Historic Landscape Characterisation

Template Project Design

For EH-supported county-wide HLC projects

This is a companion volume to '*HLC: Taking Stock of the Method*', the short report of the 2001-02 National HLC Method Review. It is also a free-standing document, that will be updated periodically.

The volume provides an outline template and guidance for a Project Design for EH-sponsored county-wide Historic Landscape Characterisation projects. It is drawn from the project designs and method statements of four currently active projects (Cheshire, Cumbria, Devon and Shropshire) and four emergent projects (Buckinghamshire, Dorset, Northamptonshire, North Yorkshire). It is designed to help other local authorities to produce PDs for new projects.

The template offers both general explanation (eg of the HLC programme and its aims) and specific examples of what an HLC PD should contain. It concentrates mainly on methodology, and reflects the conclusions of the Method Review carried out for EH in 2001-2002 by Oscar Aldred and Somerset County Council.

It is only a template, and it may need to be adapted to local needs. Nor does it cover all points that writers of a PD will need to consider. PDs should also meet all the other requirements for EH-supported projects, notably with respect to presenting task, time, staffing and cost information. The EH document 'Minimum Standards for Project Designs' is attached as Annex C of the Template.

CHARACTERISATION TEAM, ENGLISH HERITAGE

FIRST EDITION
DECEMBER 2002

Copies of this document in hard copy and by email are available from:

Graham Fairclough,
Characterisation Team
English Heritage,
23 Savile Row,
London W1S 2ET;

020 7973 3124;

graham.fairclough@english-heritage.org.uk

THE EH HISTORIC LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISATION PROGRAMME
TEMPLATE PROJECT DESIGN

CONTENTS

THE EH HISTORIC LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISATION PROGRAMME
TEMPLATE PROJECT DESIGN

Authorship

This 1st edition HLC Template is based on best practice at October 2002 and reflects the conclusions of the 2001-02 National HLC Method Review. It is in particular a distillation of the Project Designs (or where available, the draft method statements) of four active HLC projects, those for Cheshire, Cumbria and the Lakes, Devon and Shropshire. These have been amplified by a number of more recent draft PDs being prepared during the summer of 2002, in Dorset, Northamptonshire and North Yorkshire.

Although I've compiled the template, and occasionally intruded personal viewpoints, I shouldn't claim much of the credit for its contents, which have been borrowed freely and heavily from the work of many other people within the HLC 'community'. First, the work of Oscar Aldred on the Method Review has been very influential, and this in turn builds on the work of all HLC project officers past and present. Second, the work of those who wrote the most recent PDs (ie Rob Edwards, Miles Johnson, Samuel Turner, Andy Wigley, Claire Pinder and Graham Bryant, Chris Burgess, Rob White and doubtless many others) has been fundamental. Finally, my first draft was improved after comments from Oscar, Miles, Rob and Andy.

Of course, despite all that help, if the tone of this document is sometimes too didactic or pedantic, or too formal or too informal, or if it states the obvious at too much length but is unclear on critical issues, then the fault is mine. I'd be very grateful if users will submit constructive suggestions for making a better 2nd Edition.

Graham Fairclough
English Heritage
25 November 2002

THE EH HISTORIC LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISATION PROGRAMME TEMPLATE PROJECT DESIGN

Introduction to the Template

This document presents a template for a project design for carrying out Historic Landscape Characterisation at county scale. It incorporates the conclusions of the national HLC Method Review carried out by Somerset County Council for EH in 2001-02, and draws on current best practice in the most recently started projects (notably Cumbria, Cheshire, Devon and Shropshire) and emerging projects (Buckinghamshire, Dorset, Northamptonshire and North Yorkshire).

The template does not contain all of the information needed to prepare a full PD for EH commissioned projects. You should also consult *EH Commissioned Archaeology Programme Guidance for Applicants* (Release 1.2, October 2002). This is available on the EH web-page, but its appendix on *Minimum Standards for Project Designs* is attached as Annex C for ease of reference

The Template is written assuming that you (the person writing a PD) are working in a county council Archaeology or Historic Environment department. If that is not the case, please make adjustments accordingly.

Like all PDs, an HLC PD needs to be free-standing, and it should be capable of being understood by a reader with no previous knowledge of the project itself or of the HLC programme as a whole (for example as colleagues from other Departments in your council). Don't forget that one set of very important readers will be candidates for the job of HLC Officer and, more importantly, the successful candidate in his/her first week! If they cannot understand the PD ….

An HLC Project Design needs 5 sections, and each is discussed separately later in the document:

1. Summary & Introduction
2. Background
3. Aims and objectives
4. Method statement
5. Resources and programming

Part 1 of the Project Design: Summary & Introduction

To help make the PD free-standing, a summary should briefly set out rationale, methods and aims, perhaps as follows:

County-wide Historic Landscape Characterisation projects form part of a national programme supported and developed by English Heritage but carried out by local government, chiefly county council historic environment services within Sites and Monuments Records. They aim, through a desk-based programme of GIS mapping and analysis, to achieve an archaeologist's understanding of the historical and cultural origins and development of the current landscape. They seek to identify material remains at landscape-scale that demonstrate the human activities that formed the landscape as it is seen today.

Like all types of characterisation, HLC projects provide broad-brush overviews of complex aspects of the historic environment in order to provide new, wide-ranging information for conservation, management and development decisions. Their objective is to promote better understanding and management of the historic landscape resource, to facilitate the management of continued change within it, and to establish an integrated approach to its sustainable management in partnership with other organisations

HLC is a GIS-based technique. Its information is structured by the identification and grouping of archaeological, historic and other environmental attributes attached to land parcels (ie 'HLC polygons' within GIS). This method, unlike conventional landscape assessment, allows the creation of many different classifications of historic landscape types, each of distinct and recognisable common character, to meet many different uses and applications. The distribution of landscape types can be mapped using GIS supported by written descriptions of the landscape types and the historical processes that they represent. HLC forms a permanent and renewable database that may be utilised to provide information for a variety of planning, conservation and management-led initiatives and strategies.

The principal stage of HLC will define GIS polygons, based on groups of modern land parcels, that reflect common historic characteristics. Each polygon will be assigned to one of a pre-defined set of broad high level HLC Types. More detailed characterisation is made possible by defining a range of attributes for each polygon, and recording tem in a Relational database (such as Access or similar), linked to a GIS recording in an Access or similar database, linked to the GIS (such as MapInfo or ArcView). These attributes reflect the specific historic landscape features that characterise each polygon (eg aspects of field pattern, origin/age of woodland, presence of abandoned industrial activity). Later stages of the project will interrogate these attributes to produce HL Types and other classifications. The HL characterisation will be concerned primarily to recognise visible, extant historic character.

This PD describes the HLC project that is proposed for XXshire

Part 2 of the Project Design - BACKGROUND

This part of the PD needs to define the project area and explain how the project is related to other existing landscape work in the county, notably landscape assessment.

2.1 Location and description of the project area, and previous landscape and characterisation work

The project area

This section should define and describe the area that will be covered by the PD, specifying details such as extent in km^2, population and number of district councils. The project area will normally be a county council administrative area, plus any additional extra-CC areas such as the smaller Unitary Authorities that are unlikely to be viable as separate HLC projects and whose omission could also compromise a County project. Such extra areas should also include parts of AONBs (or National Parks) that extend beyond the county border. Parts of AONBs that have already been HLC'd should be excluded, but in such cases the PD will need to describe how cross-border compatibility will be achieved and at what level (eg at GIS structural level or at output levels). There may also be cross-

CC border work to the edges of national character areas or into 'green' areas of metropolitan councils, especially where HLC-type urban assessment has/is taking place. A map should be included showing the project area with relevant information, including all county, district and AONB etc boundaries, major cities and towns, etc.

The project area's landscape variety and character

This section should be a very brief high level description of the project areas's landscape as seen through conventional views of geology, topography, and generalised landscape character. In addition, the national Countryside Character Map's treatment of the project area should be summarised, and the character areas that lie wholly or partly within the project area should be listed and shown on a map (Countryside Commission / Agency 1998/99). The EH Settlement Atlas (Roberts and Wrathmell 2000) is also relevant, and Provinces, sub-Provinces and local regions that fall within the project areas should be listed and briefly discussed.

Previous landscape and characterisation work

Landscape and characterisation work that has already been carried out in the project area should be briefly referred to, with particular reference to large-scale work that might support HLC work and interpretation. This section should mention where appropriate:

- County or district scale landscape assessment (include map(s) of county character areas)
- EUS projects
- NMP work and state of progress
- Any previous HLC in parts of the county, or neighbouring counties
- Major (ie extensive) landscape archaeology surveys
- Any Lifescapes or related ecological work

2.2 Rationale for the HLC programme and for this particular project

The HLC Programme

The first rationale for an HLC project and its methodology is its national context, including its place in the ongoing EH national programme. This national programme is justified by the need for improved understanding of the historic dimension of the landscape in order to help manage change in the whole archaeological and historic environment resource. It works at landscape scale rather than monument or site level, and forms part of the move towards integrated and sustainable policies. It concerns itself with the whole humanly-made or human–modified fabric of the countryside itself rather than only with the conventional 'archaeological' remains within it. Setting out this over-arching rationale at the outset is an essential step towards grounding the project proposal. This part of the PD can later be rolled forward and amplified to become the basis of the opening chapters of the project report and other publications that will take the HLC into its conservation-led applications.

The background and rationale for the HLC programme is very accessible, being contained in a large number of publications (see Bibliography). The developmental history in particular is set out in detail in the 2002 Method Review by Oscar Aldred. Because, again, the PD, is required to be free-standing, not assuming prior knowledge by readers or appraisers, it needs to summarise this background by considering most of the following topics:

> *… that the present day landscape is a matter of human creation and perception, arising from intellectual, emotional and aesthetic concerns. The fabric of the land that helps people*

to create their idea of landscape is recognised to be the product of thousands of years of human activity, through successive periods of change and modification. Understanding landscape means understanding its dynamism, and the underlying cultural processes and political, social, economic and cultural influences.

… that the need to study archaeological sites in terms of their wider setting, not in isolation, has long been appreciated amongst archaeologists. There is a long and successful tradition of "landscape archaeology", the study of remains of past periods at landscape scale, notably in upland areas and high earthwork survival. Landscape ecology has also made major contributions (eg Rackham) and in parallel, there is an even older tradition of research on landscape, notably Hoskins). New national contexts for understanding historic landscape at large scale are also starting to appear (notably the EH Settlement Atlas, Roberts and Wrathmell 2000, and forthcoming).

… that in recent years landscape assessment has become well-established (Countryside Commission 1987, 1993, 2002), and that this recognises the importance of integrating archaeological approaches to landscape with landscape assessment. You can only integrate what already exists, however, and no suitable archaeologically-based landscape characterisation was available in the early 1990s.The weakness of attempts to expand landscape assessment by "bolting-on" a historical dimension was recognised from the early 1990s. 'Views from the Past' (Countryside Commission 1994, 1997) attempted to address this problem, but it is only possible to integrate types of understanding and knowledge that already exists. It soon became clear that before integration could be achieved a new and separate type of landscape characterisation – HLC - was required, focussed on archaeologists' perspectives, and providing a historical overview.

… that at the same time, an EH R&D project was established to consider the government's invitation in its 1991 White Paper 'This Common Inheritance' to consider the desirability of establishing a register of historic landscapes. This project (later published as Yesterday's World, Tomorrow's Landscape, Fairclough et al 1999) concluded that a partial and selective register would in England be an inappropriate way to protect and manage historic landscape character. It recommended instead a comprehensive programme of HLC, borrowing from but improving on landscape assessment techniques. Protection of historic landscape requires not designation but good management supported by information and understanding. Creating this understanding is the purpose of HLC.

… that the method was fully pioneered in Cornwall in 1993-94 (Herring 1998), and subsequently, with increasing sophistication and exploitation of GIS, in many other counties that did HLC early, eg old Avon, Peak District NP, Axholme, Cotswolds AONB and Hampshire. (Fairclough (ed.) 1999, 2002a). HLC ideas have been embedded into the planning process through PPG15 and PPG7, and most recently in A Force for our Future. HLC is also in line with the guidance of the new (2000) European Landscape Convention.

