



ENGLISH HERITAGE

Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment

PPN 4: Complex Architectural Survey

Version	Date	Comments
1.0	January 2008	1 st published version

Preface

MoRPHE Project Planning Notes (PPNs) form an integral part of the Management of Research in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE) Project Management Methodology issued by English Heritage in 2006.

They are intended to be presented together with, and read in conjunction with, the 'MoRPHE Project Managers Guide' which gives generic guidance on project management. The Project Managers Guide can be downloaded from the English Heritage 'Free Publications' list website:

www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This guidance is intended to be used by managers and members of project teams who are following the generic MoRPHE project guidance and are involved in investigating and researching complex historic buildings and ancillary structures. It assumes that the analysis of the site will be undertaken in an integrated way, utilising specialist skills drawn from a range of disciplines, but that the focus of the work will be on the principal building and associated structures.

1.2 This project planning note is therefore particularly applicable for those involved in investigating country houses, castles, large industrial complexes or other major monuments, be they in guardianship or in private ownership. Throughout this document the word 'site' is used to describe a monument or site comprising a principal building, associated buildings and its landscape setting.

2.0 Planning

The following sections identify issues to be considered during the planning of the project. These should be addressed in the initial Proposal prepared during Start-up, or they may require more detailed investigation during the project Initiation stage. Refer to the MoRPHE Project Managers Guide for further information on the Start-Up and Initiation of projects.

2.1 Setting Objectives

2.1.1 The scope and structure of projects of this kind can be influenced by a wide range of factors. Chief among these are the extent of current knowledge of the historical development of the site and the need to answer particular research questions. The latter result in the formulation of research aims and objectives that are conditioned by a complex array of factors including the requirements of the Sponsor (the principal

stakeholder or client who may often provide funding and contribute to the aims and objectives of the project), the size and apparent complexity of the site, the availability of access, the extent to which the specialist knowledge or skills necessary to obtain the appropriate level of understanding of the site are available in-house or externally, the costs likely to be associated with the project, and so forth.

2.1.2 Occasionally, the principal driver may be the need to plug a significant gap in the understanding of a particular building type but in such cases there will always be other conservation and management benefits.

2.1.3 Establishing the right balance across this diverse range of drivers is critical. They are almost always grounded in the need to obtain an up to date and improved understanding of the significance of the site to inform its repair, conservation, presentation (if it is open to the public) or management.

BOX A: SAMPLE ENGLISH HERITAGE PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Greys Court Project originated with a request from the National Trust for the architectural investigation of the site in order to provide the raw material for a new guidebook and to inform the presentation of an important guardianship site.

The multi-disciplinary Apethorpe Hall Research Project, on the other hand, is part of a multi-million pound project, and is primarily aimed at informing a major repair programme being undertaken by English Heritage, and alterations associated with an eventual change of owner.

At St Giles's House, Wimborne St Giles, Dorset, architectural and landscape investigation work was undertaken as a 'grant in kind' to help 'unlock' a long standing conservation problem by feeding into proposals for the conservation and repair of a privately-owned Grade I building at risk.

2.1.4 The scope of the project and the outcomes should be tailored to meet the specific needs of the Sponsor and be appropriate to the perceived significance of the site. Most complex building projects require a balance to be struck between the need for understanding (for the purposes of assigning significance and placing a site in its wider historical, architectural and landscape context) and a requirement for recording/survey to help plan and document repair and conservation works. Specific guidance on appropriate levels of historic building recording is set out in the English Heritage publication *Understanding Historic Buildings: a guide to good recording practice*, 2006.

