CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks go to the Nick Gillibrand of Mason Gillibrand Architects, for his considerable assistance and informative on-site discussions. We must also thank Giles Bowring of Lawkland Hall for allowing ready access and assistance.

The survey was undertaken by Jamie Quartermaine and the CAD drawings were generated by Anthony Padgett and Jamie Quartermaine. The report was written by Jamie Quartermaine and edited by Richard Newman.

SUMMARY

A watching brief was undertaken by Lancaster University Archaeological Unit (LUAU), on behalf of Mason Gillibrand Architects, in advance of the dismantling of part of a wall in the hallway of Lawkland Hall, near Settle, North Yorkshire (NGR SD 776 659). The watching brief was undertaken during February 1998, in accordance with guidelines from English Heritage, who required the recording of this internal wall in the course of its partial demolition.

The recording of the elevation was undertaken by a combination of semi-rectified photography with respect to a manually surveyed control. The drawings were then generated within a Computer Aided Draughting (CAD) environment. The survey plan was based on one generated by Mason Gillibrand Architects.

The plaster and wall finishes were removed prior to the dismantling of the wall and this revealed that the southern half had previously been demolished, and had been replaced by panelling. The panelling is not of great antiquity and it is probable that these alterations occurred in *c*1912, when the present staircase was constructed. At the southern end of the wall the *insitu* moulded jambs of an early doorway were exposed; this doorway had been narrowed by the construction of a less ornate door jamb to the south of the first. The doorway is adjacent to that of the outshut to the hall, which has a very similar moulding design to that of the early door jamb and there is thus an implication that both doors were broadly contemporary.

The northern end of the wall was found to have been rebuilt within recent years, in order to provide structural support for a major ceiling beam. In places this rebuild overlay late nineteenth/twentieth century ceramic tiles and it is probable that it was a product of the construction of the present staircase, which occurred in *c*1912.

The survival of an early doorway in this wall would suggest that it was originally an early, potentially seventeenth century, structural element of the hall. The rebuilding of the northern part of the wall, however, has prevented the confirmation that this was part of an angled passage between the central door and the rear outshut, but the probability remains that this was its original form.

The demolition of the northern part of the wall has not resulted in the loss of much, if any, original wall fabric. It is, however, recommended that any further dismantling to the wall involves the retention *in situ* of the early moulded door jamb at the southern end as this is an important survival of the seventeenth century central range.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Circumstances of Project

1.1.1 A watching brief was undertaken by Lancaster University Archaeological Unit (LUAU), on behalf of Mason Gillibrand Architects, in advance of the dismantling of part of a wall in the hallway of Lawkland Hall, near Settle, North Yorkshire (NGR SD 776 659). Lawkland Hall is a grade 1 listed building and the watching brief is a condition of Listed Building consent. The watching brief was undertaken during February 1998, in accordance with guidelines from English Heritage, and a project design compiled by LUAU (*Appendix 1*). This required the recording of the passageway wall in the stairway hall in the course of its partial demolition.

1.1.2 The survey at Lawkland Hall was undertaken to a professional standard in accordance with the specification for recording of historic buildings as set down by the Royal Commission for Historical Monuments for England (RCHM(E)). The survey involved the outline recording of a single elevation and the production of a survey plan. This was undertaken in conjunction with an oblique and semi-rectified photographic survey of the affected elements of the stair hall.

1.1.3 This report presents an account of the survey techniques, and presents the analysis of the affected structure.

1.2 Location and topographical context

1.2.1 Lawkland Hall is situated in an area of good arable land in the large flat-bottomed valley between the Forest of Bowland and the massif of the Yorkshire Dales; it is 4km west of the historic market town of Settle. The hall and villages of Lawkland and Lawkland Green are located at the centre of a radial, pre-enclosure field system which is *c*1.5 sqkm in extent. This small field system is largely surrounded by enclosure fields, which would suggest that this was an isolated agricultural community surrounded by common until relatively recently (late eighteenth - nineteenth century).

1.2.2 The building is a large two-storey house with a two-storey east wing and a three-storey west wing; it is situated at the base of the very gently sloping valley of Staipes Beck, facing north.

