

**Prospect Place
Scarborough
North Yorkshire**

Archaeological Strip and Record Excavation

Planning ref: 09/01564/FL

Contents	Page
Figure List	2
Plate List	2
Summary	3
1. Introduction	3
2. Topography and Geology	4
3. Archaeological and Historical Background	4
4. Methodology	6
5. Results	6
6. Discussion	8
7. Bibliography	9
8. Project Staffing Details	9

Figure List

Page

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|----|
| 1. | Site Location. Scale 1:25000 | 10 |
| 2. | Site Location. Scale 1:500 | 11 |

Plate List

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | General View of Site. Facing North West. | 12 |
| 2. | Northern Boundary Wall. Facing North West. | 12 |
| 3. | Over-lapping Stone and Brick Walls. Facing North West. | 13 |
| 4. | Western foundation Trench. Facing South West. | 13 |
| 5. | Southern Foundation. Facing West. | 14 |

**Prospect Place
Scarborough
North Yorkshire**

TA 0460 88864

Archaeological Strip and Record

© MAP Archaeological Practice Ltd.

September 2011

**Prospect Place
Scarborough
North Yorkshire
TA 0460 88864
Archaeological Strip and Record Excavation**

Planning Ref. 09/01564/FL

Summary

An Archaeological Strip and Record Excavation was carried out by MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd over two days in September 2011 at a development site situated at the western end of Prospect Place, Scarborough, North Yorkshire. The work was carried out during the excavation of foundations for a pair of semi-detached dwellings. No archaeological features were revealed during the ground-works, but a small number of 16th-18th century sherds were present.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the results of an Archaeological Strip and Record Excavation carried out during the ground-works associated with the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings at Prospect Place, Scarborough, North Yorkshire (TA 0460 88864, Figs. 1 and 2).

- 1.2 The ground-works had the potential to affect multi-period archaeological remains; accordingly the developer was required by Scarborough Borough Council, on the advice of the Heritage Unit of North Yorkshire County Council, to implement a Scheme of Archaeological Investigation and Recording at the site (Planning ref. 09/01564/FL). MAP Archaeological

Consultancy Ltd was engaged to undertake the Archaeological Watching Brief, which took place over two days in September 2011.

- 1.3 All works were funded by the developer Crown Properties.
- 1.4 All maps within this report are reproduced under licence from the Ordnance Survey with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Crown Copyright licence no. AL 50453A.

2. Topography and Geology

- 2.1 The site lies at the western end of Prospect Place, immediately to the southwest of the former Bell Hotel (Figs. 1 and 2). Immediately before the development, the area formed the garden of the property adjoining to the east (Pl. 1). The western and northern boundaries of the site existed as retaining walls for open areas at higher levels. The access road lay immediately to the south. The land rises to the west and north in a series of terraces, but drops away very sharply to the east and south beyond the early-19th century terraced houses that form Prospect Place.
- 2.2 The underlying geology of the site consists of glacially-deposited boulder clay (Mackney *et al* 1983).

3. Archaeological and Historical Background

- 3.1 A pre-conquest origin for Scarborough has been previously suggested because of the way that St Sepulchre Street and Cooks Row cut across the otherwise rectilinear arrangement of streets relating to the 12th century town-planning of the borough (e.g. Farmer, 1976). This arrangement possibly suggests that a pre-conquest settlement was incorporated into the later medieval borough. However, a Viking origin for

settlement at Scarborough is open to question. References to the Viking conquest by *Skarði* of Scarborough in 13th and 14th century Icelandic sagas can be seen as the deliberate eulogising of the deeds of individuals' supposed ancestors, and the drawing together of folk traditions, rather than statements of fact (Arnold 2001). Arnold has also pointed out that the origin of the first element in 'Scarborough' comes from the Old English word *sceard*, meaning 'gap or notch', as opposed to a Viking warrior named Skarði. As Pearson points out, no pottery of definite 10th or early 11th century date has been found in the town, particularly from excavations around the Damyot stream / Sepulchre Street area (the supposed core of pre-conquest settlement). However, the identification of an Anglo-Saxon (mid-5th to mid-9th century) sherd from an excavation at Blenheim Street is a definite suggestion of early pre-conquest activity at Scarborough (On-site Archaeology 2006), although it does not automatically prove that there was continuity of settlement from the Anglo-Saxon period to the medieval borough via Viking-era occupation.

