



Gatehouse Project, Pontefract Castle

Community Archaeology Project

Updated Project Design

Stage 5: Task 5.4

Chris Casswell

Gatehouse Project, Pontefract Castle

Updated Project Design

Prepared on behalf of:

Wakefield Metropolitan District Council and
Historic England

Compiled by:

Chris Casswell

With contributions from:

Karen Barker, Chris Cumberpatch, Elizabeth Foulds, Josh Hogue, Nat Jackson, Indie Jago, Matt Law, Gerry McDonnell, Stuart Noon, Maiya Pina-Dacier, Hannah Russ, Carl Savage, Ruth Shaffrey, Ellen Simmons, Harriet Tatton, Johanna Ungemach, David Wallace, Brendon Wilkins and Jane Young

DigVentures

The Workshop
24a Newgate
Barnard Castle
County Durham
DL12 8NG

hello@digventures.com
0333 011 3990
@thedigventurers



Purpose of document

This document has been prepared as an Updated Project Design for the Gatehouse Project, Pontefract Castle Project Team, Historic England, Wakefield Metropolitan District Council and other stakeholders. The purpose of this document is to provide an updated outline of planned work, aims and objectives of the work, and methodology to be employed.

DigVentures accepts no responsibility or liability for any use that is made of this document other than by the client for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared.

Copyright

© DigVentures Limited 2020

Project summary

DV project code	PON19
OASIS ID	digventu1-347513
Scheduled monument	1010127
National Grid Reference	SE 46075 22320
Borough/county	City of Wakefield/West Yorkshire
Title:	Gatehouse Project, Pontefract Castle Updated Project Design
Author(s):	Chris Casswell MCIfA
Origination date:	30th October 2020
Circulation:	Wakefield Metropolitan District Council, Historic England and Project Team
Reviewed by:	Manda Forster MCIfA
Approval:	Brendon Wilkins MCIfA

Carbon Footprint

A printed copy of the main text in this document will result in a carbon footprint of 99g if 100% post-consumer recycled paper is used and 126g if primary-source paper is used. These figures assume the report is printed in black and white on A4 paper and in duplex.

DigVentures is aiming to reduce its per capita carbon emissions.

Acknowledgements

We would like to offer a sincere thank you to Historic England, in particular Neil Redfern, for the support and enthusiasm given throughout the project, to Merrill Diplock, Angela Routledge, Ian Downes and the entire team at Wakefield Metropolitan District Council, Jenni Butterworth from Drakon Heritage and Conservation, Ian Sanderson from West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Services



Executive summary

This document has been prepared as an addendum to the assessment report on the community excavation at Pontefract Castle. The purpose of the document is to provide an Updated Project Design on reflection of the assessment results, providing recommendations and directions for the fulfilment of the project for Wakefield Metropolitan District Council and Historic England.

The Project Team now propose to complete analysis of material recovered from the excavation, providing an essential baseline for future management and investigation of the site. The Updated Project Design outlines updated key archaeological research questions, roles, procedures, stages, and outputs in compliance with MORPHE. It is submitted in association with an updated cost resource (DV_PON19_UpdatedCostResource_V3.10) and Gantt schedule (DV_PON19_UpdatedGantt_V3.9). Project completion will be achieved through the following tasks:

Pottery analysis	Full discussion of ware types present, characteristics of pottery groups, additional identification, and discussion of parallels from elsewhere at Pontefract Castle
Animal bone analysis	Additional identification of bird, fish and deer remains, analysis of body part representation, and comparisons with data collected during previous work at the castle and on contemporary sites in the region and castles nationally.
Environmental processing	Process remaining sample residues to maximise representative sample recovered and re-float heavy residues for recovery of charcoal.
Plant macrofossil analysis	Full sorting and identification of uncharred seeds to provide evidence for the local environment.
Wood charcoal analysis	Identification of wood charcoal >2mm to provide evidence for the local woodland environment
Mollusc analysis	Full quantification and analysis of the molluscs to better understand the immediate environment and the process by which the drawbridge pit was filled.
Coin identification	Expert identification of coins.
Worked stone identification	Expert identification of stone discs.
Scientific dating	AMS dates from four samples to help refine the phasing and chronology within the drawbridge pit.
X-ray and conservation	X-ray all non-modern corroded iron objects to aid in interpretation, and conservation on two corroded coins
XRF	XRF copper ally 'pivot' to determine physical composition
Conservation	Conservation report and remediation
Illustration	Illustration of seven small find artefacts and five sherds of pottery.
Publication	Supplementary analyses will contribute to the results outlined in the Stage 5 assessment report and integration and publication of the results in a peer-reviewed journal.
Archive deposition	Consolidation and preparation of the archive ready for deposition to both digital and museum-based repositories alongside project closure.