2.1.5 Complex historic building research projects involve the collection of data (evidence) and provision of the necessary analysis within time and cost constraints. The academic justification for the project, as set out in the aims and objectives section, must be clearly formulated and expressed at the outset. There is a large number of potential research questions which will differ from site to site. However the following generic research questions are likely to be applicable in most instances:

- ◆ What was the original form and plan of the building and when was it built?
- ◆ Who designed it?
- ◆ Who was it built for and how was it used?
- ◆ How would it have been regarded and understood by contemporaries?
- ◆ How has the building evolved in terms of its appearance, plan and usage?
- ◆ What are the main phases in the historical and architectural development of the building (what are the dates of these phases of work, who made the alterations, and why?)?
- ◆ What materials is the building made of (by phase)?
- ◆ What methods of construction were employed (by phase)?
- ◆ What decorative finishes were employed externally and internally?
- ◆ What is the setting of the principal building, e.g. garden or parkland, ancillary structures, etc? How significant are these features both in their own right and as part of an ensemble? To what extent were their form, position and appearance shaped by earlier periods of human activity?
- ◆ Where were the approaches to the building at different times in its history?
- ◆ How significant is the building and its setting when compared with similar sites locally, regionally, nationally and internationally?

BOX B: ENGLISH HERITAGE RESEARCH AGENDAS

Projects commissioned by English Heritage should cross-reference their aims and objectives to national priorities, currently defined in the Implementation Plan for Exploring our Past 1998 (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/ConWebDoc.2203>), soon to be replaced by SHAPE, Strategic frameworks for Historic Environment Activities and Programmes in English Heritage, the English Heritage Research Strategy Agenda, and the English Heritage Corporate Strategy 2005-2010.

2.2 Useful techniques for estimating time and budget

2.2.1 Investigation and research projects can be difficult to cost as a result of the unknowns inherent in many of them – the more complex the project the greater the potential for unforeseen delays and additional costs. Of course the more experienced the project manager the easier he/she will find it to estimate time and budgets, drawing on experience of working on similar sites elsewhere. When costing staff time and other expenses a notional daily rate is assigned depending on the grade or level of experience/expertise of the project team member in question. Some aspects of survey work such as measured survey and photography can be estimated with greater precision.

2.2.2 Controlling time and money, the work plan: it is necessary to formulate a work plan (part of the Project Design) to ensure that a project operates effectively within its time and cost constraints. The work plan will detail:

- ◆ Products of the project (e.g. a completed site archive and/or a report)
- ◆ the projected start date
- ◆ the projected finish date
- ◆ the tasks to be performed to deliver the products
- ◆ the order in which they must be performed
- ◆ the projected start and finish dates for individual tasks
- ◆ Timing and format of Review Points: major reviews of the project's progress against its aims and objectives.

There are a number of different ways of representing the work plan, but these are usually presented in the form of a Gant chart. The size and complexity of the project will dictate the best methods of record and display.

2.2.3 An initial and fairly detailed assessment of the most important sources and their whereabouts should be undertaken during Start Up of a project to estimate the number of days needed. Even with this preparation, the nature of these projects means that a careful record of Issues (in a project Issues Log) that arise during the execution of the project will be needed to monitor changes of plan and any change to timetable or budget required. For example

- ◆ a detailed assessment of key documents may suggest further highly relevant sources of information necessitating an additional unforeseen investment of staff time.
- ◆ ongoing investigation of the fabric may result in the need for unforeseen commissioning of specialist reports to help aid overall understanding. For example, a detailed assessment of a section of interior wall may uncover faint traces of an early wall painting that requires analysis by a wall paintings specialist.
- ◆ In some cases the need to undertake urgent repairs may result in areas of the fabric being opened up, which in turn may reveal important features or evidence requiring careful investigation, interpretation or recording (see 2.3, below).

2.2.4 However, in the vast majority of circumstances the staged approach and regular review points inherent in the MoRPHE framework assists the project manager in planning for the unknown.

2.3 Risks and their management

2.3.1 Complex historic building research projects can involve many specific and potentially significant risks. These may include, for example, a sudden change of ownership necessitating a complete reappraisal of the project team's involvement with the site, the unexpected discovery of asbestos leading to a cessation in on-site activity while it is removed, or the

discovery of hidden features of interest that may require analysis and recording leading to delays in the project timetable.

