



7 CULTURAL HERITAGE

7.1 Introduction

- 7.1.1 Hallam Land Management commissioned *John Samuels Archaeological Consultants* to carry out an assessment of the cultural heritage value of land at Crossroads Farm, Bramham, in order to identify any features which may be affected by the development proposal and to establish a mitigation strategy. The study area is situated close to the junction of the A1 and A64 roads and is centred on NGR SE 4340 4022. The northern boundary of the site lies on the border between North and West Yorkshire, although the proposed development area lies wholly within the administrative boundary of North Yorkshire. The proposed development area is situated in a shallow valley at between 68 and 73 metres AOD. The general area contains the remnants of probably Roman period fields which are preserved as cropmarks. Prehistoric, Anglo Saxon and Medieval finds are known from the surrounding area. The main features of interest on this site are the historic buildings, once a coaching inn on the Great North Road. This section of the environmental statement has been written by Dan Slatcher BA, MA, MIFA in consultation with John Samuels BA, PhD, FSA, MIFA, MLI.

NYCC HER	
SNY	18601
ENY	5895
CNY	10745
Parish	8070
Rec'd	?1002

7.2 Study Area

- 7.2.1 An area of about 1 kilometre around the proposed MSA was considered in detail. An area of about 5 kilometres around the proposed development area was considered in less detail, with the site also being considered in its local, regional and national context.

7.3 Physical Features

- 7.3.1 Physical features considered include Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens, the Historic Landscape Pattern, Ancient Routeways and Historic Battlefields.

7.4 Methodology

- 7.4.1 This assessment is based on the requirements of Government Guidance to Local Planning Authorities *Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 Archaeology and Planning* (PPG 16), DoE 1990, *Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 Planning and the Historic Environment* (PPG 15), DoE & DNH 1994, *The Hedgerow Regulations* 1997, DoE 1997, advice from English Heritage *Management of Archaeological Projects*, English Heritage 1991, and is based on the requirements of the professional standards *Code of Conduct*, Institute of Field Archaeologists 1994, *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessment*, Institute of

Field Archaeologists 1999 Reference has also been made to the DoE Good Practice Guide (1995) Preparation of Environmental Statements for Planning Projects that Require Environmental Assessment'

- 7.4.2 The relevant local plan policies have been considered Chief among these are from the North Yorkshire Structure Plan of 1996 Policy E1 (Part iii) and E2 (part ii) The Selby District Local Plan Deposit Draft (paragraph 3.24 – the re-use of buildings is also relevant)

7.5 Data Collection

- 7.5.1 Desk-top research undertaken by John Samuels Archaeological Consultants comprised analysis of relevant information contained in and provided by the County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR), documentary and cartographic searches of relevant material in published and unpublished sources were undertaken at relevant Record Offices and our own library resources Information about Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Registered Battlefields and Registered Parks & Gardens was obtained from English Heritage

7.6 Survey

- 7.6.1 A site visit and walkover survey was undertaken to examine the topography and current land use of the site, and to identify any previously unrecorded above ground archaeology

7.7 Status of Features

- 7.7.1 At the time of writing there is no nationally agreed method of measuring the relative importance of archaeological monuments PPG16 (paragraph 8) draws a distinction between nationally important remains and those of lesser distinction On this basis it is possible to distinguish between monuments of national, regional local or negligible importance

National	Monuments that are scheduled and protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979), those suitable for scheduling, or considered to be of national importance but not covered by the Secretary of State's criteria for scheduling
Regional	Sites listed in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) or other sources which are of a reasonably well defined extent, nature and date and significant examples in the regional context

Local Sites listed in the SMR or other sources which are of very low potential or minor importance

Negligible Areas in which investigative techniques have produced negative or minimal evidence of antiquity, or where large scale destruction of deposits has taken place (eg by mineral extraction)

7 7 2 Within this assessment Grade I listed buildings are considered to be of national importance, Grade II* listed buildings of regional importance, Grade II listed of local importance