Table of contents

1	INTRODUCTION	7
1.1	Project summary	7
2	RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES REVISITED	7
2.1	Project model	7
2.2	Objective 1. Refine our understanding of the gatehouse's chronology and phasing	7
2.3	Objective 2. Increase our understanding of the local environment	7
2.4	Objective 3. Enhance and interpret the heritage significance of Pontefract Castle	8
3	BUSINESS CASE	8
3.1	Historic England Research Agenda	8
3.2	Research frameworks	8
4	STAGE 7: TASKS	9
5	PUBLICATION	9
6	PROJECT ARCHIVE	9
7	PROJECT MANAGEMENT	10
7.1	Project oversight	10
7.2	Project review	10
8	PROJECT TEAM	11
9	STAGES, PRODUCTS AND TASKS	12
10	OWNERSHIP	12
11	METHOD	13
12	RISK LOG	13
13	PROJECT COSTS	13
14	BIBLIOGRAPHY	14

List of tables

Table 1: Updated project review matrix	11
Table 2: Team and responsibilities	12
Table 3: Stages, products and task list	12
Table 4: Risk log	13
Table 5: Project costs	14
Table 6: Specialist costs	14



1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project summary

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared as an addendum to the assessment report on target excavations at Pontefract Castle gatehouse (Casswell et al. 2020). The purpose of the document is to provide an updated project design on reflection of the assessment results, providing recommendations and directions for the fulfilment of the project Stage 5, Task 5.4 for Wakefield Metropolitan District Council and Historic England.
- 1.1.2 The original project design (Casswell et al. 2019) was formulated in response to the 2016 discovery of an unidentified gatehouse complex during pre-development works at Pontefract Castle (hereafter 'the site'). A programme of non-intrusive and intrusive investigation was designed to provide information to contribute to the future management, research and presentation of the site, creating multiple educational and participatory learning experiences for community participants. This was supported by Historic England with funding allocated under the terms of the NPPF Emergency Investigation Assistance.
- 1.1.3 The current priority, as outlined below, is to complete the analysis of the artefactual assemblage and interpretation of the site, and to provide a fully published account of the research. This final project execution phase (Stage 7) will therefore provide an important baseline for the future management of the site. Stage 6 (Evaluation) has been completed, with a comprehensive discussion of the impact of the project included in the Assessment Report (Casswell et al. 2020) and a short documentary film submitted to the museum.

2 RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES REVISITED

2.1 Project model

- 2.1.1 The aims of the project are articulated in full in the Project Design (Casswell et al. 2019, Section 3, Aims 1-5, Q1-16). The project design was formulated according to the brief (Sanderson 2018, Section 5), the goal being to fully record, analyse and report all archaeological remains within the area of interest ('preservation by record'); to place the results of this work in the public domain by publishing the results in an appropriate format as agreed by Historic England; and to inform how the Gatehouse might be presented to the public. The following reflects on the original aims of the project considering the results of assessment and recommendations for further work (Casswell et al. 2020) and is articulated as three objectives for further analysis and publication:

2.2 Objective 1. Refine our understanding of the gatehouse's chronology and phasing

- 2.2.1 Both the non-intrusive and intrusive investigations have helped to answer questions regarding defining the physical extent, character and chronological sequence at Pontefract Castle in fulfilment of Aims 1-3 Q1-9 of the Project Design (Casswell et al. 2019; see Casswell et al. 2020, Section 10 for discussion). However, dating the construction of the drawbridge pit and associated stratigraphic sequence is currently based almost exclusively on the pottery. While this has enabled the sequence to be phased, scientific dating of material recovered from the environmental samples would provide greater chronological resolution.
- 2.2.2 Further expert consultation on the finds, in particular the metallic artefacts recovered from non-modern contexts may aid in their identification. This would include x-ray of unidentified coins and all iron objects from non-modern contexts, in particular the corroded nails to establish possible date and use.

