



Historic England



# Norman's Bay Wreck, Pevensey Bay, East Sussex Conservation Statement and Management Plan

Mark Beattie-Edwards

Discovery, Innovation and Science in the Historic Environment



## Norman's Bay Wreck, Pevensey Bay, East Sussex: Conservation Statement and Management Plan

Mark Beattie-Edwards

NGR: TQ 69960 03146

© The Nautical Archaeology Society (NAS) and Historic England

ISSN 2059-4453 (Online)

The Research Report Series incorporates reports by the expert teams within the Investigation & Analysis Department of the Research Group of Historic England, alongside contributions from other parts of the organisation. It replaces the former Centre for Archaeology Reports Series, the Archaeological Investigation Report Series, the Architectural Investigation Report Series, and the Research Department Report Series.

Many of the Research Reports are of an interim nature and serve to make available the results of specialist investigations in advance of full publication. They are not usually subject to external refereeing, and their conclusions may sometimes have to be modified in the light of information not available at the time of the investigation. Where no final project report is available, readers must consult the author before citing these reports in any publication. Opinions expressed in Research Reports are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily those of Historic England.

For more information contact [Res.reports@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:Res.reports@HistoricEngland.org.uk)  
or in writing to:

Historic England, Fort Cumberland, Fort Cumberland Road, Eastney, Portsmouth PO4 9LD



## SUMMARY

The Norman's Bay Wreck, off the Sussex coast, was designated under the Protection of Wrecks Act (1973) in 2006 as an English or Dutch ship of unknown identity, dating between the 17th and 18th centuries AD. It was initially speculated that the wreck maybe that of the English 70-gun ship, *Resolution*, lost in The Great Storm of 1703, however dendrochronology undertaken in 2007 suggests that the vessel was built in the middle of the 17th century AD with parent timbers coming from Germany or the Low Countries of Europe. A plausible hypothesis from the Nautical Archaeology Society (NAS) is that the site represents the remains of the *Wapen van Utrecht*, a 64gun Dutch ship lost during the Battle of Beachy Head which took place off the Sussex coast of England in 1690.

In 2010 the NAS were commissioned by English Heritage to create the Norman's Bay Designated Wreck Diver Trail. The aim of the project was to develop, install and test a diver visitor trail around the wreck site. The diver trail was installed by the NAS during 2010 and launched in the spring of 2011. Since it launched, the trail has been promoted and managed by the NAS as a mechanism to provide divers with an opportunity to both visit and help survey a protected wreck in shallow water.

The Conservation Statement and Management Plan has been produced to enable local and regional stakeholder involvement in the conservation management of the Norman's Bay Wreck site, to balance both the site's protection along with economic and social needs. The principle aim of the Conservation Management Plan is to identify a shared vision of how these values of the Norman's Bay Wreck can be conserved, maintained and enhanced for future generations.

The following management policies have been formulated in accordance with achieving this principle aim:

### Management Policy 1

We will seek to enhance managed visitor access to the protected wreck site as a mechanism to enhance the value of the site.

### Management Policy 2

We will seek to improve interpretive materials for the site that accompanies some of the artefacts from the site now on display at the Shipwreck Museum in Hastings.

### Management Policy 3

Through web-based initiatives, we will seek to continue to develop a virtual dive trail for the site. This is particularly important as visibility on the site is often less than one metre.

### Management Policy 4

When projects are commissioned on the wreck we will seek to use the site as a training resource where this is appropriate.

#### Management Policy 5

We will seek to encourage the investigation and continued survey of the site and the area around the known remains to establish the full extent of the site.

#### Management Policy 6

We will seek to commission a programme of assessment and research to contribute towards a fuller understanding of the site in its entirety.

#### Management Policy 7

We will seek to undertake historical research into the Battle of Beachy Head (1690) to explore the hypothesis of the wreck being the remains of the Dutch ship, the *Wapen van Utrecht*.

#### Management Policy 8

We will seek to undertake a programme of monitoring with particular consideration being given to the impact of commercial fishing within the designation area.

#### Management Policy 9

If identified as being of Dutch origin, we will seek mechanisms to consider shared ownership and partnership working with the Dutch authorities.

#### Management Policy 10

We will seek to ensure that unnecessary disturbance of the seabed within the restricted area (by fishing and diving) be avoided wherever possible, in order to minimise the risk of damage to buried archaeological material.

#### Management Policy 11

We will seek to ensure that this management plan will be reviewed and updated on a regular basis so that it continues to reflect the conditions and state of knowledge pertaining to the site.

### CONTRIBUTORS

This Conservation Statement & Management Plan for the Norman's Bay Protected Wreck site was prepared in 2016 and 2017 by Mark Beattie-Edwards, MA, MCIfA.

The following individuals and organisations were invited to comment on earlier drafts of this document:

The Crown Estate

Historic England, Maritime Specialists

Historic England, South-East Region

East Sussex County Council HER

Sussex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority

Harbour Master, Premier Marinas, Eastbourne

Natural England

Nautical Museums Trust, Shipwreck Museum, Hastings

Bexhill Museum

*Our W* skipper David Ronnan  
*Sussex Shipwrecks* skipper Mike Keane  
*Channel Diver* skipper Steve Johnson

#### **COPYRIGHT DECLARATION**

The Nautical Archaeology Society (NAS) gives permission for the material presented within this report to be used by the archives/repository with which it is deposited, in perpetuity, although the NAS retains the right to be identified as the author of all project documentation and reports, as specified in the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (chapter IV, section 79). The permission will allow the repository to reproduce material, including for use by third parties, with the copyright owner suitably acknowledged.

#### **DISCLAIMER**

This Report has been prepared solely for the person/party which commissioned it and for the specifically titled project or named part thereof referred to in the Report. The Report should not be relied upon or used for any other project by the commissioning person/party without first obtaining independent verification as to its suitability for such other project, and obtaining the prior written approval of the NAS. The NAS accepts no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this Report being relied upon or used for any purpose other than the purpose for which it was specifically commissioned. Nobody is entitled to rely upon this Report other than the person/party which commissioned it. The NAS accepts no responsibility or liability for any use of or reliance upon this Report by anybody other than the commissioning person/party.

#### **DATE OF PLAN**

March–May 2017

#### **CONTACT DETAILS**

Nautical Archaeology Society, Fort Cumberland, Portsmouth, PO4 9LD  
Mark Beattie-Edwards; +44 (0)2392 818418; [nas@nauticalarchaeologysociety.org](mailto:nas@nauticalarchaeologysociety.org)



# CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Background and purpose	1
1.2	Aims and objectives	4
1.3	Scope	4
1.4	Authorship	4
1.5	Status	5
2	UNDERSTANDING THE NORMAN'S BAY WRECK	6
2.1	Background	6
2.2	Description of surviving features	8
2.3	Gaps in existing knowledge	11
2.4	Ownership, management and current use	14
2.5	Statutory and other designations	15
3	ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	17
3.1	Basis for assessment of significance	17
3.2	Statement of significance	17
3.3	Gaps in understanding significance	18
4	ISSUES AND VULNERABILITY	19
4.1	Introduction	19
4.2	The physical condition of the site and its setting	19
4.3	Conservation and presentation	20
4.4	Visitation	20
4.5	Inappropriate use	20
4.6	Resources and skills	21
4.7	Lack of information or understanding about the site	21
5	CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT POLICIES	22
5.1	Introduction	22
5.2	The Norman's Bay Wreck is a shared resource	22
5.3	Everyone can participate in sustaining the Norman's Bay Wreck	23
5.4	Understanding the value of the Norman's Bay Wreck is vital	23



5.5 The Norman's Bay Wreck will be managed to sustain its value	24
6 FORWARD PLAN	26
6.1 Introduction	26
6.2 Proposed projects in relation to the Norman's Bay Wreck	26
7 IMPLEMENTATION	27
7.1 Consultation	27
7.2 Adoption of policies	27
8 REFERENCES	28
9 AUTHORSHIP AND CONSULTATION	30
10 APPENDIX 1: LINKS TO WEB-BASED RESOURCES	31

## LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1: Location of the Norman's Bay Wreck site and the location of The <i>Anne</i> Protected Wreck site	2
Fig. 2: Total extent of multibeam sonar survey of the Norman's Bay Wreck designation area	2
Fig. 3: Multibeam sonar survey of the Norman's Bay Wreck	3
Fig. 4: Copper cauldron on display in the Shipwreck Museum	9
Fig. 5: Site plan of the Norman's Bay Wreck	10
Fig. 6: Exhibition on the Norman's Bay Wreck at the Shipwreck Museum	15

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background and purpose

- 1.1.1 Wreck sites may contain the remains of vessels, their fittings, armaments, cargo and other associated objects or deposits and they may merit legal protection if they contribute significantly to our understanding of our maritime past. The Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 (PWA) allows the UK Government to designate, in territorial waters, an important wreck site to prevent uncontrolled disturbance. Although the National Heritage Act 2002 enabled English Heritage (now Historic England) to assist in costs relating to works under the PWA, the responsibilities of Historic England for the physical management of designated wreck sites must align with the Historic England strategic and research priorities.
- 1.1.2 This document seeks to set out a Conservation Statement and Management Plan for the Norman's Bay Wreck, an archaeological site designated under the PWA, lying in Pevensey Bay, East Sussex (Figs 1–3). The designation order under the Protection of Wrecks Act (1973) for the Norman's Bay Wreck, dated 23rd May 2006, was laid before Parliament on the 24th May 2006 and came into effect on the 14th June 2006. In the designation orders explanatory notes it states that an area within a distance of 100 metres of Latitude 50°48.1767 N, Longitude 00°24.6380 E, is protected.
- 1.1.3 The Norman's Bay Wreck is attributed to the National Heritage List for England (NHLE); the List Entry Number is 1000084.  
<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1000084>
- 1.1.4 Historic England has published a set of *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance* for the sustainable management of the historic environment, designed to strengthen the credibility and the consistency of decisions taken and advice given (English Heritage 2008). These *Conservation Principles* are intended to support the quality of decision-making, with the ultimate objective of creating a management regime for all aspects of the historic environment that is clear and transparent in its purpose and sustainable in its application. As such, *Conservation* is taken to be the process of managing change in ways that will best sustain the values of a place in its contexts, and which recognises opportunities to reveal and reinforce those values (English Heritage 2008).
- 1.1.5 This Conservation Statement and Management Plan has therefore been produced to enable local and regional stakeholder involvement in our aspirations for the conservation management of the Norman's Bay Protected Wreck site.




Fig. 1: Location of the Norman's Bay Wreck site and the location of The *Anne* Protected Wreck site. These two wrecks are potentially from the same sea battle that took place in AD 1690.




Fig. 2: Total extent of multibeam sonar survey of the Norman's Bay Wreck designation area, undertaken in 2016 by MSDS Marine Ltd on behalf of the Nautical Archaeology Society.






Fig. 3: Multibeam sonar survey of the Norman's Bay Wreck undertaken in 2016 by MSDS Marine Ltd on behalf of the Nautical Archaeology Society.

## **1.2 Aims and objectives**

1.2.1 The principle aim of this Conservation Statement and Management Plan is to identify a shared vision of how the values and features of the Norman's Bay Wreck site can be conserved, maintained and enhanced for future generations, whilst balancing conservation with economic and social needs.

1.2.2 This has been achieved through the following objectives:

- Understanding the Norman's Bay Wreck.
- Assessing the significance of the Norman's Bay Wreck.
- Identifying where the significance of the Norman's Bay Wreck is vulnerable.
- Identifying policies for conserving the significance of the Norman's Bay Wreck.
- Realising the public value of the Norman's Bay Wreck.

## **1.3 Scope**

1.3.1 In 1995, the Archaeological Diving Unit (ADU) sought to determine factors affecting the stability of Protected Wreck sites (report ref. 95/30). This assessment considered the exposure of archaeological material, the probability of active degradation, site dynamics (energy) and sediment covering. It concluded that many of the sites designated under the PWA are actively deteriorating.

1.3.2 This assessment was subsequently reconsidered by Historic England, which sought to place an understanding of the physical stability of, and therefore risk to each designated wreck site against ongoing investigations, ease of access for visitors and potential for wider awareness. Practical measures that can conserve, maintain and enhance the values and features of the Norman's Bay Protected Wreck identified as being at risk will be delivered through this Conservation Statement and Management Plan.

1.3.3 Access to England's Protected Wreck sites is managed through a licensing scheme and authorisation by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport.

## **1.4 Authorship**

1.4.1 Contributions to this Conservation Statement and Management Plan have been sought through stakeholder involvement. Several individuals and organisations have been consulted (listed in section 9.2).

- 1.4.2 This document is based on the Historic England Standard for Conservation Statements for English Heritage Sites and draws on other similar plans for protected wreck sites (English Heritage, 2007 & 2013)
- 1.4.3 This Conservation Statement and Management Plan has specifically referenced similar statements and plans drawn up for the protected wrecks of HMS *Colossus* (English Heritage 2017, revised 2008), The *Anne* (English Heritage 2013, revised 2014) and for the Bartholomew Ledges protected wreck (Camidge and Johns 2016).
- 1.4.4 This Conservation Statement and Management Plan has been written by Mark Beattie-Edwards, MA, MCIfA, Chief Executive Officer of the NAS, who were commissioned by Historic England in February 2016 (Historic England Project Number 7062). Mark has held a license to visit and investigate the Norman's Bay Wreck since 2010.

## 1.5 Status

- 1.5.1 The final version of this report was adopted on the 19th May 2017. Notes on its status and any subsequent revisions will be maintained.

## 2 UNDERSTANDING THE NORMAN'S BAY WRECK

### 2.1 Background

- 2.1.1 The Norman's Bay Wreck came to public light on the 17th April 2005, when three friends, Paul Stratford, Martin Wiltshire and Steve Paice dived on the location to free trapped lobster pots for a local fisherman. The lobster pots had become snagged on an unknown obstruction (Stratford 2007). It was thought that prior to this visit in 2005 the site was not known of, except to fisherman as a moderate fishing snag risk (Wessex Archaeology 2006a). However, later in 2005 Paul Stratford was presented with a copper alloy cauldron from an anonymous local diver who claimed to have recovered the object some year's earlier (Stratford 2007). The cauldron is now on display in The Shipwreck Museum in Hastings, East Sussex with a label stating it was recovered in 1999, six years earlier than Paul's discovery in 2005. In addition to the copper cauldron, a number of other items including a wrought iron bolt, a concretion and a cast iron shot were recovered by divers some years earlier and anonymously handed in during 2006 (Receiver of Wreck Droit Number 158/06). Based on this evidence it can be surmised that the existence of the wreck was known about by some local divers for at least six years before being reported to heritage authorities in April 2005.
- 2.1.2 Upon making their discovery, one of the divers, Paul Stratford contacted Dr Peter Marsden at The Shipwreck Museum in Hastings and also informed English Heritage. A few small items were raised by Mr Stratford and given to Dr Marsden and were reported to the Receiver of Wreck at the Maritime and Coastguard Agency. At this time it was proposed that the remains may be those of the wreck of the British 70-gun warship, *Resolution*, known to have foundered in Pevensey Bay in the Great Storm of 1703 (Stratford 2007).
- 2.1.3 In September 2005, English Heritage contracted Wessex Archaeology to undertake an undesignated site assessment of the wreck as part of the Contract for Archaeological Services in Relation to the Protection of Wrecks Act (1973). The brief from English Heritage was for Wessex Archaeology to generate a record that provided sufficient data to establish the extent, character, date and importance of the site. Further tasks were set, requiring Wessex Archaeology to provide an accurate location and to assess the remains against the English Heritage Criteria for Designation (Wessex Archaeology 2006a).
- 2.1.4 The recorded position of the centre of the Norman's Bay Wreck is Latitude 50° 48.1767' N and Longitude 00° 24.6380' E (WGS 84) (Fig.1). The charted depth recorded at this location by the United Kingdom Hydrographic Office (UKHO) is six metres. The tidal range on the site is nearly eight meters on a spring tide, with diver recorded depths over the last five years ranging from seven to 15 meters, depending on the state of the tide. The predominant tidal direction in this location is east to west on the rising flood tide and

