



## Bishop Auckland Bus Station and Car Park

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT

BL000034-JAC-XX-XX-AS-T-00001 | P01

21/12/22



## Bishop Auckland Bus Station and Car Park

Project No: BL000034  
 Document Title: ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT  
 Document No.: BL000034-JAC-XX-XX-AS-T-00001  
 Revision: P01  
 Document Status: Suitable for Stage approval  
 Date: 21/12/22  
  
 Client Name: Durham County Council  
 Client No: N/A  
 Project Manager: Dominic Brown  
 Author: James Goad  
 File Name: BL000034-JAC-XX-XX-AS-T-00001

Jacobs  
 2nd Floor Cottons Centre  
 Cottons Lane  
 London SE1 2QG  
 England  
 Phone: +44 (0)203 980 2000  
[www.jacobs.com](http://www.jacobs.com)

© Copyright 2022 Jacobs. The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Jacobs. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Jacobs constitutes an infringement of copyright.

Limitation: This document has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of Jacobs' client, and is subject to, and issued in accordance with, the provisions of the contract between Jacobs and the client. Jacobs accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for, or in respect of, any use of, or reliance upon, this document by any third party.

### Document history and status

Revision	Date	Description	Author	Checked	Reviewed	Approved
P01	21/12/22	ISSUED FOR PLANNING APPLICATION	JG	AM	AM	DB

**Contents**

**Executive Summary** ..... iv

**1. Introduction**..... 1

1.1 Project background..... 1

1.2 Proposed scheme description..... 1

1.3 Scope and purpose..... 1

1.4 Limitations..... 2

**2. Legislation and Policy**..... 3

2.1 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 ..... 3

2.2 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990..... 3

2.3 Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 ..... 3

2.4 National Planning Policy Framework..... 3

2.5 Local Planning Policy ..... 6

2.5.1 Durham County Council Plan 2020 – 2023 ..... 6

**3. Methodology**..... 7

3.1 Data Sources..... 7

3.2 Study Areas ..... 7

3.3 Assessment of Value..... 7

3.4 Assessment of Setting..... 8

3.5 Assessing magnitude of impact ..... 9

3.6 Significance of effect..... 9

**4. Consultation**..... 11

**5. Geology, Soils and Topography** ..... 12

5.1 Geology..... 12

5.2 Geotechnical Ground Investigation ..... 12

5.3 Topography..... 13

**6. Archaeological Baseline** ..... 14

6.1 Designated assets..... 14

6.2 Non-designated assets ..... 14

6.2.1.1 Prehistoric periods (c.750,000 BP – AD 43) Romano-British period (AD 43 – AD 410) and Early Medieval (AD 410 – AD1066) ..... 14

6.2.1.2 Medieval (AD 1066 – AD c.1540) ..... 14

6.2.1.3 Post-medieval (AD c.1540 – AD 1900) ..... 14

6.2.1.4 Modern (AD 1900 – present)..... 15

6.3 Historic map regression..... 15

6.3.1.1 Map of the County Palatine of Durham, 1820 (Greenwood) ..... 15

6.3.1.2 Bishop Auckland Tithe Map 1839 (Figure 2)..... 15

6.3.1.3 Map of the County Palatine of Durham, 1840 (Hobson)..... 15

6.3.1.4 Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland circa 1860, Sheet 42.2..... 15

6.3.1.5	Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1889, Sheet 42.2 (Figure 3).....	15
6.3.1.6	Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1923, Sheet 42.2 .....	15
6.3.1.7	Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1938-50, Sheet 42.2.....	16
6.3.1.8	Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1951-59, Sheet 42.2.....	16
6.3.1.9	Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1961-69, Sheet 42.2.....	16
6.3.1.10	Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1971-79, Sheet 42.2.....	16
6.3.1.11	Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1980-94, Sheet 42.2.....	16
6.4	Previous archaeological assessments and interventions.....	16
6.5	Local historical summary.....	17
6.6	Archaeological potential.....	18
<b>7.</b>	<b>Impact Assessment .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Conclusions .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>21</b>

**Appendix A. Gazetteer of Archaeological Assets**

**Appendix B. Figures**

## Executive Summary

*The proposed bus station development lies at the edge of the historic core of Bishop Auckland, which is medieval in origin as a settlement and lies in the hinterland of a large Roman fort 1km to the north. Whilst there aren't any known archaeological assets within the site, the proximity of the scheme to the historic core of the town presents a potential for unknown archaeology to exist.*

*Historic map regression has demonstrated that the proposed scheme was developed from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century with housing and that this small but dense development was cleared in the early 1980's to make way for the existing bus station. There are therefore highly likely to be remains of this housing in the buried environment, but it is uncertain to what extent these have removed archaeological remains from earlier periods.*

*A programme of trial trench investigation has been recommended to determine the presence, extent and significance of archaeological remains in those areas of the site proven to be most affected physically by the proposed engineering solutions.*

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Project background

The Bishop Auckland bus station and car park, hereafter referred to as 'the proposed scheme' will take place within a context of wider, heritage-led regeneration within the town centre.

