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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September 2004, Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd (EDAS) were commissioned by English Heritage to undertake a photographic survey and make archaeological observations at five individual monuments within the Yorkshire region as part of a limited programme of repair and consolidation. The five monuments were Newton Kyme Castle (NGR SE46604493), John of Gaunt’s Castle near Harrogate (NGR SE21955453), Neville Castle at Kirkbymoorside (NGR SE6946894), Seamer Manor House at Seamer (NGR TA01308344) and Crayke Castle at Crake (NGR SE55937071). This report details the recording work that was done at Crayke Castle.

The ruined structure, known as the “New Tower” in an Elizabethan survey, stands some 20m north of the former Great Hall, which is still occupied, within an area of lawned and landscaped gardens. The ruins are approximately L-shaped in plan, with a maximum length (north-south) and width (east-west) of c.15m. They are two storeys in height and terraced into a former motte, so that the upper floor is at the same level as the top of the motte. The lower floor is essentially a vaulted basement or cellar level, although the raising of the surrounding ground surface in the post-medieval period may have served to enhance this impression. There were formerly three storeys above this, and the principal access appears to have been through a storeyed porch on the west side, incorporating a small entrance lobby with a ribbed vault on the ground floor. This led into a small passage which gave access to either the rooms on the lower floor or the space to the east, which has now disappeared above ground.

The existing residential block is traditionally ascribed to Robert Neville, Bishop of Durham from 1438 to 1457 and fourth son of Ralph Neville (d.1426), 1st Earl of Westmoreland, and the “New Tower” is thought to be of the same date. However, the surviving fabric incorporates the remains of an earlier building which may have been at least two storeys high and which probably dates to the late 13th or early 14th century (I’Anson 1913, 343); its plan form and extent are as yet unknown. The early building was then substantially modified, and perhaps partly demolished, to allow for the erection of the existing ruin.

Any understanding of the development and meaning of Crayke castle would be greatly enhanced by a consideration of its wider landscape contexts. A detailed survey of the earthworks around the castle and the church would help to establish the relationship between the motte and bailey, the later stone castle buildings and the rest of the village. This should be coupled with a detailed inspection (and possible survey) of the main residential block and further documentary research. While the present work has produced a plan of the New Tower, it would also be beneficial to produce elevation drawings of the structure, to allow for a better understanding of any sequence of development.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 In September 2004, Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd (EDAS) were commissioned by English Heritage to undertake a photographic survey and make archaeological observations at five individual monuments within the Yorkshire region as part of a limited programme of repair and consolidation. The five monuments were:

- Newton Kyme Castle, North Yorkshire (NGR SE46604493)
- John of Gaunt’s Castle, near Harrogate, North Yorkshire (NGR SE21955453)
- Neville Castle, Kirkbymoorside, North Yorkshire (NGR SE6946894)
- Seamer Manor House, North Yorkshire (NGR TA01308344)
- Crayke Castle, North Yorkshire (NGR SE55937071)

1.2 The scope of the work, which was to initially include a rectified photographic survey of each site, was set out in a brief issued by English Heritage. This was discussed and amended following a series of site visits, and a revised method statement incorporating a general photographic survey was subsequently issued by EDAS (see Appendix 2).

2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site Location

2.1 Crayke Castle stands on the north side of the village of Crayke in North Yorkshire (NGR SE55937071), in an elevated position with superb panoramic views over the Vale of York. The remains of the castle are represented by earthworks, buried archaeological remains and two distinct upstanding buildings. The largest of these buildings is the imposing four storey residential block built by the Bishop of Durham in the mid 15th century, which is still occupied. However, the building forming the subject of this report is located to the east of the main block, and is represented by a two storey ruin within landscaped gardens.

2.2 The site is a Scheduled Monument (SM 12602-01), first included in the schedule on 19th February 1958. The scheduling was subsequently revised on 7th December 1995 (DCMS 1995). The site is listed on the National Monuments Record (site SE 57 SE 15) and the North Yorkshire County Historic Environment Record (site 1825). The castle is also a Grade I Listed Building, first listed on 28th February 1952 (EH IOE 333416).

Objectives of the Project

2.3 The objectives of the project, as set out in the revised method statement issued by EDAS (see Appendix 2), were as follows:

- to provide a photographic survey of the monument, to record its condition “as found” prior to the proposed limited interventions;
- to make archaeological observations and undertake a watching brief during the proposed limited interventions, to record and recover any information relating to any archaeological or architectural features and deposits which might be present on the site and which will be affected by the proposed interventions;
- to provide a report on the above.
Survey Methodology

2.4 The photographic survey was undertaken using a Medium Format camera with perspective control and tripod. As a rule, an ISO 400 silver-based film was used, with slower speeds employed where suitable to produce higher definition images. General and oblique photographs were taken of all elevations, providing straight-on and oblique-angle shots to ensure comprehensive coverage, as well as a selection from a distance showing the monument in its landscape setting (as far as was practicable). Detailed shots were taken (using appropriate lenses and ancillary lighting or flash) of any surviving historic architectural detailing or fittings. All detailed photographs contained a graduated photographic scale of appropriate dimensions (subject to access), whilst ranging rods were positioned discreetly in more general shots. All shots taken during the survey were printed at a size of 6" by 4"; a total of 44 black and white photographs were taken, supplemented by a number of 35mm colour slides and prints. The photographic catalogue is presented as Appendix 1, and a limited number of the prints are reproduced in this report for illustrative purposes; some of the photographic location points are shown on figure 4.

2.5 The initial site visit and the photographic survey took place on the 12th January 2005, prior to the scaffolding of the structure, when the remains were fairly heavily vegetated. A further visit was made on the 10th June 2005 after scaffolding to monitor the consolidation works being carried out, and to inspect those areas of the monument not previously accessible or not visible from the ground; any new information was noted and included in the description given below. A final site visit was made by the photographer on 27th October 2005 to record the site following the completion of the consolidation works.

2.6 The project archive, comprising written and photographic elements, has been deposited with York Museum (site code CCC 05; accession number YORYM 2007.6005). The black and white photographs have been retained by English Heritage, but the negatives, contact sheets and colour slides remain with the site archive.