2.3.2 These are dealt with by identifying possible risks in the Risk Log which should accompany the Project Design and by developing countermeasures to help offset their effect on the project timetable or budget (see the section on the 'Risk Log' on page 46 of the MoRPHE Project Managers guide). (NB. This section focuses on general risks and does not include Health and Safety risks – a generic statement on these is included in the MoRPHE guide, p.25). Given the uncertain nature of complex architectural survey projects the countermeasures might typically form 15-20% of the project timetable and budget.

2.3.3 One specific health and safety risk is that must be avoided is lone workers visiting sites. Working in pairs or in larger groups is vital for health and safety reasons, particularly if the site in question is unoccupied or in poor condition. It also is to be encouraged since it facilitates on-site discussion and assists in the process of reaching an agreed interpretation.

2.4 Likely list of products or outcomes

2.4.1 Field notes: made by members of the project team in the course of investigation work or fabric analysis to describe or record particular features and information about phasing. Field notes form much of the raw material for subsequent reports (see below).

2.4.2 Measured drawings: including plans, sections, elevations and details as appropriate. The relevant sketches are normally made in notebooks and measurements captured as part of the survey work applied to the sketch. Alternatively measurements may be captured in digital form (using EDM equipment) and downloaded to a laptop on site. Field measurements are used to produce finished drawings back in the office.

2.4.3 Photography: project team members will take photographs in conventional or digital formats as an aide-memoire to assist with later interpretation and report writing or in order to provide illustrations for a project report or publication. Photographs for archiving and publication are normally taken by a specialist architectural photographer.

2.4.4 Documentary material: information from a wide variety of documentary sources, published and unpublished will be obtained during the course of a project. Some of this information will be worked into the body of the project report; other material can be attached to the report as an appendix or be archived.

2.4.5 Report: normally an illustrated narrative presenting the evidence for the interpretation of the site and its component parts. It should be set out in a logical manner and include a summary (at the beginning), a conclusion, notes (when appropriate), and a bibliography. In a limited number of cases the significance of the site may be such that a decision is made to dispense with the production of a 'grey literature' report and

proceed straight to an appropriate form of publication (see, section 2.4.8, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, below). However, the process of producing a report is invariably helpful in clarifying the interpretation of the site and identifying the need for additional, targeted investigation and research prior to the preparation of publication text.

2.4.6 Recommendations for further research and investigation: there will be occasions when the project team will become aware of the potential for further work which goes beyond the scope of the current project. Recommendations can be recorded in the project report or supplied to the Sponsor/building owner for action at a later date.

2.4.7 Archive files: these should include the report (see above) in both hard copy and digital format and relevant supporting research material not included in the report and which is not available in a public archive. The project report and archive material should be deposited in a public archive, normally the local Historic Environment Record (HER). Where the site and report are of national interest consideration should be given to depositing the report and supporting material in a national archive such as the National Monuments Record of English Heritage.

2.4.8 Publication: in some cases the project will result in significant new findings and reinterpretations of a site justifying publication.

2.4.9 Presentations: where the project forms part of a wider scheme of conservation or management project members will frequently be called upon to present interim findings in advance of the report/publication. In most cases informal presentations to owners, occupiers, staff and interested local people are of immense benefit in reaching non-traditional audiences for research findings and in fostering a sense of stewardship. They also provide opportunities to formulate and test theories, and to elicit knowledge which might not otherwise become available to the project team.

2.5 Likely project stages

2.5.1 Start up - Initial request from Sponsor for research, investigation or survey. Initial site visit(s) and meeting(s) and background research to identify likely requirements, scope and outcomes. Ends with Review Point R1.

2.5.2 Initiation – detailed planning, production of project design and approval. Ends with Review Point R2.

2.5.3 Fieldwork - on-site data capture and research (these activities are sometimes undertaken sequentially, but there are considerable benefits attached to integrated fieldwork and research: team members can learn from each other and can resolve any issues of interpretation on site). Maintain good communication with the sponsor (and the owner if different

from the sponsor), key stakeholders (Project Board or Project assurance Officer), and other members of the project team

Review Point R3.1 should be a qualitative review (including an assessment of the potential of the data captured on site and a revision of the aims and objectives for analysis as necessary). This review point involves deciding on an appropriate dissemination strategy, e.g. a 'grey literature' report, popular publication, academic paper, or academic monograph, or the most appropriate combination of the above. Other key questions to be addressed at this point include: 'Has the necessary information been obtained on the site and from relevant archives, to enable office-based interpretation and manipulation of the data?', 'Has the necessary archiving and indexing work been undertaken; and are the Sponsor, other key stakeholders and members of the project team aware of the progress of the project and any issues arising from this execution stage?'

