

Marine Class Descriptions and Principles of Selection in Aggregate Areas

EH Project Number 5383

Ref: 67040.02

February 2008

MARINE CLASS DESCRIPTIONS AND PRINCIPLES OF SELECTION IN AGGREGATE AREAS

EH Project Number 5383

Ref: 67040.02

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. WA has been commissioned by English Heritage to carry out a project on a means of selecting sites that are sufficiently important in archaeological terms to warrant special measures if they are implicated in proposed marine aggregate dredging. Such special measures could include protection by exclusion zones, recording and recovery, or some other form of mitigation.
- 1.2. The project was commissioned on the basis of a *Scope of Consultancy* (Wessex Archaeology August 2007, ref: T11315).

2. BACKGROUND: THE PURPOSE AND USE OF SELECTION

- 2.1. The historic environment is made up of all forms of physical evidence of peoples' activities in the past, including indirect evidence presented by palaeo-environmental remains. The scope of the historic environment is, therefore, very broad. Not all of this evidence warrants the same level of study or protection. Selectivity is required, as much for intellectual rigour as for enabling development and targeting ever-scarce resources. Implicitly, selectivity requires decisions to be made between physical evidence that is, in archaeological terms, 'more important' from physical evidence that is 'less important'.
- 2.2. In the context of marine aggregate dredging, decisions about selection involve several parties, including:
 - Archaeological curators: archaeologists with formal responsibility for safeguarding – both for the present and the future – the historic environment in the area for which they are responsible, be it national (English Heritage) or local (local government archaeological officers).
 - Marine aggregate companies: companies wishing to extract marine aggregates to meet demand from construction and other industries, whose licence applications, operations and overall costs will be affected by measures that address the historic environment.
 - The regulator (Marine and Fisheries Agency): the agency responsible for issuing, monitoring and enforcing licences for marine aggregate extraction, taking into account advice from archaeological curators, among others.
 - Environmental consultancies and survey companies: organisations frequently employed by aggregate companies to acquire data and provide advice on aggregate resources and the environmental implications of their extraction, often in the course of the Environmental Impact Assessment that accompanies licence applications.
 - Archaeological consultants and contractors: organisations employed by aggregate companies or their consultants to acquire data and provide advice on

how the historic environment can be addressed in the course of licence applications and extraction.

- Marine stakeholders: a wide range of individuals and organisations – both public and private – that have interests in marine aggregate areas, including elements of the historic environment that are ‘important’ to such stakeholders irrespective of their archaeological interest.
- The wider public: society at large has interests in the historic environment, in the availability of aggregates, and in the features and activities championed by other marine stakeholders.

2.3. Given this range of parties, and the existence of a formal licensing system, discussions and decisions about selecting elements of the historic environment have to be understandable, consistent, transparent, repeatable and, if necessary, contestable. Consequently, the means of selecting sites in aggregate dredging areas has to be system-based and open.

3. A PROPOSED APPROACH TO SELECTION IN MARINE AGGREGATE AREAS

3.1. THE DEVELOPING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTEXT AND ITS RELEVANCE TO SELECTIVITY IN MARINE AGGREGATE AREAS

- 3.1.1. The context for developing a system for selecting important archaeological sites in marine aggregate areas is being set by broader administrative and legal changes associated with the Heritage White Paper, *Heritage Protection for the 21st Century* (DCMS WAG March 2007), and the proposed Heritage Protection Bill announced in November 2007. The Heritage Protection Bill will reform and unify the terrestrial and marine heritage protection systems in England (for further details, see www.commonleader.gov.uk/output/page2173.asp), whilst the White Paper made clear the Government’s intention to broaden the range of marine heritage assets that can be protected, to make designation decisions on the basis of ‘special interest’, and to make designation decisions easier to understand by publishing new selection criteria.
- 3.1.2. The emphasis on unifying the approach on land and at sea, on making decisions on the basis of ‘special interest’, and of publishing the selection criteria is all clearly relevant to managing the historic environment in marine aggregate areas. Given such a clear steer, this project has sought to achieve a set of recommendations that are consistent with the apparent direction of the reform of heritage protection.
- 3.1.3. The Heritage White Paper adopted the term ‘historic asset’ to refer to discrete elements of the historic environment that could be subject to protection. This single term is capable of encompassing elements of the historic environment whose treatment has been disjointed by their definition as (Listed) building, (Scheduled) monument and (Protected) wreck, for example. In the interests of maintaining a unified approach, the term ‘historic asset’ is used throughout this paper notwithstanding problems the term has of its own.
- 3.1.4. In addition to the White Paper and announcement of the Draft Bill, other evidence of the current direction of Government and EH policies is provided by changes already introduced in respect of Listing (see *Revisions to Principles of Selection for Listed Buildings*, DCLG Circular 01/2007 / DCMS Circular PP992, 8 March 2007), and by EH’s *Conservation Principles: Policies and guidance for the sustainable management of the historic environment* (Second Stage Consultation, February 2007).

- 3.1.5. The criteria for Listed Buildings, i.e. 'special architectural or historic interest' were recently elaborated in DCLG Circular 01/2207, which also set out General Principles for selection and referred to a series of Selection Guides that 'demonstrate what features are considered significant and likely to make a building of special architectural or historic interest when assessing buildings of a particular type for different periods, regions or styles' (para. 6.8). A series of Selection Guides for buildings has been published by English Heritage (see <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.8833>).
- 3.1.6. For Monuments subject to scheduling under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, decisions about selection were assisted by a series of Monument Class Descriptions (MCDs) developed in the course of the Monuments Protection Programme. The MCDs still exist (see below) and may form a supplementary tier of detailed guidance to support Selection Guides. 'Step Reports' provided a similar level of guidance in selecting examples of assets in industrial archaeology (see below).
- 3.1.7. Importantly, the Heritage White Paper noted that '[marine] designation decisions will be based on the most appropriate management regime for a marine historic asset, not simply on its "special interest" alone' (p. 44). Consequently, appropriateness of management regime can be seen as a legitimate further tier to decisions about selection in marine aggregate areas.
- 3.1.8. To summarise, an approach can be developed to selectivity in marine aggregate areas in which six sets of criteria have a bearing on decisions:
- Definition of historic asset;
 - Definition of special interest;
 - Principles of Selection;
 - Selection Guides;
 - Class Descriptions / Step Reports;
 - Appropriateness of management regime.
- 3.1.9. To illustrate, in considering a feature implicated by marine aggregate dredging, decisions will have to take into account the following:
- Is the feature actually an historic asset, or is it a natural feature or some other detritus that does not warrant further archaeological consideration?
 - If the feature is an historic asset, is it of sufficient interest to warrant some form of protection or mitigation?
 - Is the 'special interest' of the asset consistent with the overall principles being applied to the selection of historic assets on other schemes or in other sectors (including on land)?
 - Does the special interest of the asset accord with the considerations that archaeologists have identified as the source of interest for this particular type of asset?
 - Is the special interest of the asset consistent with the findings of the relevant Class Description or Step Report for this class of asset or historic industry?
 - Can the asset be managed in a way that accords with sustainable development?