1.3 Historical Background

1.3.1 Lawkland Hall is first documented when it came into the possession of the Ingilbys of Ripley in about 1572 who then held the house until 1912 (Hutton 1985).

It was subsequently owned by John Ambler who made considerable alterations, and then sold it to James Southworth in 1938. It was sold to the present owners in 1958.

1.3.2 The earliest known element of the building was an open hall in the position of the present central range; however, this was demolished in 1679 and replaced by the present range. The earliest surviving element of the building is, on present evidence, the west wing, which may reflect the construction or rebuild of *c*1572, and the constructional form and decoration of this structure would fit within a sixteenth century context. The new central range and east wing were built in 1679. The central range had a passageway linking the two wings, the central door of the central range and an outshut, and would have had a basic 'L'-shape (Hutton 1985).

1.3.3 In the early eighteenth century the great chamber on the first floor became the principal room and an internal staircase was built to improve access, which would have resulted in considerable changes to the layout of the stair hall, partially removing the earlier linking passage. The many flat-mullioned windows principally over the north facade were built in the middle eighteenth century, in an attempt to regularise the appearance of the principal facade (Pevsner 1966). In the same century a gazebo was built on top of the outshut.

1.3.4 The present stairway dates to the alterations made by Ambler in *c*1912 and involved the replacement of the south window and extensive alterations to the internal geometry of the stair hall.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Project Design

2.1.1 A project design (*Appendix 1*) was submitted by LUAU in response to a request by Mason Gillibrand Architects, on behalf of Giles Bowring, for an archaeological watching brief at Lawkland Hall, North Yorkshire. This project design was in accordance with the requirements of English Heritage (Letter dated march 1997).

2.1.2 The project design provided for a watching brief of the stair hall-way to record those structural elements exposed by the development. It involved the generation of a large-scale plan and elevation drawing of the affected wall. The work has been carried out in accordance with the project design, and the results of the watching brief are presented in this report.

2.2 Watching Brief Methodology

2.2.1 The recording of the structure was undertaken by a building surveyor, in the course of the development, and comprised the execution of a measured survey and the production of site photographs from which a plan and graphic record were derived.

2.2.2 ***Photographic Survey:*** a semi-rectified photographic record was produced of the affected elevation in conjunction with a manual survey of control targets across the extent of the elevation. Any residual oblique distortion within the photographs was corrected using photographic rectification software (AutoCAD). The final drawing was generated within an industry standard Computer Aided Draughting (CAD) system.

2.2.3 ***Drawn Survey:*** the survey recorded the outlines of all significant stones, such as quoins and ashlars, the outlines of the walls and masonry breaks, but not individual stones. The elevation drawing was output at a scale of 1:50.

2.2.4 ***Analysis:*** the analytical results presented below are based on two visits; the first followed the removal of the wall finishes, and the second the partial dismantling of the wall and the opening of a former door-way at the south end of the wall.

2.3 Archive

2.3.1 A full archive of the watching brief 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 with a copy of the report given to the North Yorkshire Sites and Monuments Record. 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.

3. WATCHING BRIEF RESULTS

3.1 The development involved first the removal of wall finishes and then the dismantling of the northern end of the wall (1.5m of this wall was removed). The removal of wall finishes from the passageway wall, in the stairway hall, revealed that the northernmost part of the wall survived to ceiling height, but the southernmost had been removed and was now a void faced by panelling (6). The character of this panelling and its condition suggests that it was of relatively recent construction.

3.2 Examination revealed that the northern end of the wall was rebuilt within the last hundred years in order to support a major ceiling beam set on its terminus. The extent of the rebuild was demonstrated by the presence of a distinctive pale lime/cement mortar (3) which extended *c*300mm from the northern end of the wall and had been uniformly applied from the top to the bottom. This was particularly noticeable on the eastern face of the wall (Plate 5). The end of the wall had large, irregular long and short quoins at the base, extending up to a height of *c* 1.5m; above this height roughly dressed stones were used as quoins. Despite the different character of the quoining between the top and bottom of the wall this does not appear to reflect different phases of construction, particularly given that the uniform mortar has been applied across the whole height of the wall here. It is probable that the dressed quoins were utilised until this source of the stone was exhausted and then the builders continued with a much cruder and smaller quoin stone. The source of the dressed quoin stones is not known but it is possible that they were part of the original wall prior to the rebuild.

3.3 The removal of the northern section revealed that the wall was in part constructed over ceramic tiles. These tiles were clearly set against a foundation course of undressed stones which was at the core of the wall, and the second course of stones was set on to the foundation course and partly over the ceramic tiles. The tiles were of late nineteenth century date at the earliest.

3.4 The ceiling beam (5) (orientated west/east), supported by the southern terminus of the wall, is machine cut and in good condition, and is probably of twentieth or perhaps late nineteenth century date.

3.5 The wall to the south of the rebuilt section would appear to be of greater antiquity, and a product of more than one phase of construction (1, 2 and 9). Examination of the eastern face of the wall revealed that it has at least two distinct constructional forms; the upper half of the wall (1) incorporated considerable amounts of limestone slabs/slates, mixed in with the sandstone blocks, but by contrast the lower half of the wall was predominantly constructed of small and medium coarsely dressed sandstone blocks. Although there is an obvious distinctive character between the two builds, the interface between them was not precisely defined, but occurred at an approximate height of *c*1.5m up from the floor. This constructional form is not as evident on the western face of the wall, but is nevertheless definable, albeit with difficulty.

3.6 At the southern end and on the eastern face of the wall is a single hand-made brick

inserted into the masonry wall fabric; it was set within a lime mortar that is distinct from that used elsewhere in the wall. It is evident, therefore, that this was an insertion, possibly to block a putlog hole or similar aperture, and consequently has no significant implications for the chronology of the wall. The lime mortar and hand-made character of the brick, however, would suggest that it was not a recent insertion.

3.7 This section of wall supports a wall plate (4) (orientated north/south) along the length of the wall to carry the first floor, which is of roughly worked oak and is in a poor condition, reflecting its evident antiquity. It has been truncated to the south by the insertion of the more recent machine-cut ceiling beam (5) (*Section 3.4*).

3.8 At the southern end of the wall is the remnant of a door jamb (7), which survives to a height of 1.1m although there is no surviving fragment of an equivalent jamb on the southern side of this doorway. The moulding of the door jamb (7) is identical to that of the adjacent door to the outshut, and this contemporaneity can be assumed. The base of the door jamb in the passageway wall is slightly higher (*c* 0.25m) than that of the outshut door, but this could reflect the existence of a former step and is not necessarily an indication that the blocks are *ex situ*. These stones are closely married together, as would be appropriate for their use as a door jamb, and there is no evidence that the jamb stones had been reused as quoins or building material. Although it is not possible to be totally confident, the evidence would appear to suggest that these door jambs are *in situ* and therefore provide an indication of an early doorway.

3.9 This early doorway had been modified by the construction of another doorway (8) inside it, of roughly dressed sandstone quoins, which had been subsequently faced with a timber door jamb. There are therefore surviving elements of three successive doors in this location.

3.10 The lower, earlier sandstone fabric (9) immediately to the north of the wall was probably contemporary with the moulded door jambs.

3.11 The upper half of the original door jamb (7) has been truncated. It is evident, however, that the wall had been partly dismantled, including the removal of the upper part of the door jamb, and then subsequently rebuilt up to the ceiling, since an undressed stone lay directly above the truncated door jamb. The rebuild of the upper part of the wall, evidenced by the undressed stone above the truncated jamb, probably corresponds to the limestone slab/sandstone fabric (1) which was identified in the surviving northern part of the wall (*Section 3.5*). Above the undressed stone, on top of the jamb, there is now a void and it is evident that the wall was then partially dismantled and replaced with panelling probably during the construction of the present stair case (*c* 1912?).

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Summary Phasing

4.1.1 The passage wall under investigation has been demonstrated to have been adapted on a number of occasions in the past, and there are substantial elements which have been rebuilt. However, there are elements which would appear to date from the original construction. The most significant of these is the extant fragment of door jamb (7) in the southern part of the wall, which has a moulding form that is very similar to that of the adjacent outshut. This may be an indication that they were contemporary and it is probable, therefore, that both the passageway wall and the entrance to the outshut were constructed during the 1679 construction of the central range. The present evidence would suggest that the lower part of the wall (9), with the exception of the rebuilt northern end, was contemporary with the door jamb and may therefore reflect original fabric.

4.1.2 At some stage the upper part of the wall (1 and possibly 2) and the upper part of the door jamb were demolished and the wall was rebuilt in a similar style but incorporating limestone slabs. This event was possibly contemporary with the construction of a new door jamb (8) to the south of the original moulded jamb.

4.1.3 The northern end of the wall (3) has been rebuilt, probably as part of the *c*1912 remodelling and rebuilding of the stair-way, although it may have also been rebuilt during the eighteenth century construction of the original staircase. The earliest element of the wall was the undressed foundation stones, against which the ceramic floor tiles were laid and then the more modern wall stub was constructed superseding both the floor tiles and the foundation course.

4.2 Wall Function

4.2.1 The doorway (7) exposed during the removal of the finishes is apparently contemporary with the outshut door, and both were seemingly a part of the original design for the central range. The thickness of the wall (0.55m) demonstrates that it was always an internal wall and it would appear to have defined an 'L'-shaped passage linking the central door and east wing with the outshut; the recently discovered door would have provided access between the outshut/passageway and the principal ground floor room of the central range. When, in the eighteenth century, the great chamber on the first floor became the principal room of the hall an internal staircase was built to provide access. This negated the need for the 'L'-shaped passage and part of the northern section of the dividing wall was probably removed at this stage. The large ornate doorway (7) between the former principal ground floor room and the outshut passageway would have become redundant and was probably either blocked or narrowed at that stage.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 The passageway wall has been the subject of considerable structural change since its original construction and there is relatively little remaining of the original fabric. The upper part of the original wall has been lost as has the northern terminal of the wall. One of the few surviving elements of the original build would appear to be the fragment of early door jamb (7) and this provides invaluable evidence of the development of the hall. It is recommended, therefore, that any proposed development of the hallway and passage wall should incorporate the preservation of this structural element.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcock, NW, and Hall, L, 1994 *Fixtures and fittings in dated houses, 1567-1763*, CBA, York

Hutton, B, 1985 *Lawkland, Lawkland Hall*, unpubl rep for North Yorkshire and Cleveland Vernacular Buildings Study Group

Pevsner, N, 1966 *The Buildings of England - Yorkshire: The West Riding*, London

Wood, M, 1965 *The English Medieval House*, repr London 1994

APPENDIX 1

PROJECT DESIGN

Lancaster University Archaeological Unit

July 1997

LAWKLAND HALL, LAWKLAND,

NORTH YORKSHIRE

ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF

Proposals

The following project design is submitted in response to a request from Mason Gillibrand Architects in conjunction with a verbal brief from the North Yorkshire County Council Environmental Services and English Heritage for an archaeological watching brief during alteration works at Lawkland Hall, Settle.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Lancaster University Archaeological Unit (LUAU) has been invited to submit a project design and costs for an archaeological watching brief during the proposed alterations to the hallway at Lawkland Hall, Austwick. The stair hall is late Victorian/Edwardian in form, but part of the wall that has already been uncovered and reflects an area of seventeenth century ground floor layout, which included an angled passage and possibly the location of an internal window.

1.1.2 Following this discovery English Heritage has advised that the wall should be exposed and demolished in the presence of an archaeologist who should record the wall and any further features that are revealed.

1.2 Lancaster University Archaeological Unit

1.2.1 The Lancaster University Archaeological Unit has considerable experience of the evaluation and excavation of sites of all periods, having undertaken a great number of small and large scale projects during the past 15 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. Numerous watching briefs have been undertaken during initial site preparations for building projects (e.g. Lancaster Market Hall and a watching brief at Samlesbury Hall). 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, in accordance with the brief produced by the North Yorkshire County Council, to provide a suitable level of archaeological observation, recording, and response during the alteration works. The required stages to achieve these ends are as follows:

2.2 watching brief

- To record accurately any structural features by means of detailed observation and recording.
- To generate plan and elevation drawings, showing the extent of the archaeological features exposed.

2.3 Archive/Report

2.3.1 A written report will assess the significance of the data generated by the alteration works, and will be suitable for deposition as part of a permanent archive of the work undertaken.

3. METHOD STATEMENT

3.1 Watching Brief

3.1.1 It is proposed that the watching brief will comprise an oblique and rectified photographic record which will be digitised into a CAD system for subsequent enhancement. Drawings will be produced by manual survey techniques and will be incorporated into the site plan generated by Mason Gillibrand Architects. It is anticipate that the graphic record will incorporate as a minimum an elevation and an amended plan drawing, although further drawings will be generated if the archaeological complexity of the exposed fabric warrants it.

3.1.2 A textual record of the features within the wall will be compiled using the relevant LUAU *pro forma* and their function and phasing described.

3.1.3 The amount of recording will be dependant upon the archaeological complexity of the exposed fabric and consequently it is not possible to submit a fixed price.

3.2 Archive/Report

3.2.1 ***Archive:*** the results of all archaeological work carried out during fieldwork will form the basis for 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.

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. This archive will be provided in the English Heritage Central Archaeological Services format and a synthesis will be submitted to the North Yorkshire Sites and Monuments Record (the index to the archive and a copy of the report). LUAU practice is to deposit the original record archive of projects (paper, magnetic and plastic media) with the appropriate County Record Office.

3.2.2 ***Report:*** one bound and one unbound copy of a written synthetic report will be submitted to the Client within four weeks of completion of fieldwork, and a further copy submitted to the North Yorkshire Sites and Monuments Record following any comments from the Client. 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 examination within the context of the building and will evaluate the significance of the exposed fabric and will assess the impact of the proposed development upon the building. It will include a description of the exposed fabric together with appropriate illustrations, including detailed plans and elevations. The report will also include a complete bibliography of sources from which data has been derived. This 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), if required.

3.2.3 ***Confidentiality:*** all internal reports to the client are designed as documents for the specific use of the Client, for the particular purpose as defined in the project brief and project design, and should be treated as such. With the agreement of the Client, reports may be circulated to the County Archaeologist for discussion and approval as necessary, but are not suitable for publication as academic documents 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.

3.3 Project Monitoring

3.3.1 Any proposed changes to the project design will be agreed with the North Yorkshire County Archaeologist in co-ordination with the Client. The North Yorkshire County Council Environmental Services will be informed at the commencement of the project and LUAU will arrange a preliminary meeting with them at the outset of the project, if required. LUAU will give access to the County Archaeologist for the purpose of monitoring the proposed works, in consultation with the Client.

3.3.2 An initial meeting of all parties will be arranged at the commencement of the project, if the Client so desires. LUAU will consult regularly with the Client during fieldwork, and this will include the attendance of a representative of the Client, if required, at any meetings convened with the County Archaeologist, to discuss the report or any other matter.

4. WORK TIMETABLE

4.1 The various stages of the project outlined above will fall into two distinct phases, which would follow on consecutively, where appropriate. The phases of work would comprise:

4.2 watching brief

4.2.1 Monitoring of wall exposure, and observation and recording of any archaeological features and materials revealed. The time scale of this phase will be dictated by the development programme.

4.3 Archive/Report

4.3.1 LUAU generally calculates a 1:1 ratio of fieldwork : post-fieldwork (archive, analysis, and report preparation).

4.3.2 LUAU can execute projects at very short notice once an agreement has been signed with the client. The date for completion of the works would be dictated by the site construction programme. The report will be submitted to the Client within four weeks of the completion of field work.

5. OUTLINE RESOURCES

5.1 The following resource base will be necessary to achieve the proposals detailed above. The cost on the accompanying sheet is quoted as a day rate, inclusive of all management, overheads, and other disbursement costs (travel and expenses), to undertake the programme of work as defined in the project brief and this project design.

5.2 watching brief

5.2.1 The duration of the watching brief depends upon that of that of the contractor undertaking the alteration work.

5.3 Archive/Report

5.3.1 The archive and report element of the project is estimated as being as twice the proportion of the number of man-days in the field.

5.3.2 The project will be under the management of Jamie Quartermaine BA Surv Dip MIFA (Project Manager) to whom all correspondence should be addressed. All Unit staff are experienced, qualified archaeologists, each with several years professional expertise. Project Officers in Unit terminology are senior supervisors, capable of organising and running complex area excavations as well as short-term evaluations to rigorous timetables.

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figures:

Photographs: