

6.4 CULTURAL HERITAGE

Introduction

- 6.4.1 This chapter describes a series of assessments that have examined the potential effects of the proposed residential development at High Eastfield (17.4ha) and Middle Deepdale (19.8ha) to the north of Eastfield, Scarborough (designated Ha1 and Ha2 respectively) upon the cultural heritage resource. In addition to residential development the proposals include associated highway works, recreational, educational and community facilities. Two areas of public open space (POS13 and POS14) to the north of Eastfield totalling 8.6ha are also included within the assessments. The Planning Application Boundary covering all elements of the proposed development extends to some 78.4ha.
- 6.4.2 The purposes of these assessments have been to establish any significant heritage assets within the study areas, to identify any predicted likely significant effects (both direct and indirect) of the proposed development upon the heritage assets and their settings and to propose appropriate mitigation measures.
- 6.4.3 The principal heritage assets which make up the historic environment include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, the local historic landscape, all other recorded archaeological remains, important palaeoenvironmental deposits and hedgerows of historic importance. The potential for previously unrecorded archaeological remains within the footprint of the proposed development has also been considered.
- 6.4.4 The cultural heritage assessment is based upon the Scoping Report (Peacock and Smith 2008) for the study. This identified that there are no World Heritage Sites, Conservation Areas, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens or Registered Battlefield Sites within the study area, and these designated heritage assets are not further discussed as part of the study. The scope of the assessment study has been agreed by the Historic Environment Service of North Yorkshire County Council as heritage advisers to Scarborough Borough Council in the response to the Scoping Report received from Scarborough Borough Council dated 17 May 2010.
- 6.4.5 The boundary of the study area upon which the detailed archaeological assessment is based includes both the footprint of the proposed development and an area extending up to 1km from the Planning Application Boundary. This study area is located entirely within the Scarborough Borough of the County of North Yorkshire. The application areas are located within the civil parish of Scarborough (the historic parishes of Cayton and Seamer). The area of the proposed developments are separated by Deep Dale and bounded to the south by the existing housing

along the northern edge of Eastfield with the village of Osgodby to the east, and currently consists largely of arable farmland. The land slopes gradually from its northern edge at a height of some 75m AOD to about 55m AOD on the southern boundary. The solid geology within the area is Middle Calcareous Grit within the northern part of the site, Oolitic limestone and sandstone towards the south with a band of Malton Oolitic and Coral Rag along the southern boundary and some Mudstone within the northern part of Deep Dale. Towards the base of Deep Dale the Lower Calcareous Grit has been eroded to expose the underlying Oxford Clay. Superficial deposits of glacial till (predominantly gravelly clay) overlie the solid geology across the majority of the development area except the north-western corner and within Deep Dale. The soils within the area are primarily fine deep loamy soils of the Burlingham 2 association.

6.4.6 The assessment of indirect effects has examined the potential effects upon the setting of all Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings within 2km of the Planning Application Boundary.

6.4.7 The chapter describes the methodology and information sources utilised in the preparation of the assessments, including the prediction methodology. The relevant planning policy context with respect to heritage assets is summarised. The baseline conditions within both the detailed and wider study areas are stated, and are based upon the results of desk studies, geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching. The potential effects of the construction of the development upon the cultural heritage resource are set out. Where appropriate, any associated mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or remedy any adverse effects are identified and the significance of the resultant residual impacts stated.

6.4.8 The assessments are illustrated in **Figures 6.4.1–6.4.6** and supporting information provided in **Appendices 6.4.1–6.4.5**.

Planning Policy Context

6.4.9 The planning context with respect to cultural heritage in relation to the development proposals includes the Yorkshire and Humber Plan, the Scarborough Borough Local Development Framework, statutory legislation and Planning Policy Statements. Relevant heritage policies in both the former North Yorkshire County Structure Plan and the Scarborough Local Plan have expired and are no longer applicable.

The Yorkshire and Humber Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2026

6.4.10 Policies relevant to cultural heritage in the May 2008 Yorkshire and Humber Plan include Policy ENV9 on the Historic Environment, which states (amongst other clauses) that the Region will

safeguard and enhance the historic environment, and ensure that the historical context informs decisions about development and regeneration.

Scarborough Borough Local Development Framework (2009)

- 6.4.11 Policies relevant to cultural heritage in the November 2009 Draft Core Strategy (Preferred Options) of the Scarborough Borough Local Development Framework include Core Policy DEV2 on New Development and the Built Environment which states (amongst other clauses) that the Borough's distinctive and historic built environment will be protected, in particular key features of local interest and key public views.

Statutory Legislation

- 6.4.12 Scheduled Monuments are designated by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport on the advice of English Heritage as selective examples of nationally important archaeological remains. Under the terms of Part I Section 2 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 it is an offence to damage, disturb or alter a Scheduled Monument either above or below ground without first obtaining permission (Scheduled Monument Consent) from the Secretary of State. This Act does not allow for the protection of the setting of Scheduled Monuments.
- 6.4.13 Section 66 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 states that the planning authority must have special regard for the desirability of preserving (*inter alia*) the setting of any Listed Building that may be affected by the grant of planning permission.
- 6.4.14 The draft Heritage Protection Bill (2008) proposes a range of amendments to current heritage legislation, one of the principal features of which would be a single list of heritage assets to be classified as 'registered heritage structures' or 'registered heritage open spaces' based upon their special historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest. Heritage asset consent would be required for works that involve demolition or destruction, or which damage or disturb the special interest of a registered heritage structure. The relevant planning authority must also have regard to registered heritage structures or open spaces in considering whether to grant planning permission for any development that may affect them or their settings, and have special regard to the desirability of preserving a registered heritage structure or open space and its setting.

Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (2010)

- 6.4.15 Relevant policies in PPS5 include Policy HE6 which states that planning authorities should require an applicant to provide a description of the significance of a heritage asset affected

(based upon historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest), and the contribution of the setting to that significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact. Where an application site includes, or is considered to have the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field evaluation. The principles for guiding determination of applications for consent relating to all heritage assets is set out in Policy HE7, and should be related to the significance of the heritage asset, while Policy HE8 states that the effect upon this significance of the heritage asset or its setting is a material consideration in determining the application.

- 6.4.16 Policy HE9 sets out the principles guiding the consideration of applications for consent relating to designated heritage assets, and emphasises the presumption in favour of conservation. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets should be exceptional, and that to designated assets of the highest significance, including scheduled monuments, grade I and II* listed buildings and grade I and II* registered park and gardens or World Heritage Sites should be wholly exceptional and require clear and convincing justification. Where there will be substantial harm or loss to the significance of a heritage asset local planning authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the harm or loss is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss. Policy HE10 states additional policy principles for development affecting the setting of a designated heritage asset, and when applications do not preserve those elements of its setting that make a positive contribution to the significance of the asset, any harm must be weighed against the wider benefits of the application. The greater the negative impact on the significance of the heritage asset, the greater the benefits that will be needed to justify approval.
- 6.4.17 Policy HE12 sets out the principles guiding the recording of information related to heritage assets. Where loss of the whole or part of the heritage asset's significance is justified, local planning authorities should require the developer to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost, using planning conditions or obligations as appropriate. Developers should publish this evidence and deposit copies with the relevant historic environment record and any archive with a local museum or other public repository.
- 6.4.18 Further guidance on the implementation of the policies in PPS5 is provided in a separate document – *PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide* – issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government, Department for Culture, Media and Sport and English Heritage. The aim of the Practice Guide is to assist local authorities and applicants in implementing PPS5 but does not constitute a

statement of government policy in itself nor seek to prescribe a single methodology or particular data sources. The Practice Guide includes information on understanding setting and its contribution to the significance of a heritage asset, as well as assessing the implications of change affecting setting, and will in due course itself be supported by further as yet unpublished detailed guidance on these factors. Further draft guidance on the setting of heritage assets has been produced by English Heritage (2010).

Methodology and Information Sources

6.4.19 The assessments have involved a comprehensive desk-based review of published and readily accessible documentary, cartographic and aerial photographic information relating to heritage assets within the study areas. The information derived from this review has been supplemented by walkover inspections of the area of the proposed development and an inspection of those sites, areas and buildings within the wider study area whose settings or character could potentially be affected by the proposals. Further specific evaluation of the proposed development area has involved both geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching.

6.4.20 The principal aims of the cultural heritage assessments have been:

- to identify known heritage assets within or in the vicinity of the proposed development
- to identify areas within the footprint of the proposed development with the potential to contain previously unrecorded archaeological remains
- to assess the physical (direct) and visual (indirect) effects of the proposed development upon Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and other archaeological remains, including upon their special historic interest, character and appearance and settings
- to establish the significance of the heritage assets affected
- to propose appropriate mitigation measures to be built into the development proposals to avoid, reduce, remedy or compensate for any potential adverse effects identified
- to assess the significance of any residual impacts (taking account of proposed mitigation).