- 3.2 Scarborough was not mentioned in the Domesday survey (1086), which suggests that, if there was any settlement at all, it was of minor importance, and that the area of the present town probably consisted of agricultural land under the jurisdiction of the royal manor of Falsgrave. The first recorded activity in the town was the construction of a castle on the headland in the reign of King Stephen during the late 1130s. It is believed that a settlement evolved around the road leading to the castle (i.e. the Castle Road area), with another possible settlement in the area east of Holy Sepulchre church.
- 3.3 Scarborough underwent fundamental changes during the reign of Henry II (1154-1189) with the castle taking on its present-day layout. The town was completely reorganized to form the Old Borough, with the organization of

streets, defences and terracing walls, probably in the late 1150s or early 1160s.

- 3.4 The Old Borough was clearly an economic success, because the New Borough was established within decades of the former, in the latter part of Henry's reign, perhaps as early as by the late 1160s (Dalton 2001). The New Borough apparently formed a trading area with a wide market place, with its layout perhaps reflecting the boundaries of the cultivated land on which it was built. It is believed that the western defences of the New Borough, consisting of a rampart and ditch, were constructed in the later 13th century, to be augmented by a stone wall in the 16th century, and re-instated at the time of the Jacobite revolt in the mid-1740s.
- 3.5 Prospect Place is situated at the southeast corner of the New Borough, between the former market place of Newborough to the north and the steep cliff edge to the south. Bland's Cliff originated as the 'New Coach Road' (depicted on Cossins' 1725 *New and Exact Plan of the Town of Scarborough*), that gave affluent visitors access to the seashore and spa (Pearson 2005, 17). The 1725 Plan labels the area of the site '*The Cliffs*', with a curving boundary separating this area from the properties along the Newborough '*Markett Place*' to the north.
- 3.6 J. Wood's '*Plan of the Town and Environs of Scarborough*' (1828) shows Prospect Place in much the same form as it exists in today, but with an L-shaped building (probably an outbuilding) occupying the actual site.
- 3.7 Pearson suggested that the stone wall that formed the northeast boundary of the site was a possible fragment of a putative wall that may have formed the southern defences of the New Borough, running along the South Bay Cliffs to the Old Borough (Pearson 1987, Area Fifteen, No. 6). However, Pearson points out that there is no evidence that defences

actually existed at this location (*ibid.* p. 22); also, as previously mentioned, the boundary shown by Cossins at this location had a different alignment that curved from the southwest to the northeast.

- 3.8 An Archaeological Watching Brief was carried out by MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd at The Bell Hotel, Blands Cliff (immediately to the northeast of the site) at various dates from December 2007 to July 2008. The work involved monitoring the groundworks associated with the erection of 19 self-contained flats at the Bell Hotel and associated alterations and extensions to 8 Prospect Place (Ref: 05/01081/FL). Two undated sections of stone wall were recorded plus a nineteenth century brick wall and levelling deposits.

4. Methodology

- 4.1 The initial phase of the groundworks consisted of a general site strip by a 2 tonne 360° excavator, to a level c. 0.70m from the existing ground surface. The initial strip was followed by the excavation of strip foundations along the east, south and west sides of the new building; the northern foundation, which was rafted, was constructed off the surface reached by the initial site strip. The northern boundary wall was demolished to accommodate the new building.
- 4.2 The groundworks were observed at all times by an archaeologist, and the exposed surfaces inspected for archaeological features and deposits. A series of digital images were taken for record purposes.

5. Results

- 5.1 Natural deposits, consisting of compact reddish brown boulder clay, were identified at a depth of 0.75m from the existing ground surface.