The proposed scheme takes place within the historic town centre and will provide parking for visitors and conveyance via buses to and from the town. The additional parking capacity is deemed to be necessary following the wider renovation and upgrading of assorted attractions within the town, thus driving up the number of people visiting the town. It is also necessary to reduce car movement through the town centre (Jacobs 2020).

The proposed scheme lies within the historic town centre of Bishop Auckland, and being located adjacent to the town's conservation area, triggers the need for a statement of significance (heritage statement) in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG).

## 1.2 Proposed scheme description

The proposed site layout is arranged with the car park on the western half and the bus station on the eastern half. A pedestrianised area shall be located in the north east corner of the site. The proposed site layout seeks to minimise opportunities for spaces that encourage anti-social behaviour by keeping pedestrian access to key routes only.

The aim of the proposed scheme is to reduce traffic movement through the site, which the design reflects. The benefits comprise reduction of traffic congestion and improved pedestrian safety. The pedestrian area will provide a visually clear and safe route for movement from both the car park or bus station toward the town centre.

The proposed bus station building will have a strong architectural identity and include a large waiting hall, which creates a sense of activity and openness.

The proposed car park will be a hard standing area at ground level.

The design will incorporate buried water attenuation tanks. These will be located within the bus turning circle to the south of the bus station building and within the limits of the ground level car park.

## 1.3 Scope and purpose

This desk-based assessment (DBA) will form part of a planning submission to Durham County Council for the above scheme. It aims to assess the archaeological implications of the proposed scheme in line with national planning policy.

In accordance with the requirements of paragraph 194 of the NPPF by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG, 2012), this DBA provides a summary of the proposed works, an assessment of their potential impacts (positive and negative) and effects on the historic environment. The professional guidance from the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) for historic environment desk studies (CIfA 2014) has also been utilised.

The Heritage Statement should be read in conjunction with the following:

- General arrangement drawings (BL000008-JAC-ZZ-Z-DR-AA-0010, BL000008-JAC-02-1-DR-AA-1010, BL000008-JAC-02-Z-DR-AA-1011, BL000008-JAC-01-1-DR-AA-0020, BL000008-JAC-01-A-DR-AA-0021, BL000008-JAC-01-B-DR-AA-0022, BL000008-JAC-01-Z-DR-AA-0030, BL000008-JAC-01-Z-DR-AA-0040, BL000008-JAC-02-Z-DR-AA-1020 and BL000008-JAC-02-Z-DR-AA-1030)

- Bishop Auckland High Street Fund: RIBA Stage 2 Concept Design Report (Jacobs 2020, BL000008-JAC-XX-0-RP-ZZ-0001)

### **1.4 Limitations**

The assessment has been conducted utilising the design details available in the plans and document given above and the data sources available at the time of production.

## 2. Legislation and Policy

### 2.1 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

This Act (amended by the National Heritage Acts of 1983 and 2002) provides for the protection of Scheduled Monuments but does not afford any protection to their setting.

### 2.2 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

The Town and Country Planning Act (1971) as amended by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 details the statutory protection afforded to Listed Buildings. The relevant legislation in this case extends from Section 66 (1) of the 1990 Act, which states that in considering planning applications the Local Planning Authority (LPA) shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the Listed Building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

In addition, Section 72 of the 1990 Act states that in exercising all planning functions, LPAs must have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing Conservation Areas.

### 2.3 Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013

This deregulatory legislation allows greater authority to LPAs in respect of Listed Building Consent. It also allows greater definition of a Listed Building by allowing the exclusion of attached buildings and structures and those within the curtilage of the principal Listed Building from protection. It states that a certificate of immunity from listing may be applied for at any time and it replaced Conservation Area Consent with planning permission.

### 2.4 National Planning Policy Framework

In March 2012, the Government published the NPPF which has been subsequently updated, most recently in July 2021.

The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and a key dimension of 'sustainability' is defined as '*...protecting and enhancing our...historic environment*' (MHCLG et al 2012).

The NPPF recognises the historic environment as comprising all aspects of the environment which have resulted from the interaction between people and places through time (MHCLG et al 2012, Annex 2: Glossary). The elements of the historic environment that are considered to hold significance are called heritage assets (MHCLG et al 2019, Annex 2: Glossary).

The associated PPG identifies heritage assets as:

*A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).*

The glossary annexed to the PPG defines the setting of a heritage asset as:

*The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. 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.*

Significance is defined by the NPPF as 'the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest'. This significance or value may be related to a heritage asset's archaeological, architectural and artistic or historic elements and can derive not only from its physical presence but also from its setting (MHCLG 2012). The NPPF details the main policies regarding heritage assets in Section 12, 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' (MHCLG 2012).