General Approach and Information Sources

Archaeological Remains

6.4.21 The assessments of potential direct and indirect effects on archaeological remains have been based upon a review of existing available information and desk studies, supplemented by walkover inspections of the proposed development area, an inspection of those sites within the wider study area whose settings could potentially be affected by the proposals and subsequent geophysical survey and trial trenching within the Planning Application Boundary (see below). The record of archaeological sites within the vicinity of the development proposals is aided by a

number of earlier studies undertaken. In particular these include the results a number of archaeological investigations have been undertaken in the area of Osgodby to the east, including the recent desk-top assessment and archaeological investigations for the A165 Scarborough to Leberston diversion, while a number of earlier archaeological excavations have also been undertaken in the areas of both Seamer and Crossgates to the south-west.

6.4.22 The following organisations or individuals were consulted in relation to archaeological interests:

- North Yorkshire County Council (Historic Environment Service)
- English Heritage
- North Yorkshire County Records Office (NYCRO)
- Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York (BIHR)
- local studies library (Scarborough)
- Scarborough Archaeological and Historical Society

6.4.23 The following data sources were utilised for the assessment:

- North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (HER)
- National Monuments Record (NMR)
- vertical and oblique aerial photographs
- published and unpublished historical and archaeological studies
- cartographic sources (general, tithe and historic Ordnance Survey maps)
- statutory list of Scheduled Monuments
- results of geophysical surveys
- results of archaeological trial trenching

6.4.24 Site walkover inspections of the area within the proposed development boundaries were made over a period of two days in September 2006 and March 2009, supplemented by a further inspection in November 2010. These were undertaken to determine the extent of survival of any buildings and other structures, to note the location, nature, extent and condition of any additional recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites, and to identify any concentrations of surface artefacts which might indicate the presence of subsurface archaeological features. The initial inspection included all of the fields within the development boundaries which were inspected along transects some 75m apart, while the latter concentrated on the inspection of recorded sites. On both occasions almost all the fields had been recently cultivated and sown, and conditions for the recognition of surface artefacts were good. Artefacts collected were located with a hand-held GPS and flint and pottery subsequently submitted to specialists (Francis Wenban-Smith and Peter Didsbury respectively) for spot-dating. The inspection in March 2009 included visits to Scheduled Monuments within the area.

- 6.4.25 A geophysical survey totalling 67ha and covering all accessible areas of both Ha1 and Ha2 was undertaken in stages between April and October 2009 (ASWYAS 2009). On the basis of the results of the geophysical survey further evaluation of the development areas was undertaken by means of archaeological trial trenching. This extended to the excavation of 111 trenches covering an area of some 0.95ha and was undertaken in two phases between December 2009 and June 2010 (MAP 2010a; 2010b). English Heritage was consulted regarding the scale and scope of the geophysical survey and trial trenching (Cardwell 2009a; 2009b).
- 6.4.26 The assessments have been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999 and have taken into account guidance on the preparation of Environmental Statements (Department of Environment 1995) and the consultation paper on good practice and procedures for Environmental Impact Assessment (DCLG 2006) and guidance on the preparation of desk-based assessments prepared by the Institute for Archaeologists (2008).
- 6.4.27 [A draft of this chapter was submitted for informal comment to North Yorkshire Historic Environment Service and English Heritage prior to the finalisation of the assessment report.]

Listed Buildings

- 6.4.28 The principal sources of information consulted as part of the assessment of Listed Buildings were North Yorkshire County Council, Scarborough Borough Council and English Heritage. A site inspection of Listed Buildings within the study area was made in March 2009.

Prediction Methodology

- 6.4.29 Conservation Principle 5.1 states that “*decisions about change in the historic environment demand the application of expertise, experience and judgement, in a consistent, transparent process guided by public policy*” (English Heritage 2008a, 23). Guidance in understanding and establishing the significance of the heritage asset itself (in relation to evidential, historic, aesthetic and communal values) is provided in this document. The values (historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest) ascribed to the assessment of a heritage asset in *PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment* (DCLG 2010) are not identical, but as the most recent guidance, and that which reflects Government policy, are those that have been used for the purposes of the assessments undertaken.
- 6.4.30 While *PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment* and the supporting *Practice Guide* (DCLG/DCMS/EH 2010) provide guidance on establishing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of setting to that significance, there are no established comprehensive

professional or definitive criteria for predicting the likely significance of the residual effects of development proposals upon the historic environment although the draft consultation addresses a number of relevant factors with respect to the setting of heritage assets (English Heritage 2010). Therefore, a range of sources have been utilised to define the criteria that have been used in the assessment of likely significant direct effects, and those factors relevant to assessing the likely significant indirect effects of a development proposal on the setting of designated heritage assets (see **Appendix 6.4.1**).

6.4.31 Likely significant direct and indirect effects upon the historic environment have been determined by a sequence of assessments which combine (i) the sensitivity of the heritage asset based on value and/or importance (significance) as set out in **Table 6.4.1** below with (ii) the scale or magnitude of the predicted effects as set out in **Table 6.4.2** below. The interaction of sensitivity and magnitude results in the level of the predicted effects as set out in **Table 6.4.3**. The methodologies and criteria employed in these assessments for determining the sensitivity of a heritage asset and the scale or magnitude of the effects are as follows.

Sensitivity

6.4.32 The sensitivity of a heritage asset (as relevant to this assessment study) is based upon a combination of the following:

- citations for statutory designations (relating to such factors as the special historic interest and importance of Scheduled Monuments and special historic interest of Listed Buildings);
- guidance in *PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment* (DCLG 2010) and the supporting *Practice Guide* (DCLG/DCMS/EH 2010);
- criteria for assessing the national importance of monument (DCMS 2010a)
- principles of selection for Listed Buildings (DCMS 2010b);
- English Heritage Monuments Protection Programme criteria;
- guidance prepared by English Heritage in *Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for Management of the Historic Environment* (2008a) and *Seeing History in the View: A Method for Assessing Heritage Significance in Views* (2008b); and
- professional judgement.

6.4.33 The sensitivity of these resources is based upon their relative importance using the scale in **Table 6.4.1**, although it is recognised that occasionally sites can have a higher level of sensitivity in a local context, and *vice versa*.

Table 6.4.1: Definitions of cultural heritage sensitivity

Sensitivity	Level of importance	Examples of definitions
-------------	---------------------	-------------------------

Very High	International	An internationally important site e.g. World Heritage Site.
High	National (UK)	A designated asset e.g. Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Conservation Area, Registered Historic Parks and Garden or Battlefield, plus unscheduled archaeological remains or unlisted buildings worthy of such designation.
Medium	County (North Yorkshire)	Other archaeological remains and unlisted buildings considered to be of regional importance.
Low	Local (Scarborough)	Unscheduled archaeological remains or unlisted building considered to be of local importance. Sites with a local value or interest for educational or cultural appreciation. Sites that are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion at a higher grade.

6.4.34 It should be noted that when defining the sensitivity of a heritage asset, it is the asset that is the resource/receptor, not the surrounding landscape or the amenity of visitors to the asset. Therefore, the sensitivity of a heritage asset is based on the value and/or importance of the asset itself, and is not dependent on the character of the surrounding landscape or its accessibility to the public.

6.4.35 With respect to setting, it should be noted that the value and/or importance of the setting of a heritage asset may not necessarily be the same as the value and/or importance of the asset itself (it could either be higher or lower). In these assessments, the sensitivity of the setting of each heritage asset is separately graded in terms of its contribution to the significance of the asset (where applicable) and the extent to which this would be affected by the proposed development is taken into account in determining the magnitude of the effects upon setting (see next section). The methodology for the prediction of the effects upon the setting of designated heritage assets, based upon a range of relevant sources, is provided in more detail in **Appendix 6.4.1**.

Magnitude of Effects

6.4.36 Magnitude of effects (scale of change) for both direct and indirect effects has been determined by considering the predicted deviation from baseline conditions. Quantifiable assessment of magnitude has been undertaken where possible. In cases where only qualitative impact assessment is possible, magnitude has been defined as fully as possible.

6.4.37 In all cases, the various levels of predicted magnitude of effect have been defined in accordance with the definition provided in **Table 6.4.2**.

Table 6.4.2: Definitions of magnitude

Magnitude	Definition
Very substantial	Complete destruction of the heritage asset. Change or loss resulting in a complete change to the understanding and appreciation of the asset or its historical context or setting.
Substantial	Substantial destruction of the heritage asset. Change or loss resulting in a substantial change to the understanding and appreciation of the asset or its historical context or setting.
Moderate	Partial loss or alteration to the heritage asset. Change or loss resulting in a moderate change to the understanding and appreciation of the asset or its historical context or setting.
Slight	Minor loss or alteration to the heritage asset. Change or loss resulting in a slight change to the understanding and appreciation of the asset or its historical context or setting.
Negligible	Negligible change or no material change to the heritage asset. Negligible change in the ability to understand and appreciate the asset or its historical context or setting.
No change	No material change to the heritage asset. No change in the ability to understand and appreciate the asset or its historical context or setting.

Significance of Effects

6.4.38 **Table 6.4.3** shows how the interaction of magnitude and sensitivity results in the level of predicted effect and whether these may (shaded) or may not be significant in the context of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999.

Table 10.5: Significance of Effects

Sensitivity	Magnitude of effects				
	Very substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Negligible
Very high	Severe	Severe/ major	Major	Major/ moderate	Moderate
High	Severe/ major	Major	Major/ moderate	Moderate	Moderate/ minor
Medium	Major	Major/ moderate	Moderate	Moderate/ minor	Minor
Low	Major/ moderate	Moderate	Moderate/ minor	Minor	Minor/none

Key:

Significant

Not
significant

6.4.39 The identification of significant effects in this way does not necessarily mean that a development proposal is unacceptable. Any impacts predicted may be direct or indirect; secondary; cumulative; short, medium or long term; temporary or permanent; intermittent or continuous; reversible or irreversible; beneficial or adverse; and the nature of such predicted effects will determine whether such impact would be acceptable. For example, in certain cases a minor impact could be considered important in a local context and deserving of further consideration and mitigation (dependent upon factors such as amenity value). Equally, a major effect may be considered acceptable if it is short term and temporary. Professional judgement is accordingly as important at each stage of the assessment process as any qualitative methodology.

Existing Features of Cultural Heritage Interest

Listed Buildings

6.4.40 The only Listed Building within the study area is the Poachers Barn (formerly listed as Osgodby Hall), located on the north side of Osgodby Lane in Osgodby, some 150m to the east of the application boundary (**Site 16; Figure 6.4.1**). This is a late 18th century building with earlier origins, a 19th century extension and 20th century alterations. It is of six bays and two storeys, and is rendered with sash windows and a pantile roof (**Appendix 6.4.2a**). The building is listed grade II.

6.4.41 The front of the building faces eastwards towards modern residential development across the car park, and further housing is located to the south of the building. There are open views

westwards from the rear of the building, across the recently constructed Eastway Link Road from the A165 diversion (**Appendix 6.4.2b**).

6.4.42 There are no other buildings within the immediate vicinity of the study area, although other listed buildings within the wider area include the Church of St John the Baptist (Grade I) in Cayton some 1.3km to the south, and the war memorial on Oliver's Mount (Grade II) located some 2.1km to the north.

Archaeological Remains

6.4.43 Heritage assets of archaeological interest recorded within the Planning Application Boundary and up to 1km of the proposed development are listed in **Table 6.4.4** and their location indicated on **Figure 6.4.1**. Sites within the study area have been allocated an individual number (their relevant North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (NYM) number is included within **Table 6.4.1** where applicable). All sites and finds recorded as a result of the desk studies are listed, together with the principal areas of settlement and occupation activity, or most significant individual archaeological features, recorded by the geophysical survey and subsequent archaeological trial trenching (indicated on **Figures 6.4.2 and 6.4.3** within Ha1 and Ha2 respectively). Anomaly references and trial trench numbers refer to those in the respective reports on the geophysical survey (ASWYAS 2009) and trial trenching (MAP 2010a; 2010b). Individual surface finds of flint artefacts or pottery sherds collected within the Planning Application Boundary during site walkover surveys are not listed, but are referred to in the text where applicable. All sites (excluding finds) are graded in archaeological significance as of high (national), medium (county) and low (local) sensitivity in accordance with **Table 6.4.1** above. If a site is a Listed Building then its statutory grade is stated. Areas of possible ridge and furrow and former field boundaries recorded within the area of the proposed development from aerial photographic and cartographic sources have not been allocated individual site numbers, but are indicated on **Figure 6.4.1** or the historic mapping in **Figures 6.4.4 and 6.4.5**.

Table 6.4.4 Heritage assets within the 1km study area

Site	NYM	Grid Reference	Classification	Period	Grade
1	–	TA 0405 8445 TA 0426 8448 TA 0401 8436	Occupation	Neolithic	Medium
2	21882	TA 0399 8534	Round barrow	Bronze Age	High
3	9530	TA 0365 8546	Round barrow	Bronze Age	Medium
4	9532	TA 0300 8534	Round barrow	Bronze Age	Medium
5	–	TA 0355 8438	Round barrow	Bronze Age	Medium

Site	NYM	Grid Reference	Classification	Period	Grade
6	–	TA 0378 8462	Round barrow	Bronze Age	Medium Low
7	12642	TA 0473 8433	Flint arrowhead	Bronze Age	–
8	12599	TA 0301 8441	Pottery	Iron Age	–
9	12601	TA 0329 8379	Cart burial	Iron Age	–
10	–	TA 0395 8465	Settlement	Iron Age Roman	Medium
11	–	TA 0465 8475	Settlement	Roman	Medium
12	–	TA 0536 8461	Settlement	Iron Age Roman	Medium
13	12518	TA 0550 8473	Shrunken settlement (Osgodby)	Medieval	Medium
14	12520	TA 0553 8474	St Leonard's chapel	Medieval	Medium
15	23462	TA 0518 8515	Trackway	Medieval	Low
16	12522	TA 0550 8473	Osgodby Hall	18th century	LB II
17	–	TA 0371 8451	High Eastfield	18th century	Low
18	–	TA 0546 8457	Manor Farm	18th century	Low
19	–	TA 0330 8458	Musham	19th century	Low
20	–	TA 0452 8533	Middle Deepdale	19th century	Low
21	–	TA 0332 8446	Railway line	1845	Low
22	–	TA 0424 8415	Low Deepdale	19th century	Low
23	–	TA 0441 8465	Boundary bank	19th century	Low
24	–	TA 0433 8468	Sandstone quarry	19th century	Low
25	–	TA 0360 8474	Sandstone quarry	19th century	Low
26	–	TA 0358 8427	Limestone quarry	19th century	Low
27	–	TA 0351 8422	Limestone quarry Limekiln	19th century	Low
28	–	TA 0438 8450	Barn	19th century	Low
29	–	TA 0490 8455	Sheep house	19th century	Low
30	–	TA 0450 8487	Buildings	19th century	Low
31	–	TA 0447 8468	Building	19th century	Low
32	–	TA 0511 8465	Building	19th century	Low
33	–	TA 0491 8479	Pond	19th century	Low

Site	NYM	Grid Reference	Classification	Period	Grade
34	–	TA 0516 8467	Pond	19th century	Low
35	–	TA 0522 8477	Pond	19th century	Low
36	–	TA 0442 8486	Earthwork platform	Unknown	–

6.4.44 Baseline data on recorded archaeological sites and features within the Planning Application Boundary and the surrounding study area are summarised in chronological order. The initial or main description of a site or find is identified by a **bold** number within the text.

Prehistoric

6.4.45 There is no recorded evidence of Mesolithic (some 9500–4000 BC) occupation within the study area, although the area of Seamer Carr and Star Carr to the south contains evidence for a Mesolithic landscape of international importance (Schadla-Hall 1987). Settlement sites at these locations are in excess of 2.3km from the proposed development on lower lying ground on the edge of the former Lake Flixton. No evidence of occupation has been recorded on the higher ground to the north, although a large assemblage of worked flints of late Mesolithic date has recently been recovered from the area of a later barrow and kerbed cairn some 1.2km to the south-east near to Cow Leys Farm (NAA 2007a, 5).

6.4.46 A smaller assemblage of worked flint of late Mesolithic or early Neolithic date was recovered during the trial trenching within the Planning Application Boundary. The assemblage of 24 worked flints consisted of at least nine flints of Mesolithic date, including a truncated blade similar to a type found at Star Carr, together with material of uncertain and later date (MAP 2010a, 116–119; **Appendix 6.4.4**). All of the flint was recovered from residual or subsoil contexts within the eastern half of the Planning Application Boundary (Ha2), and the material suggests that the area of the proposed development was probably at least utilised for hunting and gathering activities during the Mesolithic period.

6.4.47 The earliest recorded archaeological evidence of occupation within the Planning Application Boundary dates to the Neolithic period (some 4000–2500 BC). This occupation (**Site 1**) was identified in three areas within the south-eastern part of Ha1 as a result of the trial trenching (MAP 2010b; **Appendix 6.4.5**). Concentrations of small pits or postholes and gullies were recorded in Trenches 17, 22 and 35, and similar but undated features in Trench 95. Material recovered from excavated features in Trench 22 included a significant assemblage of 102 sherds of Durrington Walls style pottery of the later Neolithic Grooved Ware tradition (some 3000–2500 BC), together with worked flint of the same period from features in Trench 22 and also Trenches 17 and 35. The majority of the assemblage of worked flint (99 of the 119 pieces) was recovered from Trench 35 and included a chisel arrowhead, fabricator and scraper. Some of the features in Trenches 22 and 35 in particular contained relatively rich environmental

evidence suggestive of a contemporaneous mixed woodland environment that included hazel. The association of the pottery, flint and environmental evidence adds to the importance of the area of occupation which is considered to be of regional or county significance. The extent of the later Neolithic occupation was not clearly defined (it was not evident within Trenches 26, 27 or 110) and therefore appears to consist of relatively concentrated evidence at specific locations dispersed throughout the south-eastern part of Ha1.

