

HAMBLETON D.C

3rd
End Jan
11-3-7

REC'D 14 DEC 2007

ES	RES	CX
		ACK

SLR

NYCC HER	
SNY	18930
ENY	6161
CNY	
Parish	2087
Rec'd	14/12/07

CULTURAL HERITAGE
STATEMENT

Planning Application & Environmental Statement for a Borrow Pit

Land at Upsland, near Sutton Howgrave, North Yorkshire



November 2007
SLR Ref 403-0027-00197/002



solutions for today's environment

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

WOODNER	
Q	18980
6	6'6'
C.F.	
Parish	2007
Rec'd	14/12/07

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

14.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE

Contents

Introduction	1
Methodology	1
Relevant Legislation, Policy and Guidance	2
Legislation	2
Government Policy and Guidance	2
North Yorkshire County Council Policy and Guidance	3
Desk-Based Assessment	5
Designated Cultural Heritage Features	5
Non-designated Cultural Heritage Features	6
Archaeological Background	7
Documentary and Cartographic Evidence	13
References	21
Aerial Photography	21
Site Visit and Visibility	22
Assessment of Effects and Mitigation	22
Effects upon statutorily designated features	22
Effects upon other Features of Cultural Heritage Interest	24
Proposed Mitigation	24
Evaluation of Predicted Effects	25
Conclusion	31

NYCC HER	
SNY	18930
E.V	6161
ONY	
Perish	2087
Rec'd	14/12/07

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

Introduction

- 14 1 Cultural heritage is represented by a wide range of features that result from past human use of the landscape. These include historic structures, many still in use, above ground and buried archaeological monuments and remains of all periods, artefacts of anthropological origin, and deposits and sediments that can help us recreate past environments. In its broadest form cultural heritage is represented by the landscape and townscape itself.
- 14 2 This section of the ES, presents the findings of a cultural heritage desk-based assessment undertaken as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment of a site at Upsland, in the parish of Kirklington Cum Upsland in North Yorkshire. It has been prepared by Andrew Josephs, Environmental Consultant,
- 14 3 The proposed development, which has been described in Section 5 above, would involve the extraction of sand and gravel from around 27ha of land, processing of the excavated mineral and subsequent dispatch to a highways contract for the upgrade of a section of the A1. The site would be worked on a phase by phase basis, minimising the extent of the workings exposed, and progressively restoring the workings as the quarry expands. The proposed development is anticipated to last around three years, with an output of around 330,000tpa. The proposals would also incorporate the progressive restoration of the quarry workings to a combination of agriculture and wetland habitats.
- 14 4 The approximate centre of the proposed development is at NGR SE 305 804, its location shown on Figure 1 (refer to Appendix 14/1).

Methodology

- 14 5 The proposed development was the subject of a desk-based assessment, geophysical survey, field walking and trial-trenching evaluation in 1992, prior to a planning application by Pioneer Aggregates in 1994 (subsequently withdrawn). The archaeological work was carried out by Northern Archaeological Associates¹. This report has provided important information in respect of the archaeological potential of the application site.
- 14 6 Research has included collation of available information from the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (NYCC HER) and online databases, including the National Monuments Record, HEIRNET, PASTSCAPE and MAGIC. There has been significant research and field investigation carried out in the vicinity of the Thornborough Henges (approximately 1.25km south-west of the proposed development), and in connection with ongoing and proposed mineral extraction at Tarmac's Nosterfield Quarry. Much of this has been published on the web.
- 14 7 (www.archaeologicalplanningconsultancy.co.uk/mga/projects) and has been assessed as part of this EIA.

¹ *Archaeological Assessment and Field Evaluation of a Proposed Gravel Quarry at Upsland, Sutton Howgrave for Pioneer Aggregates (UK) Ltd. Northern Archaeological Associates. NAA 93/8. Revised report April 1994.*

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

- 14 8 Research was also undertaken by Anthony Breen of historical documents and maps at the North Yorkshire County Archives. Searches were made of the on-line index to the National Archives and of all collections held in local record repositories listed on the Access to Archives website.
- 14 9 A visit to the proposed development area (PDA) and its environs was carried out on December 19th 2006.
- 14 10 The aim of this section of the ES is to compile information that will assist in determining the cultural heritage implications of the proposed development, inform whether further evaluation works is required and allow the scope of any required mitigation to be set.
- 14 11 This section considers both direct and indirect effects upon cultural heritage. Direct effects would normally occur within the area of ground disturbance that precedes mineral extraction or the creation of infrastructure, and areas to be landscaped and managed as part of the overall scheme. Indirect effects can occur as a result of significant changes to the setting of an historic landscape or feature, whether permanent or temporary. This is particularly relevant to designated features of cultural heritage importance, such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. After consideration of topography, a study area of 2km from the PDA has been selected as an appropriate zone within which an effect could occur.

Relevant Legislation, Policy and Guidance

Legislation

- 14 12 The importance of cultural heritage is clearly recognised at both national and local levels. Certain features that are deemed to be of particular importance are given legal protection through the *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979* (Scheduled Monuments), the *Town and Country Planning Act 1990* (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) and the *Hedgerows Regulations 1997* (Hedgerows of Historic Importance).

Government Policy and Guidance

- 14 13 Further advice on how cultural heritage should be treated in the planning process is given in Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG) 15 and 16. PPG 15² (1994) deals with the historic environment, including listed buildings, conservation areas and other components of the historic environment whilst PPG 16 covers archaeology.
- 14 14 The introduction to PPG15 sets out the Government's view of cultural heritage.

"It is fundamental to the Government's policies for environmental stewardship that there should be effective protection for all aspects of the

² Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG) 15, 1994, *Planning and the Historic Environment*

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

historic environment The physical survivals of our past are to be valued and protected for their own sake, as a central part of our cultural heritage and our sense of national identity They are an irreplaceable record which contributes, through formal education and in many other ways, to our understanding of both the present and the past Their presence adds to the quality of our lives, by enhancing the familiar and cherished local scene and sustaining the sense of local distinctiveness which is so important an aspect of the character and appearance of our towns, villages and countryside The historic environment is also of immense importance for leisure and recreation "

- 14 15 PPG 16³ (1990) describes archaeological remains as a 'finite and non-renewable resource' that should not be 'thoughtlessly or needlessly destroyed' It describes preservation in situ of archaeological remains as being the most favourable outcome where they might be affected by development However, where this is not possible then a programme of archaeological excavation and recording in advance of development may be an acceptable alternative for features of less than national significance

North Yorkshire County Council Policy and Guidance

- 14 16 North Yorkshire County Council policy on cultural heritage in relation to development is set out in the Minerals Local Plan 1997 This is summarised below

Heritage

- 4 2 11 Government guidance on archaeology and the historic environment is set out in PPG15 "Planning and the Historic Environment" 1994 and PPG16 "Archaeology and Planning" 1990 It stresses the finite and non-renewable nature of the resource, in many cases being highly fragile and vulnerable to destruction Mineral extraction can present a particular threat to archaeological sites and historic landscapes, including the industrial archaeology associated with old quarry sites Each case will be judged on its merits, weighing the intrinsic importance of the known remains and the outcome of any site evaluation against the need for the development
- 4 2 12 Where the County Council decides that preservation in situ of archaeological remains is not justified in the circumstances of the case and that development resulting in the destruction of the archaeological remains should proceed, it will satisfy itself, before granting planning permission, that the developer has made appropriate provision for the excavation and recording of the remains Such excavation and recording should be earned out before development commences and work to a specific project brief Commitment to such an arrangement may need to be incorporated in a Planning Obligation

³ Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG) 16, 1990, *Archaeology and Planning*

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

4.2.13 Prior to the submission of an application the developer should consult the County Sites and Monuments Record to ascertain the archaeological potential of a site. This Record is the key database of known archaeological information on sites of national, regional and local importance, whether scheduled or not. Increasingly such sites are identified in District-wide local plans.