- 5.2 A c. 0.10m deep deposit of dark grey silty clay with abundant coal fragments was present above the natural boulder clay, and contained several sherds of 17th-18th century pottery. The horizon above consisted of mixed soil and brick rubble, and coincided with the foundations of a brick-built privy with associated service runs. A modern drain ran along the entire eastern foundation of the new building, penetrating c. 0.20m into the natural. The latest deposit consisted of a 0.20m deep layer of topsoil.
- 5.3 The stone wall that formed the eastern 4.25m of the site's northern boundary consisted of seven courses of roughly laid, un-bonded sandstone blocks, with a single, more regular un-bonded foundation course below existing ground level (Pl. 2). It was surmounted by four courses of 6.5cm thick bricks, with a further sixteen courses of modern, machine-made bricks at the top.
- 5.4 The western end of the stone wall was overlapped by another wall (Pl. 3) that had twenty-four courses of 6.5cm wide bricks, with sixteen modern machine-made courses above. Removal of this wall revealed a 0.70m wide, c. 2m high, wall of modern brick that was founded on a 0.25m raft of weak cement, and rendered (or plastered) on its northern face. The wall butted up to the stone wall and appeared to be the southern element of a cellar (or perhaps an air-raid shelter) within the yard of the former Bell Hotel.
- 5.5 No negative archaeological features were present.

6. Discussion

- 6.1 Although the archaeological fieldwork at Prospect Place took place within the area encompassed by the New Borough of the medieval town at Scarborough, no features or deposits demonstrably earlier than the 18th century were present. The stone wall at the northern margin of the site

was essentially undated, although likely to be later than the time of Cossins' 1725 'Exact Plan' plan of Scarborough that depicts a different alignment for this boundary. It is likely that the location of the site, close by the steep South Bay cliff, ruled out occupation until the construction of Prospect Place in the late 18th century. The new development was a result of the new-found popularity of the south-western part of Scarborough, which became fashionable at this time, partly due to its proximity to the spa.

7. Bibliography

- Arnold, M. 2001 The Legendary Origins of Scarborough. In *Medieval Scarborough: Studies in Trade and Civic Life*; eds. Crouch, D and Pearson, T.
- Dalton, P. 2001 The Foundation and Development of Scarborough in the Twelfth Century. In *Crouch and Pearson eds.*
- Mackney, D. *et al.* 1983 Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 1: Northern England.
- MAP 2008 The Bell Hotel, Blands Cliff, Scarborough, North Yorkshire. Archaeological Watching Brief Report.
- On-Site Archaeology 2006 Blenheim Street, Scarborough – Archaeological Evaluation.
- Pearson, T. 1987 An Archaeological Survey of Scarborough.

Pearson, T. 2005 The Archaeology of Medieval Scarborough.
Excavation and Research 1987-2004.

8. Project Staffing Details

Fieldwork: Mark Stephens.

Text: Mark Stephens

Figures: Kelly Hunter



Figure 1. Site Location



Figure 2. Area of Development



Plate 1. General View of Site. Facing North West.



Plate 2. Northern Boundary Wall. Facing North West.



Plate 3. Over-lapping Stone and Brick Walls. Facing North West.



Plate 4. Western foundation Trench. Facing South West.



Plate 5. Southern Foundation. Facing West.

**WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL STRIP
AND RECORD**

**The Bell Hotel
Prospect Place
Scarborough
North Yorkshire**

SE 0460 8864

Prepared for Hayes Lazenby

by

**MAP Archaeological Practice Ltd
Tel. 01653 697752**

24th August 2011

**The Bell Hotel
Prospect Place
Scarborough
North Yorkshire**

SE 0460 8864

**WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR
ARCHAEOLOGICAL STRIP AND RECORD**

1. Summary

- 1.1 The topsoil, overburden strip and archaeological recording is to take place during the erection of a pair of semi detached dwellings to the rear of the Bell Hotel, Prospect Place, Scarborough, North Yorkshire associated with the (planning application 09/01564/FL).

2. Purpose

- 2.1 This written scheme of investigation (WSI) represents a summary of the broad archaeological requirements to mitigate the impact of development proposals upon the archaeological resource and to comply with the archaeological planning condition. This is in accordance with the guidance of Planning Policy Statement 5. No work on site should commence until the implementation of the scheme is the subject of a standard ICE Conditions of Contract for Archaeological Investigation agreement between the Client and the selected archaeological contractor.

3. Location and Description

- 3.1 The Proposed Development Area is located to the rear of the former Bell Hotel, Prospect Place, Scarborough, North Yorkshire (SE 0460 8864).