- 6.4.48 Although there is no evidence for settlement sites dating to the Bronze Age (some 2500–700 BC) within either the Planning Application Boundary or the surrounding study area, evidence of occupation during this period is attested by the recorded round barrows (burial mounds) located along the edge of the higher ground to the north of, and possibly within, the development area. Three such barrows are located within the study area, which represent the eastern extremity of an extensive group of such barrows on the edge of the Tabular Hills centred on Irton Moor to the north-west. These include a bowl barrow (**Site 2**) to the north of High Eastfield Farm and some 480m to the north of the Planning Application Boundary. This site is a Scheduled Monument (SM 35449). The barrow is located towards the summit of a gentle south-facing slope and is visible as an earthen mound up to 0.5m high which has been spread by ploughing and now measures some 30m in diameter. Although visible as a slightly stonier area with an arable field, the monument does not form a dominant feature within even its immediate surroundings (**Appendix 6.4.2c**). There are extensive views from the site to the south, south-west and south-east across the Vale of Pickering and towards the escarpment of the Yorkshire Wolds beyond.
- 6.4.49 A probable round barrow (**Site 3**) is recorded some 360m to the west as a cropmark from aerial photographs, while a further round barrow (**Site 4**) is recorded towards the western edge of the study area at Weydale Closes, which has been lowered and spread as a result of cultivation. These barrows possibly suggest a group of barrows or cemetery within this area. A further barrow, later replaced by a kerbed cairn, has recently been excavated near to Cow Leys Farm, some 1.2km to the south-east of the proposed development area, and was associated with finds of Neolithic and early Bronze Age date (NAA 2007a).
- 6.4.50 Further but uncertain evidence for Bronze Age barrows has been identified within the Planning Application Boundary. The geophysical survey (**Appendix 6.4.3**) identified two such features (RB1 and RB2) within the western part of Ha1 to the south and north of High Eastfield respectively. The former (**Site 5**) was further evaluated by Trench 87 and two relatively substantial curvilinear ditches were recorded suggesting a probable barrow some 13m in diameter although no internal features were identified. The latter (**Site 6**) was evaluated by Trench 101, which identified a shallow surrounding gully but no internal features, and the interpretation of the feature as a barrow is less certain.

6.4.51 A probable pit alignment (PA1) identified by the geophysical survey on the western boundary Ha1 may be Bronze Age or later in date. Evidence of probable Bronze Age activity within the development area is represented by two flint artefacts collected during the site walkover inspections. These are a crude scraper and a small thumbnail scraper, both of probable Bronze Age date but possibly earlier. The only other evidence of Bronze Age activity within the study area is that of a flint barbed and tanged arrowhead (**Site 7**) found in a garden at Eastfield. These artefacts, together with the other undated flint finds from the study area, collectively suggest activity of Bronze Age date contemporaneous with the round barrows recorded within the vicinity.

Iron Age and Roman

6.4.52 More extensive evidence of settlement within the study area and the immediate vicinity is recorded from the (later) Iron Age and Roman periods onwards. Earlier Iron Age activity is represented by the find of a sherd of early Iron Age pottery in Crossgates (**Site 8**), although this was associated with a sherd of Roman red ware.

6.4.53 A cart burial (**Site 9**) of later Iron Age date was recorded in a ballast pit at Seamer Station in about 1862 (Mortimer 1905, 358). The bones of a horse and the iron wheel hoops were recovered, but there is no record of a human internment.

6.4.54 A number of possible Iron Age square barrows (SB1–SB7) were identified within the Planning Application Boundary within Ha1 by the geophysical survey. Four of these anomalies were further evaluated by means of trial trenching (Trenches 29, 82, 93 and 111) but no substantive evidence for a barrow was identified at any of these locations. Most of the suggested barrows were in the proximity of probable geological features, which might be the cause for the anomalies, while the dispersed nature of the locations (rather than being concentrated in cemeteries as was common at this period), casts further doubt on the identification of the anomalies as square barrows.

6.4.55 Two areas of settlement of late Iron Age and Roman date are located within the Planning Application Boundary. That located to the north-east of High Eastfield within Ha1 (**Site 10**) extends to some 7.2ha and is located on a gentle south-facing slope (**Appendix 6.4.2d**). It was originally identified as a number of probable enclosures and associated trackways from aerial photographs (part of which were recorded as NMR TA 08 SW60). Geophysical survey of the area identified a 'ladder' settlement visible as a complex of enclosures along north to south aligned trackways (TR1 and TR2). A range of enclosures (E1–E8) of various sizes and forms, both rectilinear and more polygonal, were recorded, while the alignment and location of some of the enclosure boundaries suggested multi-phase occupation within this area (**Figure 6.4.2**). The extent of the settlement towards the southern end was less clearly defined. Numerous discrete features of probable archaeological origin were identified within the area of settlement.

At least some of the enclosures within the northern and southern part of the area appeared to be appended to linear boundary ditches (D1 and D2) which extended beyond the area of settlement.

- 6.4.56 The trial trenching within the area of settlement clarified its extent and indicated that its origins were probably in the late Iron Age. Pottery of Iron Age (and Roman) date was recovered from enclosure E2 (Trench 4) at the northern end of the settlement, while less diagnostic pottery of late Iron Age or early Roman date was recovered from a number of other enclosures. Curvilinear gullies possibly indicative of circular roundhouses were found within the northern part of Trench 7.
- 6.4.57 The majority of the enclosures proved to be defined by substantial ditches. Within the northern part of the area enclosures E1, E2 and E4 proved to be relatively devoid of internal features and evidence of occupation, and a possible kiln in this area (K1) was not substantiated. Within the central and southern part of the area the rectilinear enclosures demonstrated a more complex sequence or intercutting and recut ditches which contained internal features indicative of domestic settlement. These included evidence of rectangular timber structures defined by post-holes (such as in Trench 9) or by low stone foundation walls presumed to have supported a timber superstructure (such as in Trenches 5, 6 and 7), and associated with other features such as floors and other exterior surfaces, post-pads, pits, gullies and slots together with spreads of associated rubble. Ceramic building material suggested that at least some of the structures had tiled roofs. The trackways along either side of the settlement were substantiated, although only at one location (Trench 14) was evidence of a surviving surface recorded. Outlying features to the east were predominantly the boundaries for contemporary fields or larger enclosures (E13 and E14), although a further irregular enclosure (E12) located in the south-eastern part of Ha1 did contain further structural evidence (Trench 35).
- 6.4.58 Overall the quantity of finds recovered from the settlement area was relatively low, and indicate that the site was not of high status. There was evidence of occupation from at least the 1st century AD, but the settlement appears to have primarily been of 2nd to 4th century date. Environmental preservation within a number of contexts was good, and the cereal remains of both barley and wheat were recovered, probably being hearth waste or from cereal processing, and suggest a mixed cereal economy with both peat and wood being used for fuel. The animal bone evidence recovered is indicative of the breeding of sheep, cattle and pig for meat, and the use of horses and perhaps cattle for traction. Evidence was recovered for four perinatal or juvenile human burials within the site area.
- 6.4.59 A further area of previously unrecorded settlement (**Site 11**) extending to some 4.7ha was identified by the geophysical survey to the east of Deep Dale within Ha2 and proved to be contemporaneous with that to the west from the results of the trial trenching (**Appendix 6.4.2e**).

The alignment of the features recorded within this area differs from those to the west, with the general trend being from north-west to south-east. The archaeological features are mostly located within the north-western part of Ha2 and primarily consist of a number of enclosures (E15–E20) located to the south of a linear boundary ditch (D4) or trackway (TR3), with further but less coherent enclosures (E21–E23) located to the south.

- 6.4.60 The trial trenching within this area clarified the extent and nature of the settlement area. The northern trackway survived intermittently, and no evidence for any surfacing along its length was recovered. A number of enclosures were recorded to the south of the trackway, which as at Site 10 were in many cases defined by substantial ditches. A number of features were investigated within the interior of the various enclosures and included probable structural features such as pits and gullies within enclosure E16 (Trench 40) and curvilinear gullies and post-settings of a domestic nature within enclosure E19 (Trench 54). Evidence for probable working areas were recorded in a number of the enclosures, including a stone-lined trough in enclosure E15 probably related to iron-working (Trench 37) and two hearths probably associated with cereal processing in enclosure E17 (Trench 53). No evidence of settlement was identified to the north of the trackway or within the eastern half of Ha2.
- 6.4.61 As with the settlement within Ha1, the overall the quantity of finds recovered from the area was relatively low and indicate that the site was not of high status, and included evidence for industrial processes such as iron working. The date of occupation appears to have been between the 1st and 4th centuries, and so broadly contemporaneous with Site 10 to the west. The environmental assemblage was small, but preservation within a number of contexts was fair to good.
- 6.4.62 These two areas of predominantly Roman period, and possibly associated, settlement within the Planning Application Boundary add to those areas of contemporaneous settlement previously recorded in the vicinity such as at Site 12 to the east (see below). At least in the immediate vicinity these suggest relatively evenly spaced areas of settlement along this south-facing slope on the northern side of the Vale of Pickering. On the basis of the results of the evaluation both areas of settlement appear to be relatively low status, although that to the east in Ha1 demonstrated a relatively greater range of material culture and higher level of sophistication in relation to the form of domestic structures. This contrasted to some degree with the area of settlement within Ha2, which also contained more substantive evidence for industrial processes and which may suggest some form of differentiation between the two areas. Despite clear evidence from the trial trenching of the active degradation of substantial parts of both sites from agricultural activity, the areas of settlement have considerable potential for the recovery of important archaeological information and to be associated with other sites of similar date in the vicinity, and on this basis are considered to be of regional or county significance.

