




## Written Scheme of Investigation for Marine and Intertidal Archaeological Mitigation

### Thurrock Flexible Generation Plant

Application document number A8.11b

APFP Regulations reference 5(2)(q)



## Quality Management

Version	Status	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Review date
0	Draft	Dr Nikki Cook	n/a	n/a	
1	Final	Dr Nikki Cook	Dr Peter Ireland	Dr Peter Ireland	19/02/2020
2	Revised following HE comment	Dr Nikki Cook			25/11/2020
3	Revised following ECC comment	Dr Nikki Cook			04/03/2021

## Approval for issue

[Date]

© Copyright RPS Group Plc. All rights reserved.

The report has been prepared for the exclusive use of our client and unless otherwise agreed in writing by RPS Group Plc, any of its subsidiaries, or a related entity (collectively 'RPS'), no other party may use, make use of, or rely on the contents of this report. The report has been compiled using the resources agreed with the client and in accordance with the scope of work agreed with the client. No liability is accepted by RPS for any use of this report, other than the purpose for which it was prepared. The report does not account for any changes relating to the subject matter of the report, or any legislative or regulatory changes that have occurred since the report was produced and that may affect the report. RPS does not accept any responsibility or liability for loss whatsoever to any third party caused by, related to or arising out of any use or reliance on the report.

RPS accepts no responsibility for any documents or information supplied to RPS by others and no legal liability arising from the use by others of opinions or data contained in this report. It is expressly stated that no independent verification of any documents or information supplied by others has been made. RPS has used reasonable skill, care and diligence in compiling this report and no warranty is provided as to the report's accuracy. No part of this report may be copied or reproduced, by any means, without the prior written consent of RPS.

Prepared by:

**RPS****Dr Nikki Cook MCIfA**

Technical Director, Historic Environment

20 Western Avenue, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire.  
OX14 4SH**T** +44 7729 429817**E** nikki.cook@rpsgroup.com

Prepared for:

**Thurrock Power Ltd****Andrew Troup**

Director

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, 239 High Street Kensington  
London W8 6SA

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Purpose of this Document.....	1
1.2	Method Statements .....	1
1.3	Mitigation Measures .....	2
1.4	Scheme description.....	3
1.5	Site Description .....	4
1.6	The Proposed Development .....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Current baseline .....	7
<b>3</b>	<b>AIMS AND OBJECTIVES .....</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1	Aims .....	17
3.2	Objectives.....	17
3.3	Research Framework.....	18
<b>4</b>	<b>MITIGATION MEASURES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1	Intertidal/marine mitigation: evaluation, monitoring and recording (Stage 2/3) .....	19
4.2	Archaeological Excavation (Stages 3) .....	24
4.3	Additional archaeological monitoring: Construction .....	25
4.4	Unexpected discoveries .....	25
<b>5</b>	<b>REPORTING .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>ARCHIVING .....</b>	<b>27</b>
	Transfer of Ownership .....	27
<b>7</b>	<b>OTHER MATTERS.....</b>	<b>28</b>
7.1	Archaeological Contractor .....	28
7.2	Standards .....	28
7.3	Insurance, Health and Safety.....	28
	References .....	29



# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 This Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been prepared as part of the application by Thurrock Power Ltd ('the Applicant') for a Development Consent Order (DCO), that has been submitted to the Secretary of State (the SoS) for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) (the PA 2008), in respect of the proposed development scheme (the Application).
- 1.1.2 This WSI sets out an overarching mitigation strategy for the intrusive and non-intrusive recording of known and potential marine and intertidal archaeological remains, to be undertaken during pre-construction, construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the proposed development scheme, as required.
- 1.1.3 The marine and intertidal archaeological fieldwork will be undertaken in line with a requirement of the DCO stating that this WSI will be complied with (i.e. by condition of any consent granted by the SoS).
- 1.1.4 A detailed Method Statement (project design), each with specific aims, will be required for each phase of work. No package of construction can commence until the archaeological mitigation measures for that package have been implemented in accordance with the method statements approved by the Historic England and the Marine Management Organisation (MMO).

## 1.2 Method Statements

- 1.2.1 The archaeological fieldwork will be undertaken in phases and in accordance with the phased construction of the Application.
- 1.2.2 A detailed Method Statement will be produced ahead of each stage of archaeological work (whether pre-construction or during construction), to be compliant with this WSI, and to be approved in advance by the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) (in consultation with Marine Team at HE).
- 1.2.3 Each focussed Method Statement will specify, in a detail project design, the techniques to be used, recording systems, finds sampling (for archaeological, geoarchaeological and environmental deposits), scientific analyses, health and safety, report publication and archive deposition that will be required for each stage of the archaeological works. A report for each stage of archaeological work will be produced, which will satisfy the WSI/method statement for that phase of work and also determine whether further work is required. In the case of mitigation excavation, should they be required, a post-excavation assessment will be produced in accordance with an agreed updated project design setting out the requirements for analysis, publication and dissemination of results.
- 1.2.4 Method Statements will be initially provided to the Applicant for comment. On receipt of comments from the Applicant and any updates required are addressed, each Method Statement will be submitted to the Marine Team at HE, in their role as archaeological advisor to the MMO, allowing a minimum of 10 working days for the MMO and HE to comment.

- 1.2.5 No archaeological works will commence unless each Method Statement has been approved. Specialist advice will be sought from the Historic England Regional Science Advisor (HE RSA) where appropriate, and the Method Statement will include provision for the MMO and HE to monitor the archaeological work as appropriate. Following approval, a 10-day period of notice will be given to the MMO and HE prior to the commencement of the agreed archaeological works in order to schedule the monitoring of fieldwork.
- 1.2.6 Each phase of archaeological work will produce an archaeological report which will satisfy the method statement for that phase of work and determine whether further work is required.
- 1.2.7 Archaeological monitoring and mitigation of any works associated with the development below the Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) within the Thames Estuary will be compliant with guidance set out in the Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee (JNAPC) *Code of Practice for Seabed Development* (JNAPC 2006) and *The Assessment and Management of Marine Archaeology in Port and Harbour Development* (Gane and Cooper 2016), as applicable. The *Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries* (to be set out in this WSI) will also be followed.
- 1.2.8 This WSI sets out the methodologies and standards that will be employed by the Applicant and their Retained Marine Archaeologist (RMA) and Archaeological Contractor (AC) to implement the mitigation strategy in format and content.
- 1.2.9 This WSI conforms to current best practice and to the guidance outlined in MoRPHE, the JNAPC *Code of Practice for Seabed Development*, *The Assessment and Management of Marine Archaeology in Port and Harbour Development* (Gane and Cooper 2016) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CIfA) *Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief*, *Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation*, *Standard and guidance for field evaluation*, *Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives*, *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* as applicable. Further guidance is also contained in *Dredging and Port Construction: Interactions with Features of Archaeological or Heritage Interest*, PIANC Guidance Document No. 124-2014 (PIANC 2014), Marine Aggregate Industry's *Protocol for Reporting Finds of Archaeological Interest* (BMAPA and Historic England 2005), *Identifying and Protecting Palaeolithic Remains: Archaeological Guidance for Planning Authorities and Developers* (Historic England 1998), *Managing Lithic Scatters: Archaeological Guidance for Planning Authorities and Developers* (Historic England 2000), *Military Aircraft Crash Sites: Guidance on their Significance and Future Management* (Historic England 2002), and *Ships and Boats: Prehistory to Present – Designation Selection Guide* (Historic England 2012). Other extensive technical guidance will also be adhered to, as appropriate, and as stipulated within each detailed Method Statement for each stage of works.

## 1.3 Mitigation Measures

- 1.3.1 Following consultation with HE it is proposed that the impact from the proposed development on the marine and intertidal archaeological interest at the site should be investigated and recorded by a staged programme of intrusive archaeological work in accordance with this WSI, following DCO consent, with work to be

undertaken pre-commencement and where relevant, during construction, operation and decommissioning phases.

