

NYCC HER	
SNY	8478
ENY	737
CNY	1258
Parish	4018
Rec'd	08/03/2022

HIGH FARM, THROXENBY,  
SCARBOROUGH, NORTH YORKSHIRE

ADDITIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
ASSESSMENT

Ed Dennison Archaeological Services  
18 Springdale Way  
Beverley  
East Yorkshire  
HU17 8NU

4018

Recd 8/3/2.

NYE 737.

NYC 1258

NYS 8478

HIGH FARM, THROXENBY,  
SCARBOROUGH, NORTH YORKSHIRE

ADDITIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
ASSESSMENT

Report no: 2002/154.R01  
Version: Final  
Date: March 2002

Ed Dennison Archaeological Services  
18 Springdale Way  
Beverley  
East Yorkshire HU17 8NU

On behalf of

St Catherine's Hospice Trust  
137 Scalby Road  
Scarborough  
North Yorkshire YO12 6TB

**ADDITIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT,  
HIGH FARM, THROXENBY, SCARBOROUGH,  
NORTH YORKSHIRE**

**CONTENTS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1	INTRODUCTION .....	page 1
2	ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND .....	page 6
3	THE STUDY AREA .....	page 12
4	ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MITIGATION .....	page 22
5	BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	page 27
6	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	page 30

**APPENDICES**

1	Gazetteer of archaeological sites
2	Photographic catalogue

## LIST OF FIGURES

- 1 General location plan
- 2 Detailed site plan
- 3 Landscape evolution
- 4 Map regression
- 5 Archaeological sites

## LIST OF PLATES

- 1 Farm building, now demolished (Site 1), looking north-east
- 2 Garage and coal houses (Site 2), looking south-east
- 3 North boundary wall (Site 3), looking north-west
- 4 Farm building (Site 5), looking north-west
- 5 Farmhouse (Site 7), looking north
- 6 Farmhouse (site 7), looking south-west
- 7 Barn, later cow shed (Site 8), looking south
- 8 Interior of barn, later cow shed (Site 8), looking north
- 9 Farm building (Site 10), looking south-west
- 10 Farm building (Site 11), looking north
- 11 Roller mill inside farm building (Site 11), looking south-west
- 12 Farm buildings (Sites 12 and 13), looking south-east
- 13 Farm building, now partly demolished (Site 13), looking west
- 14 Enclosure (Site 21), looking south



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ed Dennison Archaeological Services (EDAS) were commissioned by Braithwaite and Jackson, on behalf of St Catherine's Hospice Trust, to undertake an additional archaeological assessment of the buildings and land around High Farm in Throxenby, on the west side of Scarborough in North Yorkshire (NGR TA01508900 centred).

The work was required to provide a detailed assessment of the archaeological and architectural implications of a proposed development, and followed on from an earlier assessment produced in 2001. The archaeological assessment, and any subsequent mitigation recording work that might be required, was a condition of planning permission granted by Scarborough District Council in October 2001 (application no 01/00652/FL).

This assessment involved some basic documentary research and a detailed site visit, the latter incorporating a summary descriptive and photographic record of the farm complex. Earthworks noted within the site were also sketch plotted onto current site surveys. A total of 23 sites were identified within the proposed development area.

Documentary research established that the medieval and early post-medieval village of Throxenby was always small. Settlement is likely to have been strung out along Throxenby Lane, to the south of the Moor Lane junction, and an earthwork bank (Site 18) running through the development site could delimit the area of occupation. A prominent enclosure (Site 21) might also represent a former medieval croft or plot which was subsequently re-used. A later post-medieval manor house may also lie within or beneath the present Throxenby Hall.

Cartographic evidence shows that High Farm was established between 1777 and 1833 on a "greenfield site", specifically to manage fields created by the enclosure of Throxenby Common. The complex was originally laid out around a central foldyard, and was physically separate from an earlier farmstead centred on the Hall. Several of the structures now within the development site were associated with the Hall farmstead, and two buildings (Sites 8 and 9) exhibit a style and plan form commensurate with the relatively high status of the site.

By 1890 the Hall had passed to non-farming tenants, and the agricultural buildings at this site seemed to have been taken over by High Farm. This expansion was accompanied by the building of a new agricultural range (Sites 10 to 12) and the conversion of existing buildings, while several of the older, original, structures at High Farm were demolished. Subsequent alterations make it difficult to assess the original functions of some of the buildings within the development site, but they probably comprised byres, loose boxes and shelter sheds. One of the buildings (Site 11) was converted to the processing of flour, seeds, oats etc in the early 20th century, and a c.1900 small roller mill survives.

It is suggested that most of the development site has limited archaeological potential, although a c.40m wide band along the eastern boundary may contain remains of medieval and later settlement. It is recommended that the existing buildings and earthworks within the site are recorded before demolition or disturbance, and that an archaeological watching brief is undertaken during the initial stages of development.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Reasons and Circumstances of the Project

- 1.1.1 In January 2002, Ed Dennison Archaeological Services (EDAS) were commissioned by Braithwaite and Jackson, on behalf of St Catherine's Hospice Trust, to undertake an additional archaeological assessment of the buildings and land around High Farm in Throxenby, on the west side of Scarborough in North Yorkshire (NGR TA01508900 centred).
- 1.1.2 The work was required to provide a detailed assessment of the archaeological and architectural implications of a proposed development, and followed on from an earlier assessment produced by AOC Archaeology in 2001. The archaeological assessment, and any subsequent archaeological recording work that might be required, was a condition of planning permission granted by Scarborough District Council in October 2001 (application no 01/00652/FL).
- 1.1.3 The project involved the collation of some basic documentary research and a detailed site visit, the latter incorporating a summary descriptive and photographic record of the farm complex. Earthworks identified within the site were also sketch plotted onto current site surveys. The work was funded by the developers of the site, St Catherine's Hospice Trust.

## 1.2 Site Location and Description

- 1.2.1 The development site lies on the north side of Throxenby Hall, in Throxenby, which itself is located c.3km west of Scarborough town centre (at NGR TA01508900 centred) just outside of the boundaries of the North York Moors National Park (see figure 1). High Farm, comprising a house and several agricultural structures in varying states of repair, lies in the south-west corner of the development site, which also encompasses pasture fields to the east and north (see figure 2).
- 1.2.2 The site is bounded to the east by Throxenby Lane, to the south by the grounds of Throxenby Hall, to the north by residential housing, and to the west by pasture land. The site lies at c.75m-80m AOD and has an east-facing aspect. The underlying geology is middle Jurassic oolitic sandstones and shales, with the local deposits known as the Scalby Formation (Brumhead 1979, 113-114). These rocks are overlain by glacial till, and the soils are a typical stagnogley, clay-enriched, seasonally waterlogged, slowly permeable soil of the Salop Association (Soil Survey of England and Wales 1983).
- 1.2.3 None of the buildings within the site are listed as being of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. The nearest listed building is Lodge Cottage (No 96), on the west side of Moor Lane or Throxenby Lane, some 400m to the south-east of the site.



### **1.3 Summary of Previous Work**

- 1.3.1 The site was the subject of a previous archaeological assessment, produced in January 2001 by AOC Archaeology (Hemley 2001). This provided an outline to the site, a summary of national and local planning procedures and policies relating to archaeology, a summary of the archaeological and historical interest, an assessment of significance and potential at the site, and a consideration of the impact of the development. A subsequent addendum to this report was produced, following comments received from North Yorkshire County Council archaeological staff.
- 1.3.2 As part of the development proposals, the site was the subject of a detailed topographical survey by Land Surveys of Leeds. As well as identifying buildings and structures within the site, this survey also highlighted a number of earthworks within the grounds. Two of the farm buildings, proposed for conversion as part of the development, have also been surveyed at 1:50 scale.

### **1.4 Aims and Objectives**

- 1.4.1 The aims of the project were:
- to gather sufficient information to identify and establish the extent, nature, character, condition, quality and probable date of any archaeological and historic features within the proposed development site (the study area);
  - to establish the functional relationships, if any, between the archaeological and historic features in the study area;
  - to consider the current development proposals, assess the implications of those proposals on the identified archaeological and architectural resource, and to provide recommendations to mitigate these implications as appropriate.

### **1.5 Survey Methodology**

- 1.5.1 The methodology for this additional archaeological assessment was discussed and agreed with the client's representatives and archaeological staff at North Yorkshire County Council. No formal specification or brief was produced.
- 1.5.2 The work can be summarised as follows:
- additional documentary and cartographic research at local libraries and record offices to place the site into context, and to provide more detail on the medieval and post-medieval history and development of the High Farm complex;
  - a detailed site inspection to produce summary descriptions of the buildings and earthworks within the site, augmented by photographs where appropriate;

- to provide an in-depth assessment of the archaeological and historic resource within the site, to assess the development proposals, and to provide appropriate recommendations to mitigate impacts in order to satisfy the planning condition.

