

UK Docks, River Drive, South Shields

Archaeological Evaluation

Planning Ref: ST/0461/14/FUL

Prepared for:	Gary Wilson UK Docks River Drive South Shields NE33 1LH
Prepared by:	Chris Scott BA (Hons), MA, MCifA Solstice Heritage Crabtree Hall Business Centre Little Holtby Northallerton North Yorkshire DL7 9NY
Checked by:	Jim Brightman BA (Hons), MLitt, MCifA
Project Ref:	SOL1516-65
Document Ref:	DOC1617-36
Dates of Fieldwork:	October 2016
Date of Document:	October 2016



© Solstice Heritage 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Solstice Heritage would like to thank Gary Wilson of UK Docks for commissioning this work and for his assistance throughout the project. We would also like to thank Jennifer Morrison, Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer at Newcastle City Council, for her input to and monitoring of the work. Where map data has been used in the preparation of the accompanying figures, this is derived from Ordnance Survey Opendata and is crown copyright all rights reserved.



CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	2
1.1 Project Background.....	2
1.2 Site Location.....	2
1.3 Aims and Objectives	2
2. Policy and Guidance Framework	5
2.1 Legislation	5
2.2 Policy	5
2.2.1 National	5
2.2.2 Local	6
2.3 Guidance	7
2.3.1 National	7
2.3.2 Regional.....	7
3. Archaeological and Historical Background	8
3.1 Landscape and Geology	8
3.2 Previous Work.....	8
3.3 Potential Significance	8
4. Methodology	9
4.1 Fieldwork	9
4.2 Post-Fieldwork.....	9
4.3 Chronology	9
4.4 Quality Assurance.....	10
4.5 Assumptions and Limitations.....	10
4.6 Copyright	10
5. Results	11
5.1 Trench 1	11
5.2 Trench 2	13
6. Discussion	16
6.1 Modern.....	16
7. Conclusions	18
7.1 Confidence, Constraints and Limitations	18
7.2 Research Potential.....	18
7.3 Potential Impacts on the Archaeological Resource	18
7.4 Project Archive	18
8. Sources	19
8.1 Bibliography	19
8.2 Web Sources	19
Appendix 1 – Context Register	20
Appendix 2 – Specification	21



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Site Location	3
Figure 2 Site plan showing trench layout	4
Figure 3 Trench 1 after excavation facing east (scale = 2 m and 2 m).....	12
Figure 4 Trench 1, facing north (scale = 2 m and 2 m)	12
Figure 5 Trench 2 after excavation facing west (scale = 2 m)	13
Figure 6 Plan and section of Trench 1	13
Figure 7 Plan and section of Trench 2	15

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2 Legislation relating to cultural heritage in planning	5
Table 3 Key passages of NPPF in reference to cultural heritage (archaeology)	6
Table 4 Local planning policy.....	6
Table 5 National guidance documentation consulted	7
Table 6 Key principles of the Regional Statement of Good Practice	7
Table 7 Context Register	20



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the results of a programme of evaluation trenching undertaken on land on the south bank of the River Tyne at UK Docks, River Drive, South Shields as a condition of planning permission in advance of the demolition of an existing office and workshop, to be followed by the construction of new office and staff facilities, a new boat shed, an extension to the existing boat shed and a new jetty within the existing boat yard site. The trenching was undertaken in order to characterise the potential effects of the proposed development on the archaeological resource, with the trenches targeted to available areas of ground impact.

Two trenches of 4 m x 1.2 m were excavated by machine under archaeological supervision and any features were further investigated and excavated with hand tools. All recording was undertaken to standards as set out in the relevant Chartered Institute for Archaeologists guidance and in accordance with an agreed specification, included as Appendix 2 below.

Anthropogenic features observed were restricted entirely to landscaping deposits and truncated structural remains of a modern date. No other anthropogenic features, deposits or artefacts were identified. No Roman or medieval period harbour or quay structures were identified.

The results of the evaluation indicate that the potential direct impact of the proposed development on the archaeological resource is likely to be minor or negligible.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

This report has been prepared by Solstice Heritage on behalf of UK Docks to outline the results of a programme of archaeological evaluation. The evaluation was undertaken to address a condition of planning permission in advance of the demolition of an existing office and workshop, to be followed by the construction of new office and staff facilities, a new boat shed, an extension to the existing boat shed and a new jetty within the existing boat yard site.