- 6.4.63 Part of a previously unrecorded late Iron Age or Romano-British settlement site (**Site 12**) was recently excavated immediately to the east of the proposed development area in advance of the construction of the Eastway Link Road from the A165 diversion. The area investigated contained up to six probable timber roundhouses represented by ring gullies, together with a number of probable ditches or linear features and pits. A number of the features, including the ring gullies, contained pottery of later Iron Age or Roman date (NAA 2007b, 3–4). The number of potential structures and their distribution suggest either an extensive settlement or several phases of occupation. No evidence was recovered during the trial trenching to suggest any substantive extension of this area of settlement westwards into Ha2 within the proposed development area.
- 6.4.64 An enclosed settlement site of later Iron Age and Roman date is also recorded further to the west (outside the study area) at Crossgates (NYM 23655). This has been identified as a result of fieldwalking, geophysical survey and partial excavation and has identified and recorded enclosures, field systems and the remains of timber round houses which was replaced by a more substantial rectangular building with stone footings dating to the 1st century AD (MAP 1999; 2001). Part of this site was subsequently protected as a Scheduled Monument (SM 34830) and is located some 1.4km to the south-west of the proposed development.
- 6.4.65 An enclosed Romano-British farmstead to the south-east of Osgodby near to Cow Leys Farm (TA 065 843), some 1.2km from the application boundary, was identified during the construction of the contractor's compound for the A165 diversion. This consisted of a roundhouse with internal pits and postholes situated within a ditched enclosure. A number of further pits and postholes, including the remains of a probable furnace, were also excavated within and to the south of the enclosure, which appears to have formed part of a wider system of enclosures extending beyond the limits of excavation (NAA 2007c).

Early Medieval

- 6.4.66 There is no direct archaeological evidence of any medieval occupation within the study area prior to the Norman Conquest, although a probable Anglo-Saxon cemetery (NYM 12637) is recorded as being found in Crossgates, some 1.3km to the south-west of the development area, during the 19th century.
- 6.4.67 Place-name evidence would suggest that the shrunken village of Osgodby (**Site 13**) has early medieval origins. This settlement is listed as *Asgozbi* in Domesday Book in 1086 (Faull and Stinson 1986, 299). The name means 'Asgaut's farm', the first element being the Old Norse name *Asgautr* (Smith 1928, 104). This could suggest an origin for the village of at least the 9th century, although no features or finds of this date have been identified during the various excavations undertaken on the site.

6.4.68 Other villages or hamlets within the area which also have pre-Norman origins include Cayton and Seamer, both place-names having Old English origins (Faull and Stinson 1986, 322, 332; Smith 1928, 102–3). Although these settlements are outwith the study area (though the historic parish of Cayton falls within the proposed development area), these villages and hamlets suggest an established pattern of occupation by this period. Deepdale is also listed in Domesday Book (Faull and Stinson 1986, 299) but the location of any settlement at this time is not clear.

Later Medieval

6.4.69 At the time of the Domesday Survey in 1086 land in both Deepdale and Osgodby was soke (land held under private jurisdiction) of the king's manor of Falsgrave, while the two manors at Cayton were held separately by the king (Page 1968, 431–2). In the 12th century the manor of Deepdale was held by Durand de Cliff and William de Cayton, who gave it to Byland Abbey. Before 1170 the monks of Rievaulx quit-claimed to Byland the house that the latter had built at Deepdale. The abbey claimed free warren in Deepdale and Cayton outside the forest by charter of 1246, and held the manor or grange of Deepdale until the Dissolution, which may have discouraged secular settlement within the vicinity (Riches 1999, 5).

6.4.70 Land at Osgodby and Cayton belonged to the fee of the Earl of Albermarle, this being held in 1235 under the Earl of Norfolk. In the early 13th century Richard, son of Osgod de Osgodby, is recorded as living at the hall (capital messuage) and made grants in Osgodby to Byland Abbey. In 1275 Thomas de Wyneter of Bridlington settled six oxgangs of land in Osgodby and Deepdale on John Bard of Butterwick. Later in the 13th century Deepdale was in the fee of Percy, and the Earls of Northumberland were afterwards mesne lords (Page 1968, 432–3).

6.4.71 By 1316 William le Latimer was joint lord of both Cayton and Osgodby, though the Bard family continued to hold land in Osgodby during the 14th century, and in 1400 William Bard held two-thirds of the manor. The manor subsequently passed to the Wyvill family in 1452. By 1509 this land in Osgodby was still held of the honour of Albermarle, while Cayton was held directly of the lords of Pickering Castle. The Wyville family continued to hold land in Osgodby until John Wyvill became captain of the rebels at Scarborough during the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1537 and this lands were confiscated (*ibid*, 433).

6.4.72 Direct evidence for settlement during the later medieval within the study area is almost exclusively derived from limited evidence of structural remains and more extensive archaeological investigations within the area of the shrunken medieval settlement of Osgodby (**Site 13**) and its immediate vicinity. The village flourished between the 12th and 14th centuries, and poll tax returns suggest a peak of between 40–50 cottages. The village then

progressively depopulated and only the manorial complex and a few farms occupied the site between the 16th and 20th centuries (Farmer 1968, 59; BHWB 2002, 11). Historic Ordnance Survey maps indicate the extent of the former village as represented by visible earthwork remains (**Figure 6.4.5**), while archaeological excavations, primarily in advance of housing developments since the mid 20th century, have provided further direct evidence for the medieval village.

- 6.4.73 Evidence of structural remains of medieval date are limited, but included the former site of the chapel of St Leonard (**Site 14**), although this was demolished in 1971. There are documentary references to a chaplain in Osgodby from 1284, and a chantry is recorded in 1535 (BHWB 2002, 7). Parts of the remains of the structure may have dated to 14th century, although the building appears to have been shortened in length and re-modelled in the 17th century.
- 6.4.74 The former chapel appears to have formed part of the complex of Osgodby Hall, which has medieval origins as the former manor house and possible structural remains dating to the 14th century (Farmer 1968, 59). The existing structure is however essentially an 18th century building, and is accordingly discussed later (Site 16).
- 6.4.75 The archaeological investigations on the site of the former medieval settlement have included areas to both the north and south of Osgodby Lane to the east of Osgodby Hall. The six earthwork enclosures investigated in the area to the north contained buildings, dwellings, later barns, pits and related features dating to between the 13th and 15th centuries, while the area to the south contained foundations, pits and other features suggesting occupation in the same period (Farmer 1968).
- 6.4.76 More recent investigations within the area of the former village have concentrated on Park Hill to the west of Osgodby Hall and Manor Farm, the name of the hill possibly being of medieval origin and suggesting an enclosure attached to the manor house. Fieldwalking suggested the potential for medieval settlement within the area to the west of Manor Farm in particular (Pearson 1991). Later geophysical survey that was undertaken in the same area in advance of the construction of the link road to the A165 diversion identified a number of anomalies probably representing banks and ditches derived from former earthworks associated with the medieval village (MNY 23380), together with anomalies suggestive of ridge and furrow cultivation (WYAS 2004), possibly associated with further areas of ridge and furrow recorded to the north-east (MNY 23464; BHWB 2002, 6). Subsequent excavation of the link road corridor in advance of construction identified the remains of six medieval buildings, defined both by stone foundations and trenches, and all aligned onto substantial sunken roadways. A number of rectangular ditched enclosures were also recognised, which appeared to pre-date the buildings and therefore suggest an expansion or re-organisation of the medieval settlement (NAA 2007b). No evidence for medieval settlement was identified within the trial trenches

excavated to the west of this area within Ha2, although evidence for possibly contemporary furrows and associated ditches were recorded to the north (Trenches 76 and 77) and had previously been identified from aerial photographic evidence.

6.4.77 The only recorded feature to the west of this area of settlement is the route of a former trackway (**Site 15**) known as “The Old Road” between Scarborough and Osgodby via Knox Lane and suggested as of medieval origin (BHWB 2002, 3). Within the area of the proposed development area this is evident as an existing farm track.

6.4.78 With the exception of these sites, the only evidence of possible activity of medieval date within the boundaries of the proposed development are areas of former ridge and furrow cultivation within Ha1 and Ha2 recorded by both the geophysical survey and in the trial trenching. Three sherds of medieval pottery were also collected during the site walkover inspections, the distribution of which suggests that they are derived from manuring of the fields during this period. Further occasional finds of medieval date, including a silver penny of Edward III (1327–1377), were also made during the trial trenching.

Post-Medieval and Modern

6.4.79 The former medieval settlement at Osgodby appears to have been reduced to no more than a group of farms by the early post-medieval period. Osgodby Hall appears to have continued to be the focus for the settlement, and was a reasonably substantial building listed as having ten hearths in 1673. The former hall was not however lived in again after 1705, the manor being in the hands of the Wyvills of Constable Burton by 1716, and the hall subsequently fell into ruin (Page 1968, 55; BHWB 2002, 9).

6.4.80 The hall (**Site 16**) was rebuilt in the 18th century. The existing structure on the site, the Poachers Barn public house, is a listed building and described in **paragraphs 6.4.40–6.4.41** above.

6.4.81 The date of the other farmsteads and areas of settlement within the study area remain uncertain, but High Eastfield (**Site 17**) appears to be indicated on Jeffreys’ map of Yorkshire, dated to 1771, although the existing house and farm complex are later in date (**Appendix 6.4.2f**).

6.4.82 The complex of buildings at Manor Farm (**Site 18**) in Osgodby appear to be indicated on Tuke’s map of Yorkshire, dated to 1787, although the remains of the former buildings on this site have recently been demolished and no structural remains survive.