- 1.3.2 Stage 1 non-intrusive geophysical survey work of areas impacted by the Application (Zones A, C, D, E, F and G), where such areas are surveyable, have been completed using magnetometry, as advised and undertaken by a specialist contractor (Wessex Archaeology). The results have been incorporated into an updated baseline and significance of effect assessment as set out in the Historic Environment Supplemental Report (RPS, December 2020).
- 1.3.3 The programme of archaeological works is anticipated to comprise the following:
- Pre-construction foreshore/intertidal recording and evaluation (Stage 2);
  - Archaeological monitoring and mitigation of works associated with the dredging activities associated with the construction of the causeway (Stage 2);
  - Additional geoarchaeological site investigation and/or monitoring works, and analysis/deposit modelling of the results (Stage 2);
  - Any marine geotechnical site investigation works (boreholes and riverbed samples), which are to be reviewed by specialist geoarchaeologists, with the results of these investigations to be linked to the results of the ongoing terrestrial geoarchaeological monitoring and deposit-modelling works (Stage 2).
  - Additional archaeological fieldwork, including mitigation excavation, as appropriate, following the results of Stage 2 works, undertaken in accordance with the phased construction plan for the development (Stage 3).
  - Publication of results (in formats to be agreed) (Stage 4).
- 1.3.4 On completion of all archaeological works across the Site, Stage 4 will comprise an overarching report which will synthesise the results of the various investigations, and will set out any further post-excavation analysis that may be required prior to the publication of the results in an appropriate, publicly-accessible format (journal or monograph). The extent, scope and format of this report will be agreed in advance with all stakeholders.

## 1.4 Scheme description

- 1.4.1 Thurrock Power proposes to develop a flexible generation plant on land north of Tilbury Substation in Thurrock. The flexible generation plant will provide up to 600 megawatts (MW) of electrical generation capacity on a fast response basis, together with up to 150 MW of battery storage capacity.
- 1.4.2 Thurrock Power is a subsidiary of Statera Energy Limited, a private British company that develops, builds and operates flexible electricity generating plant in the UK.
- 1.4.3 Statera Energy was established with the aim of delivering increased flexibility for the UK electricity system to assist in the transition to a low carbon economy in the expectation that renewable energy sources, such as solar and wind, will become the dominant form of generation of the future.

- 1.4.4 Thurrock Power will be a fully integrated developer, owner, and operator of the proposed Thurrock Flexible Generation Plant.

## 1.5 Site Description

- 1.5.1 The proposed development site is located on land south west of Station Road near Tilbury, Essex. The British National Grid coordinates are TQ662766 and the nearest existing postcode is RM18 8UL. It is within the administrative area of Thurrock Borough Council and lies in the Thurrock Green Belt.
- 1.5.2 The application boundary and location of the proposed development are shown in the Location and Order Limits Plans, application document A2.1.
- 1.5.3 The main development site currently comprises open, flat fields crossed by drainage ditches and three overhead power lines with steel lattice electricity pylons. It is immediately to the north of the existing Tilbury Substation and site of the decommissioned Tilbury B coal fired power station, with the River Thames further to the south. To the north is a section of the London, Tilbury and Southend Railway known as the Tilbury Loop, used mainly for commuter passenger services between central/east London and locations in Essex.

## 1.6 The Proposed Development

- 1.6.1 In overview, the proposed development comprises the construction and operation of:
- reciprocating gas engines with rated electrical output totalling 600 MW;
  - batteries with rated electrical output of 150 MW and storage capacity of up to 600 MWh;
  - gas and electricity connections;
  - creation of temporary and permanent private access routes for construction haul and access in operation, including a causeway for barge deliveries; and
  - designation of exchange Common Land and habitat creation or enhancement for protected species translocation and biodiversity gain.
- 1.6.2 The proposed development will be designed to operate for up to 35 years, after which time ongoing operation and market conditions will be reviewed. If it is not appropriate to continue operating after that time, one or both generating and storage elements of the development (gas engines or batteries) will be decommissioned.
- 1.6.3 For descriptive purposes, land within the order limits has been divided into zones, labelled as follows.

### Zone A

- 1.6.4 The 'main development site' immediately north of Tilbury Substation, within which the principal buildings or structures of the proposed development will be constructed. The gas engines, batteries, electrical switchgear (customer substations), runoff attenuation, control room and staff parking will be within zone A. This zone also includes land reserved for Carbon Capture Readiness (CCR).

**Zone B**

- 1.6.5 This is the existing National Grid Tilbury Substation. The proposed development will connect to the 275 kV circuit at this substation via underground cables crossing from zone A into zone B.

**Zone C**

- 1.6.6 Zone C is a corridor of land south of the railway line in which a permanent access road and underground gas pipeline will be constructed, between Station Road (which is at the north-eastern edge of this zone) and the main development in zone A. The route of the access road and gas pipeline within this corridor will be defined following detailed design. Up to two hectares of zone C may also be used for laydown or temporary construction compounds, if required.

**Zone D**

- 1.6.7 Zone D comprises sections of agricultural fields within which the gas pipeline and National Grid gas connection compound (AGI) will be constructed. The existing NTS 'Feeder 18' high pressure pipeline crosses zone D3.

**Zone E**

- 1.6.8 This zone north of the railway, currently agricultural land, is the area in which exchange Common Land will be provided together with a new footbridge connection to Fort Road. A route for access from zone F2 to zone E, across the south of Parsonage Common, is provided for use during work to establish the Common Land and footbridge.

**Zone F**

- 1.6.9 Zone F, currently agricultural land in the main with some existing scrub, will be used for habitat creation or enhancement to mitigate for the permanent loss of habitat within zone A and other areas of the proposed development. It is divided into four sub-zones (F1-4) to accommodate the habitat types proposed. Access routes for establishing and maintaining the habitat creation areas are provided from Cooper Shaw Road.

**Zone G**

- 1.6.10 This zone includes all of the infrastructure required for delivery of ALLs via roll-on roll-off barge and transport to the main development site (zone A). It includes the construction and operation of a permanent causeway on the foreshore of the River Thames, the dredging of a berthing pocket to enable barges to access the causeway, a local modification to the existing sea defences, and a haul road from the causeway to zone A. The proposed haul road will comprise part of the existing private highway infrastructure on RWE's former Tilbury B Power Station site and a new section of purpose-built road to connect to zone A. For part of the haul road route, two options are being considered; flexibility to determine the preferred option prior to construction is required due to recent ground disturbance in this area.

**Zone H**

- 1.6.11 Zone H comprises an existing private road through the former Tilbury B Power Station site and a re-aligned private road, as consented for the Tilbury2



development, which will provide the primary access route for construction traffic (with the exception of ALLs delivered via barge) from the new section of A1089 public highway being constructed for Tilbury2.

**Zone I**

- 1.6.12 This section of public highway at Station Road is subject to a Traffic Regulation Order restricting access by vehicles >7.5t in weight, which will be suspended temporarily to allow HGV traffic access for construction of the gas connection compound in zone D3.

**Zone J**

- 1.6.13 A temporary public right of way will be created, if necessary, in this zone along the existing road (where there is an existing marked recreational route). The temporary footpath would provide a diversionary route for Footpath 200 to Station Road if it is necessary for the existing footpath where it crosses zone D1 to be stopped up temporarily during gas pipeline construction.

## 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Current baseline

- 2.1.1 A detailed description of the historic environment baseline is presented within The Environmental Statement (application document A6) at Volume 6, Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment, which should be read in conjunction with this WSI. The results of the Stage 1 site-wide geophysical surveys should also be read (Wessex Archaeology 2017; Wessex Archaeology 2020) and the Historic Environment Supplemental Report (RPS, December 2020).
- 2.1.2 There is considerable evidence from known sites and finds, as well as cropmarks shown on aerial photographs, to suggest extensive activity in the Study Area throughout the prehistoric period, with multi-period sites suggesting almost continuous occupation from early prehistory. However, the main focus of settlement seems to have been the higher ground nearby at Mucking, and also at Gun Hill/West Tilbury, Linford, East Tilbury and Orsett/Chadwell St Mary. The Site is bisected from these settlements and the higher ground by part of the London, Tilbury and Southend Railway known as the Tilbury Loop, used mainly for commuter passenger services between central/east London and locations in Essex.
- 2.1.3 The Site lies within a historic landscape which is characterised as low-lying drained marshland, with small areas of rough grazing land, largely held as common but with some former dispersed farmsteads and small, irregular fields indicating piecemeal enclosure, divided by reed-filled ditches. There are few hedgerows in the flat landscape, but where they do exist species usually include hawthorn, oak, elm, and occasionally elder, blackthorn, and dog rose. Tree cover is sparse on the drained marshland and is mainly restricted to the planting associated with the industrial developments, including the sewage works, edges of settlements and hawthorn scrub and small trees either side of the railway line. Scrub and small trees also, intermittently, line roads and paths. There has been significant boundary loss within the Site and its surrounds, resulting in a more open landscape and areas of grazed and cultivated marsh and common. However, the patterns of historic drainage channels remain extant and legible and there is considerable time-depth, but with diminished legibility.
- 2.1.4 The main development site (Zone A) currently comprises open, flat fields crossed by drainage ditches and three overhead power lines with steel lattice electricity pylons. It is immediately to the north of the existing Tilbury Substation and site of the decommissioned Tilbury B coal fired power station, with the River Thames further to the south. Geophysical survey within Zone A has identified possible archaeological features in this area, and a large channel (possibly dating to the Bronze Age) was recorded in a geoarchaeological assessment (Quest 2019).
- 2.1.5 Detailed figures showing the chronological spread of sites and monuments, and historic mapping, are contained within Volume 6, Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment.

