

## APPENDIX 1

### Kirby Misperton West (6) Wellsite Extension

#### Context Listing

Context	Description
1	Deposit 10YR 4/3 clay loam topsoil
2	Deposit 10YR 4/2 Natural clay
3	Deposit 10YR 4/3 Mixed clay and silty clay

## APPENDIX 2

#### Photographic Archive Listing

##### Digital

Frame	Description	Scale	Facing
1	Pre-excavation view	N/A	South-west
2	Pre-excavation view	N/A	South-west
3	Pre-excavation view	N/A	South-west
4	Pre-excavation view	N/A	North
5	Stripping at entrance	N/A	North
6	Stripping at entrance	N/A	South-west
7	Stripping at entrance	N/A	South-west
8	Stripping at entrance	N/A	South-west
9	Stripping at entrance	N/A	South
10	Stripping at entrance	2x1m	South
11	Stripping at entrance	2x1m	South
12	Stripping at entrance	N/A	North-east
13	Entrance and stripped area	N/A	North-east
14	Stripping of site	N/A	South-east
15	Stripping of site	N/A	South-east
16	Stripping of site	N/A	South
17	Stripped entrance	N/A	South
18	Stripping southern end of site	N/A	North-east
19	Stripping southern end of site	N/A	North-east
20	Stripping southern end of site	N/A	North-east
21	Stripping southern end of site	N/A	North-east
22	Stripping southern end of site	N/A	North-east
23	Stripping southern end of site	N/A	North-east
24	Stripping southern end of site	N/A	North-west
25	Stripping southern end of site	N/A	North-west
26	Stripped area	2x1m	South-east
27	Stripped area	2x1m	South-east
28	Post-excavation view	N/A	South
29	Duct trench	1x1m	North-east
30	Overall view from south	N/A	North-east
31	Overall view from north	N/A	South-west
32	Southern end of site	N/A	South
33	Stripping of southern end of site	N/A	South
34	Excavation of drainage trench	N/A	South-east
35	Excavation of drainage trench	N/A	South-east
36	Excavation of drainage trench	N/A	South-east
37	Drainage trench	1x1m	North-west

38	Stripping northern end of site	N/A	North-east
39	Stripping northern end of site	N/A	North-east
40	Removal of bund	N/A	North-east
41	Removal of bund	N/A	North-east
42	Stripping northern end of site	N/A	North-east
43	Overall view	N/A	North
44	Stripping northern end of site	N/A	East
45	Stripping northern end of site	N/A	East
46	Detail of section and natural clay	1x1m	North-east
47	Post-excavation view	N/A	South
48	Natural clay surface following stripping	2x1m	South-east
49	Drainage trench	N/A	South-west
50	Ground surface following removal of bund	1x1m	South-west
51	Stripping northern end of site	N/A	North-east
52	Stripping northern end of site	N/A	North-east
53	Post-excavation shot from south	N/A	North-east
54	Stripping below former bund	2x1m	North-east
55	Stripping below former bund	2x1m	North-east
56	Stripping below former bund	2x1m	South
57	Stripping below former bund up to compound fence	N/A	North-east
58	Stripping below former bund up to compound fence	N/A	North-east
59	Detail of disturbed ground below bund	2x1m	North-east
60	Disturbed ground below bund	2x1m	North-east
61	Post-excavation view	N/A	North
62			

### APPENDIX 3

#### Project Team Details

##### Fieldwork

Charlie Morns

##### Post-excavation

Charlie Morris *report*

Mark Stephens *editorial*

Tom Silversides *CAD and illustrations*

**Peter Cardwell**

**Archaeological and Heritage Consultant**

**KIRBY MISPERTON WEST (6) WELLSITE EXTENSION  
NORTH YORKSHIRE**

**WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION**

prepared for  
**VIKING UK GAS LTD**

Report 38/2

October 2010

**VIKING UK GAS LTD  
KIRBY MISPERTON WEST (6) WELLSITE EXTENSION  
NORTH YORKSHIRE**

**WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION**

1 0	Introduction	2
2 0	Location and project description	3
3 0	Archaeological background	4
4 0	<b>Objectives</b>	8
5 0	<b>Mitigation methodology</b>	9
6 0	Archaeological recording	10
7 0	<b>Monitoring</b>	12
8 0	Post-excavation assessment	12
9 0	<b>Site archive</b>	14
10 0	Programme	16
11 0	Confidentiality, copyright and publicity	16
12 0	<b>Health and safety</b>	16
	<b>References</b>	18

**VIKING UK GAS LTD**  
**KIRBY MISPERTON WEST (6) WELLSITE EXTENSION**  
**NORTH YORKSHIRE**

**WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR**  
**ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION**

