigel Brown, Jenny Glazebrook (eds). (2000). Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties 2. Research agenda and strategy. East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 8. [http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap8/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap8/). [Accessed March 2019]
- 1.18 East Anglian Archaeology (2019). Regional Research Framework Review. <http://eaareports.org.uk/algao-east/regional-research-framework-review/> [Accessed March 2019]
- 1.19 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014 Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation
- 1.20 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014 Guidelines for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials
- 1.21 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014 Code of Conduct
- 1.22 Schmidt et al. (2016). EAC Guidelines for the use of Geophysics in Archaeology [http://old.european-archaeological-council.org/files/eac\\_guidelines\\_2\\_final.pdf](http://old.european-archaeological-council.org/files/eac_guidelines_2_final.pdf). [Accessed July 2019]
- 1.23 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). (2014). Standard and guidance for archaeological geophysical survey. [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics\\_2.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics_2.pdf). [Accessed July 2019]
- 1.24 Historic England. 2016. Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice
- 1.25 Historic England (2011) Environmental Archaeology [https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/environmental\\_archaeology/](https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/environmental_archaeology/) [Accessed July 2019]
- 1.26 Historic England. 2015 Archaeometallurgy: Guidelines for Best Practice. <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/archaeometallurgy-guidelines-best-practice/> [Accessed 04/12/2020]
- 1.27 Watkinson & Neal. 1988. First Aid for Finds. RESCUE/United Kingdom Institute for Conservation



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – OVERARCHING  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 
- 1.28 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists .2014. Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials
- 1.29 English Heritage .1995. A Strategy for the Care and Investigation of Finds
- 1.30 Historic England. 2017. Organic Residue Analysis and Archaeology: Guidelines for Best Practice. <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/organic-residue-analysis-and-archaeology/> [Accessed 04/12/2020]
- 1.31 Historic England. 2018. The Role of the Human Osteologist in an Archaeological Fieldwork Project. Swindon. Historic England.
- 1.32 SCCAS. 2019. Archaeological Archives in Suffolk: Guidelines for Preparation and Deposition
- 1.33 Historic England. 2019. Piling and Archaeology [Piling and Archaeology | Historic England](#)
- [1.34 Cotswold Archaeology 2021 Main Development Site - Area 3 Sizewell C, Leiston Suffolk Archaeological Evaluation.](#)
- [1.35 Cotswold Archaeology 2020 Two Village Bypass Area 2 Archaeological Evaluation Report.](#)
- [1.36 Cotswold Archaeology 2019 A12/B1122 Yoxford Roundabout Archaeological Evaluation Report.](#)
- [1.37 Cotswold Archaeology 2020 Sizewell C Link Road Areas 2, 4C and 4D Yoxford and Theberton Suffolk Archaeological Evaluation.](#)
- [1.38 Cotswold Archaeology 2021 Link Road Area 1, Sizewell C, Kelsale Suffolk Interim Fieldwork Summary Archaeological Evaluation.](#)
- [1.39 Cotswold Archaeology 2020 Freight Management Facility Archaeological Evaluation Report.](#)
- [1.40 Cotswold Archaeology 2020 Green Rail Route Archaeological Evaluation Report.](#)

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – OVERARCHING  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

---

[ANNEX 2.11.A.1: Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England](#)

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – OVERARCHING  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

---

[ANNEX 2.11.A.2: Requirements for a Trenched  
Archaeological Evaluation](#)

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**





SIZEWELL C PROJECT – OVERARCHING  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

---

[ANNEX 2.11.A.3: Requirements for Archaeological  
Excavation](#)

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – OVERARCHING  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

---

[ANNEX 2.11.A.4: Requirements for a Geophysical Survey](#)

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – OVERARCHING  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

---

[ANNEX 2.11.A.5: Additional Requirements for a  
Palaeoenvironmental Assessment](#)

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**