



**BRIGHTON 2018**

## **WEDNESDAY 25 APRIL**

---

### **SESSION AND PAPER ABSTRACTS**

#### **14.00 – 17.30 COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES TO MANAGING CULTURAL HERITAGE IN CHALLENGING LANDSCAPES**

Organisers: Lawrence Shaw, New Forest National Park Authority  
Paul Belford, Clwyd Powys Archaeological Trust

A protected landscape can be defined as an area, which has a clear boundary, within which nature, wildlife and heritage are protected, ensuring that people can continue to benefit from the natural and historic environments without destroying them. Though these landscapes may have a clearly defined boundary and nominated protection bodies, the number of different landowners and stakeholders can be challenging. Another challenge is that certain archaeological features within a landscape, such as linear earthworks, may enjoy different levels of protection, depending on the status of the landscape through which they pass.

This session will consider the challenges seen when managing the cultural heritage in these landscapes as well as these linear monuments and the issues that surround multi-authority multi-agency and multi-owners. Papers will seek to show how organisations have delivered innovative and/or synergic workflows to successfully achieve good practice and sustainable protection of the cultural heritage in protected landscapes.

A linked excursion to the South Downs National Park will look at some of the challenges and successes discussed during this session being dealt with on the ground.

#### **PAPER ABSTRACTS**

##### **What do we do with those shapes?**

Tim Yarnell, Forestry Commission

The Forestry Commission is a major manager of land in protected areas including World Heritage Sites, National Parks, National Nature Reserves and Areas of Outstanding Beauty. With a brief to manage forests to benefit people, environment and the economy there are several challenges to meet especially where objectives may compete. Managing the history of the woods and the land they occupy is no exception to this. Over the last decade vast quantities of new data have increased our knowledge of the extent of what lies beneath the trees. Of course, Lidar has played a prominent role in this; points have become polygons and hachured plans terrain models.

This paper is not about how data is obtained or handled but the choices that are faced by managers when presented with it. Archaeologists often refer to the finite and non-renewable resource. In woodland that resource is now demonstrably a lot greater than many thought it was. So, when a land manager presented with all this data how do we answer their question 'What do we do with all those shapes'?

### **A risky business: reducing risks to scheduled monuments**

Alison McQuaid, Historic England

This paper will discuss how Historic England seeks to work in partnership to assess threats, monitor condition and deliver projects to reduce risks to scheduled monuments in protected landscapes across the south east. In particular, it will consider on-going collaborative initiatives within the South Downs National Park to encourage the cross-fertilization of ideas that can lead to innovation and new solutions to complex monument management issues. The paper will also highlight the challenges for monitoring condition and reducing risks to scheduled monuments under multi ownerships and with multi threats which can pose conflicting solutions and outcomes.

### **From flint-head spear to javelin missile**

Richard Osgood, Defence Infrastructure Organisation

From a 'Heritage At Risk perspective', perhaps driving tanks over field systems, firing artillery at Roman villages and infantry digging around prehistoric landscapes may be at the upper echelons of curatorial horror. Protecting these landscapes is certainly a challenge yet damage is very rare. Putting large linear monuments entirely out of bounds becomes restrictive from a military training perspective – so how to include these in military scenarios whilst ensuring their protection? How does the Ministry of Defence minimise disturbance to archaeology and meet the requirements laid down in planning regulations and statute? Can heritage actually be a useful tool in the training of military personnel now that the Government has ratified The Hague Convention for protection of Cultural Property? Innovation is key and, focussing on the largest training area, Salisbury Plain, this paper sets out to illustrate how the team of professional archaeologists within the Ministry achieve it.

### **Exmoor Mires and the historic environment: a partnership with the past**

Martin Gillard, Exmoor National Park Authority

Since 1998 there has been a programme of Mires restoration within Exmoor National Park, carried out in partnership by various stakeholders. The impact on the historic environment has been an integral concern; a dedicated officer having been employed since 2010. Mires restoration schemes have been assessed for their potential consequences regarding the historic environment. The often-slight historic features of Exmoor have been protected by the establishment of exclusion zones and close liaison with onsite contractors. In addition to mitigation works Exmoor Mires has also funded research, producing reports ranging from the Mesolithic to the Second World War; including the palaeoenvironment and tephrochronology. It has not been without challenge; approaches to balance contrasting interests have to be negotiated. But how to assess the merits of a landscape locally designated for its evidence of agricultural improvement when these are the very features to be altered by mires restoration?

### **Sunlit uplands? Managing moorland archaeology in the Yorkshire Dales National Park**

Miles Johnson, Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority

The Yorkshire Dales uplands have provided long-term stability for archaeological and palaeoenvironmental remains, and include earthworks (later prehistoric, early medieval, industrial) that frequently survive at a landscape scale. The areas embody some of the special qualities of the National Park. There are diverse threats to archaeological remains in this environment including; changing land management, visitor pressure, erosion and moorland fires. These are landscapes with competing management interests (recreation, shooting, communing, nature conservation, carbon

sequestration, flood management), and sometimes competing designations, where multiple stakeholders occupy particular niche areas and try to work out how to fit it all together.

