



Society of Antiquaries of London

Society of Antiquaries of London

THE FUTURE OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN ENGLAND

A Manifesto

Contents

Contents.....	1	© Society of Antiquaries of London 2020
Foreword.....	2	
Introduction.....	3	
Executivesummary.....	4	
1 The public value of archaeology.....	5	Contributors
2 Evidence that change is required.....	6	Gill Andrews, Hon. VPSA
2.1 Failures post-PPS5.....	6	Stuart Brookes, FSA
2.2 The impact of the past decade on local authority archaeology services.....	8	Duncan Brown, FSA
2.3 Summary and conclusion.....	9	Stewart Bryant, FSA
3 Principles for the development of the structure	10	Paul Drury, PSA
3.1 Improving the public value.....	10	Stephen Dunmore, FSA
3.2 Integratingresearch.....	10	Christopher Evans, FSA
3.3 Improvingarchives.....	10	Gillian Hey, FSA
3.4 The role of Local Government	11	John Hines, FSA
3.5 Improving information management.....	11	Rob Lennox
3.6 Encouraging collaboration.....	11	John Lewis, FSA
4. Proposal for an alternative model.....	12	Hana Morel
5. Next steps and conclusion.....	14	Christopher Scull, FSA
Appendix A: Potential roles of the regional hubs.....	15	
Appendix B: Case-studies in the UK and Europe.....	18	<i>Organisations that provided comments on the first draft</i>
1. Case-Studies in the UK.....	18	ALGAO UK (Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers)
2. Case-Studies in Europe.....	20	CBA Council for British Archaeology
References.....	22	ClfA Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
		FAME (Federation of Archaeological Employers)
		Rescue
		SMA (Society for Museum Archaeology)
		UAUK (University Archaeology UK)
		November 2020
		This paper is openly available at: https://www.sal.org.uk/future_of_arch/
		To offer comments and feed-back, please go to: manifesto@sal.org.uk

Foreword



Paul Drury, FSA
President,
Society of Antiquaries of London

The Society of Antiquaries of London is a charity whose purpose is to promote understanding and appreciation of the human past, particularly through the study of its material remains. Delivering public benefit from such studies, rooted in a tradition of research excellence, is a central concern.

Although our charter remit embraces ‘this and other countries’, this paper focusses on the need to reimagine the organisation of development-led archaeology in England. Our objective is to encourage best use of resources, focussed on delivering the public benefit of increasing and disseminating knowledge of the past, as envisaged in national planning policy since 2010.¹ We write against the background of a decade of sustained growth in archaeological activity, reflecting that of the development industry, set alongside retrenchment of the public sector curatorial role in guiding the archaeological response. Parallel constraints on museums have meant that the problem of curating archaeological archives remains, indeed grows with every archaeological intervention. The opportunities and challenges posed by this situation have been the subject of several papers and much discussion over the past decade, but little agreement about the need for or practicality of structural change in the sector.

During 2019–20, a working group of the Society developed drafts of this paper as a contribution to ongoing reflection on these issues, with the aim of further stimulating discussion and practical action across the sector. The initial version was circulated to member organisations of The Archaeology Forum (TAF) and discussed at a session of TAF in 2019, after which the working group was reconstituted on a broader basis. We are most grateful for that wider input, but responsibility for the views expressed in this final version rests with the Society.

On 12 March 2020, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published a White Paper, *Planning for the Future*, which set out — albeit at a very general level — radical proposals for the reinvention and simplification of spatial planning in England.² Coupled with central government encouragement towards fewer, larger, single tier local authorities, this makes change to the present structure for managing the historic environment in general, and the archaeological resource in particular, inevitable. This paper was largely completed when the White Paper appeared, just before the consequences of COVID-19 emerged as an additional and major concern.

‘Beware what you wish for’, as the saying goes, especially since the word ‘archaeology’ nowhere appears in the White Paper. But our emerging view is that this major reform presents the opportunity to improve the structural provision for archaeology in England. The Society’s response to the White Paper consultation was formulated on those lines,³ and we will be suggesting ways to achieve its objectives as the proposals for reform develop. In future, the public may have very different expectations of the archaeological sector, the benefits it produces and the ways that they are delivered.

1 In PPS5, and maintained in the NPPF.
2 <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future>.
3 https://www.sal.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Planning-for-the-Future-SAL-online-response_29-Oct-2020.pdf.

Executive Summary

Over the thirty years since the publication of the UK Government's *Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning* (PPG16) in 1990 the practice of archaeology in England has developed significantly, the major achievements being:²

- a vast increase in the amount of archaeological work undertaken;
- a revolution in our knowledge of the past in many areas;
- the development of a greater understanding about the distribution and ubiquity of the archaeological resource;
- the general acceptance of measures for safeguarding the archaeological dimension of the historic environment within the planning system.

However, the introduction of PPG16 and its successor policies has also seen:

- a significant change in the funding model for undertaking archaeology, from mixed developer and government funding, to almost wholly developer funded;³
- a system dominated by discrete competitively-tendered projects which place limitations on time, funding, and impetus to develop co-operative working practices and which has been slow and inconsistent in responding to the potential for public engagement;⁴
- a gradual and crippling decline (35% since 2006) in resources for local authority archaeological services,⁵ responsible for specifying archaeological responses to development proposals and monitoring outcomes.

PPG16 was predicated on achieving 'preservation by record'. PPS5 (2010) shifted the emphasis, stating that the ultimate justification of archaeology funded through public policy is to increase understanding of the past for the benefit of the public. Despite this, archaeological practices have tended to fossilise around the process-driven approach adopted during the expansion of development-led archaeology between 1990 and 2010.

Key Findings:

- Currently, the system does not deliver adequate public benefits because it is process-focused and under-resourced.
- There is minimal and fragmented provision for the specification and oversight of work, inadequate provision for using the data to generate and disseminate knowledge, and almost no provision for curating and making accessible the archive.
- The Society believes that a profound cultural change is necessary to address these issues and that, in considering the future practice of archaeology in England, it is vital to look beyond the immediate consequences of declining public resources.

Recommendations:

- Fundamental to change must be recognition across the sector of the need for greater collaboration in the planning role, fieldwork, research and dissemination.
- A new system of regional hubs, based on the Society's key principles (Section 3), would deliver the necessary cultural change.
- These regional hubs would be umbrella bodies, supporting local authority services, encouraging cross-disciplinary work, fostering research and training, and promoting best practice.
- Archaeological work should provide key public benefits by advancing understanding, encouraging engagement and participation and promoting social cohesion and placemaking.⁶

In making these propositions, the paper builds on reports which acknowledge the benefits and limitations of the current system, such as the Southport Report,⁷ the Howell-Redesdale Inquiry,⁸ the British Academy's Reflections on Archaeology report,⁹ and the ClfA's 21st-Century Challenges for Archaeology initiative.¹⁰

A profound cultural change is necessary

1 GOV.UK 2020a.
2 For example, see Darvill 2016; 2018.
3 For example, Trow 2018.
4 For example, Southport Group 2011.
5 ALGAO 2019, 15; RTPi 2019.
6 See IHBC 2016; Historic England 2016; more generally, Egan 2004; GOV.UK 2020b .
7 Southport Group 2011.
8 Howell and Redesdale 2014.
9 British Academy 2017.
10 Wills 2018.

1 The Public Value of Archaeology

Using archaeology's potential to help build communities, inspire placemaking, improve wellbeing, contribute to local identity and encourage resilience is crucial to the future of the discipline.

