

**Supplementary
Environmental
Statement Volume II**

Thornton Road,
Pickering

Archaeology

17 June 2010

MAP Archaeological
Consultancy Ltd
Showfield Lane
Malton
North Yorks YO17 6BT

Tel: 01653 697752
[http://www.maparchltd.
co.uk/](http://www.maparchltd.co.uk/)

Contents

| | | |
|-------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1.0 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2.0 | Policy Context | 3 |
| 3.0 | Assessment Methodology & Significant Criteria | 5 |
| | Assessment Methodology | 6 |
| | Significant Criteria | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| | Consultation | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4.0 | Baseline Conditions | 7 |
| 5.0 | Potential Effects | 9 |
| | Introduction | 9 |
| | During construction | 9 |
| | After Completion | 10 |
| 6.0 | Mitigation Measures | 11 |
| | Introduction | 11 |
| | During construction | 11 |
| | After Completion | 11 |
| 7.0 | Residual Effects | 13 |
| | Introduction | 13 |
| | During construction | 13 |
| | After Completion | 13 |
| 8.0 | Summary & Conclusions | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 9.0 | Abbreviations | 17 |
| 10.0 | References | 19 |

- J1.0 **Introduction**
- J1.1 Cultural heritage and archaeology is considered to include all recorded archaeological remains, including Scheduled Monuments, designated sites (such as registered parks and gardens or battlefield sites) and other archaeological remains.
- J1.2 The aim of this chapter is to characterise and assess the impact of the proposed development on the Cultural Heritage i.e. the historic landscape, below ground archaeology and any historic buildings. The potential for previously unrecorded archaeological remains within the development boundary are also assessed.
- J1.3 The document should be read in conjunction with Chapter J and appendices J1 to J4:-
- Appendix J1: Listed Buildings within 1km of the Proposed Development Area
 - Appendix J2: Figures J1-J10
 - Appendix J3: Plates J1-J16
 - Appendix J4: Geophysical Survey Report
- J1.4 This chapter has been prepared by MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd on behalf of David Wilson Homes and the assessment is based on the scheme details contained within the scoping report.

J2.0

Policy Context

Same as Chapter J Paras 2.1-2.5

J3.0

Assessment Methodology & Significant Criteria

Same as Chapter J Paras 3.1-3.13

J4.0

Baseline Conditions

Same as Chapter J Paras 4.1-4.26

J5.0 Potential Effects

Introduction

J5.1 The previous use of the site as post-medieval farmland may have removed some traces of archaeological deposits. There is the possibility for archaeological deposits to have survived but the potential for these is low. This assessment has identified the principal areas within the boundaries of the Proposed Development Area where the construction phase may impact upon archaeological deposits.

During construction

J5.2 The Proposed Development will require the insertion of boreholes and geotechnical test pits and groundworks for the insertion of roads, services and foundations. These works will have the potential to have a direct impact on any buried archaeological deposits. The construction Phase may have an adverse significance on archaeological deposits without mitigation. The sensitivity of the site is assessed low and the magnitude of impact is assessed as negligible.

J5.3 The Impact of the Proposed Development to the nearby Listed Building on the north side of Thornton Road is negligible, as a major road and existing buildings on the south side of Thornton Road separate the Proposed Development Area from the Listed Building

J5.4 There are no Scheduled Monuments or Listed Buildings on or bordering the Proposed Development Area and thus the potential effects for these is negligible.

J5.5 All interior post-medieval field boundaries and the earthwork remains of the post-medieval ploughing will be removed but exterior post-medieval field boundaries will remain intact. The magnitude of impact is negligible, the sensitivity of these features are low, and the significance is not significant. The Proposed Development will have a negligible impact on the visible earthworks and the interior field boundaries (remains of post-medieval ploughing).

J5.6 The Proposed Development could possibly have an effect on the prevailing local drainage conditions. The Geophysical Survey Results indicate that the impact on any buried archaeological deposits would be negligible.

J5.7 The construction programme associated with the development proposals will have a short term impact in terms of noise and vibration in the immediate environment of the site. It is likely that these will have a minor adverse impact on features of archaeological and historic environment importance.

J5.8 There will be negligible effect on the character of the surrounding area during the construction phase.

After Completion

J5.9

Potential effects upon the archaeological remains after completion of the Proposed Development would be negligible.

J6.0 Mitigation Measures

Introduction

J6.1 Mitigation measures proposed relate to both layout and design of the development within the most archaeologically sensitive areas.

During construction

J6.2 The predicted impact of the development proposals would be mitigated through an Archaeological Watching Brief on all groundworks during the construction phase.

J6.3 No Mitigation measures are needed for the Listed Building on Thornton Road.

J6.4 There are no Scheduled Monuments or Listed Buildings on or bordering the Proposed Development Area, therefore there will be no effect on the character of the adjacent land during the construction phase.