## Designated heritage assets

- 2.1.6 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefields, Registered Parks and Gardens, Protected Military Remains or Historic Wrecks lie within the Site itself.
- 2.1.7 Designated assets within a wider 5km buffer of the Site, taken from the centre of Zone A, comprise 11 Scheduled Monuments, 206 listed buildings (three Grade I, 16 Grade II\* and 187 Grade II), one Registered Park and Garden and a number of Conservation Areas. Two Conservation Areas (West Tilbury Parts 1 and 2, and East Tilbury) are located on the north side of the River: the remainder are largely to the south within Gravesham District, and most are clustered to form the historic core of the town.
- 2.1.8 Three sites within the 5km Wider Study Area are also recorded on Historic England's Heritage at Risk register. These comprise the East Tilbury Conservation Area; and the Scheduled Monuments at Coalhouse Fort and Cliffe Fort.

## Prehistoric

- 2.1.9 The Site lies c.1.25km to the south of the geological and topographical boundary of the East Tilbury Marshes Gravel (Gibbard 1985) and borehole sequences have confirmed the presence of a thick sequence of intercalated alluvial and peat deposits overlying sands and gravels of the Shepperton Gravel between c. -11m OD and -17m OD (Quest 2019). The peat deposits have been shown to provide significant palaeoenvironmental information considered to be of a national or international importance providing detail of environmental and landscape change during the prehistoric periods (Quest 2013).
- 2.1.10 From the beginning of the Holocene, the River Thames underwent a gradual transition from a braided river system to a single meandering channel and the chalk and gravel was progressively buried under deep alluvial deposits as a result of relative sea rise. During the course of the Holocene, further periods of stabilisation of the valley floor and changes in sea level are indicated in the Tilbury area by peat horizons.
- 2.1.11 No Palaeolithic archaeological features have thus far been recorded in the Study Area: at present, the EHER contains only records of findspots relating to material of this date. None are recorded within the Site itself. The considered potential for Palaeolithic material to be found within the Study Area is recorded geospatially in the EHER, and is documented as 'Low'.
- 2.1.12 In some areas where deep gravel deposits have been recorded, peat accumulation dating to the Mesolithic period has been identified underlying the alluvial sedimentation. Some findspots of Mesolithic material are recorded within the Study Area, but none within the Site itself.
- 2.1.13 However, a partial skeleton was found in 1883 within peat at c.10m below ground level (bgl) at the Tilbury Docks site (Spurrell, 1889), c.3km to the west-southwest of Zone A. More recent analysis (Schulting, 2013) has revealed the skeleton to be of Late Mesolithic date (8015–7860 cal BP): the Late Mesolithic is a period for which human skeletal finds are very rare in Britain, and such a find highlights the presence of human habitation, and the potential utilisation of the floodplain not far from the Thurrock FGP site, during this period.

- 2.1.14 Although evidence of prehistoric archaeology is limited in the Lower Thames Valley, the palaeoenvironmental record indicates woodland clearance, cultivation and animal husbandry was taking place which suggests the presence of prehistoric farming settlements close-by. The area is likely to have been marsh/swamp for much of the Mesolithic and Neolithic, periods which saw extensive use of coastal and estuarine zones for subsistence. The estuarine silts are likely to preserve any features present from these periods, such as fish traps, if they are present.
- 2.1.15 An ancient ridgeway route running between Chelmsford and Horndon-on-the Hill in Essex, and Higham in Kent, is presumed to have crossed the Thames at East Tilbury, to the east of the proposed development site at a point where the Thames narrows, and is likely to have been a well-known routeway which had been in use throughout the prehistoric period, as nomadic hunter-gatherers gradually began to settle more permanently in the landscape during the later prehistoric period.
- 2.1.16 The area surrounding East Tilbury and Lindford is recorded in the EHER as a prehistoric ritual landscape, and there are various areas of cropmarks and known sites and finds from the Neolithic and Bronze Age recorded throughout the Study Area. Archaeological evaluation by trenching and excavation has revealed occupation from the Neolithic, as well as late Bronze Age ditches belonging to superimposed field systems and limited Roman features.
- 2.1.17 At Gun Hill, c.1.2km to the north-northwest of Zone A, evidence suggests a field system may have been created by the late Bronze Age which continued in use into the Iron Age, whilst at Mill House Farm, West Tilbury, a variety of cropmarks were identified comprising ring ditches, curvilinear features, a trackway, enclosures, and pits dated to the Bronze Age, suggesting an established settlement site on the higher ground above the floodplain, c.2km due north the Thurrock FGP Site. It is likely that the people who were actively using and managing the land within Zone A and the West Tilbury Marshes were living at this location in West Tilbury, and another encampment may well have existed at East Tilbury. A Bronze Age channel ditch was also identified within Zone A during the SI works in BH1 in October 2019.
- 2.1.18 The earliest salt production in Britain using the industrial ceramic known as briquetage is now firmly dated to the Middle Bronze Age and its use extends to the early Roman period. When found at Gun Hill, the briquetage at Gun Hill was the earliest record of such material in Essex.
- 2.1.19 It is likely that the marshland area surrounding the proposed Development Site, from the foreshore at East Tilbury Marshes and Coalhouse Fort in the east, across and round to Tilbury, with its extensive saltmarsh and tidal floodplain, was actively managed for grazing and subsistence, and that the first industry in the area, that of salt production, would have been actively taking place as the landscape was reclaimed and managed and its resources exploited for both salt and animal grazing.
- 2.1.20 Settlement and funerary/ritual evidence within the Study Area continues from the Neolithic and Bronze Age into the Iron Age, with several sites seeing continued and expanded activity. There are as yet no recorded Iron Age sites or finds within the Development Site, although adjacent to Zone D, at East Tilbury Place, part of a sub-rectangular enclosure was recorded, some of which had already been destroyed by gravel extraction. The enclosure ditch was c.1.5m wide and approximately 0.75m deep: pits outside the enclosure were excavated and



contained 'soft red undecorated pottery', charcoal and animal bones dating to the Iron Age period.

- 2.1.21 The evidence from the multi-phase site at Gun Hill at West Tilbury suggest that the first major period of settlement was in the Early to Middle Iron Age, although earlier activity is recorded through ephemeral finds of Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age date.
- 2.1.22 Originally thought to be a Neolithic henge (it eventually proved to be a Late Bronze Age ringwork), the nationally significant site at Mucking, c.4km to the north-northeast of Zone A, contains remains dating from the Neolithic to the Middle Ages – a period of some 3,000 years – and the Bronze Age and Anglo-Saxon features are particularly notable. The story of the site at Mucking begins with a succession of Early Neolithic, Grooved Ware, and Beaker-attributed occupations. Eight earlier Bronze Age barrows were found, plus a Middle Bronze Age field system with an accompanying settlement. It was, though, with the establishment of its two ringworks during the Late Bronze Age that the fortified site, whose economy was fuelled by metalworking and salt production, begins to look different from other parts of the landscape, not least because of the continuous high density of occupation that stretches from the beginning of the first millennium BC through to the early Anglo-Saxon period.
- 2.1.23 It is likely from the evidence within the Study Area that the process of salt production most likely began at Tilbury Marshes during the Bronze Age, but this industrial process was certainly an established part of Iron Age life in the area, with domestic settlement focused on the higher ground, but with the low level marshlands being managed for salt production.
- 2.1.24 The settlement evidence within the Study Area is likely to have been satellite activity to the main fortified settlement at Mucking.

### **Roman/Romano-British**

- 2.1.25 Recorded sites of Roman date are widespread across the Study Area, and some material is recorded within the Site itself, on the foreshore and on the landward side of the Mean High Water mark in and around Zone G. The wider area would have been heavily Romanised and it is likely that extraction of gravel, chalk and clay continued during the Roman period. The Roman settlers significantly expanded the industry of salt production which had begun much earlier in the later prehistoric period, leading to the creation of 'red hills' and salterns – remains of salt-making activity of prehistoric and/ or Roman date.
- 2.1.26 To the south of Zone A an extensive area of Roman settlement is recorded in the area immediately adjacent to the proposed causeway and jetty (Zone G). Below the present high tide level, the area measuring c.1.1km long and c.0.3km wide (as recorded in the EHER) comprises the remains of an extensive settlement, associated with much 1st and 2nd century AD pottery, and may represent a landing-place for traffic from Kent or elsewhere. These features are highly significant, with the potential for high quality survival of organic material in the protective riverine silts. If the site was a landing point for goods, then there is potential for damaged, lost or abandoned maritime craft and features to be preserved within the riverbed sediments in the immediate area.

