

## 8 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

### 8.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: firstly, to weigh the likely occurrence, level of survival and significance of the buried archaeological resource so that any impact on that resource may be appropriately assessed and where necessary mitigated, and secondly, to assess the impact of the proposals upon the special architectural or historical interest of designated and non-designated heritage assets which will potentially be affected by the development.

The site lies partly within the 12<sup>th</sup> century medieval core of Birmingham and has been the subject of previous assessments through research and trenching as well as adjacent excavations. These have demonstrated that archaeological deposits of medieval date survive within the area of the proposed development. Furthermore there are buildings (or facades of buildings) of special architectural significance attached to the development site which must be protected or enhanced.

This chapter sets out the baseline conditions in these regards and how these conditions may be changed by the proposed development.

This ES chapter is supported by a series of figures presented in *Appendix 8*.

### 8.2 Legislation and Policy Context

#### 8.2.1 National Policy

National Planning Policy in England is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in March 2012. Guidance to help practitioners implement this policy, including the legislative requirements that underpin it, is provided in National Planning Practice Guidance Suite (March 2014) and Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Practice Guide (English Heritage 2010), produced to support the previous Planning Policy Statement 5. Planning policy refers to 'heritage assets' and the policies relating to designated heritage assets are intended to apply equally to all types of designation. The policies in the NPPF are a material consideration that must be taken into account in development management decisions and in development of Local Plans, where relevant. Therefore, the development management policies in the NPPF can be applied directly by the decision-maker when determining whether development should proceed.

The NPPF supports a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and sets out the definitions of sustainability including protecting and enhancing the historic environment. P131 of the NPPF states that

“In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- The desirability of sustaining or enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation
- The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness”

P132 states that “great weight” should be given to the conservation of the significance of designated heritage assets and that harm to this significance (either through alteration or destruction of the asset or through development within its setting) requires “clear and convincing justification”. The harm or loss needs to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposed development and “substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and world heritage sites, should be wholly exceptional”.

English Heritage has issued detailed guidance on the “Setting of Heritage Assets” (2011). This guidance is based on the policies set out in PPS5 and on principles and guidance already issued by English Heritage in the “Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide” (2010) and “Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment” (2008).

*Circular 01/01: Arrangements for handling heritage applications - notification and directions by the Secretary of State* provides valuable guidance on the requirements of applications involving architecturally or historically sensitive structures and the Secretary of State’s powers of direction are still in operation and will be used by BCC in assessing submissions.

### **8.2.2 Regional Policy**

Regional planning policies were abolished in March 2013.

### **8.2.3 Local Policy**

#### **City wide policies (Archaeology Strategy 2004)**

##### *POLICY 1 – Archaeological research frameworks and agendas:*

The City Council's response to development proposals affecting archaeological remains will have regard to national and regional archaeological research frameworks and agendas.

##### *POLICY 2 – Involvement of Planning Archaeologist:*

The City Council will ensure that the Planning Archaeologist is involved in pre- or post-application discussions on proposals where there are archaeological implications.

##### *POLICY 3 – Advice on archaeological requirements:*

The City Council will prepare briefs for archaeological work required as part of the planning process, will advise on the fitness for purpose of proposals for archaeological work, and will monitor archaeological work.

##### *POLICY 4 – List of contractors and consultants:*

The City Council will maintain a list of archaeological contractors and consultants known to be able to undertake archaeological work in accordance with briefs prepared by the Council

##### *POLICY 5 – Sites and Monuments Record:*

The City Council will maintain a Sites and Monuments Record in accordance with recognised best practice and keep the record updated and will make summary information from this accessible on the Internet, and will develop a Historic Environment Record.

##### *POLICY 6 – Planning documents:*

As part of its guidance to potential developers the City Council will ensure that known and potential archaeological implications are properly included and clearly stated in any city-wide or site-specific supplementary planning guidance and other planning policy it prepares, such as local action plans, development briefs and local development documents.

##### *POLICY 7 – Professional standards:*

The City Council will expect all archaeological work in the City to be undertaken in accordance with the Code of Conduct, Standards and Guidance of the Institute of Field Archaeologists to ensure that it is consistent with best professional practice.

*POLICY 8 – Assessment and evaluation:*

Where existing information suggests that a proposed development is likely to affect archaeological remains, above or below ground, the City Council will require a Planning Application, application for Listed Building Consent or application for Conservation Area Consent to be accompanied by an archaeological assessment, normally including an archaeological evaluation, depending on the extent of proposed development and the archaeological sensitivity of the location. Such information should also include details of appropriate mitigation measures. The application will be refused if this information is not submitted.

*POLICY 9 – Archaeology and Environmental Impact Assessment:*

Where scoping has identified that archaeological remains are likely to be affected by a proposed development, an Environmental Impact Assessment which does not contain an adequate assessment of the archaeological impact of the proposed development and proposed mitigation measures will not be acceptable.

*POLICY 10 – Archaeological remains of national importance:*

The City Council will seek advice from English Heritage where it considers that archaeological remains affected by development proposals are of national importance and will consult English Heritage on specialist areas such as archaeological science and unusual site types.

*POLICY 11 – In-situ preservation of archaeological remains:*

The City Council will encourage innovative design to ensure in-situ preservation of archaeological remains as part of new development.

*POLICY 12 – Preservation in situ and preservation by record:*

Where the City Council considers that preservation in situ of archaeological remains which are not of national importance is appropriate and feasible, it will require design which ensures this. Where it considers that preservation of archaeological remains by record is acceptable because preservation in situ is not feasible or necessary, or there is an opportunity for enhancing knowledge of particular areas or periods, the City Council will require archaeological mitigation measures which maximise the return of archaeological information. Innovative approaches to achieve this will be encouraged.

*POLICY 13 – Post excavation analysis and publication:*

Where the City Council considers that preservation by record of archaeological remains is acceptable and it imposes conditions requiring archaeological excavation in advance of commencement of development, the scheme of investigation must include provision for excavation, post-excavation assessment, analysis, preparation of a publishable report and publication in a recognised journal or series. Conditions will not be discharged until the on-site archaeological work has been completed to the satisfaction of the City Council and there is proof that the applicant has satisfactorily secured the implementation of post-excavation assessment, analysis, preparation of a publishable report and publication in a recognised journal or series, deposition of the archive, including finds, arising from the work, and deposition of an electronic archive with the Archaeological Data Service.

*POLICY 14 – Archaeological remains in the City Centre:*

The City Council will require planning applications for development involving significant ground disturbance or alteration to historic buildings in Digbeth, Deritend and adjoining parts of the City Centre to be accompanied by an archaeological assessment. This will depend on the extent of proposed development and the archaeological sensitivity of the location as indicated by existing information. The assessment will normally include an archaeological evaluation. If the assessment shows that archaeological remains are likely to be affected by the proposed development, the City Council will require archaeological excavation and/or building recording in advance of commencement of development if preservation of archaeological remains in situ is not feasible.

*POLICY 17 – Unexpected discoveries:*

In the case of unexpected archaeological discoveries during development, or discoveries of unexpected complexity or importance during archaeological works required as part of development proposals, the City Council will encourage developers to enter into discussions to consider ways in which these remains can be preserved or recorded.

*POLICY 18 – Public information:*

In sites which are publicly prominent, in addition to archaeological works required as conditions of planning permission, the City Council may also attach conditions requiring public interpretation of archaeological results through information panels or other means or will enter into planning agreements for public display and interpretation of archaeological remains through interpretation panels or literature wherever feasible.

**The Birmingham Unitary Development Plan deposit draft alterations, published in May 2001: Chapter 8 - ADDITIONAL CITY-WIDE POLICIES Development affecting archaeological remains 8.36**

This document was adopted and is the current Development Plan. The Birmingham Development Plan has recently been under Examination in Public Inquiry although at the time of production it is the UDP and other retained policies that are viewed as being current.