2.5.4 Office-based analysis – analysis of field data and production of measured drawings. This stage may involve additional on-site and archive research as necessary.

Review Point R3.2 A review to assess whether the team have all the information needed to proceed to the next stage

2.5.5 Report writing - involving peer review, and, as appropriate, review by the Sponsor and other stakeholders, production (usually involves desktop-publishing) and dissemination. Produce draft report and pass to peers for review. Send to Sponsor/owner and other stakeholders for comment. Make final amendments, desk-top publish the report (if required) and disseminate it to the Sponsor/owner, stakeholders and others with an interest in the site, as appropriate. Complete archiving and indexing. Deposit the archive files in national and local archives, and with copyright libraries, as appropriate.

Review Point R3.3 - Are the necessary consents and resources in place to produce the publication? Is the text of an appropriate academic standard? Are the author and the Sponsor content with the format and appearance of the publication, and are mechanisms in place to ensure it is disseminated as widely as possible?

2.5.6 Publication - (this execution stage can be included in the main project if publication is envisaged as the principal outcome or treated as a separate follow-up project). Finalise publication proposal. Obtain approval from a publisher or journal editor. Write publication text. Incorporate comments from members of the project team and other peers. Pass to publisher and answer any editorial enquiries. Send publication proposal to publisher or editor and gain approval for it. Agree timetable for publication. Send draft publication text to peers and external/internal referees as appropriate. Arrange launch or other publicity for the publication as appropriate.

2.5.7 Note on Execution stages: Archiving and associated entry of project/archive information on databases such as those administered by HERs, the Archaeology Data Service (OASIS) and the National

Monuments Record (AMIE) are not regarded as a separate execution stage. Best practice is for archiving and associated indexing is undertaken throughout the project's life cycle (for more on archive preparation, see the MoRPHE guide, p.31).

2.5.8 Additionally, some projects incorporate a significant training and/or outreach component and in such appropriate circumstances these activities may form a separate execution stage.

2.5.9 Closure. The project is closed by the Project Executive. Guidelines for future projects may be reviewed and updated to record experience gained from the project. Local and national research agendas may be updated to reflect any future directions for research identified by this project.

2.6 Team structure and skills

2.6.1 Complex building projects will normally be managed by an experienced architectural historian or investigator, buildings analyst or buildings archaeologist. Ideally he/she should have experience of working on the building type in question, be able to analyse the evidence contained in the fabric of the building, and have the ability to gather and interpret relevant documentary material. Above all he/she must be able to reconcile and synthesise a wide range of evidence in order to tell the story of the development of the site and place it in its wider historical context. He/she will report to the Project Executive, the person ultimately responsible for the project's outcome. Most single-site projects will have a Project Executive who also acts as Project Assurance Officer, but in contentious, high profile or very complex projects he/she may wish to establish a Project Board drawn from a range of stakeholders (see the MoRPHE guide, pp.18, 55) to help share the quality assurance and monitoring roles. The Project Manager will agree with the Project Executive or Project Board the frequency of review meetings and the relationship of those meetings to key review stages in the project life cycle.

2.6.2 The combination of skills highlighted in 2.6.1 is in fact quite rare in a single individual so it will often be necessary to assemble a project team incorporating a range of skills and experience, and drawn from across a number of disciplines. On occasions and depending on the nature of the project it may be desirable to include a less experienced individual on the team in line with continuing professional development and wider sector capacity-building initiatives. In practice, however, the project team will normally be managed by a Senior Architectural Investigator (or heritage sector equivalent) and include at least one investigator (or equivalent). Additionally, the project teams for complex building projects will normally include one or more measured survey and graphics specialists and an architectural photographer. The latter will almost always be required if one of the intended outcomes is a publication. Depending on the nature of the site, the project team may also include a landscape archaeologist and a geophysicist. Additionally, it may be appropriate to obtain the services of a scientific dating expert (dendrochronologist) as well as a specialist in historic interiors. The key findings of specialists' reports should be fully integrated with the results of the investigation and survey work.

