

---

## CONTENTS

---

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
1.1 Circumstances of Project.....	4
1.2 Topography and Geology.....	4
1.3 Historical Background.....	5
<b>2. Methodology</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1 Project Design .....	7
2.2 Trial Trenching.....	7
2.3 Archive .....	8
2.4 Health and Safety .....	8
<b>3. Results</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	9
3.2 General Trench Descriptions.....	9
<b>4. Discussion</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>5. Impact and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>11</b>
5.1 Impact.....	11
5.2 Recommendations .....	11
<b>6. Bibliography</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix 1:</b> .....	<b>13</b>
Detailed Trench Descriptions	
<b>Appendix 2:</b> .....	<b>14</b>
Project Design	
<b>Illustrations</b> .....	<b>19</b>
Figure 1 Great Asby Location Plan	
Figure 2 Study Area	
Figure 3 Trench Location Plan	

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

Thanks are due to the staff of the Cumbria Record Office in Kendal, and to Bette Hopkins of Cumbria County Council Archaeology Service for Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) information. Thanks in particular are due to Roy Rhodes of North West Water Ltd and to John Collins of Bechtel for their support.

The work was undertaken by Chris Wild and Ian Scott. The report was compiled by Chris Wild, and edited by Jamie Quartermaine (Project Manager) and Rachel Newman (Deputy Director). The project was managed by Jamie Quartermaine.

---

## SUMMARY

---

An archaeological evaluation was carried out by Lancaster University Archaeological Unit (LUAU) in advance of a sewerage scheme in the village of Great Asby in Cumbria (NGR NY 6865 1360) on behalf of North West Water Ltd in December 1997. It followed on from an archaeological assessment undertaken by LUAU in February 1997 (LUAU 1997). The present evaluation involved the investigation, by trial trenching, of a proposed sewage treatment works, in an area c65m x 48m, c0.5km to the east of the village, and also two outfall sewerage pipes. In the event access was not available to enable trenching of either of the two sewerage pipes.

The evaluation involved the excavation of five trenches, each measuring 30m by 1.6m, which were mechanically dug, under archaeological supervision, prior to being cleaned and inspected by experienced archaeologists. The trenching revealed a very shallow stratigraphy, devoid of disturbed subsoils. Two areas of modern infill of a former stream bed were observed, one containing modern brick. No other artefacts or features of archaeological significance were recovered during the evaluation.

To an extent the negative results reinforced the earlier supposition (LUAU 1997) that this part of the village was undeveloped during medieval times, although it does appear that the subsoils of the site had been truncated, thus removing any potential archaeological deposits.

The development will not have an impact upon an identified archaeological resource and therefore it is recommended that no further archaeological investigation be undertaken in the area of the proposed treatment works. However, as it was not possible to examine the area of the sewer pipes it is recommended that they be examined as a watching brief during the construction work.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

### 1.1 Circumstances of Project

- 1.1.1 An archaeological assessment was undertaken in February 1997 (LUAU 1997), by the Lancaster University Archaeological Unit (LUAU), in advance of a proposed sewerage scheme in the village of Great Asby in Cumbria (NGR NY 6865 1360) (Fig 1), which will involve the construction of a treatment works and associated sewage pipes. The assessment highlighted the archaeological potential of the study area, but did not identify any specific sites within the extent of the proposed treatment works. Because of the archaeological potential, the County Archaeologist recommended that a programme of evaluation trenching be undertaken within the extent of the proposed treatment works to identify the potential for extant sub-surface remains.
- 1.1.2 In accordance with a verbal brief from the County Archaeologist and a project design by LUAU (*Appendix 2*), an archaeological evaluation was carried out by LUAU to investigate the potential of a sub-surface archaeological resource within the extent of the proposed treatment works and outfall pipes. The work was carried out on behalf of North West Water Ltd in December 1997. The evaluation area within the proposed sewage treatment works was c65m x 48m in extent and was situated c0.5km from the eastern end of the village (Fig 2). It was also required that trenches be excavated along the line of a effluent/stormwater outfall pipe to Asby Beck (NY 6862 1367) and also an overflow pipe near the village (NY 6833 1343); however, in the event, access was not available for either pipe and no trenching could be undertaken in these areas.
- 1.1.3 This report sets out the results of the work in conjunction with a method statement, and an assessment of the impact that the development proposals will have upon any archaeological resource.