Policy 4/7 Archaeological Assessment

The Mineral Planning Authority will require applications for mining operations and the associated depositing of mineral waste affecting sites of known or potential archaeological importance to be accompanied by an archaeological field evaluation including a proposed mitigation strategy.

Policy 4/8 Archaeological Sites

Proposals for mining operations and the associated depositing of mineral waste which would have an unacceptable effect on nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings, will not be permitted. The Mineral Planning Authority will seek to preserve, in-situ or by record, other sites of regional, county or local importance, as appropriate to their archaeological interest, in making decisions on planning applications.

4.2.14 The historic environment also includes listed buildings, conservation areas, parks and gardens, battlefields and the wider historic landscape. Government guidance requires effective protection for all aspects of the historic environment which, by its nature, is irreplaceable. However, it is recognised that it cannot be preserved unchanged in all circumstances. Those features which are considered to be nationally or regionally important are identified and classified as such, for example, through scheduling ancient monuments, the listing of historic buildings and the designation of conservation areas. English Heritage has compiled a register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest and a register of Historic Battlefields in order to assist decision making.

Policy 4/9 Other Heritage Features

Proposals for mining operations and the associated depositing of mineral waste will be permitted only where there would not be an unacceptable effect on listed buildings, registered parks, gardens and historic battlefields or conservation areas, including their settings.

Desk-Based Assessment

Designated Cultural Heritage Features

Scheduled Monuments

14 17 Six scheduled monuments (SMs) lie within 2km of the proposed site. The location and approximate extent of these is shown on Figure 2 and summarised in Table 14/1 below.

Table 14/1
Scheduled Monuments within 2km of PDA

Description	Scheduled Monument Ref	Distance from PDA boundary (m) at nearest point
Earth circles, cursus, pit alignments and burial sites near Nosterfield and Thornborough, including Centre Hill round barrow	SMNY36a	1700
	SMNY36b	1100
	SMNY36c	1500
Moated site at Upland Farm	SM28251	100
Three round barrows at Three Hills, 500m NE of Camp House	SM29508	1400
Round barrow 425m NW of Rushwood Hall	SM29509	1600
Round barrow on Stapely Hill, 250m NE of Comer Lodge	SM29526	1900
Medieval settlement, lordly residence, post-medieval gardens and walls immediately S of Howgrave Hall	SM31361	750

Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas

14 18 Fifteen listed buildings are situated within 2km of the PDA. The locations are shown on Figure 3. Twelve lie within the village of Kirklington, approximately 1km north-east of the PDA. All are Grade II listed, except for The Church of St Michael which is Grade I and Kirklington Hall, Grade II*. The village of Kirklington is also a Conservation Area and its extent is shown on Figure 4.

14 19 Howgrave Old Hall and the gatepiers and wall to its north are Grade II listed. These are the nearest listed structures, approximately 750m to the south-east of the PDA.

Other Designated Cultural Heritage Features

14 20 There are no World Heritage Sites, historic parks and gardens or historic battlefields within 2km of the PDA.

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

Non-designated Cultural Heritage Features

- 14 21 A search of the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (NYHER) and online databases was undertaken of a search area of 2km in order to obtain information on cultural heritage sites and interventions (such as archaeological fieldwork) located within the PDA and the surrounding area. This was chosen as being an appropriate area of search in order to recover information that can place the PDA into its local context, as well as helping to identify the potential for previously unrecorded features within the PDA. We are grateful to Nick Boldron of the NYHER for his assistance.
- 14 22 The search produced 73 records of interventions (or events) and 59 monuments and finds. The locations of these are shown on Figures 5 and 6. The information was used to assist in the preparation of the section 2.3. Records that lie within the PDA and 500m of its boundary are summarised below in Table 14/2.

Table 14/2

Non-designated cultural heritage features and events within the PDA and 500m of its boundary

Description	NYCC HER Ref	Distance from PDA (m)
<u>Within the PDA</u>		
Cropmark complex tested by evaluation consisting of an Iron Age/Romano-British field system and possible settlement site overlain by a later medieval field system. Formerly SMR 8458	M20199	
Cropmark complex not detected by trial trenching, and interpreted as partially or completely destroyed by ploughing. Formerly SMR 8460	M20202	
Cropmark of possible building not detected by trial trenching or geophysical survey, but seen on vertical aerial photographs, and thought to have been partially or completely destroyed by ploughing	M24083	
Northern Archaeological Associates desk based assessment of proposed quarry, 1992	E2625	
Geophysical Surveys of Bradford magnetometry survey of proposed quarry, 1992	E2626	
Northern Archaeological Associates fieldwalking evaluation of proposed quarry, 1992	E2627	
Northern Archaeological Associates trial trench evaluation of proposed quarry, 1992	E2628	
<u>Within 500m of PDA boundary</u>		
Upsland Farm moated site comprising an infilled ditch surrounding a raised central platform and located on gently undulating land. The site is an unusual elliptical shape with the moat ditch enclosing a platform	M19887	160
Possible henge at Duskhills, described as "very doubtful" by NYCC. APs show evidence for pond and wetland in rough grass which has been intensively farmed for arable in recent years	M19919	230
Cropmark evidence for Possible Enclosure north of The Belt	M19920	400

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

Description	NYCC HER Ref	Distance from PDA (m)
Trackway of unknown date	M20204	380
Trackway of unknown date	M20205	460
Ditch of unknown date	M20206	400
Trackway of unknown date	M20208	425
Enclosure system of unknown date	M20219	100
The remains of a possible Bronze Age round barrow east of Thornborough village are visible as cropmarks on air photographs (1999) They comprise a circular ditch with a diameter of circa 9m, there is a gap in the ditch circuit to the north-east Inside the ditch there is a pit -possibly a burial	M24036	400
A 48m section of possible pit alignment of Prehistoric or Roman date is visible as faint cropmarks on air photographs east of Thornborough Village (1999) A possible further section of the alignment, circa 16m in length, is visible just to the north	M24037	400
Former field boundaries recorded on 1 st edition Ordnance Survey and seen on aerial photographs	M24084	20
Field Archaeology Specialists Ltd carried out a Resistivity Survey as part of a phased evaluation of the proposed Ladybridge Farm quarry extension, 2004	E3178	440
Field Archaeology Specialists Ltd carried out a Fieldwalking Survey as part of a phased evaluation of the proposed Ladybridge Farm quarry extension 2003	E3179	500
Field Archaeology Specialists Ltd carried out a Fieldwalking Survey as part of a phased evaluation of the proposed Ladybridge Farm quarry extension 2004	E3180	240
Field Archaeology Specialists Ltd carried out an Augment Survey as part of a phased evaluation of the proposed Ladybridge Farm quarry extension 2003	E3181	500
Field Archaeology Specialists Ltd carried out a Topographic Survey as part of a phased evaluation of the proposed Ladybridge Farm quarry extension 2004	E3183	500
Field Archaeology Specialists Ltd carried out Trial Trenching as part of a phased evaluation of the proposed Ladybridge Farm quarry extension 2004	E3184	380
Metal Detector Rally at Thornborough, September 2006	E3368	160

Archaeological Background

Previous archaeological investigations within the PDA

- 14 23 Northern Archaeological Associates (NAA) carried out desk-based assessment, geophysical survey, field walking and trial-trenching evaluation in advance of a planning application by Pioneer Aggregates (subsequently withdrawn in 1994) (cf Footnote 1) A copy of the report is held by the NYHER
- 14 24 Two cropmark sites (M20199 and M20202) are recorded within the PDA and these were the focus of each phase of the evaluation Further trenches were placed across a possible building identified on aerial photographs 100m north of M20199, and within the south-eastern part of the Moat at Upland Farm to check for palaeo-environmental potential