4. Archaeological and Historical Background

- 4.1 The origins of Scarborough are obscure, some commentators postulating the existence of a possible pre-conquest settlement

because of the manner that St Sepulchre Street and Cooks Row cut across the otherwise rectilinear arrangement of streets relating to the 12th century town planning of the borough (e.g. Farmer, 1976). The implication was that a pre-conquest settlement was incorporated into the later medieval borough. However, the supposition of a Viking foundation for settlement at Scarborough is a contentious issue. References to the Viking conquest by *Skarði* of Scarborough in the 13th and 14th century Icelandic sagas can be seen as deliberate eulogising of the deeds of individuals' supposed ancestors, and the drawing together of folk traditions rather than statements of fact (Arnold 2001). Arnold has also pointed out that the origin of the first element in 'Scarborough' comes from the Old English word *sceard*, meaning gap or notch, as opposed to a Viking warrior named Skarði. As Pearson points out, not even one definite sherd of 10th or early 11th century pottery has been found in the town, even in excavations around the Damyot stream / Sepulchre Street area. However, the identification of an Anglo-Saxon (mid-5th to mid-9th century) sherd from an excavation at Blenheim Street that took place in April 2006, is evidence of early pre-conquest activity at Scarborough (On-site Archaeology 2006), although not of continuity with the medieval borough via a Viking-era settlement.

- 4.2 Scarborough was not mentioned in the Domesday survey (1086), which suggests that, if there was any settlement at all, it was of minor importance, and that the area of the present town probably consisted of agricultural land under the jurisdiction of the royal manor of Falsgrave. The first recorded activity in the town was the construction of a castle on the headland in the reign of King Stephen during the late 1130s. It is believed that a settlement evolved around the road leading to the castle (i.e. the Castle Road area), with another possible settlement in the area east of Holy Sepulchre church.
- 4.3 Scarborough underwent basic changes during the reign of Henry II (1154-1189) with the castle taking on its present day layout. The town

was fundamentally reorganized to form the Oldborough, with streets, defences and terracing walls, probably in the late 1150s or early 1160s.

4.4 The Oldborough was clearly an economic success, as soon after the New Borough was established in the latter part of Henry's reign, perhaps as early as by the late 1160s (Dalton 2001). The New Borough apparently formed a trading area with a wide market place, with its layout perhaps reflecting the boundaries of the cultivated land on which it was built. It is believed that the western defences of the New Borough, consisting of a rampart and ditch, were constructed in the later 13th century, to be augmented by a stone wall in the 16th century, and refurbished at the time of the Jacobite revolt in the mid-1740s.

4.5 An Archaeological Watching Brief was conducted by MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd at The Bell Hotel, Blands Cliff, Scarborough, North Yorkshire (SE 0460 8864) from December 2007 to July 2008. The work involved monitoring the groundworks associated with the erection of 19 self-contained flats at the Bell Hotel and associated alterations and extensions to 8 Prospect Place (Ref: 05/01081/FL). Two undated sections of stone wall were recorded and a nineteenth century brick wall and levelling deposits.

5. Objectives

5.1 The objectives of the archaeological work are:

1. to determine by means of targeted archaeological excavation the character, extent and nature of the archaeological remains within the development area,
2. to locate, recover, identify, assess and conserve (as appropriate) any archaeological artefacts exposed during the course of the excavation,

3. where appropriate, to undertake a post-excavation assessment after completion of fieldwork and site archive to assess the potential for further analysis and publication, and to undertake such analysis and publication as appropriate,

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

6. Access, Safety and Monitoring

6.1 Access to the site should be arranged through the commissioning body.

6.2 It is the archaeological contractor's responsibility to ensure that Health and Safety requirements are fulfilled. Necessary precautions should be taken near underground services and overhead lines. A risk assessment should be provided to the commissioning body before the commencement of works.

6.3 The project will be monitored by the Historic Environment Team, NYCC, to whom written documentation should be sent ten days before the start of the excavation including:

1. the date of commencement,
2. an opportunity to monitor the works.

6.4 Where appropriate, the advice of the English Heritage Regional Advisor for Archaeological Science, (Yorkshire and Humber Region) may be called upon to monitor the archaeological science components of the project. Archaeological contractors may wish to contact him to discuss the science components of the project before submission of tenders.

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.

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 Historic Environment Team, NYCC and the commissioning body as soon as is practically possible. This is particularly important where there is any likelihood of contingency arrangements being required.