The NPPF (paragraph 194) requires that:



*In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.*

Paragraph 195 states:

*Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.*

Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that, local planning authorities should take into account:

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

Paragraph 199 states that:

*When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.*

Paragraph 200 states:

*Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:*

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

Paragraph 202 states that:

*Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*

Paragraph 1203 states that:

*The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.*

Paragraph 205 states:

*Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.*

### 1.4 Planning Practice Guide

The Planning Practice Guide (PPG) (MHCLG 2014) clarifies this additional requirement under 'What is the main legislative framework for planning and the historic environment?' where it states that:

*In addition to normal planning framework set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:*

- *the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides specific protection for buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest;*
- *the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 provides specific protection for scheduled monuments;*
- *the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 provides specific protection for protected wreck sites; and*
- *any decisions relating to listed buildings and their settings and conservation areas must address the statutory considerations of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (see in particular sections 16, 66 and 72) as well as satisfying the relevant policies within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan.*

(See ID 18a-002-20140306)

PPG states that local planning authorities may identify non-designated heritage assets and in some areas, these heritage assets may be identified as 'locally listed' (MHCLG, 2019, para. 39). These identified heritage assets may include buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes which have a degree of value meriting consideration in planning decisions but which are not formally designated heritage assets (MHCLG, 2019, para. 39).

The PPG states under 'Why is 'significance' important in decision-taking?' that:

*Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals.*

Under the discussion of 'How to assess if there is substantial harm?' the PPG offers:

*What matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.*

The PPG states under 'What is the setting of a heritage asset and how should it be taken into account?' that:

*A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it. Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.*

*The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance. When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its on-going conservation.*

*When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its on-going conservation.*

(PPG, paragraph: 013, reference ID: 18a-013-20140306).

## **2.5 Local Planning Policy**

### **2.5.1 Durham County Council Plan 2020 – 2023**

The local plan has no specific historic environment policies, presumably relying on the NPPF and NPG to cover such considerations within development control.

The plan does however mention the need to fulfil the objectives of the Bishop Auckland Heritage Action Zone (HAZ).

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Data Sources

The following data sources have been examined to support this assessment:

- The County Durham Historic Environment Record (HER)
- Historic England’s designation data (National Heritage List)
- Unpublished archaeological reports
- Historic maps (Groundsure data and the National Library of Scotland)
- The Genealogist website (<https://www.thegenealogist.co.uk/>) for the historic tithe map
- Bishop Auckland conservation area character appraisal
- Historic landscape character data
- Bishop Auckland Heritage Action Zone documents
- Durham County Council website for [planning](#) and historic landscape characterisation ([HLC](#)) information

#### 3.2 Study Areas

A study area has been utilised which encompasses a central point within the proposed scheme and a radial area extending 500m around it.

#### 3.3 Assessment of Value

The value of the relevant historic environment assets within this report has been assessed using the principles of cultural heritage assessment (IEMA 2021) and the three-step approach therein, summarised thus:

- Description: research and investigations leading to a factual statement that establishes the nature of the asset
- Cultural significance: analysis of what is valued about the asset, leading to a statement of cultural significance
- Importance: a conclusion regarding the level of protection that the asset merits in planning policy and cultural heritage legislation

This process will be applied to those assets thought to be potentially at risk of some degree of change by the proposals, either physically or in terms of setting.

The asset values arrived at above will be measured using the asset values presented in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 104 (Table 3.2N) as reproduced below (National Highways 2019).

**Table 1 Asset values**

Value (sensitivity) of asset	Description
Very high	Very high importance and rarity, international scale and very limited potential for substitution e.g. World Heritage Site
High	High importance and rarity, national scale, and limited potential for substitution, such as a listed building, some conservation areas

Value (sensitivity) of asset	Description
	and scheduled monuments, or non-designated archaeology of very rare value
Medium	Medium or high importance and rarity, regional scale, limited potential for substitution e.g. some conservation areas, rare historic buildings
Low	Low or medium importance and rarity, local scale e.g. most archaeological remains
Negligible	Very low importance and rarity, local scale e.g. some archaeology or a very recent date or which has otherwise been heavily damaged or degraded

This report will also utilise the DMRB magnitude of impact scores (Table 3.5N, LA 104) as well as the effect (Table 3.7, LA 104).

### 3.4 Assessment of Setting

Buried and extant archaeology has a setting, though this is commonly less likely to contribute to asset value than other historic environment assets like built heritage and designed landscapes. Nevertheless, setting will be included in value assessment where deemed relevant.

The contribution of the setting to the value of heritage assets is assessed in accordance with the guidance provided in the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England 2017) which states that:

*'Setting is not a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation, though land within a setting may itself be designated. Its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset. This depends on a wide range of physical elements within, as well as perceptual and associational attributes pertaining to, the heritage asset's surroundings'* (Historic England 2017, 4).

The following assessment of value includes the contribution made by setting in reference to Historic England's guidance and comprises:

- the physical surroundings of the asset, including its relationship with other heritage assets
- the way the asset is appreciated
- the asset's associations and patterns of use

The NPPF Glossary (MHCLG 2012, Annex 2) also notes that *'Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting'* and goes on to define the setting of a heritage asset as:

*'The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may contribute to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral'* (MHCLG 2012).

Addressing the setting as it relates to an asset's value, and the determination of change to them from the proposed scheme will be determined using Historic England's five-step approach for understanding how setting contributes to a historic asset's importance:

- *Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected*
- *Step 2: Assess the degree to which these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated*

- *Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance or on the ability to appreciate it*
- *Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm*
- *Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes*

(Historic England 2015)

### 3.5 Assessing magnitude of impact

The magnitude of impact is assessed as the degree of change that would be experienced by a heritage asset, or its setting, if the proposed scheme was completed, as compared with a 'do nothing' scenario. The magnitude of impact can be either adverse or beneficial.

The assessment of the magnitude of impact on a heritage asset has been determined using professional judgement guided by the methodology and criteria provided by the British Standard Guide to the Conservation of Historic Buildings BS7913:2013 (British Standards Institution 2013, 16). This defines the magnitude of impact on historic buildings using a five-point scale (No Change, Negligible, Minor, Moderate, Major – see Section 2.8 below) (British Standards Institution, 2013, p.16).

### 3.6 Significance of effect

Following the methodology provided in the British Standard Guide above, the magnitude of impact can be plotted against the value of the heritage asset using the table below (Table 1) to arrive at an assessment of the significance of effect (adverse or beneficial) (British Standards Institution, 2013, p.16).

For the purpose of this assessment, residual effects on designated assets of large or very large adverse significance were taken to be commensurate with 'substantial harm' as defined by the NPPF (MHCLG, 2012).

Where residual effects on designated assets are of moderate, slight significance or neutral, these are to be taken to be commensurate with 'less than substantial harm' as defined by the NPPF (MHCLG, 2012).

**Table 2: Calculation of significance of effect**

Heritage Value	Magnitude of Impact				
	No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
Very High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate or Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
High	Neutral	Slight	Slight or Moderate	Large	Large
Medium	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate or Large
Low	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Neutral or Slight	Slight	Slight or Moderate
Negligible	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Neutral or Slight	Slight



## 4. Consultation

Consultation with the Durham County Council archaeological advisor was carried out by email.

The consultee stated that the proposed scheme had undergone considerable clearance and landscaping when the present bus station was constructed, but that pockets of archaeology may survive. Given this, intrusive investigation was likely to be required to inform planning determination. Ordinarily, in accordance with the NPPF, this would be carried out pre-planning submission and the results submitted in a report in support of the planning application. However, given the current status of the site as a working bus station, the opportunity for closure and evaluation prior to planning submission is not available. Investigation will therefore be postponed until the post-submission period and tied in with a phase of geotechnical investigation. This is when partial closure of the bus station has been arranged. If the geotechnical and archaeological investigations can occur concurrently this will minimise the period during which the bus station will face partial closure and therefore limit inconvenience to the public.

A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) approved by Durham County Council for the archaeological trial trench investigation will be submitted with the application.



## 5. Geology, Soils and Topography

### 5.1 Geology

The BGS [map viewer](#) summarises natural bedrock and superficial deposits. The viewer indicates the bedrock below the proposed scheme as the Pennine Middle Coal Measures Formation comprising mudstone, siltstone and sandstone. These rock formations are sedimentary bedrock which were formed approximately 310 to 318 million years ago in the Carboniferous Period. The local environment in that time was previously dominated by swamps, estuaries and deltas.

The superficial deposits comprise glacial sedimentary deposits from the Devensian period. These deposits formed up to two million years ago in the Quaternary Period. This was a local environment was formed during the Ice Age, being detrital in nature and created by the action of ice and meltwater.

### 5.2 Geotechnical Ground Investigation

The existing bus station site was subject to some geotechnical investigation prior to its development. Exploratory borehole logs are available from BGS ([map viewer portal](#)) dated to 1982, which presumably preceded site clearance and development. The precise locational data is not reproduced for brevity but are all within the existing or on the proposed scheme boundary. Summary data is reproduced in the table below (Table 3).