1.2 SITE LOCATION

The proposed development is situated to the north side of River Drive (B1344) and on the south bank of the River Tyne, c. 100 m north of Arbeia Roman Fort (Figure 1). The site is centred at NGR NZ 36436 68111.

1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Archaeological field evaluation is defined as:

“A limited programme of non-intrusive and/or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified area or site on land, inter-tidal zone or underwater. If such archaeological remains are present field evaluation defines their character, extent, quality and preservation, and enables an assessment of their worth in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate” (Cifa 2014, 2).

The overarching aim of the evaluation was:

- To assess, through a programme of intrusive trenching, the potential physical impact of the proposed development on the archaeological resource.

The objectives of the evaluation were:

- To determine (where possible) the nature, depth, extent, significance and date of buried archaeological remains that may be located within the proposed development area
- To determine the condition or state of preservation of any archaeological deposits or features encountered
- To determine the likely range, quality and quantity of artefactual and environmental evidence present
- To answer any relevant research questions
- To inform the scope of archaeological mitigation works if required
- To produce a report on the findings at the site.

Figure 1 Site Location



Figure 2 Site plan showing trench layout

2. POLICY AND GUIDANCE FRAMEWORK

2.1 LEGISLATION

National legislation that applies to the consideration of cultural heritage within development and the wider planning process is set out in Table 1 below.

Title	Key Points
Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002)	Scheduled Monuments, as defined under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979), are sites that have been selected by a set of non-statutory criteria to be of national significance. Where scheduled sites are affected by development proposals there is a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. Any works, other than activities receiving class consent under The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1981, as amended by The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1984, which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering-up a Scheduled Monument require consent from the Secretary of State for the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.
Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990	Buildings of national, regional or local historical and architectural importance are protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Buildings designated as 'Listed' are afforded protection from physical alteration or effects on their historical setting.
Hedgerows Regulations 1997	The Hedgerow Regulations (1997) include criteria by which hedgerows can be regarded as historically important (Schedule 1 Part III).

Table 1 Legislation relating to cultural heritage in planning

2.2 POLICY

2.2.1 NATIONAL

The principal instrument of national planning policy within England is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (CLG 2012) which outlines the following in relation to cultural heritage within planning and development:

Paragraph	Key Points
7	Contributing to protecting and enhancing the historic environment is specifically noted as being a part of what constitutes 'sustainable development' – the “golden thread” which, when met, can trigger presumption in favour.
17	A core planning principle is to “conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for the contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations”.
128	During the determination of applications “local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting”. This information should be proportionate to the significance of the asset and only enough to “understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance”.
129	Paragraph 129 identifies that Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise.
132	It is noted that significance – the principal measure of inherent overall heritage worth – can be harmed or lost through development within its setting. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and any adverse effects require “clear and convincing justification” relative to the significance of the asset in question.
135	At paragraph 135 it states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In

	weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
139	At paragraph 139 it states that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.
141	In paragraph 141 amongst other matters it states that planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

Table 2 Key passages of NPPF in reference to cultural heritage (archaeology)

2.2.2 LOCAL

Under planning law, the determination of an application must be made, in the first instance, with reference to the policies of the local development plan. For the proposed development this is represented by the South Tyneside Local Development Framework (LDF) (2007) and its associated development management policies, which remains the principal tool of local development management until the implementation of the new Local Plan:

Policy	Key Points
DM6	<p>“We will support development proposals that protect, preserve and where possible enhance the historic, cultural and architectural character and heritage, visual appearance and contextual importance of our heritage assets and their settings, including:</p> <p>A; the following Scheduled Ancient Monuments/World Heritage Sites: i) Arbeia Roman Fort (and Vicus as part of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site); ii) Marsden Lime Kilns; and iii) St. Paul’s Monastery and the site of the former Village of Jarrow.</p> <p>B; the following Conservation Areas, including their historic settlement cores, distinctive open spaces and boundary walls: i) Cleadon; ii) Cleadon Hills; iii) East Boldon; iv) Hebburn Hall; v) Mariners’ Cottages; vi) Mill Dam; vii) Monkton Village; viii) St. Paul’s, Jarrow; ix) West Boldon; x) Westoe Village; and xi) Whitburn;</p> <p>C; listed buildings and structures, non-listed buildings and structures included on the council’s list of locally significant heritage assets, significant landscape features of local heritage and archaeological value and archaeological deposits and remains.</p> <p>Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Conservation Areas are shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Archaeological deposits and remains, below ground and on the surface should be recorded, and where possible, preserved in situ. Proposals for built development on: i) previously undeveloped sites; or ii) previously developed sites where archaeological interest has been established by a previous find recorded in the Historic Environment Record; will not be determined until the potential impact of the proposed development on archaeological deposits and remains has been adequately assessed and evaluated, and any adverse impacts will be avoided, minimised or mitigated, or in the absence of adequate information, will be refused.</p> <p>Planning permission will be refused if the impact of development on heritage assets and archaeological remains is unacceptable. Where appropriate, we will use Article 4 directions, planning conditions and planning obligations to secure mitigation measures to ensure that development is acceptable in planning terms.</p>

Table 3 Local planning policy

2.3 GUIDANCE

2.3.1 NATIONAL

During the evaluation and preparation of this document, the following guidance documents have been referred to, where relevant:

Document	Key Points
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (CLG 2014)	The Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) released the guidance to NPPF in March 2014 in a 'live' online format which, it is intended can be amended and responsive to comment, particular as case law develops in relation to the implementation of NPPF. In relation to cultural heritage the NPPG follows previous guidance in wording and 'keys in' with, in particular, extant English Heritage guidance documents. The NPPG references many similar terms to the previous PPS5 Practice Guidance.
Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (HE 2008)	This sets out the guiding principles of conservation as seen by Historic England and also provides a terminology for assessment of significance upon which much that has followed is based.
Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (Cifa 2014)	This document represents non-statutory industry best practice as set out by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. The evaluation work has been undertaken to these standards, as subscribed to by Solstice Heritage.

Table 4 National guidance documentation consulted

2.3.2 REGIONAL

Archaeological work within Tyne and Wear is often required to comply with *Yorkshire, The Humber and The North East: A Regional Statement of Good Practice for Archaeology in the Development Process* (SYAS 2011). The key principles in relation to the evaluation undertaken are summarised in the table below:

Principle	Key Points
2	Archaeological work should be undertaken by professionally qualified and appropriately experienced archaeologists and organisations.
3	All archaeological work will have a scope agreed in advance with the archaeological curator (this document), and any changes to the scope or methodology will be agreed in writing with the archaeological curator.
4	Monitoring of archaeological work by the local archaeological curator will be the norm, and reasonable notice of commencement of fieldwork will be given.
5	Archaeological work will be undertaken in accordance with the best practice guidance of English Heritage and the IfA.
6	The local Historic Environment Record should be consulted prior to the commencement of fieldwork.
7	Archaeological work in the planning process should have regard to national and local published research agenda (see section 4.2 below)
9	Reports and required data will be submitted to the archaeological curator and local HER in a timely fashion and in accordance with the agreed WSI.
10	Any comments made by the archaeological curator on reports and outputs will be made within a reasonable timetable of receipt.
11	Where appropriate significant archaeological findings will be submitted for publication in a suitable journal or journals.
12	Any archive produced will be deposited in an ordered and acceptable fashion within a reasonable timetable, the details of which will be given in the report.
13	During the course of archaeological work arrangements will be made, where possible, for disseminating information about the site to the general public.

Table 5 Key principles of the Regional Statement of Good Practice

3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 LANDSCAPE AND GEOLOGY

The proposed development site sits within the 'Tyne and Wear Lowlands' National Character Area (NCA). This landscape is defined as 'an area of gently undulating or rolling land, incised by the valleys of the major rivers and their tributaries' (NE 2013, 3).

The proposed development area sits on the mudstone, siltstone and sandstone of the Pennine Middle Coal Measures Formation, with a mapped superficial geology of wind-blown sand (BGS 2016).

In terms of determinant factors on the archaeological remains of the site, however, the more dominant geological influence is that of the close presence of the river. All of the trenches sit on the mapped superficial geology of wind-blown sand.

Online mapping provided by the UK Soil Observatory (2016) characterises the soils across the development site as 'sand dune soils', freely draining and lime-rich.