- 14 25 Cropmark site M20202 could not be substantiated by the evaluation, and the conclusion of NAA was that it *'had almost certainly been partially or completely ploughed away'*
- 14 26 The cropmark site within the central and south-western part of the PDA (M20199) was confirmed through both geophysical survey and trial-trenching. It consisted of *'an extensive series of ditches, trackways and other features'* and appears to represent *'a late prehistoric/Romano-British settlement with an associated field system which was subsequently overlain by later (medieval) ditches. No dateable finds were recovered'* (NAA)
- 14 27 NAA concluded that *'the limited knowledge regarding prehistoric/Romano-British settlement in the Vale [of York] means that any site which contains a range of settlement features, as is the case here, must be considered to be of regional importance'*

The archaeology of the vicinity of the PDA

- 14 28 A lies within a landscape of gently rolling hills between the river valleys of the Swale and the Ure. 1.5km to the west, within the Thornborough Plain are the scheduled remains of three henges and associated monuments including a cursus, pit alignments and barrows (SM NY36a,b and e) and two further barrows (SM 29508, 29509)
- 14 29 This nationally important complex of monuments has attracted considerable attention in recent years in connection with Tarmac Limited's application to extend their Nosterfield Quarry into an area known as Ladybndge Farm
- 14 30 A further possible pit alignment of prehistoric or Roman date (M24037), and a possible Bronze Age barrow (M24036) have been identified on aerial photographs, to the east of Thornborough village (400m south-west of the PDA)

Ladybndge Farm

- 14 31 A thorough desk-based assessment and field evaluation has been undertaken by Mike Griffiths and Associates and Field Archaeology Specialists Ltd (E3178-3184, excluding 3182 lie within 500m of the PDA). The results of this work have been summarised and published on the web⁴ and comprised a series of phases, including aerial photographic assessment, fieldwalking, geophysical and topographic survey, auger survey, hand excavated sieved test pits and machine excavated trenches. These were located to provide general coverage across the site in addition to targeting potential anomalies recorded during the geophysical survey, fieldwalking and desk based assessment.

⁴ M. Griffiths & S. Timms 2005 *An Archaeological Assessment of Nosterfield, Ladybndge and The Thornborough Plain* www.archaeologicalplanningconsultancy.co.uk/mga/projects

Garner-Lahire, J. Spall, C. & Toop, N. 2005 *Archaeological Evaluation, Ladybndge Farm, Nosterfield, North Yorkshire* (FAS)

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

14 32 At its nearest point, the Ladybridge Farm evaluation lies approximately 250m west of the PDA. The findings of the work undertaken there provide an indicator to the potential of the PDA, although it is important to note that the Ladybridge Farm site sits within the Thornborough Plain, whereas the PDA is just to the east within an undulating landscape.

14 33 The results may be summarised thus:

- Fieldwalking recovered a total of 206 pieces of struck flint or chert over an area of 37.7ha, although the assemblage was largely undiagnostic of date and function.
- Topographic and Auger Survey located the eastern edge of a large infilled lake previously recorded within Nosterfield Quarry to the west. A large depression in the centre of the site was tested by auguring, the aim of which was to map subsurface deposits and identify areas of palaeo-environmental potential. Organic deposits were identified in a number of depressions and sink holes, and the presence of peat deposits with high palaeo-environmental potential were located in the east of the site.
- Geophysical Survey recorded a total of 46 anomalies, of which, upon trenching, only 2 were identified as archaeological features and a further 7 proved to be sink holes. A further 46 features that were recorded during the trenching did not appear as anomalies in the results of the geophysical survey. The difficulty in identifying archaeological features is attributed to the drift geology.
- Test Pitting results reflected the general distribution of material that had been recorded in the fieldwalking.
- Evaluation Trenching was designed to target areas of archaeological potential which had been identified in the fieldwalking and geophysical survey and to characterise, in general, the archaeological deposits within Ladybridge Farm. A total of only 55 potential features were identified, of which approximately half were non-archaeological. Features were of shallow depth indicating truncation ploughing.

14 34 The conclusions to the evaluation are reported in Griffiths and Timms (2005) thus:

“The evaluation at Ladybridge Farm recorded a low density, dispersed and highly truncated pattern of archaeological features on the site. The features lacked environmental potential and exhibited poor preservation of faunal remains. The majority of flint was undiagnostic and surface scatters did not appear to correlate with in situ archaeological features. Apart from general statements regarding presence and absence very little of substance can be said of the date and character of activity on the site.”

In the context of the Desk Based Assessment, the evaluation did not support the levels of significance which were originally ascribed to the flint scatter recorded by the Vale of Mowbray Neolithic Landscape Project (DBA 70) or the cropmarks visible in the aerial photographs (DBA 43 and DBA 61).

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

Indeed none of the linear cropmarks were identified as archaeological features on site and it is suggested that they may have been destroyed by ploughing

The most recent transcription of aerial photographs undertaken by WYAS shows that three fields within the Ladybridge Farm proposal contained ridge and furrow earthworks in the immediate post Second World War period. Both the topographic survey and evaluation trenching failed to identify any trace of these features anywhere on the site

Evidence for the severe truncation of archaeological deposits was also evident in the pits recorded during the trenching. From this it is clear that between 0.3m and 0.5m of archaeological deposits have already been destroyed. This has removed any evidence for occupation surfaces, buried soils or shallow archaeological features which could relate to structures or boundaries. On average it has also removed an estimated 65% of the features that survive. The potential of archaeological features that have survived on the site has also been severely limited in this way

The presence of a number of sink holes does provide a valuable opportunity to sample and investigate these features with a view to obtaining important palaeo-environmental information. The evaluation succeeded in identifying sink holes and depressions on the site which contained well preserved organic deposits. These deposits could be highly significant if dateable sequences of sediment deposition survive. Sampling and analysis of these features could provide further evidence for the vegetational history of the area "

Thornborough Plain

14 35 Other work in the vicinity of the PDA has been undertaken by The Vale of Mowbray Neolithic Landscape Project, established by Dr Jan Harding in 1994. A programme of fieldwalking, geophysical survey, trial-trenching and excavation was carried out over a five year period in and around the Thornborough Henges as part of a research based landscape study of the area.

14 36 A second phase of field-based investigation on the Thornborough Plain, funded by English Heritage using Aggregate Sustainability Levy Funding, was undertaken by Dr Harding and Newcastle University in 2003. Part of the project's aim was to produce an archaeological resource guide for the area and combine the results of earlier investigations into a single publication.

14 37 Dr Harding has summarised the history of the Thornborough complex of monuments thus:

'The history of the Thornborough landscape began after the retreat of the glaciers around 12,000 years ago. Transient Mesolithic groups moved across the landscape, as evidenced by scattered flint artefacts. Its first intensive use occurred during the Neolithic period, when the creation of clearances within the heavy deciduous woodland provided space for settlement, agriculture and the building of large ceremonial structures such

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

*as a fourth millennium BC cursus monument That this landscape was of particular importance and significance is demonstrated by its subsequent development over the next 1000 years into one of the largest and most impressive ceremonial centres in the British Isles At the height of its use the three massive, closely-spaced henges formed a religious focus for a population living as far afield as the central Pennines and the chalklands of the Yorkshire Wolds By the Iron Age the monument complex was no longer in use*⁵

- 14 38 He notes that the henges are not isolated examples but part of a 'sacred landscape' of Neolithic and early Bronze Age monuments that extends for 12km southwards along River Ure valley