- 2.1.27 At Coal Road, east of Low Street Lane, c.1.3km to the northeast of Zone A, the bank of an old gravel pit produced small quantities of Romano-British pot dating to the 2nd century. Approximately 500m to the northeast, to the west of East Tilbury, a field system was recorded which comprised of a complex of field boundaries dating from the Roman period in close proximity to a late Bronze Age settlement. The presence of a number of pits and postholes in this area, combined with pottery evidence hints at the existence of a Romano-British settlement in the vicinity.
- 2.1.28 At East Tilbury, near to Coalhouse Fort, a substantial Roman building would appear to have existed in the area of St Catherine's Church, where the walls reportedly contain some Roman and later bricks. The EHER notes that it was reported in the 18th century that gravel-digging near the church often uncovered tessellated pavement, and it is likely that a high-status building was located in the vicinity.
- 2.1.29 The line of a Roman Road follows what is now Princess Margaret Road, which overlies the earlier prehistoric Ridgeway route: a corresponding road apparently approached the north Kent coast at Higham, where burial evidence has been found. Roman remains have also been recorded at Tilbury Fort to the southwest of Zone A, with finds including Samian ware and fibulae.
- 2.1.30 There was clearly a large Roman/Romano-British presence within the Study Area, involving salt production and a likely landing-stage/trading post, as suggested by the extensive area of settlement and ceramics found on the foreshore to the east of Zone G, which also extended inland with field systems, settlements and burials, including the establishment of new encampments and the re-purposing of earlier ones.

### **Saxon and Medieval**

- 2.1.31 The nationally significant site at Mucking, c.4km north-northeast of the Site, had been abandoned by the Romano-British during the 4th century and there was a gap before the Saxon occupation of the site began in the early 5th century. This was among the earliest Anglo-Saxon settlements in England. The Anglo-Saxon settlement gradually moved north over the course of two hundred years after its establishment, and during or after the 8th century, the settlement was either abandoned, or drifted beyond the area that was excavated, with the area previously occupied by the Anglo-Saxon settlement becoming part of a Saxo-Norman field system.
- 2.1.32 As was the case during the Bronze Age, where satellite settlements and activity occurred in the Study Area away from the main settlement at Mucking, so too during the Saxon period there were satellite settlements within the landscape surrounding the Site, most of which revolved around the foundation of early Christian churches. Small villages became established around the churches, which then grew into the historic settlements at East Tilbury (around St Catherine's Church); West Tilbury (around St James' Church); and at Chadwell St Mary (around St Mary's Church).
- 2.1.33 St Catherine's Church at East Tilbury may relate to Bede's earliest Christian site at 'Tilberg': the site has the potential to be an early Saxon settlement/religious site as it lies on the ancient highway from the East Tilbury ferry to Mucking and beyond. Moreover, within an arable field close to the church, heavily worked by a metal detecting group, the EHER has recorded that more than 20 early Saxon sceattas have been found, plus a range of 14th to 17th century metal objects.

- 2.1.34 The scheduled earthworks to the southwest of St James' Church at West Tilbury include a length of rampart with an internal ditch reputed to be the site of a Saxon hall – a high-status residence. In c.628 Tilbury was recorded as the location of Bishop Cedda's palace and the scheduled earthworks may indeed be the remnants of an early ecclesiastical site at this location and the original manor.
- 2.1.35 During the medieval period, the early Christian chapels and religious sites often became the foci for expanding settlements which also aggregated around earlier manors, themselves established during the Saxon period, such as those at West Tilbury, East Tilbury and Chadwell St Mary. The proposed development site was in the agrarian hinterland of these Saxon and expanding medieval settlements.
- 2.1.36 The historic settlement most closely associated with the Site is West Tilbury, which is situated at the edge of an escarpment immediately overlooking the marshes, and the hamlet around Low Street, which together form Parts 1 and 2 of the West Tilbury Conservation Area. The Low Street hamlet developed around the second West Tilbury manor of Condoovers, created in the 15th century, and Walnut Tree Cottage (Grade II listed) was the manor farm.
- 2.1.37 Evidence from West and East Tilbury Marshes and also Mucking Marsh suggests that the land was improved and used for grazing during the medieval period: the landscape is characterised by a rectilinear pattern of fields divided by drainage ditches with a medieval sea wall surviving on the eastern edge of Mucking Marsh, and a surviving counter wall and ditch at West and East Tilbury Marshes. The current footpath linking Tilbury Fort with Coalhouse Fort largely follows the line of the medieval sea wall and ditch, and part of the Zone G haulage road lies adjacent to the counter wall, which survives as a tall grassy bank.
- 2.1.38 In the Medieval period West Tilbury was a small settlement very closely related to agriculture. Much evidence of this past has been retained in the present landscape, including a complete example of a Medieval 'open field' system in the area of The Great Common Field bounded by Rectory Road, Turnpike Lane, Blue Anchor Lane and Muckingford Road. Much Medieval 'common land' upon which farmers had common rights to graze animals still remains in the vicinity of West Tilbury, including Parsonage Common and Walton Common, parts of which fall within the proposed development site.
- 2.1.39 The historic dispersed and polyfocal settlement pattern largely survives at West Tilbury, where the Grade II\* listed former parish Church of St James (now redundant and repurposed as a family home) includes 11th century fabric. The church tower and the trees around the churchyard are an important silhouette and landmark from all directions. West Tilbury Hall (Grade II) is the manor of the village. It was built in the 16th century in a prominent hilltop position on the site of the previous 'Domesday Manor', and a Medieval market and fair, both dating from the 14th century, were held at West Tilbury on the area that is now The Green.
- 2.1.40 The moated site recorded at St Chad's Well may also be the remnants of a medieval manor, although it has also been suggested that St Chad's Well may have been a Holy Well of Roman date, and located on a Roman road or trackway leading northwards from the estuary and the known settlement site on the foreshore in the area of Zone G.

- 2.1.41 The EHER also records a medieval road and causeway located on the redan outwork of what eventually became first, a blockhouse at Tilbury during the Tudor period, and later the Tilbury Fort. The road most probably connected with the ferry houses on the Essex side of the river, which were associated with boats crossing the Thames from Gravesend, with the medieval road and causeway thereby linking Gravesend with West Tilbury. Medieval Gravesend was an important and wealthy town, derived from its position on the Thames: in the 14th century Richard II granted to the watermen of Gravesend and their successors the sole right to ferry passengers to London. This right, which was successively confirmed by later monarchs, was the beginning of the long ferry, and gave great impetus to the growth of Gravesend as a maritime centre and port.

### Post-Medieval

- 2.1.42 The picture of settlement and activity in the wider area during the early Post-Medieval period was similar to that of the later medieval period and comprised mostly the continuation of the established medieval settlement, enclosure, agricultural practices and routeways through the landscape, with little expansion.
- 2.1.43 However, the wider area was significant in the defence of the River Thames from at least the reign of Henry VIII onwards, as it appears that it was during the Post-Medieval period that the first fortifications appear on the shorelines on both sides of the Lower Thames Estuary, including the scheduled monuments comprising Tilbury Fort and the early phases of the mainly 19th century Coalhouse Fort on the Essex side, and a blockhouse at Gravesend on the Kent side.
- 2.1.44 King Henry VIII ordered the building of a blockhouse at Tilbury in 1539 and also new marsh roads (Fort Road and Cooper Shaw Road) that cut across West Tilbury Green and other common land. The blockhouse at Tilbury was superseded by the far larger and more complex fort and battery seen today, which is pentagonal, double-moated star-plan, with arrowhead-shaped bastions projecting from four of the angles, designed by the chief engineer to Charles I, Sir Bernard de Gomme and succeeded the Henrican blockhouse in the late 17th century.
- 2.1.45 Gravesend Blockhouse located c.2.1km southwest of Zone A on the south bank of the River Thames was built in 1539 as part of a chain of coastal defences in response to the renewed threat of invasion. It was one of five artillery blockhouses built along this stretch of the River Thames to defend the approach to London and the dockyards at Woolwich and Deptford. The other blockhouses were located at Tilbury, Higham, Milton and East Tilbury. The Gravesend Blockhouse crossed its fire with Tilbury Blockhouse on the north bank of the river and guarded the ferry crossing between Gravesend and Tilbury.
- 2.1.46 The site of Coalhouse Wharf and the Coastguard Lookout is thought to be the location of the 1540 blockhouse at East Tilbury: a second blockhouse was built subsequently to the seaward side of the first, and by 1735 this was described as 'inundated and ruined by the sea'.
- 2.1.47 West Tilbury also has a well-chronicled association with Elizabeth I and her address to the troops at the time of the Armada in August 1588, at their camp at Gun Hill.
- 2.1.48 Within an area surrounded by Zone G of the Site, 'Wick House' is recorded from documentary sources as a Post-Medieval site c.100m southeast of the 400kv



substation at Tilbury Power Station, but this has not been identified on the ground, and the area is now much disturbed. It may once have been a small farmstead.