2.3 Objective 2. Increase our understanding of the local environment

- 2.3.1 An assessment of the site's archaeological and palaeoenvironmental conditions has been made (Casswell et al. 2020, Aim 3 Q10-13); however, further work would be required to gain a better understanding of the local environment and how this may have effected diet and economy during the late medieval and early post-medieval periods. Palaeoenvironmental data and animal

remains recovered from the drawbridge pit suggest there was provision of goods to a high-status residence; further analysis work would elucidate this apparent conspicuous consumption.

- 2.3.2 Processing remaining residues of environmental samples would greatly help maximise the amount of plant macrofossils, wood charcoal and molluscs, providing a more representative sample for further analysis work. Full sorting and identification of the assemblages of uncharred seeds present in medieval deposits would be expected to provide evidence for the local environment; it is also possible that more evidence for consumable goods in the form of food remains may be identified. Analysis of the wood charcoal would be expected to provide evidence the availability of woodland trees in the wider area, and identification of molluscan remains may provide some palaeoenvironmental information on the immediate environment as well as the process by which the drawbridge pit was filled.
- 2.3.3 To understand the nature of people's diet and the economy further work would be needed on the identification of bird and cervid remains from the site. A wide range of bird species was recovered from the drawbridge pit, along with fish and deer. Additional identification and analysis of these remains and body part representation would be expected to increase our understanding of people's diets and the economy of the Castle.
- 2.4 Objective 3. Enhance and interpret the heritage significance of Pontefract Castle
 - 2.4.1 The Gatehouse Project delivered a range of opportunities for local community members, school children and visitors to the area while the excavation was ongoing (Casswell et al. 2020, Aim 5), accompanied by online videos and blogs that served to reach a wider audience. The assessment report will be made freely available to all online, followed by a final analysis report where an interpretation of the significance of the work undertaken and how it develops our understanding of the castle will be made (Aim 4 Q14). This will be further enhanced through submission of a full article to a national peer-reviewed publication (see Section 5).
 - 2.4.2 Full analysis reporting will comprise a comprehensive report on the final results and significance of the archaeology recorded, discussing comparisons with data collected from previous work at the Castle, contemporary sites regionally and castle sites nationally (Aim 4 Q14-15). If any themes are found within the complete and stable archaeological archive, recommendations will be made to benefit archives, local museums and education, improving regional accessibility (Q16). Upon submission of the final analysis report, this information with full interpretation will then be disseminated to a wider audience through publication in the peer-reviewed journal *Medieval Archaeology*.

3 BUSINESS CASE

- 3.1 Historic England Research Agenda
 - 3.1.1 The project has been designed in accordance with priorities articulated in the Historic England Research Strategy (2017) and Historic England Corporate Plan (2018-21). The Research Strategy defines nine broad themes that describe Historic England's research interests to ensure that any proposed work is aligned with HE's mission. The Gatehouse Project drivers can therefore be articulated within the fundamental theme to #understand (urban and public realm; military and defence) in addition to other research outcomes that will address other Historic England and sector priorities, delivering significant value added benefit. As a consequence of the innovative digital and multi-partner collaborative approach, there is a significant 'value added' dimension to this project, encompassing research themes including #adapt (local planning, societal change); #conserve (buildings and landscapes, collections and archives; preserving archaeological remains); #inform (information systems and services); #skill (developing the workforce; working more effectively); #inspire (audience research, research media); #innovate (materials; human environment; dating and chronology; measuring and sensing).
- 3.2 Research frameworks
 - 3.2.1 The key research agenda relating to the 'Gatehouse Project' is the 'Yorkshire Archaeological Research Framework: Research Agenda' (Roskams and Wyman 2005) particularly appendix 3.3 (Medieval Towns Assessment: Pontefract - R. Finlayson 2005). In addition to elucidating the 13th and 14th century development of the castle itself, the project also presents an opportunity to