Consolidation Works

2.7 A full copy of the specification for the consolidation works provided by Ferrey & Mennim is included as part of the project archive. It had previously been decided that the work should concentrate on making the building structurally sound, rather than fully repair the monument. In outline, the work involved selective repointing, rebuilding of corework and the infilling of voids. The vaulted undercroft was consolidated, and the extensive ivy growth was removed from the structure (see plates 7 and 8). Wall tops were generally rebuilt, that in the south-west corner being rebuilt to door head level. It was also necessary to dismantle and rebuild the masonry over the west door.

3 OUTLINE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 As a result of its elevated position, Crayke acts as a natural vantage point and both the village and surrounding area have a long history of occupation. Excavations carried out during the late 1950s revealed evidence of Romano-British occupation to the north of the village (Hayes 1962, 90-100), whilst other earlier investigations below Crayke Hall uncovered Roman pottery, various early medieval finds including a bronze pin or pendant, a hoard of ironwork, and two fragments of an Anglian stone cross, and a medieval kiln (Sheppard 1939). Three small trenches dug in 1956 just
outside the churchyard uncovered a number of east-west aligned human skeletons thought to be medieval in date (Hildyard 1959).

3.2 A further trench was excavated just to the north-east of the church in 1983, which uncovered other burials and established that the cemetery was earlier than the mid 13th-mid 14th century (see figure 2). More importantly, in relation to the castle, the recent work has been able to provide a suggested settlement sequence for the village as a whole and has examined the topography of the early medieval monastery. In summary, the monastery lay on the south-east slope of Crayke Hill with the cemetery on the hilltop and the church slightly downslope. Sometime after 883 the monastery was abandoned, and the landscape was subsequently reorganised. A village with a triangular green was laid out, with an open field system; the former monastic cemetery lay within part of the North Field. In the pre-Conquest period a church and hall were inserted into the north field, and the rest of the field was divided into two. Further subdivision of the field followed, together with the extension of the churchyard to the north and south, the infilling of the triangular green, and the subsequent planned expansion of the village along Brandsby Street (Adams 1990).

3.3 The vill and “tria in circuito ipsius villae miliaria” were given by King Egfrid to St Cuthbert in c.685 AD after he became Bishop of Lindisfarne. It is assumed that Cuthbert founded the monastery at Crayke and his body rested there for four months following Norse incursions onto Lindisfarne (l’Anson 1913, 343). The Anglo-Saxon Bishops of Durham maintained a manor house at Crayke and the village was listed as a possession of the See of Durham in 1086 (DCMS 1995); indeed it remained so until c.1830 and as late as 1844 it was still considered to be an outlying part of the County of Durham (l’Anson 1913, 343).

3.4 During the late 11th or early 12th century, the monastic complex was replaced by a motte and bailey castle built by the Bishops of Durham. The bailey formerly occupied the majority of the top of the hill above the 100m contour line, being approximately 210m long (east-west) by 90m wide (north-south). It is now divided into two halves by a modern reservoir which occupies the central area. The DCMS description suggest that the motte survives as a 2.5m high earthwork to the north of the main castle block (DCMS 1995). The castle is first documented in 1195 when Bishop Hugh Pudsey stopped there whilst travelling down from Durham. King John also stayed at the castle three times during the early 13th century, and it was visited by all three Edwards in the first half of the 14th century (Douglas-Irvine 1968, 120). Several phases of building and re-building are known to have occurred, and it is assumed that the initial timber buildings were later replaced in stone (DCMS 1995); l’Anson suggests that this may not have taken place until the late 13th or early 14th century (l’Anson 1913, 343).

3.5 The remains of Crake Castle occupy two distinct and self-contained buildings (see figure 3 and plate 1). The existing residential block, representing the southern building, is traditionally ascribed to Robert Neville, Bishop of Durham from 1438 to 1457 and fourth son of Ralph Neville (d.1426), 1st Earl of Westmoreland and co-builder with his father, John, of Sheriff Hutton castle. The structure is of four storeys rising to a crenellated parapet; each storey steps back with a chamfered set-back, as at Raby Castle in County Durham, another Neville residence. It is built of well coursed and squared sandstone and has a low pitched roof, rebuilt during the 19th century using earlier timbers and covered with stone slates. The south-facing elevation is sparsely fenestrated, with tall but narrow square-headed windows which become smaller as one rises up the building. There are three existing entrances to the ground floor of the main block, all inserted during the 18th-19th centuries. The
first and second floor chambers were originally reached by a possible timber-framed staircase positioned at the north-east angle (Emery 1996, 327).

3.6 Internally, each of the four floors within the residential block appears to have comprised a single space, lit by deeply splayed single lights in the opposing long walls and linked by a newel stair at the north-west corner. Running parallel to the north side of the ground floor is a shorter abutting range with a magnificent vaulted interior supported by fourteen transverse ribs. As Emery has previously noted, the vaulting suggests a substantial superstructure over, although the form of the adjacent residential block indicates that it was intended as a stand-alone structure. The vaulted room may have been used as a storage area for a kitchen above; building accounts for 1441-42 record the construction of a kitchen between the old hall and the great chamber. Emery further suggests that the hall may have been timber-framed and located on the north side of the residential block (Emery 1996, 327-329).

3.7 The ruin forming the subject of this report is the northerly of the two detached structures, and is discussed in detail below. Emery notes that it was described as the “New Tower” in an Elizabethan survey and suggests that it may have been occupied by the Bishop’s Steward, dating from approximately the same period as the main residential block i.e. the mid 15th century (Emery 1996, 329). The Elizabethan survey is an important piece of evidence for the New Tower as it describes the structure in some detail, and there is also a dimensioned line plan which shows the attached parlour on the east side, which has now completely vanished. The Elizabethan survey describes the building as follows:

*The new Tower – the castle of Crake is buyled of harde stone, the walles wherof v fote thicke; the same is vaughted underneath throughout and is thre storie height above the vaught. This house is all covered over w’ leade and in reasonable good reparacion. The groundw worke of the house or story wherin the hall is, is about xl fote longe and xxvij fote wyde on the owtsyde. Ther is at the entrye into the castle a high porche of xv fote one way and ix fote another waie w/ lodgings over it covered w’ leade, and a newe strong grate dore of iron at the entryng in at it* (quoted in Douglas-Irvine 1968, 121).