**1 0 INTRODUCTION**

1 1 This document represents a written scheme of investigation for undertaking archaeological mitigation in advance of and during the construction of the proposed extension to an existing gas wellsite near Kirby Misperton in North Yorkshire

1 2 The principal elements of the proposed development comprise an extension to the east of the existing wellsite (SE 7638 7920) to drill additional exploratory wells at the end of an access track leading north-west from Habton Road, which runs between Great Habton and Kirby Misperton

1 3 The written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been prepared in order to set out the scale and scope of the archaeological mitigation. This has been requested by the Historic Environment Team of North Yorkshire County Council in order that the document can be referenced in any relevant archaeological condition(s) should planning consent for the proposed development be granted

1 4 The principal elements of the archaeological mitigation strategy consist of

- a programme of observation, investigation and recording (or 'watching brief') in the area of the wellsite extension
- a subsequent programme of assessment, analysis, report preparation and archiving

1 5 The WSI has been prepared by Peter Cardwell (archaeological and heritage consultant) and is primarily based upon the results of the archaeological assessment (Cardwell 2010)

1 6 The WSI will be submitted to the Historic Environment Team of North Yorkshire County Council in order that the proposed mitigation strategy constitutes a scheme of works that has been agreed on behalf of the planning authority

---

tender for and undertake the mitigation strategy that has been agreed with the planning authority

## 2.0 LOCATION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The proposed wellsite extension is located 6.9km north-west of Malton, 5km south-west of Pickenng, some 1.5km west of Kirby Misperton village, and 0.3km to the south-east of Little Barugh (Figure 1). The extension to the east of the existing wellsite (SE 7638 7920) is located at the end of an access track leading north-west from Habton Road, which runs between Great Habton and Kirby Misperton. The proposed site is within the Ryedale District of North Yorkshire and the civil pash of Kirby Misperton.
- 2.2 The site is located on the northern floodplain of the rivers Rye and Derwent, some 2km west of Costa Beck. The site of the proposed wellsite extension lies at a height of 23m with the access track extending 1km to the south-east, rising to 25m before returning to 23m again at its eastern extremity.
- 2.3 The field in which the proposed extension would be located is relatively level and located immediately to the east of the existing wellsite. The ground rises to the east of the area towards the low ridge on which Alma Farm is located. The field is currently permanent pasture and is defined by hedges on all sides, with the woodland and bund of the existing wellsite defining the western side. Occasional trees are located on the southern side of the access road to the existing wellsite.
- 2.4 The proposed development would consist of an extension to the eastern side of the existing gas wellsite in order to drill one or two additional exploratory wells and retain the site and wellhead for the production of gas. The extension would consist of the removal of the bund on the eastern side of the existing wellsite to construct a platform for the drilling and later production equipment, surrounded by a ditch and bund up to 9m wide and 2m high on the northern, eastern and southern side. This bund would be planted with trees to replace those on the eastern bund of the existing site. The proposed extension would measure up to 105m north to south by 45m east to west, a total area of approximately 0.45ha. Access to the site would be along the existing road and no alterations to this are proposed as part of the planning application.
- 2.5 The solid geology within the area consists of Kimmendge Clay of the Upper Jurassic series (British Geological Survey 1995). Glacial activity and subsequent alluvial deposition formed a series of glacial islands of sand, gravel and boulder clay (such as that occupied by Kirby Misperton and Little Barugh) with peats and alluvial clays and silts subsequently accumulating in the river valleys and stream beds of the Vale of Pickenng (YAT 1998, 3).

2.6 The soils within the study area consist of those of the Dunkeswick association (slowly permeable seasonally waterlogged fine loamy and fine loamy over clayey soils) within the northern half and those of the Foggathorpe 2 association (slowly permeable seasonally waterlogged stoneless clayey and fine loamy over clayey soils) within the southern half (Jarvis *et al* 1984)

### 3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 Archaeological sites and finds recorded across a wider area surrounding the proposed development were discussed within the archaeological assessment (Cardwell 2010). All archaeological sites and other heritage assets recorded in the North Yorkshire County Council Historic Environment Record (HER) within 500m of the proposed development are listed in Table 1 below and indicated on Figure 2. Records are prefixed with an MNY number. A central grid reference, suggested classification and date are provided for each site, which are listed in chronological order to accord with the text.