- 6.4.83 Greenwood's map of Yorkshire of 1817 indicates further buildings at Musham (**Site 19**) to the west of High Eastfield, possibly in the vicinity of the former cottages at Musham Bank Gate (as mapped in 1856) which are no longer extant. The same map indicates further structures at Deep Dale to the north-east, probably the two farmsteads at Middle Deepdale and High Deepdale.
- 6.4.84 Knox's 1821 map of the area of Scarborough indicates that a farmstead at the location of Middle Deepdale (**Site 20**) is extant by this date, and also confirms the farmstead at East Field.
- 6.4.85 Although to the west of the application boundary, a notable addition to the landscape was the construction of that part of the York and Scarborough Railway (**Site 21**) between Seamer and Scarborough which was opened in 1845 (Hoole 1974, 76–9).
- 6.4.86 The first detailed cartographic evidence for the central and eastern parts of the study area are those maps dated to 1848 associated with the tithe awards for Cayton and Osgodby (that for Seamer not covering the western part of the study area), which confirms that the farmsteads within the study area at both Middle Deepdale and Manor Farm in Osgodby are extant by this date, as well as Low Deepdale (**Site 22**) to the south (**Figure 6.4.4**).
- 6.4.87 The field boundaries at this time also have some noticeable differences with those that are depicted on the subsequent first edition Ordnance survey map of 1856 and later (as illustrated from the Ordnance Survey map of 1911 on **Figure 6.4.5**), suggesting a significant change to the landscape within a relatively short period. The names of the fields recorded on the associated tithe awards do not indicate any structures or other features in addition to those listed below.
- 6.4.88 A probable boundary earthwork (**Site 23**) on the west side of Deep Dale is extant at the time of the 1848 tithe award and is evident as a bank of lynchet aligned east to west on the eastern side of the dale. It measures some 55m in length by 5m wide and up to 1m high, and has a break of slope down to the north (**Appendix 6.4.2g**). While recorded at this time, and formerly continuing as a field boundary to the east, it is possible that this boundary has earlier origins.
- 6.4.89 The first edition Ordnance Survey map of 1856 indicates what forms the basis of the existing field pattern within the study area for the first time. In the Historic Landscape Characterisation for North Yorkshire the full extent of the development area is categorised as "enclosed land". Those existing hedgerows which are evident on the 1848 tithe plan and which still are still extant today are accordingly likely to qualify as 'important' with respect to archaeology and history under the terms of The Hedgerow Regulations (DoE 1997, as amended 2002) and are indicated on **Figure 6.4.1**. The 1856 map also indicates additional agricultural and other

features not shown on earlier maps. This includes two sandstone quarries within the western half of the study area. That within Deep Dale (**Site 24**) is some 160m in length and cut into the west side of the dale. The area is listed as 'Quarry Bank' in the 1848 Cayton tithe award, but by 1893 is depicted as an 'Old Quarry'. The site and is now largely overgrown with grass and scrub, although exposed rock faces up to 40m in length and some 7m high remain visible (**Appendix 6.4.2h**). A further smaller quarry (**Site 25**) was located to the north of High Eastfield, but has subsequently been infilled and is no longer visible. Limestone quarries are also recorded on the south-western boundary of the Planning Application Boundary. The northernmost quarry (**Site 26**) was out of use by 1911, while that to the south (**Site 27**) was still in use but no longer contained a limekiln mapped in 1856.

- 6.4.90 Structures recorded within the application boundary include the site of a former barn (**Site 28**), which is also indicated on the 1848 Cayton tithe award map. The structure appears to be ruinous by 1893 and is no longer extant by 1911. No remains of the barn are now visible, with the possible exception of a slight concentration of stone in the vicinity which may have derived from the structure.
- 6.4.91 A 'sheep house' (**Site 29**) is also recorded in 1856 immediately to the south of the application boundary, but is now located to the rear of existing housing and no visible remains are evident.
- 6.4.92 A further complex of two buildings and an associated enclosure (**Site 30**), together with a possible pond, are located just north of the application boundary. No visible remains of these buildings now survive. Two further possible buildings (**Sites 31 and 32**) are also recorded within the application boundary in 1856, though the representation of these is less certain given the scale of the mapping.
- 6.4.93 The locations of a number of former ponds are recorded within the application boundary in 1856 (**Sites 33, 34 and 35**). All have not been infilled and are no longer visible, although Site 32 is evident as a slight hollow within an area of existing woodland.
- 6.4.94 The only other feature recorded is that of a probable earthwork platform (**Site 36**) recorded on the eastern side of Deep Dale just to the north of the Planning Application Boundary. This feature is first recorded on the 1911 Ordnance Survey map and is evident as a slight level platform up to 20m in length by 10m wide cut into the slope to the east with a built up area to the west. The feature has some similarities with a house platform. Given its recorded date its origins remain uncertain, although an earlier date for the feature cannot be discounted.
- 6.4.95 The area within the application boundary has remained relatively unchanged since the early 20th century, although a number of field boundaries (and particularly to the north and east of High Eastfield) have been removed and ponds infilled. Former field boundaries were identified

and recorded in some of the trial trenches (such as Trenches 72 and 73 in Ha2). The principal change to the landscape over the last half century or so has been the development of Eastfield as a settlement since Scarborough Corporation approved the scheme to build a housing estate as a satellite town to Seamer in 1948. The original name for the estate was to have been High Eastfield, but was soon shortened to Eastfield, with the first residents moving in from 1950.

Effects of the Development

Construction Effects

- 6.4.96 The direct (physical) effects of the proposed development upon archaeological remains would arise during the initial phases of construction within each area and would principally be as a result of topsoil stripping, ground reduction and levelling, the excavation of foundation, service and drainage trenches, and tree planting. These construction effects would arise not only within the areas of proposed residential housing and other buildings, but also in those areas of road and bridge construction, as well as landscaping within areas of proposed open space. These effects could therefore potentially arise throughout most of both Ha1 and Ha2. The details of the development proposals are provided in **Chapter 3**. The effects on those archaeological remains within the footprint of the proposed development are discussed individually or collectively below.
- 6.4.97 All of the identified and potential areas of Neolithic occupation (Site 1) within the south-eastern part of Ha1 would be located within an area of proposed housing. The effects of construction upon these areas of occupation are predicted to be a substantial adverse effect upon an asset of medium sensitivity and would therefore be of *major* significance.
- 6.4.98 All but the northern and north-western part of the area of Roman period settlement (Site 10) within Ha1 (including enclosure E12 to the south-east) would be located within an area of proposed housing or within the area of part of the corridor for the link road between the A64 and A165. The effects of construction upon this area of settlement are predicted to be a substantial adverse effect upon an asset of medium sensitivity and would therefore be of *major* significance.
- 6.4.99 All but the northern extent of the area of Roman period settlement (Site 11) within Ha2 would be located within an area of proposed housing or within the area of part of the corridor for the link road between the A64 and A165. The effects of construction upon this area of settlement are therefore predicted to be a substantial adverse effect upon an asset of medium sensitivity and therefore of *major* significance.

- 6.4.100 In addition to these major areas of settlement a number of larger enclosure or field boundaries that are probably contemporaneous with Sites 10 and 11 are located within areas of proposed housing, and particularly in the eastern half of Ha1. A probable contemporaneous trackway, as well as an earlier pit alignment, are located within a road corridor along the west side of the development area. The effects of construction upon these features are predicted to be a substantial adverse effect upon assets of medium to low sensitivity and therefore of *major/moderate* or *moderate* significance dependent upon their location and degree of survival.
- 6.4.101 Part of the medieval trackway (Site 15) is located in an area of proposed housing or the corridor for the link road between the A64 and A165 within the eastern part of Ha2. The effects of construction upon part of this trackway are predicted to a moderate adverse effect upon an asset of low sensitivity and therefore of *moderate/minor* significance.
- 6.4.102 Part of the boundary bank (Site 23) on the east side of Deep Dale may be located in areas of the proposed attenuation facility, pedestrian or cycle links, the bridge across Deep Dale for the link road between the A64 and A165 or landscaping. The effects of construction upon this boundary are predicted to be a moderate adverse effect upon an asset of low sensitivity and therefore of *moderate/minor* significance.
- 6.4.103 The southern part of the post-medieval quarry (Site 24) on the west side of Deep Dale would be located within the area of the bridge across the dale for the link road between the A64 and A165. The effects of construction upon this quarry are predicted to be a moderate adverse effect upon an asset of low sensitivity and therefore of *moderate/minor* significance.
- 6.4.104 The site of a post-medieval barn (Site 28) on the eastern edge of Ha1 and two other possible barns or buildings within Ha2 (Sites 31 and 32) would be located within areas of proposed housing. The effects of construction upon these sites are predicted to a substantial adverse effect upon an asset of low sensitivity and therefore of *moderate* significance.
- 6.4.105 The sites of former post-medieval ponds (Sites 33, 34 and 35) would be located within areas of proposed housing within Ha2. The effects of construction upon these sites are predicted to be a substantial adverse effect upon assets of low sensitivity and therefore of *moderate* significance.
- 6.4.106 A number of lengths of surviving hedgerows either side and within Deep Dale, and within Ha2, qualify as important would be located within areas of the attenuation facility within Deep Dale or areas of housing. The effects of construction upon these hedgerows are predicted to be a substantial or moderate adverse effect upon assets of medium to low sensitivity and therefore of *moderate/minor* significance.