'Some 5 kilometres to the south-east of Thornborough, and on exactly the same alignment, is the single henge of Nunwick (Dymond 1964) Approximately 4 kilometres to the south is a further cluster of Neolithic and early Bronze Age sites, including the henges of Hutton Moor and Cana Barn, twenty round barrows, a single and a double pit alignment, and an elongated enclosure The deliberate siting of the two henges on either side of a pronounced ridge, at the top of which is the elongated enclosure, suggests that, like Thornborough, they functioned as a single complex Further south-east are over 100 known pits, excavated in 1994 and 1995 as part of the A1(M) widening (Tavener 1996) These form distinct concentrations and are associated with the remains of extensive Neolithic settlement They were also associated with two double pit alignments Finally, the three standing stones of the Devil's Arrows lie just to the south of the River Ure (Burl 1991) These massive monoliths share the same approximate alignment of the three henges at Thornborough '

- 14 39 Research has also been earned out on the wider landscape of the Ure and Swale valleys⁶

- 14 40 The aim of the research was

'To collate and interpret, for the first time, all the available Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age data from the Ure-Swale Catchment and present it in a coherent and usable format Its contents will assist in the management and development of the study area, and provide focus and direction for future research themes and priorities'

- 14 41 The authors note that 'most of the known monuments in the Ure-Swale Catchment are being destroyed at an alarming rate by modern agricultural practices' They call for a more systematic approach to the management of the Ure-Swale Catchment

⁵ Harding, J *The neolithic and bronze age monument complex of Thornborough, North Yorkshire, and its landscape context* Desk top assessment http://thornborough.ncl.ac.uk/desktop_assessment/desktop_contents.htm

⁶ Harding, J and Johnson, B *Thornborough prehistoric project, North Yorkshire The mesolithic, neolithic and bronze age archaeology of the Ure-Swale catchment* http://thornborough.ncl.ac.uk/reports/pubs_reports_ureswale/ureswale_assess.htm

'The area contains one of the largest concentrations of Neolithic and Bronze Age monuments in the British Isles, yet is under increasing threat from deep-ploughing, road and house building, and most notably, mineral extraction. A systematic fieldwork programme, when combined with the current state of knowledge and understanding, could result in the better management of these threats by characterising this nationally important landscape into areas of high, medium and low archaeological potential. Too much archaeology has been destroyed in the post-war period for the current situation to continue.'

- 14 42 In the context of the PDA, there is no known archaeology that dates to the Neolithic and Bronze Age periods

Iron Age, Roman and later landscape

- 14 43 Drawing on work earned out over 12 years at Nosterfield Quarry and Ladybndge Farm, Giffiths and Timms (2005) conclude that the archaeological evidence indicates an increased level of activity across the Thornborough landscape in the Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age period, and this has been taken to indicate that the henges date to this period

'By the Iron Age the Thornborough Henges appear to have lost their ritual significance and excavations in the western half of Nosterfield Quarry have recorded the only archaeological evidence for this period. The palaeo-environmental evidence suggests that the Early Iron Age was characterised by thick woodland which began to decline with increased rainfall and a fall in temperature. By the 5th century BC the landscape appears to have been subject to considerable reorganisation.'

- 14 44 This reorganisation may have included the PDA where, although undated, the suggestion is that the cropmark site (SMR 8458) is of late Iron Age/Romano-British date. Prior to this period there is no archaeological evidence that the PDA is part of the cultural landscape associated with the Thornborough Plain and the henges

- 14 45 The focus of Roman activity in the vicinity of the PDA would appear to have been a villa and estate centred on the village of Well, 3km to the north-west. The estate is not thought to have extended as far as the PDA, as, although evidence related to agricultural activity was found in the western part of Nosterfield Quarry (2km west of PDA), including a possible corn-drying kiln, no archaeological evidence for Roman activity was recorded during the evaluation at Ladybndge Farm

- 14 46 The medieval landscape is represented by a series of villages with their surrounding field systems, on average 2km apart. These are served by larger market towns such as Bedale, Masham, Ripon and Thirsk. The landscape includes a number of deserted or shrunken settlements such as Howgrave (SM 31361) 1km south of the PDA, and Yarnwick (SMR M20172), 1km to the north-east

- 14 47 The moat that surrounds Upsland Farm (SM 28251) may be all that remains of a medieval settlement Beresford⁷ suggests that this is at best a 'minor' settlement, and may be doubtful Breen (see below, 2 4) has suggested that this may be the site of a manor The 1992 evaluation included a trench placed through part of the moat and island This found evidence for well-preserved organic remains within the moat representative of the local vegetation, though '*not of immense importance particularly in view of their undatability*'⁸
- 14 48 An hydrological study undertaken by Engineering Geology Ltd in 1992 indicated that the water table in the vicinity of Upsland Moat should be unaffected by gravel extraction

Documentary and Cartographic Evidence

Introduction

- 14 49 Documentary and cartographic research was earned out at the North Yorkshire Record Office in Northallerton by Anthony Breen Searches were also made of the on-line indexes to the National Archives and of all collections held in local record repositories listed on the Access to Archives website It is important to note that there are very few references to Upsland At the National Archives in Kew there are a total of 21 documents listed in the indexes containing the name Upsland, of these most are modern records from the nineteenth century onwards There are just two pre 1700 documents Of all the collections listed on Access to Archives, the only repository to hold records relating to Upsland is the North Yorkshire Record Office
- 14 50 This site is within the civil parish of Kirklington cum Upsland and was formerly part of the ecclesiastical parish of Kirklington The ecclesiastical parish included the four townships of Kirklington cum Upsland, Howgrave, Sutton (Howgrave) and East Tanfield These townships were later separate civil parishes Though the appearance of Upsland as a separate place-name suggests that it should have been a separate township it is always linked with Kirklington in terms of both civil and ecclesiastical boundaries In the introduction to the 1840 tithe apportionment there is an additional note that helps to define the area of Upsland from the remaining parts of the parish According to the Victorian County History '*Upsland is in the south west corner of the parish (Kirklington cum Upsland) and consists of one or two farm-houses near which are the remains of a moat*'
- 14 51 Upsland appears to have been a separate manor The descent of the lordship of the manor is described in the Victorian County History This description is based on published medieval sources and index references to calendars of documents There is a total absence of manorial court records, surveys or extents This may be a point of some significance and will be discussed in the conclusion to this research (section 2 4 6)

⁷ Beresford M W 1955 The Lost Villages of Yorkshire *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* Vol 38, pp309

⁸ Huntley, J P *Botanical Assessment of environmental samples in NAA (1994) op cit* Appendix II

Maps

- 14 52 The application site is shown on the modern Ordnance Survey map of the area as lying entirely within the civil parish of Kirklington Cum Upsland. The parish boundary with the civil parish to Howgrave forms the eastern boundary of the application site. The curving line of the northern boundary follows the course of a stream. The southern boundary rests on the public road B6267 with the site of Upsland Farm and surrounding moat to the south of the road, and beyond the proposed quarry site. The application site is defined by field boundaries at its western side.
- 14 53 The first edition of the 1:10560 Ordnance Survey maps of the application site was published in 1856 (Figure 7). The area of the application site is divided between the two sheets numbered 86 and 102. The map shows the contour lines measured in feet and the triangulation station at Upsland Hill. The main area of the site is situated at Mill Hill marked within the 150 feet contour line. To the north a 125 feet bench is marked on the Mill Beck. Apart from the field boundaries the only other features are a well marked against a field boundary running northeast towards a foot bridge over the Mill Beck and a small gravel pit marked to the west of Mill Hill. A track way is shown on the modern Ordnance Survey map crossing the application site from Upsland Hill to the road. On the 1856 map this track way leads to 'White House', outside the PDA. Beyond the road named on this map as Lime Road and to the east of the moat there is Dushills situated above the 125 feet contour line. To the south of the moat there is another stream marked on the map as Upsland Beck. This small stream feeds into the moat from the northwest and is more clearly shown on the 1840 tithe map.
- 14 54 In the space of only sixteen years between the date of the tithe map and the published first edition of the Ordnance Survey map one field boundary had been removed between the fields marked 270 and 271 on the tithe map, and another field (267) was subdivided into two small fields before the publication of the 1856 map. A number of names entered on the tithe map at a later date appear to be subsequent owners of the land. The fields are described in greater detail in the tithe apportionment. Both the apportionment and map (Figure 8) are available at Northallerton on microfilm (ref MIC 1796) and have been copied in part for this research.
- 14 55 The entire area of the PDA was then part of a farm of 176 acres 1 rood and 14 perches. The farm is named 'Upsland' in the apportionment and was in the occupation of William Auton as tenant to Mr Peter Ewart. Mr Ewart owned another farm of 79 acres 3 roods and 23 perches and an area of grass measured at 1 acre 3 roods. There is an important distinction between these three areas noted in the 'remarks' column of the apportionment. Against the total acreage of Upsland there is a note '*modus in lieu of all tithes*'. This remark is not entered against the other two landholdings. In the introduction to the apportionment there is the following statement:

'The undermentioned moduses or compositions real or prescriptive or customary payments are payable instead of the undermentioned tithes of the said Township that is to say the whole of that part of the said township called or known by the name of Upsland and containing by estimation Two

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

hundred and Eighty Acres Statute Measure is subject to a Modus of Thirty Shillings in lieu of all Tithes'

- 14 56 The date at which this modus was put in place is not recorded
- 14 57 *In medieval Yorkshire 'Landholdings were measured in oxgangs (bovates) and ploughlands (carucates), with 8 oxgangs making 1 ploughland' (Sheppard) Neither measurement - oxgang nor ploughland - had a fixed acreage both being based on the physical capacity of a team of oxen to plough a specific area of land in a year Richardson describes an oxgang as 'normally considered to be one-eighth of a Hide' and describes the measurement of a Hide as varying 'between 60 and 180 acres' It is therefore possible that the area of Upsland, measured in the tithe apportionment as 280 acres, was originally two or three carucates*
- 14 58 Other earlier manuscript maps such as the 1760 estate map of Sutton cum Howgrave and Upsland (ref MIC 1497/164-166) show only the position of the farm building and road line There are no other earlier detailed maps of this site
- 14 59 Before examining earlier documentary sources it is necessary to briefly mention the field names They include Well Field 263 not in the same position as the well marked on the Ordnance Survey map Mill Field 264 and Mill Hill 265 are in the same position as Mill Hill on the Ordnance Survey map Gravel Hole Field 266 is not in the same position as the Gravel Pit marked on the Ordnance Survey map To the south of the road Lower Beck Field 278 and Beck Side Field 281 are to the south and north of the Upsland Beck feeding into the moat towards the east Nicholson Close 277 possibly records the name of an agricultural labourer Thomas Nicholson listed with his family at Kirklington in the 1841 census There is an earlier list of field names for this farm described in further detail below

Deeds

- 14 60 Unlike most counties of England there was a registry of deeds for each of Yorkshire's three Ridings The North Riding Register of Deeds began in 1736 and closed in 1970 Although it was never compulsory to register deeds, the vast majority are registered as this gave more secure title to property This opens the possibility of tracing earlier owners of a site using the indexes of the registry In this instance this is not necessary as there are copies of earlier deeds relating to the application site in a Solicitor's Collection (ref ZCZ) The documents received at various times between 1953 & 1956 from Messrs Edmundson & Gowland, Solicitors, Ripon have been calendared under their respective townships and in the catalogue of this collection there are eight documents relating to Upsland (ref ZCZ 584-590) The first two deeds are apparently not related to this site The first is dated 28 January 1611 and concerns 'Rushe Close in Upsland' sold by Christopher Bulmer of Upsland to John Other (584) The second is dated 5 May 1614 and concerns Tessimond Piece in Upsland sold by Christopher Bulmer of Upsland to Richard Wiseman, a wheelwright (585) Christopher Bulmer is mentioned in the description of the lordship in the Victorian County History as heir to his

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

father William Bulmer who died in 1575, *'but who does not seem to have succeeded his father'*

- 14 61 The relevant documents cover the period 1778 – 1796 These are not original documents but later solicitor's copies made in August 1831 The latest document is the will of Thomas Cundall of Upsland, parish of Kirklington, who bequeathed his property first to his wife Ann for her life or widowhood and then to his daughters
- 14 62 The earlier documents are conveyance of the property in the form of a lease and release dated 22 and 23 May 1778 (ref ZCZ 586 & 587) The conveyance was produced as a result of a case heard at the Court of Chancery in 1777 and there is a reference to this case listed in the National Archives on-line catalogue (Wishart v Sadler C12/423/103) These Chancery suits were normally an attempt either to clear an entail on an estate or settle a disputed title This was done to provide a true title for future sales of the land
- 14 63 The text of the lease begins with the names of the parties to the deed In this instance description is unusually lengthy The first named party was William Thomas Wishart *'late of the City of Edinburgh and now of Poxhall in the County of West Lothian in North Britain'* He was acting as son and heir of his father William Wishart, *'late Doctor of Physick of the University of Edinburgh'* William Wishart with his father also William Wishart were devisees of *'named in the last will and testament of Sir James Wishart Little Chelsea in the county of Middlesex'* The will of Sir James Wishart of Little Chelsea was proved at the Prerogative Court of Canterbury on 19 June 1723 This suggests that the original dispute was long standing The other parties, such as *'Mary Sadler of Pickhill in the County of York widow'*, were *'five sisters and coheirs of Mark Geldart late of Burrell and afterwards of Cowling'* or their descendants William Wishart with the other parties had on the 22 May leased the land to George Moss
- 14 64 The property is described as
- 'All that capital messuage or dwelling house with the site thereof now or sometime heretofore commonly called Upsland and heretofore the mansion or dwelling house of John Green deceased and all that dwelling house or cottage now or sometime heretofore called Laverack Hall and all that parcel of ground adjoining thereto containing by estimation two roods or thereabouts also now or sometime heretofore commonly called or known by the name of Laverack Hall'*
- 14 65 This is evidently copied from earlier documents as John Green is listed in the 1673 Hearth Tax as paying tax on three hearths in Kirklington cum Upsland The description continues with a list of field names and acreages beginning with *'And all that Close or Parcell of Ground now or sometime heretofore commonly called or known by the name of Old Upsland containing by estimation three acres or thereabouts'*
- 14 66 The other pieces are described with the same phrase and include
- *'Calf Close - five acres'*

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

- 'Greaf lngs - thirteen acres'
- 'Calf Close - nine acres' (N B There are two Calf Closes)
- 'Little Field - ten acres'
- 'Stoney Flatt - sixteen acres'
- 'Dry Lees - seven acres'
- 'Mill Hill - nine acres'
- 'Plewed Green - ten acres'
- 'Spring Green - twenty seven acres'
- 'Duskell Close - one acre'
- 'Within the Mote - six acres'
- 'Mill Close - thirty Acres'
- 'Cammott Field - six acres',
- 'Ox Close - twenty acres'
- 'Little Calf Close - on three acres'

14 67 The description finishes with

'Which said messuages closes or parcels of ground are situate lying or being within the Lordship Hamlet Grainge or Territories of Upsland aforesaid or within the Parish of Kirklington aforesaid And are now or late were in the occupation of Robert Auton as tenant or farmer thereof to or under the said William Thomas Wishart'

14 68 No doubt the William Auton, listed as a tenant in the 1840 title apportionment, was a descendant of this Robert Auton. The field name and acreage bear little resemblance to those listed in the title apportionment making any useful comparison difficult if not impossible. Even in the instance of a field name element surviving as with the thirty acres of Mill Close it appears that the field had been sub-divided before 1840 into Mill Field 12 acres and 7 perches and Mill Hill 16 acres 2 roods and 12 perches. The combined acreage is 1 acre 1 rood and 21 perches less than the 1778 estimated acreage, but in 1778 there was also a Mill Hill with an estimated nine acres.