Table 1 Archaeological sites within area of proposed development

NYHER	Grid Reference	Classification	Period
MNY2501	SE 77 79	Stone axe	Neolithic
MNY25334	SE 7705 7950	Ridge and furrow	Medieval
–	SE 7655 7923	Ridge and furrow	Medieval
–	SE 7672 7908	Ridge and furrow	Medieval
–	SE 7688 7898	Ridge and furrow	Medieval
MNY2523	SE 7616 7977	Little Barugh village	Medieval Modern
MNY24135	SE 7720 7935	Ridge and furrow	Post-medieval
–	SE 7650 7920	Farmstead	Post-medieval
–	SE 7642 7924	Pond	Post-medieval
–	SE 7653 7897	Pond	Post-medieval
–	SE 766 790	Ditch and pit	Post-medieval

---

3 2 A total of 11 archaeological sites, features, buildings or finds (excluding general references to events) are recorded within 500m of the boundary of the proposed development

3 3 Sites within the assessment study area are summarised below in chronological order, concentrating upon those within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development (emboldened)

*Prehistoric*

3 4 The earliest known prehistoric activity within the Vale of Pickering dates back to at least the early Mesolithic period, with settlement primarily identified towards the eastern end of the Vale in the form of occupation sites such as at Star Carr and Seamer Carr

3 5 During the Neolithic and Bronze Age other areas appear to have been settled and cultivated, although much of the base of the Vale of Pickering appears to have contained scattered flint artefacts into the post-Roman period (Lee 1997, 23) Activity of this period is attested by a number of flint axes of Neolithic date within the vicinity of the wellsite extension, including the example from Kirby Misperton (MNY2501), although this is not accurately provenanced, as well as from Barugh and Normanby (Elgee 1930, 38) Excavations on the route of the Knapton pipeline recorded a small cluster of linear and pit features near Great Habton (some 1.7km to the south) from which flint artefacts dating between the Mesolithic and the Bronze Age were recovered (Lee 1997, 32) A corded beaker comes from the Costa Beck area (some 2km to the north-east), together with 'urns' and flint tools from excavations at Kirby Misperton (Hayes 1977)

3 6 No evidence of Iron Age occupation is recorded within the study area, although a probable lakeside settlement has been investigated at Costa Beck in excess of 2km to the north-east on a number of occasions This included a series of wooden piles protruding above the bed of the stream as well as animal bone, an inhumation burial and pottery (Iron Age gntty ware) sealed by layers of alluvial clay Further investigations produced evidence of prehistoric settlement on both sides of the river, primarily focussed to the north of Low Barn Farm and possibly continuing into the early Roman period (Hayes 1988, YAT 1998, 5–6, NAA 2003, 3)

3 7 No archaeological features or finds of prehistoric date, or any deposits with palaeoenvironmental potential, were identified either during the monitoring of test pit excavations along the route of the Knapton pipeline to the east of the existing wellsite or during monitoring of the construction of the access road to the wellsite The monitoring of a test pit on the pipeline route (ENY2727 located at SE 7643 7918 on the eastern edge of the field in which the wellsite extension



---

ground level, sealed by 0.15m of clay, 0.15m of sand and gravel and 1.6m of mottled clay with pockets of fine silty sand below the turf (NAA 1994a, 24)

#### Roman

- 3.8 Evidence of settlement from both the late Iron Age and Roman periods not only continues to be evident on the fen margins and the Vale edges, but also within the Vale itself. This includes the Roman period settlement investigated to the west of the Knapton generating station on the route of the pipeline corridor and access road (Lee 1997, 27–31), as well as more extensive areas of settlement recently identified by geophysical survey (Landscape Research Centre website)
- 3.9 There is however no evidence of Roman period settlement within the vicinity of the existing wellsite. A trackway of possible Iron Age or Roman date is visible on aerial photographs some 1.1km to the south (NMR1478309). Neither this feature nor any evidence of occupation of this date was identified in this area on the route of the pipeline to Knapton generating station.

#### Medieval

- 3.10 Anglo-Saxon settlement in the area of Kirby Misperton is suggested from Domesday Book in 1086. This records two separate manors as *Chirchebi* (Old Norse for 'farm by the church') and *Misperton* (Old English for 'farm with the medlar tree') which had probably been in existence for some time (Smith 1928, 75–6). By 1086 both manors were held by Berenger de Toni, who granted them to the abbot of St Mary's of York and who held two fees, one of two carucates six oxgangs including half the church and a mill, the other, of four carucates six oxgangs, was 'waste' but held as a manor (Page 1968, 445). In 1324, that same mill was granted by Richard de Kirkby Misperton to John de Dalton of Pickering and in the 16th century was recorded as appurtenant to the manor (*ibid*, 444).
- 3.11 The existing wellsite is located immediately to the west of the historic township and current parish boundary associated with the settlement of Little Barugh (MNY2523) to the west and Kirby Misperton to the east, and is approximately equidistant (1.5km) between Great Barugh and Kirby Misperton. Barugh is also recorded in 1086, probably deriving its name from the Old English *beorg* or hill, and which therefore probably refers to Great Barugh (Smith 1928, 74).
- 3.12 The lay subsidy roll of 1301 records ten names for *Kykeby Misperton cum Nonington* (Nunnington – with which Kirby Misperton was joined in the 12th century), ranging in value between 2s 9d and 8d (Brown 1897, 113). As it stands, the village of Kirby Misperton is a shrunken village (MNY2503), aerial photographs showing it to have contracted from its fullest extent.
- 3.13 St Lawrence's Church in Kirby Misperton is a Grade II\* listed building (MNY2505) which is thought to be early 14th century in date but which includes

