

APPENDIX 1

Context Listing

Castle Dykes House, Castlegate, Malton - 01.04.08

Evaluation Trench 1

Context	Description
1000	Deposit; 10YR 4/1; sl. sandy silt, modern topsoil
1001	Deposit; 10YR 4/2; sandy silt; ?dump
1002	Deposit; 10YR 4/2; clay silt; fill of 1003
1003	Cut; Posthole or small pit cut
1004	Deposit; 10YR 4/2; sandy, clay silt; upper fill of 1008
1005	Group No.; concrete-filled posthole
1006	Group No.; seating for cast-iron vessel
1007	Deposit; 10YR 6/4;sandy silt; primary fill of 1008
1008	Cut; ?Ditch cut

APPENDIX 2

Finds Catalogue

Castledykes, Malton: Archaeological Excavation (MAP 01-04-08)

Context	Type	Total	Description	Weight	Spot date
1001	Pottery	102	77 Body sherds	2115	Late medieval
			17 Rim sherds		
			7 Base sherds		
			1 Handle		
1001	Bone	53	Fragments	698	N/A
1001	CBM	3	Tile Fragments	118	Modern
1002	Pottery	16	7 Body sherds	304	Late medieval
			8 Rim Sherds		
			1 Base sherd		
1004	Pottery	60	54 Body sherds	1195	Late medieval
			1 Rim sherd		
			3 Base sherds		
			2 Handles		
1004	Bone	13	Fragments	344	N/A
1004	FE Object	1	Nail	8	Modern
1007	Pottery	63	32 Body sherds	1510	Late medieval
			18 Rim sherds		
			13 Base Sherds		

APPENDIX 3

Drawing Archive Listing

Castle Dykes House, Castlegate, Malton 01.04.08

Drawing Number	Scale	Type	Description
1	1:10	Section	SE-facing section of 1003
2	1:20	Plan	General Plan of features in trench
3	1:10	Section	South and East-Facing sections of trench

APPENDIX 4

Photographic Archive Listing

Castle Dykes House, Castlegate, Malton 01.04.08

Film 1058: Monochrome Print

Frame	Description	Scale	Facing
1	ID		
2	Trial Trench after machining and cleaning	1x1 + 1x1.5m	North
3	Trial Trench after machining and cleaning	1x1 + 1x1.5m	North
4	Pit/Posthole 1003 half-sectioned	1x1m	Northwest
5	Pit/Posthole 1003 half-sectioned	1x1m	Northwest
6	East-facing baulk of trench	1x1m	West
7	East-facing baulk of trench	1x1m	West
8	South-facing baulk of trench	1x1 + 1x1.5m	North
9	South-facing baulk of trench	1x1 + 1x1.5m	North
10	South-facing baulk of trench	1x1 + 1x1.5m	North
11	South-facing baulk of trench	1x1 + 1x1.5m	North

Digital

Frame	Description	Scale	Facing
1	Trial Trench after machining and cleaning	1x1 + 1.5m	North
2	Pit/Posthole 1003 half-sectioned	1x1m	Northwest
3	Pottery in fill 1007	1 x 0.3m	Northwest
4	East-facing baulk of Trench	1x1m	West
5	South-facing baulk of Trench	1x1 + 1.5m	North
6	South-facing baulk of Trench	1x1 + 1.5m	North