### **Documentary and Cartographic Research**

- 1.5.3 Documentary research was undertaken at the East and North Yorkshire Record Offices (EYCRO and NYCRO) in Beverley and Northallerton, at the Local History Sections of Beverley and Scarborough Libraries (BLHS & SLHL), and at the Yorkshire Archaeological Society in Leeds. The purpose of this research was to establish the nature and extent of any readily-available documentary sources relating to the site, and to carry out limited analysis to extract relevant information where possible. It should be noted that the documentary research was confined to the examination of published material; no research on original documents was carried out.
- 1.5.4 The majority of the cartographic sources date from the late 18th century. Various editions of the Ordnance Survey maps, at both 6" and 25" scales, were examined, as were any other appropriate or relevant maps and plans. The earlier material included various county maps dating from 1775 onward, the 1771 enclosure map and subsequent award, and an 1833 sale plan and schedule. A list of all the sources consulted as part of this assessment is provided in the bibliography (Chapter 5) below.
- 1.5.5 A number of published and unpublished documentary sources in both local and national collections were also consulted for background information and specific data on specialised aspects of the history and archaeology of the area, including place and field name evidence. Once again, a list of all these sources is provided in the bibliography below.

### **Records of Previous Archaeological Investigations**

- 1.5.6 Discussion with North Yorkshire County Council archaeological staff established that an examination of the County Sites and Monuments Record (NYCC SMR) was not required as part of this study; this data had already been consulted as part of the previous assessment and there were no recorded sites within or immediately adjacent to the site (Hemley 2001, 13). Aerial photographs held by the NYSMR were also not consulted for this study. However, information was obtained from the National Monuments Record (NMR), compiled and maintained by English Heritage in Swindon; in the event, there were no sites recorded in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- 1.5.7 There have, to date, been no archaeological excavations or non-intrusive (eg. geophysical survey, earthwork survey etc) investigations carried out within the development site. However, four small test pits were dug in November 2000 and these were monitored for any archaeological information (see figure 5). Three of the four pits contained no archaeological deposits and one (test pit 2 on the east side of the farm house) contained tile and pottery dating to the late 19th/early 20th century (Hemley 2001, 13).



- 1.5.8 Archaeological excavations were carried out in 1957-59 by the Scarborough and District Archaeological Society on the south side of Lady Edith's Drive, either side of the continuation of Throxenby Lane, in the area now occupied by Raincliffe School and the Scarborough Technical College (Rimington 1961). This work uncovered the foundations of five houses, and possibly two more, with occupation dating from the late 12th century to the late 14th centuries. Subsequent work in 1969 uncovered several more buildings (Radley 1969, 246).

### **Oral History**

- 1.5.9 Mrs Elizabeth Midgeley, who now lives in Hunmanby, was contacted for any information she might have on the site. Her family had lived at High Farm for several generations, but her recollections were largely confined to social history and there was little of specific interest which could add to this assessment.
- 1.5.10 Trevor Pearson of the Scarborough and District Archaeological Society was also contacted to see if he had any additional knowledge on the site or its environs. He was able to clarify a number of points, such as the discovery of a probable medieval trod in the early 1970s which had previously been thought to be Roman, and which had resulted in the naming of the adjacent "Roman Way". However, he had no specific new information relating to the development site itself.

### **Detailed Site Visits**

- 1.5.11 Visits to the development site were made to determine the extent of survival of any earthworks, buildings or other structures, to note the location, nature, extent and condition of any additional recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites, and to identify any concentrations of material which might serve as an indication of sub-surface archaeological features. Visits were made on the 6th and 25th February 2002, in overcast and wet conditions.
- 1.5.12 For the purposes of this assessment, each building or feature considered to be of archaeological or architectural interest was given a site number. Earthworks were sketched onto a 1:500 scale site plan provided by the client; as noted above, some of the earthworks had already been recorded by the general topographical site survey. All the buildings were already shown in plan, together with areas of hard standing, trees and hedges, and the site had been levelled to heights AOD. As part of the site visits, 35mm colour photographs were also taken and these have been catalogued as Appendix 2; some of the photographs are included in this report for illustrative purposes.
- 1.5.13 A structured pro-forma gazetteer of sites was compiled, which includes a summary description and preliminary interpretation of the extant remains (for example location, dimension, plan, form, function, possible date and sequence of development), mention of any relevant documentary evidence, and an assessment of importance, current condition and vulnerability; this gazetteer is presented as Appendix 1,

while a summary of the sites is contained in Chapter 3 below. The locations of all the identified sites are shown on figure 5.

- 1.5.14 The information gathered as a result of the site visits conforms to a Level 1 survey as defined by the RCHME (1996 & 1999).



## 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 In order to put the development site into context, it is necessary to consider the wider archaeological background of the region, and so reference may be made to sites lying outside the study area. This information has been compiled from a variety of sources which are listed in the bibliography below. As noted above, this background information only concentrates on the post-Roman periods.

### 2.2 The Anglo-Saxon Period (c.450-1066)

- 2.2.1 The pattern of local and regional place-name elements provides a clue to the distribution of settlement and ethnic groups between the 4th and 9th centuries. The extent of Anglian colonisation can be seen through villages with suffixes such as *-ham* (meaning a village, homestead or manor), *-ton* (farmstead), and *-ing* while later Scandinavian settlements traditionally have *-by* and *-thorpe* suffixes (Lang 1989, 56-61 & 66). Local examples include Scalby, Burniston, and Ayton. The part played by the Danes in the colonisation of the marshy land is also emphasised by the frequency of minor names incorporating *-holm* (island) and *-carr* (boggy ground), both deriving from Scandinavian terminology (Gelling 1984, 50-52). Throxenby, formerly known as Thurstandby and Throssenby, stems from a personal name and means "Tharston's farm" (Smith 1928, 110).
- 2.2.2 Archaeological evidence for Anglo-Saxon activity is often more difficult to recover. Many of the villages in the area are recorded in the 11th century Domesday Book (but see below), suggesting that they had their origins in the Anglo-Saxon period, but their continued occupation and development means that archaeological evidence is often destroyed. However, there is now a substantial body of evidence to suggest that the coastal zone was well settled and exploited during this period; the overall pattern is of a group of high status, pre-conquest inland sites (eg. Hunmanby, Flamborough, Bridlington, Falsgrave and Seaton), possibly forming the centre of royal or regional estates, which have strong links to the coast and sea-borne trade (Pearson 1999).

### 2.3 The Medieval and early Post-medieval Periods (1066-1750)

- 2.3.1 By AD 1100, a hierarchy of administrative sub-divisions was in place and these lasted until they were replaced by the civil parish system in the 19th century. The North Riding was divided into a number of wapentakes, which were in turn divided into parishes and townships; the former were ecclesiastical units while the latter denoted a unit of civil administration, usually corresponding to a manor or *vill*.
- 2.3.2 The development site lies within the former township of Throxenby which was in the Wapentake of Lythe. Throxenby, together with Burniston, Cloughton, Hatterboard, Newby, Scalby and Staintondale townships, formed the large ecclesiastical parish of Scalby; Newby was amalgamated with Throxenby in 1886, and a civil parish was formed in 1894 (Russell 1968a, 476-477). Compared to the other former



townships, Throxenby was small, comprising only 399 acres. This land was grouped around the present settlement, although there were also detached areas on the coast just to the north of Peasholm and slightly inland around Coldy Hill.

- 2.3.3 At the time of the 11th century Domesday Survey, Throxenby was part of the large federal estate of Falsgrave, held by Earl Tostig of Northumbria before the Conquest and by the King (William I) in 1086. This estate or sokeland (land under private jurisdiction) encompassed 21 neighbouring settlements, from Staintondale in the north to Filey in the south (Harrison 2000, 309-310). The estate was also heavily settled and populated, and 108 sokemen (near-freeholders or tenants) with 46 ploughs were recorded on the eve of the conquest (Faull & Stinson 1986, 1Y3). The estate retained a degree of integrity for several centuries, and the administrative, judicial, economic and ecclesiastical functions were still operating to some extent in the late 12th century (Pearson 2001, 80).
- 2.3.4 The Falsgrave holding was also included in the honour of Pickering, and formed most of the East Ward of the Royal Forest of Pickering, which was also previously known as the Forest of Scalby. Although under Forest jurisdiction by the early 12th century, the King's tenants in this area continued to be classed as relatively free "sokemen" who owed money rents and regular taxes to the Crown, but were not encumbered with the usual range of menial services. The manor house at Throxenby, of which Christopher Keld of Newby died seised in January 1644-45, was called the Forester's Lodge (Russell 1969a, 479).
- 2.3.5 As noted above, Scalby, Burniston, Cloughton and Stainton were soke of the King's manor of Falsgrave. Most of the manor continued to be held by the Crown until 1267 when Henry III granted it to his son Edmund, who in the same year received the honour of Pickering and became the first Earl of Lancaster (Russell 1969a, 480). Some parts of Falsgrave soke were also given to religious institutions; most of Staintondale was given to the Knights Hospitallers and Bridlington Priory in the mid 12th century (Harrison 2000), while the Franciscan Order of Grey Friars established a short-lived friary, including a church, at Hatterboard between 1245 and 1281 (Rimington 1961, 11-12; Goldthorp 1886, 310).
- 2.3.6 In 1276 William de Morsers, Lord of Elvington, gave Henry de Percy his manor and vill in Throxenby, and in 1284-85 Henry still held two carucates (c.240 acres) in Throxenby (Clay 1963, 285; Surtees Society 1867, 140 & 142). The Percy family were prominent regional landowners who also held the large manor and port of Whitby, as well as extensive lands in East Yorkshire; although their main manor was at Topcliffe, they had a smaller house at Seamer (Russell 1969b, 485). Throxenby manor remained with the Percy family until 1536-37 when Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, conveyed it, with other estates, to the Crown. From this time, it appears to have followed the descent of Scalby, and is now held by the Crown in right of the Duchy of Lancaster (Russell 1969a, 481); in 1619-21 it was said to belong to Christopher Keld, who was probably a lessee.



- 2.3.7 A village at Throxenby is not specifically mentioned in the 11th century Domesday Survey, and it has been suggested that it, together with Newby and Hatterboard, were established at a slightly later date (Harrison 2000, 310). As with the neighbouring, deserted and now destroyed Hatterboard village, the first record of Throxenby occurs in 1167 when "Trstanebi" is mentioned in taxation records (Smith 1928, 11). Although there are several references to "Thurstanby" throughout the 13th and 14th centuries, the village appears always to have been small. Only four people are listed as tax payers in the 1301 Lay Subsidy; Rogero Northyby, Willelmo filio [son of] Henrici, Roberto Westiby and Ricards filio Henrici; William son of Henry paid the most tax at 2s 6d (Brown 1896, 57-58).
- 2.3.8 An Inquisition Post Mortem (IPM) taken in 1314-15 after the death of William de Morers, the main tenant of Sir Henry Percy, notes that his lands and tenements in Thurstanby comprised 40 acres of arable and 5 acres of meadow in demesne, a park, a wood, nine tenants holding 16 bovates (c.240 acres) of land, five cottars holding five cottages, and a halmote court (court leet) (Brown 1896, 58 note). An IPM taken at Pickering in 1577, which gives a list of the vills and hamlets owned by the Crown at this time, also mentions Throxenby, and Norden's 1619-21 Survey of the hundred of Pickering Lyth notes that Throxenby village paid a yearly tax of 23d (Turton 1894, 8 & 53). The village is also named, as "Frostenby", on Saxton's 1577 map of Yorkshire (Smith 1928, 110).
- 2.3.9 All these references show that, although the village was never very large, it was never deserted like neighbouring Hatterboard. The fact that the medieval overlords (the Percy family) and the tenants in chief (de Morers) lived elsewhere might suggest that was never a manor house or other substantial dwelling in the township during most of the medieval period; as suggested by the 1314-15 IPM, the population would have been made up of small tenant farmers and individual cottagers. Given the lack of a consolidating force such as a manor house or church, it is likely that medieval settlement was strung out along Throxenby Lane, in the main part of the township, as was the case at Hatterboard (Rimington 1961).
- 2.3.10 However, as noted above, there is a reference to a large house or hall at Throxenby in the mid 17th century, when it was held by Christopher Keld(e) of Newby; Keld is also noted as holding the manor in Norden's 1619-21 survey of the Hundred (Turton 1894, 35). At this time the hall was then called a Forester's Lodge, and it might have replaced an earlier tower at Hatterboard which was in ruins by 1480 (Rimington 1961, 13). The 1673 Hearth Tax records 13 people living in the township of Throxenby - Thomas Keld had five hearths, Christopher Fletcher, Edwards Caton and Jo Langton each had two hearths each, and the other nine people had one hearth each (Ripon Historical Society 1991, 41). The five hearth building must be a reference to the Hall, although it's precise location is uncertain; it might lie on the site of, or be hidden within, the present Throxenby Hall which, from external evidence, appears to be late 18th or early 19th century in date.
- 2.3.11 In terms of agricultural land, the open fields associated with the village are likely to have been located on the east side of the main approximate north-south route through the township, with moorland, woods and



common to the west. The village itself would have been surrounded by smaller enclosures, representing the fields and crofts attached to the houses and small farmsteads. This pattern of land management is reflected in the 1777 enclosure map (NYCRO I/SCA), which shows a series of small "ancient enclosures" either side of the southern end of Throxenby Lane and around the hall (see figure 3). Open ground to the west and north is named as "Throxenby Common". Without further detailed research, it is difficult to be sure when these fields were laid out, but it is probable that their boundaries were formalised in the 17th century; the former open fields of the neighbouring Hatterboard were enclosed with "quicke setts" (ie. hawthorn) in 1634 when the Crown (Richard III) annexed most of the manor to his Northstead estate (Rimington 1969, 16).

## **2.4 The Later Post-medieval Period (1750 onwards)**

- 2.4.1 As noted above, in 1536-37 Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, conveyed the manor of Throxenby to the Crown. From this time, it appears to have followed the descent of Scalby, and is now held by the Crown in right of the Duchy of Lancaster (Russell 1969a, 481).
- 2.4.2 The history of the post-medieval landownership of the township has not been traced in any detail. However, in 1777 the entire manor was owned by George Osbaldeston (NYCRO MIC 289). He was part of a large and famous local family who also held Hutton Buscel manor as well as numerous other estates, including Hunmanby, throughout East and North Yorkshire (Lang 1971).
- 2.4.3 By 1833 the majority of Throxenby township was a peripheral part of the important East Yorkshire Londesborough estate, held by the Dukes of Devonshire; without further detailed research, it is not possible to establish when or how Throxenby was added to this substantial holding. However, the vast Devonshire estates, which were centred on Skipton, had passed down through the Clifford family from the 15th century and then the Boyle family; Elizabeth Clifford had married Richard Boyle, the 2nd son of the 1st Earl of Cork and 1st Earl of Burlington. When another Richard Boyle, the last Earl of Burlington, died in 1753, the estates subsequently passed to the Dukes of Devonshire (Neave 1977, 18-20).
- 2.4.4 In 1833 a large part of Throxenby township was put up for sale. Details of the sale are set out below, but the land was purchased by William Joseph Denison for £10,050 (EYCRO DDLO). He was a member of Parliament, a JP, and a High Sheriff of Yorkshire and, when he died in 1849, he left some £2.3m in money and over 60,000 acres of land in Yorkshire (mostly around Seamer) and in Surrey. His beneficiary by marriage, Lord Albert Conyngham, also took the name Denison and in 1850, after the purchase of the rest of the Londesborough estate from George Hudson (the railway entrepreneur) and Grimston Park near Tadcaster from the Duke of Devonshire, was created Lord Londesborough; he was also a prominent antiquarian and archaeologist. In addition to their houses at Londesborough and Grimston, the family had a shooting box in Scarborough (Londesborough Lodge), which became their main residence after 1850.



- 2.4.5 William Denison's son, William Henry Forester Denison (1834-1900), was Liberal MP for Beverley and then Scarborough and, on joining the Conservatives, was made 1st Viscount Raincliffe and 1st Earl Londesborough in 1887. He squandered a large part of the family fortune and sold off Grimston Park to pay off debts (Ward 1967, 17-18; Neave 1977, 21-25). He also made Blankney Hall in Lincolnshire the main summer residence and the North Yorkshire estates were gradually disposed off, although Throxenby is still noted as being owned by Lord Londesborough in 1890 (Bulmer 1890, 1018-19). Given the status of the family, and the fact that they had Londesborough Lodge in Scarborough, it is doubtful whether the family ever visited Throxenby; the hall and adjacent land would have been tenanted out to local landowners.
- 2.4.6 Some 4,000 acres of land in Scalby and Throxenby were enclosed by Act of Parliament in 1771 (NYCRO I/SCA). This acreage included 2,000 acres of arable in the common fields as well as Throxenby Moor, also called Newby Moor. The accompanying map, which is described as being made from an "old plan made by Thos Pickering from John Foord's plan", provides the first, reasonably detailed, plan of the village area (NYCRO MIC 2234/420); it shows the Hall and a single east-west aligned building to the north, together with three cottages on the east side of Throxenby Lane (see figure 3). The Hall is surrounded by number of small enclosures, which might represent the remnants of medieval crofts. New roads were also created across the common at this time, to be called Red Scar Lane and Newby Moor Lane.
- 2.4.7 Other 18th and 19th century county-wide maps, such as those by Jeffreys (1775) and Greenwood (1817), name the village and show buildings, albeit diagrammatically, either side of Throxenby Lane. Knox's 1821 map of Scarborough depicts the area in slightly more detail, and shows the hall in elevation, as a two storey structure with a hipped roof, with a single building to the north, in the same way as is shown on the 1771 enclosure map.
- 2.4.8 As noted above, 198 acres of Throxenby township were put up for sale in 1833 by the Londesborough Estate (EYCRO DDLO). The auction documents include a plan, which provides the first accurate depiction of the study area (see figure 3). This shows the recently created enclosures on the former Throxenby Common as a straight-sided rectangular fields, the hall and adjacent farm buildings, and further cottages along the southern end of Throxenby Lane. A lime kiln is also shown at the junction of Throxenby Lane and Newby Moor Lane. This map is also the first to depict buildings at the High Farm site (see below).
- 2.4.9 The 1833 map is also useful in that it provides tenancy details and field names; there is no mid 19th century tithe map as the ecclesiastical tithes were extinguished at the time of enclosure. Within the area covered by the map, land was divided between three main tenants. The Revd. Robert Howard lived at the Hall and tenanted some 50 acres in the south and north parts of the township. Thomas Mackwood lived at High Farm and his land lay around the farmstead, mostly on the west side of Throxenby Lane (see figure 3). William Raynton lived at Low Farm and his land was all on the east side of the lane. There are no archaeologically-significant field names.

- 2.4.10 The sale particulars of June 1833 also provide a detailed description of the Hall:

"A Capital Mansion called Throxenby Hall ... containing dining and drawing rooms, breakfast parlour and study, principal and secondary staircases, eight best bedrooms, with numerous attics for the accommodation of servants, convenient and suitable attached and detached offices of every description, excellent coach house, stabling, barns and granaries, pumps of hard and soft water, flower and kitchen gardens, with a neat carriage entrance to the Hall, forming a complete and desirable residence for the Country Gentleman" (EYCRO DD/LO).

- 2.4.11 Despite this glowing endorsement, possibly enhanced to achieve a good sale, the Hall was described in 1857 and 1890 as a "plain old fashioned building" (Kelly 1857, 1474; Bulmer 1890, 1018-19) and it was used as a farmhouse for much of the 19th century. In 1851 it was occupied by Joseph Baker, a 48 year old farmer of 120 acres, his wife, three agricultural labourers, and three female servants (SLHL HO 107, 2368), while in 1890 and 1893 it was occupied by William Hebden Esq, a banker (Bulmer 1890, 1018-19; Kelly 1893, 255); in 1901 he lived there with his wife, six children, a nurse and five servants (SHLS RG13, 4534). In 1905 the Hall was described as the "Yorkshire and Throxenby Convalescence Home", with Miss Florence Vigor as matron (Kelly 1905, 370). In the 1930s it became a residential hotel or guest house, and in February 1947 it was opened as a North Yorkshire County Council reform school (notes in SLHL).



### 3 THE STUDY AREA

#### 3.1 Physical Characteristics

- 3.1.1 The development site lies on the north side of Throxenby Hall, and comprises the remains of High Farm, namely the house and several agricultural structures in varying states of repair, and adjacent pasture fields to the north and east (see figure 2). The site lies at c.75m-80m AOD and has an east-facing aspect.

#### 3.2 Historical Development

- 3.2.1 As stated above, the first detailed plan of the site is the 1771 enclosure map (NYCRO I/SCA MIC 289). This shows the majority of the study area as unenclosed land, being part of the larger "Throxenby Common" (see figure 3). The map also notes that the whole of the township was owned by George Osbaldeston at this time. The Hall and an east-west aligned building lying to the north are shown, together with smaller fields around, and there appears to be a track leading north from the hall complex into the common. Three buildings are also shown on the east side of Throxenby Lane, with plots of land extending back (east) from the road. High Farm is not depicted on this map.
- 3.2.2 The newly enclosed fields were created by the Enclosure Award of November 1777, and the resulting field pattern is shown on a plan of 1833. This plan is significant, as it depicts buildings within the High Farm complex for the first time, and shows that the farm was separate from the expanded farm complex associated with Throxenby Hall (see figure 3). It is presumed that High Farm was built to manage the newly-enclosed fields, as was Low Farm on the east side of Throxenby Lane. The schedule accompanying the 1833 plan shows that High Farm comprised c.95 acres, and included the detached part of the township on the coast to the north of Peasholm; none of the associated field names are significant, all being "Closes".
- 3.2.3 The 1833 map shows that High Farm was laid out around a central courtyard or foldyard, typical of newly established farms on land enclosed in the late 18th or early 19th century (RCHME 1987, 86-87 & 159-161). The house lay on the south side of the yard, with agricultural ranges on the north and east sides, and in the north-west corner. No formal access road is depicted, but it is presumed that it followed a track shown on later maps, which ran around the north side of the complex. At this time, the farm was occupied by Thomas Mackwood but by 1841 a Joseph Mackwood, then aged 67 is named at the farm with two agricultural labourers (SLHL HO 107, 1261).
- 3.2.4 The greater availability of maps and other documents after 1855 allows the development of the farm complex to be established (see figure 4).
- 3.2.5 In 1851 the farm was described as being 86 acres in extent, and was still occupied by Thomas Mackwood, then aged 41. He lived at the farm with his wife Anne, four children and one servant, and employed four agricultural labourers (SLHL HO 107, 2368). The 1854 Ordnance Survey

map shows that the farm had expanded, with new buildings creating a virtually fully enclosed foldyard. This period of expansion is also mirrored in the adjoining farm buildings at the Hall. In 1857 the farm was still occupied by Thomas Mackwood (Kelly 1857, 1474).

- 3.2.6 In 1872 the Hall was described as being unoccupied, and the farmers in the township were named as John Dalton, farm bailiff to John Knight, Thomas Pickering (described as a farmer and bacon curer), and Mrs Thornton (Kelly 1872, 241); it is unclear which, if any, of these was living at High Farm.
- 3.2.7 By 1890-91 it can be seen that several of the agricultural ranges around the High Farm foldyard had been demolished, leaving a barn in the north-east corner and a smaller structure on the west side. The farmhouse, however, had been enlarged and was twice its original width. This is in contrast to the Hall farm complex, which shows signs of continuing development, and it seems likely that many of these buildings were taken over by High Farm when the Hall passed into non-farming hands; as noted above, William Hebden, a banker, was living at the Hall by 1890 and by 1905 it was used as a convalescence home. The re-organisation of the two formerly separate farmsteads into one large sprawling complex meant the construction of new boundary walls and the development of the southern set of buildings may well have been associated with this change in ownership or tenancy. In 1893 High Farm was occupied by John William Harrowsmith (Kelly 1893, 255), and in 1901 he was 48 years old and living at the farm with his wife and seven children (SHLS RG13, 4534).
- 3.2.8 The subsequent Ordnance Survey maps of 1912 and the 1930s show that High Farm remained more or less static during the first part of the 20th century. Apart from the construction of an extension to the house and the building of a garage, little development appears to have taken place. In 1933 the farm was occupied by William Henry Johnson (Kelly 1933, 293). By 1970 several new, modern structures had been erected, to accommodate changing agricultural practices.

### 3.3 Archaeological Sites

- 3.3.1 A total of 23 sites or areas of archaeological and architectural interest were recorded in the study area. Their locations are shown on figure 5 and full details of each site are given in Appendix 1. The following provides a summary of each site, in numerical order.

#### *Site 1: Farm building, north side of High Farm*

- 3.3.2 This building forms part of the north side of a quadrangular farm complex marked on maps of 1833 and 1854. The range originally extended further to the east and west; a narrower structure at the east end had been demolished by 1854 while the west end had been demolished by 1890. At the time of the first site visit (6th February 2002), the building was a single storey structure built of coursed squared sandstone with a pitched renewed pantiled roof (see plate 1). Part of the south elevation had collapsed. Internally, the building was divided into five structural bays by roof trusses, only some of which were original. The form of the



trusses suggested a late 18th century rather than early 19th century structure and, although its original function is unclear, the building may have been a byre or perhaps mixed accommodation for horses and/or cattle. A second visit to the site, just over two weeks after the first, revealed that the building had been totally demolished, apparently at the request of the NYCC footpaths officer.

*Site 2: Garage and coal houses, east side of High Farm*

- 3.3.3 The two storey garage to the north of the farmhouse is built of handmade buff bricks laid in English Garden Wall bond, and it has a pitched pantiled roof (see plate 2). There are 3-light sliding sash windows at both floor levels in the north and south elevations, each light having six panes. There are also two coal houses, possibly the remains of earlier pigsties, attached to the north side of the garage. Cartographic evidence suggests that the garage was built between 1912 and 1928, while the coal houses were present by 1890. Both structures appear to have replaced an earlier north-south agricultural range shown in 1833 and 1854.

*Site 3: Boundary wall, north and west sides of High Farm*

- 3.3.4 Two lengths of boundary wall, built of coursed squared sandstone with semi-circular coping and standing c.1m high (see plate 3), are shown on a map of 1890. Part of the northern length replaced an agricultural range, and dates from 1833, while the western length was built between 1854 and 1890

*Site 4: Modern farm building, north side of High Farm*

- 3.3.5 A modern, open-sided, single storey, lean-to structure of breeze block and timber construction, probably built in recent years. It is also partly built over an earlier wall (Site 3).

*Site 5: Farm building, High Farm*

- 3.3.6 Cartographic evidence suggests that this building was built between 1833 and 1854, and that it formed part of a longer west range which had been demolished by 1890. The single storey building is built of handmade buff bricks laid in English Garden Wall bond (see plate 4). It has a pitched pantiled roof, and the roof structure is formed by collar beam trusses of slight scantling. It was latterly used as a workshop, although its original function is unclear.

*Site 6: Farm building, west side of High Farm*

- 3.3.7 A modern, open-sided, single storey, lean-to structure, of breeze block and timber construction, built in recent years.

*Site 7: High Farm farmhouse*

- 3.3.8 A building is shown in this location on maps of 1833 and 1854. By the latter date it formed the east end of an off-set agricultural range but by

1890 it was again isolated, although approximately twice its previous width. By 1912 a small extension had been added to the north side.

- 3.3.9 The earliest part of the building (A) is a two storey, east-west aligned farmhouse with a rectangular, single pile, central entry plan. It is built of coursed squared sandstone, much of which has herringbone tooling, and has a pitched roof of blue slate with brick stacks at either end of the ridge. The main (south) elevation is of symmetrical appearance (see plate 5). Part B is represented by a single storey outshut built against the north elevation of part A; it is of coursed squared sandstone with a single-pitch, modern concrete tiled roof (see plate 6). There is a pair of 12-pane Yorkshire sliding sash windows in the north elevation. Part C is a two storey north-south extension, attached to the north-east corner of the original house. It is built of machine-made red bricks laid in English Garden Wall bond and also has 12-light Yorkshire sliding sashes, as well as a 16-pane vertical horned sash (see plate 6). The interior of the house could not be inspected at the time of survey.
- 3.3.10 The earliest part of the farmhouse (A), with its symmetrical elevation and central front door, is typical of early 19th century farmhouses in the region, often erected as part of a planned rectangular farmstead layout (RCHME 1987, 86-87); cartographic evidence shows that it was built between 1777 and 1833. The outshut (B) was probably added between 1854 and 1890, and appears to have originally run the full length of the north elevation. It is not clear from the outside whether the 1890-1912 extension (C) was built over the outshut, or if it was partly demolished to make way for it.

*Site 8: Farm building, south-west of High Farm*

- 3.3.11 A building is first shown here in 1833, forming part of a separate complex of structures to the south-west of High Farm. By 1854 it forms the east side of a U-shaped range, with a sub-divided foldyard to the west. It also has a small square extension on the east side.
- 3.3.12 The rectangular two storey building is built of squared coursed sandstone, some of which has herringbone tooling, with edge-laid quoins and limestone dressings, and has a hipped blue slate roof. Many of the original openings have plain stone Gibbs surrounds and stone keystones carved to resemble triple keystones (see plate 7). Other inserted openings can be seen in the east and west elevations although these are currently obscured by later lean-to sheds. Internally, the building is divided into seven structural bays by bolted king-post roof trusses, with a half-truss to the hip at either end of the roof. The floor is of concrete with a central drain and there are ten concrete double cattle stalls arranged along the east side (see plate 8); this re-organisation has removed all original internal features. However, the relative height of the original doorways in the east and west walls, and the original window in the north wall, suggest that a floor has been removed.
- 3.3.13 The Gibbs surround became fashionable from the late 1720s onwards (Byrne 1986, 142-143), and its use in the original doorways and windows of this building suggests that it is of late 18th rather than early 19th century date; this is confirmed by the cartographic evidence which shows



that it was built between 1777 and 1833. The rather severe appearance of the building, with its limited degree of architectural treatment, harks back to the Classical and Palladian movements, and confirms that the structure was originally associated with Throxenby Hall rather than High Farm. The barn may also have contained a byre with a loft over at the north end, and the small rectangular structure shown on the east side in 1854 may have been a horse engine house. The building was almost certainly purpose-built as a barn, the small opposing doorways in the long elevations being typical for the region (RCHME 1987, 167-169).

*Site 9: Farm building, south-west of High Farm*

- 3.3.14 A building, apparently of two cells, is shown in this approximate location on the 1777 enclosure map. It is also shown on a map of 1833, although a right-angled extension has been added to the west end (part of Site 13). By 1854, the building formed the south side of a large, U-shaped range, and it is similarly depicted on subsequent maps.
- 3.3.15 The building is currently of a single storey, although it was originally of two; only the east cell of the structure, measuring 14m by 6.5m, is contained within the development site. This is built of coursed squared sandstone with red brick dressings and quoins, and has a flat corrugated steel roof. All door and window openings have jambs and cambered heads of handmade red brick. Internally, the cell is in a poor condition, with the first floor structure partly collapsed at the west end. There are six single/double stalls built against the south wall, with plank and batten partitions and wooden mangers retaining one or two wrought-iron tethering rings.
- 3.3.16 Although a building is shown here in 1777, there are no surviving structural features (within that part of the structure contained within the development site) that definitely place it in the 18th century. It is therefore possible that it is an early 19th century rebuilding on the site of an earlier structure. However, like the large barn (Site 8) to the east, it is of a different style to the rest of the buildings on the site and, relative to them, it has received a higher degree of architectural detailing; this suggests that it is associated with Throxenby Hall rather than High Farm. The windows, the stalls facing a long wall on the opposite side to the entrance, and the original two storey structure, all indicate that the building was probably a stable, with a hay loft over, although it has most recently been used as byre.

*Site 10: Farm building, west of High Farm*

- 3.3.17 A small building is shown in this approximate position on a map of 1833, and a different structure is depicted in 1854. The present single storey building appears to date from 1890. The east and west gables are built of coursed squared sandstone with stone coping, whilst the north and south elevations are of handmade red brick laid in English Garden Wall bond. The north and south elevations are both of five bays and of pier and panel construction (see plate 9); the majority of the south side appears originally to have been open-sided, with all the infill between the piers being of later brickwork. The interior contains six single and two

double concrete cattle stalls. The roof is supported by principal rafter trusses incorporating tie-beams and raking struts of small scantling.

*Site 11: Farm building, west of High Farm*

- 3.3.18 A building is shown here on maps of 1833 and 1845, but slightly to the north of the existing structure. By 1890, the building had assumed the same ground plan as that now existing, and it formed part of the north range of the foldyard associated with Throxenby Hall.
- 3.3.19 The lower level of this two storey, rectangular building is built of coursed squared sandstone whilst the first floor is of brick (see plate 10); the bricks are of similar appearance and dimensions to those used in the garage at High Farm (Site 2). The north elevation is partly obscured by a later wooden lean-to, but a flight of stone and brick steps lead up to a doorway at the west end of the first floor. The interior of the ground floor is divided into two cells of disparate size. The smaller western cell was once clearly a loose box, whilst the larger western cell retains a c.1900 small roller mill in the south-west corner (see plate 11); it was probably used mainly for flour milling but could also have crushed seeds, oats etc. The first floor was in poor condition at the time of survey.
- 3.3.20 The cartographic and structural evidence suggests that the building was originally a single storey stone structure, perhaps a byre, which was built with the rest of the associated range between 1854 and 1890; it replaced a smaller structure located just to the north of the present building. In the late 19th or early 20th century the first floor was added, and the building converted to small scale milling, seed crushing etc.

*Site 12: Farm building, west of High Farm*

- 3.3.21 This single storey building is first depicted in 1890. It is built of coursed squared sandstone and the south elevation contains a pair of doorways with stable doors. A double doorway opening in the west gable has been blocked and now contains two windows of similar form to those described under Site 10 (see plate 12). The interior of the building is divided into two looseboxes.

*Site 13: Farm building, south-west of High Farm*

- 3.3.22 In 1833 this building was connected to the north side of the barn to the south, and by 1854 it formed the north end of a long north-south aligned range. The southern two thirds of the building are built of handmade red bricks laid in a rough Flemish bond, whilst the northern third, probably the earliest part of the structure, is of squared coursed sandstone (see plates 12 and 13). The interior is divided into two cells of differing size by an east-west stone wall. At the time of the second site visit (25th February 2002), the southern brick-built element was being carefully dismantled.

*Site 14: Trackway, north side of High Farm*

- 3.3.23 A track is shown here on a map of 1854, and on subsequent maps. It is represented by a poorly defined, east-west aligned, earthwork, c.5m wide and up to 0.75m high, which leaves the west side of the present farm



access road. The track appears to have formed the original access into High Farm, with the present road being created after 1938.

*Site 15: Field boundary, north of High Farm*

- 3.3.24 The 1777 enclosure map shows a track or lane running north into this area from Throxenby Hall. A field boundary is shown here in 1833 and 1854, but not thereafter. The surviving north-south earthwork bank is fairly well defined but spread, c.5m wide and c.0.5m high.

*Site 16: Possible building (site of), north side of High Farm*

- 3.3.25 A small square structure is shown in this approximate location on a map of 1833, but not on later maps. A small earthwork platform, c.4m by 2m, survives in the field, and the site probably represents some kind of temporary structure.

*Site 17: Boundary, north of High Farm*

- 3.3.26 A poorly defined, east-facing bank, c.2m wide and up to c.0.3m high, runs north-south across the pasture field. It is not shown on any historic maps, although the field is named as "Homestead, garth and garden" in 1833. The bank may represent a former boundary, perhaps within the garden, or separating the garden from pasture. It is also on the same approximate alignment as another bank (Site 23) to the south.

*Site 18: Boundary, north-east of High Farm*

- 3.3.27 A poorly defined, spread, east-facing bank, c.4m wide and 0.2m high, runs across the pasture field. The bank continues on the same alignment to the south of the farm access track, as a larger earthwork c.5m wide and up to 0.5m high, and this runs into the back of a prominent enclosure (Site 21). The earthwork is not shown on any historic maps, and it may represent the rear or back boundary of former (medieval?) plots or garths positioned on the west side of Throxenby Lane. The farm access track, which was not created until after 1938, clearly cuts across the earthwork.

*Site 19: Earthwork, north-east of High Farm*

- 3.3.28 A north-south bank, c.4m wide and up to c.0.6m high, lies on the east side of the pasture field, and continues on the south side of the farm access track. It probably represents part of an earlier alignment of Moor Lane, as shown on the 1777 enclosure plan (see figure 3).

*Site 20: Pond (site of), east of High Farm*

- 3.3.29 A sub-rectangular pond is shown in this approximate position, on the north side of an enclosure (Site 21), on a map of 1854, with a leat running out of the south-east corner. The pond is also depicted on subsequent maps. The feature survives as a poorly defined, sub-rectangular area c.15m east-west by c.8m north-south, within a sunken terrace or platform. Leats running in and out are just visible. The position of the pond, which appears larger on the historic maps, is curious, being perched on the side of a natural slope. It may be a garden feature (the site is located within

a field named as "Homestead, garden and garth" on a 1833 plan), or more probably is a watering place for stock.

*Site 21: Enclosure, east of High Farm*

- 3.3.30 A sub-rectangular enclosure is shown here on maps from 1833 onwards, with a footpath running past the south-west corner. The enclosure is represented by a sub-square depression, c.25m square, at the lower east side of a pasture field (see plate 14). The sides are formed by steeply sloping banks averaging between c.2m to 3m wide and standing up to c.1.2m high; the interior slopes gently from west to east and contains no visible features. The sharpness of the banks reflect the recently abandoned field boundaries. The field is named as "Homestead, garden and garth" in 1833, and this feature may be the garth.
- 3.3.31 The precise purpose of the enclosure as depicted on the historic maps is unclear, but it may be a stock holding area. However, the plan, form and possible "garth" name of the earthwork also suggests a medieval or early post-medieval croft, forming a plot at the rear of a house positioned on the street frontage; the earthwork could therefore have originated in the medieval period. The west end of the enclosure is also defined by a bank which parallels Throxenby Lane, suggesting the back line of other crofts (Site 18).

*Site 22: Earthwork platform, south-east of High Farm*

- 3.3.32 A curvilinear north-east facing bank lies in the south-east corner of the pasture field. The bank is c.5m wide and stands up to c.1.5m high at its south-west end, becoming shallower and narrower as it curves around to the west. A sub-rectangular depression at the west end might represent the remains of a small building or structure. The bank appears to define a well-developed plateau or levelled area, and there is another possible small structure represented by a low rectangular platform in the south-east corner. The function of this earthwork is unclear, and it is not shown on any of the historic maps. The sharpness of the earthworks suggests a late creation, perhaps from the 20th century; it might be the base of a tennis court or another similar garden feature.

*Site 23: Earthwork platform, east of High Farm*

- 3.3.33 A levelled sub-rectangular platform measuring c.35m north-south by c.23m east-west lies on the east side of the farmhouse (Site 7), defined by a slight c.0.3m high right-angled bank. Once again, the function of this feature is unclear, and it is not depicted on any historic maps. It may be the remains of a garden enclosure, and the north-south bank has a similar alignment to another bank seen further to the north (Site 17).

### **3.4 Discussion and Conclusions**

- 3.4.1 The medieval and post-medieval village of Throxenby always appears to have been small, compared to most of the other neighbouring settlements, and the area covered by 19th century township was significantly less than those around it. Only four taxpayers are listed in 1301 and a document of 1314-15 suggests that there were nine



smallholdings and five cottages in the manor (Brown 1896, 57-58). The 1673 Hearth Tax implies there were three sizable houses and at least nine small cottages in the village (Ripon Historical Society 1991, 41). Although some of these houses and smallholdings could have been located in outlying parts of the township, the village appears to have been small and probably suffered some decline during the early post-medieval period.

- 3.4.2 It is likely that the settlement would have been strung out along either side of the southern part of Throxenby Lane, to the south of the Moor Lane junction, as was the case at Hatterboard to the south (Rimington 1961). An earthwork bank (Site 18) running parallel to the west side of the lane could mark the limit of occupation while an enclosure (Site 21) might represent a former medieval croft or plot at the rear of a street frontage house, which was subsequently re-used. The manor was held by absentee landlords during the medieval and early post-medieval periods, and this probably explains the lack of an early manorial centre or focus.
- 3.4.3 A manor house is however mentioned at Throxenby in 1644-45 (Russell 1969a, 479), and the fact that it had five hearths in 1673 implies that it was a substantial building. The existing Hall appears, from external evidence, to be late 18th or early 19th century in date, but it is possible that the remains of an earlier structure lie embedded within, or underneath, the present building.
- 3.4.4 The 1771 enclosure plan shows Throxenby Hall as a relatively modest building, apparently of two parts, with a single building to the north. At this time the manor was held by George Osbaldeston, part of a large and famous local family. By 1833 the land had passed to the Dukes of Devonshire and was included in their extensive Londesborough estate. They, or their tenant, may have enlarged or rebuilt the Hall which was described as a "Capital Mansion" in 1833 (EYCRO DDLO). At this time, the Hall formed the centre of a farm of c.50 acres and two of the farm buildings (Sites 8 and 9) exhibit a style and plan form commensurate with a relatively high status site. Structural evidence suggests that Site 9 was originally of two storeys, with a ground floor stable perhaps with a hay loft over, while Site 8 was almost certainly built as a barn but may also have contained a byre at the north end with a loft over; they may be the stables, barns and granaries mentioned in the 1833 sale particulars. Site 8 in particular has a rather severe appearance and limited architectural treatment which harks back to the Classical and Palladian past.
- 3.4.5 High Farm itself was established between 1777 and 1833 on a "greenfield site", specifically to manage fields mostly created by the 1777 enclosure of Throxenby Common. The complex was originally laid out around a central courtyard or foldyard, typical of newly established farms of this period (RCHME 1987, 159-161), just to the north-east of the Hall farm. A period of expansion took place in both complexes between 1833 and 1854, and in 1851 High Farm covered 86 acres and was occupied by the Mackwood family.
- 3.4.6 However, by 1890, several of the agricultural ranges around High Farm had been demolished, leaving only a barn in the north-east corner (Site



1), a smaller structure on the west side (probably Site 5), and the farmhouse (Site 7). At the same time, the Hall passed into non-farming hands, and it seems likely that many of the Hall farm buildings were taken over by High Farm. The re-organisation of the two formerly separate farmsteads into one large sprawling complex meant the construction of new boundary walls, and a new agricultural range was created by building new structures and converting existing buildings (Sites 10 to 12). Subsequent alterations make it difficult to assess the original functions of some of the buildings within the expanded High Farm complex, but they probably comprised byres, loose boxes and shelter sheds. By this time the farm had passed to the Harrowsmith family.

- 3.4.7 Subsequent cartographic evidence shows that there was little development at High Farm during the first part of the 20th century, although a second floor was added to Site 11 and the building was converted to the processing of flour, seeds, oats etc. An extension was added to the house (Site 7) and a garage was also built. By 1970 several new, modern structures had been erected (Sites 4 and 6), to accommodate changing agricultural practices.

## **4 ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MITIGATION**

### **4.1 Introduction**

4.1.1 For archaeological sites and monuments, the main impacts arising from development may be summarised as:

- possible disturbance and/or destruction of above or below-ground archaeological deposits from works associated with the proposals, whether from actual construction or secondary works such as landscaping, site compounds and borrow pits etc;
- possible demolition or loss of parts of buildings or other structures;
- severance from other linked features such as field systems, agricultural complexes and landscapes;
- changes in the original landscape;
- increased visual intrusion and increases in noise, vibration and disturbance;
- loss of amenity.

4.1.2 Possible mitigation measures to offset development impact can be summarised as:

- locate any disturbance away from archaeological remains and their settings;
- undertake appropriate recording works and other investigations in advance of construction;
- undertake appropriate recording works and other investigations during construction.

4.1.3 Such measures depend on the importance of the site and in practice a combination of measures is often used.

### **4.2 Summary of Development Proposals**

4.2.1 Full details of the proposals are contained with the detailed planning permission (application no 01/00652/FL), which was granted by Scarborough District Council in October 2001.

4.2.2 In summary, the proposals involve the demolition of all buildings and structures on the site, apart from two barns (Sites 8 and 9) which will be converted and refurbished for new use. A new Hospice development will be built which, with associated car parking and landscaping, will cover the majority of the site. Existing ground levels will be significantly modified, with the western part of the site being cut away and the material used to fill the sloping ground to the east, thus creating a level development area.

A small pond will be created within or near the earthwork enclosure (Site 21), and a new gatehouse will be built at approximately the existing site entrance.

#### 4.3 Assessment of Importance and Condition

4.3.1 Using the data gathered by the desk-top research, an initial assessment of the importance and condition of each site identified within the study area can be made. This assessment is based on professional judgement, and a combination of the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport's criteria for scheduling ancient monuments and listing buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest, and the criteria developed by English Heritage in their Monuments Protection Programme.

4.3.2 In terms of importance, sites have been graded into two categories. One category provides an assessment relative to the county-wide archaeological resource (ie. national, regional/county, district and local) while the second category provides an assessment relative to the other sites within the study area (ie. high, medium and low).

4.3.3 The relevant information can be summarised in the following table.

Site No	Site Name	Importance overall	Importance within site	Condition
1	Farm building, north side of High Farm	Local	Low	Destroyed
2	Garage and coal houses, east side of High Farm	Local	Low	Good
3	Boundary wall, north and west sides of High Farm	Local	Low	Fair
4	Modern farm building, north side of High Farm	None	None	Good
5	Farm building, High Farm	Local	Low	Fair
6	Farm building, west side of High Farm	None	None	Good
7	Farmhouse, High Farm	Local	High	Good
8	Farm building, south-west of High Farm	Local	High	Fair
9	Farm building, south-west of High Farm	Local	High	Poor
10	Farm building, west of High Farm	Local	Low	Good
11	Farm building, west of High Farm	Local	Medium	Fair
12	Farm building, west of High Farm	Local	Low	Good
13	Farm building, south-west of High Farm	Local	Low	Poor
14	Trackway, north side of High Farm	Local	Low	Poor
15	Field boundary, north of High Farm	Local	Low	Poor
16	Possible building (site of), north side of High Farm	Local	Low	Poor
17	Boundary, north of High Farm	Local	Low	Poor
18	Boundary, north-east of High Farm	Local	Low	Poor
19	Earthwork, north-east of High Farm	Local	Low	Fair
20	Pond (site of), east of High Farm	Local	Low	Poor
21	Enclosure, east of High Farm	Local	High	Good
22	Earthwork platform, south-east of High Farm	Local	Medium	Fair
23	Earthwork platform, east of High Farm	Local	Low	Poor



- 4.3.4 From this table, it can be seen that all the sites are considered to have a local grade of importance when considered against the county resource, but within the site as a whole, the farmhouse (Site 7), the two early farm buildings associated with the Hall (Sites 8 and 9), and the earthwork enclosure (Site 21) are considered to have a high level of importance. It should be noted that the various grades of importance are based on the currently available information.

#### **4.4 Impact of Development**

- 4.4.1 As suggested above, all buildings and structures within the site will be demolished, except Sites 8 and 9 which will be converted. It can also be assumed that the changes in ground levels will result in the destruction of all earthwork features. It is therefore considered that the opportunity for the preservation *in situ* of any below ground archaeological deposits within the site will be minimal.

#### **4.5 Archaeological Potential**

- 4.5.1 During the medieval and subsequent periods, a large part of the study area was, and is still, given over to agriculture. High Farm was established between 1777 and 1833 on a "greenfield site", specifically to manage fields mostly created by the 1777 enclosure of Throxenby Common. As a result, the discovery of additional significant medieval or later period sites within the area of the existing farm buildings and the pasture field to the north is considered to be unlikely.
- 4.5.2 However, the medieval village of Throxenby appears to have been located adjacent to the study area, along Throxenby Lane to the south of the Moor Lane junction. It is likely that houses would have been arranged along either side of the road, and an earthwork bank (Site 18) might represent the western limit of occupation. The enclosure (Site 21) might represent a former medieval croft or plot at the rear of a house positioned on the street frontage. It is therefore possible that archaeological deposits associated with the medieval village may exist within a c.40m wide strip on the east side of the development site.
- 4.5.3 The position of the former Throxenby Hall has also not been established. Although the medieval and early post-medieval landowners are likely to have been absent from the village, a manor house at Throxenby is mentioned in 1644-45 (Russell 1969a, 479), and the fact that it had five hearths in 1673 implies that it was a substantial building. The existing Hall appears to be late 18th or early 19th century in date, but it is possible that the remains of an earlier structure lie embedded within or underneath the present building. However, there is also the faint possibility that below-ground deposits associated with an earlier hall may lie within the area of the present development.
- 4.5.4 Finally, although not covered by this assessment, there is some evidence for pre-Roman settlement and occupation in the area around the development site. The possibility of uncovering prehistoric material within the site should not, therefore, be discounted.

## 4.6 Recommendations for Mitigation

- 4.6.1 It is envisaged that several, separate stages of work will be required to ensure that the identified archaeological sites within the development area are afforded an adequate and appropriate level of recording prior to their destruction (preservation by record). Such work is now standard practice, and a condition requiring archaeological recording has been placed on the planning permission, in line with national and regional planning guidance; the latter was discussed by the previous archaeological assessment (Hamley 2001, 6-7), and so is not repeated here.
- 4.6.2 The results of each stage of work will normally influence and set the parameters for the next. However, the work undertaken for this assessment, and the levels of importance attached to the identified sites means that detailed proposals can be formulated at this stage. It is therefore recommended that two stages of mitigation works are carried out by appropriate and qualified archaeological contractors, as outlined below.
- 4.6.3 It should be noted that the parameters and methodology for any mitigation recording should be discussed and approved by North Yorkshire County Council archaeological staff and the Local Planning Authority. This will ensure compatibility with existing recording standards and compliance with the planning condition. It may, for example, be necessary to produce method statements or specifications for the proposed mitigation works.

### *Stage 1: Pre-development recording*

- 4.6.4 It is recommended that the buildings and upstanding earthworks within the site are recorded in advance of any demolition or ground disturbance.
- 4.6.5 For the buildings (Sites 2 to 13 - Site 1 has already been demolished), this recording should comprise a Level 2 survey as defined by the RCHME (1996). This is a descriptive record, containing an analysis of the building's developments and use, augmented by internal, external and general black and white photography, and sketched drawings with limited dimensional information. In most cases, this work can build on that already done for this assessment and the existing site survey. However, a slightly higher level of recording work is recommended for the farmhouse (Site 7) and the two early barns (Sites 8 and 9), given their relative importance to rest of the site. The interior of the farmhouse should be inspected, and a ground floor plan should be produced. For the two barn, the existing 1:50 scale surveys should be enhanced to show relevant architectural detail; if possible, these buildings should also be inspected from the grounds of Throxenby Hall (subject to access) to gain a complete record. A 1:20 scale plan should also be made of a typical stall in Site 9.
- 4.6.6 For the earthworks (Sites 14 to 23), this recording should also comprise a Level 2 survey as defined by the RCHME (1999). This is a descriptive and drawn record which incorporates a written account and a metrically accurate plan, typically at 1:1000 or 1:500 scale. Once again, this work



would build on the sketch plots produced for this assessment, and on the existing site survey data.

- 4.6.7 The results of this Stage 1 pre-development recording should then be presented as a combined survey report, and a site archive prepared. Copies of the report should be provided for the North Yorkshire Sites and Monuments Record and the Local Planning Authority, in addition to any other client requirements.

*Stage 2: Watching brief during construction*

- 4.6.8 It is recommended that the whole of the development site is subject to an archaeological watching brief during the initial stages of construction. Topsoil strips and shallow ground excavations should be monitored and inspected, and time should be allowed for the adequate identification, investigation and recording of any archaeological material that might be uncovered. If significant remains are encountered, it may be necessary to temporarily halt development in that part of the site, whilst the recording takes place.
- 4.6.9 Although the watching brief should take place over the full extent of the development site, monitoring and observation should be concentrated in that part of the site considered to have a relative high archaeological potential, namely a c.40m wide strip on the east side of the site.
- 4.6.10 On completion of the work, a watching brief report should be produced and disseminated as outlined above. Depending on the type and quality of any finds, appropriate post-excavation work, such as the dating of pottery and the processing of samples, may need to be carried out.
- 4.6.11 An ordered project archive, incorporating both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 works, should then be prepared and deposited with a registered museum. Depending on the level of results, further publication in an appropriate journal such as the *Transactions of the Scarborough Archaeological Journal* may be required.

## 5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

EYCRO - East Yorkshire County Record Office  
NYCRO - North Yorkshire County Record Office  
SLHL - Scarborough Local History Library

### Unpublished sources

- 1771/77      Enclosure map and award (NYCRO I/SCA - MIC 289 (award) & MIC 2234-420 (map))
- 1775    Jeffrey's map of Yorkshire (plate IX) (SLHL)
- 1817    Greenwood's map of Yorkshire (SLHL)
- 1821    Knox's map of Scarborough (SLHL)
- 1833    Particulars of Condition of Sale of Estates in the North and West Riding of the County of Yorkshire ... 18 June 1883 (EYCRO DDLO)
- 1841    Census for Throxenby township (SLHL HO 107, 1261)
- 1851    Census for Throxenby township (SLHL HO 107, 2368)
- 1855    Ordnance Survey 1st edition 6" map (sheet 77)
- 1890/01    Ordnance Survey 25" map (sheet 77/16)
- 1895    Ordnance Survey 6" map (sheet 77SE)
- 1901    Census for Throxenby (SLHL RG13, 4534)
- 1912    Ordnance Survey 25" map (sheet 77/16)
- 1928    Ordnance Survey 25" map (sheet 77/16)
- 1930    Ordnance Survey 6" map (sheet 77SE)
- 1970    Ordnance Survey 1:2,500 map (sheet TA0188)

### Published sources

- Brown, W (ed) 1896 *Yorkshire Lay Subsidies: 30 Edward I (1301)*. Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series vol 21
- Brumhead, D 1979 *Geology Explained in the Yorkshire Dales and on the Yorkshire Coast*
- Bryne, A 1986 *London's Georgian Houses*
- Bulmer, T 1890 *History and Topography and Directory of North Yorkshire, part 2*



Clay, C T (ed) 1963 *Early Yorkshire Charters vol XI: The Percy Fee*. Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series, Extra Series

Faull, M & Stinson, M (eds) 1986 *Domesday Book: A Survey of the Counties of England, No 30: Yorkshire*

Gelling, M 1984 *Place-Names in the Landscape*

Goldthorp, L M 1886 "The Franciscans and Dominicans in Yorkshire, Part 1: The Grey Frairs". *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* vol 32, 264-320

Harrison, B 2000 "Staintondale, North Yorkshire: A Moorland Estate of the Knights Hospitaller". In Thirsk, J (ed) *The English Rural Landscape*, 307-322

Hemley, S 2001 *An Archaeological Assessment of High Farm, Throxenby, Scarborough, North Yorkshire* (unpublished AOC report)

Kelly & Co 1857 *Post Office Directory of the North Riding of Yorkshire*

Kelly & Co 1872 *Post Office Directory of the North Riding of Yorkshire*

Kelly & Co 1893 *Post Office Directory of the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire*

Kelly & Co 1905 *Post Office Directory of the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire*

Kelly & Co 1933 *Post Office Directory of the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire*

Lang, J T 1989 "Anglo-Saxons and Vikings". In Spratt, D A & Harrison, B J D (eds) *The North York Moors Landscape Heritage*, 55-71

Lang, W 1971 "Squire of England". *Yorkshire Life* April 1971 vol 25, 48-49

Neave, D 1977 *Londesborough: History of an East Yorkshire Estate Village*

Pearson, T 1999 "Early Medieval Settlement of the Yorkshire Coats". *Northern Archaeology* vol 18/19, 159-164

Pearson, T 2001 "Falsgrave Soke and Settlement". In Crouch, D & Pearson, T (eds) *Medieval Scarborough: Studies in Trade and Urban Life*, 79-84

Radley, J (ed) 1969 "Yorkshire Archaeological Register 1968". *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* vol 42, 237-249

RCHME 1987 *Houses of the North York Moors*

RCHME 1996 *Recording Historic Buildings: A Descriptive Specification*

RCHME 1999 *Recording Archaeological Field Monuments: A Descriptive Specification*

Rimington, F C 1961 *The Deserted Medieval Village of Hatterboard near Scarborough*. Scarborough and District Archaeological Society Research Report No 2

Ripon Historical Society 1991 *The Hearth Tax Lists for the North Riding of Yorkshire, Michaelmas 1673, Part 4: Ryedale, Pickering Lyth and Scarborough Wapentakes*

Russell, A 1968a "Scalby". In Page, W (ed) *History of the County of York North Riding: Volume 2*, 476- 483

Russell, A 1968b "Seamer". In Page, W (ed) *History of the County of York North Riding: Volume 2*, 483-489

Smith, A H 1928 *The Place Names of the North Riding of Yorkshire*. English Place names Society vol 5

Soil Survey of England and Wales 1983 Sheet 1: Northern England

Surtees Society 1867 *The Survey of the County of York taken by John de Kirkby, commonly called Kirkby's Inquest...* vol 49

Turton, R B (ed) 1894 *The Honor and Forest of Pickering*. North Riding Record Series (new Series) vol 1

Ward, J T 1967 *East Yorkshire Landed Estates in the Nineteenth Century*. East Yorkshire Local History Series no 23



## 6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 6.1 This additional archaeological assessment report was initiated by St Catherine's Hospice Trust through their agents, Braithwaite and Jackson, and was funded by the Trust. Ed Dennison Archaeological Services (EDAS) are grateful to Mr Colin Straw and Ms Karen Brooks of Braithwaite and Jackson, and Ms G Falkingham of North Yorkshire County Council's Heritage Unit, for the formulation of the project and their co-operation during it.
- 6.2 The desk-based research was carried out by Ed Dennison while the majority of the site assessment work was done by Shaun Richardson, both of EDAS. Shaun Richardson took the photographs and produced draft site descriptions, and the final report and illustrations was prepared by Ed Dennison. Any errors or inconsistencies in the text remain the responsibility of Ed Dennison.