---

fragments of Saxon cross shaft in its fabric (MNY2506 and MNY2507), as well as a carved grave slab (MNY2508) and a sundial (MNY2509)

- 3 14 Other evidence of medieval occupation in the vicinity of Kirby Misperton is mostly recorded within or to the east of the village and includes the moated site (MNY2511) to the south-east of Kirby Misperton Hall. It is recorded that this, along with the church, was held as a rectory manor by St Mary's Abbey at York. Medieval pottery was recorded below a post-medieval floor in buildings south of Ducks Farm (MNY2513), while a probable building platform, banks and associated field systems of medieval date have been recorded to the east of the village (MNY25290).
- 3 15 A number of areas of former ridge and furrow cultivation have been recorded to the south of the village (MNY2514–MNY2517) and the evidence suggests that some of these at least are probably medieval in origin.
- 3 16 No certain evidence of settlement of medieval date is recorded within the vicinity of the proposed wellsite extension, although some of the ridge and furrow within the area probably has medieval origins. This includes that recorded to the north of Alma Farm (MNY25334) where visible earthworks survive over 13m wide and 0.6m high (NAA 2003, 6). Further ploughed-out ridge and furrow was evident during monitoring of topsoil stripping to the north-east of Alma Farm (MNY24135) but was only 5m wide and therefore probably post-medieval in date, although the only find recovered was a sherd of 15th century Hambleton-type ware (*ibid*, 8).
- 3 17 Broad ridge and furrow measuring some 10–12m wide and of probable medieval date also survives in three fields between Alma Farm and the existing access road to the wellsite, and within a field to the east of that in which the wellsite extension is proposed (Table 1 and Figure 3). Areas of former ridge and furrow cultivation which are no longer extant are also indicated, including that within the field in which the wellsite extension is proposed, but are not listed in Table 1.

*Post-medieval and modern*

- 3 18 The principal change to the landscape in the post-medieval period within the vicinity of the proposed wellsite extension was the enclosure of the previous open field system. The township of Little Barugh was enclosed about 1600 (Page 1968, 444), although whether this enclosure extended to the field immediately to the west of the existing wellsite is unclear. The date of enclosure within this part of Kirby Misperton township is unknown, but pre-dates the earliest recorded mapping consulted of 1845. In the historic landscape characterisation all of the land surrounding the proposed development is dated to the post-medieval period between 1540 and 1750. The existing field pattern is however in existence by the time of the tithe awards for Great and Little Barugh.

---

## Survey in 1854

- 3 19 The location of Alma Farm to the east of the existing wellsite is occupied by a house and homestead in 1845, but this may not be the first farmstead within the area as both the field within which the wellsite extension is proposed and the field to the east are named as *Old House Close* in the title apportionment award, although there is no visible evidence for the site of a farmstead within either. This could suggest an earlier farmstead existed on or near this location.
- 3 20 A former pond is located to the north-west of this field from at least 1854 (Figure 3). This is no longer evident, but the site is at the base of the slope up towards the ridge on which Alma Farm is located. A further pond is located immediately to the south of the access road and labelled *Brick Pond* on the Ordnance Survey map and the field named *Brick Pond Close* in the title apportionment of 1845.
- 3 21 This latter pond is located immediately adjacent to where two archaeological features were identified during the monitoring of the construction of the existing access road. These were approximately 35m north-east of the pond and consisted of a ditch 0.8m wide and a pit 0.8m in length. Both contained numerous fragments of post-medieval brick, and the landowner at that time stated that a concentration of brick fragments was noted some 40m to the north after ploughing and that the pond had been dug for clay to manufacture bricks (NAA 1994, 29). These features were accordingly considered to relate to brick manufacturing in the area in the 19th century, which also included a brick and tile works (MNY2879) recorded to the north-east of Kirby Misperton.
- 3 22 The existing Alma Farm is called Sugar Hill on the Ordnance Survey maps of both 1854 and 1911. The field boundaries from this period have subsequently been modified over the last century (Figure 3).
- 3 23 The crash site of a 68 Squadron Blenheim Mk I (L1207) on 23 March 1941 is located some 1.7km to the south (MNY26556).