Development proposals affecting archaeological remains will be considered in the light of the following policies:

- An assessment of the archaeological aspects of development proposals will be required from applicants before the planning application is determined. Planning permission will not be granted where the assessment of the archaeological implications is inadequate.
- Development proposals which will have an adverse effect on scheduled ancient monuments and other nationally important remains and their settings will not be allowed.
- Development adversely affecting other known archaeological remains will be resisted although permission may be granted if the applicant has demonstrated that particular archaeological remains will be satisfactorily preserved either in situ or, where this is not feasible, by record.
- Where appropriate, Section 106 agreements will be negotiated to protect, enhance and interpret archaeological remains.

**Digbeth, Deritend and Bordesley High Streets Conservation Area: Supplementary Planning Policies (March 2009)***1.2 Conservation Area Consent*

There will be a presumption in favour of retaining buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area. This will include buildings of contextual or group value.

*1.3 Recording*

Where consent is granted for significant demolition the Council will expect an accurate archive record to be made prior to the commencement of any works. This will include photographs and/or where appropriate, measured survey drawings and will be provided at the expense of the applicant.

### *1.9 Burgage Plots*

The surviving twelfth century burgage plots on Digbeth (136-144 Digbeth) should retain their separate identities as historic building plots.

### *2.4 Development in the Conservation Area Setting*

New development in the setting of the conservation area should respect and preserve characteristic views within, from and into the area

### *3.5 Developers' Contributions*

Where appropriate developers will be expected to contribute to the improvement of the public realm.

## **8.3 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria**

### **Data collection**

The work undertaken to underpin the assessment contained within this chapter has combined a thorough review of all previous research and investigations relating to the site (associated with the Phase 1 application – now consented) alongside the results of other archaeological observations that have been made within a 500m radius of the centre of the site (the study area). Data to assist with this was obtained through commissioning a search of the Birmingham Historic Environment Record (HER) and obtaining copies of reports held on the *Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations* (OASIS) grey literature library, as well as consulting published sources for work within the study area. This was complimented by a site walkover survey with the aim of assessing the likely extents of cellars in the site and obtaining access to as many of these as practical.

### **Assessment of archaeological potential**

An assessment of the potential for assets within the site is based on an appraisal of known assets obtained through the data collecting exercise. Potential is here defined as the likelihood of heritage assets surviving within the site, and the likely significance of any such assets. The distribution and type of known sites in the vicinity, considered in relation to environmental factors such as geology, topography and soil quality, is most relevant to this assessment. Regard is also paid to the distribution of fieldwork and the likely accuracy and relevance of its results. Site development factors affecting survival of archaeological remains, such as cellars and wall footings, are also taken into account. Archaeological potential is then assigned to one of the five categories outlined in the *Table 8.1*.

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

**Table 8.1: Archaeological potential**

Potential	Definition
<b>High</b>	Heritage assets survive across a substantial area resulting in good levels of interpretation, and these are of high or medium importance.
<b>Moderate</b>	Remains of high or medium importance survive and are minimally truncated by later footings enabling good interpretation of the heritage asset within the site.
<b>Low</b>	Archaeology survives in islands between wall footings but these are very dense and reduce the evidential value <i>i.e.</i> interpretation of the heritage asset
<b>Negligible</b>	A combination of cellars and/or wall footings has removed all but a very small proportion of archaeological features making interpretation very limited.
<b>Nil</b>	Development has resulted in total loss through the excavation of cellars.

**Assessment of cultural significance**

An assessment of cultural significance is given for all known heritage assets that are potentially affected by the development. The cultural significance of an asset reflects the level of protection assigned to it by statutory designation or, in the case of undesignated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor. 'Cultural significance' is a concept defined in the PPS Practice Guide (English Heritage 2010, paragraph 12), where it is 'used as a catch-all term to sum-up the qualities that make an otherwise ordinary place a heritage asset. The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its architectural, historic, artistic or archaeological interest.' Cultural Heritage significance should not be confused with the unrelated usage of 'significance' in referring to impacts in EIA.

Nationally and internationally designated assets are assigned to the highest level of sensitivity. Grade II Listed Buildings and Grade II Registered Parks & Gardens are considered of medium sensitivity, reflecting their lesser importance attached to them by the NPPF (paragraph 132); non-designated assets of more than local importance are also assigned to this level. Other non-designated assets which are considered of local importance only are assigned to a low level of sensitivity.



**Table 8.2: Criteria for Assessing the Importance of Heritage Assets**

Importance of the asset	Criteria
<b>Very high</b>	World Heritage Sites and other assets of equal international importance
<b>High</b>	Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Monuments, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Battlefields, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings, and undesignated heritage assets of equal importance
<b>Medium</b>	Conservation Areas, Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens, Grade II Listed Buildings, heritage assets on local lists and undesignated assets of equal importance
<b>Low</b>	Undesignated heritage assets of lesser importance

The starting point for the assessment of impacts on heritage assets is an analysis of what constitutes the significance of an asset. Significance, as defined in NPPF, is the sum of the values we attach to an asset because of its heritage interest.

NPPF recognizes four types of heritage interest: archaeological, architectural, artistic and historic (NPPF: Annex 2). Archaeological interest is defined in NPPF as follows:

*“There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially may hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places and of the people and cultures that made them.”*

Neither architectural, artistic nor historic interest is defined in NPPF and this assessment has adopted the definitions used in its predecessor (PPS5):

*“Architectural and artistic interest ... are interests in the design and general aesthetics of a place. They can arise from conscious design or fortuitously from the way the heritage asset has evolved. More specifically, architectural interest is an interest in the art or science of the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures of all types. Artistic interest is an interest in other human creative skill, like sculpture.*

*Historic interest [is] an interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material record of our nation’s history, but can also provide an emotional meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity.”*

The characteristics of the asset's fabric and setting are identified and weighted according to how much they contribute to the archaeological, architectural, artistic and historic interest that together account for the significance of the asset. Characteristics which cannot be compromised without considerable loss of heritage significance are referred to as 'key characteristics'.

The significance of a heritage asset derives both from its physical fabric and from its setting. Setting is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as:

*"the surroundings in which an asset is experienced. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance, or may be neutral."*

The extent to which setting contributes to the overall significance of heritage assets varies widely. Setting may not be among the key characteristics that contribute to an asset's significance, and even where it is, only certain attributes of that setting will be relevant. In assessing the contribution of setting to an asset's significance, a checklist provided in English Heritage's guidance on Setting (English Heritage 2011, 19) is referred to. An asset's physical surroundings, the experience of the asset, and its associations and patterns of use may all contribute to its significance. Characteristics of setting that contribute to an asset's significance may be localised and limited to its immediate surroundings, or may also include more distant visual relationships, especially where an asset is located at a prominent viewpoint or intended to form a conspicuous landmark.

Setting describes the experience of the asset as a place in the present-day landscape, rather than a past landscape imagined from archaeological and historical evidence. However, setting contributes to heritage significance through the links and continuities between past and present landscape. Historical authenticity is therefore an important criterion. Characteristics of setting that would have been meaningful in the past, and are still available to the visitor, are more relevant than characteristics which are valued principally in terms of a modern landscape aesthetic.