west to east on the ebbing tide, with slack water periods normally coming approximately two hours before the high or low water time at Eastbourne, which is located five nautical miles to the south east.

- 2.1.5 The topography surrounding the wreck is mostly flat (Figs 2 & 3). The seabed around the site is mostly composed of a compressed sand and aggregate mixture covered with a fine layer of slit and loose sand. A large number of mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) can be found within this sediment (Wessex Archaeology 2006a) as well as *Lanice conchilga* worms. Depending on the time of year, nearly all the hard surfaces on the site are covered with mussels and on many occasions the mussels have to be removed during survey tasks, which then very quickly recolonize the cleared area. Wessex Archaeology reported large colonies of mussels in September 2005, but none in the May 2006 suggesting their number swell during the warmer times of year in English coastal waters (Wessex Archaeology 2006b). All exposed timbers observed on the wreck, including those sampled for dendrochronology were badly damaged by Piddock (*Pholas dactylus*) (Nayling / English Heritage 2008).
- 2.1.6 In April 2011 the NAS dive team was joined by marine biologist Alison Bessell to undertake a marine life survey of the site. Bessell's survey indicated that most hard surfaces on the wreck are covered with a delicate hydroid and bryozoan turf of *Kirchenpaueria pinnate*, *Chartella papyracea*, *Aplidium* (*Sidnyum*) *turninatum* and occasional *Tubularia indivisa*, Dead men's fingers (*Alcyonium digitatum*), various sponges including *Suberites ficus* and the hydroid *Tubularia indivisa*. Bessell observed the presence of Tompot Blennies (*Parablennius gattorugine*), Common Starfish (*Asterias rubens*), Pouting/Bib (*Trisopterus luscus*), Common Whelks (*Buccinum undatum*), anemones (*Urticina feline*), Lobster (*Hommarus gammarus*), a variety of Nudibranchs (*Doris pseudoargus*, *Crimora papillata*, *Flabellina pedata*, *Polycera quadralineata* and *Janolus cristatus*). Numerous amphipods are also present on the wreck including *Jassa falcata*, *Erichthonius punctatus* and *Ampelisca spinipes* (Bessell 2011).
- 2.1.7 Following the 2005 survey by Wessex Archaeology it was thought that the site contained approximately 45 cast iron guns on the seabed covering an area of 40m long (north–south) by 12m wide (east–west), standing approximately between 1.5m and 0.5m high off the seabed at the northern end of the site (Wessex Archaeology 2006a). As a result of diver surveys carried out by the NAS between 2010 and 2016, the confirmed number of guns has increased to 51, with additional concreted features being found scattered around the wreck site that may also be iron guns.
- 2.1.8 The non-intrusive survey of the site is still ongoing and it is possible that more features, including guns will be found in future investigations. The size of the site and the number of iron guns suggests that the Norman's Bay Wreck is the remains of a third-rate or 'middling' warship of the 17th or 18th century. It was initially speculated that the wreck maybe that of the



English 70-gun ship, *Resolution*, lost in The Great Storm of 1703, however dendrochronology undertaken in 2007 suggests that the vessel was built in the middle of the 17th century AD with parent timbers coming from Germany or the Low Countries of Europe (Nayling / English Heritage 2008). A plausible hypothesis from the historian Frank Fox and the NAS is that the site is the remains of the *Wapen van Utrecht*, a 64-gun Dutch ship lost during the Battle of Beachy Head which took place off the Sussex coast of England in 1690 (Beattie-Edwards et al, forthcoming).

- 2.1.9 As the wreck on The Norman's Bay Wreck has not been conclusively identified it is not possible to present a comprehensive documentary history of the vessel.

## 2.2 Description of surviving features

- 2.2.1 The Norman's Bay Wreck is still being researched and recorded by the NAS with new finds being made every year. The site plan is an ever evolving view of the assemblage on the seabed. The first site plan was created by Wessex Archaeology during their undesignated site assessment visit in September 2005. This plan was published in their 2006 report for English Heritage as part of the contract for Archaeological Services in Relation to the Protection of Wrecks Act (1973) (Wessex Archaeology 2006a). All subsequent visits by both Wessex Archaeology and the NAS have used this site plan as a basis for their surveys. The methodology employed to generate the 2006 plan involved the use of a GPS diver tracking system allowing an accurate position to within one metre (Wessex Archaeology 2006a: 3). The level of accuracy from this GPS system has been relied upon for all subsequent diver surveys.
- 2.2.2 In 2005 the Wessex Archaeology dive team reported approximately 45 cast iron guns on the seabed covering an area of 40m long (north–south) by 12m wide (east–west), standing approximately between 1.5m and 0.5m high off the seabed at the northern end of the site (Wessex Archaeology 2006a). As a result of diver surveys carried out by the NAS between 2010 and 2016, the confirmed number of guns increased to 51, with an additional features being found scattered around the wreck site that may also be guns (Fig 5). The comprehensive survey of the gun assemblage is still ongoing and it is possible that more guns will be found in future investigations.
- 2.2.3 Apart from the iron guns the other main obvious feature of the Norman's Bay Wreck assemblage is a single large iron anchor which is located in the middle of the site. The GPS position of the anchor as recorded by Wessex Archaeology in 2005 was used as the centre position for the designation order which came into force in 2006.
- 2.2.4 Also included in the assemblage on the seabed is a significant amount of stone ballast, a number of small artifacts and numerous unknown features. Most of these unknown features are heavy encrusted concretions which may include additional iron guns or iron shot.

- 2.2.5 The existence of timber on the Norman's Bay Wreck was first identified by Martin Wiltshire, Steve Pace and Paul Stratford in 2005 when they came across bricks, copper, sheeting and heavily gribbled fragments of timber (Wessex Archaeology 2006a). During visits by Wessex Archaeology in 2005, two visible lengths of timber, each of around 5m in length were recorded, however these are no longer present on the seabed, most likely having been destroyed by marine wood borers. Although timber has been observed and recorded on both the west and eastern parts of the site, the most coherent articulated hull timbers are on the eastern edge of the assemblage. In their designation wreck assessment Wessex Archaeology reported that there were sections of coherent framing running down both sides of the site, just outside the limit of the site as defined by the cannons, with little of the framing being visible with the majority lying flush with the seabed (Wessex Archaeology 2006b). During 2016 investigations by the NAS physical evidence of hull framing on the western site of the site was discovered. To date no evidence has been found for any bow or stern timbers.
- 2.2.6 As previously described, a copper alloy cauldron (Museum ID HASSH 676) was recovered by an anonymous local diver and is now on display in The Shipwreck Museum in Hastings, East Sussex with a label stating it was recovered in 1999 from the Norman's Bay Wreck. The cauldron measures 48.5cm in diameter at the rim and 37cm in diameter at its base and is 23cm tall. The rim is turned over with two handles present on opposite sides (Fig. 4). A number of other small items including a wrought iron bolt, a concretion and a cast iron shot (45mm diameter) were also recovered by divers and anonymously handed in during 2006 (English Heritage List Entry Number: 1000084 / Receiver of Wreck Droit Number 158/06).