## 4 0 OBJECTIVES

- 4 1 The principal aim of the programme of archaeological mitigation detailed below would be to undertake an agreed level of investigation within the development area necessary to fulfil any relevant planning condition(s) should the wellsite extension be granted consent. This would involve the controlled investigation and recording of any archaeological features, finds or deposits within the area of the specified construction works, and subsequent analysis and report preparation in order to achieve 'preservation by record' of any remains affected.

---

character, extent and form of past activity within the development area to be established, and this in turn should better inform an understanding of the history and development of the local area in accordance with both regional and national research objectives

4.3 The main objectives of the programme of archaeological mitigation are outlined below

- to establish the nature and extent of any archaeological features within the development area and undertake appropriate investigation and recording
- to establish the presence, nature and sequence of any areas of occupation and, where present, to investigate such areas to determine their form, and record evidence for domestic, agricultural or industrial structures and any associated activities
- to establish, where possible, absolute and relative chronologies for the various activities and features represented
- to investigate the nature and pattern of the land use and environment within the wider landscape through an appropriate sampling strategy
- to produce a report on the results of the work suitable for publication within an appropriate journal, and for deposition within both the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record and the National Monuments Record
- to undertake a scheme of works that meets with the professional standards for archaeological work both nationally and within area of the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record

4.4 General guidance relating to excavation, recording, report preparation and archiving include that prepared by English Heritage (1991, 2006) and the Institute for Archaeologists (2008a, 2008b) More specific guidance is referenced in the relevant sections below

## 5.0 MITIGATION METHODOLOGY

5.1 A programme of observation, investigation and recording (or 'watching brief') would be employed within the area of the wellsite extension within the Planning Application Boundary. Relatively few archaeological features are recorded within these components of the development, although specific features recorded include

- former ridge and furrow cultivation

- 
- a former field boundary and pond
  - features associated with a possible former farmstead

5.2 Initial archaeological supervision of topsoil stripping and any ground reduction would be undertaken within all of these areas in order to determine the presence of archaeological features or deposits. Areas would be stripped using a mechanical tracked excavator with a toothless bucket, and would operate under archaeological supervision at all times. If features were identified within any part of such an area, that part would remain un-trafficked by the site contractor until archaeological investigation and recording had been completed. Areas of archaeological significance would be demarcated. On the completion of any necessary excavation and recording within designated areas these would be released to the site contractor.

5.3 Should single or isolated groups of archaeological features be identified, then the archaeologist(s) undertaking the watching brief would generally be expected to clean, excavate and record them in the course of their duties. In the case of extensive or complex archaeology, the archaeological contractor would submit an additional methods statement for the mitigation of the impact on the archaeological remains encountered which would be agreed with the Historic Environment Team of North Yorkshire County Council. The area would be released to the site contractor on completion of any archaeological works identified in the respective methods statement.

## 6.0 **ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORDING**

6.1 The location of all areas investigated would be surveyed in order that these (and all archaeological features and deposits within them) could both be relocated in relation to existing landscape features and located within the Ordnance Survey National Grid. Archaeological deposits would need to be explicitly related both to depths below existing surface levels and actual heights in relation to Ordnance Datum.

6.2 All archaeological features would be photographed and recorded at an appropriate scale. Sections would normally be drawn at a scale of 1:10, identifying individual contexts and the underlying natural subsoil, with a minimum of at least two adjoining sections of the trench being recorded. Archaeological plans would normally be drawn at a scale of 1:20 although areas largely devoid of archaeological features would be recorded at a scale of 1:50.

6.3 A written description of features would be recorded on pro-forma sheets using an appropriate context recording system.