## 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries

- 2.1.49 As noted in its Conservation Area appraisal, the timber-framed buildings and oldest plan forms at West Tilbury date from the medieval period, but the present external appearance of many of these earlier original buildings owe their external surface character from the later agriculturally prosperous 18th and 19th centuries, including the later use of render or re-facing in brick, the raising of roofs and the alteration of doors, porches and windows which hide a wealth of earlier historic details. The settlement prospered and grew, but with little physical change to its size. The majority of the Grade II listed buildings within the Conservation Area at West Tilbury are of late 18th or early 19th century date and cluster around The Green.
- 2.1.50 The River Thames, providing easy access to London, became heavily defended during the Post-Medieval period and later, with modernisations to Tilbury Fort, and the construction of New Tavern Fort at Gravesend (a scheduled monument, and Grade II\* listed), with the fort at Gravesend designed and built to provide cross fire with Tilbury Fort on the north side of the river.
- 2.1.51 The first phase of the present Coalhouse Fort scheduled monument was begun in 1799 but was disarmed and abandoned after the Battle of Waterloo, and was enlarged and replaced in 1847-55 by a more complex structure. Following recommendations made by the Royal Commission on the Defence of the UK in 1860 the fort of the 1850s was then superseded by the present buildings between 1861-74.
- 2.1.52 Cliffe Fort, also a scheduled monument, is located c.4km east of Zone A, on the southeast side of the Thames in Kent, and lies due east of Coalhouse Fort as a pair defending The Lower Hope at a bend in the Thames leading into Gravesend Reach. The Fort was constructed during the 1860s as part of the River Thames' coastal defence system.
- 2.1.53 Shornmead Fort is located c.3.2 km southeast of Zone A, on the south side of the Thames in Kent, c.2km around the foreshore to the southwest of Cliffe Fort and was built with the intention to cross its fire with Coalhouse and Cliffe Forts in defending this part of the River.
- 2.1.54 By 1854, the London Tilbury and Southend Railway had been constructed. The railway line divides the application Site and bisects the historic settlements to the north from the ancient marshland commons and managed landscape to the south. The railway provided access to the landing stage at Tilbury for passenger liners, which was replaced in 1924 by the present structure, comprising Riverside Station and floating landing stage, which is Grade II\* listed, located c.2km southwest of Zone A and to the west of Tilbury Fort. There was also a station at Low Street.
- 2.1.55 The construction of the railway severed some of the historic routeways linking the settlements and higher ground to the farmland marshes, and altered some field patterns as the fields were bisected.

## Early 20<sup>th</sup> century

- 2.1.56 At the end of the 19th century, there had been little socio-economic change since the medieval period within the immediate area of the Site, which had remained largely rural and agricultural in nature. However, to the west, Tilbury Docks were opened in 1886 to alleviate congestion in the main London docks in the East End, and began the process of the gradual modern industrialisation of this part of the Thames.
- 2.1.57 At the same time, the construction of the railway and development of the Docks led to the beginnings of the creation of the modern urban town of Tilbury on the Chadwell Marshes to the west of the Site, to house the workers.
- 2.1.58 At East Tilbury, c.1.5 km northeast of Zone A, a purpose-built industrial village was developed between the 1930s and the 1960s for the British Bata Shoe Company Ltd as one of a number of satellites or colonies that the parent organisation, the Bata Shoe Company, based in Zlin, near what is now the eastern border of the Czech Republic, was constructing around the world in the 1930s. The East Tilbury Conservation area now covers the site and surroundings, and some of the houses and buildings within are also Grade II listed. Both the layout and design of the pre-war factory, housing and community facilities were devised by the parent company and the settlement combines Garden City planning and Modernist architecture. Its character has subsequently been diluted by a large private residential development of the 1970s and piecemeal change to the company buildings and is on the Heritage at Risk register.
- 2.1.59 During the First World War anti-aircraft guns at Tilbury Fort brought down a German airship, whilst to the north at Orsett there was a military airfield, which operated as a landing ground from 1916 to 1919 during the early days of military aviation.

## World War II

- 2.1.60 A number of defensive features of Second World War date have been recorded both within the application Site and in its vicinity. During WWII there was the development of a wide range of defensive measures to meet the much greater threat of invasion and attack from the air, and included anti-aircraft batteries, gun emplacements (spigot mortars), road barriers and anti-landing ditches, particularly within locations considered vulnerable to attack, such as Lower Thames Estuary. The low-lying topography of Essex, particularly along the coast, presented many such vulnerable locations, and many fields were criss-crossed with ditches to prevent their use by enemy aircraft.
- 2.1.61 During the course of the Second World War, military features appeared in the English landscape on an unprecedented scale, but their impact was largely ephemeral, as the majority of features were removed at the end of hostilities. The appearance of cropmarks of medieval and earlier sites on both NMP mapping and Lidar data also indicates that these anti-invasion defences probably had little impact on earlier archaeological features beyond the ditches.
- 2.1.62 At both Mucking Marsh and West and East Tilbury Marshes, there are spreads of anti-glider ditches recorded from aerial photos, although none of those recorded within the Site are now visible.

## Post-War (Modern) to present

- 2.1.63 In the 1940s, with the expansion of urban Tilbury, a sewage works was built to the south of the town, immediately adjacent and to the east of Tilbury Fort.
- 2.1.64 Tilbury 'A' Power Station was constructed to the southwest of the Site and adjacent to the sewage works between 1949 and 1957. Tilbury 'B' was constructed adjacent to Tilbury 'A' during the 1960s. At this time the jetty was lengthened to the east and its original coal-handling cranes were replaced. By the 1970s works buildings and an electricity sub-station had been constructed and a number of overhead power lines crossed the wider area.
- 2.1.65 The two Tilbury Power Stations, A and B, were built on made ground previously reclaimed from marsh and their construction obliterated the only historic farmstead in the zone – Marsh Farm. Tilbury 'A' was partly demolished in 1999, whilst Tilbury 'B' was converted to biomass in 2011. The jetty was enlarged in 2004. Following the closure of the Power Station, a programme of demolition has commenced across the remainder of 'A' and 'B' and relatively few structures now remain.
- 2.1.66 The former Tilbury Power Station site is currently being redeveloped to create a new port terminal, Tilbury2, comprising modifications and enlargements to the existing jetty and other marine works, as well as warehousing, other buildings and structures, and a new railway provision with improved road bridge.
- 2.1.67 At the time of writing, site investigation works are being undertaken to the east of Zone A on the East Tilbury Marshes as part of a plan for a Lower Thames Crossing to be put forward by Highways England as a DCO application in 2020/2021.

### 3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Aims

- 3.1.1 The specific aim of this WSI is to set out the baseline resource for the known and potential archaeological assets within the site, and the mitigation strategies proposed to address the impacts identified.
- 3.1.2 The general aims of the archaeological mitigation programme are as follows:
- To determine the location, extent, date, character, condition, significance and quality of the archaeological remains within the area of mitigation;
  - To seek to clarify the nature and extent of existing disturbance and intrusions, and hence assess the degree of archaeological survival of buried deposits and any surviving structures of archaeological significance;
  - To inform the scope and nature of any further archaeological work that may be required or the formation of a mitigation strategy and/or management strategy;
  - To mitigate (offset) the loss of the archaeological remains within the areas of significant archaeological potential;
  - To preserve the archaeological evidence contained within the site by record, and to attempt a reconstruction of the history and use of the site;
  - To record all archaeological remains encountered in detail;
  - To assess the artefactual and environmental potential of the archaeological deposits encountered;
  - To assess the archaeological features in line with relevant research agendas;
  - To consider the site within its local, regional and national context as appropriate;
  - To produce a site archive for deposition with an appropriate museum, and to provide information for accession to the Essex HER, to ensure the long-term survival of the excavated data;
  - Publication and dissemination of results to stakeholders at all levels, as appropriate.