**Table 3: Historical geotechnical ground investigation**

Bishop Auckland bus station exploratory borehole number	BGS reference	Depth sunk below ground level (bgl)	Description
1	NZ22NW182/1	4m	Undisturbed ground with 0.27m deep topsoil bgl, with natural strata beneath
2	NZ22NW182/2	3.5m	First 0.50m bgl identified as 'made ground' – described as soil with traces of brick rubble. Natural strata recorded thereafter
3	NZ22NW182/3	3.0m	Detail of the first 0.45m bgl not discernable from BGS scan as the handwriting has faded. Natural strata confirmed thereafter
4	NZ22NW182/4	3.0m	Made ground in the form of ash and brick rubble was recorded to a depth of 1.10m bgl
5	NZ22NW182/5	3.0m	Ash and brick rubble made ground recorded down to 0.33m bgl
6	NZ22NW182/6	3.0m	Ash and brick rubble 'made ground' recorded up to 0.90m bgl
7	NZ22NW182/7	3.0m	Ash and brick rubble made ground recorded down to 1.15m bgl

It is clear that the 1982 investigation summarised in the table demonstrates 'made ground', or depth disturbed by historic construction of between 0.33m and 1.15m below the 1982 ground surface. It is likely

that these deposits reflect the development of the site from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century onwards, being composed generally of ashy and brick waste.

### **5.3 Topography**

The westernmost of the borehole record in Table 2 above (borehole no.1) recorded the 1982 ground surface as 103.13m above Ordnance Datum (aOD). The easternmost borehole (borehole no.6) recorded ground level as 96.83m aOD. Even accounting for ground levels changing slightly during the bus station redevelopment the borehole logs and street level images indicate there is a shallow slope from west to east.

## 6. Archaeological Baseline

The archaeological assets are reproduced on figure 1 in Appendix A.

### 6.1 Designated assets

There are no scheduled monuments within the proposed scheme boundary or in the 500m study area.

The nearest scheduled monument to the proposed scheme is the Newton Cap Bridge 660m to the north-west.

### 6.2 Non-designated assets

#### 6.2.1.1 Prehistoric periods (c.750,000 BP – AD 43) Romano-British period (AD 43 – AD 410) and Early Medieval (AD 410 – AD1066)

There are no known archaeological assets from these periods within the proposed scheme or in the wider study area.

#### 6.2.1.2 Medieval (AD 1066 – AD c.1540)

There are no known archaeological assets from this period within the proposed scheme boundary.

In the wide study area, there are six assets from this period which include some levelled earthworks of indeterminate date but could well be medieval in date. These comprise:

- Auckland College (H1400) – the medieval remains of Auckland College
- Probable medieval remains at North Bondgate (H45211) – features such as pits, burgage plot and deposits relating to medieval tanning activity
- A levelled earthwork (HAZ no. 5926) running roughly north-south on the south side of the River Wear valley, north of the Market Place
- A levelled earthwork (HAX no. 6020) on the same valley side as above and running on the same axis as 5926 above and approximately 170m east of it
- A levelled earthwork (HAZ no. 5926) on the same valley side as the above and running on the same axis as those above and 10m east of 6020
- A levelled earthwork (HAZ no. 157) on the same valley side as the above and running on the same axis as those above and 175m east of 5926

#### 6.2.1.3 Post-medieval (AD c.1540 – AD 1900)

There are nine sites on the HER in the study area outside the proposed scheme which date to this period:

- St. Anne's (H1404 and H1405) – the site of stocks and black hole lockup in the post-medieval period
- Market House (H1406) - the so-called Market Cross at Bishop Auckland is in fact the Market House. It stood in the Market Place in a line with Fore Bondgate and around 50 yards in front of the Talbot Inn. One or two shops were attached. It was extant in 1672, and pulled down at about the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century
- Auckland Grammar School (H1411) – early 17<sup>th</sup> century school pulled down in 1781
- Primitive Methodist Church, Tenters Street/Gibbon Street (H50569) - a church is first marked here on the second edition Ordnance Survey maps of 1894-99. It has been recorded that this was the site of a Primitive Methodist church on Tenters Street. Google Streetview images from 2013 indicate the site

is now occupied by the Elim Pentecostal church; a modern dark-brick building with sloped roof rather than a late 19<sup>th</sup> century building

- Post-medieval linear ditch and linear pit, land adjacent to 4, Market Place (H60611)
- Site of Independent Chapel, 2 Great Gates (H66542) – built in 1829 and demolished around 2002
- Graveyard behind Friends Meeting House (H66545) – post-medieval in date, being present on a town map dating to 1850
- The Angel Inn (H66911) – a public house dating from 1840 and removed around 1980

### 6.2.1.4 Modern (AD 1900 – present)

There are no buried archaeological assets from this period recorded on the HER within the proposed scheme or wider study area, although much of the built environment such as the bus station and adjacent MSCP is of the early 1980's.

## 6.3 Historic map regression

### 6.3.1.1 Map of the County Palatine of Durham, 1820 (Greenwood)

The site of the proposed scheme is not depicted as developed at this time, though the original medieval and post-medieval village to the north is shown in some detail.

### 6.3.1.2 Bishop Auckland Tithe Map 1839 (Figure 2)

**6.3.1.3 The map shows the location of the proposed scheme and the old centre of the town in good detail, comprising several sub-rectangular enclosed fields. It is apparent from the map that the later road pattern within and adjacent to the later bus station is reflected in the positions of the field boundaries from the tithe map. There are no upstanding structures apparent in the map. Map of the County Palatine of Durham, 1840 (Hobson)**

The location of the proposed scheme is still undeveloped, but what looks like a track is marked running through what would later be the bus station, on a rough north to south axis.

### 6.3.1.4 Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland circa 1860, Sheet 42.2

The western half of the proposed scheme has been developed and features a railway line (probably in a cutting) passing along the western edge of the proposed scheme on a north west to south east axis. This is presumably the route of the modern A689 which later utilised the former railway viaduct over the River Wear. There are a number of properties in the north west corner of the site, running at a right angle off Clayton Street, which is denoted. There are also a small number of properties in the south east corner of the proposed scheme. The central and eastern half of the site is undeveloped. To the east of the proposed scheme the area of what would become the Newgate Centre MSCP is shown as fields and the rear of the properties fronting on to Market Street.

### 6.3.1.5 Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1889, Sheet 42.2 (Figure 3)

There has been considerable infill within the area of the proposed scheme since the previous OS map. There is little left of the previous open space visible in 1860 that is undeveloped. The proposed scheme features several small roads laid out in a grid pattern with most of the property aligned on a north to south axis. The area to the east of the site now occupied by the MSCP is itself now developed.

### 6.3.1.6 Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1923, Sheet 42.2

This is little change from the 1889 map.

**6.3.1.7 Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1938-50, Sheet 42.2**

There is little change from the 1923 map.

**6.3.1.8 Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1951-59, Sheet 42.2**

There is little change from the previous epoch.

**6.3.1.9 Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1961-69, Sheet 42.2**

There is little change from the previous epoch.

**6.3.1.10 Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1971-79, Sheet 42.2**

There is little change from the previous epoch, except for the railway line at the western side of the proposed scheme, which has been dismantled.

**6.3.1.11 Ordnance Survey Bishop Auckland 1980-94, Sheet 42.2**

There has been significant change to the area of the proposed scheme from the 1970's. The bus station has been created and the buildings once occupying the space have been demolished and the area reconfigured, with the loss of the existing street pattern. The Newgate Shopping Centre and MSCP has come into existence (1983) and the line of the dismantled railway is being converted to the A689.

## **6.4 Previous archaeological assessments and interventions**

There are 22 archaeological interventions (events) within the 500m data search area. No event data has been recorded for the zone within the proposed scheme boundary, other than it being covered by an aerial photographic survey and Heritage Action Zone desk study (see below).

Within the study area outside of the proposed scheme, the following archaeological activity is recorded on the county HER. Each event is identified with the HER reference number:

- A photographic survey (E43667) of Durham's entire historic coal field, with the principal objective of identifying former historic mine workings. The site of the proposed scheme falls within the area covered, which is represented on the HER by a large polygon covering the town
- Historic area assessment of the Bishop Auckland, County Durham Heritage Action Zone (E70205) and featured coverage of the historic town core, Bishop's Palace and its landscaped park
- Desk Based Assessment (E31884) of land adjacent to No.4 High Bondgate, Bishop Auckland summarised prehistoric and Romano-British documentary evidence of activity but stated the lack of physical evidence. The report identified a high potential for medieval and post-medieval archaeology at the development site in question
- A watching brief was held at North Bondgate car park (E66077) but the results are not described in the HER data received
- A desk-based assessment at North Bondgate (E43442) which identified a potential for unknown medieval and post-medieval archaeological remains
- The production of a desk-based assessment for North Bondgate (E38444) identified the presence of medieval and post-medieval tenements which used to be present on the site. The study utilised the results of borehole logs which indicated that depths of made ground were present across the site. The material from the logs was recorded as modern overburden but this may also contain medieval and post-medieval deposits. Beneath this, another archaeological resource may also survive
- An archaeological building recording exercise at 59-60 North Bondgate (E61552)