1.1 Archaeological research involves the scientific study of the material remains of past societies and is one of a range of approaches to the study of the human past. Where written records do not exist or are sparse, archaeological techniques of analysis, interrogating the material remains of human activity, provide the only or main source of information about our past. For historic periods, it provides a wider and often more egalitarian range of sources than the documentary record alone, and so helps us to develop a more balanced, wider-ranging picture. The consequent public interest in the archaeological resource as a key part of our cultural heritage, and the public interest in its management to increase knowledge of our human past, have long been recognised in English law and policy.¹¹

1.2 The current National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to be mindful of 'the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring',¹² echoing the approach of many international conventions and national policy documents.¹³ Awareness of the historic environment, for example:

- has a positive influence on how people feel about where they live, promoting a stronger sense of place, and higher levels of social capital;
- attracts businesses, generating economic activity, local wealth and jobs;¹⁴
- brings people together and acts as a catalyst for involvement in shaping local areas and improves people's confidence and skills.¹⁵

1.3 The practice of archaeology and the knowledge it generates has instrumental potential to help address important contemporary issues, for example:

- community archaeology brings people into direct engagement with the time depth of their surroundings, contributing to local identity and resilience;
- participation in archaeological fieldwork has active benefits for mental and physical wellbeing;
- research demonstrates that specific groups of people¹⁶ derive higher wellbeing benefits from heritage participation, and improved life satisfaction.¹⁷

1.4 Engaging genuinely and meaningfully with the broader public constituency that values and wants to engage in the study of the past, particularly through its material remains, is the way to ensure that archaeology thrives long-term. Embracing and building an informed and engaged community of interest helps to promote and consolidate a wider understanding and appreciation of archaeology's public value, with the potential to encourage advocacy of the importance of the wider historic environment. Using archaeology's potential to help build communities, inspire placemaking, improve wellbeing, contribute to local identity and encourage resilience is crucial to the future of the discipline. While these points have been acknowledged in Historic England's Heritage Counts reports, they are also central principles within the recently published Planning White Paper¹⁸

1.5 There is well-documented wide public interest in and engagement with the past across the UK. This is evident in many ways, such as:

- the appetite for TV documentaries and for exhibitions, public lectures and popular history/archaeology publications;
- the number of archaeological societies across the country; the large number of volunteers participating in heritage-related activities;
- the substantial number of National Trust and English Heritage members and of paying visitors to their properties;
- the success of crowdfunding and community heritage ventures;
- the popularity of metal-detecting;
- the enquiries about public participation that any archaeology or heritage project generates.

11 Beginning with the first Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1882.
12 NPPF 2019, para 185b.
13 These include The Valetta Convention (Council of Europe 1992), The Faro Convention (Council of Europe 2005), The English Heritage, *Conservation Principles* (2008), Archaeology Forum 2005, Heritage Alliance 2019, NLHF 2019, Society of Antiquaries 2019, NPPF 2019.
14 Historic England 2010; 2012; 26% of creative industries are located in conservation areas (Historic England 2018a).
15 Historic England 2011.
16 The research evidences people: with a long-standing illness or disability; 'blue-collar' occupations; over 45 years old; without children.
17 Historic England 2014.
18 GOV.UK 2020a

2 Evidence that change is required

2.1 Failures post-PPS5

This section explores the failure during the past decade post-PPS5 to fully realise opportunities for delivering improved public benefit from the planning and archaeology system.

2.1.1 Although PPG16 was in many ways a success and led to a dramatic increase in archaeological investigation, it lacked proper provision for synthesis, historical narrative building, publication, and the deposition of archives. These omissions were eventually rectified, at least on paper, with the publication of PPS5 in 2010, which led to a brief period of optimism in the sector, as well as the publication of the Southport Report in 2011. This included proposals aimed at using the new PPS5 policies to increase public benefit, including public participation, research collaboration and the development of archive resource centres.¹⁹ The PPS5 policies were subsequently carried forward virtually unchanged into the NPPF in 2012 and the recent NPPF revision in 2019.

2.1.2 The past decade has, however, produced significant evidence that the outcomes of the current archaeology and planning system are not delivering the scale of changes to practice and improvements in public benefit envisioned in the introduction of PPS5, including some of the Southport Report recommendations. This evidence is summarised below and addressed in section 4 as part of the suggested model for regional hubs.

2.1.3 A five-year review in 2017 of the Southport Report concluded that good progress had been made against many of the Report's recommendations, but that the overall vision of public participation had yet to be delivered.²⁰ With regard to the recommendation for greater research collaboration, it concluded: 'collaboration is not the norm, and the default position for the majority of archaeological projects initiated through the planning process is for research to be tightly scoped within predefined budgets. There remains a disconnect between the cost of archaeological work and the value of the research it might generate'.²¹

2.1.4 An important development of the past decade has been the publication of several important national research projects that have used the outputs of development-led archaeology as their principal source of evidence.²² These projects clearly demonstrate the ability of development-led archaeology to transform understanding of the past. However, they also highlight some significant methodological shortcomings in fieldwork and post-excavation, making it both difficult and relatively costly to undertake comparative research from primary sources at a national scale.²³ These include:

- **The difficulty of using the outputs of archaeological investigations for research projects at a national or regional scale**
An example is provided by Morrison *et al.*²⁴ using a relatively small 154km² area of the Upper Thames Valley as a case study. The area has been extensively investigated in recent times, but basic geographical information is not available in digital form, including accurate georeferencing of site plans, location of site boundaries and plans showing major excavated features.²⁵
- **Varying standards of specialist reports (e.g. pottery and other finds reports) across the sector making synthesis and data mining difficult.**
For example, in reflecting on the Roman Rural and Settlement Project, Timby,²⁶ flags several deficiencies in pottery reports, including the failure to consistently apply

'There remains a disconnect between the cost of archaeological work and the value of the research it might generate'

- 19 See Southport Group 2011; Thomas 2019.
20 Nixon 2017.
21 Nixon 2017, 9.
22 E.g. The Roman Rural Settlement Project (Allen *et al.* 2015); English Landscape and Identities Project (EngLaId) (Gosden *et al.* 2019); Fields of Britannia (Rippon, Smart and Pears 2015); Building Anglo-Saxon England (Blair 2018).
23 Rippon 2016; Fulford and Holbrook 2018; Blair 2018. Following The Roman Rural Settlement Project a review of methodologies for fieldwork and post-excavation, funded by Historic England, resulted in eight methodology discussion papers. These are available on the Cotswold Archaeology website: <https://cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk/community/discover-the-past/developer-funded-roman-archaeology-in-britain/methodology-study/>
24 Morrison, Thomas and Gosden 2014.
25 Ibid. section 2.
26 Timby 2017.



Excavation at Terminal 5 Heathrow Airport
Photo © Framework Archaeology courtesy of Wessex Archaeology and Oxford Archaeology

standard classifications and terminologies, varying standards and types of quantification within and between reports, a lack of contextual information, and poor metadata.