7 7 3 English Hentage registered **P**arks and gardens are considered to be of national or regional importance, with unregistered histonc parks and gardens of local importance

7.8 Consultations

7 8 1 The County Archaeological Officer and English Heritage have been consulted

7 8 2 The County Archaeological Officer has indicated that the archaeological interest in this site can be secured through a negative planning condition (see Appendix H)

7 8 3 A site meeting has been held with English Heritage to discuss the merits of the buildings, which are provisionally assessed as being of local importance English Heritage has indicated that they are content with the approach being taken to histonc building conservation on this site

7.9 Potential Impacts

7 9 1 Development of the scale proposed has the potential to cause both direct and indirect impacts on archaeology and cultural heritage

7 9 2 The worst adverse impact would be the total loss or destruction of a physical feature of statutory importance, for example the demolition of a listed building or destruction of a Scheduled Ancient Monument

7 9 3 Impacts can also anse as a result of changes to the setting of an histonc monument or building Such impacts may be adverse or beneficial

7.10 Existing Baseline Conditions

7 10 1 Bramham Moor and the surrounding landscape has seen human activity since at least the Neolithic penod Neolithic and Bronze Age tools have been found as

stray finds (N Yorks SMR nos. **9583.00010**, **9583.00011**, **9583.00012**, **9583.00013** and **9584.00000**), but there is no firm evidence for occupation in the vicinity of the proposed development area and there are few lithic artefacts from the immediate environs of the proposed site area. The North Yorkshire SMR locates prehistoric sites c 1 kilometre to the south of the proposed development area.

7 10 2 Aerial photographic evidence indicates that the study area was occupied and farmed during the Iron Age and/or Roman periods. No finds of Iron Age material have been made in the area but Roman artefacts have been recovered and it is clear that much of north Nottinghamshire and southern Yorkshire had settlements consisting of small farmsteads set in enclosed fields by the end of the Iron Age, continuing through the Roman period. However, cropmarks on the western side of the A1, immediately west of the proposed development area, have been investigated through trial trenching (Babtie Group 1996). This area produced no evidence for prehistoric activity. There had been agricultural activity, in the form of traces of ridge and furrow, during the medieval period and gilliar quarrying during the nineteenth century.

7 10 3 There seem to have been no major structures associated with occupation in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development area during the Roman period. The Roman settlement of *Ca/caria*, modern Tadcaster, is the nearest Roman town. The chief features of the Roman period in the area are roads. The proposed development area is close to the junction of 3 major Roman roads. These were the road from Ilkley to Tadcaster and Rudgate, the road linking this with Dere Street, which ran from York north towards Aldborough. Finally, the Roman Ridge (N Yorks SMR no. **9163.01000**, Scheduled Ancient Monument, County No. **621**) linked Tadcaster to Doncaster, a distance of **29.5** miles. None of these roads appear, from aerial photographic and cartographic evidence, to intrude into the proposed development area. A further possible Roman road runs north west - south east and is visible on aerial photographs held by WYAS (Aerial photograph number **44443173**) from roughly SE **4320 4119** to SE **4447 4072**, c **500** metres outside the proposed site area.

7 10 4 The settlements in the area are generally medieval or earlier in origin. The Domesday Book of **1086** mentions Tadcaster, Bramham, from the Old English meaning 'homestead amongst the broom', Hazelwood, when it was called (H)ese/uuode, meaning 'hazel wood', Barwick in Elmet, meaning 'a bartey farm, an outlying grange or part of an estate retained for the lords use' and Oglethorpe, from the Old English meaning 'Oddkell's outlying farmstead'. The nearby village of Aberford takes its name from the Old English Aedburford, meaning 'Eadburg's

ford' and clearly refers to the crossing of the Cock Beck. The place names generally indicate a remote area.