14 69 The release mentions that William Thomas Wishart had contracted to acquire the title in 'fee simple' from Mark Geldart on 16 August 1770 for £1160. In this document the property was simply described as

'All that Capital Messuage or tenement farm and farmhold with the appurtenances commonly called or known by the name of Upslands containing by admeasurement one hundred and eighty five acres or thereabouts free from all incumbrances except for a modus of nineteen shillings and eight pence payable to the rector of Kirklington for the time being and his successors for and in lieu of all tithes'

14 70 Note that the acreage of 185 acres is larger than the 176 acres 1 rood and 14 perches listed in 1840. The payment towards the total sum of the modus represents nearly two thirds of the total amount of 30 thirty shillings though the acreage is more than two thirds of the total of 240 acres. The contract was not completed before the death of Mark Geldart. In his will Mark Geldart bequeathed money from his freehold properties to be divided between the other parties named in the lease. The same field names and acreage appear

on pages 3 and 4 of the release. On the final page of the release there are the endorsements copied from the original document and a memorial of this transfer was registered at Northallerton on the twenty fourth day of July 1778. Afterwards the property passed to Thomas Cundall.

- 14 71 There are some additional points that need to be discussed in relation to these deeds of lease and release. The first is that if the earlier documents had been available to the solicitor when these copies were made in August 1831, it is likely that they would have been copied at that time. This suggests that the earlier documents had been produced in connection with the case heard in Chancery in 1777.
- 14 72 The property is described as in 'fee simple' that is 'a freehold estate that passes without restriction to the lawful heir' (Richardson). This may be a result of the Chancery suit, though it is worth noting that there appears to be no copyhold lands attached to the farm (copyhold being land held of a manor, the form of tenure abolished in 1922). The title and property description does not include a phrase mentioning a manor or reputed manor or site of a manor though it was 'within the lordship' etc. It is possible that the title to the manor had been detached from the property. None of the parties named in the deeds are mentioned in the description of the lordship given in the Victorian County History.
- 14 73 In relation to the potential archaeology of the area there are two dwellings mentioned in the description of the property - Upsland and Laverack Hall. However only one previous occupier, John Green, is mentioned and it is known that he was living in 1673. The two properties were therefore likely to have been united before that date. The sites of these houses are mentioned separately from 'Within the Mote', a parcel of land consisting of an estimated acreage of six acres and the field known as 'Old Upsland' with an estimated acreage of three acres. It is also interesting to note the two former greens Plewed Green and Spng Green.

The Lordship of Upsland

- 14 74 In the Domesday Book Upsland appears as *Upsale*. Smith suggests that this may mean 'Upper Hall' although 'probably it is really *Uppes(ale)lund* from the name of the place mentioned in the DB and *lund*'.
- 14 75 The descent of this lordship is described on page 375 of the first volume of the Victorian County History. It begins with the Domesday description of the 'two manors and 3 carucates which Archil and Torfin had held at Upsland'. Later in the text it states
- 'In 1286-87 William de Holteby held two carucates in Upsland under Mary de Nevill lady of Middleham and 1 carucate under Avis Marmion but part if not all of Upsland seems to have passed shortly afterwards to Thomas Colvill who held 2 carucates of Ralph and Mary Nevill'*
- 14 76 The description continues

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

'The heirs in this family were called Thomas Colvill for four generations and were tenants in Upsland until 1405, when Sir Thomas Colvill kt was seised at his death of the manor, held of Sir Henry Fitzhugh kt'

- 14 77 There are gaps in the description with no lord mentioned from the death of John Percy of Kildale in 1442 through to William Bulmer in the reign of Henry VII (1485 – 1509) *'He probably acquired it by marriage with one of the daughters and heirs of John Percy of Kildale'* This William Bulmer was not the same person as a William Bulmer who *'held it at his death in 1575'* The description then suggests that Christopher Bulmer (previously mentioned in this report) *'must have sold the manor to Lord Burghley who was seised of it at his death in 1598'* Yet the two deeds at Northallerton show Christopher Bulmer selling land in Upsland in 1611 and 1614
- 14 78 It is possible that the lands were detached from the title to the lordship at the close of the sixteenth century. Some of the later references are to Inquisitions Post Mortem held not to determine the cause of death but to determine the full extent of the property formerly owned by the deceased and for the crown to claim the feudal dues and other revenues arising from the property. These records, now held at the National Archives, sometimes include extents or other descriptions of the property
- 14 79 It should be noted that the property was quite separate from the adjoining lands held of the manor of Kirklington, Howgrave, or East Tanfield. In relation to Howgrave the evidence of the 1760 estate map shows the more complex manorial structure as it includes references to copyhold lands

Conclusion

- 14 80 The area of this study was, before the end of the seventeenth century, entirely within a single tenanted farm. There is some evidence of the rearranging of the field boundaries in the late eighteenth century or earlier nineteenth century. Before the farm was united into a single land holding there had been two farms - Upsland and Laverack Hall
- 14 81 In the medieval period - during the fourteenth century - this was a tenanted estate or sub-manor held by a succession of owners named Thomas Colvill. The last of this family was knighted before his death in 1405. The succession of owners or tenants from this date onwards is obscure and the account given in the Victorian County History is incomplete and at times slightly conjectural
- 14 82 It is tempting to associate the sites of both Upsland and Laverack Hall to the area of the present farmhouse and moat to the south of the road and outside the area of this site. This may not be the case (note the existence of another farm called Upsland to the north-west of the PDA) and the site of an isolated well shown on the 1856 Ordnance Survey map could provide a focus for archaeological research
- 14 83 As this appears to have been a sub-manor without a significant number of sub-tenants or a complicated manorial structure (evident by the freehold title and lack of copyhold), the area may well have consisted from the medieval

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

period onwards of only one or two farms. Demesne farms of around one hundred acres were not uncommon in the late medieval period.

References

Maps

- 1 10560 Ordnance Survey Maps sheet numbers 86 and 102 published 1856
- MIC 1796/49-55 Tithe Map and Apportionment Kirklington 1840
- MIC 1497/164-166 A Plan of Philip Bendlowes Estate at Sutton cum Howgrave 1760

Deeds

- ZCZ Calendar of Documents received at various times between 1953 & 1956 from Messrs Edmundson & Gowland, Solicitors Ripon
- ZCZ 586/6 Lease Wm Thos Wishart Esqr & others to Mr George Moss 22 May 1778
- ZCZ 586/7 Release of an estate at Upland in the pash of Kirklington in the county of York Wm Wishart Esq his wife el al to Mr George Moss 23 May 1778

Published Sources

- W Page (ed) *'The Victorian County History, Yorkshire North Riding'* Vol 1 1968
- John Richardson *'The Local Historian's Encyclopaedia'* Historical Publications Ltd New Barnet, Herts 1986
- June A Sheppard *'Metrological Analysis of Regular Village Plans in Yorkshire'*
- A H Smith *'The Place-Names of the North Riding of Yorkshire'* English Place-Name Society Vol V 1928
- *'North Riding Register of Deeds'* North Yorkshire County Record Office Publications No 38 p 37
- *'The Hearth Tax List for the North Riding of Yorkshire Michaelmas 1673'* Part Two Allerton, Gilling East, Halikeld, and Hang East Wapentakes' Ripon Historical Society and Ripon Harrogate & District History Group 1991

Aerial Photography

14 84 Between November 2004 and March 2005, English Heritage earned out an aerial photograph transcription of the Thornborough Henges area as part of the National Mapping Programme (NMP). The survey recorded all sites visible from aerial photographs and covered the PDA. The plot is included as Figure 9 and an enlarged view of the features identified within the PDA reproduced as Figure 10. Northern Archaeological Associates also included an aerial photographic transcription based upon information contained in the North Yorkshire HER in their 1994 report.

14 85 This exercise has therefore not been repeated as part of this assessment.

