

Hagholm Road, Cleghorn: Archaeological Monitoring

Data Structure Report

by Katie Sludden

issued 16th November 2008



Rathmell

Archaeology Ltd

Quality Assurance

This report covers works which have been undertaken in keeping with the issued brief as modified by the agreed programme of works. The report has been prepared in keeping with the guidance of Rathmell Archaeology Limited on the preparation of reports. All works reported on within this document have been undertaken in keeping with the Institute of Field Archaeology's Standards and Policy Statements and Code of Conduct.

Signed Date

In keeping with the procedure of Rathmell Archaeology Limited this document and its findings have been reviewed and agreed by an appropriate colleague:

Checked Date

Copyright Rathmell Archaeology Limited. All rights reserved.

No part of this report may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Rathmell Archaeology Limited. If you have received this report in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control and notify Rathmell Archaeology Limited.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the commissioning party and unless otherwise agreed in writing by Rathmell Archaeology Limited, no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of the report. No liability is accepted by Rathmell Archaeology Limited for any use of this report, other than the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided.

Opinions and information provided in the report are on the basis of Rathmell Archaeology Limited using due skill, care and diligence in preparation of the same and no explicit warranty is provided as to their accuracy. It should be noted and it is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to Rathmell Archaeology Limited has been made.

Contents

1 Overview	3
2 Historical Background	3
3 Project Works	5
4 Findings	7
5 Recommendations	9
6 Conclusion	9
7 References	11
Appendix 1: Record Summaries	12
Appendix 2: GPS Points	14
Appendix 3: Discovery and Excavation Scotland	15
Contact Details	16
<i>Figures</i>	
Fig. 1a-f Historical OS Maps	4
Fig. 2 Location of Area Strip	6
Fig. 3a-g Images taken during watching brief	8

1 Overview

- 1.1 Riach Partnership Ltd on behalf of R F Chattelle (Developments) Ltd have secured planning consent for their residential redevelopment of the Haghholm Road, Cleghorn. Preceding archaeological evaluation works identified an archaeologically sensitive area in a 20m deep belt across the southern limit of their development area. Given the archaeological potential of this ground South Lanarkshire Council conditioned the planning consent for archaeology (CL/08/0010 – Condition 19), requiring the submission and agreement of a Written Scheme of Investigation for a staged programme of archaeological works to mitigate the adverse impact on the archaeology in this area.
- 1.2 A project management error led to the whole of the groundworks for the development area being undertaken prior to the agreement of the Written Scheme of Investigation. Hence these groundworks were not subject to archaeological monitoring. A subsequent on-site meeting between Riach Partnership Ltd, South Lanarkshire Council and the West of Scotland Archaeology Service have agreed that some archaeological mitigation works were still feasible, although unquantifiable loss has occurred.
- 1.3 This Data Structure Report presents the findings of the subsequent archaeological monitoring exercise undertaken on the surviving portion of the site at Haghholm Road, Cleghorn (NGR: NS 911 452). The archaeological works were designed to mitigate the impact on the archaeological remains within the development area. This report has been prepared assuming prior cognisance of the Written Scheme of Investigation (Rees, 2008) and the Evaluation Data Structure Report (Matthews and Sludden, 2007).
- 1.4 The archaeologically sensitive area available measured roughly 322m² in extent and was stripped in two sections due to varying depth of overburden upon the natural subsoils. The development site is currently under development with several residences being constructed on the northern portion of the site.
- 1.5 *Archaeological and Historical Background*
 - 1.5.1 The development area is located southeast of the modern village of Cleghorn within agricultural land and is accessible from the east end of Jerviswood drive. The area is defined by Cleghorn Junction, where the railway running from the northwest to east splits at the junction to turn south then southwest. The modern village of Cleghorn lies within the western angle of this junction, the development area some 200m from the line.
 - 1.5.2 The settlement of Cleghorn first appears on Pont's map where a bridge crosses Mouse Water at the meeting of two tributaries. Cleghorn "Water" Mill is also marked on the map indicating early industrial origins of the village. This is also repeated more clearly on Bleau's map in 1654 when several other features of the area are noted. Interestingly the then village of Cleghorn is located to the northwest of the present village on the opposite side of Mouse Water, directly upon what Roy (1747-55) has identified as a Roman road running north to south. There are earthworks to the east of the old village, noted by Roy as an "Old Entrenchment"; these are the remains of a Roman temporary camp now known as Campwood (NMRS No.: NS94NW 2). A dyke is also illustrated as Innuswood Dyke running WSW to ENE along the south side of the river although this is not mentioned again. Cleghorn Mill is located just north of Mouse Water beside Cleghorn Bridge, which lies to the immediate west of the modern village.
 - 1.5.3 On Ross's map (Ross, 1722) Cleghorn is still located on the north of the river with some wooded areas marked but no detail of individual structures. On Forrest's 1799 map the field boundaries of the development area are marked to the southeast of Haghholm, to the east of Cleghorn Mill. The Roman road is also marked running northwest to southeast along the southern boundary of the development area. Further down the Mouse Water from Cleghorn Mill a Lint Mill is present, in addition a Toll Bar lies at the bridge. The Roman road and camp to the north is also marked but the original settlement of Cleghorn seems to have been superseded by a single grand house, owned by Lockhart Elliot Esq. The railway is first noted