clarify the relationship between the pre-Conquest borough and the later Norman town. Roberts and Whittick (2013) pursue this theme in a more recent overview of the excavated evidence from Pontefract, outlining 'a compelling case for Pontefract having been not only the site of the documented royal vill, but also that of an Anglo-Saxon minster.'

4 STAGE 7: TASKS

- 4.1.1 The final stage of the project will comprise fulfilment of the above objectives, contributing to the production of a final publication of the field investigations and archive submission. The task list, with allocation of staff time and team members is given in Section 13, supported with an updated Gantt chart and task list (DV_PON19_UpdatedGantt_V3.9) and costing supplied as a standalone file (DV_PON19_UpdatedCostResource_V3.10). Detailed method statement relating the specific techniques or approaches is given in the Project Design (Casswell et al. 2019, Appendix 1).
- 4.1.2 Stage 7 includes the recommended further analysis stipulated by the project's specialist team and outlined in the Assessment Report (Casswell et al. 2020), alongside consolidation of the project archive. Individual tasks include: a comprehensive report on the pottery assemblage discussing characteristics and parallels from other work at Pontefract Castle; additional identification of bird, fish and deer remains, and analysis of animal remains body part representation to identify high cuts of meat; full sorting and identification of uncharred seeds present from early drawbridge pit fill environmental samples; processing remaining 20 litres from samples to enable recovery and identification of wood charcoal and molluscan remains; scientific (AMS) dating of four charred cereal grains or uncharred seeds to aid in the refinement of the phasing; x-ray all iron and coins from non-modern contexts to allow full identification; conservation assessment report; XRF the copper alloy pivot to determine physical composition, and; illustration of selected artefacts.
- 4.1.3 These supplementary analyses will contribute to the results outlined in the Stage 4 assessment report (Casswell et al. 2020), which will be updated as a final technical report. The results will also be presented and published in a peer-reviewed journal. Stage 7 will also include the preparation of the archive ready for deposition to both digital and museum-based repositories.

5 PUBLICATION

- 5.1.1 The community excavation undertaken as part of the Gatehouse Project has greatly increased our understanding of the development of Pontefract Castle. The findings have challenged pre-conceived interpretations of the character of the main gatehouse and provided a complete, dated stratigraphic sequence from its construction through to the present day. Very few drawbridge pits have previously been excavated and even less have been published.
- 5.1.2 A peer-reviewed journal paper will provide an opportunity to highlight and disseminate the results of the work to an academic audience. Publication and dissemination will provide an important baseline for the future management of the site, and for future investigation. Given the national importance of Pontefract Castle an appropriate place for publication would be *Medieval Archaeology*. An open access arrangement is available with the journal, ensuring dissemination to a wider audience in keeping with the principles of public archaeology adopted by DigVentures.
- 5.1.3 Additional dissemination will involve the following, as mentioned in the Project Design (Casswell et al. 2019, Section 7.4):
- Dedicated digital archive of the excavation data
 - Wide circulation of the project assessment and final report, and links to the OASIS record

6 PROJECT ARCHIVE

- 6.1.1 The project archive will be prepared in accordance with the deposition guidelines provided by Wakefield MDC Museum and Arts, Pontefract Museum, and in line with DigVentures guidelines for Archive Preparation, following Appendix 1, P1 of MORPHE PPN 3 (English Heritage 2012),



fulfilling the Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long term storage (UKIC 1990). Comprehensive instructions for the preparation of physical and digital archive materials have been outlined in the project brief and original project design (Sanderson 2018; Casswell 2019). Consultation will be undertaken with David Evans at Pontefract Museum in advance of fieldwork commencing to determine the museum's requirements for the deposition of an excavation archive. All reports produced by the project will be openly and freely disseminated through the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record, Archaeological Data Service, OASIS portal and Scribd website. Copyright on all reports submitted will reside with DigVentures, although a third party in-perpetuity licence will automatically be given for reproduction of the works by the originator, subject to agreement in writing with DigVentures.