The relevance of setting to the significance of a heritage asset does not depend on it being visited, accessible to the public, or recognisable by the average visitor (English Heritage 2011, 8). It is also accepted that all assets have a setting, at least in theory (English Heritage 2011, 5). Nevertheless, the concept of setting presupposes the experience of an asset as a place within the present-day landscape. Setting is therefore likely to contribute more to the significance of an asset that provides a rich and informative experience for potential visitors, and is considered particularly relevant in the case of well-preserved assets that are prominent features in the landscape. At the other end of the scale, setting is unlikely to contribute much

to the significance of assets with no surviving above-ground remains (the principal exceptions to this being places where the natural topography holds considerable historic interest, such as battlefields). The integrity and preservation of the setting is also a factor: where a heritage asset survives as part of a well-preserved historic landscape that includes many related features, setting is accorded greater weight than in cases where more recent land use has disrupted the coherence of the asset's setting, making the location of the asset more difficult to appreciate. Settings that have experienced change may nevertheless continue to contribute to the value of a heritage asset and therefore remain sensitive to further change.

### **Assessment of the magnitude of effects on heritage significance**

The magnitude of effect is a measure of the degree to which the significance of a heritage asset will be increased or diminished by impacts resulting from the development. Magnitude is assessed as high/medium/low, and adverse/beneficial, or negligible, using the criteria in *Table 8.3* as a guide. High magnitude adverse effects correspond to 'substantial harm' in terms of NPPF paras 132-134, while medium and low magnitude adverse effects correspond to 'less than substantial harm'.

In cases where the only potential impact is on the setting of a heritage asset, only that part of the significance derived from setting can be affected. The contribution that setting makes to significance must be identified and the assessment of magnitude weighted proportionately. English Heritage's guidance on The Setting of Heritage Assets includes a list of factors that should be considered when assessing impacts on the setting of heritage assets (English Heritage 2011, 21).

**Table 8.3:** *Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Effects on Heritage Assets*

<b>Magnitude of effect</b>	<b>Guideline Criteria</b>
<b>High beneficial</b>	The asset is preserved in situ, where in the absence of the development its heritage significance would be lost or severely compromised; or The heritage significance of the asset is substantially enhanced by changes to its setting which restore key characteristics which were previously lost or obscured.
<b>Medium beneficial</b>	The asset is preserved in situ, where in the absence of the development an appreciable loss of heritage significance would be likely to occur; or Key characteristics of the asset are preserved by record, where in the absence of the development they would be lost or severely compromised; or The heritage significance of the asset is appreciably enhanced by changes which make key characteristics of the asset's setting easier to appreciate.

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

Magnitude of effect	Guideline Criteria
<b>Low beneficial</b>	The asset is preserved in situ against ongoing gradual deterioration; or The asset is recorded and studied, enhancing understanding and appreciation of its heritage significance; or The development leads to a slight improvement in the asset's setting, but in ways that do not substantially affect its key characteristics, slightly enhancing the asset's heritage significance.
<b>Negligible</b>	The asset's fabric and/or setting is changed, but in ways which do not substantially affect any of the characteristics from which its heritage significance derives, and with no appreciable reduction or enhancement in the asset's heritage significance.
<b>Low adverse</b>	Parts of the asset's fabric and/or setting are lost or changed, but without substantially affecting key characteristics, and with only a very slight loss of heritage significance.
<b>Medium adverse</b>	One or more key characteristics of the asset's fabric and/or setting is affected, but to a limited extent, resulting in an appreciable but partial loss of the asset's heritage significance.
<b>High adverse</b>	Key characteristics of the asset's fabric and/or setting are lost or fundamentally altered, such that the asset's heritage significance is lost or severely compromised.

**Assessment of the significance of effects**

The significance of an effect (EIA 'significance') on the significance of a heritage asset (Heritage 'significance'), resulting from a direct or indirect physical impact, or an impact on its setting, is assessed by combining the magnitude of the effect and the importance of the heritage asset. The matrix in *Table 8.4* provides a guide to decision-making but is not a substitute for professional judgement and interpretation, particularly where the importance or effect magnitude levels are not clear or are borderline between categories.

**Table 8.4:** *Criteria for Assessing the Significance of Effects on Heritage Assets*

Asset importance	Magnitude of effect			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
<b>Very high</b>	Major	Major	Major or moderate	Negligible
<b>High</b>	Major	Major or moderate	Moderate or minor	Negligible

## SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

### Environmental Statement Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

<b>Medium</b>	Major or moderate	Moderate or minor	Minor	Negligible
<b>Low</b>	Moderate or minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible

#### Effects on unknown heritage assets

Construction impacts on unknown heritage assets cannot be assessed in terms of magnitude and significance. However it is possible to assess the risk of a significant effect occurring, based on the level of archaeological potential combined with the scale of the development. Scale refers primarily to the extent of disturbance, with a motorway or major housing development being examples of a large-scale development, while a single house-plot would be an example of a small-scale development. *Table 8.5* is used as a guide to estimating the risk of a significant effect occurring.

**Table 8.5: Criteria for Assessing the Risk of Significant Effects on Unknown Heritage Assets**

Level of disturbance	Archaeological potential			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Large-scale	High	High	Medium	Low
Medium-scale	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Small-scale	Medium	Low	Negligible	Negligible
Negligible	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

## 8.4 Baseline Conditions

### Overview

The collection and collation of information relating specifically to the site dates back to 2005 when an “Historic Environment Study” was produced for Birmingham City Council<sup>1</sup>. This was updated in 2007 on behalf of Salhia Investments in the form of “An Archaeological Desk-based Assessment”<sup>2</sup>. Subsequently an archaeological evaluation was undertaken involving the

1 Hislop, M. (2005) Site Bounded by Digbeth, Allison Street, Well Lane and Park Street, Birmingham City Centre: An Historic Environment Study 2005: Birmingham Archaeology PN 1274

2 Ramsey, E. (2007) Digbeth Cold Store, Birmingham: An Archaeological Desk-Based assessment 2007: Birmingham Archaeology PN1703

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE****Environmental Statement**  
Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

excavation of five trenches, four of which lie within the proposed development<sup>3</sup> (see *Appendix 8.1*). All the above reports were undertaken in accordance with briefs produced by the Birmingham City Archaeologist and followed proposals approved by the same.

One of the key features of the area is the former presence of Burgage plots. These were long thin strips of tenanted land, typically with a stall or dwelling at the front from where the tenant would provide good or services, often derived from the Burgage plot.

An excavation was undertaken immediately to the southeast and adjoining the proposed development site as part of the Phase 1 works for the site. The results from this work included the large town boundary ditch containing environmentally rich deposits and 12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> century pottery. To the east of this a building with a combination of walls constructed either as all brick or as a stone footing with brick superstructure was uncovered measuring 4.7 x 5.3 metre in plan. The excavators believe that the later phase of this dated to the 17<sup>th</sup> century with the stone footings possibly forming sills for an original timber superstructure. In either case the building would have stood without the town boundary ditch. Nearer to the town ditch a line of lime filled pits was discovered alongside other features of postulated 17<sup>th</sup> century date, within this eastern part of the site an historic garden soil was recorded as surviving.

During the Phase 1 construction phase an archaeological watching brief was undertaken of the area that had not been excavated due to the presence of the roadway for Orwell Passage at the time. The ground disturbance was very shallow and only revealed mainly 19<sup>th</sup> century or later drains and walls. At the west end of the area of observation ground reduction was sufficient to expose the upper ditch deposits where they came into contact with rubble make up for the road. No other significant features were exposed.

With the exception of a general synthesis relating to the history and development of Medieval Birmingham, very little detail relating to the study area has been provided previously. Whilst coincidentally the entire Medieval core of the 12<sup>th</sup> century (AD1166) settlement lies within the study area there is little evidence to suggest occupation prior to this and nothing within the site itself (despite the name “Birmingham” having possible Saxon origins by referring to Beorma’s people). Exceptions to this are a couple of Roman coins [3266 and 2992] and a prehistoric flint [2996]). A small number of flint artefacts and sherds of Roman pottery were found during work on the sites for the new Bullring development. These again imply very low levels of activity of these periods in the area.