- **The lack of research into and development of archaeological field techniques**
Fulford and Holbrook had difficulty finding examples amongst their database of 3,600 excavated Roman settlements of evidence-based research being used innovatively to improve field excavation methodology.²⁷ The two notable exceptions were the long-lived and complex excavations at Colne Fen, Cambridgeshire, and the Terminal 5 project at Heathrow Airport, London, which pioneered an iterative research-based excavation strategy. The reflexive, research-based method used at Heathrow has not been influential in subsequent archaeological research and practice.²⁸ Besides making a strong case for more such approaches to excavation by field archaeologists and local government advisers, Fulford and Holbrook make specific recommendations for improvements, including systematic recording of excavation volume, the greater use of metal-detector surveys and more radiocarbon dating.²⁹
- **The need for more operational research to improve archaeological practice**³⁰
In the commercial environment in which most archaeology takes place, there is no consistent, ongoing synthesis of data, and little research (posing questions of the data and seeking to answer them insofar as the data allows). The experience of these projects has shown that collaboration between archaeological contractors, academics and other specialists can lead to archaeological practice firmly embedded within wider discourses about the past.

2.1.5 In practice there are difficulties in setting up collaborative arrangements. Freelance specialists exist but are not sufficiently numerous to meet more than a fraction of the need, and archaeology departments in universities are experiencing pressures which can put serious constraints on their ability to enter into such projects. The resources required for large-scale national research, such as were achieved for the Roman Rural Settlement Project and EngLaId, will be increasingly difficult to obtain in the future. It is therefore incumbent on the archaeology sector to ensure that the outputs of development-led archaeology are capable of being used for regional and national research without the necessity of substantial funding beyond that delivered through developer contributions, as was necessary for the Roman Rural Settlement and EngLaId projects.

- 27 Fulford and Holbrook 2018.
28 See Fulford and Holbrook 2018; Thomas 2019.
29 Fulford and Holbrook 2018, 224–7.
30 Bryant, Fulford, and Holbrook 2017.

2.1.6 The above evidence suggests that innovation in archaeological practice and collaboration between commercial field archaeology, universities and local government are rare. There is also a lack more generally of evidence for a reflexive approach whereby practice is improved by learning from experience and empirical evidence. We believe that these deficiencies have contributed significantly to the fossilisation of practices in field archaeology around a process-driven approach developed during the expansion of development-led archaeology between 1990 and 2010; practices that are inefficient and do not deliver research excellence in outcomes and outputs.

2.2 The impact of the past decade on local authority archaeology services

2.2.1 The number of staff in local authority archaeology services has fallen by 35% since 2010, from 385 to 264.³¹ However, the overall figure disguises significant differences between the regions with a 50% to 60% staff reduction in the South West, North West and East Midlands regions compared with 10% to 20% in the South East, East of England and the North East regions.³² This has meant, for instance, that in the North West region (Cumbria, Lancashire, Cheshire, Greater Manchester, Merseyside), which has around fifteen staff in total, services are already at — or close to — the bare minimum.

2.2.2 The impacts of the staff reductions³³ are difficult to quantify. Relatively authoritative impressionistic evidence has come from the Roman Rural Settlement Project, which exchanged information with all local authority services between 2010 and 2016. Fulford and Holbrook conclude that variability between local authority services has increased during this period and go on to say that, ‘[u]ndoubtedly a major factor behind this variation is the reduction in curatorial service provision over the last few years which has led to many curatorial archaeologists working in virtual isolation, or such posts being graded at a relatively junior level’.³⁴ To Fulford and Holbrook’s observations can be added the loss of skills and expertise from many senior local authority archaeologists leaving the profession.

2.2.3 Evidence can also be drawn from instances where a planning advice service has been shut down and subsequently reinstated, as at Northamptonshire County Council between 2006 and 2010. The number of reports sent to the Historic Environment Record fell from 200 per year before the cuts to 50 per year thereafter, and advice to Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) on planning proposals increased from 50 to 400 per year when the service was reinstated. These statistics suggest that, despite attempts by contractors, consultants and local archaeologists to fill the vacuum, at least 75% of developments with archaeological implications had no planning provision or inadequate provision while the service was cut.³⁵ Some indirect evidence of the long-term impact on public benefit can also be demonstrated in Merseyside where the service was deleted between 2010 and 2015. The absence of local authority staff to enforce developer funding of post-excavation projects led to several programmes being frozen, including one for a major excavation within a World Heritage Site.³⁶ Further and better evidence could be drawn from more research, but the effects of cuts to local services, both locally severe and nationally problematic, are and have long been evident.

2.2.4 Historic Environment Records (HERs) are vital for the successful operation of the archaeology and planning system. Their use for research has traditionally been given a lower priority than planning advice. A recent survey of direct enquiries and requests for information to HERs revealed that only 3% of the total of 17,000 came from people undertaking research.³⁷ Whilst this figure does not take account of researchers using online HER data, it does suggest that the use of HERs for research continues to be low. Fewer HER staff due to the decline in local government resources and the sharp reduction in national, strategic enhancements of HERs since 2010 have probably contributed to their lower research profile. The Historic England-funded characterisation programmes, urban databases, urban extensive surveys,³⁸ and aggregates levy fund projects ended and have not been replaced by new research programmes for HERs.

31 Historic England, ALGAO, and IHBC 2018, fig 1.
32 Ibid. fig 4. See also Patrick 2019.
33 For an overview of cuts, see Local Government Association 2018; ‘Cuts to Local Services | Key Issues | UNISON National’, accessed 13 March 2020, <https://www.unison.org.uk/at-work/local-government/key-issues/cuts-to-local-services/>.
34 Fulford and Holbrook 2018, 219.
35 Pitts 2012.
36 Wills and Bryant 2019.
37 Historic England and ALGAO 2019.
38 See Grenville and Fairclough 2004 for the range of HER projects funded by English Heritage.

2.3 Summary and conclusion

2.3.1 The past decade has seen the publication of a range of evidence that the archaeology and planning system is not delivering the public benefit required by the NPPF (2019).³⁹ There is also worrying evidence of the negative impact of the ‘silo’ structure of the archaeology sector that does not prioritise research or encourage innovation and collaboration.

2.3.2 This period has also seen a dramatic decline in local authority archaeology services. While the number of staff has recently stabilised at around 260–70, the impact has been highly variable and the current situation is not sustainable, particularly in the Midlands and the North. The impact of these cuts has highlighted the lack of resources for research, training, access to expertise, strategic investment in HERs, and facilitating greater collaboration to achieve public benefit.

2.3.3 The Society concludes that the structure of English archaeology is not currently able to provide adequate public benefit proportionate to its cost. We therefore wish to see the structure reformed in order that the public benefit returns from the investment in our past of over £200 million per annum, and which has delivered an archaeological workforce over 7,000 strong, improves significantly and rapidly. The Planning White Paper⁴⁰ heralds reforms that would, if developed and implemented thoughtfully and constructively, provide the opportunity to achieve this ambition. The Society considers the proposals outlined in this paper are timely and must be considered should any wider planning reform take place.

39 Maidment 2015, esp. 32–51; the aim of planning is to regulate the use of land in the public interest.
40 GOV.UK 2020a.

3 Principles for the development of the structure

3.1 Improving the public value

The public value of and benefit from development-led archaeology must be improved.

The *National Planning Policy Framework* states that ‘local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible’.⁴¹ For this policy to be delivered, the funding must be sufficient to ensure in-depth research for synthesis;⁴² the curation, accessibility and use of the archive; wider sectoral research efforts, and community engagement and participation. The system needs rapidly and consistently to change and develop to address these issues, informed by measuring and evaluating public benefit in a ‘virtuous circle’ that helps shape future activity.

3.2 Integrating research

In-depth, comparative and synthetic research must lie at the heart of all aspects of archaeological work.