- 6.1.2 The digital archive of the project will comprise selected project documents (in Microsoft Word format), context register, sample register, photographic register, and specialist data tables (in Microsoft Excel format), archive images (as uncompressed .tiff and lossy .jpg formats), GIS project files (in ESRI Shape formats and associated files), raw survey data (as Common Separated Values), and 3D photogrammetry models (hosted on Sketchfab). The archive will be compiled in accordance with Archaeology Data Service (2011) guidelines and the data management plan for the project.

7 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

7.1 Project oversight

- 7.1.1 The Project Manager will continue to produce Monthly Status Reports for the Project Executive and Project Team throughout this Execution Stage up to the review of the Assessment Report/UPD. This will present an overview of progress, list tasks completed or part completed, including any on-going work and issues affecting progress. The Project Manager will be responsible for ensuring that the project runs to schedule, keeping track of key resources (notably staff time) on the basis of weekly Work Records. The Project Team will have a project meeting at each milestone described to ensure that all major tasks are briefed/debriefed as necessary. Provision will be made for the project in 'Basecamp', which is a web-based project communication package used by DigVentures, enabling project participants to generate and record notes, tasks, milestones and other project-related communication.

- 7.1.2 Projects are undertaken under the direction of the Project Director who is responsible for the successful completion of all aspects of the project. All work is monitored and checked whilst in progress on a regular basis, and the Project Director/Managing Director checks all reports and other documents before being issued. A series of guideline documents or manuals form the basis for all work.

- 7.1.3 The Project Manager, Brendon Wilkins, is a full member of the Institute for Archaeologists (MCIfA). DigVentures is a ClfA Registered Organisation (No. 102), and fully endorses the Code of Conduct, the Code of Approved Practice for the Regulation of Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology, and the Standards and Guidance documents of the Institute for Archaeologists. All DigVentures staff are employed in line with the Institute's Codes and will usually be members of the Institute.

7.2 Project review

- 7.2.1 The project will continue to be reviewed by the Project Executive and Project Manager, with a formal review undertaken at the end of each Stage. An updated project review matrix is given in Table 2.

Stage	Description	Review Point	Completion Date
Initiation	Consideration of Project Proposal by WMDC and HE	RV1 – HE and WMDC	Completed – February 2019
Stage 1	Project Start-up, development of project design by DigVentures in consultation with wider specialist team, SAM consent application, preparation of project website, public participation programme	RV2 – Sign-off on MoRPHE Project Design, and liaison with stakeholders and site management team	Completed – May 2019



Stage	Description	Review Point	Completion Date
	and community audit and content design, pre-site management team meeting	RV3 – Update meeting / recruitment, microsite RV4 – Pre commencement review	Completed – June 2019 Completed – August 2019
Stage 2	High resolution aerial photogrammetry survey, GIS creation and assessment of 2016 watching brief archive, DDT set up, RAMS, team mobilisation, trench preparation (30 Sept – 04 Oct)	RV5 – Site visit	Completed – October 2019
Stage 3	Field Investigation, including excavation trenches Education programme, Finds Lab workshops, documentation	RV6 - 8 – Site visit, Education programme	Completed – October 2019
Stage 4	Field Investigation, photogrammetry, Site based recording workshops, open days Additional field excavation	RV9 – Site Visit, Public programme RV10 – Site visit, Open day	Completed – November 2019 Completed – August 2020
Stage 5	Assessment Report and Updated Project Design	RV11 – Post-excavation assessment RV12 – Assessment report and UPD	Completed – May 2020 Completed – October 2020
Stage 6	Evaluation report and video documentary of the dig	RV13 – Eval report / documentary	Completed – October 2020
Stage 7	Analysis and Final Reporting Publication and archive deposition	RV14 – Draft technical report RV15 – Final technical report RV16 – Publication draft RV17 – Project archive	Proposed – February 2021 Proposed – February 2021 Proposed – April 2021 Proposed – March 2021
Stage 8	Project closure	RV18 – Project closure	April 2021

Table 1: Updated project review matrix

8 PROJECT TEAM

8.1.1 A full breakdown of the Project Team for the project is given in the Project Design (Casswell et al. 2019, Section 10 Table 3). The DigVentures' Project Team will be as follows (Table 2) for Stage 7.