… that the most recent approaches have moved from a classification-led method to an attribute-based system. In this method, the interpretations and observations ('attributes') that were employed in early HLC projects to allocate land to pre-defined types are instead attached to GIS map polygons, thus leaving classification to later GIS analysis so that decisions are more transparent and defensible. This type of HLC GIS can produce not just one but many different classifications (and other analytical outputs) depending on need and

context. Modern HLC uses GIS not simply as a data-holding and display mechanism, but as an analytical tool, to use recorded landscape attributes to create a range of interpretations.

… that HLC, notwithstanding the growing sophistication of GIS, is a relatively generalised characterisation of historic attributes designed to serve as a resource management tool, to manage change to the historic and archaeological dimensions of the living landscape. It cannot be a free-standing tool for this, nor is it a replacement for other established datasets such as SMRs, building records or other landscape assessments. But it fills a large gap in the available range of conservation mechanisms, and can be used alongside these other systems to move closer to fully integrated methods. The primary aim of county-wide HLC projects is a consistent overall approach that is as transparent as possible, inclusive, repeatable, and above all comprehensive (i.e. no "white land"). This broad framework enables later more detailed assessment to be carried out as and when required and practical. It also offers the maximum benefit in terms of spatial planning, development control, landscape strategies and archaeological resource management, allowing HLC to be multi-functional in relation to all areas and methods. Importantly, it also emphasises the interpretative and subjective character of 'landscape', thus preventing HLC from becoming merely another form of environmental database.

… that more recently, the Countryside Agency (with Scottish Natural Heritage) have published an updated version of their early 1990s landscape assessment guidance (2002), which accepts, as HLC does, that the characterisation of landscape should be a separate and prior task to its evaluation, protection or prioritisation. The general purpose of landscape assessment has been defined (Countryside Commission1993) as assisting local authorities, the private sector, land-use and conservation agencies to understand how and why landscapes are important, appreciate landscape issues, accommodate new development within the landscape and guide inevitable landscape change.

… that the 2002 version of the Countryside Agency's guidance describes HLC as `a practical and robust method for defining and mapping historic landscape character at the county scale'. It recognises that understanding the time-depth of the landscape requires expert analysis and the specialist perspectives of archaeologists, and that GIS-based HLC provides greater understanding of landscape character than landscape character assessment alone. Historic Landscape Characterisation should `inform' – and if possible precede – the process of Landscape Character Assessment. Where this is not possible, however, it is relatively easy to enrich LCA descriptions in the light of later HLC work.

<u>This HLC project</u>

The County Council carrying out this particular HLC project will in addition have a range of other reasons for embarking on HLC. These should be set out in this section of the PD, not only to justify the project for EH funding, but also to create support for it in the county council and district councils that, given the partnership nature of HLC projects, may be contributing substantially to project costs. This section provides the bridge to part 2 Aims and Objectives.

Themes covered might include linkage to Structure Plans or Neighbourhood Plans, the preparation of landscape strategies or the legal requirement to complete AONB management plans, or contribution to large scale World Heritage bids or National Park designation. In some counties, there may be particular emphasis on advising DEFRA on agri-environmental matters or in dealing with Hedgerow Regulation work. There might be internal organisational reasons for carrying out an

HLC project, such as using HLC to encourage integration between different sections of an authority, or to develop new integrated approaches to environmental management.

The PD will usually need to consider how to make connections between the HLC and the SMR (eg how the HLC can give context to an SMR, or enhance it). There will also need to be consideration of how the completed HLC will in future form an integrated part of the SMR subject to updating and archival care, etc (and see Method, Stage 4 below).

This section will almost always need to discuss the relationship of HLC to landscape assessment, whether carrying out HLC as a preparation for landscape assessment or to strengthen an existing landscape assessment. There may also be a need to be explicit about the county HLC's relationship to neighbouring HLC work, especially in relation to preparing future regional overviews

Likely partners and their special needs, including funding and data exchange arrangements could be mentioned in summary here too (but see section 4 below as well), as should some of the main uses that are envisaged for the completed HLC.

Part 3 of the Project Design - AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Having explained the overall rationale in part 2, part 3 of the PD should set out its specific aims and objectives; these in turn will be related to measurable tasks and other components in part 4.

3.1 Overall Aim

The bigger aim of the project need to be stated first. Simply, this is to create, rapidly, for the whole of the project area, a GIS-based, accessible and updateable characterisation (description and definition) of the project area's historic landscape. The HLC will form part of the SMR, and will be created using existing information and understanding of the archaeological and historical attributes of the present day landscape. It will be broad and generalised, not detailed and site-specific.

This will be a characterisation of the present-day landscape of the project area in terms of its historic and archaeological dimension, and of the mainly visible evidence for the human processes that formed it. This characterisation – the HLC - will be made in a way that makes it capable of contributing to emerging national and future regional HLC and to wider county council agenda, of amplifying and enriching overall landscape assessment in the county, and enhancing, contextualising and illuminating the existing SMR. In short it will be designed to support and improve the sustainable management of the archaeological heritage resource and of continuing change within it.

3.2 Project Objectives

Within the above aim, the PD should also define more focussed and measurable objectives that can be related to the real tasks and stages of the project, for example:

1. To produce a GIS-based HLC by characterising the landscape in historic terms. It will define GIS polygons encompassing areas of land which have similar historic character, and

collect attribute data for each polygon that relates to a range of aspects such as detailed field patterns and morphology, historic land-use, landscape change and previous land-use etc.

2. To use the structured attributes attached to each HLC polygon to define and describe Historic Landscape Character based on aspects of present land-use, land management and settlement patterns which reflect differing historical processes in their formation.

3. To collect and create a set of sources and defined 'data sets', to support the HLC characterisation stages, to be transparent, and to facilitate future updates.

4. To analyse and interpret HLC to produce preliminary synthesis, for example both thematic and in terms of character areas, parishes or topographic units, and to inform countryside management, spatial planning and outreach, research and evaluation programmes.

5. To assess the potential for further development of HLC and its uses, and for the definition of future HL, landscape management and other archaeological resource and research strategies.

6. To identify mechanisms by which the HLC can be updated and revised, and if possible absorb other viewpoints, eg public perception.

7. To disseminate the results of the project through professional and popular publications and other media; to ensure that it can become available to landscape managers, planners etc;

8. To produce an archive, a report summarising the project, and practical recommendations and methods for updating.

3.3 Broader Objectives

HLC has more far-reaching objectives than those of the project itself, and these are not necessarily as easily defined or measured, nor are they usually fully achievable during the project's lifetime. They will vary between county councils, being tailored to particular needs at particular times, but they will normally include:

- Improving and promoting an understanding of the historic character of the landscape of the county and of local areas to a variety of users, owners and stakeholders,
- Establishing HLC as first and foremost a resource management tool - creating an accessible body of interpretation and data in order to enable high-quality well-informed and sustainable resource management and conservation at a landscape level,
- Finding ways to update and enlarge the county HLC so that it continues to reflect current landscape character, and may be compared in future to the benchmark of the original HLC,
- Addressing the importance of areas of historic interest, significance and evidential potential as well as individual sites, of the fabric of the whole, widening old-fashioned views of what is the proper subject of archaeological study and understanding,
- Assisting the building of partnership with other agencies and other disciplines,
- Encouraging integrated working with other environmental and conservation agencies eg for agri-environmental and rural diversification schemes – HLC should be seen as an is essentially integrative tool,
- Enhancing awareness of local distinctiveness and identity among communities (and using HLC as framework to acknowledge people's perception of their own landscape).

Part 4 of the Project Design - METHOD STATEMENT

Introduction

The Method Statement is the core of the PD, and is discussed at some length in this Template.

EH-financed HLC projects are expected to use the methodology devised and improved in a succession of HLC projects from Cornwall, though Hampshire, Eastern England, Lancashire and Somerset and culminating (for the moment) in Cumbria, Cheshire, Shropshire and Devon. The accepted core best practice was isolated and defined during the 2001-2 national HLC Method Review carried out for EH by Oscar Aldred. The method presented below brings all this best practice together, but you will still find it useful to obtain copies of the Method Statement from one or two current projects, especially those of neighbouring counties or those in the same Region. HLC projects starting to be planned from 2003/04 will use the method set out in this template.

Whilst the principles and general approach of the method must be followed, there may still be justification for some adaptation to reflect the distinctive cultural landscape history, land management, state of understanding, etc of the project area. Some projects will also need to find ways of making sure that their results can be matched up with adjacent counties that might have been created using earlier methods. This ought to be practical through careful intelligent use of GIS: the recommend structure ought to be capable of diverse outputs, some of which can be made to be consistent with neighbouring HLC, even where those might be emerging from less sophisticated GIS structures. This has been done in a number of places (eg Cotswolds, Surrey). In addition to such county-consistency issues, a future stage of the HLC programme aims to produce regional HLC synthesis that will be at a level that can rise above detailed county dissimilarities.

The HLC method works from a broad to a detailed level. This ensures that an overview of the whole area is created within the limits of the project. It will also provides a county-wide (and later regional) context and framework for future refinement of the characterisation in those areas that merit further work for some reason, such as special landscape interest, perhaps, but more likely management or planning priority or threat. It is more important in HLC to cover the whole county superficially than to complete detailed work in part of a county only. The potential through GIS for the integration of HLC results with other heritage datasets should also be outlined in the PD. HLC is best seen as a starting point for future refinement as well as being the first ever overall characterisation of a county's historic landscape. Experience shows that projects that attempt to take account of all aspects of landscape, or to work at local rather than county scale will be less successful and may fail.

The HLC method comprises four main stages of work, which structure the project's timetable and should be subdivided into tasks. This fourfold approach is a tried and tested one that new projects should adopt unless there is good reason to follow a different model (eg co-ordination with landscape assessment work running in parallel, when timing and prioritisation might need to be modified). The four stages are:

Stage 1: Familiarisation, Refinement of Project Methodology and Sample Tests
Stage 2: Characterisation: Mapping Character and Digitisation
Stage 3: Review and Analysis of HLC
Stage 4: Report, Archive and Dissemination

The PD must describe what is proposed under each of these headings. The following sections give guidance.

In very general terms, the duration of stage 1 is usually 2-3 months. The duration of stage 2 depends on the size of the county, the complexity of its landscape, the availability and degree of digitisation of the main data sources. The best guide is to consult neighbouring counties that have already carried out HLC, but as very crude rule of thumb – which must be tested and reviewed with respect to any given county - this stage ought to be about 50-60% of the overall project duration. Stage 3 might be expected to be about 20-25% of the project's length timetable, and stage 4 about three - four months.

4.1 Stage 1: Familiarisation, Refinement of Project Methodology and Sample Tests

The Familiarisation sub-stage will involve the project officer in becoming acquainted with the project area, key partners and data sources, explaining the methodology and objectives of HLC, critically reviewing any existing landscape assessments, and doing any necessary training in GIS use. Another important part of this stage is to consult neighbouring active projects (and completed projects in the same English Region) to maximise compatibility. First, if neighbouring projects adhere to core HLC practice, to borrow details of eg data structures and attributes, and second, in the case of older methods, to ensure that your project can produce outputs that are compatibly with others'.

Refinement of project methodology will include examination of potential data and information sources with regard to their content, geographical cover and how they might be exploited in relation to the HLC. A GIS-based system (such as MapInfo or ArcView), with a linked Relational Data-base (such as Access or similar package), and a practical method of data collection and analysis, will be developed as part of this sub-stage. The GIS system is a key tool for HLC, enabling the construction, analysis and presentation of the HLC database, and this is a critical stage of the project which the PD should describe in some detail. Obviously full data structures etc will not be available when the PD is being drafted but the PD should set out an outline structure to guide the incoming HLC Officer. Some guidance on database structure is provided under 'Stage 2' below and in Annex B, and this is a prime area of detail where consultation with neighbouring active HLC projects will be helpful.

Sample work will be designed to test the draft project method and its GIS database structure on sample areas of the project area. The PD should specify the location and size of the sample areas, and how they are representative of the whole county. They should be defined to test the method against the most foreseeable major variations in the county's landscape. Their location needs to be chosen to cover the diversity of the project area's HL character, and to ensure as far as possible that the proposed method fits all the contexts that exist within the study area. Normally 3 or 4 discrete blocks of land (eg 10x10km sq) are sufficient, but parishes can offer advantages. There is little point in doing transects. The PD should include a map showing the proposed test areas, although final decisions will usually be taken with the Project Group at a start-up meeting.