7. Brief

- 7.1 The archaeological contractor should be informed in advance of the correct timing and schedule of site preparation and preliminary excavation works associated with the construction of the proposed development. A specified timetable should be agreed within which the archaeological excavation may be carried out prior to further construction commencing.
- 7.2 Archaeological work within the area of proposed development should include the initial supervision of the preliminary site/topsoil strip areas down to the top of archaeological deposits. Overburden such as turf, topsoil, made ground, rubble or other superficial fill materials may be removed by machine using a back-acting excavator which should be fitted with a toothless or ditching bucket. Mechanical excavation equipment shall be used judiciously, under archaeological supervision down to the top of archaeological deposits, or the natural subsoil (C Horizon or soil parent material), whichever appears first. Bulldozers or wheeled scraper buckets should not be used to remove overburden above archaeological deposits. Topsoil should be kept separate from subsoil or fill materials.
- 7.3 Once overburden/topsoil has been removed, any further machine or hand excavation should be halted to allow the archaeological contractor

to observe, clean and assess any archaeological remains on the site. Using the information and artefacts collected to this stage, all features and deposits should be assessed as to their origin or function, probable date, and importance for further recording. Features and layers identified as having potential for further recording should be excavated by hand, sampled, and recorded as set out below. This is in order to fulfil Objectives 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 above and in order to understand the full stratigraphic sequence. In case of query as to the extent of investigation, a site meeting shall be convened with the Historic Environment Team Leader, NYCC.

- 7.4 The character, information content and stratigraphic relationships of features and deposits should be determined. 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.
- 7.5 The project should be undertaken in a manner consistent with the guidance of MAP2 (English Heritage 1991) and professional standards and guidance (IFA 2001). Scientific investigations should be undertaken in a manner consistent with the English Heritage best-practice guidelines (2003). An outline strategy of sampling for scientific

dating, geoarchaeology and soil science (Canti 1996), biological analysis (English Heritage 2002), artefact conservation and analysis (Watkinson and Neal 1998), and analysis of technological residues (English Heritage 2001), ceramics, and stone should be agreed with the Local Authority, in consultation with the English Heritage Regional Advisor for Archaeological Science (RA) before commencement of site work. This strategy should be based on the results of previous archaeological work in the area. The strategy will be subject to variation as appears necessary during the excavation, following consultation with the Local Authority and the RA.

- 7.6 All specialists in Archaeological Science (both those employed in-house by the archaeological contractor or those sub-contracted) should be named in project documents. Agreement of specialists must always be obtained before their names are listed. Their competence to undertake proposed investigations, and the availability of adequate laboratory facilities and reference collections should be demonstrated. There should be agreement in writing on timetables and deadlines for all stages of work.
- 7.7 All deposits should be fully recorded on standard context sheets, photographs and conventionally-scaled plans and sections. Each excavation area should be recorded to show the horizontal and vertical distribution of contexts. The elevation of the underlying natural subsoil where encountered should be recorded. The limits of excavation should be shown in all plans and sections, including where these limits are coterminous with context boundaries.
- 7.8 Any significant unstratified artefacts or small finds should be collected. Metal detecting, including the scanning of topsoil and spoil heaps, should only be permitted subject to archaeological supervision and recording so that metal finds are properly located, identified, and conserved.

- 7.9 Using the information and artefacts collected to this stage, all features and deposits should be assessed as to their origin or function, probable date, and importance for further excavation. Features and layers identified as having potential for further recording should be fully excavated, sampled, and recorded. Full excavation should be carried out on features and deposits of limited potential where the stratigraphic relationships, phasing or origin of these are still unclear. Further excavation may also be needed to expose the full stratigraphic sequence across the site.
- 7.10 All artefacts and ecofacts visible during excavation should be collected and processed, unless variations in this principle are agreed with the Senior Archaeologist, NYCC. In some cases, sampling may be most appropriate. Finds should be appropriately packaged and stored under optimum conditions, as detailed in *First Aid for Finds* (Watkinson & Neal, 1998). A regular transfer of finds from the site to the conservation laboratory is desirable, particularly in the case of long term excavations
- 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-slugs hammer-scale and spherical droplets). In these instances, the guidance of English Heritage (2001) should be followed.
- 7.12 Samples should be collected for scientific dating (radiocarbon, dendrochronology, luminescence dating, archaeomagnetism and/or other techniques as appropriate). For this excavation, tenders should allow provision for a minimum of four dates using scientific techniques.
- 7.13 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 the outline strategy presented in the Project Design, and in

consultation with the geoarchaeologist. The guidance of Canti (1996) and English Heritage (2002) should be followed.