---

3 Duncan, M. (2008) Digbeth Cold Store, Birmingham: An archaeological evaluation 2007: Birmingham Archaeology PN1703.01

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

A search of the HER undertaken as part of this assessment established the archaeological investigations that contribute to our understanding of the buried archaeological resource in this part of Birmingham (*Table 8.6, Figure 8.1*) as well as the nature and date of the archaeology uncovered (*Table 8.7, Figure 8.2*).

**Table 8.6:** *Archaeological events identified within the study area from Birmingham HER (Figure 8.1)*

Event	Site	Type	Reference
EBM009	Hartwell Smithfield Garage	Eval	Litherland, S. and Moscrop, D. 1996. Hartwell (Smithfield) Garage site, Digbeth, Birmingham: An archaeological evaluation. Litherland, S. 1996. Digbeth: Hartwell(Smithfield) Garage.
EBM020	Park street/ Bordesley Street	Eval	Tavener, N. 2000. Land on the southern corner of Park Street and Bor.
EBM128	Birmingham Moat	WB	Watts, L. 1978-79, Birmingham Moat: its history, topography and destruction (Trans Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Society 89)
EBM160	Hartwell Smithfield Garge 1997	WB	Litherland, S. 1997. An Archaeological watching brief at Hartwell (Smithfield) Garage site, Digbeth, Birmingham 1997.
EBM161	The Row	WB	Patrick, C. 2000. The Row, Birmingham City Centre, West Midlands. An archaeological watching brief 2000.
EBM169	Wrotesley Street	WB	Jones, C. 2000. Archaeological observation at Wrotesley Street.
EBM170	Hartwell Smithfield Garage	WB	Miller, D and Jones, L. 2000. Watching Brief at Hartwell Smithfield Garage,
EBM205	Hartwell Smithfield	Eval	Bob Burrows et al. 2000. Further Archaeological investigations at Hartwell Smithfield Garage Site, Digbeth, Birmingham, 2000.
EBM240	Floodgate Street	Eval	Williams, J. 2001. Floodgate Street, Digbeth, Birmingham: An archaeological evaluation.
EBM241	Floodgate Street	Exc	Hewitson, C. 2010. Excavations at Gibb Street and Floodgate Street draft report.
EBM242	170 High Street	Eval	Martin, H. 2004. 170 High Street, Deritend, Birmingham: Archaeological evaluation 2004
EBM255	St Bartholomew's chapel site, Albert St and Chapel St	Eval	Krakowicz, R and Rudge, A. 2004. Masshouse Circus, Birmingham City Centre, Archaeological Recording 2002.

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

Event	Site	Type	Reference
EBM307	Dean House	Exc	Martin, H and Ratkai, S. 2006. The Dirty Brook: excavations at Dean House, Upper Dean Street, Birmingham.
EBM316	Freeman Street	Eval	Hayes, L. 2006. City Park Gate, Birmingham Report on an archaeological evaluation.
EBM335	Park St Gardens	Eval	Richards, G. 2007. An archaeological evaluation of land adjacent to Park Street Gardens, Birmingham.
EBM342	St Martins churchyard	Exc	Brickley, M, Buteux, S, Adams, J, Cherrington, R. 2006. St Martin's Uncovered. Investigations in the churchyard of St Martins-in-the Bull Ring, Birmingham, 2001.
EBM344	The Brolly Works	Exc	Porter, S. 2007. The Brolly Works, Allison Street, Digbeth, Birmingham. An archaeological evaluation and excavation.
EBM346	Walker Building	WB	Collins, P and Colls, K. 2007. The Walker Building 58 Oxford Street Digbeth Birmingham.
EBM377	Hartwell smithfield garage test pits	WB	Duncan, M. 2008. Hartwell Smithfield Garage, Digbeth, Birmingham, Archaeological Watching Brief 2008.
EBM382	Digbeth cold store	Eval	Duncan, M. 2008. Digbeth Cold Store Birmingham. An archaeological evaluation 2007
EBM392	Birmingham City University eastside	Eval	Mann, P. 2008. Proposed BCU Eastside campus, Banbury Street, Birmingham. Archaeological evaluation 2008.
EBM393	Connaught square	WB	Bacon, R. 2008. Connaught Square, Digbeth-Deritend, Birmingham. An archaeological watching brief 2007-2008.
EBM404	Digbeth coach station	Exc	Wright, J. 2008. Digbeth Coach Station, Birmingham, Report on archaeological investigations. Unpublished document: De'Ath, R. 2010. Digbeth Coach station, Birmingham, Report on Archaeological Investigations. Wessex Archaeology. 2010. Archaeological Investigations at Digbeth Coach Station, Birmingham. Leivers, M. 2011. Archaeological investigations at Digbeth Coach Station, Birmingham.



**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

Event	Site	Type	Reference
EBM424	Banbury street Birmingham City University excavation	Exc	Higgins, T. 2008. Archaeological Excavations at Banbury Street, Birmingham Interim Summary of results. Higgins, T. 2008. BCU Eastside campus, Banbury Street, Birmingham, Post excavation assessment report. Higgins, T and Score, V. 2009. An Archaeological Excavation, Birmingham City University, Eastside Campus, Banbury Street, Birmingham. Score, V and Higgins, T. 2011. Early prehistoric clearance in Birmingham? Excavations at Banbury Street.
EBM426	Manzoni gardens	Eval	Burrows, R and Mould, C. 2000. Historic Town-Plan Analysis and Archaeological Evaluation of Manzoni Gardens, Birmingham City Centre.
EBM427	Open markets	Eval	Burrows, R and Mould, C. 2000. Historic Town-Plan Analysis and Archaeological Evaluation of Manzoni Gardens, Birmingham City Centre.
EBM430	Row market	Eval	Hovey, J. 1999. An archaeological evaluation at The Row Market, Edgbaston Street.
EBM431	Row market	WB	Ramsey, E. 2000. An archaeological watching brief at The Row Market, Edgbaston Street.
EBM433	Park street	Exc	Burrows, B and Martin, H. 2002. Park Street Birmingham: Post-Excavation Assessment and Research Design. Patrick, C and Ratkai, S. 2008. The Bull Ring Uncovered. Excavations at Edgbaston Street, Moor Street and Park Street, Birmingham, 1997-2001. pp 50-87
EBM435	Moor street 2000	Exc	Mould, C. 2002. An Archaeological Evaluation and Excavation at Moor Street Post-Excavation Assessment and Research. Patrick, C and Ratkai, S. 2008. The Bull Ring Uncovered. Excavations at Edgbaston Street, Moor Street and Park Street, Birmingham, 1997-2001. pp 38-49
EBM437	Edgbaston street	Exc	Patrick, C and Ratkai, S. 2008. The Bull Ring Uncovered. Excavations at Edgbaston Street, Moor Street and Park Street, Birmingham, 1997-2001. pp 9-37
EBM472	Upper dean street	Exc	Kipling, R and Score, V. 2012. Archaeological excavation of the Dirty Brook, Upper Kipling, R. 2009. Excavations at Dean Street/Upper Dean Street, Birmingham 2009

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

Event	Site	Type	Reference
EBM491	Carrs lane	Exc	Webster, J. 2009. Archive Statement: Archaeological excavation 25-31 Carrs Lane Birmingham. Webster, J. 2012. Archaeological excavation at 25-31 Carrs Lane, Birmingham.
EBM494	Rea street area 1	Exc	Duncan, M and Krawiec, K. 2009. Birmingham, Rea Street, Digbeth.
EBM495	Rea street area 2	Exc	
EBM604	Beorma quarter	Exc	Kipling, R. 2014. Archaeological Excavations at the Beorma Quarter, Digbeth Birmingham (Phase 1).
EBM635	Park street gardens	WB	Hudson, K. 2012. Eastside Park Archaeological summary report.
EBM646	Orwell passage	WB	Craddock-Bennett, L. 2013. Orwell Passage, High Street, Digbeth, Birmingham. Archaeological watching brief.
<b>Key:</b> WB = Watching brief; Exc = Excavation; Eval = Evaluation			