3.8 Visiting Crayke in the early 16th century, the antiquary Leland also described the castle:

*There remaineth at this tyme smaul shew of any castel that hath been there. There is an haul with other offices and a great stable voltid with stone of a meatly auncyent building. The great squar tower that is thereby, as in the toppe of the hill and supplement of logginges, is very fair, and was erected totally by Neville, Bishop of Duressme (quoted in Emery 1996, 328).*

3.9 The 15th century castle was enclosed by a walled precinct, thought to occupy an area roughly equivalent to that of the earlier bailey, containing ancillary buildings and perhaps also a chapel. A 16th century survey also lists a barn, the site of which survives to the north of the church as a rectangular earthwork. Excavations in this area uncovered evidence for a gatehouse to the east of the barn, served by an existing hollow way known as “Love Lane” (DCMS 1995). The gatehouse was listed as being ruinous in 1560-1570 (Emery 1996, 328). The castle was apparently subsequently made untenable as a fortress by an Act of Parliament in 1646 (DCMS 1995), although any slighting activity that was carried out appears to have left the main residential block largely unscathed. A small clump of trees to the north of the castle, known locally as “Cromwell’s clump”, is reputed to be the site from which
Parliamentarians stationed guns to fire on the building (Crayke Local History Group 1984, 36).

3.10 The residential block continued in use as a dwelling throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, and it was considerably enlarged during this period by the addition of a long rear range to the north-east corner. Photographs taken during the 1930s show the residential block to be clearly visible from the surrounding fields, with far fewer trees than now exist; the southern elevation was almost completely covered in ivy at this date. The “New Tower” ruin appears to be completely obscured by trees on the photographs, and a large lean-to greenhouse and gardens are shown to its east (Crayke Local History Society 1984, 35-36). The ivy has subsequently been removed and the interior of the residential block refurbished. The majority of the internal walls are now rendered but most of the medieval features remain exposed and visible. Despite their narrowness and 20th century tree planting, the second and third floor windows, and indeed the roof, still give superb panoramic views to the south, both York Minster and Sheriff Hutton castle being clearly visible.

3.11 The earliest known modern archaeological work at Crayke castle appears to have been carried out by I’Anson in the early 20th century, who described the site as part of his survey of earthwork castles in the North Riding, noting that “both motte and bailey of the early Norman castle may still be distinctly traced” (I’Anson 1913, 343). As noted above, several trenches have been excavated within the former bailey area (Hayes 1962; Adams 1990), whilst the residential block and the adjacent ruined structure were covered by Emery as part of his seminal work on medieval residences in the north of England (Emery 1996, 327-329). The castle has also featured in the publications of local history societies (e.g. Crayke Local History Society 1984) but, as far as can be determined, no detailed archaeological or architectural survey has been carried out.

4 SITE DESCRIPTION

4.1 The following site description is based on observations made and information noted during the site visits of the 12th January and 10th June 2005, supplemented by details contained in the sources listed in the bibliography. As part of the work, the opportunity was taken to produce a measured plan of the ruined structure at a scale of 1:50 (see figure 4); for ease of description, the rooms or spaces within the structure have been labelled A, B, C etc.

4.2 The ruined structure stands some 20m north of the residential block, within an area of lawned and landscaped gardens; the two elements are linked by a steep south-east facing bank, planted with trees (see plate 1). At the time of the initial site visit, the upper parts of the structure were covered with ivy, whilst the lower eastern end was also heavily vegetated (see plates 2 and 3).

4.3 The structure is approximately L-shaped in plan, with a maximum length (north-south) and width (east-west) of c.15m. It is two storeys in height and terraced into the former motte, so that the upper floor is at the same level as the ground on the summit of the motte. The lower floor is essentially a basement or cellar level, although raising of the surrounding ground surface in the post-medieval period may have served to enhance this impression.

4.4 The walls stand to a maximum height of c.6m and are faced externally on the south and west sides with neatly coursed and squared sandstone, similar to that noted in the residential block; the west side also incorporates a chamfered set back, like those on the residential block, c.1m above ground level. Where the facing stone
has fallen away or been removed, a wall core of sandstone rubble set with a cream lime mortar is exposed (see plate 2). The external walls vary between 1.0m and 1.90m in width, whilst the internal walls have an average width of 0.60m. Unless otherwise stated, internal elevations are of thinly coursed rubble. A low rubble wall butts the west end of the south external face of the structure.

4.5 As stated above, the upper floor is reached from the area of raised ground between the ruined structure and the residential block. The principal surviving access to the upper floor is through the remains of a shallow four-centred arched doorway in the west wall of a small entrance lobby (A) (see plate 4). Much of the masonry of the external face of the doorway has been cut away and, whilst some quoins and wall face remain, it is possible that the structure once extended further to the west. There are some small slots and recesses associated with the former doorway, as well as some carved 19th or early 20th century graffiti. The lobby was formerly covered by a ribbed quadripartite vault, although only the springing pieces for the ribs now remain in each corner.

4.6 The lobby (A) was lit by single-light windows in the north and south walls. Both windows once had two-piece shallow four-centred heads with simple external chamfers. The south window is in a very poor state of preservation but the north window preserves evidence for external iron bars as well as a slot to the upper part for fixed glazing. During the repair and consolidation work, the clearance of the ivy revealed that both windows once had simple relieving arches over. There is a noticeable difference between the masonry of the east and south internal walls of the lobby, the south wall consisting almost entirely of thinly coursed rubble.

4.7 There is a two-centred arched doorway in the east wall of the lobby (see plate 4), chamfered to the west side with a relieving arch over and rebated for a door to the east side. The doorway leads into a short east-west aligned passage (B), floored with stone setts and with a shallow four-centred arched vault over. At the east end of the passage, there is a doorway with an arched head of the same profile, rebated to the west side and chamfered to the east. The room or space into which the doorway opened has completely gone above ground level, although low walls can be seen to either side of the doorway continuing for a short distance to the east; the northern of these appears to butt the doorway jamb. It is assumed that the passage and doorway gave access into the upper floor parlour which was formerly attached to the east side (see figure 3).