- 7.14 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.
- 7.15 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 that may be required. Allowance should be made for a site visit from the contractor's environmental specialists/consultants where appropriate.
- 7.16 In the event that any human remains are encountered, they must be treated at all stages with care and respect. Excavators must be aware of, and comply with, the relevant legislation and any Department of Constitutional Affairs and local environmental health concerns. Burials should be recorded *in situ* and subsequently lifted, washed in water

(without additives), marked and packed to standards compatible with McKinley and Roberts (1993). Site inspection by a recognised specialist is desirable in the case of isolated burials, and necessary for cemeteries. Proposals for the final placing of human remains following study and analysis will be required in the Project Design. Further guidance is provided by English Heritage (2004). For this excavation, tenders should allow provision for any human remains to be subject to carbon and nitrogen isotope study.

Post-Excavation Assessment

7.17 Upon completion of archaeological fieldwork, where appropriate, a post-excavation assessment should be undertaken and an assessment report produced in accordance with the guidance of MAP2 (English Heritage 1991). The assessment report should summarise the evidence recovered and should consider its potential for further analysis, review the programme of archaeological science, update the project design as necessary and provide costings for the post-excavation analysis stage of work, with proposals for the production of a final report and/or publication. The site assessment report should include reports on all aspects of Archaeological Science investigated, and include assessment of their suitability for analysis, so as to inform the updated project design.

7.18 Assessment of artefacts should include x-radiography of all iron objects (Jones ed. 2006), after initial screening to separate obviously modern debris, and a selection of non-ferrous artefacts (including all coins and a sample of any industrial debris relating to metallurgy). An assessment of all excavated material should be undertaken by conservators and finds researchers in collaboration. Where necessary, active stabilisation/consolidation will be carried out, to ensure long term survival of the material, but with due consideration to possible future investigations. Once assessed, all material should be packed and

stored in optimum conditions, as described in Watkinson and Neal (1998).

- 7.19 Assessment of any technological residues should be undertaken. Processing of all samples collected for biological assessment, or sub-samples of them, should be completed. Assessment will include recording the preservation state, density and significance of material retrieved, to inform up-dated project designs. Methods presented in English Heritage (2002) should be followed. Unprocessed sub-samples should be stored in conditions specified by the appropriate specialists.
- 7.20 Samples collected for geoarchaeological assessment should be processed as deemed necessary by the specialist, particularly where storage of unprocessed samples is thought likely to result in deterioration. Appropriate assessment should be undertaken (see Canti 1996, English Heritage 2002). Animal bone assemblages, or sub-samples of them, should be assessed by a recognised specialist (English Heritage 2002). Assessment of human remains should be undertaken by a recognised specialist (English Heritage 2004).

Analysis

- 7.21 Within a time agreed with the Historic Environment Team Leader, NYCC, a timetable for post-excavation work should be produced, following consultation (including team meetings for larger-scale sites), with all specialists involved in the project. Agreement of timetables should be made in writing with external specialists.
- 7.22 A detailed and cost-effective strategy for scientific dating should be prepared, in consultation with appropriate specialists. Samples for dating should be submitted promptly, and prior agreement should be made with the laboratory on turn-around time and report production.

- 7.23 All artefacts should be conserved and stored in accordance with Watkinson and Neal (1998). Investigative conservation should be undertaken on those objects selected during the assessment phase, with the aim of maximising information whilst minimising intervention. Where necessary, active stabilisation/consolidation will be carried out, to ensure long-term survival of the material, but with due consideration to possible future investigations. Proposals for ultimate storage should follow Walker (1990).
- 7.24 Appropriate analysis of technological residues should be undertaken, as outlined in English Heritage (2001). Samples or sub-samples collected for all types of biological and geoarchaeological analysis should be processed, and material retrieved analysed by recognised specialists. Any unprocessed sub-samples should be stored in conditions specified by the specialists, or a reasoned discard policy should be developed (English Heritage 2002).
- 7.25 Analysis of animal bones should be undertaken by a recognised specialist, as specified in the updated project design (see also English Heritage 2002). Analysis of human remains should be undertaken by a recognised specialist, as specified in the up-dated project design.