The PD needs to define the planned products of stage 1, and make provision for the draft project methodology to be modified as appropriate in the light of the test area results, usually coinciding with a meeting of the Project Group and perhaps the steering group, see below). A finalised written Method Statement will be produced as a manual for stage 2. This will be kept updated during the project as methods are refined even further or revised in response to adding new attributes or

utilising new data sources. This continual refinement during the main stages of HLC work is an important part of the HLC method, sometimes requiring a reworking of some earlier attributes. The evolving Method Statement will be the starting point for the final Project Report in Stage 4.

4.2 Stage 2: Characterisation: Mapping & Digitisation

Stage 2 is the central, principal stage of the project. It applies the methodology refined and finalised in stage 1 to the whole county, particularly by defining and characterising GIS polygons and then ascribing attributes to each polygon, within a related database, that describe its present-day HLC, previous and (where known) earlier HL character. The methodology for doing this will reflect the conclusions of the national HLC Method Review (2002), and is summarised below. Annex B provides more detail on several topics only summarised in this section. See also Fairclough 2002a and Dyson-Bruce 2002.

The definition and mapping of HLC polygons, the creation of attributes and their subsequent analysis to produce classifications of types, will primarily be a desk-based exercise, using maps and vertical air photographs. Fieldwork does not form a significant part of the project, not primarily because of resource constraints but simply because it is in fact very difficult to perceive broad patterns of landscape character in the field, except in simplistic visual terms, or at very local level. Vertical aerial photographs, particularly where the County Council's GIS already contains county-wide coverage of recently-taken geo-referenced colour vertical photographs, are increasingly an essential aid to the project, used to enhance and verify interpretation from maps.

The next section gives guidance on the range of sources most used in HLC. First and foremost, however, comes the landscape knowledge, expertise and understanding that always exists – recognised or not – in the heads of SMR officers, county archaeologists and their colleagues. It is difficult to be systematic about this, but the HLC project can be used as a catalyst for capturing some of this experience and placing it into a structured context. Such people will be invaluable to the HLC officer during this stage. Indeed this is one of the reasons why in-house construction of an HLC is strongly to be preferred, because the cumulative day to day proximity of the work to existing members of the team is perhaps the best way to facilitate the sharing of knowledge. It also fosters increased ownership, which is an issue that should extend well beyond those actively involved in making the HLC. This section of the PD should refer to such considerations.

<u>Sources</u>

Whilst HLC is essentially an exercise in *interpretation* (the reading of material culture, in this case the landscape at large) rather than *data collection*, it does of course require the use of a large number of data-sets. Many of these are nowadays easily accessible and available digitally in most counties. In many cases, however, the datasets have never been brought together, and doing this can be a valuable important task of this part of the project that the PD should consider. If they are not digitally available, the HLC project might be used to justify acquiring them, although unfortunately not with EH HLC grants, because they have wide pan-council application.

The primary source for HLC is the present-day landscape itself, but as a desk-based high-level (indeed, by analogy, an aerial) view of the landscape it has to be viewed through maps and air photographs, pre-eminently:

- current digital maps (preferably MasterMap) to define polygons and capture data
- the 1:25,000 paper maps to provide context and accessible outputs

- geo-referenced GIS-based vertical APs and
- other digital data sources.

Archaeological knowledge, morphological interpretation and landscape history will be used as means of interpreting these sources to create an archaeological understanding of the material remains that they depict.

Supporting evidence as appropriate will be sought from other data sets such as habitat surveys, historic maps and documentary evidence. In addition historic county maps dating from the late 18th and early 19th century are sometimes available and may be used as a further aid to interpretation. In general terms, however, the acquisition of data from other historic maps, such as tithe, enclosure and estate plans, is too large a task within an HLC project, and it is best to regard them as a resource for future use within a complete HLC framework. It may be possible during the HLC project to use historic maps in a strategic manner, however, by extrapolating an interpretation from the detailed characterisation of key areas, whether surrounding areas or areas of similar type or history. In such cases, it is necessary to protect transparency by recording the assumptions that lie behind the extrapolation.

There are many other data sources that are potentially suitable for incorporation within the HLC, but few datasets provide consistent and comprehensive coverage at county level, especially as digitised data is preferable. These include several sources that may prove useful in interpreting landscape change (eg large area landscape surveys, composite maps of parliamentary enclosure etc.). These will be used where available and again extrapolated to the surrounding areas of landscape. Other datasets such as the SMR, oblique aerial photographs or boundary information will normally be used during the analysis phase of the HLC project, because it is usually a matter of the HLC explaining the SMR data as much as the SMR forming the HLC.

Annex A sets out many of the sources most commonly used in recent HLC work.

Defining HLC Polygons

The PD need not go into too much detail about how polygons will be defined but a general description is needed. HLC polygons will usually be defined using current digital Ordnance Survey mapping (MasterMap). HLC does not use the MasterMap TOID-defined polygons individually, but through a process of grouping them into larger polygons (ie 'HLC Polygons' - 'hyper-polygons' – the HLC building block) on the basis of shared generalised predominant characteristics. An alternative way of using MasterMap is not to create hyper-polygons, but to data-code several MasterMap polygons at the same time, whether in one or more groups. In practice this produces the same effect, a purposeful generalisation of the highly detailed MasterMap product.

The PD in general should throughout emphasise that the HLC process is one of generalisation – characterisation – based on interpretation, not a collection of data reduced to the smallest unique area of land. HLC polygons will be digitised in GIS (eg MapInfo or ArcView), direct to screen at a scale between 1:10,000 and 1:25,000; 1:25,000 paper maps are very useful to provide a more general (sometimes corrective) overview where necessary.

Polygons need to be small enough and distinctive enough to allow the attachment of attributes that can later be used to create classifications. At the same time, however, polygons should not too small that they fragment the landscape and prevent any generalised understanding of HLC. The aim is not to reduce the landscape down to zillions of small units, each of which is unique and distinct, its

definition separately justifiable. It is a more subjective and generalising process than that. The ability to synthesise understanding and interpretation is HLC's strength, which should not be drowned in too much detail. HLC looks for patterns and similarities between areas, not always emphasising differences. It is self-evident that every field or enclosure is in some way distinctive and unique, but what is required for sensible landscape management is to recognise similarities, to group areas into higher level definitions, to create patterns.

Annex B gives more guidance on defining polygons.

HLC work in other counties has demonstrated that it is highly desirable, if not essential, for the same person to allocate land parcels to polygons, to identify their characterising attributes and thus, later, to create HLC Types by analysis of the database and polygons. As well as enhancing consistency, and increasing transparency, this also builds up greater experience and understanding of the county's HL character, and creates opportunities for the recognition of nuances and, if necessary, modification to types, leading to a more subtle and sustainable characterisation.

HLC Attributes

The Access or similar database that will have been established in stage 1 will in stage 2 be used to record 'attributes' of each polygon, including such data as broad landscape type, possible date and confidence level. By 'attributes' is simply meant data, facts or observations (distinguished one from the other obviously) that describe one or more aspects of the polygon's character. They are specifically those aspects that either helped to define polygon boundaries in the first place or those that will later help to group polygons analytically into various sets of classes and types. Confidence level values will be added to indicate the degree of certainty assigned to the coding of each land unit. Known or suspected previous character types will also be mapped at this stage.

A little developmental background on how the method reached this position might be useful, and is included in Annex B. This might help to steer new projects away from older ideas but also to avoid needless attempts to improve on aspects of the methods that are already partly obsolete. Again, before finalising your PD you are advised to read *HLC: Taking Stock of the Method,* Oscar Aldred's report of the Method Review for more detail, and to consult with neighbouring HC projects.

The preferred method requires data and interpretation to be attributed to polygons in three main areas of the database, but the unique link to the polygon will allow fully independent interrogation or display of individual aspects or themes. Previous Landscape Type can be analysed separately, for example, rather than only being an aspect of present-day character, and vice versa. The description of this part of the process from the draft Cheshire Method Statement (slightly modified for the template) is included in Annex B as a guide.

The three sets of attributes are:

1. broad high-level groups
2. present-day historic landscape character
3. previous historic landscape character

Commonly used examples of terms and attributes for all three are in annex B.

1. The general high-level pre-defined classification is the simple attribution of each polygon to one of a small number of broad, high level Historic Landscape types, such as Enclosed

Land' 'Urban', 'Ancient Woodland'. The PD should specify the broad types that will be used, taking into account any that have been used in neighbouring counties. Whilst such 'hard-wired' allocation of polygons to groups is strictly unnecessary given attribute-based methods, it still has advantages, such as the rapid production of simple entry-level maps, and the simpler structuring of the database for easier data input

2. Present-day historic landscape character requires the creation of attributes that reflect the detail of HLC; this is the central task of the project, drawing on modern maps, APs and interpretation. It allows the sub-division of the pre-defined broad types, the creation of ranges of HL types and other classifications, and the interpretation of historic character and development. It covers such things as field morphology in terms of regularity, size, patterning, the shape of internal and external boundaries, whether aspects of character are still in active uses, interpretative functional sub-divisions of types.

3. Previous historic landscape characters (where it is possible to recognise them) are recorded by attributes that indicate one or more successive previous types of historic landscape character. These are drawn from historic maps, interpretation and extrapolation from localised archaeological landscape surveys were they exist. They might, for example, be land that was common or woodland prior to enclosure, earthwork remains of abandoned prehistoric or medieval settlement that indicate past enclosure in unenclosed land etc, or mineral extraction prior to restoration of field boundaries and before that parliamentary enclosure. Indicators of previous HLC might include dog-leg boundaries, ridge and furrow, marl pits, some types of field or farmstead name. This provides increased time depth for the HLC. It will, however, not always be possible to obtain data for all these attributes, and in this case the appropriate attribute field will be left blank.

See Annex B for further description of attributes and their use within this threefold framework. Structured in this way, the attributes will allow stage 3 of the project to use GIS interrogation to produce a range of interpretation, classification and modelling, and this provides the essence of the HL characterisation.

4.3 Stage 3: Review, Analysis and Interpretation

The penultimate stage of the HLC project will be the review of the characterisation results and their analysis, leading to an assessment of the potential for further development. This stage of analysis and interpretation will extend understanding of the county's HL character, and make connections with other landscape assessment and with planning and management agenda. It is an important stage of the project, normally as a rule of thumb occupying 20-25% of the project's duration.

The historic attributes of the present day landscape defined in Stage 2 against polygons will be used to define HL types, create thematic assessments, and to determine areas of similar historic character. The most important of these is the first, the conversion of raw GIS database into sets of interpretations, and most notably (as explained above) into classifications of HLC Types. These types are similar to those defined at the outset of early HLC projects but they are not pre-defined, being instead drawn organically from the inherent attributes of polygons rather than being imposed form above. Part of this process is to produce different classifications as demonstration of what the HLC can be used for.

It is likely that several nested layers of classification will be produced. These should include both complex classifications (for example of field patterns), and simple 'entry level' broad types. One set of HLC types should be designed that is sufficiently simple for use on a poster-size map of the county that can serve as an 'icon' of the whole project for dissemination, publicity and awareness raising purposes. This might be the top level Groups with subdivisions of the main types (notably fields), for instance by date or mode of enclosure. A number of other types of analysis answering particular questions should be carried out eg illustrating HLC vulnerability to loss, rates of change in the past few decades, models of earlier landscape character. It will not be possible to predict all of these in the PD, but an initial indicative list is needed of the type of analysis and products that are planned.

Also during this stage, secondary sources will be used to assess and understand emerging patterns and trends within the data, particularly in terms of time slices, time depth and landscape change. Data from existing archaeological surveys and from the SMR will be layered onto the character mapping in order to provide further information regarding landscape change. It can use HLC to explain patterning in the SMR, and to illuminate the character of SMR data – in terms of gaps, predictive modelling and so on.

An additional task for Stage 3 is to review other landscape characterisations and existing landscape designations within the area, in the light of the HLC. Conformity between these will be identified and potential improvements suggested. In particular, Countryside Character Areas will be examined with the aim of incorporating the historical character into the Area descriptions. The need and potential for further stages of more detailed historic environment assessment will be identified.

The PD should also describe how stage 3 will also include a first consideration of how the HLC results could be used to assist management and conservation of the historic landscape and in the preparation of future management strategies. This might include management guidelines for landscape character areas, or for HLC types; it might include consideration of relative rarity of different HLC types or measures of vulnerability or risk. It should include a discussion tailored to the county's situation of how HLC will work in the planning process (see eg Fairclough 2002b).

The project will undoubtedly raise more questions than answers, and they will be better, more sharply focussed questions. Stage 3 will also include the first outline of a research agenda for the Historic Landscape to identify future, more detailed and focused projects.

A peer-group and stakeholder seminar ought to be held during this stage (see Stage 5).

4.4 Stage 4: Report, Archive and Dissemination (publication, applications and updating)

The principal products of the project will be a mapped GIS database (that can be analysed within programmes such as MapInfo and Access), an archive of the raw survey data and a written report. The PD should specify each of these, and the methods of dissemination.

<u>GIS</u>

- GIS and database format, including method statement and 'user's manual' (see Report, below)
- Arrangement for making the GIS accessible through the SMR
- Proposals for wherever possible making the HLC available interactively on line to other County Council and perhaps District Council departments

- Consideration of method and future re-working or updating.

Archive

The PD should explain simply how an Archive will be prepared, and in what form. The archive for example needs to include copies of the project design, of subsequent method statements, of data tables with explanations, copies of correspondence, text and mapped information produced and/ or copied as part of the project, and copies of all reports produced as part of the project. It should contain a full copy of the whole HLC, to be kept as a benchmark for future comparison and study of trends on landscape change, while the HLC itself is kept undated.

Updating

Updating the HLC should be a recognised key SMR task. Procedures for periodic benchmark-archiving will need to defined, frequency depending on rates of change and perhaps tied to OS MasterMap updating (refer to the CCs OSLO officer). Present-day HLC in some polygons will become Previous, and there should be provision for capturing in the polygon matrix external views, both of landscape experts and public perception.

Report

A written and illustrated project report will be needed, both hard copy and on CD, including at least 3 copies to English Heritage and with dissemination to appropriate organisations and institutions. Whist the main product of the project is the GIS itself, the project report is important. It will explain to users of the HLC the method employed and the assumptions and inferences used (thus establishing transparency and the limits of confidence), and it will define future research agendas.

The report will also provide a first provisional set of conclusions, limited by current research stances and knowledge, and a new view of the county's landscape. It should include some hard copy maps carefully created from the GIS to fulfil several roles: among them, demonstrating conclusions to arise from the HLC at first analysis, showing the potential of the HLC to do much more, providing new views that can alter public perceptions about the county.

It's often a good idea to include with the report a large, perhaps poster size, HLC map, at a fairly basic level of simple HLC types that can carry a small number of big, easily assimilated, new insights themes about the county's historic landscape. This can act to advertise the project, and to be an icon of the project as a whole, and as a symbol of the landscape's historic dimension that can act as catalyst for further interest and support.

The PD should specify a provisional structure for the report. This might be:
- Introduction (Background to the project, Aims and Objectives, etc)
- Methodology & Non technical summary of results
- Characterisation (including written description of morphological and interpretative HLC types)
- Discussion of Results, including summary of assessment stage of project
- Recommendations for further work, including potential for further analysis and research
- Management Guidelines for dealing with the historic landscape, linked to HLC types or areas, and identifying archaeological management guidelines to assist in the preparation of future landscape management strategies.

Wider Dissemination of Results

The PD should specify a range of ways of disseminating the project's results, and the existence of the GIS as an ongoing management tool. There will have been some publicity during the project itself (see Monitoring and Stakeholder Involvement, below) that will have suggested further ideas. Cross-reference to how the HLC will be made available online and through the web is required in this part of the PD, as is references to intentions for feedback to be part of updating, plus plans for issuing the project report as appropriate and for posters, leaflets and "glossy" publications. There will be a wider dissemination of the results of the project through lectures/ seminars and briefings for other organisations. A summary of the project could also be contributed to the transactions of the local archaeology society journal.

Web access

The PD should suggest methods for wider publication of the results of the HLC, and if possible an interactive version of the HLC itself, on the Web or on CD. Such an interactive version might invite comments and additions that can be fed back into updating.

Part 5 of the PD: Resources and Programming

This section of the PD must describe the arrangements that are being made for personnel, funding and other resource provision and the timetable intended for the project. This template does not cover this in detail, because standard EH Guidance is applicable, see Annex C.

Personnel

This must include a description of the project team and supporting staff. Most HLC projects, and this is English Heritage's strongly recommended method, are undertaken in house within the SMR or county archaeologist's department by a single project officer, normally after a dedicated recruitment. The project officer is normally managed by the County Archaeologist or by a similarly-placed and similarly qualified officer, and (s)he will receive support from other members of the County Archaeological team. All these individuals should be named in the PD (apart from the HLC officer who probably will not yet be known, pending recruitment after approval of the PD).

The PD should also identify other staffing who will be involved in the project – such as where necessary GIS support from corporate IT, colleagues in countryside or spatial planning teams, members of biological records centres, district or unitary archaeologists, specialist advisers if any, AONB Officers etc.

Monitoring and stakeholder involvement

The overall project management and monitoring structure must be specified. One commonly adopted and effective three-tier model for HLC projects, designed to achieve completion of the project on time, while taking advantage of landscape expertise beyond the project and creating wider local ownership, is as follows:

1 **Project Group**, a small project management group, will meet at start up, and thereafter at milestones during the project, to guide the project, ensure the PD is achieved within cost and time (or that variations or extensions are justified), and agree the definitive methodology and approach after stage 1. Membership should include:

- the HLC officer,
- the county archaeologist or appropriate representative,
- the EH project officer (usually from the EH Characterisation Team)
- sometimes an EH Regional representation,
- perhaps one or two other closely involved CC staff (eg AONB officer), and perhaps one or two district representatives if appropriate (eg where they are funding partners).

Detailed membership of this Group should be agreed and listed in the PD.

2. **Steering Group**, a larger group, meeting less frequently and designed to guide the project in terms of user needs, relevance to future applications, and making best use of knowledge that lies beyond the project. Members, alongside the Project Group, might include two or three officers from district councils, AONBs and CC Countryside teams, a representative from the EH Regional Office, neighbouring county archaeologist or HLC officers (particularly if cross-border issues exist). It will not always be possible to include a definitive list of members in the PD, but a good indication should be given.

3. **Advisory Group**, a large group – peer group and stakeholders - meeting perhaps only once or twice during the lifetime of the project but which might maintain an existence in the longer term. The PD should give an idea of the range of membership intended. In particular, this group will create familiarity with the project (and its objectives, results and future applications) among the relevant sectors. These will include archaeologists (university and unit as appropriate, county Archaeological Societies or Committees), local authority planning, countryside and historic environment conservation officers, AONB partners, parish Ancient Monuments Liaison Officers and similar. It should include DEFRA staff, EH and EN and CA officers. It may meet in the form of a series of seminars held at key points in the project, to canvass wider opinion, build local ownership and understanding of the project, and ensure that the resultant HLC is capable of meeting a range of needs. Such seminars could create consensus about the HLC, and its role, among the archaeological community and environmental agencies in the area, eg on the validity of approach being adopted and the future practical applications of the characterisation.

Partnership

This section should discuss how the project will be carried out in partnership. It is most constructive to see an HLC project not merely as a finite project to create a GIS-based HLC, but as the first stage of a process of awareness raising, partnership, exchange of expertise and knowledge, integration and co-operation. Partners in this sense can include anyone, and the PD should give some indication of the range. This might include other sections of the County Council such as Planning, Countryside, District or Unitary authorities, AONB management committees, non-governmental groups (eg CBA, CPRE, FWAG) as well as government agencies (eg EN, CA) and, increasingly, regional government and development bodies.

Health and Safety

Specify Health and Safety arrangements both within County Council offices and during any field work.

Copyright

The PD should specify copyright arrangements: copyright in HLC will be jointly held by EH and the body (usually a County Council) that has created and will maintain the HLC and its GIS

databases. The PD should describe how the County Council will licence partners and others to use the information where this does not conflict with other copyrights (e.g. Ordnance Survey) and what levels of acknowledgement copyright conditions will be required.

Costs

Full costs of the project will be set out, indicating clearly which are sought from EH and which will be found from other named sources. Support in kind – eg accommodation costs, overhead charges met by the CC, time inputs from existing staff eg County Archaeologists, IT and licence purchases - should be identified and costed in cash.

The costs must be presented in standard EH style (see Annex C), most importantly broken down by

- *financial year, with overall totals*
- *staff, equipment etc.*
- *EH/LA/other funding must be clearly shown*

Timetable

An HLC PD must include list of tasks linked to the main stages of the method (see part 4). This will usually show the progress of the characterisation (stage 2) work across the county (eg district by district) and must be clearly linked to a cascade or Gantt chart showing real time (see Annex C).

AFTERWORD

I hope all this helps! I would always prefer to see Project Designs in draft (and to help with writing them) rather than to see 'complete' PDs arriving unannounced and without prior discussion.

There will be a second edition of this PD as methods improve further, and this will provide an opportunity to fill gaps and remedy lack of clarity. So please send constructive comments for future improvements. My email is graham.fairclough@english-heritage.gov.uk.

Graham Fairclough
25 November, 2002

Bibliography

Some of these texts might be useful for compiling an HLC PD. Some (eg HLC Project Reports) are grey literature, but available through SMRs. You should also consult the PDs of current projects, particularly of neighbouring counties or those in the same English Region. The PD's own bibliography can borrow from this list, but should also include local material of various types.

This bibliography is in four parts:
a) General texts on characterisation, sustainability, landscape and landscape assessment
b) General HLC texts & development of HLC thought
c) HLC Project Reports
d) Magazine articles

a) General HLC texts & development of HLC thought

Aldred, O. 2002: *HLC: Taking stock of the Method (The EH National HLC Method Review),* English Heritage & Somerset County Council

Countryside Commission, 1994: *Views From the Past – historic landscape character in the English countryside* (consultation report). Cheltenham.

Countryside Commission, 1996: *Views From the Past - Historic Landscape Character in the English Countryside,* CCW4. Cheltenham.

Darlington, J. 2002: Mapping Lancashire's Historic Landscape: the Lancashire HLC programme, in Fairclough and Rippon (eds.) 2002, 97-105

Dyson-Bruce, L. 2002: Historic Landscape Assessment – the East of England experience in Burenhult, G. (Ed) *Archaeological Informatics: Pushing the Envelope,* Procs.29th CAA Conference, Gotland, April 2001, BAR International Series 1016, Archaeopress, 35-42

Dyson Bruce, L., Dixon, P., Hingley, R.and Stevenson, J. 1999. *Historic Landuse Assessment (HLA): Development and Potential of a Technique for Assessing Historic Landuse Patterns.. Report of the pilot project 1996-1998,* Historic Scotland and the RCAHMS, Edinburgh

Fairclough, G.J., 1994: Landscapes From the Past - Only Human Nature. In Selman, P. (ed.), 1994: *The Ecology and Management of Cultural Landscapes - proceedings of an IALE UK conference at Cheltenham, 1993.* Landscape Issues, vol. 11 No 1. Cheltenham, 64-72.

Fairclough, G. J., 1995: The Sum of All Its Parts : An Overview of the Politics of Integrated Management in England. In Berry and Brown 1995: 17 - 28.

Fairclough, G. J., 1998: Assessment and characterisation: English Heritage's historic landscape policy. In *Landscape archaeology and ecology vol.* 3 : *Landscape perception, recognition and management: reconciling the impossible?,* Procs. of a conference at Sheffield, 1996). Sheffield: The Landscape Conservation Forum and Sheffield Hallam University.

Fairclough, G. J., 1999a: Protecting Time and Space: understanding historic landscape for conservation in England. In Ucko, P.J. and Layton, R. (eds.), 1999: *The Archaeology and*

Anthropology of Landscape. One World Archaeology 30 (papers from the 1994 World Archaeology Congress, New Delhi), London: Routledge, 119-134.

Fairclough, G.J., 1999b: Protecting the Cultural Landscape - national designations and local character. In Grenville, J. (ed.), 1999: *Managing the Historic Rural Environment*. London: Routledge and English Heritage, 27-39.

Fairclough, G. J. 2002a: Cultural landscape, computers and characterisation , in Burenhult, G. (Ed) 2002: *Archaeological Informatics: Pushing the Envelope*, Procs. 29th CAA Conference, Gotland, April 2001, BAR International Series 1016, Archaeopress, 277-294

Fairclough, G. J. 2002b: Cultural landscape and spatial planning: England's Historic Landscape Characterisation Programme, in Green, L.M. & Bidwell, P.T. (eds.) 2002 : *Heritage of the North Sea Region: Conservation and Interpretation*, Papers from INTERREG IIC Conference 29-31 March 2001, South Shields, Donhead, Shaftesbury, 123 –149

Fairclough, G.J. forthcoming (2002??) : Cultural landscape, sustainability and living with change? In the proceedings of the US/ICOMOS 4th International Symposium April 5-8, 2001, Philadelphia

Fairclough, G. J., Lambrick, G. and McNab, A.,1999: *Yesterday's World, Tomorrow's Landscape - the English Heritage Historic Landscape Project 1992-94*. London: English Heritage.

