

REC 9/10/03



THE UNIVERSITY
OF BIRMINGHAM

NYCC HER	
SNY	8328
ENY	1892
CNY	
Parsh	
Rec'd	09/10/2003

A63 Selby Bypass

Archaeological Salvage
Recording and
Watching Brief
2002

Birmingham University Field Archaeology Unit



Institute of Field
Archaeologists

NYS 8328
NYE 1892

Birmingham University Field Archaeology Unit
Project No 827 04
August 2003

**A63 Selby Bypass
Archaeological Salvage Recording
and Watching Brief 2002**

by
Roy Krakowicz, Mary Duncan and Malcolm Hislop

with a contribution by Aimette Hancocks

For further information please contact
Birmingham University Field Archaeology Unit
The University of Birmingham
Edgbaston
Birmingham B15 2TT
Tel 0121 414 5513
Fax 0121 414 5516
E-Mail BUFAU@bham.ac.uk
Web Address <http://www.bufau.bham.ac.uk>

A63 Selby Bypass, Archaeological Salvage Recording and Watching Brief 2002

Contents

1 0	Summary
2 0	Introduction
3 0	Background
4 0	Methodology
5 0	Results
6 0	Finds
7 0	Discussion
8 0	Acknowledgements
9 0	References

Tables (withm text)

1	Details of archaeological watching brief strategy
2	Details of site-specific watching brief
3	Lengths of bypass where no watching brief was required
4	Details of culverts monitored
5	Details of circular ring-gully F708, F709
6	Summary of the finds

Figures

1	Location of Selby Bypass
2	Detailed plan from ch 0- ch 2900
3	Detailed plan from ch 2900-ch 5100
4	Detailed plan from ch 5100-7800
5	Detailed plan from ch 7800-ch 9600
6	Salvage recording, plan of features
7	Salvage recording, sections
8	Watchmg brief, sections of selected features
9	Watching brief, plans of selected features
10	Sector L, locations of field boundaries trial-trenched

Plates

- 1 Salvage recording, ring gully segment F708 03, detail
- 2 Salvage recording, pit F713, detail
- 3 Salvage recording, ditch F700 02
- 4 Sector D, overburden strip near chainage 2940
- 5 Sector D, feature F712, detail
- 6 Sector E, feature F701, detail
- 7 Sector K, feature F801, detail
- 8 Sector K, feature F802, detail

A63 SELBY BYPASS, ARCHAEOLOGICAL SALVAGE RECORDING AND WATCHING BRIEF 2002

1 0 SUMMARY

Watching brief and salvage recording was undertaken along the A63 Selby Bypass by Birmingham University Field Archaeology Unit (BUFAU) on instruction from Skanska Construction UK Limited. The watching brief involved the observation of subsoil horizons for archaeological features during the mechanical clearance of overburden. Features, or possible features of archaeological interest were tested by hand-excavation. Most were found to be field boundaries. The most interesting discovery was at chainage 3600, where a ring-gully was associated with several ditched features, all of presumed Iron Age date, although no dating evidence could be obtained. In the north of the bypass, where full clearance of the overburden was not undertaken, a series of machine-cut trenches were dug at selected locations to test field boundaries thought to be of possible historical interest. Most were found to have been of recent origin.

Preliminary archaeological work undertaken in connection with the bypass scheme has included archaeological assessment, fieldwalking and geophysical survey. Work undertaken by BUFAU in connection with the bypass has included building recording and trial-trenching in addition to the watching brief and salvage recording. A palaeoenvironmental study of the River Ouse valley was also undertaken by the University of Hull.

2 0 INTRODUCTION

Watching brief and salvage recording was undertaken along part of the line of the A63 Selby Bypass by Birmingham University Field Archaeology Unit on instruction from Skanska Construction UK Limited (Fig 1). The watching brief involved the observation of subsoil horizons for archaeological features during the mechanical clearance of overburden. Features, or possible features of archaeological interest were tested by hand-excavation. Most were found to be field boundaries. The most interesting discovery was at chainage 3600, where a ring-gully was associated with ditched features, all of presumed Iron Age date, although no dating evidence could be obtained. In the north of the bypass, where full clearance of the overburden was not undertaken a series of machine-cut trenches were dug at selected locations to test field boundaries thought to be of historical interest. Most were found to have been of recent origin.

The watching brief and salvage recording was undertaken in accordance with the Employer's Requirements for the Scheme (Highways Agency 2001) and a Written Scheme of Investigation prepared by BUFAU (BUFAU 2001).

Preliminary archaeological work undertaken in connection with the bypass scheme has included archaeological assessment, fieldwalking and geophysical survey. The assessment was compiled by BHWB, with earlier stages of reporting being prepared by Lancaster University Archaeological Unit and Northern Archaeological Associates. Geophysical surveys were undertaken by GeoQuest Associates. Work

undertaken by BUFAU in connection with the bypass has included building recording and trial-trenching in addition to the watching brief and salvage recording described in this report. A palaeoenvironmental study of the River Ouse Valley was also undertaken by the University of Hull.

The results of the building recording (Hislop 2003), trial-trenching (Williams 2003) and palaeoenvironmental assessment (University of Hull 2002) have been separately reported, and will not be repeated here.

3.0 BACKGROUND (Figs 2-5)

Details of the archaeological background to the bypass are contained in the archaeological assessment (Mouchel 2000). This section of the report contains a summary of the assessment data. A total of 15 sites were identified as a result of assessment by BHWB. They comprised cropmarked field boundaries (Sites 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13), the course of a former railway (Site 8), the course of the Selby Canal (Site 9), a former army camp (Site 2), a possible mesolithic flint scatter (Site 3), woodland, scrub and associated earthworks at Staynor Wood (Site 11), an area of palaeoenvironmental potential in the Ouse valley (Site 14), and an abandoned munitions complex (Site 15). All sites were identified as of local, district, or regional importance.