- The site of a watching brief at Wear Chare (E65021) during the construction of a new house recorded the presence of a possible 17<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup> century boundary wall, a small rectangular structure and the base of a stone culvert
- A historic town survey (E9570) produced in 1976 gave a broad outline of the town's history and its archaeological potential
- A watching brief was carried out in the town Market Place (E63274) at no.9 but no significant archaeological deposits were found
- No archaeological remains are recorded on the HER entry for the archaeological monitoring (E65558) of groundworks at nos. 2-3 Market Place
- No.4 Market Place has been subject to a suite of archaeological work prior to redevelopment, which commenced with a desk-based assessment (E38432)
- Archaeological building recording (E38716) on land adjacent to no. 4 Market Place recorded historic boundary walls at the property but these were determined not to be contemporary with the house's construction, being later
- No.4 Market Place required archaeological trial trench evaluation (E65198) of land adjacent to it which recorded post-medieval ditches and pits
- No.5 Market Place has also seen archaeological intervention in the shape of a watching brief (E9684) which did not find any significant archaeological deposits
- No.9 Market Place also had a watching brief on water mains replacement (E67178) but this did not uncover any significant archaeological remains
- Archaeological building recording took place at the former McIntyre's Shoe Shop, 25, Newgate Street (E67418)
- Archaeological building recording (E67591) took place at Bishop Auckland Mechanics' Institute. This Level 4 detailed survey demonstrated construction in 1880 with a later addition
- Archaeological building recording took place at the former Central Stores of Bishop Auckland Co-Operative Society at no.80 Newgate Street (E70201)
- A magnetometer survey (E7705) was carried out at Bishop Auckland Football Club as the first step in a programme of archaeological work. Anomalies were detected which suggested the presence of archaeological remains
- A combined archaeological trial trench evaluation and watching brief (E7838) were carried out at Bishop Auckland football ground which did not record any significant archaeology
- Archaeological building assessment of St Peter's Church (E61642)

### 6.5 Local historical summary

The following is a summary of information retrieved from the [Bishop Auckland Town Team](#) website and [Wikipedia](#).

The earliest known reference to Bishop Auckland is a royal-ecclesiastical one, with the then village (probably dating from at least the late Anglo-Saxon (early medieval) period as a gift of a Bishop's borough given to the Bishop of Durham as a gift by King Canute in around 1020. Much of the town's earliest history surrounds its links with the Bishops of Durham. The development of the town is typical of those which grow up around a medieval marketplace instituted to generate revenue for the local aristocrat, but eventually superseded by rapid development following on from the innovations of the Industrial Revolution. With Bishop Auckland, the early 19<sup>th</sup> century saw the rapid development of the Durham Coalfield, and Bishop Auckland was surrounded by small pits, the last of which was closed in the 1960's, but retained its status as a Market Town, providing

professional services and shopping for the many mining villages which surrounded it, and also the lead miners of Weardale.

Bishop Auckland's rapid development as an industrial town was enabled with the construction of the mainline railway. As with other industrial centres of the time, industrial development had both positive and negative effects, with the positive expansion of the town with new buildings and new facilities, but with also a rapid expansion in population and resultant problems of overcrowding. There has been a gradual decline in the industry of the area and by the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, Bishop Auckland had changed substantially, becoming more a service hub for the district and a centre for shops and other infrastructure. The viaduct that once carried a railway over the Wear valley to the town and its intersecting railway junction was abandoned as such in the 1960's and ultimately converted into the current road bridge.

There has been little formal archaeological intervention in Bishop Auckland's historic centre, and consequently knowledge of its early development in archaeological terms is severely limited. The previous desk studies relating to property development within and in the vicinity of the Market Place identify a high potential for buried archaeology dating to the medieval and post-medieval periods.

### **6.6 Archaeological potential**

There is a high potential for the existence of post-medieval structural remains in the buried environment across the scheme. The creation of the bus station in 1983 resulted in the existing mid and late 19<sup>th</sup> century built environment being removed, with presumably a certain amount of 'cut and fill' taking place across the site to make it a level surface.

Despite the demolition and levelling, it is reasonable to assume that there will be extensive buried remains of the 19<sup>th</sup> century houses, probably in the form of yard surfaces, wall footings and cellars. Such remains would survive under the levelling layers used for the existing bus station hardstanding.

In terms of cultural significance these have some local value as they directly reflect the rapid urbanisation of both Bishop Auckland, the wider Durham region and parts of England in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This is directly tied to the period of post-medieval industrialisation and the changes it wrought on the economy, resulting in the wholesale movement of local populations into urban centres from the countryside. They are therefore indicative of a particular historic period. It is not anticipated that such settlement would vary radically from any other such example of the region. These remains warrant a low archaeological value.

The site was a field up until the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century and had been in close proximity to the medieval village of Bishop Auckland. Given that, it is possible that the buried environment might contain traces of medieval and early post-medieval field systems such as boundary ditches or ridge and furrow. It is unknown as to the extent to which the later housing and bus station removed these remains. There is a moderate potential for medieval remains to survive in isolated pockets across the site. These are more likely to be agricultural in nature than related to direct settlement.