Fig. 4: Copper cauldron on display in the Shipwreck Museum, Hastings (Scale 25cm)





Fig. 5: Site plan of the Norman's Bay Wreck (NAS 2016)

- 2.2.7 Five areas of red galley bricks were observed during diving operations by Wessex Archaeology in 2005 and 2006. The areas varied in their shape and density but were all located in the northern area of the wreck. The largest concentration of bricks was recorded by Wessex Archaeology in 2006 and comprised 9 to 12 whole and partial bricks mortared together in a simple flat overlapping pattern measuring approximately 0.5m by 0.5m (Wessex Archaeology 2006a). The distribution of bricks has led to the assumption that this part of the wreck, north of the anchor, is the galley area of the vessel (Wessex Archaeology 2007).
- 2.2.8 Other material recovered from the Norman's Bay Wreck include a sheet of copper (Receiver of Wreck Droit Number 199/05); a musket ball found by a visiting diver in 2011 (Receiver of Wreck Droit Number 196/11); a piece of felt, described as light grey on the outside with black fibers or hair in the middle (Receiver of Wreck Droit Number 045/06); a piece of tile (Receiver of Wreck Droit Number 044/06) described as slightly curved with a residue of pitch on the inside, both recovered by Wessex Archaeology in 2006. To date no pottery has been found to aid with the identification of the wreck.

### 2.3 Gaps in existing knowledge

- 2.3.1 The most obvious gap in our knowledge of the Norman's Bay Wreck is the vessel's identity.
- 2.3.2 The NAS's own investigation work on the wreck has focused on improving the site plan created by Wessex Archaeology in 2006 and trying to determine the wreck's nationality and identity.
- 2.3.3 Although it was at first thought, that the Norman's Bay Wreck might have been that of the British warship *Resolution*, lost in 1703, there are a number of large ships recorded as being lost in the area in the 17th and early 18th century, making the definitive identification of the wreck difficult.
- 2.3.4 A number of possible candidates have been suggested by Serena Cant from Historic England (Cant 2013), including the *Orange Tree*, an English fireship which was possibly captured in the Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672–1674), which caught fire near Rye in 1673. Although a fireship would be expected to have only a few guns, it is known that guns were often used as ballast. Other candidates might be the Dutch ship *St Christopher* stranded near Rye in 1697, carrying a cargo of guns, although these appear to have been salvaged at the time. The German merchantman, *Sarah* or *Saragh* was lost in 1709, but would have been unlikely to have carried the number of guns found on the seabed. Another possibility might be an *Ostender* cast away near Pevensey in 1667, but again the number of guns found on the Norman's Bay Wreck might preclude this merchantman (Cant 2013: 76). If the vessels listed above are ruled out due to their expected limited armament then the most plausible candidates for the Norman's Bay Wreck were those vessels lost during the Battle of Beachy Head in 1690.

- 2.3.5 A full description of the losses of the Dutch ships at the Battle of Beachy Head in 1690 was published in 2013 by Serena Cant from Historic England (Cant 2013: 71) and online by Frank Fox in 2014. The online account by Mr Frank Fox, Dr Peter Le Fevre and Mr Richard Endsor titled '*Dutch Ships at the Battle of Beachy Head as Related to the Normans Bay Wreck*' was published on J. D. Davies's blog "Gentleman and Tarpaulins" on the 19th May 2014. This account is a reexamination of the fleets at the Battle of Beachy Head and the identification of a 'plausible candidate' for the Norman's Bay Wreck. In their online article the authors highlight that the English language sources give little details of the Dutch vessels and their fates so sought to remedy this deficit using British, French, and Dutch printed primary sources, as well as British manuscript sources (Fox et al 2014).
- 2.3.6 Re-examination of the historical accounts suggests that the Dutch fleet lost ten ships during the battle, although Cant concludes only seven losses (Cant 2013: 73). The ten losses were listed in a report from Admiral Evertsen, printed in the Dutch newspapers *Europische Mercurius* (July 1690: 45–46) and *Hollandsche Mercurius* (1690: 207–208). The ships reported to have been lost during the battle were the *Suikermolen*, *Kroonvogel*, *Friesland*, *Noord Holland* (or *Noorderkwartier*), *Gekroonde Burg*, *Wapen van Utrecht* (or *Stad Utrecht*), *Elswout*, *Tholen*, and the *Maagd van Enkhuizen* (72 guns) and the *Maagd van Enkhuizen* (6 gun fireship).
- 2.3.7 From the list of ten Dutch losses it is possible to exclude the three smaller vessels, the *Suikermolen*, the *Kroonvogel* and the *Maagd van Enkhuizen* fireship as being the Norman's Bay Wreck as simply not having enough guns. Three of the other vessels, the *Elswout*, *Tholen* and the 72-gun *Maagd van Enkhuizen* were described as being beached, abandoned and burned near the town of Hastings, six nautical miles to the north–east of the Norman's Bay Wreck. These events can be corroborated by travel passes being issued by the English government to the captains and officers of the three ships (Fox et al 2014). Three of the larger warships, the *Friesland* (or *Vriesland*), *Noord Holland* (or *Noorderkwartier*) and *Gekroonde Burg* were described as having been burnt or scuttled offshore of Beachy Head (Fox et al 2014). Using the approximate positions of these losses they are all more than 15 nautical miles south of the position of the Norman's Bay Wreck.
- 2.3.8 2.3.8. The remaining Dutch loss, the 64-gun *Wapen van Utrecht* (or *Stad Utrecht*) commanded by Captain Pieter Claassen Decker was reported by Gillis Schey, the Dutch rear admiral on the *Prinses Maria* as sinking 'along the English coast' (*Europische Mercurius*, July 1690: 47). The *Prinses Maria* had stayed with the damaged *Wapen van Utrecht* as she retreated inshore, eventually taking the crew of the *Wapen van Utrecht* aboard, before it sank during the night of the 2nd or early morning of the 3rd July 1690 (Fox et al 2014). Whilst the Dutch account is vague in its description of the location of the loss of the *Wapen van Utrecht*, another source from the 30th August 1960 is rather more exact.

2.3.9 After the battle, Queen Mary promulgated a warrant which read '*Whereas 3 Ships of Warr belonging to the States Generall of the United Provinces (another name for the Dutch Republic of 1581–1795, now the Netherlands) were burnt neare Hastings, & a 4th was sunk neare the Haven of Pemsey (Pevensey) after the late engagement of ye French Fleet*' (Fox et al 2014). The warrant went on to instruct her subjects "to assist in every way the persons appointed by the Dutch ambassador to 'fish up' the guns and equipment from these ships (Fox et al 2014, source National Archives SP 44/339, Warrants p368–369).