**Table 8.7:** Archaeological assets identified within the study area from Birmingham HER (Figure 8.2)

Ref	Monument	Location	Summary	Period
2891	MBM782	Digbeth	Gold medieval ring with diagonally fluted decoration. Inscription on interior surface. Found c1890	Medieval
2992	MBM874	Dudley Street	Roman coins found during sewer construction at the junction of Dudley St and Smallbrook Street	Roman
2996	MBM878	Deritend	A polished stone axe was found in Sept 1953 during road widening on the N side of High St Deritend	Prehistoric
2997	MBM879	Ladywell	Ladywell is a spring of soft water feeding Lady Well Baths	Post Med
3014	MBM896	Parsonage moat	Sub-square moated enclosure which contained the Parsonage by the 18th century	M+PM
3015	MBM897	Birmingham moat	Manor House Moat, Birmingham	M+PM

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

Ref	Monument	Location	Summary	Period
3286	MBM992	Dudley St/Smallbrook St	Roman coins	Roman
3295	MBM1001	Bordesley St	A medieval leather shoe from 72/80 Bordesley St, found in 1955	Medieval
3300	MBM1004	Bromsgrove St	Cannon ball found in well during construction of an outfall sewer in 1974	Post Med
3303	MBM1007	Birmingham city centre	Anglo-Saxon settlement, supposedly late Saxon - place name	Saxon
20095	MBM1739	Malt/moat mill	Identified as the parva molendinum mentioned in 1296	M+PM
20096	MBM1740	Town mill and Lloyd's mill	Water-powered corn mill from 16th century or earlier, later also a slitting mill	M+PM
20427	MBM2077	Hartwell Smithfield garage, east part	Evaluation by trial trenching demonstrated the survival of ""islands"" of archaeological deposits between	Post Med
20615	MBM2267	High Street Deritend medieval pottery	Medieval pottery found during watching brief of 1953 on High St. Deritend road widening work.	Medieval
20619	MBM2272	Park Street And Bordesley Street	Buried soil c.1700 A.D., pit, and one medieval pottery sherd.	Post Med
20642	MBM2296	Hartwell Smithfield Garage- West Part	Medieval pits recorded in evaluation and watching brief. Surviving stratigraphy also observed in test pits	Medieval
20664	MBM2320	Floodgate Street Tanning Site	Documentary evid for 18th cent and earlier tanning. 17th cent waterlogged deposits surviving under 19th cent cellars.	Post Med
20667	MBM2324	Row Market	Medieval pit and later features	Medieval
20669	MBM2326	Upper Dean Street	Former watercourses, osier pits and 19th century buildings	Post Med
20671	MBM2328	Dean Street/Upper Dean Street	Post-medieval watercourses and other features	Post Med

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

Ref	Monument	Location	Summary	Period
20680	MBM2337	Park Street	Excavated remains consisting of boundary ditches, pits, graves and timber-lined tanks	M+PM
20681	MBM2338	Moor Street	Excavated remains consisting of a ditch, pits, wells and layers	M+PM
20682	MBM2339	St Martin's Churchyard	Excavation of graveyard to N and W of church	M+PM
20683	MBM2340	Near St Martin's Church	Archaeological evaluation revealed medieval well	Medieval
20687	MBM2344	Freeman Street	Freeman Street was laid out between 1727 and 1731.	Post Med
20689	MBM2346	Gough's Hide Yard	Hide yard in existence by 1889	Post Med
20690	MBM2347	Ditch Or Watercourse	North-south ditch or watercourse in 1553 survey	Medieval
20692	MBM2348	Park Street Gardens	Overspill burial ground for St Martin's church	Post Med
20693	MBM2349	Masshouse And Franciscan Convent	Site of Catholic Masshouse and Franciscan Convent, 1687-88	Post Med
20701	MBM2357	High Street Deritend, 170	Former channel of River Rea, with probable remains of 18th and 19th cent industry and potentially earlier remains including waterlogged organic deposits	M+PM
20703	MBM2359	Deritend Bridge	Former pool, channel and large flax retting pit	Post Med
20744	MBM2398	Bradford Street	Probable remains of the tail race of a water mill and industries such as leather tanning.	M+PM
20785	MBM2443	Freeman Street	Pits and soils containing medieval pottery, and 18th cent cellars, walls, yards	Medieval
20800	MBM2458	The Brolly Works	Evaluation and a small area excavation revealed 19th cent cellars	M+PM
20802	MBM2460	Oxford Street Test Pits	Buried remains of 19th century date observed in geotechnical test pits	Post Med
20813	MBM2472	Ditch	Medieval boundary ditch	Medieval

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

Ref	Monument	Location	Summary	Period
20827	MBM2489	Digbeth	Surviving burgrave plot boundaries. Evaluation revealed boundary ditch, medieval and post-medieval tanning and organic deposits with excellent pollen and beetle survival.	Medieval
20830	MBM2492	Eastside Prehistoric Deposits	Tree holes covered by peaty clay, with radiocarbon dates of c12000 BP and c10000 BP. Two worked flints at base of deposit. Pollen suggests Boreal date. Overlying layer of charcoal. Also 18th cent and later features.	Prehistoric
20831	MBM2493	Coach Station Industrial Debris	Ivory working and button making	Post Med
20869	MBM2532	Manzoni Gardens	Post-Medieval Features predating 19th century market hall	Post Med
20902	MBM2567	Carrs Lane	Medieval and post-medieval clay-lined pits and gully and associated levelling deposits	Medieval
21083	MBM2749	Mill Pool For Town Mill Or Lloyds Mill	Mill pool	Post Med
21084	MBM2750	Watercourse Joining Moats	Watercourse running from Parsonage Moat to Manor House moat	M+PM
21085	MBM2751	Watercourse	Watercourse feeding Manor House Moat, later Pudding Brook	Post Med
21086	MBM2752	Dirty Brook	Watercourse running parallel to Pudding Brook	Post Med
21087	MBM2753	Head Race To Town Mill	Head race to Town Mill. Runs into mill pool.	Post Med
21088	MBM2754	Watercourse	Stream leading from mill pool to River Rea	Medieval
21089	MBM2755	Digbeth/High Street Deritend	Pool on south side of Digbeth/High Street	M+PM
21290	MBM2958	New Street Cattle	At least 14 cattle horn cores found in trench	Post Med
<b>Key:</b> M+PM = Medieval and Post-medieval; Post Med = Post-medieval				

**Geology and topography**

The location of the 12<sup>th</sup> century occupation is focused on a Keuper Sandstone Ridge (1) near to a fault line that causes the ground to slope down to the south-east towards the Rea Valley.

The fault has resulted in the presence of springs and easily bored wells and as such would have been attractive to settlers. The earliest features within the study area are large ditches, potentially channelling this abundant aquatic resource.

### **Medieval and later evidence**

To the south of the site a 3m deep moat surrounding the medieval manorial site was partly excavated in 2000<sup>4</sup> with 12<sup>th</sup> -13<sup>th</sup> century pottery recovered from its base and the filling of the feature continuing up until 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> century on the basis of pottery found higher up (EBM161). Reputedly medieval structures survived into the late 18<sup>th</sup> century here and the moat was still visible in 1815. Work during a watching brief on the site exposed two phases of wall relating to the manor house (5, p90).

This feature was connected to the moat around the Parsonage to its west and forms part of a roughly oval enclosure called the “Hersum” ditch, the northern loop of which bisects the proposed development site from its southeast to northwest corner.