Especially at the regional and national level, addressing research frameworks and priorities, which themselves need to be responsive to developing knowledge, should inform all phases of development-led archaeological work (that is, curatorial advice, evaluation, investigation, analysis, publication and archiving). The academic sector with its wealth of expertise must be called upon or encouraged to contribute to current archaeological work in a more consistent and meaningful way. A greater focus on research priorities will improve efficiency, make decisions regarding mitigation more robust, and help archaeology become more intellectually stimulating and less process-oriented. Prioritising research must also extend to that of archaeological practice itself, where a more reflexive, evidence-based approach is required.

3.3 Improving archives

The sustainable provision of archaeological archives and standards for curation and access must be achieved.

There is a fundamental need for a national strategy for the curation and storage of archaeological archives, which must be firmly linked to the planning system from which most project archives derive. Museums were expected to take on this role, providing both curatorial expertise and a connection between archaeology and the public, but their ability to respond has been limited and sporadic, primarily because resources did not follow the expectation. Being run mostly by local authorities, their budgets have tended to decline in line with those of archaeological services and have tended of necessity to focus on revenue generation and overtly public-facing activities.

Archaeology can and must be collaborative, research-led and deliver public benefit

41 NPPF 2019, para 199.

42 For the need to improve synthesis, see Thomas 2019.

3.4 The role of Local Government

Core Local Government archaeological planning services and efficient and effective heritage management at scale must be achieved and maintained.

Access to effective archaeology services is vital for the consistent application of nationally applicable planning policy set out in the NPPF.⁴³ The screening of all development proposals (including those outside the planning system), providing informed and objective advice to local planning authorities, effective monitoring of outcomes and standards, and the maintenance of HERs, are critical for the identification and management of all non-designated archaeology.⁴⁴ To do so, all planning authorities must have access to and work with archaeology services consistently meeting at least a minimum standard of competence and resource. There is both scope and need for improvement of the current *ad hoc*, fragmented arrangements in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and resilience, particularly the need for sufficient resources and support at a larger geographical scale, building on existing networks and structures.⁴⁵ A long-term aim should be that planning advice, HERs and museums should be supported by statute.

3.5 Improving information management

Consistency and sustainability in information management and archaeological practice should be improved.

Comparative research is facilitated by consistency of approach to managing the data generated from fieldwork and held in legacy records, from geospatial referencing of interventions to the ordering and curation of the archive. Its sustainability depends on technical resilience — how the data are held and managed — and the resilience of the organisation responsible. Consistency is important in the process of managing the non-designated resource through the planning process, but archaeological practice itself needs to become more iterative and responsive (3.2), with its effectiveness informed by research and boosted by innovation.

3.6 Encouraging collaboration

Collaboration within the archaeological profession and with other sectors and the public should be encouraged, supported and facilitated.

Collaborative practice facilitates better social, economic and professional outcomes, and so an integrated approach must be the default mode in the pursuit of knowledge. Contractors can and do work well with other stakeholders including fellow contractors, academic institutions, Independent Research Organisations, and civil servants despite commercial demands, as well as the public itself. Local authorities equally develop collaborative arrangements with commercial archaeologists and academic specialists to improve the conservation and research outcomes of development-led archaeology. These collaborations need to be scaled up and embedded formally into practice, through the support of established collaborative arrangements with dedicated resources. Engaging genuinely and meaningfully with the broader public constituency that values and wants to be engaged in the study of the past is the way to ensure that archaeology — in its broadest sense — thrives long-term.

43 At para. 199.

44 The roles of local authority (archaeology) services are described in the ClfA Standard and Guidance for Local Authority Historic Environment Services https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS&GArchadvice_2.pdf

45 For example, regional research frameworks, ALGAO regions, regional HER committees.

4 Proposal for an alternative model

4.1 The Society's intention is to review the future of archaeology, particularly development-led archaeology, to enable the sector to deliver on the principles set out above. After so much data have been amassed over thirty years, what is now needed is a more reflexive archaeology, a more collaborative and innovative culture with research and public benefit at the forefront. This means a focus on qualitative improvement rather than process-driven quantitative expansion.

4.2 The Society believes that a regionally-based structure for the delivery of local authority archaeological services is the optimal solution for realising cultural change and achieving the principles and aims outlined in Section 3. A regional structure could provide economies of scale and the necessary critical mass of expertise to make local authority services more resilient; would encourage the creation of regional archive facilities; and would provide improvements in terms of collaboration and public benefit outcomes, including synthesis of existing and future data and research. The regional scale is logical in terms of England's population, geography and the ability to understand the character of the archaeological resource. For all these reasons, a regionally-based solution would elevate the sector to an advantageous position of resilience and capacity to deliver improved archaeological services in England.

4.3 The proposed model is for regional research hubs that would integrate and develop existing services and deliver rapid progress towards improved research and other public benefit outcomes from development-led archaeology. They would serve as umbrella centres of excellence for research with access to university academics, specialist technical advisors and other experts. Hubs would engage directly in cross-disciplinary work with a regional focus, thereby improving the quality of synthesis, ensuring a more reflexive approach to practice and providing support for local authority services in key areas. They would also act as a focus to co-ordinate public participation, through, for example, local and county archaeological societies and other community groups.

4.4 Regional research hubs would also facilitate innovation, collaborative relationships and consistent approaches to advice, information management and practice across the sector, and liaise with other regional hubs, archaeology societies, universities, and independent research organisations. By co-locating regional expertise, hubs would facilitate better access to a range of specialist and scientific expertise, techniques and advice that is sometimes difficult for contracting organisations to make contact with or draw upon. They would, at the same time, help make best use of existing resources, provide training to and be supportive of the role of archaeological advisers embedded in local authorities, and would not hinder their relationships in areas where they are effective.

4.5 As a key part of the regional approach, it will be essential, in partnership with local planning authorities, to support and strengthen the role of archaeological planning advice — that is, the maintenance and development of HERs, archaeology as an essential element of planning decisions at all levels, the provision of advice on archaeological responses to development proposals and monitoring outcomes. Local authorities need archaeological advice to discharge their planning duties and are increasingly concerned to secure that advice from a service they can trust, providing reliable and timely responses in the most cost-effective way. If that advice is available at regional level, economies of scale mean that the range of expertise underpinning it can be wider than is possible in small teams, and for users, the resilience of the service is greater.

A new system of regional hubs, based on the Society's key principles, would deliver the necessary cultural change

4.6 What emerges could take different forms in different regions, wherever possible building on initiatives already in place. Appendix B sets out some case-studies in the UK and Europe which may be helpful in considering practical implementation of the Society's proposals. In some cases, change may be incremental.

4.7 A more detailed analysis of the potential roles and activities for regional hubs is at Appendix A. In summary, these roles could include:

- Providing a focus for regional research.
- Undertaking regional research into the operation of the archaeology and planning system.
- Developing partnerships between local authorities, commercial archaeological units, universities and local societies.
- Developing a regional information strategy.
- Coordinating training and CPD that is geared towards clear public benefit outcomes.
- Providing a strategic response to the impact of land use planning.
- Where necessary, hosting regional archives.

4.8 The Government's recent White Paper⁴⁶ sets out a radical agenda to reform the planning system in England, which if enacted will have a major impact on the way that archaeology is practised and funded. The Society believes that regional hubs would be better aligned to delivering archaeological provision under a reformed system. For example, the proposal for 'Growth', 'Renewal' and 'Protected' planning zones would be best informed by drawing upon regional synthesis which is derived from local knowledge and expertise. This would underpin a more strategic response by facilitating the use of new tools for Historic Environment Records such as predictive modelling and sensitivity mapping to inform the archaeological potential of planning areas or zones.