J6.5 The proposed mitigation measures will record the post-medieval field boundaries and the earthwork remains of the post-medieval ploughing.

J6.6 The proposed development may have an impact on drainage conditions, this impact would be negligible and will be mitigated against by the proposed Archaeological Watching Brief.

J6.7 The predicted impacts of the development proposals have been mitigated prior to construction by means of geophysical survey (Appendix J4). The results indicate that the potential for archaeological deposits to survive below ground are low. Therefore the predicted impacts of the development proposal would be mitigated through an archaeological Watching Brief during construction (Tables J5, J6 and J7).

After Completion

J6.8 As all archaeology will have been dealt with during the construction phase there will be little to mitigate against after completion of the project and therefore the effect would be negligible.

J6.9 The impact of the construction phase on the nearby listed building would be negligible after completion.

J6.10 The impact of the construction phase on the historic landscape and its setting would be negligible after completion.

J6.11 The mitigation put forward will have created a detailed enough archive record of all archaeological deposits by means of recording, analysis and publication.

J7.0 Residual Effects

Introduction

J7.1 Residual effects relate to any archaeological sensitive areas that would remain after mitigation.

During construction

J7.2 There will be no residual impacts for the all the issues raised during the construction phase would have been dealt with by the Proposed Mitigation (Table J3).

J7.3 The residual impact to archaeological remains will be negligible.

J7.4 The residual impact to the nearby listed building would be negligible will be negligible.

J7.5 The Proposed Development will not alter the setting of the historic character landscape.

After Completion

J7.6 There will be no residual effects on the archaeological remains after completion.

J7.7 There will be no residual effects to the nearby Listed Building after completion.

J7.8 There will be no residual effects on the setting of the historic landscape characterisation after completion.

Table J5: Summary of the Predicted effects on the proposed development on the relevant receptors in relation to cultural heritage and archaeology during the construction phase

| Receptor | Probability | Effect | Significance | Duration of Impact | Permanence |
|--|-------------|------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| Damage and loss to archaeological remains | Likely | Negligible | Not significant | Short term | Temporary |
| Damage or Loss to nearly Listed Buildings | Unlikely | Negligible | Not significant | Short-term | Temporary |
| Damage or loss to historic landscape and setting | Unlikely | Negligible | Not significant | Short-term | Temporary |

Table J6: Summary of the Predicted residual effects on the proposed development on the relevant receptors in relation to cultural heritage and archaeology during the operational phase

| Receptor | Probability | Effect | Significance | Duration of Impact | Permanence |
|--|-------------|------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|
| Operational Phase | | | | | |
| Damage and loss to archaeological remains | Unlikely | Negligible | Not significant | Long-term | Permanent |
| Damage or Loss to nearly Listed Buildings | Unlikely | Negligible | Not significant | Long-term | Permanent |
| Damage or loss to historic landscape and setting | Unlikely | Negligible | Not significant | Long-term | Permanent |

| Key | Probability | Effect | Significance | Duration | Permanence |
|------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| | Certain | Major | Significant | Long-term | Permanent |
| | Likely | Moderate | Not significant | Medium-term | Temporary |
| | Possible | Minor | | Short-term | |
| | Unlikely | Negligible | | | |

Table J7: Implementation of Incorporated Mitigation and Monitoring Proposals

| Environmental Measure/Monitoring Proposal | Actioned By | Compliance Mechanism |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Archaeological Watching Brief on all groundworks | David Wilson Homes | By Planning Condition |

J8.0

Abbreviations

- 1 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
- 2 Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5)
- 3 Historic Environment Register (HER)
- 4 Sites and Monuments Record (SMR)
- 5 North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC)

J9.0

References

J9.1

Primary

National Monuments Register (www.pastscape.org.uk)

North Yorkshire Heritage and Environment Section - Historic Environment Register

Listed Buildings Register (www.imagesofengland.org.uk)

North Yorkshire Record Office

1789 Enclosure Award Map of Pickering with Newton (NYCRO PR/P1 11/1)

1839 Tithe Plan of Pickering (NYCRO T(PR/P1))

1854 First Edition Ordnance Survey Map Sheet 91. Scale 6 inch to one mile

1938-1952 Second Edition Ordnance Survey Map Sheet 91. Scale 6 inch to one mile

J9.2

Secondary

Beresford, M. & Finberg, H.P.R. 1973 English Medieval Boroughs: A Handlist. David and Charles.

IFA 2001 Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk Based Assessments. Institute of Field Archaeologists.

Page, W. (ed.) 1968 The Victoria History of the County of York North Riding. Volume 2. Institute of Historical Research. University of London.

Smith, A.H. 1979 The Placenames of the North Riding of Yorkshire. English Placename Society. Vol. 5. Cambridge University Press.

Williams, A and Martin, G.H. 1992 Domesday Book A Complete Translation. Penguin Books.