

## **R/2021/1046/CD ERF Grangetown: Condition 7 of R/2019/0767/OOM (FOR OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN ENERGY RECOVERY FACILITY)**

The submitted Post-Excavation Assessment was supplied to us under separate cover by Prospect Archaeology (archaeological consultants to the developer) in November and assessed by us in December. The following observations and recommendations were made, for amendment to the PXA and communicated to Prospect Archaeology.

Until such amendments are made and/or discussed further, we would not recommend that the document as submitted is sufficient to satisfy the relevant part of the condition.

### NEAR Ltd Observations and recommendations

#### **Energy Recovery Facility Site, South Bank, Redcar Post-Excavation Assessment**

(Pre-Construct Archaeology, August 2021)

PCA Site Code ERF21; Report R14631

1. Structure of report – acceptable
2. General level of detail – acceptable
3. Typographical slips are numerous (e.g. ‘context’ para 1.6, ‘later show’ para 2.5.8, ‘is recorded to have been’ para 2.5.10, ‘list’ para 3.2.2 etc) – should be corrected on final edit
4. In several places the text is overly compressed or suffers from the omission of words or contorted syntax. The ‘best’ example of this is probably at paragraph 5.4.1, but these are relatively frequent issues (the reasoning in the last sentence of paragraph 1.7, for example, is obscure), and in the places where they occur, should be resolved, possibly by adopting a slightly more discursive approach.
5. Paragraph 1.2 (non-technical summary) should make it clear that there was an agreed WSI for the work by NAA (NAA Report 20/43, April 2020); and a later WSI for the recording and watching brief work agreed in 2020 (Prospect Archaeology 2020), then subsequently revised (see note 12 of these notes).
6. Paragraph 1.10: suggest this is deleted and replaced with a paragraph that properly summarises the further work in the relevant context, e.g. “The recording and evaluation work carried out has confirmed the extent, condition and some functional relationships of the Blast Furnaces, but the survival of the same does not warrant their preservation *in situ*, or any further analysis of the finds, structures or deposits recovered. The only further work proposed therefore is for a technically accurate and generally accessible publication of the history of the blast furnaces informed by the recording work, to assist with local understanding and engagement with this significant element of the region’s heritage. This work will require further analysis of the drawings and other archival materials produced by the investigation and some

specialist academic input the history of the site. The form, scope, and content of such publication will be agreed with the local planning authority.”

Paragraph 8.6 will need amending accordingly.

7. Generally, the non-technical summary would benefit from a re-write so that it is user-friendly (which must be the purpose of the section?).
8. Is Area B “c 10ha” ? (paragraph 2.2.1); Paragraph 4.1.3 puts it at 70 x 120 metres. Clarification of what is meant by ‘Area B’ required.
9. The report is well-illustrated - but see comments at note 11 below, and in the summary at note 20
10. Paragraph 2.4.2 - which report is being referred to in the final sentence? If the Prospect report is meant, then the sentence needs to say that ‘archaeological mitigation *‘required to be undertaken.. etc’*
11. Paragraphs 2.5.10 and 1.8 - There is a significant historical/archaeological point here about the operation/functioning of the site at this time, involving the supply of the Bessemer converters. The report should illustrate, by way of a specifically drawn plan, to explain how the site is conceived (by those writing the report) to have been functioning at this significant period (1910-1920), showing the location of the blast furnaces and converters, instead of relying solely on OS maps.  
Also, in the same paragraph: ‘is recorded to have been demolished’ – where (reference?: ditto the first sentence of paragraph 1.8 (“historic accounts” - which?)
12. Paragraph 4.1.2 - The WSI should be annexed to the PXA as an appendix (this is Prospect Archaeology 2020b, and Prospect Archaeology 2021) – so that the initial requirement and the revised scope of the investigation is clear to the reader. NB Also replace the word ‘update’ with the word ‘revised’ (first line of the paragraph), as was agreed with Prospect when the revision was accepted.
13. Paragraph 4.1.3 - either refer to the plan in the WSIs (see above) or, better, inset the relevant plan showing Area B from the revised Prospect WSI (2021).

The sentence ending “to ascertain the level of truncation from the late 20<sup>th</sup> century phase of the Cleveland Steel works” is incorrect/misleading; see 4.1 of the revised Prospect WSI and note that (a) the evaluation of ground investigation works had demonstrated that the parts of the site to the south and west of Area B to be of less significance than area B (as anticipated) but that watching brief activity in these areas (in accordance with paragraph 7.2 of the initial 2020b WSI which, for example, required that “*Built structures such as walls will be examined and sampled to a degree whereby, as far as is practicable given general site conditions, their extent, form, date, function and relationship to other features and deposits can be established.*” was by March 2021 agreed to be of limited value following the effects of unmonitored remediation.

14. Paragraph 4.1.4, clarify that the numerous structures that were ‘demolished and grubbed out’ were present at the time of the Tees Archaeology Desk-Based Assessment in 2019.
15. Para 5.3.16 - syntax obscures meaning: re-write

16. Paragraph 5.4.1 – Re-write required due to poor expression and failure to follow correct conventions: e.g. “furnaces 1-3 were still being used by the Ordnance Survey map of 1895”; reference to assertions in other reports without specific reference or justification; and overly compressed wording hindering comprehension.
17. Does plate 22 show BF3 and duct 16, or is it BF2 and duct 16 (compare with notation on drawn plan at page 89, fig. 12)?
18. Referencing of OS mapping (under ‘Cartographic Sources’) is only partial, and should give the map scale and edition.
19. Extensive drone footage was produced to give a ‘live’ impression of the site following cleaning and recording. This footage should be referred to as part of the resources that will be publicly available, with sufficient details, e.g. project ID, video reference number, date, running time, orientation and feature.
20. Section 6 - Contents of the Archive. This does not reference the drone video footage, see above.

Neil Cookson, 24.12.21