#### 3.2 Objectives

- 3.2.1 The objectives of this WSI are as follows:
- to fulfil the requirements of the Archaeological Curators (Marine team at HE advising the MMO) in respect of archaeological monitoring and mitigation of works associated with the construction activities associated with the project;
  - to mitigate the impact of these works at the Thurrock FGP site via appropriate and recognised strategies;



- to propose measures for mitigating effects upon any archaeological material that may be encountered during the operations associated with the scheme, including watching briefs on dredgers and in the intertidal zone;
- to ensure that any further geophysical and geotechnical investigations associated with the project are subject to archaeological input and review with subsequent recording and sampling if necessary;
- to provide for archaeological involvement in any diver and/or Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) obstruction surveys conducted for the scheme; and
- to establish the reporting, publication, conservation and archiving requirements for the archaeological works undertaken in the course of the scheme.

3.2.2 Site specific objectives will be set out clearly in the separate Method Statements produced for each phase of archaeological work.

### **3.3 Research Framework**

3.3.1 The programme of archaeological investigation will be conducted within the general research parameters and objectives defined by 'Research and Archaeology Revisited: a revised framework for the East of England' (compiled by M. Medlycott; 2011) and the earlier Archaeological Research Frameworks edited by Glazebrook (1997) and Brown and Glazebrook (2000).

## 4 MITIGATION MEASURES

### 4.1 Intertidal/marine mitigation: evaluation, monitoring and recording (Stage 2/3)

- 4.1.1 This comprises the mitigation strategy for marine and intertidal archaeological deposits below Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) in the Thames Estuary.
- 4.1.2 A causeway will be constructed to enable delivery by barge of certain abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) that are too large to transport on the highway network. The causeway will be located at the south of the former Tilbury B power station site, south of the flexible generation plant main development site.
- 4.1.3 The causeway will be approximately 195 m long, approximately 12.5 m wide on its top running surface and 24 m wide at its base, and approximately 1 m to 4.3 m in height above Ordnance Datum (aOD), sloping upwards towards shore to meet ground level at the top of the foreshore where there is an existing sea defence wall. The sides of the causeway will be formed to a stable slope and protected from erosion by tidal currents by rock filled reno mattresses or suitably sized rock riprap. At the river end of the causeway it will terminate in a flat faced gabion wall next to which the delivery barges to be beached in a berthing pocket created by dredging and removing rocks as required. Working platforms for a mobile crane (used to raise and lower the barge ramp) will be provided as part of the causeway at its river end. The indicative causeway design is curved in plan in order to accommodate both the causeway and a beached delivery barge within an area of acceptable foreshore gradient. Further out into the river channel, the bed has been dredged for navigation purposes and therefore becomes significantly steeper and unsuitable for beaching a vessel. The causeway and beached barge, when present, will be positioned a safe distance from the navigation channel.
- 4.1.4 The head of the causeway will meet the base of the existing sea wall. A flood gate consisting of a slot in barrier system with removable posts will be constructed in the sea wall to allow passage of vehicles onto the causeway. To the east/west of the causeway, dredged material from its construction will be used to create an area of saltmarsh, extending and enhancing existing saltmarsh to compensate for the area lost due to causeway construction.
- 4.1.5 The causeway (Zone G) will be constructed as described in the Application Document A7.8: Concept Design of Causeway for Deliveries of AILs.
- 4.1.6 To construct the causeway, the very soft foreshore sediment will be removed at low tide and backfilled with crushed rock fill placed on a geotextile (to prevent the rock sinking into the bed material below). The causeway will then be formed from further crushed rock aggregate, reinforced by one or more further layers of geotextile. The causeway crest will be formed by rock filled gabions or precast concrete pads.
- 4.1.7 The causeway is expected to be constructed by backhoe excavator working progressively outward from the riverbank, replacing the excavated/dredged material with the crushed rock fill, laying the geotextile layers and completing the rock mound to the design level, prior to placing the crest gabions or precast concrete pads. The excavator will form a working platform to support itself as it advances. Geotextile/geogrid will be placed below the rock fill, and further

geotextile/geogrid layers placed within the rock fill layer, to raise the tensile strength and assist with spreading the load.

- 4.1.8 The anticipated dredging method for the barge beaching pocket is by a floating marine dredging plant, which may be a backhoe dredger, trailer suction hopper dredger, cutter suction dredger or a water injection dredger. The dredging method and plant selected will depend on further engineering studies into the properties of the material to be dredged the availability of dredgers within the London area at the time the works are to be constructed. Approximately 16,100 m<sup>3</sup> of material is expected to be dredged. Approximately 11,000 m<sup>3</sup> of this material is expected to be deposited locally for saltmarsh creation or enhancement.
- 4.1.9 The Dredging Contractor has, at time of writing, not been confirmed. This will be confirmed during the detailed design stage following provision of the DCO.
- 4.1.10 The key responsibilities of the Dredging Contractor will include:
- *notifying the Retained Archaeologist when dredging works are to commence, giving enough warning so that the Archaeological Contractor can ensure the vessel staff/UXO specialists are aware of any specific considerations;*
  - *Informing the Archaeological Contractor of any environmental constraint or matter relating to health, safety and welfare of which they are aware that is relevant to the archaeologists' activities;*
  - *Obeying legal obligations in respect of 'wreck' and 'treasure' under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995 and the Treasure Act 1996 respectively;*
  - *Respecting any constraint maps including AEZs;*
  - *notifying the Archaeological Contractor, prior to any diving, in the event that an obstruction on the seabed is to be ground-truthed by divers. If the obstruction is identified as being of potential archaeological interest the dredging contractor will notify the Archaeological Contractor within 24 hours;*
  - *allowing suitably trained and inducted Archaeological Contractor staff access to any barges containing dredged material as part of the archaeological watching brief (if backhoe dredging methodology to be used);*
  - *contacting the Archaeological Contractor in the event of a discovery identified as being of potentially high archaeological interest. The Archaeological Contractor will be notified as soon as possible after the discovery and within 24 hours of the discovery in accordance with the Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries; and*
  - *suspending work in a particular location in the event that objects of potential archaeological interest are encountered. On receiving such a request, the dredging contractor will immediately inform the Development Scheme Project Manager verbally and will redeploy its equipment to work in an alternative location. The dredging contractor will submit a Change Notification to the Development Scheme Project Manager within 7 days.*
- 4.1.11 All Construction Contractors engaged in the project whereby there is an archaeological element will:
- *familiarise themselves with the generic requirements of the WSI and make them available to their staff;*

- *obey legal obligations in respect of 'wreck' under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995;*
- *assist and afford access to archaeologists employed by the dredge contractor;*
- *inform the Retained Archaeologist of any environmental constraint or matter relating to health, safety and welfare of which they are aware that is relevant to the archaeologists' activities; and*
- *implement the Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries via the dredge vessel's master and Project Manager.*

- 4.1.12 A formal programme of archaeological monitoring in the form of a watching brief will be conducted during all construction work in the intertidal zone. This work would be conducted during periods when these areas were uncovered by the tide, to enable any archaeological remains present to be identified and recorded in safety by a suitably qualified archaeologist. Watching brief activities will be conducted in accordance with the standards outlined in the ClfA's Standard Guidance for an archaeological watching brief (ClfA 2014a).
- 4.1.13 **The intertidal watching brief programme requirements will be set out in an activity-specific Method Statement in advance of any construction work in the intertidal zone.**
- 4.1.14 A Protocol, similar to the established Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries: Offshore Renewables Projects (The Crown Estate 2014) and the Marine Aggregate Industry Protocol for the Reporting of Finds of Archaeological Interest (BMAPA and Historic England 2005), will be established for the construction phase of the project. The Protocol provides a system for reporting and investigating unexpected archaeological discoveries encountered during the course of the project. The aim of the Protocol is to reduce any adverse effects of the development upon the historic environment by enabling project staff, contractors and sub-contractors to report finds in a manner that is both convenient to their every-day work and effective with regard to curatorial requirements. Archaeological discoveries reported via the Protocol may include submerged prehistoric material, shipwreck material or aviation material. The Protocol will also make provision for the institution of temporary exclusion zones around areas of possible archaeological interest, for prompt archaeological advice and, if necessary, for archaeological inspection of important features prior to further works in the area.
- 4.1.15 A second Protocol similar to the established Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries: Offshore Renewables Projects (The Crown Estate 2014) and the Marine Aggregate Industry Protocol for the Reporting of Finds of Archaeological Interest (BMAPA and Historic England 2005) will be established for the operation and maintenance phase of the project. The Protocol provides a system for reporting and investigating unexpected archaeological discoveries encountered during the course of any maintenance dredging conducted during the life of the development. The aim of the Protocol is to reduce any adverse effects of the maintenance dredging on the historic environment by enabling project staff, contractors and sub-contractors to report finds in a manner that is both convenient to their every-day work and effective with regard to curatorial requirements.