2.3.10 The 'Designated Site Assessment' by Wessex Archaeology (2012) highlighted a number of areas where further work is required to improve our understanding of this site. The main suggestions were that:

- A detailed examination of the remaining timbers at may produce a greater understanding of the vessel's framing pattern, which could be used to make more robust interpretations of the site's formation and highlight areas of the site for potential trial excavations. Results from this examination could be addressed within a recent study by A. J. Hoving in his book *Nicolaes Witsen and Shipbuilding in the Dutch Golden Age* and Kroum N. Batchvarov's research into the framing of the *Vasa* for instance.
- Such repeated instances of moulded bevels, scarf joints (especially outboard interlocking) at differing angles and a lack of treenails (within the timber hull structure) may further indicate the vessel's structure and *in situ* position. Opposing this, the use of wedged treenails and large compression marks could represent a differing interpretation.
- Tentative trial excavations could provide a greater range of dating and provenance however, due to the deteriorated extent of the timbers, visible (on the wreck) it is difficult to determine the productiveness of a trial trench or exploratory fanning of this area. It is also worth noting that the fragile condition of the timber samples have illustrated the need for care regarding how samples from tightly spaced timbers are removed in order to protect sapwood rings.
- Such investigations would certainly enhance the site plan and enable a greater experience for public diver trials and the NAS investigations.
- It is also suggested that further documentary research into the potential ordnance carried aboard Dutch warships from the 17th century is undertaken. Accordingly this may tentatively highlight possible candidates for recovery and further interpretation.
- If further investigation does point towards this being the remains of a Dutch ship, built solely for the purpose of War, its remains would be of unique archaeological significance. There is little or no comparative data from the period for such a Dutch vessel.

2.3.11 Recommendations made by the licensee of the wreck in 2016 (Beattie-Edwards 2016) as part of the PWA reporting requirements included:

- Continue to undertake a non-intrusive survey to build on the existing survey which has proved to be of invaluable assistance.
- Recover a gun within the main concentration of guns for x-ray and concretion removal. This exercise would help identify the type, age and provenance of the gun and therefore the wreck. This would help identify whether the wreck is in fact English or one of the Dutch ships lost in the Battle of Beachy Head in 1690.
- Continue to look for small pottery sherds that could assist in the identification of the nationality of the wreck.
- Undertake an excavation of the eastern area of the site, where organic material (in the form of hull timbers) is known to survive. The only way we are going to learn the nationality of this protected wreck, for certain is from small finds. The lack of small finds surface over the last seven years clearly demonstrates that these finds will not be made without excavation.

## 2.4 Ownership, management and current use

- 2.4.1 As the Norman's Bay Wreck has not been identified, the owner cannot currently be determined. The seabed on which the wreck site lies is owned by the Crown Estate. Public access to the site is achieved by licence under the PWA. This licensing is currently administered by Historic England.
- 2.4.2 Wessex Archaeology divers have visited the site on three separate occasions (2005, 2006 and 2007). Their first visits in 2005 and 2006 were extensive and they undertook a total of 21 dives on the site. The site was assessed by the Archaeological Contractor for Services in Relation to the PWA. The guns and anchor were positioned using an SBL acoustic position fixing system and a site plan was produced.
- 2.4.3 In 2010 the NAS began to visit the site with NAS members and recreational divers and in June 2010 the NAS applied to English Heritage for a grant to establish a diver visitor trail on the site. The visitor trail was opened in the summer of 2011 and continues to be managed by the NAS. The NAS principally uses a charter boat, *Our W*, based within Sovereign Harbour, Eastbourne, but has also visited the wreck with their rigid inflatable boat.
- 2.4.4 In 2016 there were three dive charter boats operating in Sovereign Harbour, Eastbourne—*Our W* (skipper David Ronnan), *Sussex Shipwrecks* (skipper Mike Keane) and *Channel Diver* (skipper Steve Johnson). Since the diver visitor trail opened in 2011 all three charter boats have taken divers to visit the wreck to a lesser or greater degree.

2.4.5 As physical access to the site is restricted to licensed divers, the recovery of artefactual material can in theory be managed and controlled. Any historically-recovered material would now be in private collections and the current whereabouts of much of it is unknown. A small collection of objects recovered from the site are on display in the Shipwreck Museum in Hastings (Fig 2). A small number of small finds are being stored by the NAS at their offices in Fort Cumberland, Portsmouth.




Fig. 6: Exhibition on the Norman's Bay Wreck at the Shipwreck Museum, Hastings

## 2.5 Statutory and other designations

2.5.1 The designation order under the Protection of Wrecks Act (1973) for the Norman's Bay Wreck, dated 23rd May 2006, was laid before Parliament on the 24th May 2006 and came into effect on the 14th June 2006. In the Orders explanatory notes it states that an area within a distance of 100 metres of Latitude 50°48.1767 North, Longitude 00°24.6380 East, is protected (Fig 2). The Order states that it was believed to be the wreck of the 70-gun man of war *Resolution*, off the coast of Norman's Bay, East Sussex (Statutory Instrument 2006/1392).

2.5.2 Designation under the Protection of Wrecks Act (1973) recognises the site as an historic wreck that could contribute to the understanding of the UK's maritime past on account of its historical, archaeological or artistic importance. Designation prevents uncontrolled disturbance to the site and



also means that English Heritage can develop research, education and access initiatives to raise awareness and encourage involvement in the wreck (English Heritage 2010).

- 2.5.3 The Norman's Bay Wreck does not lie within any of the current Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) areas (as of April 2017), but it does lie within the Beachy Head East recommended MCZ. The features within Beachy Head East that are most likely to be sensitive are Blue Mussel Beds, *Sabellaria* reefs, Subtidal chalk, Circalittorial Rock, Peat and Clay exposures and Native Oyster. Current advice from Natural England is to avoid these areas when anchoring and to only remove mussels which are necessary to carry out survey work (Consultation Response from Natural England, dated March 2017).
- 2.5.4 To the west of the protected wreck, the closest MCZ is Beachy Head West, along with other designated sites nearby including the Pevensey Levels Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which has an intertidal section not far from the wreck and Seaford to Beachy Head SSSI. To the east the closest protected areas are the Hastings Cliffs Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Dungeness, Romney Marsh and the Rye Bay Special Protected Areas (SPA) as well as a RAMSAR site of the same name. An interactive map of the protected zones around the wreck can be found at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>
- 2.5.5 Short Snouted Seahorses, protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) are found in the area of the wreck. Advice on diving and photographing seahorses can be found here <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/understand-marine-wildlife-licences-and-report-an-incident>
- 2.5.6 In addition, Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) places a duty on all public bodies to have regard to biodiversity. Guidance for this duty is contained in 'Biodiversity duty: public authority duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity' by Natural England and DEFRA published in October 2014.

### 3 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

#### 3.1 Basis for assessment of significance

3.1.1 *Significance* has been defined as *the sum of the cultural and natural heritage values of a place* (English Heritage 2008a). Cultural heritage value has many aspects, including:

- the potential of a place to yield primary information about past human activity (evidential value, which includes archaeological value);
- the ways in which it can provide direct links to past people, events and aspects of life (historical value);
- the ways in which people respond to a place through sensory and intellectual experience of it (aesthetic value, which includes architectural value)
- the meanings of a place for the people who identify with it, and communities for whom it is part of their collective memory (communal value) (English Heritage 2008a).

3.1.2 The historic environment is a cultural and natural heritage resource shared by communities characterised not just by geographical location, but also by common interests and values. As such, emphasis may be placed upon important consequential benefits or potential, for example as an educational, recreational, or economic resource, which the historic environment provides. The seamless cultural and natural strands of the historic environment are a vital part of everyone's heritage, held in stewardship for the benefit of future generations (English Heritage 2013:8)

3.1.3 The basis for assessing significance therefore enables consideration of the varying degrees of significance of different elements of the site. By identifying those elements which are vital to its significance and so must not be lost or compromised, we are able to identify elements which are of lesser value, and elements which have little value or detract from the significance of the site (English Heritage 2013 / Camidge & Johns 2016).