- 7 10 5 The nearby Hazelwood castle (**N Yorks SMR number 9583.02000**) came into being in around 1290, when William le Vavasour obtained a licence to crenellate his property here (Smith 1961: 75). The only part of the castle to survive complete in its medieval form is the chapel (**N Yorks SMR number 9583.02100**). There was a medieval deerpark associated with the castle (**N Yorks SMR number 9583.02200**). A cross of medieval, probably 15th century date, stands close to the chapel (**N Yorks SMR number 9583.02101**). Immediately north of the castle is an ornamental garden, almost certainly of post medieval date (**N Yorks SMR number 9583.02210**). Just north of the chapel is an 18th century folly tower (**N Yorks SMR number 9583.02220**). The area of Hazel Wood (**N Yorks SMR number 9589.00000**) was probably either part of the medieval parkland or formed its boundary. It has been felled and replanted, however.
- 7 10 6 The battle of Bramham Moor (**WYAS PRN 6115**) was fought nearby on 9th February 1408, when the forces of Henry IV defeated a group of rebels led by the Earl of Northumberland. Relatively little else is known about the encounter, other than that its location was somewhere east of the Great North Road, north of its junction with the A64. Other recent archaeological work has sited the battle around Spen Common Lane. The Battle of Bramham Moor is not on the English Heritage Register of Historic Battlefields.
- 7 10 7 There are numerous limestone quarries in the area. Most of these appear from cartographic evidence to be post medieval in date. At least two are shown as being in use immediately to the east of the proposed development area on the first edition six inch to the mile OS map of 1881. This map differentiates between 'limestone' and 'galliard', although the two industries were probably identical in technique. There is no direct evidence to suggest that the proposed development area had itself been quarried.
- 7 10 8 Bramham Park is an 18th century park and garden laid out perhaps by John Wood the Elder. It is registered at Grade I on the English Heritage Register and is of National Importance.
- 7 10 9 Cartographic evidence for the study area is fairly limited. Thomas Jeffrey's map of Yorkshire of 1775 (See Plan ES 8a) shows the main road, now the A1, from Ferrybridge to Wetherby. The Leeds to Tadcaster road crosses it through Bramham Moor and this meets the Roman Ridge coming from the south close to Hazelwood Hall. At this time the proposed MSA site is indicated as moorland. The proposed development area lies in Stutton with Hazelwood, which was

enclosed in 1798. The curiously shaped parish boundary to the north of the proposed development area was created by the line of the old Leeds Road, shown on F. Whites plan of the area, dating to about 1795. Bramham Moor was divided among the adjacent townships along the line of this road to the north, with 'Hesslewood Cam' forming the parish boundary to the west of the Roman ridge and the Great North Road. The first edition one inch to the mile Ordnance Survey (OS) map of 1858 (See Plan ES 8b) shows the proposed development area as open land. There was a building in the north-east corner of the crossroads. This is marked as 'White Hart Inn'. The first edition six inch OS map of 1881 (See Plan ES 8c) shows the proposed development area being a group of large fields, with the only building those of the inn at the crossroads.

- 7 10 10 By the time of publication of the six inch OS edition of 1909 (Plan ES 8d) there had been some minor hedgerow removal but other than this, the picture was identical to that of the first edition map. The provisional edition of the six inch map, revised in 1950 (Plan ES 8e), was again identical. It is noteworthy that many of the quarnes shown on the first edition six inch to the mile map of 1881 had disappeared by 1950, if not before.
- 7 10 11 Crossroads Farm itself is a group of buildings which consist of the main house (building 1) and a number of other ancillary buildings. The most significant of these are the two ranges of outbuildings to the north (buildings 3 and 4) and north-west (building 2) of the main house.
- 7 10 12 The main house is of two storeys, with rooms in the attic and basement cellars. It has three bays, with a central entrance door. Stylistically, it appears to date from about 1800-1820. It is L-shaped in plan, with the rear wing being of a later phase than the main part of the house.
- 7 10 13 Limited sources have been traced for the history and development of the buildings themselves.
- 7 10 14 The buildings are not shown on Thomas Jeffrey's map of Yorkshire of 1775, when the proposed MSA site is indicated as moorland.
- 7 10 15 F. Whites plan of the area, dating to about 1795, was designed to illustrate a claim to part of Bramham Moor apparently for purposes of enclosure. Several versions are held in the West Yorkshire Archive in Leeds, at least one annotated by hand. None of these make reference to buildings in this location, either existing or proposed.
- 7 10 16 The area was enclosed in 1798 and it appears to be this event that led to the establishment of the new inn.