- 14 86 The NMP transcription suggests that the types of cropmarks evident within NYHER site M20199 are also found in the south-east corner of the PDA. There is no evidence that they continue across Mill Hill (that separates the two areas), but this area will have been susceptible to plough damage and downslope soil movement that is likely to have severely truncated archaeological features.

Site Visit and Visibility

- 14 87 A site visit was made on December 19th 2006. The fields were partially waterlogged and held a crop (Photograph 1). As the area has previously been partially fieldwalked in 1992, and the subject of geophysical survey and trial trenching, it was not considered necessary to undertake a formal site walkover.
- 14 88 A visit was also made to the Scheduled Monuments to assess potential setting issues, to the Conservation Area of Kirklington and to St Michael's Church, Kirklington.
- 14 89 The PDA is not visible from the Henges, nor from Kirklington or Sutton Howgrave. This is confirmed by an assessment of the Zone of Theoretical Visual Influence undertaken by SLR, the results of which are shown cartographically on Figures 11 and 12. These show the theoretical visibility of the proposed extraction and processing plant, respectively, based on a bare topography (refer to Section 10 above).
- 14 90 In consultation with Andrew Josephs Ltd, SLR has produced photographic views of the proposed development, and these have been examined as part of this assessment. The key views in relation to cultural heritage are reproduced as Photographs 2 and 3 within this section, and the full set is contained in Section 12 within this ES.
- 14 91 These show that extraction of the higher topographical features would be just visible from Upland SM, although the processing plant would be more visible. There would be no view at all of the PDA from the henges (photograph 3).

Assessment of Effects and Mitigation

Effects upon statutorily designated features

Direct effects

- 14 92 There would be no direct effects upon statutorily designated features of cultural heritage interest.

Indirect effects

- 14 93 The indirect effects of development are more difficult to assess. There are no published guidelines on what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

effects upon the setting of, for example, scheduled monuments and listed buildings. A number of factors need to be taken into account including

- The type of monument
- The nature and scale of the development
- Working methodology
- Temporality
- Topography
- Visibility, screening and physical separation
- Proximity
- The critical views of, and from the building or monument
- Accessibility, interpretation and public appreciation

14 94 Terminology is important in understanding the proximity of a cultural heritage feature to the proposed development. For the purposes of this assessment these are set out in Table 14/3. It should be borne in mind that proximity is only one of the factors that need to be considered, and that an adjacent monument may, for example, be less visible if well screened, than one further away but with uninterrupted critical views.

Table 14/3
Definitions of Proximity

Term	Definition
Within	The cultural heritage feature lies within the Proposed Development Area
Adjacent	The cultural heritage feature shares a boundary with the Proposed Development Area
Close proximity to	The cultural heritage feature lies within 100m of the Proposed Development Area
In the vicinity of	The cultural heritage feature lies within 500m of the Proposed Development Area
In the broader landscape	The cultural heritage feature lies more than 500m from the Proposed Development Area

Scheduled Monuments

14 95 One scheduled monument lies in close proximity to the PDA, Upland Moated Site (SM28251). The proposed extraction would be just visible from the monument, although the processing plant would be more visible. This is a temporary structure. An hydrological study has indicated that the water table in the vicinity of Upland Moat should be unaffected by gravel extraction, and therefore there would be no adverse effects upon waterlogged and organic deposits of archaeological importance.

14 96 The other scheduled monuments within the study area lie in the broader landscape and have no visual connection with the PDA as a result of topography, built development and vegetation. They are also physically separated from the PDA by the B6267 (Lime Lane).

Listed Buildings

- 14 97 All listed buildings lie in the broader landscape of the PDA and at ground level have no visual connection with the PDA. It is possible that Mill Hill is visible from the tower of St Michael's Church, Kirklington.

Conservation Areas

- 14 98 The Conservation Area of Kirklington lies, at its nearest boundary, 900m from the PDA. At ground level there are no clear views into the PDA.

Other Designated Cultural Heritage Features

- 14 99 No World Heritage Sites, historic parks and gardens or historic battlefields lie within 2km of the PDA.

Effects upon other Features of Cultural Heritage Interest

- 14 100 The 1992 evaluation indicates that a series of ditches, trackways and other features associated with a probable late prehistoric/Romano-British lie within the southern part of the PDA. The archaeology was assessed as being of regional importance.
- 14 101 The National Mapping Programme has suggested that the area of cropmarks extend into the south-east corner of the PDA, outside the area evaluated in 1992. It would be reasonable to assume that these are also representative of regionally important archaeology.
- 14 102 The PDA was subsequently overlain by medieval and post-medieval field systems of local importance.
- 14 103 Documentary and cartographic research suggests that the site of a well shown on the OS 1st edition, and adjacent to a trackway (now followed by a public footpath), may signal the site of a building. There is no aerial photographic evidence to support this.
- 14 104 Although of regional importance it is clear from the 1992 evaluation that plough damage has significantly affected the archaeological resource within the PDA, and that continued ploughing would eventually destroy all but the basal fills of the deepest features. SMR M8460 would appear to have already been ploughed out.
- 14 105 It is assumed that any archaeology within the PDA would be lost or affected by extraction or works associated with infrastructure and landscaping.

Proposed Mitigation

- 14 106 There is no evidence that archaeological features exist within the proposed extraction area that could be considered of national significance. The features have been ascribed regional importance and preservation *in situ* is therefore not a pre-requisite of a mitigation strategy.

14 107 In accordance with recommendations in PPG 16 (paragraph 24), should it not be possible to preserve archaeological features *in situ* a second-best option is preservation through excavation and recording in advance of development. It is therefore proposed that archaeological investigation be undertaken in line with the phasing of the quarry. The mitigation would normally be secured via a planning condition attached to a planning permission and the detail would be agreed in advance of development with the Heritage and Environment Section of North Yorkshire County Council. A formal Written Scheme of Investigation would be submitted to the County Council and approved before development commenced.

14 108 In brief, the mitigation strategy would comprise the following stages:

- Removal of overburden under the supervision of an archaeologist,
- Archaeological excavation, mapping and recording of a sample of features identified,
- Analysis, assessment and publication.

Evaluation of Predicted Effects

Criteria

14 109 In accordance with the EIA Regulations the significance of an effect should be identified. This is achieved using a combination of published guidance^{9/10} and professional judgement.

14 110 Four criteria have been considered in evaluating the significance of the predicted effects of quarrying within the PDA.

Type of effect

14 111 Effects may be positive, negative, neutral (i.e. no discernible effect) or none. They may be permanent or temporary. They may also be cumulative with other effects occurring in the vicinity.

Probability of the Effect Occurring

14 112 An assessment is made as to the likelihood of the identified effect occurring. Probability is considered as certain, likely or unlikely.

Importance or Sensitivity

14 113 Three categories of importance or sensitivity are identified: national, regional and local.

⁹ PPG 16, Annex 4

¹⁰ *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges*, 1995 Volume 10, Section 6. Highways Agency Advice Note. Approaches to evaluation of significance and approach to mitigation is equally relevant to large-scale developments.

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

- 14 114 Sites with a statutory designation would normally be considered to be of *national importance*. This applies to Scheduled Monuments, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields. Listed Buildings are graded in importance grade I (most important), II*, and II. The first two categories contain buildings (and other structures) that *may* be regarded as nationally important. It is worth noting that programmes for reviewing designations are ongoing and further sites currently not designated may be added. Sites may also be discovered as a result of new research that are also of national importance.
- 14 115 Other than in exceptional circumstances, nationally important sites and their settings should be preserved from adverse development.
- 14 116 *Regionally important* sites are defined as making a contribution to the region's historic environment. They are most likely to be archaeological sites and features that are not considered sufficiently important or well preserved to be scheduled as Ancient Monuments. Mitigation would be required if affected by quarrying, for example through archaeological excavation and recording. Grade II buildings would also fall into the regionally important category.
- 14 117 *Locally important* archaeological sites, buildings and structures, and other components of the historic environment are defined as contributing to the local landscape. Mitigation may be required (such as photographic recording) if affected by development.

