Land off Hoyland, Barnsley, South Yorkshire

Archaeological Evaluation Report

April 2021

Client: Newlands Property Developments LLP

Issue No: 1
OA Reference No: 2112/2021-22
NGR: SK 35300 99850

oxfordarchaeology

Client Name:	Newlands Property Developments LLP
Document Title:	Land off Hoyland, Barnsley, South Yorkshire, South Yorkshire
Document Type:	Archaeological Evaluation Report
Report No.:	2112/2021-22
Grid Reference:	SK 35300 99850
Site Code:	LHB20
Invoice Code:	L11276EV
Receiving Body:	South Yorkshire HER
Accession No.:	
OA Document File Location:	X:\Adam T\Projects\L11276_Land_off_Hoyland_Barnsley
OA Graphics File Location:	X:\Adam T\Projects\L11276_Land_off_Hoyland_Barnsley\CAD
Issue No:	1
Date:	20/04/2021
Prepared by:	Dr Adam Tinsley (Senior Project Manager)
Checked by:	Dr Adam Tinsley (Senior Project Manager)
Edited by:	Dr Alan Lupton (Operations Manager)
Approved for Issue by:	Dr Alan Lupton (Operations Manager)
Signature:	

……..

OA South
Janus House
Osney Mead
Oxford
OX2 0ES

t. +44 (0)1865 263 800

OA East
15 Trafalgar Way
Bar Hill
Cambridge
CB23 8SQ

t. +44 (0)1223 850 500

OA North
Mill 3
Moor Lane Mills
Moor Lane
Lancaster
LA1 1QD
t. +44 (0)1524 880 250

e. info@oxfordarch.co.uk
w. oxfordarchaeology.com
Oxford Archaeology is a registered Charity: No. 285627

Director and Chief Executive
Gill Hey, BA PhD FSA MCIfA
Private Limited Company, No: 1618597
Registered Charity, No: 285627
Registered Office: Oxford Archaeology Ltd
Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0ES

Land off Hoyland, Barnsley, South Yorkshire

Archaeological Evaluation Report

Written by Dr Adam Tinsley

With illustrations by Mark Tidmarsh

Contents

List of Figures

List of Plates

Summary

Oxford Archaeology (OA) North were commissioned by Newlands Property Developments LLP, to undertake an archaeological trial trench evaluation of the site of a proposed industrial development and associated drainage on land off Hoyland, Barnsley, South Yorkshire. This was undertaken in advance of the submission of a planning application for development of the land and follows the production of a desk-based assessment of the site and subsequent discussion and agreement with South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) and the local planning authority for Barnsley. During these discussions it was agreed that a series of trenches would examine the putative standing remains of a possible late medieval deer park boundary wall, thought to relate to the former manor of Tankersley. In addition, a further series of trenches were placed to sample the intended route of drainage works to the south of the proposed development, which passes through an area potentially containing former bell pits known as Bell Ground. The fieldwork was undertaken over a period of six days, from the 29th of June to the 3rd of July 2020, and a single day on the 7th of July. The trenching revealed no archaeological features of significance of any period, and no conclusive material evidence that the upstanding wall had a medieval origin, beyond its relative position and orientation.

Acknowledgements

Oxford Archaeology (OA) North would like to thank Graham Pardoe, of Newlands Property Developments LLP, for commissioning this project. Thanks are also extended to Katrina Hulse, of Cushman and Wakefield, for her advice and help, and Andy Lines who monitored the work on behalf of South Yorkshire Archaeology Service.

The project was managed for OA North by Dr Adam Tinsley and Paul Dunn. The fieldwork was directed by Aidan Parker, who was supported by Anne Templeton. Survey and digitising was carried out by Aidan Parker, while figures were produced by Mark Tidmarsh. Thanks are also extended to Karen Barker, who prepared the archive.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of work

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology (OA) North has been commissioned by Newlands Property Developments LLP to undertake an archaeological trial trench evaluation of the site of a proposed industrial development and associated drainage on land off Hoyland, Barnsley, South Yorkshire (NGR: SK 35300 99850).