This talk assesses recent collaborative work in the Yorkshire Dales in the context of changing approaches to the uplands and increased recognition of the wider 'environmental services' that moorlands provide. It will consider the current support for heritage protection in these areas and offer some thoughts about where future challenges and opportunities may lie.

### **Public Environmental goods and services and the Historic Environment. Engaging with environmental policy**

Hannah Fluck, Head of Environmental Research, Historic England

The UK departure from the EU presents particular challenges for the natural environment and agricultural sectors. While the details of post Brexit environmental and agricultural policies are yet to be determined we do know that they are likely to be underpinned by approaches that seek to identify 'value' in terms of public environmental goods and services. While the heritage sector takes for granted that the UK landscape is the result of complex interaction between human activity and natural processes, many of the frameworks that are increasingly influencing natural environment policy, such as 'natural capital' and 'ecosystem services', don't adequately recognise the complexity of the relationship between 'heritage assets' and the 'natural' environment. Historic England is beginning to look at how the historic environment might be better recognised within these approaches and the results of our research into the subject are presented here.

### **Offa's Dyke: managing a linear monument in multiple landscapes**

Paul Belford, Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust

Offa's Dyke was constructed to delineate the kingdom of Mercia. Academic debate has concerned the extent of the original earthwork, its purpose, function and relationship to earlier and later landscape features. However, management and conservation are also important issues. There is considerable variation in the Dyke's survival and designation. As well as running through both England and Wales, the Dyke also passes through seven different unitary authorities, an AONB and several SSSIs. It is divided across numerous ownerships, with land uses including forestry, arable, pasture, upland and urban settlement. Offa's Dyke is also part of a National Trail with over 300,000 users annually. There are therefore divergent and conflicting interests which affect outcomes for historic and natural environments. This paper explores innovative ways in which these issues have been addressed and considers how responses may be improved in the future.

### **STORM: safeguarding the future of cultural heritage sites through novel management and hazard warning systems**

Michael Nevell and Rob Williamson, Centre for Applied Archaeology, University of Salford

The STORM project, funded by the EU through the Horizon2020 fund, aims to combine non-invasive and non-destructive survey methods with tools for climate monitoring in order to develop a real-time warning and disaster management system for European cultural heritage sites threatened by climate change. The UK test-bed is an area of upland landscape on the north-western edge of the Peak District: Mellor in Stockport. This landscape is one of five European pilot sites, and encompasses three sites, all in different ownerships and with varying levels of statutory and local protection: Shaw Cairn, a moorland Bronze-Age burial site; Mellor Hilltop, an Iron-Age ditched enclosure; and Oldknow's Mill a riverside 18th-century textile mill. The paper will look at the difficulties in bringing together multiple stakeholders, the impact of different types of protection on the project, and how this experience compares with the other four European pilot sites.

## **Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site: translating outstanding universal value into national and local protection**

Sarah Simmonds, Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site

Stonehenge and Avebury were inscribed as a single UNESCO World Heritage Site in 1986 in recognition of their Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). In 2007 the World Heritage Committee underlined the 'pivotal importance of Statements of OUV in all World Heritage processes'. The retrospective document articulating the Site's OUV or significance was adopted by UNESCO in 2013. This and the attributes derived from it now form the focus of the current Management Plan and framework for protection and management decisions.

This paper explores some examples of how the challenge of meeting international obligations to protect the World Heritage Site and sustain its OUV can be addressed in national and local contexts where established policy and assessment approaches are often unused to such 'foreign' concepts. Close partnerships and shared understanding are central to overcoming these challenges in the complex multiple ownership and multi-agency context of the World Heritage landscape.

## **Challenges and problems of heritage management on Rapa Nui, a small archaeology rich, and fast developing Island**

Gabriela Atallah, Jocelyn Hey, and Francisco Torres, Rapa Nui, Easter Island

Rapa Nui is renowned for its archaeological heritage. Its large statues and platforms dominate the island's landscape and world's imagination. But the fact that the whole island has evidence of past activity is as impressive as the moai, being described as a one continual archaeological site.

Rapa Nui faces similar heritage issues seen at many other locations, from development to regulations, community empowerment and lack of heritage conservation plan. But what makes Rapa Nui interesting as a case study is how heritage is at the core of the discourse Rapa Nui community has on its fight towards more political and administrative autonomy from Chilean government as well as the key to its future development.

This paper will explore how heritage can trigger social transformations in a small community and at the same time, to be at the centre of social tensions caused by those transformations, even threatening its own conservation.