Should such agricultural remains exist, their cultural value would depend on what form they take. Ridge and furrow was a common agricultural model and physical remains would be negligible in value.

## 7. Impact Assessment

The proposed scheme will comprise the total removal of the existing bus station. The proposed scheme is essentially divided into three areas: the new bus station will be smaller in scale at the eastern end of the scheme, with the central and western parts of the scheme being ground-level car park. The car and the bus station turning area will include the presence of buried water attenuation tanks.

The plate below is an illustrative example of the potential for the buried water tanks to affect the buried environment.

Plate 1: Indicative placement of water tanks.



It is reasonable to assume that the greatest degree of impact from the proposed scheme on the buried environment will be from the excavation associated with the water tank placement, given the depth of excavation required.

The remaining area of the site will see limited excavation for services and tree pits. The bus station building will be built on concrete raft foundations.



## **8. Conclusions**

This assessment has identified archaeological potential beneath the existing ground surface within the proposed scheme boundaries. The proposed reconfiguration of the bus station and introduction of car parks will involve the removal and/or damage of such deposits.

There has not been a great deal of archaeological fieldwork undertaken in Bishop Auckland's historic town centre, so there is a general dearth of information on the extents to which significant archaeological remains survive.

Given the uncertainties regarding the presence and nature of archaeological remains, it would be consistent with the directions in the NPPF to ground-truth the indicative potential borne out in this report. This course of action is the only way to establish the presence, extent and significance of buried archaeological remains.

## 9. References

British Standards Institution 2013 British Standard Guide to the Conservation of Historic Buildings  
BS7913:2013

CIfA 2014 Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment, as updated October 2020

Historic England 2017 Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets

IEMA 2021 Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment In The UK

Jacobs 2020 Bishop Auckland High Street Fund RIBA Stage 1 Concept Design Report, Jacobs doc ref. BL000008-JAC-XX-0-RP-ZZ-0001

MHCLG 2012 National Planning Policy Framework, updated July 2021

MHCLG 2014 Planning Practice Guidance, as updated July 2019

National Highways 2019 Design manual for roads and bridges LA 104 environmental assessment and monitoring

## Appendix A. Gazetteer of Archaeological Assets

HER / HAZ reference number	Asset name	Description	Asset value assigned in this report
H1400	Auckland College	The medieval remains of Auckland College	Medium
H1404	The site of stocks at St. Anne's	Post-medieval in date	Low
H1405	The site of a black hole lockup at St. Anne's	Post-medieval in date	Low
H1406	Market House	The site of a house at Bishop Auckland. It stood in the Market Place in a line with Fore Bondgate and around 50 yards in front of the Talbot Inn. One or two shops were attached. It was extant in 1672, and pulled down at about the beginning of the 19 <sup>th</sup> century	Medium
H1411	Auckland Grammar School	Early 17 <sup>th</sup> century school pulled down in 1781	Medium
H45211	Probable medieval remains at North Bondgate	Features such as pits, burgage plot and deposits relating to medieval tanning activity	Low
H50569	Primitive Methodist Church on Tenters Street/Gibbon Street	A church is first marked here on the second edition Ordnance Survey maps of 1894-99. It has been recorded that this was the site of a Primitive Methodist church on Tenters Street. Google Streetview images from 2013 indicate the site is now occupied by the Elim Pentecostal church; a modern dark-brick building with sloped roof rather than a late 19 <sup>th</sup> century building	Low
H60611	Land adjacent to 4, Market Place	Post-medieval linear ditch and linear pit	Low
H66542	Site of Independent Chapel, 2 Great Gates	Built in 1829 and demolished around 2002	Low
H66545	Graveyard behind Friends Meeting House	Post-medieval in date, being present on a town map dating to 1850	Low
H66911	The Angel Inn	A public house dating from 1840 and removed around 1980	Low
HAZ no. 5926	A levelled earthwork	An earthwork running roughly north-south on the south side of the River Wear valley, north of the Market Place	Low

## Archaeological Desk Based Assessment

---

HER / HAZ reference number	Asset name	Description	Asset value assigned in this report
HAX no. 6020	A levelled earthwork	On the same valley side as above and running on the same axis as 5926 above and approximately 170m east of it	Low
HAZ no. 5926	A levelled earthwork	On the same valley side as the above and running on the same axis as those above and 10m east of 6020	Low
HAZ no. 157	A levelled earthwork	On the same valley side as the above and running on the same axis as those above and 175m east of 5926	Low

## **Appendix B. Figures**

Figure 1 Archaeological assets

Figure 2 Bishop Auckland Tithe Map 1839

Figure 3 Ordnance Survey Sheet 42.2 Six inch to 1 mile 1898





**Legend**

Figure 2 – Bishop Auckland Tithe Map 1839

— Site Boundary