46 GOV.UK 2020a.

5 Next steps and conclusion

5.1 The Society will present this document to the sector for constructive feedback. We will then work to explore interest from funding bodies to help develop an evidence base, drawing on the experience and best practice of those who are currently innovating in the areas of research collaboration and regional delivery models.

5.2 If progress is to be made, there will need to be substantial agreement in the sector that the status quo is unsustainable, that cultural change is needed and such change can best be delivered through a regional structure. The engagement of local authorities, universities, Historic England, ALGAO, FAME, ClfA and relevant Government Departments will also be crucial.

5.3 In any reframing of archaeological services, existing LPA teams will need to join with others in a sustainable structure, requiring political agreement between the authorities concerned. However, maintaining established contacts between archaeological officers and planning casework officers, both in development management and local plans, would be vital. This suggests a possible model involving a single HQ, but with many staff working remotely or flexibly.

5.4 Regional groupings will need to take account of archaeological integrity (logical areas for research strategies), the degree of pressure for change (to achieve critical mass of demand/resources) and institutional geography (to build on existing strengths). Established regional networks are potentially relevant, including Historic England's Regional Research Frameworks initiative and Regional Science Advisors, and the Doctoral Training Partnerships (most university-based) created under the Arts and Humanities Research Council.

5.5 Combining local HERs into a single regional database would be a major advance and will be essential to enable data to be interrogated across a region to inform regional and national research themes and develop their potential for interpretation, prediction and modelling at regional level.⁴⁷ Hubs would need to co-operate to agree common data standards in order to move towards compatibility of data and metadata, at least across England.

5.6 Financing regional teams would necessarily rely substantially on the two established sources of income, charging developers for commercial use of the HER database and procurement by local planning authorities of planning advice in relation to archaeology,⁴⁸ although other sources of funding could be explored. The supply of data to guide environmental management under the proposed DEFRA 25-year Environmental Plan (subject to the realities of leaving the EU) could also generate income. The Howell-Redesdale Inquiry's suggestion of a voluntary levy on all developments attracted no support and can be discounted as unworkable.⁴⁹

5.7 In conclusion, the Society is well aware that these proposals to remedy the imbalances in the current system by regionalising HERs and archaeological advisory teams will be challenging. Nonetheless, we believe that a drastic change in ambition as well as structure is essential, if only to demonstrate that the substantial annual investment through commercial archaeology continues to be seen to deliver commensurate public value for money.

5.8 The consequences of *ad hoc* public sector retrenchment in the face of a deep recession following the Covid-19 crisis, exacerbating the shortcomings of present practice, may otherwise lead to a public and political conclusion that the costs of development-led archaeology impose a burden of questionable value.

- 47 One aim could be to develop programmes for record enhancement which improve compatibility and particularly the ability to search on the same terms, and to ensure that further technical development moves towards rather than away from common data standards.
- 48 Currently by maintaining an in-house team, contributing to a joint service, or buying in advice.
- 49 Howell and Redesdale 2014, 11–12.

Appendix A: Potential roles of the regional hubs

Provide a lead for regional research

A regional resource hub would be ideally placed to ensure that the regional research framework is kept up-to-date and developed as a live, evolving strategy, responsive to new insights and information, rather than a 'finished' document. A dedicated resource could extend the scope of regional research to include subjects such as the impact on the historic environment of land-use change outside the planning system (e.g. agri-environment, climate change). More specifically, it could:

- Facilitate collaboration and innovation in archaeological practice and research between archaeological societies, universities, local authorities, museums and commercial units.⁵⁰
- Positively influence the quality of archaeological synthesis and publication.⁵¹
- Support innovative tools to improve synthesis, for instance by using overarching planning conditions to stipulate the production of single syntheses as part of the public benefit outcome of large development projects with multiple developers.⁵²
- Develop tools for the modelling of past landscapes. This is likely to have significant potential for landscapes and regions that have been intensively developed and have good quality evidence, such as the Thames Valley, East Yorkshire and the East of England. It could also be used to improve predictive modelling for planning advice.

To undertake regional research into the operation of the planning and archaeology system

New research into the outcomes of archaeological practice would be used to realize greater public benefit by introducing a reflexive approach that would improve standards, achieving a greater consistency of approach across a region and provide support for local authority services. The scope of such research would range from initial curatorial advice through to post-excavation and publication. This would facilitate greater information exchange and highlight any existing comparative work to ensure that: LPA decision, monitoring and enforcement processes are more robust and efficient; the processes of archaeological assessment, data gathering and analysis are more geared towards informing regional and national research; good practice identified from research, such as the case of Heathrow Terminal 5 (see 2.1.4), is implemented.

Potential areas for research are:

- the regional effectiveness of methodologies and other aspects of practice in field survey and investigation and post-excavation analysis;⁵³
- the outcomes of local authority advice to LPAs: regionally-based research to compliment the national ALGAO survey;⁵⁴
- the impact of changes to planning policy and law, including permission in principle, the limitation of the use of pre-commencement planning conditions, and the expansion of permitted development, now envisaged as extending to the complete redevelopment of existing buildings;⁵⁵
- gathering information which can be used to support services threatened with cuts and which can also measure impact of local government services cuts on the protection of archaeology and lost public benefit.⁵⁶

- 50 The Bexhill to Hastings Link Road in East Sussex and the use of systematic metal-detecting in Cheshire provide two good examples of such innovative collaboration, see Wills and Bryant 2019, 2, Case-Studies 5 & 112.
- 51 See Appendix B. The East Anglian Archaeology Editorial Board provides a good model of an existing regional structure that could be adapted to work in other regions.
- 52 Wills and Bryant 2019, Case Study 109, provides an example of the use of an overarching planning condition.
- 53 This would address the problems identified above in section 3.1.5–7. See also Bryant, Fulford, and Holbrook 2017, 16–17; Wills and Bryant 2019, 1, 54, recommendation 5.
- 54 See ALGAO 2016.
- 55 See Wills and Bryant 2019, recommendation 1; MHCLG 2020.
- 56 To address problems identified above in section 3.2.4.

Develop partnerships between local authorities, commercial units, universities, museums and local societies

Funded advice on development projects from relevant academic specialists to commercial units and curators could be facilitated by developing partnerships between regional hubs and universities. The arrangements could be tested on large and/or complex development projects with a high potential to address regional and national research. The Society is aware that different agendas and goal-driven expectations across sectors create obstacles for successful partnerships, however, working in collaboration and partnership could offer more scope for further exploration, experimentation and innovative practices.

Encourage flexible working within the sector and between local authority services

The adoption of increased flexible working practices can address shortages in skills and expertise and can increase cross-sector working and understanding. Potential themes:

- Arrangements for secondments from contracting units to local/regional teams.
- Mapping of skills and expertise within the region, especially for museum and local authority teams, to identify areas of skills shortage and opportunities for training and mentoring.
- Encourage flexible working between local authority services.⁵⁷
- Use existing fora, such as regional HER committees, ALGAO regional meetings and for regional research frameworks to formalise regional networking, training and support.

Develop a regional information management strategy

Local authority information systems (HERs and casework management systems) underpin the archaeology and planning system, and in the case of HERs, are a critical resource. A regional strategy would include:

- Working with HERs, museums and the archaeology sector to compile a definitive annual figure of archaeological surveys and investigations in the region and use this to support OASIS.⁵⁸
- Working with regional HER committees and Historic England; to review HER recording policies and data structures within the region with a view to introducing a consistent regional approach to future data management and recording; to consider ways to increase the use of HERs for research; and produce a strategy for regional data enhancement from survey and research.

