



ENGLISH HERITAGE

ROOSWIJK
GOODWIN SANDS, off KENT

CONSERVATION STATEMENT & MANAGEMENT PLAN

Author	Mark Dunkley
Status	Updated by Alison Hamer
Date	13 October 2008
Date of Adoption	13 October 2008
Date of Revision	11 August 2009

ROOSWIJK CONSERVATION STATEMENT & MANAGEMENT PLAN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *Rooswijk* is a Dutch East Company vessel which stranded on the Goodwin Sands in 1739 while *en route* from the Texel to the East Indies.¹ The site was found after several years of documentary research and following a magnetometer survey on the site, ingots marked 'VOC' (Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie, or Dutch East India Company) were recovered in 2004. Additional material was recovered in 2005. Following archaeological assessment, the site was designated under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 in January 2007.

This Conservation Statement and Management Plan has been produced to enable local, regional and national stakeholder involvement in English Heritage's aspirations for the conservation management of the *Rooswijk* to balance conservation with economic and social needs. The principle aim of the Plan is to identify a shared vision of how the values and features of the *Rooswijk* can be conserved, maintained and enhanced.

The following management policies have therefore been developed;

Policy 1 We will continue to support and develop authorised access to the site as a mechanism to develop the instrumental value of the *Rooswijk*.

Policy 2 Through liaison with Regional Teams and the Properties Presentation Team, we will seek to provide interpretative material for the marine historic environment at English Heritage properties in the area.

Policy 3 We will assist the Government of the Netherlands in developing further work on site. This will be enabled through an agreed Project Design.

Policy 4 Through web-based initiatives and publication, we will continue to improve the accessibility of related material and support appropriate links so as to develop effective public understanding.

Policy 5 We will work with the Government of the Netherlands to gain, and publish, a fuller understanding the site.

Policy 6 Key gaps in understanding the significance of the component parts of the site should be identified, prioritised and addressed so that these significances can contribute to informing the future conservation management of the site.

Policy 7 Unless a clear and agreed research framework has been devised, unnecessary disturbance of the seabed within the restricted area should be avoided wherever possible in order to minimise the risk of damage to buried archaeological remains.

¹ Dates in relation to the *Rooswijk* used throughout this document are given in the contemporary Old Style as used in England. At this time, Holland had already adopted the New Style.

ROOSWIJK CONSERVATION STATEMENT & MANAGEMENT PLAN

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 PURPOSE	1
1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.....	2
1.4 SCOPE AND LIAISON	2
1.5 AUTHORSHIP	3
1.6 STATUS.....	3
2 UNDERSTANDING THE ROOSWIJK.....	4
2.1 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGNATED SITE.....	4
2.2 DESCRIPTION OF SURVIVING FEATURES	5
2.3 OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CURRENT USE	7
2.4 GAPS IN EXISTING KNOWLEDGE	8
3 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	10
3.1 BASIS FOR ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	10
3.2 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	10
3.3 GAPS IN UNDERSTANDING SIGNIFICANCE.....	13
3.4 STATUTORY AND OTHER DESIGNATIONS.....	14
4 ISSUES AND VULNERABILITY	15
4.1 INTRODUCTION	15
4.2 THE PHYSICAL CONDITION OF THE SITE AND ITS SETTING.....	15
4.3 CONSERVATION AND PRESENTATION PHILOSOPHY	16
4.4 VISITOR AND OTHER OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS	17
4.5 THE EXISTENCE (OR LACK) OF APPROPRIATE USES.....	17
4.6 RESOURCES, INCLUDING FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS AND AVAILABILITY OF SKILLS.....	17
4.7 LACK OF INFORMATION OR UNDERSTANDING ABOUT ASPECTS OF THE SITE	18
5 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT POLICIES.....	19
5.1 INTRODUCTION	19
5.2 THE ROOSWIJK IS A SHARED RESOURCE	19
5.3 EVERYONE SHOULD BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN SUSTAINING THE ROOSWIJK.....	20
5.4 UNDERSTANDING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ROOSWIJK IS VITAL	20
5.5 THE ROOSWIJK SHOULD BE MANAGED TO SUSTAIN ITS VALUES.....	21
5.6 DECISIONS ABOUT CHANGE MUST BE REASONABLE, TRANSPARENT AND CONSISTENT	22
6 FORWARD PLAN.....	23
6.1 INTRODUCTION	23
6.2 PROPOSED PROJECTS IN RELATION TO THE ROOSWIJK.....	23
7 IMPLEMENTATION.....	25
7.1 CONSULTATION	25
7.2 ADOPTION OF POLICIES	25
8 REFERENCES.....	26
9 AUTHORSHIP AND CONSULTATION.....	28

APPENDIX 1: HISTORIC CARTOGRAPHY OF KELLET GUT 29

APPENDIX 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 2007 DESIGNATED SITE ASSESSMENT 30

ROOSWIJK

CONSERVATION STATEMENT & MANAGEMENT PLAN

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 England's historic environment is particularly rich and varied; it is our legacy to the future and we owe it to future generations to make sure it is protected and enhanced.

1.1.2 Wreck sites may contain the remains of vessels, their fittings, armaments, cargo and other associated objects or deposits and they may merit legal protection if they contribute significantly to our understanding of our maritime past. The Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 (PWA) allows the UK Government to designate, in territorial waters, an important wreck site to prevent uncontrolled disturbance. Although the National Heritage Act 2002 enabled English Heritage to assist with costs relating to works under the PWA, this opportunity must be balanced against our strategic research priorities.²

1.1.3 In addition, the UK Government has adopted the Annex to the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage 2001 as best practice for archaeology. This Annex comprises a series of ethical *rules concerning activities directed at underwater cultural heritage* which provide objective standards by which to judge the appropriateness of actions in respect of archaeology underwater.³

1.2 Purpose

1.2.1 This document seeks to set out a Conservation Statement and Management Plan for the *Rooswijk*, an archaeological site designated under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 lying within the Goodwin Sands, off Kent. The site was found after several years of documentary research. Silver bullion was salvaged from the site following a magnetometer survey in 2004 and further recovery was undertaken in 2005.⁴ Following archaeological assessment, the site was designated in early 2007 (DCMS News Release 006/07).

1.2.2 The *Rooswijk* is attributed the National Monuments Record (NMR) number TR 45 NE 754.

1.2.3 English Heritage has published a set of *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance* for the sustainable management of the historic environment

² *Discovering the Past, Shaping the Future: Research Strategy 2005-2010* establishes English Heritage's first five year plan of action for the use of research to support our business, government priorities and the historic environment sector.

³ See:

http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=33966&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

⁴ The meaning of the term *salvage* within this document is based on that used within the introduction and scope of the *Scientific and Archaeological Diving Projects Approved Code of Practice* (HSC 1998).

designed to strengthen our credibility and consistency of decisions taken and advice given (English Heritage 2008). These *Conservation Principles* are intended to support the quality of our decision-making, with the ultimate objective of creating a management regime for all aspects of the historic environment that is clear and transparent in its purpose and sustainable in its application. As such, *Conservation* is taken to be the process of managing change in ways that will best sustain the values of a place in its contexts, and which recognises opportunities to reveal and reinforce those values.

1.2.4 This Conservation Statement and Management Plan has therefore been produced to enable local, regional and national stakeholder involvement in identifying aspirations for the conservation management of the *Rooswijk*.

1.3 Aims and Objectives

1.3.1 The principle aim of this Conservation Statement and Management Plan is to identify a shared vision of how the values and features of the *Rooswijk* can be conserved, maintained and enhanced.

1.3.2 This will be achieved through the following objectives;

- Understanding the *Rooswijk*
- Assessing the significance of the *Rooswijk*
- Identifying where the significance of the *Rooswijk* is vulnerable
- Identifying policies for conserving the significance of the *Rooswijk*
- Realising the public value of conservation of the *Rooswijk*

1.4 Scope and Liaison

1.4.1 In 2007, English Heritage sought to develop assessment methods to characterise the state of all designated historic assets and to understand their current management patterns, their likely future trajectory and how that can be influenced to ensure their significance is maintained for both present and future generations. For historic wreck sites, methodologies were developed to allow for the systematic quantification of the resource and to set benchmarks for the monitoring of future change. A major component of this process comprises the identification of risks to historic wreck sites so as to provide a measure of how a site is likely to fare in the future (see English Heritage 2007a).

1.4.2 Practical measures that can conserve, maintain and enhance the values and features of the *Rooswijk* identified as being at risk will be delivered through this Conservation Statement and Management Plan.

1.4.3 There are currently 61 wrecks designated in the UK under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973. Access to these sites is managed through a licensing

scheme and authorisation by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport. Of the 46 protected sites in England, five lie within the Goodwin Sands.

- 1.4.4 The Rijksdienst voor Archeologie, Cultuurlandschap en Monumenten (RACM) has been invited to provide comment in relation to the preparation of this Plan and ongoing management of the *Rooswijk*.
- 1.4.5 In addition, the current owner of the wreck and its contents was invited to provide comment in relation to management of the *Rooswijk* and contribute archaeological and historical information for integration within this Conservation Management Plan. Management concerns of the owner related to alleged unauthorised access. Further, no archaeological or historical information was provided by the owner for integration within this Conservation Management Plan derived from the 2004/5 operations.

1.5 Authorship

- 1.5.1 Prepared by English Heritage, contributions to this draft Conservation Statement and Management Plan are currently being sought through stakeholder involvement. Full acknowledgements of those who contributed to, or were consulted on, its preparation will be presented in the final version.
- 1.5.2 This document is based on the English Heritage Standard for *Conservation Statements for English Heritage sites* (ref: EHS 0003:2005) and draws on generic management plans for shipwreck sites (e.g. Cederlund 2004).

1.6 Status

- 1.6.1 This Plan was adopted in October 2008 and notes on its status (in terms of revision) will be maintained.

2 UNDERSTANDING THE ROOSWIJK

2.1 Historical Development of the designated Site

2.1.1 The *Rooswijk* was built in 1737 and was owned by the Amsterdam Chamber of the Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC, or Dutch East India Company). She foundered towards the north-eastern end of the Kellet Gut, Goodwin Sands, in late December 1739 *en route* from Amsterdam and Texel to Jakarta [formerly Batavia] with coin, bullion and a general cargo, including sheet copper, sabre blades and stone blocks, as well as passengers (NMR record TR 45 NE 754).

2.1.2 The loss was reported in contemporary London, Kentish and regional newspapers, one of which conveyed that;

‘Yesterday came Advice, that a Dutch Ship bound for Batavia, was lost on the Goodwin Sands, with all the Ship's Crew, being upwards of two hundred Men.’

The Sherborne Mercury/Weekly Advertiser, January 8th, 1740

2.1.3 No contemporary salvage of the wreck is reported, though ‘several pieces of wreck...and a great many packets of letters, all of them directed to Batavia’ were noted to comprise flotsam following the loss (*The Post*, January 3rd, 1740).

2.1.3 The wreck site was found by a recreational diver after several years of documentary and field research. Following a magnetometer survey on the site, silver ingots marked ‘VOC’ were recovered in 2004 and additional material was recovered in a large operation in 2005 (*Diver*, April 2007). The majority of specie recovered has been sold at auction, and has since been re-sold through eBay and other web-outlets, such as newworldtreasures.com.

2.1.4 The wreck received international attention in December 2005 when a quantity of silver, ‘still in [its] original ‘packaging’ of wooden chests’, was ceremoniously handed to the Dutch Finance Minister aboard the Dutch frigate *De Ruyter*, anchored in Plymouth Sound.⁵ This ceremony coincided with the project receiving national coverage in *The Independent* (12 December 2005).

2.1.4 Following archaeological assessment in 2006, the site was designated under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 in January 2007. This designation came into force on the 9th February 2007 (SI 2007/61).

2.1.5 Although commentaries and opinions on the *Rooswijk* project and subsequent designation have appeared in various publications (such as Van Duivenvoorde, 2006 and *Diver* magazine, April 2007), academic publication on the biography of the *Rooswijk* and subsequent recovery operations have not yet been made available. However, the known information and particulars

⁵ As reported on www.bbc.co.uk/devon/content/articles/2005/12/14/incan_silver_feature.shtml, accessed 15/01/08.

of the *Rooswijk* may be presented as a summary *Ship Biography* which draws together the main attributes of the site and provides a statement of the site's archaeological interest;

Build	1737, VOC shipyard, Amsterdam. Owned by the Amsterdam Chamber of the VOC.
Use	The vessel is described as a <i>retourschip</i> , a specific type of Dutch East Indiaman, designed to withstand the lengthy voyages of 18 months to three years typically undertaken <i>en route</i> to Indonesia.
Loss	Foundered towards the north-eastern end of the Kellet Gut, probably after grounding on the Goodwin Sands, on the 30 th December 1739. A severe easterly storm is recorded in contemporary newspapers. The <i>Rooswijk</i> was lost on her second voyage to Batavia.
Survival	In 2005, it was reported that the wreck covers an area of approximately 100m x 80m, and comprises at least three main concentrations of material, with stratified deposits surviving to a depth of at least 1.5m. Excavation, targeted at the recovery of bullion and associated storage items, has indicated that material evidence from the ship's constable's cabin lies underneath dining-area debris.
Investigation	No contemporary salvage is recorded and it is likely that the vessel lay undisturbed and subject to environmental conditions, for 265 years. Systematic recovery of material occurred in 2004 and 2005 followed by planned dispersal and disposal. Some material remains in passive storage. Access to, and integration of, the archive of these interventions has not been permitted. In 2006 and 2007, the site was assessed by the Government's archaeological contractor to determine conservation management requirements.

2.2 Description of Surviving Features

2.2.1 The site lies at a charted depth of 13m on a predominantly sandy seabed on the north-east side of the Goodwin Sands within the Kellet Gut, a passage leading from Trinity Bay to a position SE of Goodwin Knoll. Kellet Gut is bordered by drying patches of the Goodwin Sands and is subject to constant change (UKHO 2006: 102). A summary of historic cartography related to the Kellet Gut is given in Appendix 1.

2.2.2 The Goodwin Sands themselves consists of approximately 25 metres of modern sediment (fine sand) resting on an Upper Chalk platform (British Geological Survey, Thames Estuary Sheet 51°N-00°, 1:250 000 Series). Despite a clockwise tidal trend, the Goodwins change morphology on a seasonal and anti-clockwise rotational basis (Cloet 1954: 204): aerial photography has revealed that North Sand Head may be the pivot for the rotation (Larn and Larn 1995).

2.2.3 A magnetometer survey of the site in 2003 (of unknown specification) identified the three clusters of objects/features;

- Initial impact site (characterised by the presence of cannon);
- Middle site (comprising largely unidentified material);
- Area of stern (including the presence of rudder pintles).

2.2.4 Following the salvage operation in 2005, a news release reported the survival of at least three decks in the stern area (*The Independent*, 12 December 2005):

- A cartridge locker, containing bar and round shot;
- Constable's cabin/gunroom (constabelskamer), containing 50 muskets;
- Dining debris from the Great Cabin.

2.2.5 It appears that the wreck covers an area of approximately 8000m² with stratified deposits surviving to a depth of at least 1.5m. Only the area of the stern has been excavated and a 4m long element of ship structure with an adjacent gun-port lid and rudder pintles has been recovered from the site along with c.11, 000 other items, of which at least 10, 500 objects comprise specie and bullion. This particular discovery is unique as it provides a near complete assemblage of silver ingots cast only for a single voyage (*The Independent*, 12 December 2005).

2.2.6 In addition, over 100 items are recorded as comprising 'personal possessions' and the NMR record for the *Rooswijk* (ref. TR 45 NE 754) has been updated to reflect all material declared to the Receiver of Wreck in 2005:

A musket stock; 2 musket side plates marked VOC; a musket trigger plate; two wooden chests and lids; 21 ebony knife handles; 2 concreted knives; a Mexican pillar dollar; 553 silver ingots marked "VOC"; a tobacco tin; a huntsman's sword hilt; a gilt sword hilt; a sword scabbard belt hook; part of a leather scabbard; a brass wine pot with a missing leg; a pistol stock; a cutlass handle; a cutlass scabbard; a copper alloy cauldron; and 3 stoneware vessels recovered from this wreck. (Receiver of Wreck Droit 099/05).

2.2.7 Following the issue of export licenses, the first batch of salvaged coins and ingots from the site were auctioned by Ponterio & Associates, USA, in 2006. Other material was transferred to the Netherlands. A joint conservation assessment of material in passive holding by English Heritage and RACM was undertaken in May 2006. Of the material observed, the assessment noted that a number of artefacts had been stabilised by a range of techniques no longer used by the conservation profession in the UK and concluded that a greater emphasis should be placed on 'investigative conservation and stabilisation' rather than the observed 'display-type' approach (Panter 2006).

2.2.8 Although the site's position was provided to English Heritage by the 2005 project team, an invitation to provide archive information to support a full archaeological assessment of the site in 2006 was declined. Nevertheless, the assessment noted that the site consists of two main areas of wreckage and recorded exposures of hull and interior framework along the edges of the 2005 excavation trench (located in the stern area) which had the appearance of being recently exposed. A number of large concretions and groups of iron bars were also located and in many cases these features were noted to be

sited on areas of timber (Wessex Archaeology 2006a).

- 2.2.9 Further archaeological assessment in 2007 concluded that although the 'extent and depth of the...archaeological deposits and stratigraphic sequence are currently uncertain...the preservation environment of at least part of the site appears to be good' (Wessex Archaeology 2007).

2.3 Ownership, Management and Current Use

- 2.3.1 As a Dutch East India Vessel, the *Rooswijk* remained the property of the State of the Netherlands. However, in 2005, title to the vessel and its cargo (but not personal effects) was transferred by the State to a private individual for the specific purpose of salvage.
- 2.3.2 The *Rooswijk* lies within England's Territorial Sea. In addition to the owner of the seabed - normally around England & Wales the Crown Estate - consents may be required to undertake archaeological investigations.
- 2.3.3 The 2005 *Rooswijk* project has proved particularly contentious, not least because it was established from the outset that some material would be disposed of through sale (Hildred 2005: 5). In addition, the project team chose not to disclose details of the discovery or salvage operation to the Department for Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) and/or English Heritage until work was completed in 2005. This meant that the engagement of the Government's contractor for archaeological services in relation to the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 was delayed and that the site could not be readily and completely assessed against the non-statutory criteria for designation or otherwise.
- 2.3.4 In conjunction with State archaeologists from the Netherlands Rijksdienst voor Archeologie, Cultuurlandschap en Monumenten (RACM) and relevant stakeholders, the site was assessed by the Archaeological Contractor in 2006 consistent with the strategy for managing, presenting and interpreting historic wreck sites in England's Territorial Sea.
- 2.3.5 Following advice from English Heritage and the Government's Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites (ACHWS), the *Rooswijk* was subsequently designated under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 in January 2007 by the Minister for Culture, DCMS (SI 2007/61).
- 2.3.6 Action to commence conservation management of the site was commissioned by English Heritage in 2007 which sought to undertake a condition survey of the site and determine the site's vulnerability (English Heritage 2007b).
- 2.3.7 Physical access to the *Rooswijk* is restricted to licensed divers and further recovery of artefactual material will be managed through the current licensing system. However, five current groups of archaeological material may be identified:

- Exported specie sold at auction/ re-sold through eBay;
- Material exported to Museums in the Netherlands;
- Archaeological material in the UK, not destined for export;
- Material in private collection, and;
- Material transferred to the Dutch Treasury.

2.3.8 A Licence to Survey the site is currently held by Ken Welling, advised by Alex Hildred. The project team are seeking to 'survey and recover exposed vulnerable artefacts' and use this information to 'formulate a future strategy for continuing work on site' (Hildred & Welling 2008). This work is supported by the Government of the Netherlands and any further material recovered from the site is to be exported to Vlissingen for conservation and curation (subject to the investigations of the Receiver of Wreck).

2.3.9 Other than news releases in December 2005 and published commentaries, access to archival information related to the 2004/5 recoveries is restricted by the project team. In addition, deposition arrangements for material destined to remain in the UK are not yet certain, though some material may be donated to Kent Museum's Service (again, subject to the investigations of the Receiver of Wreck).

2.3.10 In July 2006, the Nautical Archaeology Society ran a Finds Handling and Registration course in Plymouth on material recovered from the *Rooswijk*. The course facilitated public engagement and aimed at providing:

An introduction to the principles of finds handling and registration and its applications to archaeological recording. The course [covered] the handling and registering of finds recovered from the wreck of a Dutch East India vessel lost on the Goodwin Sands in 1739 and excavated in 2004 and 2005. The course [was] suitable for the general public, individuals undertaking the NAS Training syllabus and professional archaeologists wanting to increase their knowledge and skills in registering finds from an underwater archaeological site.

NAS Part III Qualification, Course Advertisement 2006

2.3.11 There has been no authorised recovery of material from the *Rooswijk* since designation.

2.4 Gaps in Existing Knowledge

2.4.1 Technical details of the *Rooswijk*'s construction, voyages and subsequent loss may be determined through both documentary research and archaeological investigation. As access to the 2004/5 excavation archive has not yet been permitted and given the paucity of publication related to the excavation and recovery operations, the weakest part of the ship-biography is therefore her investigation and the synthesis of work undertaken since discovery and recovery from 2003.

2.4.2 It is understood that 2004/5 survey and salvage data has been collated into a GIS system, though repeated requests to incorporate all primary site data into systematic archaeological assessments have been declined by the project team.

- 2.4.3 In addition, the results of the 2004/5 salvage operations have yet to be published either in full, or as an interim archive assessment publication (though a popular account of the operation is given in the 2006 *Saga of the Goodwins* by David Chamberlain). Therefore, the amount and condition of material currently in storage in the UK derived from pre-designation operations is not known.
- 2.4.4 Pending publication, an assessment of the site's formation processes, historic geomorphology, cartography and prevailing abiotic environmental conditions is required to assist in interpretation and planning.
- 2.4.5 A programme of geophysical survey, to include boomer and magnetometer, is required to assist in the interpretation of stratigraphy and quantify the extent of (ferrous) material remaining on the seabed.
- 2.4.6 As such, a formal programme of archive assessment and research is required to contribute towards a fuller understanding the site in its entirety and to assist in developing planned operations.

3 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

3.1 Basis for Assessment of Significance

- 3.1.1 *Significance* means *the sum of the cultural and natural heritage values of a place* (English Heritage 2008). Cultural heritage value has many aspects, including the potential of a place to yield primary information about past human activity (evidential value, which includes archaeological value), the ways in which it can provide direct links to past people, events and aspects of life (historical value), the ways in which people respond to a place through sensory and intellectual experience of it (aesthetic value, which includes architectural value) and the meanings of a place for the people who identify with it, and communities for whom it is part of their collective memory (communal value).
- 3.1.2 In addition, the historic environment is a cultural and natural heritage resource shared by communities characterised not just by geographical location but also by common interests and values. As such, emphasis may be placed upon important consequential (technically, 'instrumental') benefits or potential, for example as an educational, recreational, or economic resource, which the historic environment provides. The seamless cultural and natural strands of the historic environment are a vital part of everyone's heritage, held in stewardship for the benefit of future generations.
- 3.1.3 The basis for assessing significance therefore enables consideration of the varying degrees of significance of different elements of the site. By identifying those elements which are vital to its significance and so must not be lost or compromised, we are able to identify elements which are of lesser value, and elements which have little value or detract from the significance of the site.

3.2 Statement of Significance

- 3.2.1 The Dutch East India Company (VOC, Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie), founded in 1602 and dissolved in 1795, was a Dutch trading company. It was the largest and most impressive of the early modern European trading companies having sent almost a million Europeans to work in the Asia trade on 4,785 ships.⁶ The Company's extensive archives, registered by UNESCO as part of the Memory of the World programme, have allowed for comprehensive study of VOC operations which have been widely published (see, for example, Prakash 1994 and Blak *et al* 2007).
- 3.2.2 The basic VOC trading pattern was to export silver and gold to Asia, and with this to purchase and return to Europe valuable spices, silks and porcelain which would then be sold at auctions. Silver was particularly important as it was much more valuable in Asia than in Europe, so its mere transportation to the East realised a profit (Marsden 1997: 91).

⁶ *Archives of the Dutch East India Company*, Nomination submitted by Netherlands in 2002 for inclusion in the UNESCO Memory of the World International Register.

3.2.3 Although the return voyages to Asia in support of Company activities were long ones, they rarely ended fatally. Out of a total of 8000 voyages (including those under the earlier Voorcompagnieën), less than 8% (i.e. 1 in 12½) came to an untimely end (source: www.vocshipwrecks.nl).⁷ For a number of reasons (principally associated with the survival of documentary evidence and the reputation of these vessels as treasure ships) the wreck sites of many Dutch East Indiamen have been investigated around the coasts of Europe, Southern Africa and Western Australia. As a group, they indicate graphically the commodities and products involved in this commerce and the extent of VOC operations.

3.2.4 The wrecks of Dutch VOC ships in British waters form an important sub-component of discovered maritime archaeological sites, and include the designated *Kennemerland*, wrecked on Skerries in 1664 and the *Hollandia*, lost off St. Agnes in 1743. In all, England's National Monuments Record (NMR) records 26 Dutch VOC losses in English waters dated from the *Golden Lion*, lost in 1592, to the loss of the *Zeelille*, lost in 1795. It is noteworthy that two other Dutch East Indiamen are recorded as being lost on the Goodwin Sands in the same decade as the *Rooswijk*; the *Loosdrecht* (ran ashore in 1736) and the *Meermond* (stranded in 1736).

3.2.5 The NMR includes six records of Dutch VOC ships lost in the two decades either side of 1739, (one of which is the currently designated *Amsterdam*, stranded 1749), as follows;

Vessel	Location	Date of loss	Current Status
<i>Meermond</i>	Goodwin Sands, SE	1736	Not located
<i>Loosdrecht</i>	Goodwin Sands, SE	1736	Not located
<i>Boot</i>	South Hams, SW	1738	Not located
<i>Rooswijk</i>	Goodwin Sands, SE	1739	Designated 2007
<i>Hollandia</i>	St. Agnes, SW	1743	Salvaged 1971 - c. 1977
<i>Amsterdam</i>	Hastings, SE	1749	Designated 1974

3.2.6 The *Rooswijk* is identified as being of importance because it comprises a combination of high quality surviving features and technical elements including vessel fittings, armament, equipment, personal belongings and cargo (*The Independent*, 12 December 2005). In addition, the quantity and condition of materials recovered from the *Rooswijk* in 2004/5 indicate that large sections of the wreck were buried and preserved to a high degree.

3.2.7 The wreck therefore represents archaeological evidence for the practice of large-scale overseas commerce between the Netherlands and Asia during the eighteenth century and is representative of a famous merchant vessel type. The aesthetic value of the *Rooswijk* as a merchant vessel is therefore closely tied to its evidential value on the seabed. These two elements are fundamental to the site's significance as further historical information may be derived from continued archaeological investigation, assessment and research.

⁷ Note that *Dutch Asiatic Shipping*, the Dutch standard work on the VOC, gives a figure of 3% for a total of 7800 voyages.

- 3.2.8 At present, the only named individual connected to the loss of the *Rooswijk* is her Captain (Schipper), Daniel Ronzieres, despite 250 lives being lost (NMR record TR 45 NE 754). A search of the VOC online database (www.vocsite.nl) indicates that Ronzieres is associated with no other VOC ship or voyage; the assumption being that this was his first (and only) voyage as Captain.
- 3.2.9 The evidential and historical potential of the *Rooswijk* is such that it contributes to the understanding of the mid-eighteenth century bullion trade, East India Companies and their trade, and Dutch and European maritime history and, of course, personal tragedy.
- 3.2.10 Communal values for the *Rooswijk* are more difficult to define; while there is clear association with the Netherlands, there is no current evidence that the *Rooswijk* was bound for an English port, such as London or Dover (construction of Ramsgate Harbour began in 1749) or an association with one.
- 3.2.11 The point of departure in the Texel is c. 2° north of the Goodwins and it is obvious that the *Rooswijk* would have had to have passed south-west through the Dover Straits *en route* to Asia. It is conjectured that the *Rooswijk* was seeking shelter in the Downs anchorage before continuing to the south and west or that owing to the easterly storm, a navigational error caused the Master/Captain to believe that they were further south than they actually were.
- 3.2.12 In addition, there is no current evidence to suggest that the bodies of those lost were washed ashore and recovered for interment in Kent nor is there any evidence of contemporary salvage of the *Rooswijk*. Therefore the only contemporary association between Kent and the *Rooswijk* is ephemeral: the 'great many packets of letters' found and subsequently reported in contemporary newspapers.
- 3.2.13 Arguably, however, there is a great sense of communal value attributed to the *Rooswijk* by the 2004/5 project team, demonstrated by their continued involvement in continued survey.
- 3.2.14 In addition, the adjacent East Kent Coast Maritime Natural Area is similarly valued for the cited chalk marine cave and reef habitats are of international importance.
- 3.2.15 The local community and licensee therefore maintain a keen interest in the site (through its evidential value); some members of the community have even published personal accounts of previous investigations (see Chamberlain 2006). In this capacity, the community investigates and monitors the site. In addition, the *Rooswijk* may be seen to provide an instrumental recreational (and therefore economic) resource by virtue of 'diving tourism'. However, wider educational value is only obtainable through museum displays in the Netherlands.

3.2.16 Whereas historical, communal and instrumental values contribute to the assessment of significance of the *Rooswijk*, these values cannot stand-alone. Without the continued enhancement of certain values, interest in the *Rooswijk* would be diminished. As such, extant material remains on the seabed are vital to the significance of the site and must therefore not be lost or compromised.

3.2.17 The following table seeks to summarise these values of the *Rooswijk* as a whole, by noting how those values relate to the surviving fabric and its constituent parts;

Evidential	<p>Relating to the potential of the <i>Rooswijk</i> to yield primary information about past human activity, chance recovery and opportunistic excavation has indicated survival of substantial elements of hull structure, fittings, armaments, cargo and other associated objects or deposits.</p> <p>It is believed that at least 10,000 objects have already been recovered a substantial proportion of which has been dispersal by sale.</p>
Historical	<p>Relating to the ways in which the <i>Rooswijk</i> can provide direct links to past people, events and aspects of life, the wreck is identified with the well-documented Dutch East India Company (VOC). Documentary evidence places the wrecking event within its historical context while archaeological material recovered from the site provides insights to shipboard life.</p>
Aesthetic	<p>Relating to the ways in which people respond to the <i>Rooswijk</i> through sensory and intellectual experience of it, the vessel's strength lies in it being a vessel of the VOC. As a <i>retourschepen</i>, the vessel is of technological importance.</p>
Communal	<p>Relating to the meanings of the <i>Rooswijk</i> for the people who identify with it, and whose collective memory it holds.</p> <p>Designation of the <i>Rooswijk</i> (under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973) is, in itself, an expression of communal value.</p>
Instrumental	<p>Economic, educational, recreational and other benefits which exist as a consequence of the cultural or natural heritage values of the <i>Rooswijk</i> may be identified in its value as a dive site as well as lying adjacent to the East Kent Coast Maritime Natural Area.</p>

3.3 Gaps in Understanding Significance

3.3.1 Despite the acknowledged need for a formal programme of staged assessment and research, the assessment of significance has not been acutely hindered by any gaps in knowledge identified in Section 2.4 above. However, certain key gaps in our understanding of the significance of the component parts of the site may need to be filled so these significances can contribute to informing its future conservation management. Most notable among these is the integration and publication of data derived from the 2004/5 salvage operations and a comprehensive understanding of the communal value of the *Rooswijk*.

3.4 Statutory and Other Designations

- 3.4.1 Statutory Instrument 2007/61 affords protection to a circular area of seabed (radius 150m) around position 51°16.443 N 001°34.537 E (WGS84) under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973.
- 3.4.2 Archaeological interventions that impact the seabed may require a licence issued by the Marine & Fisheries Agency (MFA), under the terms of the Food & Environmental Protection Act 1985 and/or the Coast Protection Act 1949. The MFA is an Executive Agency of DEFRA.
- 3.4.3 The Goodwin Sands lies within the East Kent Coast Maritime Natural Area. The concept of Natural Areas was a response by English Nature to the EU Convention on Biological Diversity signed by the UK Government in 1992. They are intended to provide a framework for an integrated approach to nature conservation and are defined in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan as 'biogeographic zones which reflect the geological foundation, the natural systems and processes and the wildlife in different parts of England, and provide a framework for setting objectives for nature conservation.'
- 3.4.4 In addition, Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) places a duty on all public bodies to have regard to biodiversity. Guidance for this duty is to be published by DEFRA.

4 ISSUES AND VULNERABILITY

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This section summarises the main conservation and management issues that specifically affect, or may affect, the significance of the monument and its component parts and elements. The ways in which the significance of the site may be vulnerable will also be identified.

4.1.2 Vulnerability (and therefore risk) may be assessed against environmental factors (such as natural processes) and human impacts on the site, including the setting (see English Heritage 2008). Commissioned research is being undertaken to assess site specific marine environments to provide a better understanding of the level of risk to assets or whether a site is in a stable condition. Current assessment indicates that such sites are at medium or high risk, unless they are completely buried below bed level during successive tidal cycles.

4.1.3 It is accepted that all wreck sites are vulnerable simply because of the nature of their environment, though sites will be considered to be at risk when there is a threat of damage, decay or loss of the monument. However, damage, deterioration or loss of the monument through natural or other impacts will not necessarily be considered to put the monument at risk if there is a programme of positive management.

4.1.4 Practical measures that affect site stability, preservation *in situ* and increased visitor access will be addressed here, while the necessity to address the paucity of publication in relation to previous interventions on the site is recognised (see also section 4.7).

4.1.5 Issues relate specifically to the values identified in Section 3.2 above and are presented here thematically rather than in order of severity or priority for remedial action. Relevant issues cover a wide range, including - but not restricted to;

- The physical condition of the site and its setting;
- Conservation and presentation philosophy;
- Ownership and other legal requirements (including visitation);
- The existence (or lack) of appropriate uses;
- Resources, including financial constraints and availability of skills;
- Lack of information or understanding about aspects of the site, and;
- Conflicts between different types of significance.

4.2 The Physical Condition of the Site and its Setting

4.2.1 Sections 2.2.8 and 2.2.9 above noted that 'exposures of hull and interior framework' indicated that the 'preservation environment of at least part of the site appears to be good' (Wessex Archaeology 2006a and 2007).

- 4.2.2 Given the likely preservation of buried archaeological remains, wherever possible unnecessary disturbance should be avoided. However, once material is exposed (due to the general mobility of the Goodwin Sands), deterioration of hull structure and wooden material due to biological decay is likely to be fairly rapid. Once timbers are weakened by biological attack they may be subject to detachment and dispersal.
- 4.2.3 As special features of the *Rooswijk* may be subject to physical and/or biological decay, the site is currently considered to be at High Risk. However, current observations indicate that elements of the site are, at present, relatively stable (Wessex Archaeology 2007). Temporary stabilisation of other historic wreck sites in the northern part of the Goodwin Sands by accreting sediments has also recently been recorded thereby indicating a possible general trend in the reduction of vulnerability.⁸
- 4.2.4 Regional modelling of sediment erosion has been commissioned (through English Heritage's participation in the EU Culture 2000 MACHU Project) so as to gain an understanding of present and future trends in local sedimentation. Such work will assist the planning of future conservation strategies.
- 4.2.5 Corrosion rates of ferrous material on site have yet to be studied.

4.3 Conservation and Presentation Philosophy

- 4.3.1 Although a detailed site plan is yet to be published, no comprehensive account of quantifiable changes in condition has been undertaken from the site's discovery, salvage and subsequent natural accretion of sediments.
- 4.3.2 It is therefore acknowledged that there may have been a serious deterioration in the overall condition of the wreck owing to intrusive salvage operations. The site is potentially vulnerable to erosion as the processes of sediment movement around the wreck are not yet understood.
- 4.3.3 Despite evidential and aesthetic value of the *Rooswijk* being of vital significance to the site, *in situ* management of the entire hull is not yet quantifiable owing to a lack of information in relation to the full extent of known remains.
- 4.3.4 As noted in Section 2.3 above, Deal Castle is the nearest English Heritage Property to the *Rooswijk* which also overlooks four other Protected Wreck sites on the Goodwin Sands. There is therefore an opportunity to provide interpretative material and appropriate signage for the wider marine historic environment within the Castle.

⁸ See www.st-andrews.ac.uk/rasse/index.html.

4.4 Visitor and other Occupancy Requirements

4.4.1 Given the demonstrable interest in the site by the Government of the Netherlands and proposed project work for 2008, physical public access to the *Rooswijk* will not be encouraged. Any persons wishing to visit the *Rooswijk* will be directed to the Licensee and be encouraged to participate in the existing licensed survey initiative.

4.4.2 'Virtual access' to the site has been enabled through current web-based initiatives (e.g. EH Interactive map). It is recognised that interest in the site stimulated through electronic access will be limited by the lack of formal archaeological publication.

4.5 The Existence (or lack) of Appropriate Uses

4.5.1 In 2007, an unsubstantiated claim in relation to unauthorised access to the site by Belgian divers was made. The site's current owner and project team were unable to provide sufficient information to allow further investigation of the allegation.

4.5.2 Regular, consistent and reliable information relating to the condition of the *Rooswijk* will be necessary to monitor the existence (or lack) of appropriate uses of the site.

4.5.3 Enforcement of the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 is the responsibility of the appropriate County Constabulary as it is a criminal offence to any of the following in a designated area without a licence granted by the appropriate Secretary of State:

- Tamper with, damage or remove any part of a vessel lying wrecked on or in the seabed or any object formerly contained in such a vessel.
- Carry out diving or salvage operations directed to the exploration of any wreck or to removing objects from it or from the seabed, or uses equipment constructed or adapted for any purpose of diving or salvage operations. This is likely to include deployment of remotely operated vehicles.
- Deposit anything including anchors and fishing gear which, if it were to fall on the site, would obliterate, obstruct access to, or damage any part of the site.

4.5.4 It is also an offence to cause or permit any of the above activities to be carried out by others, without a licence, in a restricted area.

4.6 Resources, including Financial Constraints and availability of Skills

4.6.1 There is no doubt that extensive recovery of archaeological material, including hull structure, indicates the evidential value of the *Rooswijk* site and that interaction with archaeological material (through the NAS' finds handling course) relates to both aesthetic and historical value. Despite the Vlissingen museum indicating that it is willing to accession future material recovered

from the site, there shall be a presumption against further excavation and recovery until an agreed project design has been submitted.

4.6.2 In accordance with the Diving at Work Regulations 1997, archaeological interventions underwater commissioned by English Heritage can only be undertaken by a registered Diving Contractor, and then only by such a Contractor with appropriate archaeological experience.

4.7 Lack of Information or Understanding about aspects of the Site

4.7.1 As noted above, there are two areas that hinder public understanding of the *Rooswijk*;

- Lack of publication/synthesis of previous activities (including documentary evidence), and the;
- Requirement for comprehensive site map, confirmation of risk assessment,

4.7.2 The data from previous activities represents the only record of investigations and, therefore, is itself an irreplaceable resource.

4.7.3 It is the intention of this Conservation Management Plan to provide a mechanism to reconcile the lack of information/understanding about the site to assist in its management for all.

5 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT POLICIES

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This section of the Conservation Statement and Management Plan builds on the Assessment of Significance and the issues identified in Issues and Vulnerability to develop conservation policies which will retain or reveal the site's significance, and which provide a framework for decision-making in the future management and development of the site or reveal the site's significance and also:

- Meet statutory requirements;
- Comply with English Heritage's standards and guidance.

5.1.2 It is intended that the policies will create a framework for managing change on the *Rooswijk* that is clear in purpose, and transparent and sustainable in its application. Our aim is to achieve implementation through the principles of shared ownership and partnership working so as to balance protection with economic and social needs.

5.1.3 Policies are also compatible with, and reflect, English Heritage's *Conservation Principles for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment* (English Heritage 2008) and its published policies and guidelines, as well as the wider statutory and policy framework.

5.2 The *Rooswijk* is a Shared Resource

5.2.1 The *Rooswijk* forms a unique record of past human activity which reflects the aspirations, ingenuity and investment of resources of previous generations. It may also be an economic asset as a generator of tourism or inward economic investment.

5.2.2 The *Rooswijk* is therefore a social asset as a resource for learning and enjoyment. It should be used and enjoyed without compromising the ability of future generations to do the same.

5.2.3 In addition, the conflict between the desire for access to the site and the restrictions imposed by conservation needs and legislative limitations will be reconciled through visitor management.

5.2.4 Learning is central to sustaining the historic environment. It raises people's awareness and understanding of their heritage, including the varied ways in which its values are perceived by different generations and communities. It encourages informed and active participation in caring for the historic environment.

5.2.5 Education at all stages should help to raise awareness and understanding of the site's values, including the varied ways in which these values are perceived by different generations and communities.

Management Policy 1 We will continue to support and develop authorised access to the site as a mechanism to develop the instrumental value of the *Rooswijk*.

Management Policy 2 Through liaison with Regional Teams and the Properties Presentation Team, we will seek to provide interpretative material for the marine historic environment at English Heritage properties in the area.

5.3 Everyone should be able to participate in sustaining the *Rooswijk*

5.3.1 Local, regional and national stakeholders have the opportunity to contribute to understanding and sustaining the *Rooswijk*. Judgements about its values and decisions about its future will be made in ways that are accessible, inclusive and informed.

5.3.2 Practitioners should use their knowledge, skills and experience to help and encourage others to understand, value and care for the *Rooswijk*. They play a crucial role in communicating and sustaining the established values of the wreck, and in helping people to refine and articulate the values they attach to it.

5.3.3 It is essential to develop, maintain and pass on the specialist knowledge and skills necessary to sustain the historic environment. Written agreements with project partners should therefore be developed so as to formulate a future strategy for continuing work on site.

Management Policy 3 We will assist the Government of the Netherlands in developing further work on site. This will be enabled through an agreed Project Design.

Management Policy 4 Through web-based initiatives and publication, we will continue to improve the accessibility of related material and support appropriate links so as to develop effective public understanding.

5.4 Understanding the significance of the *Rooswijk* is vital

5.4.1 The significance of the *Rooswijk* embraces all the cultural and natural heritage values that are associated with it. To identify and appreciate those values, it is essential first to understand the structure and ecology of the site, how and why that has changed over time, and its present character.

5.4.2 The purpose of understanding and articulating the significance of the *Rooswijk* is to inform decisions about its future. The degree of significance determines what protection is appropriate under law and policy.

5.4.3 Judgements about values are necessarily specific to the time they are made. As understanding develops, and as perceptions evolve and places change, so assessments of significance will alter, and tend to grow more complex.

5.4.5 We acknowledge that documentary and archaeological records of previous interventions on the *Rooswijk* form an irreplaceable resource to identify values and assist with maintaining a cumulative account of what has happened to the site, and understanding how its significance may have been altered.

5.4.6 A formal programme of staged assessment and research is therefore required, to contribute towards a fuller understanding the site in its entirety. Such work will conform to the *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment* (English Heritage 2006) and is likely to comprise the following stages;

- Collation of the site archive and archive signposting;
- Assessment to determine academic potential of the archive;
- Determination of further work to fulfil this academic potential;
- Preparation of a research archive;
- Report text for publication, and finally;
- Publication.

Management Policy 5 We will work with the Government of the Netherlands to gain, and publish, a fuller understanding the site.

5.5 The *Rooswijk* should be managed to sustain its values

5.5.1 Changes to the *Rooswijk* are inevitable, whether caused by natural processes, through use, or by responses to social, economic and technological advances. Such changes will be managed in ways that will best sustain the significance of a place in its setting, while recognising opportunities to reveal or reinforce its values for present and future generations.

5.5.2 Action taken to counter harmful effects of natural change, or to minimise the risk of disaster, should be timely, proportionate to the severity and likelihood of identified consequences, and sustainable in the long term.

5.5.3 Heritage values express the public interest in our historic environment, regardless of ownership. Use of law and public policy to the extent necessary to protect that public interest is justifiable if it is supported by advice and assistance to help owners to sustain the heritage.

5.5.4 Intervention that causes limited harm to the values of a place may be justified if it increases understanding of the past, reveals or reinforces particular heritage values, or is necessary to sustain those values for future generations, so long as any harm is decisively outweighed by the benefits.

5.5.5 New work should aspire to a quality of design and execution, related to its setting, which may be valued both now and in the future. This neither implies nor precludes working in traditional or new ways, but demands respect for the significance of a place in its setting.

Management Policy 6 Key gaps in understanding the significance of the component parts of the site should be identified, prioritised and addressed so that these significances can contribute to informing the future conservation management of the site.

5.6 Decisions about change must be reasonable, transparent and consistent

- 5.6.1 Decisions about changes to the *Rooswijk* demand the application of expertise, experience and judgement by those advising on and making decisions, in a consistent, transparent process guided by public policy.
- 5.6.2 The range and depth of understanding, assessment and public engagement should be sufficient for the impacts of change on the significance of the site to be fully understood, but efficient in the use of resources.
- 5.6.3 Potential conflict between sustaining the significance of a place and other public interests should be minimised by seeking the least harmful means of accommodating those interests.
- 5.6.4 If conflict cannot be avoided, the weight given to heritage values in making the decision should be proportionate to the significance of the place and the impact of the proposed change on it. However, measures taken to counter the effects of natural change will be proportionate to the identified risks and sustainable in the long term.
- 5.6.5 Other changes will be devised so as to avoid material harm. Irreversible intervention on the *Rooswijk* may nonetheless be justified if it provides new information about the past, reveals or reinforces the values of a place or helps sustain those values for future generations – so long as the impact is demonstrably proportionate to the predicted benefits.
- 5.6.6 The effects of changes to the condition of the *Rooswijk* will be monitored and evaluated, and the results used to inform subsequent action.
- 5.6.7 If retaining any significant part of the *Rooswijk* is not reasonably practicable, its potential to inform us about the past will be exploited. This involves the recovery of information through prior investigation, followed by analysis, archiving and dissemination of the results at a standard appropriate to its significance.
- 5.6.8 Where such loss is deliberate, the costs of this work should normally be borne by those who initiate the change.

Management Policy 7 Unless a clear and agreed research framework has been devised, unnecessary disturbance of the seabed within the restricted area should be avoided wherever possible in order to minimise the risk of damage to buried archaeological remains.

6 FORWARD PLAN

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 In order to commence the implementation of the proposed Management Policies outlined in Section 5, English Heritage is seeking to support a range of projects that will increase our understanding of the value and setting of the *Rooswijk*. These projects are outlined in Section 6.2 below.

6.1.2 The 2007 Designated Site Assessment by the Government's Contractor for Archaeological Services in Relation to the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 produced a series of recommendations to assist with the conservation management of the site. These recommendations are presented in Appendix 2.

6.2 Proposed Projects in relation to the *Rooswijk*

6.2.1 *Rooswijk Project 2008*. This project, supported by the Government of the Netherlands, seeks to monitor the site and formulate a future strategy for continued investigation (Hildred & Welling 2008). It is expected that work will comprise historical research, remote sensing and diver survey and we are assisting the project team in developing procedures to enable Surface Recovery of vulnerable artefacts.

6.2.2 *Managing Cultural Heritage Underwater (MACHU)*. Developed with the support of the Culture 2000 Programme of the European Union, the primary goal of this project is to make information about our common underwater cultural heritage accessible for academic purposes, policy makers and for the general public. English Heritage has selected the Goodwin Sands as an area to test sediment-erosion modelling and we intend to study the sedimentation around a broad area surrounding the *Rooswijk*. Further information on the MACHU project is available from www.machuproject.eu.

6.2.3 *Accessibility: presentation*. Working in conjunction with colleagues in our Properties Presentation team, we will seek to provide interpretative material at Deal Castle for the Goodwin Sands Protected Wreck sites.

6.2.4 The proposed timescale for the implementation of these projects is summarised below:

Project Title	Project Summary	Timetable
<i>Rooswijk Project 2008</i>	Monitoring & assessment	Spring 2008
MACHU	Wide area sediment / erosion modelling	2006-2009
Accessibility: presentation	Provision for interpretative material at Deal Castle	2009?

6.2.5 *Continued Field Assessment*. Undertaken through the Contract for Archaeological Services in relation to the Protection of Wrecks Act (1973), the detailed non-intrusive survey and risk monitoring that commenced in 2006

will continue as required. It is not proposed to utilise the services of the Archaeological Contractor when project work is being undertaken by the *Rooswijk* Project Team.

7 IMPLEMENTATION

7.1 Consultation

7.1.1 The generic format for historic wreck site *Conservation and Management Plans* has been agreed by the Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites (ACHWS). The document has also been internally reviewed by English Heritage.

7.1.2 The *Conservation and Management Plan* for the *Rooswijk* shall be circulated for a four-week stakeholder consultation to refine how the values and features of the *Rooswijk* can be conserved, maintained and enhanced. Responses to the consultation will be considered and the *Plan* revised as appropriate.

7.2 Adoption of Policies

7.2.1 Following consultation, the *Plan* was adopted in October 2008.

7.2.2 A programme that identifies a realistic timescale for implementing the *Plan*, taking into account those areas which need immediate action, those which can be implemented in the medium or long term, and those which are ongoing will be devised.

7.2.3 Responsibilities for implementation lie with English Heritage (led by the Maritime Archaeology Team), though consultation with stakeholders will be maintained throughout. In addition, provision will be made for periodic review and updating the *Plan*.

8 REFERENCES

- Advisory Committee on Historic Wrecks Sites, Agenda and Minutes of 101st Meeting, London, 28th February 2006
- Anon, 2007a, English Heritage exposes Channel silver wreck to 'great danger', *Diver*, April 2007
- Anon, 2007b, Silver account disputed, *Diver*, May 2007
- Blak, G. L., Van Dijk, F., & Kortlang, D. J., 2007, *The Archives of the Dutch East India Company (VOC) and the Local Institutions in Batavia (Jakarta)*, Brill
- Cederlund, C. O., 2004, (Ed) *MoSS Final Report*, The National Board of Antiquities, Finland
- Chamberlain, D., 2006, *Saga of the Goodwins*, Beaches Books
- Cloet, R.L., 1954, Hydrographic Analysis of the Goodwin Sands and the Brake Bank, *Geographical Journal*, CXX, part 2, p.203-215.
- Department for Culture, Media & Sport, 2005, *Protecting our Marine Historic Environment – Making the System Work Better: Analysis of responses July 2005*
- Department for Culture, Media & Sport, 2007, *Advisory Committee on Historic Wrecks Sites Annual Report 2006*, April 2006 – March 2007
- English Heritage, 1999, *Conservation Plans in Action*
- English Heritage, 2005, *English Heritage Research Agenda: An introduction to English Heritage's research themes and programmes*
- English Heritage, 2006, *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide*
- English Heritage, 2007a, Protected Wreck Sites at Risk: a risk management handbook, unpublished document
- English Heritage, 2007b, *Brief for Archaeological Services in Relation to the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973, Designated Site Assessment: Rooswijk*, unpublished document, March 2007
- English Heritage, 2008, *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance, for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*
- Heritage Lottery Fund, 1998, *Conservation Plans for Historic Places*
- Hildred, A., 2005, *Goodwin Sands Archaeological Project*, unpublished project outline, April 2005
- Hildred, A. & Welling, K., 2008, *Rooswijk 2008 Project Design and Diving Plan*, unpublished Project Design
- Kerr, J. S., 2000, *Conservation Plan. A Guide to the Preparation of Conservation Plans for Places of European Cultural Significance*
- Larn, R. & Larn, B., 1995, *Shipwreck Index of the British Isles Volume 2*, London.
- Marsden, P., 1997, *Ships and Shipwrecks*, English Heritage

Rooswijk: Conservation Statement & Management Plan

Panter, I., 2006, Conservation Assessment of Material Recovered from the Wreck of the VOC Rooswijk, reproduced in Wessex Archaeology, 2006, Rooswijk, *Goodwin Sands, Undesignated Site Assessment*, Appendix VI

Prakash, O., 1994, *Precious Metals and Commerce: Dutch East India Company in the Indian Ocean Trade*, Variorum

Roberts, P. & Trow, S., 2002, *Taking to the Water: Initial Policy for the Management of Maritime Archaeology in England*, English Heritage

UKHO, 2006, *Admiralty Sailing Directions, Dover Strait Pilot*, (NP 28), Taunton

Van Duivenvoorde, W., 2006, Dutch Ministry of Finance Violates Agreement on Submerged Cultural Heritage, *INA Quarterly*, 31.1, Spring 2006

Wessex Archaeology, 2006a, Rooswijk, *Goodwin Sands, Undesignated Site Assessment*, ref. 53111.02k-9, unpublished report for English Heritage

Wessex Archaeology, 2006b, *On the Importance of Shipwrecks*, ALSF Project ref: 58591.02a, unpublished report for English Heritage

Wessex Archaeology, 2007, Rooswijk, *Goodwin Sands, Designated Site Assessment*, ref. 53111.03ddd, unpublished report for English Heritage

9 AUTHORSHIP AND CONSULTATION

- 9.1 This Conservation Statement & Management Plan for the *Rooswijk* has been prepared by:

Mark Dunkley
Maritime Archaeologist
English Heritage
Fort Cumberland
Eastney
Portsmouth
PO4 9LD

Tel: 023 9285 6768

Mark.dunkley@english-heritage.org.uk

- 9.2 The following individuals and organisations have been invited to comment on this draft *Plan*:

Architecture & Historic Environment Division, DCMS
Current *Rooswijk* Owner & Project Team
East Kent Maritime Trust
English Heritage, South-East Region
Kent County Council, HES
Licensee
Natural England
Nautical Archaeology Society
Nominated Archaeologist
Rijksdienst voor Archeologie, Cultuurlandschap en Monumenten (RACM)
The Crown Estate

APPENDIX 1: HISTORIC CARTOGRAPHY OF KELLET GUT

Identified Charts, pre-1850 (UK Hydrographic Office only)

Title	Date	Hydrographer	UKHO ref.
A mapp of the Downs	1736	Labelye	A38
Whitstable to North Foreland	1775	MacKenzie	738a
Downs and South Queens Channel	1819	MacKenzie	738b

Summary of Modern morphology

Kellet Gut is first charted in its current form on the 1937 edition of Chart 1828 (UKHO ref. OCB 1828 D06). The preceding 1932 edition does not record the Kellet Gut, but shows Goodwin Knoll extending south of East Goodwin Light by at least 0.6 nm.

APPENDIX 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 2007 DESIGNATED SITE ASSESSMENT

In the following paragraphs, short term means in the next 12 months or before any further licence is granted to the individual/organisation concerned, medium terms means the next 2-3 years and long term over 3 years from the date of this report.

Further Archaeological Recording

It is strongly recommended that the level 3a survey should be completed in the short to medium term. Further baseline archaeological survey work will need to be carried in order to do this. The following questions in particular need to be addressed:

- How far the site extends in all directions;
- Whether the West and East sites are in fact discrete concentrations connected by a scatter of material or whether they are part of a single large concentration;
- The position and relationship of the North Site to the West and East Sites;
- The depth and character of the stratigraphy;
- The character of the natural substrate below the archaeological deposits.

Unless access to the 2005 archive can be established and that archive contains the necessary data, then the above will necessarily require intrusive investigations.

The bottom time that divers will require to complete the above should not be underestimated.

Condition Assessment

It is strongly recommended that the Contractor or a suitable licensee should undertake further condition survey work. This should commence in the short-medium term. The aim of this work should be to establish the rate of decay of exposed and near surface archaeological material. This may require a program of repeated visits to the site over a number of years to undertake measurements and experimentation.

Desk-based Assessment

A desk-based assessment of the *Rooswijk* site would be highly desirable in the short to medium term. This should consider what documentary and other material is already in existence and should identify and then examine additional sources. It would be advantageous if access could be obtained to the archive of the 2005 salvage operation as part of this assessment.

Conservation Statement and Management Plan

Urgently required in the short term. The plan should examine options for a formal management plan. A formal agreement, if achievable, may be more desirable than a voluntary plan given the site's recent contentious history.

The plan should examine options for the future investigation and management of the site. In the light of national, regional and local research policies and strategies it should seek to define what will be considered appropriate/inappropriate in terms of future investigation. Although the site is within UK territorial waters, liaison with the Dutch authorities would be highly desirable in this respect.

Publication

It is strongly recommended that encouragement and/or pressure should be brought to bear to ensure that an interim report on the 2005 archaeological results is forthcoming in the short term. This interim report should contain sufficient information to inform future site investigations, regardless of who they are carried out by.

(Wessex Archaeology 2007)