Fairclough, G.J., Lambrick, G. & Hopkins, D. 2002: Historic Landscape Characterisation in England and a Hampshire case study, in Fairclough and Rippon (eds.) 2002, 69-83

Fairclough, G. J. (ed.), 1999: *Historic Landscape Characterisation.* Papers presented at an English Heritage seminar held at the Society of Antiquaries, 11 December 1998. London: English Heritage.

Fairclough, G.J. and Rippon, S.J. (eds.) 2002: *Europe's Cultural Landscape: archaeologists and the management of change*, EAC Occasional Paper no 2, *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium* and English Heritage, Brussels and London

Herring, P., 1998: *Cornwall's Historic Landscape - presenting a method of historic landscape character assessment*. Truro: Cornwall Archaeology Unit and English Heritage, Cornwall CC.

Roberts, B.K. and Wrathmell, S. 2000: *An Atlas of Rural Settlement in England*, EH, London.

Roberts, B.K. and Wrathmell, S. forthcoming (2002): *Region and Place*, EH, London

b) General texts on characterisation, sustainability, landscape and landscape assessment

Council of Europe, 1995: *Recommendation R(95)9 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the integrated conservation of cultural landscape areas as part of landscape policies*, Strasbourg

Council of Europe 2000: *European Landscape Convention*, Florence, European Treaty Series - No. 176; www.coe.int/T/E/cultural-co-operation/Environment/Landscape

Countryside Agency, English Heritage, English Nature and the Environment Agency, 2001: *Quality of Life Capital: Managing environmental, social and economic benefits*

Countryside Agency & Scottish Natural Heritage, 2002: *Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland*, CAX 84.

Countryside Commission 1987: *Landscape Assessment – a Countryside Commission approach*, CCD18, Cheltenham

Countryside Commission 1993*: Landscape Assessment Guidance*, CCP423, Cheltenham

Countryside Commission, English Heritage & English Nature 1993 : *Conservation Issues in Strategic Plans*, CCP420, Cheltenham

Countryside Commission, English Nature & English Heritage, 1997: *What Matters and Why: environmental capital – a new approach*, Cheltenham

Countryside Commission and Countryside Agency, 1998-99: Countryside Character volumes: volumes 1-8, Cheltenham. www.countryside.gov.uk/cci

DCMS & DETR 2002: The Historic Environment: A Force for Our Future, PP378, Department for Culture, Media and Sport & Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions, London. www.culture.gov.uk/heritage

English Heritage, Countryside Commission and English Nature 1996: *Conservation Issues in Local Plans*, English Heritage, London

English Heritage 1997 : *Sustaining the historic environment*

English Heritage, 2000: *Viewpoint: Consultation Papers for the Review of Policies Relating to the Historic Environment* (The Power of Place consultation)

European Union, 2000: *European Spatial Development Perspective*, Potsdam

Historic Environment Review, 2000: *Power of Place, A future for the historic environment*, London

c) HLC Project Reports (normally available in / from the relevant SMR)

Aldred, O., 2001: *Somerset and Exmoor Historic Landscape Characterisation Project 1999-2000*. Taunton: Somerset County Council and English Heritage.

Bannister, N., 2001: *Surrey Historic Landscape Characterisation*, Kingston: Surrey County Council, English Heritage and the Countryside Agency.

Barnatt, J., 1999 (draft) : *Landscape Through Time: Historic Landscape Characterisation in the Peak Park, **draft** report.* Bakewell: Peak District National Park Authority and English Heritage.

Barnatt, J., Johnson, M. and May, R., 2000: *The Derbyshire Historic Landscape Survey Character Assessment - Aims, Method and Definition of Character Types*. Bakewell: Peak District National Park Authority for English Heritage and Derbyshire County Council

Croft, A., Munby, J., and Ridley, M. 2001: *Kent Historic Landscape Characterisation Report*. Maidstone: Oxford Archaeology Unit for Kent County Council and English Heritage.

Donachie, J. and Hutcheson, A., 2000: *The South West Wiltshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment*. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology for English Heritage.

Ede, J. with Darlington, J., forthcoming (2002): *The Lancashire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project Report*. Preston: Lancashire County Council and English Heritage.

Ford, M., 1999: *Historic Landscape Characterisation in East Anglia: Part 1 - Suffolk*. Bury St Edmunds: Suffolk County Council and English Heritage.

Hoyle, J., 1999: *Historic Landscape Characterisation: Cotswolds AONB, draft report*. Gloucester: Gloucestershire County Council and English Heritage.

Lambrick, G. and Bramhill, P., 1999: *Hampshire historic landscape assessment, final report*. Winchester: Oxford Archaeology Unit and Scott Wilson Resource Consultants for Hampshire County Council/English Heritage, 2 vols.

Miller, K.R., 1997: *The Isle of Axholme Historic Landscape Characterisation Project.* Leeds: Countryside Commission.

New Forest District Council, 2000: *New Forest District Landscape Character Assessment*. Lymington: New Forest District Council with Hampshire County Council, the Countryside Agency and English Heritage.

White, P. with Ray, K., forthcoming (2003?): *The Herefordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation Report*, Hereford: Herefordshire County Council.

d) Magazine articles

Society for Landscape Studies Newsletter Spring/Summer 2002 6-9
Understanding and Managing the Landscape: The English Heritage Historic Landscape Characterisation Programme, Graham Fairclough

Heritage Today September 2001 pp28-29
Fields of Green: the countryside agenda, Graham Fairclough

Green Futures July/August 2001 pp24-25
Drawing out the Daughters of Time, Graham Fairclough

Countryside Character Newsletter, Issue 3 (*Countryside Character and GIS*) Summer 2001 pp 2
HLC: A new cornerstone of character assessment, Graham Fairclough

Conservation Bulletin
Cultural Landscape: View from Europe (Issue 42, March 2002, 10-11)
Boundless Horizons: Historic Landscape Characterisation (Issue 40, March 2001, 23-26)
New Landscapes of Conservation (Issue 22, March 1994, 16-17)
The Historic Landscape: An EH Policy Statement, (Issue 14, June 1991, 4-5)

ANNEX A

THE MOST COMMONLY-USED SOURCES FOR HLC

This list is a guide to drawing up a preliminary list of sources for a new project to help in writing a PD, drawn mainly from Cheshire and Cumbria. A number of Basic (ie essential) and Other sources have been identified through a number of HLC projects for use in HLC. Basic sources are required to have consistent coverage across the project area, to be easily accessible in digital format for use in GIS, and to cover several or even all aspects of the HLC. Other secondary sources may not have full geographic coverage nor be digital, and many are single-theme data-sets; they are useful, however, for informing the characterisation process, guiding interpretation and perhaps allowing extrapolation from well-known areas to less well-understood areas, and helping to answer specific questions.

BASIC SOURCES

OS Master Map (polygon functionality, most recent OS mapping)
OS 1st 6" edition maps in digital format (allow easy comparison with modern mapping).
1999 full county, vertical colour Aerial Photographic coverage, if possible digital and geo-referenced
.
OTHER SOURCES (used when they can provide specific information or answer specific questions).

1. Other landscape scale or similar surveys
Countryside Character areas (Countryside Agency)
Cumbria County Landscape classification
County and / or district Landscape Character Assessments
EUS and other Historic Towns Survey GIS
EN Natural Areas
Lake District ESA landscape classification (digital)
Land Utilisation survey (Dudley Stamp)

2. Relevant Existing County Council Digital Data Sets: availability can vary, but may include:
SMR
eg from Cheshire: Brine shafts, 1993 Derelict Land Survey, Closed Landfill Sites, Mineral Sites
Field boundary types (GIS)
Landuse data (Landscape Change project)
Phase 1 Habitat Data (digital)
Core fell land at date of 1st Ed. OS (digital)
Section 3 (Moorland) map (digital)
Parish boundaries (digital)

3. Other Maps
OS 2nd –3rd Edition, 6"& 25" Maps
Early small scale county maps
Estate maps
Tithe maps (paper)
Enclosure Awards (paper)

Estate plans (paper)
18th and 19th Century County maps (paper)

4. Surveys

Estate surveys (eg Percy Survey)
Place / field / farm name surveys
Archaeological surveys (eg North West Wetlands Survey, EH/RCHME surveys)
National Trust landscape surveys
Relevant PhD theses

5. Lists, registers etc

DCMS List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest
Heathland, Grassland and Peatland Inventory GIS
Ancient Woodland Inventory
EH register of Parks and Gardens
EH list of SAMS
Conservation areas
Common land register
SSSI and SAC boundaries (digital)

ANNEX B HLC POLYGONS, DATA STRUCTURE, TYPES AND ATTRIBUTES

This annex provides some more detailed guidance to support paragraph 4.2 of the Template PD (Stage 2: Characterisation: Mapping & Digitisation). It covers:

- Defining HLC Polygons,
- HLC data-handling method – classification and attributes,
- HLC Data Structure,
- HLC Attribute Sets

Attached to the annex are 4 tables of more detailed information
Table 1: Attribute set 1 and subdivision
Table 2: Commonly-used HLC Attributes
Table 3: A selection of morphologically-interpreted attributes from Cumbria CC
Table 4: Alternative approach to HLC level 2 attributes, from Shropshire CC

Defining HLC polygons

Definition of polygons will be based upon modern land use and the dominant historic character of the land's present, visible form, for example derived from medieval enclosure, ornamental landscape, or industrial activity. Morphological interpretation and analysis of the modern map, supported where appropriate by consultation of historic maps, will be a primary tool.

The HLC polygon is the basic unit of data- (attribute-) capture and of analysis during stage 2, and thereafter whenever the HLC is used to answer specific queries or carry out further characterisation. Each HLC polygon covers a discrete geographical area that contains a particular combination of HLC that allows the polygon to be assigned to a single historic landscape character broad Group. These units are not equivalent to Landscape Character Assessment 'character areas', because they are can recur in different areas. Like Character Areas, however, although much smaller in size, they will usually be defined – as described below in more detail - by one or more predominant attributes in the midst of combinations of other attributes, rather than being wholly homogenous, monolithic or single-theme.

HLC polygons are defined as groups of modern land-parcels, each group possessing in general the same historic landscape character – in other words, the character of defined polygons will be heterogeneous, not homogenous but generalised. Minor diversity will be overlooked in favour of the broad picture. Use of MasterMap, with its seductive ability to ascribe attributes to all its TOID-defined polygons indiscriminately, requires discipline to ensure that the HLC remains sufficiently generalised. This can be achieved by attaching the same data to several polygons simultaneously or to specially created hyper-polygons (HLC polygons); either has the same result.

In particular, small areas are rarely digitised separately, given the county scale of the work. A rule of thumb can be operated (eg Shropshire HLC has a 1ha cut-off for polygons), but too mechanical an approach is not recommended. Small areas should be amalgamated into neighbouring or surrounding polygons if they do not determine landscape character at county scale and in their specific geographical context. For example, small areas may be worth defining as separate polygons where they comprise recent areas of expansion within or around the fringes of a settlement. They may not be worth defining as separate polygons where, for example, small plantations of trees that are an inherent feature of an 18th century enclosure pattern (where the presence of regular field corner trees can be an attribute of a much larger polygon). The houses and gardens of dispersed

rural settlement are always likely to be too small to be represented meaningfully in a county-level HLC, and need to be treated in separate projects using other methodologies.

It is likely (where it is either certainly known such as through easily accessible documentary or cartographic evidence, or where it can reasonably be assumed by interpretation, comparison or extrapolation) that previous HLC will also influence the definition of polygons. The factors that determine what is included within a polygon are that:

- Most areas included within it possess characteristics that can be assigned to the same Broad Group (e.g. unimproved land, fieldscapes etc.)
- Most areas included within it share a common set of other attributes. (For example, all of the woodland included within the polygon is broad-leaved and has one or more wavy external boundaries etc.; or that it shares same predominant Pattern, i.e. 'regular', 'irregular', or 'none' or Boundary Morphology, i.e. 'sinuous', 'straight', 'erratic' or 'none').
- Most areas within it can be interpreted as having the same previous landscape character (i.e. all of the fields within the polygon contain evidence of medieval strip fields).