4.8 The north wall of the passage contains a doorway with a two-centred arched head, chamfered on the south side and rebated to the north with pintle holes to support a door. The doorway opens into a short dog-leg stone stairway, which takes a sharp curved turn to lead down to the lower floor of the structure. The stairway is lit by a small window in the west wall (originally barred but not glazed) (see plate 5) and the lower half curves around a neatly dressed newel. The newel appears to have been crudely truncated, perhaps suggesting that it once continued upwards in the same form but was later altered. There are similar discrepancies at the bottom of the stairway. The threshold is raised substantially above the level of the floor in the adjacent space (D), necessitating the use of offset stone steps; in addition, the roof vault of the space cuts awkwardly across the shallow four-centred head of the doorway (see plate 6).

4.9 Room D, into which the stairway opens is the largest surviving covered space within the ruined structure, being some 5.80m long (east-west) by 3.70m wide (north-south). It has a broad barrel vault over; the height from the dirt floor to the centre of the vault is 2.56m. Both vault and walls are of thinly coursed rubble, apart from at
the west end where there is a concentration of coursed squared stone around the doorways here. There is a straight joint at the south end of the west wall, between it and the south wall. At its west end, the south wall contains a deeply splayed blocked window flanked to the east by a doorway. The window has a semi-circular rear arch and a steeply sloping base, although the latter may have been built up at the same time as the blocking was inserted. The external opening is narrow with a shouldered head, chamfered externally and was originally barred and glazed. The adjacent doorway has a four-centred arch of stone voussoirs and leads to a flight of stone steps which rise steeply to the external ground surface; the south face of the doorway is recessed from the general external wall line and the whole apparently survived in better condition when it was illustrated by Douglas-Irvine in 1968 (Douglas-Irvine 1968, 120). At the east end of the room, the roof vault has collapsed and the open end has been consolidated to leave a relatively neat edge. Below the vault end, a low retaining cross-wall has been inserted, beyond which the ground surface rises. The south wall of the room continues east for a short distance beyond the cross-wall and then has a quoined return to south, probably a former window or door jamb. There is a ragged joint in the north wall opposite this return; the wall beyond has been rebuilt recently as a garden feature. The VCH description notes that there was formerly an open arch at the east end of the room formerly connecting with the cellar below the parlour (Douglas-Irvine 1968, 121).

4.10 A number of doorways opening off room D lead to connected spaces. At the south end of the west wall, there is a low doorway with a monolithic sub-triangular lintel, apparently crudely shaped to form a shouldered head (see plate 6). The lintel may be flanked by the remains of a slightly corbelled string-course, perhaps a fragment of an earlier north-south passage or vault pre-dating that over room D. The doorway gives access to a small room (C) with a broad barrel vault over; the vault has been repointed using a hard light brown lime mortar. At the east end, it appears to have been built across a higher semi-circular headed opening positioned to the rear of the doorway. The room is otherwise featureless, apart from a window in the north wall of very similar form to that described above within room D.

4.11 There are two openings in the north wall of room D. The low east opening has a large monolithic lintel and substantial quoined jambs, both chamfered to the south side. It is almost certainly a doorway, although the base was obscured by the soil which totally fills the interior of the room into which it once led. It is possible that this room was similar to that which is entered through the doorway to the west (room E). This doorway has a shallow four-centred arched head rebuilt in red handmade brick to the south but it retains its original two-part stone head to the north. It leads into a long rectangular room (E), which is slightly narrower than room D, but has a broad barrel vault over (see plate 3); the very south end of the vault is slightly rounded and the corners corbelled inwards towards the centre. Like the vault over room D, it has also partially collapsed but also appears to have been consolidated at some point in the past. Room E is lit by a single very deeply splayed window in the west wall, shouldered to the exterior and with a semi-circular headed rear arch. Like the similar windows noted throughout the structure, it was formerly provided with bars and fixed glazing. To the north, there is a blocked opening which almost certainly started life as a window of similar form, but which was later considerably widened to the exterior and then blocked. It appears that a deep linear depression was cut into the raised ground to the immediate west of the structure, along the wall, to allow light into these windows and presumably to allow for construction of the structure itself. Room E terminates in a narrow doorway, now visible only in plan, which leads into a narrow dog-leg passage, again only visible in plan; the VCH suggests that this was formerly a garderobe (Douglas-Irvine 1968, 121). The east side of the passage
butts the north end of room E, whilst there is a straight joint between it and the west side.

4.12 In addition to the remnants of the earlier motte and bailey noted by I’Anson in 1913, a brief inspection of the area surrounding the castle uncovered further earthworks. There are several long rectangular platforms (F), visible as shallow earthworks, extending east in line with room D until they are interrupted by the reservoir. It is probable that these are the remains of a range of buildings associated with the ruined structure, running along the north edge of the bailey here, although some caution must be exercised as the greenhouse shown in the 1930s photographs also appears to have been sited in this general area. There may be further earthworks terraced into the steep slope to the north of the buildings, whilst there are a number of well preserved platforms in the bailey area to the east of the reservoir, one of which represents a 16th century barn.

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Emery suggests that “there was little more than a few years between the erection” of the existing residential block at Crayke and the ruined structure which forms the subject of this report (Emery 1996, 329). Whilst this might be true for part of the ruined structure, it clearly incorporates the remains of an earlier building, as noted in the SM description (DCMS 1995). The structural evidence recorded during the current works has revealed the remains of the early building to comprise the west wall of room D, including the semi-circular headed arch to the rear of the doorway into room C, the doorway leading to the staircase, and the lower half of the staircase itself, which was originally of newel form. There may have been a north-south passage on the east side of the wall, as perhaps suggested by the masonry flanking the doorway to room C. The early building was therefore of at least two storeys and, if I’Anson’s suggestion is correct, it perhaps dates to the late 13th or early 14th century (I’Anson 1913, 343); its plan form and extent are as yet unknown.