Develop a regional resource for community-based archaeology

A regional hub would be able to work with local museums, CBA, PAS and other partners to co-ordinate community-based archaeology in the region, including providing a network for active community groups, a calendar of events and consider opportunities for training excavation and survey projects. It would look to improve opportunities for public engagement and dissemination for development-led projects by building on examples of good practice, as has proved successful in Greater Manchester and Cambridgeshire.⁵⁹

Coordinate training and CPD that is geared toward clear public benefit outcomes

The aims would be to ensure that all practicing archaeologists are aware of developments in technology, research and policy, their significance, and the opportunities they present to improve skills and training for delivering public benefit. Examples include:

- Regional seminars and workshops on research topics and key skills.⁶⁰
- Seminars and day conferences with academics and specialists to update planning archaeologists, museum curators and project managers on the latest research and encourage them to cascade this down to their teams (e.g. DNA sampling, analysis and implications for research; the latest on precision dating).

57 For example: trial innovative procedures to provide cover for long-term leave and/or departures of employees, on a cost-recovery basis; allow a small proportion of time [1–5%] to provide specialist advice, support and training for other local authorities. These should be cost-effective over the longer-term.

58 Online Access to the Index of archaeological Investigations: <https://oasis.ac.uk/pages/wiki/Main>

59 See Appendix B. Also, The ClfA Voluntary and Community Archaeology special interest group could also be used to help develop guidelines and good practice <https://www.archaeologists.net/groups/voluntary>

60 For example, the analytical writing skills workshop in East of England, organised in 2014 by East Anglian Archaeology, a two-day workshop attended by thirteen archaeological practitioners from commercial units.

- Sharing good practice in making the most of opportunities for community engagement and popular dissemination.
- Regular programmes of regional seminars on heritage legislation and policy including updates, run by HE, ALGAO and ClfA.

Provide a strategic approach to the impact of land-use planning

A regional hub would enable a more strategic approach to planning by encouraging consistent input to local plan policies, local plan allocations and major infrastructure projects. This could also include a resource for working with the Historic England regional planner and local authority archaeology services in order to respond to consultations and providing input to local plan Examinations in Public.

Access to specialist advice and the development of regional networks by a regional hub would support the monitoring and enforcement of quality standards via the planning system and through ClfA professional and ethical standards.

Regional archives and the role of Museums and Collections

It will be necessary more closely to incorporate the role of museums and collections into a regional structure, in order to build a more coordinated, coherent framework for promoting the results of archaeology projects. Museums already act as hubs for public access, community engagement, learning and research, and employ staff with considerable expertise in all those areas. Museums have much to offer in the fields of regional research, developing partnerships, flexible working, regional information management, community archaeology and training. They liaise with planning archaeologists, archaeological contractors, community groups and academic institutions to ensure standards for archive delivery are maintained and to provide access to collections that cover much more than the products of the planning system.

A regional hub could act as a store for archaeological archives but also, by employing personnel with curatorial expertise, will be able to provide advice to local museums, promote consistent standards for collecting and curating archaeological material, and engage in the development of strategies for community engagement and research. Regional hubs with a co-ordinating, advisory and development role will bring museums and collections more centrally into the planning system, promoting a joined-up approach that will bring considerable benefits for developing good practice and the reflexive, research-based approach that is the aim of this proposal.

Regional hubs as physical entities could offer regions without adequate museum coverage the potential advantage of being able to offer co-location of regional facilities for the curation, use and development of archaeological archives, which to date has been a long-standing problem. The Mendoza Report charged Historic England to ‘Work with key stakeholders to produce recommendations for DCMS early in 2018, which will improve the long-term sustainability of the archaeological archives generated by developer-funded excavations’. Among their subsequent recommendations to DCMS, Historic England referred to ‘The potential for regional repositories or a national repository to make more effective use of scarce skills in archaeological archive curation.’⁶¹

61 Historic England 2018b; see case-study Appendix B, *Huis van Hilde*.

Appendix B: Case-studies in the UK and Europe

Case-Studies in the UK

Access Cambridge Archaeology

Access Cambridge Archaeology ran from 2006–19. Many of its projects were supported by the National Lottery Heritage Fund under the ‘Our Heritage Programme’. It described itself thus:

Access Cambridge Archaeology is an outreach unit within the Division of Archaeology at the University of Cambridge. The primary aim of Access Cambridge Archaeology is to enhance educational, economic and social well-being through active participation in archaeology. It seeks to achieve this by running novel, fun and challenging activities for members of the public, including school pupils, to develop new skills and confidence; raise their educational aspirations, boost their academic performance; enjoy learning for the love of it; take part in new archaeological excavations and make new discoveries about themselves and the world around them. Since ACA was set up in 2004, over 10,000 people have got involved in ACA activities through their schools, local communities or hobbies, working alongside experts from the University of Cambridge to explore the past and build for the future.
<https://www.access.arch.cam.ac.uk/>

Defence Archaeology Group (DAG)

DAG is a Not for Profit organisation that facilitates archaeological projects around Britain and abroad. By utilising Vocational Recovery Activities, whilst fostering links with institutions and archaeological schemes, DAG supports a diverse outreach programme focusing on both the technical and social aspects of field archaeology to help with the recovery, management and skill development of tri-service injured military personnel.

DAG facilitated projects offer participants opportunities to learn new skills and undertake comprehensive training using various aspects of archaeology and heritage management, that compliment both Service and Veteran rehabilitation programmes.
<https://www.dag.org.uk>

East Anglian Archaeology (EAA)

EAA is a regional archaeology publishing house (the only one in the UK) based at Norfolk County Council that specialises in publishing archaeology monographs (c six per year and a total of 167 to date). Almost all monographs over two years old are available open access. EAA has been in existence since the 1970s and it encompasses the six counties (Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Hertfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire). The EAA editorial committee is made up of local government archaeologists (one from each county), the HE Ancient Monument Inspectors and regional science advisor, and several former county archaeologists. It has had a prominent role in the regional research frameworks since the 1990s including publishing the reports. It has also published (with ALGAO) guidance on post-excavation assessments and has organised several regional workshops on analytical writing skills for post-excavation staff.

Greater London Archaeological Advisory Services (GLAAS)

(from: <https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/greater-london-archaeology-advisory-service/>)

GLAAS is part of Historic England’s London Local Office and a Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ClfA) Registered Organisation. Working with a number of partners, developers, archaeologists, and London boroughs, it promote understanding and enjoyment of archaeological heritage through its protection, management and interpretation.

Merseyside Archaeological Advisory Services (MAAS)

(from: <https://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/merseyside-archaeological-advisory-service/>)

MAAS was set up in 1991 and jointly funded by all five Merseyside local authorities (Knowsley, Liverpool, St Helens, Sefton and Wirral) to provide an archaeological planning advisory service. The MAAS was hosted by National Museums Liverpool and was based within the Museum of Liverpool division. It closed on 31 March 2011 because the partners cut all funding. The Merseyside Historic Environment Record has now been transferred to the Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service (MEAS).

South Yorkshire Archaeological Services (SYAS)

(from: <https://www.joinedupheritagesheffield.org.uk/content/organisation/south-yorkshire-archaeology-service/>)

SYAS are archaeological advisors to the Councils of Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield, and also offer advice to a wide range of other land managers, as well as developers. SYAS maintain the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) for South Yorkshire which holds information on the known archaeological sites and finds in the county. SYAS also promotes public understanding and appreciation of the historic environment. Each year SYAS holds an Archaeology Day — a series of talks presenting the results of recent archaeological fieldwork and research in South Yorkshire, and produces ‘Archaeology in South Yorkshire’, a regular round-up of recent fieldwork and research.