3.2. LAND AND SEA

- 3.2.1. A distinction between historic assets on land and historic assets at sea has arisen from different traditions of legal and administrative provision. To some extent, these different traditions reflect practical differences in dealing with these environments. However, these environments do not have hard boundaries in physical terms, and even in legal and administrative practice the distinction between land and sea is often blurred or overlapping.
- 3.2.2. The value of a land/sea boundary is further diminished in that a tentative division of historic asset into types that are found at sea and types that are found on land soon breaks down. It is increasingly recognised that areas that are now sea were once dry land, so 'terrestrial' assets can be found underwater. It is often forgotten, however, that large areas of present day land were formerly sea, because of land reclamation that may date back to Roman times, or due to more-or-less natural changes in watercourses and shorelines. As the boundary between land and sea has migrated back and forth, so too have the human activities specifically associated with coasts and riverbanks, so that their remains can now be found on land or underwater. Further blurring occurs insofar as no viable boundary can be drawn, in terms of types of asset, between open sea and estuary or between estuary and river. Equally, the difference between modified river and canal in making up a 'navigation' may be harder to maintain in practice than it first seems. Aircrew forced to crash in historic periods are likely to have had little choice in deciding which side of the land-sea boundary their aircraft would fall. Overall, it is difficult to hard-wire different types of historic asset to a distinction between land and sea: all types of site that can be found on land can be found at sea; all types of site that can be found at sea can be found on land.
- 3.2.3. Insofar as it is not possible to distinguish between different types of historic asset in terms of whether they are on present day land or under present day water, then the criteria for selection referred to above have to be common across land and sea. This commonality is due less to an abstract principle of 'seamlessness' than to the practical necessity of achieving consistency in selection decisions, bearing in mind that aggregate extraction is also conducted both on land and at sea and aggregate companies could reasonably expect some coherence across their operations.
- 3.2.4. It is proposed, therefore, that complete consistency between land and sea is required in respect of the first three tiers of selectivity, i.e.:
- Definition of historic asset;
 - Definition of special interest;
 - Principles of Selection.
- 3.2.5. With respect to the fourth tier – Selection Guides, which address specific asset types – it is also proposed that they should apply across all environments. As noted above, Selection Guides have already been published for Listed Buildings. The themes of the existing Selection Guides are so broad that they are already relevant to the selection of assets found at sea, though the need for more explicit consideration of assets at sea needs to be borne in mind in their future development. 'Gaps' in the current Selection Guides and the need to develop additional Selection Guides are discussed below.

- 3.2.6. Some Selection Guides already have a 'terrestrial' lead and some can be expected to have a 'marine' lead. Nonetheless, both 'terrestrial' and 'marine' Selection Guides will need to include paragraphs that address examples of the assets that are found at sea and on land, respectively.
- 3.2.7. As with Selection Guides, the additional detailed guidance provided by Class Descriptions or Step Reports (fifth tier) may need to be capable of being applied across all environments. However, the sub-sets of assets to which they apply are much smaller than the Selection Guides, so there may be scope to identify some asset classes and historic industries that – as far as currently-known sites are concerned – are restricted in their current environmental range.
- 3.2.8. The appropriateness of management regime (sixth tier) could be decided case-by-case with sole regard to the circumstances of a specific asset in relation to a particular aggregate licence area. However, it would be advantageous to industry, regulator and other stakeholders to adopt a framework that will build upon previous experience and facilitate commonality of expectation. Although there is no directly applicable model, there is potential to make use of schemas such as the Conservation Policies set out within EH's *Conservation Principles, Protected Wreck Sites at Risk* (English Heritage, March 2008), and management considerations previously considered as principles of selection (such as fragility and vulnerability, see below).
- 3.2.9. The following sections review current information on all six tiers of selectivity, and comments on their application to marine historic assets and marine aggregate dredging.

4. DEFINITION OF HISTORIC ASSET

"Is the feature actually an historic asset, or is it a natural feature or some other detritus that does not warrant further archaeological consideration?"

4.1. REVIEW

- 4.1.1. There is no established definition of historic asset as yet, but on the basis of available information any future definition is expected to include:
- historic buildings and archaeological sites that fall within the definition of 'building' or 'monument' (Heritage White Paper, p. 12); plus
 - 'sites of early human activity without structures' (Heritage White Paper, p. 12); plus
 - historic sites (parks, gardens and battlefields) (Heritage White Paper, p. 12); plus
 - 'any feature containing a man-made object or structure fixed to the building or forming part of the land and comprised within the curtilage' if the feature is of special interest, even if the building is not.
- 4.1.2. It is anticipated that a future definition of historic asset will encompass portable objects on the surface (to address, for example, sites such as the stone-axe factories in the Lake District where Neolithic polished axes in varying stages of manufacture are exposed on mountain sides associated with the quarries, see *Conservation Bulletin* 52). The definition is expected to encompass the grouped contents of a site even if there is no structure present, to address situations such as

the Bronze Age 'cargoes' of the designated wreck sites at Langdon Bay and Moor Sand, for example, where the presence of a vessel is questionable.

- 4.1.3. Implicit in all these elements is the notion that the asset has been constructed or manufactured or is in some other way a material trace or consequence of human activity, i.e. historic assets are of anthropogenic origin. Features that are wholly 'natural' cannot be historic assets, except that natural features may fall within the geographical extent of an asset.
- 4.1.4. Other than natural features, there is a range of things that are of anthropogenic origin that would not be considered as historic assets, which are new and currently in use or only recently discarded. Such distinctions have to be tempered by recognition that some things which are still in current use are historic (such as many buildings on land), and many historic assets will have been through a phase of discard or disinterest (i.e. being 'rubbish'). In making decisions, it may be advisable to have some broad rules to distinguish 'historic assets' from other material of anthropogenic origin, centring on whether the item has attributes that afford historical or archaeological interpretation. A lack of distinct attributes or an obvious recent origin should preclude the item from further consideration as an historic asset.
- 4.1.5. The need to encompass assets that are represented by objects only should be noted, as this report is concerned primarily with 'sites' that are currently *in situ* on the seabed and have to be managed in that context (even if management ultimately results in the site being removed). This report is not concerned with single objects that have already been recovered from the seabed, except insofar as a single recovered object may indicate the presence of a more extensive site on the seabed. Equally, a single object still on the seabed that is demonstrably isolated and not part of a site could be treated on its own merits, rather than as an 'historic asset' in the sense used in this report.

4.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.2.1. It is recommended that the definition of historic asset should be common across all environments and asset categories.
- 4.2.2. The definition should include:
 - buildings and sites falling within the definition of Listed Building or Monument;
 - historic sites;
 - 'sites of early human activity without structures';
 - objects or structures that form part of a building or site;
 - sites comprised of portable objects on the surface;
 - the grouped contents of a site, even if there is no structure present.
- 4.2.3. Definitions should clearly exclude features that are wholly natural, i.e. not of anthropogenic origin, except where these fall within the geographical extent of an historic asset.
- 4.2.4. Material of anthropogenic origin that is of obvious recent origin or lacks distinct attributes and therefore does not afford historical or archaeological interpretation can be excluded from the scope of historic assets. Broad rules on distinguishing historic assets from 'rubbish' may be helpful.