Table 2. Project stages and products in a complex architectural survey project

Stage	Research products	Archive products	Dissemination products
Start up	Initial site visits and meetings. Preliminary research completed		
Review Point R1	Has the case for this project been made in the Project Proposal? Does the site merit detailed investigation? Are the objectives specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely (SMART)?		
Initiation	Additional research to support the Project Design	Project Archive file created	Communication with potential stakeholders (e.g. a meeting or workshop). Disseminate project design to stakeholders. Incorporate comments into Project Design.
Review Point R2	Is the project design realistic and achievable? Are sufficient resources available? Are the required areas of expertise included in the project team? Are all appropriate stakeholders aware of the project and in agreement with its aims and objectives?		
Fieldwork	Investigation completed Assessment report completed Dissemination strategy drafted	Site archive created and indexed: Field notes Measured drawings Photographic material Documentary material	Sponsor informed of work Owner informed of work OASIS entry created
Review point R3.1	Does the potential of the information captured on site support further analysis? Is the information captured on site and from relevant archives suitable for the proposed analysis? Is the dissemination strategy appropriate? Is the archive complete and indexed? Have the Sponsors and Owners been kept informed of progress and any Issues arising?		
Office-based analysis	Site interpretation prepared. Photographs and measured drawings produced. Gaps in available information identified. Follow-up site visits completed Follow-up archive visits completed	Research archive created and indexed and added to site archive.	Maintain good communication with the Sponsor and Owner Make contact with Sponsor/owner and various archives to arrange any additional visits.

Table 2 cont.

Review point R3.2	Does the project team have all the information it needs in order to proceed to the next, dissemination, stage?		
Report writing	Draft report produced Final report produced. Dissemination strategy updated	Complete archiving and indexing. Archive deposited. Report deposited with copyright libraries.	Peer review of draft report completed Final report circulated OASIS entry updated
Review point R3.3	Is the report acceptable to the Sponsor, Project Executive, Project Board or Project Assurance Officer, and peers? Are arrangements for archiving and disseminating the report complete? Is the plan for the publication stage appropriate?		
Publication (optional, depending on the importance of the site, availability of resources, etc)	Publication text completed Editorial plan agreed with publisher	Publication plan added to archive	Publication delivered Launch of publication held.
Review point R3.4	Have all participants Sponsors, Owners and stakeholders been notified of the completion of work / publication?		
Closure	Guidelines for future projects updated. Research agendas updated	End of Project Plan or Report added to archive	

2.7 Project Design

2.7.1 In the majority of cases the project design should follow the checklist on page 45 of the MoRPHE Project Managers Guide. Occasionally, however, there will be circumstances when it is necessary to add or expand particular sections. These might include, for example:

- ◆ Clear identification in the Business Case section of the conservation or management needs that have prompted the survey of the building.
- ◆ The Methods statement should state how integration of architectural evidence with that from archaeological investigation, or landscape studies, or documentary evidence would be achieved in multidisciplinary projects.

2.7.2 For English Heritage Research Department initiated projects refer also to the standard for Research Project inception, issued as a MoRPHE Technical Guide.