1.1.2 The work is being undertaken prior to the submission of a planning application to develop the site for industrial purposes. Following a period of consultation, a desk-based assessment (DBA) was produced by OA North (2020), which highlighted the general low potential of the site for archaeological remains, with large elements of the area having been previously subject to open cast coal mining during the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century. Following the production of the DBA, discussions were held with Andy Lines of the South Yorkshire Archaeological Service (SYAS) and a scheme of archaeological evaluation was agreed in order to assess the potential of specific areas within the proposed development area (PDA). Subsequently, Newlands Property Developments LLP commissioned OA North to undertake a geophysical survey of a proposed drainage route to the south of the main application site, this was intended to inform the positioning of subsequent evaluation trenches. The geophysical survey was undertaken by Magnitude Surveys Ltd (2020) and identified no likely targets for trial trenching. A limited scheme of evaluation trenches was subsequently devised in order to generally sample the target area and provide an element of ground truthing. This programme of evaluation trenching was set out in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), in which the methodology for conducting the work was set out as agreed with SYAS and all stakeholders (*Appendix B*). This document outlines how OA North implemented those requirements and presents the results of the fieldwork.

1.2 Location, topography and geology

1.2.1 The site is located between the villages of Tankersley, to the west, and Hoyland Common, to the east, in the Barnsley district of South Yorkshire. The M1 motorway corridor currently bisects the landscape on a north/south axis, between the two settlements and immediately west of the PDA. The PDA relates to a proposed industrial development west of Sheffield Road (A6135), which would be accessed via this and Tankersley Roundabout at M/A61 junction 36. The PDA (and the route of the M1) is crossed by Tankersley Lane, towards the north, and it is bounded to the west by the M1, to the north and east by the A6135 Sheffield Road and to the south by Bell Ground Wood and Park Side Farm (north of the Trans-Pennine Railway NCN67). Bell Ground Wood and Park Side Farm, whilst not included in the present masterplan area lie within a wider proposed development area, where piped/ditched surface drainage runs from the PDA will be directed; one attenuation pond is also located within this area (Fig 1).

1.2.2 The underlying solid geology of the PDA is characterized as Pennine Middle Coal Measures Formation, which is a sedimentary mudstone, siltstone, and sandstone

bedrock, formed in the Carboniferous Period in a local environment previously dominated by swamps, estuaries and deltas (BGS 2021). The deposits reflect the channels, floodplains, and deltas of a river in a coastal setting (with periodic inundation from the sea). Coal occurs in seams between the rocks, and, in some places, is overlain by ironstone deposits. In South Yorkshire, the Coal Measures have been extensively mined. Uneven erosion of the varied geology has resulted in a rolling landform. There are no superficial geological deposits recorded (ibid). Soils are acid loamy and clayey, slowly permeable and seasonally wet with impeded drainage (Cranfield University 2021).

1.3 Archaeological and historical background and potential

1.3.1 The archaeological and historical background of the site has been described in detail in the DBA (OA North 2020), and will not be reproduced here.

1.3.2 In brief, while open cast mining is well documented across the site, and has likely removed any previous remains where it has occurred, part of the archaeological potential of the site resides with its former inclusion within a former medieval deer park associated with Tankersley Manor. This potential was identified by the DBA (OA North 2020) in relation to an extant section of drystone wall, extending roughly east/west from the top of the landscape verge of the M1, a short distance south of Tankersley Lane. Prior survey of the wall (Site **07**) indicated that it may have been substantially altered during the twentieth-century, but potential for sub-surface remains of its medieval form may survive. The park boundary, shown as a high wall on the eighteenth-century engraving, may have incorporated a ditch, and the wall may have been constructed within a footing trench. Such remains would have the highest potential of survival within the field containing earthwork evidence of ridge and furrow (Site **14**), giving the two sites an enhanced group value.