- 4.2.5. This report is primarily concerned with assets that are to be managed *in situ*. Single recovered objects that are not associated with a site, and objects on the seabed that are demonstrably isolated, are not considered further as historic assets.

5. DEFINITION OF SPECIAL INTEREST

“If the feature is an historic asset, is it of sufficient interest to warrant some form of protection or mitigation?”

5.1. REVIEW

- 5.1.1. The first tier has set out the scope of what constitutes a historic asset that is relatively broad and likely to include many features. The intention of this second tier is to distinguish the sub-set of historic assets that are considered to be of ‘special interest’.

- 5.1.2. The Heritage White Paper states its preference for the term ‘special interest’ on the basis of the existing regime for Listed Buildings, which refers to buildings of ‘special architectural or historic interest’. The Heritage White Paper proposes ‘special architectural, historic or archaeological interest’ (p. 13), though in respect of marine historic assets reference is made only to ‘special archaeological or historic interest’ (p. 44).

- 5.1.3. The Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 currently requires that in order to be designated a vessel (or any objects contained or formerly contained within it) must be of ‘historical, archaeological or artistic, importance’ (s. 1(1)(b)). ‘Artistic’ interest might be subsumed within ‘architectural’, though it might be worth noting that – at least anecdotally – *Colossus* was designated on the basis of the artistic importance of the Greek vases it was carrying, rather than the archaeological or historical interest of the wreck. Vases might not qualify as ‘architectural’, though the *Colossus* would probably have qualified as having special archaeological or historical interest in today’s climate.

- 5.1.4. The following definitions of architectural and historic interest are given in DCLG Circular 01/2007:

Architectural Interest. To be of special architectural interest a building must be of importance in its architectural design, decoration or craftsmanship; special interest may also apply to nationally important examples of particular building types and techniques (e.g. buildings displaying technical innovation or virtuosity) and significant plan forms;

Historic Interest. To be of special historic interest a building must illustrate important aspects of the nation’s social, economic, cultural, or military history and/or have close historical associations with nationally important people. There should normally be some quality of interest in the physical fabric of the building itself to justify the statutory protection afforded by listing.

- 5.1.5. There does not appear to be a definition of Archaeological Interest, as yet. On the basis of the above definitions, however, it might be assumed that in order to be of special archaeological interest, a historic asset must – on the basis of its physical characteristics – contribute to understanding and/or awareness of social, economic, cultural, or military history.

- 5.1.6. The AMAA 1979 used a criterion of 'national importance' (AMAA 1979 s.1(3)). 'National' can be problematic (see below) and the need to adopt criteria that are 'sufficiently neutral to avoid subjective value judgements' is a key contention of *Heritage Protection for the 21st Century*.
- 5.1.7. With respect to the DCLG Circular 01/2007 of historic interest, care may need to be taken in respect of what constitutes 'the *nation's* ... history' and '*nationally* important people' in light of the multicultural character of England's citizenry and changes in nationhood in the periods represented by assets of special interest.
- 5.1.8. *Heritage Protection for the 21st Century* noted the need to avoid 'the problems of assigning values of national importance to a marine environment where some of the material worthy of designation is not of British origin'. Several recent projects have highlighted the 'special interest' to other countries and nationals of marine historic assets that lie within the remit of UK curators (*Mendi; Rooswijk; Bonhomme Richard*), though in some of these cases the assets are also of special interest within the UK.
- 5.1.9. It should be borne in mind that the definition of 'asset' and 'special interest' (and the Principles of Selection, Selection Guides etc.) may have a bearing on claims relating to the 'special architectural, historic or archaeological interest' to the UK of historic assets that lie outside UK jurisdiction (e.g. within High Seas or within the territorial jurisdiction of other states).

5.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.2.1. It is recommended that the definition of special interest should be common across all environments and asset categories.
- 5.2.2. 'Special interest' should encompass:
- Historic Interest
 - Archaeological Interest
 - Architectural Interest
 - Artistic Interest
- 5.2.3. Artistic Interest may be adequately subsumed under Architectural Interest.
- 5.2.4. The definition of special interest under each heading should be capable of (i.e. not preclude) application to historic assets in UK Waters.

6. PRINCIPLES OF SELECTION

"Is the 'special interest' of the asset consistent with the overall principles being applied to the selection of historic assets on other schemes or in other sectors (including on land)?"

6.1. REVIEW

Buildings

- 6.1.1. DCLG Circular 01/2007 includes General Principles under the following headings:

- Age and rarity
- Aesthetic merits
- Selectivity
- National interest

6.1.2. With respect to age and rarity, DCLG Circular 01/2007 notes the following general principles:

- Before 1700, all buildings that contain a significant proportion of their original fabric are listed;
- From 1700 to 1840, most buildings are listed;
- After 1840, because of the greatly increased number of buildings erected and the much larger numbers that have survived, progressively greater selection is necessary;
- Buildings of less than 30 years old are normally listed only if they are of outstanding quality and under threat.

6.1.3. DCLG Circular 01/2007 notes that the Secretary of State may take into account the degree to which the exterior of a building contributes to the architectural or historic interest of any group of buildings of which it forms part, which is known as group value. Although referring to exteriors, DCLG Circular 01/2007 notes that where a building is designated because of its group value, protection applies to the whole property. Group value is noted to be particularly relevant where buildings comprise an important architectural or historic unity or a fine example of planning, or where there is a historical functional relationship between a group of buildings. Presumably, group value is invoked where the interest of an individual building would not otherwise be sufficiently special to warrant designation.

6.1.4. DCLG Circular 01/2007 also notes that 'state of repair' is not a relevant consideration when considering the test of special interest.

Monuments

6.1.5. The criteria used in respect of 'national importance' in the context of the AMAA 1979 (and for nationally-important non-scheduled remains) are set out in Annex 4 of PPG 16 as follows:

- Period
- Rarity
- Documentation
- Group Value
- Survival/Condition
- Fragility/Vulnerability
- Diversity
- Potential

6.1.6. The criteria for national importance are set out slightly differently on EH's website (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1369>):

- extent of survival
- current condition
- rarity
- representativity, either through diversity or because of one important attribute
- importance of the period to which the monument dates
- fragility
- potential to contribute to our information, understanding and appreciation
- extent of documentation enhancing the monument's significance

Wrecks

6.1.7. The Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites (ACHWS) and DCMS adopted criteria for assessing the importance of wrecks or the sites of wrecks, and for considering whether designation as a restricted area under the terms of the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973. The criteria, which mirrored the AMAA 1979 / PPG 16 criteria, are as follows (DCMS March 2002):

- Period
- Rarity
- Documentation
- Group value
- Survival/condition
- Fragility
- Vulnerability
- Diversity
- Potential

Parks and Gardens

6.1.8. For the Register of Parks and Gardens, EH uses the following criteria (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1415>):

- Sites with a main phase of development before 1750 where at least a proportion of the layout of this date is still evident, even perhaps only as an earthwork.
- Sites with a main phase of development laid out between 1750 and 1820 where enough of this landscaping survives to reflect the original design.
- Sites with a main phase of development between 1820 and 1880 which is of importance and survives intact or relatively intact.
- Sites with a main phase of development between 1880 and 1939 where this is of high importance and survives intact.
- Sites with a main phase of development laid out post-war, but more than 30 years ago, where the work is of exceptional importance.
- Sites which were influential in the development of taste whether through reputation or references in literature.