3.0 Project Execution

3.1.1 The scope of the project and its objectives are determined following a meeting (or a series of meetings in respect of more complex sites) with the Sponsor. It is usually best to make a preliminary visit with the Sponsor (internal or external) to get an impression of the site and what might be involved, and to follow this with a meeting at which the Sponsor sets out his/her requirements in general terms and outlines the purposes to which any products arising out of the project will be put. This process should result in an improved understanding of the type of investigation or survey work that will be appropriate for the stated purposes. At this stage it is important to obtain an appreciation of the range of relevant documentary sources held by the Sponsor, the owner, or in local record offices, together with information on the scope, intensity and value of any earlier architectural or archaeological investigation or survey work. Information about the Sponsor's preferred timetable should be elicited together with details of access arrangements. This preliminary site visit and meeting is normally undertaken on a no-obligation basis and in the interests of information gathering. For complex multi-phase buildings a site visit is an essential pre-requisite in determining whether or not to proceed to the preparation of a proposal. Other types of project will not necessarily involve this level of engagement at start up because the subject/sites may be well known to the future project team, there may be adequate initial information available in secondary sources, there may be no need to inspect interiors, and objectives and outcomes can be more easily identified and articulated. For complex buildings the initial pre-start up site visit/meeting is an essential first step in getting a feel for whether the project is likely to proceed and, if it is, determining the likely shape of the proposal (in discussion with the Sponsor).

3.1.2 Following the site visit/meeting there should be a meeting of those members of staff likely to be involved in the project, to decide, in the light of the factors outlined above, to proceed in principle, not to proceed or proceed in part. If the decision is not to proceed this should be conveyed to the Sponsor and other stakeholders by means of a telephone

call followed by confirmation in writing setting out the reasons for the decision. If it is decided to proceed with the investigation project or to contribute in a more limited way to a project involving other parties then this will necessitate an additional meeting with the Sponsor at which the details of the project team's involvement can be agreed.

3.1.3 The next stage is to produce a project proposal following the template set out on page 44 of The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide. As stated in the MoRPHE guide 'The proposal is the first document produced once the need for a project has been identified'. It includes sufficient information to enable assessment at Review Point R1. If the project is to be undertaken by an external organisation commissioned by English Heritage the organisation will need to produce either a project proposal or an offer of services in response to a brief. Before producing these documents, however, it may be necessary to make a second site visit to ensure that all members of the project team have had a chance to see the site and that all areas of the site to be investigated have been seen. At Grey's Court and Oxburgh Hall or Muncaster Castle a number of key buildings were tenanted and therefore inaccessible during the initial site visit so as a follow up it was necessary to make special arrangements with the tenants to gain access to the interiors of these structures. On occasions it may be necessary to produce an outline proposal before full access to the site has been obtained. In these circumstances it is important that any commitments in the documents are recorded as contingent on obtaining full access to the relevant parts of the site, and also to key documents where these are identified as being in private hands (e.g. Oxburgh and Muncaster again).

3.1.4 Once approved (at MoRPHE Review Point R1), project proposals should be turned into project designs, the size and level of detail of which will be governed by the scale of the project and the complexity of the site. The project design should contain all the information needed to obtain authorisation at the Review Point R2. The project design sets out the various 'execution stages', which for a complex building project are likely to include investigation, research, measured survey, and photography; office-based analysis and working up of field data, and report writing. Further information on the layout and content of project designs is set out on pages 44-46 of The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide. The key point to remember is that project designs are 'living' documents that will need to be reviewed, updated or revised at the completion of each execution stage (Review Point R3). Strict document control is vital so that all project team members and other colleagues are aware of which version of the project design they are working to.

3.1.5 Following the formal approval of the project design, the active data-collection phase – fieldwork – may commence. This may not be initiated until such an agreement has been reached.

3.1.6 It is likely that on-site monitoring visits and the production of highlight reports will have been built into the project design, and have been agreed with the Project Sponsor. These may be scheduled to take place at regular intervals, or to occur upon significant stages or findings. Monitoring visits should be attended by all members of the project team, and should reflect where the project is in terms of the original project design.