#### 3.2 Statement of significance

3.2.1 The significance of the Norman's Bay Wreck cannot be fully understood as the wreck is yet to be conclusively identified.

3.2.2 Current thinking is that the wreck site may be the remains of the *Wapen van Utrecht*, a 64-gun Dutch ship lost during the Battle of Beachy Head which took place off the Sussex coast of England in 1690.

- 3.2.3 The Norman's Bay Wreck, along with the *Anne* (lost at the Battle of Beachy Head in 1690) and the *Coronation* wrecked in 1691 (which took part in the Battle of Beachy Head) are the only identified wreck sites of the late 17th century in English territorial waters (English Heritage 2012, 10).
- 3.2.4 The historical value of the Norman's Bay Wreck is its potential to contribute to our understanding of the Battle of Beachy Head which took place off the Sussex coast of England in 1690.
- 3.2.5 We can understand the aesthetic value of the ship that was wrecked through study of the historic images late 17th century vessels. Some of the artefacts recovered from the wreck site are in themselves of aesthetic as well as evidential, historical and communal value.
- 3.2.6 The Norman's Bay Wreck site was discovered by local divers and the local community retains a keen interest in the site and may be viewed as unofficial 'custodians'. The Norman's Bay Wreck may be seen to provide a recreational (and therefore economic) resource by virtue of diving tourism. Local educational value may be viewed in relation to the display in the Shipwreck Museum in Hastings.
- 3.2.7 Whereas historical and communal values contribute to the assessment of significance of the Norman's Bay Wreck site, these values cannot stand alone. Without the continued enhancement of certain values, interest in the Norman's Bay Wreck site would be diminished. As such, extant material remains on the seabed are vital to the significance of the site and must therefore not be lost or compromised.
- 3.2.8 The Norman's Bay Wreck has potential group value with other heritage assets that also took part in the Battle of Beachy Head. These include four protected wrecks: the *Anne* (lost 1690), *Coronation* (lost 1691), *Stirling Castle* (lost 1703) and the *Restoration* (lost 1703).

### 3.3 Gaps in understanding significance

- 3.3.1 The most notable gap in understanding the significance of the Norman's Bay Wreck is the lack of a positive identification, including
- the name of the ship;
  - its country of origin and date (contributing to its historical value);
  - establishment of the full extent of the site and the identification of any buried structural remains on the seabed (contributing to its evidential value).

## 4 ISSUES AND VULNERABILITY

### 4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 This section summarises the main conservation and management issues that specifically affect, or may affect, the significance of the protected wreck and its component parts and elements.
- 4.1.2 Vulnerability (and therefore risk) may be assessed against environmental factors such as natural processes and human impact on the site, including the setting (English Heritage 2008b). Current assessment may indicate that such marine sites are at medium or high risk, unless they are completely buried below bed level during successive tidal cycles (Camidge & Johns 2016).
- 4.1.3 It is accepted that all wreck sites are vulnerable because of the nature of their environment, though sites will be considered to be at risk when there is a threat of damage, decay or loss of the monument. However, damage, deterioration or loss of the monument through natural or other impacts will not necessarily be considered to put the monument at risk if there is a programme of positive mitigation through effective management. Practical measures that affect site stability, preservation *in situ* and increased visitor access will be considered (English Heritage 2013).

### 4.2 The physical condition of the site and its setting

- 4.2.1 Although the Norman's Bay Wreck is located well within sight of the Sussex coast, but at 1.7 nautical miles from shore it is located within a marine setting.
- 4.2.2 The site is easy to access by boat from Eastbourne, but being shallow it is subject to sea swell and being located in the English Channel it is subject to tidal currents.
- 4.2.3 The greatest impediment to working on this site is poor visibility which makes navigating and working on the site very difficult. There is usually less than one metre visibility underwater, although periods of better than three metre visibility have been encountered on very rare occasions (June 2010 and April 2016). This factor makes diving and surveying the wreck difficult. Conversely, the poor visibility on the site also may afford some protection, by deterring greater authorised access as well as possible unauthorised access.
- 4.2.4 The seabed sediments around the wreck are reasonably stable, although recent diver surveys by the NAS indicate that the levels of sediments over the wreck do vary at different period of the year. Even slight changes in sediment levels can expose or completely mask features.

- 4.2.5 Although the setting of the site appears to be fairly stable, there is a direct threat arising from small scale commercial fishing activity which is known to take place near to the wreck site. On a number of occasions fishing vessels from Eastbourne have been witnessed deploying or collecting their nets very close to the wreck site. It is very difficult to determine whether this has taken place illegally within the designation area.

### **4.3 Conservation and presentation**

- 4.3.1 The site was first designated under the Protection of Wrecks Act on the 23rd May 2006 (Designation Order: No 1392), coming into force on the 14th June 2006. The protected area of 100 metres radius is centred at 50 48.1767 N 000 24.6380 E
- 4.3.2 There is some interpretive information available for the site online. Material is currently available on the Historic England and NAS websites as well as some limited information on [www.wrecksite.eu](http://www.wrecksite.eu) (Appendix 1). A digital and paper archive is held by the NAS.
- 4.3.3 There is a small display of objects and display panel in the Shipwreck Museum in Hastings (Fig 6). The known artefacts recovered from the site are currently held by the Shipwreck Museum, Hastings and the NAS. The NAS is in the process of transferring artefacts to the Shipwreck Museum as the repository for the entire collection.

### **4.4 Visitation**

- 4.4.1 There is currently a dive trail on the site which is maintained and managed by the NAS. A total of 65 divers visited the site in 2011 with 81 visiting in 2012 (NAS 2013). The NAS took 21 new visitors to the site as part of their protected wreck events in 2016. There is a waterproof guide to help divers during their visit to the site.
- 4.4.2 A virtual dive trail similar to that recently commissioned by Historic England on other protected wrecks is in preparation by the NAS and 3deep Media Ltd. When launched (due in Spring 2017) this product will allow virtual site visits.

### **4.5 Inappropriate use**

- 4.5.1 Unlicensed diving activity on the site is not believed to regularly take place. The three local charter boat skippers are in contact with the NAS (and the licensee) and have not reported any suspicious activity around the site. Therefore it would appear that local self-regulation has served to regulate illegal diving on the site.
- 4.5.2 As indicated in 4.2.5, small scale commercial fishing activity has been witnessed being undertaken near to the Norman's Bay Wreck site. On a number of occasions fishing vessels from Eastbourne have been witnessed

deploying or collecting their nets and pots very close to the wreck site, but it is very difficult to determine whether this has taken place illegally within the designation area.

- 4.5.3 Regular and consistent information relating to the condition of the Norman's Bay Wreck site will be necessary to monitor the existence (or lack) of appropriate uses of the site.

## **4.6 Resources and skills**

- 4.6.1 Recovery of archaeological material from the Norman's Bay Wreck indicates the evidential value of the site and interaction with archaeological material relates to both its aesthetic and historical value. The cost of dealing with recovery, storage and conservation of large items from a marine context is very high and this may exceed the professional and funding capacity of Historic England. In which case, external funding and professional skills would need to be obtained.
- 4.6.2 Smaller robust artefacts such as ceramic finds which can be recovered, stored and conserved easy and relatively cheaply may be able to assist in the identification of the wreck. The recovery of some of the smaller concretions on the site may reveal artefacts or information about the materials and processes forming the concretions.
- 4.6.3 In accordance with the Diving at Work Regulations 1997, underwater archaeological investigations commissioned by Historic England can only be undertaken by a registered Diving Contractor with appropriate archaeological experience.
- 4.6.4 Opportunities for seeking funding for improved interpretative and display works relating to the Norman's Bay Wreck site should be discussed with the Shipwreck Museum, Hastings as well as at other locations such as the Eastbourne Redoubt Fortress and with the Sovereign Harbour Marina.