- Sites which are early or representative examples of a style of layout, or a type of site, or the work of a designer (amateur or professional) of national importance.
- Sites having an association with significant persons or historical events.
- Sites with strong group value.

Battlefields

6.1.9. In respect of the Register of Historic Battlefields, EH notes that battlefields are significant in five ways (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1436>):

- As turning-points in English history, for example the Norman Conquest which followed the Battle of Hastings in 1066, or the turmoil of the Civil Wars in the seventeenth century which changed the roles of monarchy and parliament.
- The reputations of great political and military leaders were frequently built on battlefield success.
- Tactics and skills of war still relevant to the defence of the country evolved on historic battlefields.
- Battlefields are the final resting places for thousands of unknown soldiers, nobles and commoners alike, whose lives were sacrificed in the making of the history of England.
- Where they survive, battlefields may contain important topographical and archaeological evidence which can increase our understanding of the momentous events of history which took place on their soil.

EH Conservation Principles

6.1.10. Unlike the other schemas referred to in this section, English Heritage's *Conservation Principles* do not refer to a specific type of asset. However, they are worth considering here because they can apply to all types of asset, and – implicitly – they include some principles of selection that do not appear elsewhere.

6.1.11. The *Conservation Principles* document is rather broader in intent than selection alone. The Conservation Principles themselves are as follows:

- The historic environment is a shared resource.
- Everyone should be able to participate in sustaining the historic environment.
- Understanding the heritage value of places is vital.
- Significant places should be managed to sustain their values.
- Decisions about change must be reasonable, transparent and consistent.
- Recording and learning from decisions is essential.

6.1.12. The *Conservation Principles* focus on 'heritage values', as distinct from the 'instrumental values' i.e. social and economic values that are also associated with heritage places. Four families of 'heritage value' are identified, each of which is sub-divided, as follows:

Evidential	Cultural Natural
Historical	Illustrative Associational

Aesthetic	Design Artistic Artless Beauty Sublime
Communal	Commemorative / Symbolic Social Spiritual

- 6.1.13. It is worth noting that the emphasis in the *Conservation Principles* is very much on how assets are perceived and valued in the present, rather than their importance to societies in the past, or perhaps as a 'universal' importance out of time. The 'point of view' from which value or interest is perceived is not necessarily articulated clearly in most schemas; although the *Conservation Principles* are clearer in this regard, their focus on the present is not beyond debate.
- 6.1.14. The *Conservation Principles* includes the following staged approach to assessing significance:
- Understand the fabric and evolution of the place
 - Identify who values the place, and why they do so
 - Relate identified heritage values to the fabric of the place
 - Consider the relative importance of those heritage values
 - Consider the contribution of associated objects and collections
 - Consider the contribution of setting and context
 - Compare the place with other places sharing similar values
 - Draft a statement of significance
- 6.1.15. In this process, the contribution of 'associated objects and conditions' and of 'setting and context' can be regarded as additional principles of selection that do not appear as explicitly in the other schema.
- 6.1.16. The *Conservation Principles* sets out a series of conservation policies and guidance that are prefaced by some 'universal considerations'. The considerations of authenticity – implying continuity of fabric and/or intent – can also be regarded as a principle of selection that is comparable to extent of survival.

Comparison and Summary

- 6.1.17. The principles currently in use across different types of asset can be summarised in two groups as follows (see Appendix I for broad equivalences):

Group 1	
Narrative	The asset is directly related to important trends or key turning points in the historical story of England.
Association	The asset provides a tangible link to (known) people or events.
Respect	The asset is the site of major loss of life and/or human remains.
Aesthetic	The asset has high sensory (usually visual) quality.
Current relevance	The asset has direct relevance to current activities.

Group 2	
Rarity	There are few other known examples.
Representative	The asset typifies the attribute(s) of special interest, or the range of those attributes.
Diversity	The asset embodies multiple facets of such assets' special interest.
Potential	The asset is capable of revealing more.
Extent of Survival	The asset is intact.
Documentation	The asset is augmented by other sources.
Grouping	The asset is augmented by spatial relationships to other assets.
Objects and Collections	The asset is augmented by moveable physical evidence.
Setting and Context	The asset is augmented by relationships to its physical and/or intellectual surroundings.
Exceptional	The asset is beyond comparison.

- 6.1.18. There is a third group of selection principles evident in the AMAA 1979 (and hence also in the ACHWS principles), namely condition, fragility and vulnerability. For reasons discussed below, these 'principles' are considered as factors relevant to Appropriateness of Management Regime rather than as Principles of Selection.
- 6.1.19. The division into two groups reflects a separation of the Principles into those that must be integral to any asset if it is to be considered as of 'special interest', and those that enable assets to be sorted relative to each other. These 'Integral' and 'Relative' factors could be considered as each lying on a different axis, hence:

		Integral				
		Narrative	Association	Respect	Aesthetic	Current relevance
Relative	Rarity					
	Representative					
	Diversity					
	Potential					
	Extent of Survival					
	Grouping					
	Documentation					
	Objects and Collections					
	Setting and Context					
	Exceptional					

- 6.1.20. In this configuration, Principles of Selection can provide both an account of why assets are elevated into the realm of 'heritage' that is reasonably understandable in wider society, and of how selections can be made amongst such assets to identify the most important.
- 6.1.21. It is worth noting that the general principles in respect of Listed Buildings and the Register of Parks and Gardens both include age ranges amongst their principles. These correlate as follows:

Period	Listed Buildings	Parks and Gardens
1700	Before 1700, all buildings that contain a significant proportion of their original fabric are listed.	
1750		Sites with a main phase of development before 1750 where at least a proportion of the layout of this date is still evident, even perhaps only as an earthwork.
1820		Sites with a main phase of development laid out between 1750 and 1820 where enough of this landscaping survives to reflect the original design.
1840	From 1700 to 1840, most buildings are listed.	
	After 1840, because of the greatly increased number of buildings erected and the much larger numbers that have survived, progressively greater selection is necessary.	
1880		Sites with a main phase of development between 1820 and 1880 which is of importance and survives intact or relatively intact.
1939		Sites with a main phase of development between 1880 and 1939 where this is of high importance and survives intact.
Post-WWII		Sites with a main phase of development laid out post-war, but more than 30 years ago, where the work is of exceptional importance.
Less than 30 years	Buildings of less than 30 years old are normally listed only if they are of outstanding quality and under threat.	

6.1.22. Although 'age' is not in itself a 'principle', it can clearly act as a guide or short-cut in identifying special interest arising from a principle. There is certainly scope to use age in a similar way in identifying special interest in respect of marine assets.

6.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

6.2.1. As noted above, it is recommended that the Principles of Selection should be common across all environments and asset categories.

6.2.2. The principles of selection used in existing schemas can be divided into two groups, reflecting a separation of the principles into those that must be integral to any asset if it is to be considered as of 'special interest', and those that enable assets to be sorted relative to each other. The two groups are as follows:

Group 1	Integral factors
Narrative	The asset is directly related to important trends or key turning points in the historical story of England.
Association	The asset provides a tangible link to (known) people or events.
Respect	The asset is the site of major loss of life and/or human remains.