HLC data-handling method – classification and attributes

Each polygon has a number of attributes that are recorded in the project database. These include information about the polygon's location, 'interpreted' information about present and historical landscape character, and more 'objective' morphological observations of polygon features. As a start to discussion here, some development background might be helpful on how the method evolved from its early classification-led systems to its current attribute-based approach.

The earliest path-finding HLC projects, because they had no GIS at all or used only primitive un-formed GIS, were based on a predetermined set of landscape types, whether very simple in the first projects (eg Cornwall), or more extensive in later ones (eg Hampshire). There were advantages to classification-led approaches; speed, an emphasis on high level generalisation, a focus on the wood not the trees, so to speak, that ran no risk of being buried in data and facts, and was unable to see patterns, clarity and directness. But the results were single-dimensional. Only one map was possible in the earliest cases, and while later projects were able to produce variant maps they were still based on a 'flat', fixed classification. More to the point, it was a method that required polygons to be straight-jacketed into a single category or type.

Projects that followed these two first two generations (the 'third wave', see chapter 2 of *HLC: Taking Stock of the Method*, the report of the National Method Review, such as Hertfordshire, or Somerset, Lancashire or Herefordshire) therefore developed more sophisticated and flexible systems that exploited GIS more fully. In essence, these projects (as well as being more rigorous in terms of recording decisions, ascribing confidence values, using more data) took a step back in the interpretative decision chain. Rather than attributing polygons to a single classification on the basis of various indicators (eg shape of fields, dog-leg boundaries and so on), their databases instead recorded those indicators merely as 'attributes' of polygons. These attributes are attached to polygons but polygons are not allocated definitively to any one HLC types, indeed the creation of the classifications themselves is left to the later stage of analysis, using the attributes in a wide variety of ways to produce multiple not singular classifications. These methods, however, still retained at high level a very simple overall classification to which attribute-led sub-types could be fitted.

Recent development of the HLC method, therefore, and in particular the opportunities afforded by recent GIS developments, has allowed modern HLC to use both a simple high-level pre-defined classification as a 'frame' for more in depth classifications, and this is the approach that new PDs should adopt. The in-depth classifications are produced from sophisticated sets of attributes attached to the same polygons so that alternative classifications and thematic analysis can also be developed, almost infinitely in response to the questions and needs of future users. The data structures used also allows through its flexibility the further input of data from future research, data collection or any other types of study.

A fuller description of this aspect of data capture from Cheshire and Cumbria might be helpful:

The new OS Master Map holds information as 'features', i.e. each individual element, such as an enclosure or building, is an individual polygon, line or point to which attributes can be attached. OS Master Map holds information about each feature through a unique identifier or 'TOID'. It has the distinct advantage over previous OS digital maps in that a feature from the OS Master Map can be selected and have data attached to it, without the need for further digitising. There will be no minimum polygon size, as this is predetermined by OS Master Map.

In the Cheshire HLC , a conjoining group of (or in some cases, very rarely, individual) OS Master Map polygons which all share the same Historic Landscape Character are selected and a unique polygon ID (UID) attribute attached to each "hyper-polygon" (not a physical polygon but a table linking a collection of TOID's to an HLC polygon). Attributes are attached in an Access database to each HLC polygon, and the record is identified by the same UID. This group will form what would have been an HLC polygon and can be drawn via the GIS using the UID attribute.

This method removes the need for the attributes assigned to the HLC Type polygon to be held for each of the constituent OS Master Map features, making for a more efficient data structure. This also ensures that the OS Master Map's predefined features do not direct the characterisation process. The advantage of this system is that digitisation of polygons is no longer necessary and the initial stage of assigning HLC Types is quicker and subsequent editing easier.

An alternative but similar method is used in Cumbria, whose HLC transferred to MasterMap from using blank polygons generated from OS Landline. MasterMap polygons are selected, and copied into an HLC overlay of polygons, much like MasterMap in appearance, which are then coded within the GIS via use of a plug-in application. As in Cheshire, polygons are normally coded in groups, but groups may not be contiguous. Because each HLC polygon is linked by a unique ID to the database, the database is tied directly to map geometry rather than through a "hyper-polygon". Whilst creating a much larger database, this method may possess some useful advantages in terms of displaying thematic maps and queries.

HLC Data Structure

Each polygon ought to have three principal levels of attributes attached to it, recorded within a structure Access-type database related to the GIS. Analysis of this creates classifications of HLC types, and other types of high level analysis such as thematic or parish-based characterisation. The database obviously requires other fields beyond these, but many of those can be either generated automatically by the HLC (eg unique polygon IDs, area) or be inserted by interaction with other GIS layers, (which LCA Character areas a polygon lies within).

HLC Attribute Set 1: HLC Groups (broad types)

These are very broad, general HLC groups (which are a major influence in defining polygons), to one of which each polygon can be allocated. This allocation to groups will be highly generalised, and will take account of predominant historic character, not detail. Polygons in unenclosed land, for example, will also include small areas of woodland or roads, polygons of enclosed land might include roads and settlement- attribution is a generalisation, selecting from and adding interpretative value to the OS map (not simply redrawing it).

Unenclosed (or Unimproved) Land

Enclosed Land ('Fieldscapes')

Woodland

Industrial land (large areas where industry is predominant in terms of landscape character)

Military

Ornamental, parkland and recreational (including modern leisure landscape, eg caravan sites, race-courses and circuits and their functional hinterlands)

Settlements

Orchards

Communications (generally too small scale for HLC [line not area], but perhaps some aspects can be included, eg large M-way service areas, canal basins, large railway sidings etc, retail distribution centres)

Water and Valley Floor (ie distinctive HL types in these topographic zones eg watercress beds, water meadows; many aspects of these areas will fall naturally under another type (eg Enclosed Land, woodland, industrial)

Water Bodies (large ones only)

These broad groups also have the advantage of structuring on-screen attribute recording, by constraining it (eg for drop down menus of terms) within the group structure. They can be subdivided further if wished, as long as they are kept at a high level. For example, Enclosed Land might have post-medieval and medieval division, or Unenclosed might be distinguished between land with and without evidence for past enclosure and settlement. Such distinctions can also be recorded at HLC level 2 and 3. Some sub-types are shown in Table 1, column 3.

HLC Attribute Set 2 – present day HLC attributes.

Within the global frame of their allocation to one of the nine or so HLC Groups (or to any sub-types within that), a series of more detailed *attributes* are attached to each polygon to show other aspects of HL character. This will include some attributes that exist only in parts of the polygon, thus allowing diversity to be captured at a general level. These attributes will allow further more finer-grained analysis, and the creation of lower levels of classification, as well as the interrogation and analysis to proceed.

A number of different sources of information are used to help determine these attributes. Table 2 at the end of this annex summarises some of the different attributes that have been used in recent projects, and a simpler set is shown in Table1, column 2. Tables 3 and 4 show slightly different approaches. The choice of attributes used will vary between counties, subject to diversity of landscape, available knowledge and data sources. Some areas, for example, may be able to use

place-names and farm-names indicative of HLC, or take advantage of locally available data-sets (eg on historic farm building types).

The main headings and groups of attributes used (which vary from broad group to broad group) are:

- Boundary morphology
- Interpretation and indicative features
- Active /Inactive distinctions
- Boundary changes
- Period
- Confidence
- Source
- Free text notes

HLC Attribute Set 3 – interpretation of previous historic landscape character (where possible).

Previous HLC – to create deeper time depth and understanding of cause and process - can be recorded where evidence exists (eg 1st Ed OS) or where it is possible to make informed interpretation (eg by simple map interpretation, comparison or extrapolation). Previous HL character is indicated by recording the attributes that lead to such a conclusion, using the same sets of attributes and type as for present day HLC (see tables 1, 2, and 3). This will make use of the same polygons defined for present-day HLC, thus maintaining the integrity of the overall interpretation and allowing, for example, all the parkland or industrial attributes to be brought together and displayed in single maps irrespective of later landscape changes to them. In a few cases, several layers of HLC may be capable of definition, for example:

- late 20th century fields (present day) reclaimed from mid-century airfield or gravel extraction (1st previous), over parliamentary fields (2nd previous) which in turn can be deduced to have been enclosed from open fields or common (3rd previous); or
- a sequence from medieval fields and settlement through parkland to modern settlement.

Confidence levels and sources for each layer will vary, of course, and some interpretations will be based on archaeologists' perceptions while others on historians', but this is no obstacle. The aim is to read the landscape, drawing meaning and interpretation from it. The landscape is its own historical document.

Examples of previous HLC that ought to be recorded are many and include:

- the heath or open field from which fields were enclosed,
- the woodland that preceded assart-types of fields,
- the strip fields that indicate pre-enclosure open fields,
- extensive late- and post- medieval coal and ironstone workings within areas that are now characterised by rough pasture,
- medieval fields and settlement below parkland
- 'degraded' parkland beneath essentially late 20th fieldscapes,

- fields below settlement expansion,
- modern fields reclaimed from WWII airfield

As well as building up time depth (allowing inferences to be made about the previous historic character of the polygon in question), this part of the HLC project also provides a way through the discussion about loss and erosion. (When is parkland, for example, so degraded that it is not longer the principal current landscape character?) It avoids the sterile debate about so-called 'relict' landscape, and it allows the present day landscape to be characterised without losing sight of very visible earlier land-uses.

By allowing earlier HLC to be recorded in its own right as a separate attribute set, it avoids the temptation to give priority to degraded (in effect inactive) examples of HLC types (at the expense of later landscape change which provides the real present-day character). It thus absolves the HLC officer from trying to make value judgements as to which types of HLC are more significant (degraded parkland or post-1950 farming patterns, for example). Such decision may well be necessary at later stages of the management cycle, for example in development control, but if at all possible they should not be allowed to cloud the initial characterisation itself. The same applies at very much earlier periods, enabling so-called 'relict' landscapes to be recognised without denying the later historic character of the land in which they lie. This is an inclusive approach, not the selective and thus exclusive approach that we are used to.

For some polygons it will be feasible to identify several successive previous HL character, but for others it may not be possible to identify any at all. This apparent inconsistency in the results of HLC is not a problem, because all the data on previous HLC is nested below the comprehensive present-day HLC attributions, which itself is geographically comprehensive. All polygons with parkland attributes, for example, can if needed be retrieved together (a 'diagonal' retrieval, rather than horizontal or vertical in terms of the data structure) irrespective of what level of previous HLC they occupy, irrespective of condition and survival, irrespective if required of confidence values.

It is important to recognise that 'Previous HLC' data are not GIS layers *per se*, but additional data (strategic, higher level, attributes) attached to the same layer. This data is capable of flexible analysis both in chronological horizons but also (and more usefully, given incomplete understanding) thematically.

As with present day HLC, the following attributes are normally recorded, using wherever possible the same sets of terms and criteria as for the present day HLC (table 2, 3 and 4), although some (eg the active /inactive distinctions and boundary change) will not be used:

- Previous HLC attribute group (selecting from the same broad groups as for present day HLC – see Table 1)
- Previous HLC character description (using attribute terms as at table 2, 3 or 4)
- Boundary morphology if knowable
- Interpretations and indicative features
- Period – broad date ranges in which the previous HL character is envisaged to fall can be assigned.
- Confidence
- Source/reference (used in interpretation)
- Free text notes

Annex B **TABLE 1: Attribute set and possible set of sub-divisions**

Landscape Group	Subsidiary interpretation egs	Morphological Sub-divisions
Unimproved ground		Estuarine Mudflats
		Salt marsh
		Sand dunes
		Moss
		Heath
Woodland	Ancient	Small Irregular
	Deciduous plantation	Small-Medium Irregular
	Coniferous plantation	Medium-Large Irregular
	Unknown	Large-Very Large Irregular
		Small Regular
		Small-Medium Regular
		Medium-Large Regular
		Large-Very Large Regular
Enclosed Fieldscapes	Assarts	Small Irregular
	Consolidated	Small-Medium Irregular
	Strip Fields	Medium-Large Irregular
	Droveway	Large-Very Large Irregular
	Isolated Enclosure	Small Rectilinear
	Parliamentary Enclosure	Small-Medium Rectilinear
	Planned Private Enclosure	Medium-Large Rectilinear
	Modern Field Amalgamation	Large-Very Large Rectilinear
	Moss Rooms	
	Reclaimed Land	
	Reclaimed Industrial	
	Strip Fields	
Recreational/ Ornamental	Ornamental Parkland Deer park Urban Park Sports Ground Camping / caravan site	Recreational Ornamental
Industrial	Stone quarries Gravel extraction Peat extraction Textile Mill complexes Chemical manufacture Opencast coal etc	Active Inactive
Settlement		Dispersed
		Nucleated
		Urban
Military	(eg WWII airfields, depots)	Active
		Inactive
Communications	Roads ,Canals, Railways	
Water Bodies		Open water a) Reservoirs, b) Natural
		Rivers

Annex B **TABLE 2: Commonly used HLC Attributes**

These are taken principally from the Cumbria, Cheshire and Devon HLC method statements. They can be adapted, and added to, to suit local need and landscape character. They can be used for both present day and previous HLC levels.