Film 757: Colour Slide

Frame	Description	Scale	Facing
1	I.D. Shot	N/A	N/A
2	Overall photo of site	2x1m	North
3	Overall photo of site	2x1m	North
4	Overall photo of site	2x1m	North East
5	Overall photo of site	2x1m	North East
6	Overall photo of site	2x1m	South West
7	Overall photo of site	2x1m	South West
8	Photo of wall 5004	2x1m	East
9	Photo of wall 5004	2x1m	East
10	Chalk rubble 5004	1x2m	East
11	Chalk rubble 5004	1x2m	East
12	Chalk surface 5010	2x2m	South east
13	Chalk surface 5010	2x2m	South east
14	Cut 5008/9	1x1m	North
15	Cut 5008/9	1x1m	North
16	Wall + Deposit 5017 + 5018	1x2m	West
17	Wall + Deposit 5017 + 5018	1x2m	West
18	Structure	2x2m	North East
19	Structure	2x2m	North East
20	SE Corner of structure	1x1m	South
21	SE Corner of structure	1x1m	South
22	Grid Sq 1005/990 pre ex	2x2m	North
23	Grid Sq 1005/990 pre ex	2x2m	North
24	Pit Sections 5024, 5026	1x2m	West
25	Pit Sections 5024, 5026	1x2m	West
26	Hearth + Wall	2x2m	North West
27	Hearth + Wall	2x2m	North West
28	Gully + PH? 5028, 5030	1x1m	North
29	Gully + PH? 5028, 5030	1x1m	North
30	Structures NW area	2x2m	East
31	Wall + pit 1050, 5037	1x1m	West
32	Pits + linear 5050, 5052, 5054, 5057	1x1m	West
33	Photo of building area 5012, 5014, 5019	2x2m	South East
34	Pits + postholes 5064, 5066, 5068, 5071, 5073	1x1m + 0.3	East
35	Ditch + pit 5057, 5077	1x1m + 0.3	East
36	Cleaning 1020/990 1020/995	2x2m	North
37	Cleaning 1020/995 1025/995	2x2m	East

APPENDIX 5

Environmental Archive Listing

Castle Dykes House, Castlegate, Malton 01.04.08

No.	Context	Description	Type	Amount
1	1002	Pit/Posthole fill	GBA	20 l
2	1004	Ditch fill	GBA	20 l
3	1007	Primary fill of Ditch 1008	GBA	20 l

APPENDIX 6

Castle Dykes House, Castlegate, Malton. 01.04.08 Pottery Assessment

Methods

A useful assemblage of 238 sherds was recovered, all of which were examined under a hand lens and compared to MAP's type collection of medieval and post-medieval pottery. The sherd totals by fabric type and context are shown in the table below.

Fabrics

Medieval

Four medieval fabrics were found: Splashed, Beverley type-1, York Glazed, Staxton/Potter Brompton and Scarborough wares.

The Splashed ware sherds were from cooking pots or jars, of note being the 8 sherds (some joining) from a cooking pot with a sooted base (Context 1007). The Beverley type-1 material comprised cooking pots or jars as well as 'splashed glazed' pitchers. A 12th century date would be appropriate for both of these fabrics.

Staxton ware sherds were the most numerous category, comprising 2/3rds of the assemblage. These were mostly from cooking pots, with many sooted base sherds present, but there was also a smallish jar (1004) and a possible curfew sherd decorated with an applied thumbed strip (also 1004). The date range would fall between the 12th and the 14th centuries.

Glazed jugs are represented in York Glazed and Scarborough wares. There were 3 sherds from the same highly decorated York Glazed jug from Context 1001, which also yielded the only 2 Scarborough sherds in the assemblage.

Post-medieval

The sole post-medieval sherd was in Ryedale ware, and came from Context 1001, and was from a dish or bowl with an internal lustrous glaze. Date: 17th century.

Conclusions

The assemblage is a moderately-sized assemblage from which a number of themes emerge.

As far as dating goes, the pottery from the features is relatively tightly dated to the 12/13th century. Although Staxton ware has a relatively broad date range (12-14th century), the presence of both Splashed and Beverley type-1 sherds, along with York Glazed sherds, in relatively fresh condition, supports a date within the range 1100-1250 rather than later in the span.

There are no imports, and with the possible exception of the Splashed ware, the pottery is of relatively local origin. The absence of Gritty ware is surprising (although much of the Splashed ware is of the 'Splashed Gritty' type); it seems likely that this because the Staxton kilns were supplying the bulk of cooking pots locally in the 12/13th century, backed up by Beverley.

The vast majority of the vessels (c. 80%) represented are associated with food preparation, and many sherds are sooted from such use.