## Evaluation techniques

- 4.1.16 A programme of systematic and/or random sampling of the sediments within the dredge areas to check for buried archaeological deposits will allow the assessment of the potential for further archaeological receptors within the dredge area prior to the removal of any archaeological deposits, or the supporting sediments around any archaeological receptors. This work would take place prior to any capital dredging work of any type commencing and be undertaken with a suitably qualified archaeologist present.
- 4.1.17 The exact system of sampling to be undertaken will be decided in consultation with Historic England and set out in a separate Method Statement covering the works. It is suggested that this process is completed alongside any UXO assessment and clearance.

## Archaeological watching brief: dredging

- 4.1.18 A Watching Brief is recommended to monitor the dredging work within areas where the grab sampling or ground truthing suggested buried archaeological deposits, if a backhoe methodology is used. This work would be located on the dredger itself, or on the barges used to hold excavated material, depending on access.
- 4.1.19 Recovery of any archaeological material within the Watching Brief will be completed under the supervision of suitably qualified archaeologist, with any artefacts or structural fragments returned to the quayside for storage in an allotted archaeological storage area, which may consist of accessible skips or tanks. Any archaeological artefact will then be assessed as part a quayside monitoring programme.
- 4.1.20 Excavated surfaces and up-cast material will be inspected by a suitably qualified archaeologist. Any finds will be collected and allocated a record number and their position will be logged. Archaeological features or structures that are encountered will be examined and/or excavated using divers, or during low tide. A sufficient sample of each layer/feature type will be investigated in order to elucidate the date, character, relationships and function of the feature/structure. Recording will include written, drawn, and photographic elements as conditions allow.

## Archaeological Finds, including human remains, treasure, wreck

- 4.1.21 Major archaeological finds of high value could include a shipwreck, logboat, aircraft, human remains or large assemblages of non-human bone and teeth.
- 4.1.22 Should the discovery of a major archaeological find either on-board or on the seabed be found, all dredging/sampling will cease immediately within the area, and a Temporary Exclusion Zone (TEZ) will be implemented around the location of the find.
- 4.1.23 Only in agreement with the MMO and Historic England will any action be taken to implement any potential lift and recovery operations following satisfactory completion of in situ inspection.
- 4.1.24 Any human remains (articulated or disarticulated, cremated or unburnt) discovered, will be left *in situ*, covered and protected. If identified when removed by backhoe dredging, all dredging in the area will be stopped immediately. A Ministry of Justice

licence will be obtained by the Retained Archaeologist before any further excavation (including where remains are to be left *in situ*). Following discussions with Historic England, and with advice from a specialist osteoarchaeologist, the need for and appropriateness of their excavation/removal or sampling as part of the evaluation will be determined. Should human remains require excavation, they will be fully recorded, excavated and removed from the site in compliance with the terms of the Ministry of Justice licence.

- 4.1.25 Dredging will not recommence within the area of the TEZ until confirmation has been received from Historic England that the TEZ can be removed.
- 4.1.26 Archaeological finds of moderate value could include: an anchor, individual mammoth tooth, isolated animal bone, isolated ships timbers or concretions.
- 4.1.27 If an intermediate archaeological discovery is identified on the seabed in the course of operations, the discovery will be photographed and/or videoed *in situ* by an archaeological diver, or a suitable ROV, with additional recording carried out and further advice sought from experts as required.
- 4.1.28 Quay side archaeological monitoring will be undertaken either by a team of two marine archaeologists, or by a single marine archaeologist if supported by a member of the dredge team staff to avoid lone working. The work will be undertaken as required and will be informed by the dredge vessel programme.
- 4.1.29 The on-site archaeologist(s) will visually review all finds material in conjunction with their corresponding preliminary reporting forms: the material will be examined, and should material of archaeological interest be confirmed, the material will be fully recorded.
- 4.1.30 All artefacts identified from material recovered will be retained, processed and recorded in accordance with the ClfA's Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Watching Briefs (2014a) and Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological material (2014b).
- 4.1.31 All finds and other items of archaeological interest have an owner, but the law regarding ownership varies according to the character of the material, the environment in which it was found, and national legislation. Ownership will be transferred to the institution receiving the archive unless other arrangements are agreed with Historic England. Finds and other items of archaeological interest recovered offshore in the course of investigation are the property of The Crown Estate as the landowner, with the exception of all human remains, and 'wreck' for the purposes of the Merchant Shipping Act 1995.
- 4.1.32 Contingency will be made for specialist advice and conservation needs on-site should unexpected, unusual or extremely fragile and delicate objects be recovered, and the advice and input from an appropriate Conservation Service will be sought. Objects that require immediate conservation treatment to prevent deterioration will be treated according to guidelines laid down in First Aid for Finds (Watkinson 1998) and First Aid for Underwater Finds (Robinson 1998). A full record will be made of any treatment given.
- 4.1.33 Finds will be primarily conserved, bagged and boxed in accordance with guidelines set out in the United Kingdom's Institute for Conservation's Conservation Guidelines No 2 (UKIC 1984).

- 4.1.34 In the event that any item(s) of ordnance is discovered it should be treated with extreme care as it may not be inert. Industry guidelines provided by the UXO contractor must be followed prior to any recording of items for archaeological purposes. Depending on the items' age, ordnance may be of archaeological interest, especially when discovered with other related material from a wreck, either shipwreck or aircraft, and should be recorded if it is safe to do so. Any firearms and ammunition (e.g. from a crashed military aircraft) are likely to be subject to the Firearms Acts (various dates). Ammunition should be regarded as ordnance, irrespective of its size.
- 4.1.35 In the event of the discovery of any material covered or potentially covered by the Treasure Act 1996, the Applicant and the Curator(s) will be notified immediately. All necessary information required by the Treasure Act 1996 (i.e. finder, location, material, date, associated items, etc.) will be reported to the Coroner within 14 days.
- 4.1.36 The majority of aircraft wrecks are military and therefore fall under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986. The relevant authorities will be notified immediately should any suspected aircraft remains be encountered during works, and a TEZ implemented.
- 4.1.37 Archaeological artefacts that have come from a ship are 'wreck' for the purposes of the Merchant Shipping Act 1995. The Retained Archaeologist should ensure that the Receiver of Wreck is notified within 28 days of recovery, for all items of wreck that have been recovered.
- 4.1.38 The project archive should be deposited with Essex Museum. Deposition of any finds with the archive will only be carried out with the full agreement of The Crown Estate or the owner (as confirmed by the Receiver of Wreck).
- 4.1.39 The complete site archive, which may include paper records, photographic records, graphics, artefacts, ecofacts and digital data, will be prepared following standard conditions for the acceptance of excavated archaeological material by the Essex Record Office, and in general following nationally recommended guidelines (Society of Museum Archives 1995; Brown 2011; ADS 2013; Archaeology Archives Forum 2007; ClfA 2014c; UKIC 1984 and Walker 1990). The archive will be deposited with the Essex Record Office once the contents are in the public domain.
- 4.1.40 All digital data will be considered part of the primary archive and will accord with the procedures recommended by The Crown Estate, Marine Environment Data and Information Network (MEDIN), Archaeological Data Service (ADS) and Historic England. Data will be compiled in a format suitable for submission of Monument, Event and Source records for entry into the NRHE (offshore) and the Essex Historic Environment Record (inshore).

## 4.2 Archaeological Excavation (Stages 3)

- 4.2.1 The results of each phase of archaeological evaluation will determine where further mitigation measures will be required in advance of or during construction. Mitigation might comprise a programme of excavation in advance of construction. The detailed scope will be set out in separate task-specific method statements as discussed in **Section 1.2**.

### **4.3 Additional archaeological monitoring: Construction**

- 4.3.1 The results of each phase of archaeological investigation will determine if further mitigation measures will be required in advance of, or during, construction. Mitigation might comprise a programme of archaeological monitoring during construction groundworks (i.e. watching brief). The detailed scope will be set out in separate task specific method statements as discussed above.