3.2 PREVIOUS WORK

A desk-based assessment (McKelvey 2013) identified the potential for the proposed development site to contain remains of a hypothesised Roman-period quay related to the supply base at the fort of Arbeia, located to the south of the site. The desk-based assessment also identified a likelihood for the site to contain the extension of a medieval quay wall uncovered in 2005 at the nearby SAFT site (*ibid*). Three test-pits, excavated in advance of proposed redevelopment of this former battery factory site, recorded part of the medieval quay wall to the south of the existing river frontage (Garret 2005).

3.3 POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Based upon the desk-based assessment and previous archaeological work within the immediate vicinity, there were two main foci of potential archaeological significance in relation to the proposed development site. Firstly, the potential presence of medieval and early post-medieval quay walls within the site is of regional significance through their potential to assist in the understanding of the development of the use of the river through time. There is also a much lower potential for archaeological remains dating to the Roman period. Such remains would be of international significance in their contribution to the understanding of the Hadrian's Wall system.

Given that the trenches were located so as to target areas of potential impact rather than potential or known archaeological features, there were no specific research agenda priority areas upon which this work focused.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 FIELDWORK

The two trenches were laid out in available locations, where the numerous services within the site could be avoided, and excavations were undertaken and completed on the 13th October 2016. The work was undertaken by Chris Scott and Scott Williams of Solstice Heritage.

All mechanical excavation (through overburden and non-anthropogenic levelling layers) was undertaken with a back-acting, toothless ditching bucket under constant supervision of a suitably qualified archaeologist. The trenches consisted of 2 no. 4 m x 1.2 m trenches.

Where archaeological features and deposits were encountered, these were recorded to the standards outlined in the agreed WSI and the relevant Cifa Standard and Guidance. All features and deposits were recorded on *pro forma* record sheets, drawn in plan and section at a suitable scale, and photographed. In addition to any specific features or deposits, a general record of the trench stratigraphy was made on *pro forma* record sheets, a plan and section of each trench was made at a suitable scale and photography was completed. Detailed methodology was outlined in the specification provided, and this has been included as Appendix 2 below.

Constraints on the fieldwork were extensive. Utility services within the site were widespread and required the alteration of the locations and sizes of the planned trenches. Despite this, it is considered that the evaluation was successful in providing a developed understanding of the archaeological potential of the site and, in particular, the impact area of the development.

4.2 POST-FIELDWORK

The primary site archive comprises site records and digital photography on CD. This has been used to compile this report, all of which will be deposited with a local repository museum in digital and paper format as the principal record of the evaluation work. The physical archive comprises primary field records (no artefactual material was recovered), and advice will be sought on the detailed requirements for retention and deposition. An OASIS record has been completed for this work, including a digital version of this report, the reference for which is **solstice1-265729**. Deposition of the physical archive will be undertaken following acceptance of the final project report.

4.3 CHRONOLOGY

Where chronological and archaeological periods are referred to in the text, the relevant date ranges are broadly defined in calendar years as follows:

- Palaeolithic (Old Stone Age): 1 million – 12,000 BP (Before present)
- Mesolithic (Middle Stone Age): 10000 – 4000 BC
- Neolithic (New Stone Age): 4000 – 2400 BC
- Chalcolithic/Beaker Period: 2400 – 2000 BC
- Bronze Age: 2000 – 700 BC
- Iron Age: 700 BC – AD 70
- Roman/Romano-British: AD 70 – 410
- Anglo-Saxon/Anglo-Scandinavian: AD 410 – 1066
- Medieval: AD 1066 – 1540
- Post-medieval: AD 1540 – 1750
- Industrial: AD 1750 – 1900
- Modern: AD 1900 – Present

4.4 QUALITY ASSURANCE

Solstice Heritage commits all fieldwork and post-fieldwork assessment, analysis, reporting and dissemination to be undertaken to the standards stipulated by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Cifa) as is outlined in Appendix 2 below. The project has been managed by Chris Scott, who is a fully accredited member of the Cifa (MCifa level).

4.5 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Data and information obtained and consulted in the compilation of this report has been derived from a number of secondary sources. Where it has not been practicable to verify the accuracy of secondary information, its accuracy has been assumed in good faith. All statements and opinions arising from the works undertaken are provided in good faith and compiled according to professional standards. No responsibility can be accepted by the author/s of this report for any errors of fact or opinion resulting from data supplied by any third party, or for loss or other consequence arising from decisions or actions made upon the basis of facts or opinions expressed in any such report(s), howsoever such facts and opinions may have been derived.