5.2 The early building then appears to have been substantially modified, and perhaps partly demolished, to allow for the erection of the existing ruin. Emery proposes that the combination of four and two-centred arches within the ruin, the chamfered set back to the west wall, and the appearance of the stonework all indicate that it was built at about the same time as the residential block, i.e. during the 1440s (Emery 1996, 328). This may be partly correct - the arrangement of the ruined structure, with a series of vaulted spaces and a principal entrance from raised ground to one side bears some resemblance to the remains of Harlsey Castle, a mid 15th century tower house also in North Yorkshire, although the structure at Crayke is not as large (Matthews & Richardson 2007). However, the straight joints and other features within the ruined structure at Crayke probably indicate a more complex development from the late 13th century onwards. For example, the external shouldered window heads used throughout the ruin are a variation on the Caernarvon arch form, which was commonly used from the mid 13th century through to about 1400 (Hislop 2000, 47). Further questions could also be posed. As Emery has remarked, the windows in the main residential block are surprisingly narrow and plain for a mid 15th century building of this form, so why decorate those in the ruin with shouldered heads externally when they were far less visible? Why was the ruin described as the “new tower” in a late 16th century survey when it was supposedly already over 100 years old by then – had it been modified more recently? And finally, as already asked by Pevsner (1966, 131), were the ruined structure and the main residential block ever physically linked?
5.3 Whatever the actual date and sequence of construction of the ruin, it is clear that by the time the Elizabethan survey was made, the earlier building had been significantly altered to create a structure with a vaulted lower floor and, according to the survey, three storeys above this. The principal access into the structure appears to have been through a storeyed porch on the west side, incorporating a small entrance lobby with a ribbed vault on the ground floor. This led into a small passage which gave access to either the rooms on the lower floor or the space to the east, which has now disappeared above ground. Emery has the lower floor of the ruin as vaulted residential chambers, with a parlour over the north part and a hall to the east, the whole perhaps permanently occupied by the Bishop’s Steward (Emery 1996, 329). Douglas-Irvine (1968, 120) has the arrangement the other way round, with the hall to the north and a parlour to the east.

5.4 The Elizabethan survey places the hall on the ground floor of the structure (i.e. that level reached through the remains of the porch) and gives the dimensions of the hall as being 60 feet long by 27 feet wide “on the outside” (i.e. c.20m long by c.9m wide externally). If one assumes a vaulted chamber of the same size as room E running parallel to the latter’s east side, and also an external wall of the same width, then an approximate measurement of 9m is reached, perhaps supporting Douglas-Irvine’s placement of the hall to the north; this measurement also equates with a joint in the south wall here. However, the c.20m length is more problematic: were the south end of the hall to be set above the south wall of room E, then a length of 20m would put the north end beyond the edge of the steep slope forming the north side of the castle site. It therefore seems more likely that a ground floor hall here, or at least the space described as such in the survey, would have also run over room D as well. The measurements given in the Elizabethan survey for the porch correspond closely to the those of the surviving structure, and it was evidently a storeyed structure with lodgings above. If the hall was located in the north part of the ground floor, then the porch may well have opened into some kind of screens or cross-passage at its southern end. Finally, the earthworks visible to the east of the ruin may indicate that it lay at one end of a range, rather than being a free-standing residence, which would have implications for its function and development. In addition, the extent of 18th and 19th century repairs to the ruin is also not yet fully understood, and they may have been more comprehensive than presently suspected.

5.5 Any understanding of the development and meaning of Crayke castle would be greatly enhanced by a consideration of its wider landscape contexts, building on that work already done by Adams (1990). For example, I’Anson commented on the close proximity of the church to the castle over 90 years ago (I’Anson 1913, 322-323), and this theme has been more recently explored on a national basis by Creighton (2002, 11). The form of the main residential block also merits further study in the light of work undertaken on medieval designed garden landscapes surrounding such structures. As has been stated above, Crayke has some of the most expansive views of any residence of this date in North Yorkshire, and yet the windows in all four elevations of the residential block are narrow, as if there was no desire on the part of Bishop Neville to look out. However, if he had looked out of the windows on the upper floors, he could have seen York Minster, perhaps reminding him of his ultimate ecclesiastical overlord, God, and also Sheriff Hutton castle, former residence of his father Ralph Neville. He could quite literally see where he had come from; a similar visual relationship has been proposed between the earlier earthwork castles and the later stone castles at Sheriff Hutton and Middleham (Ed Dennison, pers. comm.). Further work also needs to be carried out on the “slighting” of the castle in 1646; research currently being undertaken by Ms Lila Rakoczy at York University is demonstrating the complex legal, political and social contexts of
such activity, and the reality is often far removed from the traditionally accepted straightforward view of dismantling of fortifications by Parliament.

5.6 Clearly, some questions relating to the early history of the site could only be answered by excavation. However, a detailed survey of the SM area, the earthworks included within, the immediate surrounding area and the church, would provide enough information to establish the basic relationship between the motte and bailey, the later stone castle buildings and the village. This should be coupled with a detailed inspection (and possible survey) of the main residential block and further documentary research. Figure 4 provides a plan of the New Tower, but it would also be beneficial to produce elevation drawings of the structure, to allow for a better understanding of any sequence of development.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY


Crayke Local History Group 1984 Crayke in Times Past

Creighton, O 2002 Castles and Landscapes

DCMS (Department of Culture, Media and Sport) 1995 Schedule Entry for Crayke Castle, Crayke, North Yorkshire (SM 12602)


Hislop, M 2000 Medieval Masons


Matthews, E & Richardson, S 2007 Harlsey Castle, North Yorkshire: Some Preliminary Observations (unpublished report for Mrs Kirk, Harlsey Castle Farm)


Sheppard, T 1939 “Viking and Other Relicts at Crake, Yorkshire”. Yorkshire Archaeological Journal vol 34, 273-281

7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

7.1 EDAS would like thank Steve Arrowsuch (Historic Building Restoration), Giles Proctor, Keith Emerick and Lindsey Martell (English Heritage) and Dominic Lockett (Ferrey & Mennim) for their co-operation during the project. Thanks are also due to
the site owners, Mr and Mrs Hollinrake, for access to the monument to carry out the archaeological recording. The on-site recording was undertaken by Shaun Richardson, and Steve Haigh took the photographs. The final report was produced by Ed Dennison, with whom the responsibility for any errors remains.
CRAYKE: THE VILLAGE
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Plate 1: General view of site, showing relationship between residential block and the ruined “New Tower”, looking N (photo 1/15).

Plate 2: South elevation prior to vegetation removal and consolidation, looking N (photo 1/1).
Plate 3: View into room E prior to consolidation, looking S (photo 1/16).

Plate 4: View into lobby (A) prior to consolidation, looking E (photo 1/11).
Plate 5: Part of west elevation prior to vegetation clearance and consolidation, looking E (photo 1/8).