Decisions regarding deviation from or enhancement to the original scheme of work should be agreed at this time

4.0 Review

4.1 Relevant standards and guidelines

There are no published standards specifically relating to the investigation of complex historic buildings, although a great deal of useful guidance is contained in Kate Clark's *Informed Conservation: Understanding Historic Buildings and their Landscapes for Conservation* published by English Heritage in 2001, and in the 2006 English Heritage guidance note *Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice*, compiled by Dr Adam Menuge and endorsed by the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO), The Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC), The Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA), the Council for British Archaeology (CBA), and The National Trust. The latter document contains guidance on the recording of historic buildings for the purposes of historical understanding and identifies appropriate levels of record for particular circumstances. These guidelines form part of a series of sector-endorsed guidance documents available via the English Heritage HELM website. Forthcoming titles in the series include *Understanding Historic Buildings: Policy and Guidance for Local Planning Authorities* (2007), which highlights the importance of pre-application assessments and recording within the English Planning framework, and *Understanding Historic Areas* (2008) which addresses the range of approaches to undertaking assessments of historic areas. Both ALGAO and IFA have produced standards and guidance for the analysis and recording of historic buildings. For more information on these publications and other relevant guidance documents, see section 7.0, Further information, below.

4.2 Approaches to assessment of quality

4.2.1 The Project Manager is responsible for ensuring that the investigation is carried out in an appropriate way and to the necessary standard. The Project Executive, Assurance Officer or Project Board provide an independent quality check of both the method and results, a process known as 'peer review'. In practice this may involve the project team meeting the person or persons responsible for project assurance to discuss the evolving interpretation of the site. The individuals responsible for project assurance must have experience of working on complex, multi-phase, sites and be capable of providing the necessary guidance to the project team. Larger projects, such as the Apethorpe Hall Research Project, may involve members of the project team discussing their findings with a range of other acknowledged experts in the field to help refine the interpretation. In some cases experts will offer their time for free out of interest, on other occasions they will expect the project to cover their travel costs and in some instances their time. In the latter instance the amounts involved are usually modest and represent good value for money if such visits result in important new insights.

4.2.2 As part of the peer review process the project report or publication text should be read by the Project Executive, Project Assurance Officer or Project Board (or any combination of the above), as well as other academic referees as necessary, and their comments incorporated in the final version. This can involve a considerable amount of time and consequently external readers expect to be paid for this work.

4.3 Communication to support continuous review

4.3.1 In addition to the regular review of the project design it is important to keep a record of project team meetings either in the form of minutes or at the very least action points which can be referred to and checked off at subsequent meetings. The frequency of project team meetings will depend on the scale and complexity of the project and to some extent the size of the project team. Small project teams can meet on a more regular basis. Larger project teams which may include staff based in a number of locations will normally meet less frequently and communicate by email and telephone in the intervening periods. The Apethorpe Hall Research Project Team met at six-eight weekly intervals throughout the life of the research project. During the course of the project electronic versions of specialist reports, sub-project proposals and designs, and relevant research materials (photographs, inventories, etc) were posted on a shared drive which all members of the project team could access remotely. This minimised the need for the costly and time-consuming sending of hard copy.

4.4 Documentation of agreement during the project

4.4.1 The Project Manager must inform the Projective Executive and where appropriate, the Sponsor, of the need for significant deviations from the aims, objectives, anticipated outputs and timetable. These will be raised in the course of project monitoring, in highlight reports (see 3.1.6, above) and as part of the regular updating of the Risk and Issues Logs. This level of reporting will facilitate effective decision making at Review Points and highlight any urgent problems that may need to be addressed in the course of the various execution stages.

5.0 Archive and Dissemination

General advice on archive preparation is provided in section 2.5.3 of the MoRPHE Guide and in section 7.3 of the English Heritage guidance booklet *Understanding Historic Buildings: a guide to good record practice* (2006). There is no published standard and guidance for historic building research archives, although a number of organisations, such as English Heritage, have evolving protocols of their own. Useful information is available in Duncan H Brown's *Archaeological Archives: A guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation* (Archaeological Archives Forum, 2007). The aim should be to deposit the full archive in an appropriate repository for continuing curation and access. Some multi-disciplinary projects

involving archaeological excavation may result in finds that may need to be separately deposited in a specialist archive or museum. In such circumstances, the main paper archive should be signposted to the archive/collection holding related finds and vice versa.