4.6 COPYRIGHT

Solstice Heritage will retain the copyright of all documentary and photographic material under the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act (1988).



5. RESULTS

5.1 TRENCH 1

Trench 1 was excavated within the northern part of the site and was aligned roughly east-west (Figure 3). The trench was stepped in at its southern side at 1 m depth due to the close presence of heavy materials skips at this side and could not be widened due to constraining obstacles. The trench was excavated through the loose black gravel yard surface (001), which had an average thickness of 0.08 m (Figure 4). Below this was a compacted layer of modern, clean yellow crushed stone (002) with a thickness of 0.14 m. Below (002), and located at the western side of the trench close to a high bank within the site, was a tipped mixed demolition/clearance deposit (005) containing broken brick, concrete and stone fragments within a black silty soil matrix, which had a maximum depth of 0.54 m. This deposit was similar to deposit (011) in Trench 2, although it is most likely redeposited in this context. At the eastern end of the trench (005) overlay deposit (003), another compacted layer of modern crushed yellow stone with a thickness of 0.36 m. This in turn overlay a buried surface of tarmac (004), presumably a previous yard surface, which had a thickness of 0.04 m.

Below the tarmac surface was another levelling deposit of modern crushed yellow stone (007) with a maximum thickness of 0.84 m. At the western extent of the trench this yellow stone overlay a probable drain cut (010), filled with rounded beach pebbles (008) (Figure 4). This north-west to south-east aligned cut was c. 0.7 m in height and c. 1.0 m in width. The drain was cut through a further mixed demolition/clearance deposit (009), containing broken brick, concrete and stone fragments within a black silty soil matrix which had a maximum depth of 0.90 m. This deposit was also similar to deposit (011) in Trench 2.

Underlying deposit (009), at just over 2 m below existing ground level, a probable patch of naturally-deposited beach sand was observed, although excavation could not be continued to expose this completely due to safety concerns.



Figure 3 Trench 1 after excavation facing east (scale = 2 m and 2 m)



Figure 4 Trench 1, facing north (scale = 2 m and 2 m)

5.2 TRENCH 2

Trench 2 was excavated close to the southern edge of the site, adjacent to its boundary with River Drive (Figure 5). The trench was excavated through the loose black gravel yard surface (001), which had an average thickness of 0.08 m. Below this was a compacted layer of modern, clean yellow crushed stone (002) with a thickness of 0.25 m. Beneath this modern make-up layer (002) was a mixed demolition/clearance deposit (011) containing broken brick, roofing slate, concrete and stone fragments within a black silty soil matrix. Deposit (011) had a thickness of 0.7 m. This demolition deposit overlay a flat, grey concrete surface (012), interpreted as a basement floor. The surface lipped slightly up at its eastern extent where a wall foundation was uncovered at the eastern extent of the trench. Within the northern section of the trench there were some red imperial size bricks surviving, mortared in position within this wall line. The floor itself contained three square sockets, arranged in an east-west line. These were interpreted as sockets for timber uprights within a stud partition between front and rear basement rooms within the building. The two sockets close to the centre of the trench were a regular door's width apart (c. 0.8 m), suggesting that they formed the base of the frame of a doorway at this point. Excavation was not carried on below the concrete floor, and no further archaeological features were present.



Figure 5 Trench 2 after excavation facing west (scale = 2 m)

Figure 6 Plan and section of Trench 1



Figure 7 Plan and section of Trench 2



6. DISCUSSION

6.1 MODERN

No anthropogenic features, deposits or artefacts considered to date to earlier than the late 19th to early 20th century were recovered through the evaluation trenching. Trench 1 uncovered a series of very modern make-up deposits and surfaces which relate to the raising of the site level at its eastern side, presumably to create a level yard area above the highest tide mark and with level access to the road. In deposit (005), this levelling included redeposited demolition material presumably originating from within the site.