## **4.7 Lack of information or understanding about the site**

- 4.7.1 The lack of understanding about the identity of the site means that its true significance is not yet fully known or articulated. Clarity on the provenance of the material (both chronologically and geographically) could completely alter the site's significance and may alter the conservation approach to it. A more accurate understanding of the date of the material would be very valuable. This would help target more detailed documentary research which might provide information on the origin and ownership of the wreck.

## 5 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT POLICIES

### 5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 This section of the Conservation Statement and Management Plan builds on the Assessment of Significance and the issues identified in Section 4: Issues and Vulnerability, to develop conservation policies which will retain or reveal the site's significance, and which provide a framework for decision-making in the future management and development of the site or reveal the site's significance and also meet all statutory requirements as well as complying with Historic England's standards and guidance.
- 5.1.2 It is intended that the policies will create a framework for managing change on the Norman's Bay Wreck site that is clear in purpose, and transparent and sustainable in its application. The aim is to achieve implementation through the principles of shared ownership and partnership working so as to balance protection with economic and social needs.
- 5.1.3 All policies are compatible with, and reflect, Historic England's *Conservation Principles for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment* (2008) and its published policies and guidelines, as well as the wider statutory framework.

### 5.2 The Norman's Bay Wreck is a shared resource

- 5.2.1 The Norman's Bay Wreck site forms a unique record of past human activity. In addition, the site is an economic asset and provides a resource for education, research and enjoyment.
- 5.2.2 The conflict between the wish for public and professional access to the site and the restrictions imposed by conservation needs and legislative limitations will be reconciled through continued flexible and appropriate visitor management.
- 5.2.3 Therefore, we must sustain and use the Norman's Bay Wreck site in ways that allow people to enjoy and benefit from it, but which do not compromise the ability of future generations to do the same.

#### Management Policy 1

We will seek to enhance managed visitor access to the protected wreck site as a mechanism to enhance the value of the site.

#### Management Policy 2

We will seek to improve interpretive materials for the site that accompanies some of the artefacts from the site on display at the Shipwreck Museum in Hastings.

### **Management Policy 3**

Through web-based initiatives, we will seek to continue to develop a virtual dive trail for the site. This is particularly important as visibility on the site is often less than one metre.

## **5.3 Everyone can participate in sustaining the Norman's Bay Wreck**

- 5.3.1 Stakeholders must have the opportunity to contribute to understanding and sustaining the Norman's Bay Wreck site. Judgements about its values and decisions about its future will be made in ways that are accessible, inclusive and transparent.
- 5.3.2 Heritage professionals should use their knowledge, skills and experience to encourage others to understand, value and care for their heritage. They play a crucial role in communicating and sustaining the established values of the wreck, and in helping people to articulate the values they attach to it.
- 5.3.3 Education at all stages will help to raise awareness and understanding of such values, including the varied ways in which these values are perceived by different generations and communities. It will also help people to develop, maintain and pass on their knowledge and skills. Where appropriate we will encourage the use of the site as a training resource.

### **Management Policy 4**

When projects are commissioned on the wreck we will seek to use the site as a training resource where this is appropriate.

### **Management Policy 5**

We will seek to encourage the investigation and continued survey of the site and the area around the known remains to establish the full extent of the site

## **5.4 Understanding the value of the Norman's Bay Wreck is vital**

- 5.4.1 The significance of the Norman's Bay Wreck site embraces all the interdependent cultural and natural heritage values that are associated with it. To identify and appreciate those values, it is essential first to understand the structure and nature of the place, how and why that has changed over time, and its present character.
- 5.4.2 Naturally, any judgements about values are specific to the time they are made. As our understanding develops, and as people's perceptions evolve and places change, so assessments of significance of archaeological sites will alter.



- 5.4.3 A programme of continual assessment and research is required, to contribute towards a fuller understanding of the site in its entirety. Such work will conform to the *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment* (Historic England 2015).

#### **Management Policy 6**

We will seek to commission a programme of assessment and research to contribute towards a fuller understanding of the site in its entirety.

#### **Management Policy 7**

We will seek to undertake historical research into the Battle of Beachy Head (1690) to explore the hypothesis of wreck being the remains of the Dutch ship, the *Wapen van Utrecht*.

### **5.5 The Norman's Bay Wreck will be managed to sustain its value**

- 5.5.1 Conservation is the process of managing change in ways that will best sustain the values of a place in its contexts, and which recognises opportunities to reveal or reinforce those values.
- 5.5.2 Changes to the Norman's Bay Wreck site underwater are inevitable and it is acknowledged that all wreck sites are vulnerable simply because of the nature of their environment (English Heritage 2008). We will build on the previous work to sustain heritage values, where these values represent a public interest in the Norman's Bay Wreck site regardless of ownership. It is therefore justifiable to use law and public policy to regulate the management of the Norman's Bay Wreck site as a place of established heritage value.
- 5.5.3 Any measures taken to counter the effects of natural change will be proportionate to the identified risks, and will be sustainable in the long term.
- 5.5.4 Irreversible intervention on the Norman's Bay Wreck site may be justified if it provides new information about the wreck, reveals or reinforces the values of the place or helps sustain those values for future generations, so long as the impact is demonstrably proportionate to the expected benefits.
- 5.5.5 The effects of changes to the condition of the Norman's Bay Wreck site will be monitored and evaluated, and the results used to inform any subsequent action.

- 5.5.6 If retaining any significant part of the Norman's Bay Wreck site is not reasonably practicable, its potential to inform us about the past will be exploited. This involves the recovery of information through intrusive investigation, followed by analysis, archiving and dissemination of the results at a standard appropriate to its significance.

#### **Management Policy 8**

We will seek to undertake a programme of monitoring with particular consideration being given to the impact of commercial fishing within the designation area.

#### **Management Policy 9**

If identified as being of Dutch origin, we will seek mechanisms to consider shared ownership and partnership working with the Dutch authorities.

#### **Management Policy 10**

We will seek to ensure that unnecessary disturbance of the seabed within the restricted area (by fishing and diving) be avoided wherever possible, in order to minimise the risk of damage to buried archaeological material.

#### **Management Policy 11**

We will seek to ensure that this management plan will be reviewed and updated on a regular basis so that it continues to reflect the conditions and state of knowledge pertaining to the site.

## **6 FORWARD PLAN**

### **6.1 Introduction**

- 6.1.1 In order to commence the implementation of the proposed Management Policies outlined in Section 5, Historic England will seek to commence a range of projects that will increase our understanding of the value and setting of the Norman's Bay Wreck site. These projects are outlined below.

### **6.2 Proposed projects in relation to the Norman's Bay Wreck**

- 6.2.1 A review and appraisal of all the surviving artefacts recovered from the site should be undertaken by a finds specialist to help further determine their geographical origin and date.
- 6.2.2 As the underwater conditions on the site are often poor, further enhancement of virtual (web based) site presentation should be undertaken. The finds assemblage assessment proposed above could also contribute to the enhancement of this virtual resource.
- 6.2.3 When resources are available, continued non-intrusive survey of the site should be carried out to help establish the full extent of the assemblage.
- 6.2.4 When resources are available, a programme of site monitoring should be carried out on an annual basis utilising the PWA licensing system.
- 6.2.5 A study of the historical events surrounding the 1690 Battle of Beachy Head should be undertaken, with attention especially placed on records of any salvage (fishing up) or destruction of the wrecks after the battle.

