
Contents

1. Summary	3
2. Introduction	3
3. Planning Background	4
4. Archaeological Background	4
5. Historical Background	5
6. Site Location and Geology	5
7. Methodology	5
8. Results	6
8.1 Area 1.....	6
8.2 Area 2.....	7
8.3 Area 3.....	7
9. Specialists Reports.....	10
9.1 Environmental.....	10
9.2 Ceramic Building Material.....	12
9.3 The Faunal Remains (Animal Bone).....	17
10. The Other Finds	19
10.1The Pottery.....	20
10.2Clay Tobacco Pipe.....	22
10.3 The Glass Assemblage.....	22
11. Discussion	26
12. Recommendations.....	26
13. Acknowledgements	27
14. Archive	27
15. Bibliography	27
16. On-Line Sources	29

Appendices

Appendix 1: Context Register

Appendix 2: Written Scheme of Investigation

List of Figures

- Fig 1: Site Location Plan
- Fig 2: Plan of Areas and Archaeological Features
- Fig 3: Plan of Areas 1 and 2
- Fig 4: Plan of Area 4
- Fig 5: Sections 1 to 3, Area 1
- Fig 6: Section 4, Area 3

List of Plates

- Plate 1: Development site, pre-excavation, Area 1, looking southeast.
- Plate 2: Development site, Area 3, Looking southeast.
- Plate 3: Pit [105], Area 1, Section 1, looking northwest (Scale: 0.50m).
- Plate 4: Soak-away [107], Area 1, Section 2, looking northeast, (Scale: 0.50m).
- Plate 5: Area 1 Excavated, looking southeasteast (Scale: 1m).
- Plate 6: Area 2, looking southwest (Scale: 0.50m).
- Plate 7: Soak-away [204], Area 2, looking northeast (Scale: 0.50m).
- Plate 8: Foundation/wall 306, Area 3, section 4, looking northeast (Scale: 0.20m)
- Plate 9: Foundations/wall 309, 310 and 311, Area 3, Section 4, looking northeast (Scale: 0.50m).
- Plate 10: Pit [318] & foundation/wall 312, Area 3, Section 4, looking north (Scale: 1m).
- Plate 11: Foundation/wall 320, Area 3, Section 4, looking northeast (Scale: 1m).
- Plate 12: Concrete foundation 335 and surface 337, Area 3, Section 4, looking east (Scale: 1m).
- Plate 13: Ditch? [328], Area 3, Section 4, looking north (Scale: 1m).
- Plate 14: Soak-away [331], Area 3, Section 4, looking east (Scale: 1m).
- Plate 15: Area 3, looking southeast (Scale: 0.50m).
- Plate 16: Area 3, looking east (Scale: 0.50m).
- Plate 17: (101) Glass assemblage.
- Plate 18: (201) Glass assemblage.
- Plate 19: Bottle, (201), J E BROWN, MARKET WEIGHTON (Scale: 15cm & 10cm).
- Plate 20: (301) Glass assemblage.
- Plate 21: Bottle (301), BURDALL'S MFG CHEMIST SHEFFIELD (Scales: 15cm & 5cm).
- Plate 22: Bottle (301), PETERS, HULL (Scales: 15cm & 10cm).
- Plate 23: Bottle (301) KOMPO REGISTERED (Scales: 10cm & 5cm).
- Plate:24: Bottle (301), SPOONS (Scale 10cm).

1. Summary

An archaeological watching brief was undertaken over a period of 6 days (30th October and 9th to 13th December 2013), on land to the rear of Chapel Farm, Town Street, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire.

The planning condition included the archaeological observation, investigation and recording (watching brief) for below ground-works associated with the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access road following partial demolition of outbuildings. For the purpose of this report, the site has been subdivided into three areas.

The earliest feature was encountered in Area 3, interpreted as a possible ditch which may be associated with that encountered by York Archaeological Trust in 1999 on the adjacent property to the east. No dating evidence was found which could determine when the ditch? had been in use.

A later pit was also found in Area 3 which was below a group of brick foundations relating to outbuildings associated with the Primitive Methodist Chapel which had formerly occupied the development site in the mid 19th to early 20th century.

The remaining features encountered were of the modern period, which included a series of soak-aways, encountered in Areas 1 and 3, and a pit in Area 1.

The finds assemblage mainly dated from the late 19th/early 20th century, with the exception of two sherds of pottery of the 14th to 16th century and a diagnostic fragment of Romano-British box flue tile.

2. Introduction

This report presents the results of archaeological monitoring undertaken over 6 days on 30th October and 9th to 13th December 2013, on land to the rear of Chapel Farm, Town Street, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire (NGR: SE 81930 45875). The machine excavation of the foundation trenches and service trench (watching brief) was monitored on behalf of Mr. H. Sadler, in response to a planning condition (Reference: DC/13/00664/PLF/WESTWW (Revised Scheme of 12/04724/PLF)) issued by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the 11th April 2013.

The archaeological monitoring was undertaken to identify and record the presence/absence of any archaeological features identified in the written scheme of investigation produced and previously submitted to HMSR by PastSearch and approved on 21st June 2013 (Appendix 2).

3. Planning Background

Permission for this development was granted on the 11th April 2013 subject to an archaeological condition. The condition was imposed to comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:

‘No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details (Circular 11/95. Model Clause 55).

The recommendation of a programme of observation, investigation and recording during all below ground works has been imposed as “lies within an area of archaeological interest within the village of Hayton, which sits along the Roman road between Brough and York, and in which extensive evidence of occupation from the Romano-British period has been identified.” (ERYC 11th April 2013)

4. Archaeological Background

(Provided by the HSMR, 2nd April 2013. Ref: SMR/PA/CONS/18285)

“The site of the proposed development lies within the village of Hayton, which itself lies on the course of the Roman road which ran from Brough to York. Located along this road, and to the south-west of the development site lies the site of a Roman auxiliary fort along with various areas of Romano-British occupation. Excavations at the fort site has shown that it was of Flavian origin (69-89 A.D) and that it was abandoned during the same period; barrack buildings, refuse pits and gates were also identified during the archaeological work. Evidence of later occupation within the area of the fort was also identified, this evidence existed in the form of a Grubenhaus (sunken floored building) along with spindle whorls, a bone comb and sherds of several late 5th century pots.

Other finds from the fort included coins, animal bones and quern stones; a human skull was also discovered at the bottom of the inner ditch and a complete cow burial of pre-Roman date was found near the eastern corner. Adjacent to the application site a programme of archaeological work identified a possible Roman ditch, whilst another Roman ditch was recorded during another programme of works across the road from the proposal site.

It is likely therefore, that any groundworks in this area will encounter previously unknown heritage assets dating to the prehistoric, Romano-British and later periods.” (HSMR, 2nd April 2013)

York Archaeological Trust (YAT) monitored below-ground excavations on adjacent land to the east. They recorded a ditch, on a northeast – southwest alignment (Fig: 2).

5. Historical Background

Hayton as mentioned in the Domesday Book (1086), was under the administrative subdivision of Pocklington. It states that the Head of the manor was Burnby I, had a taxable value of 2.5 gelds, 1.5 ploughland. The lords in 1066 were Asa and Northmann, with overlord Bernwulf. In 1086 the lord and tenant-in-chief was William of Percy.

Ordinance Survey maps of 1892 to 1910 show that a Primitive Methodist Chapel with associated outbuildings occupied the development site. The same buildings were also observed on the 1927 OS map, although they were no longer stated as the Chapel. By 1971, however, some of these buildings had been removed and a dwelling built at the front (Fig: 1).

Bulmer's History and Directory of East Yorkshire states that "There is a small Primitive Methodist chapel in the village, rebuilt in 1850."

6. Site Location and Geology

The site is centred on NGR: SE 81930 45875 on land to the rear of Chapel Farm, Town Street, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire, which has recently been used as a pasture and ménage.

The underlying solid geology of the site is "of Mercia Mudstone Group - Mudstone. Sedimentary Bedrock formed approximately 200 to 251 million years ago in the Triassic Period. Local environment previously dominated by hot deserts. Superficial deposits of Pocklington Gravel Formation - Gravel, Sandy. Superficial Deposits formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary Period. Local environment previously dominated by ice age conditions." (*British Geological Survey 2013*)

7. Methodology

All work carried out by PastSearch was undertaken by a qualified archaeologist in accordance with IFA standards and guidelines (IFA 2008 a; b) and the Written Scheme of Investigation submitted by PastSearch and approved by HSMR 21st June 2013 (Appendix 2).

The foundation trenches for the dwelling and boundary wall, and the service trench were excavated by a mechanical excavator using a 0.60m toothed bucket.

All archaeological features were cleaned and recorded on pro forma sheets using the PastSearch context recording system. A written record was made of each deposit, including a description and dimensions.

Plans of the trenches were produced at scales of 1:50 and 1:100. Sections were drawn at scales of 1:10 and 1:20.

A digital photographic record was made of all trenches. Black and white and colour photographs were taken of selected features.

The excavated material (spoil) was visually examined for archaeological artefacts during and after excavation.

8. Results

For the purpose of this report the foundation trenches and service trench have been recorded as three separate areas. Where possible, features which have continued across these areas, have been indicated.

8.1 Area 1 – Foundation Trenches for Dwelling/Garage (Fig: 3; Plates: 1, 3-5)

The foundation trench formed an ‘L-shape’ on a northwest – southeast alignment 20.40m (nw-se) x 15.50m (ne-sw), with a dividing trench 8.50m from the southeast between the dwelling and the garage. The trenches were approx. 0.60m wide and excavated to a depth of 0.60 – 0.70m below ground level (BGL).

The natural subsoil (103) consisted of a mix of orange sand and flint/chalk gravel, which was sealed by subsoil (102) of dark grey-brown sandy silt up to 0.10m thick. This in turn was sealed by topsoil (101) of very dark brown sandy loam silt up to 0.40m thick. A small quantity of pottery (Table: 4), ceramic building material (CBM) (Table: 2), animal bone (Table: 3) glass (Table: 5) and clay tobacco pipe (Section: 10.2) was collected from topsoil 101

Topsoil 101 was truncated at the northwestern end of the area by pit [105]. Possibly circular having a fill (104) of building rubble, comprising of glacial erratic stones, concrete and CBM (Table: 2), of 20th century date. This pit was observed mainly in section (Fig: 5; Plate: 3) and was not fully excavated due to levels required for foundations, and possible subsidence which may have been caused by removal of fill.

At the northeastern end (101) was truncated by soak-away [107] (Fig: 5; Plate: 4), a linear feature on a northeast – southwest alignment, with near vertical sides and filled with oolitic limestone rubble (106). It continued northeastward becoming [204] in Area 2. However, it was not observed in the northwestern trench of Area 1 and therefore probably turned northwest – southeast after approx. 4.00m becoming [109], having a similar fill (108).

Soak-away [109] was also conjectured to continue on a northwest-southeast alignment and observed in Area 3 as [339] and [334].

The soak-aways in Area 1 were not fully excavated, they were 0.60m wide and over 0.60m deep.

At the northeastern end the topsoil had been removed and a ménage surface of sand and stone hardcore (110) had been laid up to 0.20m thick, which sealed soak-away [107].

8.2 Area 2 – Foundation Trench for Boundary Wall (Fig: 3; Plates: 6 & 7)

The foundation trench was excavated for a boundary wall on the northwestern, northeastern and southeastern sides of the dwelling/garage, having a 4.50m access within the northeastern wall. The trenches were approx. 0.60m wide and excavated to a depth of 0.40 (BGL).

The northwestern side was 8.50m from the dwelling and extended 24.00m from the southwestern site boundary. It turned southeast for 32.50m with the 4.25m access approx. 2.00m from the southeastern end. The southeastern trench was 9.00m, set approx. 2.50m from the garage.

The natural subsoil was not encountered in Area 2, due to the limited level of excavation. Subsoil (202) of dark grey-brown sandy silt up to 0.10m was sealed by topsoil (201) of very dark brown sandy loam silt up to 0.40m thick. A small quantity of pottery (Table: 4), CBM (Table: 2), animal bone (Table: 3) and glass (Table: 5) was collected from topsoil 201.

Topsoil 201 was truncated by soak-away [204] a linear feature on a northeast – southwest alignment, with near vertical sides and filled with oolitic limestone rubble (203). Its continuation southwestward was encountered in Area 1 as [107], however it was not observed further to the northeast as excavation was not conducted in that part of the site.

The soak-away was not fully excavated but of similar dimensions to those in area 1 and sealed by the ménage surface of sand and stone hardcore (205) up to 0.20m thick.

8.3 Area 3 – Services Trench (Fig: 4; Plates: 2, 8-16)

The service trench was excavated at the eastern side of the full development site, extending approx. 5.00m beyond the boundary of Chapel Farm, in the main highway of Town Street, on a northwest – southeast alignment for 77.00 m and turned southwest for 16.00m, stopping just inside the access gap of area 2. The trench was approx. 0.60m wide and 0.80m to 1.10m deep.

The natural subsoil (303) consisted of a mix of orange sand and flint/chalk gravel, which was truncated by ditch? [328] being 3.40m wide and 0.30m wide, having single fill (327) of brownish grey sandy silt.

This feature had been conjectured on site to have been a ditch, as it was known that York Archaeological Trust had observed what they determined as a ditch at the adjacent site to the east in 1999. However the size and location of the trench on that site, did not allow full dimensions to be recorded. Their plan (Fig: 2) indicated that this ditch may have turned westward and possibly encountered in Area 3. As Area 3 was only 0.60m wide and [328] totally covered this width, it was difficult to identify its function and may alternatively have been a shallow pit. Two bone fragments of medium sized mammals were collected from the fill (Table: 3), and an environmental sample was taken from the fill and analysed by PRS (Section 9.1; Table: 1) which was found to contain occasional uncharred seeds of orache/goosefoot and charred grain of possible barley. Also small fragments of coal, cinder and bone.

The ditch? was sealed by subsoil (302=316) of dark grey-brown sandy silt up to 0.50m thick. This was truncated by pit [318], possibly circular in shape with near vertical sides, 1.30m wide and 1.20m deep. Having a single fill (317) of sandy clay-silt.

Approx. 1.80m to the southeast, the ground had been levelled by a deposit/layer of gravel (308) up to 0.30m thick, it was, as well as the subsoil truncated by brick foundations/walls which related to outbuildings associated with the Primitive Methodist chapel which formerly occupied the site in the 19th to early 20th century.

According to the 1892-1927 OS maps and an aerial photograph owned by the client (dating late 1960's / early 1970's), the outbuildings along the northeastern boundary of the site consisted of a small square building at the southern end, with two joining rectangular buildings on a northwest-southeast alignment, at the northwestern end a rectangular building on an almost east-west alignment, on the other side of which were two more rectangular buildings aligned northwest-southeast. All of these outbuildings were of brick construction.

Building 1: Small Square Building at Southern end.

The southeastern most foundation/wall was 306 set within construction cut [307], aligned northeast-southwest. Four courses remained consisting of brick of 213x 105 x 64mm in size. The return wall was not encountered within Area 3, however parallel foundation/wall 309, within construction cut [319] was encountered 4.30m to the northwest. Three courses remained, brick sizes being 210 x 106 x 65mm. The collected brick samples from both foundations/walls were of very late 18th to 19th century date (Table: 2).

A single course of three bricks laid on stretchers (310) were immediately to the northwest which may have created a surface for a small passage between 309 and 311.

Buildings 2 & 3: Two Joining Rectangular Buildings aligned NE-SE.

Six courses of foundation/wall (311) remained aligned northeast-southwest, constructed of similar sized bricks to (312), a returning wall on a northwest-southeast alignment, which were 230 x 100 x 75mm. Approx. 9.70m of 312 was encountered, five courses remained. The collected brick sample was of very mid to late 19th century date, with evidence of re-use (Table: 2). The alignment of Area 3 meant that the continuation of this wall could not be observed nor the parallel foundation/wall to 311 to indicate any internal partition of these buildings, as topsoil was present in the section.

Building 4: Rectangular Building Aligned Roughly E-W.

The next foundation/wall to be observed was (320) set within construction cut [321], bricks measuring 230mm x 114mm x 56mm, aligned northeast-southwest four courses remained, and one course of the return wall (322) was observed, bricks measuring 230 x 11 x 64mm. The collected brick samples from both foundations/walls were of very late 18th to 19th century date (Table: 2). Again topsoil masked most of this foundation/wall.

The parallel wall was not observed.

These foundations/walls were butted up to by topsoil (301) of very dark brown sandy loam silt up to 0.40m thick which was truncated by several features. A small assemblage of glass was collected from topsoil 301 (Table: 5).

It appeared that the two remaining buildings noted on the earlier OS maps at the northwestern end were completely removed and a new building replacing them, as approx. 14.20m north west of 320 was a concrete foundation (335) measuring 0.80m wide and 0.60m thick, to the southeast of which was a hardcore surface (326) of building rubble 0.20m thick with a concrete surface (325) 0.10m thick. Similar layers were also encountered on the southeastern side of 320, being hardcore (324) and concrete (323) 0.10m thick each.

Modern service trenches were observed and the southeastern end of Area 3, where it had been excavated into the highway, (340) electric and (341) foul water. A possible service trench [314] was encountered at 20.0m from the southeastern end, no pipe remained but had been backfilled with brown-grey sandy silt (313) and had truncated the earlier foundation/wall 312.

Two soak-aways were observed towards the northwestern end. Soak-away [331] was located approx. 1.30m northwest of concrete 335. It was aligned northeast-southwest with near vertical sides and flat base, encountered 1.20m BGL, having a 'primary' fill (330) of grey silt being filtered through stone rubble fill (329). A sherd of 19th century pottery was collected from fill 330 (Table: 4). Similarly 3.80m to the northwest was soak-away [334] with 'primary' fill (333) and stone rubble fill (332). It was aligned almost east-west and may have become 338/[339] in the northeast – southwest aligned section of Area 3 (Figs: 2 and 4), which continued on to [109] in Area 1. [339] was not fully excavated due to limits of excavation levels at this end. Each of the soak-aways were approx. 0.70m wide.

To the southeast of concrete 335, Area 3 was sealed by a rubble hardcore (305), which also included large piece of concrete (313) up to 0.10m thick, which was then sealed by tarmac (304) up to 0.10m thick.

To the northwest of concrete 335, Area 3 was sealed by hardcore (337) of stone rubble up to 0.10m thick, over which was sand surface (336) up to 0.10m thick for a ménage.

9. Specialist Reports

9.1 Environmental

John Carrott (PRS)

Summary

Five sediment samples (from which one was selected for processing), recovered from deposits encountered during archaeological observation, investigation and recording (watching brief) at Chapel Farm, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire, were submitted for an assessment of their bioarchaeological potential. The works were undertaken in advance of the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access road following partial demolition of outbuildings. A small number of archaeological features were encountered, including ditches and pits, together with relatively recent features and deposits, such as layers of hardcore, gravel and rubble, soak-aways, foundations/walls and modern services, some of which were probably associated with outbuildings of the former Primitive Methodist chapel which occupied the site in the 19th to early 20th century. Dating evidence was extremely limited but much if not all of the activity appeared to be of medieval or later date – ditch 328 was the earliest feature encountered and may be associated with a Romano-British ditch encountered on adjacent land during works in 1999 (by York Archaeological Trust), however.

*No interpretatively valuable concentrations of ancient biological microfossil or macrofossil remains were recovered from the sediment sample from the fill of ditch [328]; the feature possibly associated with the Romano-British ditch seen during 1999 works on the adjacent site. A small number of charred grains (including one tentatively identified as barley, cf. *Hordeum*) provided a hint of past cereal processing activity but the assemblage was far too small and too poorly preserved to provide any further information. The only other biological remains likely to be of 'ancient' origin were a few tiny (less than 4 mm) fragments of indeterminate bone (some of which were calcined).*

The charred cereal grains could provide sufficient suitable material for radiocarbon dating to be attempted but the extension of any date returned from these isolated remains to the deposit as a whole would be rather suspect and this cannot be recommended.

No further study of the extremely limited biological remains recovered is warranted.

KEYWORDS: CHAPEL FARM; HAYTON; EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE; ASSESSMENT; UNDATED – ?ROMANO-BRITISH; MODERN; PLANT REMAINS; CHARRED PLANT REMAINS; CHARRED CEREAL GRAIN; VERTEBRATE REMAINS (SOME CALCINED)

Introduction

Archaeological observation, investigation and recording (watching brief) was undertaken by PastSearch (Archaeological Services), at Chapel Farm, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire (centred on NGR SE 81930 45875), on the 30th of October and the 9th-13th of December 2013. The works were undertaken in advance of the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access road following partial demolition of outbuildings.

The works encountered a small number of archaeological features, including ditches and pits, together with relatively recent features and deposits, such as layers of hardcore, gravel and rubble, soak-aways, foundations/walls and modern services, some of which were probably associated with outbuildings of the former Primitive Methodist chapel which occupied the site in the 19th to early 20th century. Dating evidence was extremely limited but much if not all of the activity appeared to be of medieval or later date – ditch [328] was the earliest feature encountered and *may* be associated with a Romano-British

ditch encountered on adjacent land during works in 1999 (by York Archaeological Trust), however.

Five sediment samples ('GBA'/'BS' *sensu* Dobney *et al.* 1992), two of which were selected for processing (in consultation with the excavator), were submitted to Palaeoecology Research Services Limited, Kingston upon Hull, for an assessment of their bioarchaeological potential.

Methods

The sediment samples were inspected and their lithologies recorded, using a standard *pro forma*, prior to the processing of one (selected in consultation with the excavator) for the recovery of organic macrofossils (and artefactual remains) broadly following the techniques of Kenward *et al.* (1980).

The washover contained uncharred organic material and was kept wet for examination for macrofossils using a low-power microscope (x7 to x45 magnification). Macrofossil remains were identified by comparison with modern reference material (where possible), and the use of published works (e.g. Cappers *et al.* 2006 for plant remains). Remains were identified to the lowest taxon necessary to achieve the aims of the project. Nomenclature for plant taxa follows Stace (1997).

The residue was primarily mineral in nature and was dried prior to the recording of its components. The residue was separated into four fractions using 10 mm, 4 mm and 2 mm sieves. Sorting for all remains, including artefacts, was undertaken to 4 mm. Residue less than 2 mm was retained unsorted. The residue fractions were scanned for magnetic material.

All of the components of the washover and residue were recorded using a five-point semi-quantitative scale. The abundance scale employed was: 1 – few/rare, up to 3 individuals/items or a trace level component of the whole; 2 – some/present, 4 to 20 items or a minor component; 3 – many/common, 21 to 50 or a significant component; 4 – very many/abundant, 51 to 200 or a major component; and 5 – super-abundant, over 200 items/individuals or a dominant component of the whole. The abundance of recovered organic and other remains within the sediment as a whole may be judged by comparing the washover volume and the quantities of remains recovered from the residue with the size of the processed sediment sample.

A microfossil 'squash' subsample (~5 ml) from the deposit was examined using the 'squash' technique of Dainton (1992). Originally designed specifically to investigate the content of eggs of intestinal parasitic nematodes, this method routinely reveals the presence of other microfossils, such as pollen and diatoms, and, where present, these other classes of remains were also recorded. The slide was scanned at x150 magnification and at x600 where necessary.

During recording, consideration was given to the suitability of any macrofossil remains for submission for radiocarbon dating by standard radiometric technique or accelerator mass spectrometry (AMS).

Results

Notes from the initial inspection of all of the samples collected are shown in Table 1. The results from the processing and assessment of the selected sample are presented below.

Context 327 [fill of ditch 328 – possibly associated with a Romano-British ditch encountered on adjacent land during works in 1999]

Sample 3/T (5.5 kg/5 litres sieved to 300 microns with washover and microfossil ‘squash’; no unprocessed sediment remains).

Just moist, mid grey/grey-brown (mottled with mid brown on a mm-scale), unconsolidated to crumbly (working slightly sticky), slightly clay sand, with stones (2 to 40 mm, flint and chalk) and ?modern rootlet present.

The small washover (~25 ml) was mostly sand and modern rootlet, with some coal (to 6 mm; abundance score 3), a little indeterminate charcoal (to 3 mm; score 2) and cinder (to 22 mm but all but one piece less than 4 mm; score 2), and occasional uncharred seeds of orache/goosefoot (*Atriplex/Chenopodium*). Also present were five charred cereal grains (or fragments thereof) – preservation was generally poor but the best preserved grain was perhaps of barley (cf. *Hordeum*).

The rather small residue (dry weight 997.6 g) was composed of angular flint (to 52 mm), none of which showed evidence of having been worked, chalk fragments (to 18 mm) with slightly rounded edges and sand. There was also a little cinder (to 24 mm; 15.2 g in the fractions greater than 4 mm) and very occasional fragments of indeterminate bone (some calcined) in the 2-4 mm fraction. The finest (<2 mm) residue fraction was the largest of the four (54%) and composed largely of sand, with two of the three coarser fractions being mostly flint and chalk (2-4 mm – 10%; 4-10 mm – 16%) and the greater than 10mm fraction (20%) being almost exclusively angular flint (with a single piece of cinder). No magnetic material was present.

The microfossil ‘squash’ subsample was almost entirely inorganic, with just a trace of organic detritus and a few fungal hyphae present.

Discussion and Statement of Potential

No interpretatively valuable concentrations of ancient biological microfossil or macrofossil remains were recovered from the sediment sample from the fill of ditch [328] – although the washover was kept wet because of the presence of uncharred organic material, on examination this proved to consist of modern rootlet and a few modern seeds. The small number of charred grains provided a hint of past cereal processing activity but the assemblage was far too small and too poorly preserved to provide any further information. The only other biological remains likely to be of ‘ancient’ origin were a few tiny (less than 4 mm) fragments of indeterminate bone (some of which were calcined).

The charred cereal grains could provide sufficient suitable material for radiocarbon dating (via AMS) to be attempted but the extension of any date returned from these isolated remains to the deposit as a whole would be rather suspect and this cannot be recommended.

Recommendations

The only ancient organic remains recovered were a small number of poorly preserved charred cereal grains of no significant interpretative value and no further study is warranted.

Retention and Disposal

The charred cereal grains recovered from Context 327 should be retained for the present pending a decision regarding their submission for radiocarbon dating – although, as noted above, this is not considered to be a reliable method of dating the deposit itself. Unless required for purposes other than the study of biological remains, all of the other remaining material, including the unprocessed sediment samples, may be discarded.

Table 1: *Chapel Farm, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire: Notes from Initial Visual Inspection of Sediment Samples. Note: Information Appears in Bold Face for the Sample Processed for the Assessment.*

Context	Sample	No. of tubs	Potential	Sediment description and notes
302 Subsoil	1	1 (~3 litres)	Very Low	Moist, mid to dark brown/grey-brown, unconsolidated to crumbly (working soft and slightly plastic), slightly sandy clay silt, with stones (2 to 40 mm, mostly flint and some chalk) and occasional black flecks of very rotted ?charcoal present.
317 Fill of Pit [318]	2	1 (~7 litres)	Very Low	Moist, mid brown/grey-brown, firm and slightly sticky (working soft and slightly sticky), clay silt, with stones (2 to 20 mm, flint and chalk) common and occasional black flecks of very rotted ?charcoal present.
327 Fill of ditch [328]	3	1 (~6 litres)	Very Low	Just moist, mid grey/grey-brown (mottled with mid brown on a mm-scale), unconsolidated to crumbly (working slightly sticky), slightly clay sand, with stones (2 to 40 mm, flint and chalk) and ?modern rootlet present.
330 Primary fill of soak-away [331]	4	1 (~1 litres)	Very Low	Moist, very dark brown/grey-brown, unconsolidated (working somewhat soft), silt, with abundant black ash. Stones (2 to 20 mm, chalk) and occasional small pieces of coal (to 5 mm) were also present.
333 Primary fill of soak-away [334]	5	1 (~1 litres)	Very Low	Just moist, dark brown/grey-brown, unconsolidated (working soft), silt, with stones (2 to 60 mm, mostly chalk and flint) present.

9.2 Ceramic Building Material

S.E. Tibbles Cert. Arch. Dip Arch

Introduction and Methodology

The assemblage of ceramic building material (hereafter CBM) comprised nineteen complete and part pieces, with a total weight of 18,209 grams. Four forms were identified: box-flue tile, brick, roof tile and industrial ceramic (Table 1).

The assemblage was subject to basic quantification (count and weight) and information regarding dimensions, form and type was recorded and catalogued accordingly. The presence of original surfaces was taken into consideration to aid identification. The CBM was classified adopting a best-fit policy based on surviving dimensions and general characteristics.

It should be noted that the diversity of size and colour within bricks and tiles caused during the manufacturing process, must be taken into consideration when comparing examples within collected assemblages and local typologies. The varying sizes and colours can be attributed to the variation in the clays used, shrinkage during drying, firing within the kiln or clamp and the location of the brick/tile within the kiln. The dating of brick and tile can be highly contentious due to its re-usable nature, therefore the date range given is that of known dates where material has been recorded.

The Assemblage

The assemblage of CBM was recovered from eight contexts and included samples of foundations/walls (see Table 2 for details).

Box-flue Tile

One fragment of box-flue tile was recovered from topsoil (101) Area 1. The surface details and breaks were 'crisp' in appearance. The fragment was part of a combed face, with remnants of keying for the adhesion of plaster or mortar: 1 diagonal track of 6 tines, with a broad U-shaped profile to the tracks that suggests a comb with blunt/worn tines was used. The tile was reduced near-throughout with a wall thickness of 19mm.

Bricks

The brick assemblage comprised five complete and four part samples (Table 2), with a total weight of 17,752 grams. Complete dimensions ranged between 210mm x 106mm x 65mm (8 2/8" x 4 1/8" x 2 1/2") to 230mm x 100-114mm x 56-75mm (9 1/8" x 4-4 1/2" x 2 1/4 - 3").

Over half of the assemblage (56%) was dated between the late 18th and 19th centuries, all were samples from walls/foundations: [306] [309] [312] [320] and [322]. The remainder of the brick assemblage was dated to the 20th century.

Re-used material was evident from [312]. The brick, a bull-nosed type with one rounded header, displayed mortar over all surfaces, barring 1 stretcher, including over the bull-nosed header. This type of brick has a variety of uses, particularly for window surrounds

and sills and ‘vulnerable’ corners of buildings, e.g. where traffic may have to pass through a narrow entrance.

Further evidence of re-used material, though not within an *in situ* structure, was recorded within the bricks from pit fill (104). One brick was broken along the length, the broken surface heavily worn to a ‘wedge-shape’, with a tapering width between 105mm to 60mm. The characteristics of the worn breaks and stretcher surface are typical of use within a floor or an area of hard-standing.

No distinguishing features were recorded on the remainder of the brick assemblage.

The Roof Tile

The eight fragments of roof tile present, recovered from topsoil (101) and (201) were identified as pantile and modern roof tile. This assemblage had a combined weight of 316.8 grams. No diagnostic examples, e.g. tiles with at least 2 complete dimensions or means of suspension such as a nib, were recorded. The pantiles had a thickness range between 14mm to 16mm, the modern tile had a complete thickness of 15mm.

Industrial Ceramics

One fragment from topsoil (101), Area 1 was identified as industrial ceramic, probably a pipe. The fragment had a weight of 53 grams and a thickness of 16mm. No distinguishing features were recorded.

Table 2: The Ceramic Building Material by Context..

Area & Context	Type	Comments	Quantity	Date	Weight (g)
Topsoil 101	Box-flue Tile	Diagnostic. Finger-smoothed combed face: 1 diagonal track, 6 tines with a broad U-shaped profile. Reduced near throughout. Thickness: 19mm	1	RB	87.2
	Roof Tile	Non-diagnostic. Pantile. Thickness: 16mm	4	Late 18 th to early 19 th century	59
		Non-diagnostic. Thickness: 15mm	2	20 th century	72
	Brick	Non-diagnostic. Thickness: N/A	1		5
	Industrial Ceramic	Non-diagnostic. Pipe. Thickness: 16mm.	1		53

Table 2: The Ceramic Building Material by Context.(cont).

Area & Context	Type	Comments	Quantity	Date	Weight (g)
104 Fill of Pit [105]	Brick	Diagnostic. Buff fabric, Pale Yellow (2.5Y/7/4). Machine-made. Probably a local product. Same brick-type as other fragments from [104]. Width: 110mm Thickness: 76mm.	1	20 th century	569
		Non-diagnostic. Buff fabric, Pale Yellow (2.5Y/7/4). Machine-made. Both probably local products. Same brick-type as other fragments from [104]. One fragment is wedge-shaped, one stretcher worn/abraded (post-breakage) with rounded broken edges. Re-used. Dimensions: >198mm x 105mm to 60mm x 75mm. Remaining fragment thickness: 80mm	2		1945
Topsoil 201	Roof tile	Non-diagnostic. Pantile. Thickness: 14mm & 15mm	2	Late 18 th to early 19 th century	185.8
306 Sample of foundation	Brick	Complete. Cream mortar on bed surfaces and 1 header. Grey discolouration from over-firing. Dimensions: 213mm x 105mm x 64mm	1	V. late 18 th to 19 th century	2865
309 Sample of foundation/ wall		Complete. Cream mortar on bed surfaces, with patches of mortar on 1 header and 1 stretcher surface. 1 header unevenly finished. Slightly over-fired. Dimensions: 210mm x 106mm x 65mm	1		2835
312 Sample of foundation/ wall		Complete. Bull-nosed brick (1 rounded header). Cream mortar on all surfaces barring 1 stretcher. Over-fired. Re-used (mortar on bull-nose). Dimensions: 230mm x 100mm x 75mm	1		Mid to late 19 th century
320 Sample of foundation/ wall	Brick	Complete. Cream mortar on bed and header surfaces. Dimensions: 230mm x 114mm x 56mm	1	V. late 18 th to 19 th century	2794
322 Sample of foundation/ wall		Complete. Heavily mortared (cream) on bed surfaces, 1 header and 1 stretcher. Dimensions: 230mm x 110mm x 64mm	1		3422

Discussion

The earliest material present was the fragment of combed box-flue tile from topsoil (101). Keying by scoring, incisions made by a knife or a stick for example, is considered an early practise, superseded by combing (Betts 2001, 228; Brodribb 1987, 109; Croom 1997, 156; Ward 1999, 48). The Chapel Farm tile is probably within an early 3rd to early 4th century date range. Although of some archaeological interest – its presence suggests a building with a hypocaust system within the vicinity – on its own the tile does little to enhance our understanding of the known Romano-British activity within the area.

The majority of the brick assemblage was dated between the very late 18th to 19th centuries, erring towards the latter date. The remainder was of 20th century date. Re-used bricks were recorded from pit fill (104) and within foundation/wall [312]. The Pale Yellow (2.5Y/7/4) fabric of the bricks from (104) suggest local products.

No complete roof tiles were evident and none were of any archaeological significance. The pantiles were dated between the late 18th to early 19th centuries and the modern tile was of 20th century date.

Overall, the archaeological potential of the ceramic building material is limited. The Romano-British box-flue tile represents residual evidence of activity within the area of the development during this period. Its presence is not surprising considering the scale of Romano-British activity known within the immediate locale (Halkon 2013, 138-140).

The remainder of the CBM contributes little in terms of additional information regarding the manufacture and use of this material within the area. The assemblage reflects various aspects of construction and/or possibly alterations to the building(s) that previously occupied the site, probably relating to the Methodist Chapel, and subsequent modern activity.

Recommendations

No further work is required on the assemblage and the majority is not recommended for deposition within a museum; the box-flue tile should be considered for deposition but this would be at the recipient museum's discretion. Unless the landowner requests the return of the CBM assemblage, it may be discarded.

9.3 The Faunal Remains (Animal Bone)

S.E. Tibbles Cert. Arch. Dip Arch

Introduction and Methodology

This assessment aims to identify the archaeological potential of the faunal remains recovered from the archaeological investigation at Chapel Farm, Hayton, East Yorkshire, in keeping with the specific aims of the written scheme of investigation (Adams 2013) and the requirements of MoRPHE, 'PPN3: Archaeological Excavation' and MAP2 (English Heritage 2008; 1991).

The small assemblage of animal bone was recovered from four contexts, including unstratified. The material was subject to basic quantification by count and weight (Table 3) and details were recorded on ‘bulk finds’ sheets.

Animal Bone

Thirteen fragments of animal bone were recovered from the following contexts: (101) (201) (300) and (327) (see Table 2 for details). The assemblage had a combined weight of 499 grams. The surfaces of the bones were ‘battered’ and eroded, but for the most part, in fairly good condition. All were from domestic species and no complete bones were present.

The majority (69%) were from medium-sized mammals such as pig and/or sheep/goat (caprovid). The remainder comprised two cattle long bones, a humerus and a femur? and two fragments not identifiable to species.

Evidence of butchery in the form of cut-marks was recorded on three bones. A fragment of skull, not identifiable to species, from (101) and a cattle femur and a fragment not identifiable by species or bone type from (201), displayed multiple cut-marks on cleanly cut edges made by a tool with a serrated blade. Additional cut-marks were recorded on the outer surface of the unidentifiable fragment from (201). No other distinguishing features were recorded.

Table 3: *The Animal Bone by Context.*

Context	Quantity	Species	Comments	Weight (g)
101 Topsoil	1	Medium-sized mammal (e.g. pig/caprovid)	Tibia? Distal and proximal ends broken.	17
	4		Long bone fragments (no id). Distal and proximal ends broken.	35
	1		Femur? Distal and proximal ends broken.	22
	1		Tooth fragment, molar. Slightly burnt.	5
	1	Species ID not identifiable	Skull fragment. Evidence of butchery: cut-marks made with a tool with a serrated blade. Very similar to cut-marks (201)	9
201 Topsoil	1	Cattle? (<i>Bos?</i>)	Femur? Evidence of butchery: distal and proximal ends removed by a tool with a serrated blade. Multiple cut-marks.	167

Table 3: *The Animal Bone by Context (cont).*

Context	Quantity	Species	Comments	Weight (g)
201 Topsoil (cont)	1	Species ID not identifiable	Unidentifiable fragment. Evidence of butchery: 1 edge cut with a tool with a serrated blade. Very similar to cut-marks (101). 2 incised horizontal lines cut into outer surface of bone.	10
300 Unstratified	1	Cattle (<i>Bos</i>)	Humerus. Proximal and distal ends broken.	201
327 Fill of ditch [328]	1	Medium-sized mammal (e.g. pig/caprovid)	Ulna. Proximal end damaged and majority of shaft missing.	25
	1		1 metacarpul. Proximal and distal ends missing.	8

Discussion and Recommendations

Overall, the assemblage is too small to be of any archaeological significance, particularly as the majority (85%) was recovered from topsoil or was not stratified. All of the faunal remains were domestic species, with both medium-sized mammals (such as pig, caprovid) and large mammals (cattle) present. The cut-marks recorded are probably from butchery however, the possibility of bone-working should not be entirely discounted but this is only very tentatively suggested. The assemblage can be described as being fairly typical of food consumption and most likely represents domestic waste.

No further work is considered necessary. Unless the land owner requests its return, the animal bone is recommended for discard, although the bone from ditch [328] may be considered for retention, but this would be at the recipient museum's discretion.

10. The Other Finds

Karen Adams

Pottery and clay tobacco pipe identification by Peter Didsbury

Glass identification by Sophie Tibbles

Aims and Objectives

This assessment, which is in keeping with the requirements of MoRPHE, 'PPN3: Archaeological Excavation' and compliant with MAP2 requirements (English Heritage 2008; 1991), aims to identify the archaeological potential of the finds assemblage

recovered from the archaeological investigation , on land to the rear of Chapel Farm, Town Street, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire.

Introduction and Methodology

The finds assemblage comprised of three material categories: Pottery, Clay Tobacco Pipe, and Glass, having been retrieved from contexts: Topsoil (101); Topsoil (201); Area 3 Unstratified (300); Topsoil (301) and Primary Fill (330) of Soak-away [331].

All material types were subject to basic quantification by count and weight, the details of which were recorded on ‘bulk’ and ‘finds context’ sheets, where applicable. The assemblage was appropriately packed for long term storage.

Condition of the Assemblage

All of the material categories were stable and in good condition.

Quantification of the Assemblage

Pottery: 34 sherds

Clay tobacco pipe: 1 fragment

Glass: 40 shards

Catalogue by material type

10.1 The Pottery

Fabric terms compatible for those in use for Hull and Beverley typologies, or follow those of Watkins 1987.

Code	Common Name
BANDSL	Banded Slip Ware
GREB	Glazed Red Earthenware Brown
FPWW	Factory-Produced White Earthenware
HAMB	Hambleton Ware
HUM1 / HUM 5	Humber Ware
LBLAK	Late Black Ware
MODSW	Modern Stone Ware
TPWW	Transfer-Printed White Earthenware
UGRE	Unglazed Red Earthenware
UNAT	Unidentified Medieval Orange Ware
WHDIP	White-Dipped Ware

A total of 34 sherds of pottery, with a combined weight of 766.9; having an average sherd weight (ASW) of 22.56g was retrieved from three contexts: Topsoil layers (101) and (201), and Primary Fill (330) of Soak-away (331). Also from Area 3 Unstratified (300).

The majority of the assemblage was of mid/late 19th to early 20th century date, with three shards representing 14th to 16th century onwards, and consistent with domestic waste.

Table 4: *The Pottery Assemblage by Context.*

Context No.	Fabric Code	Date	Description	Quantity	Weight (g)
101 Topsoil	HAMB	15 th Century		1	35.9g
	HUM1/ HUM5	14 th / 16 th Century onwards		1	12.1g
	UNAT	Medieval		1	6.9g
	BANDSL	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century		1	15.2g
	FPWW	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century		3	8.8g
	LBLAK	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century		1	7.4g
	MODSW	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century		4	60.7g
	TPWW	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century		2	12.1g
	UGRE	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century	Flower pot	1	12.1g
	WHDIP	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century		1	22.3g
201 Topsoil	FPWW	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century	Including 1 large pie bowl	8	120.4g
	MODSW	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century	Including 2 preserve jars	4	178.6g
	TPWW	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century	Dish	1	20.2g
	WHDIP	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century		2	146.7g

Table 4: *The Pottery Assemblage by Context (cont).*

Context No.	Fabric Code	Date	Description	Quantity	Weight (g)
300 Unstratified	LBLAK	Late 19 th / Early 20 th century		1	46.7g
330 Primary Fill of Soak- away [331]	UGRE	19 th century	Flower pot	1	5.6g
Total				34	766.9g

10.2 Clay Tobacco Pipe

One stem fragment weighing 2.5, was retrieved from Topsoil (101). Having no decorative features, an external stem diameter of 7.56mm, and central bore diameter of 1.95mm. Dating between late 19th and early 20th century, was consistent with the date ranges for the majority of the retrieved pottery. (P. Didsbury, *pers.comm.*).

10.3 The Glass Assemblage

A total of forty shards of glass, having a combined weight of 3061g was retrieved from three contexts: Topsoils (101), (201) and (301) (Table: 5).

The assemblage consisted mainly of bottles and jars associated with food, beverages (wine, beer, carbonated drinks) or pharmaceutical products, there was also one drinking glass, of the late 19th to 20th century date.

Fourteen had bottle makers numbers and/or letters on the base, which generally date from late 19th century onwards.

Five had external screw threads which were introduced from 1930 onwards (www.objectlessons.org).

Of the bottles with details of contents manufacturers, three from (301) were identified:

Burdalls Mfg Chemist, Sheffield (Plate: 21) – Were particularly known for making gravy salt and moved to the former complex of Hillsborough Barracks in October 1932 (www.sheffieldhistory.co.uk).

Peters Hull (Plate: 22) – Possibly that of (Julius) Peters, a Hull based company. He was born in Germany, however in 1871 he was running the Fleece Inn at 197 High Street, Hull. In 1880 he died and his wife continued the business, and in 1888 she married Peter Gerdt. This company produced Kola Champagne, Hop Ale, Ginger Beer, Champagne Cider, Lemonade and Orange Champagne. Their trademark was a buffalo. (hullwebs.co.uk).

However this bottle only had “Peters Hull” as the contents manufacturer’s details, it did not have the buffalo logo, and the lettering was of a more ornate fashion than in most examples. It may therefore date from 1888 onwards.

The D, B. & Co LD glass manufacture’s mark on the base of this bottle may refer to Bagley & Co Ltd, based in Knottingley between 1898 and 1962 (www.sha.org).

Kompo Registered (Plate: 23) – Advertised as “the best-known remedy for colds, influenza, sore throats etc.” Also claimed to treat complaints such as diarrhoea, cold feet and bad circulation (www.rpharms.com)

The bottle collected from topsoil (201) with the contents manufacture’s details of JE Brown, Market Weighton (Plate: 19) could not be identified, and the remaining fragments collected from Areas 1, 2 and 3 were too incomplete to identify.

Table 5: The Glass Assemblage by Context.

Context No.	Form	Date	Description	Quantity	Weight (g)
101 Topsoil	Rim/ Shoulder	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Jar. Clear.	1	38.5g
	Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle?/Jar? Clear. Series of 3 vertical triangles? 6 horizontal triangles.	1	12.8g
	Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle?/Jar? Clear.	1	8.5g
	Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle? Yellow-brown.	1	3.4g
	Basal	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Pale green-blue. Mould-made.	1	13.5g
201 Topsoil	Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Brown. Mould- made. External screw thread. Base Mark: 404 2.	1	77.7g
	Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Jar. Storage/Chemistry. Clear. Mould-made. Etched on inner rim. Base Mark: BRITISH MADE S10.	1	284.1g
	Body /Basal	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Pale green-blue. Details of contents manufacturer on body: J. E. BROWN, MARKET WEIGHTON.	1	407.7g
	Rim/ Shoulder	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Jar. Clear.	1	98.1g

Table 5: The Glass Assemblage by Context (cont).

Context No.	Form	Date	Description	Quantity	Weight (g)
201 Topsoil (cont)	Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Jar? Clear. Mould-made.	1	56.2g
	Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle? Clear. Mould-made. Details of contents manufacturer on body: []IN[]	1	17.4g
301 Topsoil	Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Food. Clear. Mould-made. Square cross- section body. External screw thread. Base Mark: BC2	1	381g
	Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Food. Clear. Mould- made. Square cross-section body. External screw thread. Base Mark: BC5	1	381.5g
	Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Clear. Mould- made. Octagonal cross- section body. External screw thread – metal cap intact. Front panel recessed with details of contents manufacturer: BURDALL'S MFG CHEMIST SHEFFIELD Base Mark: 3 489	1	216.9g (content inside)
	Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Jar. Clear. Mould-made. Storage/Chemistry. Base Mark: 155 F	1	295.4g
	Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Cosmetic/Pharmaceutical. Clear. Mould-made. Thickened rim.	1	58.3g
	Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Clear. Cosmetic/Pharmaceutical Mould-made. Base Mark: A55 C2 UG []	1	57.8g
	Near Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Neck & rim missing. Pale green/blue. Mould-made. Details of contents manufacturer on body: PETERS HULL. Base Mark: D, B. & C _o L _D S.	1	307.1g
	Body/ Basal	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	3 joining shards. Bottle. Clear. Mould-made. Front: Semi-circular for label, Back: 4 facets. Base Mark: G987 S5 UGB.	1	365.3g

Table 5: The Glass Assemblage by Context (cont).

Context No.	Form	Date	Description	Quantity	Weight (g)
301 Topsoil (cont)	Near Complete	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Clear. Mould-made. Rectangular cross-section body. Octagonal panel with details of contents manufacturer on body: KOMPO (REGISTERED). Base Mark: 148.	1	106.1g
	Body/ Basal	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Clear. Mould-made. Oval cross-section body. Base Mark: 419.	1	100.4g
	Body/ Basal	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Pharmaceutical. Clear. Mould-made. Rectangular cross-section body. One side has measurement scale. SPOONS. Base Mark: 2	1	55.6g
	Body/ Basal	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Clear. Mould-made. Square cross-section body. Base Mark: A. B. C.	1	69.3g
	Shoulder/ Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Clear. Mould-made. Details of contents manufacturer on body: CAR[]	1	12.3g
	Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Clear. Mould-made. Details of contents manufacturer on body: B[.].	1	4.8g
	Basal	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Clear. Mould-made. Details of contents manufacturer on body: [] REGD	1	8.8g
	Basal	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Jar. Clear. Mould-made. Storage/Chemistry. Base Mark: 450	1	120.4g
	Shoulder	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Clear. Mould-made.	1	5g
	Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Non-joining. Bottle. Clear. Mould-made.	2	77.8g
	Basal	Early 20 th century	Drinking Glass, poss. Short tumbler. Clear. Mould-made. 14 facets.	1	102.7g
	Rim/ Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Non-joining shards. Various jars. Clear. Storage/Chemistry.	3	112.8g
	Rim/ Body	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Joining shards. Jar. Clear. Storage/Chemistry.	2	52.1g

Table 5: *The Glass Assemblage by Context (cont).*

Context No.	Form	Date	Description	Quantity	Weight (g)
	Neck/ Shoulder	Late 19 th /Early20 th century	Bottle. Pharmaceutical. Clear. Mould-made.	1	20g
	Neck	20 th century	Bottle. Food. Clear. Mould-made. External screw thread – metal caps intact. Details of contents manufacturer on caps: HP	2	101g
	Body	Early20 th century	Bottle. Wine/beer. Green. Mould-made.	1	32g.
Total				40	3061.8g

11. Discussion

The earliest feature to be encountered was in Area 3, interpreted as a possible ditch which may be associated with that encountered by York Archaeological Trust in 1999 on the adjacent property to the east. However it may have been a shallow pit. No dating evidence was found which could determine when this feature had been in use. Analysis of the environmental sample from the fill was found to contain occasional uncharred seeds of orache/goosefoot and charred grain of possible barley. Also small fragments of coal, cinder and bone.

A later pit was also found in Area 3 which was below a group of brick foundations/walls relating to outbuildings associated with the Primitive Methodist Chapel which had formerly occupied the development site in the mid 19th to early 20th century. The brick samples collected from the foundations/walls were consistent with these dates.

The remaining features encountered were of the modern period, which included a series of soak-aways, encountered in Areas 1 and 3, and a pit in Area 1.

Retrieved material from the topsoil of the three areas mainly dated from the late 19th/early 20th century and consistent with domestic waste. However, two sherds of pottery were of the 14th to 16th century date.

Also a diagnostic fragment of box flue tile, of probable early 3rd to early 4th century date range, the presence of which suggests a hypocaust system in the locale.

12. Recommendations

No further work is recommended. However, if any future works are undertaken in the vicinity, there is the potential for the presence of further archaeological remains.

Unless the land owner requests its return, the finds assemblage is not recommended for retention. However, the Romano-British box flue tile, medieval pottery, some

of the glass assemblage with contents manufacturer's details, and the animal bone from pit fill 327 may be suitable for deposition at the discretion of the recipient museum.

13. Acknowledgements

PastSearch would like to thank Mr. H. Sadler for his invaluable assistance and co-operation throughout the duration of the monitoring, also Phillip Hodgson, machine drivers.

The on-site recording was undertaken and the figures were reproduced by Karen Adams.

PRS are grateful to Karen Adams, of PastSearch, for providing the material and the archaeological information.

14. Archive

The archive consists of:

A context register, context sheets, a plan and section register, plan and section drawings, contact sheets of digital photographs, a hard and digital copy of the report.

Following the completion of the archaeological monitoring, an ordered and indexed archive has been compiled in accordance with English Heritage guidelines (1991). The archive will be deposited within the relevant museum within the next six months.

15. Bibliography

Adams, K., 2013

Chapel Farm, Town Street, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire. Written scheme of investigation for archaeological observation, investigation and recording (watching brief) for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access road following partial demolition of outbuildings. (Unpublished)

Betts, I. M., 2001

'The Building Materials and geological samples from Fennings Wharf' in Watson, B. Brigham, T. and Dyson, T., 2001, 228-233

Blakeman, A., 2002

Bottles and Pot Lids, A Collector's Guide

Brodribb, G., 1987

Roman Brick and Tile, Gloucester

Cappers, R. T. J., Bekker, R. and Jans J. E. A. (2006). Digitale Zadenatlas van Nederland. Gronigen Archaeological Studies 4. Gronigen: Barkhuis Publishing and Gronigen University Library.

- Croom, A. T., 1997
'Tile' in Wenham, L. P. and Heywood, B., 1997, 155-157
- Dainton, M. (1992). A quick, semi-quantitative method for recording nematode gut parasite eggs from archaeological deposits. *Circaea, the Journal of the Association for Environmental Archaeology* **9**, 58-63.
- Dobney, K., Hall, A. R., Kenward, H. K. and Milles, A. (1992). A working classification of sample types for environmental archaeology. *Circaea, the Journal of the Association for Environmental Archaeology* **9** (for 1991), 24-6.
- English Heritage, 1991
Management of Archaeological Projects (MAP2)
- Halkon, P., 2013
The Parisi. Britons and Romans in Eastern Yorkshire. (Gloucester)
- Hedges, A. A. C., 1975
Bottles and Bottle Collecting, Shire Album 6
- Hume, I. N., 1969
A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America
- Institute of Field Archaeologists, 2008a
Standard and Guidelines for Archaeological Excavation, September 1995, Revised October 2008
- Institute of Field Archaeologists, 2008b
Standard and Guidelines for an Archaeological Watching Brief, October 1994, Revised October 2008
- Ward, C., 1999
Iron Age & Roman Piddington: The Roman Ceramic Building Materials, 1979-1998, The Upper Nene Archaeological Society
- Watson, B., Brigham, T. and Dyson, T., 2001
London Bridge 2000 years of River Crossing, MoLAS Monograph **8**
- Wenham, L. P. and Heywood, B., 1997
The 1968 to 1970 Excavations in the Vicus at Malton, North Yorkshire, Yorkshire Archaeol. Report No. **3**
- YAT, 1999, M Johnson
Report on an Archaeological Watching Brief at Edenvaar, Burnby Lane, Hayton

16. On-line Recources

British Geological Survey, 2012

Geology of Britain Viewer, www.mapapps.bgs.ac.uk [Accessed 06/11/2013]

Burdalls: www.objectlessons.org [Accessed: 5 February 2014]

www.sheffieldhistory.co.uk [Accessed: 5 February 2014]

Domeday Book: www.domesdaymap.co.uk [Accessed: 18 January 2014]

Genuki: www.genuki.org.uk [Accessed 18 January 2014]

Kompo Registered: www.rpharms.com [Accessed 6 February 2014]

Ordnance Survey, 2012

Old-maps.co.uk, www.old-maps.co.uk/maps.html [Accessed 15/06/2013]

Peters: www.hullwebs.co.uk [Accessed 6 February 2014]

www.sha.org [Accessed 6 February 2014]

17. Appendices

Appendix 1: *Context Register*

Area 1

100 – Unstratified

101 – Topsoil

102 – Subsoil

103 – Natural

104 – Fill of Pit [105]

105 – Pit

106 – Fill of Soak-away [107]

107 – Soak-away

108 – Fill of Soak-away [109]

109 – Soak-away

110 – Ménage Surface

Area 2

200 – Unstratified

201 – Topsoil

202 – Subsoil

Area 3

300 – Unstratified

301 – Topsoil

302 – Subsoil = 316

Area 3 (cont)

- 303 – Natural
- 304 – Tarmac Surface
- 305 – Hardcore
- 306 – Foundation/Wall
- 307 – Construction Cut for Foundation/Wall 306
- 308 – Levelling Layer
- 309 – Foundation/Wall
- 310 – Brick Surface
- 311 – Foundation/Wall
- 312 – Foundation/Wall
- 313 – Not Used
- 314 – Fill of Service Trench [315]
- 315 – Service Trench
- 316 – Subsoil = 302
- 317 – Fill of Pit [318]
- 318 – Pit
- 319 – Construction Cut for Foundation/Wall [309]
- 320 – Foundation/Wall
- 321 – Construction Cut for Foundation/Wall [320]
- 322 – Foundation/Wall
- 323 – Surface
- 324 – Hardcore
- 325 – Surface
- 326 – Hardcore
- 327 – Fill of ?Ditch [328]
- 328 - ?Ditch
- 329 – Upper/ Secondary Fill of Soak-away [331]
- 330 – Primary Fill of Soak-away [331]
- 331 – Soak-away
- 332 – Upper/ Secondary Fill of Soak-away [334]
- 333 – Primary Fill of Soak-away [334]
- 334 – Soak-away
- 335 – Concrete Foundation
- 336 – Surface
- 337 – Hardcore
- 338 – Fill of Soak-away [339]
- 339 – Soak-away
- 340 – Service Trench
- 341 – Service Trench

Appendix 2: *Written scheme of investigation for archaeological observation, investigation and recording (watching brief) for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access road following partial demolition of outbuildings at Chapel Farm, Town Street, Hayton.*

1 SUMMARY

The purpose of this written scheme of investigation is to present an archaeological strategy in support for the below ground works associated with archaeological observation, investigation and recording (watching brief) for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access road following partial demolition of outbuildings at Chapel Farm, Town Street, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire. (NGR: (Centre) SE81958 45868). Application number: DC/13/00664/PLF/WESTWW (Revised Scheme of 12/04724/PLF), SMR Ref: SMR/PA/CONS/18285.

The ground works are expected to be undertaken over a period of days in June and July 2013.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Site archaeological background

The following information has been provided by the HSMR (2 April 2013).

“The site of the proposed development lies within the village of Hayton, which itself lies on the course of the Roman road which ran from Brough to York. Located along this road, and to the south-west of the development site lies the site of a Roman auxiliary fort along with various areas of Romano-British occupation. Excavations at the fort site has shown that it was of Flavian origin (69-89 A.D) and that it was abandoned during the same period; barrack buildings, refuse pits and gates were also identified during the archaeological work. Evidence of later occupation within the area of the fort was also identified; this evidence existed in the form of a Grubenhaus (sunken floored building) along with spindle whorls, a bone comb and sherds of several late 5th century pots. Other finds from the fort included coins, animal bones and quern stones; a human skull was also discovered at the bottom of the inner ditch and a complete cow burial of pre-Roman date was found near the eastern corner. Adjacent to the application site a programme of archaeological work identified a possible Roman ditch, whilst another Roman ditch was recorded during another programme of works across the road from the proposal site.

It is likely therefore, that any groundworks in this area will encounter previously unknown heritage assets dating to the prehistoric, Romano-British and later periods.

The planning application suggests that the proposed work will involve below-ground disturbance (e.g. for the excavation of the footings, and new services for the new

dwellings, and any preliminary ground preparation) – and that these are likely to extend to a sufficient depth to impact upon surviving archaeological remains. Hence, it is important that a programme of archaeological observation, investigation and recording is carried out during construction work so that any archaeological deposits that might be uncovered can be recorded.”

2.2 Site location and geology

The site is centred on NGR: (Centre) SE81958 45868 and lies on land to the north west of Chapel Farm, Town Street, Hayton, East Riding of Yorkshire.

The underlying solid geology of the site is Mercia Mudstone Group - Mudstone. Sedimentary Bedrock formed approximately 206 to 248 million years ago in the Triassic Period, with superficial deposits of Pocklington Gravel Formation - Sandy Gravel. Superficial Deposits formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary Period.

2.3 Planning background

Permission for this development was granted on the 11 April 2013 subject to various conditions including an archaeological condition that:

“No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details (Circular 11/95, Model Clause 55).

The request for this condition is in line with Policies 128, 129, 131, 135, 136, 139 and 141 within Section 12 ‘*Conserving and enhancing the historic environment*’, in the *National Planning Policy Framework 2012*.”

The recommendation of a programme of observation, investigation and recording (watching brief) during all below ground works has been requested because” the application site lies the village of Hayton, which sits along the Roman road between Brough and York, and in which extensive evidence of occupation from the Romano-British period has been identified.”

3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The aim of this archaeological recording shall be to:

- ▶ Establish the presence/absence, nature, date, depth, quality and importance of any archaeological features and deposits, including burials.
- ▶ Enable an assessment of the potential and significance of the archaeology of the site to be made, and the impact which development will have upon them.

The current knowledge of the site and its environs suggests that archaeological remains of Romano-British might be present. The objective of the archaeological investigation will therefore be to:

- ▶ Identify and record all archaeological features and artefacts exposed during the below ground works;
- ▶ Establish the sequence of archaeological deposits;
- ▶ Determine the form and function of any archaeological features identified;

The results will be presented in appropriate detail in a post-excavation assessment report. Assessment of the results of the fieldwork will also aim to provide recommendations as to the need, or otherwise, for further research on any of the excavated material and will determine the appropriate methods for dissemination of the results should they be of any archaeological significance.

All archaeological work will be carried out to a sufficient standard to satisfy the aims of the project and the requirements of HSMR, as outlined in their Notes for archaeological contractors proposing to work in the area covered by the Humber SMR (Evans 1999); the work will also conform to the standards promoted in the Institute of Field Archaeologists' Standards and Guidance for archaeological excavation (IFA 2008a; b).

4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 The site

4.1.1 Access road (Fig: 2; Plate 3)

The proposed route of the access road mainly follows that of a pre-existing hard standing area along the northeastern boundary of Chapel Farm, and to the northeast of the proposed development area of the detached dwelling (See Plate 3). Therefore little to no further reduction of ground level is expected which will require observation. Any further ground reduction that is required for the access road, to be undertaken by an appropriate mechanical excavator with a toothless ditching bucket, to the required depth. The recording will involve identifying, planning and photographing features to a standard acceptable to HSMR.

4.1.2 Foundation trenches and drainage (Fig: 2; Plate 2)

The removal of turf and excavation of foundation trenches and drainage to be undertaken by an appropriate mechanical excavator with a toothless bucket, down to the required levels. The recording will involve identifying, planning and photographing features to a standard acceptable to HSMR.

N.B. If the construction programme is to be excavated in phased stages, then the archaeological work may be similarly phased, but the basic approach and methodology will remain the same.

4.2 Excavation

At the very least, the sequence and depth of exposed subsoil deposits will be noted.

Where features of archaeological interest are present, recording procedures will be those generally used on archaeological excavations. Plans will be completed at an appropriate scale (e.g. 1:20 or 1:50). Sections will also be drawn at an appropriate scale (e.g. 1:10), and written context description will be compiled. A full digital photographic record will be taken using a Fuji Finepix XP50, 14 mega pixel resolution. Also significant features or artefacts will be recorded in 35mm format photographs in monochrome print film and colour slide, using a Nikon FG-20 SLR camera. The level of features or deposits relative to Ordnance Datum will be determined where possible.

Any artefacts recovered will be bagged according to their context. The recovery and processing of the finds will be undertaken in accordance with IFA and ULIC standards and guidelines (2008d; Watkinson and Neal 1998). Soil samples will be taken from features or deposits deemed likely to have palaeoenvironmental potential (see below). The environmental sampling and subsequent assessment and/or analysis (if required) will be in line with the recommendations of English Heritage policy guidance (2011 2nd edition).

If finds or archaeological remains of special significance are encountered, negotiations between the client, PastSearch and HSMR should take place to determine appropriate procedures.

4.3 Finds Strategy

Finds encountered will be recorded to professional standards; in line with IFA and MoRPHE guidelines and also compliant with specifications of MAP2 (IFA 2008c; English Heritage 2008; *ibid* 1991) using recognised procedures and numbering systems compatible with the accessioning system employed by the recipient museum. Recording, marking and storage materials will be of archive quality. Finds of particular interest – ie. Those other than bulk finds such as animal bone, pottery or ceramic building materials – will be allocated a Recorded Find number and their description will be entered onto an appropriate *pro forma* sheet. A site-specific accession number will be agreed with the Museum Service.

The analysis/conservation of any finds from the site will be dealt with as follows: after quantification of any such material, the clients will be provided with cost estimates for any necessary work so that funding can be agreed – contingency sums only will be included in any cost estimates.

Artefacts such as gold or silver, as defined under the categories of ‘treasure’ in accordance with Section C of The Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice, will be reported to the Coroner.

4.4 Human Remains

If human burials are encountered, they will be recorded in situ and removed in accordance with the conditions set out in a license for the removal of Human Remains,

issued by the Ministry of Justice. PastSearch will contact the Ministry on the client's behalf.

Human remains will be treated with due respect and adequately recorded using recording forms designed specifically for such use, in line with procedures outlined in IFA Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains (Brickley and McKinley 2004) and English Heritage guidelines (2004; 2005). Any skeletal material will be lifted and arrangements made for storage, unless licence specifies reburial or cremation.

4.5 Strategy for the recovery and sampling of biological remains

Environmental samples to be taken from any identifiable archaeological features; the sampling and subsequent assessment and/or analysis will be in line with the recommendations of English Heritage policy guidance (2011 2nd edition).

When the material has been quantified, estimates for the assessment (and where necessary, subsequent analysis) will be passed to the client to arrange funding; only indicative allowances for this work will be included in any initial cost estimates.

The aim of sediment sampling within the context of this evaluation will be to gather sufficient material for analysis of biological remains within archaeological features and to assess their bio-archaeological potential. To this end a number of samples will be taken from excavated features. It is not intended to introduce an extensive blanket sampling policy involving the routine sampling of features; rather, a range of dated and undated contexts will be targeted, combining judgement with systematic sampling where this is appropriate. These may include burnt deposits and those with visible preserved organic material from specific types of features e.g. pit fills, ditch fills, occupation deposit/floor silts (if clearly uncontaminated, i.e. separated from modern soils, sealed beneath other clay floors).

A selection will also be made of deposits with no visible potential. The exceptions will be deposits which are unstratified, unsealed (liable to contamination), ground makeups or other deposits which are likely to have been imported and contain residual or intrusive material, except where specific questions are posed. This is in line with the recommendations of English Heritage policy guidance (2011 2nd edition).

All samples will initially be examined at PastSearch premises. In light of this examination and the results of the fieldwork, suitable material will be sent to Palaeoecology Research Services (PRS) based in Hull for assessment.

4.6 Spot/ID samples

A small number of spot samples, such as concentrations of small bones, seeds etc. might be taken, as may sample of wood for identification.

4.7 Animal Bones

Animal bones will be hand-collected from all excavated features, and will be bagged and labelled according to their excavated context. Where deposits are noted to contain

dense concentrations of bones, then these will be sampled as BS samples as described in the English Heritage policy guidance (2011, 2nd edition). Collected bones will be examined by PRS.

4.8 Specialist dating

Specialist dating may be considered in certain circumstances, normally where contexts or features cannot be dated by other ‘conventional’ methods (e.g. pottery, artefacts, documentary). There are three main types which may be considered, broadly: dendrochronological sampling of preserved timbers; archaeo-magnetic assay of slow-accumulated water lain silts and hearth/kiln structures; radiocarbon/accelerator mass spectroscopy (AMS) dating of organic material recovered either from GBA/BS samples or taken as Spot/ID samples (e.g. bone, shell, organic sediments). Costs for such analyses will be approved with the client before expenditure

4.9 Off-site works

Upon completion of all below ground works requiring observation, investigation and recording, collected artefacts, soil samples, and written and drawn information will be retained for assessment which will comply with IFA and MoRPHE guidelines and also compliant with specifications of MAP 2 (IFA 2008c; English Heritage 2008; *ibid* 1991). At which time its full potential and significance can be properly assessed. The site records will be indexed and assessed, leading to the production of a detailed report;

All finds will be examined, catalogued and prepared for the archive. PastSearch retain the right at this stage to discard unstratified material; particularly that from modern topsoil and overburden, unless of clear intrinsic interest.

Any finds recovered will be cleaned and examined; recording, marking and storage materials will be of archive quality. Provision will be made for the radiography of all stratified metal finds and the assessment of the conservation needs of the whole finds assemblage by a recognized specialist, such as the York Archaeological Trust (YAT) conservation laboratory. A sum will be allocated to allow for initial conservation or stabilization of artefacts found. If applicable, a report will be produced by the conservator on the results of this assessment for inclusion in the main evaluation report.

The pottery will be assessed by a sub-contracted pottery specialist with experience of regional ceramic forms and fabrics.

Soil samples will be sent to an environmental specialist following an initial selection process for more detailed examination, including paraffin flotation for the recovery of insect remains in necessary. Arrangements will also be made to assess specialist samples where these have been taken.

The animal bones and any human bones will be assessed by suitably qualified specialists.

Artefacts requiring radiocarbon, dendrochronology or species identification will also be selected for specialist analysis.

4.10 Archive preparation and deposition (including finds retention/disposal)

The archive will be prepared (including finds retention/disposal) in accordance with procedures recommended by English Heritage (2008) and the IFA (2008c; Brown 2007). The site archive, including finds and environmental material, subject to the permission of the relevant landowners, will be labelled, conserved and stored according to the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation (UKIC) (Walker 1990) and the Museums and Galleries Commission (MGC 1992).

It is intended that the site archive will be deposited with a suitable repository which meets the criteria for the storage of archaeological material; they will be contacted at an early stage in the project. Finds remain the property of the landowner until such time as they may grant title to a museum.

Upon completion of post-excavation work, the ownership of the finds can be transferred to the museum, with the written archive also being transferred by the archaeological contractor. All recorded finds would be deposited as a matter of course, but discussions would need to take place upon completion of post-excavation work to determine which bulk finds were of sufficient importance to be deposited as per the recipient museums guidelines. An allowance will be made as a contribution to the recipient museum towards the long-term curation and storage of materials.

4.11 Report production

Within six weeks of the completion of the work, a report will be produced by the archaeologist and submitted to the developer, the local Planning Authority and the SMR office.

The final report should include the following (as appropriate)

- ▶ Summary.
- ▶ Site code/project number.
- ▶ Planning reference number and SMR Casework number.
- ▶ Dates for fieldwork visits.
- ▶ Grid reference.
- ▶ A location plan, with scale.
- ▶ A plan of the developer's plan showing the areas monitored (e.g. the site of the new dwelling, service trenches, and the new access road), and indicating the position of archaeological features in relation to the foundations etc., with scale.
- ▶ Section and plan drawings (where archaeological deposits are exposed), and ground level, Ordnance Datum and vertical and horizontal scales.
- ▶ Photographs (a minimum 35mm format) where significant archaeological deposits or artefacts are encountered; also general photographs to show the prevailing condition of the site at the time of fieldwork. These may be supplemented with digital photographs, with a minimum resolution of 10 megapixels.

- ▶ A written description and analysis of the methods and results of the archaeological fieldwork, in the context of the known archaeology of the area.
- ▶ Specialist artefact and environmental reports, as necessary.

Digital copies of the reports (in PDF format) will be supplied to the client, the HSMR and to the Local Planning Authorities. A hard copy will also be submitted to the HSMR and if requested, to the client.

4.12 Copyright, confidentiality and publicity

Unless the client wishes to state otherwise, the copyright of any written, graphic or photographic records and reports rests with the originating body; that is the archaeological organization undertaking the fieldwork and analysis.

The results of the work will remain confidential, initially being distributed only to the clients, their agents, and HSMR, and will remain so until such time as it is submitted in support of a planning application and is then deemed to have entered the public domain. All aspects of publicity will be agreed at the outset of the project between the client and HSMR.

A brief note on the findings will be submitted for publication in a local or regional archaeological journal. However, the findings may be of insufficient importance to merit more detailed publication. Recommendations as to the need or otherwise for additional post-excavation works to produce a published report, will be identified in the assessment reports.

4.13 Health and safety, insurance

Health and Safety will take priority over archaeological matters. Under the terms of the Management of Health and Safety Regulations 1992, PastSearch prepare a Risk Assessment for any excavations undertaken. Overall policy is in line with recommendations set out by SCAUM Manual Health and Safety in Field Archaeology (Allen and St. John Holt 2006).

Members of staff are given a Health and Safety induction at commencement of all projects. PastSearch is fully covered by a Public Liability Insurance Policy.

4.14 Monitoring

The work will be monitored by HSMR to ensure that it is carried out to the required standard. This working scheme of investigation has been submitted to them for approval. The opportunity will be afforded for them to visit the site and to inspect and comment upon the excavation and recording procedures.

5 TIMETABLE AND STAFFING

5.1 Timetable for the work

The archaeological recording work should not cause undue delay to the overall programme of site work, however, the main contractor and client will ensure that PastSearch has sufficient time and resources to make sure fulfilment with all elements of this WSI.

The work is expected to be undertaken over a period of days in June/July 2013.

The fieldwork will be followed by a post-excavation period, during which the assessment report will be produced, including (as appropriate) any specialist assessments.

5.2 Project Team, Staff Experience and Technical Expertise

The on-site monitoring will be carried out by a Project Officer. Subsequent hand-cleaning and investigation, recording or surveying, will require the assistance of Site Assistants.

The off-site team will comprise the Project Officer, Finds Officer and an Illustrator, with the assessment of any pottery and ceramic building material being undertaken by a specific sub-contracted specialist, and contributions from other artefact and environmental specialists as required. The above will be under the overall direction of the Project Officer. The project team includes the following, with expertise drawn as necessary from the external specialists listed.

Project Manager

K. Adams – Extensive professional experience in archaeological fieldwork since 1986, on excavations covering a large range of archaeological periods, in particular Iron Age and Romano-British. Also finds processing in accordance with MAP2 and MoRPHE requirements and CAD illustration.

Site/Finds Assistants

Experienced staff who have worked in the region on numerous projects.

Finds Analysis

S. Tibbles, Cert. Arch. (Hull) & Dip. Arch. (Hull) – has extensive experience in finds assessments and publications.

Pottery Specialists

P. Didsbury, MPhil, Cert.Ed. – who has extensive experience of pottery research on material from the region, and in particular, has published reports on Saxon, medieval and post-medieval regional assemblages.

Ceramic Building Materials

J. Tibbles, BA (Hons), Cert.Arch. (Hull), Dip.H.E, AIFA. – has extensive experience in CBM assessments and publication reports for all periods. Has also developed the regional typology for CBM over recent years.

S. Tibbles, Cert. Arch. (Hull) & Dip. Arch. (Hull) – has extensive experience in CBM assessments and publications. Has developed the regional Romano-British tegula typology.

Conservation

York Archaeological Trust Conservation Laboratory (conservation, specialist reports on wood and leather).

Environmental Specialists

Palaeoecology Research Services (biological remains).

Human Remains

York Osteoarchaeology

And appropriate specialists for Lithics, Worked Stone, Soil, Archaeomagnetism, Geophysics, Dendrochronology, Radiocarbon/AMS, as required

6 REFERENCES

Allen, J.L. And St. John Holt, A. 2006

Health and Safety in Field Archaeology, Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers.

Brickley and McKinley (eds) 2004

Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains, IFA Paper No.7.

British Geological Survey 2012

Geology of Britain Viewer, <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html> [Accessed 11 June 2013]

Brown, D.H. 2007

Archaeological Archives: A guide to best practice in the creation, compilation, transfer and curation, Published by IFA on behalf of the Archaeological Archives Forum.

English Heritage 2011

Environmental Archaeology, A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation, Second edition, Swindon.

English Heritage 2008

PPN3: Archaeological Excavation (MoRPHE)

English Heritage 2005

Guidance for best practice for treatment of human remains excavated from Christian burial grounds in England, Swindon

English Heritage 2004

Human Bones from Archaeological Sites Guidelines for producing assessment documents and analytical reports, Swindon

English Heritage, 1991
Management of Archaeological Projects (MAP2)

East Riding of Yorkshire Museums Service 2006,
Policy on Archaeological Archives (Revised June 2006)
East Riding of Yorkshire Museums Service 2009,
Guidelines for sampling/disposal of archaeological material prior to deposition in museums (Draft April 2009).

Evans, D. 1999
Notes for Archaeological contractors proposing to work in the area covered by Humber SMR.

Institute of Field Archaeologists 2008a
Standard and Guidance for archaeological excavation, September 1995 (revised October 2008).

Institute of Field Archaeologists 2008b
Standard and Guidance for archaeological watching brief, October 1994 (revised October 2008).

Institute of Field Archaeologists 2008c
Standard and Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials, September 2001, revised October 2008

Museums and Galleries Commission 1992
Standards in museum care of archaeological collections

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The Treasure Act, 1996
Code of Practice (2nd Revision)

Walker, K. 1990
Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long term storage, United Kingdom Institute for Conservation.

Watkinson, D and Neal, V 1998
First Aid for Finds, RESCUE and the Archaeology Section of the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation, 3rd edition, London