Figure 1a: Bleau 1654



Figure 1b: Roy 1747-55



Figure 1c: Forrest 1799



Figure 1d: Ainslie 1745-1828



Figure 1e: 1st ed. Ordnance Survey 1850



Figure 1f: Ordnance Survey 1920-30

in Ainslie's Map (1780) running south of Cleghorn from Lanark to Carstairs.

- 1.5.4 On the 1st edition Ordnance Survey Cleghorn had become a farmstead NW of the railway station comprising several buildings as well as a bridge over the railway, which still exists today. The Roman road and the Mill are again marked on this map. Cleghorn is in fact located here until at least 1920 (OS, 2nd edition, 1920-30); the modern village of Cleghorn appears as a new build development to the east of Cleghorn Bridge. As such there is no potential at this location for earlier settlements associated within Cleghorn.
- 1.5.5 The National Monuments Record of Scotland identified no known archaeological sites within the development area; however the area immediately surrounding the site has a concentration of various archaeologically significant sites that would suggest a likelihood of archaeological structures being present within the scope of the development.
- 1.5.6 The National Monuments Record for Scotland contains records of a Roman road (NMRS No.: NS94NW 15.00) running northwest-southeast to the immediate south of the site boundary. The nature, extent and definite route of this road is uncertain at this location and there is the potential that it may extend into the southern portion of the development area. The presence of this road indicates the potential for further Roman sites within the development area. This is also highlighted by the fact that the area around Cleghorn, somewhat unusually, contains a concentration of archaeological activity related to the Roman occupation of southern Scotland as well as several sites of late medieval date.
- 1.5.7 There are three Scheduled Ancient Monuments in the vicinity: Corbiehall Roman Fort (HS Index No.:1139) (more commonly known as Castledykes Roman Fort), Campwood temporary Roman camp (HS Index No.:1138) and Corbiehall Roman temporary camps (HS Index No.:3825) (more commonly known as Castledykes Roman temporary camps). Gostane (NMRS No.:NS94SW 2) and Stick hill (NS94SW61) are described as a "Hollow Ways" which may relate to the Roman road.
- 1.5.8 Cleghorn bridge to the west of the village is also noted to be of ancient origin (WoSASPIN: 10714) supposedly originating from a Roman construction, but this is contested by the fact that a natural ford exists nearby and would negate the need for a bridge in this location. Cleghorn Mill (WoSASPIN: 17415) is illustrated on the earliest maps of the area (Figure1a) and continues in use until at least the 1920s.
- 1.5.9 Several Cists have also been uncovered, the closest being from Silvermoor (NMRS No.:NS94NW5) which contained a male skeleton (NMAAS Accession No.: ET13). Their date is unknown; they are either Bronze Age, or relate to early medieval activity around Cleghorn.

3 Project Works

- 3.1 The programme of works agreed with West of Scotland Archaeology Service commenced with an archaeological monitoring exercise which took place on the 21st October 2008; the works consisted of the stripping of an area in the southeast corner of the site. The intention, as outlined in the WSI (Rees 2008) was to explore the surviving sediments within this portion of the site to inform on further archaeological survival relating to the previously uncovered Bipartite Pit found during the Archaeological Evaluation in 2007 (Matthews and Sludden, 2007). The strip was split into two conjoined areas (See Figure 2) in order to manage the spoil from the deep overburden over Strip 2.
- 3.2 The Bipartite Pit was likely to have been removed before archaeological monitoring took place. No evidence of further Roman Activity was uncovered during onsite monitoring works.
- 3.3 In compliance with the WSI (Rees 2008) any potential archaeological features were investigated. All features impacted by the ground reduction appeared to be of relatively modern or natural origin, and no artefacts were recovered.
- 3.4 All works complied with WoSAS Standard Conditions, the Institute of Field Archaeology's Standards and Policy Statements and Code of Conduct and Historic Scotland Policy Statements.