## **7 IMPLEMENTATION**

### **7.1 Consultation**

- 7.1.1 An agreed draft of the Conservation Statement and Management Plan for the Norman's Bay Wreck Protected Wreck site was internally reviewed by Historic England.
- 7.1.2 The Conservation Statement and Management Plan for the Norman's Bay Wreck Protected Wreck site was circulated for a four-week stakeholder consultation to refine how the values and features of the Norman's Bay Wreck Protected Wreck site can be conserved, maintained and enhanced. Responses to the consultation were considered and the Management Plan revised as appropriate.

### **7.2 Adoption of policies**

- 7.2.1 The Management Plan was adopted on the 19th May 2017.
- 7.2.2 A programme that identifies a timescale for implementing the plan will be devised by Historic England, taking into account those parts which require immediate action, those which can be implemented in the medium or long term, and those which are ongoing.
- 7.2.3 Responsibilities for implementation of the Management Plan lie with Historic England, though consultation with stakeholders will be maintained throughout. In addition, provision will be made for periodic review and updating of the Management Plan.

## 8 REFERENCES

- Beattie-Edwards, M *et al* forthcoming 'The Norman's Bay Wreck, East Sussex, UK—A possible 17th century Dutch ship from the Battle of Beachy Head'. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology*
- Beattie-Edwards, M 2016 'The Norman's Bay Wreck, Licensee Report 2016'. Unpublished report for Historic England/DCMS
- Bessell, A 2011 'Norman's Bay Wreck Site faunal survey April 2011. Compiled by Alison Bessell with images by Alison Mayor and Jim Fuller'. Unpublished report for the Nautical Archaeology Society
- Camidge, K and Johns, C 2016 'Bartholomew Ledges, St Mary's Sound, Isles of Scilly. Conservation Statement & Management Plan'. Draft
- Cant, S 2013 *England's Shipwreck Heritage. From logboats to U-boats*. English Heritage
- English Heritage 2005 *English Heritage Research Agenda: An introduction to English Heritage's research themes and programmes*
- English Heritage 2008a *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance, for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*
- English Heritage 2008b 'Protected Wreck Sites at Risk: A risk management handbook'. Unpublished document
- English Heritage 2010 *Protected Wreck Sites. Moving towards a new way of managing England's historic environment*
- English Heritage 2012 *Introductions to Heritage Assets: Ships and Boats: Prehistory to 1840*
- English Heritage 2013 (revised 2014) *The Anne, Pett Level, Nr Cliff End, Rye Bay, Rother, East Sussex. Conservation Statement & Management Plan*
- English Heritage 2007 (revised 2008) *HMS Colossus, Isles of Scilly. Conservation Statement & Management Plan*
- Firth, A 2014 *Heritage Assets in Inland Waters—an appraisal of their significance and protection*
- Fox, F 2009 *The Four Day's Battle of 1666. The Greatest Sea Fight of the Age of Sail*. Seaforth Publishing
- Historic England 2015 *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment*

- Nautical Archaeology Society 2013 *The Local Economic Benefit of a Protected Wreck. Report for English Heritage*. English Heritage Project Number 6606
- Nayling, N 2008 *The Norman's Bay Wreck, Tree Ring Analysis of Ships Timbers*. English Heritage Research Department Report Series 25
- Roberts, P and Trow, S 2002 *Taking to the Water: Initial Policy for the Management of Maritime Archaeology in England*. English Heritage
- Stratford, P 2007 'My dive into history: The *Resolution* Protected Wreck in Norman's Bay'. Published in *Nautical Archaeology*, the newsletter of the Nautical Archaeology Society, Summer 2007
- Wessex Archaeology 2006a *Norman's Bay Wreck, East Sussex. Undesignated Site Assessment* (Ref: 53111.02K-8)
- Wessex Archaeology 2006b *Norman's Bay Wreck, East Sussex. Designated Site Assessment* (Ref: 53111.03nn)
- Wessex Archaeology 2007 *Norman's Bay Wreck, East Sussex. Designated Site Assessment* (Ref: 53111.03zz)
- Wessex Archaeology 2009 'South East of England Designated Wrecks, Marine geophysical survey and interpretation'. Unpublished report (Ref: 699951.01)
- Wessex Archaeology 2012 *Norman's Bay Wreck, East Sussex. Designated Site Assessment* (Ref: 53111.03rrr)

## 9 AUTHORSHIP AND CONSULTATION

### 9.1 This Conservation Statement & Management Plan for the Norman's Bay Protected Wreck site was prepared in 2016 and 2017 by: Mark Beattie-Edwards, MA, MCIfA

C/O Nautical Archaeology Society,

Fort Cumberland,

Eastney,

Portsmouth

PO4 9LD

Email: [nas@nauticalarchaeologysociety.org](mailto:nas@nauticalarchaeologysociety.org)

Telephone: +44 (0)23 92 818419

### 9.2 The following individuals and organisations were invited to comment on earlier drafts of this document:

The Crown Estate

Historic England, Maritime Specialists

Historic England, South-East Region

East Sussex County Council HER

Sussex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority

Harbour Master, Premier Marinas, Eastbourne

Natural England

Nautical Museums Trust, Shipwreck Museum, Hastings

Bexhill Museum

*Our W* skipper David Ronnan

Sussex Shipwrecks skipper Mike Keane

*Channel Diver* skipper Steve Johnson

## 10 APPENDIX 1: LINKS TO WEB-BASED RESOURCES

Historic England Norman's Bay Listing

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1000084>

Nautical Archaeology Society webpage

<http://www.nauticalarchaeologysociety.org/content/normans-bay-protected-wreck-site>

<http://www.nauticalarchaeologysociety.org/content/norman%E2%80%99s-bay-wreck>

WreckSite.eu webpage

<http://www.wrecksite.eu/wreck.aspx?13567?menu=no?chart=no>

JD Davies blog

<https://jddavies.com/2014/05/19/dutch-ships-at-the-battle-of-beachy-head-as-related-to-the-normans-bay-wreck/>





## Historic England Research and the Historic Environment

We are the public body that looks after England's historic environment. We champion historic places, helping people understand, value and care for them.

A good understanding of the historic environment is fundamental to ensuring people appreciate and enjoy their heritage and provides the essential first step towards its effective protection.

Historic England works to improve care, understanding and public enjoyment of the historic environment. We undertake and sponsor authoritative research. We develop new approaches to interpreting and protecting heritage and provide high quality expert advice and training.

We make the results of our work available through the Historic England Research Report Series, and through journal publications and monographs. Our online magazine Historic England Research which appears twice a year, aims to keep our partners within and outside Historic England up-to-date with our projects and activities.

A full list of Research Reports, with abstracts and information on how to obtain copies, may be found on [www.HistoricEngland.org.uk/researchreports](http://www.HistoricEngland.org.uk/researchreports)

Some of these reports are interim reports, making the results of specialist investigations available in advance of full publication. They are not usually subject to external refereeing, and their conclusions may sometimes have to be modified in the light of information not available at the time of the investigation.

Where no final project report is available, you should consult the author before citing these reports in any publication. Opinions expressed in these reports are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily those of Historic England.

The Research Report Series incorporates reports by the expert teams within the Investigation & Analysis Division of the Heritage Protection Department of Historic England, alongside contributions from other parts of the organisation. It replaces the former Centre for Archaeology Reports Series, the Archaeological Investigation Report Series, the Architectural Investigation Report Series, and the Research Department Report Series