- 
- 6 4 Digital photography would be used for general photographic purposes For archive purposes at least a selection of the photographic record of the site would be taken using monochrome prints and colour slide at a minimum format of 35mm
- 6 5 The excavation and watching brief would include a metal detector survey of cleaned trench surfaces and spoil heaps within the area of any recorded or identified features
- 6 6 All scientific investigations both on site and as part of the subsequent report preparation would be undertaken in a manner consistent with the English Heritage (2003) best-practice guidelines
- 6 7 Any human remains (inhumations and cremations) encountered during either the strip, map and sample recording or the watching brief would be recorded, recovered and processed in accordance with English Heritage (2002a) and IFA (Buckley and McKinley 2004) guidelines A Licence for the Removal of Human Remains would be obtained from the Ministry of Justice
- 6 8 Forty- to sixty-litre bulk palaeoenvironmental samples would be taken from appropriate representative deposits (such as occupation and midden deposits or ditch and pit fills) and submitted for assessment If particularly rich deposits of bone were encountered then a minimum of 100 litre coarse-sieved samples would be taken Particular attention would be paid to the recovery of samples from any waterlogged deposits present Recovery and sampling of environmental remains would be in accordance with guidelines prepared by English Heritage (2002b) and the sampling strategy provided by the specialist and agreed with English Heritage Samples would also be taken for pollen analysis from appropriate deposits in order to establish preservation and identify the past use of the area
- 6 9 Secure contexts would be sampled for dating purposes as appropriate (whether on site or as sub-samples of processed bulk samples) This would include C-14 dating, archaeomagnetic dating and dendrochronological dating Any concentrations of charcoal or other carbonised material recovered on site would usually be retained Samples for archaeomagnetic dates would be taken on site by the relevant specialist Samples for dendrochronological dates would be taken either on site or from recovered timbers by the relevant specialist in accordance with published guidelines (English Heritage 1998) Samples would be processed subsequent to initial post-excavation assessment
- 6 10 Banded soils or sediment sequences would be inspected and recorded on site, and samples for laboratory assessment collected where appropriate in collaboration with the archaeo-environmentalist involved in the sedimentological investigations The guidance of English Heritage (2007) would be followed

---

artefacts would be three-dimensionally recorded prior to processing. Finds would be recorded, processed and submitted to specialists for post-excavation assessment in a manner consistent with best professional practice (Watkinson and Neal 1998)

- 6.12 All finds recovered would be washed, marked, appropriately packaged and stored under optimum conditions. Finds recovery and storage strategies would be in accordance with published guidelines (English Heritage 1995, Watkinson and Neal 1998, IFA 2008c). Provision would be made for site visits from both specialists and a conservator as necessary.
- 6.13 In accordance with English Heritage guidance (1991), all iron objects, a selection of non-ferrous artefacts (including all coins) and a sample of any industrial debris relating to metallurgy would be X-radiographed before assessment in accordance with the guidance provided by Jones (2006). Where there was evidence for industrial activity, large technological residues would be collected by hand, with separate samples collected for micro-slugs. In these instances, the guidance of Bayley *et al* (2001) would be followed.
- 6.14 Any artefacts of gold or silver recovered during the archaeological mitigation which are considered to be treasure would be dealt with in accordance with the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (Revised) 2002.

## 7.0 MONITORING

- 7.1 Access would be made available at all reasonable times to the Historic Environment Team of North Yorkshire County Council and English Heritage to inspect the archaeological mitigation on site.
- 7.2 Access to the site would be on the basis of prior notification and subject to any necessary health and safety requirements.

## 8.0 POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 On completion of the fieldwork phases of the archaeological mitigation an assessment of the site records and finds would be undertaken in accordance with national guidance (English Heritage 1991, 2006).
- 8.2 On instruction from the developer (or their archaeological consultant) a post-excavation assessment report on the results of the mitigation would be prepared and submitted to the Historic Environment Team of North Yorkshire County Council (and the English Heritage Regional Science Advisor) within six months.

---

any further works, and specifically further detailed analysis and report preparation

8.3 The post-excavation assessment report would include

- a cover page or introduction containing the site name, the site code, the planning application number, museum site code, an Ordnance Survey grid reference and the name of the originating body
- a list of contents, figures and tables
- a non-technical summary
- an introduction
- the planning background
- the archaeological and historical background
- a methodology
- a summary of the project's results
- an interpretation of the results in appropriate context
- a post-excavation assessment of the stratigraphic and other written, drawn or photographic records
- a catalogue and post-excavation assessment of each category of artefact recovered during the fieldwork (including a conservation assessment)
- a catalogue and post-excavation assessment of any faunal remains recovered during the fieldwork
- a catalogue of soil or other samples collected and post-excavation assessment of the results of the soil-sampling programme
- catalogues and post-excavation assessments and summary reports of all scientific dating procedures or other analyses carried out or proposed
- a discussion of the significance of the results of the post-excavation assessment
- a discussion of the potential for further analysis of the site archive
- a conclusion



- 
- an appendix containing a list and summary description of all contexts recorded
  - a summary of the contents of the project archive and its location
  - a location plan of the site areas investigated at an appropriate scale of at least 1:5,000
  - a site plan showing excavation locations within the site at a recognised planning scale (and not less than 1:500), and located with reference to the Ordnance Survey National Grid
  - plans and sections of archaeological features at a recognised scale
  - general photographs of the excavation and watching brief in progress and selected photographs of archaeological features investigated

**9.0 SITE ARCHIVE**

9.1 The site archive would contain all the data collected during the archaeological excavation and watching brief (as well as previous desk-based studies and surveys undertaken in relation to the site). The archive would include all records, finds and environmental samples that merit retention. It would be quantified, ordered, indexed and internally consistent.