The relatively fresh and unabraded condition, along with large sherd size and the presence of joining sherds, suggests that the pottery was used in close proximity to the site before disposal. These factors apply to much of the material from 'dump' layer 1001 as much the 'sealed' sherds, suggesting that the dumped soil also originated from the immediate locality.

Recommendations

The pottery should be retained as it is a stratified assemblage with the ability to add much information concerning the sources and use of medieval Malton..

Twelve sherds from the fills of Ditch 1008, and 2 from Pit 1003, would merit publication in an expanded report.

Context Number	Medieval						Post Medieval	
	SPL	BEV 1	STPB	YGL	SCW	RYE		
	1001	1	9	76	20	2	1	
1002		1	6	3				
1004		13	42	8				
1007	8		49					
TOTAL	9	23	173	31	2	1	238	

Key

Medieval

- BEV 1 = Beverley type 1 Ware
- SPL = Splashed ware
- STPB = Staxton/ Potter Brompton ware
- SCW = Scarborough ware
- YGL = York glazed Ware

Post- Medieval

- RYE = Ryedale ware

**WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR
ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION**

**CASTLE DYKES HOUSE
CASTLEGATE
MALTON
NORTH YORKSHIRE**

NGR SE 7899 7155

**Prepared by MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd
on behalf of Mr & Mrs Aldrich**

**CASTLE DYKES HOUSE
CASTLEGATE
MALTON
NORTH YORKSHIRE**

WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL
EVALUATION

1. Summary

- 1.1 The installation of a car parking and turning area is proposed in the grounds of Castle Dykes House, Castlegate, Malton. The development proposals involve the creation of an access through the existing boundary wall and groundworks to create the parking and turning area.
- 1.2 The site lies on the northern side of Castlegate, within the area of the medieval town and adjacent to the boundary of the scheduled ancient monument of the former castle of Malton.
- 1.3 Accordingly, the Heritage and Environment Section of NYCC has advised the Local Planning Authority that a scheme of archaeological evaluation is undertaken at the site. The aim of this work is to establish the nature, location, extent and state of preservation of archaeological remains within the development area. The results of this work will enable the archaeological impact of the development to be fully appreciated and an appropriate design mitigation, and/or further archaeological work, to be agreed to preserve archaeological deposits either *in situ*, or by record. This scheme of investigation has been prepared to define the scope of this archaeological evaluation by MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd, acting on behalf of Mr and Mrs Aldrich.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 This written scheme of investigation represents a summary of the broad archaeological requirements to enable an assessment of the

impact of development proposals upon the archaeological resource. This is in accordance with policies within the Ryedale District Local Plan and the guidance of Planning Policy Guidance note 16 on *Archaeology and Planning*, 1990.

3. Location and Description (centred at NGR SE 7899 7155)

- 3.1 The extent of the application area is indicated on a site location plan supplied by design4architecture (Mr Tony Harrison) at 1:100 scale. The proposed development forms a triangular area with a maximum extent of 19m x 11m.
- 3.2 The site lies north in the walled garden to the west of Castle Dykes House.
- 3.3 The site lies at the junction of two soil types, with the Elmton 2 Association to the north (calcareous fine loamy soils over Jurassic limestone) and Fladbury 3 Association to the south (clayey fine silty over river alluvium) (Mackney *et al.*, 1984).

4. Historical and Archaeological Background

- 4.1 The site lies in area with the potential for the survival of remains of Roman, medieval and post-medieval date.
- 4.2 The Roman fort at Orchard Field lies c. 100m to the north-east, with a civilian settlement extending to the south. Excavations took place within the Roman fort between 1927 and 1930 (Corder 1930), and at the civilian settlement between 1949 and 1952 (Mitchelson 1964) and 1968-70 (Wenham and Heywood 1997). In addition in 1997 MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd identified a large ditch of potentially Roman military origin c. 40m north-east of the site during the Time Team visit to Malton (MAP 1996).

