

MANOR FARM, HOOTON LEVITT,  
SOUTH YORKSHIRE

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL OBSERVATION,  
INVESTIGATION AND RECORDING

VOLUME 1: MAIN REPORT



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

MANOR FARM, HOOTON LEVITT,  
SOUTH YORKSHIRE

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL OBSERVATION,  
INVESTIGATION AND RECORDING

VOLUME 1: MAIN REPORT

Report no:	2006/283.R01
Version:	Final
Date:	December 2008
Author:	Ed Dennison & Shaun Richardson

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

On behalf of

Newton Wright Construction Ltd  
Hill Top Farm  
Hemingfield  
Barnsley  
S73 0PZ

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL OBSERVATION, INVESTIGATION AND  
RECORDING, MANOR FARM, HOOTON LEVITT, SOUTH YORKSHIRE**

**CONTENTS OF VOLUME ONE: MAIN REPORT**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND .....	7
3	DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDING BUILDINGS.....	12
4	DESCRIPTION OF OTHER STRUCTURES AND EARTHWORKS.....	31
5	RESULTS OF THE WATCHING BRIEF.....	35
6	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	40
7	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	47
8	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	50

Appendices contained in Volume 2.

## LIST OF FIGURES

- 1 General location
- 2 General site plan
- 3 Detailed site survey
- 4 Ordnance Survey 1854 map
- 5 Ordnance Survey 1916 map
- 6 Building A (farmhouse)
- 7 Building B (south range)
- 8 Building B (south range)
- 9 Building C (west range)
- 10 Buildings D and E (north range)
- 11 Sections through buildings
- 12 South elevation of Building D1 and marks on beams
- 13 Watching brief trench plans
- 14 Watching brief trench sections

## LIST OF PLATES

- 1 Aerial view of Manor Farm (c.1980s), looking north.
- 2 Farmhouse (Building A), prior to conversion, looking north.
- 3 Farmhouse (Building A), north elevation after removal of render, looking south-east.
- 4 Farmhouse (Building A), south elevation after demolition of east west and hallway, looking north-west.
- 5 Farmhouse (Building A), ground floor, firehood in room A2, looking south-east.
- 6 Farmhouse (Building A), typical original truss.
- 7 South range (Buildings B1 to B3), north elevation, looking south.
- 8 Building B1, north elevation, looking south.
- 9 Building B1, ground floor, corbels in south wall, looking north-west.
- 10 Building B1, ground floor, window in north wall, looking north.
- 11 Building B1, ground floor, unblocked window in south wall, looking south.
- 12 Building B2, ground floor, east cell, brick paving and drain, looking north-east.
- 13 Building B2, east cell, 17th century floor frame, looking north-east.
- 14 Building B3, looking south-west.
- 15 Building C1, looking north-west.
- 16 Building C1, looking north.
- 17 Buildings D1 and D2, south elevation, looking north.
- 18 Building D1, east face of east truss, looking west.
- 19 Buildings D3 and E, looking north-west.
- 20 Building D3, north elevation, looking south.
- 21 Building D3, east end of ground floor, looking east.
- 22 Building D3, line shaft at east end, looking south.
- 23 Privy in garden, looking south-east.
- 24 Double seat in privy, looking south.
- 25 Trench 1, looking east.
- 26 Trench 5, looking south.
- 27 Trench 13, looking north-west.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In April 2006, Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd (EDAS) were commissioned by Mr Clive Davenport of Newton Wright Construction Limited to undertake a programme of archaeological and architectural recording at Manor Farm, Peak Lane, Hooton Levitt, South Yorkshire (NGR SK51929130). The work was to comprise the detailed recording of the farm buildings on the site (excluding the farmhouse), and to assess, as far as was possible using non-intrusive methods, whether or not further archaeological remains may be present within the area of a proposed development. As a result of this assessment, a further phase of archaeological recording was undertaken. All the archaeological and architectural work was required as part of a planning approval for the redevelopment of the farm complex. The farmhouse was also subsequently converted into housing, and so EDAS took the opportunity to record this structure at their own expense.

Manor Farm may have originated as a pre-Conquest manorial centre, perhaps created after the 10th century as a result of the break up of a larger early medieval "multiple estate". Whilst this is likely to be an overly simplistic interpretation, several features within the immediate landscape, including field boundaries and a mill, were present by the late 11th/mid 12th century and so may have earlier origins. A probable mid 12th century building (Building B1) also survives on the farm itself, indicating that the site was of some importance by this date. This building may have been built by, or might have been associated with, Richard Fitz Turgis, the co-founder in 1147 of Roche Abbey, and it probably comprised a small chamber-block, detached from but operating in tandem with a timber-framed ground floor hall. With the exception of two posts buried within the wall of one of the buildings forming the north farm range (Building D1), no standing evidence for either the hall or any other of the ancillary buildings that might have been expected to be present on a medieval manorial centre has survived above ground, although upstanding earthworks (and the position of existing buildings) may partly define the manorial precinct and perhaps indicate the position of other features such as fishponds or a moat.

The manor of Hooton passed to the de Levet family through marriage in the late 12th/early 13th centuries, and it acquired the suffix "Levitt" as a result during the same period. It seems unlikely that the 12th century chamber block and associated timber-framed hall remained in use as the principal accommodation on the site throughout the medieval period, and they were probably replaced by a timber-framed house in the later middle ages. This might have been contained within the existing farmhouse, or it could have been located elsewhere on site.

It is possible that the existing farmhouse (Building A) was newly built in the early 17th century, during a period of re-organisation and rebuilding on the site. The addition of a structure to the west end of the 12th century building during the mid 17th century (Building B2), as well as other alterations to the building itself, marked the downgrading of its status to a service structure, whilst an earlier timber-framed building may have been rebuilt as animal accommodation during the same period (Building D1). The farmhouse was then enlarged in the later 17th century by the addition of at least one wing, and was modified again during the 18th century. In the mid 18th century, the west range of the farm (Building C) was either built or re-modelled, work which included the construction of a building with a pigeon loft; this was apparently done, at least in part, to enhance the appearance of the farm when approached from the west and to formalise the entrance here. A threshing barn (Building D3) was built in the late 18th century and a building (Building D2) was added to its west side before the mid 19th century. After 1854, the core area of the farm appears to have undergone few major modifications, the only ones noted being the addition of a cart-shed to the north range and the creation of a covered yard on the latter's south side.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## Reasons and Circumstances of the Project

- 1.1 In April 2006, Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd (EDAS) were commissioned by Mr Clive Davenport of Newton Wright Construction Ltd to undertake a programme of archaeological and architectural recording at Manor Farm, Peak Lane, Hooton Levitt, South Yorkshire, prior to and during the re-development of the complex (NGR SK51929130 centred). The work involved two phases of activity. Phase 1 comprised the detailed recording of the farm buildings (excluding the farmhouse) and an assessment, as far as was possible using non-intrusive methods, whether or not further below-ground archaeological remains may be present within the area of the proposed re-development. As a result of this assessment, Phase 2 comprised an archaeological watching brief carried out during the limited groundworks associated with the re-development of the site and the conversion of the farm buildings. All the archaeological and architectural recording was made a condition of planning approval (see below), and was mostly funded by Newton Wright Construction Ltd.
- 1.2 The scope of the Phase 1 building recording and assessment was initially determined by a brief issued by the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) (see Appendix 6 in Volume 2). The terms and conditions of this brief were then clarified following discussions with Mr Jim McNeil of the SYAS and Mr Peter Thornborrow, Conservation and Urban Design Officer at Rotherham Metropolitan District Council, and an EDAS methods statement was produced and agreed in advance of the site work (see Appendix 7 in Volume 2). An EDAS specification for the Phase 2 watching brief was also prepared and agreed before the commencement of groundworks (see Appendix 8 in Volume 2).

## Site Location and Description

- 1.3 Manor Farm (NGR SK51929130) is located at the western end of Hooton Levitt village, in an elevated position on a flat topped spur overlooking the valley of the Maltby Dike to the north, at a height of c.128m AOD (see figure 1). The site is approached via a track leading off Peak Lane, and comprises, from east to west, a grassed paddock, a belt of woodland to the north, the farm complex and a 6m wide strip of the field to the west of the farm (see figure 2). The farm itself comprises a farmhouse with an attached walled garden and three ranges set around a central courtyard (see plate 1). All parts of the site were empty and accessible at the time of the survey, with the majority of the building interiors being clean and clear of debris.
- 1.4 For the purposes of re-development, the site complex was divided into four plots. Plot 1 comprised the southern range of farm buildings (hereafter referred to Building B), Plot 2 was the eastern end of the north range (Building D3), Plot 3 was the central part and western end of the north range (Buildings D1 and D2), and Plot 4 was western range (Building C) (see figure 3). A further farm building, attached to the south side of Building D3, was identified as Building E while the farmhouse was Building A.
- 1.5 The south range of farm buildings (i.e. Building B) is listed as being of Special Architectural or Historic Interest (Grade II) (see Appendix 4 in Volume 2). The site has not been the subject of any comprehensive previous archaeological or architectural assessment, although the SYAS Sites and Monuments Record holds

plans and photographs of part of the listed range made by Peter Ryder in 1978 (SYSMR no. 1160).

## **Planning Background**

- 1.6 Planning permission for the conversion of barns into four dwellings, including the erection of single storey extensions and alterations to vehicular access, at Manor Farm was approved on 26th January 2006 (application RB2005/0643 (FUL)). One of the conditions (no. 5) stated: *"No development shall take place until the applicant, their agent or their successor in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority"*.
- 1.7 Listed Building Consent for the conversion of barns into four dwellings and the erection of single storey extensions was also granted on 26th January 2006 (application RB2005/0644 (LBC)). However, there were no conditions requiring any archaeological or architectural recording on this consent.
- 1.8 There were several other planning approvals and Listed Building Consents for the re-development of the site complex, namely the conversion of and an extension to the barn in Plot 1 (RB2006/1636 (FUL) and RB2006/1635 (LBC) both granted on 5th April 2007), the conversion of an extension to the farmhouse (RB2007/1180 (FUL) granted on 9th August 2007), and the conversion of and an extension to the barn in Plot 4 (RB2006/1896 (FUL) and RB2006/1956 (LBC) both granted on 15th November 2007). None of these approvals or consents had any conditions requiring any archaeological or architectural recording.

## **Aims and Objectives of the Recording Work**

- 1.9 The aims of the Phase 1 recording work were to gather sufficient information to establish the extent, nature, character, condition, quality and date of all surviving archaeological and historical features within the survey area. This was then used to provide an assessment of the likely nature of the buried deposits on the site and to consider the need for further investigation, to fully inform on the nature of any buried archaeology present.
- 1.10 The aim of the Phase 2 watching brief work was to record and recover information relating to the nature, date, depth, and significance of any archaeological features and deposits which might be affected by the groundworks associated with the development.

## **Survey Methodologies**

- 1.11 As noted above, the scope of both phases of recording work was defined by an EDAS methods statement and specification (see Appendices 7 and 8 in Volume 2). In accordance with these documents, the survey methodologies were as follows:

### *Documentary research*

- 1.12 The observations made on site during the survey and recording work (see below) were supplemented by information gathered from the following archive sources:
  - Rotherham Local Studies Library, Rotherham

- Sheffield Local Studies Library, Sheffield
- Sheffield City Archives, Sheffield
- South Yorkshire Sites and Monuments Record, Sheffield
- Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Leeds.

- 1.13 Discussions were also undertaken with the current and previous owners of the site regarding its history, and with Mr Peter Ryder regarding previous survey work. These discussions established that the latter held no other material regarding Hooton Levitt other than that which had already been deposited with the South Yorkshire SMR.

#### *Detailed site survey*

- 1.14 A detailed topographic survey of the whole of the site was carried out in May 2006 to record the position and form of all features considered to be of archaeological and/or historic interest. The extent of the survey area is that shown on figure 3. The survey was carried out at a scale of 1:500 using EDM total station equipment. Sufficient information was gathered to allow the survey area to be readily located through the use of surviving walls, wall junctions, and other topographical features. The survey recorded the position at ground level of all upstanding buildings and other structures, wall remnants, boundaries and any other features considered to be of archaeological or historic interest. The detailed site survey paid particular attention to those structures required to be recorded as part of the building survey (see below).
- 1.15 The site survey was integrated into the Ordnance Survey (OS) national grid by resection to points of known co-ordinates. Heights AOD were obtained by reference to OS benchmarks in the vicinity. A temporary bench mark was established and left on site using a ground marker approved by the client. Control points were observed through trigonometric intersection from survey stations on a traverse around and through the site. The maximum error in the closure of the traverse was less than +/- 25mm. The locations, descriptions and values of the bench marks and control points are stated in the final survey data.
- 1.16 On completion of the EDM survey, the field data was plotted and re-checked on site as a separate operation, in June 2006. Any amendments or additions were surveyed by hand measurement, and the results digitised back into the electronic survey data.

#### *Detailed building survey*

- 1.17 Ground and first floor plans of all the farm buildings of historic interest were produced in June 2006 at a scale of 1:50, using a combination of EDM survey, hand survey techniques and drawn data previously gathered by the client. The resulting plans show all significant details such as openings (blocked or unblocked), constructional detail, fixtures and fittings etc. No measured elevation drawings were prepared at this stage, the internal and external elevations being recorded photographically (see below), but sketch elevations were produced from photographs where it was thought they were necessary to elucidate the text.
- 1.18 In addition to the above, two sections through appropriate buildings were produced at a scale of 1:20. The first section was drawn through the east end of the south range, and the second through the west end of the north range. Prior to producing the sections, any trusses were brushed clean so that evidence for constructional techniques, including tool marks, carpenters' marks, etc could be identified. All



drawings were produced according to the guidelines established by English Heritage (2006, 18-21).

- 1.19 It should be noted that the farmhouse was specifically excluded from the initial development proposals, and there was no requirement by the client to undertake any form of archaeological recording as part of a later planning permission for alterations and conversion of the house. Nevertheless, given that an understanding of the farmhouse informs the overall development of the site, a ground floor plan was produced by EDAS using the same methods as outlined above, and observations and photographs were made of the interior during the alterations, at no expense to the client.
- 1.20 The initial project brief and subsequent EDAS methods statement (see Appendices 6 and 7 in Volume 2) stated that a contingency allowance should be made for detailed analyses, should the recording reveal aspects of the building that warrant such an approach. Furthermore, the need for analyses of paint, mortar, stucco, etc and dendrochronological dating of timbers should be considered. As a result of the survey work, no such analyses were considered to be necessary as part of the current project.

#### *Photographic survey*

- 1.21 General pre-intervention photographic recording of the site and its significant parts, together with close-up photography of significant details, was undertaken in June 2006, following guidelines produced by English Heritage (2006, 10-12).
- 1.22 All black and white photographs were taken with a medium format camera with perspective control (where appropriate), together with selected 35mm colour transparencies where relevant, for example where colour is an aspect that needs to be recorded. External photographs were taken, as far as was possible, at a right angle to the external elevations, whilst the interior coverage aimed to produce a record of all significant spaces and details. Each photograph was normally provided with a scale where appropriate. A total of 127 black and white photographs, and 24 colour slides, were taken during the course of the survey work.
- 1.23 All photographs are clearly numbered and labelled with the subject, orientation, date taken and photographer's name, and cross referenced to film and negative numbers. All photographic film was exposed and processed to ensure high quality definition, and was processed to archival standards according to manufacturer's specifications. Photographic registers detailing the location and direction of each shot have been completed (see Appendices 1 and 2 in Volume 2), and the locations and directions of each pre-intervention photograph are shown on figures in Appendix 3. Black and white copies of these photographs (except duplicate or near duplicate shots) are also given in Appendix 3 of Volume 2.

#### *Initial reporting*

- 1.24 Once the initial field recording had been completed, the fieldwork records were submitted to Mr Peter Thornborrow for approval, in order that above-ground works should be allowed to start on site. Once above-ground works had started, two further visits were made to site, on the 9th and 31st August 2006, in order to view and record any new structural information thus exposed. An interim report was also prepared in September 2006, and an assessment of the archaeological potential of the site was made. As noted above, this led to a programme of

archaeological observation, investigation and recording (watching brief) carried out during the limited groundworks associated with the conversion of the farm buildings.

*Archaeological watching brief*

- 1.25 The archaeological watching brief concentrated on the excavation of drainage trenches in and around the farm complex. A total of 13 trenches were monitored between September 2006 and September 2007. Trenches 1 and 2 were excavated on 27th September 2006, along the former north and south sides of Building D2, which had been demolished as part of the redevelopment works. Trenches 3 and 4 were both soakaway pits located towards the western end of the farmyard, and were also excavated on 27th September 2006. Trench 5, dug to the south of Building C on the west side of the farm complex, was also monitored on the same day.
- 1.26 Trench 6 was excavated on 5th February 2007, around the former footprint of Building B3 at the west end of the farm's south range, again demolished as part of the redevelopment works. Trenches 7 and 8 were excavated on the same day in the former farmhouse garden. Trench 9, located in the paddock to the east of the farm complex close to the access track leading off Peak Lane, was excavated on 6th February 2007. Trench 10 was also located in the paddock, to the south of Trench 9; although its excavation was not monitored, it was left open so that it could be recorded on 8th May 2007. Trench 11 ran along the north side of the access track from Peak Lane and was excavated on the 7th May 2007. Finally, Trenches 12 and 13 were both excavated on 5th September 2007; Trench 12 ran across the western part of the farm yard, while Trench 13 was located on the former footprint of the structure set between Buildings C and D1 at the yard's north-west corner.
- 1.27 In all cases, excavation was undertaken using a wheeled JCB excavator equipped with either a 0.60m or 0.90m wide toothed ditching bucket. In many areas of the site, the natural bedrock lay very close to the ground surface (in some cases within a depth of only 0.30m); the watching brief was ended when this was encountered, as excavation had to be continued using a breaker. Following standard archaeological procedures, each discrete stratigraphic entity (e.g. a cut, fill or layer) was assigned an individual context number and detailed information was recorded on *pro forma* context sheets. A total of 44 archaeological contexts were recorded; these are all described in Chapter 5 as three digit numbers (e.g. 005) and are listed in Appendix 5 of Volume 2. In-house recording and quality control procedures ensured that all recorded information was cross-referenced as appropriate. The positions of all monitored groundworks were marked on a general site plan, and more detailed drawings were made of each area as necessary; a photographic record was also maintained using 35mm colour prints.
- 1.28 In addition to observing below-ground archaeological deposits, the watching brief visits also provided an opportunity to view the farm buildings during their conversion, and much additional and valuable structural information was recorded. A series of 35mm colour prints were also taken during these works, and these are also included in the photographic registers and plans given in Appendices 1 to 3 of Volume 2; selected shots are reproduced in Appendix 3 of Volume 2.

### *Final report*

- 1.29 A detailed written record of the buildings and other features within the farm complex has been prepared from the observations made on site. Volume 1 of this report describes the surviving buildings and other structures, and analyses their form, function, history, and sequence of development, as far as is possible using the previously gathered information. The buildings are also placed within their historical and technological context, where possible. Volume 2 of the report contains the appendices, one of which includes black and white copies of the photographs taken as part of the building recording.

### *Archive*

- 1.30 An archive of material relating to the survey work, which includes field notes, survey data, field and final drawings, and photographic negatives, prints and slides, will be deposited with Rotherham Museum (site code MHL 06; accession no. ROTMG 2006.11). No artefacts were recovered from the watching brief work.

## 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

### Introduction

- 2.1 The following historical background information has been prepared from the sources listed above and in the bibliography (Chapter 7 below), and from observations made on site. It should be noted that there is a lack of published or easily accessible unpublished material relating to Hooton Levitt itself, and therefore the general sources consulted for the background information were limited in number. It was also not possible to trace any detailed plans or views of the site pre-dating the mid 19th century, and it is occasionally not clear if a source is referring to Manor Farm or the nearby Hooton Levitt Hall, which is now demolished.
- 2.2 In the following text, the modern spelling of Hooton Levitt is used when referring to the settlement, although the earlier form of “Levet” is retained when referring to the family of this name who were the lords of the manor for much of the medieval period.

### Medieval Period

#### *Pre-Conquest to 12th century*

- 2.3 Hey notes that the later (c.750 to 950) Anglo-Saxon place-name ending *-tun*, meaning a settlement or small estate in countryside that had been cleared of woodland, occurs 42 times in South Yorkshire in the 1086 Domesday Book. Of these, 16 were parish names and the rest were townships (Hooton Levitt was a township in the parish of Maltby), and settlements with this place-name ending are perhaps best regarded as once having had a special purpose within the framework of a large estate. The several Hootons in South Yorkshire are all located on spurs of land and were later distinguished from one another by the names of their lords, for example Levitt, Pagnell and Roberts (Hey 2003, 29-30). In terms of their ecclesiastical organisation, the manor of Hooton Levitt was served by St Bartholomew’s Church at Maltby. It is not known to what extent this reflects any early arrangement, although Hey notes that the church at Maltby retains an 11th century west tower (Hey 2003, 51).
- 2.4 The 1086 Domesday Survey records that, in Hooton Levitt prior to 1066, “... *Buga had 1 manor of 3 carucates and 6 bovates taxable where 2 ploughs are possible. Now Count Robert has in lordship 1 plough; and 8 villagers and 3 smallholders with 3 ploughs. 1 mill, 28d. The whole, 6 furlongs long and as wide. Value now 20s.*” (Faull & Stinson 1986, 307d & 308a).
- 2.5 The “Robert” referred to in the Domesday entry is Robert, Count of Mortain, half brother of William the Conqueror, while the mill is one of 25 water-powered corn mills listed in Domesday Book in South Yorkshire (Hey 2003, 64 & 177; Holmes 1895, 101). In the 19th century Hunter had speculated that the manor had passed from Robert to one of his principal tenants, Nigel Fossard, and afterwards to the de Mauley family. However, the de Vescis, who were lords of Rotherham during the 12th century (Hey 2003, 142) also held land in Hooton; in Kirkby’s Inquest of 1277, Hooton is shown to be held by John de Vesci as one knight’s fee and the same John de Vesci accepted the homage of “Nicholas de Lyvet for the fee which he holds in Hooton near the Abbey of Roche” in a grant made to Rufford Abbey (Hunter 1828, 265).

- 2.6 Hey has also noted that the benefactors of each of South Yorkshire's religious houses were all lesser lords who were resident in the district. In 1147, Richard, the son of Turgis (also know as Richard de Wickersley or more commonly as Richard fitz Turgis), the lord of Hooton Levitt, and Richard de Busli, lord of Maltby and a junior member of the de Busli family of Pontefract, co-operated in the foundation of the Cistercian house at Roche Abbey (Hey 2003, 94).
- 2.7 The foundation charters of Roche Abbey appear to be unusual in that the monks were able to choose on which of the co-founders' lands the abbey should be built, without prejudicing the claim of either man to be deemed founder. For example, Richard de Busli's charter of 30th July 1147 states: *"Let it be it known to all who see or hear these letters that I, Richard de Busli, with the consent of my wife and heirs, have given to god and St Mary, and to the monks of the Rock (Roche), for the salvation of my soul, and the souls of all my ancestors, the whole wood from the middle of the road of Eilrichthorpe to Lowthwaite, and as far as the water which is the boundary between Maltby and Hooten, and the two which belonged to Gamul, with a great culture that is there adjacent and pasture for 100 sheep, in number six score in the soke of Maltby, on condition: that they build their abbey on whichever side of the water they please, Richard de Busli and Richard Fitz Turgis agreeing between themselves that they should be considered the founders of the abbey, on whoever's property the abbey may be built, in perpetual alms, free and quiet from all secular service or gift. Before these witnesses: Adam of Newmarch, Hugh of Stainton, Odo FitzJohn, William FitzRaven, Jordan Paine, Gamel FitzBesing, Hugh of Langthwaite, Robert of Scalesby, Richard Barbot, Gervase of Barneby, Swein, son of Tor and his son Jordan"* ([www.cistercians.shef.ac.uk/roche/history/foundation/foundation2.php](http://www.cistercians.shef.ac.uk/roche/history/foundation/foundation2.php)).
- 2.8 Richard Fitz Turgis' charter of the same date also states: *"Let it be known to all who see or hear this charter that I, Richard Fitz Turgis, with the consent of my wife and heirs, have given to God and St Mary, and to the monks of the Rock (Roche), for the salvation of my soul, and the souls of all my ancestors, the whole land from the borders of Eilrichthorpe, as far as the brow of the hill beyond the stream which runs from Fogswell, and so to a heap of stones which lies in the assart of Elsi, and so beyond the road as far as the Wolfpit, and so by the culture of Hartshow to the borders of Slade Hooten; all that land and all that wood below these bounds and common pasture of all my land and fifty cart loads every year from my wood of Wickersley, where I shall provide , or someone on my behalf, in perpetual alms, free and quiet from all secular services on this condition: that they build an abbey on whichever side of the water they please, according to which place shall seem best, Richard Fitz Turgis and Richard de Busli agreeing between themselves that both should be considered the founders of the abbey on whoever's property the abbey may be built, in perpetual alms, free and quiet from all secular service and gifts. Before these witnesses: Adam of Newmarch, Hugh of Stainton, Odo Fitzjohn, William FitzRaven, Jordan Paine"* ([www.cistercians.shef.ac.uk/roche/history/foundation/foundation2.php](http://www.cistercians.shef.ac.uk/roche/history/foundation/foundation2.php)).
- 2.9 The monks chose to build on de Busli's land, who later also granted them sufficient timber from his woods at Maltby to complete their buildings at Roche ([www.cistercians.shef.ac.uk/roche/history/foundation](http://www.cistercians.shef.ac.uk/roche/history/foundation)). It appears that Fitz Turgis gave further land to the abbey, as Aveling notes that Henry de Laci granted and confirmed the donation which Richard de Wickersley (fitz Turgis) and Roger and Jordan Hooton had made, namely the common pasture of all the territory of Hooton Levitt (Aveling 1870, 116). Another Jordan, referred to as the son of Jordan de Insula, and Elizabeth his wife, gave all their land at Hooton Levitt to Roche Abbey (Aveling 1870, 116). The precise nature of any early relationship between the

abbey and Manor Farm is not yet known, but Fitz Turgis has been proposed as the builder of the much altered 12th century building that survives at the farm (Hey 2003, 79; Ryder 1982, 125).

- 2.10 An undated reference, also provided by Aveling, also mentions a Robert de Wickersley in connection to Hooton Levitt: "*Adam, son of Simon de la Roche, and Joan his wife, daughter of Robert de Wickersley, gave one oxgang of land here, with a toft and croft, which gift Sir Robert de Wickersley, knight, confirmed*" (Aveling 1870, 116).

#### *The later Medieval period: 13th to 15th centuries*

- 2.11 Fitz Turgis' son, Roger de Wickersley, had a daughter called Constantia who married William de Levet, and it is about this time, in the early 13th century, that the settlement appears to have acquired its suffix (Hunter 1828, 265). A deer park (Maltby Park) was noted in connection with Maltby from the early 13th century (Rodgers 1998) but there are no such references to Hooton Levitt. However, Aveling, in his book on Roche Abbey, records several references to Hooton and the Levet family during this period. For example, Hamond de Levet, the son of William de Levet, gave one oxgang of land in Hooton Levitt to Roche Abbey, together with a toft and croft in the same place, while Richard de Levet, also son of William, gave: "*half the mill here, with the pool and free water course from Maltby Mill to the Monk's Mill, with the suit of the said moiety, reserving a right to himself, his heirs and assigns, to grind all their corn that shall grow upon four oxgangs in this territory, a multure of the sixteenth bowl*" (Aveling 1870, 116).
- 2.12 In 1249, Hamond de Levet is named again in a charter by which two Manselyns, of Doncaster and Brodsworth, released all the lands, rents and tenements they held from him in Hooton Levitt to Roche Abbey (Hunter 1828, 265; Aveling 1870, 116). At a slightly later date, Nicholas Levet appears as lord of Hooton. A James "Livett", lord of Hooton, acted as a witness to a grant made in 1366 by Joan le Harpur of her property in Maltby to Roche Abbey. A "Joan Lane" still exists at the north-east end of Hooton Levitt; this is now a cul-de-sac but in 1854 it is shown continuing as a footpath in the direction of Roche Abbey.
- 2.13 Following the establishment of Roche Abbey in 1147, the advowson (i.e. the right to appoint a priest to an ecclesiastical benefice (Friar 2001, 1)) had alternated between fitz Turgis and de Busli, and subsequently their descendants. It remained with the Levets until 1377, when John Levet granted all rights he had in the patronage of Roche Abbey to Richard Barry, citizen and merchant of London (Hunter 1828, 265; Aveling 1870, 126-7). In 1421, William Levet of Hooton Levitt appears in a fine concerning the advowson of Roche Abbey. Hunter states that their connection with the settlement ceases at about this time, as by 1454 the manor of Hooton Levitt was amongst the possessions of the Clifford family. It is then believed to have descended with Maltby to the Earl of Scarborough (Hunter 1828, 265).

### **Post-medieval Period**

#### *16th and 17th centuries*

- 2.14 At the Dissolution of the Monasteries, the property that Roche Abbey held in Hooton Levitt was valued at £4 19s 2d (Aveling 1870, 116). Shortly after the Dissolution, a list was compiled of property formerly owned by the abbey in the manors of Hooton Slade, with Carr, Hooton Levitt and Hooton Robert. This makes

reference to a total of twelve tenements, the hedges enclosing them and other items such as 80 oaks of 60 to 80 years growth, but the reproduced version does not specify exactly where these properties were (Aveling 1870, 144).

- 2.15 Hunter lists the Spencer and Fretwell families as being amongst the principal freeholders of Hooton Levitt. The Fretwells were assumed to be a branch of the same family whose principal seat was at Hellaby (Hunter 1828, 265) and in 1610 a Richard Frewtell, carpenter, married Lucy Herring of Hooton Levitt ([www.maltbyonline.co.uk/chapter8.shtml](http://www.maltbyonline.co.uk/chapter8.shtml)). The Spencers apparently lived at Manor Farm in the 17th century (Wild c.1890, 27), although other sources have them as the builders of Hooton Levitt Hall ([www.maltbyonline.co.uk/chapter7.shtml](http://www.maltbyonline.co.uk/chapter7.shtml) - see below). They were descended from Thomas Spencer, the younger brother of William Spencer of Attercliffe and Bramley Grange, who was settled at Hooton by his father (Hunter 1828, 265).

#### *The 18th century*

- 2.16 Published lists of Yorkshire Enclosure Awards include no references to Hooton Levitt (English 1985) but documents in Sheffield City Archives provide some details on the process of enclosure and exchange of the former open fields which took place in the late 18th century. These documents need to be read in conjunction with several pages of sketch surveys in the Fairbanks collection made of William Hoyle's estate in 1787 (SCA FC/FB 64; FC/FB 64supp). Although there are no direct references to Manor Farm, some of the fields mentioned in the agreements between Peter Halliday and William Hoyle "regarding land at Hooton Levitt" (SCA CP-30(48); SCA CP-30 (49)) refer to "Normanstone Field" which appears to lie to the south of the farm, either side of Peak Lane. Unfortunately, it was not possible to trace a tithe map for Hooton Levitt, and the copy of the 1839 Maltby tithe map and apportionment held by the West Yorkshire Archive Service is incomplete (WYAS 266). Whilst there are some very detailed late 18th century maps of the Maltby area (for example, SCA LD1094), none of these cover the appropriate area.

#### *The 19th and 20th centuries*

- 2.17 The 1st edition Ordnance Survey 1854 6" map names the site under discussion as "Manor House" and shows at its core two parallel ranges, both aligned north-east/south-west, set on either side of a yard (see figure 4). The north range is L-shaped in plan, returning to the south at its western end, whilst the south range was at this date continuous with the farmhouse at its east end; an enclosed ornamental garden appears to the south of the south range. A track leaves the centre of the west side of the yard and runs south-west before curving sharply to the south along the west side of Cliff Plantation. The main approach to the site is from Peak Lane, and is shown as a wide enclosed track, apparently with several small buildings along its northern side.
- 2.18 The map evidence suggests that the layout of Manor Farm changed little during the later 19th and early 20th century. Between 1854 and 1888, a structure was attached to the east end of the south side of the north range, with a covered yard/shelter shed probably added slightly later but also before 1888. Apart from this, there were only minor changes, and the site continued to be known as Manor House until at least 1916 (see figure 5).
- 2.19 Other 19th century sources also provide some information on Hooton Levitt Hall, some knowledge of which is relevant to an understanding of the development of the Manor Farm site. Wild, writing in c.1890, stated that at the hall, then the

residence of Colonel A E Winder, there were the remains “*of a chapel or some religious house amongst this outbuildings*” (Wild c.1890, 27). He further speculated that a number of skeletons discovered when the foundations of “Maltby Grange”, apparently located nearby, were being dug out might have been a graveyard associated with this chapel. Some sources allege that there has been a hall on the site since 1117 (Rotherham Borough Council 1979, 31; Rotherham Rural District Council c.1975, 11) but there are no supporting references. Similarly, an online local history source states that Hooton Levitt Hall was built in 1620 “from its foundations” by William Spencer of Bramley, but then adds that it is first mentioned in 1649 when it had a “good estate attached”, again without providing any references. Freeman Bower, a Justice of the Peace and solicitor is said to have lived at the Hall in the late 18th century ([www.maltbyonline.co.uk/chapter10.shtml](http://www.maltbyonline.co.uk/chapter10.shtml)).

- 2.20 Relatively little information regarding the occupants of the farm can be gleaned from the various 19th century census and commercial directories. Although both sources list several farmers in the village, the names of the various farms are not specifically listed, and so the precise occupant of Manor Farm cannot be determined without further research. However, the 1891 census shows that the farm was occupied by Tom Thackrah, who was only 27 at the time and who originated from Dewsbury; he lived at the farm with this wife Edith and two young female servants (PRO RG12/3857 p20; [www.ancestry.co.uk](http://www.ancestry.co.uk)). In 1901 the farm was occupied by the Wagstaff family, which comprised Clarence Wagstaff (42), his wife Sarah and their seven children, as well as his mother-in-law and sister-in-law, and two servants (PRO RG13/4403 p26; [www.ancestry.co.uk](http://www.ancestry.co.uk)).
- 2.21 An early 20th century postcard of Hooton Hall depicts the “garden front”, most probably the south-east facing elevation (Tuffrey 2000, 37). On this, the hall is shown as a three storey building of three bays, the south-east front rendered and scored and rising to a balustraded parapet. The overall appearance of the building, particularly the low second floor windows, suggests that it was modified or remodelled in the late 18th century in a manner noted in similar houses in both West and North Yorkshire (RCHME 1986, 89; Richardson & Dennison 2005). However, there are a number of indications that it incorporates an earlier structure. The central ground floor doorway appears to have some kind of crest or emblem above the lintel, whilst the first floor window above the doorway is set markedly lower than those that flank it. Map evidence indicates that the half-timbered ivy clad “Old English” style structure shown to one side of the main house on the postcard was built between 1854 and 1888, perhaps partly as a service wing. The hall and attached building were demolished in the 1950s.
- 2.22 Almost all of the surviving buildings within the core of the village are 20th century in date, with former colliery housing occupying the north-east end and modern bungalows on the site of the Hall. However, at the property known as Home Farm, between the colliery housing and the modern bungalows, the house fronting onto the road may be 18th century in date, whilst the external appearance of the long range to the rear suggests that it is of the late 17th century or earlier.
- 2.23 In the 1970s and early 1980s, Manor Farm was used partly as a bird of prey rescue centre (Rotherham Star 1983) and indeed in 1978 Ryder was unable to survey one part of the south range’s first floor because it was being used to accommodate falcons (SYSMR 1160). Latterly, it was used mostly as a stables and was purchased by Newton Wright Construction in 2006.



### 3 DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDING BUILDINGS

#### Introduction

- 3.1 In the following chapter, the standing structures on the site are described in detail. In order to aid description in the following text and on figures 3 and 6 to 12, and as outlined in Chapter 1 above, the main buildings are identified using a unique letter reference system, being labelled from “A” to “E” in an anti-clockwise direction, starting in the south-east corner of the complex; a number of buildings have been further sub-divided using “B1” etc (see figure 3). Although the majority of the surviving buildings are aligned north-east/south-west, they are assumed to be aligned east-west for ease of description. Unless otherwise noted, the terms used to describe the timber elements are taken from Alcock *et al* (1996) and Campbell (2000). Any relevant information noted during the Phase 2 watching brief is also given here, with a more detailed account of the below-ground works being provided in Chapter 5 below.
- 3.2 Throughout the following descriptions, reference is made to the detailed black and white photographic building record, as well as other colour photographs taken during the watching brief work. These photographs are referenced in the text using bold type, the numbers before the stroke representing the film number and the number after indicating the frame (e.g. **3/1**). Volume 2 of this report contains the various appendices relevant to the photographic building recording: Appendix 1 provides a catalogue of all the building recording photographs taken during the project, while Appendix 2 provides a list of the relevant photographs grouped by individual building. The building survey photographic location points are shown on figures in Appendix 3. Good quality black and white photocopies of the majority of the pre-conversion photographic prints and some of the shots taken during the conversion of the buildings (except duplicated or near duplicated shots) are given in Appendix 3 while other shots are reproduced as plates in this volume of the report.

#### **Building A (farmhouse)** (see figure 6)

- 3.3 As stated in Chapter 1 above, no detailed drawn record was required of the farmhouse as it was specifically excluded from the main phase of development proposals, and no recording condition was subsequently placed on a later planning approval. However, given that an understanding of the farmhouse informs the overall development of the site, EDAS undertook additional work to produce a ground floor plan, and observations and photographs were made of the interior during the alterations. For the purposes of description, each major space on the ground floor has been assigned a unique letter/number reference. i.e. A1, A2 etc.
- 3.4 The farmhouse is shown as being continuous with the south range in 1854 (see figure 4) but there is no surviving evidence to suggest that the two were ever structurally linked. The maps show that the existing gap between the two buildings was present by at least 1901, when a small structure is also shown attached to the north-east corner of the house. This was still present in 1916 (see figure 5) but it had been removed at the time of the architectural survey work.

#### *Plan form and external elevations*

- 3.5 The farmhouse is rectangular in plan, measuring 18.0m long (east-west) by 11.5m wide (north-south) externally (see figure 6). However, the existing plan form is the result of a complex structural development, with the house possibly originating as a

linear three-cell single pile structure (i.e. spaces A1, A2 and A3), which had first a west wing (A4) and then later an east wing (A6) added to create a U or F shaped plan (see Chapter 6 below). At a later date, the gap between the two wings on the south side of the house was infilled (A5) and various other additions (A7) were made to create the current rectangular form.

- 3.6 The house is of two storeys, with a half-cellar beneath the west end, and has Welsh slate roofs to all parts, hipped to either end of the main house and pitched to the wings; a slated catslide roof is carried over a late extension to the east wing (see plate 2). Small uprights at the base of the south gable coping of the west wing were probably once surmounted with decorative finials. There is a large lateral stack on the west side of the former west wing, a ridge stack towards the east end of the main part of the house, and a small stack at the south-east corner of the former east wing. Most of the external elevations were originally rendered at the time of the original inspection, obscuring the material beneath, but much of this was removed during subsequent alterations, revealing coursed squared limestone/sandstone with dressed corner quoins. At ground floor level, the walls have an average width of 0.65m.
- 3.7 The fenestration of the north elevation (7/1), like that of all the other external elevations, had been almost completely modernised and this, together with the render, originally served to obscure much of the building's appearance. After the removal of the render, it appeared that the elevation incorporated several phases of construction (23/19). Prior to the render removal, the central section of the north elevation, some 9.30m long, had the appearance of rising from a plain stepped plinth which incorporated a flat-headed doorway with a very substantial dressed lintel and jambs (6/18) towards its east end. However, it became clear that only the blocks of the door jambs formed part of the elevation, and that the "plinth" actually butted the wall face. There was once another similar doorway to the east but this had all but been destroyed by the insertion of garage doors. Both doorways were set in the lowest of the three possible phases of construction noted in the elevation.
- 3.8 Up to between 1.77m and 2.40m above ground level (roughly approximating to the height of the ground floor ceiling), the elevation was built of coursed squared stone, quite thinly coursed towards the top and set with a pinkish lime mortar. The eastern part of the first floor, running as far west as the internal staircase, was also of squared stone but was far less well coursed than that below, and it was set with a cream coloured rather than a pinkish mortar. The western end of the first floor was better coursed again, with the course depths generally diminishing towards the eaves.
- 3.9 Although the fenestration of the north elevation had all been modernised, the removal of the render revealed traces of earlier windows. The westernmost windows on the ground and first floors both appeared to have replaced three-light mullioned windows (23/20). To the east, there was a blocked two-light ground floor window with a recessed splayed mullion, set slightly higher than the mullioned windows formerly present to either side, with a small window of 18th century appearance above lighting the internal staircase (23/21; see plate 3). Further east again, there was once another three-light mullioned (or mullioned and transomed?) window to the ground floor, while the window above on the first floor may once have been of three-light mullioned form. The first floor window above the garage doors at the east end of the elevation was much more recent, perhaps late 19th or 20th century in date.

- 3.10 Almost nothing of historic interest was initially visible in the house's east elevation (7/2). Following the demolition of the late extension to the east wing and the removal of the render, no trace of earlier windows could be seen around the two existing windows in this elevation, although the first floor window had an area of 19th century brick blocking beneath suggesting that it was once a doorway, perhaps serving an external stair (23/22). The stone used for the quoins also appeared to change at c.2m above ground level.
- 3.11 The west elevation was dominated by the large lateral stack towards the south end; a single two-light window with recessed splayed mullions was visible on the ground floor to the north of the stack (7/12), adjacent to the arched gateway between the farmhouse and the south range (7/4), with a similar window revealed above to the first floor. When the render was removed to the south of the stack, a curious opening was partly exposed on the ground floor. It was rendered internally, splayed and had been blocked up. The interior may once have been rebated and a single cast-iron pintle remained in place to one side. Its form was suggestive of a door rather than a window, although this was not certain (23/24 and 23/25). The arched gateway between the farmhouse and the east end of Building B (7/4) is a modern creation, having replaced a partially collapsed square-headed gateway previously recorded by Ryder in 1978.
- 3.12 Prior to the removal of the external render, the south elevation of the house was also of a plain appearance (1/16), with all window openings housing modern glazed units (see plate 2). The off-centre doorway to the central part of the south elevation had a similar but slightly narrower surround to that in the north elevation. However, following the demolition of the east wing (A6) and the narrow entrance hall (A5) to its west, numerous additional features were exposed (22/18 and 22/19; see plate 4). At the very east end of the ground floor, there was a doorway with chamfered interrupted jambs and a flat lintel; to the immediate west, two-light windows with recessed splayed mullions were visible to both the ground and first floors (22/12 to 22/14). There was then a largely blank area where the east wing had formerly stood, with some evidence for blocking or alteration to the ground floor and also later inserted doorways (22/10 and 22/11). The position of the former hallway (A5) between the east and west wings had been subject to much alteration, and few earlier features could be discerned (22/15); when this portion of the house was being demolished, a small splayed window was exposed in the doorway formerly set at its south end (Clive Davenport, *pers. comm.*). The east elevation of the west wing (A4) was, with the exception of two modern inserted doorways, completely blank (22/16). No new features were revealed to the south gable of the west wing when the render was removed, although the size and positioning of the modern windows here suggested that they replaced mullioned windows of at least three lights, or possibly even mullioned and transomed windows (22/17 and 23/23).

### *Circulation*

- 3.13 The main access to the interior of the ground floor was through the doorway in the north elevation. This led into a small lobby-entry. To the east, a doorway retaining a mid 17th century panelled door hung on spearhead strap hinges (20/18 and 20/19) led into the former garage space (A1). The main feature of interest in this area was the large former fireplace in the west wall, much altered but once provided with a firehood, the north end of the bressumer now being supported by two inserted columns. The south end of the bressumer was supported on an east-west aligned timber, and there was a more recent brick fireplace inserted into the back of the firehood. In the south wall, a cupboard opened to reveal a two-light

mullioned window (**20/16** and **20/17**), clearly pre-dating the east wing to the south (**A6**), and visible from the exterior once the east wing had been demolished. There may have been an area of blocking or rebuilding to the west of this window. The garage space (**A1**) was crossed by a single centrally placed east-west aligned beam with chamfered soffits.

- 3.14 Moving west from the small entrance lobby, the kitchen (**A2**) was entered through a doorway with a mid 17th century panelled door. Like all the other rooms within the house, the kitchen was entirely fitted out with modern fixtures and fittings. However, stripping out revealed the east wall to contain the remains of a large former fireplace provided with a firehood (**24/7**; see plate 5). The bressumer was stop-chamfered to both sides (**24/8** to **24/10**), and there were two vertical joints in the room's south wall in line with the south end of the bressumer. The internal jambs of the wide window in the north wall ran down to floor level, suggesting that it may once have been fitted with a projecting bay externally. A tall glazed cupboard alcove in the south wall may once have been a doorway or window (**24/12**), whilst another doorway led into the entrance passage on the house's south side (**A5**). Further doorways were positioned at either end of the west wall; the northern was fitted with a late 17th century two-panelled door, whilst the southern had a mid to late 17th century panelled door hung on H-hinges.
- 3.15 The north doorway formerly led into a small space at the foot of the narrow staircase ascending to the first floor, and then through into a long narrow room that has been created by modern partitioning. The south doorway gave access to a passage from which the small understairs space could be reached. Within this space, it could be seen that the stairs were supported on three sides by timber studs, with a larger post positioned midway along the east side (**24/11**); following stripping out, the studs could be seen to have once continued further north (**20/22** and **20/23**).
- 3.16 The passage then turned into a long narrow room which, like the room immediately to the north, had been created by sub-dividing a much larger space; however, stripping out revealed this partition to be of studs (**20/20** and **20/21**). When the more recent partitions were removed, the resulting single space (**A3**) was seen to be crossed by two east-west aligned ceiling beams with chamfered soffits between which wrought-iron hooks hung from the ceiling. These hooks were positioned over a half sunk-cellar, accessed by stone steps at the east end and fitted out with stone benches on brick piers around two sides; the north side preserved five stone storage alcoves. The area of the room to the north of the cellar was floored with worn flagstones (**20/24** and **20/25**; **21/4** and **21/5**), while its south wall was built of red handmade bricks (average dimensions 230mm x 120mm x 75mm) laid in stretcher bond and set with a lime mortar.
- 3.17 Returning to the kitchen (**A2**), the doorway in the south wall led into the entrance passage (**A5**) on the south side of the house; the external doorway at its south end was widely splayed to the interior (**21/7** and **21/8**). The passage in turn gave access to the rooms to the west and east. The west room (**A4**), within the west wing, retained a high (0.30m) but quite plain skirting board, which may have been of an early date, and was crossed by an east-west aligned beam with stop-chamfered soffits, set to the north of centre; stripping out here revealed coursed squared stone to the base of the walls (**21/6**). The east room (**A6**), forming the ground floor of the east wing, retained few visible features of interest, apart from at the south end of the west wall, where the lower part bulged outwards and was noticeably misaligned from that above. A further room to the east (**A7**) was

contained within the later lean-to set beneath the catslide roof; this had a modern conservatory on its east side.

- 3.18 Access to the first floor was via the staircase positioned between rooms A2 and A3; stripping out revealed the staircase to be of sawn softwood. The disposition of the first floor rooms, allowing for modern sub-division, was very similar to that seen on the ground floor. When the modern sub-divisions and wall plaster were removed, a number of features were exposed. Where the staircase rose to the first floor, there was a stud partition positioned on its east side (24/16). To the west of the stairs, within the west wing, a 19th century brick fireplace was positioned towards the south end of the wing's west wall (21/9; 21/12 and 21/13), although it may have marked the position of an earlier fireplace, as the back was built of large squared coursed stone pieces, one of which bears a Marian mark (21/10). This could be a masons' mark but it might equally have been placed here for magical purposes; such marks are often found around doorways, windows and fireplaces as these were seen as points where evil spirits or witches could enter a house and which were therefore in need of protection (Easton 1999, 22-23). Towards the north end of the same wall, the two-light mullioned window visible externally could also be seen (21/11).
- 3.19 Moving east, there was another room which had the stack rising from the firehoods on the ground floor forming the east side of the room. The stack was built of stone and was very substantial, with dressed quoins to the corners of the upper part (21/18). An (18th century?) brick flue had been added to the west side, serving a fireplace (21/15) at its base. A passage along the north side of the stack (21/16) led to the rooms at the east end of the first floor. Prior to stripping out, these formed bedrooms and a bathroom, but after the removal of modern partitions, some earlier features were exposed, such as mullioned windows and the stepped base of the stack (21/17).
- 3.20 At the time of the initial site visits, the roof space was accessed via a hatch over the room at the east end of the main body of the house. Much of the roof structure had been replaced in softwood relatively recently (21/14 and 24/14; see plate 6), although enough survived to suggest the earlier form. It appeared that the roof trusses over the main body of the house and the west wing were of substantial hardwood tie-beam and principal rafter form, with raking struts between the two (21/14). Each principal supported a single trenched purlin, with a diagonally-set ridge-piece at the apex of the principals. At the north end of the west wing there were the remains of a roof truss set very close to the wall, whilst at the south end the roof truss appeared to be set into the wall itself (24/18). To the immediate east of the stone stack, a roof truss had a re-used king-post with a splayed head fixed to one side (21/19). There were a number of other large timbers lying about in the attic space, apparently left here after the most recent repairs, but further study would be needed to establish if they originated within the house or were brought from elsewhere. It was not possible to access the roof space over the east wing prior to its demolition and so the form and/or preservation of any trusses here remains unknown. The ceiling beams running between the trusses in the west wing had failed in at least one place and had been repaired (24/19).

#### **Building B (south range) (see figures 7 and 8)**

- 3.21 The south range is shown with the major part of its existing plan in 1854 (see figure 4), and it remained unchanged until at least 1916. The only clear difference visible on the maps is that up to and including 1916, the west end of the south range's south side was flush with the rest of the building (see figure 5), whereas at the time

of the survey it projected slightly beyond it. Photographs and drawings made in 1978 show that, with the exception of the removal of a large cruciform wall-tie at the east end of the south elevation, the exterior had been virtually unaltered in recent years.

- 3.22 For the purposes of description, the south range has been broken down into three separate elements (see plate 7).

#### *Building B1*

- 3.23 Building B1 formed the east end of the south range. This structure was rectangular in plan, measuring 10.0m long (east-west) by 7.0m wide (north-south) externally, aligned east-west and of two storeys in height. The major parts of the external elevations were built of squared limestone/sandstone rubble brought to courses with large dressed quoins to the south-east and north-east corners, although there had obviously been much subsequent alteration. Like the rest of the south range, the building had a pitched roof covered with corrugated sheeting at the time of the survey. At ground floor level, the walls were extremely thick, averaging 1.30m for the end and 1.15m for the side walls; they reduce to an average of 0.90m in width on the first floor. Building B1 clearly pre-dates Building B2 to the west.
- 3.24 The north elevation (**7/5**, **7/11** and **8/14**) had a single loop-headed slit window at ground floor level, to the west of which were external stone steps leading to the first floor; between the two, the remains of an inserted window with a chamfered jamb, probably formerly mullioned like those in Building B2, were visible (**7/6**; see plate 8). The existing external steps butted the north elevation and incorporated a low blocked opening. This was initially thought to have been used as a dog house, but its unblocking during the subsequent conversion works (**17/9**) showed that it was filled with mortared rubble used to support the steps, and it never appears to have led into any kind of recess. The stone steps themselves were very worn, and their profile indicated that they had all been inverted at some point to extend their life (**17/10** and **17/11**). The steps rise to a slab at their head; the underside of the slab was chamfered, so that the top projected beyond the edge of the steps to the north and west. This was not an earlier re-used stone, for example, part of a chamfered plinth, as another example survived elsewhere on the site (see Building B3 below) and similar slabs have also been noted at farm complexes elsewhere in South Yorkshire, such as at Edderthorpe near Darfield (Clive Davenport, *pers. comm.*), suggesting that they are a regional feature. The steps led to a first floor doorway at the west end of the north elevation, with a small inserted window to its west. To the east, a large cruciform wrought-iron wall tie was set between floor levels, and above this there was a single slit window, almost certainly loop-headed originally. The Listed Building description (see Appendix 4 in Volume 2) suggests that the head survives, but it was hidden by modern cement render at the time of the survey; it may rather have been replaced by the concrete ring beam set around the majority of the first floor wall tops (see below).
- 3.25 The east gable appeared to have been subject to at least partial rebuilding. The ground floor appeared relatively undisturbed, although there was an inserted window at the north end and a ragged joint towards the south end. At first floor level, the southern two-thirds of the wall face projected slightly beyond the north third, and had probably been wholly or partially rebuilt. This was confirmed during the subsequent conversion works, when the upper part of the gable was dismantled and found to contain a great deal of 19th century brickwork behind stone rubble facing.

- 3.26 The south elevation was largely blank (1/17). There was a single loop-headed slit window towards the west end, with an inserted pipe ventilator above (1/18). To the east of the window, and set at a slightly higher level than it, there appeared to be a sub-squared blocked opening, c.1m wide and incorporating the loop-head of another slit window. To the first floor, there was a ragged joint towards the centre of the elevation (1/19), whilst to the west there was another ragged joint marking the former south-west corner of the building (2/3). The whole area between the slit window and a downpipe had been thickly repointed, and it appeared that the wall face had been partially or wholly rebuilt.
- 3.27 The interior of the ground floor was only accessible through the doorway at the west end of the north elevation, and it was floored throughout with concrete. During the conversion works, the concrete was taken up and revealed the remains of a brick paved floor set 0.12m below the surface of the concrete (17/3 to 17/8). The reddish-orange north-south aligned bricks making up the floor were neatly hand-moulded (average dimensions 0.23m by 0.11m by 0.07m) with a shallow frog to their upper surface. At their west end, they incorporated a north-south aligned stone drain similar to that noted in Building B2 (see below). Adjacent to the south wall, an east-west line of small stones was visible, set 0.69m to the north of the bottom of the wall. These were probably the remnants of either troughs and/or tethering positions for stalls, or they possibly marked the line of a feeding passage. A dry orange sand containing a high proportion of stone rubble was visible beneath both the bricks and the stones.
- 3.28 Internally, the wall immediately to the east of the doorway had been massively reduced in width to allow access to inserted loose boxes (2/12) (see below); in this section of wall, a large curved architectural fragment (2/13), perhaps part of a corbel, had been used to support part of the floor frame. The existing floor frame was formed by three north-south aligned beams, apparently softwood, and bearing incised marks reminiscent of the so-called "Baltic" timber marks used to mark imported timbers during the 18th and 19th centuries (see figure 12). Each of the beams was 0.31m deep by 0.16m wide, with small, neat stopped chamfers to both sides of the soffit. The joists running between the beams were on average 0.09m deep by 0.07m wide, and were set high up on the sides of the beams. The existing floor frame contained no evidence for alteration and did not incorporate any earlier timbers, and so was probably late 18th or early 19th century in date.
- 3.29 Surviving structural evidence suggests that the original first floor frame was formed by a pair of parallel north-south aligned beams, supported by substantial corbels, of which only those in the north wall survived at the time of the survey (2/17; see plate 9). The corbels were very substantial, with a curved profile, each being some 0.40m wide by 0.40m deep, and the beams which they supported were presumably correspondingly large. There were no corresponding corbels in the south wall and no trace of any scarring caused by their removal, although this might have been obscured by the thick layer of limewash which covered all the internal walls at the time of the survey. The corbels were set 0.15m apart; the gap was filled by an upright timber forming one side of an internal gateway. This timber, and those used as gate-posts to the two modern loose boxes here, had all come from the same source. They had been creosoted black, but appeared to be softwood principal rafters, once housing purlins secured by through tenons, which had been cut up and re-used here. They were all 0.28m wide by 0.08m deep, and were probably 19th century in date.

- 3.30 A large worked stone, approximately L-shaped in plan, was set on top of the corbels; it sat awkwardly on them, projecting at one end, and appeared to be a later addition, used together with some smaller stones to support the existing floor frame. It was just one of a number of alterations which had been undertaken when the existing floor frame was inserted, as the section drawn through this end of the range demonstrates (see figure 11). The existing floor frame was set c.0.60m higher than the one supported by the corbels. Whereas the internal walls of the building had originally stepped inwards at the level of the top of the corbels, they were raised using either coursed squared stone or rubble to allow the existing floor frame to be set at a higher level than the earlier one.
- 3.31 The window in the north wall was deeply splayed to the interior, 0.78m high and 0.82m wide, with a flat lintel and sill, although there was a 0.33m high blocking beneath the sill suggesting that the window base may once have been stepped as on the first floor (2/7 and 2/15; see plate 10). A window, fitted with a modern frame, had been cut through the north end of the east wall (2/9), whilst at the south end, quoins marked the north side of a 1.30m wide blocked opening (2/5), possibly a doorway, although it was not clearly visible externally. The blocked interior of the deeply splayed window towards the west end of the south wall, 1.05m high by 0.84m wide, was clearly visible (2/6 and 2/10), whilst there appeared to be a blocking of similar proportions at the south end of the west wall (2/11), with two possible ragged joints further to the north. The interior of the splayed window in the south wall was unblocked during the conversion works, revealing it to be of very similar form to that seen in the north wall (13/16a and 13/17a; see plate 11).
- 3.32 As part of the conversion works, a doorway was cut through the south end of the west wall, removing both the blocking here and the recess within Building B2 (see below) (13/18a, 13/19a and 14/10 to 14/13). When viewed in section, the west wall of Building B1 could be seen to be faced with roughly coursed stone but to have a fairly loose rubble core set with a friable orange sand mortar containing frequent and prominent pieces of lime. There was no evidence that the wall had been pierced by a ground floor opening here at an earlier date. However, the creation of the doorway did reveal what appeared to be dressed stones some 1.77m to the west of the splayed window in the south wall, although their purpose remains uncertain.
- 3.33 As stated above, the interior of the ground floor was sub-divided into two loose boxes at the time of survey. The west loose box had been created by inserting a low L-shaped stone wall in the south-west corner, and this appeared to be a fairly recent addition, although an older wooden hay rack had been re-used to create the upper part of the partition; there was a small quarter-circular trough in the south-west corner. The east loose box occupied the remaining space, with a gate beneath the corbels in the north wall. As previously noted, the west end of the north wall had been substantially cut back to allow access to the loose boxes.
- 3.34 The first floor, accessed via the external stone steps to the north elevation, was floored with narrow boards (average width 0.15m). Prior to the survey, the first floor was divided up into a number of chicken coops using timber and wire partitions, but these were removed to facilitate the photographic recording. The first floor space was crossed by three softwood king-post trusses, bolted throughout, and probably of late 19th or early 20th century date (4/7). The end of each tie beam was buried in the wall, whilst raking struts rose from the narrow king post to the principals. Each principal supported four staggered purlins, supported by downslope wedges. There were no common rafters, corrugated sheeting having replaced them, whilst the purlins and roof covering were modern.



- 3.35 The first floor walls had been subject to much alteration and rebuilding, whilst in several places, the inserted walling described above, which supported the floor frame, rose up above floor level. The east wall was particularly crudely constructed (3/18); rough masonry rose from the ground floor and then stepped inwards to rise towards the gable. Above the step, the wall contained a number of projecting stones although these do not seem to fulfil any purpose, whilst the uppermost part appeared to be a modern rebuild (see above). There was a similar but much more neatly constructed step at the base of the south wall (4/1), whilst a doorway at the south end of the west wall led through into the first floor of Building B2. There was a step at the base of the west wall, whilst above, the wall was faced with drystone masonry (4/3). During the subsequent conversion works, the doorway in the west wall was enlarged, revealing the south jamb of a much earlier doorway in the same position (13/18a, 13/19a and 14/10 to 14/13). The south jamb of this earlier door comprised well dressed stone quoins, with a total height of c.1.6m, rebated to the west. Unfortunately the north jamb did not survive, making it impossible to estimate the original width of the doorway, whilst the head had been disturbed by the concrete ringbeam, removing all evidence for its original form.
- 3.36 A small inserted window at the west end of the north wall retained a wooden frame while to the east of the doorway, the remains of the probable mullioned window described above could be seen (4/5). To the east of the window, the wall increased in thickness. The slit window here was rebated to the interior, in contrast to the similar ground floor window, and was formerly fitted with either a board shutter or glazed shutter; the scars left by the removal of the pintle blocks and a securing bolt were still visible (4/6). The window had a flat lintel, but the base was stepped downwards towards the interior.

#### *Building B2*

- 3.37 Building B2 formed the central part of the south range. The building was rectangular in plan, measuring 9.3m long (east-west) by 7.0m wide (north-south) externally, aligned east-west and of two storeys in height. The major parts of the external elevations were built of thinly coursed limestone/sandstone rubble with large edge-laid quoins to the south-west and north-west corners. Like the rest of the south range, the building had a pitched roof covered with corrugated sheeting at the time of the survey. At ground floor level, the walls were on average 0.60m thick, reducing slightly in width on the first floor. Building B2 post-dates Building B1 to the east, but pre-dates Building B3 to the west.
- 3.38 The north elevation had two doorways to the ground floor, each leading to a single internal cell (see below) (7/7 and 7/8; see plate 7). The east doorway had a slightly cambered head, whilst that to the west was flat-headed; both were fitted with stable-type doors of 19th century appearance. The jambs of both doors, and that of the ground floor doorway of Building B1, rose from orange sandstone blocks with vertical tooling. The east doorway appeared to have had a similar doorway to its west, so that there were once two doorways leading into this cell but one was subsequently blocked. Above, a first floor doorway led into the east cell on the first floor, and was fitted with the same inverted chamfered slab as existed at the top of the external steps leading to Building B1's first floor. This suggested that there may once have been an external staircase here too, although there was no surviving structural and/or cartographic evidence for one, or perhaps the doorway may have been used for loading purposes only. A window to the west of the doorway was once of a two-light mullioned form but it had subsequently been radically altered.

- 3.39 The south elevation of the building was largely blank, with the exception of small ground and first floor windows at the very east end. A modern pipe ventilator had been inserted through the west end of the elevation. The former west gable of the building was enclosed within Building B3 to the west (3/12 and 3/13). In this elevation, on the ground floor, there was a blocked flat-headed doorway at the north end, with a centrally positioned blocked two-light mullioned window set within a chamfered surround (3/14); the central mullion was of chamfered flat-splay form. Above, on the first floor, there was a similar window, also blocked. These windows were both revealed more fully when Building B3 was demolished during redevelopment and conversion works (20/5 to 20/8).
- 3.40 The interior of the ground floor was divided into two cells, both accessed through the ground floor doorways in the north elevation. The east cell was paved throughout with brick, and their north-south orientation showed that beasts were originally tethered along the west wall (2/18). A narrow strip of brick paving along the east wall, corresponding to the width of the door, was aligned east-west, and this was separated from the main area of paving by a stone-lined drain (3/6; see plate 12); all the bricks were red and handmade, with shallow frogs to their upper surface (average dimensions 230mm by 120mm by ?). The floor was lifted during the conversion works to reveal only a dry orange sand but the north-south stone-lined drain could be seen to be connected with a similar feature running along the bottom of the outside north wall of the building (13/22a). A line of stones, of uncertain function, was also seen running parallel to the south wall of the cell when the floor was lifted (14/14).
- 3.41 The internal walls had a thick coating of limewash at the time of the survey but a number of features were still visible. In the approximate centre of the east wall (i.e. the original west gable of Building B1), a c.1m tall recess was present (3/2), with a much larger recess to the south (3/4), and possibly a small blocked opening set between them. The base of the larger recess was set c.0.90m above floor level and it rose to ceiling height, being almost as deep as the wall. The north jamb of this recess was formed from large quoins and another stone projected from the top of the rear side, whilst what was initially thought to be a re-used fragment of window rebate was set at the top of the south side. During the conversion works however, this was revealed to be the base of the south jamb of a first floor doorway into Building B1 (see above). The complete removal of the recess during the conversion works showed that it had never extended any further than its existing dimensions at the time of original survey, and that it appeared to have been originally constructed as a cupboard or storage area. In the south wall, immediately to one side of the adjacent recess, there was a small window with unequally splayed sides (3/5). No features were visible in the west wall (3/1), which appeared to be contemporary with the external walls.
- 3.42 The first floor frame over the east cell was partly 17th century in date, formed by twin east-west aligned oak spine beams (0.25m square) with stop-chamfered soffits; the chamfers were rather wide and crude but slightly neater in the west cell than in the east (see below) (4/16; see plate 13). In the east cell, original joists survived to the south of the southern beam, extending over the large recess at the south end of the east wall; they were of hardwood, 0.10m wide by 0.14m deep, and were joined to the beam using bare-faced soffit tenons. Elsewhere, the joists appeared to be later replacements; they were generally smaller (0.09m wide by 0.10m deep). Interestingly, the north side of the southern spine beam over both cells retained clear evidence that the joists to the north were later replacements, but there was no such evidence to either side of the northern beams. This raises the possibility that the south spine beams themselves were re-used here in the

17th century, perhaps also with the few larger joists in the east cell, and that the existing north spine beams and other joists were newly cut in the 17th century. Probable 17th century floor boards (0.26m wide) survived over the joists of the east cell, although there were partly obscured at first floor level by much narrower boards, probably 19th century introductions. To the west cell, the earlier boards had been entirely replaced by the later ones.

- 3.43 The interior of the ground floor of the west cell was floored with concrete and the walls were also limewashed at the time of the survey; a concrete trough ran along the base of the south wall (3/7). There were few internal features visible apart from those already described under the external walls (3/8). When the concrete floor was removed during the conversion works, a layer of dry orange sand and stone rubble was revealed. This overlay the remains of a stone sett wall, set c.0.20m below the level of the concrete, together with a line of dressed slabs of uncertain purpose laid along the base of the south wall.
- 3.44 The first floor of both cells could only be accessed through the first floor of Building B1 to the east. It is possible that the first floor was originally a single space, and the shared wall was a later introduction, although limewash obscured the exact relationship at the time of the survey. Both cells were floored with 0.15m wide east-west aligned boards, obscuring much earlier wider boards in at least one place (see above); their floors were set c.0.15m higher than that of Building B1. There were few visible features of interest in either wall apart from those described under the external elevations (4/9, 4/10, 4/12, 4/13 and 4/15). The doorway between the two cells (4/11) was set in the centre of the shared wall, the upper part of which appeared to be a modern rebuild; the roof structure over both cells was entirely modern.

### *Building B3*

- 3.45 Building B3 formed both the western part of the south range and the southern part of the west range. The building was sub-rectangular in plan, with maximum external dimensions of 13.75m in length by 6.20m in width, aligned north-south and of a single storey in height (see plate 14). An aerial photograph taken in c.1980 shows the building to have been of two storeys at that date, with a clay tile roof hipped to the western return at the south end (see plate 1). The major parts of the external elevations were built of coursed squared limestone/sandstone rubble with quoins to all four corners. The building had a single-pitch roof, sloping downwards from east to west (7/10), covered with corrugated sheeting at the time of the survey. At ground floor level, the walls were on average 0.55m thick but there was much local variation, especially at the north end, where they varied between 0.50m and 0.75m in width. Building B3 post-dates Building B2 to the east, but is butted by the wall enclosing the garden on the south side of the farmhouse. The building was taken down and rebuilt after recording as part of the redevelopment works.
- 3.46 The south elevation contained two rectangular windows, one set slightly higher than the other. The main feature in the west elevation (8/7, 8/8 and 8/10) was a set of stone steps, formerly leading to the first floor of the north end of the building and very similar in appearance to those described under Building B1 above. To the south of the steps there was a large sloping brick buttress, and beyond this a blocked doorway with a substantial stone lintel (13/23a), formerly leading into the south end of the building. There may have been two ragged joints in the north elevation of the building, whilst a doorway in the east elevation retained a 19th

century plank and batten stable-type door (3/16), typical of those surviving throughout the farm complex.

- 3.47 The only access into the interior was through a doorway set in the internal angle between this building and Building B2 to the west. The c.1980 aerial photograph suggests that there was once a narrow passage between the two buildings here, which was later roofed over (see plate 1), and that the original entrance was set further back to the south. The interior of the building was floored with concrete throughout at the time of the survey and the roof structure was entirely modern; when the concrete was removed during the conversion works, no features of interest were revealed.
- 3.48 The interior of the building was divided into three cells, which appeared to reflect the original arrangement, although there had been much subsequent alteration (3/10 and 3/11). There were few features of interest visible internally other than those described as part of the external elevations and passing through the walls. The northernmost cell had a few small blocked features visible in the north-east corner (3/17), and was of similar external dimensions to Building C to the north (see below). The east wall incorporated a possible re-used piece of a substantial jowled post, inverted and used as a part of a door frame. The first floor of the northernmost cell was formerly accessed by external steps in the west elevation.

#### **Building C (west range)** (see figure 9)

- 3.49 Building C formed part of the west range, which is shown in 1854 with a plan form similar to that which existed at the time of the survey, although in 1854 it extended slightly beyond the west end of the north range (see figure 4). It is similarly depicted between 1888 and 1916 (see figure 5). The c.1980 aerial photograph indicates that this northern extension was formed by a structure with a corrugated sheet roof, apparently separate from the main part of the west range (see plate 1). This was demolished at some point after c.1980 and little remained at the time of survey.
- 3.50 Building C and an attached structure to the north formed the north part of the west range. The main building (C1) was rectangular in plan, measuring 6.0m long (north-south) by 5.0m wide (east-west) externally, aligned north-south and of two storeys in height (although see below) (see plate 15). The attached structure to the north (C2) measured 3.5m long by 5.0m wide. The major parts of the external elevations were built of coursed squared limestone/sandstone rubble, varying in depth, with quoins to all four corners. The main building had a pitched roof (still stone-slatted in parts but in poor condition at the time of survey) with gable coping rising from moulded kneelers, whilst the attached structure had a pitched corrugated sheet roof. At ground floor level, the walls were on average 0.55m thick. The attached structure appeared to be of one build with the main building but butted the west end of the north range (Building D1).

#### *Building C1*

- 3.51 There was formerly a 1.70m wide centrally positioned ground floor doorway in the east elevation of this structure with a shallow relieving arch over (1/3), but this had subsequently been reduced to about half of its original width. There was a doorway of similar dimensions at the west end of the south elevation, whilst in the west elevation, a modern window towards the north end had been created by blocking a former doorway (8/2, 8/4 to 8/6). Finally, there was a centrally positioned blocked doorway in the north elevation. Above, approximately three-

quarters up each elevation, there was a continuous ledge projecting c.0.10m from the wall face. On the east elevation, the ledge passed beneath a small centrally positioned window, possibly a later insertion (see plate 15). However, on the south elevation, there was a tall blocked opening beneath the ledge, centrally positioned and possibly a former window, although it was tall enough to have been a doorway (1/5 and 8/11; see plate 16). Above the ledge, there was a much lower and slightly narrower blocked opening, set above its taller counterpart below. On the west elevation, the ledge respected the sill of a window offset to the north, but on the north elevation it appeared to have risen over a half-hipped roof of the building (C2) immediately to the north (8/12). There was however no indication that the attached structure had ever risen above its existing height, nor that a taller building had been demolished; perhaps the structure with the half-hipped roof was planned but never built.

- 3.52 The principal access to the interior of the main building was through the doorway in the east elevation. The ground floor was floored with concrete at the time of the survey, although brick paving could be seen in a few places where the concrete had decayed. There were few additional features visible in the limewashed walls that could not be seen externally (4/17 and 4/18). The first floor was in a poor structural condition at the time of survey and was therefore not fully accessible, although a ladder allowed some inspection of the upper parts of the interior. The first floor frame was formed by east-west aligned softwood joists supporting 0.17m wide boards of modern appearance; a trimmer indicates that a flight of steep wooden steps once rose to the first floor from the north-west corner of the ground floor. Above, all first floor walls (except immediately beneath the windows) had a “striped” appearance rising to c.2m above floor level. The “stripes” were created by closely spaced vertical lines of limewash or render set over a reddish wall plaster; the gaps in between the render stripes were presumably caused by former fittings having been removed (5/2, 5/4 and 13/24a). Joist holes in the north wall suggested that an attic may once have been present. The first floor was crossed by a single re-used tie-beam (5/1), set to the south of centre; the majority of the roof structure above appeared to be modern softwood with corrugated sheeting.

### *Building C2*

- 3.53 The attached northern structure was clearly of one build with the main building, the coursing being continuous to the west elevation. The north elevation clearly butts the west end of Building D1 but thickens noticeably at its east end, with a possible blocked opening immediately to the west. The interior of the structure was accessed through a gateway at one end of the modern east wall. It was floored with concrete and had a modern trough running along the base of the west wall (5/5). The roof was unequally pitched and entirely modern.

### **Building D (north range)** (see figure 10)

- 3.54 Building D forms part of the north range, which is shown in 1854 with a plan form similar to that now existing (see figure 4). With minor alterations (see below), it is similarly depicted until 1916 (see figure 5). A covered yard was created on the south side of the north range between 1854 and 1888. This was demolished immediately prior to the current survey but was six bays in length, the corrugated sheeting roof supported on slender softwood king-post trusses. The south end of each truss rested upon a whole section timber post with short struts to the wall plate; the foot of each post was set in a concrete base. Whilst the trusses might have been taken from the original late 19th century structure, it had clearly been rebuilt during the 20th century and was of little architectural interest.

- 3.55 For the purposes of description, the north range has been broken down into three separate elements.

*Building D1*

- 3.56 Building D1 formed the west part of the north range. The main building was sub-rectangular in plan (a slight parallelogram), measuring 16.0m long (east-west) by 5.6m wide (north-south) externally, aligned east-west and of a single storey (although see below) (see plate 17). The major parts of the external elevations were built of coursed squared limestone/sandstone rubble, varying in depth, with small quoins to all four corners (a single moulded kneeler survives to the north-east corner). The building had a pitched roof covered with corrugated iron sheeting at the time of the survey, although the c.1980 aerial photograph appears to show a Welsh slate roof (see plate 1). At ground floor level, the walls were on average 0.50m thick. Building D1 predates both Building D2 to the east and Building C to the south, and it was taken down and rebuilt after recording as part of the redevelopment works.
- 3.57 The building had been subject to a great deal of alteration during its lifetime, and this is particularly evident in the external elevations. The following description of the south elevation (**1/6** and **8/16**) should be read in conjunction with the sketch elevation (see figure 12). Starting at the west end, the west gable of the building clearly comprised two skins of masonry; in all elevations, the outer skin could be seen to either butt the earlier gable or for there to be a ragged joint between the two. When the outer skin was dismantled as part of the conversion works, it was found to contain many pieces of re-used stone bearing strong diagonal tooling marks, as well as a piece of similarly dressed semi-circular wall coping (**14/23a** and **14/24a**).
- 3.58 In the south elevation, a short distance to the east of the ragged joint between the two wall skins, there was another ragged joint, beyond which a narrow blocked opening was visible. There was then a blocked 1.40m wide doorway with a shallow wooden lintel, above which was one of a pair of blocked windows flanking an off-centre doorway (**1/7**). The doorway had a narrow brick blocking with a concrete lintel to the west. Towards the east end of the elevation, there was a relatively straight joint rising through its full height (**1/8**).
- 3.59 The former east gable of the building was concealed within Building D2 at the time of the survey, but it appeared to contain no features. The very east end of the north elevation (**7/17** and **7/18**) was partly obscured by a later stone buttress, but the entire elevation could be seen to rise from an intermittently visible rubble plinth projecting some 0.10m from the wall face above. There were several small blocked openings between the buttress and the off-centre doorway to the west. Again, the doorway had blockings to either side, indicating that it was once wider. A c.1m deep test pit dug adjacent to the east side of the doorway revealed rubble footings, flush with the plinth, apparently continuing below the base of the pit, together with what may have been a north-south aligned wall visible at the base of the east-facing section. To the west of the doorway, there was a straight joint passing through the wall thickness, with several small openings to the west, together with a further buttress at the building's north-west corner. The rubble plinth continued around the north-west corner and then along the west gable. As stated above, the west gable consisted of two skins of masonry; it was the 0.50m outer skin which rose from the plinth, but which was built over the earlier inner skin which formed the building's gable.

- 3.60 The main access to the interior of the building was through the opposed off-centre doorways in the north and south walls. The south door opened into a narrow passage framed by two low modern walls; the building was floored throughout with concrete at the time of the survey. When these modern walls were demolished and the concrete floor removed during the conversion works, the west wall was revealed to run parallel to two large dressed slabs of uncertain function. No other features of interest were observed, although the rubble beneath the concrete contained many hand-moulded frogged brick fragments stamped "Maltby Metallic Brick". At least eight chamfered stones, each 0.48m square, were also recovered. They resembled large gate-pier caps in form, but might possibly have once been used as stylobates.
- 3.61 The interior of the building was divided into three bays of approximately equal size (about 5m in length) by a pair of oak roof trusses (5/6 and 5/7) (see plate 18). Each truss was of tie-beam and principal rafter form, and pegged throughout (see figure 11). The south end of each deep and slightly cambered tie-beam was buried within the top of the south wall of the building, but the north end was lapped over a 0.14m square wall plate using a neat lap-dovetail joint exposed during the conversion works. The wall plate was divided into three sections by stop-splayed scarf joints positioned to the east of, and to the west of, the east and west trusses respectively. However, the wall plate bore no evidence for re-use, for example, having been turned. The south principal of each truss was relatively straight but slightly diminished towards the apex (19/12). By contrast, the north principals were rather sinuous and both cut from the same timber; the principals were lapped at the apex, with a ridge purlin. Each principal supported a single trenched purlin; the purlins were scarfed across the principals using stop-splayed joints with vertical butts. In addition, in the central bay only and on the south side of the roof only, straight wind-braces rose from the principals to the purlin (5/13). As with the wall plate, there was no evidence that any of the original timbers within the trusses were re-used. The north principal of each truss had been supported at a later date by two short trusses rising from the tie-beam and secured to the principal using hand-made wrought-iron nails (5/8, 5/10 to 5/12; see plate 18). A number of additional timbers had also been secured to the upper part of the east truss, but these appeared to be a mid 20th century repair and are of no historic interest.
- 3.62 The upper or fair face of each truss faced away from the central bay. The south and north ends of the east truss were numbered "I" and "II" respectively (19/10 and 19/11), both to the tie-beam and principal, whilst the west truss was similarly numbered "III" to the south end; it is assumed that the "III" at the north end had decayed away. When the west gable of the building was dismantled during the conversion works, the westernmost common rafters were seen to be pegged over the purlins.
- 3.63 The interior contained few features that could not be viewed externally. The main features of interest were two posts, apparently buried in the inside of the south wall. Neither post appeared to be related in any way to the existing trusses. The western post (5/14) was visible between 1.68m and 2.88m above the internal floor level. It was 0.24m wide, with a slightly jowled head and a long mortice for a brace to a tie-beam. The eastern post (5/16) was visible between 1.15m and 2.65m above the internal floor level. It was 0.20m wide, again with a slightly jowled head but with no sign of a mortice for a brace, although this may have been obscured by render. When the west gable of the building was dismantled during the conversion works, a further timber was revealed, set into the thickness of the west end of the north wall (15/3a). Further dismantling caused the timber to become loose. It was 1.34m in length, with a slightly curvilinear shape and a flattened "head" 0.28m long

(15/5a and 15/6a). The upper side of the “head” had a shallow ridge running along its length. This appeared to have been used to fit the timber into the soffit of the wall plate, so that it functioned as a brace, but unfortunately the soffit here was very decayed, and so it was not possible to establish the form of any joint between the two. In form, the timber resembles a small piece of a re-used jointed cruck truss, but it was probably too small to have come from such a structure.

### *Building D2*

- 3.64 Building D2 formed the central part of the north range. It was sub-rectangular in plan, measuring 8.5m long (east-west) by 5.6m wide (north-south) externally, aligned east-west and of a single storey (see plate 17). The major parts of the external elevations were built of coursed squared limestone/sandstone rubble to c.2.2m above ground level, but had been raised in machine-made brick at a later date. The building had a pitched roof covered with corrugated iron sheeting at the time of the survey, and at ground floor level, the walls were on average 0.45m thick. Building D2 post-dated both Building D1 to the west and Building D3 to the east, forming an infill between the two. It was demolished after recording as part of the redevelopment works.
- 3.65 The east and west ends of the structure are formed by the gables of the earlier buildings to either side, and are therefore discussed under these buildings (D1 and D3 respectively). The very west end of the north elevation (7/17 and 7/18) was partly obscured by a later stone buttress. To the east, in the approximate centre of the elevation, there appeared to be a straight joint at a low level, with the stonework to the west butting that to the east. Towards the east end of the elevation, there was a small blocked window within the stonework, possibly with a staggered joint below. Above, there were three small vents in the upper brickwork part of the elevation. The south elevation (1/9) had a blocked doorway at the west end, and an open doorway at the east end; between, within the stonework, there was a two-light wooden framed hopper-headed window. The brickwork above contained a single vent.
- 3.66 The only access into the interior of the building was through the doorway at the east end of the south elevation. The interior was floored with concrete at the time of the survey, with a slight well at the south-east corner, and a low modern north-south aligned wall to the west of centre (5/17 and 5/18). The main feature of interest in the interior was the single central roof truss. The majority of the truss was of modern softwood construction, but it re-used a much older tie-beam (6/1). The tie-beam had been re-used from a fully timber-framed building, with long mortices to either end of the soffit to take braces from posts. Given the length of the tie-beam, it is possible that it may once have been associated with one of the posts described under Building D1 above.

### *Building D3*

- 3.67 Building D3, a large barn, formed the east part of the north range. The barn was rectangular in plan, measuring 16.40m long (east-west) by 6.95m wide (north-south) externally, aligned east-west and of two storeys (see plates 19 and 20). A smaller single-storey structure was formerly attached to the north end of the east gable but this was demolished in advance of the survey (7/14). The major parts of the external elevations were built of coursed squared limestone/sandstone rubble, varying in depth, with quoins to all four corners. The barn had a pitched roof covered with corrugated iron sheeting at the time of the survey. At ground floor level, the east gable and south wall were on average 0.60m thick, the west gable



and north walls being slightly narrower. Building D3 predated Building D2 to the west.

- 3.68 There was an inserted ground floor doorway at the north end of the east gable (7/14), fitted with a mid 17th century panelled door, almost certainly removed from the farmhouse (Building A). The north-east corner of the barn had been rebuilt at ground floor level when the smaller structure was attached to the east gable. There were several blocked ground-floor splayed slit ventilators to the south. Above, there were a further three levels of ventilators, originally symmetrically arranged, although some were subsequently blocked.
- 3.69 The north elevation (7/16; see plate 20) had a centrally placed ground floor doorway, fitted with a board and batten stable door hung on very long spearhead strap hinges; the door was certainly 19th century in date and may be as early as the later 18th century (6/6). To the east of the doorway, there appeared to be a small blocked window, then a blocked splayed slit ventilator and then a blocked doorway, partly obscured by two modern stub walls which formerly supported an oil/diesel storage tank; a small square structure is shown here in 1916. To the west, there were three splayed slit ventilators. Above, on the first floor, there were two further levels of similar ventilators. These were originally symmetrically arranged but had been disturbed to the west end by an inserted first floor loading doorway.
- 3.70 The west gable of the barn was largely concealed by Building D2, but it appeared to have once had at least four levels of symmetrically arranged ventilators. The majority of the ventilators were of splayed slit form, but at least two on one of the upper levels were triangular. Like the north elevation, the south elevation was also once of largely symmetrical appearance but was partly obscured by Building E (1/14) (see below). The central ground floor doorway was also fitted with a stable door, but this was much more modern than that in the north elevation. To the west of the doorway, there were two pairs of triangular ventilators (6/15), and a doorway at the south-west corner, probably inserted after Building E had been built; during conversion works, a new ground floor window was inserted between the two triangular ventilators (12/12a to 12/17a). To the east, there were two further slit ventilators, one splayed and the other straight-sided. Above, to either side of the doorway, there was another level of splayed ventilators and then small square windows.
- 3.71 The principal access to the interior of the barn was through the opposed central doorways in the north and south elevations. These led to the former threshing floor, which was paved with smooth well-cut sandstone flags at the time of the survey (6/7; see plate 21). There was a dirt floor on either side of the threshing floor, with some concrete towards the east end. The west end of the ground floor was largely open, with a single east-west rank of softwood posts supporting the first floor above (6/3 and 6/4). The east end was sub-divided into two parts by a stone T-plan cross-wall; this was removed during the conversion works, exposing the main internal walls and revealing it to be a later insertion. At the south end of the cross wall, a small cell had been created for the secure storage of farm chemicals. Against the north wall, two low breeze-block walls formerly supported a piece of machinery which fed through an opening in the first floor above. There was a slight step down into the area on the east side of the cross-wall, which was crossed by a north-south aligned lineshaft, secured in wall bearing boxes at either end and by hanging brackets in the centre (6/9; see plate 22). There were five spoked pulleys for flat-belt drives mounted on the lineshaft (6/10). Four of these originally drove machinery positioned to the west of the lineshaft, whilst the belt

from the northernmost passed through a wood-lined opening in the wall to a small steam engine positioned in the attached structure; this structure was built before 1854. The steam engine was later replaced by an oil engine, but it remained in use until after the Second World War (Clive Davenport, *pers. comm.*).

- 3.72 The first floor was accessed via a set of steeply inclined wooden steps positioned at the north end of the threshing bay. The two parts of the wooden plank first floor were originally separate, but at the time of the survey they were linked by an inclined ramp with a handrail at the south end. The east side of the first floor, where the planks were aligned north-south, bore some evidence of alteration, with a number of blocked openings or patched areas most probably relating to former machinery positioned beneath on the ground floor (6/11). The west side of the first floor, where the planks were aligned north-south, was largely featureless, with the exception of a raised storage area attached to a roof truss at the very west end (6/12). Blocked openings positioned above the opposed ground floor doorways in the north and south walls suggest that substantial beams once ran across the barn on either side of the threshing bay. The first floor was crossed by six 19th century softwood king-post trusses (6/13). Each principal supported four staggered purlins, wedged to the downslope side. However, set at a slightly lower level, there were three further beams crossing the first floor, and it may be that these were the remaining tie-beams of the original roof trusses.

#### **Building E (east side of north range)** (see figure 10)

- 3.73 Building E is not shown in 1854 but it does appear in 1888, along with the covered yard on the south side of the north range. A small internal structure in the south-west corner of Building E is shown in 1901 and 1916 (see figure 5) but between these dates the south-east corner of the main building appears to have been altered.
- 3.74 Building E is located on the south side of the barn (Building D3) at the east end of the north range, and clearly post-dates the latter building (see plate 19). It was a parallelogram in plan, measuring 11.0m long (north-south) by 7.0m wide (east-west) externally, aligned north-south and of a single storey. The major parts of the external elevations were built of coursed squared limestone/sandstone rubble. The building had a pitched roof covered with corrugated iron sheeting at the time of the survey, and at ground floor level the walls were on average 0.5m thick.
- 3.75 The building was open-sided to the east (1/12 and 6/17), with two slender cast-iron columns supporting the base of the roof slope. The north column rested on a concrete base, but the south column retained its chamfered padstone. The south gable had a staggered joint at the east end, whilst the south-west corner had been thickened/strengthened using concrete (1/11); a small window with the remnants of a cast-iron frame was positioned towards the top of the gable. The west elevation was largely featureless, with the exception of a blocked two-light window at the south end (7/13). The window was set so low down that the base was obscured by the raised external concrete yard surface. It had monolithic jambs and lintels, rebated to the west face to take external shutters, and is probably 18th century in date. The window was presumably used to light a small cell inserted into the south-west corner of the interior of the building, although its presence remains a puzzling feature.
- 3.76 The main internal feature of interest was this small inserted cell in the south-west corner of the building, apparently created by adding two walls (6/16). Like the main walls, they were built of coursed square rubble but with edge laid quoins to the

south-east corner; the form of the upper part of the latter suggested that the inserted cell was somewhat truncated and it may once have projected above the building's gable. This, together with the 18th century window described above, may indicate that it is a fragment of an older structure incorporated into the main building, rather than post-dating it as the structural evidence would suggest. A doorway at the south end of the east wall gave access into the interior of the cell. Several recesses cut into the south gable, together with blocked joists holes in the north wall, showed that the cell was once provided with an upper floor. The two roof trusses crossing the main part of the building were both of softwood king-strut form, dating to the 20th century.

## 4 DESCRIPTION OF OTHER STRUCTURES AND EARTHWORKS

### Other Structures

- 4.1 In addition to the main parts of the complex described above, there were a number of other surviving structures and architectural fragments scattered around the site, as well as a small number of buildings shown on 19th century maps which had been demolished by the time of the survey (see figure 3).

#### *Privy*

- 4.2 A small privy was located in the south-east corner of the garden to the rear (south) of the farmhouse (Building A); map evidence indicates that it was built between 1854 and 1888. It was very overgrown with ivy, but appeared to be square in plan with a pantiled pyramidal roof (see plate 23). The interior was choked with vegetation at the time of the survey; however, it retained a single wooden bench seat in the south-east corner placed over an earth closet (9/3, 18/15, 18/16, 18/19 and 18/20; see plate 24). The privy is not shown on the 1854 Ordnance Survey map, but it is on the 1888 edition; it is not shown on the 1916 edition (see figures 4 and 5).

#### *Garage and outbuilding*

- 4.3 A modern stone garage with a single-pitch corrugated sheet roof stood to the east of the farmhouse (Building A) (9/4). The garage was attached to the north end of a small single-storey two cell outbuilding, which itself appeared to have developed in a number of phases; the party wall between the two was formed by a quite substantial gable, suggesting that the building once extended further to the south. A small square structure is shown here in 1888, which had been extended to the south by 1901 to form the two cell building; the garage to the north was added after 1916 (see figure 5).

#### *Modern farm buildings*

- 4.4 There were three large modern farm buildings located in the area to the north of the north range (Building D) (8/1). The central and eastern buildings were very recent; the western, a six bay Dutch barn supported on timber posts set in concrete pads and with short angled struts to the wall plate, was built according to post-Second World War recommendations (Committee on Farm Buildings 1945, 149-155). A Dutch barn is shown in this position in 1916 (see figure 5) but it is considered unlikely that the existing structure is of this date, and it probably represents a post-1945 rebuilding.

#### *Demolished buildings*

- 4.5 In 1854, two small rectangular structures are shown attached to the north wall of the track leading into the farm complex from Peak Lane (see figure 4). Only one survived in 1888 and this had gone by 1901.
- 4.6 Between 1888 and 1901, a large rectangular structure, open-sided to the east, was built to the south-east of farmhouse (Building A), in the narrow strip of land between the farmhouse garden and the paddock. It was extended to the south between 1901 and 1916 (see figure 5), and is still shown on the c.1980s aerial photograph (see plate 1). It had been demolished by the time of the survey. The c.1980s aerial photograph also shows two small temporary structures attached to

either side of the east wall of the paddock, but these too had been removed by the time of the present survey.

### **Architectural Fragments**

- 4.7 A number of architectural fragments were identified around the site, the majority concentrated around or incorporated into a pergola located at the north-east corner of the garden to the rear (south) of the farmhouse (Building A) (see figure 3).
- 4.8 The south-east column of the pergola, which stands 2.1m in height in total, had been put together from a number of different pieces (8/18). The base may be formed from a very worn piece of mullioned window frame, upon which was set part of a composite column comprising several circular worked stones. These reduced in diameter from 0.48m at the base to 0.27m at the top; the whole was reminiscent of the similar columns sometimes seen supporting the open sides of 18th/19th century cartsheds. The whole structure was surmounted by a 0.59m high staddle stone taken from a free-standing granary. It was impossible to tell if any of these pieces were from the farm complex or if they were imported from elsewhere. However, the rear of the pergola was supported by three pieces of worn finial, with two further pieces lying on the floor (9/1), and these have almost certainly come from the farmhouse (Building A); they are very similar to the finials mounted on the gable apexes of 16th and 17th century houses in West Yorkshire (e.g. Dennison & Richardson 2001).
- 4.9 Away from the pergola, there were a few further scattered items. The modern garage to the north-east of the farmhouse (Building A) had a 0.30m diameter column section, similar to those noted above in the pergola, set into the apex of the gable. Part of the coping of the low wall on the north side of the farmhouse was also formed by a 0.46m long moulded stone, possibly part of an early 18th century window surround (9/6).

### **Boundary Walls, Earthworks and Gardens**

#### *The farmhouse garden*

- 4.10 In 1854, the farmhouse garden is shown as a walled enclosure with an undivided interior (see figure 4). In the centre of the enclosure, there are two opposed semi-circular beds, surrounded by a circular area of lawn, probably with further beds outside of this and a pathway around the edge of the garden area. By 1888, this arrangement had been replaced by three rectangular sub-divisions, linked by a path. A privy had been built in the south-east corner of the garden (see above), whilst a small square structure is shown in the centre of the north side. The latter also appears in 1901 but the sub-divisions in the garden are not shown; neither are visible in 1916 (see figure 5).
- 4.11 The garden to the rear (south) of the farmhouse is sub-rectangular in plan, measuring c.43m long (east-west) by c.25m wide (north-south) (see figure 3). At the time of the survey, the western half of the garden had most recently been used to cultivate vegetables (2/4), whilst the eastern half was largely grassed (8/17) (see also plate 1). The whole area was enclosed on three sides by a 1.0m wide coursed squared stone wall with flat capping. The wall stood c.1.2m high on the south and east sides of the garden but rose to over 2.0m on the west side. The southern end of the west side stood on a very spread bank, up to 0.4m high, which then appeared to curve around to the east. Here, there was a very slight rectangular depression, c.10m long by 6m wide, aligned east-west in the corner of

the garden, possibly a former building platform. To the east, there was a low east-facing north-south aligned bank which bisects the garden area, which represents the continuation of the partially extant hedge line. As already noted, the privy in the south-east corner of the garden still survives (**18/15**, **18/16**, **18/19** and **18/20**).

#### *The paddock*

- 4.12 In 1854, the paddock to the east of the farm complex, on the south side of the access track, is shown with its existing plan form and containing a number of trees (see figure 4). At this date, the narrow strip of land between the paddock and the farmhouse garden was open at the south end, apparently continuous with the large field to the south-east. The south end had been closed off by 1888, and it is similarly depicted in 1901 and 1916. As noted above, the c.1980s aerial photograph shows that there were some modern sheds in this area (see plate 1). Both the 1888 and 1916 Ordnance Survey maps depict regularly placed trees in the paddock itself, suggesting it was planted as an orchard (see figure 5).
- 4.13 The paddock (**9/5**) to the east of the farmhouse is sub-rectangular in plan, measuring a maximum of 75m wide (east-west) by 90m long (north-south); at the time of the survey it was ungrazed pasture (see figure 3). The paddock is enclosed by coursed squared stone walls on all four sides, varying in form and dimensions.
- 4.14 On the north, west and south sides, the wall is built of squared stone, coursed to varying degrees and with triangular coping, standing to an average of 1.0m in height. There is a narrow blocked gateway in the west wall to the north of the modern garage; a small structure is shown here in 1888 and 1901, but it had been partly demolished by 1916. Adjacent to the garage, the only existing gateway into the paddock retains a single semi-circular headed stone gate stoop. At c.2m in height, the wall on the east side of the paddock is somewhat taller, especially where it faces onto Peak Lane. A c.25m long section of this wall running south from the gateway leading to the site had large coursed sub-square stones at the base, set on a crude stepped plinth (**9/8**). The plinth and squared stones both end at a slight change in angle in the wall's alignment, and this might represent either an earlier wall fragment or possibly a building formerly situated here. Adjacent to this section of wall, the gateway leading to the track giving access to the site is flanked by 1.45m high stone stoops with triangular heads (**9/7**); a 0.81m diameter millstone is set into the wall to the north. The wall on the north side of the track (**8/13**) leading to the site has a number of larger stones at the base, but it was not possible to ascertain if these are re-used pieces; they may relate to the structures shown here in 1854.
- 4.15 A number of earthworks were identified within the paddock (see figure 3), but it is likely that a winter inspection, when the vegetation would be much lower, would reveal further features. The main earthwork within the paddock is a spread bank which runs around the south and east sides. To the south, the bank is set back slightly from the boundary wall, and is c.2.50m wide by 0.50m high with a flattened top; it appears to start outside the paddock, in the narrow grassed area between the garden and the paddock itself. Within the paddock, the bank runs north-east and parallel to the southern wall, and then begins to curve around slightly to the north. At this point, there is a c.5m wide gap before the bank resumes, running parallel to the paddock's east wall; it is again of similar dimensions but fades out towards the northern end. There is a shallow linear depression, approximately 12m wide, running parallel to the eastern section of the bank within the paddock. This appears to begin to curve around at its southern end but then fades out. To

the west of the depression, the ground rises evenly towards the area in which the farm is located. There may be several slightly flattened or stepped areas within this general slope on the southern side of the paddock, possibly former platforms, but the vegetation cover was such at the time of the inspection that no clear idea of their form could be gained.

## 5 RESULTS OF THE WATCHING BRIEF

- 5.1 As noted in Chapter 1 above, a total of 13 trenches were excavated across and around the site between September 2006 and September 2007. A total of 44 archaeological contexts were recorded, and these are described in the following text as three digit numbers (e.g. 002) (see also Appendix 5 in Volume 2). The results of the watching brief are described trench by trench; the trench positions are marked on figure 13 and some of the trench sections are illustrated on figure 14.

### Trench 1

- 5.2 Trench 1 was located along the former line of the north wall of Building D2, an infill structure of late 18th to mid 19th century date, subsequently much altered and then demolished as part of the redevelopment works; the trench extended west beneath the east end of Building D1, which was taken down and rebuilt as part of the works (see plate 25). The trench was aligned east-west, a maximum of 15.0m long, 0.90m wide and was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.80m below ground level (BGL) (129.94m AOD).
- 5.3 Beneath a 0.10m deep layer of recent demolition material (001), a firm orange clayey sand was exposed (002), clean with infrequent stone inclusions, and which continued to 0.65m BGL. This overlay the fractured surface of natural sandstone bedrock (003), which continued below the base of the trench. Intermittently in both the north and south sections of the trench, between 0.60m and 0.80m BGL, an unmortared thinly coursed sandstone rubble (004), at least 0.20m thick, was set directly onto the fractured bedrock, which were assumed to be the remains of the footings of Buildings D1 and D2. Towards the western end of the trench, a 2.10m long and 0.90m wide cut (005), aligned north-west/south-east, was visible. This cut had vertical sides and was sealed by demolition material (001); it is believed to be the remains of a sheep dip (Clive Davenport, *pers. comm.*). It was backfilled with compacted stone rubble, lime mortar and pantile fragments (006).

### Trench 2

- 5.4 Trench 2 was located along the former line of the south wall of Building D2, an infill structure of late 18th to mid 19th century date, subsequently much altered and then demolished as part of the redevelopment works; the trench extended west beneath the east end of Building D1, which was taken down and rebuilt as part of the works. The trench was aligned east-west, a maximum of 15.0m long, 0.90m wide and was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.70m below ground level (BGL) (129.94m AOD).
- 5.5 Beneath a 0.40m deep band of demolition material (001), a firm orange clayey sand was exposed (007), clean but with infrequent stone inclusions, which continued to 0.60m BGL. This overlay the fractured surface of natural sandstone bedrock (008), which continued below the base of the trench.

### Trench 3

- 5.6 Trench 3 was located in the south-west corner of the farm yard, and was excavated partly as a soakaway pit and partly to establish the nature of the ground make-up in this area. The trench was almost square, measuring 1.40m north-south by 1.30m east-west, and it was intended to be excavated to a maximum depth of 1.40m BGL (129.92m AOD). However, beneath a 0.40m deep layer of



orange clayey sand (009), which contained frequent inclusions of sandstone rubble, the fractured surface of the sandstone bedrock (010) was encountered and so excavation was suspended. Towards the west side of the trench, the surface of the natural bedrock was only 0.15m below the yard surface.

#### **Trench 4**

- 5.7 Trench 4 was located in the north-west corner of the farm yard, and was excavated partly as a soakaway pit and partly to establish the nature of the ground make-up in this area. The trench was almost square, measuring 1.40m north-south by 1.30m east-west, and it was intended to be excavated to a maximum depth of 1.40m BGL (129.92m AOD). However, beneath a 0.40m deep layer of orange clayey sand (009), which contained frequent inclusions of sandstone rubble, the fractured surface of the sandstone bedrock (011) was encountered and so excavation was suspended.

#### **Trench 5 (see figure 14)**

- 5.8 Trench 5 was located to the west of the north end of Building B3, in the pasture field immediately to the west of the farm complex, and was excavated to establish the nature of the ground make-up in this area. The trench was aligned east-west, measured 2.20m long by 1.50m wide, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.25m below ground level (BGL) (130.50m AOD) (see plate 26).
- 5.9 Beneath a 0.20m deep layer of turf and dark brown sandy silt topsoil (012), a layer of compact dark orange clayey silt (013), up to 0.4m thick, was exposed. This overlay a compact orange silt sand (014), which in turn overlay a similar deposit (015) with very frequent inclusions of hard packed sandstone rubble. The latter may have formed the lowest fill of a north-south aligned cut (017). Only the north side of the cut was clearly visible; it dropped vertically for 0.30m and then sloped unevenly and very steeply downwards from west to east beyond the base of the trench. The cut was cut into and filled by a deposit of very hard packed sandstone rubble (016), probably the fractured surface of natural bedrock.

#### **Trench 6 (see figure 14)**

- 5.10 Trench 6 was located along the former footings of Building B3, a heavily altered structure of probable mid to late 18th century date, demolished as part of the redevelopment works and rebuilt according to its appearance prior to the most recent phase of alterations. The trench was rectangular in plan, the western arm measuring a maximum of 13.20m north-south, while the north and south arms were shorter at a maximum of 6.0m in length. All parts were 0.60m wide, and the trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.50m BGL (130.40m AOD) at its southern end, decreasing to 1.15m BGL (130.50m AOD) at its northern end.
- 5.11 The uppermost deposit uncovered was the remains of the 0.30m deep squared sandstone footings (018) for the boundary wall which formerly ran along the alignment of the trench's western arm. The footings overlay a dark brown clayey silt (019) which had a maximum depth of 0.80m BGL. In the southern arm of the trench, the clayey silt (019) was seen to overlay a number of features. A similar deposit of firm dark brown clayey silt (020), but containing a higher frequency of inclusions of small stones, may have formed the remains of a shallow bank. This feature was bounded to the east by a concentration of thinly coursed stone rubble (021), possibly the remains of a north-south aligned wall footing, and to the west by a more definite wall footing (022). This appeared to be aligned north-west/south-

east, and so was not a remnant of either the footings of the boundary wall or those associated with Building B3. The wall footing (022) comprised unmortared hard packed stone rubble, some of which had been roughly squared. All three features described above had either been cut into or disturbed a deposit of green/brown silty sand (023) with frequent inclusions of thin sandstone slabs up to 1.0m across; this was most probably the fractured surface of natural sandstone bedrock.

### **Trench 7**

- 5.12 Trench 7 was located in the north-west corner of the former garden belonging to the farmhouse (Building A), and was excavated to establish the nature of the ground make-up in this area. The trench was aligned east-west, measured 2.50m in length and 1.20m in width, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.30m BGL (130.20m AOD). Beneath the 0.34m deep layer of turf and black silt topsoil (024), a deposit of dark brown clayey silt (025), 0.17m thick, was seen. This in turn overlay a green/brown silty sand (026) containing frequent inclusions of thin sandstone slabs up to 1.0m across, similar to that seen in Trench 6 above (019/023). The surface of the natural sandstone bedrock (027) was encountered at 0.73m BGL (130.77m AOD).

### **Trench 8**

- 5.13 Trench 8 was located in the centre of the north side of the former garden belonging to the farmhouse (Building A), and was excavated to establish the nature of the ground make-up in this area. The trench was aligned east-west, measured 2.50m in length and 1.20m in width, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.30m BGL (129.73m AOD). Beneath the 0.34m deep layer of turf and black silt topsoil (024), a shallow band of weathered angular stone rubble (028) 0.16m thick was observed, possibly the remains of a footpath. This overlay a deposit of orange brown sand (029); the surface of the natural bedrock (030) was encountered at 1.10m BGL (129.93m AOD).

### **Trench 9 (see figure 14)**

- 5.14 Trench 9 was located on the north side of the paddock to the east of the farm complex, within an area of grass. The trench was aligned east-west, measured 10.00m in length by 2.40m in width, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.40m (127.30m AOD). It was dug to form a temporary dump for site refuse before this was removed permanently from site.
- 5.15 The uppermost layer visible within the trench was a loose black silt topsoil (031), which averaged 0.34m in depth. This overlay a band of red brown silty clay (032), up to 0.40m thick. In several places, the upper surface of the silty clay contained spreads of small pieces of angular sandstone rubble, possibly the remains of a former surface. At its west end, the silty clay (032) incorporated a band of black ashy silt towards its base, which became less distinct as a separate deposit as it moved east, eventually merging with a reddish brown clean clay (036) (see below). The silty clay (032) overlay a 0.28m thick deposit of reddish brown clean clay (033), visible only towards the western part of the trench. This in turn had been deposited over the fractured surface (034) of the natural sandstone bedrock. This surface rose slightly towards the centre of the trench, reflecting the underlying natural bedrock, and overlay a reddish brown clean clay (036), visible only in the eastern part of the trench. This clay eventually merged with the silty clay (032) above. The natural sandstone bedrock (035) was encountered at between 0.85m and 1.20m BGL.

### **Trench 10 (see figure 14)**

- 5.16 Trench 10 was located on the west side of the paddock to the east of the farm complex, within an area of grass. The trench was aligned east-west, measured 8.50m in length by 2.40m in width, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.74m (127.21m AOD). It was dug to form a temporary dump for site refuse before this was removed permanently from site.
- 5.17 The uppermost layer visible within the trench was a black silt topsoil (031), which averaged 0.25m in depth. The topsoil overlay a band of orange-brown sand (037) which contained frequent inclusions of angular sandstone rubble. The sand was at least 1.74m thick, increasing in depth from west to east, and extending below the base of the central and eastern parts of the trench. As it increased in depth, it incorporated a band of small stones in a greater concentration than seen elsewhere in the deposit, where the angular rubble was more common. At the western end of the trench, the sand could be seen to overlie a deposit of very hard packed angular stone rubble (038), possibly the fractured surface of natural sandstone bedrock. The surface of the rubble sloped downwards from west to east.

### **Trench 11**

- 5.18 Trench 11 was located along the north side of the access track from Peak Lane. The trench was aligned east-west, measured 70.0m in length by 0.60m in width, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.70m (between 125.50m to 128.30m AOD across the length of the trench). It was dug to bring services into the farm complex from Peak Lane. The excavation of the eastern 27m was subject to monitoring, with the rest being inspected after excavation.
- 5.19 The loose black silt topsoil (039) was c.0.7m deep and continued below the base of the trench at its eastern end. Between 3.70m and 4m to the west of the trench's east end, a hard packed but poorly defined spread of stone rubble appeared to mark the point where the topsoil began to contain a greater proportion of an orange sand. This continued until 8.30m from the trench's east end, where the silt topsoil gradually resumed, only to fade back again to the orange sand. At 25.50m from the trench's east end, the fractured surface of sandstone bedrock (044) appeared in the base of the trench (at c.126m AOD). The remainder of the trench was formed by the orange sand overlying the natural bedrock surface (044); this sloped gradually upwards from east to west, and was followed by the general slope of the track.

### **Trench 12**

- 5.20 Trench 12 was located in the western side of the farm yard. The trench was aligned north-east/south-west, measured 15.0m in length and 1.50m in width, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.10m (129.95m AOD). Following the removal of a shallow layer of orange clayey sand (040), 0.30m thick with frequent inclusions of sandstone rubble (the equivalent of deposit 009 seen in Trenches 3 and 4), the fractured surface of natural sandstone bedrock (041) was encountered at only 0.30m BGL. However, towards the western end of the trench, the clayey sand (040) become more soil-like in appearance, and increased slightly in depth.

### **Trench 13**

- 5.21 Trench 13 was excavated along the former line of the east and west walls of the structure formerly standing between Buildings C and D1, which was demolished as part of the conversion works (see plate 27). The west arm of the trench measured a maximum of 8.0m in length (north-south), returning 6.50m to the east at its north end; the east arm was parallel but somewhat shorter. Both arms were 1.10m wide and were excavated to a maximum depth of 0.70m BGL (130.85m AOD). Beneath a shallow layer of orange sand (042), the fractured surface of the natural sandstone bedrock (043) was encountered at an average of 0.50m BGL.

## 6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The archaeological and architectural recording undertaken at Manor Farm has raised a number of questions which merit further discussion.

### **The Early Medieval Development of the Site**

- 6.2 As noted in Chapter 2 above, Hey suggests that settlements like Hooton Levitt, which contain the place-name ending *-tun* are perhaps best regarded as once having had a special purpose within the framework of a larger Anglo-Saxon estate. The Domesday Survey confirms that prior to 1066, Hooton comprised a manor held by Buga, and the differences in the number of ploughs listed between 1066 (two) and 1086 (four) might suggest that Robert Count of Mortain had undertaken controlled movement and/or resettlement from his poorer lands to his more productive areas in the intervening period, as Bishop has proposed for both Roger de Busli and Ilbert de Laci in the same region (Bishop 1948).
- 6.3 The advantages of the site for settlement are obvious; the location, on a spur of land, retains long-distance views to the north, north-west and south-east even today. To the north, the site overlooks the valley of the Maltby Dike. As the foundation charters for Roche Abbey demonstrate, the dyke formed a boundary between two estates as early as 1147, and they may also have had pre-Conquest origins. The dike continued to act as the boundary between the townships of Maltby and Hooton Levitt into the 19th century. In 1854, the entire lengths of the north and east sides of Hooton Levitt township were bounded by the Maltby Dike, with another watercourse, the Kingsforth Brook, partly defining the west side. A limited walkover survey of the area noted that other sections of the township boundary as shown in 1854, such as that positioned on the ridge to the south of Manor Farm between Hooton Levitt and Laughton-en-le-Morthern, seem to utilise natural features and so this may well also have been established at an early date. Hooton Levitt Mill lies on the Maltby Dike, and is another feature mentioned in the Domesday survey. Although it is not certain if the mill shown in 1854 is on exactly the same site as its medieval predecessor, this is quite possible, the mill being sited for convenience of source of power rather than proximity to the settlement (Moorhouse 1981b, 703).
- 6.4 Given the structural evidence for an early building on the site (see below), possibly linked with Richard Fitz Turgis, lord of the manor by 1147, it is tempting to see the 12th century occupation of Manor Farm as a continuation of a pre-Conquest manorial centre on the same site, perhaps created after the 10th century as a result of the break up of a larger early medieval “multiple estate” began in the late Anglo-Saxon period (Hey 2003, 39). However, there is no firm evidence for this and it is likely to be an overly simplistic interpretation. Hey, primarily through the use of place-name evidence, stresses the complex nature of settlement development in this region in the period between c.750 and 1100 (Hey 2003, 32-37), whilst the most recent overview of the archaeology of Yorkshire in the period AD 700-1066 notes the current sketchy understanding of rural settlement during this period and the lack of identified rural settlement sites away from the Yorkshire Wolds (Hall 2003).
- 6.5 By 1147, when he acted as the co-founder of Roche Abbey, Richard Fitz Turgis was lord of Hooton Levitt. He is often proposed as being the likely builder of the oldest surviving building at Manor Farm, that forming the east end of the south farm range (Building B1). Although subject to much subsequent alteration, particularly on the first floor, the structural evidence suggests that in its original

form, this building comprised a free-standing rectangular structure of two storeys, some 10.0m long by 7.0m wide externally, with ground floor walls averaging 1.3m wide. An original or early ground floor entrance may have been located at the south end of the east gable, leading into a ground floor where the floor surface was probably set c.0.5m below the concrete which was present at the time of the survey. The ground floor was probably split into two cells of equal size, perhaps separated by a screen positioned between the central paired beams of the first floor frame, which were supported at either end of very substantial curved corbels. Each cell was lit by at least one, and probably two, deeply-splayed loop-headed windows, possibly placed in an inverted mirror-image arrangement to either side of the central partition. Originally, the first floor appears to have been accessed by an external staircase rising up the west gable, and it might have been formed by a single space; however, the scale of the later alteration is such that the only early surviving feature is the loop-headed window in the north wall. In contrast to the ground floor windows, this was fitted with a shutter, perhaps indicating some slightly higher status or greater degree of comfort to the first floor. There is no clear evidence for the form of heating on either floor, but fireplaces must surely have been present?

- 6.6 Although the Listing Building description suggests it is “probably late medieval”, the form of Building B1 strongly suggests that it is indeed 12th century in date, as first proposed by Ryder (1982, 125). In this context, the unreferenced assertion that there has been a hall on the site of Hooton Levitt Hall since 1117 is interesting; perhaps the original reference, whatever it may have been, related to the building at Manor Farm rather than the Hall. It is also possible that Wild was referring to the building when he described the remains of “a chapel or some religious house” amongst the outbuildings of the Hall, perhaps again confusing one with the other, although the subsequent demolition of the Hall complex means that it is now impossible to confirm this.
- 6.7 The form of Building B1 is suggestive of what was formerly described as a “hall house” or a “first floor hall”, characteristic of surviving examples of 12th century domestic architecture (Wood 1965, 17-21). However, more recent works have revised this idea, pointing out that a building may survive simply due to the fact that it was built of a more durable material than its contemporaries, rather than because it was a self-contained dwelling unit, arguing that in fact such buildings are chamber-blocks, detached from but operating in tandem with a ground floor hall, and often occurring in manorial complexes (Grenville 1997, 69-78). The only other comparable building known to survive in South Yorkshire is Hatfield Old Manor House (built c.1180), although at 14.20m long by 7.8m wide internally, it is far larger than that at Hooton Levitt (which is 7.30m long by 4.50m wide internally), and it was much modified during the later medieval period in its role as a royal residence associated with the nearby hunting ground of Hatfield Chase (Birch & Ryder 1988; Emery 1996, 321). In addition, Hooton Levitt lacks a vaulted undercroft, for example like that seen at Burton Agnes Manor House in East Yorkshire, built in c.1170-80 (Wood 1965, 83). However, as Grenville notes, there is considerable variation in size and elaboration of the surviving examples of these buildings and, outside Yorkshire, there are much smaller examples of similar houses; in fact, dimensionally, Hooton Levitt corresponds closely with the smallest example cited by Grenville (1997, 74). The smaller size of Building B1 at Hooton Levitt might not necessarily be a reflection of an early date or a lack of resources on Fitz Turgis’ part, but could be due to specific needs designated by him or to existing constraints on the site (Grenville 1997, 77). The positioning of the original staircase against a gable rather than along one of the long elevations is unusual,

only one other example, at Hemingford Grey, being illustrated by Grenville (1997, 74-75).

- 6.8 If, as proposed above, Building B1 is a chamber block perhaps dating to c.1150, then it would quite clearly not have existed in isolation, and it would have formed part of a manorial centre. It should have been accompanied by a timber-framed hall; although there is some tenuous evidence for such a structure at Hatfield Old Manor House, as of 1997 there were no known unambiguous examples where a stone chamber block and contemporary timber-framed hall could be identified on the same site (Grenville 1997, 72 & 77). In addition to the hall, one might also expect a range of other buildings to occur on a manorial centre, for example, stables, brewhouse, barns, a dovecot and other agricultural buildings, together with fishponds, orchards and gardens. Some of these would have been contained within the core of the centre, almost certainly located on the raised ground currently occupied by the farm, but with others within the paddock area to the east, the whole enclosed within a precinct defined by a bank, wall or fence (see below).
- 6.9 However, the watching brief uncovered little or no evidence for other medieval structures around the farm complex, and there was indeed a complete lack of finds of any period from the excavated trenches. This is probably due in part to the high level of the underlying bedrock in this area, in some cases only 0.15m to 0.30m below the existing ground surface; subsequent development and alteration of the farm may have removed any traces of medieval structures. A cut (017) recorded in Trench 5 might be the remains of a ditch defining the western side of a precinct, but it could equally be the result of 17th or 18th century levelling activity to create a platform for the later farm buildings. Equally, the footings and bank (020, 021 and 022) seen in Trench 6 may be the remains of early structures, but it is difficult to make any sense of them in isolation. Away from the farm complex, both the garden and paddock areas contained greater depths of sub-soils, as might be expected, and so some medieval evidence may lie within these areas. A detailed topographical survey of the paddock area would be beneficial, and may reveal the earthwork remains of such structures.
- 6.10 A more detailed understanding of the contemporary landscape context of any 12th century manorial centre at Hooton Levitt would require additional documentary research beyond the scope of this report. However, a number of suggestions can be made. Manor Farm lies at the south-west end of the existing village, which has been subject to much modern development. However, in 1854, most of the village's buildings appear to front onto the an area of unenclosed track and a green running between Peak Lane and Joan Lane (see figure 4) – might these form the remnants of a block of north-west/south-east orientated tofts and crofts, with a frontage on the green? Such an arrangement might have been laid out at any time between c.950 and 1150 (Hey 2003, 54), although it is difficult to explain the presence of Hooton Levitt Hall within the tofts and crofts, especially if Manor Farm occupies the site of the early manorial centre.
- 6.11 Further afield, it is possible that further documentary research would allow the sites and features mentioned in Fitz Turgis' and de Busli's joint-foundation charter for Roche Abbey to be located more closely. The "*water which is the boundary between Maltby and Hooten*" can be identified as the Maltby Dike, whilst it is possible that the land described as "*the culture of Hartshow to the borders of Slade Hooten*" lay somewhere within the southern part of Hooton Levitt township. The name "Normanstone Field" which occurs in late 18th century documents, and which was possibly located to the south of Manor Farm, is also interesting. The antiquity and derivation of this name are not known, but it is possible that it relates

to a former boundary stone/stones located here (Moorhouse 1981a, 275-276), given that the field lies close to the boundary between the townships of Slade Hooton and Hooton Levitt.

### **The Later Medieval Period**

- 6.12 Hooton passed to the de Levet family through marriage in either the late 12th or early 13th centuries, and appears to have acquired the suffix "Levitt" as a result in the early 13th century. The manor was to remain with the Levets until the 16th century, and during this time, they would have continued to develop and modify the manorial centre at Manor Farm.
- 6.13 However, with the possible exception of the farmhouse (Building A) (see below), there is very little surviving structural evidence for later medieval buildings on the site. The two posts buried within the south wall of Building D1 at the west end of the north range may form the remains of a late medieval building of post and truss construction, possibly with an aisle to the south side, which was later incorporated into the existing building. The location of a timber-framed building here might also indicate that the present arrangement of the farm ranges has its origins in the later medieval period. The possible brace to the west end of the north wall plate of the building, set into the wall and observed during the conversion works, is a puzzling feature. It might be taken to indicate the former presence of further timber-framing, although as stated below, there is no other structural evidence to suggest that, in their existing form, Building D1 and the surviving roof trusses within are anything other than 17th century in date.
- 6.14 As stated above, the buildings of the manorial complex are likely to have been contained within some kind of precinct, surrounded by a boundary. It is possible that the bank, perhaps visible in the south-west corner of the farmhouse's garden but more clearly on the south and east sides of the paddock, is a remnant of such a boundary. If this were to be the case, then it again suggests that the current layout of the farm reflects and respects a much earlier arrangement. It is probable that some of the earthworks within the paddock relate to the former location of structures here; it is possible that the shallow linear depression running parallel to the east side was once water-filled, perhaps the remains of fish ponds, gardens or even a moat-like structure. In their assessment of Hatfield Manor House, Birch and Ryder (1988) mark the 12th century manor house near the centre of the sub-square "Manor Garth", with all other buildings concentrated in the north-west corner. The Manor Garth measured some 150m in either direction, with the remnants of a moat along the east side. The parallels with Hooton Levitt are obvious, i.e. the core of the manorial complex located in the south-western corner of a precinct with a boundary bank to the south side and a possible moat to the east. If this is assumed to be correct, then at c.120m square, it is possible that the landholding held by the current owner (Mr Clive Davenport) at the time of the survey might equate closely to the dimensions of a manorial precinct; the steeply sloping bank along the north side of the landholding would form a natural boundary for such an enclosure.

### **The Post-medieval Period**

#### *The 17th century*

- 6.15 It appears from the surviving structural evidence that a period of re-organisation and rebuilding took place at Manor Farm during the 17th century. The dateable architectural features surviving within the farmhouse (Building A), such as the



panelled doors, mullioned windows and roof trusses, are all broadly dateable to the mid to late 17th century. The plan form suggests that the building may have originated as a lobby entry house with a three-room single-pile plan (i.e. spaces A1, A2 and A3), a form noted in West Yorkshire from the early 17th century (RCHME 1986, 155); comparison with such structures might indicate a kitchen at the east end, with a central housebody and a parlour at the upper (west) end, all with chambers over. As was suggested above, regarding the reference to a hall being on the site of Hooton Levitt Hall since 1117, it is possible that the reference to Hooton Levitt Hall being newly built in 1620 also actually refers to the Manor Farm site. A date of c.1620 would tie in well with the surviving structural evidence for the early plan form of the house. On balance, the west wing (space A4) is probably contemporary with the three main rooms, perhaps providing another parlour and giving the house an L-shaped plan, whilst the east wing (A6) was clearly of a later, unknown, date. At some point in the 18th century, the gap between the two wings (A5) was infilled to create an entrance passage on the house's south side, whilst the surrounds of the existing and part-destroyed doorways in the north elevation are also of 18th century appearance.

- 6.16 No substantial areas of timber-framing were visible within the farmhouse at the time of the initial survey, and none were uncovered during subsequent alterations. Nevertheless, it is possible that an early 17th century lobby-entry plan form had actually developed from a late medieval house, perhaps one of the three bay form recorded by Ryder, where a firehood and stack were replaced in stone in the 17th century (Ryder 1979, 62-69; Hey 2003, 170-171). There are good reasons to believe that a late medieval house existed somewhere on the site. As will be discussed below, there is no clear evidence for substantial alterations to the 12th century building (Building B1) at the east end of the south range that pre-date the 17th century. It seems unlikely that a 12th century chamber block and associated timber-framed hall would have remained in use as the principal accommodation on the site throughout the medieval period, and therefore one would expect them to have been replaced by a timber-framed house in the later middle ages. This structure might be contained within the existing farmhouse, or could have been located elsewhere on site, and then demolished in the early 17th century when the present farmhouse was built.
- 6.17 The central part of the south range (Building B2) is of mid 17th century date, and was added to the earlier 12th century structure (Building B1), approximately doubling its size. In its original form, it was of two cells to the ground floor, both of which retain elements of their 17th century floor frames; the first floor may once have been a single space. There is no evidence for heating to any part of the building, perhaps suggesting it had a service rather than a domestic function. The lack of 17th century windows in the south elevation also points to a service function, perhaps suggesting that the garden area to the south of the house was being turned into a more private space for the family. At the same time as the central part of the south range was built, at least one window was inserted into the north wall of the 12th century structure (Building B1). As stated above, although the latter has been much altered, there are no changes that are clearly dateable to before the 17th century. The insertion of the 17th century window probably marks another stage in the decline in the building's status from 12th century chamber block to service building serving a later house, and finally to agricultural usage during the 19th and 20th centuries.
- 6.18 The west end of the farm's north range (Building D1) also dates to the 17th century, although as stated above, it may incorporate the remains of a medieval timber-framed building. Despite later alterations, its 17th century form was in fact

well preserved, comprising three bays of equal length, with largely unaltered roof-trusses supported on stone walls. Principal rafter roof trusses of the type surviving in the building are commonly found in farm buildings and barns in the region, and are often relatively late in date. In barns, the choice of this kind of truss, as oppose to a king-post, may be explained by the presence of hay lofts, access to which would have been impeded by the bulky king-posts (Ryder 1979, 20). There is no clear evidence for such hay lofts originally at Hooton Levitt, and the building was probably used to accommodate beasts at first, but later modifications, such as the off-centre opposed doorways to the central bay, indicate that it was at least partly turned over to the processing and storage of crops. It would most likely have ceased to be used for this and returned to animal accommodation when the adjacent barn (Building D3) was built.

### *The 18th century*

- 6.19 Much in the same way that medieval buildings were replaced and adapted during the 17th century, the farm complex continued to evolve during the 18th century, both to replace ageing structures and to adapt to changing agricultural practices. The earliest of the 18th century additions to survive at Manor Farm is probably Building C and its attached structure. Despite the lack of nesting boxes, the form of the building is strongly suggestive of a dovecote, or perhaps more correctly a pigeon loft positioned above first and ground floor rooms.
  
- 6.20 At one time, the projecting ledge around the upper part of the building might have been interpreted as a measure to prevent vermin climbing the external walls, particularly after the spread of the brown rat throughout England after c.1730. However, whilst the brown rat did have an undoubted effect on the design of some types of agricultural buildings (McCann 1996), others suggest that ledges which are placed at any substantial height are actually alighting ledges or sunning ledges for birds (Dennison 1989, 3; Brunskill 1999, 190-191; McCann 1991, 89-160). An apparent entrance hole above the ledge in the building's south elevation is positioned according to advice given by 18th century writers on animal husbandry (Dennison 1989, 6). The lack of nesting boxes is explained by them being wooden and attached to the internal walls, rather than being built into them; their removal may explain the "striped" appearance of the first floor walls, although this is not certain, especially as they appear to have been located in the attic rather than on the first floor. A number of other features within the building also remain unexplained. The tall opening in the south elevation beneath the ledge does not correspond to the existing first floor, and the internal floor levels seem therefore to have been modified. It is also unclear why such a relatively small building would require four doorways on the ground floor.
  
- 6.21 Building C is probably mid rather than late 18th century in date. The north cell of the west end of the south range (Building B3) is of similar size and was once of two storeys. It is possible that the two were built as a pair to enhance the appearance of the west range of the farm when viewed from the west. The 1854 Ordnance Survey map (see figure 4) shows a track leaving the centre of the west range and then running along the edge of Cliff Plantation; this track would have passed between the two buildings.
  
- 6.22 The threshing barn (Building D3) at the east end of the north range was built during the late 18th century. Although the internal T-shaped cross wall at the east end is a later insertion, it is possible that the barn was originally provided with a hay loft over a byre here; however, both parts of the first floor, in their existing forms, are 19th century in date. The barn was provided with a steam engine in the mid 19th

century, housed in the shed attached to the west gable, and this was used to drive a variety of fodder preparation machinery positioned at the barn's east end.

*The 19th century to the present day*

- 6.23 Building D2 originated as a single storey infill building at some point between the late 18th and the mid 19th centuries. It was later raised in brick but retains no features of historic interest. The existing floor frame in the 12th century structure (Building B1) was inserted in around c.1800, requiring modifications to the interior walls. Building E was apparently built between 1854 and 1888 as a cart-shed, but it may have incorporated the remains of an earlier structure not shown in 1854. During the same period, a large covered yard was built on the south side of the north range.
- 6.24 Apart from the changes that might be expected on a working farm, such as the replacement of earlier floor and yard surfaces with concrete, Manor Farm appears to have been little modified during the 20th century. A large Dutch barn had been built to the north of the north range by 1916 but the existing structure in this position appears to post-date the Second World War.

## 7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

RALSL = Rotherham Archives and Local Studies Library

SCA = Sheffield City Archives, Sheffield

WYAS = West Yorkshire Archive Service, Wakefield

### Primary sources

- 1787 William Hoyle's Estate at Hooton near Maltby Surveyed in the 10th Month 1787 (SCA FC/FB 64supp pp44-45)
- 1787 William Hoyle's Estate at Hooton Levitt near Maltby Surveyed in the 10th Month 1787 (SCA FC/FB 64 pp58-61)
- 1787 Survey, valuation and Division of Certain Lands at Hooton Levitt in the Parish of Maltby ... May 23rd 1787 between Peter Halliday of Carlton-le-Moorland in the County of Lincoln, Gentleman and William Hoyle in the County of Sheffield, Gentleman (SCA CP-30(48))
- 1787 Article of Agreement intended made concluded and fully agreed upon ths 23rd May 1787 between Peter Halliday of Carlton-le-Moorland in the County of Lincoln, Gentleman and William Hoyle in the County of Sheffield, Gentleman (SCA CP-30(49))
- 1791 Map of an Estate at Maltby belonging to Richard Acklow Esq (SCA LD1094)
- 1839 Maltby Tithe Map and Apportionment (WYAS 266)
- 1854 Ordnance Survey 6" map sheet 290
- 1888 Ordnance Survey 25" map Yorkshire (West Riding) sheet 290.15
- 1901 Ordnance Survey 25" map Yorkshire (West Riding) sheet 290.15
- 1916 Ordnance Survey 25" map Yorkshire (West Riding) sheet 290.15
- 1978 Plans and photographs of east end of north range of farm buildings made by P Ryder (SYSMR 01160)
- c.1980 Aerial photograph of Manor Farm, Hooton Levitt (held by C Davenport)

### Secondary sources

Alcock, N, Barley, M, Dixon, P & Meeson, R 1996 *Recording Timber-Framed Buildings: An Illustrated Glossary* (CBA Practical Handbook in Archaeology 5)

Aveling, J 1870 *The History of Roche Abbey from its Foundation to its Dissolution*

Birch, J & Ryder, P 1988 "Hatfield Manor House, South Yorkshire". *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* vol 60, 65-104

Bishop, T 1948 "The Norman Settlement of Yorkshire". In Hunt, R, Pantin, W & Southern, R (eds) *Studies in Medieval History Presented to F M Powicke*, 2-14

Brunskill, R 1999 *Traditional Farm Buildings of Britain and Their Conservation*

Campbell, J 2000 "Naming the Parts of Post-Medieval Roof Structures". *Vernacular Architecture* vol 31, 45-51

Committee on Farm Buildings 1945 *Farm Buildings (Post-War Building Studies no. 17)*

Dennison, E 1989 *Monuments Protection Programme: Single Monument Class Description: Dovecotes* (unpublished mss)

Dennison, E & Richardson, S 2001 *Headley Hall Farm, Thornton, Bradford, West Yorkshire: Architectural Recording* (unpublished EDAS report 2000/115.R01 for English Heritage and the Drake family)

Easton, T 1999 "Ritual Marks on Historic Timber". *Weald and Downland Open Air Museum Magazine Spring 1999*, 22-28

Emery, A 1996 *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales: Northern England*

English, B 1985 *Yorkshire Enclosure Awards*

English Heritage 2006 *Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice*

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

Friar, S 2001 *The Local History Companion*

Grenville, J 1997 *Medieval Housing*

Hall, R 2003 "Yorkshire AD700-1066". In Manby, T, Moorhouse, S & Ottaway, P (eds) *The Archaeology of Yorkshire: An Assessment at the Beginning of the 21st Century*, 171-180

Hey, D 2003 *Medieval South Yorkshire*

Holmes, R 1895 "Dodsworth's Yorkshire Notes: The Wapentake of Osgoldcross". *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* vol 13, 99-153

Hunter, J 1828 *South Yorkshire: The History of the Deanery of Doncaster*, Vol I

Maltby & Wickersley Advertiser 1982 "Conversion of Mansfield Farm, Hooton Levitt". *Maltby & Wickersley Advertiser* 10th September 1982 (RALSL Maltby Press Cuttings vol 4)

McCann, J 1991 "An Historical Enquiry into the Design and Use of Dovecotes". *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society* vol 35, 89-160

McCann, J 1996 "The Influence of Rodents on the Design and Construction of Farm Buildings in Britain to the mid 19th Century". *Journal of the Historic Farm Buildings Group* vol 10, 1-28

Moorhouse, S 1981a "Boundaries". In Faull, M & Moorhouse, S (eds) *West Yorkshire: An Archaeological Survey to AD 1500* vol 2, 265-289

Moorhouse, S 1981b "Corn Mills". In Faull, M & Moorhouse, S (eds) *West Yorkshire: An Archaeological Survey to AD 1500* vol 3, 702-723

RCHME 1986 *Rural Houses of West Yorkshire 1400-1830*

Richardson, S & Dennison, E 2005 *The Old Rectory, Slingsby, North Yorkshire: Preliminary Architectural Assessment* (unpublished EDAS report 2004/252.R01 for Mr & Mrs P Shepherd)

Rodgers, A 1998 "Deer Parks in the Maltby Area". In Jones, M (ed) *Aspects of Rotherham* 3, 8-30

Rotherham Borough Council 1979 *Rotherham Official Guide*

Rotherham Rural District Council c.1975 *Rotherham Rural District*

Rotherham Star 1983 "Hooton Levitt Farm Open to the Public". *Rotherham Star* 18th August 1983 (RALSL Maltby Press Cuttings vol 4)

Ryder, P 1979 *Timber Framed Buildings in South Yorkshire*

Ryder, P 1982 *Medieval Buildings of Yorkshire*

Tuffrey, P 2000 *In and around Rotherham*

Wild, H c.1890 *Rambles in Ivanhoe Land: No 3 Maltby, Roche Abbey, Sandbeck, Firbeck*

Wood, M 1965 *The English Mediaeval House*

### **Electronic Sources**

Census information (<http://www.ancestry.co.uk>).

The Cistercians in Yorkshire (<http://www.cistercians.shef.ac.uk/roche>) accessed 26th June 2006.

Maltby Town Council: The Growth of a Township (<http://www.maltbyonline.co.uk>) accessed 30th June 2006.

## **8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

- 8.1 The programme of archaeological and architectural observation, investigation and recording was carried out at Manor Farm in response to a condition of planning approval, and the majority of the work was funded by the developer of the site, Newton Wright Construction Ltd. Other work, such as the recording of the farmhouse (Building A), was undertaken by EDAS at their own expense.
- 8.2 The archaeological and architectural recording was undertaken by Shaun Richardson, with assistance from Richard Lamb and Ed Dennison. Stephen Haigh took the black and white photographs and Benchmark Land Surveys of Leeds completed the topographical site survey, which was augmented by further on-site recording by Shaun Richardson. Shaun Richardson also produced the field and final survey drawings.
- 8.3 EDAS also gratefully acknowledge the help and assistance of a number of individuals, especially Mr Clive Davenport of Newton Wright Construction Ltd, various site operatives and workers, Mr Jim McNeil of the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service and Mr Peter Thornborrow of Rotherham Metropolitan District Council. Mr Davenport also provided a copy of the 1980s aerial photograph (plate 1).
- 8.4 The final report and archive were produced by Ed Dennison, and any errors or inconsistencies remain the responsibility of Ed Dennison. The copyright of this report has been transferred to Newton Wright Construction Ltd, although Ed Dennison and Shaun Richardson retain the right to be accredited as authors.