Group 1 cont.	Integral factors
Aesthetic	The asset has high sensory (usually visual) quality.
Current relevance	The asset has direct relevance to current activities.
Group 2	Relative factors
Rarity	There are few other known examples.
Representative	The asset typifies the attribute(s) of special interest, or the range of those attributes.
Diversity	The asset embodies multiple facets of such assets' special interest.
Potential	The asset is capable of revealing more.
Extent of Survival	The asset is intact.
Documentation	The asset is augmented by other sources.
Grouping	The asset is augmented by spatial relationships to other assets.
Objects and Collections	The asset is augmented by moveable physical evidence.
Setting and Context	The asset is augmented by relationships to its physical and/or intellectual surroundings.
Exceptional	The asset is beyond comparison.

- 6.2.3. 'Age' is not in itself a principle, but it can clearly act as a guide or short-cut in identifying special interest arising from one or more of the principles above.
- 6.2.4. It is recommended that factors formerly regarded as principles of selection such as Fragility and Vulnerability are considered in relation to the Appropriateness of Management Regime, not as Principles of Selection.

7. SELECTION GUIDES

"Does the special interest of the asset accord with the considerations that archaeologists have identified as the source of interest for this particular type of asset?"

7.1. REVIEW

- 7.1.1. In March 2007 English Heritage published 21 Selection Guides for buildings under headings that broadly equate to the Class Names of the NMR Monument Type Thesaurus (http://thesaurus.english-heritage.org.uk/thesaurus.asp?thes_no=1).
- 7.1.2. It is currently anticipated that a series of (Archaeological) Selection Guides will be drafted to complement the already-published (Building) Selection Guides. In due course, the archaeological and building selection guides may be combined into a single integrated series.
- 7.1.3. The published (Building) Selection Guides for buildings do not have a uniform structure, though they have a consistent core addressing:
- Special Considerations
 - History
 - Special Interest
- 7.1.4. Although it may not always be obvious, almost all of the Selection Guides encompass many assets that may be situated at sea. It is to be hoped that, in future, Selection Guides will incorporate paragraphs that explicitly address examples of assets that are found in – or are otherwise associated with – the sea and/or watercourses.

7.1.5. There are a number of asset types that do not appear to fall amongst the Selection Guides that have been prepared to date. In particular, there is a need for Selection Guides on:

- Boats and Ships in Archaeological Contexts
- Prehistoric Landsurfaces and Deposits
- Historic Sea Areas
- Fishing

7.1.6. Draft Selection Guides on Boats and Ships, and on Prehistoric Landsurfaces and Deposits, have been prepared in the course of this project. It is anticipated that Selection Guides on Historic Sea Areas and on Fishing will be drafted in due course.

7.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.2.1. As noted above, it is recommended that all Selection Guides should cover asset types across all environments.

7.2.2. It is recommended here that a further four Selection Guides are prepared on:

- Boats and Ships in Archaeological Contexts (in draft);
- Prehistoric Landsurfaces and Deposits (in draft);
- Historic Sea Areas;
- Fishing.

7.2.3. The Selection Guides provide a mechanism for using other schemas (see Appendix II) to elaborate the Principles of Selection. In particular, the framework developed for the ALSF project *On the Importance of Shipwrecks* can be applied to Integral Principles (Build; Use; Loss) and Relative Principles (Survival; Investigation). Although developed for shipwrecks, this BULSI framework is potentially capable of elaborating Principles of Selection in respect of other asset types.

8. MONUMENT CLASS DESCRIPTIONS AND STEP REPORTS

“Is the special interest of the asset consistent with the findings of the relevant Class Description or Step Report for this class of asset or historic industry?”

8.1. REVIEW

8.1.1. As part of the Monuments Protection Programme (MPP), English Heritage prepared a series of Monument Class Descriptions (MCDs) to act as a guide in decisions about scheduling. About 230 MCDs were prepared in the late 1980s and early 1990s. MCDs have the following structure:

- Definition
- Date
- General description
- Distribution and regional variation
- Rarity

- Survival and Potential
- Associations
- Characterisation criteria
- Bibliography
- Acknowledgements
- Figures

- 8.1.2. It is currently envisaged that the current MCDs could be used as a supplementary tier of detail to the Selection Guides. An equivalent tier of supplementary detail may certainly be advantageous in providing specific advice about sub-sets of assets within the scope of each 'maritime' Selection Guide. The numerous sub-sets (functional; constructional; chronological) of boats and ships suggest, for example, that a class-based approach to providing finer-grained detail on the identification of special interest would be helpful.
- 8.1.3. It is also worth mentioning the step-based approach to identifying special interest that has been taken with respect to industrial archaeology. In this approach, research was directed to characterising a whole industry as a basis for selecting which specific assets might warrant protection.
- 8.1.4. The reports are known as Step Reports because 'the coverage of each industry proceeds through six steps, from a report setting out the general character of the industry and the policies that should guide protection (Step 1), through short-listing and site assessment (Steps 2 and 3) and internal policy decisions (Steps 4 and 5) to the final documentation of the sites selected for Scheduling (Step 6)' (English Heritage *Archaeology Review 1997-98*). Numerous industries have been addressed in this way; examples include Chemical Industries, the Salt Industry (which included coastal salt-making), and Water and Sewage.
- 8.1.5. As with MCDs, the step-based approach might also warrant consideration in addressing the character and interest of some maritime industries, such as shipbuilding, the development of docks, coastal drainage and reclamation, the canal industry and so on.

8.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.2.1. In principle, Class Descriptions and Step Reports may need to be capable of being applied across all environments. However, the sub-sets of assets to which they apply are smaller than the Selection Guides, so there is scope to identify some asset classes and historic industries that – as far as currently-known sites are concerned – are not found in UK Waters.
- 8.2.2. There has not been scope to review each of the c. 230 existing MCDs and c. 20 industries covered by Step Reports in the course of this review. Consequently, it is not yet possible to indicate which existing MCDs/Step Reports might need to be amended to incorporate assets in UK Waters. Equally, it is not yet possible to indicate whether 'new' Class Descriptions/Step Reports may be required to provide sufficient, detailed guidance on asset types in UK Waters. It is therefore recommended that a review of existing MCDs/Step Reports is carried out to inform future proposals for detailed guidance.

9. APPROPRIATENESS OF MANAGEMENT REGIME

“Can the asset be managed in a way that accords with sustainable development?”

9.1. REVIEW

9.1.1. Decisions about the appropriateness of management regime are likely to be specific to the circumstances of a particular asset in relation to a particular aggregate licence. It is conceivable that, for example, a particular historic asset of acknowledged special interest cannot be managed sustainably *in situ* in the context of marine aggregate dredging, and that another approach will be required.

9.1.2. The Conservation Policies and Guidance set out in English Heritage’s *Conservation Principles* provide a framework for decisions about management that could be applied to marine aggregates. The *Conservation Principles* sets out a series of conservation policies and guidance that are prefaced by some ‘universal considerations’. These considerations include ‘Sustainability and reversibility’. Sustainability ‘requires using and managing [historic assets] in ways that will, wherever possible, ensure that their significance can be appreciated by generations to come’. Reversibility entails that changes made to historic assets ‘are capable of being reversed, in order not unduly to prejudice options for future generations’.