7 10 17 A lease for 7 years was granted from Sir Walter Vavasour (the owner of the Hazlewood Estate) of 'a newly built messuage at the cross roads at Haselwood common and 20 acres of enclosed land there' dated to 1st January 1799 (WYAS Leeds VAV 732) A further lease was granted by Sir Thomas Vavasour on 12th May 1807 for a 'newly erected capital messuage at the cross roads on Bramham Common (commonly called Bramham Moor) with coachhouses lately converted into a school, a garden, stables, cottages, half a granary and part of a barn, with several closes of land on Haselwood Common comprising 80 acres in all These leases appear to refer to the proposed development area They give an approximate date for the buildings of the last five years of the 18th century

7 10 18 The first edition one inch to the mile OS map of 1858 shows the area as open land There was a building in the north - east corner of the crossroads This is marked as 'White Hart Inn' It seems likely that Crossroads Farm was originally a coaching Inn on the Great North Road

7 10 19 The first edition six inch OS map of 1881 shows the buildings marked as 'Filbert Grove or White Hart Inn'

7 10 20 A series of bound OS plans at 1:2500, published in 1893 (WYAS Leeds VAV 1323) show the extent of the Hazlewood Estate at that time The site by this time was marked as 'Cross Roads Farm' and is indicated as being part of the estate

7.10 21 By the time of publication of the six inch edition of 1909 (revised from the first edition six inch map in 1906) (See Plan ES 8d), the buildings were again called 'Crossroads Farm' and no reference to an inn was made There had been some minor hedgerow removal but other than this, the picture was identical to that of the first edition map

7.11 Identification & Evaluation of Key Impacts

7 11 1 Aerial photographic evidence and geophysical survey indicated that there are the remains of field systems of possible prehistoric date in the study area, although none are visible within the site considered here Field investigation of a group of these linear features immediately west of the proposed development area was carried out by West Yorkshire Archaeological Service on behalf of Babbie (Babbie 1996) Their conclusion was that none of the features "is of special archaeological interest and their potential for providing further information seems low" (Babbie 1996 4) Remains of this type would be of local importance There seems to be little significant evidence for prehistoric activity in the area

7 11 2 A further group of linear features to the north of the proposed development area (WYAS ref 44 44 3173) appears on morphological grounds to be a later field

system rather than bnckwork or ladder pattern fields of late prehistonc date
Similarly, cropmarks to the east of the site appear to represent evidence for later
activity These features would be of up to local importance

7 11 3 The nearest Scheduled Ancient Monument to the proposed development area is
the Roman road near Hazelwood Castle (North Yorks County number 621, SE
439 403 - SE 435 394) The monument is located to the south of the A64
Tadcaster Road and given that the A1/ M1 link road junction has been
constructed in the immediate vicinity it is felt that the present development
proposal would have a negligible impact on the setting of the scheduled area The
line of this road lies c 500 metres outside the proposed development area The
other possible Roman road in the area, running north-west, south-east, also lies
c 500 metres outside the proposed development area This feature is of local to
regional importance and this too will not be affected by the development

7 11 4 The remainder of known archaeological sites lie within Hazel Wood and
Hazelwood Park These are of local importance and none would be affected by
the proposed development

7 11 5 Site visits undertaken by Dan Slatcher of John Samuels Archaeological
Consultants revealed an area of farmland under rough pasture A number of field
boundanes have now been removed No previously unrecorded sites or features
were seen