### 1.2 Topography and Geology

- 1.2.1 The village of Great Asby lies on the south-west side of the Eden valley, in an area of rolling pasture land. To the south, the land rises up onto Asby Winderwath Common and an area of limestone pavement, known as Great Asby Scar.
- 1.2.2 The underlying geology is Dinantian Limestone of the Carboniferous Series (OS Geological Map 1959, Sheet 3; Inst. Geol. Sci. 1980, Sheet 54N 04W, 1:25000 Series).
- 1.2.3 The village is a linear settlement, based around a central green, on which the church is situated. Asby Beck runs through the centre of the village, along the southern edge of the green and then joins the River Eden.

## 1.3 Historical Background

- 1.3.1 **Prehistoric:** the area around Great Asby, particularly on the uplands to the south, has a considerable wealth of prehistoric remains (RCHME 1936). There is a considerable number of funerary monuments across the extent of these uplands, particularly round cairns of the Bronze Age; however, there is also a long cairn at Rayseat Pike (Crosby Garrett Fell), which is of Neolithic date. The area also includes a number of stone circles, notably that at White Hag, Oddendale and Castlehowe Scar within Crosby Ravensworth parish. The artefactual surveys of Jim Cherry (1987) have identified a substantial wealth of prehistoric lithics from across the Limestone uplands of Great Asby and Crosby Ravensworth fells. Much of this is of Bronze Age date, but a significant amount of Neolithic and Early Bronze Age material was found in localised areas, notably Beacon Fell, near Orton Scar.
- 1.3.2 **Iron Age/Roman:** later periods are similarly very well represented; there is a particularly large number of enclosed settlements within the parishes of Asby, Crosby Ravensworth and Crosby Garrett (RCHME 1936). A minority of these have a form which is typologically of Iron Age date, notably the hillfort at Castle Folds on Great Asby Scar. The majority of enclosed settlements, however, are of a form typologically ascribed to the Romano-British period, although they may have had Iron Age origins. The most notable of these is that of Ewe Close (south-west of Crosby Ravensworth) (Collingwood 1909), but there are at least twelve others within the parishes of Asby, Crosby Garrett and Crosby Ravensworth, including one at Holborn Hill, only 0.8km from Great Asby (RCHME 1936). This density of such settlements is greater than from any other area of north-west England and testifies that this area was heavily occupied during this period. By implication it is likely that the better drained lowlands were also heavily occupied.
- 1.3.3 **Early Medieval:** the study area lies entirely within the village of Great Asby, which is a township within the large parish of Asby, also including the settlement of Little Asby. The settlement has probable early medieval origins; the name Asby derives from Old Scandinavian *askr* + *bý*, which means the farmstead or village where the ash trees grow (Mills 1991, 13). Although it is not known precisely when the settlement originated, given that the parish name is Old Scandinavian, and that a hoard of pre-Conquest metalwork has been recently discovered in the parish (R M Newman pers comm) it is likely that there was pre-Conquest settlement in the area. However, this probably comprised dispersed farmsteads or hamlets, rather than the present nucleated village (Taylor 1983, 125). Professor Rosemary Cramp has suggested that the hoard may imply a pre-Conquest monastic settlement (R M Newman pers comm).
- 1.3.4 **Medieval:** the parish of Asby is first mentioned in documents from the reign of Henry

---

II (1154-1189) (Nicholson and Burn 1777, 508-510). The parish church of St Peter, situated in the centre of the village green, was first mentioned in 1299, although the present building dates to 1866 (Pevsner 1967, 248). Within the village centre is a rectory, partly of fourteenth century date and also a well, which is dedicated to St Helen; the name St Helen is often associated with pagan sites that have been christianised. To the north-east of the village is Marble Mill, which is marked on the OS 1st edition maps (1859) but which may have had medieval origins. Despite the potential early medieval origins of settlement in the area the form of the present village of Great Asby would suggest that this was a deliberately planted settlement around a green, dating back to the eleventh or twelfth centuries (Roberts 1989).

- 1.3.5 ***Nineteenth Century Enclosure:*** the area of the proposed treatment works, in the south-eastern part of the study area, was enclosed in the early nineteenth century from common grazing land. Although it is presently permanent pasture, it has only recently been improved from rough pasture, which involved putting drainage trenches through the area.

---

## 2. METHODOLOGY

---

### 2.1 Project Design

- 2.1.1 A project design (*Appendix 2*) was submitted by LUAU, in response to a request from North West Water Ltd for an archaeological evaluation of the proposed mains sewerage development at Great Asby, near Appleby, Cumbria (centred NGR NY 6865 1366). This was designed to meet the requirements of a verbal Project Brief by the Cumbria County Archaeologist.
- 2.1.2 The project design provided for an archaeological evaluation involving the excavation of five trenches on the site of the proposed sewage works and single trenches on the lines of two sewer pipes. In the event it was not possible to excavate trenches on the sewer lines because of access restrictions, but in all other respects the work has been carried out in accordance with the Project Design. The results of the evaluation are presented in this report.

### 2.2 Trial Trenching

- 2.2.1 The trenches were laid out, in agreement with the County Archaeologist, to give a representative coverage of the area. The trial trenches in the area of the water treatment plant were each 30m in length and were mechanically excavated using a 1.6m wide toothless ditching bucket. This was followed by manual cleaning and excavation for the purposes of examining archaeological detail. All excavation was carried out stratigraphically, whether by machine or by hand. Excavation was undertaken to the depth of the natural subsoils.
- 2.2.2 The recording methods employed by LUAU accord with those recommended by English Heritage's Central Archaeology Service (CAS). Recording was in the form of a *pro forma* Trench Sheet for the trench, which recorded the orientation, length, and depth of machining, and described the nature of the topsoil, subsoil (where applicable), and geological deposits (*Appendix 1*). A photographic record was maintained and any finds recovered were bagged and recorded by context.
- 2.2.3 The position of each trench was recorded using differential Global Positioning System (GPS) techniques, which uses electronic distance measurements along radio frequencies to satellites to enable a fix in Latitude and Longitude, which were subsequently converted mathematically to Ordnance Survey National Grid. This information was then superimposed onto a map digitised from a drawing provided by the client (Figs 2 and 3).

## **2.3 Archive**

- 2.3.1 A full archive of the trial trenching programme has been produced to a professional standard in accordance with current English Heritage guidelines (English Heritage 1991). The archive will be deposited with the County Record Office (Kendal) and a copy of the report will be given to the County SMR. A copy of the archive will also be available for deposition with the National Monuments Record in Swindon.

## **2.4 Health and Safety**

- 2.4.1 Both Lancaster University and LUAU maintain Safety Policies, the latter based on the SCAUM (Standing Conference of Unit Managers) Health and Safety Manual (1991). In keeping with current Health and Safety at Work Regulations, prior to commencing on-site work, a risk assessment for each activity was completed. Due regard was given to all Health and Safety considerations during all aspects of the project. The positions of all trenches were scanned using a U-scan meter to detect for any live services.



---

## 3. RESULTS

---

### 3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 A total of five trenches was excavated to evaluate the archaeological potential of the proposed water treatment site. The positions of the trenches are shown in Figures 2 and 3; the generalised trench description is given below (*Section 3.2*), whilst the detailed descriptions for each excavated trench are given in *Appendix 1*.

### 3.2 General Trench Descriptions

3.2.1 The soils of the five trenches were similar, and typically comprised c0.2m of topsoil overlying natural silty clays. These varied from light greyish brown to orangey brown in colour, but were all of very similar form and texture. No disturbed subsoils were observed in any of the trenches.

3.2.2 Trenches 2 and 3, positioned across the small gully identified during the previous survey (LUAU 1997; Site 7) as a former stream bed, revealed a channel c7m wide filled with sub-angular sandstone fragments up to c0.4m x 0.2m x 0.2m in size. These stones were contained in a matrix of dark brown silty clay containing quantities of plant roots. In the southern of these two trenches (Trench 2), two small fragments of modern brick/tile were recovered.

3.2.3 No datable archaeological features were identified elsewhere within any of the evaluation trenches. Those artefacts that were recovered from the evaluation were exclusively post-medieval in date.

---

## 4. DISCUSSION

---

- 4.1 No significant archaeological evidence, either artefactual or structural, for human activity was revealed within the evaluation trenches. However, this does not entirely preclude the possibility of archaeological remains from elsewhere within the site.
- 4.2 Trenches 2 and 3 both revealed areas of tipped stone fragments within an infilled gully; however, their excavation revealed no associated structural remains. It is probable that they represent infilling of the former stream bed to level the field during recent land improvements. The recovery of modern brick from one of the deposits, and oral evidence would also support this explanation.
- 4.3 Across the area as a whole the stratigraphy was very shallow, without any disturbed subsoils. To an extent the shallow soils may reflect the upland character of the landscape, which is typically associated with shallow soil deposits. However, it may potentially also reflect the truncation of the overlying topsoil and subsoils, as a result of recent land drainage and physical land improvements.
- 4.4 The lack of evidence of settlement or associated artefactual material within the study area, allied with the documentary and cartographic study previously carried out (LUAU 1997), suggests that the area lay outside the bounds of the medieval settlement of Great Asby.

---

## 5. ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### 5.1 Impact

5.1.1 The original assessment (LUAU 1997) has highlighted the archaeological potential of the locality around the study area, being within the vicinity of a medieval village and in an area of prehistoric potential. The evaluation trenches, however, have not recovered any evidence of settlement or associated artefactual material. There is consequently no evidence for a significant archaeological resource that would be affected by the proposed development.

### 5.2 Recommendations

5.2.1 The evaluation of the site of the proposed water treatment plant at Great Asby, Cumbria has not revealed any archaeological features which would be compromised by the proposed development, and the identified resource was not of sufficient archaeological importance to justify recommending any further formal archaeological work in the area of the treatment works.

5.2.2 The lines of the two outfall pipes could not be evaluated because of access restrictions. To compensate for this omission it is recommended that they be examined by an archaeological watching brief in the course of the proposed topsoil strip for the pipe laying.

---

## 6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

*The references defined below include sources that were used as background information but have not been directly quoted in the text.*

Cherry, J, and Cherry, PJ, 1987 *Prehistoric habitation sites on the limestone uplands of Eastern Cumbria*, Cumberland and Westmorland Antiq Archaeol Soc Res Ser **II**, Kendal

Collingwood, WG, 1909 Report on a further exploration of the Romano-British settlement at Ewe Close, *Trans Cumberland Westmorland Antiq Archaeol Soc*, New Ser, **9**, 295-309

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

Kapelle, WE, 1979 *The Norman Conquest of the North: the region and its transformation 1000-1135*, London

LUAU, 1997 *Great Asby, Cumbria; archaeological assessment*, unpubl rep

Mills, AD, 1991 *A Dictionary of English Place-Names*, Oxford

Nicholson, J, and Burn, R, 1777 *The History and Antiquities of the Counties of Westmorland and Cumberland*, **1**, London

Pevsner, N, 1969 *The Buildings of England: Cumberland and Westmorland*, London

Phythian-Adams, C, 1996 *Land of the Cumbrians: A Study in British Provincial Origins AD 400-1200*, Aldershot

Roberts, BK, 1989 Nucleation and dispersion: distribution maps as a research tool, in Aston, M, Austin, D and Dyer, C (eds), *The Rural Settlements of Medieval England*, 59-76, Cambridge

Royal Commission on the Historic Monuments of England (RCHME), 1936 *An inventory of the ancient and historical monuments in the county of Westmorland*, London

Taylor, C, 1983 *Village and Farmstead: A History of Rural Settlement in England*, London

Whelan, W, 1860 *The History and Topography of the Counties of Cumberland and Westmoreland (sic)*, Pontefract

---

## APPENDIX 1

### DETAILED TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS

---

**Trench No**            **1**  
**Orientation**        **North/South**

**Description**

Machine excavation of topsoil up to 0.25m in depth revealed mottled yellowish brown natural silty boulder clay. This contained occasional lenses of orangey brown silty clay and sub-rounded and sub-angular small stones. A sondage excavated to 1.2m in depth at the southern end of the trench revealed that this deposit continued for some depth, and became a more leached greyish colour with depth.

---

**Trench No**            **2**  
**Orientation**        **East/West**

**Description**

Machine excavation of 0.2m of topsoil revealed natural orangey mid-brown silty boulder clay with occasional small sub-angular sandstone fragments and some mineralization flecking. At a distance of 10.7m from the eastern end of the trench this deposit dipped to a depth of 0.62m and for an overall width of 7.3m, forming a shallow gully. This gully was filled with sub-angular sandstone fragments up to 0.4m x 0.2m x 0.1m. The feature was half-sectioned, but no pattern or structure was observed within the stone, which was contained in a dark brown silty clay containing quantities of roots. Two fragments of modern brick/tile were recovered from this fill.

---

**Trench No**            **3**  
**Orientation**        **East/West**

**Description**

Machine excavation of 0.2m of topsoil revealed natural orangey mid-brown silty boulder clay with occasional small sub-angular sandstone fragments and some mineralization flecking. Some 3.4m from the eastern end a continuation of the gully aligned north/south through Trench 2 was revealed, of similar dimensions. This was filled with a similar sandstone deposit, with some slightly larger fragments (0.4m x 0.2m x 0.2m) and less roots in the matrix.

---

**Trench No**            **4**  
**Orientation**        **East/West**

**Description**

Machine excavation of 0.08m to 0.25m of topsoil revealed natural orangey mid-brown silty boulder clay with occasional small sub-angular sandstone fragments. At the western end of the trench this merged to a greyer, probably leached, mottled silty clay. At the eastern end of the trench the natural clay was less silty and had a slightly higher concentration of sub-rounded and sub-angular pebbles.

---

**Trench No**            **5**  
**Orientation**        **North/South**

**Description**

Machine excavation of 0.16m of topsoil revealed natural mottled orangey mid-brown silty boulder clay with occasional small sub-angular sandstone fragments and some mineralization flecking. At the northern end of the trench this merged to a greyer, probably leached, mottled silty clay. The cut for a land drain 0.2m wide, with straight sides and filled with a mottled, more plastic, clay, was observed across the trench, in an approximately north-east / south-west alignment, between 13m and 18m from the northern end of the trench.

---

---

APPENDIX 2  
PROJECT DESIGN

---

December 1997

Lancaster  
University  
Archaeological  
Unit

**GREAT ASBY**  
**Near APPLEBY,**

**CUMBRIA**

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION**

***Proposals***

*The following project design is offered in response to a request from Mr John Collins of North West Water Limited, for an archaeological Evaluation in advance of a sewerage scheme at Great Asby, near Appleby in Cumbria.*

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 An archaeological evaluation is required in advance of a sewerage scheme in Great Asby, near Appleby, Cumbria. The development will involve the laying of sewerage pipes through the main streets of the village and the construction of a treatment works on a site to the east of the village. An archaeological assessment has been undertaken of the study area, which highlighted the archaeological potential of the area, but did not identify any specific sites within the extent of the proposed treatment works. The County Archaeologist has recommended that a programme of evaluation trenching be undertaken within the extent of the proposed treatment works to identify the potential for extant sub-surface remains.
- 1.2 The Lancaster University Archaeological Unit has considerable experience of the assessment and evaluation of sites of all periods, having undertaken a great number of small and large scale projects during the past 15 years. Evaluations and assessment have taken place within the planning process, to fulfil the requirements of clients and planning authorities, to very rigorous timetables. LUAU has the professional expertise and resource to undertake the project detailed below to a high level of quality and efficiency. LUAU and all its members of staff operate subject to the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) Code of Conduct.

## 2. OBJECTIVES

- 2.1 The following programme has been designed to provide an accurate archaeological assessment of the designated area, within its broader context in accordance with a verbal brief from the County Archaeologist. The required stages to achieve these ends are as follows:
- 2.2 **Field Evaluation**
- 2.2.1 A limited programme of trial excavations, as recommended by the County Archaeologist, will be undertaken to establish the nature, extent, chronology, and preservation of any archaeological deposits encountered. This will involve the excavation of a 5% sample of the extent of the area to be top-soil stripped for the treatment works (NY 6865 1360) and also individual trenches along the line of two sewer pipes (NY 6862 1367 and 6835 1344). Suitable samples recovered will be assessed for their palaeoenvironmental potential.
- 2.3 **Evaluation Report**
- 2.3.1 A written evaluation report will assess the significance of the data generated by this programme within a local and regional context. It will advise on the mitigation measures necessary to protect and/or record (to appropriate levels) identified archaeological features and deposits, including any appropriate further evaluation, excavation, and recording strategies.

## 3. METHODS STATEMENT

- 3.1 The following work programme is submitted in line with the stages and objectives of the archaeological work summarised above.
- 3.2 **Field Evaluation**
- 3.2.1 **Access:** Liaison for basic site access will be undertaken with the client. The precise location of any services within the study area will also be established.
- 3.2.2 **Greenfield Trenching:** This programme of trenching will establish the presence or absence of any previously unsuspected archaeological deposits and, if established, will then briefly test their date, nature, and quality of preservation. Excavation will normally be limited to the upper surface of significant archaeological deposits, unless further work is regarded by ourselves and the county archaeologist as essential in order to complete the full evaluation. This element of the trial trenching is invaluable in order to assess the area of the proposed treatment works and the adjacent compound, where there is a potential for archaeological deposits to survive which are not visible on the surface. This also reduces the possibility of the discovery of any important archaeological features within those designated plots during groundworks, so as to minimise the possibility of any disruption at that late stage. Excavation will normally be limited to the upper surface of significant archaeological deposits, unless further work is regarded by ourselves and the County Archaeologist as essential in order to complete the full evaluation.

This element of the trial trenching is invaluable in order to assess those parts, within the proposed study area, where there is a potential for archaeological deposits to survive which are not visible on the surface.

- 3.2.3 **Treatment Works Trenching:** The trenching is required to evaluate a c 65 x 50m (3250 sqm) area of the proposed treatment works and adjacent compound at (NY 6865 1360). This 'greenfield' trenching would be undertaken using a conventional 30m alternate trench configuration, which provides a 5% coverage of the investigated area. This would involve the excavation of five trenches measuring 30m in length, by 2m in width, and the orientations of the trenches would be varied to improve the likelihood of them crossing linear features. The precise locations of the trenches may be subject to discussions with the client and County Archaeologist at the outset of the project.
- 3.2.4 **Sewer Pipe Trenching:** In addition it is also required that single trenches be excavated along the line of two sewer pipes; one is the final effluent/stormwater outfall pipe to Asby Beck and the other an overflow pipe near Asby village. A single 30m x 2m trench will be excavated to examine each proposed pipe line, and will be orientated along the line of the pipeline. The precise location of the trenches will be subject to an initial site examination. Further trenches may be excavated subject to the results of the single evaluation trenches.
- 3.2.5 **Methodology:** To maximise the speed and efficiency of the operation the removal of overburden will be undertaken by machine (with a standard five or six foot toothless ditching bucket), although in areas where ephemeral remains are encountered elements may be hand dug. All trenches will be excavated in a stratigraphical manner, whether by machine or by hand. Trenches will be accurately located with regard to surrounding features, by use of a total station survey instrument.
- 3.2.7 **Health and Safety:** Full regard will, of course, be given to all constraints (services etc) during the excavation of the trenches, as well as to all Health and Safety considerations. LUAU 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 (1991) and risk assessments are implemented for all projects. As a matter of course the Unit uses a U-Scan device prior to any excavation to test for services. It is assumed that the client will provide any available information regarding services within the study area, if available.
- 3.2.8 **Reinstatement and Security:** Land disturbed as a result of this work will be reinstated to the Client's satisfaction, although LUAU as a matter of course replaces material in a stratigraphic manner and relays the surface, if possible. It is presumed that the Client will have responsibility for site security. LUAU would take responsibility for temporary fencing arrangements to exclude livestock or any other farming activities. In addition, any deep sections of open trench would be fenced off to prevent any accidents occurring to LUAU/client staff.
- 3.2.9 **Recording:** All information identified in the course of the site works will be recorded stratigraphically, with sufficient pictorial record (plans, sections and both black and white and colour photographs) to identify and illustrate individual features. Primary records will be available for inspection at all times.
- 3.2.10 Results of the field investigation will be recorded using a system, adapted from that used by Central Archaeology Service of English Heritage. The archive will include both a photographic record and accurate large scale plans and sections at an appropriate scale (1:50, 1:20, and 1:10). All artefacts and ecofacts will be recorded using the same system, and will be handled and stored according to standard practice (following current Institute of Field Archaeologists guidelines) in order to minimise deterioration. Samples will be collected for technological, pedological, palaeoenvironmental and chronological analysis as appropriate, but it is only intended to process such material for assessment at this stage. If necessary, access to conservation advice and facilities can be made available. LUAU maintains close relationships with Ancient Monuments Laboratory staff at the Universities of Durham and York and, in addition, employs artefact and palaeoecology specialists with considerable expertise in the investigation, excavation and finds management of sites of all periods and types, who are readily available for consultation.
- 3.3 Evaluation Report**
- 3.3.1 **Archive:** The results of the fieldwork will form the basis of a full archive to professional standards, in accordance with current English Heritage guidelines (*The 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. It will include summary processing and analysis of all features, finds, or palaeoenvironmental data recovered during fieldwork. The deposition of a properly ordered and indexed project archive in an appropriate repository is considered an essential and integral element of all archaeological projects by the IFA in that organisation's code of conduct. LUAU conforms to best practice in the preparation of project archives for long-term storage. The expense of preparing such an archive is part of the project cost, but only represents a very small proportion of the total. This archive can be provided in the English Heritage Central Archaeology Service format, both as a printed document and on computer disks as ASCII files, and a synthesis (in the form of the index to the archive and the report) will be included in the Cumbria Sites and Monuments Record. A copy of the archive can also be made available for deposition with the National Archaeological Record in Southampton. LUAU practice is to deposit the original record archive of projects (paper, magnetic and plastic media) with the appropriate County Record Office (Whitehaven), and a full copy of the record archive (microform or microfiche) together with the material archive (artefacts, ecofacts, and samples) with an appropriate museum. The actual details of the arrangements for the deposition/loan and long term storage of this material will be agreed with the landowner and the receiving institution.

- 3.3.2 **Evaluation Report:** One bound and one unbound copy of a written synthetic report will be submitted to the Client, and a further copy submitted to the Cumbria County Archaeologist. The report will include a copy of this project design, and indications of any agreed departure from that design. It will present, summarise, and interpret the results of the programme detailed above and will include a full index of archaeological features identified in the course of the project, with an assessment of the overall stratigraphy, together with appropriate illustrations, including detailed plans and sections indicating the locations of archaeological features. Any finds recovered from the excavations will be assessed with reference to other local material and any particular or unusual features of the assemblage will be highlighted and the potential of the site for palaeoenvironmental analysis will be considered. The report will also include a complete bibliography of sources from which data has been derived, and a list of further sources identified during the programme of work, but not examined in detail.
- 3.3.3 This report will identify areas of defined archaeology, the location of trenches, and whether the results of the sampling were positive or negative. An assessment and statement of the actual and potential archaeological significance of the site within the broader context of regional and national archaeological priorities will be made. Illustrative material will include a location map, section drawings, and plans if appropriate; it can be tailored to the specific requests of the client (eg particular scales etc), subject to discussion. The report will be in the same basic format as this project design; a copy of the report can be provided on 3.5" disk (IBM compatible format).
- 3.3.4 **Proposals:** The report will make a clear statement of the likely archaeological implications of the pipeline development. It will highlight whether, as a first option, the preservation *in situ* of significant archaeological features should take place and possible strategies for the mitigation of the impact of the development will be considered. When preservation is neither possible, nor practical, a further stage of archaeological work may be required. In this case, recommendations for such mitigation measures will be submitted. It should also be made clear that the results of this archaeological evaluation should only be considered as representative of the below ground archaeological potential of those areas presently accessible for trial trenching.
- 3.3.5 **Confidentiality:** The evaluation report is designed as a document for the specific use of the Client, for the particular purpose as defined in the project design, 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.

## 4. PROJECT MONITORING

### 4.1 North West Water Limited

- 4.1.1 LUAU will consult with North West Water Limited regarding access to land within the study area. This consultation will include, if required, the attendance of a representative of the client at any meetings convened with the Cumbria County Archaeologist, or his representative to discuss progress or the report.

### 4.2 Cumbria Sites and Monuments Record

- 
- 4.2.1 Any proposed changes to the project brief or the project design will be agreed with the Cumbria County Archaeologist in coordination with the client. LUAU will arrange a preliminary meeting, if required, and the Cumbria SMR will be informed of the commencement of the project in writing.

**5. WORK TIMETABLE**

- 5.1 The phases of work will comprise:

5.2 ***Evaluation***

A one day period is required to undertake the trenching programme.

5.2 ***Prepare Evaluation Report***

A three day period would be required to complete this element.

- 5.3 LUAU can execute projects at very short notice once an agreement has been signed with the client. LUAU would be able to submit the report to the client within three weeks from the commencement of the project.

**6. OUTLINE RESOURCES**

- 6.1 The following resource base will be necessary to achieve the proposals detailed above.

6.2 ***Evaluation***

1 man-days Project Supervisor

1 man-days Project Assistant

6.3 ***Evaluation report***

2 man-days Project Supervisor

1.5 man-days Draughtsman

- 6.4 The project will be under the management of **Jamie Quartermaine, BA, Surv Dip, MIFA** (Unit Project Manager) to whom all correspondence should be addressed.

---

## ILLUSTRATIONS

---

Figure 1 Great Asby Location Plan

Figure 2 Study Area

Figure 3 Trench Location Plan