9.1.3. The Conservation Policies are set out under the following headings:

- Routine Management and Maintenance
- Periodic Renewal
- Repair, including Adaptation to Sustain Significance
- Intervention to Increase Knowledge of the Past
- Restoration
- New Work and Alteration
- Reconciling Conservation with other Heritage Interests
- Enabling Development

9.1.4. It has been noted above that DCLG Circular 01/2007 notes that ‘state of repair’ is not a relevant consideration when considering the test of special interest. Other principles that have applied historically are also perhaps better considered in relation to appropriateness of management regime, rather than as Principles of Selection. For example, the framework developed as part of the ALSF project *On the Importance of Shipwrecks* (see Appendix II) did not seek to incorporate ‘vulnerability’ and ‘amenity value’ because they were felt to relate to management decisions rather than to importance.

9.1.5. As noted above with reference to the existing principles already referred to in respect of the AMAA 1979 and the PWA 1973, the following ‘principles’ may warrant reconsideration:

PWA 1973 (DCMS March 2002)

Survival/condition

Fragility

Vulnerability

AMAA 1979 (EH website)

Extent of survival

Current condition

Fragility

- 9.1.6. It is considered here that Fragility and Vulnerability are better regarded as factors to be considered in relation to Appropriateness of Management regime, than as Principles of Selection.
- 9.1.7. Equally, it is also concluded that Current Condition, taken to be analogous to 'state of repair' for Listing, should be considered only in relation to Appropriateness of Management regime, not as a Principle of Selection.
- 9.1.8. Extent of Survival is taken to refer to the volume of an asset's fabric that still exists, either in situ or in secondary contexts, and considered either in absolute terms or relative to the assumed volume of the asset's fabric prior to it being incorporated into the archaeological record. In this definition (and as reflected in the discussion above), it is suggested that (Extent of) Survival be considered as a true Principle of Selection as it enables selectivity of the 'best preserved example' between otherwise similar assets, rather than as a factor relating to Appropriateness of Management Regime.
- 9.1.9. It may be necessary to distinguish between Extent of Survival as a Principal of Selection, and Survival in the biographical approach developed in the ALSF project *On the Importance of Shipwrecks* (see Appendix II).

9.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.2.1. As noted above, there is no directly applicable model from which to derive a framework for selection according to the appropriateness of management regime. However, some factors formerly considered as principles of selection, together with EH's Conservation Principles and the recent *Protected Wreck Sites at Risk* framework (see Appendix II), provide a starting point.
- 9.2.2. It is recommended that a framework for selecting appropriate management regimes is developed for the marine aggregates industry that – as well as economic and operational factors – takes into account factors such as the following:
- Condition (state of repair)
 - Fragility
 - Vulnerability
 - Human Activities
 - Natural Processes
 - Existing Management
 - Amenity Value
 - Ecological Interest

10. SELECTION IN PRACTICE

- 10.1. It is recommended that an operational framework for selection is developed for assets in marine aggregate areas, based on the six tiers above. The operational framework should be capable of application in the course of the different types of archaeological studies (desk-based; geophysical; diver/ROV-based) commonly carried out during the Environmental Assessment that accompanies aggregate licence applications.

- 10.2. The operational framework could be developed on the basis of English Heritage's *Conservation Principles* and other relevant schema, including IFA Standards and Guidance, Watson and Gale 1990 and WA's Recording Levels (see Appendix II).
- 10.3. The purpose of the operational framework would be to set out, with respect to any particular asset, the evidence, interpretation and assessment that has been undertaken with reference to each of the six tiers detailed above. Such a framework will necessarily cover direct observations (position, extent, form, character), metadata relating to such observations (who, when, precision, accuracy), secondary materials drawn upon to inform the assessment, and details of the judgement that has been reached.

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1. To conclude, this report has established a basis for selecting assets in marine aggregate areas on the basis of their 'special interest' in a way that builds upon a wide range of previous schemes of selection and which is consistent with the regime that is emerging from the heritage protection review. Recommendations have been made in respect of each of six tiers of selection, including recommendations for detailed guidance that is currently being drafted or revised. As a result, selectivity in marine aggregate areas should be not only more transparent and consistent in its own right, but also consistent with selection prompted by other marine activities, and with the selectivity being practiced on land.

12. REFERENCES

- DCMS/WAG, March 2007, *Heritage Protection for the 21st Century*. London: DCMS.
- DEFRA, March 2007, *A Sea Change: a Marine Bill white paper*. London: The Stationary Office.
- Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), March 2007, *Revisions to Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings*, DCLG Circular 01/2007, DCMS Circular PP992. London: The Stationary Office.
- English Heritage, February 2007, *Conservation Principles: policies and guidance for the sustainable management of the historic environment*, Second Stage Consultation. London: English Heritage.
- English Heritage, March 2008, *Protected Wreck Sites at Risk: a risk management handbook*.
- Parham, D. and Palma, P., March 2007, 'Identifying Shipwrecks of Historic Importance lying within Deposits of Marine Aggregate, Stage 1 – Project Report', *unpublished report for English Heritage*. Bournemouth: Bournemouth University.
- Roberts, P. and Trow, S., 2002, *Taking to the Water: English Heritage's initial policy for the management of Maritime Archaeology in England*. London: English Heritage.
- Watson, K. and Gale, A., 1990, 'Site Evaluation for Maritime Sites and Monuments Records: the Yarmouth Roads Wreck investigations', *JNA* 19.3: 183-192.
- Wessex Archaeology, July 2004, 'Princes Channel Wreck, Thames Estuary. Evaluation Work: Dendrochronological Dating, Geophysical Survey and Diving Inspection', *unpublished report for PLA*, ref: 56472.02. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology.
- Wessex Archaeology, April 2006, 'On the Importance of Shipwrecks: Final Report Volume 1', *unpublished report for English Heritage*, ref: 58591.02a. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology.
- Wessex Archaeology, January 2007, 'Wrecks on the Seabed R2. Assessment, Evaluation and recording: Year 2 Report', *unpublished report for English Heritage*, ref: 57453.03. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology.