I. Attributes

1. Boundary morphology

used for
- Unenclosed Land (rarely uses Internal Boundary Morph),
- Woodland,
- Enclosed land / 'Fieldscape'
- Recreation & Ornamental

External boundaries a) Predominant & b) Secondary
Internal boundaries a) Predominant & b) Secondary
- Straight
- Sinuous
- Curvilinear
- S Curve
- None (Internal classes only)

Other External Boundary Morphology
- Settlement edge
- Road
- Railway
- Canal
- Water course
- Woodland

Boundary Change (low, medium, high) (Mainly used for Fields)

2. Interpretations and indicative features :

for Woodland:
- Ancient,
- Plantation Deciduous
- Plantation Coniferous
- Unknown
- Coppiced (if can be recognised from as or data sets available)

for Enclosed Land ('Fieldscape') (taken from various PDs, so not a consistent set, presented here for its ideas):
- Assarts
- Consolidated Strip Fields

- Droveway
- Isolated Enclosure
- Parliamentary Enclosure
- Planned Private Enclosure
- Regular or irregular piecemeal enclosure
- Modern Field Amalgamation
- Moss Rooms
- Reclaimed Land
- Reclaimed Industrial
- Intakes
- Wastes and commons (greens)
- Marl pits
- Field barns / animal sheds
- Indicative place- and farm-names
- Medieval crofts if large groups
- Strip Fields
- Fossilised strips
- Open field *ridge and furrow* and other types of ridged cultivation
- Other Open Field indicators
- Distinctive farm layouts on 1st Ed OS
- smallholdings
- 'squatter' fields
- plotlands & other land allotments

for Recreational and Ornamental:
Any type of designed ornamental or recreational land use such as parks and playing fields. Many will be too small for HLC (bearing in mind that HLC will be used in conjunction with the SMR, in which site and monument data should be recorded instead):

- Ornamental Parkland
- Deer Parks
- Urban Parks
- Sports Grounds
- Camping & caravan sites
- Garden allotments

for Industrial:
This can be a long list. The main criterion is scale – does the industry really register at landscape scale, is it truly dominant? (Bearing in mind again the link to SMRs) Egs are:

- Quarry
- Peat Quarry
- Metal Mine/Processing
- Other Mine/Processing-
- Mineral Chemical Manufacturing

for Military:
can be (eg) hill fort, burgh, castle, depot / barracks, airfield, although of these probably only airfields and depots are large enough for county level HLC (se above).

for Communications:
roads, canals, railways, air - though mainly 'hubs' for these – eg M-way service stations, retail distribution centres, canal basins, railway sidings, airports (not the flight-lines!)

for Settlement:
'Dispersed', 'Nucleated'. Sometimes also appropriate are 'Urban', particularly if subdivided eg into historic core, 19th cent growth, 20th cent expansion (all relatively easily assumed from map evidence and plan form), or divisions based on housing, civic, industrial, commercial. Dispersed settlement is difficult for HLC to incorporate in any meaningful way, however, because it is essentially point not pattern data.

for Water Bodies:
Open water (a) artificial, (b) natural); rivers (if very wide – few qualify at HLC scale)

3. Active & Inactive

used for:

- Industrial
- Military
- Communications

But note that use inactive in present day level only where it remains the dominant HLC, not where it is previous HLC.

4. Boundary Change

an indication of the degree of boundary loss, gain and change from the OS 1st edition maps, within carefully defined units of measurement. Relevant to Woodland, Industrial, Military, Settlement, Ornamental-Recreation and Unimproved Ground groups). Either a % estimated measurement for internal boundaries or a measure of size of the whole block (especially for woodland, ornamental or settlement) eg

- Shrunken
- Expanded
- None
- N/A

5. Confidence

This field provides a measure of the confidence that should be put in the date and interpretation attributes assigned to the polygon. It provides a rough indication of the likely 'correct-ness'.

- Certain: Indicates that there is no or very little doubt about the interpretation: used for example where landscape types are identified and dated through documentary sources, landscape surveys or other research.

- Probable (default setting): Suggests that an interpretation is highly probable (approximately over 75-80% chance). Applied to areas of landscape that are morphologically typical of a specific character type or period, eg where there is very strong archaeologists' consensus about interpretation eg this is ridge and furrow, this is a fossilised strip field.

- Possible (greater degree of uncertainty or 'unsure': Suggests that an interpretation is possible but by no means certain (approximately over 50% chance); used in circumstances where there are few indications of type or date through morphology, where archaeologists' consensus is weak

6. Date

The period when current HLC came into being, a guide only. Prehistoric, Roman, Medieval, Post-Medieval, 19th century, 20th century, N/A, or use standard SMR terms, or use list below:

Period Name	**Dates**	**An alternative Cumbrian narrative**
Late 20th C	AD 1945 – present	iv. Post- 1950: characterised by widespread agricultural improvements, and large-scale industrial extractions.
Early 20th C	AD 1914 – AD 1945	iii. 1864-1950: the last large-scale enclosure of wastes and commons, in some areas industrial expansion. O.S2nd Ed (c1900) be used to indicate changes in first part of this period. All post-1864 settlement placed in this category
Early Modern ('Victorian' ,'Industrial')	AD 1800 – AD 1913	ii. 1770- 1864: much of the 'Enclosure Period' (large scale regular enclosure of wastes and commons, and some remnants of open field). 1864 is date of O.S. 1st Ed map. Includes all pre-1864 settlement.
Post-Medieval - Late Post-Medieval - Early Post-Med	AD 1500 – AD 1799 1660-1799 1500 –1660	i. Pre- 1770: broad because with earlier periods of enclosure it is often easier to assign an interpretative category than a date to a polygon. Areas of pre- 1770 enclosure that are identified will be recorded in free text field.
Medieval	AD 1066 – AD 1499	
Earl Medieval ('Saxon')	AD 410 – AD 1065	
Roman	AD 43 – AD 409	
Prehistoric (late or early?)	500,000 BC – AD 42	
Unknown		v. Not applicable: for unenclosed areas such as moorland and fell where a date cannot be assigned.

7. Source

A field to list the source or sources from which the interpretation was made. This is a simple yes/no field relating to the sources used to define the type and attributes. The sources listed are likely to be:

- OS Master Map
- OS 1st Edition
- Enclosure Award
- Tithe Map
- Aerial Photograph
- Other

8. Notes

One or more free text areas for additional information and comments. Essential, and may be attached to several parts of the database (eg to previous HL character). Some things recorded here at the outset of characterisation might become so standard that they 'graduate' to attribute fields; others can support analysis in other ways, others will point the way to future research needs. Here, too, comments on validity, confidence levels etc can be added, increasing transparency.

II. Morphological observations

Morphology is at the core of HLC, which is basically an archaeologists' perspective, reading material culture, looking at the shape and pattern of the landscape; it is one way of drawing patterns and meaning objects, things or landscape. HLC may use documentary and cartographic sources in a supporting role, but it does not start with them. This is so especially for enclosed field patterns, but can also be applicable elsewhere (eg un-enclosed land large scale subdivisions, woodland internal compartments, settlement layout).

Below are some of the morphological (and other) issues that are most commonly used, for example in Devon, from whose PD and method statement much of the following is drawn. The same approach can be taken to recording any historic or archaeological aspect of the polygon, for example general character of buildings (function, for, material) in a polygons, farm-names indicative of date for example or origin – Heath Farm, Waterloo Farm), field names, marl pits, field barns and cow sheds, etc). The guidance below can be sued in conjunction with the data structure set out above in part I of this annex.

1. Pattern (organisational pattern within each polygon):
Pattern refers to the boundaries and divisions within each polygon (see eg Aldred 2001: 9). It is useful for landscape history since organisational pattern can refer to processes of change such as planning (or a lack of it). Eg – Regular, Irregular, No pattern ('Settlement' HL types are rarely assigned pattern attributes since they are often too intricate for county-level analysis).

2. Primary or (pre-)dominant boundary morphology
Describes the morphology of the majority of boundaries within the polygon (only refers to internal boundaries but can (as long as the are clearly differentiated) apply to external boundaries, most notably for blocks of woodland or moorland affected by assart or intake). Attributes can be, eg:

- Sinuous (ie those which are not straight or erratic.
- Straight (ie perfectly straight boundaries, the result of post-medieval and modern surveying techniques).
- Erratic (Wildly erratic boundaries, eg as found (rarely) in prehistoric field systems)
- None (ie no internal boundaries in the polygon.

3. Dominant % **(**Approximation of proportion of boundaries within the polygon in the 'dominant' category.)

4. Secondary Boundary Morphology

Describes the morphology of the minority of boundaries within the polygon, using the same terms as for primary / predominant ones.

5. No. of Fields in Polygon

A count of the number of subdivisions in the polygon shown on the modern OS (Landline) map (e.g. number of fields in a polygon of *historic character type* 'enclosures'). With 6, one way of measuring boundary change or loss

6. Number of 19th cent Fields

A count of the number of subdivisions in the polygon that are shown on the OS 1st ed. 25in map. (NB because of complete or part re-organisation, a count of '5' under 'No. of fields' and '5' under 'No. of C19 fields' does not necessarily refer to the same 5 fields.)

7. Boundary Characteristics

Other characteristics of the boundaries within a polygon. Not all boundaries in the polygon must exhibit a characteristic for it to be recorded in the database. These are particularly important for future development of classification, notably previous HLC There are two classes of information, referring to (a) internal and (b) external boundaries.

a) Internal Boundary Characteristics, eg:
- *Dog leg*
- *S curve (*boundaries showing 'reversed s'/'reversed j' curves)
- *Following watercourse* (useful for interpreting e.g. presence of one sinuous boundary within polygon with otherwise straight-sided boundaries of post-medieval date)
- *Agglomeration (eg* prehistoric field systems)
- *Co-axiality*

b) External Boundary Characteristics, eg:
- *Wavy edge (*external boundary forms irregular sinuous line)
- *Settlement edge (i*ndicates one or more boundaries of polygon delimited by settlement.
- *Roadside/canal-side (*internal or external boundary follows a road, canal, or railway

Annex B TABLE 3: A selection of morphologically-interpreted attributes (Cumbria)

pe Parliamentary enclosure	Planned, generally large-scale enclosure, of wastes or open field occurring through the period 1770-1900. Parliamentary enclosure normally possesses a distinctive, organised layout with ruler straight boundaries and often with contemporaneous roads or trackways.
pp Planned private enclosure	Morphologically similar to parliamentary enclosure, although not always laid out with quite the same precision. Planned private enclosure of wastes and open field will be identifiable particularly in areas where the extents of parliamentary enclosure are already known.
iw Intakes	Intakes can vary considerably morphologically but are defined here as parcels of enclosures that represent an expansion of agricultural land into wastes and common pasture. In many instances it will be possible to spot more than one phase of intake.
ie Isolated enclosure	Individual enclosures, often constructed pre- 1770 and occurring as "islands" within areas of unenclosed waste. In wastes that were enclosed during the 18th and 19th centuries, isolated enclosures were often removed.
ri Regular or irregular piecemeal enclosure	Piecemeal enclosure is applied where enclosures appear to have been established on a field-by-field basis. Morphologically, can vary considerably.
wc Wastes and commons	Land that formed unenclosed wastes and commons during the medieval period and prior to the 18th and 19th century large-scale enclosures. Former wastes and commons frequently retain the physical evidence of past industrial activities such as mining, quarrying and peat cutting.
wg Wastes and commons (green)	Village greens are a visible element of many villages in Cumbria but have not always survived due to encroachment of settlement and enclosure. They were important communally-used areas that often formed the points of departure for driftways or outgangs along which stock was taken to summer pastures.
of Open field	Often quite large areas that were farmed communally in cultivation strips during the Medieval and early post-medieval periods. Open fields were subject to different processes and time-scales of enclosure and so can be indicated by many morphological forms.
fs Fossilised strips	Long thin enclosures with parallel curving boundaries. This category is a direct indicator of open field, the enclosures representing the shape of previous cultivation strips.
mc Medieval crofts	Small enclosures of medieval origin, often occupying the ground between a medieval settlement and its associated open field(s). Medieval crofts are often shorter in length and have slightly more wavy-edged boundaries than fossilised strips.
as Assarts	In this instance, assart refers to the enclosure and clearance of wooded areas, resulting in patterns of small, irregular enclosures interspersed with woodland.
Op Ornamental Parkland	This category applies to areas of landscape that have a noticeable ornamental element. Often associated with Manor houses ornamental parklands date from the 16th century, although most are of 18th or 18th century date. Some medieval deer parks survive in more ornamental form.
Mi Modern improvements	Characterised by widespread boundary removal and/or rationalisation, resulting in large (sometimes irregular) enclosures. Modern improvements occur largely post-1950.
rl Reclaimed industrial land	Some areas of present agricultural or recreational land have previously been subject to intense industrial activity between the O.S. 1st edition and present O.S. coverage (e.g. opencast, gravel extraction, landfill sites etc). The category provides a method of indicating this activity whilst retaining the definition of present status.
Sh Smallholdings	Typically indicated by a pattern of irregular or sub-rectangular enclosures with wavy-edged boundaries and dispersed small farmsteads. In some instances, smallholdings are defined in discrete parcels of enclosures. Many will predate 1770.