Plate 6: West side of room D prior to consolidation, looking W (photo 2/4).
Plate 7: South elevation after consolidation, looking N (photo 7/1).

Plate 8: View into room E after consolidation, looking S (photo 7/13).
**APPENDIX 1: PHOTOGRAPHIC REGISTER**

Film 1: Medium format black & white prints taken 12/1/05 (pre-consolidation)
Film 2: Medium format black & white prints taken 12/1/05 (pre-consolidation)
Film 3: Medium format black & white prints taken 12/1/05 (pre-consolidation)
Film 4: 35mm colour slides taken 12/1/05 (pre-consolidation)
Film 5: 35mm colour slides taken 12/1/05 (pre-consolidation)
Film 6: 35mm colour prints taken 10/6/05 (during consolidation)
Film 7: Medium format black & white prints taken 27/10/05 (post-consolidation)
Film 8: 35mm colour slides taken 27/10/05 (post-consolidation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Film</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South elevation of site, looking N</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South elevation of site, looking NW</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>East end of site, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>North end of site, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Room E, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Site, looking NE</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Central part of west elevation, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>South end of west elevation, SE</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lobby room A, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Upper part of site, looking NE</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Juxtaposition of site with residential block, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Doorway in east wall of Room B, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Juxtaposition of site with residential block, looking N</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>South elevation of residential block, looking N</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Window in west wall of Room E, looking W</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Doorway at south end of Room E, looking S</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North side of Room D, looking N</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West side of Room D, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>South wall of Room D, looking S</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Steps in south wall of Room D, looking S</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Window in north wall of Room C, looking N</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Arch over doorway in east wall of Room C, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>West wall of Room C, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Staircase, looking N and down</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Doorway to staircase from Room B, looking NW</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>South wall of Room B, looking SW</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Doorway at west end of Room B, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Room A, looking SW</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Room B, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>North end of Room E, looking N</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Site, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Room E, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Room E, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Room E, looking SE</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Site, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Site, looking SE</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Upper part of site, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Upper part of site, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Upper part of site, looking NE</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Site, looking N</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Residential block and site, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Residential block and site, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Doorway at east end of Room B, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Residential block and site, looking N</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Doorway at south end of Room E, looking S</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>West wall of Room D, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Room D, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Window in north wall of Room C, looking N</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arched head of south window to Room A, during consolidation, looking NW</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Detail of typical stonework to upper parts of site during consolidation, looking N</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arched head of south window to Room A, during consolidation, looking NE</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Relieving arch over doorway in east wall of Room A, looking E</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Consolidation work in progress, looking E</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arched head of south window to Room A, during consolidation, looking N</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Consolidation work in progress, looking E</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site after consolidation, looking N</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Site after consolidation, looking NW</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arch to steps in south wall of Room D after consolidation, looking N</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Site after consolidation, looking SE</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Site after consolidation, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Room A after consolidation, looking SW</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Room A after consolidation, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Upper part of site after consolidation, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Site after consolidation, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Room E after consolidation, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Room E after consolidation, looking SW</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>West wall of Room D after consolidation, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Area F after consolidation, looking W</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Room D after consolidation, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Upper part of site after consolidation, looking S</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lobby room A after consolidation, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Room E after consolidation, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Room E after consolidation, looking S</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Room D after consolidation, looking E</td>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: EDAS METHOD STATEMENT

RECTIFIED PHOTOGRAPHIC SURVEY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF, YORKSHIRE MINIBARS (BUILDINGS AT RISK) PROJECT

Introduction

English Heritage require some rectified photographic survey work to be undertaken at six individual monuments within the Yorkshire region as part of a limited programme of repairs. This survey work will record the present condition of the various structures and their component parts prior to any repairs. A watching brief will then be carried out once repairs are in progress, so that records can be made of the proposed intervention work and any additional archaeological or architectural information that might be uncovered.

The six individual monuments are as follows:

• Newton Kyme Castle, North Yorkshire (NGR SE46604493)
• Rothwell Castle, West Yorkshire (NGR SE342283)
• John O’Gaunt’s Castle, near Harrogate, North Yorkshire (NGR SE21955453)
• Neville Castle, Kirkbymoorside, North Yorkshire (NGR SE6946894)
• Seamer Manor House, North Yorkshire (NGR TA01308344)
• Crayke Castle, North Yorkshire (NGR SE55917067 – SE56247071)

The following method statement has been prepared by Ed Dennison of Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd (EDAS) in response to an English Heritage brief and a visit to the individual sites.

Objectives

The objectives of the project are:

• to provide a rectified survey of each of the six monuments to record their condition “as found” prior to the proposed limited inventions;
• to provide an archaeological watching brief during the proposed limited interventions, to record and recover any information relating to any archaeological or architectural features and deposits which might be present on the site and which will be affected by the proposed interventions;
• to provide a report on the above.

Pre-intervention Survey

The pre-intervention survey work will comprise two distinct elements, the rectified photographic survey and a brief architectural / archaeological description. Given the costs and procedures involved, a standard photographic survey is proposed as an alternative to the rectified photographic survey.

Rectified Survey

The rectified photographic survey will be sub-contracted to Photarc Surveys Ltd of Harrogate. EDAS and Photarc have worked together on several historic building recording projects in the past, including Harewood Castle and All Saints Church, Pontefract.

The site photography will be taken using a Zeiss UMK 10/1318 camera using black and white negative film commensurate with a 1:20 scale survey. All photography will be taken from ground level - there is no inclusion within the present fee proposal for hydraulic platforms and/or scaffolding towers, although this could be included if required.

It is important to note that some elevations of the six monuments are small, and not worthy of specialised photographic survey (see below). Only those elevations with a perpendicular stand off distance greater than 1.6m will also be able to be covered. Apart from Seamer Manor House, the ends of walls will not be covered unless they have some residual returns. It should also be noted that some sections of the “to-be-
recorded walls are presently obscured by vegetation, although this might have died back if the surveys were undertaken in the winter months.

Some angled photography may be necessary to maximise the coverage, but this will be kept to a minimum. Photography will be taken using mainly natural daylight but flash will be used for internal areas.