4 Findings

- 4.1 The development area is centred NGR: NS 911 452 and the monitored strip can be seen in Figure 3a and 3b before archaeological works took place. The area strip is located on top of undulating farmland, bordered by a housing estate to the west, high trees to the east, sloping agricultural ground to the north running from the N-S field boundary there, and fields to the south. The land on the north of the farmstead looks down across the valley to the railway running E-W.
- 4.2 It was discovered that a watching brief task on the southern portion of the development area had been overlooked, and much of the 20m buffer zone had been removed without archaeological supervision. The surviving portion of the site had already been de-turfed and topsoil removed and bunded along the eastern boundary. The area to the southwest was reduced significantly, and the subsequent sediments were moved to the southeast corner of the site where the natural subsoils were thought to remain intact. This area consists of the area strip presented here.
- 4.3 The monitored strip is located in the far southeast corner of the development area within a 20m buffer of archaeological sensitivity outlined in previous investigations (Matthews and Sludden, 2007 and Rees, 2008). The area extended 23m-25m long by 11m-15m wide and was 320mm to 1.8m below the ground level of overburden deposit (001). One visit was required to observe groundworks for the new housing development there.
- 4.4 The stripping was undertaken using a toothless ditching bucket. Work commenced on Strip 1, working east and ceased when the depth of overburden reached 1.2m as the ground naturally fell away towards the southeast. This area is referred to as Strip 1 and measured 11.2m by 8m, which comprised very compact yellow and light brown sandy gravel (002) at 320mm (west end) to 1.2m (east end) depth from the present surface of the overlying deposits. These were mid brown stony gravels and silt which is re-deposited natural subsoil (001) from the levelling excavations in the southwest corner of the site.
- 4.5 The topsoil bund which ran from the southeast corner north along the eastern boundary was significantly reduced in order to explore the underlying sediments therein. This area is referred to as Strip 2, which measured 15m by 13.4m. The depth of excavation here extended to 1.8m before natural subsoil was met. The trench edge had to be stepped twice from the soil bund in order to reach this depth.
- 4.6 A heavily waterlogged area was located within the field to the south and reached the top of the old stone field wall running east to west. As the area strip extended eastwards along the southern boundary it became evident that undermining the sediments along the wall would result in the flooding of the area strip and beyond. Here a 1-1.5m baulk was retained in order to prevent this.
- 4.7 The only feature found within strip 2 was a modern rubble field drain running down the south-north slope. This was encountered within one of the Evaluation trenches running northeast from the southern boundary wall. This trench was Evaluation Trench Number 4 (Matthews and Sludden 2007, 6) which ran north-south along the eastern development boundary. The leached subsoil from this trench can be seen in Fig. 3f and Fig. 3g.



Fig. 3a: Pre-Ex Shot Area Strip



Fig 3b: Pre-Ex Shot Area Strip.



Fig 3c: Post-Ex Shot of Strip1



Fig 3d: Post-Ex Shot of Strip1



Fig 3e: General shot of waterlogging



Fig. 3f: Post-Ex Shot of Strip 2



Fig. 3g: Post-Ex Shot of Strip2

5 Recommendations

- 5.1 Presented below are our provisional recommendations for continuing archaeological mitigation of the development. These recommendations are framed with reference to the issued planning guidance. The appropriateness and acceptability of our recommendations rest with South Lanarkshire Council and the West of Scotland Archaeology Service, their advisors. Confirmation that the below recommendations are acceptable should be confirmed with these bodies prior to the implementation of any development works whose appropriateness may rely on these recommendations.
- 5.2 The archaeological monitored strip failed to identify any archaeological features in addition to that found during the preceding evaluation. Further, due to the premature ground breaking works the original feature had been lost. Given the combination of circumstances and the archaeological mitigation undertaken to date we recommend that no further on-site works are appropriate on this development.
- 5.3 However significant archaeology, in the form of the bipartite fire pit, was excavated and sampled in the course of the on-site works. It is appropriate that post-excavation analysis and reporting is undertaken on this material to elucidate the origin and function of this feature. Specifically we recommend the commission and undertaking of a Post-Excavation Research Design compliant with Sections 2.7 and 2.8 of the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation for the bipartite fire pit. Based on the understanding of the materials now held we would recommend the detailed actions to be undertaken (other than liaison, notification, summary reporting etc) should comprise:
- 5.4 Post-Excavation Analysis - in keeping with Section 2.7 of the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation
- i. Flotation sieving of all sediment samples;
 - ii. Palaeo-environmental assessment of flots & retents;
 - iii. Extraction and identification of suitable palaeo-environmental material for dating;
 - iv. Radiometric dating of two single entities;
 - v. Examination and analysis of any artefacts.
- 5.5 Reporting - in keeping with Section 2.8 of the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation
- i. Preparation of a short illustrated report summarising the findings of the works;
 - ii. Preparation of archive and disposal of same;
 - iii. Preparation of finds, notification and disposal of same.
- 5.6 It is proposed that given the scale and character of the archaeology it is not appropriate to seek to publish the illustrated report, rather to submit this as grey literature to the relevant archives.
- 5.7 The appropriateness and acceptability of our recommendations rest with South Lanarkshire Council and the West of Scotland Archaeology Service, their advisors. Confirmation that the above recommendations are acceptable should be confirmed with these bodies prior to the implementation of any development works whose appropriateness may rely on these recommendations.