APPENDIX I: COMPARISON OF PRINCIPLES

	Buildings DCLG Circular 01/2007	Monuments AMAA 1979 / PPG 16	Wrecks ACHWS	Parks and Gardens	Battlefields	Conservation Principles
Integral						
Narrative (Trend or Turning Point)	'...technological innovation, or ... illustrating particular aspects of social or economic history'	Period: all types of monument that characterise a category or period should be considered for preservation	Period: 'The historic interest of all types of wreck which characterise a category or period should be considered, and the selection of sites for protection should include wrecks which illustrate important aspects of social, political, economic, cultural, military, maritime, and technological history.'	Sites which were influential in the development of taste whether through reputation or references in literature.	As turning-points in English history, for example the Norman Conquest which followed the Battle of Hastings in 1066, or the turmoil of the Civil Wars in the seventeenth century which changed the roles of monarchy and parliament.	Evidential value. Historical value: illustrative.
Association	Definition of statutory criterion of 'historic Interest' includes '...close historical associations with nationally important people'		See Documentation: 'The significance of a wreck may be enhanced by close historic association with documented important historical events or people...'	Sites having an association with significant persons or historical events.	The reputations of great political and military leaders were frequently built on battlefield success.	Historical value: associational
Respect					Battlefields are the final resting places for thousands of unknown soldiers, nobles and commoners alike, whose lives were sacrificed in the making of the history of England.	Communal value: commemorative
Aesthetic	Aesthetic merits: '...intrinsic architectural merit ...'					Aesthetic value: design; artistic; artless beauty; sublime

	Buildings DCLG Circular 01/2007	Monuments AMAA 1979 / PPG 16	Wrecks ACHWS	Parks and Gardens	Battlefields	Conservation Principles
Current relevance					Tactics and skills of war still relevant to the defence of the country evolved on historic battlefields.	Communal value: social; spiritual
Relative						
Rarity	Age and rarity	Rarity: there are some monument categories which in certain periods are so scarce that all surviving examples which still retain some archaeological potential should be preserved ...	Rarity: There are some wreck categories which, in certain periods are so scarce that all surviving examples which still retain some archaeological potential should be preserved.			
Representative	Selectivity: '... represents a particular historical type'	Under Rarity: 'In general, however, a selection must be made which portrays the typical and commonplace as well as the rare. This process should take account of all aspects of the distribution of a particular class of monument, both in a national and regional context'.	Under Diversity: 'Some vessels types may be represented in the surviving record by a wide variety of building types and techniques which may be chronologically, regionally, or culturally conditioned. The sample of protected sites should reflect this wide variety of forms.'	Sites which are early or representative examples of a style of layout, or a type of site, or the work of a designer (amateur or professional) of national importance.		

	Buildings DCLG Circular 01/2007	Monuments AMAA 1979 / PPG 16	Wrecks ACHWS	Parks and Gardens	Battlefields	Conservation Principles
Diversity	National interest: '... distinctive regional buildings', 'distinctive local and regional traditions' or '...represent a nationally important but localised industry' that '...make a major contribution to the national historic stock	Diversity: some monuments may be selected for scheduling because they possess a combination of high quality features, others because of a single important attribute.	Diversity: The importance of wrecked vessels can reflect the interest in their architectural design, decoration and craftsmanship, or their technological innovation or virtuosity, as well as their representativity.			
Potential		Potential: on occasion, the nature of the evidence cannot be specified precisely but it may still be possible to document reasons anticipating its existence and importance and so to demonstrate the justification for scheduling.	Potential		Where they survive, battlefields may contain important topographical and archaeological evidence which can increase our understanding of the momentous events of history which took place on their soil.	
Extent of Survival		Survival/Condition: the survival of a monument's archaeological potential both above and below ground is a particularly important consideration and should be assessed in relation to its present condition and surviving features.	Survival/Condition	'...at least a proportion of the layout of this date is still evident, even perhaps only as an earthwork' '...enough of this landscaping survives to reflect the original design' '...survives intact or relatively intact' '...survives intact'		Evidential value, historical value and some aesthetic values ... are dependent upon a place retaining the actual fabric that has been handed down from the past.

	Buildings DCLG Circular 01/2007	Monuments AMAA 1979 / PPG 16	Wrecks ACHWS	Parks and Gardens	Battlefields	Conservation Principles
Documentation		Documentation: the significance of a monument may be enhanced by the existence of records of previous investigations or, in the case of more recent investigations, by the supporting evidence of contemporary written records.	Documentation: 'The significance of a wreck may be enhanced by ... the supporting evidence of contemporary records or representations.' The importance of a wreck may also be enhanced by the existence of records of previous archaeological recording or survey work.			
Grouping	Account of statutory criteria includes group value (para. 6.10)	Group Value: the value of a single monument ... may be greatly enhanced by its association with contemporary monuments ... or with monuments from different periods ...	Group value: The value of a single wreck may be greatly enhanced by its co-location with other similar vessels ... or by its association with other contemporary features such as port facilities or defensive sites. Association with vessels of other periods (for example on long-standing navigation hazards) may also enhance the value of a site.	Sites with strong group value.		
Objects and Collections						Historically-associated objects can make a major contribution to the values of a place, and association with a place can add cultural value to those objects.

	Buildings DCLG Circular 01/2007	Monuments AMAA 1979 / PPG 16	Wrecks ACHWS	Parks and Gardens	Battlefields	Conservation Principles
Setting and Context		Under Group Value: 'In some cases, it is preferable to protect the complete group of monuments, including the associated and adjacent land, rather than to protect isolated monuments within the group.'				Definition of the setting of a significant place will normally be guided by the extent to which material change within it could affect the place's significance. 'Context' embraces any relationship between a place and other places. It can be ... temporal, functional, intellectual or political, as well as visual ...
Exceptional				'...the work is of exceptional importance'		

APPENDIX II: OTHER RELEVANT SCHEMA

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SHIPWRECKS

In the course of the ALSF project *On the Importance of Shipwrecks*, WA developed a framework on behalf of EH for evaluating the importance of shipwrecks. The framework had a number of components.

The principal component is the 'BULSI' approach based on 'ship biographies' that addresses the following sequence:

- Build
- Use
- Loss
- Survival
- Investigation

Across the biography, the framework considered the following four themes:

- Evidence: the extent to which the quality and range of material on the seabed may contribute to an understanding of the vessel;
- Integral: questions that deal with the vessel itself;
- Contextual: questions that deal with the vessel in its wider context;
- Potential: the potential of the remains on the seabed to contribute to knowledge and understanding of a vessel, or to the wider maritime cultural landscape.

The framework also included 'Associations' – historical associations between the vessel and people, places or events – and 'Dimensions' – the different and multiple geographical scales within which a vessel might be considered important (e.g. local; regional; international).

The framework included a series of questions structured according to the BULSI framework, the four themes, Associations and Dimensions. The framework allowed for text answers and a tick box to give a consistent scale. As the framework was developed within an MS Access database, then the scale for each answer could be drawn forward as a summary to inform a Statement of Importance. The Statement of Importance is textual and comprises three elements: a summary history; a summary statement; and a break-down of importance in relation to the BULSI framework.

Although developed specifically for shipwrecks, the BULSI approach to the biography of a site could be applied to other forms of site that are built, used and subsequently 'lost' into the archaeological record. The approach might also be stretched to cover sites that are not formally 'built', but which nonetheless come – through intentional human agency – to be sites of activity. This notion of building might also encompass the natural processes that give rise to a site becoming both habitable and chosen for inhabitation.

Bournemouth University (BU) carried out a project building on the *On the Importance of Shipwrecks* project, called *Identifying Shipwrecks of Historic Importance Lying within deposits of Marine Aggregate* (Parham and Palma 2007). The project sought to enhance current records of known wrecks within the NMR using available documentary sources, and included an assessment of such sources and their usefulness for enhancing NMR records. Enhanced records are used as a basis for an assessment of wreck importance. The BU project sought to enhance records against the BULSI framework, but noted that considerable research was needed in order to fulfil the framework for each wreck.