Welsh Archaeological Trusts⁵⁰

The Welsh Archaeological Trusts consists of four Welsh Archaeological Trust organisations established in the mid-1970s to respond to rescue archaeology together with providing a uniform local archaeology service across Wales. The four organisations are: Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust; Dyfed Archaeological Trust; Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust; Gwynedd Archaeological Trust.

The Trusts maintain Historic Environment Records for their respective areas to provide archaeological advice to central government, planning authorities and other public bodies. Cadw supports this heritage management together with associated archaeological projects and conservation of sites and historic landscapes. On 1 July 2010 the four Welsh Trusts launched their online searchable HER website: *Archwilio*. The site contains the combined record of the four Trusts and gives the public free access to over 100,000 pieces of information about historic sites across Wales.

West Yorkshire Archaeological Services (WYAS)

(from: <https://www.wyjs.org.uk/about-us/>)

For more than thirty years WYAS, led by a joint committee, has been delivering a diverse range of professional services to both the public and private sectors on behalf of West Yorkshire local authorities — Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Leeds and Wakefield. Some of these services fulfil a statutory role in the region such as Trading Standards, Archives and Archaeological Advisory Services whilst others, Archaeological Services, Calibration Services and Analytical Services provide a first class commercial resource which supports businesses locally, nationally and in some instances globally.

Overall, WYAS focus on ensuring that things are done ‘right first time’ through robust compliance and quality control, whilst supporting economic resilience and regeneration. Their strategic business plan is based on three inter-connected priorities: potential of our people; business and economy; environment and heritage.

51 See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Welsh_Archaeological_Trusts

Case-Studies in Europe



Huis van Hilde, Photo: Dqfn13, CC BY-SA 4.0, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=49602818>

Huis van Hilde, The Netherlands

Huis van Hilde, in Centricum, near Amsterdam, is a newly-built regional collections centre for archaeological archives combined with a museum and a sort of heritage community centre, for school visits and other public engagement. The collections side, complete with curator, is state funded but the engagement, marketing and sales (shop and café) part is run by a separate company with its own manager and is self-funded.

<https://huisvanhilde.nl/>

Heritage Management Protection in Scandinavia

(by John Hines)

The Nordic countries of Scandinavia (Denmark, Norway and Sweden) enjoy a good reputation for the quality and effectiveness of their national and public heritage protection measures. This extends to the way in which those are administered, and integrated into research, interpretative, and presentational agenda. The requirements of the law in fact differ quite substantially between these three nations: so that, for instance, private metal-detector use is extremely widespread in Denmark but so strictly controlled by licence in Sweden that is considered effectively forbidden, particularly in relation to known or suspected archaeological sites. All of these lands benefit from a legal framework for heritage which is not only comprehensive and well-enforced, but perhaps best of all has the virtue of being fairly simple and uncomplicated. The relevant Acts are never lengthy documents (although of course there are supplementary Instruments/Orders of bureaucratic complexity), and the legislation is reluctant to identify exceptions. It is also true that for historical reasons — not least the role a rich archaeological heritage could play in nation-building and reconceptualizations of identity through the centuries of post-Renaissance European history — the Scandinavian nations collectively nurtured an exceptional sense of public respect for and appreciation of the material heritage of the past.

The *Danefæ* system, Denmark

The medieval laws concerning found ‘treasure’ (*Danefæ*: in effect, treasure trove) had been developed by the mid-18th century in to a system where the monarchy and its government not only laid claim to precious archaeological finds but would pay a reward to the finder,

with the objects consequently going into the royal and subsequently the national collection. There is now in Denmark a twin core to the maintenance and encouragement of public support for heritage protection. The *Danefæ* system will not only compensate a finder for the *material* value of what is found, but in addition will offer a variable reward, based not on a market value of the find in the antiquities trade but on the prompt reporting and securing of the site of a discovery for as thorough professional archaeological excavation or survey as possible. The latter, of course, requires resourcing, and the key channel of support in that respect is the strong and much valued system of ‘local museums’, placed on a statutory basis by the first national Museums Act of 1958, updated on a number of occasions since (most recently in 2001/2, when, belatedly perhaps, the ‘developer/polluter pays’ principle was adopted.) Previous modifications had created strong regional museum councils (1976), and then coordinated their activity more with those of local authorities and particularly their planning departments (1984). Of course there are still issues over priorities and focus, while the relationship between these curatorial and fieldwork sectors and the arguably relatively small university research sector and the role of the state Research Council and its few, but often extremely large grants, remains a cause of tension.

Riksantikvarieämbetet, Sweden

Sweden has had a ‘Cultural Heritage Service’ (*Riksantikvarieämbetet* — *RAÄ*) from as early as the 17th century, although more general protection for sites themselves were not introduced into law until 1867. All finds are determined to belong to the state rather than to the crown. The *RAÄ* remains a key body in the management of the heritage sector. Over time it has separated from the national museum (*Statens Historiska Museum*) to deal more with sites in situ, surveying, excavation and recording. Contract archaeology is now widespread in Sweden, with development subject to a developer-pays principle in respect of both survey and excavation/post-excavation. This is administered at a regional government (*landskap*) level. The current legislation providing protection for the historic environment and specifying sites and finds should be dealt with is the Heritage Protection Act of 1988. Interestingly this protected historic place-names as well as sites and finds, long preceding the recent Welsh legislation.

Heritage Management, Norway

Norway did not achieve statehood as a nation independent of Sweden (and previously, to 1814, Denmark) until 1904. The archaeological heritage of Norway not surprisingly played a very strong role in Norwegian nationalism in the 19th century. Under the Qvisling government and Nazi occupation from 1940–5 this led to unwelcome fascist appropriation of the historical sites and museums at Borre and Bygdøy. The key current legislation in Norway is the Cultural Heritage Act of 1978, which essentially reinscribed a previous general protection for all archaeological deposits and finds pre-dating AD 1537, the year of the Reformation: rather archaically, now, reflecting a sense of a chronological boundary line between an ‘archaeological’ and a ‘historical’ past. Protection for historical buildings varies from total protection for any buildings dated up to 1649 and an attempt to conserve any buildings of 100 years old or more. In Norway it is important that different protection applies to sites of Saami (Lappish) culture, where the cut-off point is as recent as 1917. The delivery or oversight of fieldwork is much more centralized in Norway, through *Riksantikvaren*’s office (the State Antiquary) and the five major regional museums in Oslo, Stavanger, Bergen, Trondheim and Tromsø, all of them (now) more or less closely linked with university departments. The relative wealth of Norway means that these museums are able to support staff who are effectively full-time research specialists, separate from the university teaching academics.

References

ALGAO 2016. ALGAO: England Casework Survey 2011–14 Summary Report. <https://www.algao.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/PlannningSurveyReportMarch2015final.pdf>

——— 2019. Archaeology in Development Management: Its Contribution in England, Scotland and Wales. <https://www.algao.org.uk/archaeology-development-management>

Allen, Martyn, *et al.* 2015. ‘The Rural Settlement of Roman Britain: An Online Resource’. Archaeology Data Service. <https://doi.org/10.5284/1030449>

Archaeology Forum 2005. ‘Archaeology Enriches Us All’, <https://www.archaeologyuk.org/archforum/enriches.pdf>

Blair, John 2018. *Building Anglo-Saxon England*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford

British Academy 2017. *Reflections on Archaeology*. <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/publications/reflections-archaeology>

Bryant, Stewart, Fulford, Michael and Holbrook, Neil 2017. ‘The Roman Rural Settlement Project: How Operational Research Can Inform Future Practice Strategies’. *The Archaeologist*, **101** (n.d.)

