

clearly seen when assessing the archaeological potential of F135b and F135c. Archaeological features are clearly recorded in F135c which almost certainly extend into F135b. Clearly there are likely to be features in F135b that have not been detected by the survey due to the masking effect of the green waste.

The relatively narrow corridor width also has an impact, not in identifying anomalies but in reducing the confidence that can be placed on an archaeological interpretation – it is very difficult to determine whether a single isolated 30m linear anomaly is due to ploughing, a field drain or 19th century boundary or a much older archaeological ditch that might be part of a prehistoric field system, without either other lines of evidence or a wider archaeological context. During this survey it has been assumed that linear anomalies oblique to the current field pattern are more likely to be archaeological than agricultural and have so been interpreted as of possible archaeological origin. Where the CCS survey corridor passes close to, or overlaps fully or partly with, the current SEGL corridor, data from the earlier survey has also been included in the graphics and the results used to inform and provide greater confidence in the interpretations made in this report. The availability of the AP and LiDAR report has also been invaluable in corroborating or giving confidence to the survey interpretations.

Anomalies caused by ridge and furrow cultivation are noted in numerous locations throughout the survey corridor. Again, there is the potential for this activity to have produced anomalies of higher magnitude than those which might be caused by earlier underlying archaeological features, if present, and so 'mask' them. However, it is not thought likely that any extensive remains would not still be detectable under these circumstances.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Most of the anomalies recorded by the survey are due to recent or post-medieval agricultural activity; modern ploughing, ridge and furrow cultivation (which was particularly prevalent over the Yorkshire Wolds), and field drainage which was very common across the lower lying sections of the Scheme, across the Holderness Plain, the Vale of York and across the land either side of the River Ouse. A lot of anomalies were also recorded that are due to geological

variation or natural processes, such as the deposition of alluvium adjacent to watercourses.

In addition, anomalies of probable archaeological origin have been recorded at sixteen locations termed Areas of Archaeological Activity (AAA's). These AAA's are mostly (but not universally) located on the higher better draining upland areas of the Wolds but are also present on the Holderness Plain and predominantly comprise parts of enclosures, trackways and field boundaries forming parts of wider clusters of enclosure, and possibly settlement, some of which were previously known, others identified for the first time during the recent AP and LiDAR assessment. These settlements and enclosures are largely interpreted as of Iron Age or Roman date. A few anomalies/features have only been recorded by the magnetic survey including a probable round barrow and a possible square barrow. At most locations the magnetic survey has provided greater resolution and more detail, especially of smaller or ephemeral features, than was indicated by the cropmarks. In a few locations the cropmarks perhaps provide a more detailed picture.

Overall, it is concluded that the surveys are likely giving a good indication of the below ground archaeological resource where survey has been carried out, subject to the limitations of the technique. It is hoped that other survey techniques such as metal detector survey, will help answer specific archaeological questions and potentially identify archaeological remains not usually identified by magnetometer survey, such as areas of early medieval settlement or unenclosed prehistoric activity. Together all surveys will add further information on the archaeological resource and, together with the other information submitted in support of the TCPA application, will allow a thorough contextualisation and evaluation of the archaeological resource along the Scheme to be made.

7. REFERENCES

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) 2014 Standard and guidance for archaeological geophysical survey (Reading) https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfA%26GGeophysics_3.pdf accessed 4th January 2022