TAKING TO THE WATER

Taking to the Water: English Heritage's Initial policy for the Management of Maritime Archaeology in England (Roberts and Trow 2002) advocated a Register of Archaeologically Important Maritime Sites on either a statutory or non-statutory basis that should:

- Include all types of archaeological site;
- Include wreck sites of known location, whose identity is unknown;
- Include well documented, potentially important wrecks, whose location is unknown; and
- Not impose limits on public access other than for those sites that are regarded as the most vulnerable to damage.

WATSON AND GALE

The interim report on investigation of the designated Yarmouth Roads Wreck (Watson and Gale 1990) was set out as an example of the application of a scheme that 'aimed to acquire information which would permit reliable, comprehensive inter-site comparisons'. The scheme identified the following topics:

- The area and distribution of surviving ship structure.
- The character of the ship structure (construction, vessel type, etc.).
- The depth and character of stratigraphy (conditions of preservation, presence of secure contexts, events in the formation of the site, etc.).
- The volume and quality of artefactual evidence (archaeological value of the assemblage or of individual objects).
- The apparent date of the ship's construction and/or loss (to assist historical research and to identify the context of other evidence).
- The apparent function (warship, merchant/nature of trade).
- Apparent origin (of the vessel, cargo/passengers or crew).

This schema has subsequently been used by WA in initial evaluations of the Princes Channel Wreck (Wessex Archaeology, July 2004). It is also commonly used in WA's assessment of Undesignated Wreck Sites under the Contract for Archaeological Services in support of the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973.

WA RECORDING LEVELS

WA has developed a series of recording levels derived originally from the RCHME's recording levels for building recording. These levels have been developed and applied over several years, notably through the ALSF Wrecks on the Seabed project (see Wessex Archaeology, January 2007). The WA recording levels set out a series of five levels that each have a specific objective and scope, which can be related to types or stages of investigation. The levels are as follows:

Level	Objective	Investigation
1	A record sufficient to establish the presence, position and types of site.	Assessment
2	A record that provides sufficient data to establish the extent, character, date and importance of the site.	Evaluation

Level	Objective	Investigation
3	A record that enables an archaeologist who has not seen the site to comprehend its components, layout and sequences.	In situ Recording
4	A record sufficient to enable analytical reconstruction and/or reinterpretation of the site, its components and its matrix.	Removal
5	A record that places the site in the context of its cultural environment and other comparable sites.	Inter-site Analysis

The recording levels can be applied to all forms of marine/maritime asset, though they have most commonly been applied to wrecks. In this form, the BULSI framework developed for *On the Importance of Shipwrecks* has been used to provide a 'Recording Focus' at Level 2.

PROTECTED WRECK SITES AT RISK

Protected Wreck Sites at Risk: a risk management handbook (English Heritage, March 2008) is an EH methodology, linked to a database, for identifying factors affecting the management of designated wreck sites. 'Risk' is equated to 'Vulnerability' in the criteria for selection of nationally important monuments for scheduling. As noted above, within this project, 'vulnerability' is being regarded not as a Principle of Selection, but as a factor in considering the Appropriateness of Management Regime.

Protected Wreck Sites at Risk provides a mechanism for recording administrative and factual information that may have a bearing on the management of a wreck, together with recording metadata about who has carried out the risk assessment and when. The scheme includes assessment of the fabric of the site and of the site's amenity value and physical/intellectual accessibility. The scheme makes provision for management actions to be set.

Protected Wreck Sites at Risk also includes a Risk Decision Tree that aids the user in assessing whether the site is at High, Medium or Low Risk. The factors to be taken into consideration within the decision tree include the current form of the site (substantial above-bed remains; limited above-bed remains; buried remains), current environment (site energy and sediment grain size), current condition (generally satisfactory through to extensive significant problems), natural processes (erosion/deposition, biological, mechanical) and human activities.

MARINE BILL: MARINE CONSERVATION ZONES

A Sea Change: a Marine Bill white paper (Defra, March 2007) proposes the introduction of Marine Conservation Zones (MCZ) to conserve or aid the recovery of:

- Rare or threatened habitats;
- Rare or threatened species;
- Globally or regionally significant areas for geographically restricted habitats or species;
- Important aggregations or communities of marine species;
- Areas representing the full range of biodiversity in UK waters;
- Areas important for key life cycle stages of mobile species;
- Areas contributing to the maintenance of marine biodiversity and ecosystem functioning;
- Features of particular geological interest.

MCZs are intended to contribute to the functioning and quality of the wider marine environment by providing a refuge within which marine species can flourish and help repopulate the wider environment, and by protecting important habitats and species from destruction.

The designation of MCZs is expected to take into account current and future socio-economic implications. Also, where there is a choice between several areas identified as potential sites, a number of factors may be relevant in selecting the most appropriate site. These additional factors include:

‘whether an area is also important for other reasons, including special archaeological or historic interest, education or research’.

Clearly, there may be a number of instances where MCZs and heritage protection coincide, for example:

- where MCZs and historic assets overlap coincidentally;
- where a historic asset warrants designation as an MCZ because it is of ecological importance for a threatened species or habitat etc.;
- where a feature of particular geological interest is also of archaeological special interest;
- where the choice of MCZ is based partly on the additional importance arising from special archaeological or historical interest.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC VESSELS

The approach adopted by the National Register of Historic Vessels (NHRV) was summarised in the course of *On the Importance of Shipwrecks* (Wessex Archaeology January 2006: Appendices Vol. 2). The NRHV applies to vessels that meet (or – in the case of nationally or internationally important vessels or sole surviving examples – are close to) the following criteria:

- Built in the UK before the end of 1955;
- Over 40 tons displacement and/or over 40ft (12.19 metres) in length;
- Based or operated in UK waters;
- Substantially intact.

There are two sub-groups within the NHRV: Core Collection; and Designated Vessels. The criteria for selection are divided into integral criteria, contextual criteria, and ‘modifiers’. The initial criteria were modified by the inclusion of criteria relating to the management of the vessel, and then subject to further revision and addition. The criteria, which are scored, can be summarised as follows:

Integral

- Technological Innovation
- Exemplary Status – Type and Construction
- Exemplary Status – Function
- Aesthetic Impact

Contextual

- Historical Associations with People and Events
- Socio-Economic Association

Modifiers

- Percentage Originality of Fabric of Vessel at the end of its normal Working Life
- Condition
- Age
- Rarity (of vessel type)
- Rarity (of vessel by function)

Project

- Conservation Strategy
- Project Technology
- Business Management
- Outreach
- Feasibility

There are over 1200 vessels in the NRHV, which are indexed on the NRHV website as follows (NB: total = 886; some vessels are not ascribed to a type):

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------|
| • Cargo Vessel | 240 vessels |
| • Experimental Craft | 1 vessel |
| • Fighting Vessel | 66 vessels |
| • Fishing Vessel | 112 vessels |
| • Leisure Craft | 157 vessels |
| • Passenger Vessel | 150 vessels |
| • Research Vessel | 3 vessels |
| • Service Vessel | 157 vessels |

As at 20 September 2007 there are 60 vessels in the Core Collection and 151 Designated Vessels.