Annex B **Table 4: Alternative approach to HLC level 2 attributes (Shropshire)**

Attribute Group	Attribute
1. Unimproved Land	Enclosed (Yes/ No)
	Elevation (higher ground [244m], lower ground [< 244m])
	Type of ground (heathland, moorland, hill pasture)
	Interpretation of previous character – see level three.
	Additional notes
2. Fieldscapes	Predominant field size (small, small-medium, medium-large, large-very large) [perhaps ha-based thresholds]]
	Predominant field shape (irregular, rectilinear)
	Predominant boundary morphology (straight, sinuous, curvilinear)
	Secondary boundary morph. (straight, sinuous, curvilinear, none)
	Other internal boundary morphology (non, dog leg, s-curve, following watercourse, co-axial)
	Other external boundary morphology (sinuous, settlement edge, line of communication [eg road, canal, railway], woodland, none).
	No. of fields lost since 1st ed. 6" OS map
	Interpretation of previous character – see Level 3
	Additional notes
3. Woodland	Nature of boundaries (straight, sinuous, curvilinear)
	Is it present on the 1st Ed 6" OS map? (Yes/ No)
	Is it designated as being ancient semi-natural (Yes/ No)
	Forestry Commission Indicative forestry designation (Broadleaf, Coniferous, Felled, Mixed, Shrub, Young Trees, None)
	Interpretation of previous character – see level three.
	Additional notes.
4. Water and Valley Floor Fields	Type (open water, raised bog/ 'moss', floodplain)
	Degree of enclosure (fully enclosed, partly enclosed, unenclosed)
	If open water is it natural (Yes/ No)
	If man made is it (a lake/pond, marl pits or reservoir)?
	Additional notes
5. Industrial and extractive	Type (stone quarry, gravel quarry, disused mine with associated spoil tips, industrial complex or factory)
	If a quarry is it active? (Yes/ No)
	If disused mine with spoil tips, former colliery or metal ore mine?
	Additional notes
6. Military	Type of installation (airfield, barracks, ordnance depot).
	Current use (abandoned, active but other uses, still military use)
	Additional notes
7. Ornamental, parkland and recreational	Type (garden or 'designed' landscapes, golf course, race course, sports field, other parkland)
	Additional notes
8. Settlement	Type (historic [pre 1800], industrial [1800-1913], post-1914 [1914-1944], post-war (1945-]).
	Additional notes.
9. Orchards	Present on 1st ed. 6" OS map? (Yes/ No)
	Additional notes

ANNEX C EH General Guidelines on Minimum standards for Project Designs

Being Appendix 5 of *EH Commissioned Archaeology Programme Guidance for Applicants* (Release 1.2, October 2002) available on the EH web-page

APPENDIX 5: MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR PROJECT DESIGNS

Project designs **should be constructed as comprehensive and free-standing documents which do not assume prior knowledge of the project and its circumstances by appraisers.**

Project designs should be structured to accord with MAP2 appendix 2 and must include:

- background
- aims and objectives
- methods statement
- resources and programming

Project designs for **fieldwork projects** must include:

- provision for the completion of site archives in accordance with MAP2 appendix 3
- provision for the completion of a summary report in accordance with MAP2 appendix 3
- provision for completion of the assessment report in accordance with MAP2 appendix 4
- provision for the completion of an updated project design for analysis in accordance with MAP2 appendix 5

Project designs for **analytical projects** must include:

- provision for the completion of the research archive in accordance with MAP2 appendix 6
- provision for completion of the report for publication or other end goal

Assessments and updated project designs should form linked parts of a single document unless otherwise specified. As a general rule the following may be adopted as a useful structure:

- Background (MAP2 A5.1)
- Assessment (MAP2 A4.1-3)
  - Factual data
  - Statement of potential
- Storage and curation
- Aims and objectives (MAP2 A5.3)
- Methods statement (MAP2 A5.4)
- Resources and programming (MAP2 A5.5)

Rather than include lengthy specialist assessment reports in the main body of the text these should be summarised with the full report attached as an appendix.

Aims and objectives, *methods statements*, and *resources and programming* should all be presented as discrete sections of a project design, as indicated in the MAP2 appendices.

For ease of reference illustrations are best bound together at the end of a document rather than distributed through the text.

The authorship of individual sections, if not the same as the rest of the document, should be clearly indicated.

Project designs should be dated, paginated, have a contents page, bear a version number, and name the author(s) and organisation.

A location map, a plan of the site/study area if appropriate, and the NGR should be included.

If there are references in the text there should be a bibliography.

Contents

It is important that **project designs** should *link aims and objectives*, *methods statements* and *resources and programming*. In the **assessment and updated project design** potential should be assessed against the original project aims, and the revised aims should be founded in the potential as established by the assessment.

Numbering individual *aims and objectives* and *methods statements* allows easy cross-referencing between sections, and a tabulated task list is a useful way of integrating aims, methods, and resource allocation (see example 1).

Weight of documentation is no substitute for quality, and documents should be as concise as is consistent with presenting a strong case in sufficient detail. This is particularly true of assessments, where presenting information and results in a tabular form can be useful.

Defining and presenting *aims and objectives* is one of the most challenging aspects of preparing a **project design**. Thinking of aims and objectives as questions can be helpful. It also helps the case if aims can be related to English Heritage priorities and to regional and specialist interest research agendas. When applying MAP2 to pre-

MAP2 projects, retrospective definition of aims and objectives can be very constructive. In presenting aims and objectives it is helpful to treat aims as major themes or goals to which specific objectives contribute, e.g.:

1. What was the subsistence base of the settlement?
   1.1. What was the contribution of animal husbandry to the subsistence economy?
   1.2. What was the contribution of agriculture to the subsistence economy?
   1.3. What part did exploitation of marine resources play in the subsistence economy?

Assessments should address the original project aims and form the basis of the revised project aims.

Methods statements must be explicit, and it is important that their relevance is demonstrated: for instance, how will they address a specific area of potential or a specific aim, and what will the product be? Where appropriate, organisations should refer to their procedures manuals held by English Heritage Archaeology and Survey Department, and to professional guidelines.

Resources and programming must include:

- a task list, preferably tabulated and indicating staff and resources, and cross referenced to aims and methods (see example 1)
- a statement of management structure and management responsibilities
- a breakdown of the project team including individual responsibilities
- a statement of accommodation and facilities, including proper justifications and specifications for equipment purchases and a statement of ownership where appropriate
- a Health and Safety statement. This is required for all projects. In most cases it will be sufficient to refer to H&S policies held on file by Archaeology and Survey Department, but these should be up-to-date and take account of recent EC directives. There should be assurances that all necessary risk assessments have been undertaken
- a real timetable and Gantt chart, which should include all tasks, including those to be performed by outside contractors and English Heritage staff

Financial Information must include:

- a year-by-year breakdown as shown in example 2 which must include
  - the names of all staff to be employed on the project with their job title, grade, spinal point, daily rate, number of days on project and cost to project
  - the names of sub-contracted specialists to be employed on the project with their specialism, daily rate, number of days on project and cost to project
  - non-staff costs
  - overheads
  - capital equipment
- for projects running across more than one financial year a summary of this information for the project as a whole
- daily rates for all staff and external contractors
- the number of days to be worked by English Heritage staff who are members of the project team

Example 1: tabulated task list

Task No.	Aims	Task	Performed by	Days	Cost
1		Project management	PVC RTV APW	1 6 3	
2		Copy site archive	WDS	2	
3		Transport of material to London	WDS	1	
4	1,2	Documentary analysis	RTV	15	
5	1,3,4	Identify/analysis and report on pottery	TWP	17	
6	1,3,4	Ceramic input into site phasing	TWP RTV	1 2	
7		Produce updated phasing	RTV	4	
8		Write stratigraphic text	RTV	39	
9	4,5,7	Identify/analysis and report on worked wood	MK	5	
10	4,5,7	Update metalwork catalogue	APW	5	
11	4,5,7	Update glass catalogue	APW	5	
12	5,7	Identify/analysis and report on textile	EMc	2	
13	6,7	Identify/analysis and report on insects	CfA	7	
14	6,7	Identify/analysis and report on animal bone	CfA	25	
15	6,7,8	Identify/analysis and report on environmental material	Tech CfA	25 15	
16		Edit and integrate specialist reports	RTV APW	12 6	
17		Write background/introduction	RTV	10	
18	3	Produce pottery drawings	Tba	14	
19	4,5	Produce other finds drawings	FD	22	
20		Produce site plans etc	FD	17	
21		Write discussion	RTV	10	
22		Collate report for dissemination	WDS RTV	2 2	
23		Collate and deposit archive	WDS	3	

The task number, task, performed by, and days columns are essential parts of the task list. The aims and cost columns do not have to appear on a task list, although this information should be presented elsewhere.

Example 2: presentation of financial information

Year: 2001-02

Unit Staff		Sc.	SP	Per day	Days	Cost	Total
Project manager	AJK	*	*	145.00	100	14,500.00	
Project officer	LFG	*	*	120.00	150	18,000.00	
Supervisor	JRC	*	*	110.00	150	16,500.00	
Assistant	EGM	*	*	90.00	120	10,800.00	
Finds manager	tba	*	*	130.00	27	3,510.00	
Enviro. manager	PTE	*	*	130.00	14	1,820.00	
Finds assistant	tba	*	*	90.00	80	7,200.00	
Enviro. assistant	KMB	*	*	90.00	65	5,850.00	
Computing officer	PMP	*	*	100.00	14	1,400.00	
Graphics officer	SRA	*	*	100.00	85	8,500.00	
Total salary costs for year						*sub-total A*	88,080.00
External Specialists							
Ceramics	PFG			150.00	30	4,500.00	
Animal bone	TMG			150.00	20	3,000.00	
Total specialist fees for year						*sub-total B*	7,500.00
Non-staff costs							
Transport						600.00	
Computer consumables						300.00	
Graphics materials						100.00	
Total non-staff costs						*sub-total C*	1,000.00
Overheads							
Unit overheads (*sub-total A & C*) @ 25%						22,270.00	
Overhead on external specialist fees (*sub-total B*) @ 10%						750.00	
Total overheads							23,020.00
Capital equipment							
Desktop PC						1,800.00	
Laptop PC						1,500.00	
Total capital equipment							3,300.00
Gross total for year 2002-03							**£122,900.00**

* delete as appropriate
Sc = Scale
SP = Spinal Point

NB This example shows costs for a project that takes place in one financial year only. If a project is to run for more than one year, then the sums for the following and subsequent years should each be adjusted for inflation (see section 11.10 above for details). Further information is available from Tim Cromack (tim.cromack@english-heritage.org.uk).