6 Conclusion

- 6.1 A programme of archaeological investigative works was undertaken on behalf of Terrenus Consulting Ltd representing RF/Chattelle Developments in respect of the proposed residential development on land at Cleghorn Phase 2, South Lanarkshire. The archaeological works were designed to inform the planning decision and mitigate any adverse impact on the archaeological remains within their development area. These investigative works included a

desk-based assessment, site inspection and intrusive trenching covering approximately 10% of the proposed development area and a subsequent monitoring exercise on a portion of the 20m buffer along the southern boundary of the development area.

- 6.2 The archaeological evaluation of the site revealed only one feature which was interpreted as a bipartite pit. This feature was approximately 3m from the southern boundary of the site and may relate to Roman activity in the general area. No trace of the Roman road depicted by Roy was noted within the development area. No other anthropic material was recovered anywhere on site, with the exception of disturbance from the placement of modern drainage.
- 6.3 No evidence was recovered of the Roman road and there was no evidence of ground disturbance that might have related to such a structure. It did appear, however, that the site had been gradually cleared and levelled for use as rough pasture.
- 6.4 On balance we have assessed the site and encountered only one feature which relates to prehistoric activity within the development area. This feature will require relevant analysis and dissemination. This is especially relevant when considering the lack of adherence to a full monitored strip of the southern boundary of the site and the immeasurable loss of potential archaeological structures therein.

7 References

7.1 *Documentary*

Barclay, G	1983	Excavation of a settlement of the Later Bronze Age and Iron Age at Myrehead, Falkirk District
Breeze & Rich-Gray	1980	“Fire-pits” at Camelon Stirlingshire
Gibson & Tavener	1989	Excavations at Dundee High Technology Park, Tayside.
Raison, P & Rees, T	1996	<i>‘Excavations at three cropmark sites at Melville Nurseries, Dalkieth’</i> , SAJ, Glasgow
Rees, T	2007	Personal Communication
SODev	1994	<i>National Planning Policy Guideline 5, Archaeology and planning</i> , Scottish Office Development Department.
SOEnv	1994	<i>Planning Advice Note 42, Archaeology</i> , Scottish Office Environmental Department.

7.2 *Cartographic*

Roy	1755	Military Survey of Scotland
Ordnance Survey	1850	1 st edition map 1:2500
Ordnance Survey	1895	2 nd edition map 1:2500
Ordnance Survey	1903	3 rd edition map 1:2500
Ainslie	1821	Ainslie's Map of the Southern Part of Scotland
Thompson	1822	Northern part of Lanarkshire, Southern Part
Pont	1596	Glasgow and the county of Lanark
Blaeu	1654	Upper Clydeside, Lower Clydeside
Ross	1773	A map of the shire of Lanark
Forrest	1816	The county of Lanark from actual survey

Appendix 1: Record summaries

Context Summaries

Context No.	Area/Trench	Type	Description	Interpretation
001		Subsoil	Mixed brown compact silt and gravels, very hard and compact. Contains frequent angular and sub angular stones; small (5cm by 5cm by 5cm) up to very large (50cm by 50cm). Some occasional pebbles also. Varies in depth from 320mm up to 1.8m from present ground surface (levelled area)	Re-deposited Natural Subsoil (Overburden)
002		Subsoil	Yellow and brown sandy gravels very compact. Located on top of slope from the west.	Natural Subsoil
003		Subsoil	Mixed grey silt with occasional yellow sandstone. Very wet and soft. . Located on base of slope from the west.	Natural Subsoil