4.3 As mentioned above, the site almost certainly lies within the area of the medieval settlement at Malton, although apparently outside the area enclosed by the town wall. The Borough of New Malton was founded in the third quarter of the 12th century (Beresford 1967). Malton Castle was granted by Henry I to Eustace fitz John in the early 12th century, and went through several phases of occupation, destruction and rebuilding until it was finally demolished in the late 16th century (Robinson 1978, no. 174). The wall that forms the boundary to the site is scheduled as the southern boundary of the ancient monument of Malton castle (NMR No. SE 77 SE 46), and is believed to represent part of the castle wall itself (MAP 1993).

4.4 After the foundation of the Derwent Navigation in 1702 Castlegate developed into an industrial quarter with the establishment of various breweries and mills that exploited the river for transport. Castle Dykes House belongs to this period of growth in Malton, being described as of probable early 18th century origin, with early 19th century additions (www.imagesofengland.org.uk loE number 389393).

5. Objectives

5.1 The objectives of the archaeological evaluation work within the proposed development area are:

.1 to determine by means of trial trenching, the nature, depth, extent and state of preservation of any archaeological deposits to be affected by the development proposals. Trial trench(es) of sufficient size and depth to provide this information will be excavated, and archaeological deposits will be explicitly related to depths below existing surface and actual heights in relation to Ordnance Datum.

.2 to prepare a report summarising the results of the work and assessing the archaeological implications of proposed development,

.3 to prepare and submit a suitable archive to the appropriate museum.

6. Access, Safety and Monitoring

- 6.1 Access to the site will be arranged through the commissioning body.
- 6.2 It is the archaeological contractor's responsibility to ensure that Health and Safety requirements are fulfilled.
- 6.3 The project will be monitored by the Senior Archaeologist, North Yorkshire County Council, to whom written documentation should be sent before the start of the trial trenching confirming: a) the date of commencement, b) the names of all finds and archaeological science specialists likely to be used in the evaluation, and c) notification to the proposed archive repository of the nature of the works and opportunity to monitor the works.
- 6.4 Where appropriate, the advice of the Regional Archaeological Science Advisor for Archaeological Science (Yorkshire & The Humber region) at English Heritage will be called upon.
- 6.5 It is the archaeological contractor's responsibility to ensure that monitoring takes place by arranging monitoring points as follows:
 - .1 a preliminary meeting or discussion at the commencement of the contract to agree the locations of the proposed trial trenches.
 - .2 progress meeting(s) during the fieldwork phase at appropriate points in the work schedule, to be agreed.

.3 a meeting during the post-fieldwork phase to discuss the draft report and archive before completion.

6.6 It is the responsibility of the archaeological contractor to ensure that any significant results are brought to the attention of the Archaeologist, North Yorkshire County Council and the commissioning body as soon as is practically possible.

7. **Brief**

7.1 The proposed area of actual ground disturbance is c. 146m² in size and includes an area that is c. 2.50m higher than the pavement to the south and c.1.40m higher than the general level of the gardens closer to the house. Potentially therefore there will be the need to remove (by hand) c. 2.50m of deposit to reach the level needed for archaeological purposes and so a single trench is proposed, stepped in the centre to allow the depth required. The trial trench will determine the nature, depth, extent and state of preservation of archaeological deposits at the site. It is proposed that the trench should be 5m x 5m in size, with a step 2m x 2m in size in the centre, positioned to avoid the existing trees and shrubs as far as possible. The project should be undertaken in a manner consistent with the guidance of MAP2 (English Heritage, 1991) and professional standards and guidance (IFA, 1999).

7.2 In case of query as to the extent of investigation, a site meeting shall be convened with the Senior Archaeologist, North Yorkshire County Council.

7.3 All deposits should be fully recorded on standard context sheets, photographs and conventionally-scaled plans and sections. Each trench area should be recorded to show the horizontal and vertical distribution of contexts. Normally, all four sides of a trench should be recorded in section. Fewer sections can be recorded only if there is a

substantial similarity of stratification across the trench. The elevation of the underlying natural subsoil where encountered will be recorded. The limits of excavation will be shown in all plans and sections, including where these limits are coterminous with context boundaries.