7.12 Construction Period

7 12 1 The majonty of the area of the new MSA will compnse car parks, HGV parks, a
petrol filling station and hardstanding The remainder of the Scheme will compnse
buildings set almost entirely within the footpnnts of existing buildings For these
reasons it is believed that the overall impact on archaeological remains will be low
to medium Despite advances in archaeological evaluation techniques, all
developments run the nsk of the discovery of unexpected archaeological remains
dunng construction The nsk here can be minimised because the low impact of
the car park areas on any archaeology and the reuse of existing building
footpnnts means that a design solution has in effect been adopted The County
Archaeologist has indicated that he is content that archaeological matters can be
safeguarded through a PPG16 paragraph 30 type negative planning condition

7 12 2 The setting of Bramham Park has been considered dunng the design process
The main body of the park is sheltered from the proposed MSA by large areas of
woodland associated with the park and within the boundary of the registered
area The registered park and garden are divided from the proposed
development area by the A1 road and by a large soil mound immediately to the

west of the old line of the great north road. In addition, there are a group of buildings to the north west of the proposed development area, on the west side of the old Great North Road. The effect on the setting of the registered park and garden by the currently proposed scheme will be minimal.

- 7.12.3 The former White Hart coaching inn and associated buildings will be affected during the construction phase. They will be altered but retained in order to form parts of the MSA. The impact of the development on the historic buildings will be major but the design has been carefully worked out to preserve the nature and historic interest of the buildings. Much of the construction phase impact will be temporary. Overall, constructional impacts will have a beneficial effect on the historic buildings.

7.13 Operational Life

- 7.13.1 The former White Hart coaching inn and associated buildings will be affected by maintenance work etc during the operational life of the MSA. This will be a substantial benefit to the buildings because they are currently not being maintained.

7.14 Mitigation

- 7.14.1 The basis for the mitigation strategy has been worked out in close consultation with English Heritage, through a continuing dialogue in the form of a series of letters and a site meeting. The current proposal is seen as an enabling development which will in effect rescue the historic buildings from their present rather poor condition and preserve them for the foreseeable future through a viable new use. Although the buildings are not listed, the proposed development is designed to improve their setting.
- 7.14.2 Below ground archaeological remains will be preserved by record through the implementation of a programme of archaeological recording during construction work (archaeological watching brief). This is in line with the requirements laid out by the Heritage Unit of North Yorkshire County Council in a letter dated 18 March 2002. The scope of these works will be detailed in a written scheme of investigations to be developed and agreed upon through consultations with the North Yorkshire County Council Heritage Unit.
- 7.14.3 Mitigation of the effects of development on the historic buildings will be achieved in the first instance by careful, sympathetic design. A Design Statement and Audit of Existing Buildings has been prepared by Koyander Associates. This statement is included as an Appendix in the Planning Application (Part A). This describes each building in some detail and includes redesign proposal drawings, which

endeavour to retain as much as possible of the historic fabric. Features of the design will include the reuse of existing building footprints to minimise the effect on the setting of the historic buildings. In addition attention has been paid to the scale and massing of the new development.

- 7.14.4 Mitigation prior to, and possibly during the construction phase on the historic buildings will include building recording, in order to preserve by record the current structural and decorative details.

Bibliography and References

Babtie Group	1996	M1 - A1 Link Road (Lofthouse to Bramham) Known Archaeology Report - Known Archaeology Area 24
English Heritage	1996	County List of Scheduled Monuments North Yorkshire
English Heritage	1996	County List of Scheduled Monuments West Yorkshire
English Heritage	1984	Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic Interest in England Part 32 North Yorkshire
Northern Archaeological Associates	1994	M1 - A1 Link Road Geophysical Results and Recommendations for Archaeological Work
Sawyer PH	1968	Anglo Saxon Charters - Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks No 8
Smith, AH (ed)	1961	The Place Names of the West Riding of Yorkshire part 4
Soil Survey of England and Wales	1983	1:250,000 Sheet 1 and Legend England and Wales