5.2 The project dissemination strategy is finalised at Review Point R3.3. The means of dissemination will reflect the significance of the site and the importance of the evidence and resulting interpretation. In addition to the range of dissemination outputs described in section 2.5.4, above, it may be appropriate to use the site for the delivery of training programmes in building analysis and as a focal point for outreach events, subject of course to the agreement of the Sponsor or owner. Also, subject to obtaining the necessary permissions it may be appropriate to provide information on the project to the public and the wider academic community via an appropriate website. Reports and publications can be made available as .PDF files for download via the website, taking care to ensure that the necessary copyright permissions and intellectual property issues are addressed. Project team members are sometimes asked to present academic papers on the results of the investigation and to give talks to historical societies and other community and specialist interest groups. These avenues of dissemination can be useful as a means of engaging local communities in the project and can sometimes result in the unearthing of useful contacts or research information.

6.0 Further information

Historic building investigation has a long history but the emergence of publications articulating principles and methods is a relatively recent phenomenon. The titles listed below are among the more important recent publications, and reflect a spectrum of approaches, not all of which will be appropriate in every case.

Alcock, N W 2003 Documenting the History of Houses, British Records Association Archives and the User 10, London: British Records Association

Alcock, N W; Barley, M W; Dixon, P W & Meeson, R A 1996 Recording Timber-Framed Buildings: An Illustrated Glossary, Practical Handbooks in Archaeology 5, revised edition, York: CBA

Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers 1997 Analysis and Recording for the Conservation and Control of Works to Historic Buildings, ALGAO

Buchanan, Terry 1983 Photographing Historic Buildings for the record, London: HMSO

Clark, Kate 2001 Informed Conservation: Understanding Historic Buildings and their Landscapes for Conservation, London: EH

Council of Europe 1995 Core Data Index to Historic Buildings and Monuments of the Architectural Heritage, Strasbourg: Council of Europe

Dallas, Ross (ed) 2003 Measured Survey and Building Recording for Historic Buildings and Structures (Guide for Practitioners 4), Edinburgh: Historic Scotland

EH 1999 The Presentation of Historic Building Survey in CAD, London: EH

EH 2003 Measured and Drawn: Techniques and practice for the metric survey of historic buildings, Swindon: EH

EH 2004 Dendrochronology: Guidelines on Producing and Interpreting Dendrochronological Dates, London: EH

EH 2006 Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice, London: EH

EH forthcoming 2007 Understanding Historic Buildings: Policy and Guidance for Local Planning Authorities, London: EH

Hughes, Helen (ed) 2002 Layers of Understanding: Setting Standards for Architectural Paint Research, London: EH

IFA 2001 Standard and Guidance for the Archaeological Investigation and Recording of Standing Buildings or Structures, 2 edn, Reading: IFA

Morriss, Richard K 1999 The Archaeology of Buildings, Stroud: Tempus

Palmer, Marilyn & Neaverson, Peter 1998 Industrial Archaeology: principles and practice, London: Routledge

RCHME 1991 Recording Historic Buildings: A Symposium, (Papers presented at a joint symposium of the RCHME and the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain, held in London, May 1991), London: RCHME

Swallow, Peter; Dallas, Ross; Jackson, Sophie; Watt, David 2004
Measurement and Recording of Historic Buildings, 2 edn, Shaftesbury:
Donhead

Wood, Jason (ed) 1994 Buildings Archaeology: Applications in Practice,
Oxford: Oxbow Books

7.0 Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Edmund Lee, English Heritage Standards and Guidelines Manager who provided invaluable support and advice throughout the course of this project and who commented on the text. I would also like to thank Chris Scull for his comments and Brian Kerr for providing me with an early draft of his Project Planning Note on Archaeological Excavation (MoRPHE Project Planning Note 3).

8.0 Contact details

This Project Planning Note was written by John Cattell, Chief Buildings Historian, English Heritage, Kemble Drive, Swindon SN2 2GZ, telephone 01793 441 627, email: john.cattell@english-heritage.org.uk . Comments to improve future editions of this planning note are welcome, and should be sent to morphe@english-heritage.org.uk