- 7.4 The use of mechanical excavation equipment is ruled out by there being no suitable access, therefore hand-excavation of all deposits will be necessary. Topsoil will be kept separate from subsoil or fill materials. The need for, and any methods of, reinstatement will be agreed with the commissioning body in advance of submission of tenders.
- 7.5 Should any human remains be encountered, these will be left *in situ* following the determination of the extent of the remains and grave cut(s).
- 7.6 Metal detecting, including the scanning of topsoil and spoil heaps, will only be permitted subject to archaeological supervision and recording so that metal finds are properly located, identified, and conserved. All metal detection should be carried out following the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice.
- 7.7 Due attention will be paid to artefact retrieval and conservation, ancient technology, dating of deposits and the assessment of potential for the scientific analysis of soil, sediments, biological remains, ceramics and stone. All specialists (both those employed in-house and those sub-contracted) should be named in project documentation, their prior agreement obtained before the fieldwork commences and opportunity afforded for them to visit the fieldwork in progress.
- 7.8 Finds should be appropriately packaged and stored under optimum conditions, as detailed in *First Aid for Finds* (Watkinson & Neal, 1998).
- 7.9 The character, information content and stratigraphic relationships of features and deposits should be determined and a running section

along the excavation area, from highest to lowest point, should be recorded to show the vertical distribution of layers. All linear features, such as ditches, should have their shape, character, and depth determined by hand excavation of sections. A minimum sample of 20% of each linear feature of less than 5m in length and a minimum sample of 10% of each linear feature greater than 5m in length (each section will be not less than 1m wide) should be excavated. All junctions of linear features should have their stratigraphic relationships determined, if necessary using box sections. A 100% sample of all stake-holes should be excavated, and all pits, post-holes and other discrete features should be half-sectioned by hand to record a minimum of 50% of their fills, and their shape. Any other unknown or enigmatic features should be investigated similarly. Large pits, post-holes or deposits of over 1.5m diameter should be excavated sufficiently to define their extent and to achieve the objectives of the investigation, but should not be less than 25%. All intersections should be investigated to determine the relationship(s) between features.

- 7.10 Scientific investigations should be undertaken in a manner consistent with the English Heritage best-practice guidelines (2003).
- 7.11 Where there is evidence for industrial activity, macroscopic technological residues (or a sample of them) should be collected by hand. Separate samples (c. 10ml) should be collected for micro-slags hammer-scale and spherical droplets). In these instances, the guidance of English Heritage (2001) and Jones (*ed* 2006) should be followed.
- 7.12 Samples should be collected for scientific dating (radiocarbon, dendrochronology, luminescence dating, archaeomagnetism and/or other techniques as appropriate), following an outline strategy presented to the Senior Archaeologist, NYCC.
- 7.13 Where appropriate, buried soils and sediment sequences should be inspected and recorded on site by a recognised geoarchaeologist.

Samples may be collected for analysis of chemistry, magnetic susceptibility, particle size, micromorphology and/or other techniques as appropriate, following an outline strategy presented to the Senior Archaeologist, NYCC, and in consultation with the geoarchaeologist. The guidance of Canti (1996) and English Heritage (2002) should be followed.