Council of Europe 1992. *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised)* (Valetta Convention) <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/rms/090000168007bd25>

——— 2005. ‘*Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* (Faro Convention)’. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/faro-convention>

Darvill, Timothy 2016. ‘What’s Been Going On?’ *The Archaeologist* **98** (Spring), 12–13. <http://eprints.bournemouth.ac.uk/23816/1/IAP%20article%20TA98.pdf>

Darvill, Timothy, *et al.* 2018. *Archaeology in the PPG16 Era: Investigations in England 1990-2010*, Oxbow Books, Philadelphia, PA

Egan, John 2004. The Egan Review: Skills for Sustainable Communities. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/11854/1/Egan_Review.pdf

English Heritage 2008. *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance*. <http://historicengland.org.uk/advice/constructive-conservation/conservation-principles/>

Fulford, Michael and Holbrook, Neil 2018. ‘Relevant Beyond the Roman Period: Approaches to the Investigation, Analysis and Dissemination of Archaeological Investigations of the Rural Settlements and Landscapes of Roman Britain’, *Archaeological Journal* **175**, 214–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00665983.2017.1412093>.

Gosden, Chris, *et al.* 2019. English Landscape and Identities. <https://englaid.wordpress.com>

GOV.UK 2020a. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government: *Planning for the Future*, White Paper August 2020. <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future>

——— 2020b. ‘GOV.UK Guidance: Historic Environment’<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment>

Grenville, Jane and Fairclough, Graham 2004. ‘Characterisation: Introduction’, *Conservation Bulletin* **47**. <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-bulletin-47/cb-47/>

Heritage Alliance 2019. Heritage Manifesto. <https://www.theheritagealliance.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Manifesto-2019.pdf>

Historic England 2010. ‘Heritage Counts 2010 - Economic Impact of the Historic Environment’. <http://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/2010-economic-impact/>

——— 2011. ‘Heritage Counts 2011 - Historic Environment and Big Society’ <http://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/2011-big-society/>

——— 2012. ‘Heritage Counts 2012 - The Historic Environment and Resilience’. <http://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/2012-the-historic-environment-and-resilience/>

——— 2014. ‘Heritage Counts 2014 - The Value and Impact of Heritage’ <http://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/2014-the-value-and-impact-of-heritage/>

——— 2016. ‘Heritage Counts 2016: Heritage and Place Branding’. <http://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/2016-heritage-and-place-branding/>

——— 2018a. ‘Heritage Counts 2018: Heritage and the Economy’. <https://historicengland.org.uk/content/heritage-counts/pub/2018/heritage-and-the-economy-2018/>.

——— 2018b. ‘Mendoza Review: Historic England’s Recommendations to DCMS on the Future of Archaeological Archives, March 2018’. <https://historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/consultations/he-response-to-dcms-mendoza-review-mar18-pdf/>

Historic England and ALGAO 2019. ‘HER Annual Survey 2019’. https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/filearea.cgi?LMGT1=HERFORUM&f=/Surveys/HER_Annual_Survey

Historic England, ALGAO and IHBC 2018. ‘The Tenth Report on Local Authority Staff Resources | Historic England’. <http://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/tenth-report-la-staff-resources/>

Howell, John and Redesdale, Lord 2014. *The Future of Local Government Archaeology Services*, An exploratory report commissioned by Ed Vaizey, Minister for Culture, Communications and Creative Industries, and conducted by John Howell MP and Lord Redesdale. https://www.appag.org.uk/future_arch_services_report_2014.pdf

IHBC 2016. ‘Event: Character Building: Putting Heritage at the Heart of Planning and Placemaking’. <https://events.ihbc.org.uk/?p=5832>

Local Government Association 2018. Local Government Funding: Moving the Conversation On, https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/5.40_01_Finance%20publication_WEB_0.pdf

Maidment, Christopher 2015. ‘Planning in the Public Interest? Looking for the “public Interest” in English Plan-Making’, unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Sheffield. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/42605662.pdf>.

Morrison, Wendy, Thomas, Roger M and Gosden, Chris 2014. ‘Laying Bare the Landscape: Commercial Archaeology and the Potential of Digital Spatial Data’. *Internet Archaeology* **36**. <https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.36.9>

Nixon, Taryn 2017. ‘“What about Southport?” A Report to ClfA on Progress against the Vision and Recommendations of the Southport Report 2011, Undertaken as Part of the 21st Century Challenges in Archaeology Project’. https://www.academia.edu/34276002/Nixon_T._2017_What_about_Southport_A_report_to_ClfA_on_progress_against_the_vision_and_recommendations_of_the_Southport_Report_2011_undertaken_as_part_of_the_21st_century_challenges_in_archaeology_project

NLHF 2019. ‘Strategic Funding Framework 2019–2024’, National Lottery Heritage Fund. <https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/about/strategic-funding-framework-2019-2024>

NPPF 2019. National Planning Policy Framework. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Patrick, Chris 2019. ‘Historic Environment Policy: The View from a Planning Department, The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice’. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice* **10**: 3–4, 395–407. DOI: 10.1080/17567505.2019.1696564

Pitts, Mike 2012. ‘Local Authority Cuts’, *British Archaeology*, **122**

Rippon, Stephen 2016. Approaches to the investigation, analysis and dissemination of work on Romano-British rural settlements and landscapes: A review, Paper 2: The contextualization of results. <https://cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk/community/discover-the-past/developer-funded-roman-archaeology-in-britain/methodology-study/>

Rippon, Stephen, Smart, Chris and Pears, Ben 2015. *The Fields of Britannia: Continuity and Change in the Late Roman and Early Medieval Landscape*. Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-fields-of-britannia-9780199645824?cc=gb&lang=en&>

RTPI 2019. *Resourcing Public Planning*. <https://www.rtpi.org.uk/policy/2019/november/resourcing-public-planning/>

Society of Antiquaries 2019. ‘Statement of Values’. https://www.sal.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/StatementofValues2019_Final.pdf

Southport Group 2011. Realising the Benefits of Planning-Led Investigations in the Historic Environment: A Framework for Delivery, Institute of Field Archaeologists, Reading

Thomas, Roger 2019. ‘It’s Not Mitigation! Policy and Practice in Development-Led Archaeology in England,’ *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice* **10**: 3–4. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17567505.2019.1662999>

Timby, Jane 2017. Approaches to the investifation, analysis and dissemination of work on Romano-British rural settlements and landscapes. Paper 4: Review of current practices in Roman pottery analysis. <https://cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/RRS-Methodology-Paper-4-pottery.pdf>

Trow, Steve 2018. ‘Archaeology and the State We’re In: Defining a Role for Historic England in the Archaeological Practice of the Twenty-First Century’. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice* **9**: **2**, 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17567505.2018.1456718>

Wills, Jan 2018. The world after PPG16:21st-century challenges for archaeology (CiFA/ Historic England) <https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/21st-century%20Challenges%20for%20Archaeology%20project%20report%20October%202018.pdf>

Wills, Jan and Bryant, Stewart 2019. Archaeology and Planning Case Studies, ClfA for Historic England. <http://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/archaeology-and-planning-case-studies/>