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, Scarborough 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. Copyright

9.1 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 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.

9.2 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.

10. Report

10.1 Following post-excavation assessment and analysis as appropriate, a report should be prepared following the County Council's guidance on reporting: *Reporting Check-List*. The report should set out the aims of the work and the results as achieved, including photographs of operations, description of the remains including all relevant plans and sections, interpretation and assessment of the significance of the remains. The report should also include a listing of contexts, finds, plans and sections, and photographs.

10.2 The results from investigations in Archaeological Science, *including negative results*, should be included in the Site Archive and reported to the HER.

- 10.3 A timetable for completion of reports should be agreed with all specialists, and agreements in writing with sub-contracted external specialists are desirable. The time-table should allow for adequate provision by the excavator of contextual information, provisional dating and stratigraphic relationships of contexts. Reports should include clear statements of methodology. The results from scientific analysis should be clearly distinguished from their interpretation. Non-technical summaries of results should be included. Reports on Archaeological Science should be published fully, in the text of printed reports or in the main body of reports disseminated by electronic means, wherever the results merit it.
- 10.4 At least six copies of the report should be produced and submitted to the commissioning body, the Local Planning Authority, the museum accepting the archive, the English Heritage Regional Advisor for Archaeological Science and, under separate cover, North Yorkshire County Council Heritage Section.
- 10.5 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.
- 10.6 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 Historic Environment Team Leader, NYCC of the details of the work and to provide the Historic Environment Record (HER) with a report on the work.

- 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. Centre for Archaeology Guidelines 20002/01
<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>
- English Heritage 2004 *Human Bones from Archaeological sites. Guidelines for producing assessment documents and analytical reports.* Centre for Archaeology Guidelines, unnumbered.
http://194.164.61.131/filestore/publications/pdf/free/human_bones_2004.pdf
- Fenton-Thomas C. 2005 The Forgotten Landscape of the Yorkshire Wolds.
- Geoquest 2004 Land to the north of Main Street, Weaverthorpe
- Institute of Field Archaeologists 2001 Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation
<http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/content/inPages/docs/codes/exc2.pdf>

- Jones, D M (ed.) 2006 Guidelines on the X-radiography of Archaeological Metalwork. English Heritage.
- McKinley, J & Roberts, C 1993 IFA Technical Paper **13**, *Excavation and post-excavation treatment of cremated and inhumed human remains*.
- MAP 2007 27 Wood Street, Norton, North Yorkshire. Archaeological Evaluation. MAP Archaeological Consultant Ltd.
- .
- Smith, A.H. 1937 The Place-Names of the East Riding of Yorkshire and York.
- Society of Museum Archaeologists 1993 *Selection, retention and dispersal of archaeological collections. Guidelines for use in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales*.
- Walker, K. 1990 *Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage*, Archaeology Section of the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation.
- Watkinson, D & Neal, V 1998 First Aid for Finds (3rd edition), RESCUE & the Archaeological Section of the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation.

APPENDIX 1- SPECIALISTS

Conservation	Ian Panter	YAT	01904 663036
Prehistoric Pottery	Terry Manby		01430 873147
Roman Pottery	Jeremy Evans		0121 7784024
	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	S.Garside – Neville		01904 621339
Animal Bone		WYAS	0113 3837517
Small Finds	Hilary Cool		0116 9819065
Leather	Ian Carlisle	YAT	01904 663000
Textile	Penelope Walton Rogers	Textile Research in Archaeology	01904 634585
Slag/Hearths		Bradford University	01274 3835131
Flint	Pete Makey		01377 253695
Environmental Sampling		Diane Alldritt	0141 649 877
Human Remains	Malin Holst	York Osteology Ltd	01904 737509
C14 Dating		SUERAC	0141 270136
Dendro		Sheffield University	0114 2220123
Archaeomagnetic	Mark Noel	Geoquest Associates	01624819364