Photographic record

Image No.	Print		Slide		Digital	Description	From	Date
	Film No.	Neg. No.	Film No.	Neg. No.				
1	1	1	1	29		Pre Excavation Shot	E	21/10/08
2	1	2	1	30		Pre Excavation Shot	S	21/10/08
3	1	3	1	31		Pre Excavation Shot	N	21/10/08
4	1	4	1	32		Post Excavation Shot Strip 1	N	21/10/08
5	1	5	1	33		Post Excavation Shot Strip 1	S	21/10/08
6	1	6	1	34		Post Excavation Shot Strip 1	SSE	21/10/08
7	1	7	1	35		Post Excavation Shot Strip 1	S	21/10/08
8	1	8	1	36		General Shot Waterlogged area to the south	W	21/10/08
9	1	9	2	1		Post Ex Strip 1	SW	21/10/08
10	1	10	2	2		Working Shot Strip 2	NE	21/10/08

Image No.	Print		Slide		Digital	Description	From	Date
	Film No.	Neg. No.	Film No.	Neg. No.				
11	1	11	2	3		Post Excavation Shot Strip 2	SSW	21/10/08
12	1	12	2	4		Post Excavation Shot Strip 2	S	21/10/08
13	1	13	2	5		Post Excavation Shot Strip 2	SE	21/10/08
14	1	14				Post Excavation Shot Strip 2	ESE	21/10/08
15	1	15				Post Excavation Shot Strip 2	SSE	21/10/08
16	1	16				Post Excavation Shot Strip 2	SW	21/10/08
17	1	17				Post Excavation Shot Strip 2	SW	21/10/08

Appendix 2: GPS Points

Point Id.	NS	BNG	Elevation	Accuracy	Description
01	91155	45028	213m	3m	Strip 1 SW Corner
02	91162	45028	212m	3m	Strip1/2 dividing line
03	91164	45038	213	3m	Strip1/2 dividing line
04	91159	45039	213m	3m	Strip 1 NW Corner
05	91177	45024	206m	3m	Strip 2 SE Corner
06	91182	45036	208m	4m	Strip 2 NE Corner

Appendix 3: Discovery & Excavation in Scotland

LOCAL AUTHORITY:	South Lanarkshire Council
PROJECT TITLE/SITE NAME:	Cleghorn Phase 2
PARISH:	Lanark
NAME OF CONTRIBUTOR:	Katie Sludden
NAME OF ORGANISATION:	Rathmell Archaeology Limited
TYPE(S) OF PROJECT:	Monitoring
NMRS NO(S):	None
SITE/MONUMENT TYPE(S):	Possible Bipartite Pit
SIGNIFICANT FINDS:	None
NGR (2 letters, 6 figures)	NS 911 452
START DATE (this season)	21 st October 2008
END DATE (this season)	21 st October 2008
PREVIOUS WORK (incl. DES ref.)	None
PROPOSED FUTURE WORK:	Post Excavation Analysis and Reporting of Bipartite pit discovered during previous Archaeological Evaluation.
MAIN (NARRATIVE) DESCRIPTION: (may include information from other fields)	An archaeological monitoring exercise was undertaken on the 21 st October 2008 with respect to proposed groundworks in support of the development at Haghalm Road, Cleghorn. Archaeological monitoring failed to identify any significant archaeological features within the available development area. The Bipartite Pit discovered during the archaeological evaluation has been removed without archaeological supervision.
PROJECT CODE:	RA07080
SPONSOR OR FUNDING BODY:	RF/Chattelle Developments
ADDRESS OF MAIN CONTRIBUTOR:	Unit 8 Ashgrove Workshops, Kilwinning, Ayrshire KA13 6PU
E MAIL:	contact@rathmell-arch.co.uk
ARCHIVE LOCATION (intended/deposited)	Report to West of Scotland Archaeology Service and archive to National Monuments Record of Scotland.

Contact Details

Rathmell Archaeology can be contacted at its Office or through the web:

Rathmell Archaeology Ltd

Unit 8 Ashgrove Workshops
Kilwinning
Ayrshire
KA13 6PU

www.rathmell-arch.co.uk

t.: 01294 542848 f.: 01294 542849
e.: contact@rathmell-arch.co.uk

The West of Scotland Archaeology Service can be contacted at their office or through the web:

West of Scotland Archaeology Service

Charing Cross Complex
20 India Street
Glasgow
G2 4PF

www.wosas.org.uk

t.: 0141 287 8332-3 f.: 0141 287 9259
e.: enquiries@wosas.glasgow.gov.uk

End of Document