Trench 2 uncovered further modern levelling deposits within the site, as well as the basement structure of a building fronting onto River Drive (previously Pilot Street). The building excavated is most likely the one shown in this position on the 1938 Ordnance Survey (OS) map (Figure 8), which appears to have been first mapped in 1912. This mapping date, and the construction materials seen during excavation, suggest that the building was built around 1900. The mapping and the excavation suggest an industrial use for the building, almost certainly related to the use of the surrounding site for shipbuilding, but no certain use can be definitively evidenced. The building appears to have been demolished in 1938 and the site cleared, when historic photographs show this part of the river frontage being cleared (South Tyneside Images 2016). This period of clearance and redevelopment is most likely the source of demolition deposits (009) and (011), which itself accords well with the photographic evidence showing the site as rough, cleared ground with rubble evident (Figure 9).

The evaluation did not reveal any evidence of earlier quay or harbour structures relating to the medieval or Roman period, and it seems most likely that, if surviving within the site, they are deeply buried and severely truncated by later development of the area. The limited nature of the evaluation undertaken does, however, allow for the possibility that other untested areas of the site retain some potential to host limited and/or truncated archaeological remains.



Figure 8 OS Six Inch map surveyed in 1938. Probable excavated building outlined in red.



Figure 9 Photograph dated to 1938, showing the cleared site (centre left) with the still extant Tyne Chemical Company building at the extreme left.

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 CONFIDENCE, CONSTRAINTS AND LIMITATIONS

Constraints on the fieldwork were significant and limited the available area which could be safely investigated. Despite this it is considered that the accuracy of the results of the evaluation allow a good level of understanding to be gained of the potential of the site to contain significant archaeological deposits.

7.2 RESEARCH POTENTIAL

No features, deposits or artefacts were recovered with which to address any research agenda questions or priorities.

7.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE

The results of the evaluation indicate that the potential direct impact of the proposed development on the archaeological resource is likely to be minor or negligible.

7.4 PROJECT ARCHIVE

The physical and digital archive for this project is currently held by Solstice Heritage pending acceptance of the final evaluation report. Following this, the archive will be prepared and deposited in line with the specification provided and CIfA Standards and Guidance.

8. SOURCES

8.1 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Cifa). 2014. *Code of Conduct*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Cifa). 2014. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Cifa). 2014. *Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Cifa). 2014. *Standard and Guidance for the Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Deposition of Archaeological Archives*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). 2012. *National Planning Policy Framework*. London, The Stationery Office.

Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). 2014. *National Planning Practice Guidance*. London, The Stationery Office.

Garret, F. 2005. *SAFT, River Drive, South Shields, Tyne & Wear: an archaeological evaluation*. Report No 168, Tyne & Wear Museums Archaeology Department.

Historic England (HE). 2008. *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance*. London, Historic England.

McKelvey, J. 2013. *River Drive, South Shields: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment*. Unpublished Archaeological Report, AD Archaeology.

Natural England (NE). 2013. *National Character Area Profile: 14 Tyne and Wear Lowlands*. London, Natural England.

South Tyneside Council 2007. *Local Development Framework*. South Shields, South Tyneside Council.

South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS). 2011. *Yorkshire, The Humber and the North East: A Regional Statement of Good Practice for Archaeology in the Development Process*.

8.2 WEB SOURCES

British Geological Survey (BGS). 2016. *Geology of Britain Viewer*. Available from: <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>. [10th October 2016].

South Tyneside Images. 2016. *Historic Images of South Tyneside*. Available from: <http://www.southtynesideimages.org.uk/newsite/index.php>. [17th October 2016].

United Kingdom Soil Observatory (UKSO). 2016. *Soils Map Viewer*. Available from: <http://mapapps2.bgs.ac.uk/ukso/home.html?layer=NSRISoilscapes>. [10th October 2016].



APPENDIX 1 – CONTEXT REGISTER

Context Number	Type	Description	Probable Date
001	Deposit	Modern gravel surface	Modern
002	Deposit	Quarried stone levelling	Modern
003	Deposit	Quarried stone levelling	Modern
004	Deposit	Tarmac surface	Modern
005	Deposit	Redeposited demolition material	Modern
006	Deposit	Quarried stone levelling	Modern
007	Deposit	Quarried stone levelling	Modern
008	Fill	Beach pebbles/ fill of drain	Modern
009	Deposit	Demolition material	c. 1938
010	Cut	Cut of drain	Modern
011	Deposit	Demolition material	c. 1938
012	Structure	Concrete floor of basement	c. 1900

Table 6 Context Register

APPENDIX 2 – SPECIFICATION