### **4.4 Unexpected discoveries**

- 4.4.1 There is the potential at any point during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the consented scheme for unexpected archaeological and geoarchaeological remains to be discovered during groundworks, even after extensive evaluation.
- 4.4.2 Should discoveries of significant archaeological and geoarchaeological remains be made, these may require additional time and resources to investigate and record, and would require a separate Method Statement to be approved by the MMO and HE, where appropriate.
- 4.4.3 In the first instance, the MMO and HE will be notified by the Applicant or their agent, and any groundworks in the area of the discovery will cease until an on-site (or virtual) monitoring meeting can be arranged and a contingency plan agreed with Thurrock Council.

## 5 REPORTING

- 5.1.1 A report on the results of each phase of archaeological work will be prepared, both in bound paper format with colour images, and also in electronic format as a PDF with a minimum file size of 300dpi.
- 5.1.2 The report should include as a minimum:
- i. The Archaeological Contractor's site/finds code.
  - ii. Perceived archaeological potential of the site and vicinity from documentary sources – historic, cartographic, archaeological, HER, geographical, topographic and environmental.
  - iii. The aims and methods adopted in the course of the fieldwork.
  - iv. Illustrative material including maps, plans, sections, drawings and photographs as necessary: photographs should include images of work in progress together with any significant features revealed.
  - v. The nature, extent, date, condition and significance of the archaeological finds with specialist opinions, recommendations for further analysis and parallels from other sites if required.
  - vi. The anticipated degree of survival of archaeological deposits across the site, as affected by its present state and recent past (e.g. extent of quarrying).
- 5.1.3 Copies of the report will be sent to the Applicant and RPS for onward submission to the Historic England Marine Team for approval on behalf of the MMO, who will approve the report within 15 working days of receipt.
- 5.1.4 On completion of archaeological works across the Thurrock FGP site, and to a timetable agreed with the Historic Environment Advisor to Thurrock Council and HE, an overarching report on the archaeology of the scheme will be prepared. The report will include details of any further analysis that may be required prior to the publication of the results. The report will include proposals for publication in a suitable journal. The final report will be submitted to the Historic Environment Advisor to Thurrock Council and HE for approval within 20 days of receipt.
- 5.1.5 The EHER will receive a CD containing an archive version of the final approved report and a selection of site photographs that can be used (if required) for public engagement by the EHER.
- 5.1.6 Once the EHER is in receipt of the final overarching report an approval letter will be issued by the Historic Environment Advisor to Thurrock Council for onward submission to the local planning authority.
- 5.1.7 Following completion of the scheme of construction, the Client will produce an OASIS form for any completed and agreed Archaeological Reports produced as a result of this WSI and will submit a copy as a PDF file to Historic England's NRHE (oasis@english-heritage.org.uk).



## 6 ARCHIVING

- 6.1.1 The integrity of the site archive should be maintained by the contractor until the close of the project. The archive of all records and finds must be prepared consistent with the principles set out in MoRPHE Project Planning Note 3 (2008).
- 6.1.2 It will include all materials recovered (or the comprehensive record of such materials) and all written, drawn and photographic records relating directly to the investigations undertaken. It will be quantified, ordered, indexed and internally consistent. It will also contain a site matrix, a site summary and brief written observations on the artefactual and environmental data.
- 6.1.3 United Kingdom Institute for Conservation guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long term storage (1990) will be followed. Arrangements for the curation of the site archive will be agreed in writing with the recipient Museum who will issue a museum acquisition number before site work commences. This is expected to be Essex Museum and an agreement in principle to take the complete archive has been sought. Details of such arrangements will be copied to the Historic Environment Advisor to Thurrock Council and the Local Planning Authority before site works commence.
- 6.1.4 The site archive is to be deposited as a single block at the close of the project with the appropriate museum within 3 months of completion. It will then become publicly accessible. The contractor will need to hold discussions with the museum curator prior to archaeological work commencing regarding the collection and discard policy relevant to the site, and to observe such requirements. If the museum is unable to accept the archive an alternative solution regarding the storage of the archive will be found. The Historic Environment Advisor to Thurrock Council will be advised once the relevant museum has been approached regarding this archive.
- 6.1.5 County Historic Environment Record Summary Sheets should be completed for the site, as per the County HER manual and appended to the final report.
- 6.1.6 In addition, at the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/projects/oasis/> must be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators Forms. All appropriate parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the HER. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive). A copy of the OASIS summary sheet in digital form should be emailed to the Hon. Editor of the Essex Archaeology and History Journal ([paul.gilman@me.com](mailto:paul.gilman@me.com)) for inclusion in the annual roundup of projects.
- 6.1.7 The digital archive generated by the project will be deposited with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS).

### Transfer of Ownership

- 6.1.8 Arrangements for long-term storage and deposition of the archive, including all artefacts, with the exception of human remains and any objects covered by the Treasure Act 1996 (as amended by the Coroners and Justice Act 2009), will be agreed with the landowner and recipient museum prior to the commencement of fieldwork.

## 7 OTHER MATTERS

### 7.1 Archaeological Contractor

- 7.1.1 The Retained Marine Archaeologist appointed to undertake the archaeological mitigation measures will be **TBC** for the marine and intertidal works. They will have a demonstrable track record of successfully undertaking large, complex archaeological projects of this nature, with specialist archaeological and geoarchaeological expertise. A list of the technical specialists will be submitted to the MMO for approval.
- 7.1.2 The Geo-archaeological Contractor appointed to undertake the Terrestrial geo-archaeological mitigation measures will be QUEST.
- 7.1.3 These contractors have a proven track record in undertaking fieldwork on sites adjacent to the River Thames or equivalent, and the relevant geology.
- 7.1.4 The field team deployed by the Archaeological Contractors will include only full time professional archaeological staff.
- 7.1.5 The Archaeological Contractors are a body on the ClfA Register of Archaeological Organisations and will be consistent throughout the project.

### 7.2 Standards

- 7.2.1 RPS Group endorses the Code of Practise and the Code of Approved Practise for the Regulation of Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.
- 7.2.2 All staff supplied by the archaeological contractor would be of a standard approved by Thurrock Power's archaeological consultants and be employed in line with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologist's Codes of Practise and be members of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.
- 7.2.3 Provision would be made for monitoring of all stages of the project by the client and the local planning authority and their representatives (including HE and the HE RSA, as appropriate).

### 7.3 Insurance, Health and Safety

- 7.3.1 The Archaeological Contractor will maintain both public liability and professional indemnity insurance to suitable levels of coverage. Full details of insurance cover can be supplied on request.
- 7.3.2 All work will be carried out to comply with the Health and Safety and Work etc Act 1974 and the Management of Health and Safety Regulations 1999.

## References

### Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Guidelines:

[http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/node-files/code\\_conduct.pdf](http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/node-files/code_conduct.pdf)

[http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/node-files/ifa\\_code\\_practice.pdf](http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/node-files/ifa_code_practice.pdf)

### National Guidance:

Department of Communities and Local Government *National Planning Policy Framework* 2012

Department of Energy and Climate Change *Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy 1 (EN-1)* 2011

### Guidelines:

Historic England 2011 *Environmental Archaeology: A Guide to the Theory and Practise of Methods from Sampling and Recovery to Post Excavation*

Historic England 2015 *Geoarchaeology: Using Earth Sciences to Understand the Archaeological Record*

Historic England 2014 *Animal Bones and Archaeology: Guidelines for Best Practise*

Historic England 2016 *Preserving Archaeological Remains; Appendix 2 Preservation Assessment Techniques*

*Historic England 1998 Dendrochronology*

MAP2 Management of Archaeological Projects (Second Edition) 1991

MoRPHE Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide 2009

MoRPHE Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment PPN 3: Archaeological Excavation January 2008

Museums and Galleries Commissions *Standards in the Museum Care of Archaeological Collections* 1991

United Kingdom Institute for Conservation (UKIC) *Conservation Guideline No 2* (n/d)

United Kingdom Institute for Conservation (UKIC) *guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long term storage* 1990

### Site Specific:

CgMs 2017 *Archaeological Statement Tilbury2 land at Former RWE Power Station, Tilbury, Essex*

CgMs 2017 *Archaeological Desk Based Assessment Tilbury2 Former RWE Power Station, Tilbury, Essex*

Quest 2017 *Tilbury2 Land at Former RWE Power Station, Tilbury Geo-archaeological fieldwork, Radiocarbon Dating and updated Deposit Model*

QUEST 2019. Thurrock FGP Geoarchaeological Deposit Model Report, ref 177/18

Wessex Archaeology. 2017. Land adjacent to Tilbury Substation, Tilbury, Essex. Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report

Wessex Archaeology. 2020. Thurrock FGP. Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report.

ASE 2017 *Archaeological Watching Brief Land at the Former RWE Power Station, Tilbury, Essex*