Further work, comprising building recording (Sites 2 and 15), palaeoenvironmental survey (Site 14), fieldwalking and geophysical survey (Sites 3 and 6) was proposed. Subsequently, trial-trenching was required at Sites B2-3 and S2 (see Williams 2003 for results).

The assessment details the results of research into the use of Site 15, the former munitions complex, which are not repeated here. This site was thought to have been a National Trench Warfare Factory commissioned around 1915, used to produce phosgene and to charge this chemical into Russian made shells. A magazine at Barlby was first mapped by the Ordnance Survey in 1894, and continued to be mapped until at least 1963-4 (Mouchel 2000, 6).

Work by BHWB prior to the preparation of the assessment recommended fieldwalking over a total of four areas. An area to the south of Brayton Barff was walked in 1999, although no significant artifact concentrations could be noted. Other fieldwalking, to the southeast and south of Staynor Hall identified brick and tile, thought to be derived from manuring scatters.

Geophysical survey was undertaken to locate any features associated with cropmarked features on either side of the A19 road, and in the area of Site 15, to locate any peripheral, but associated features. Adjoining the A19 road the geophysical survey identified modern disturbances (Areas S1 and S3), verified by test-pits, and possible anomalies associated with square or circular enclosures (Area S2), although conclusive results were prevented by adverse ground conditions. In the area surrounding Site 15 the geophysical survey identified possible ditched anomalies (Area B2), and a possible kiln or hearth (Area B3). These areas were subsequently trial-trenched with negative results (Williams 2003). Other areas within the bypass

corridor had also been subjected to geophysical survey, near Brayton Hall and Staynor Hall

The valley and floodplain of the River Ouse at the northern end of the bypass is an area of palaeoenvironmental significance. A specialist study was undertaken by the University of Hull, Centre for Wetland Archaeology (Lillie 1999). A total of nine boreholes were located to test areas where preliminary borehole investigations suggested there was potential for waterlogged sediments. The borehole investigations showed that the River Ouse was active and migrating before being embanked. The river has worked a wide alluvial floodplain through its history, with associated meanders. Low energy fen-carr environments were recorded at the river margins. The potential of the alder fen-carr through to sedge-reed-swamp and possible wet grasslands, dating from approximately cal BC 3800 for further analysis and dating, was highlighted.

Following the recommendations contained in the earlier assessment by BHWB, the 2000 assessment (Mouchel 2000) recommended an archaeological watching brief to record the identified archaeological sites within the bypass. This strategy is detailed in Table 1.

4.0 METHODOLOGY (Figs 2-5)

The watching brief was undertaken in stages between January and April 2002, in accordance with the contractors' programme. The watching brief involved continuous archaeological observation along parts of the bypass, in accordance with the design brief, the Employer's Requirements, and the Written Scheme of Investigation. Archaeological observation was undertaken during the removal of topsoil overburden by 360 degree excavators. Features of archaeological, or possible archaeological interest were tested by hand-excavation. Recording was by means of pre-printed proformas for contexts and features, supplemented by scale plans (1:50, 1:20, as appropriate) sections (1:20), and monochrome print and colour slide photography.

The archaeological watching brief fell into three categories (BUFAU 2001). Firstly, a site-specific watching brief relating to features or areas of known or suggested archaeological potential (Sites 1, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13). Secondly a general watching brief undertaken over the remainder of the bypass (Appendix 13), with the exception of areas where the project design specified that an archaeological watching brief was not required (Sites 3, 4, 8, 9, 10), or where the topsoil was not stripped. Thirdly, where topsoil was not stripped, in the north of the bypass, archaeological observation and recording took the form of machine-cut trenches which were hand-cleaned and recorded. The detailed strategy of archaeological recording is summarised in Table 1.

The majority of the site-specific watching briefs involved the targeting of field boundaries, represented either by existing field boundaries or by cropmarked features. Possible historic ditched boundaries were to be tested by means of machine-cut trenches extending on either side of the boundary. The trenches were intended to identify any evidence for earlier ditch cuts, and to provide a sequence of the re-cutting where present.

TABLE 1 Details of archaeological watching brief strategy (Figs 2-5)

<i>Site-based watching brief*</i>	<i>General watching brief</i>	<i>Watching brief not required</i>
200-750 (1)		
	750-1550	
		1550-2600 (3), [2400-2550 (4)]
	2600-3100	
3100-4300 (7)		
	4300-4500	
		4500-4550 (8)
	4550-4900	
		4900-5000 (9)
	5000-5300	
		5300-6500 (10)
	6500-7000	
7000-7350 (11)		
	7350-7800	
7800-8000 (12)^		
8000-8900 (13)^		
		8900-9800^

Note Arranged from south to north along the bypass, the lowest chamages first

* Site nos (m brackets) as detailed in the assessment (Mouchel 2000)

^ trial-trenching in lieu of watching brief during topsoil removal No watching brief was required between chamages 7800 and 9800 m the north of the bypass because the overburden was not removed here

TABLE 2 Details of site-specific watching brief

<i>Chamage</i>	<i>Site no</i>	<i>Details</i>
200-750	1	Former field boundaries between Hagg Lane and Field Lane (Fig 2)
3200-3500	5	Curvilinear cropmarked feature, possible field boundary, southeast New Farm (Fig 3)
3100-4300	7	Former field boundaries and cropmarked tracks, east and west of Doncaster Road (Fig 3)
7000-7350	11	Woodland and scrub, and associated earthworks, Staynor Wood (Fig 4)
7800-8000	12	Cropmarked former field boundaries, north of East Common Lane (Figs 4-5)
8100-8900	13	Cropmarked former field boundaries and parish boundary, northwest of Newlands Farm (Fig 5)

No archaeological watching brief or further archaeological input was required at the sites listed in Table 3

