

Peter Cardwell

Archaeological and Heritage Consultant

| NYCC HER | |
|----------|---------|
| SNY | 16335 |
| ENY | 5528 |
| CHY | 10066 |
| Parish | 3071 |
| Rec'd | 22/9/10 |

KIRBY MISPERTON WEST (6) WELLSITE EXTENSION NORTH YORKSHIRE

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

prepared for

VIKING UK GAS LTD

Report 38/1

July 2010

C10066 516335
P3011 65528
Kirby Misperton

VIKING UK GAS LTD

**KIRBY MISPERTON WEST (6) WELLSITE EXTENSION
NORTH YORKSHIRE**

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

Summary

An archaeological desk-based assessment of the proposed extension to the Kirby Misperton wellsite established that this is located within an area with limited evidence of prehistoric settlement or activity within the immediate vicinity, this instead being primarily located on the higher ground around Kirby Misperton to the east or along Costa Beck further to the north-east. No sites of Roman date are recorded within the vicinity, although a Roman road (Wade's Causeway) runs through Great Barugh to the west.

Settlements at both Kirby Misperton to the east and Great Barugh to the south-west were established before the Norman Conquest, although the proposed development site is located equidistant between the two villages and immediately east of the boundary between the two townships. Evidence of settlement of medieval date is focussed on these villages, and there is no evidence for occupation sites of this date within the vicinity of the proposed extension. There is however evidence for both existing and former ridge and furrow cultivation to the east of the site, including ploughed-out ridge and furrow in the field within which the extension is proposed, at least some of which probably has medieval origins.

The existing field pattern was established in the post-medieval period with the enclosure of the former open fields, although this has subsequently been modified within the last century. A farmstead was established on the site of the existing Alma Farm (then called Sugar Hill) by the early 19th century, although an additional or earlier farmstead may have been located further to the west in an area adjacent to the proposed wellsite which probably dates to at least the 18th century and possibly earlier. Evidence of clay extraction for brick manufacturing is also recorded in the immediate vicinity of the proposed extension, and probably dates to the 19th century. This includes extraction pits evident as former or existing ponds, features recorded on the existing access road to the wellsite and spreads of brick in adjacent areas.

The predicted effects of the construction of the proposed extension would be upon any surviving remains of former ridge and furrow cultivation, as well as upon a former field boundary and pond within the north-eastern part of the area, although part of the extension has previously been disturbed for the construction of the existing gas pipeline to the Knapton generating station. Features associated with a possible former farmstead to the east may also extend into the area. All of these sites are considered to be of low sensitivity and no significant effects are accordingly predicted subject to archaeological observation, investigation and recording during construction. A written scheme of investigation for this proposed mitigation would be agreed in advance with North Yorkshire County Council.

No effects upon the setting of any nationally important monuments within the area are predicted, and specifically upon the scheduled earthworks at Great Barugh to the west.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Peter Cardwell was commissioned by Viking UK Gas Ltd to undertake an archaeological assessment study of a proposed extension to an existing gas wellsite near Kirby Misperton in North Yorkshire. The aim of the assessment is to identify any significant archaeological constraints within the study area, identify any predicted effects and propose appropriate mitigation measures. The report has been prepared to support the planning application for the wellsite extension submitted to North Yorkshire County Council.
- 1.2 The report describes the location of the proposed wellsite extension and its environs, and the methodology and information sources utilised while undertaking the study. It describes any known archaeological sites within the study area and assesses the potential for any previously unknown or unrecorded archaeological sites to survive within the development area. The potential effects (including those on the setting of Scheduled Monuments in the vicinity) are discussed and appropriate mitigation proposed.
- 1.3 The assessment study was undertaken during June and July 2010.

2.0 LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

- 2.1 The proposed wellsite extension is located 6.9km north-west of Malton, 5km south-west of Pickering, some 1.5km west of Kirby Misperton village, and 0.3km to the south-east of Little Barugh (Figure 1). The extension to the east of the existing wellsite (SE 7638 7920) is located at the end of an access track leading north-west from Habton Road, which runs between Great Habton and Kirby Misperton. The proposed site is within the Ryedale District of North Yorkshire and the civil parish of Kirby Misperton.
- 2.2 The site is located on the northern floodplain of the rivers Rye and Derwent, some 2km west of Costa Beck. The site of the proposed wellsite extension lies at a height of 23m with the access track extending 1km to the south-east, rising to 25m before returning to 23m again at its eastern extremity.
- 2.3 The field in which the proposed extension would be located is relatively level and located immediately to the east of the existing wellsite. The ground rises to the east of the area towards the low ridge on which Alma Farm is located. The field is currently permanent pasture and is defined by hedges on all sides, with the woodland and bund of the existing wellsite defining the western side. Occasional trees are located on the southern side of the access road to the existing wellsite (Plates 1 and 2).
- 2.4 The solid geology within the area consists of Kimmendge Clay of the Upper Jurassic series (British Geological Survey 1995). Glacial activity and subsequent alluvial deposition formed a series of glacial islands of sand, gravel and boulder clay (such as that occupied by Kirby Misperton and Little Barugh) with peats and alluvial clays and silts subsequently accumulating in the river valleys and stream beds of the Vale of Pickering (YAT 1998, 3).

2.5 The soils within the study area consist those of the **Dunkeswick** association (slowly permeable seasonally waterlogged fine loamy and fine loamy over clayey soils) within the northern half and those of the **Foggathorpe 2** association (slowly permeable seasonally waterlogged stoneless clayey and fine loamy over clayey soils) within the southern half (Jarvis et al 1984)

2.6 The proposed development would consist of an extension to the eastern side of the existing gas wellsite in order to drill one or two additional exploratory wells and retain the site and wellhead for the production of gas. The extension would consist of the removal of the bund on the eastern side of the existing wellsite to construct a platform for the drilling and later production equipment, surrounded by a ditch and bund up to 9m wide and 2m high on the northern, eastern and southern side. This bund would be planted with trees to replace those on the eastern bund of the existing site. The proposed extension would measure up to 105m north to south by 45m east to west, a total area of approximately 0.45ha. Access to the site would be along the existing road and no alterations to this are proposed as part of the planning application.

3.0 **METHODOLOGY AND INFORMATION SOURCES**

3.1 The principal aims of the archaeological assessment are

- to identify known archaeological sites within the study area
- to identify any areas with the potential to contain previously unrecorded archaeological remains
- to assess the effects of the proposed development and ancillary works upon the archaeological sites and their settings
- to propose appropriate mitigation measures that could be built into the development proposals in order to avoid, reduce or remedy any potential adverse effects identified

3.2 The report is based upon a review of existing available information and desk studies, supplemented by a site inspection. Information on archaeological sites within the area was aided by the results of a number of previous studies, and particularly the assessments, evaluation and mitigation undertaken in advance of and during the construction of the Knapton generating station and associated pipeline and other later pipeline developments (NAA 1994a, 1994b, 2003, YAT 1998)

3.3 The following organisations or individuals were consulted for the assessment

- North Yorkshire County Council (Business and Environmental Services)
- English Heritage
- North Yorkshire County Record Office (NYCRO)
- Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York (BIHR)
- Northallerton Library (Local Studies)

- Pickenng Library (Local Studies)

3.4 The following data sources were utilised for the assessment

- North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record
- National Monuments Record
- published and unpublished historical and archaeological studies
- cartographic sources (title and historic Ordnance Survey maps)
- vertical aerial photographs

3.5 A site inspection of the proposed development area was undertaken in June 2010. This was undertaken to determine the extent and survival of any buildings or other structures, to note the location, extent, nature and condition of any additional recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites, including any earthworks, and to identify any artefacts which might indicate the presence of archaeological activity or subsurface features.

4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BASELINE INFORMATION

4.1 All archaeological sites and other heritage assets recorded in the North Yorkshire County Council Historic Environment Record (HER) within 500m of the proposed development are listed in Table 1 below and indicated on Figure 2. Records are prefixed with an MNY number. Additional sites recorded from further research or site inspection are listed in Table 1 and indicated on Figure 3. A central grid reference, suggested classification and date are provided for each site, which are listed in chronological order to accord with the text. The sites are graded of high, medium and low importance based on their designation, professional judgement and the criteria set out for identifying Scheduled Monuments (DCMS 2010).

4.2 All archaeological sites and events within 1km of the proposed development are listed in Appendix 1 with their location indicated on Appendix 2. These sites are referenced as necessary within the text in order to place the results of the assessment study within a wider context.

Table 1: Archaeological sites within 500m of proposed wellsite extension

| HER | Grid reference | Classification | Period | Grade |
|----------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------|
| MNY2501 | SE 77 79 | Stone axe | Neolithic | – |
| MNY25334 | SE 7705 7950 | Ridge and furrow | Medieval | Low |
| – | SE 7655 7923 | Ridge and furrow | Medieval | Low |
| – | SE 7672 7908 | Ridge and furrow | Medieval | Low |
| – | SE 7688 7898 | Ridge and furrow | Medieval | Low |
| MNY2523 | SE 7616 7977 | Little Barugh village | Medieval Modern | Medium |

| HER | Grid reference | Classification | Period | Grade |
|----------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-------|
| MNY24135 | SE 7720 7935 | Ridge and furrow | Post-medieval | Low |
| – | SE 7650 7920 | Farmstead | Post-medieval | Low |
| – | SE 7642 7924 | Pond | Post-medieval | Low |
| – | SE 7653 7897 | Pond | Post-medieval | Low |
| – | SE 766 790 | Ditch and pit | Post-medieval | Low |

4.3 A total of 11 archaeological sites, features, buildings or finds (excluding general references to events) are recorded within 500m of the boundary of the proposed development. All but one of these sites are graded of low sensitivity, although while individual sites may be graded as of low sensitivity it is accepted that groups of such sites may have a greater significance within a local context.

4.4 Sites within the assessment study area are summarised below in chronological order, concentrating upon those within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.

Prehistoric

4.5 The earliest known prehistoric activity within the Vale of Pickering dates back to at least the early Mesolithic period, with settlement primarily identified towards the eastern end of the Vale in the form of occupation sites such as at Star Carr and Seamer Carr.

4.6 During the Neolithic and Bronze Age other areas appear to have been settled and cultivated, although much of the base of the Vale of Pickering appears to have contained scattered shrinking lakelets into the post-Roman period (Lee 1997, 23). Activity of this period is attested by a number of flint axes of Neolithic date within the vicinity of the wellsite extension, including the example from Kirby Misperton (MNY2501), although this is not accurately provenanced, as well as from Barugh and Normanby (Elgee 1930, 38). Excavations on the route of the Knapton pipeline recorded a small cluster of linear and pit features near Great Habton (some 1.7km to the south) from which flint artefacts dating between the Mesolithic and the Bronze Age were recovered (Lee 1997, 32). A corded beaker comes from the Costa Beck area (some 2km to the north-east), together with 'urns' and flint tools from excavations at Kirby Misperton (Hayes 1977).

4.7 No evidence of Iron Age occupation is recorded within the study area, although a probable lakeside settlement has been investigated at Costa Beck in excess of 2km to the north-east on a number of occasions. This included a series of wooden piles protruding above the bed of the stream as well as animal bone, an inhumation burial and pottery (Iron Age gritty ware) sealed by layers of alluvial clay. Further investigations produced evidence of prehistoric settlement on both sides of the river, primarily focussed to the north of Low Barn Farm and possibly continuing into the early Roman period (Hayes 1988, YAT 1998, 5–6, NAA 2003, 3).

- 4 8 No archaeological features or finds of prehistoric date, or any deposits with palaeoenvironmental potential, were identified either during the monitoring of test pit excavations along the route of the Knapton pipeline to the east of the existing wellsite or during monitoring of the construction of the access road to the wellsite. The monitoring of a test pit on the pipeline route (ENY2727 located at SE 7643 7918 on the eastern edge of the field in which the wellsite extension is proposed) identified Kimmendge Clay at a depth of some 2.2m below existing ground level, sealed by 0.15m of clay, 0.15m of sand and gravel and 1.6m of mottled clay with pockets of fine silty sand below the turf (NAA 1994, 24)

Roman

- 4 9 Evidence of settlement from both the late Iron Age and Roman periods not only continues to be evident on the fen margins and the Vale edges, but also within the Vale itself. This includes the Roman period settlement investigated to the west of the Knapton generating station on the route of the pipeline corridor and access road (Lee 1997, 27–31), as well as more extensive areas of settlement recently identified by geophysical survey (Landscape Research Centre website)
- 4 10 There is however no evidence of Roman period settlement within the vicinity of the existing wellsite. A trackway of possible Iron Age or Roman date is visible on aerial photographs some 1.1km to the south (NMR1478309). Neither this feature nor any evidence of occupation of this date was identified in this area on the route of the pipeline to Knapton generating station. A beehive quern (MNY9051) has been found at Great Barugh, but the findspot is not accurately provenanced.
- 4 11 A Roman road (Wade's Causeway) has long been suggested as running south-west to north-east through Great Barugh (Hayes and Rutter 1964) and although its Roman date was doubted (Clark 1935, 65), it was nevertheless included by Margary (1967) as his route 81b (MNY8891 and MNY 8892, NMR1012169)

Medieval

- 4 12 Anglo-Saxon settlement in the area of Kirby Misperton is suggested from Domesday Book in 1086. This records two separate manors as Chirchebi (Old Norse for 'farm by the church') and Mispeton (Old English for 'farm with the medlar tree') which had probably been in existence for some time (Smith 1928, 75–76). By 1086 both manors were held by Berenger de Toni, who granted them to the abbot of St Mary's of York and who held two fees, one of two carucates six oxgangs including half the church and a mill, the other, of four carucates six oxgangs, was 'waste' but held as a manor (Page 1968, 445). In 1324, that same mill was granted by Richard de Kirkby Misperton to John de Dalton of Pickering and in the 16th century was recorded as appurtenant to the manor (ibid, 444)
- 4 13 The existing wellsite is located immediately to the west of the historic township and current parish boundary associated with the settlements of Great Barugh (MNY2476) and Little Barugh (MNY2523) to the west and Kirby Misperton to the east, and is approximately equidistant (1.5km) between Great Barugh and Kirby Misperton. Barugh is also recorded in 1086, probably deriving its name from the Old English *beorg* or hill, and which therefore probably refers to Great Barugh (Smith 1928, 74). The ditched enclosure in Great Barugh is a Scheduled Monument (NY715)

- 4 14 The lay subsidy roll of 1301 records ten names for *Kykeby Misperton cum Nonigton* (Nunnigton – with which Kirby Misperton was joined in the 12th century), ranging in value between 2s 9d and 8d (Brown 1897, 113) As it stands, the village of Kirby Misperton is a shrunken village (MNY2503), aerial photographs showing it to have contracted from its fullest extent
- 4 15 St Lawrence's Church in Kirby Misperton is a Grade II* listed building (MNY2505) which is thought to be early 14th century in date but which includes fragments of Saxon cross shaft in its fabric (MNY2506 and MNY2507), as well as a carved grave slab (MNY2508) and a sundial (MNY2509)
- 4 16 Other evidence of medieval occupation in the vicinity of Kirby Misperton is mostly recorded within or to the east of the village and includes the moated site (MNY2511) to the south-east of Kirby Misperton Hall It is recorded that this, along with the church, was held as a rectory manor by St Mary's Abbey at York Medieval pottery was recorded below a post-medieval floor in buildings south of Ducks Farm (MNY2513), while a probable building platform, banks and associated field systems of medieval date have been recorded to the east of the village (MNY25290)
- 4 17 A number of areas of former ridge and furrow cultivation have been recorded to the south of the village (MNY2514–MNY2517) and the evidence suggests that some of these at least are probably medieval in origin
- 4 18 No certain evidence of settlement of medieval date is recorded within the vicinity of the proposed wellsite extension, although some of the ridge and furrow within the area probably has medieval origins This includes that recorded to the north of Alma Farm (MNY25334) where visible earthworks survive over 13m wide and 0.6m high (NAA 2003, 6) Further ploughed-out ridge and furrow was evident during monitoring of topsoil stripping to the north-east of Alma Farm (MNY24135) but was only 5m wide and therefore probably post-medieval in date, although the only find recovered was a sherd of 15th century Hambleton-type ware (*ibid*, 8)
- 4 19 Broad ridge and furrow measuring some 10–12m wide and of probable medieval date also survives in three fields between Alma Farm and the existing access road to the wellsite, and within a field to the east of that in which the wellsite extension is proposed (Table 1 and Figure 3) Areas of former ridge and furrow cultivation which are no longer extant are also indicated, including that within the field in which the wellsite extension is proposed, but are not listed in Table 1

Post-medieval and modern

- 4.20 The principal change to the landscape in the post-medieval period within the vicinity of the proposed wellsite extension was the enclosure of the previous open field system The township of Little Barugh was enclosed about 1600 (Page 1968, 444), although whether this enclosure extended to the field immediately to the west of the existing wellsite is unclear The date of enclosure within this part of Kirby Misperton township is unknown, but pre-dates the earliest recorded mapping consulted of 1845 In the historic landscape characterisation all of the land surrounding the proposed development is dated to the post-medieval period between 1540 and 1750 (Figure 4) The existing field pattern is however in existence by the time of the tithe awards for Great and Little Barugh in 1842 and

for Kirby Misperton in 1845, and as first mapped by the Ordnance Survey in 1854 (Figure 5)

- 4 21 The location of Alma Farm to the east of the existing wellsite is occupied by a house and homestead in 1845, but this may not be the first farmstead within the area as both the field within which the wellsite extension is proposed and the field to the east are named as *Old House Close* in the tithe apportionment award (fields 122 and 123 on the 1912 Ordnance Survey map, Figure 6) This could suggest an earlier farmstead existed on or near this location, but if so then the relative size of the fields, and the record of ridge and furrow cultivation in field 124 from aerial photographs, would suggest that field 123 was the more likely location (Figure 3) Although there are slight linear undulations at this location there is no clear evidence for a former farmstead It may be of note that this field was the only pasture field in the vicinity of the existing wellsite at the time of the tithe award in 1845 (possibly suggesting the presence of building foundations), as all of the other surrounding fields were under arable cultivation at that time
- 4 22 A former pond is located to the north-west of this field from at least 1854 (Figures 5 and 6) This is no longer evident, but the site is at the base of the slope up towards the ridge on which Alma Farm is located A further pond is located immediately to the south of the access road and labelled *Brick Pond* on the Ordnance Survey map and the field named *Brick Pond Close* in the tithe apportionment of 1845
- 4 22 This latter pond is located immediately adjacent to where two archaeological features were identified during the monitoring of the construction of the existing access road These were approximately 35m north-east of the pond and consisted of a ditch 0.8m wide and a pit 0.8m in length Both contained numerous fragments of post-medieval brick, and the landowner at that time stated that a concentration of brick fragments was noted some 40m to the north after ploughing and that the pond had been dug for clay to manufacture bricks (NAA 1994, 29) These features were accordingly considered to relate to brick manufacturing in the area in the 19th century, which also included a brick and tile works (MNY2879) recorded to the north-east of Kirby Misperton
- 4 23 The existing Alma Farm is called Sugar Hill on the Ordnance Survey maps of both 1854 and 1911 (Figures 4 and 6) The field boundaries from this period have subsequently been modified over the last century (Figure 3)
- 4 24 The crash site of a 68 Squadron Blenheim Mk I (L1207) on 23 March 1941 is located some 1.7km to the south (MNY26556)

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS

Direct (physical) effects

- 5 1 Potential direct physical effects upon both recorded and previously unrecorded archaeological remains could arise from various aspects of the construction of

the proposed extension to the existing wellsite, and principally topsoil stripping, levelling, and excavation for the drilling pit and the ditch around the platform

- 5.2 The predicted effects of the development upon recorded archaeological remains would be restricted to that of the majority of the area of the proposed extension upon any subsurface remains of former ridge and furrow cultivation, and the north-eastern corner of the extension upon a former field boundary and an infilled pond
- 5.3 No effects on any evidence of ridge and furrow or other archaeological remains along the route of the existing pipeline corridor within the central section of the proposed extension are predicted, a 14m width having previously been stripped of topsoil and used for the excavation of the pipe trench, as well as trafficked by plant and machinery
- 5.4 In each case (with respect to the subsurface remains of ridge and furrow, a former field boundary and infilled pond) the effects would be upon a site of low sensitivity and is not therefore considered to be significant
- 5.5 The potential for previously unrecorded archaeological remains, finds or deposits to be encountered within the extension is considered to be low given the limited size of the area, previous disturbance within parts and the lack of any evidence for former land surfaces in the test pit excavated to the east for the existing pipeline. The evidence for a former farmstead suggests that this may have been located to the north-east, rather than in the area of the proposed extension, although features associated with this may extend into the development area
- 5.6 Although included within the planning application boundary, no improvements to the existing access road to the wellsite are proposed and consequently no effects upon archaeological remains predicted

Effects upon setting

- 5.6 No Scheduled Monuments are located within the immediate vicinity of the proposed wellsite extension. The closest such monument to the development, and only such site within the study area, is the earthworks at Manor House Farm, Great Barugh (NY715) located some 1.4km to the west. This is a ditched enclosure of uncertain, but possibly medieval, date. The monument is within a village setting to the west of a row of houses, with the village itself being on the western slopes of the hill and therefore in a distinct and separate setting from the lower ground to the east where the wellsite extension would be located. As a result of both intervening distance and built form, as well as the screening effects of the landscaping around the existing wellsite, no effects upon the setting of this monument are predicted

6.0 EVALUATION AND MITIGATION

- 6.1 On the basis of the assessment study no significant effects upon recorded archaeological remains are predicted, and the potential for significant previously

unrecorded remains to survive within the development area is considered to be low. Given the scale of the proposed wellsite extension, the nature of the predicted effects and the previous disturbance to the central part of the proposed development, no further evaluation of the area by means of either survey or trial trenching is considered necessary in advance of the determination of the planning application.

- 6.2 As a precautionary measure, however, archaeological observation, investigation and recording as necessary of the initial topsoil stripping and levelling within the area of the wellsite extension is proposed. This would enable any surviving subsurface remains of the ridge and furrow, field boundary and pond to be investigated and recorded, and the limited potential for any features or finds associated with the possible farmstead site to the north-east to be clarified.
- 6.3 A methods statement (written scheme of investigation) for this observation, investigation and recording (and subsequent report preparation) would be prepared by the relevant archaeological contractor in accordance with published guidance (English Heritage 1991, 2006, IFA 2008) and agreed in writing with North Yorkshire County Council.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The archaeological desk-based assessment established that the proposed extension to the Kirby Misperton wellsite is located within an area with limited evidence of prehistoric settlement or activity within the immediate vicinity, this instead being primarily located on the higher ground around Kirby Misperton to the east or along Costa Beck further to the north-east. No sites of Roman date are recorded within the vicinity, although a Roman road (Wade's Causeway) runs through Great Barugh to the west.
- 7.2 Settlements at both Kirby Misperton to the east and Great Barugh to the south-west were established before the Norman Conquest, although the proposed development site is located equidistant (some 1.5 km) between the two villages and immediately east of the boundary between the two townships. Evidence of settlement of medieval date is focussed on these villages, and there is no evidence for occupation sites of this date within the vicinity of the proposed extension. There is however evidence for both existing and former ridge and furrow cultivation to the east of the site, including ploughed-out ridge and furrow in the field within which the extension is proposed, at least some of which probably has medieval origins.
- 7.3 The existing field pattern was established in the post-medieval period with the enclosure of the former open fields, although this has subsequently been modified within the last century. A farmstead was established on the site of the existing Alma Farm (then called Sugar Hill) by the early 19th century, although an additional or earlier farmstead may have been located further to the west in an area adjacent to the proposed wellsite which probably dates to at least the 18th century and possibly earlier. Evidence of clay extraction for brick manufacturing is also recorded in the immediate vicinity of the proposed extension, and probably dates to the 19th century. This includes extraction pits evident as former or

existing ponds, features recorded on the existing access road to the wellsite and spreads of bnck in adjacent areas

- 7 4 The predicted effects of the construction of the proposed extension to the existing wellsite would be upon any surviving remains of former ndge and furrow cultivation, as well as upon a former field boundary and pond within the north-eastern part of the area, although part of the extension area has previously been disturbed for the construction of the existing gas pipeline to the Knapton generating station. Features associated with a possible former farmstead to the east may also extend into the area. All of these sites are considered to be of low sensitivity and no significant effects are accordingly predicted subject to a programme of archaeological observation, investigation and recording during construction. A written scheme of investigation for this proposed mitigation would be agreed in advance with North Yorkshire County Council.
- 7 5 No effects upon the setting of any nationally important monuments within the area are predicted, and specifically upon the scheduled earthworks at Great Barugh to the west.

Date July 2010
Report 38/1
Text Peter Cardwell and Mike Bishop
Illustrations Archaeological Services Durham University

REFERENCES

Published sources

Brown W (1897) *Yorkshire Lay Subsidy, Being a Fifteenth Collected 30 Edward I (1301)* Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series 21

Clark, M K (1935) *A Gazetteer of Roman Remains in East Yorkshire*

Department for Culture Media and Sport (2010) *Scheduled Monuments Identifying, Protecting, Conserving and Investigating Nationally Important Archaeological Sites Under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979*

Elgee, F (1930) *Early Man in North-East Yorkshire*

English Heritage (1991) *Management of Archaeological Projects*

English Heritage (2006) *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide*

Hayes R H (1977) *Excavations at Kirby Misperton near Pickering Transactions of the Scarborough Archaeological and Historical Society 24*

Hayes R H (1988) *Cost Beck Iron Age Site*, in P R Wilson (ed) *North-East Yorkshire Studies Archaeological Papers by Raymond Hayes* Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 28–33

Hayes R H and Rutter J G (1964) *Wade's Causeway A Roman Road in North-East Yorkshire*

Institute for Archaeologists (2008) *Standard and Guidance for an Archaeological Watching Brief*

Jarvis R A et al (1984) *Soils and Their Use in Northern England* Soils Survey of England and Wales Bulletin No 10

Lee J (1997) *The Knapton Generating Station and Gas Pipeline Excavations* Yorkshire Archaeological Journal 69, 21–38

Margary I D (1967) *Roman Roads in Britain*

Northern Archaeological Associates (1994a) *Knapton Generating Station Pipeline Construction Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy* NAA 94/6

Northern Archaeological Associates (1994b) *Pipeline Construction Phase of the Knapton Generating Station Project Post-Excavation Assessment* NAA 94/24

Northern Archaeological Associates (2003) *Pickering Wellsite Development, North Yorkshire: Earthwork Survey and Archaeological Monitoring Report* NAA 03/60

Page W (ed) (1968) *Victoria County History of the County of York North Riding Volume Two*

Smith A H (1928) *The Place-Names of the North Riding of Yorkshire*

York Archaeological Trust (1998) *Pickenng to Kirby Misperton Gas Pipeline, North Yorkshire – Report on an Archaeological Desk Top Study Revised Version 1998*
Field Report Number 7

Maps and plans

1842 *Plan of the Townships of Great and Little Barugh in the Parish of Kirby Misperton in the North Riding of the County of York* (BIHR TA 443 S)

1845 *Plan of the Township of Kirby Misperton in the North Riding of the County of York* (BIHR TA 338 M)

1854 *Ordnance Survey 1st edition 6" to 1 mile, Yorkshire sheet 107*

1911 *Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 25" to 1 mile, Yorkshire sheet 107/5*

1912 *Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 25" to 1 mile, Yorkshire sheet 107/1*

Aerial photographs (verticals)

11 09 43 MAL/4973 Frame 127