



# **GISBURNE PARK**

**LANCASHIRE**

## **Walled Garden Assessment**

**Oxford Archaeology North**



April 2007

Covenant Health Care and  
Manning Elliott

Issue No:	2007-08/662
OAN Job No:	L9831
NGR:	SD 825 498

**Document Title:** Gisburne Park, Lancashire  
**Document Type:** Walled Garden Assessment  
**Client Name:** Covenant Health Care and Manning Elliott

**Issue Number:** 2007-08/662  
**OA Job Number:** L9831

**National Grid Reference:** SD 825 498

Prepared by: Neil Wearing  
Position: Project Officer  
Date: April 2007

Checked by: Jamie Quartermaine Signed.....  
Position: Project Manager  
Date: April 2007

Approved by: Alan Lupton Signed.....  
Position: Senior Project Manager  
Date: April 2007

**Oxford Archaeology North**

Storey Institute  
Meeting House Lane  
Lancaster  
LA1 1TF  
t: (0044) 01524 848666  
f: (0044) 01524 848606

w: [www.oxfordarch.co.uk](http://www.oxfordarch.co.uk)  
e: [info@oxfordarch.co.uk](mailto:info@oxfordarch.co.uk)

**© Oxford Archaeological Unit Ltd (2007)**

Janus House  
Osney Mead  
Oxford  
OX2 0EA  
t: (0044) 01865 263800  
f: (0044) 01865 793496

Oxford Archaeological Unit Limited is a Registered Charity No: 285627

**Disclaimer:**

*This document has been prepared for the titled project or named part thereof and should not be relied upon or used for any other project without an independent check being carried out as to its suitability and prior written authority of Oxford Archaeology being obtained. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this document being used for a purpose other than the purposes for which it was commissioned. Any person/party using or relying on the document for such other purposes agrees, and will by such use or reliance be taken to confirm their agreement to indemnify Oxford Archaeology for all loss or damage resulting therefrom. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for this document to any party other than the person/party by whom it was commissioned.*

---

## CONTENTS

---

<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Circumstances of Project .....	4
<b>2. METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Project Design.....	5
2.2 Desk-Based Assessment .....	5
2.3 Site Inspection.....	5
2.4 Archive .....	6
<b>3. BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 Historic Background .....	7
3.2 Map Regression Analysis .....	7
<b>4. SITE INSPECTION.....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1 Site Inspection.....	11
<b>5. IMPACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1 Impact .....	15
5.2 Recommendations .....	15
<b>6. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>17</b>
6.1 Cartographic Sources .....	17
6.2 Secondary Sources .....	17
<b>APPENDIX 1.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Project Design.....	18
<b>APPENDIX 2.....</b>	<b>23</b>
Gazetteer of Sites .....	23
<b>ILLUSTRATIONS .....</b>	<b>30</b>
Figures .....	30
Plates .....	30

---

## SUMMARY

---

Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) was commissioned by Covenant Health Care, in conjunction with Manning Elliott Architects, to undertake an archaeological assessment of a walled garden at Gisburne Park (SD 825498), in advance of the construction of a proposed hospital extension. Gisburne Hall was built by the Lister family between 1727 and 1736, it was finally sold off in 1944 and in 1995 the building was converted into an independent private hospital. The documentary study was undertaken between 13th and 16th March, and the site investigation was undertaken on 21st March.

The earliest gardens were established at the same time as the house and incorporated two areas of formal garden to the north and east of the house. By the time of the White plan of 1812, this had been superseded by a walled garden to the west of the house, which had formal areas and horticultural areas. The walled garden was split up in 1944 and parts of it have been subsequently heavily landscaped.

The site investigation revealed that much of the external walling has been lost, and now only c46% survives. Of the 14 buildings / structures associated with the garden that were shown on mapping from a 1909 plan, only four still survive today and this includes the head gardener's cottage. None of the soft landscaping elements, such as the footpaths or beds, still survive, and only three of the original trees have survived, in the south-eastern corner of the garden. Although, some elements survive, the overall character and layout of the garden has largely been lost.

The proposed hospital section will entail the loss of a further section of garden walling, and also the head gardener's cottage. It is recommended that a fabric survey of the cottage and a photographic survey of the adjacent section of garden wall be undertaken in advance of their demolition for the development.



---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) would like to thank Alan Forsythe, Covenant Health Care, and George Scott, Manning Elliott, for commissioning the project. Thanks are also due to the staff of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society (Leeds office of the West Yorkshire Record Office), Claremont House, Leeds, for their assistance with this project.

The desk-based assessment was undertaken by Neil Wearing, the field work was undertaken by Jamie Quartermaine, and the report was prepared by Alastair Vannon and Jamie Quartermaine; the drawings were by Rebecca Briscoe and Ann Stewardson. The project was managed by Jamie Quartermaine, who also edited the report with Alan Lupton.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

### 1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF PROJECT

- 1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) was commissioned by Covenant Health Care, in conjunction with Manning Elliott Architects, to undertake an archaeological assessment of a walled garden at Gisburne Park (SD 825498) (Fig 1), in advance of the construction of a proposed hospital extension. Gisburne Hall was built by the Lister family between 1727 and 1736, it was finally sold off in 1944 and in 1995 the building was converted into an independent private hospital. The main house is a Grade 1 Listed Building and the proposed study will inform a Listed Building Consent application. The documentary study was undertaken between the 13th and 16th March, and the site investigation was undertaken on 21st March.
- 1.1.2 The desk-based assessment comprised a search of mainly cartographic sources held by the Yorkshire County Record Office (Leeds). In addition to this, a site inspection was carried out to examine the survival of garden features within the area of the proposed development. This report sets out the results of the cartographic study and the site inspection in the form of a short document, outlining the findings, followed by a statement of the impact of the development on the archaeological remains.

---

## 2. METHODOLOGY

---

### 2.1 PROJECT DESIGN

- 2.1.1 A project design (*Appendix 1*) was submitted by OA North in response to a request from Manning Elliott, in order to inform a Listed Building Consent. The project design was adhered to in full, and the work was consistent with the relevant standards and procedures of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, and generally accepted best practice.

### 2.2 DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT

- 2.2.1 The desk-based assessment was focused on Gisburne Park Hall and immediate environs, concentrating on a cartographic regression of the park and gardens. The aim was to understand the development of the walled gardens within the historic context of the broader park area. All statutory and non-statutory sites within the area of Gisburne Park were identified and collated into a gazetteer (*Appendix 2*). Various published and unpublished documentary sources from the Lancashire Historic Environment Record (LHER) and the West Yorkshire County Record Office (WYCRO) were consulted, as well as the holdings of Clitheroe Library Local Studies Section, and other cartographic and aerial photographic sources. The results were analysed in a Geographic Information System (GIS), features identified from cartographic regression and aerial photographic sources were digitised in the GIS and plotted over the modern base maps, which were then used to inform the site inspection.
- 2.2.2 ***Lancashire Historic Environment Record (LHER):*** the LHER was consulted for both listed buildings and archaeological monuments within the immediate vicinity of Gisburne Park Hospital (Fig 2).
- 2.2.3 ***County Record Office (CRO), Yorkshire Archaeological Society, (Leeds office of the West Yorkshire Archive Service):*** this is the repository of the ‘Bradfer-Lawrence Collection’, a local historian and antiquary who amassed a large collection of original documents relating to Yorkshire history between 1935 and 1962. This collection includes the pre-Ordnance Survey maps of the estate. The Leeds office also holds the historic Ordnance Survey maps for the area.
- 2.2.4 ***Oxford Archaeology North:*** OA North has an extensive archive of secondary sources relevant to the broader study area, as well as numerous unpublished client reports on work carried out both as OA North and in its former guise of Lancaster University Archaeological Unit (LUAU); these were consulted where necessary.
- 2.2.5 ***Clitheroe Library Local Studies Section:*** Clitheroe Library holds many local history books dealing with the historic towns and halls of the Ribble Valley, as well as the Yorkshire Parish Register for Gisburne.

### 2.3 SITE INSPECTION

- 2.3.1 A site inspection was undertaken on 21st March, and examined the form, character and survival of the garden remains to the west of the main house, which is the area

that will be subject to the proposed development. The physical remains were closely examined and compared with historic mapping to establish the chronology and development of the gardens. Sketch plans were produced of the earthwork features and a photographic record was produced of all the physical remains of the former gardens.

## **2.4 ARCHIVE**

- 2.4.1 A full professional archive has been compiled in accordance with the project design (*Appendix 1*), and in accordance with current IFA and English Heritage guidelines (English Heritage 1991). The paper and digital archive will be deposited in Lancashire Record Office, Preston on completion of the project.

---

### 3. BACKGROUND

---

#### 3.1 HISTORIC BACKGROUND

- 3.1.1 The first record of the Listers in the Parish of Gisburn was in 1312 when a Lister of West Derby married Isabel de Bolton, who had previously been married to Roger de Clitheroe who died young; her Dowery was the land at Gisburne Park (Webster 2003). Gisburne Hall was built by the Lister family between 1727 and 1736; Bourguignon's map of 1735 (MS918/2) shows the house and the first landscaped gardens north of the house, it also depicts a now disused avenue running from the centre of the 'Lawn' to the village of Gisburn. Thomas Lister, born in 1752, was MP for Clitheroe and High Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1794; he was created Baronet Lord Ribblesdale in 1797. A mortgage deed in the name of Thomas Lister, dated to 1799, refers to the 'manor of Gisburn, capital messuage called Gisburne Park otherwise Lower Hall with stables, orchards, water corn mill, deer park and demesne land containing together around 175 acres' (MD335/1/1/12/1/192).
- 3.1.2 The Gisburne Corn mill is depicted on Bourguignons map of 1735, but is known to be the site of the medieval soke mill of Gisburn. It is located close to the bridge over the Ribble, and its last rebuilding was thought to have taken place in 1788 (Rothwell 1990). The deer park contained deer houses, shown on White's map of 1812 (MD335/1), and today these buildings are Deer House Farm. The kennels for the hunting packs kept by the Lords of Ribblesdale were also shown on White's map and survive today. The two lodges at the entrance to the park are of exotic gothic designs, richly ornamented with figures and pinnacles, created by the former Lord Ribblesdale (Webster 2003). The hall was sold off in 1944 to pay death duties and in 1995 the building was converted into an independent private hospital.

#### 3.2 MAP REGRESSION ANALYSIS

- 3.2.1 *Bourguignon's map of 1735* (MS918/2) (Fig 3): the landscape architect Bourguignon, of whom very little is known, produced two plans of Gisburne Park which are both dated to 1735. The first was a plan of the estate and grounds as they were at the time, and the second was an elaborate proposal for landscaping the estate. The proposal was never carried out, but the pre-development plan provides a snapshot of the first formal gardens around Gisburne Park, which were relatively short lived.
- 3.2.2 The plans show the hall and two substantial ancillary buildings, as well as the corn mill (Site **04**), the mill race and weir (Site **03**) and Gisburn Bridge (Site **10**) (Fig 2). To the immediate north of the hall are shown formal gardens laid out on an elevated terrace, screened from the river bank by a swathe of woodland. These gardens were roughly semi-circular in shape, and c 70m long at the southern base by c 35m. They had a geometric design of six plots, divided by paths, and within each was an arrangement of formal planting (Fig 3). No features such as sundials, fountains, or other ornamental garden furniture, were depicted.
- 3.2.3 The second area of gardens was to the west of the hall, and was again screened from the river by woodland. The area was split into two by an east/west track/road. The northern section is a tapering rectangular garden, c 50m east/west by 15m

north/south, and was divided into three regularly laid out plots, again bordered by footpaths. To the south was a sub-triangular garden, c 40m by 40m by 50m, which once again had a geometric design of five plots sub-divided by footpaths (Fig 3).

- 3.2.4 Today the eastern former garden has been built upon by a later extension to the hospital, and the western garden is still split by a roadway (Fig 4). The northern section is now wooded waste, on the edge of the river valley, and the southern section has been substantially altered by subsequent garden design and coincides with the area of the proposed development. The plan also depicts a very substantial driveway running from the lawn area at the south of the hall towards the village of Gisburn to the south, where a gate lodge is shown. This connects with the embanked road still shown on the modern map, and which was the original route to the hall; however, this feature is not depicted on any subsequent mapping, and had presumably fallen out of use.
- 3.2.5 **Jeffery's map of Yorkshire, 1771** (Fig 5): this is a large-scale map of the county and does not provide detail of the grounds. However, it does show two tree-lined avenues; one to the east which connects the southern lawn to the village of Gisburn and one to the west which runs to an area where a deer house is depicted on subsequent maps. However, it does not depict the driveway shown on the 1735 map, suggesting that this had gone out of use by that date.
- 3.2.6 **White's estate plan of Gisburne Park, 1812 (MD335/1) and unnamed estate plan of 1817 (MD335/1/1/12/1/192)** (Figs 6 and 7): these maps show a reasonable level of detail of the area of Gisburne Park, and as there is little difference between them, they are discussed here as one map. On both the eastern of the two avenues, shown on Jeffery's map, has not been mapped suggesting that it had fallen out of use, but the western avenue is still depicted. Both maps fail to depict the earliest gardens shown in 1735.
- 3.2.7 Both maps clearly show that the western fields had been landscaped and had become the main area of formal gardens, in fact the unnamed map of 1817 actually labels this area as 'Gardens' (Fig 7). Both maps show the same extent of walled garden as the later maps, and There are two east/west rows of hothouses marked; one at the northern boundary of the garden, and one aligned on a pathway running across the southern quarter. The 1812 map does not show the smaller row of hothouses to the south, but the 1817 map does. The eastern area of the first gardens is shown as a clear plot, suggesting that by this time the area has been cleared and had become a lawn. The earlier western garden has by this date been re-landscaped, and is partially wooded, whilst the southern area has been substantially changed by a secondary episode of garden landscaping.
- 3.2.8 **Tithe map of the Township of Gisburne, 1844 (MD335/1/5/4)** (Fig 8): this plan shows the area of the township of Gisburne, including the village, the surrounding fields, and the park and hall. However, due to the scale of the map, there is not sufficient detail to determine individual elements of the garden area. The hothouses mapped on the 1812 and 1817 maps appear to have been depicted somewhat stylistically as they are both shown as single blocks.
- 3.2.9 **Ordnance Survey, 6" to 1 mile map (1850)** (Fig 9): the first edition six inch map of 1850 does not show detail of the garden layout, but does show a clear plot of the eastern garden, which was then still in use as a lawn. The western avenue to the south of the hall was again shown in the park, although the eastern one was

perceivable as the remnants of regularly planted rows of trees. Also distinct tree-lined field boundaries were depicted along the surviving western avenue in the park area. Again the mapping does not show any sign of the prominent triangular shaped plot of the earlier formal garden suggesting that the area had been reworked by this time.

- 3.2.10 The six inch Ordnance Survey mapping shows that by 1850 the gardens have been enclosed with walls and that this formal layout includes a series of footpaths around the walled edge and diagonally across the garden. There are also two ranges of hothouses, as well as additional buildings at the north-east and south-west corners. Smaller features are indicated by the map in the eastern half of the garden but are not well enough defined at this scale to determine their nature.
- 3.2.11 **Ordnance Survey, 25" to 1 mile map 1909** (Figs 10 and 11): this map provides the most detailed plan available of the formal layout of the gardens at Gisburne Park, and it more clearly sets out and labels the features than any map pre- or post- dating it. The overall layout corresponds to that shown on the 1850 six inch map, but there are additional small features which may have been established during the time between the maps, or were simply not depicted on the earlier less detailed map. The garden contains more hothouses (including the same ones shown on the White 1812 map), as well as additional buildings to the east and west. The garden has been elaborated with additional furniture, including a sundial marked as 'SD', located at the centre of the path network within the walled garden. There is also a fountain marked 'Fn' and a spring marked 'Sp' both located to the south-west of the southernmost greenhouse.
- 3.2.12 **Current Ordnance Survey 1:10,000 mapping and modern vertical air photo mapping:** these sources depict the grounds in their present condition; they show the extension to the main hall, which has been built over the original eastern garden. The hothouses are no longer shown, and the network of paths is greatly reduced. A tennis court and swimming pool have been built in the centre of the garden area, and a large circular structure is shown at the top part of the western end of the garden, which is in current use as a horse walker. No sign of the planting or layout of the gardens is shown on the 1:10,000 map, and the air photo mapping does not allow any earthworks to be seen in this area.

---

## 4. SITE INSPECTION

---

### 4.1 SITE INSPECTION

- 4.1.1 A visual inspection of the study area enabled the identification of features relating to the formal gardens at Gisburne Park that has survived to the present day (Figs 12 and 13). The site visit also facilitated an understanding of the modifications that had taken place since the establishment of the gardens and provided an insight into the character of the garden landscape. The garden was depicted in 1909, on the 25" OS mapping, as a formal walled garden with cross-cutting pathways, horticultural areas with greenhouses, ancillary buildings, and a central sundial. The extensive remodelling of the area between 1909 and the present day, including the addition of tennis courts and a swimming pool, and the modification of the western part of the garden as a stable yard, has dramatically altered the original garden design.
- 4.1.2 ***The Gardens as Depicted in 1735:*** the earliest surviving element of landscaping design at Gisburne Park was a terrace (Site **13**), located to the north of the present day walled garden (Fig 13; Plate 1). This consisted of a narrow strip of land that was c 1.5m lower than the ground level of the ground to the south upon which the later walled garden was established. This terrace was lightly wooded at the time of the site visit and, beyond the northern edge, dropped away to the River Ribble. A large earthen bank defines the southern edge of the terrace, which was probably the spoil mound from the excavation of the adjacent sunken track. The northern edge of the terrace appears to correspond to one of the garden boundaries depicted on the 1735 map by Bourguignon (Fig 4) and, as this area was not subsequently developed by later landscaping, it is the only feature from the earlier garden design that is still visible.
- 4.1.3 ***The Walled Garden:*** the walled garden was added between 1771, when Jeffery's map showed the area of earlier gardens to have become wooded, and 1812, when White (MD335/1) depicted the basic plan of the garden that would survive into the early twentieth century. Although much of the circuit of the wall has now been removed, there are enough standing remains to inform an investigation of the character of this area. The walls were around 0.75m wide and, although not uniform in height, were up to 4m high (Plate 2). They were constructed in brick using English Garden Wall bond on the internal face, and in poorly-coursed, rough-dressed stone on the reverse. Both sides were bonded with lime mortar and no render appears to have been applied to the wall faces. The western wall (Site **15**) survived for a length of around 60m and stood to the original height of around 4m and featured an arched and vaulted recess (Site **16**) and arched doorways that had been bricked-up (Fig 13; Plates 2 and 4).
- 4.1.4 The northern wall (Site **14**) survived as a 35m stretch to the west of the head gardener's cottage, and ran for around 18m to the east of this building (Fig 13; Plate 4). The gap between this wall section and the cottage accommodated an earlier extension to the cottage (shown on the 1909 map), but this had gone by the time of the modern mapping. This northern wall portion featured a large and elaborate gateway (Site **23**) to the garden and several buttresses that were triangular in plan. The gateway was original, but the buttresses were later additions, intended to strengthen the wall, and were not shown on the 1909 plan.



- 4.1.5 At the western end of the Site **14** section of garden wall, was a 174m long north/south return section (Fig 13). This north/south wall was entirely stone-built, in contrast to the brick inner facing of the rest of the original garden walling. The wall was not shown on the 1909 plan, but it does follow the line of a former path. It was evidently constructed as a boundary demarcater between the holdings of the main house and the stable yard.
- 4.1.6 Extending east from the cottage is a short section of wall, orientated east/west, which again has a stone outer face and a brick inner face (Site **18**) (Plate 8). The north/south return of this wall is distinct in that it has a roughly coursed and roughly-dressed stone face on the inside, as well as the outside face. The differential treatment of this wall section might suggest that it was a later addition; however, the line of it is shown on the 1909 map. The wall now serves as the western face of a modern garage, and has had two windows inserted through it.
- 4.1.7 A truncated butt of wall at the southern end of this section of walling was aligned with an earthwork bank (Site **24**) that extended towards the south-eastern corner of the walled garden (Fig 13; Plate 6), and corresponds with the line of a wall shown on the 1909 plan; the earthwork is probably the remains of this line wall. However, given the location of the house to the east of the garden, and the apparent importance of the visual impact of the garden when it was first designed, it is possible that the original eastern wall may have been a low wall demarcating the garden extent. As such, it would have defined the space of the garden but allowed a vista of it from the house.
- 4.1.8 The southern garden wall (Site **17**) survived as a 50m stretch of walling with two gable-roofed outbuildings (Site **22**), that projected into the garden area to the north of the wall (Fig 13; Plate 7). This section of wall was built entirely in brick and may reflect that this was an internal wall; the OS 1909 plan shows a further wall running parallel to, and to the south of, Site **17**. This latter wall was shown as tree-lined and would have been the external boundary to the garden. Although there is now a low wall following this southern line, it is modern and there is no evidence of an earlier structure. A line of greenhouses was shown on the 1909 plan occupying the space between these two walls, and set against the extant wall (Site **17**). However, there are no longer any structures here, and no scars on the southern side of the wall to record their former existence.
- 4.1.9 **Walled Garden Design:** the fabric and design of the walls attests to a structure with a purpose that far exceeded any practical requirements for a garden wall. Notably, the decorative and ornate elements of the garden are on the internal side of the wall, rather than the external side as would be appropriate for a walled nursery garden. This garden boundary marker became instead an expression of style and, perhaps, a demonstration of private wealth. The high wall may have been important, in order to afford privacy to the garden from the access road that ran to the south of the house. The scale of the wall and the execution of features within it, such as the access archways, demonstrates the deliberate construction of a piece of ornate architecture (Plate 4).
- 4.1.10 In most places the outer face of the wall was constructed from grey stone and features one surviving squared access 'turret' (Plate 2) (Site **23**). Its externally severe aspect is accentuated by the increase in wall height over the northern access gate which is suggestive of fortification crenalations. In dramatic contrast, the inner face of the wall is constructed from bricks and decorative features that would have

demonstrated the house-holder's wealth and sense of style to their visitors, as well as creating an aesthetic space for the benefit of the occupants. It should be noted, however, that, depending upon the precise date of the wall construction, the use of brick may have had differing implications within a social context. Depending upon the local clay resources, and how well developed the brick industry had become in any given region, the price of bricks could vary enormously (Clifton Taylor 1987, 226); hence the use of brick in some places was a signifier of wealth, and in others a mundane construction material. The use of brick as a stylistic choice was also subject to pendular swings, particularly in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when fashionable tastes alternated between viewing brick as the material of preference to a fabric that appeared impoverished (*op cit* 227–8). The features, such as the northern arch (Plate 4) (Site **23**) and vaulted recess (Site **16**) (Plate 3), on the inside of the wall, are decorative and give a sense of grandeur that is less aggressively imposing than the severe counterparts that face out from the wall. The orange colour of the bricks may also have been thought to produce a 'warmer' backdrop to the garden than the grey stonework. The choice of wall fabric may also have had a practical purpose, as walling can provide shelter to plants and can also radiate stored heat from sunlight (Marc Cathey 2005). The orange brick would have proved more reflective than the grey stone and, therefore, would have been favourable from a horticultural perspective. The lack of ceramic bricks in the surrounding buildings would have made the inner wall appear more eye-catching and helped to perpetuate the impression of affluence, style, and selectivity to those within the garden, while the outer wall appears to have expressed an indomitable temperament and elevated social status to the general public.

- 4.1.11 **Horticultural Nursery:** the earliest cartographic record of horticultural features at Gisburne Park was the depiction of a rectangular structure projecting to the south of the southern stretch of walling on White's map of 1812 (Fig 6) and the 1817 estate plan (Fig 7). This building was subsequently shown on the 1909 OS mapping (Figs 10 and 11) as being a glass-roofed greenhouse. At the time of the site visit, this area was a car park, the horticultural structures no longer existed above ground, and there were no associated scars on the southern face of the extant section of garden wall. Much of the structure was within the stable yard and it is possible that these structures were demolished when the western part of the garden was divided off from the eastern part, and then heavily landscaped. The 1909 mapping depicted further greenhouses in the north-east quadrant of the garden, within a self-contained area delimited by a boundary line. At the time of the visit, the only remains of this boundary were low stretches of banking marking a rectilinear area with overgrown relict hedges growing on top of the bank along the southern, eastern, and western sides (Fig 13). The use of a hedgerow delimitation would have allowed the main horticultural area to be shielded from view from the main garden without an intrusive structure, such as a wall, that would have created a sense of fragmentation within the overall garden plan. A rectangular sunken feature was visible within this hedged area that corresponds in position with the southernmost of the depicted structures on the 1909 map (Fig 13). This may have had a sunken floor for specific horticultural purposes, such as hot-bedding or the variety of uses attributed to the sunken 'pit-house' style of greenhouse (Campbell 1999, 20-2). The final greenhouse depicted on the 1909 mapping was situated in the north-east corner of the garden and was contiguous with the southern side of the cottage. No evidence of this structure was observed.

- 4.1.12 **Buildings Associated with the Walled Garden:** the map from 1817 and the plan from 1812 (Figs 8 and 9) depicted a rectangular building projecting to the south of the centre of the northern wall, of which no trace was observable during the site visit. The estate plan from 1812 also showed five small structures spaced along the northern edge of the southern wall. The site visit revealed that the two easternmost of these were gabled brick-built outbuildings with slate-tiled roofs (Fig 13; Plate 7). The exact purpose of these buildings is not known, however, a general storage function might reasonably be ascribed to one or more of the five buildings. Similar structures have been demonstrated to have fulfilled a variety of purposes, from their use as furnace sheds that would supply heat to the cavity within a 'hot wall' (Campbell 1999, 18-19), to residential bothies that were occupied by 'young, unmarried gardeners' (*op cit*, 29). There were no obvious signs of flues or chimneys associated with the southern wall that might have suggested that it functioned as a hot wall; however, the flues from such a furnace would have vented through the wall and ultimately vented out from its top. Given that the top of this southern garden wall has been rebuilt, there would not necessarily be any extant indications of such flues. No trace of the three westernmost buildings survived, and these appear to have been destroyed during the modifications that occurred after the post-1909 division of the land.
- 4.1.13 **Northern Buildings:** three buildings that projected northwards from the northern wall of the garden, as shown on the 1909 mapping (Figs 10 and 11), were no longer visible on the ground, although one of them was the 'turret' that contained the northern doorway (Fig 13; Plate 2). One further building that was depicted on the 1909 map, and which was no longer visible above ground, was an annex on the western side of the head gardener's cottage, in the north-eastern corner of the garden. This space was occupied by a flower bed at the time of the site visit (Plate 9).
- 4.1.14 **Head Gardener's Cottage:** the cottage survived as a two-storey gabled building with slate roof tiles and a rendered exterior (Fig 13; Plate 10). The building consisted of two, slightly staggered, contiguous abutting structures with wooden-framed windows and stone window sills. Access to the interior of the buildings was not available at the time of the survey; however, it was evident that all internal walls were plastered and an inspection would not, in any case, have revealed very much. Although the walls have been externally rendered, it is possible to provide some comment on their construction. The two elements of the structure have a very different make-up of floor plan, shape, and windows. In particular, the westernmost cell has only two small six-light windows, and a very small two-light window, facing into the garden, whereas the side facing out of the garden had two large 12-light windows, a large 16-light window, and a small two light window. The principle façade of the building was evidently facing away from the garden, and may have perhaps reflected concern that the family, when enjoying the garden, were not overtly watched by the gardener. The eastern cell, interestingly, has a reverse situation. The principal windows are two very large 12-light windows (with two four-light windows on the first floor) facing out onto the garden, and on the opposite side, facing away from the garden, there are only two, small two-light windows. When this cell was constructed the principle façade was clearly facing towards the garden and reflects a very different change of emphasis from that of the western cell; it is evident that they were not contemporary. The easternmost cell has a thicker ground floor wall, and was possibly butted onto the westernmost cell; at a later stage this building was raised to add a first floor.

- 4.1.15 The first cartographic depiction that the head gardener's cottage appears on is the 1817 estate map (MD335/1/1/12/1/192) (Fig 7). It is not obviously depicted on the White plan of 1812 (MD335/1), but the building is also not shown on the 1844 tithe map (Fig 8), so clearly absence from a map is not necessarily indicative of the actual absence of the building. The building in any case was probably constructed in conjunction with the establishment of the secondary garden layout, which dates between 1771 (Jeffery) and 1812 (White). The cottage as depicted on the 1817 estate plan is a single sub-square structure, with a narrower structure extending to the west, which would appear to correspond to the western cell of the cottage, along with the small narrow western annex that was shown on the 1909 OS second edition map, but which has now gone. This would appear to confirm that the eastern cell was a later addition which was constructed at some date between the 1817 and 1909 maps. By the time the eastern cell appears on the maps (1909) (Figs 10 and 11) the nursery garden was constructed, which would have masked the building from the formal part of the garden. As such, it is therefore not surprising that the orientation of the façade changed, and the large southern-facing windows would have allowed the head gardener to view activities within the nursery garden, but these would not have been visible to the family using the formal garden areas.
- 4.1.16 **Ornamental Features and Pathways:** although the 1850 and 1909 OS maps (Figs 9 and 11) depicted pathways, some of which were tree-lined, that ran around the inside circuit of the walled garden and subdivided the area into five irregular polygonal areas, no trace of these survived. The sundial that was shown as a centrepiece on the 1909 OS mapping was also absent. The western half of the garden has been re-landscaped since the 1909 OS maps were produced, including the addition of tennis courts and a swimming pool; the central north/south path coincides with the line of the later wall, which divided the garden from the stable yard area, and is likely to have removed any trace of the path. It is therefore unsurprising that the internal features in the western part of the have not survived.
- 4.1.17 **The Park:** from as early as White's map of 1812 (Fig 6), there has been a tree-lined avenue depicted running from north-east to south-west across Gisburne Park, and this survives to the present day. A raised sub-square platform (Site 28), to the south-east of the original country house, is shown as an earthwork on the 1909 OS map (Figs 10 and 11) and was also visible as an earthwork during the site visit (Fig 12 and 13). This appears to represent a landscaping feature and, as it was not shown on the 1850 mapping, is unlikely to have been the site of a building. Examination of LiDAR aerial survey data picks out this sub-square feature and also shows the course of an extant sunken trackway (Site 29) (Fig 12) that was also depicted on the 1909 OS mapping. This was a wall-retained terrace that was constructed to create a stock-proof sunken barrier between the gardens and the park to the south that would not interrupt the southward view from the house. In particular, it served to obscure traffic from the main house that passed on a roadway around the garden to Gisburne Mill. A further sunken lane (Site 30) is shown on the LiDAR survey that runs southwards from the Ha-Ha and then curves to the south-east. Two earthworks of uncertain function were observed between the sub-square platform and the Ha-Ha (Fig 12); these consisted of a sub-circular rise (Site 26), that was *c* 20m in diameter and a curvilinear curved earthwork (Site 27) that partially enclosed this grassed mound.

---

## 5. IMPACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### 5.1 IMPACT

- 5.1.1 **Garden Survival:** the garden has been subject to considerable landscape changes since the estate was broken up and sold off in 1944. In particular, the western part of the garden has been severely altered to accommodate the needs of a stable yard, and the construction of a swimming pool and tennis court has further impacted the central section of the garden. The original garden walls, as depicted on the 1909 plan, were 432m in extent; of these 201m of walling are still standing and a further 24m of the line of the wall survives as an earthwork. This would indicate that 46% of the garden walls still survive. Of the 14 buildings / structures associated with the garden that were shown on the 1909 plan, only four still survive today and comprise the cottage, two small outbuildings against the southern garden wall, and the 'turret' surround for the northern garden entrance. None of the soft landscaping elements, such as the footpaths or beds, still survive, and only three of the original trees have survived, in the south-eastern corner of the garden.
- 5.1.2 Although, there are some surviving elements of the garden, the overall character and layout of the garden has largely been lost. This in part reflects the loss of the original components, but to a great extent reflects the splitting up of the garden and the imposition of new elements such as car parking areas and the stable yard.
- 5.1.3 **Impact of the Proposed Hospital Extension:** it is evident that considerable care has been taken with the design of the new build so as to minimise its impact upon the historic garden. However, it is perhaps inevitable that there will be some damage or loss to the early fabric. In particular, the Gardener's Cottage (Site 20) will be demolished, as will the section of garden wall to the east of the cottage. The cottage was a late eighteenth or early nineteenth century component of the secondary phase of garden landscaping. On the 1909 map (Fig 13) there were three elements to the cottage, of which the westernmost annex has already been removed and the easternmost cell was a later nineteenth century addition.
- 5.1.4 The section of garden wall that will be removed has two elements: an east/west section (Site 18) that retains its original character and has a brick inner face and stone outer face. It would appear that this was, from the outset, in a part of the garden that was intended to have a nursery function, as it includes a single plain, unornamented door, and contrasts with the elaborate entrance-way (Site 23) through the northern wall. The second element of garden wall is the north/south section (Site 19) (Plate 5) which has a stone-built internal face and has been incorporated into a later garage. The presence of the stone inner face would suggest that it has been rebuilt, at some stage, and possibly when the garage was constructed. As such, this wall has less archaeological significance than the east/west section of wall (Site 18).

### 5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.2.1 The development will have a limited impact upon an already severely disturbed garden and, as such, there are insufficient grounds for impeding the development; however, there is a case for the preservation by record of those elements of the landscape that will be most severely affected. The greatest impact of the development will be upon the Gardener's Cottage, which is a component of the late

eighteenth/early nineteenth garden design. As such, the building would warrant being recorded by building survey prior to its demolition. At present any recording will be severely limited by the extensive external render and the internal plaster, and it will not be possible to remove any of the wall coverings until it ceases to be occupied. It is therefore recommended that a building survey be undertaken immediately before the development is initiated, when it will be possible to selectively remove the wall coverings to enable the recording and analysis of the underlying fabric. The building should be subject to an English Heritage (2006) Level 3 survey. At the same time a photographic survey should be made of the east/west section of garden wall (Site 18) once the ivy, covering its internal face, has been removed.

## 6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

### 6.1 CARTOGRAPHIC SOURCES

#### ***West Yorkshire Record Office (Leeds) (WYRO)***

MD335/1 White, F, 1812 *Plan of Gisburne Park*

MD335/1/1/12/1/192 Anon, 1817 *A Plan and Mortgage Deed relating to Gisburne Park in the Parish of Gisburne and in the West riding of the county of York. Belonging to the Right Honourable Thomas Lord Ribblesdale,*

MD335/1/5/4 Tithe Map, 1840 *Township of Gisburne including Westby, Arncliffebigging, Sulside, Deepdale and Crow Park*

MS918/2 Bourguignon, P, 1735 *Gisburne Park, plan (coloured) nd (c1735?) and a plan (coloured) of a proposed design for landscaping the park*

#### ***Published Cartographic Sources***

Jefferys, T, *Map of Yorkshire*, 1771

Ordnance Survey 1<sup>st</sup> edition, 1850 *Yorkshire Sheet 166, 6"*: 1 Mile

Ordnance Survey 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, 1909 *Yorkshire Sheet 166.10 25"*: 1 Mile

### 6.2 SECONDARY SOURCES

Campbell, S, 1999 *Walled kitchen gardens*, Princes Risborough

Clifton-Taylor, A, 1987 *The pattern of English building*, London

English Heritage, 1991 *Management of Archaeological Projects*, 2nd edn, London

English Heritage, 2006 *Understanding historic buildings: A guide to good recording practice*, London

Marc Cathey, H, 2005, *Heat zone map explanation*, <http://www.gardenartisans.com/documents/HeatZoneMapExplanation.pdf>

Rothwell, M, 1990 *Industrial Heritage: A guide to the Industrial Archaeology of The Ribble Valley*, Accrington

Webster, N, 2003 *Halls and Manor Houses of North-East Lancashire*, Derbyshire

---

## APPENDIX 1

### PROJECT DESIGN

---

**February 2007**

**Oxford  
Archaeology  
North**

**GISBURNE PARK, GISBURN, LANCASHIRE**

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESKTOP ASSESSMENT,  
AND SITE INVESTIGATION**

**PROJECT DESIGN**

#### ***Proposals***

The following project design is offered in response to a request by Manning Elliott Architects on behalf of Covenant Healthcare Ltd for an archaeological desktop study, and inspection survey of a walled garden and associated structures at Gisburne Park, Gisburn, Lancashire.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Manning Elliott Architects (hereafter the client) on behalf of Covenant Healthcare Ltd has requested that Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) submit proposals to undertake an archaeological investigation of the walled garden at Gisburne Park, Lancashire (SD 825498). This is to comprise a cartographic desktop study, and an inspection survey of the garden and garden structures, which will be used to inform a Listed Building Consent application and planning application in advance of proposals for an extension to Gisburne Park Hospital.

1.1.2 Gisburne Hall is situated to the immediate north of Gisburn village, in North Lancashire, but was historically a part of the West Riding of Yorkshire. The hall was built by the Lister family between 1727 and 1736, and has nineteenth century additions. It is a pebble-dashed building with sandstone dressings and a hipped slate roof. The original house has a half-H-plan and the south facade comprises two storeys and nine bays, of which the central three bays are recessed. It is a grade 1 listed building.

1.1.3 The house was the seat of Lord Ribblesdale; however, in 1927 part of the estates were sold to pay death duties of the last Lord Ribblesdale and then, on the death of his two sisters in 1944, the rest of the estates were sold. In October 1995, Gisburne Park, was converted to an independent private hospital and rehabilitation centre, retaining much of its original character.

### 1.2 OXFORD ARCHAEOLOGY NORTH

1.2.1 Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) has considerable experience of the assessment of all sites including the recording of historic buildings together with undertaking watching briefs of all periods, having undertaken a great number of small and large scale projects during the past 23 years. Fieldwork has taken place within the planning process and construction programmes, to fulfil the requirements of clients and planning authorities, to very rigorous timetables.

1.2.2 OA North has undertaken a great deal of historic building investigations, which include Wycoller Hall, Lancashire, Samlesbury Hall, Lancashire, Rufford Old Hall, Lancashire, Lathom Hall, Lancashire, Platts Hall, Cheshire, Lyme Park Mansion House, Cheshire, Calprina Works, Greater Manchester and Kingsway Baths and Bridge Houses, Lancaster, Lancaster Castle, Furness Abbey and Bolton Castle. In addition, OA North has regularly undertaken the recording of vernacular and industrial buildings throughout the North West and has recently been commissioned by English Heritage to undertake an Extensive Survey of Clay Buildings on the Solway Plain and the detailed recording of Bewcastle in Cumbria.

1.2.3 OA North has been undertaking detailed fabric survey of buildings since 1984, and is one of the foremost specialists in building recording. OA North has developed recording and analytical techniques over the years in order to improve the efficiency and quality of the surveys. This has culminated with the use of 3d Laser scanning, which provides accurate, very detailed 3d modelling by very economic means and the model can then be used for the creation of 2d drawings as required. It is proposed to use this technique for the present recording programme.

1.2.4 OA North is an Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) **registered organisation, registration number 17**, and all its members of staff operate subject to the IFA Code of Conduct.

## 2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 The following programme has been designed according to a brief issued by Manning Elliott Architects.

2.2 **Documentary Study:** the objective of the documentary study is to provide suitable background information relating to the walled garden, possible formal gardens and horticultural structures. This will help to provide an understanding of the development buildings and the landscape, as well as identify areas of potential below-ground archaeology.

- 2.3 **Rapid Inspection Survey:** a rapid site inspection will examine the character, form and provisional development of the structures on site including the garden walls, and will also entail examination of the landscape for any designed garden features. This will be accompanied by a photographic survey to provide a basic record of the structures and to illustrate the report. The work will be undertaken in accordance with English Heritage Level 1 - type survey.
- 2.4 **Report and Archive:** a report will be produced for the client within four weeks of completion of the fieldwork. A site archive will be produced to English Heritage guidelines (English Heritage 1991) and in accordance with the *Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long Term Storage* (UKIC 1990).

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 DOCUMENTARY (CARTOGRAPHIC) STUDY

- 3.1.1 A documentary study will be carried out in order to provide information on the walled gardens, horticultural structures and any possible formal gardens. This will produce a historical context for the site, as well as identifying phases of development of the gardens and will also establish the potential for buried archaeological remains on the site of the proposed development. The emphasis will be on the investigation of cartographic sources, in order to provide a map regression of the designed landscape for Gisburne Park. It will examine Ordnance Survey mapping, tithe maps, and any estate maps that are available from the record offices. Information held as part of the Lancashire Historic Environment Record (HER), including aerial photographs, will also be examined. The study will also include secondary sources and provide information on the history of Gisburne Park.
- 3.1.2 The following sources will be used as appropriate:
- Lancashire Record Office (Preston)
  - Lancashire Historic Environment Record (Preston)
  - The National Monuments Record
  - West Yorkshire Record Office (Leeds)
  - Other libraries and collections such as Lancaster University and OA North

#### 3.2 RAPID INSPECTION SURVEY

- 3.2.1 **Photographic Archive:** a photographic archive will be produced utilising a 35mm camera (with black and white film) and a digital SLR. The archive will comprise general shots of the buildings, garden walls and designed landscape. It will record the overall appearance of the structures and gardens and will show any external detail relevant to the buildings development, design or use.
- 3.2.2 **Site Drawings:** drawings will be created to produce the following:
- (i) A sketch plan will be produced of the extant structure to show the form and location of any structural features of historic significance.
  - (ii) A general plan will be produced showing the local context.
- 3.2.3 The drawings will usually be produced at a scale of 1:100 and will be undertaken by hand survey techniques. The drawings will be incorporated into an industry standard CAD package (Autocad 2004) for the production of the final drawings.
- 3.2.4 **Interpretation and Analysis:** a visual inspection of the horticultural structures, garden walls and an outline description will be maintained to English Heritage Level I. This level of recording is primarily descriptive and will produce only a basic assessment of the development and use of the buildings.
- 3.2.5 **Site Inspection:** informed by the documentary study, an investigation will be undertaken of the hall grounds, looking at the deliberately constructed landscape features. The study will look for evidence of a formal garden layout. The results will be defined either by annotation

onto an existing site plan or by means of GPS survey; it is not intended to undertake a detailed topographic survey of the grounds.

- 3.2.6 It is proposed to undertake an OA North 'level 1' survey (*Appendix 1*) of the area in the environs of the development area, which is a rapid survey typically undertaken alongside a desk top study; it is an initial site inspection intended to identify the extant archaeological resource. It represents the minimum standard of record and is appropriate to exploratory survey aimed at the discovery of previously unrecorded sites. Its aim is to record the existence, location and extent of any such site. The emphasis for the recording is on the written description which will record type and period and would not normally exceed c50 words. The extent of a site is defined for sites or features greater than 50m in size and smaller sites are shown with a cross. The reconnaissance will be undertaken in a systematic fashion, walking on approximately 30m wide transects, within the extent of the defined study area.
- 3.2.7 Unless it is possible to provide annotation of site plans, it is proposed to use a Global Positioning System (GPS) techniques to locate and record the features and artefact sites. The use of GPS techniques can achieve accuracies of better than +/- 0.25m. A photographic record will be undertaken simultaneously.
- 3.2.8 This fieldwork will result in the production of plans at a scale of 1: 2500 or any other appropriate scale required, recording the location of each of the sites listed in a gazetteer. All archaeological information collected in the course of field inspection will be recorded in standardised form, and will include accurate national grid references. This will form the basis of a gazetteer, to be submitted as part of the report.

### 3.3 REPORT AND ARCHIVE

- 3.3.1 **Report:** the results of the data gathered during the documentary study and building investigation will be collated and submitted in report format, illustrated with the relevant drawings. The report will include account of the gardens and buildings past and present use and attempt to relate these findings to its local setting. It will incorporate the results of the documentary study and analytical evidence in order to produce an assessment of the history and development of the individual structures and landscape. The results will be compiled into the project report.
- 3.3.2 One bound and one unbound copy of the report will be submitted to the client, the Lancashire Historic Environment Monuments Record (together with an archive CDROM), and the County Archaeologist. Any subsequent work arising from this survey will be subject to separate consideration in liaison with the client.
- 3.3.3 The report will consist of an acknowledgements statement, list of contents, summary, introduction summarising the brief and project design and any agreed departures from them, methodology, interpretative account of the site and associated structures, a complete bibliography of sources from which data has been derived, and a list of further sources identified during the programme of work. The report will outline the overall form and development of the site and of the evidence supporting interpretation. The report will present the evidence for the development of the landscape around the hall, which will include a designed landscape that will potentially include formal / kitchen gardens and parkland features.
- 3.3.4 **Archive:** the results of Stages 1-34.3 above will form the basis of a full archive to professional standards, in accordance with current English Heritage guidelines (*Management of archaeological projects*, 2nd edition, 1991). The project archive represents the collation and indexing of all the data and material gathered during the course of the project. This archive will be provided in the English Heritage Central Archaeology Service format, as a printed document, and a synthesis (the evaluation report and index of the archive) will be submitted to the Lancashire Historic Environment Record.

## 4. GENERAL CONDITIONS

### 4.1 ACCESS

- 4.1.1 It is assumed that the client will ensure pedestrian and vehicular access to the site.

## **4.2 HEALTH AND SAFETY**

- 4.2.1 OA North provides a Health and Safety Statement for all projects and maintains a Unit Safety policy. All site procedures are in accordance with the guidance set out in the Health and Safety Manual compiled by the Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers (1997). A written risk assessment will be undertaken in advance of project commencement and copies will be made available on request to all interested parties. If there is any risk of asbestos contamination then masks, overalls and gloves will be worn. Survey will be excluded to any parts of the structure where there is no safe access available.
- 4.2.2 The client would be asked to determine the nature of any utility services to the properties and site prior to any fieldwork being carried out.
- 4.2.3 OA North has professional indemnity to a value of £2,000,000, employer's liability cover to a value of £10,000,000 and public liability to a value of £15,000,000. Written details of insurance cover can be provided if required.

## **4.3 CONFIDENTIALITY**

- 4.3.1 The final report is designed as a document for the specific use of the client, and should be treated as such; it is not suitable for publication as an academic report, or otherwise, without amendment or revision. Any requirement to revise or reorder the material for submission or presentation to third parties beyond the project brief and project design, or for any other explicit purpose, can be fulfilled, but will require separate discussion and funding.
- 5.3.2 Any proposed variations to the project design will be agreed with the Client. OA North will arrange a preliminary meeting, if required, and LCAS will be informed of the commencement of the project in writing.

## **5. WORK PROGRAMME**

- 5.1 The following programme is proposed:

- i*      **Documentary Study**  
10 days (on site / office)
- ii*     **Rapid Inspection Survey**  
1 days (on site)
- iii*    **Drawing Compilation**  
4 days (office)
- iv*     **Survey Report**  
8 days (office)

## **6 STAFFING**

- 6.1 The project will be managed by **Jamie Quartermaine BA (Hons)** (Senior Project Manager) to whom all correspondence should be addressed.
- 7.3 The documentary study and inspection survey will be carried out by **Chris Wild BSc (Hons)** (Project Officer). Chris specialises in the survey and investigation of historic buildings covering a range of periods and types.

## APPENDIX 2

### GAZETTEER OF SITES

---

<b>Site number</b>	<b>01</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Fountain Wood</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82210 49810
<b>Site type</b>	Possible earthwork
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN3170
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	An aerial photograph, PRN 3169, shows a faint, small, circular, ring-shaped feature, possibly a ditch, that has been almost completely ploughed out.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and will not be affected.

---

<b>Site number</b>	<b>02</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Well</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82676 49850
<b>Site type</b>	Well
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN10128
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	A well shown on the first edition Ordnance Survey and current map.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and will not be affected.

---

<b>Site number</b>	<b>03</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Weir</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82380 49760
<b>Site type</b>	Weir
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN10130
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	A weir shown on the Bourguignon plan of 1735, but is not shown on modern mapping.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and will not be affected.

---

<b>Site number</b>	<b>04</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Corn mill</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82230 49570
<b>Site type</b>	Mill
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN10131
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	A corn mill is shown on the Bourguignon plan of 1735 and also on the current OS map.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and will not be affected.

---

<b>Site number</b>	<b>05</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Limestone Quarry</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82150 49350
<b>Site type</b>	Quarry
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN10132
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	A quarry is shown on the first edition Ordnance Survey and is shown as disused on the current OS map

---

<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies close to the development area and may possibly be affected by access traffic to the site
-------------------	--

<b>Site number</b>	<b>06</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Well</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82260 49780
<b>Site type</b>	Well
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN10133
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	A well shown on the first edition Ordnance Survey but not on the current OS map.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected.

<b>Site number</b>	<b>07</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Keepers Cottage (The Poultry House)</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82795 49641
<b>Site type</b>	Cottage
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN10129
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	A 'Poultry House' is shown on the OS first edition 6" map but not on the current OS sheet. This comprises a pair of houses, dated to the mid eighteenth century, and are constructed of mortared rubble with roofs of slate and stone slate. It comprises two one-bay pavilions of two storeys, with a recessed linking wall.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected.

<b>Site number</b>	<b>08</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Country House</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82535 49706
<b>Site type</b>	Country House
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN15368
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	The Gisburne Park country house, 1727-36, with later additions. It is pebble-dashed with sandstone dressings and a hipped slate roof. The original house has a half-H-plan, and the south facade comprises two storeys and nine bays, the central three bays are recessed.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies within the development area but is unlikely to be affected.

<b>Site number</b>	<b>09</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Kennels</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82267 49651
<b>Site type</b>	Kennel
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN15369
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	Kennels shown on the anonymous plan of Gisburne Park of 1817.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected.

<b>Site number</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Poultry House Bridge</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82728 49682
<b>Site type</b>	Bridge
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN15731
<b>Sources</b>	LHER

<b>Description</b>	A bridge, probably of mid eighteenth century date, with a rough rubble build. It is narrow, with a single segmental arch, and has solid parapets and chamfered copings.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected.

<b>Site number</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Gisburn Bridge</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82178 49621
<b>Site type</b>	Bridge
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN17899
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	The bridge over the Ribble north of Gisburne Park
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected.

<b>Site number</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Mill Bridge Cottage Gisburne Park</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82200 49570
<b>Site type</b>	Bridge
<b>Period</b>	Post Medieval
<b>SMR No</b>	PRN18778
<b>Sources</b>	LHER
<b>Description</b>	An early to mid eighteenth century lodge with later nineteenth century additions.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected.

<b>Site number</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Relict Garden Terrace</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82397 49686
<b>Site type</b>	Terrace
<b>Period</b>	c1735
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	Located to the north of the walled garden a terraced area survives for some 36m in length, running approximately east/west. This terrace was lightly wooded at the time of the site visit and, beyond the northern edge, dropped away to the River Ribble. A large earthen bank defines the southern edge of the terrace, which was probably the spoil mound from excavating a sunken track 5-6m wide that divides this terrace from the walled garden. The northern edge of the terrace appears to correspond to one of the garden boundaries depicted on the 1735 map by Bourguignon, and as such represents a relic of the earliest landscaped features.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected.

<b>Site number</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Northern Garden Wall</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82397 49686
<b>Site type</b>	Terrace
<b>Period</b>	Late eighteenth / early nineteenth centuries
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	A 35m stretch of wall to the west of the gardeners cottage and 18m to the east. It is c0.75m wide and, although not uniform in height, was up to 5m high. It was constructed in brick using English Garden Wall bond on the internal face, and in poorly coursed, roughly dressed stone on the reverse. Both sides were bonded with lime mortar and no render appears to have been applied to the wall faces. The gap between this wall section and the cottage accommodated an earlier extension to the cottage (shown on the 1909 map), but this had gone by the time of the modern mapping. This northern wall portion featured a large, and elaborate gateway (Site 23) to the garden and several buttresses that were triangular in plan. The gateway was original, however, the buttresses were later additions, intended to strengthen the wall, and are not shown on the 1909 plan.

<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies within the development area and is likely to be affected.
<b>Site number</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Western Garden Wall</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82397 49686
<b>Site type</b>	Wall
<b>Period</b>	Late eighteenth / early nineteenth centuries
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	The western garden wall survived to a length of around 60m and stood to the original height of around 4m and featured an arched and vaulted recess (Site 16) and arched doorways that had been bricked-up. Constructed in brick using English Garden Wall bond on the internal face, and in poorly coursed, roughly dressed stone on the reverse. Both sides were bonded with lime mortar and no render appears to have been applied to the wall faces
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected
<b>Site number</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Vaulted Recess</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82397 49686
<b>Site type</b>	Terrace
<b>Period</b>	Late eighteenth / early nineteenth centuries
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	An arched and vaulted recess and arched doorways that has been bricked-up. The arch clearly abuts the garden wall and was likely to have been a seating area
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected
<b>Site number</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Southern Garden Wall</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 8241 4961
<b>Site type</b>	Wall
<b>Period</b>	Late eighteenth / early nineteenth centuries
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	The southern garden wall survived as a 50m stretch of walling with two gabled-roofed outbuildings (Site 22) on the inside face. This section of wall was built entirely in brick and may reflect that this was an internal wall.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected
<b>Site number</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Southern Garden Wall</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 8243 4967
<b>Site type</b>	Wall
<b>Period</b>	Late eighteenth / early nineteenth centuries
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	An east/west orientated section of garden wall that has a brick inner face and a stone outer face. This was, from the outset, in a part of the garden that was intended to have a nursery function as it includes a single plain, unornamented door, and contrasts with the elaborate entrance-way (Site 23) through the northern wall.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected
<b>Site number</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Eastern Garden Wall</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 8244 4967
<b>Site type</b>	Wall
<b>Period</b>	Late eighteenth / early nineteenth centuries
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment



<b>Description</b>	An eastern section of garden wall orientated north / south section and which has a stone built internal face and has been incorporated into a later garage. The presence of the stone inner face would suggest that it has been rebuilt, at some stage, and possibly when the garage was constructed.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site is within the development area and will be demolished

<b>Site number</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Head Gardener's Cottage</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82414 49677
<b>Site type</b>	Cottage
<b>Period</b>	Late eighteenth / early nineteenth centuries
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	The cottage survived as a two story gabled building with slate roof tiles and a rendered exterior, and which has two slightly staggered contiguous abutting structures with wooden framed windows and stone window sills. The two elements of the structure have a very different make-up of floor plan, shape, and windows. In particular the westernmost cell has only two small six-light windows, and a very small two-light window, facing into the garden. Whereas the side facing out of the garden had two large 12-light windows, a large 16-light window, and a small two light window. The eastern cell, interestingly, has a reverse situation. The principal windows are two very large 12-light windows (with two four-light windows on the first floor) facing out onto the garden, and on the opposite side, facing away from the garden, there are only two, small two-light windows. The easternmost cell has a thicker ground floor wall, and was possibly butted onto the westernmost cell. At a later stage this building was raised to add a first floor. The first map that the gardeners cottage appears on any map is the 1817 estate map.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site is within the development area and will be demolished

<b>Site number</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Sunken Earthwork</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82410 49643
<b>Site type</b>	Earthwork
<b>Period</b>	Mid / late nineteenth century
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	A rectangular sunken feature was visible within nursery garden area (Site 25) and corresponds in position with a greenhouse shown on the 1909 plan. This structure may have had a sunken floor for specific horticultural purposes.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected

<b>Site number</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Outbuildings</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82405 49604 and 82421 49618
<b>Site type</b>	Outbuildings
<b>Period</b>	Late eighteenth / early nineteenth centuries
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	Two gabled-roofed outbuildings were constructed against the internal face of the southern garden wall. Their function is uncertain, but may have provided furnaces for heating the garden wall.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected

<b>Site number</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Recessed Entrance</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82391 49661
<b>Site type</b>	Recessed Entrance
<b>Period</b>	Late eighteenth / early nineteenth centuries
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment

<b>Description</b>	An ornate, large recessed entrance to the garden through the north wall. There is a turret attached to the northern, external face of the wall to accommodate it.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected

<b>Site number</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Earthwork</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 82391 49661
<b>Site type</b>	Earthwork
<b>Period</b>	Mid / late nineteenth century
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	A linear earthwork, comprising a terraced break of slope that extends in a line from the end of Wall 19, and converges with the former end of the southern wall. This is probably the remains of the former garden boundary.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected

<b>Site number</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Hedged Nursery Compound</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 8241 4964
<b>Site type</b>	Hedged Nursery
<b>Period</b>	Mid / late nineteenth century
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	A nursery area was clearly defined on the 1909 map, but at the time of the survey, the only remains of this boundary were low stretches of banking marking a rectilinear area with overgrown relict hedges growing on top of the bank along the southern, eastern, and western sides. The use of a hedgerow delimitation would have allowed the main horticultural area to be shielded from the view in the main garden without a intrusive structure, such as a wall, which would have created a sense of fragmentation within the overall garden plan.
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected

<b>Site number</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Circular Earthwork</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 8247 4957
<b>Site type</b>	Earthwork
<b>Period</b>	Eighteenth / nineteenth century
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected

<b>Site number</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Circular Earthwork</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 8249 4956
<b>Site type</b>	Earthwork
<b>Period</b>	Eighteenth / nineteenth century
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected

<b>Site number</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Rectangular Earthwork</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 8252 4962
<b>Site type</b>	Rectangular Earthwork
<b>Period</b>	Eighteenth / nineteenth century
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	

---

<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected
-------------------	---

---

<b>Site number</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Sunken Trackway</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 8252 4952
<b>Site type</b>	Sunken Trackway
<b>Period</b>	Eighteenth century
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected

---

<b>Site number</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Site name</b>	<b>Gisburne Park, Sunken Trackway</b>
<b>NGR</b>	SD 8254 4943
<b>Site type</b>	Sunken Trackway
<b>Period</b>	Eighteenth century
<b>Sources</b>	Visual assessment
<b>Description</b>	
<b>Assessment</b>	The site lies outside the development area and is unlikely to be affected

---

---

## ILLUSTRATIONS

---

### FIGURES

Figure 1: Site Location

Figure 2: Listed Buildings and HER sites in the immediate environs of Gisburne Park

Figure 3: Extracts from the 1735 map by Bourguignon, showing the first formal gardens, the close up, bottom, is looking west

Figure 4: Original garden layouts projected onto their approximate location on the current vertical aerial photograph

Figure 5: Extract from Jefferys map of Yorkshire of 1771 showing the two avenues and hall, as well as the distinction between the area of the lawn and the deer park

Figure 6: Plan of Gisburne Park By White, 1812

Figure 7: Plan of the Gisburne estate, dated 1817, but no draughtsman is named

Figure 8: Extract from the Tithe map of the Township of Gisburn, 1844

Figure 9: Extract from Ordnance Survey map six inch map of 1850

Figure 10: Ordnance Survey 25" map of Gisburne Park, 1909

Figure 11: Detail of Ordnance Survey 25" map (1909)

Figure 12: Site map showing historic garden and parkland features

Figure 13: Detail Plan of Historic Garden

### PLATES

Plate 1: The northern terrace edge (Site **13**) of the original garden (as depicted on the 1753 map), which overlooks the River Ribble

Plate 2: The northern wall (Site **14**) viewed from outside the garden showing the external turret of the recessed arched entrance (Site **23**).

Plate 3: Vaulted recess (Site **16**) set in the north-western corner of the walled garden

Plate 4: The northern wall (Site **14**) showing the recessed arched entrance (Site **23**) from inside the garden

Plate 5: The eastern wall section (Site **19**) which has a stone-built internal face and has been adapted as part of a garage.

Plate 6: A distinct terrace edge (Site **24**) that marks the line of the eastern section of garden wall

Plate 7: One of two surviving small outbuildings (Site **22**) that were constructed against the internal face of the garden wall (Site **17**)

Plate 8: The north-eastern section of garden wall (Site **18**) to the east of the Gardener's Cottage (Site **20**)

Plate 9: The western face of the Gardener's Cottage (Site **20**) showing the gap where there had been a former annexe to the cottage

Plate 10: The southern face of the Gardeners Cottage (Site **20**) showing the two distinct eastern and western cells








Figure 2: Listed Buildings and HER sites in the immediate environs of Gisburne Park






Figure 3: Listed building and Monument sites in the immediate area of Gisburn Park





Figure 4: Original garden layouts projected onto their approximate location on the current vertical aerial photograph




Figure 5: Extract from Jefferys map of Yorkshire of 1771 showing the two avenues and hall, as well as the distinction between the area of the lawn and the deer park



Figure 6: Plan of Gisborne Park By White, 1812




Figure 7: Plan of the Gisborne estate, dated 1817, but no draughtsman is named





Figure 8: Extract from the Tithe map of the Township of Gisburne, 1844



Figure 9: Extract from Ordnance Survey map six inch map of 1850




Figure 10: Ordnance Survey 25" map of Gisburn Park, 1909



Figure 11: Detail of Ordnance Survey 25" map (1909)







Plate 1: The northern terrace edge (Site **13**) of the original garden (as depicted on the 1753 map), which overlooks the River Ribble



Plate 2: The northern wall (Site **14**) viewed from outside the garden showing the external turret of the recessed arched entrance (Site **23**).





Plate 3: Vaulted recess (Site **16**) set in the north-western corner of the walled garden



Plate 4: The northern wall (Site **14**) showing the recessed arched entrance (Site 23) from inside the garden





Plate 5: The eastern wall section (Site **19**) which has a stone-built internal face and has been adapted as part of a garage.



Plate 6: A distinct terrace edge (Site **24**) that marks the line of the eastern section of garden wall





Plate 7: One of two surviving small outbuildings (Site **22**) that were constructed against the internal face of the garden wall (Site **17**)



Plate 8: The north-eastern section of garden wall (Site **18**) to the east of the Gardener's Cottage (Site **20**)



Plate 9: The western face of the Gardener's Cottage (Site **20**) showing the gap where there had been a former annexe to the cottage



Plate 10: The southern face of the Gardener.s Cottage (Site **20**) showing the two distinct eastern and western cells





**Head Office/Registered Office/  
OA South**

Janus House  
Osney Mead  
Oxford OX2 0ES

t: +44 (0) 1865 263 800  
f: +44 (0) 1865 793 496  
e: [info@oxfordarchaeology.com](mailto:info@oxfordarchaeology.com)  
w: <http://oxfordarchaeology.com>

**OA North**

Mill 3  
Moor Lane  
Lancaster LA1 1QD

t: +44 (0) 1524 541 000  
f: +44 (0) 1524 848 606  
e: [oanorth@oxfordarchaeology.com](mailto: oanorth@oxfordarchaeology.com)  
w: <http://oxfordarchaeology.com>

**OA East**

15 Trafalgar Way  
Bar Hill  
Cambridgeshire  
CB23 8SQ

t: +44 (0) 1223 850500  
e: [oaeast@oxfordarchaeology.com](mailto: oaeast@oxfordarchaeology.com)  
w: <http://oxfordarchaeology.com>



Chief Executive Officer  
Ken Welsh, BSc, MCIfA  
Oxford Archaeology Ltd is a  
Private Limited Company, N<sup>o</sup>: 1618597  
and a Registered Charity, N<sup>o</sup>: 285627