- 6.4.107 The direct effects of the construction of the residential development upon the character of the historic landscape within the Planning Application Boundary (of “enclosed land” that has been subsequently altered) would be a substantial adverse impact upon an asset of low sensitivity and therefore of *moderate/minor* significance.
- 6.4.108 In addition to recorded archaeological sites and features, there is the potential for further previously unrecorded archaeological remains to survive within the boundaries of the proposed development. Given that the vast majority of the development area has been the subject of extensive geophysical survey, subsequently tested by targeted archaeological trial trenching, it is not considered that any such previously unrecorded remains would include extensive or concentrated areas of former settlement or occupation. However, there is the possibility of previously unrecorded individual features (such as ditches) or groups of smaller features (such as pits and gullies) to survive within the development area upon which the construction would have an impact. Any such features are most likely to be associated with the areas of recorded Roman period settlement and the effects of construction upon these features are predicted to be a substantial adverse effect upon assets of medium to low sensitivity and therefore of *major/moderate* or *moderate* significance dependent upon their location and degree of survival.

Post-Construction Effects

- 6.4.109 Indirect effects of the proposed development upon heritage assets after construction could arise from the effects of the proposed development upon the setting of designated heritage assets within the vicinity, which within the study area include a single Listed Building and Scheduled Monument. The overall effect of the proposed development upon the existing character of the historic landscape is also considered.

Listed Buildings

- 6.4.110 The Poachers Barn (formerly listed as Osgodby Hall) is located on the north side of Osgodby Lane in Osgodby some 150m to the east of the Planning Application Boundary. This building is described in **paragraphs 6.4.40 and 6.4.41** above. The building is considered to have a village setting, although as it is located on the edge of the modern village its landscape context would include the open ground to the west. As a result of the modern housing development to the east and the south the setting is considered to be of low to medium sensitivity.
- 6.4.111 The building faces in the opposite direction to the proposed development and views to the east, which include adjacent modern housing, would not be compromised. It is predicted that there would be at least some views of the proposed development from the rear of the property, but this does not form the principal view from the building, and the setting in this direction has already been severed from the existing landscape to the west by the construction of the

Eastway Link Road from the A165 diversion (**Appendix 6.4.2b**), along which trees have been planted. The character of the landscape to the west would however be changed, but because of the already altered setting on all sides of the building this is considered to be an adverse effect of negligible magnitude upon an asset of low to medium sensitivity and therefore of *minor* significance.

Scheduled Monuments

- 6.4.112 The scheduled bowl barrow (SM 35449) located some 480m to the north of the Planning Application Boundary is described in **paragraph 6.4.48** above. The setting of the monument is considered to be the agricultural field within which it is located as well as an area to the south, with the landscape context formed by the land along the slope further to the south extending as far as the existing settlement of Eastfield. As a result of alterations to its setting, and landscape context, this is considered to be of medium to low sensitivity. There is no public access to the monument.
- 6.4.113 Although the monument is presumed to have been constructed in a prominent position towards the top of the slope, the barrow itself no longer survives as a prominent feature as a result of degradation from agricultural activity. The proposed development would not be located within the immediate setting of the monument, but would be located within its wider landscape setting (of which there are extensive views from the barrow). The extent of this landscape setting is defined by the existing housing at Eastfield to the south, and this would be reduced as a result of the proposed development. Although this would not affect the understanding or heritage significance of the monument (in terms of its historic and archaeological interest) the appreciation of its landscape setting, and particularly views southwards over the Vale of Pickering, would be compromised. This is considered to be an adverse effect of slight magnitude upon an asset of medium to low sensitivity and therefore of *moderate/minor* significance.

Historic Landscape Character

- 6.4.114 The effect of the development upon the historic landscape character within the Planning Application Boundary would be to alter this from its existing categorisation of “enclosed land” to that of “settlement”. This change would be throughout almost all of the development site, but the area to the north would remain as “enclosed land”. The predicted effect would therefore be considered an adverse effect of moderate magnitude given that the proposed development would effectively form an extension to an existing area of residential housing (“settlement”) that defines the southern boundary of the existing, although the development would extend the area of housing development up the slope towards the horizon in views from the south and south-

west in particular. This effect would be upon an asset of low sensitivity and therefore of *moderate/minor* significance.

Mitigation

- 6.4.115 Proposals for mitigation of the predicted effects of the proposed development upon heritage assets are related to those of the direct (physical) effects upon archaeological remains within the Planning Application Boundary. No mitigation measures are proposed with respect to the indirect effects predicted upon the setting of designated heritage assets (Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments) within the vicinity of the development as none of these are predicted to be significant.
- 6.4.116 The proposed mitigation is based upon the survey of visible archaeological remains in advance of construction, as well as investigation and recording of subsurface archaeological remains by various methodologies (area excavation; strip map and record; or watching brief) within the boundaries of the proposed development dependent upon their importance and sensitivity. This mitigation strategy is in order to achieve “preservation by record” and is considered to accord with Policy HE12 of Planning Policy Statement 5 *Planning for the Historic Environment*. The proposed mitigation has also taken account of both the degradation of the archaeological features and deposits within the development area as a result of past and current agricultural activity, as well as the potential benefits arising from the mitigation proposals from the further understanding of our past. Each of the proposed mitigation methodologies is outlined below and the extent of the areas of archaeological investigation is shown on **Figure 6.4.6**.
- 6.4.117 In all cases the proposed mitigation would be undertaken in accordance with a detailed Written Scheme of Investigation setting out the scale and scope of the proposed works, including subsequent analysis, report preparation and archiving. This would be submitted to, and agreed by, the local planning authority or their archaeological advisors (North Yorkshire Historic Environment Service) and English Heritage in advance of the commencement of site works. The work would be undertaken in accordance with all relevant current professional guidance and best practice, and adequate time and resources would be made available to implement the mitigation strategy in advance of, or during, construction.

Survey

- 6.4.118 Measured topographic survey, including a photographic survey, of the visible remains of heritage assets within Deep Dale would be undertaken in advance of any construction activities. This would include the survey of the following sites:
- Site 23 (boundary bank)
 - Site 24 (sandstone quarry)

Area Excavation

6.4.119 This methodology would involve detailed area excavation of selected areas that would be undertaken in advance of construction. This would be implemented in the areas of late Iron Age and Roman period settlement (Sites 10 and 11) of regional significance located within Ha1 and Ha2 respectively. In each case the extent of the areas of detailed archaeological excavation would encompass all of the principal settlement features associated with each site within the Planning Application Boundary, and in the case of Site 10 would also include part of an overlapping area of Neolithic occupation (Site 1). The proposed area of excavation at Site 10 would extend to some 7.3ha, and that at Site 11 to some 6.7ha. A further smaller area of detailed excavation extending to some 0.6ha is proposed in the south-eastern part of Ha1 around enclosure E12 and an overlapping part of Site 1.

Strip, Map and Record

6.4.120 This methodology would involve topsoil (and subsoil) stripping to archaeological requirements of selected areas, followed by the mapping of all archaeological features exposed and the sample excavation of selected features and deposits. This would be undertaken in advance of, or during the early phases of, construction and would be implemented within Ha1 in the remaining area of Neolithic occupation (Site 1) and the area of subsidiary boundaries and enclosures (such as E13) located to the east of the Roman period settlement at Site 10, and would extend to some 6.4ha. A further area extending to some 1.4ha would be undertaken along the western boundary in the area of a probable pit alignment (PA1) and boundary ditches to the north (D2), as well as an area of some 1.8ha along the eastern edge of Ha2 in areas adjacent to recorded settlement (Sites 12 and 13).

Watching Brief

6.4.121 This methodology (a scheme of observation, investigation and recording) would involve archaeological monitoring of topsoil (and subsoil) stripping by an archaeologist(s) during the initial construction works, with adequate time allowed for the investigation and recording of any significant archaeological features or deposits identified. This would be implemented within all of the remaining areas of Ha1, Ha2 and Deep Dale that would be affected by construction works, and would extend to an area of some 42.7ha.

Significance of Effects

6.4.122 On the basis of this proposed mitigation the significance of the residual effects upon heritage assets of the development proposals (taking account of the implementation of the mitigation

measures) are set out in **Table 6.4.6** below. None of the likely effects predicted would qualify as significant with respect to the 1999 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.

Summary and Conclusions

- 6.4.123 On the basis of the results of the cultural heritage assessment studies, site inspections, geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching the predicted direct and indirect effects of the proposed development upon heritage assets have been established. No designated heritage assets of international or national significance are located within the development boundaries, although a number of prehistoric and Roman period sites of regional significance have been identified, together with a number of post-medieval and modern sites of predominantly local significance.
- 6.4.124 The earliest recorded occupation within the boundaries of the proposed development is of Neolithic date and has been identified in localised concentrations within the south-eastern part of Ha1 to the west of Deep Dale. These are considered to be of regional significance and construction would have a major direct affect upon these remains. As a result of proposed mitigation by means of archaeological investigation and recording this effect would be reduced to one of moderate adverse significance.
- 6.4.125 Two areas of extensive and complex settlement activity of late Iron Age and Roman date are located with Ha1 and Ha2 respectively. These areas of settlement are considered to be of regional significance and construction would have a major direct affect upon these remains. As a result of proposed mitigation by means of detailed archaeological area excavation this effect would be reduced to one of moderate significance. A number of outlying enclosures and boundaries of similar date would also be affected by construction, but as a result of proposed mitigation by means of archaeological investigation and recording the effects would be reduced to one of moderate/minor adverse significance.
- 6.4.126 Part of a medieval trackway, a boundary bank of unknown date, a former sandstone quarry and the sites of former buildings and ponds of post-medieval and modern date are all located within the development boundaries and considered to be of local significance. The construction of the development would have a direct affect upon all of these sites, but as a result of proposed mitigation by means of survey and archaeological investigation and recording the effects in each case would be reduced to one of minor adverse significance.
- 6.4.127 A number of hedgerows that qualify as important with respect to archaeology and history are located within the boundaries of the proposed development. The direct affect of construction on these hedgerows would be of moderate/minor significance, with a similar affect upon the overall historic landscape character.

- 6.4.128 The only designated heritage assets upon which the development might have an indirect effect upon their settings are a scheduled bowl barrow to the north of the site and the listed Poachers Barn in Osgodby to the east. As a result of alterations to the setting and landscape context of both assets the predicted effects upon their settings would be of moderate/minor and minor adverse significance respectively. The indirect effect of the development upon the overall historic landscape character within the vicinity is predicted to be of moderate/minor adverse significance.
- 6.4.129 The proposed mitigation of the predicted direct effects of construction upon recorded archaeological remains within the area of the proposed development would involve extensive archaeological survey, excavation, investigation and recording throughout most of the development area, together with subsequent report preparation. Not only would these proposals accord with current planning guidance, but would also have potential benefits arising from the further understanding of our past. As a consequence the proposed development at High Eastfield and Middle Deepdale is not considered to have any likely significant residual effects upon heritage assets.

Table 6.4.5: Overall Residual Impacts on Heritage Assets

Phase	Receptor/Resource	Heritage Asset	Sensitivity of Receptor	Magnitude of Impact	Duration of Impact	Impact Significance	
Construction	Archaeological remains	Neolithic occupation (Site 1)	Medium	Substantial	Permanent	Moderate adverse	
		Roman settlement (Site 10)	Medium	Substantial	Permanent	Moderate adverse	
		Roman settlement (Site 11)	Medium	Substantial	Permanent	Moderate adverse	
		Enclosures	Medium/low	Substantial	Permanent	Moderate/minor adverse	
		Medieval trackway (Site 15)	Low	Substantial	Permanent	Minor adverse	
		Boundary bank (Site 23)	Low	Moderate	Permanent	Minor adverse	
		Post-medieval quarry (Site 23)	Low	Moderate	Permanent	Minor adverse	
		Post-medieval structures (Sites 28, 31 and 32)	Low	Substantial	Permanent	Minor adverse	
		Post-medieval ponds (Sites 33, 34 and 35)	Low	Substantial	Permanent	Minor adverse	
		Hedgerows	Medium/low	Substantial	Permanent	Moderate/minor adverse	
		Historic landscape character		Low	Substantial	Permanent	Minor adverse
		Scheduled Monuments	Within 2km	High	No change	Permanent	Neutral
		Grade II Listed Buildings	Within 2km	High	No change	Permanent	Neutral
Post-construction	Archaeological remains	Within 1km	Various	No change	Long term reversible	Neutral	
	Historic landscape character	Within 1km	Low	Moderate	Permanent	Moderate/minor adverse	
	Scheduled Monuments	SM 35449	Medium/low	Slight	Long term reversible	Moderate/minor adverse	
	Grade II Listed Buildings	Poachers Barn	Medium/low	Negligible	Long term reversible	Minor adverse	

References

Published and Unpublished Sources

Archaeological Services WYAS (2009) *High Eastfield and Middle Deepdale, Scarborough, North Yorkshire: Geophysical Survey Report 1960*

BHWP Ltd (2002) *A165 Scarborough–Lebberston Diversion: Updated Stage 2 Cultural Heritage Desktop Assessment*

Cardwell (2009a) *High Eastfield and Middle Deepdale, Scarborough, North Yorkshire: Brief for Geophysical Survey Report 16/2*

Cardwell (2009b) *High Eastfield and Middle Deepdale, Scarborough, North Yorkshire: Revised Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Trial Trenching Report 16/4*

Department for Communities and Local Government (2006) *Environmental Impact Assessment: A Guide to Good Practice and Procedures Consultation Paper*

Department for Communities and Local Government (2010) *Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment*

Department for Communities and Local Government, Department for Culture, Media and Sport and English Heritage (2010) *PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide*

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2010a) *Scheduled Monuments*

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2010b) *Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings*

Department of Environment (1995) *Preparation of Environmental Statements for Planning Projects that Require Environmental Assessment: A Good Practice Guide*

Department of Environment (1997) *Countryside: The Hedgerow Regulations 1997 Statutory Instruments 1997 No. 1160 (as amended 2002)*

English Heritage (2008a) *Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*

English Heritage (2008b) *Seeing the History in the View: A Method for Assessing Heritage Significance in Views (Draft for Consultation)*

English Heritage (2010) *The Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance – Consultation Draft*

Farmer P G (1968) Excavations at the Deserted Medieval Village of Osgodby near Scarborough, 1956–65 *The Transactions of the Scarborough and District Archaeological Society* Volume **2** No. **11**

Faull M L and Stinson M (eds) (1986) *Domesday Book: Yorkshire*

Hoole K (1974) *A Regional History of the Railways of Great Britain: Volume IV The North East*

Institute for Archaeologists (2008) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment*

MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd (1999) *Crossgates Farm: Phases II & III, Seamer, North Yorkshire: Assessment Report*

MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd (2001) *Crossgates Phase III, Crab Lane, Seamer, North Yorkshire: Archaeological Excavations 2001*

MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd (2010a) *Areas B and D (Ha2) High Eastfield and Middle Deepdale, Scarborough, North Yorkshire: Archaeological Evaluation by Trial Trenching*

MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd (2010b) *Areas A and C (Ha1) High Eastfield and Middle Deepdale, Scarborough, North Yorkshire: Archaeological Evaluation by Trial Trenching*

Mortimer J R (1905) *Forty Years Researches in British and Saxon Burial Mounds of East Yorkshire*

Northern Archaeological Associates (2007a) *Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme: Fieldwork Area A Interim Report NAA 07/68*

Northern Archaeological Associates (2007b) *Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme: Fieldwork Area B and Former Play Area Interim Report NAA 07/69*

Northern Archaeological Associates (2007c) *Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme: Archaeological Monitoring and Trial Trenching Interim Report NAA 07/70*

Page W (ed) (1968) *The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Yorkshire North Riding* Volume **II**

Pearson T (1991) *Fieldwork at Manor Farm, Osgodby near Scarborough: November– December 1990*
Scarborough Archaeological and Historical Society Interim Report **12**

Peacock and Smith (2008) *An Environmental Assessment of Proposals for Residential Development, Highway Works and Associated Recreational, Educational and Community Facilities at High Eastfield and Middle Deepdale Farms, Eastfield, Scarborough: Scoping Report*

Riches C C (1999) *A Short History of Cayton*

Schadla-Hall R T (1987) Recent Investigation of the Early Mesolithic landscape and settlement in the Vale of Pickering, North Yorkshire, in P Rowley-Conwy, M Zvelebil and H P Blankholm
Mesolithic North-West Europe: Recent Trends, 46–54

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

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service (2004) *A165 Scarborough to Leubberston Diversion, North Yorkshire: Geophysical Survey Report 1208*

Maps and Plans

- 1771 The County of York surveyed and engraved by Thomas Jeffreys (sheet ix)
- 1787 Map of the County of York by John Tuke
- 1817 Map of the County of York by C Greenwood
- 1821 A map of the Country around Scarborough in the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire from Actual Trigonometrical Survey with Topographical Geological and Antiquarian Descriptions by Robert Knox
- 1848 Plan of the Parish of Cayton in the North Riding of the County of York by W Hodgson East Ayton 1848 (BIHR TA 636 M)
- 1848 Plan of the Township of Osgodby in the Parish of Cayton in the North Riding of the County of York by W Hodgson East Ayton 1848 (BIHR TA 106 S)
- 1854 Ordnance Survey 6" to mile map – Yorkshire Sheet 94
- 1893 Ordnance Survey 25" to mile map – Yorkshire sheet 94/5

1911 Ordnance Survey 25" to mile map – Yorkshire sheet 94/5

1928 Ordnance Survey 25" to mile map – Yorkshire sheet 94/5

1938 Ordnance Survey 25" to mile map – Yorkshire sheet 94/5

Aerial Photographs (Verticals)

17.11.47 RAF/CPE/UK/2396 3233

13.07.72 MAL/60 72 0

04.09.80 OS/80135 032

06.05.88 OS/88066 227 and 250

Aerial Photographs (Obliques)

20.11.69 CUC BAB 74

28.07.78 CUC CHD 40

29.07.94 NMR 12568/71

18.07.96 NMR 12872/37

11.08.00 NMR 1750/08