- 7.14 Deposits should be sampled for retrieval and analysis of all biological remains. The sampling strategy should include a reasoned justification for selection of deposits for sampling, and should be developed in collaboration with a recognised bioarchaeologist. Sampling methods should follow the guidance of the Association for Environmental Archaeology (1995) and English Heritage (2002). Flotation samples and samples taken for coarse-mesh sieving from dry deposits should be processed at the time of the fieldwork wherever possible, partly to permit variation of sampling strategies if necessary, but also because processing at a later stage could cause delays.
- 7.15 All securely stratified deposits should be sampled, from a range of representative features, including pit and ditch fills, postholes, floor deposits, ring gullies and other negative features. Positive features should also be sampled. Sampling should also be considered for those features where dating by other methods (for example pottery and artefacts) is uncertain. Bulk samples should be collected from contexts containing a high density of bones. Spot finds of other material should be recovered where applicable.
- 7.16 Coarse sieved samples for the recovery of animal bones and other artefact/ecofact categories should be 100 litres plus. Flotation samples, for the recovery of charred plant remains, charcoal, small animal bones and mineralised plant remains, should be between 40 and 60 litres in size, although this will be dependent upon the volume of the context. Entire contexts should be sampled if the volume is low. Whenever possible, coarse sieved samples (wet or dry) and flotation samples

should be processed during fieldwork to allow the continuous reassessment and refinement of sampling strategies. Samples from waterlogged and anoxic deposits, which might contain plant macros and entomological evidence, taken for General Biological Analysis (GBA), should normally be 20 litres in size. The English Heritage guidance should be consulted for details of sample size for other specialist samples which may be required. Allowance should be made for a site visit from the contractor's environmental specialists/consultants where appropriate.

- 7.17 The specialists that MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd. use are as follows:

CONSERVATION

Ian Panter	YAT		01904 612529
------------	-----	--	--------------

Prehistoric Pottery	Terry Manby		01430 873147
Roman Pottery	Vivien Swan		01904 468335
	Jeremy Evans		0121 778 4024
	Paula Ware	MAP	01653 697752
Pre-conquest Pottery	Mark Stephens	MAP	01653 697752
Medieval Pottery	Mark Stephens	MAP	01653 697752
Post Medieval Pottery	Mark Stephens	MAP	01653 697752
Clay Tobacco Pipe	Mark Stephens	MAP	01653 697752
CBM	Sandra Garside – Neville		01904 621339

Animal Bone		PRS	01388 772167
Small Finds	Hilary Cool		0116 981 9065
Leather	Ian Carlisle	YAT	01904 663000
Textile	Penelope Walton Rogers	Textile Research in Archaeology	01904 634585
Slag/Hearths	Jerry McDonnell	Bradford University	01274 383 5131
Flint	Pete Makey		01377 253695
Environmental Sampling		PRS	01388 772167
Human Remains	Malin Holst	York Osteology Ltd	01904 737509

7.18 Upon completion of archaeological field recording work, an appropriate programme of analysis and publication of the results of the work should be completed. Post excavation assessment of material should be undertaken in accordance with the guidance of MAP2 (English Heritage, 1991).

7.19 Where appropriate, the advice of the English Heritage Regional Advisor for Archaeological Science, Yorkshire Region may be called upon to monitor the archaeological science components of the project.

8. Archive

8.1 A field archive should be compiled consisting of all primary written documents, plans, sections and photographs should be produced and cross-referenced. Archive deposition should be undertaken with reference to the County Council's *Guidelines on the Transfer and Deposition of Archaeological Archives*.

8.2 The archaeological contractor should liaise with an appropriate museum to establish the detailed requirements of the museum and

discuss archive transfer in advance of fieldwork commencing. The relevant museum curator should be afforded to visit the site and discuss the project results. In this instance, the Malton Museum is suggested.

8.3 The archiving of any digital data arising from the project should be undertaken in a manner consistent with professional standards and guidance (Richards & Robinson, 2000). The archaeological contractor should liaise with an appropriate digital archive repository to establish their requirements and discuss the transfer of the digital archive.

8.4 The archaeological contractor should also liaise with the HER Officer, North Yorkshire County Council, to make arrangements for digital information arising from the project to be submitted to the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record for HER enhancement purposes. The North Yorkshire HER is not an appropriate repository for digital archives arising from projects.

9. Report

9.1 A summary report shall be produced following the County Council's guidance on reporting: Reporting Check-List.

9.2 All excavated areas should be accurately mapped with respect to nearby buildings and roads.

9.3 At least five copies of the report should be produced and submitted to the commissioning body, North Yorkshire County Council Heritage Section HER, the Local Planning Authority, the museum accepting the archive and the English Heritage Regional Advisor for Archaeological Science.

9.4 Copyright in the documentation prepared by the archaeological contractor and specialist sub-contractors should be the subject of an

additional licence in favour of the museum accepting the archive and North Yorkshire County Council to use such documentation for their statutory educational and museum service functions, and to provide copies to third parties as an incidental to such functions.

- 9.5 Under the Environmental Information Regulations 2005 (EIR), information submitted to the HER becomes publicly accessible, except where disclosure might lead to environmental damage, and reports cannot be embargoed as 'confidential' or 'commercially sensitive'. Requests for sensitive information are subject to a public interest test, and if this is met, then the information has to be disclosed. The archaeological contractor should inform the client of EIR requirements, and ensure that any information disclosure issues are resolved before completion of the work. Intellectual property rights are not affected by the EIR.
- 9.6 If the archaeological fieldwork produces results of sufficient significance to merit publication in their own right, allowance should be made for the preparation and publication of a summary in a local journal, such as the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*. This should comprise, as a minimum, a brief note on the results and a summary of the material held within the site archive, and its location.
- 9.7 Upon completion of the work, the archaeological contractor should make their work accessible to the wider research community by submitting digital data and copies of reports online to OASIS (<http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/>). Submission of data to OASIS does not discharge the planning requirements for the archaeological contractor to notify the Senior Archaeologist, NYCC of the details of the work and to provide the Historic Environment Record (HER) with a report on the work.

10. References

- Association for Environmental Archaeology 1995 Environmental Archaeology and Archaeological Evaluations, Recommendations concerning the Environmental Archaeology component of Archaeological Evaluations in England. Working papers of the Association for Environmental Archaeology, Number 2.
- Beresford, M 1967 New Towns of the Middle Ages.
- Canti, M 1996 Guidelines for carrying out Assessments in Geoarchaeology, *Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 34/96*, English Heritage.
- Corder, P 1930 The Defences of the Roman Fort at Malton.
- English Heritage 1991 Management of Archaeological Projects.
- English Heritage 2001 Archaeometallurgy: Centre for Archaeology Guidelines 2001/01
http://194.164.61.131/Filestore/archaeology/pdf/cfa_archaeometallurgy.pdf
- English Heritage 2002 Environmental Archaeology : A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation [2002/01].
<http://194.164.61.131/Filestore/archaeology/pdf/enviroarch.pdf> (5.93mb)
- English Heritage 2003 Archaeological Science at PPG16 interventions: Best Practice Guidance for

Curators and Commissioning
Archaeologists

<http://194.164.61.131/filestore/archaeology/pdf/briefs%20version%202022.pdf>

- Institute of Field Archaeologists 2001 Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation
<http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/inPages/docs/codes/exc2.pdf>
- Jones, DM (ed) 2006 Guidelines on the X-radiography of archaeological metalwork. English Heritage
- Mackney *et al.* 1983 Soils of England and Wales, Sheet 1: Northern England.
- MAP 1996 Malton Castle, Malton, North Yorkshire. Archaeological Evaluation – Interim Report.
- MAP 1993 Archaeological Survey. Castle Wall, Castlegate, Malton.
- Mitchelson, N 1964 Roman Malton: The Civilian Settlement. *YAJ* 41, 209-61.
- Robinson, J F 1978 The Archaeology of Malton and Norton.
- Watkinson, D & Neal, V 1998 First Aid for Finds (3rd edition), RESCUE & the Archaeological Section of the United Kingdom Institute for conservation.
- Wenham, L P & Heywood, B 1997 The 1969 to 1970 Excavations in the *Vicus* at Malton, North Yorkshire.

11. Additional Information

This brief was completed on 17th July 2007 by:

Mark Stephens

MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd

New Unit 1

Showfield Lane

Malton

North Yorkshire

YO17 6BT

Tel: 01653 697752