9.2 Adequate resources would be provided during fieldwork to ensure that records were checked and internally consistent.

9.3 Archive consolidation would be undertaken immediately following the conclusion of fieldwork.

- the site record would be checked, cross-referenced and indexed as necessary
- all retained finds would be cleaned, conserved, marked and packaged in accordance with the requirements of the recipient museum
- all retained finds would be assessed and recorded using pro-forma recording sheets, by suitably qualified and experienced staff and initial artefact dating would be integrated with the site matrix
- all retained environmental samples would be processed by suitably experienced and qualified staff

- 
- English Heritage (1991, 2006) In addition to the site records, artefacts, environmental remains and other sample residues, the archive would contain
- site matrices where appropriate
  - a summary report synthesising the context record
  - a summary of the artefact record
  - a summary of the environmental record
- 9 5 The integrity of the primary field record would be preserved. Security copies in digital or fiche format would be maintained where appropriate
- 9 6 An online OASIS form (<http://ads.adhs.ac.uk/project/oasis/>) would be completed on the results of the mitigation within six months of the completion of the work. This will be validated by the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record once the report has become a public document by submission or incorporation into the Historic Environment Record
- 9 7 Should the post-excavation assessment establish that no further analysis of the site archive was to be undertaken, a copy of the site report and the full site archive would be deposited with the Malton or Yorkshire Museums, subject to the agreement of the landowners and the developer. Deposition shall be in accordance with written guidelines on archive standards and procedures (Brown 2007). The archaeological contractor would liaise with the museum curator regarding their requirements in ordering, boxing and labelling the site archive
- 9 8 Archiving of digital data from the project would be undertaken in a manner consistent with professional standards and guidance (Richards and Robinson 2000) and deposited at a suitable repository such as the Archaeology Data Service
- 9 9 In addition to the deposition of the archive copies of all relevant reports would also be deposited with the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (NYHER), including in Portable Document Format (PDF) or other format, the English Heritage Regional Science Advisor, the National Monuments Record (NMR) and OASIS
- 9 10 Should no further analysis of the site archive be undertaken but the results of the archaeological mitigation were considered to merit publication, a report on the results of the work would be prepared for publication within a suitable archaeological journal within one year of the post-excavation assessment. The need for such a publication would be made in consultation with the Historic Environment Team of North Yorkshire County Council. A copy of the final report

---

would be submitted to the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record as a public document

**10 0 PROGRAMME**

10 1 The programme for undertaking each stage of the archaeological mitigation would be confirmed with the Historic Environment Team of North Yorkshire County Council a minimum of two weeks in advance of each stage of the fieldwork

10 2 The archaeological contractor would at the same time provide relevant details regarding both site staff and specialists, together with summaries of relevant experience and details of environmental sampling strategies

10 3 It is anticipated that the post-excavation assessment report would be prepared within six months of the completion of all fieldwork, with any further analysis and final report completed within a further year

**11 0 CONFIDENTIALITY, COPYRIGHT AND PUBLICITY**

11 1 The results of the fieldwork would remain confidential – initially being distributed only to the client, their agents and the Historic Environment Team of North Yorkshire County Council – and would remain so until such time as the relevant planning condition(s) were discharged and would then be deemed to have entered the public domain

11 2 The copyright of any written, graphic or photographic records and reports would rest with the archaeological organisation undertaking the fieldwork and report preparation. Aspects of copyright may however transfer to the relevant journal or museum upon publication and deposition respectively, as required

11 3 No publicity would be entered into with respect to the results of the mitigation, during the course of the investigations, without the express consent of the developer. Any such publicity would acknowledge the co-operation of the Historic Environment Team of North Yorkshire County Council and other interested parties

**12 0 HEALTH AND SAFETY**

12 1 It would be the responsibility of the archaeological contractor to ensure that health and safety requirements were fulfilled, and the organisation should

---

therefore comply with the 1974 Health and Safety Act and its subsequent amendments in all its operations. In this respect the FAME (formerly SCAUM) manual on archaeological health and safety would be followed for site works, and as normal practice, first aid boxes, an accident book and a telephone would be provided on site. Where required, safety helmets and reflective jackets would be worn and site staff would be appropriately equipped in terms of bad weather clothing. Information on service locations is to be obtained prior to the commencement of any excavation works and a Risk Assessment to HSE requirements should be prepared in advance of undertaking the site works (unless working within the terms of a Risk Assessment prepared by the main site contractor). Relevant health and safety inductions would be provided for all site staff.