Magnitude

- 14 118 The magnitude of change to a cultural heritage feature or landscape is considered in terms of its vulnerability, its current condition and the nature of the *impact* upon it. With respect to archaeology, there may be a degree of uncertainty of the magnitude of change due to a lack of information, and where this is the case it is noted. Magnitude is assessed as considerable, moderate or none and the criteria used in this report are set out in Table 14/4, below.

Table 14/4
Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of Change	Description of Change
Considerable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete destruction of a well-preserved archaeological site, historic structure or element of the cultural heritage landscape • Change to the setting of a cultural heritage feature such that our ability to understand the resource and its historical context is permanently or significantly changed
Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of an archaeological site or other cultural heritage feature already in degraded condition • Change to the setting of a cultural heritage feature such that our ability to understand the resource and its historical context is moderately or temporarily changed
None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No physical effect upon an archaeological site or other feature of the cultural heritage landscape

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

Magnitude of Change	Description of Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No discernible effect upon the setting of a cultural heritage feature, or our ability to understand the resource and its historical context

Assessing Significance

14 119 The four criteria discussed earlier are considered together to reach a conclusion upon the significance of an effect taking into account any measures that are proposed to mitigate the effect. In accordance with the EIA Regulations these are quantified as significant, not significant or neutral (i.e. no change to the existing situation). In some cases it may not be possible to quantify the significance of an effect, for example due to a gap in information, and this is noted.

14 120 To assist in arriving at a conclusion on the significance of an effect a matrix of the inter-relationship of importance/sensitivity with magnitude has been created, and this is shown in Table 14/5.

Table 14/5
Inter-Relationship of Importance/Sensitivity with Magnitude

Importance or Sensitivity	↓ Magnitude	→		
		Considerable	Moderate	None
National		Significant	Not significant	Neutral
Regional		Significant	Not significant	Neutral
Local		Not significant	Not significant	Neutral

14 121 The existence of a significant effect does not necessarily prevent development. Cultural heritage is only one factor in the decision-making process, and in addition to other environmental issues, the need for development and socio-economic factors must be taken into account.

14 122 The results of the evaluation of significance are drawn together in Table 14/6, below, together with the rationale behind the evaluation.

Table 14/6
Effects and Evaluation of Significance

	Type of Effect	Probability of Effect Occurring	Importance or Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance	Rationale
Direct effects upon statutorily designated cultural heritage features	None	Certain	National	None	Neutral	No such features lie within the PDA boundary
Indirect effects upon Upsland Moat scheduled monument (SM28251)	Negative Temporary	Likely	National	Moderate	Not significant	Views of the processing plant would be experienced from parts of the SM, but these would be temporary (maximum 3 years), would be partially screened and upon restoration the setting of the monument would not be significantly altered. Given that the site would be worked "wet" (i.e. with no dewatering), there is no evidence that the proposed development would cause an adverse or permanent effect upon waterlogged deposits in the moat.
Indirect effects upon other scheduled monuments within 2km study area	Neutral	Certain	National	None	Not significant	There is no intervisibility between scheduled monuments (other than Upsland Moat) and the PDA. The landscape of the Henges and the Thornborough Plain would not be significantly altered by the development, the archaeology within the PDA not being chronologically linked to them. The development would be short-lived. Our ability to understand this nationally important resource and its historical context would therefore be unaffected.
Indirect effects upon setting of listed buildings and Kirklington Conservation Area	Neutral Temporary	Likely	National Regional	None	Not significant	There is no view at ground level of the PDA from Kirklington village conservation area (containing 12 listed buildings) due to distance, topography and screening vegetation. It may be possible to see the PDA from the tower of St Michael's Church (Grade I). Distance and topography limit views from Howgrave Hall (Grade II).

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

Type of Effect	of	Probability Of Occurring	Importance or Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance	Rationale
Indirect effects upon World Heritage Sites, historic parks and gardens or historic battlefields	None	Certain	National	None	Neutral	No such features lie within 2km of the PDA boundary
Direct effects upon archaeology of the PDA	Neutral Permanent	Certain	Regional	Moderate	Not significant	Whilst the features have been assessed as of regional importance they are in a degraded condition due to ploughing. A programme of archaeological excavation and recording would be appropriate mitigation in advance of extraction.
Opportunities for enhancement to the archaeological record	Positive Permanent	Certain	Regional	N/A	Not significant	Archaeological excavation and recording in advance of quarrying would increase our understanding of the late prehistoric/Romano-British landscape and provide an opportunity to preserve by record a resource that is being significantly degraded by ploughing.

Conclusion

- 14 123 This Section of the ES presents the findings of a cultural heritage desk-based to accompany a Planning Application for a proposed borrow pit at Upsland, near Kirklington, North Yorkshire
- 14 124 One scheduled monument lies in close proximity to the proposed development area (PDA), Upsland Moated Site (SM28251) The proposed extraction would be just visible from the monument, although the processing plant would be more visible, but further away This is a temporary structure There would be no dewatering of the mineral, workings and an hydrological study has indicated that the water table in the vicinity of Upsland Moat should be unaffected by gravel extraction, and therefore there would be no adverse effects upon waterlogged and organic deposits of archaeological importance The effect upon the moated site is considered not significant
- 14 125 The other scheduled monuments within the study area lie in the broader landscape and have no visual connection with the PDA as a result of topography, built development and vegetation They are also physically separated from the PDA by the B6267 (Lime Lane) These include the nationally important Thornborough Henges complex of monuments, approximately 1.5km west of the PDA They form part of a landscape of Neolithic and early Bronze Age monuments that extends for 12km southwards along River Ure valley The effect upon this landscape is not considered significant
- 14 126 By the Iron Age the monument complex was no longer in use and it would appear that the landscape was reorganised The archaeological features within the PDA – identified from aerial photography and through evaluation in 1992 - may date to this period They comprise a series of ditches, trackways and other features and were assessed as being of regional importance They have however been (and continue to be) severely affected by ploughing and there is evidence that one cropmark site has been completely destroyed The effect upon the archaeology of the PDA is not significant, and there would be beneficial effects provided by the opportunity to preserve by record the archaeological resource
- 14 127 Documentary and cartographic research suggests that the site of a well shown on the OS 1st edition, and adjacent to a trackway (now followed by a public footpath), may signal the site of a building There is no aerial photographic evidence to support this
- 14 128 A total of 15 listed buildings lie within 2km of the PDA (the nearest being 800m south-east) and at ground level have no visual connection with the PDA Twelve lie within the village of Kirklington, approximately 1km north-east of the PDA All are Grade II listed, except for the Church Of St Michael which is Grade I and Kirklington Hall, grade II* The village of Kirklington is also a Conservation Area It is possible that Mill Hill (within the PDA) is visible from the tower of St Michael's Church, Kirklington The effects of the proposed development upon listed buildings and the Conservation Area of

CULTURAL HERITAGE 14

Kirklington is not considered significant. Distance and topography limit views from Howgrave Hall (Grade II)

- 14 129 There are no World Heritage Sites, historic parks and gardens or historic battlefields within 2km of the PDA
- 14 130 In accordance with planning guidance (PPG16) it would be desirable to avoid the destruction of the archaeological features within the PDA. However, if this were not possible, mitigation in the form of excavation, recording, analysis and publication would be acceptable mitigation.
- 14 131 In brief, the mitigation strategy would comprise the following stages:
- Removal of overburden under the supervision of an archaeologist,
 - Archaeological mapping, excavation and recording of a sample of features identified,
 - Analysis, assessment and publication
- 14 132 This assessment of the effects of the proposed development, in accordance with the EIA Regulations, has concluded that there will be no significant effects upon cultural heritage when taking into account the mitigation measures outlined in the ES.