The coverage afforded to each monument will be as follows (joins indicates the degree of effort if mosaicing is to be commissioned), together with details of vegetation management required:

- **Newton Kyme Castle**: the north-south wall and its returns (16 photos / 11 joins) plus the window in the churchyard (2 photos / 0 joins). Some pruning of the branches of the trees obscuring the wall will be required – this should be undertaken by the client/owner with agreement of the landowner prior to the survey taking place.

- **Rothwell Castle**: the two elevations of the remaining pillar of masonry (4 photos / 2 joins) and the two sections (3 photos / 2 joins and 3 photos / 2 joins) of the adjacent boundary wall (southern elevation only). Some limited clearance of scrub and annual vegetation will be undertaken by the survey team to help expose the two sections of the boundary wall, and to try and expose the near ground courses of the remaining pillar of masonry.

- **John O'Gaunts Castle**: the remains of the gatehouse only (8 photos / 2 joins). Long grass at the base of the elevations will be flattened by the survey team to help expose the lower courses.

- **Neville Castle**: the two elevations of the 6m high wall only – the areas described in the SAM documentation as being in private gardens are not included (7 photos / 6 joins). The western face of the wall is currently obscured by scrub vegetation and, although this could be cleared by the survey team, the wall is in a nature reserve – any approvals for vegetation clearance should therefore be arranged and undertaken by the client in conjunction with the landowner. There is also some ivy growth on the wall, that is expected to remain.

- **Seamer Manor House**: the two upstanding elevations and the ends (due to their width) of the one section of wall (6 photos / 2 joins). The long grass around the base of the elevation will be flattened by the survey team to help expose the lower courses.

- **Crayke Castle**: discussions of English Heritage have established that the currently occupied part of the castle (the “Great Chamber”) is not required to be surveyed. Work will therefore concentrate on the ruined “New Tower” to the north-east, and will include all elevations that have a perpendicular stand off distance of 1.6m or greater. This will also include all the undercroft elevations, but the side walls of the stairs would not be covered. The vaulted ceilings are not included except where they spring from the tops of the elevations (55 photos / 24 joins). There is currently a substantial amount of ivy and other growth on the ruins which is assumed will remain – these areas will therefore be obscured.

All the photography will be processed using a Zeiss rewind film processor and printed by Photarc. All the imagery will be scanned on a Zeiss SCAI photogrammetric scanner at a resolution of 14 micrometres. This will give a pixel size of 1.4mm for a scale of 1:100, although most photographs will be at a larger scale than this.

All photography will be controlled by manual measurement only, using a combination of targets and scale bars. The survey control will be undertaken at the same time as the photography. A sketch plan will accompany each individual survey to show the location and direction of each photographic shot.

The rectification will be conducted on ISM DiAP digital photogrammetric systems using Sysimage software. If mosaicing is commissioned (see below) the same software will be used.

The photographic survey team (two personnel) will be on site for up to four working days with no more than one day at any one site.
Architectural / Archaeological Description

Although not required by the survey brief, it is considered appropriate to undertake a brief assessment of the monument being photographed, so that an up-to-date architectural and/or archaeological description can be produced. This will provide an accurate statement of the form and structure of the monument (to include stonework and earthwork remains) which could then be used to inform the proposed conservation and remedial works.

It is envisaged that this description would equate to a Level 2 survey as defined by English Heritage ("Recording Historic Buildings: A Descriptive Specification", 3rd edition 1996), although additional information, for example relating to any structural phasing, would also be included. It should be noted that this description will arise solely from a visual inspection of the monument, and that no documentary or cartographic details will be gathered, apart from that which might be provided by the client at the start of the project.

This Level 2 survey work would be carried out by EDAS, and would be limited to one day's site inspection per monument.

Alternative Photographic Survey

As an alternative to the rectified photographic survey, the client might find it more cost-effective to undertake a general photographic survey of the six monuments. This work would equate to a Level 3 photographic survey as defined English Heritage.

General and detailed photographs will be taken of all external elevations, providing straight-on and oblique-angle shots, as well as a selection from a distance showing the monument in its landscape setting (as practicable). Internal rooms and spaces would also be photographed, from at least two angles to ensure comprehensive coverage. Detailed shots will also be taken (using appropriate lenses and ancillary lighting or flash) of any surviving historic interior fittings.

All photographs will be in black and white and will be taken with a Medium Format camera which has perspective control, using a tripod. A silver-based film will be used, no faster than ISO400, although slower films may be used where possible to produce higher definition images.

All detailed photographs will contain a graduated photographic scale of appropriate dimensions (subject to access), while more general shots should have a ranging rod discretely positioned. It is envisaged that approximately 30 individual shots will be taken of each monument, although some more complex structures such as Crake Castle may have up to 50.

This Level 3 photographic survey would be carried out by EDAS, and would be limited to one day's site work per monument.

Archaeological Watching Brief

It is intended that the watching brief should not delay the proposed conservation or other remedial works, and much can be achieved through liaison and co-operation with the building contractor and the project architect. However, the main contractor and architect should ensure that sufficient time and resources have been allocated to ensure proper completion of the watching brief.

All archaeological work will be carried out in accordance with the Conservation Architect's proposed timetable, unless agreed otherwise. Reasonable prior notice (minimum two weeks) of the commencement of development should be given EDAS. EDAS would then be afforded access to the site and/or monument at all reasonable times to view the works in progress, to make the necessary records. EDAS would closely monitor all proposed works, and should be allowed adequate time to clean, assess, sample and/or record any exposed or uncovered features and finds where appropriate.

Any features of archaeological or architectural interest identified by the watching brief will be accurately recorded by photographs (35mm format – colour slide and colour prints), scale drawings and written descriptions as judged adequate by EDAS, using appropriate proforma record sheets and standard archaeological recording systems. Finds and environmental samples will also be retrieved as appropriate, in accordance with national and regional guidelines.
If, in the professional judgement of the archaeologist on site, unexpectedly significant or complex discoveries are made that warrant more recording than is covered by this method statement, immediate contact will be made with English Heritage and the Conservation Architect. This will allow appropriate amendments to be made to the scope of the watching brief, in agreement with all parties concerned.

Any finds uncovered by the works will be treated according to standard archaeological procedures. The terms of the Treasure Act (1996) will also be followed with regard to any finds which might fall within its purview. Any such finds will be removed to a safe place, and recorded to the local coroner as required by the procedures laid down in the Code of Practice. Where removal cannot be effected on the same working day as the discovery, suitable security measures will be taken to protect the finds from theft.

The archaeological watching brief would be undertaken by EDAS. The number and duration of the site visits will be determined by the extent and speed of the proposed works. However, for the purposes of this method statement, it is assumed that one full day’s visit will be required for each monument.

Survey Products

Rectified Survey

In terms of the product from the rectified survey, the original imagery will be sleeved and labeled as one set of negatives and one set of contact prints. The rectified photography will be presented in digital form and provided as one set of TIFF images on CD/DVD with a ground pixel size of 3mm according to English Heritage specification for 1:20 surveys. No individual prints will therefore be produced – English Heritage, the conservation architect and/or other interested parties will be able to produce their own individual set of prints at whatever scale as and when required. However, a set of laser quality prints at a scale of 1:50 could be provided for an additional charge.

The client may consider it would be more appropriate to mosaic the individual photographs so that composite (i.e. joined-up) elevations can be produced. If mosaicing is commissioned, the mosaiced and rectified photography will be presented as plot files in a suitable format for Autocad. One set of accompanying paper plots will also be delivered.

All rectified photographic data will be retained for a minimum of six years, in accordance with Photarc’s standard procedures.

Alternative Photographic Survey

Black and white shots from the alternative photographic survey will be printed at a size of 5” x 7” (unless requested otherwise – larger size prints may be subject to additional charges). Separate photographic registers and plans detailing the location and direction of each shot will accompany the photographic record.

Archaeological Watching Brief Report

A brief archive survey report will be produced, detailing the results of the archaeological watching briefs and the pre-intervention site descriptions (if commissioned). The English Heritage project brief suggests that this document should represent a combined report from all six watching briefs, rather than individual reports for each site.

For each site, this report will assemble and summarise the available evidence arising from the watching brief in an ordered form, synthesise the data, and comment on the quality and reliability of the evidence and how it might need to be supplemented by further work.

The report will use numbered paragraphs and be paginated, and will contain the following as a minimum:

- a site location plan, related to the OS national Grid (preferably the latest OS 1:2500 map);
- a concise, non-technical summary of the results of the watching briefs;
- a description of the methodology employed, work undertaken and the results obtained;
- plans, sections or other drawings at an appropriate scale showing the location and position of identified finds and deposits;
• photographs (35mm format) where significant archaeological deposits or artefacts are encountered;
• a written description and analysis of the results of the watching briefs, in the context of the known archaeology of the area;
• specialist artefact and environmental reports, as necessary;
• a bibliography or list of sources consulted;
• a copy of this method statement (and any variations);
• an index to the site archive.

The finished report will be supplied within one month after completion of the fieldwork, unless otherwise agreed with the client. Five copies of the final report will be produced, for distribution to English Heritage (2 copies), the County Sites and Monuments Records (1 copy to North Yorkshire and 1 copy to West Yorkshire), and the owner or agent. The information content of the report will become publicly accessible once deposited with the SMRs, although the authors will retain the right to be acknowledged as originators of the work. Copyright of the report, and all survey data, will pass to English Heritage on payment of final invoices.

Archive Deposition

A properly ordered and indexed project archive (paper, magnetic and plastic media) will be deposited with an appropriate registered museum at the end of the project; given that one combined archive will be produced, the museum which covers the majority of the monuments will be chosen. It is expected that the archive will contain survey control information, field and final ink drawings, written accounts, structured catalogues and indices, and project management records. Drawn records will be presented as wet ink plots on standard “A” size matt surface stable polyester film sheets. Digital data will also be provided in a format suitable for transfer to an industry standard software.

Resources and Programming

As noted above, the project would be undertaken by EDAS, who are on North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire County Council’s approved list of archaeological contractors. EDAS is also registered as an archaeological organisation with the Institute of Field Archaeologists.

The project would be undertaken and directed by Ed Dennison of EDAS. The majority of the watching brief work would be undertaken by Shaun Richardson of EDAS. Both have particular expertise in building recording projects and have undertaken numerous similar projects in the past for English Heritage, including detailed surveys of Harewood Castle, Sheriff Hutton Castle, Slingsby Castle, Ayton Castle and Sandal Castle. Summary CV’s are attached. Other clients include the National Trust, North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Park Authorities, several Conservation Architects, and numerous commercial companies.

Photarc Surveys Ltd will be subcontracted to undertake the rectified photographic survey work. They are a well respected and experienced firm who have worked for many for English Heritage, the National Trust, Cadw, Historic Scotland, and many architects and local authorities. Summary CVs for their Technical Director and Technical Manager are attached, and further information on the company can be found on their website (www.photarc.co.uk).

As noted above, it is estimated that the rectified site survey work could be completed by a team of two personnel within four working days with no more than one day at any one site. The alternative photographic survey would be completed within one day per monument, as would the archaeological / architectural descriptions. The timescales for the watching brief would be determined by the Conservation Architect, but the level of work proposed has suggested an allowance of one day on site per monument.

The timetable for the reporting elements would depend on the range and scale of work undertaken by the watching briefs, but it is estimated that a two week period would be sufficient, after the completion of the site work.

The English Heritage project brief also suggests that three monitoring meetings will be required, at the beginning of the contract, one during the fieldwork, and one at the end of the fieldwork to discuss the reporting requirements.
The fee proposal for the work is attached as a separate sheet.

Health and Safety, and Insurance

EDAS and their subcontractors would comply with the Health and Safety at Work Act of 1974 while undertaking the project. A full copy of their Health and Safety Policy is available on request.

All archaeological work on site will be carried out with due regard for all Health and Safety considerations, under existing company policies. This may include the production of a risk assessment, although it is presently considered that there are no major Health and Safety implications as all the pre-intervention survey work will be carried out from ground level. As the watching brief will be carried out at the same time as the building works, regard will also be made for any constraints or restrictions imposed by the building contractor.

EDAS and their subcontractors would indemnify the landowners of each monument in respect of their legal liability for physical injury to persons or damage to property arising on site in connection with the survey work, to the extent of EDAS’s and Photarc’s Public Liability Insurance Cover (both £5,000,000).

Ed Dennison, EDAS
26 July 2004