1.3.3 The field containing earthwork evidence of ridge and furrow (Site **14**) agriculture has limited archaeological potential as its significance lies within the upstanding earthwork remains comprising plough-soil ridges and the furrows between them. It is possible, however, that extant earthworks may seal earlier, pre-medieval sub-surface remains. Whilst the archaeological potential of the ridge and furrow is limited, the area covered by the earthwork remains should be mapped and efforts should be made by the developer to preserve visible earthwork remains *in situ*, where possible.

1.3.4 To the south of the PDA, in the area of the potential drainage route and attenuation pond, the geophysical survey identified a range of anomalies, which were interpreted as relating to either industrial, agricultural, natural or indeterminate features or activity at the site (Magnitude 2020). The majority of these features were judged to relate to potential spreads of industrial material associated with mining activity, and associated railway, and potential demolition of a former building, although the nature of the natural geology in this area may also have enhanced background activity. No features of clear archaeological interest were therefore identified although after discussion with SYAS an element of ground truthing was felt prudent, given the level of enhanced background noise that might serve to mask unknown features.

2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The general aims of the project can be summarised as follows;

i. to adhere to and fulfil the agreed programme of works associated with the archaeological potential of the site;

ii. to determine or confirm the approximate date or date range of any remains, by means of artefactual or other evidence.

iii. to determine or confirm the general nature of any remains present;

iv. to inform a decision as to whether further archaeological investigation will be required in advance of the development, based upon an assessment of the level of preservation of below ground remains;

v. provide sufficient information that a fully and accurately costed subsequent mitigation strategy can be developed, should such remains be identified;

vi. to compile a profession archival record of any archaeological remains within the site.

2.1.2 The specific aims and objectives of the evaluation are:

i. to determine or confirm the general nature of any remains present;
ii. to determine or confirm the approximate date or date range of any remains, by means of artefactual or other evidence;
iii. to determine the level of preservation of the deer park wall and whether there is any evidence of an earlier wall or ditches either side;
iv. to ground truth the results of the geophysical survey (Magnitude 2020), undertaken in the area of the proposed drainage route to the south of the main application area.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 ***Scope of Work***: the evaluation involved the excavation and recording of nine trenches, three within the main application area, across the putative deer park boundary wall, and six within the area of the proposed drainage route and attenuation pond. The three trenches across the boundary wall were spaced evenly along the length of an extant drystone wall, postulated to represent a remnant of the original boundary, and extended up to 15m either side of it. The six trenches within the area of the proposed drainage route and attenuation pond were all 30m long and 2m wide and are intended to generally sample the area, given the lack of clear archaeological features identified during the geophysical survey.

2.2.2 ***Methodology***: the evaluation was conducted over a period of six days, from the 29th of June to the 3rd of July, and again on the 7th of July 2020. It was carried out in accordance with the agreed WSI (*Appendix B*) and therefore conformed to all industry guidelines and standards of best practice at all times (i.e. CIfA: 2019: 2020a:2020b: Historic England 1990: 2015a:2015b; NPPF 2019). The position of all trenches (Figs 2-5), agreed in consultation with he Andy Lines of SYAS, were established on-site using

a digital Global Positioning System (dGPS), accurate to within +/- 0.02m. The trench locations were then scanned using a Cable Avoidance Tool and Signal Generator (CAT and Genny), by an appropriately experienced and trained member of staff. No services were detected, and it was not necessary to adjust or relocate any trench. Only once trenches had been marked out and deemed clear of services were excavations begun.

2.2.3 The trenches were excavated by a suitably sized mechanical excavator, fitted with a toothless ditching bucket, supervised by a suitably experienced archaeologist at all times. Excavation was progressed in regular spits of no more than 0.20m, to natural geology, the first significant archaeological horizon, or a safe working depth, whichever occurred first. The resulting spoil was checked for finds, with a metal detector used to check for significant metalwork. Upon completion of mechanical excavations, each trench was assessed, manually cleaned and recorded.

2.2.4 Any archaeological remains were cleaned by hand sufficient to enhance and clarify their nature and extent, before being subjected to appropriate manual sample excavation. Any resulting site levels were established using the dGPS and are related to the Ordnance Survey Nation Grid and Datum. All information identified in the course of the site works were recorded stratigraphically, using a system adapted from that used by the Centre for Archaeology Service of English Heritage. Results of the evaluation were recorded on *pro-forma* context sheets and were accompanied with sufficient pictorial records (plans, sections and digital photographs) to identify and illustrate individual features.

2.2.5 A full and detailed photographic record of all trenches and individual contexts was maintained at all stages of the evaluation. All photographs were undertaken using monochrome and 35mm colour slide film, while digital photography was undertaken using 16 or 18 mega-pixel digital SLR or hybrid compact digital cameras to supplement the photographic record, and all frames included a graduated metric scale (Historic England 2015b). Photograph records were maintained on photographic *pro-forma* sheets.

2.2.6 Any archaeological features were then surveyed using a dGPS, in order to produce accurate scale drawings. Once the trenches have been fully recorded and approved by the Archaeologist at SYAS, they were backfilled prior to the OA North field team leaving site.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction and presentation of results

3.1.1 The results of the evaluation are presented below and include a stratigraphic description of the trenches that contained archaeological remains. The full details of all trenches with dimensions and depths of all deposits can be found in *Appendix A*.

3.2 General soils and ground conditions

3.2.1 The soil sequence in the trenches was fairly uniform throughout the PDA. The natural geology of light orange or grey-yellow clay was overlain by a medium grey brown silty clay subsoil, which in turn was overlain by a dark grey silty clay topsoil. Natural deposits were generally encountered at a depth of between 0.38-0.60m below ground level (bgl), with subsoil deposits being between 0.12-0.40m thick and topsoil on average 0.10m thick.

3.2.2 Ground conditions throughout the evaluation were generally good, and the site remained largely dry throughout. Archaeological features, where present, were easy to identify against the underlying natural geology.

3.3 General distribution of archaeological deposits

3.3.1 The only archaeological features identified within the trenches consist of the putative extant boundary wall of the deer park, identified in Trench 7, 8, and 9 (see *Section 3.4-3.6* below). Several other features, comprising stone field drains, wheel ruts, and other miscellaneous features were also observed, mainly within the same trenches, but were obviously modern in origin or of little to no archaeological value. No features of archaeological merit were identified in any of the other six trenches (Figs 3-5), within the route of the proposed draining and attenuation pond. Trench 5 was observed to contain a number of field drains which proved modern in origin (Plate 1). Trench 6 contained a spread of dark material (***604***), which on investigation was found to contain entirely modern detritus, including brick, plastic, glass and ceramic fragments (Plate 2). Further details of these trenches are contained in *Appendix A*.

Plate 1: General shot of Trench 5, viewed facing south-east. Scale 2x 1m.

Plate 2: General shot of Trench 6 with modern dump 604 at centre. Viewed facing west. Scale 2 x 1m.

3.4 Trench 7

3.4.1 Trench 7 was excavated at the eastern end of the putative extant wall of the former deer park boundary, just south of Tankersley Lane and west of Green Lane Farm (see Fig 2). It was approximately 30m by 2m, orientated north-west/south-east, and divided into two equal halves, extending either side of the extant boundary wall (Plate

3 and 4). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.52m bgl, with overburden comprising that generally found across the site (see *Section 3.2* and *Appendix A*).

Plate 3: The northern half of Trench 7, viewed facing south toward the boundary wall. Scale 2 x 1m.

Plate 4: The southern half of Trench 7, viewed facing north toward the boundary wall. Scale 2 x 1m.

3.4.2 The wall dividing the two halves of the trench, was slightly overgrown, but found to be approximately 0.65m wide and up to 1m high, comprising up to seven or eight

irregular courses of sandstone blocks set without mortar. The individual blocks were generally well dressed, but varied in size and shape, with blocks in lower courses set end on end, and larger blocks set side by side, in a crenelated fashion, within the top course. No evidence of dating was recovered associated directly with the fabric of the wall, although it appeared in relatively good condition throughout.

3.4.3 No other features of archaeological merit were identified in the trench, other than a series of roughly parallel linear features, fairly evenly spaced, and extending roughly east-west across the southern half of the trench only. These features could clearly be related to a series of wheel ruts extending across the surface of the surrounding field and through the overburden deposits (Plate 4). These wheel ruts clearly related to modern agricultural vehicles traversing the area. There was no evidence of a ditched feature, as previously postulated may accompany the deer park boundary wall. Nor was there any evidence of surviving ridge and furrow to the north of the wall, in the field identified as potentially containing such remains.

3.5 Trench 8

3.5.1 Trench 8 was excavated towards the centre of the putative extant wall of the former deer park boundary, just south of Tankersley Lane (see Fig 2). It was approximately 25.30m by 2m, orientated north-west/south-east, and divided into two unequal halves, either side of the extant boundary wall, the largest half extending south (Plate 5 and 6). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.38m bgl, with overburden comprising that generally found across the site (see *Section 3.2* and *Appendix A*).

Plate 5: The northern half of Trench 8, viewed facing south-east, Scale 2 x 1m

3.5.2 The wall dividing the two halves of the trench, was found to be approximately 0.65m wide and up to 1.20m high, comprising up to ten irregular courses of sandstone blocks set without mortar. The individual blocks were generally well dressed, but varied in size and shape, with blocks in lower courses more often set end on end, while often the largest blocks, were set side by side, in a crenelated fashion, within the top course (Plate 5). No evidence of dating was recovered associated directly with the fabric of the wall, although it appeared in relatively good condition throughout.

3.5.3 A single field drain, constructed with a stone infill, was the only other feature encountered within the trench, and extended east-west across the southern half of the trench, approximately 3m south of the boundary wall. There was no sign of any ditched or other features potentially associated with the former deer park wall.

Plate 6: The southern half of Trench 8, viewed facing north-west towards the boundary wall. Scale 2 x 1m.

3.6 Trench 9

3.6.1 Trench 9 was excavated towards the western end of the putative extant wall of the former deer park boundary, just south of Tankersley Lane, and east of the landscaped verge to the M1 corridor (see Fig 2). It was approximately 30m by 2m, orientated north-west/south-east, and divided into two roughly equal halves, either side of the extant boundary wall (Plate 7 and 8). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.54m bgl, with overburden comprising that generally found across the site (see *Section 3.2* and *Appendix A*).

Plate 7: The northern half of Trench 9, viewed facing south-east towards the boundary wall. Scale 2 x 1m.

3.6.2 The wall dividing the two halves of the trench, was found to be approximately 0.65m wide and up to 1.20m high, comprising up to eleven irregular courses of sandstone blocks set without mortar. The individual blocks were generally well dressed, but varied in size and shape, with blocks in lower courses more often set end on end, some including several large well-dressed blocks, while the upper most course comprised blocks set side by side, in a crenelated fashion (Plate 5). No evidence of dating was recovered associated directly with the fabric of the wall, although it appeared in very good condition throughout.

3.6.3 A large area of darkened natural (***903***) was identified towards the centre of the southern half of the trench, and was interpreted as an area of probably iron panning (Plate 8). Other than this probable natural feature, a single stone drain, extending north-south, and a single narrow service trench containing a modern plastic hosepipe extending east-west, were identified in the northern half of the trench. There was no sign of any ditched or other features potentially associated with the former deer park wall.

Plate 8. The southern half of Trench 9, viewed facing north-west towards the boundary wall. Scale 2 x 1m.

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Reliability of field investigation

4.1.1 On the whole, overburden deposits were easily distinguished from the underlying natural, and any features, where present, similarly were easily identifiable, with darker fills standing out against the light yellow and orange clay deposits. Working conditions were also generally good throughout, the weather being slightly overcast but dry. Trench locations were also as featured in the WSI, with no cause in any area to re-locate positions due to unfavourable ground conditions. The reliability of the field investigations can therefore be considered good with no cause for doubt.

4.2 Evaluation objectives and results

4.2.1 Very few archaeological features were identified in any trench, and, where they were (Trenches 7, 8, and 9, see *Sections 3.4-6*), these were demonstrably relatively modern in origin. No material evidence was recovered from meaningful contextual locations that could aid in the dating of the three sections of the extant drystone boundary wall, exposed to its foundation level within Trenches 7-9. The evaluation therefore successfully identified that there were no new significant archaeological remains that require further consideration. It was, however, unsuccessful, in the objective of attempting to establish the chronological date of the wall construction, at least beyond the conjecture offered below (*Section 4.3*).

4.3 Interpretation

4.3.1 As no material evidence was recovered that could unequivocally provide a chronological origin for the creation of the boundary wall, it cannot be confirmed or refuted that it represents the vestiges of the former deer park wall documented as part of the Tankersley Manor. However, where the wall was exposed in Trenches 7, 8 and 9, it was noted to be in very good condition, from foundation to the uppermost courses, with no evidence for an associated construction cut. This might indicate that, were it to represent the remains of the original deer park boundary wall, it has no doubt been subject to significant repair and potential modification in order to maintain its integrity. A counter to this might be that no further evidence, for example in the form of an associated boundary ditch, was identified along any section of the walls route. Such a ditch might reasonably be expected to accompany the original course of the deer park wall, reinforcing and enhancing the boundary and its original purpose. It is possible that previous strip-mining activity in the area had removed any trace of such a ditch, but, if this were the case and the mining activity extended so close to the original wall, it is also unlikely that the wall would have survived in such good condition. It is therefore suggested that while the extant boundary wall may occupy a position close to the original deer park boundary, and may conceivably have reused material deriving from the original, it cannot demonstrably be identified as the medieval wall.

4.4 Significance

4.4.1 No significant archaeological features or deposits were identified during the evaluation. In addition, the extant drystone wall, postulated as a potential remnant of the former deer park boundary wall associated with Tankersley Manor, could not unequivocally be dated. The significance of this feature cannot therefore be established, but, on the balance of evidence, is unlikely to represent the original boundary wall. Instead, while its position may closely mirror that of the original, and indeed it could conceivable incorporate material in its construction, the extant wall is more likely a relatively modern construction and therefore of little significance.

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

British Geological Survey (BGS), 2021 *Map Viewer* http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home/ [Online], accessed February 2021

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2019, *Code of Conduct*, Reading

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2020a, *Standard and guidance: field evaluation*, Reading

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2020b, *Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives*, Reading

Cranfield Soil and Agrifood Institute, 2021, *online soilscape mapping*, Accessed February 2021 http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/

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

Historic England, 2015 *'Management of research projects in the historic environment: The MoRPHE project managers guide'*, London

Magnitude Survey Ltd, 2020, Geophysical Survey Report of Land off Hoyland, Barnsley, unpubl client rep No. MSSK665

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019, *Ministry of Housing, Communities, & Local Government*, London

OA North, 2020, Land off Hoyland, Barnsley, Archaeological Desk-based Assessment, unpubl client rep No. 2051/2019-20

APPENDIX A TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY

Trench 1						
General description					**Orientation**	N-S
Trench located at southern extent of drainage route, in Area 3 of the geophysical survey, western trench. Devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of clay.					**Length (m)**	30
					Width (m)	2
					Avg. depth (m)	0.45m
Context No.	**Type**	**Width (m)**	**Depth (m)**	**Description**	**Finds**	**Date**
100	Layer	-	0.10m	Topsoil	-	-
101	Layer	-	0.12m	Subsoil	-	-
102	Layer	-	-	Natural	-	-

Trench 2						
General description					**Orientation**	NW-SE
Trench located at southern extent of drainage route, in Area 3 of the geophysical survey, eastern trench. Devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of clay.					**Length (m)**	30
					Width (m)	2
					Avg. depth (m)	0.53m
Context No.	**Type**	**Width (m)**	**Depth (m)**	**Description**	**Finds**	**Date**
200	Layer	-	0.18m	Topsoil	-	-
201	Layer	-	0.20m	Subsoil	-	-
202	Layer	-	-	Natural	-	-

Trench 3						
General description					Orientation	NE-SW
Trench located towards centre of drainage route, in Area 1 of the geophysical survey. Devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of clay.					Length (m)	30
					Width (m)	2
					Avg. depth (m)	0.40m
Context No.	Type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
300	Layer	-	0.10m	Topsoil	-	-
301	Layer	-	0.25m	Subsoil	-	-
302	Layer	-	-	Natural	-	-

Trench 4						
General description					Orientation	NW-SE
Trench located towards the centre of drainage route, in Area 2 of the geophysical survey. Devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of clay.					Length (m)	30
					Width (m)	2
					Avg. depth (m)	0.50m
Context No.	Type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
400	Layer	-	0.10m	Topsoil	-	-
401	Layer	-	0.40m	Subsoil	-	-
402	Layer	-	-	Natural	-	-

Trench 5						
General description					Orientation	N-S
Trench located towards the north of drainage route, immediately north of Area 2 of the geophysical survey. Devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of clay with several modern field drains extending north-west/south-east.					Length (m)	30
					Width (m)	2
					Avg. depth (m)	0.60m
Context No.	Type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
500	Layer	-	0.10m	Topsoil	-	-
501	Layer	-	0.50m	Subsoil	-	-
502	Layer	-	-	Natural	-	-

Trench 6						
General description					Orientation	NW-SE
Northern most trench along the drainage route. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of clay. A single large modern rubbish dump, approx. 9m in diameter (603/604).					Length (m)	30
					Width (m)	2
					Avg. depth (m)	0.44m
Context No.	Type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
600	Layer	-	0.10m	Topsoil	-	-
601	Layer	-	0.34m	Subsoil	-	-
602	Layer	-	-	Natural	-	-
603	Cut	-	-	Cut of large pit (not excavated)	-	-
604	Fill	-	-	Fill of large pit	Plastic, glass, ceramic (not retained)	Modern

Trench 7						
General description					Orientation	NW-SE
Trench excavated in two halves either side of and at the eastern end of stone boundary wall. Several modern wheel ruts extend east-west across southern half of trench.					Length (m)	30
					Width (m)	2
					Avg. depth (m)	0.52m
Context No.	Type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
700	Layer	-	0.10m	Topsoil	-	-
701	Layer	-	0.42m	Subsoil	-	-
702	Layer	-	-	Natural	-	-
703	Structure	0.65m	1m high	Extant drystone wall, up to eight irregular courses. No		Late post-medieval/modern

				mortar. No finds but in good condition		

Trench 8						
General description					Orientation	NW-SE
Trench excavated in two halves either side of and at the centre of stone boundary wall. A single stone field drain south of wall.					Length (m)	25.30m
					Width (m)	2
					Avg. depth (m)	0.58m
Context No.	Type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
800	Layer	-	0.10m	Topsoil	-	-
801	Layer	-	0.48m	Subsoil	-	-
802	Layer	-	-	Natural	-	-
803	Structure	0.65m	1.20m high	Extant drystone wall, up to ten irregular courses. No mortar. No finds but in good condition	-	Late post-medieval/modern

Trench 9						
General description					Orientation	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty sand.					Length (m)	30
					Width (m)	2
					Avg. depth (m)	0.54m
Context No.	Type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
900	Layer	-	0.10m	Topsoil	-	-
901	Layer	-	0.44m	Subsoil	-	-
902	Layer	-	-	Natural	-	-
903	Structure	0.65m	1.20m high	Extant drystone wall, up to eleven irregular courses. No mortar. No finds but in good condition		Late post-medieval/modern

APPENDIX B WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

APPENDIX C SITE SUMMARY DETAILS / OASIS REPORT FORM

Site name:	Land off Hoyland, Barnsley
Site code:	LHB20
Grid Reference	SK 35300 99850
Type:	Evaluation
Date and duration:	6 days, from the 29th June to the 7th July 2020
Area of Site	Extant drystone wall south of Tankersley Lane and drainage route extending south.
Location of archive:	The archive is currently held at OA, Mill 3, Moor Lane Mills, Moor Lane, Lancaster, and will be deposited with South Yorkshire HER in due course.
Summary of Results:	A total of 9 trenches excavated to investigate the extant remains of a drystone wall, potentially representing the remains of a former medieval deer park boundary wall associated with Tankersley Manor, and the route of intended drainage extending south from the development into an area occupied by potential bell pit activity. No significant archaeological remains were identified in any trench and the drystone wall is likely to represent a relatively modern build.

Project Details

OASIS Number			
Project Name	Land off Hoyland, Barnsley		
Start of Fieldwork	29th June 2020	End of Fieldwork	7th July 2020
Previous Work	DBA	Future Work	No

Project Reference Codes

Site Code	LHB20	Planning App. No.	NA
HER Number		Related Numbers	

Prompt	
Development Type	commercial
Place in Planning Process	Pre-planning application

Techniques used (tick all that apply)

☐ Aerial Photography – interpretation	☐ Grab-sampling	☐ Remote Operated Vehicle Survey
☐ Aerial Photography - new	☐ Gravity-core	☐ Sample Trenches
☐ Annotated Sketch	☐ Laser Scanning	☐ Survey/Recording of Fabric/Structure
☐ Augering	☐ Measured Survey	☐ Targeted Trenches
☐ Dendrochonological Survey	☐ Metal Detectors	☐ Test Pits
☐ Documentary Search	☐ Phosphate Survey	☐ Topographic Survey
☐ Environmental Sampling	☐ Photogrammetric Survey	☐ Vibro-core
☐ Fieldwalking	☐ Photographic Survey	☐ Visual Inspection (Initial Site Visit)

☐ Geophysical Survey ☐ Rectified Photography

Monument	Period	Object	Period
	Choose an item.		Choose an item.
	Choose an item.		Choose an item.
	Choose an item.		Choose an item.

Insert more lines as appropriate.

Project Location

County	South Yorkshire
District	Barnsley
Parish	Hoyland
HER office	South Yorkshire
Size of Study Area	
National Grid Ref	SK 35300 99850

Address (including Postcode)

Project Originators

Organisation	Newlands Property Development PLC
Project Brief Originator	Discussion with SYAS
Project Design Originator	OA North
Project Manager	Paul Dunn and Dr Adam Tinsley
Project Supervisor	Aidan Parker

Project Archives

	Location	ID
Physical Archive (Finds)	OA Nort Office	
Digital Archive		
Paper Archive	Oa North office	

Physical Contents	Present?	Digital files associated with Finds	Paperwork associated with Finds
Animal Bones	☐	☐	☐
Ceramics	☐	☐	☐
Environmental	☐	☐	☐
Glass	☐	☐	☐
Human Remains	☐	☐	☐
Industrial	☐	☐	☐
Leather	☐	☐	☐
Metal	☐	☐	☐
Stratigraphic		☐	☐
Survey		☐	☐
Textiles	☐	☐	☐
Wood	☐	☐	☐
Worked Bone	☐	☐	☐
Worked Stone/Lithic	☐	☐	☐

None	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐

Digital Media

Database	☐
GIS	☐
Geophysics	☐
Images (Digital photos)	☐
Illustrations (Figures/Plates)	☐
Moving Image	☐
Spreadsheets	☐
Survey	☐
Text	☐
Virtual Reality	☐

Paper Media

Aerial Photos	☐
Context Sheets	☐
Correspondence	☐
Diary	☐
Drawing	☐
Manuscript	☐
Map	☐
Matrices	☐
Microfiche	☐
Miscellaneous	☐
Research/Notes	☐
Photos (negatives/prints/slides)	☐
Plans	☐
Report	☐
Sections	☐
Survey	☐

Further Comments

6 FIGURES

oxfordarchaeology

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
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
w: http://oxfordarchaeology.com

OA East

15 Trafalgar Way
Bar Hill
Cambridgeshire
CB23 8SQ

t: +44 (0) 1223 850500
e: oaeast@oxfordarchaeology.com
w: http://oxfordarchaeology.com