Report	38/2
Date	October 2010
Text	Peter Cardwell
Illustrations	Archaeological Services Durham University
Edited by	Mike Bishop

---

Peter Cardwell

on behalf of Viking UK Gas Ltd

---

## REFERENCES

- Bayley J, Dungworth D and Paynter S (2001) *Archaeometallurgy* Centre for Archaeology Guidelines 2001/01 English Heritage
- Buckley M and McKinley J I (2004) *Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains* Institute of Field Archaeologists Paper No 7
- Brown W (1897) *Yorkshire Lay Subsidy Being a Fifteenth Collected 30 Edward I (1301)* Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series 21
- Brown D H (2007) *Archaeological Archives – A Guide to Best Practice in Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Curation* Archaeological Archives Forum
- Cardwell P (2010) *Kirby Misperton West (6) Wellsite Extension, North Yorkshire Archaeological Assessment, Report 38/1*
- Elgee, F (1930) *Early Man in North-East Yorkshire*
- English Heritage (1991) *Management of Archaeological Projects*
- English Heritage (1995) *A Strategy for the Care and Investigation of Finds* Ancient Monuments Laboratory
- English Heritage (1998) *Dendrochronology – Guidelines on Producing and Interpreting Dendrochronological Dates*
- English Heritage (2002a) *Human bones from Archaeological Sites Guidelines for Producing Assessment Documents and Analytical Reports* Centre for Archaeology Guidelines
- English Heritage (2002b) *Environmental Archaeology A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods, from Sampling and Recovery to Post-Excavation* Centre for Archaeology Guidelines 2002 01
- English Heritage (2003) *Archaeological Science at PPG16 Interventions Best Practice Guidance for Curators and Commissioning Archaeologists*
- English Heritage (2006) *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment – The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide*
- English Heritage (2007) *Geoarchaeology Using Earth Sciences to Understand the Archaeological Record*

- 
- Hayes R H (1977) Excavations at Kirby Misperton near Pickenng *Transactions of the Scarborough Archaeological and Historical Society* 24
- Hayes R H (1988) Cost Beck Iron Age Site, in P R Wilson (ed) *North-East Yorkshire Studies Archaeological Papers by Raymond Hayes* Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 28–33
- Institute for Archaeologists (2008a) *Standard and Guidance for an Archaeological Watching Brief*
- Institute for Archaeologists (2008b) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation*
- Institute for Archaeologists (2008c) *Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials*
- Jarvis *et al* (1984) *Soils and Their Use in Northern England* Soils Survey of England and Wales Bulletin 10
- Jones D M (ed) (2006) *Guidelines on the X-radiography of Archaeological Metalwork English Heritage*
- Lee J (1997) The Knapton Generating Station and Gas Pipeline Excavations *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 69, 21–38
- Northern Archaeological Associates (1994a) *Knapton Generating Station Pipeline Construction Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy* NAA 94/6
- Northern Archaeological Associates (1994b) *Pipeline Construction Phase of the Knapton Generating Station Project Post-Excavation Assessment* NAA 94/24
- Northern Archaeological Associates (2003) *Pickenng Wellsite Development, North Yorkshire Earthwork Survey and Archaeological Monitoring Report* NAA 03/60
- Page W (ed) (1968) *Victoria County History of the County of York North Riding* Volume Two
- Richards J D and Robinson D (eds) (2000) *Digital Archives from Excavation and Fieldwork – Good Practice* (2nd edition) AHDS
- Smith A H (1928) *The Place-Names of the North Riding of Yorkshire*
- Watkinson and Neal (1998) *First Aid for Finds*
- York Archaeological Trust (1998) *Pickering to Kirby Misperton Gas Pipeline, North Yorkshire – Report on an Archaeological Desk Top Study Revised Version* 1998 Field Report Number 7

---

**Maps and plans**

- 1842 *Plan of the Townships of Great and Little Barugh in the Parish of Kirby Misperton in the North Riding of the County of York* (BIHR TA 443 S)
- 1845 *Plan of the Township of Kirby Misperton in the North Riding of the County of York* (BIHR TA 338 M)
- 1854 Ordnance Survey 1st edition 6" to 1 mile, Yorkshire sheet 107
- 1911 Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 25" to 1 mile, Yorkshire sheet 107/5
- 1912 Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 25" to 1 mile, Yorkshire sheet 107/1
- 1995 British Geological Survey 1:250,000 series, Tyne-Tees sheet 54°N 02°W Solid Geology