TABLE 3 Lengths of bypass where no archaeological watching brief was required

<i>Chainage</i>	<i>Site no</i>	<i>Details</i>
2400-2550	4	Former field boundaries and gravel pit, southwest of Brayton Barff (Fig 2)
4450-4520	8	Course of former railway, south of Brayton Hall (Fig 3)
4800-4920	9	Course of Selby Canal (Fig 3)
5200-5800/ 5900-6300	10	Cropmarked, former field boundaries east and west of Bawtry Road (Fig 4)

Following inspection of Site 15 (former munitions complex southwest of Osgodby) it was decided in consultation with North Yorkshire County Council that no further archaeological recording was appropriate here because the remains of the complex lay wholly outside the bypass corridor

Archaeological salvage recording was undertaken following the discovery of a sub-circular ring-gully at chainage 3600 during the archaeological watching brief. Hand-excavation sampled lengths of the circular feature, and also segments of adjoining ditched features which could have been associated

Additionally, archaeological observation was maintained during the machine-clearance at a number of existing culverts, in order to locate any field boundary ditches of historic interest (Table 4). Machine re-excavation of the culverts was undertaken in advance of the topsoil strip

TABLE 4 Details of culverts monitored

<i>Culvert no</i>	<i>Chainage</i>	<i>Feature</i>
C1101	140-350	Ditch
C1101	3000	Ditch
C2403	7100	Ditch
C2501	7300	Ditch
C2505	7400	Ditch
C2503	7550	Ditch

Subject to the approval of the landowner, it is intended to deposit the project paper and finds archive with Yorkshire Museum

5.0 RESULTS (Figs 2-8, Plates 1-8)

In this section of the report the results of salvage recording at chainage 3600 are described first, followed by the results of the watching brief

5.1 Salvage recording at chainage 3600 (Figs 3, 6-7, Plates 1-3)

Following the identification of a roughly circular gully during the archaeological watching brief during topsoil removal, a small team undertook salvage recording in March 2002 around chainage 3600. Following machine removal of the topsoil across the whole width of the bypass in this location, the machined surface was hand-cleaned, and a base-plan of the features identified was prepared. Approximately 40% of the circular gully was excavated, by means of hand-dug sections each approximately 1m in length, evenly-spaced along its circumference. The other adjoining features of archaeological, or possible archaeological interest were also sampled by hand-excitation, with particular attention being paid towards testing the feature intersections.

The features investigated by salvage recording (Figs 6-7) comprised a circular ring-gully (F708, F709, Table 5), a re-cut ditch (F700, F706), a pit (F713), two ditches (F714, F716), and recent field drains (not numbered or described). No features, or possible features could be recorded within the interior of the ring-gully with the exception of feature F716 and a field drain, despite careful hand-cleaning. Any such internal features could have been removed by plough truncation.

The main feature identified was a roughly circular ring-gully (F708, Fig 7 S 1-S 6), F709, S 7, Plate 1), measuring approximately 8m in diameter. The full extent of this feature was not recorded within the bypass corridor. The presumed southeastern continuation of this feature lay outside the bypass corridor. The eastern terminal of feature F708 was enlarged and round-ended. No evidence of an adjoining terminal could be recorded to the south, possibly because of plough truncation. The ring-gully was originally dug in sections, with two further entry-gaps, positioned along its western side, being recorded. The southwestern terminal of the northwestern entry-gap was rounded (F708 06), but the opposing terminal (F708 03) was flat-ended. This entry-gap measured 0.7m in width. A further entry-gap, measuring 0.6m in width was recorded between gully segments F708 05 and F709, in the southwest of the feature. The northwestern terminal (F708 05) was rounded, while the opposing southeastern terminal (F709) was mostly flat-ended.

Details of the ring-gully are tabulated (Table 5). The feature was U-shaped in profile throughout, and was mainly backfilled with sand. Segments F708 06 and F708 04 in the west of the feature were backfilled with a single fill, whilst elsewhere two fills were recorded, the primary fill comprising redeposited subsoil, the uppermost fill comprising brown sand. A roughly circular pit (F713, S 8, Plate 2) was cut just inside the eastern terminal of the ring-gully (F708 01). Pit F713 measured a maximum of 0.6m in diameter, and 0.3m in depth. The pit was backfilled with grey silt-sand (7036), with orange and brown mottling. A northwest-southeast-aligned ditch (F714, S 12-13) was cut to the north of the ring-gully, presumably respecting its location, and cutting backfilled pit F713. Ditch F714 was V-shaped in profile, and was backfilled with dark grey sand-silt.

A further, northeast-southwest-aligned ditch (F716, S 9) was recorded, its northeastern terminus truncating the eastern terminal of the ring-gully (F708 01). Ditch F716 was not continued outside the ring-gully, which may suggest that it was

associated Ditch F716 was cut to a U-shaped profile, and was backfilled with brown sand-silt (7041), sealed by a deposit of dark grey sand-silt (7040)

TABLE 5 Details of circular ring-gully F708, F709

<i>Feature</i>	<i>Fill/description</i>	<i>Depth</i>	<i>Width</i>	<i>Profile</i>
F708 01	7031, light brown sand-silt, 7030, dark grey silt flecked with small flecks of charcoal	0 45m	0 8m	U-shaped
F708 02	7027, orange sand with brown mottling, 7026, dark brown sand	0 4m	0 8m	U-shaped
F708 03	7024, orange-grey sand, 7023, dark brown silt	0 35m	0 55m	U-shaped
F708 06	7032, brown sand with few stones	0 5m	0 65m	U-shaped
F708 04	7025, dark brown sand	0 22m	0 6m	U-shaped
F708 05	7028, light brown sand-silt, 7020, dark grey sand-silt	0 3m	0 5m	U-shaped
F709	7029, light brown sand-silt, 7021, dark grey sand-silt	0 3m	0 9m	U-shaped

Note fills are described in stratigraphic order, i.e. from first to last

The other main feature recorded was a re-cut roughly north-south aligned ditch (F706, F700, S 10-11, Plate 3) The round-ended southern terminal of this ditch respected the line of ditch F714 to the northeast. A possible entry-gap measuring 0 9m in width may have been retained between the two ditches. The primary ditch (F706) was cut to a U-shaped profile, and measured a maximum of 2m in width, and 0 2m in depth. It was heavily truncated by later ditch F700, which also terminated to the south of its predecessor. Ditch F700 01 was backfilled with light grey sand (7018) and grey clay and sand (7017) which had tipped into the eastern and western sides of the feature, respectively. Above, a layer of brown silt-sand (7016) comprised the latest surviving fill of this feature. Ditch F700 02 was cut to an irregular, U-shaped profile, and measured a maximum of 1 6m in width, and 0 45m in depth. The primary fill of this re-cut was a brown silt-sand (7015), overlain by a layer of dark grey-brown sand-silt (7014). Above was a layer of orange-yellow sand (7013) mottled with yellow staining, sealed by a layer of brown-orange mottled sand-silt (7012) which formed the uppermost ditch fill. The ditch was cut by a modern field drain (F707, 7019), aligned approximately southeast-northwest. Other field drains were also recorded.

No finds were recovered from the feature group investigated by salvage recording, except the upper fill (7012) of feature F700 which contained two fragments of ceramic tile which might be intrusive. Insufficient charcoal was present to enable scientific dating to be attempted.

5 2 General and site specific watching brief (Figs 2-5)

5 2 1 Introduction

This section of the report describes the results of the watching brief, from the western end of the bypass to its northeastern terminus, in ascending order of chainage. For

simplicity, the bypass route has been divided into twelve sections, lettered A-L for ease of reference. The watching brief results in each section are described separately. The finds are summarised in Table 6, but modern material is not quantified.

Sector A (chainages 0-900, Fig 2)

This westernmost sector included Site 1, an area of recorded field boundaries.

Results

The natural subsoil in this sector was friable sand, this was quite heavily plough scarred. The topsoil, which had a depth of around 0.3m, consisted of humic sandy silt.

A general scatter of recent pottery was recorded (but not collected) in the area between chainages 300 and 400. No trace could be recorded of any ditched field boundaries, with the exception of a single ditch at chainages 140-350 recorded during the excavation of culvert C1101. No features of archaeological, or possible archaeological interest, were recorded.

Sector B (chainages 900-1500, Fig 2)

Sector B consisted of a length of road from chainage 900-1500. No archaeological, or possible archaeological features had been identified along this length of the bypass, and this sector formed part of the general watching brief.

The topsoil and subsoil horizons were similar to those identified in Sector A. No features, or possible archaeological features could be identified, and no finds were collected from this sector.

Sector C (chainages 1500-2600, Fig 2)

The results of building recording at Site 2 are described in a separate report (Hislop 2003). No further work was required in relation to Site 3 (area of possible mesolithic activity, Brayton Barff), or Site 4 (former field boundaries and gravel pit, southwest of Brayton Barff).

No archaeological monitoring was undertaken along this sector of the bypass.

Sector D (chainages 2600-3200, Figs 2-3 and 8-9, Plates 4-5)

This sector contained no sites of archaeological interest identified in advance of the watching brief. It extended from Mill Lane to a point southwest of Brayton village. The gently undulating ground gradually dropped away from Brayton Barff, then began to level off.

In this sector the natural subsoil consisted of a multi-hued sand (predominantly pale yellow-orange-pinkish red, Plate 4). Despite some variation in the appearance of the topsoil layer along this stretch, due to differences in farming practices, in general it was 0.3-0.45m in depth and comprised a dark-brown/black sandy silt.

An existing, roughly north-south aligned field boundary was visible to the north of the bypass (at chainage 3000) It did not extend across the course of the new road Its projected continuation into the bypass corridor was inspected and hand-cleaned, but no archaeological, or possible archaeological features could be identified in this location

A possible north-south aligned field boundary crossed the bypass (at chainage 3090), but was not associated with a ditch Immediately to the west was an east-west aligned earth bank running obliquely across the bypass (chainages 2950-3060) This feature was sectioned in a machine-cut trench, which revealed a shallow ditch (F715, Fig 8 S 14), measuring 0.1m in depth This was backfilled with brown sand-silt (7038) with a high stone content, but contained no finds

A number of other field boundary ditches were identified in this sector (Fig 9) An existing field boundary hedge, aligned north-south, was located just to the west of chainage 3180 There was no evidence of an associated ditch, although three ditches (F710, F711, S 15, F712) were recorded nearby, all running parallel to the north-south-aligned field boundary

Ditch F710 was located approximately 4.0m to the west of the field boundary and comprised a shallow, U-shaped cut into the subsoil (7001) The ditch was backfilled with a mixture of topsoil and subsoil (7033), suggesting the feature was fairly modern No finds were recovered from the backfill

Ditch F711 was cut to a shallow, U-shaped profile with a flattened base It adjoined feature F710, and was backfilled with similar material It was not possible to determine a relationship between the two features The backfill of ditch F711 (7034) contained a single fragment of modern tile

A further 2.9m to the west lay ditch F712 (S 16, Plate 5), cut to a shallow, U-shaped profile It was cut into the subsoil and contained one fill (7035), a mix of topsoil and subsoil The backfill yielded no dating evidence, but was noted to contain some charcoal flecks and coal

Topsoil finds included artifacts from the early prehistoric period to the present Worked flint fragments were recovered at chainages 2860 and 2900 Sherds of Roman pottery were found within the topsoil at chainages 2620, 2650, 2780, 2800 and 2860 Sherds of medieval pottery were recovered at chainages 3118 and 3153 Post-medieval pottery sherds were recovered from the topsoil at chainages 2620, 2650, 2760, 2780, 2800 and 2860

Within this sector there was little evidence for historic field boundaries The ditches encountered may be of fairly modern date The topsoil finds probably derive from manuring No particular finds concentrations could be noted

Sector E (chainages 3200-3700, Figs 3 and 8, Plate 6)

This sector included Site 5, a curvilinear cropmarked feature to the southeast of New Farm, Site 6, circular cropmarked features to the east and west of the Doncaster Road, and Site 7, cropmarked former field boundaries and tracks to the east and west of

Doncaster Road Most notably, this sector included the undated ring-gully of probable late prehistoric date identified during salvage recording at chainage 3600, described in Section 5.1 above

Sector E of the bypass route encompassed a swathe of flat agricultural land, extending from a point southwest of Brayton village in an easterly direction until encountering the A19 road

The subsoil comprised a mainly orange-brown sand (7001), sealed by the topsoil (7000), consisting of a 0.3–0.4m-deep layer of dark-brown/black sand-silt, with a few stones scattered throughout the matrix

The easternmost feature identified was a ditched field boundary at chainage 3358, in the vicinity of Site 5. The field boundary consisted of a roughly north-south-aligned earthwork bank (F705), overlying the subsoil. The lower bank material comprised an orange-brown silt-sand (7009), measuring 0.2m in depth. This was overlain by a very compact deposit of orange-brown sand-silt (7008), measuring a maximum of 0.2m in thickness. Above was a very compact layer of brown sandy silt (7007) of irregular depth (0.2–0.4m), sealed by the topsoil. To the west of this field boundary was a shallow deposit of reddish-brown sand (7006) overlying layer 7007, beneath the topsoil. The hedgerow itself was marked by a localised area of root-disturbed subsoil (7010), overlying layer 7009. No evidence of an associated ditch could be recorded, and no finds were recovered from the bank material.

A shallow, north-south ditch F704 was recorded to the east of the former (chainage 3430). The ditch cut the subsoil, and was dug to a U-shaped profile, measuring 1.4m in width, and 0.1m in depth. It was backfilled with grey-brown sand (7005). This contained a single worked flint fragment, a sherd of post-medieval pottery and a fragment of ceramic tile.

The course of the new road cut through an existing north-south aligned hedged field boundary at chainage 3484. This hedge was represented within the bypass corridor by a V-shaped ditch (F703, Fig. 8 S.17) following the same alignment, and cutting the subsoil. The ditch measured a maximum of 0.2m in width, and 0.2m in depth. This feature was backfilled with brown sand-silt (7004) from which no finds were recovered.

A northeast-southwest-aligned cropmarked feature (part of Site 7) was recorded within the bypass corridor as a ditch (F702, S.18, between chainages 3555–3526), cutting the subsoil. A machine-excavated section (at chainage 3539) revealed that feature F702 consisted of a U-shaped ditch, 1.2m in width and 0.5m in depth. It was backfilled with brown sand-silt (7003), whose upper levels contained modern building debris, cinder and household detritus (relatively modern pottery and glass bottles).

Immediately to the east of ditch F702 was a north-south ditch (F701, S.19, Plate 6, chainage 3559) cutting into the natural subsoil (7001). Ditch F701 was aligned northeast-southwest and formed the continuation of an existing field boundary. This ditch was V-shaped in section, with a cleaning-slot in its base. The ditch measured a maximum of 1m in width, and 0.5m in depth, and was backfilled with brown sand-silt (7002). It contained a fragment of tile.

The bypass corridor to the east of ditch F702 was heavily disturbed by numerous field drains and modern services, and no features of archaeological, or possible archaeological interest could be identified

Single worked-flints were found (chainages 3372, 3388, 3390, 3410, 3550 and east of 3600) Sherds of Roman pottery were also recovered (chainage 3214x2, single sherds at 3375, 3376, 3390 and 3538) One sherd of medieval pottery was found (chainage 3414) Not surprisingly, post-medieval pottery was recovered in slightly-greater amounts, found at chainages 3200-3300 (2), 3338 (1 sherd), 3375 (11), 3376 (1), 3388 (4), 3390 (2), 3399 (3), 3414 (1) and 3485 (3)

Other recovered finds were limited to two pieces of ceramic tile (at chainages 3216 and 3327), a sherd of glass at chainage 3118 and an animal bone fragment (chainage 3390) Most, if not all of these finds could derive from manuring scatters

Sector F (chainages 3700-4300, Fig 3)

This sector of the bypass included part of Site 6, comprising circular cropmarked features to the east and west of Doncaster Road, and Site 7, cropmarked former field boundaries and tracks to the east and west of Doncaster Road Trial-trenching tested areas of archaeological potential within this sector (Williams 2003) with negative results The subsoil and topsoil within this sector were similar to those described in Sector E (above)

Possible ditch F500 was recorded at chainage 3830, to the east of the Doncaster Road This feature was L-shaped in plan, with its main axis aligned northwest-southeast The possible ditch measured a maximum of 1.2m in width, and 0.6m in depth, and was cut to a U-shaped profile The feature was backfilled with grey-brown silt-sand (5000) This feature may be geological in origin

Northwest-southeast-aligned ditch F100 (chainage 4000) was cut to a U-shaped profile, and measured a maximum of 1.4m in width, and 0.4m in depth It was backfilled with dark grey-brown sand-silt (1000) This feature was aligned roughly parallel with a modern field boundary to the east (F101) which was not associated with a ditch

Feature F600 was a recent pit recorded at approximately chainage 4010 This feature was cut through the topsoil, and was backfilled with material similar to the topsoil Other pits, also cut through the topsoil were also noted in this location, but were not tested

No finds were recovered from this sector

Sector G (chainages 4300-4900, Fig 3)

This section of the bypass included Site 8, the course of an abandoned railway, and Site 9, the Selby Canal The subsoil and topsoil in this area was the same as in Sector E (see above)

The only feature of archaeological, or possible archaeological interest within this sector was a northwest-southeast-aligned ditch (F400, chainage 4610). This feature was cut to a U-shaped profile, and measured a maximum of 1.3m in width, and 0.5m in depth. This feature was backfilled with grey-brown sand (4001), sealed by an organic peaty deposit (4002). This ditch respected the line of an existing field boundary. The other field boundaries in this sector were represented by bands of root-disturbed soil, and no associated ditches could be located during the watching brief.

No finds were recovered within this sector of the bypass.

Sector H (chainages 4900-6500, Figs 3-4)

This sector included Site 10, an area of crop-marked former field boundaries to the east and west of Bawtry Road. This site was an area in which no further archaeological fieldwork was required. Consequently, a watching brief was not maintained in this sector.

Sector I (chainages 6500-7000, Figs 4 and 8-9)

No archaeological, or possible archaeological sites were identified within this sector of the bypass in advance of the watching brief. The subsoil comprised a loose orange sand (9011), with occasional patches of clay. Above was the topsoil (9010), a layer of dark brown humic clay-sand-silt, measuring an average of 0.3m in depth.

Cut into this natural horizon was a series of twelve north-south-aligned, parallel negative features, identified from chainages 6790 to 6900. These features were mostly similar in size and alignment, and measured an average of 1m in width, and 0.1m in depth. They were backfilled with light brown friable sand clay and silt, and were heavily truncated towards the east.

Three ditches were also recorded in this sector. The easternmost ditch (F900, Fig 8 S 20, Fig 9, chainage 6860) was aligned north-south. It was cut to a U-shaped profile, and measured a maximum of 1.7m in width, and 0.5m in depth. The ditch was backfilled with grey silt-sand (9000). Further to the northeast was east-west-aligned ditch F901, S 21 (chainage 6920). This feature was U-shaped in profile, and measured a maximum of 1.1m in width, and 0.3m in depth. It was backfilled with friable brown sand-silt (9001). The northeasternmost feature identified in this sector was an east-west-aligned ditch (F902, S 22, chainage 6940). This feature was cut to a U-shaped profile, and measured a maximum of 1m in width, and 0.2m in depth. It was backfilled with friable dark brown silt-sand (9002). No finds were recovered from this feature group.

Cutting the ridge and furrow were a series of post-medieval ceramic field drains.

The group of twelve linear features from chainages 6790-6900 were probably the remnants of a medieval ridge and furrow field system, whose alignment is respected by ditches F900-F902, which cut the ridge and furrow, although no datable artifacts were recovered. The ridge and furrow alignment is respected by modern field boundaries.

No finds were recovered from this sector

Sector J (chainages 7000-7400, Fig 4)

This sector includes Site 11, woodland and scrub and associated earthworks at Staynor Wood. This subsoil mainly comprised mixed yellow and white friable sand (8001), although areas of light brown clay-silt subsoil was also recorded. Above was the topsoil, which measured an average of 0.3m in depth. This subsoil was heavily plough scarred. Many post-medieval field drains were also noted in this sector.

The ditches associated with field boundaries along this sector of the bypass were culverted, and remained in use.

A single north-south aligned gully (F903) was identified at chainage 7330, following the line of a modern field boundary. The gully was 1m in width, and 0.3m in depth, with a U-shaped profile. No dating evidence was retrieved from this sector.

No archaeological, or possible archaeological features could be identified in the area of culverts C2403 and C2501.

Sector K (chainages 7400-7700, Figs 4-5 and 8, Plates 7-8)

This sector of the bypass was an area of general watching brief. This sector passed through fields to the south of an industrial estate, located on the southeastern edge of Selby and close to the River Ouse. The land was relatively flat in this area and prone to waterlogging.

The natural subsoil (8001) comprised a deposit of multi-coloured sands, which were predominantly yellow and white. Overlying the natural subsoil was a topsoil layer of dark brown, sand-silt (8000), some 0.3-0.4m in depth.

Removal of the topsoil exposed the natural subsoil (8001), a layer of yellow and grey-white sand with occasional areas of iron-staining and panning. The subsoil was heavily plough scarred and criss-crossed by numerous post-medieval field drains, on north-south and east-west alignments. However, also cutting into the subsoil were several negative features of potential archaeological interest and these were duly recorded.

North-south-aligned ditch F800 (Fig 8 S 23, Fig 9), was recorded along the northeastern edge of the bypass corridor (at chainage 7578), cutting the subsoil. It terminated 6m inside the stripped area. It was cut to a U-shaped profile, and measured a maximum of 1.2m in width, and 0.12m in depth. It was backfilled with brown clay-sand (8002), which contained two sherds of medieval pottery.

An archaeological watching brief was also maintained during the overburden strip along the line of a side-road to the east of the bypass, beginning at chainage 7650 (Fig 9). A sub-circular pit (F801, S 24, Plate 7) measuring 1m in diameter, and 0.2m in depth was recorded along this side-road. The pit was backfilled with grey-orange sand (8003) that contained flecks/fragments of charcoal, and two sherds of post-medieval pottery. Also recorded along the side-road was a northeast-southwest-

aligned ditch (F802, Plate 8), cutting the subsoil. It was U-shaped in profile, and measured a maximum of 2.8m in width, and 0.3m in depth. It was backfilled with yellow-brown, clayey/sand-silt (8004) with a few charcoal flecks and coal residues scattered throughout the matrix. One sherd of Roman pottery, six sherds of post-medieval pottery, one slag fragment, five fired clay fragments and two clay pipe fragments were recovered from this backfill.

No archaeological, or possible archaeological features were identified during the excavation of culvert C2503 at chainage 7550.

Nine worked-flints and 52 pottery sherds (dating from the Roman, medieval and post-medieval periods) were recovered from the topsoil (8000) during the stripping operation.

Sector L (chainages 7700-8900, Figs 5 and 10)

No overburden strip was undertaken preliminary to bypass construction in this sector. Because no watching brief observation was possible in this sector, it was decided to cut a series of machine-dug trenches across the lines of the main field boundaries, to test for evidence of earlier ditch cuts, and any associated dating evidence. A total of seven trenches were excavated, each measuring 10m by 1.6m. The trench sections were cleaned to define the boundary features present, and the features were recorded by means of profile records, graphically, and photographically.

Trench 1

Trench 1 (chainage 8300) was aligned north-south, and intercepted an east-west aligned field boundary. This ditched field boundary contained a ceramic pipe at its base. No earlier ditches could be recorded.

Trench 2

Trench 2 (chainage 8280) was cut east-west. The trench intercepted a north-south field boundary, but no associated ditch was recorded.

Trench 3

Trench 3 (chainage 8650) was cut north-south to intercept an east-west-aligned field boundary. A cut for the insertion of a ceramic drain was identified, but no trace of a field boundary ditch.

Trench 4

Trench 4 (chainage 8540) was cut on a northeast-southwest alignment, to intercept a northwest-southeast-aligned field boundary. Again, no trace of a field boundary ditch could be recorded, only the cut for the insertion of a ceramic drain.

Trench 5

Trench 5 (chainage 8900) was cut northeast-southwest to intercept a northwest-southeast-aligned field boundary. No field boundary ditch was recorded, only a ceramic drain.

Trench 6

Trench 6 (chainage 7960) was aligned approximately east-west. It intercepted a northeast-southwest-aligned field boundary. The field boundary ditch recorded in this trench was mainly U-shaped in profile, tapering at the base. It was backfilled with brown silt-clay. No finds were recovered.

Trench 7

Trench 7 (chainage 78600) was cut on a northeast-southwest-alignment. This trench intercepted a northwest-southeast-aligned field boundary. No field boundary ditch was recorded, only the machine-made cut for a ceramic drain.

No earlier ditch cuts could be identified within the trenches.

Sector M (chainages 8900-9600)

No archaeological observation or other observation was undertaken in this area, with the exception of the palaeoenvironmental survey (University of Hull 2002). Site 15 lay outside the land-take for the bypass.

6.0 FINDS

Table 6 summarises the finds recovered during the watching brief, modern material is not included.

TABLE 6 Summary of the finds by Annette Hancocks

<i>Feature/ layer (chainage in brackets)</i>	<i>Flint</i>	<i>Roman pottery</i>	<i>Medieval pottery</i>	<i>Post- medieval pottery</i>	<i>Ceramic tile</i>	<i>Iron nails</i>	<i>Window glass</i>	<i>Animal Bone</i>
U/S			1	4		2		
7000		2						
Sector D (cha 2600-3200)								
Layer 7000 (2620)		1		2				
Layer 7000 (2650)		1		1				
Layer 7000 (2760)				1				
Layer 7000 (2780)		1		2				
Layer 7000 (2800)		1		2				
Layer 7000 (2860)	1	1		1				
Layer 7000 (2900)	1							
Layer 7000 (3090)								
Layer 7000 (3118)			4				1	
Layer 7000 (3153)			2					
Sector E (cha 3200-3700)								
Layer 7000 (3200 3300)				2				
Layer 7000 (3214)		2						
Layer 7000 (3216)					1			
Layer 7000 (3327)					1			
Layer 7000 (3338)				1				
Layer 7000 (3372)	1							
Layer 7000 (3375)		1		11				
Layer 7000 (3376)		1		1				
Layer 7000 (3388)	1			4				
Layer 7000 (3390)	1	1		2				1
Layer 7000 (3399)				3				
Layer 7000 (3410)	1							
Layer 7000 (3414)			1	1				
Layer 7000 (3434)								
Layer 7000 (3485)				3				
Layer 7000 (3538)		1						
Layer 7000 (3550)	1							
F704/ 7005	1			1	1			
F700/ 7012 (3600)*					2			
F711/ 7002 (3500)					1			
Layer 7000 (E of 3600)	1							

<i>Feature/ layer</i>	<i>Flint</i>	<i>Roman pottery</i>	<i>Medieval pottery</i>	<i>Post-medieval pottery</i>	<i>Ceramic tile</i>	<i>Slag</i>	<i>Fired clay/daub</i>	<i>Clay pipe</i>
Sector K (cha 7400-7700)								
F800/ 8001 (7580)			2					
F801/ 8003 (7600)				2		1	1	
F802/ 8004 (7600)		1		6		1	5	2
Layer 8000 (7600-7650)	2	1		6				
Layer 8000 (7640-7660)	3	1		5				
Layer 8000 (7660)	2							
Layer 8000 (7700)	1	1		16				
Layer 8000 (7720)	1		2	9	2			

Note No finds were collected from sectors A, B, F, G and I No watching brief was undertaken in sectors C, H and L * indicates salvage recording at chainage 3600

Finds summary

A total of 17 sherds of Romano-British pottery were recovered Four diagnostic rim sherds were recognised This material included a greyware beaded rim dish and the base of a colour-coated beaker, both of 2nd / 3rd century date

Twelve sherds of medieval and 86 sherds of post-medieval pottery were recovered The Post-Medieval material in particular was badly weathered and abraded The larger volume of this material is more than likely associated with manuring scatters The medieval material comprised of plain body ware sherds of 12th-14th century date, whilst the post-medieval material dated to the 18th-19th century

Eight fragments of ceramic tile were recovered The majority of this material comprised post-medieval roof tile, but a further two pieces had green glaze adhering to them and are deemed to be consistent with medieval floor tile

Recommendations

It is recommended that no further detailed work be undertaken of this group of material The finds assemblage consists of half a box and poses no long term storage issues Once ownership of the finds has been established the material will be deposited with Yorkshire Museum

7 0 DISCUSSION

7 1 Salvage recording

The main feature identified during the salvage recording was a circular ring-gully (Fig 6), possibly the remains of a drip gully surrounding a circular hut The southeasterly part of the circumference of this ring-gully may have been removed by plough truncation Two complete entrances were recorded, in the northwestern and

southwestern sides of the ring-gully, and a third, in the east of the feature may have been framed on its northern side by terminal F708 01. Ditch F714 and re-cut ditches F700 and F706 appeared to have been cut respecting one another. A narrow entry-gap, possibly even for sorting stock, was retained between the terminal of the two ditches, which together formed a right-angle. Both ditches and the ring-gully extended outside the area stripped for the road corridor, and full details of the overall arrangement could not be obtained.

More than one phase of activity may have been represented. Backfilled ditch F706 was cut by ditch F700, which respected the alignment of the former feature. Ring-gully terminal F708 01 was cut by pit F713, which was in turn truncated by the excavation of ditch F716. It may be significant that this ditch was not extended to the northeast, outside the ring-gully. A disappointment was the lack of secure datable artifacts, or of sufficient charcoal for scientific dating. The morphology of the feature suggests an Iron Age (e.g. Cunliffe 1991, fig. 13.29), or Roman date.

A number of curvilinear cropmarked ditches were recorded in the near vicinity of the ring-gully during earlier stages of the archaeological assessment of the bypass (Fig. 3). These features could perhaps provide a broader context for the discoveries at chainage 3600, although they also could not be securely dated. Ditch F701 which coincided with a cropmarked feature was found when tested to correspond to a modern field boundary, and its fill contained a fragment of modern tile. Of the group of possible features tested to the west within Sector E of the bypass, ditch F703 contained no datable finds and was coincident with an existing field boundary. The remaining ditches of this group (F704, F705) contained later artifacts.

7.2 Watching brief

The main aim of the watching brief was to attempt to elucidate the chronology of the surviving and the cropmarked field boundaries. The majority of the field boundaries tested could be located on the 1851 Ordnance Survey map. The field boundaries at Site 1 were all mapped at that date. Similarly, the field boundaries at Sites 5-7 and 9 were also mapped at that date. The mapped features included two parallel drains, the southernmost of which was probably represented by feature F500. The field boundaries at Site 10 were not represented on the map of 1851, possibly as a result of the re-alignment of an adjoining side road, and consequent changes in land allotment.

Most of the features identified during the watching brief were ditches, cutting the subsoil. An exception was bank (F705, Sector E) which could have originated as a positive lynchet. Associated layer 7007 could also be similarly interpreted. Few ditches were identified in Sectors A-C, I and L. Three ditches (F710-F712) were recorded adjoining an existing field boundary in Sector D, together with another field boundary (F715). These features could represent the repeated re-definition of the boundary. Five ditches were recorded within Sector E. Ditch F704 adjoined an extant field boundary, and could have been associated, while ditch F703 followed the line of a surviving field boundary. The most substantial ditch (F702) corresponded with the position of a cropmarked ditch.

Within Sector F one ditch (F500) may be geological in origin. Ditches F100 and F400 (Sector G) probably marked the earlier position of adjoining modern field boundaries.

Three ditches (F900-F902) were recorded in Sector 1. Notably, these ditches did not correspond with the cropmarked features which lay towards the southwestern end of the sector. The three identified ditches were located in the opposing, northeastern part of the sector. No dating evidence was recovered from this feature group, which contained ditches individually larger than most of the field boundary ditches located during the watching brief. Two ditches (F800, F802) and a pit (F801) were located in Sector K. Within Sector L the trial-trenches failed to identify any field boundary ditches pre-dating the modern field boundaries.

Only one feature, a gully (F903) was located in the vicinity of Staynor Wood (Site 11). Staynor Wood is an area of ancient semi-natural woodland (SMR No 10494), only a part of the woodland recorded on early 20th century Ordnance Survey maps. Staynor Wood is located approximately 400m to the east of Staynor (or Stainer) Hall (North Yorkshire SMR 10486). This site was occupied by a medieval moat. The site was acquired in 1257, and a licence to crenellate was obtained in 1365, and it was rebuilt in that century. Some archaeological excavations have been undertaken in the grounds of this property and structures (SMR 10491, 10487, 10489, 10490) including possible servants' quarters, have been located. Parts of the moat and associated earthworks have also been recorded as above-ground features (SMR No 10486). A chapel, founded in 1286 (SMR 10492) was also recorded, probably outside the moat. The existing Staynor Hall is a modernised post-medieval building of no architectural merit (SMR No 10493).

Most of the recovered finds recovered from the watching brief derived from the topsoil. And were collected from Sectors D, E and K. Fragments of worked flint, in admittedly small quantities, were recovered from Sectors D and E, but the only fragment from a feature fill (F704) was residual as it was found in association with post-medieval artifacts. Roman pottery was found in Sectors D, E and K, although in each case the quantities recovered were small, and no patterns could be observed. Only very small quantities of medieval pottery was recovered, from Sectors D, E and K, amounting to eleven sherds in total. As may be expected post-medieval pottery, of predominantly 18th-19th century date, was recovered from most sectors, including from within the fills of ditched features. Such artifacts were usually found towards the top of ditch fills, and may have been deposited relatively recently. Much of the post-medieval pottery is likely to derive from manuring scatters.

8.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The watching brief was sponsored by Skanska Construction UK Ltd, with advice from Moore Environment Parkman Ltd, represented the Highways Agency. The watching brief was undertaken by Roy Krakowicz, Mary Duncan and Kate Bain, and was managed by Alex Jones who edited this report. The drawings were prepared by Nigel Dodds and Helen Goodchild. The North Yorkshire SMR data was provided by Nick Boldrin. Neil Campling provided advice concerning the development of the Design Brief for the scheme.

9 0 REFERENCES

BUFAU 2001 Written Scheme of Investigation, Selby Bypass

Cunhffe, B C 1991 *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, 3rd edition

Highways Agency 2001 *A63 Selby Bypass Employer's Requirements*

Hislop, M, *A63 Selby Bypass, Building Recording* BUFAU Report No 827

Mouchel 2000 *Liverpool, Leeds, Hull Trunk Road, A63 Selby Bypass, Volume 17, Environmental Information*, Mouchel/Highways Agency

University of Hull 2002 *A63 Selby Bypass, Palaeoenvironmental Investigations*

Wilhams, J, 2003 *A63 Selby Bypass Trial Trenching*, BUFAU Report No 827