Name	Initials	Project Role	Key Responsibility
Lisa Westcott Wilkins	LWW	Project Executive	Overall project responsibility, budget responsibility and project assurance
Brendon Wilkins	BW	Project Manager	Overall project responsibility, budget responsibility and project assurance
Manda Forster	MF	Director of Operations	Liaison with project team, partners and stakeholders

Name	Initials	Project Role	Key Responsibility
Chris Casswell	CCa	Expert – Team Leader	Archaeological direction (on and off-site), reporting, liaison with project team, partners and stakeholders
Joshua Hogue	JH	Programme Manager	Project programming; lithics
Johanna Ungemach	JU	Community Archaeologist	Project support; evaluation, finds processing and archive
Indie Jago	IJ	Community Archaeologist	Project support
Chris Cumberpatch	CCu	Expert	Pottery
Jane Young	JY	Expert	Pottery
Hannah Russ	HR	Expert	Animal remains
Ellen Simmons	ES	Expert	Environmental
Elizabeth Foulds	EF	Expert	Small finds; illustration
Carl Savage	CS	Expert	Coins
Matt Law	ML	Expert	Molluscs
Karen Barker	KB	Expert	Conservation; x-ray
Ruth Shaffrey	RS	Expert	Stone
Gerry McDonnell	GM	Expert	XRF

Table 2: Team and responsibilities

9 STAGES, PRODUCTS AND TASKS

9.1.1 A breakdown of completed Stages 1-6 is given in the original Project Design (Casswell et al. 2019, Section 12). Further analysis, publication and archive form Stages 7. The scope of works is set out in the table below and are set against the updated project objectives, the products that will be produced and the tasks undertaken.

Stage	Description	Project Aims/ Questions	Products	Task & ID Number
Stage 7	Analysis, Final Reporting, Publication and archive deposition	Aims 4 Q14-16	18. Final technical report 19. Peer-review publication 20. Project archive	7.1 –Specialist analysis and report 7.2 – Draft final analysis report (RV14) 7.3 – Report circulation and comment from Project Team 7.4 – Final analysis report (RV15) 7.5 - Preparation of publication (RV16) 7.6 – Review by Project Team 7.7 – Consolidation of the archive (inc. conservation) 7.8 – Publication submission/review 7.9 – Updated OASIS record 7.10 – Deposit archive (RV17)

Table 3: Stages, products and task list

10 OWNERSHIP

10.1.1 The Copyright on all reports submitted will reside with DigVentures and the respective host institutions of each of the Expert team, and Historic England, although a third party in-perpetuity licence will automatically be given for reproduction of all products, subject to agreement with Historic England. The original copyright holder will retain copyright in pre-existing data, and Historic England, West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Services and Wakefield Metropolitan District Council will be granted a third-party licence in perpetuity for project materials.

11 METHOD

11.1.1 Detailed method statements relating the specific techniques or approaches can be found in original Project Design (Casswell et al. 2019, Appendix 1). The methods relate to the task list and allocation of staff responsibilities outlined respectively in Table 2 and Table 3, and visualised in the Gantt chart (DV_PON19_UpdatedGantt_V3.9), setting out a provisional programme.

12 RISK LOG

Risk	Description	Probability	Impact	Counter measures	Estimated time/cost	Owner
1	Absence of core team member	Low	Medium – possible delay to programme of work.	Reallocate responsibilities or appointment of alternative resource	Minimal if addressed by reallocation / adjustment	Project Team
2	Absence of specialist team member	Low	Medium – possible delay to programme of work.	Reallocate responsibilities or appointment of alternative resource	Minimal if addressed by reallocation / adjustment	Project Team
3	COVID-19 related	Medium	Access to material for analysis	Current delivery requires specialist team travel to access material, assumes this will be possible from January 2021. Review in January 2021 and update.	Extended programme, minimal cost implications.	Project Team

Table 4: Risk log

13 PROJECT COSTS

13.1.1 Project costs relating to all stages of work, including estimated costs for Stage 7, can be found in Table 5 and in the accompanying costing (DV_PON19_UpdatedCostResource_V3.10). Specialist costs associated with Stage 5 are summarised in Table 6, showing the cost to undertake recommendations as part of the analysis stage.

13.1.2 Project costs to date are £88,751.20, with the remaining work in Stage 7 estimated to cost £11,943.50. The total project value at the end of Stage 7 is estimated to be £100,694.70, plus VAT.

Stages		Stage value	Status
1	Project set-up, project planning	£2,530.00	Complete
2	Excavation set up / trench preparation - Site week 1	£9,520.00	Complete
3	Site Excavation, Schools & Finds Labs - Site weeks 2 - 4	£32,290.00	Complete
4	Site excavation, public & family open days - Site week 5	£24,742.20	Complete
5	Post excavation processing and assessment	£12,339.00	Complete
6	Evaluation and legacy	£7,330.00	Complete
Expenditure to date		£88,751.20	plus VAT
7	Analysis, reporting publication and archive	£11,943.50	Remaining
Estimated costs for remaining stages		£11,943.50	plus VAT

Stages	Stage value	Status
<i>Grand total</i>	£100,694.70	plus VAT

Table 5: Project costs

Specialist	Assessment	Drawbridge assessment	Analysis (estimated)	Total
Stuart Noon (Finds management and overview)	£1,200.00	£240.00	£960.00	£2,400.00
Hannah Russ (Animal bone)	£540.00	£360.00	£1,020.00	£1,920.00
Elizabeth Foulds (Small finds)	£300.00	£75.00	£1,050.00	£1,425.00
Chris Cumberpatch (Pottery)	£800.00	£200.00	£825.00	£1,825.00
Ellen Simmons (Environmental)	£650.00	£579.00	£568.50	£1,797.50
John Carrot (Pollen)	£60.00	£325.00		
Jane Young (Pottery)			£50.00	£50.00
Phil Mills (CBM)		£280.00		£280.00
Elizabeth Foulds (Illustration)			£600.00	£600.00
Carl Savage (Coins)			£60.00	£60.00
Matt Law (Molluscs)			£300.00	£300.00
Ruth Shaffrey (Stone)			£260.00	£260.00
Karen Barker (Conservation)			£1,000.00	£1,000.00
Gerry McDonnell (XRF)			£200.00	£200.00
<i>Grand total</i>	£3,550.00	£2,059.00	£6893.50	£12,502.50

Table 6: Specialist costs

14 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Casswell, C., Wilkins, B and Westcott Wilkins, L. 2019. *Gatehouse Project, Pontefract Castle. Project Design for a Community Archaeology Project*. Unpublished DigVentures document.

Casswell, C., Jackson, N., Jago, I., Pina-Dacier, M., Tatton, H., Ungemach, J. and Wallace, D. 2020. *Gatehouse Project, Pontefract Castle, Community Archaeology Project: Assessment Report*. Unpublished DigVentures document.

Historic England. 2012. Management of Research projects in the Historic Environment. PPN 3: Archaeological Excavation – Annual Report May 2011-March 2012

Roberts, I. and Whittick, C. 2013. Pontefract: A Review of the Evidence for the Medieval Town, *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 85:1, 68-96

Roskams, S. and Whyman, M. 2005. *Yorkshire Archaeological Framework: A Research Agenda*.

Department of Archaeology. York: University of York

Sanderson, I. 2018. *Brief for an archaeological excavation at Pontefract Castle, Inner Bailey Gatehouse, Pontefract*. Prepared on behalf of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council. WYAAS

United Kingdom Institute for Conservation. 1990. Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage.