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1 Introduction

Archaeological Services WYAS (ASWYAS) were commissioned by Stephen Otley of B&B Otley Discretionary 2008 Trust (the Client), to undertake a programme of trial trench excavation on land near Upper Poppleton, York (see Fig. 1) in advance of the proposed development of an area for touring caravans and motorhomes at Wheatlands, Northfield Lane, Upper Poppleton. The work was undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (Appendix 1), in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and employing standards laid down by English Heritage (2006; 2008) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014). The evaluation was carried out between October 26th and 30th 2015.

Site location, topography and land-use

The proposed development area (PDA) is located approximately 3.5km north-west of York and 1km south of the village of Upper Poppleton. The PDA consists of two agricultural fields, bound to the east by the A1237 York Ring Road and to the west by Northfield Lane. Commercial units border the site to the north and south. The site is centred at NGR SE 560 529 and lies at a height of approximately 22m OD.

Soils and geology

The underlying bedrock of the site comprises Sherwood Sandstone Group, a sedimentary bedrock formed approximately 229 to 271 million years ago in the Triassic and Permian Periods. The local environment was previously dominated by rivers (British Geological Survey 2015). The superficial geology is recorded as Poppleton Glaciofluvial Member, formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary Period. The soils of the area are of the Blackwood formation and comprise deep permeable sandy and coarse loamy soils (Soil Survey of England and Wales 1983).

2 Archaeological Background

A desk-based assessment (DBA) was carried out on 1km of land surrounding the PDA (Lee 2015). No designated heritage assets or Scheduled Monuments were found to be present within the PDA though some potential for buried archaeological remains was highlighted. Two Roman roads may have passed close to, or even through the site, and several nearby Iron Age or Roman crop mark have been located in the area. Evidence of ridge and furrow ploughing is found in close proximity to the site, which has not been dated. A map regression of the PDA identified six field boundaries which are no longer extant and that the current field boundaries showed evidence of their previous inclusion as part of an open field system. A study of the available mapping from the mid-19th century onwards, indicated that this area has remained in agricultural use from this period onwards.
A geophysical survey of the PDA was undertaken in September 2015 (Swinbank and Tanner 2015). This identified several anomalies of an uncertain origin, including a ‘U’ shaped response, a rectilinear pattern and a ridge and furrow field system. At least one field boundary was also identified.

Archaeological remains have also been excavated nearby. A Romano-British boundary ditch was identified during works at the Park & Ride car park c.100m to the north-west of the PDA. Other Romano-British artefacts were also found during the excavation at the Park and Ride, although owing to the presence of more modern artefacts within the same contexts, these were probably residual (Keefe 2013).

3 Aims and Objectives

The overall aim of the evaluation was to provide information on the presence or absence and the extent, character, date, depth of burial and degree of survival of any archaeological features or deposits which may be present within the PDA. The results of the trial trenching, in conjunction with the geophysical survey results, were used to inform the level and type of mitigation work that might be required in order to ensure that the archaeological resource was adequately recorded before development.

To achieve this aim, a total of thirteen trenches were excavated within this scheme of investigation, eleven measuring 50m x 2m and the remaining two measuring 25m x 2m. The trenches were widely placed across the PDA, many of which targeted geophysical anomalies with others located in apparently blank areas of the site (Table 1, Fig. 2).

4 Methodology

Excavation of the trenches was carried out using a mechanical excavator equipped with a toothless ditching bucket until either the top of the first archaeological horizon or undisturbed natural was reached. The resulting surface was inspected for archaeological remains. Linear features were excavated in slots at least 1m in length in order to investigate their depth and profile and to recover finds, whilst discreet features were at least 50% sampled.

A full written, drawn and photographic (35mm monochrome and digital) record of all material revealed during the course of the work was made. The trench locations were set out using GPS survey equipment with hand drawn trench plans and sections produced at a suitable scale and tied to the Ordnance Survey National Grid. All sections, plans and elevations included spot-heights related to Ordnance Datum in metres as correct to two decimal places.
All artefacts recovered were retained and removed from the site for assessment. Soil samples were taken of deposits, where appropriate, in order to identify and recover carbonised and waterlogged remains, vertebrate remains, molluscs and small artefactual material.

An inventory of the primary archive is presented in Appendix 2, and a concordance of finds and samples by context, is presented in Appendix 3. ASWYAS currently hold the site archive in a stable and secure location, but it will be deposited with Leeds Museum for long-term storage in due course.

All excavation was undertaken in line with the CIfA guidelines Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (2014), the English Heritage MoRPHE PPN3: Archaeological Excavation (2008) and in compliance with ASWYAS’s own methodologies (ASWYAS 2011).

5 Results
The results from the interventions are summarised in Table 1 and trench locations are shown in Fig. 2.

A dark greyish-brown sandy-clay or silty-sand topsoil was encountered across the entire site, varying in depth between 0.25m and 0.40m. A mid or light-brown silty-sand or sandy-clay subsoil was found beneath this with a depth of generally no more than 0.40m but occasionally, such as in Trench 9, it had built up as a layer of colluvium at the base of a slope and measured up to 1.0m in depth. Across most of the site the first geological layer encountered was a light yellowish sand, but in Trenches 7, 8 and 10 this was mixed with a mid-orangey-brown clay. A number of finds were retained from the topsoil and subsoil, including Romano-British and medieval pottery fragments, two flint fragments, an oyster shell and a fragment of Romano-British tile (see Appendix 3).

Twelve of the thirteen trenches excavated contained archaeological features which were cut into the natural and were sealed by topsoil and/or subsoil. These are discussed in detail below. Several of these correspond closely with geophysical anomalies, with others producing no clear response in the geophysics data.
Table 1. Summary of results from the individual interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench No.</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Total Depth</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.60m</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Targeting area with no geophysical responses. Undated ditch and discreet pit excavated. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.55m</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Targeting area with no geophysical responses. No archaeological remains present (Plate 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.50m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting a blank area to ascertain if linear anomalies continue. Two ephemeral traces of plough furrows recorded at northern end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.70m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting three linear anomalies. Three clear plough furrows and an undated, small gully excavated. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.55m</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Targeting area with no geophysical responses. Single, undated ditch excavated. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.45m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting a ‘U’-shaped anomaly and three linear anomalies. A large pit feature – possible quarry pit or pond of probable 18th-century date – and a linear feature and pit containing cremated bone were excavated. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.80m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting a blank area to ascertain if linear anomalies continue. A total of four features excavated. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.08m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting four linear anomalies. Three plough furrows were recorded and a ditch. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.70m – 1.10m</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Targeting two linear anomalies. Several ephemeral features seen but investigation limited due to depth. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25m x 2m</td>
<td>0.50m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting two linear anomalies. Two clearly defined furrows and an undated ditch excavated. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.80m</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Targeting three linear anomalies. Two linear features and a single large pit, Romano-British brick and cremated bone fragments recovered. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>50m x 2m</td>
<td>0.65m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting a linear anomaly. Large Romano-British ditch and small gully excavated. See below for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25m x 2m</td>
<td>0.50m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting a linear anomaly. Single undated feature excavated. See below for details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trench 1 (Figs 3 and 4)

Ditch 103 ran north to south roughly across the trench, containing two fills and measuring approximately 1m wide and 0.55m deep, with a steep, V-shaped profile. The lowermost fill (104) was a mid-brown silty-sand with a depth of 0.20m. The upper fill (105) was a mid-orangey-brown silty-sand. Neither fill contained any finds.

Pit 106 was found towards the eastern end of the trench, extending 0.86m from the northern trench edge, with a width of 0.90m and a depth of 0.31m. It contained a single dark blackish-brown silty-sand fill (107) with no finds.

Trench 4 (Fig. 5)

Two well-defined plough furrows were seen to run east-west across the trench which roughly correspond with the anomalies detected by the geophysics, with the northernmost furrow possibly also marking the location of a former field boundary.

Gully 403 also ran across the trench with a south-west to north-east alignment, to the north of the furrows. It had a width of 0.3m and a depth of 0.11m and contained a single mid-orangey-brown silty-sand fill (404) with no finds.

Trench 5 (Fig. 5 and 6, Plate 2)

Ditch 502 ran north to south across the centre of the trench, measuring 1.45m wide and 0.50m deep, with a steep, V-shaped profile. It contained a single mid-orangey-grey silty-sand fill (503) with no finds.

Trench 6 (Figs 5 and 6, Plates 3 and 4)

No trace of the linear geophysical anomalies was seen and it is presumed that these were shallow furrows which were not deep enough to cut into the natural, and were not observed during machining.

Feature 604 lay near the southern end of the trench, the edges of which correspond with the large, U-shaped geophysical anomaly the trench was targeting (Fig. 2). The northern half of the feature was partially excavated by machine to a depth of 1.0m before excavation was curtailed due to concerns over the stability of the loose, sandy baulk. No further excavation was carried out and the feature was recorded in this state. The feature had a width within the trench of 9.20m, a shallow slope to its northern edge and was filled with a dark greyish-brown sandy-silt (603). The fill contained small fragments of CBM and a sherd of 18th-century stoneware. The interpretation of the feature remains unclear though it is suggested that it may be a sand quarry pit. Its form does resemble that of a pond, though there is no
suggestion that the feature could hold water, lying in a relatively high, well drained part of the field.

Ditch 606 ran west to east across the trench along the southern edge of Feature 604. It measured 0.80m wide and 0.16m deep, with a wide, U-shaped profile. It contained a single dark greyish-brown fill (605) with no finds. Although the feature lies on the same alignment as the furrows, it does not have the wide, flat profile displayed by furrows elsewhere.

Pit 608 extended 0.65m from the southern end of the trench, with a width of 1.23m and a depth of 0.24m. It contained a backfill of mixed light and dark brown silty-sand with a lens or tip of blackish-brown material close to its surface (607). The burnt layer had a width of 0.55m in the section and a depth of 0.10m, and contained a large amount of charcoal and cremated bone. No datable finds were recovered from the fill. The base of the feature was found to be irregular, possibly reflecting disturbance, perhaps by rooting, after backfilling.

**Trench 7 (Figs 7 and 8, Plate 5)**

A total of four separate features were recorded running east to west across the northern half of the trench. These correspond roughly with the likely continuation of furrows seen in the geophysical survey and, at least before excavation, were assumed to be furrows.

Feature 703 had a width of 2.10m, a depth of 0.27m and a wide, concave profile. It was filled with a single deposit of mid-pinkish-brown sandy-silt (704) with no finds. The feature may be a particularly broad furrow.

Feature 705 measured 1.14m wide and 0.30m deep with a more pronounced U-shape to its profile. It contained a single mid-greyish-brown sandy-silt fill (706) with no finds. Despite appearing to align with other furrows, its shape and size suggest it is more likely to be a ditch of unknown date.

Feature 707 measured 2.65m wide and 0.48m deep with a wide, concave profile and contained a single mid-orangey-brown silty-sand fill (708) from which a small piece of CBM and a piece of clay pipe were recovered. Feature 707 appeared to be cut by feature 709 on its northern edge. Feature 709 had a width of 3.18m and a depth of 0.30m with a similar broad profile. It contained a single mid-orangey-brown silty-sand fill (710) with occasional clayey patches. It contained occasional small CBM fragments and medieval pottery. Both features 707 and 709 are likely to be furrows perhaps indicating two separate phases of ploughing.

**Trench 8 (Figs 9 and 10, Plate 6)**

A total of three features ran east to west across the southern half of the trench, which resembled furrows and correspond broadly with the results of the geophysical survey.
Ditch 803 ran across the trench on a south-south-west to north-north-east alignment. A 1m section of the ditch was excavated in the centre of the trench. Here, it measured 0.87m wide and 0.29m deep and contained a single mid-blackish or orangey-brown clayey-sand fill (804). The fill contained a single piece of struck flint – an end scraper. Its abraded shape indicates it had probably been in the ploughsoil for an extended period and therefore is likely to be residual.

**Trench 9 (Fig. 11)**

A total of five possible, though poorly defined, features ran across the trench, two of which corresponded in location and alignment with geophysical anomalies. Unfortunately the subsoil was particularly deep at each end of the trench, and no investigation was possible of three of the features due to safety concerns in working around an unstable baulk. The remaining two features were shallow and poorly defined spreads of darker material within the sand and are likely to have had a natural origin.

**Trench 10 (Figs 11 and 12)**

Two wide, shallow furrows were seen towards each end of the trench, with an east to west alignment, which correspond with the results of the geophysical survey.

Ditch 1004 ran across the centre of the trench, measuring 0.60m wide and 0.11m deep. It was filled with a dark brown sandy-clay fill (1003) which contained no finds. The feature was parallel with the furrows though much thinner and with steeper concave sides.

**Trench 11 (Figs 13 and 14, Plates 8 and 9)**

This trench targeted three linear geophysical anomalies. On excavation the western anomaly appeared to have been caused by a modern plastic service pipe (Fig. 2). The remaining three features may have had an archaeological origin (Fig. 13).

Gully 1106 ran north-south across the trench in the approximate location of a geophysical anomaly. It measured 0.55m wide and 0.07m deep and it contained a mid-brownish-grey silty-sand (1105). Its shallowness and indistinct fill means the feature is unreliable and may have a natural origin.

Ditch 1108 corresponds with the eastern geophysical anomaly, running north to south close to the eastern end of the trench. The feature measured 0.90m wide and 0.30m deep with a U-shaped profile and was filled with a dark greyish-brown silty-sand fill (1107) which contained no finds.

Pit 1104 lay near the western end of the trench. It had a rounded shape with a circumference of c. 1.40m and a depth of 0.60m, with near vertical sides and a flat base. It contained a
single dark brownish-grey silty-sand fill (1103) with frequent charcoal, burnt and unburnt bone, fired clay fragments and a large Romano-British brick fragment. The mixed appearance of the fill with the lack of any inwash of natural sand from the edge suggests the feature was backfilled soon after its excavation.

**Trench 12 (Figs 13 and 14, Plate 10)**

Ditch 1203 and 1205 ran east to west across the centre of the trench, corresponding with a linear geophysical anomaly. Ditch 1203 measured 2.70m wide and 0.75m deep with a wide V-shaped profile. It contained a single mid-orangey-brown sandy-silt fill (1204) which contained a small Romano-British CBM fragments and animal bone. Ditch 1205 measured 1.40m wide and 0.40m deep and contained a single mid-brownish-grey sandy-silt (1206) with no finds. Ditch 1205 appeared to cut 1203, representing a likely recut of the same boundary feature.

Gully 1207 ran for over 10m across the southern end of the trench with a north-north-west to south-south-east alignment. No trace of the feature was seen to extend into Trench 11 to the south. In section it measured 0.72m wide and 0.23m deep, though the feature became thinner and was shallow enough to have been largely ploughed out a few metres to the south. It contained a single mid-greyish-brown sandy-silt fill (1208) with no finds.

**Trench 13 (Figs 13 and 15)**

Ditch 1303 corresponds with the same geophysical anomaly as Ditch 1203/1205. The feature had a comparable width at 3.40m but was much shallower at only 0.24m. It had a shallow, wide irregular profile. Despite the difference in profile and dimensions it may be the same boundary feature, becoming shallower downslope. It contained a single, mid-orangey-brown silty-sand fill.

**6 Artefact Record**

**Flint** by I. Brookes

A total of three flint artefacts were recovered. Each of the artefacts was found in a different trench and none were in a secure context and thus they can only be regarded as residual.

There are no natural flint resources within the area of the evaluation, with the nearest primary (Cretaceous) resources those of the Yorkshire Wolds, most noticeably outcropping at Flamborough Head some 70km to the east. The flint here, however, tends to be of relatively poor quality, being pale grey, opaque and faulted (Brooks 1989, Henson 1985). Of more importance are the derived deposits also outcropping along the Yorkshire coast consisting of a series of tills and associated gravels which contain a dispersed resource of good quality.
flint. These deposits are also found in the till deposits of Yorkshire which outcrop much nearer to the site. It is these resources which are more likely to be the source of the raw materials used for the artefacts from Wheatlands.

Two of the artefacts are undiagnostic broken flakes (from Trenches 4 and 11), one of which is on a semi-translucent pale yellowish brown (10 YR 6/2 Goddard et al. 1948) flint typical of that from the tills of East Yorkshire, whilst the other is an opaque very light grey flint (N8). Whilst this raw material type may be from the chalk of the Yorkshire Wolds, it is more likely from the derived deposits of East Yorkshire.

The third artefact (from Trench 8) is an end scraper made on a translucent dark yellowish brown (10 YR 4/2) with patches of worn cortex typical of the derived Flint sources of East Yorkshire. The scraper is 30.8mm by 26.9mm by 11.3mm in size and has its working edge defined by a series of abrupt, scalar removals along the distal end. Whilst not totally diagnostic, tools of this type are common in the Early Bronze Age.

The few flint artefact recovered during the evaluation at Wheatlands are probably stray finds representing no more than a low level prehistoric use of the area.

The pottery by C.G. Cumberpatch

The pottery assemblage consists of seven sherds of pottery weighing 58g from four deposits. The details are summarised in Table 2. The latest sherd in the assemblage is a piece of Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware from fill 603 of feature 604. This is of 18th-century date.

The sherds from fill 710 of furrow 709 most probably of later medieval date although their rather anonymous nature precluded are closer identification or dating. A local Roman type, Eboracum ware, has an orange sandy fabric (Tomber and Dore 1998, 199-200) and it is possible that the smallest and most heavily abraded sherd is of this type although, on balance, a later medieval date is to be preferred.

Topsoil 900 produced a small rod handle with dull yellowish green glaze in Brandsby type ware fabric (Mainman and Jenner 2013, 1230-1245). Brandsby type ware seems to have replaced York Glazed ware during the early/mid-13th-century and remained in use until eclipsed by the rise of Humberware during the 14th century.
## Table 2. Pottery by context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>ENV</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Decoration</th>
<th>Date range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Hollow ware</td>
<td>Brown salt glaze int &amp; ext; incised lines ext</td>
<td>C18th</td>
<td>Angular lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Buff Sandy ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hollow ware</td>
<td>U/Dec</td>
<td>Late Medieval?</td>
<td>Buff-orange surfaces w/ a pale grey core w/ moderate, well-sorted sub-angular quartz grains up top 0.4mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Oxidised Sandy ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hollow ware</td>
<td>U/Dec</td>
<td>Late Medieval?</td>
<td>A hard, fine even orange sandy fabric w/ abundant fine quartz &amp; rare muscovite up to 0.4mm, occ larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Oxidised Sandy ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hollow ware</td>
<td>U/Dec</td>
<td>Roman?/Medieval?</td>
<td>A soft bright orange sandy fabric w/ moderate, well-sorted sub-angular quartz &amp; black grit up to 0.5mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Brandsby type ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rod handle</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Thick dull yellowish green glaze</td>
<td>c.1250 – c.1350</td>
<td>Fine buff sandy fabric w/ abundant fine quartz grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Yorkshire Gritty ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Jar/cooking pot</td>
<td>Diamond profile rim w/ slight internal flange and elaborate angles</td>
<td>MC11th – M/LC13th</td>
<td>Bright white fabric w/ abundant well-sorted sub-angular quartz &amp; occ red grit up to 1mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Roman Samian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>U/Dec</td>
<td>AD 120 -200</td>
<td>Central Gaulish samian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topsoil 1100 produced a rim of a jar or cooking pot in a Yorkshire Gritty ware fabric. This type, which encompasses Hillam type ware and other early medieval Gritty wares, is characterised by the distinctive square to diamond-shaped rims and the presence of prominent quartz grit. Sub-divisions of the ware are marked by the presence/absence of red grit and mica which would suggest dispersed production at a number of potteries. The example discussed here has a bright white fabric and sparse red to black grit amongst the much commoner quartz. A date range spanning the mid to late 11th to mid to late 13th century is probable for this sherd.

Fill 1204 of ditch 1205 produced the earliest pottery sherd, a fragment of a Central Gaulish samian bowl dated to AD 120-200.

**Ceramic building material** by P. Mills

There are eleven fragments of ceramic material from the excavations. This included one fragment of a sandy oxidised pottery like fabric, weighing 4g, from fill 708 of furrow 707. There are also three fragments of fired clay from pit (1103) weighing 418g. They are too small and fragmentary to identify.

The remaining seven fragments of CBM, weighing 640g, are summarised below in Table 3. The similarity in fabric and their density indicates that they are all Roman.

Table 3. CBM by context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>No. Sherds</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64g</td>
<td>Vousoir</td>
<td>This is an unusually thin (11mm) Roman form, and may indicate it derives from a vousoir brick, typically manufactured for form arches</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148g</td>
<td>Tegula</td>
<td>The slightly thickening lower arrise of a Roman tegula with the remains of a square peg hole</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>418g</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>From a Roman brick of 38mm thickness, possibly from a pedalis or Sesquipedalis</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9g</td>
<td>Brick/tile</td>
<td>Roman brick or tile</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a small collection of Roman material. This type of small assemblage is typical of small rural sites of the Roman period in the region, where small amounts of CBM could be brought onto the site for purposes such as hearth creation. The presence of the brick with the fired clay may suggest that this derives from some sort of oven. It is possible that the material was in part originally from a hypocaust structure before being reused on this site.
7 Environmental Record

Carbonised plant macrofossils and charcoal by Diane Alldritt

A total of twelve environmental sample flots were examined for carbonised plant macrofossils and charcoal. Charcoal sorted from two sample retents was also scanned for identifiable pieces.

Bulk environmental samples were processed by ASWYAS using a Siraf-style water flotation system (French 1971). The flots were dried before examination under a low-power binocular microscope typically at x10 magnification. All identified plant remains including charcoal were removed and bagged separately by type.

Wood charcoal was examined using a high powered Vickers M10 metallurgical microscope at magnifications up to x200. The reference photographs of Schweingruber (1990) were consulted for charcoal identification. Plant nomenclature utilised in the text follows Stace (1997) for all vascular plants apart from cereals, which follow Zohary and Hopf (2000).

The twelve environmental samples produced quite contrasting results with the bulk of carbonised remains recovered from the two pit features, [608] and [1104], while the ditch features largely proved sterile or contained few trace remains. The ditch samples consist of small amounts of modern roots with occasional finds of degraded cereal grain and crushed 2-3mm-sized charcoal up to 2.5ml in volume. The pit features contain substantially more remains with pit [1104] containing 35ml of charcoal 10-15mm in size, along with a few well-preserved cereal grains. Pit [608] produced a bulk quantity of 110ml of charcoal fragments up to 20mm in size, mixed through with modern straw. Modern material from the samples consists of rootlets, seeds and straw from <2.5ml up to 60ml, with some of the larger volumes of straw recorded from pit [608].

The environmental samples produced scarce traces of degraded cereal grain from the ditch deposits, possibly wind-blown or trampled into the features, with slightly greater amounts from ditch [1108] possibly deposited from nearby burning. The pit features contained good quantities of well-preserved charcoal in both [608] and [1104], whilst [1104] also contained nicely preserved cereal grain, indicating perhaps some in-situ burning episodes such as in a fire pit type setting, or deposition of burnt rubbish from nearby.

The cereal grain was found to be a mixture of barley, oats and small amounts of spelt wheat. The best preserved grains of barley and spelt wheat were found in pit [1104] and these could reflect Romano-British agricultural activity. A single grain of rye in ditch (1205) is possibly medieval or more recent.

The charcoal was identified as oak, hazel, willow/poplar and cherry type, with hazel the most common find identified across all the samples. These indicated mixed deciduous and open scrub woodland being cut for fuel, with scrub probably regularly cut back in order to define the agricultural fields.
Trench 6

Two flots from sample 600 (607) from pit [608] were examined and contain a mixture of crushed 2-3mm and larger charcoal fragments up to 2mm in size in amongst a matrix of roots and modern straw. This deposit was possibly quite shallow or plough damaged. The carbonised remains consist of entirely charcoal with no cereal grain present. The charcoal was a mixture of Corylus (hazel) with smaller amounts of Prunoideae (cherries) type and Salix/Populus (willow/poplar) present. It is possible this was a fire pit area.

Trench 8

Sample 2 (804) from ditch [803] produced a single indeterminate fragment of cereal grain in amongst a matrix of modern roots and seeds. The grain is possibly barley but is highly degraded and probably intrusive.

Trench 10

Two flots from sample 3 (1003) from ditch [1004] contain modern roots and seeds along with a single Hordeum vulgare sl. (barley) grain. This grain is vesicular and extremely degraded and was probably wind-blown or intrusive from nearby burning.

Trench 11

Two features were sampled in Trench 11, from ditch [1108] and from pit [1104]. Sample 4 (1107) from ditch [1108] consists of a few fragments of crushed charcoal too small to identify, plus some degraded cereal grains. The grain is a mixture of Avena sp. (oat) and Hordeum vulgare sl. (barley) along with indeterminate fragments, and was possibly a dumped deposit originating from nearby burning. The pit feature [1104] sample 1100 (1103), also contained cereal grain but in much better condition with both Hordeum vulgare var. vulgare (six row hulled barley) and Triticum spelta (spelt wheat) identified. Charcoal from pit [1104] is mainly Quercus (oak) and Corylus (hazel) with a few fragments of Prunoideae (cherries) also present. This could be a mixed deposit of burnt waste from a number of burning episodes, and given the generally good condition of the grain and charcoal, was probably taking place in the pit itself.

Trench 12

Two flots from sample 5 (1204) from ditch [1205] contain very few remains, but it was possible to identify a single grain of Secale cereale (rye). This grain is degraded, possibly intrusive in the deposit, but could reflect medieval agricultural activity in the vicinity.
Table 4. Plant remains by sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>1100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>104/105</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench</td>
<td>Tr.1</td>
<td>Tr.8</td>
<td>Tr.10</td>
<td>Tr.11</td>
<td>Tr.12</td>
<td>Tr.6</td>
<td>Tr.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>ditch 103</td>
<td>ditch 803</td>
<td>ditch 1004</td>
<td>ditch 1108</td>
<td>ditch 1205</td>
<td>pit 608</td>
<td>pit 1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CV</td>
<td>&lt;2.5ml</td>
<td>&lt;2.5ml</td>
<td>&lt;2.5ml</td>
<td>2.5ml</td>
<td>&lt;2.5ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>35ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>&lt;2.5ml</td>
<td>5ml</td>
<td>10ml</td>
<td>5ml</td>
<td>&lt;2.5ml</td>
<td>60ml</td>
<td>10ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonised Cereal Grain</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avena sp.</td>
<td>oat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triticum spelta</td>
<td>spelt wheat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum vulgare var. vulgare</td>
<td>six row hulled barley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum vulgare sl.</td>
<td>barley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secale cereale</td>
<td>rye</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate cereal grain (+embryo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus</td>
<td>oak</td>
<td>5 (0.55g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corylus</td>
<td>hazel</td>
<td>6 (6.59g)</td>
<td>5 (0.74g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix/Populus</td>
<td>willow/poplar</td>
<td>2 (1.48g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunusideae</td>
<td>cherries</td>
<td>1 (0.38g)</td>
<td>4 (1.34g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>1 (0.62g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Remains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern straw</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern seeds</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The animal bone by J. Richardson

Animal bone fragments, and one oyster shell fragment, were recovered and are tabulated below in Table 5. The condition of the bone is generally poor (porous and/or eroded) with the exception of the burnt bones which are typically more robust. Only cattle or cattle-size bones have been identified, but this may reflect the poor condition of the bones and the survival of only the more robust pieces.

No further analysis of this small assemblage is recommended.
Table 5. Animal bone and shell by context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Taxa</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Undiagnostic</td>
<td>Skull fragment - cremated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td>Right value fragment - eroded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Tooth fragments</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Distal metapodial - fragile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cattle-size</td>
<td>Skull fragment - burnt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cattle-size</td>
<td>Long bone fragments - 4 burnt</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Pelvic fragment - eroded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Discussion

The evaluation methodology used here has been successful in understanding the character, depth and survival of archaeology within the PDA. Despite little archaeological potential identified in the geophysical survey and desk-based assessment, twelve out of the thirteen trenches contained at least one archaeological feature, many of which were not expected. Several of these trenches exposed features indicative of more intensive activity and/or settlement and are suggestive of further significant remains elsewhere on the site.

The results of the geophysical survey can be seen to be partially reliable. The strong linear anomalies, aligned east to west and interpreted as furrows were largely corroborated by the trench evaluation. Further linear anomalies investigated in Trenches 11, 12 and 13 also appeared to produce positive results. It was not possible to fully investigate the anomalies exposed in Trench 9 and therefore the results from this trench are inconclusive. Many of the ditches excavated, however, were not detected by the geophysical survey and it is clear the site contains more archaeology than previously thought.

Dating evidence was unfortunately sparse from most of the features with only a handful having a clear date. Two furrows in Trench 7 produced post-medieval material, the large pit feature in Trench 6 produced 18th-century material, with Romano-British material recovered from a ditch in Trench 12 and pit in Trench 11. Topsoil and subsoil finds were also found to have a similar broad date from residual prehistoric flints to medieval pottery.

A ridge and furrow field system suggested by the geophysics was identified although not all of the furrows suggested by the geophysics were found in the trenches. This may be due to the varying depth of the furrows, with some not deep enough to cut into the natural. Map regression clearly shows the modern enclosed field boundaries have their basis in 19th century if not earlier (Lee 2015).

Several linear features were excavated across the site which did not resemble furrows in shape and size. Some of these were on a similar east to west alignment as the furrows, with others running at a perpendicular, north to south alignment. Similar features were excavated
in Trenches 11, 12 and 13 which appear to have been detected by the geophysics. It is likely that these belong to a separate phase of activity on the site, and most likely belong to a Romano-British rectilinear field system. The geophysics around Trenches 11 and 12 may suggest a rectangular enclosure and the possibility of settlement in the area. The two pits containing burnt bone, plus the scatter of charred cereals from this area, may also belong to the same, earlier phase of activity.

9 Conclusions

The archaeological trial trenching confirmed the presence of several features previously highlighted through geophysical survey, but other boundary features identified across the site were not detected by the geophysics. These suggest the presence of further undetected archaeological remains on the site.

Some of the previously undetected ditches may form part of a rectangular enclosure. Despite a lack of dating evidence, this series of features is likely to represent a pre-medieval field system, and possibly settlement, most likely of Romano-British date. The two pits containing burnt bone, from Trenches 6 and 11, also probably date to this period and are suggestive of domestic activity on the site. Charred cereals from features in Trenches 8, 10 and 11 may relate to this domestic occupation too.

The later ridge and furrow field system was found to extend across much of the site with furrows aligned east to west. The system probably has its origins in the medieval or post-medieval period. The land was probably still used for agriculture through to the present day though the large feature in Trench 6 may represent quarrying in the 18th-century. A scatter of flints found across the site is representative of prehistoric activity in the general area.
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Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Trial Trenching at Wheatlands, Northfield Lane, Upper Poppleton, York

1. **Introduction**
1.1 This Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been prepared by Archaeological Services WYAS (ASWYAS) for B&B Otley Discretionary 2008 Trust to carry out the excavation of thirteen archaeological trial trenches (see attached plan) prior to the proposed development of an area for touring caravans and motorhomes at Wheatlands, Northfield Lane, Upper Poppleton, York. The archaeological work will be carried out to the standards laid down by Historic England (2006; 2008) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014a, 2014b).

2. **Site location, topography and land-use**
2.1 The proposed development area (PDA) is located approximately 3.5km north-west of York and 1km south of the village of Upper Poppleton. The PDA is bounded to the east by the A1237 York Ring Road and to the west by Northfield Lane. Commercial units border the site to the north and south. The site is centred at NGR SE 560 529 and lies at a height of approximately 22m OD.

3. **Geology and soils**
3.1 The underlying bedrock of the site comprises Sherwood Sandstone Group, a sedimentary bedrock formed approximately 229 to 271 million years ago in the Triassic and Permian Periods. The local environment was previously dominated by rivers (British Geological Survey 2015) with Poppleton Glaciofluvial Member superficial deposits, formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary Period. The soils of the area are of the Blackwood formation and comprise deep permeable sandy and coarse loamy soils (Soil Survey of England and Wales 1983).

4. **Archaeological background**
4.1 A desk-based assessment (DBA) was carried out on 1km of land surrounding the PDA (Lee 2015). This identified some potential for a Roman road passing close to, or even through the site and highlighted several nearby Iron Age or Roman crop marks. Evidence of ridge and furrow ploughing is found in close proximity to the site, which has not been dated, and may extent within the PDA.

4.2 A map regression of the PDA, undertaken as part of the DBA, identified six field boundaries which are no longer extant. There is potential for buried remains of these field boundaries, and possibly others.

4.3 A geophysical survey of the PDA was undertaken in September 2015 (Swinbank and Tanner 2015). This identified several anomalies of an uncertain origin, including a ‘U’ shaped response, a rectilinear pattern and a ridge and furrow field system. At least one field boundary was also identified.
5. **Aims and Objectives**

5.1 The objective of the archaeological evaluation is to target remains of archaeological and possible archaeological nature within PDA, as previously identified during the geophysical survey.

5.2 The archaeological evaluation will also determine the presence or absence of any other archaeological remains, and characterise (nature, date, complexity and extent) any deposits that are located. The results of the evaluation will determine the need, or otherwise, for any archaeological investigation which may be required in advance of further development.

5.3 The table below should be read in conjunction with the attached figure (*Proposed trench layout overlying geophysical results and indicative site plan*).

**Table 1. Archaeological trial trenches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench No.</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>NE-SW</td>
<td>Targeting with no geophysical responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>NE-SW</td>
<td>Targeting with no geophysical responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting four linear anomalies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>NE-SW</td>
<td>Targeting five linear anomalies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Targeting a ‘U’-shaped anomaly and three linear anomalies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting five linear anomalies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting a blank area to ascertain if linear anomalies continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting a blank area to ascertain if linear anomalies continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Targeting two linear anomalies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting two linear anomalies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>NW-SE</td>
<td>Targeting three linear anomalies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>NE-SW</td>
<td>Targeting a linear anomaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25m</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>Targeting a linear anomaly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Methodology**

6.1 All excavation will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant standards (CIfA 2014c; Historic England 2008). The evaluation will involve the excavation of thirteen trial trenches (see Table 1). The locations of the trial trenches have been agreed with John Oxley of the City of York HER. The general strategy is to target potential archaeological features and to provide a spread of trial trenches across the proposed extraction. All trenches will measure 50m by 2m, or 25m and 2m, in size.
6.2 The trial trenches will be opened and the topsoil and recent overburden removed down to the first significant archaeological horizon in successive level spits of a maximum 0.2m thickness, by the use of an appropriate machine using a wide toothless ditching blade. Under no circumstances will the machine be used to cut arbitrary trenches down to natural deposits. Any machine work will be carried out under direct archaeological supervision and the machine halted if significant archaeological deposits are encountered. The top of the first significant archaeological horizon may be exposed by the machine, but will then be cleaned by hand and inspected for features.

6.3 No archaeological deposits will be entirely removed unless this is unavoidable in achieving the objectives of this evaluation, although all features identified are expected to be half-sectioned and the full depth of archaeological deposits will be assessed.

6.4 After planning, all archaeological features will be manually sample excavated in an archaeologically controlled and stratigraphic manner, in order to meet the aims and objectives.

6.5 Features will be sample excavated employing the following strategy:

- **Linear features**: sufficient excavation will be carried out to investigate the depth, profile and fills of a ditch or gully and to recover dating and environmental evidence from its fills. Normally this will involve a minimum of 10% sample dispersed along the length of the feature (each sample section to be not less than 1m wide), or a minimum of a 1m wide sample section, if the feature is less than 10m long, or if only a small part of it is exposed. With respect to trial trenches, one 1m section will be located and recorded adjacent to the trench edge. Feature intersections will always be excavated in a way that will allow a stratigraphic relationship to be determined.

- **Discrete features**: pits, post-holes and other discrete features will normally be half-sectioned by area to determine and record their form.

6.6 A full written, drawn and photographic record of all material revealed during the course of the work shall be made. The excavation limits will be surveyed using electronic survey equipment with larger scale hand drawn plans of features, at 1:20 or 1:50, being created as appropriate. Sections of linear and discrete features will be drawn at 1:10 or 1:20. All sections, plans and elevations will include spot-heights related to Ordnance Datum in metres as correct to two decimal places. Tie-in information will be undertaken during the course of the evaluation and will be fixed in relation to nearby permanent structures and roads and to the National Grid. The photographic archive will comprise monochrome negative photographs at a minimum format of 35mm, augmented
by digital photographs taken using cameras with a resolution of at least 10 megapixels.

6.7 All excavated archaeological contexts shall be fully recorded by detailed written records, giving details of location, composition, shape, dimensions, relationships, finds, samples, and cross-references to other elements of the record and other relevant contexts, in accordance with best practice. All contexts, and any small finds and samples from them will be given unique numbers. Bulk finds will be collected by context. 20th-century finds will be noted and discarded.

6.8 All artefacts will be removed from the site for assessment and analysis, and where it is appropriate, their find spots shall be recorded three dimensionally. Non-modern artefacts from the excavated topsoil and subsoil will be collected. Finds material will be stored in controlled environments, where appropriate. All artefacts recovered will be retained, cleaned, labelled and stored as detailed in the guidelines laid out in the CIfa (2014b). Any conservation work will be undertaken by approved conservators working to UKIC guidelines.

6.9 A soil-sampling programme shall be undertaken during the course of the investigation for the identification and recovery of carbonised and waterlogged remains, vertebrate remains, molluscs and small artefactual material. Metallurgical debris is a possibility on this site and samples will be processed accordingly (including scanning both flots and retents with a magnet for hammerscale). Historic England’s Regional Science Advisor, environmental and soil specialists will be consulted during the course of the excavation with regard to the implementation of this sampling programme, should waterlogged deposits be identified. In the event of waterlogged deposits being found an Environmental Strategy will make provision for the potential study of waterlogged plant material, insects and parasites. Provision will be made for the removal of soil samples of a minimum 20 litres from deposits with clear potential, and larger samples from any organically-rich deposits. Samples may also be taken from seemingly sterile deposits. Particular attention will be paid to the sampling of primary ditch fills and any surviving buried soils beneath banks or other positive features. Environmental material removed from site will be stored in appropriate controlled environments. The collection and processing of environmental samples will be undertaken in accordance with guidelines set out by the Association for Environmental Archaeology (1995) and Historic England’s Environmental Archaeology Guidelines (http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/environmental-archaeology-2nd.pdf). In addition, the processing of environmental samples will only take place within facilities approved for such purposes by Historic England’s Regional Science Advisor.

6.10 In the event of human remains being discovered they will, in the first instance, be left *in situ*, covered and protected. Excavation of human remains at this
evaluation stage is to be avoided if possible. If removal is required, this will only take place in compliance with the Burial Act 1857 and with an exhumation licence obtained from the Ministry of Justice prior to the removal of the remains. Provision will be made for the specialist reporting of the remains by a recognised osteoarchaeologist.

6.11 All finds of gold and silver and associated objects shall be reported to HM Coroner according to the procedures relating to the Treasure Act 1997.

6.12 Provision will be made for specialist dating if required, in particular radiocarbon dating.

7. Analysis and Reporting

7.1 Following the conclusion of the fieldwork a report shall be produced.

7.2 The site archive will be assembled in line with the recommended composition provided in Historic England’s PPN3 (2008).

7.2 In addition to the site records, artefacts, ecofacts and other sample residues, the archive shall contain all the data collected during the excavation, including records, finds and environmental samples. It will be quantified, ordered, indexed and internally consistent. Archive consolidation will be undertaken immediately following the conclusion of fieldwork and will involve:

- the site record being checked, cross-referenced and indexed as necessary;
- retained finds being cleaned, stabilised, marked and packaged in accordance with the requirements of the recipient museum;
- retained finds being assessed and recorded using pro forma recording sheets, by suitably qualified and experienced staff. Initial artefact dating will be integrated within the site matrix; and
- environmental samples being processed by suitably experienced and qualified staff and recorded using pro forma recording sheets.

7.3 In addition to the site records, artefacts, ecofacts and other sample residues, the archive shall contain:

- site matrices, as appropriate;
- a summary report synthesising the context record;
- a summary of the artefact record; and
- a summary of the environment record.
7.4 The integrity of the primary field record will be preserved. Security copies will be maintained where appropriate.

7.5 Provision will be made for the deposition of the archive, artefacts and environmental material in the York Museum. The museum will be contacted to ascertain their requirements for the archive (e.g. marking and labelling requirements, accession number). The archive will otherwise be prepared in accordance with the UKIC (1990), the Museums and Galleries Commission (1994) and CIfA (2014) guidelines. Provision will be made for the stable storage of paper records and their long-term storage.

7.6 Upon completion of the investigations, the artefacts, ecofacts and stratigraphic information shall be assessed to ascertain their potential and significance for further analysis.

7.7 The report will be produced within an agreed time-scale. It will be supported by an overall plan of the site, accurately identifying the location of the watching brief and any findings.

7.8 The report will outline the archaeological significance of the deposits identified, and provide an interpretation of the results in relation to other sites in the vicinity.

7.9 Copies of the report will be supplied to B&B Otley Discretionary 2008 Trust and the City of York HER. A digital copy will also be supplied to the City of York HER.

7.10 Upon completion of the work, the archaeological contractor will make their work accessible to the wider research community by submitting digital data and copies of reports online to OASIS (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/).

7.11 It is possible that the excavation findings will warrant wider publication. This may be effected through publication with an appropriate archaeological journal.

8. **Copyright, Confidentiality and Publicity**

8.1 Copyright in the documentation prepared by the archaeological contractor and specialist sub-contractors should be the subject of additional licences in favour of the repository accepting the archive to use such documentation for their statutory educational and museum service functions, and to provide copies to third parties as an incidental to such functions.

8.2 Under the Environmental Information Regulations 2005 (EIR), information submitted to the HER becomes publicly accessible, except where disclosure might lead to environmental damage, and reports cannot be embargoed as ‘confidential’ or ‘commercially sensitive’.
8.3 Requests for sensitive information are subject to a public interest test, and if this is met, then the information has to be disclosed. The archaeological contractor should inform the client of EIR requirements, and ensure that any information disclosure issues are resolved before completion of the work. Intellectual property rights are not affected by the EIR.

8.4 Unless the Client commissioning the project wishes to state otherwise, the copyright of any written, graphic or photographic record and reports will rest with the originating body (Archaeological Services WYAS).

9. **Health and Safety**
9.1 Archaeological Services WYAS has its own Health and Safety policy which has been compiled using national guidelines. These guidelines conform to all relevant Health and Safety legislation.

9.2 In addition each project undergoes a 'Risk Assessment' which sets project specific Health and Safety requirements to which all members of staff are made aware of prior to on-site work commencing. Health and Safety will take priority over archaeological matters. Necessary precautions will be taken over underground services and overhead lines at the outset of the project.

10. **Health and Safety**
10.1 Archaeological Services WYAS is covered by the insurance and indemnities of the City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council. Insurance has been effected with: Zurich Municipal Insurance, Park House, 57–59 Well Street, Bradford, BD1 5SN (policy number RMP 03GO39–0143). Any further enquiries should be directed to: The Chief Financial Officer, Insurance Section, Wakefield MDC, PO Box 55, Newton Bar, Wakefield WF1 2TT.

11. **Monitoring**
11.1 Access to the site will be arranged through Archaeological Services WYAS and B&B Otley Discretionary 2008 Trust.

11.2 Archaeological Services WYAS will produce an initial Risk Assessment and review this in the light of any developing potential risks. They will ensure that Health and Safety requirements of the main contractor are adhered to.

11.3 The project will be monitored by the City of York HER to whom written documentation will be sent before the start of the work confirming:

- the date of commencement;
- the names of all finds and archaeological science specialists likely to be used in the evaluation; and
• notification to the proposed archive repository of the nature of the works and opportunity to monitor the works.

11.4 If appropriate, the advice of the Regional Advisor for Archaeological Science (Yorkshire and the Humber Region) at Historic England will be called upon.

11.5 Archaeological Services WYAS will ensure that any significant results are brought to the attention the client and their main contractor as soon as is practically possible.
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Appendix 2: Inventory of primary archive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File 1</td>
<td>Trench record sheet</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context cards</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital photo record sheet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photo record sheet (film no. 9282)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permatrace sheets</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Concordance of contexts yielding artefacts or environmental remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artefacts and environmental samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104/105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 103</td>
<td>GBA 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fill of possible quarry pit</td>
<td>Pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fill of pit 608</td>
<td>Bone, GBA 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fill of furrow 707</td>
<td>CBM, clay pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fill of furrow 709</td>
<td>Pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 803</td>
<td>Flint, GBA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>Pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>CBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 1004</td>
<td>GBA 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>Pot, flint, shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fill of pit 1104</td>
<td>Bone, CBM, fired clay GBA 1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 1108</td>
<td>GBA 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 1205</td>
<td>CBM, bone, GBA 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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