

P_{alaeoecology} R_{esearch} S_{ervices}

**Evaluation of biological remains from a
deposit revealed during a watching brief at
Cleeton Lane Works, Cleeton Lane,
Skipsea, East Riding of Yorkshire
(site code: WB2004.046)**

PRS **2004/55**

**Evaluation of biological remains from a deposit revealed during a watching brief at Cleeton Lane Works, Cleeton Lane, Skipsea, East Riding of Yorkshire
(site code: WB2004.046)**

by

Allan Hall and John Carrott

Summary

A single sediment sample recovered from deposits revealed during a watching brief at Cleeton Lane Works, Cleeton Lane, Skipsea, East Riding of Yorkshire, was submitted for an evaluation of its bioarchaeological potential. It was thought that the sampled deposit might be a medieval to 20th century infill of a pond or palaeochannel.

The deposit does not appear to contain ancient remains, or—if not recent—they do not support the suggestion that this deposit represents infill of a pond or palaeochannel. The identified plant taxa were all common weeds of waste places and disturbed (including cultivated) land and no other biological remains were recovered.

No further work on the current material is warranted.

KEYWORDS: CLEETON LANE WORKS; CLEETON LANE; SKIPSEA; EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE; EVALUATION; ?MEDIEVAL-20TH CENTURY; PLANT REMAINS (?MODERN)

Contact address for authors:

Palaeoecology Research Services
Unit 8
Dabble Duck Industrial Estate
Shildon
County Durham DL4 2RA

Prepared for:

Humber Field Archaeology
The Old School
Northumberland Avenue
Hull
HU2 0LN

13 August 2004

Evaluation of biological remains from a deposit revealed during a watching brief at Cleeton Lane Works, Cleeton Lane, Skipsea, East Riding of Yorkshire (site code: WB2004.046)

Introduction

An archaeological evaluation excavation was carried out by Humber Field Archaeology, at Cleeton Lane Works, Cleeton Lane, East Riding of Yorkshire (NGR TA 1694 5514), during April 2004.

The site was located within the historic core of Skipsea. At some time after 1910 a works (of unknown function and no longer standing) was built on the site. The sampled deposit covered a substantial area (of at least 12 x 10 metres – the northern and western limits could not be determined during the watching brief) and it was thought that it might be a medieval, or later, infill of a pond or palaeochannel.

A single bulk sediment sample ('GBA'/'BS' *sensu* Dobney *et al.* 1992) was submitted to Palaeoecology Research Services Limited (PRS), County Durham, for an evaluation of its bioarchaeological potential.

Methods

The sediment sample was inspected and its lithology recorded, using a standard *pro forma*, prior to processing. A subsample was processed, broadly using the techniques of Kenward *et al.* (1980), for the recovery of plant and invertebrate remains.

Plant remains and the general nature of the washover were recorded briefly by 'scanning', identifiable taxa and other components being listed directly to a PC using *Paradox* software. The washover was also examined for invertebrate macrofossils. The residue was examined for larger plant macrofossils and other biological and artefactual remains.

Results

Archaeological information, provided by the excavator, is given in square brackets. A brief summary of the processing method and an estimate of the remaining volume of unprocessed sediment follows (in round brackets) after the sample number.

No invertebrate remains were recovered.

Context 1004 [possible infill of pond or palaeochannel; ?medieval-20th century]

Sample 1/T (3 kg sieved to 300 microns with washover; approximately 5 litres of unprocessed sediment remain)

Moist, mid to dark grey-brown, crumbly (working soft), slightly clay silt. Small stones (2 to 6 mm), fragments of brick/tile, coal and ?modern rootlets were present.

The small washover of about 50 ml consisted of fine herbaceous detritus, perhaps mainly fine (?recent) rootlets. There were small numbers of rather well-preserved fruits and seeds representing a very restricted range of weed taxa. All are likely to be of recent origin: one grass fruit still contained a starchy embryo, for example. The only other materials present were traces of small (<5 mm) fragments of coal and cinder.

The rather small residue (dry weight 0.77 kg) was mostly of sand and stones, with a little brick/tile (6 g, to 20 mm), coal (5 g, to 20 mm), cinder (~1 g, to 12 mm), metal (9 g), woody root (~1 g) and shell (2 unidentified fragments to 5 mm, <1 g).

Discussion and statement of potential

The deposit does not appear to contain ancient remains, or—if not recent—they do not support the suggestion that this deposit represents infill of a pond or palaeochannel. The identified plant taxa were all common weeds of waste places and disturbed (including cultivated) land.

Recommendations

No further work on the current material is warranted.

Retention and disposal

All of the remaining sediment sample, and the remains extracted from the processed subsample, may be discarded.

Archive

All material is currently stored by Palaeoecology Research Services (Unit 8, Dabble Duck Industrial Estate, Shildon, County Durham), along with paper and electronic records pertaining to the work described here.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Sophie Tibbles and Dave Rawson, of Humber Field Archaeology, for providing the material and the archaeological information.

References

Dobney, K., Hall, A. R., Kenward, H. K. and Milles, A. (1992). A working classification of sample types for environmental archaeology. *Circaea, the Journal of the Association for Environmental Archaeology* **9** (for 1991), 24-6.

Kenward, H. K., Hall, A. R. and Jones, A. K. G. (1980). A tested set of techniques for the extraction of plant and animal macrofossils from waterlogged archaeological deposits. *Science and Archaeology* **22**, 3-15.