Amongst the archaeological observations reported there is considerable variation in the nature of the geological deposits encountered. To the west (EBM430/1), northwest (EBM246/7) and within the centre of the site itself (EBM382) a compact yellow/orange sand is observed. This rises from 105.5m AOD in the site to 109m AOD to the west. Within and to the south of the site a compact red clay was observed at 106m AOD with a similar deposit to the north of the site (EBM435) at 111.5m AOD. On the lower ground to the south and east is a blue/green clay deposit (EBM240/205) referred to as Mercia Mudstone and lying at 101.7m AOD (EBM9). Deposits displaying organic preservation have been recorded from the Rea (about 500m to the east of the site) all the way to the site itself. The date of material associated with these organic deposits appears to get later the further to the east they are from the site. Within the site a c. 0.25m thick organic deposit was cut by a 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> century ditch. Immediately to the east of the site the natural mudstone had been cut by pits dating between 14<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup> centuries with activity of this date extending for another 100m (EBM205). Organic deposits, further east again (EBM9), contained wood and leather and material of 15<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> century date, whilst a similarly waterlogged but much thicker deposit adjacent to the current course of the Rea (EBM240) contained 17<sup>th</sup> century material. This evidence seems somewhat at odds with Hislop’s assertion that Digbeth High Street was a principal route into the city in the Medieval period (1, p4) as it all postdates the time by which the town ditch went out of use in the 14th century although Hodder (*pers comm*) feels there can be little doubt that the road now known as Digbeth was a major medieval route which crossed the ditch. Thirteenth century occupation evidence associated with Park Street does tend to

---

4 Patrick, C. (2000)

5 Hodder, M (2011) Birmingham the Hidden History, Tempus

suggest that this latter road follows quite an early route way. In fact with the exception of the basal fills of the moat around the manor (mentioned above) and “Hersum” Ditch, the only other evidence for occupation of pre-14<sup>th</sup> century date in the study area comes from features such as post holes and pits within the site and observations to the north along Park Street and on Edgbaston Street to the west. The presence of wasters of 12<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> century Deritend Ware might suggest there was pottery production in the near vicinity.

Activity in the study area between the 15<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> centuries provides further indications of industrial processes taking place here. Features cut into the upper fills of the ditch within the site appear to relate to some form of hide processing. The types of features that are recorded include clay-lined pits, timber-lined pits as well as shallow lime-filled pits.

There is also evidence for water features such as a pool that was reputed to lie in the northeast part of the site in the 16<sup>th</sup> century from a survey of Birmingham in 1553 (1, p6). The archaeological evidence also suggests that a considerable number of wells have been dug in the area. The site of the aforementioned pool appears to have been incorporated into Goffe and Co. mineral water manufacturer’s holding where an artesian well is meant to have been built and workmen digging in 1889 found a large (40ft) rectangular cistern dated 1854. A stone-lined well measuring 2.2m deep by 1.5m in diameter was the earliest found in the study area containing Medieval lower fills and discovered during work on the Moor Street site to the northwest of the current proposals <sup>6, 7</sup>.

In terms of the survival of archaeological features the north side of High Street appears to contain some of the best preserved archaeology within the study area. Very deep features such as the moat and portions of wall from the manor survive to the south but there has been little evidence for other features of an earlier date. At Edgbaston Street much further to the west of the site (EBM437) features dating back to the 13<sup>th</sup> century were also recovered including a timber-lined cistern or tank. This site which lies near the Parsonage moat provided considerable evidence for hide processing or tanning spanning from as early as the 12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> century and continuing through to the 17<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> century. Further to the north-west of the site on Moor Street only a very small patch of archaeology had survived landscaping for later development (EBM435) (6 and 7) with the main early medieval feature being a section of the town boundary or “Hersum” ditch along with a few 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century pits, and 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> century pits cutting these.

---

6 Mould, C. 2002. An Archaeological Evaluation and Excavation at Moor Street Post-Excavation Assessment and Research.

7 Patrick, C and Ratkai, S. 2008. The Bull Ring Uncovered. Excavations at Edgbaston Street, Moor Street and Park Street, Birmingham, 1997-2001. pp 38-49

The largest zone of archaeological survival investigated within the study area adjoins the northwest corner of the site on Park Street. It again follows a similar theme to those sites mentioned above. At its southern extent the “Hersum” ditch was identified, although here along the eastern boundary of the historic plots fronting Park Street another ditch was identified. The depth and width of this feature were not established but it also appears to date as far back as the 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century. Kiln waste discovered in the ditch sections on this site along with a piece of kiln furniture indicate that pottery manufacture is likely to be taking place in the vicinity. As with almost every other investigation previously referred to, at least the rear of the plots adjacent to the ditch appear to have been given over to tanning pits spanning the medieval period and later. Other clay-lined features going out of use in the 15<sup>th</sup> century may be associated with industrial activity, with a kiln implying high temperature processes being present too.

### **Preservation and survival**

A very striking feature across the whole of the study area is the level of preservation of organic artefacts, even including St Martin’s burial ground. Most sites investigated report on the presence of waterlogged deposits containing environmental evidence alongside preservation of timber and leather. The proposed development site is no exception in this regard and has already demonstrated high levels of similar types of preservation. It is also clear from previous evaluation work that features associated with tanning survive within this area and the site may contain the junction between the back plot ditch parallel to Park Street and the “Hersum” ditch.

Factors affecting the preservation of archaeological features on the site include cellaring and the excavation of ponds (*Figure 8.3*) from the early Post-medieval period onwards. Predominantly the known cellaring lies beneath buildings fronting High Street Digbeth and is located beneath buildings which for the most part are being retained as part of the development. Exceptions to this include the music hall and pub to its south at the junction of High Street and Park Street. These demonstrate extensive cellaring and being near the top of the hill this is likely to have removed everything except the very bottoms of deep features such as wells and deep tanning pits. To the east of the music hall there is potential for the survival of archaeological features within the ditched enclosure. In other areas of the site the mid-19th century insertion of dwellings along rows in the back plots fronting High Street appears to have come with extensive cellaring through comparing the evaluation results with historic mapping. It is also unclear to what extent number 140 High Street was cellared as there are no records of anyone having entered this building since the proposals to develop the site began. Historic cellaring beneath the training centre is also likely to be more extensive than that which currently survives, the small basement at the front of this building being clearly a modern construction.



**Likely significance of the archaeological resource within the site**

The archaeology found within the medieval core of Birmingham is quite unusual at a national level. This is mostly due to the very wet nature of the deposits and the presence of springs feeding these deposits and maintaining a relatively high level of water logging. So whilst on many sites across the UK water logging and organic preservation are common in the bottoms of deep features, in Birmingham soil layers immediately above the natural sub-strata also preserve organic remains. However, unlike similar sites located adjacent to burgh ditches in Hereford<sup>8</sup> and Derby<sup>9</sup> for example contemporary ground surfaces do not appear to survive. Taking the latter example, at St Mary's Gate Derby, clay floors with barrel impressions survived alongside clay lined pits, workshop floors and other features associated with hide processing. Therefore the evidential value of the below ground heritage assets in the site is good in terms of organic preservation but fragmentary in nature due to truncation through later levelling, construction and pit digging activities. Whilst documentary evidence dates back to the medieval period with respect to 140 High Street and burgage plots have been identified within the later Post-medieval plot layouts there is little archaeological evidence that matches this. However, plot fence lines rarely leave a trace in the archaeological record, meaning that the value relating to plots is more aesthetic than evidential in nature. In terms of historic values then the line of the back plot ditch if indeed the "Hersum" ditch lends some weight to this, but communal values are underrepresented with respect to below ground heritage in the site (the publication of Mike Hodder's book being the closest to affording public access to understanding and interpretation of the site).

For the Phase 2/3 site, particular features in addition to the ditch are the palaeoenvironmental data in the deposits cut by it (as revealed in the evaluation trench) and the sequence of post-medieval activity found in the Phase 1 excavation (tanning, "garden soil", and a 17th century stone/brick building).

**Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets****St Martin's Church (Grade II\*)**

St Martin's was established by the late 13th century; repaired in the late 17th and late 18th centuries; largely rebuilt in the 1870s (apart from the tower and spire, which had been restored in 1853); and restored in 1956-57 after bomb damage in World War II. Although the relationship with the buildings in Digbeth has remained largely unchanged, the interface with the town centre to the north was effectively obliterated in the 20th century development and redevelopment of the Bull Ring shopping centres and the inner ring roads. The relationship

---

8 Vyce, D 2001 Magistrates Court, Bath St Hereford: Analysis of Excavation HAS498

9 Crooks, C. [et al] 2003 Derby magistrates Court: Archaeological Excavation and Building Recording HAS 589

on the south side remained largely unchanged from the early 19th century construction of Smithfield Market until its demolition in 1975, since which the land immediately opposite the church has been used as an open market.

*123-135 Digbeth (Cold Store; Grade II)*

The exteriors of the listed building have been retained in the approved Phase 1 development plan.

*RTP Crisps Building, Allison Street and Well Lane (Grade II)*

The building dates to 1872, when it was erected for the manufacture of umbrella ribs. It was enlarged in 1895 and again in 1923 when it became a clothing factory, and was again altered in 1975 as a food processing factory for RTP Crisps.

*Digbeth, Deritend and Bordesley High Streets (Digbeth/Deritend) Conservation Area*

The conservation area is a designated heritage asset in its own right. As shown in Figure 4.1, the development site lies at the western corner of the conservation area, and interface boundaries with designated and non-designated heritage assets are found in Digbeth, Allison Street, and Well Lane.

The character of the Conservation Area was summarised in the Digbeth, Deritend and Bordesley High Streets (Digbeth/Deritend) Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Supplementary Planning Policies (adopted in 2009 as a Supplementary Planning Document) as follows:

*Digbeth, Deritend and Bordesley High Streets (Digbeth/Deritend) Conservation Area contains the most important remnants of Birmingham's mediaeval townscape, dating from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. It is also significant as an inner city industrial quarter with a good range of industrial and commercial buildings dating from the nineteenth to the twentieth century and provides a major focus for regeneration.*

Nos. 135-139 Digbeth are locally listed, and are thus non-designated heritage assets under NPPF. (No. 140 is neither statutorily listed nor locally listed.) The heritage assets were assessed in 2005 (Hislop, Malcolm. Site Bounded by Digbeth, Allison Street, Well Lane and Park Street, Birmingham City Centre, An Historic Environment Study, 2005. Birmingham Archaeology, Report P.N. 1274, January 2005), as follows:

- **135-136 Digbeth** – This is a Grade A locally listed building, the high rating reflecting the important contribution it makes to the character of the conservation area. It is a

comparatively tall structure, and the most ornate of the buildings fronting this block. Whereas the former Digbeth Cold Stores building impresses by its size, Nos 135-6 are significant for their eye-catching design. It is interesting too as an example of an early 20th-century emporium obviously designed to be noticed and to impress, both in respect of the exterior as well as the interior with its elaborate staircase and spacious and well-lit upper rooms. Certainly, this is one of the most important buildings in the row, and its loss would have a detrimental effect on the conservation area.

- **137 Digbeth** – This building is Grade B locally listed, and this is probably a good measure of its significance. Certainly, it wouldn't qualify for statutory listing, being too late in date, and not of sufficiently high quality. Nevertheless, it is an attractive building that makes a significant contribution to the streetscape, and is important to the character of the conservation area. Its historic interest lies in the continuity it represents, between the 18th century or before, when this plot existed as one of the tenements that made up the Inge holding, and the present day.
- **138-139 Digbeth** – No. 138-9 is a Grade B locally listed building. The recent extension and re-ordering of the interior means that the interest of the property lies almost entirely in the Digbeth elevation. This is a good, but fairly plain example of its kind. Owing to its late date, even in its original state, it is highly unlikely to have been of sufficiently high quality to qualify for statutory listing; the alterations to the interior make this certain. However, it does form an important component of the historic character of the Digbeth frontage, and makes a significant contribution to the conservation area. The historical interest lies in the continuity it represents between the land tenure of the 17th century and probably earlier, and the present.
- **Park Street Music Hall** – The Park Street music hall was built in the 1860s to revitalise the business of the former George Inn by providing additional entertainment. It operated in its initial form for about 25 years before being unsuccessfully upgraded in the late 1880s; disappeared from trade directories in the 1890s; and became disused in 1901. Very little fabric of historic interest appears to survive: only a few minimal interior details and ceiling remnants were in evidence in 2007-2008, all of which were derelict and ruinous. Any historic interest is thus now limited to social rather than socio-architectural history, as the building is effectively a shell within which a local music hall once existed, rather than a significant example of a specific building type.
- **Digbeth, Deritend and Bordesley High Streets (Digbeth/Deritend) Conservation Area** – The conservation area is a designated heritage asset in its own right. As shown in *Figure 8.5* the development site lies at the western corner of the conservation area, and interface boundaries with designated and non-designated heritage assets are found in Allison Street and Well Lane.



**Figure 8.5:** Detail from BCC Conservation Area map showing statutorily and locally listed buildings (orange and blue, respectively)

## 8.5 Assessment of Project Impacts

There are two groups of impact that will affect the buried archaeological resource. The first of these is determined by the proposed design of the buildings and their associated foundations, services and new basements (*Figure 8.4*). The second relates to construction phase activities and impacts associated with site preparation and enabling works, this is less easy to quantify.

### Direct impact of the development proposals

In the northwest part of the site a substantial basement is proposed and given a reduction in ground levels here to greater than 104.5m AOD then by comparison to depths of archaeological features this would result in complete removal of surviving archaeology within its footprint. However, the westernmost part of the basement is currently part of the cellars for the Music Hall and therefore survival of archaeological features and deposits is unlikely here in any event.

To the south of this and in the northeast part of the site there are proposals for a number of piled foundations with relatively substantial pile caps. In themselves these are likely to either totally destroy archaeological features or deposits and where this is not the case the evidential value of such materials will be considerably reduced as partial disturbance of archaeological entities makes them a lot harder to interpret.

Further to the above, both during and for a currently unspecified period after the construction phase there is a need to dewater the new basement. The aim will be to reduce the height of the water table within and around the new basement and is likely to also affect deposits for some distance from it. Given the likely presence of water logged deposits within the areas of the site affected by this then there could be a subsequent impact on the levels of preservation of such materials as a result of this activity.

**Direct impact during construction phase operations**

Other impacts on buried archaeology will occur as a result of site preparation works or enabling works. Such disturbances include the grubbing up of foundations, ground level reduction to allow for plant access and ease of working and additional excavation around pile caps or other areas where concrete needs casting or the cutting back of pile heads and insertion of shuttering. Therefore the extent of disturbances are generally greater than those mapped on the foundation drawings and difficult to manage during construction works. These types of operations do, however, result in both complete and partial loss of heritage assets where they are present.

**Indirect impacts following development**

The waterlogged nature of the archaeological resource is a consideration as this increases the value of the heritage assets within the site. Therefore dewatering or improved drainage as a result of the development could result in heritage loss through future decay if water logged layers dry out. The site has been subject to previous development some of which involved excavations to a considerable depth. This would imply that deep development and localised cellaring has not reduced the constant supply of water to the deposits on the site. However, the construction of the basement could interfere with the moisture content in the deposits identified during evaluation of the site.

**Impact upon Designated Heritage Assets**

The proposals incorporate within the scheme the Cold Store and the adjacent facades of interest including the non-designated heritage assets. Façade retention of the non-designated heritage assets also minimises the impact of the development upon the street-level setting of the Grade II cold store building at 123-135 Digbeth (which was retained in the approved Phase 1 of the development plan), and the massing to Well Lane responds to the listed building to the north by reducing the height of the building which sits immediately opposite.

### Impact upon Non-Designated Heritage Assets

As approved in 2009 (and time-extended in 2012), the proposals include the retention of buildings 135-136, 137 and the facades of 138-139 on Digbeth High Street, and thus minimise the street-level impact of development.

The proposals would remove the remains of the Park Street music hall, and although these are minimal, recording of the structure should be undertaken prior to its demolition.

Massing of the proposals respects the site's boundary interfaces with the locally-listed buildings in Digbeth High Street and Allison Street by decreasing the density and height of the new buildings towards these streets.

The structures will also replicate to an extent the form of the original burgage plots.



**Figure 8.7:** *Proposed elevation to Digbeth High Street*



## SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

## Environmental Statement Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham



**Figure 8.8:** *Proposed elevation to Allison Street*

**Table 8.8:** *Significance of impacts*

Asset type	Assessment criteria			
	Importance	Magnitude	Significance of effect	Note
Medieval features	Medium	High adverse	Moderate	Despite complete loss in part, archaeology already compromised by earlier use. But important in its broader context based on results of Beorma Phase 1 excavations and other nearby excavations.

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

Asset type	Assessment criteria			
	Importance	Magnitude	Significance of effect	Note
<b>Post-medieval features</b>	Low-medium	High adverse	Minor or moderate	Remains quite fragmentary and of low importance within the site.  But based on results of Beorma Phase 1 excavations and other nearby excavations important in their broader context, <i>e.g.</i> tanning, the “garden soil” and the small 17th cent brick building
<b>Medieval waterlogged deposits</b>	Medium - high	High adverse	Major - moderate	Many will be lost through total removal – others at risk through dewatering.
<b>Setting of burgage plots</b>	Medium	Medium beneficial	Moderate +ve	Plots will be more easily “read” by public.
<b>Archaeology of earlier than medieval date</b>	Low	High Adverse	Minor	No features identified previously
<b><u>Designated Heritage Assets:</u> St Martin’s Church</b>	Medium to High	Negligible	Negligible	Context and relationship retained by massing
<b><u>Designated Heritage Assets:</u> 123-135 Digbeth</b>	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Setting retained
<b><u>Designated Heritage Assets:</u> Listed building north of Well Lane</b>	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Setting retained
<b><u>Designated Heritage Assets:</u> Digbeth/Deritend Conservation Area</b>	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Character respected by the massing
<b>Non-Designated Heritage Assets: 135-136 Digbeth</b>	Medium	Low adverse	Minor	Façade retained
<b>Non-Designated Heritage Assets: 137 Digbeth</b>	Medium	Low adverse	Minor	Façade retained



**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
**Environmental Statement**  
 Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

Asset type	Assessment criteria			
	Importance	Magnitude	Significance of effect	Note
<b>Non-Designated Heritage Assets:</b> <b>138-139 Digbeth</b>	Medium	Low adverse	Minor	Façade retained
<b>Non-Designated Heritage Assets:</b> <b>Park St Music Hall</b>	Medium	High adverse	Moderate	Record prior to demolition

## 8.6 Assessment of Cumulative Impacts

The only likely impacts that could be viewed as cumulative relate to previous developments in the area. To the north of the site archaeological deposits were destroyed during excavations for the Bullring car park on Park Street. Excavation for the Phase 1 Beorma development also removed archaeological assets from the area. This development further removes heritage assets from a depleting archaeological resource.

**Table 8.9:** *Significance of cumulative impacts*

Asset type	Assessment criteria			
	Importance	Magnitude	Significance of effect	Note
<b>Cumulative loss of archaeological or evidential value</b>	Medium	Medium	Moderate	There are other deposits that survive within the wider study area, the quality of deposits on the site is no greater than observed elsewhere.

## 8.7 Impact Mitigation and Residual Effects

The potential loss of the historic burgage plots within the site has already been mitigated within the development design so this is not included further amongst methods of mitigation. It is quite clear from the assessment that the development proposals are of such a scale that they will result in direct impacts affecting either total or partial loss of archaeological deposits and features within the site. Where archaeological deposits or features might have survived between these areas then they could be further eroded through construction phase activities.

## SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

### Environmental Statement Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

In addition levels of preservation of archaeological organic remains could be adversely affected by dewatering of the site both during, and potential after, the development.

Under the guidance in NPPF where assets are not viewed as being of high or very high significance then consideration can be given to obtaining the archaeological evidence through excavation, recording and disseminating the results from these exercises (*Appendix 8*). Further enhancement to the site's heritage values might also be afforded through interpretation and public presentation of the results of the work as well as academic publication.

**Table 8.10:** *Summary table of predicted impacts and mitigation*

Effect	Significance of effect without mitigation	Mitigation	Significance of residual effect
Partial or total loss of archaeological features and associated loss of organic preservation.	Moderate adverse	Excavation, recording, conservation, archive deposition and publication	Minor adverse
Demolition of Park St Music Hall	High adverse	Record prior to demolition	Medium adverse

## 8.8 Summary

The below ground archaeology within this part of Birmingham is associated with occupation dating from the 12<sup>th</sup> century onwards. Development from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards has had a varying effect on the survival of such remains in some cases such as Moor Street almost completely eradicating any evidence whilst in others such as Edgbaston Street and Park Street demonstrating reasonably good levels of survival. The proposed development site has been shown to have a moderately good level of survival of archaeological remains between later areas of cellaring and foundations. The location of the medieval settlement here is such that the very plentiful water supply that may have attracted early settlers has also resulted in high levels of preservation of organic remains. This is not just particular to the site but seen within 500m of it in all directions. The nature of below ground archaeology is believed to be plots laid out along roads leading to a market place and enclosed by a large ditch measuring c. 7m across by 3m or more deep. This could be the feature known as "Hersum" ditch and part of its northeast stretch is present within the site. Early industrial activity is associated with this feature in almost every observation that has been made within the wider study area used to establish the baseline for this chapter. The archaeology within the site does not differ from

**SECTION 8: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE****Environmental Statement**  
Beorma Quarter (Phase 2 & 3), Birmingham

this model and contains evidence for early hide processing as well as pottery manufacture just to the north of the site. It is also believed that the plot boundaries that are still present within the current streetscape owe their origins to early medieval burgrave plots, possibly the only surviving remnants in the city. The site also contains evidence for land use and the nature of human activity up until the 17<sup>th</sup> century with the remains of later brick structures shown on historic maps cutting through all this earlier activity.

The current development proposals will result in the direct loss of some areas where archaeological deposits survive. It will also potentially have a detrimental effect on the levels of preservation of organic remains even where direct impacts do not affect such remains. As a means of mitigating these effects a programme of archaeological work will be required to excavate, record, assess, analyse, conserve and report on the material recovered as well as depositing the archive within the local museum. It should also provide a means of presenting the history and archaeology of the site to the general public in a way that leaves a permanent legacy of interpretation.

Based upon the appraisal of buried heritage impacts discussed above, the residual impacts associated with the **Construction Phase** are deemed to be of **MODERATE** significance and permanent in nature. The residual impacts associated with the **Operational Phase** following mitigation are deemed to be of **LOW** (minor) significance and long-term in nature.

With the exception of the Park Street music hall, impacts upon non-archaeological designated and non-designated heritage assets – all of which are of medium significance – are deemed to be **NEGLIGIBLE** during construction to **MODERATE** and beneficial during operation as the buildings (or important elements thereof) will be preserved having been incorporated in the design process of the proposed development.

In the case of the Park Street music hall (also of medium significance), the loss of remnant fabric would have a **MAJOR** impact, which would be reduced by appropriate mitigation to **MODERATE**.