CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................... 4
   1.1 Circumstances of Project ..................................................................................... 4
   1.2 Geology ............................................................................................................... 4
   1.3 Historical and Archaeological Background ....................................................... 4

2. METHODOLOGY .......................................................................................................... 7
   2.1 Project Design ..................................................................................................... 7
   2.2 Watching Brief .................................................................................................... 7
   2.3 Archive ................................................................................................................ 7

3. WATCHING BRIEF RESULTS ........................................................................................ 8
   3.1 Results ................................................................................................................. 8
   3.2 The Finds ............................................................................................................. 9

4. DISCUSSION ............................................................................................................... 10
   4.1 Conclusion .......................................................................................................... 10

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY ......................................................................................................... 11
   5.1 Cartographic Sources ........................................................................................ 11
   5.2 Secondary Sources ............................................................................................ 11

6. ILLUSTRATIONS ........................................................................................................ 13
   6.1 Figures ............................................................................................................... 13
   6.2 Plates ................................................................................................................. 13

APPENDIX 1: PROJECT DESIGN .................................................................................... 14

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF CONTEXTS ................................................................................... 15
SUMMARY

An archaeological watching brief was carried out by Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) on behalf of Balfour Beatty during the refurbishment of the water mains along Market Street, Ulverston, Cumbria (SD 49280 42382 to SD 41059 36012). Cumbria County Council Historic Environment Service recommended that an archaeological watching brief was carried out as the scheme affected an area with potential for medieval remains. The work was undertaken during September 2005. Due to the extensive utility works carried out previously in Market Street no features of archaeological significance were encountered.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF PROJECT

1.1.1 Following a planning application by Balfour Beatty, to undertake the relining of the Market Street water main, Ulverston, Cumbria (SD 49280 42382 to SD 41059 36012), Cumbria County Council Historic Environment Service (CCCHES) requested an archaeological watching brief on all launch and retrieve pits associated with the works. OA North, following the submission and approval of a Project Design (Appendix 2), was contracted to carry out the work and this report details the results of the watching brief.

1.1.2 The watermain extended the length of Market Street to the junction with King Street and the War Memorial to the west and down to the roundabout on the A590 to the east.

1.2 GEOLOGY

1.2.1 The underlying solid geology of the surrounding area consists of Silurian Ludlow greywackes (Coniston Grits) and banded mudstones and siltstones (Countryside Commission 1998). The solid geology of Ulverston is Upper Silurian Grits and Flags, overlain by boulder drift obscuring the rocks below (Soil Survey of England and Wales 1983). The geological resource has been exploited with numerous small quarries dotting the landscape in the area surrounding Ulverston.

1.3 HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

1.3.1 Prehistoric Period: evidence for prehistoric activity in the Ulverston area comes mainly from stray finds, many of which were found during the nineteenth century. A perforated stone hammer, probably dating to the Bronze Age, was found under the floor of a stable at Oubas Cottage, Ulverston, in 1868 (Gaythorpe 1899, 167-8). A polished stone axe of dark grey diorite was also recorded as having been found in the Ulverston district, and was, in 1888, in the keeping of the Peel Park Museum in Manchester (Swainson Cooper 1888, 204). A Bronze Age spear head has also been recovered from the area (Fair 1945). More recently, the butt end of a Neolithic polished stone axe was found during excavations at Dragley Beck, in the south of Ulverston (Elsworth and Dawson 2003, 16).

1.3.2 Roman Period: evidence of Roman activity around Ulverston is mainly in the form of isolated coin finds. Several Roman coins have been found in Ulverston: a Denarius of Augustus was found in c 1800 at Conishead Priory (Shotter 1989, 41), a coin of Antonius Pius was found in c 1830 (op cit, 42), and a Radiate of Probus was found before 1836 (ibid). It has also been recorded that part of a Roman pavement was found near the old Red Lane (Ashburner 1993), but there is no other evidence to support this. There were no Roman sites situated within the study area, but, as with the prehistoric
period, many of the locations of Roman findspots cannot be accurately verified, and therefore relate generally to the town of Ulverston.

1.3.3 Early Medieval Period: the effect of the collapse of Roman administration is not clear, but as the impact of the Roman invasion is largely unknown this is perhaps to be expected. Life may have continued much as it has done before (Trescatheric 1993, 23). Cumbria and North Lancashire came under a number of small kingdoms, possibly including Rheged and Strathclyde (Rollinson 1996), and the Northumbrian Angles (Newman 1996, 93). Quite what the effect of these political and military powers was is unclear, much of the evidence that survives is little more than place names and brief historical notes (Newman 1996). Reinterpretation of one of the most tangible pieces of evidence, a carved cross slab in Ulverston church, has suggested the site may have housed an early monastery (Dickinson 2003), although further evidence is needed to support this claim. What is more certain is the influence that the Vikings had on the area during the 9th and 10th century. They arrived from Ireland and the Isle of Man and their principal legacy has been their place names, which are found throughout the area (Trescatheric 1993, 27-9). Physical remains have also been discovered, such as the remains of a sword found at Rampside (Barnes 1968, 16). The arrival of Norse settlers was to continue to have a strong influence on the area for several centuries to come (ibid).

1.3.4 Medieval Period: Ulverston’s origins lie in the medieval period, although its name suggests a mix of Old English and Norse (Lee 1998). The Domesday book records Ulverston as held by Turnulph and following the Norman conquest land in Furness was granted to Earl Siward from whom it passed to Earls Tostig and the Ulf, from whom the name may have come (Birkett 1949, 5-6). Control of Ulverston during the 12th century was a mixed affair, being as it was held in part or whole at different times by the Barons of Kendal and Lancaster and Furness Abbey (op cit, 15-7). The manor was divided several times and was owned in part by the Neville estate and part by the crown by the beginning of the 17th century (op-cit, 18-20). Ulverston was granted a Market Charter in 1280, although the main market in Furness was Dalton, which was Furness Abbeys principal town. In 1283 the Abbot objected to the effect of a market at Ulverston on that at Dalton.

1.3.5 Post-Medieval period: the close connection that Ulverston had with both Furness Abbey and Coniston priory were brought to an abrupt end in 1536-9 with the Dissolution of the Monasteries. This actually had a beneficial effect on Ulverston, which was now able to supersede Dalton (Birkett 1949, 24). The land was divided up between the principal houses of the area, notably Neville Hall and Swarthmoor Hall.

1.3.6 During the 18th century Ulverston’s prosperity grew even greater due in part to the number of ships visiting with goods on a regular basis and the various local industries that had developed (Rollinson 1966, 46-7). This was further enhanced by the expanding iron industry, which made use of the landings at Ulverston (Marshall 1958, 85), and in turn led to the development of the canal in 1796; an attempt to compete with the encroachments of Barrow’s expanding harbour facilities (Fell 1968 323-4). By the beginning of the 19th century the
fortune of the town had taken a turn for the worse (Rollinson 1966, 10). The construction of the ironworks on the edge of the canal in 1874 brought some much-needed industry back into the town (Birkett, 1949, 128), as did the construction of the Glaxo pharmaceutical plant on the same site in 1946, but Ulverston’s wealthier days have long since passed.
2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 PROJECT DESIGN

2.1.1 A project design (Appendix I) was compiled in response to a verbal brief from CCCHES. The project design was adhered to in full, and the work was consistent with the relevant standards and procedures of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, and generally accepted best practice.

2.2 WATCHING BRIEF

2.2.1 A permanent archaeological presence was to be maintained during excavations concerning the laying of the new pipe; however, the northernmost 75m of the pipe trench had been excavated and back-filled without archaeological monitoring.

2.2.2 Recording was by means of OA North’s standard context recording system, with trench records and supporting registers and indices. A full photographic record in colour transparency and monochrome formats was made. Section drawings and plans were made of relevant areas of the trenches at appropriate scales. The pits were located using manual survey techniques.

2.3 ARCHIVE

2.3.1 A full archive has been compiled in accordance with the project design (Appendix I), and in accordance with current IFA and English Heritage guidelines (English Heritage 1991). The paper and digital archive will be deposited with the Cumbria Record Office (Kendal).
3. WATCHING BRIEF RESULTS

3.1 RESULTS

3.1.1 The objective of the watching brief was to define the presence of any potential archaeological features revealed. In total, 25 pits, varying from 0.8m x 0.8m up to 4.3m x 1m in size with depths varying between 0.65m and 1.3m, were excavated along the length of the water main and are described in the table below. Detail of individual contexts are provided in Appendix 2.

Table 1: Description of access and launch pit sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dimensions (l, w, d) Metres</th>
<th>Recorded Contexts</th>
<th>Description of Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 x 2 x 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4 x 0.7 x 0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7 x .7 x 1.3</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9 x 0.8 x 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not excavated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9 x 0.9 x 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 x 0.9 x 1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 x 1 x 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9 x 0.9 x 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 x 0.8 x 0.9</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5</td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4 x 1 x 1.1</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 7</td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9 x 0.9 x 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9 x 0.8 x 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 8</td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.3 x 1.3 x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9 x 0.9 x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8 x 0.8 x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.3 x 0.9 x 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.6 x 2.3 x 1.1</td>
<td>1, 2, 10, 9</td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Surface Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9 x 0.8 x 0.9</td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 x 1 x 1.15</td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.2 x 0.7 x 0.95</td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 x 0.8 x 1</td>
<td>Cobbled surface. Service backfill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.2 x 0.9 x 0.9</td>
<td>Tarmac surface. Service backfill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.9 x 2.4 x 1.1</td>
<td>Tarmac surface. Service backfill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7 x 0.9 x 1.1</td>
<td>Tarmac surface. Service backfill</td>
<td>i, 12, 13, 12, 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3 The Utility pits, were excavated in order to expose and allow the slip-lining of the existing watermain, thus all the excavations took place within previously excavated service trenches as confirmed in Table 1 above.

3.2 **THE FINDS**

3.2.1 Occasional unstratified finds of nineteenth to twentieth century glazed pottery shards were made during the excavation of the utility pits. As they were all from disturbed contexts, these were of little archaeological value and were not retained.
4. DISCUSSION

4.1 CONCLUSION

4.1.1 Inspection of the stratigraphy observed within the sections of the launch and retrieve pits revealed re-deposited backfill from the construction of the road and previous utility works. It is very probable that any archaeological remains that may have existed along Market Street would have been disturbed by the initial excavation of the service trenches for the existing watermain.
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APPENDIX 1: PROJECT DESIGN
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Balfour Beatty (hereafter the client) are proposing the refurbishment of watermains along Market Street, Ulverston, Cumbria. As the scheme will affect an area with potential for medieval remains the Cumbria County Council’s Archaeology Service has issued a brief for a programme of archaeological works to be undertaken.

1.2 OA North has considerable experience of the assessment, evaluation and excavation of sites of all periods, having undertaken a great number of small and large-scale projects during the past 20 years. Watching briefs, evaluations and excavations have taken place within the planning process, to fulfil the requirements of clients and planning authorities, to very rigorous timetables.

1.3 OA North has the professional expertise and resources to undertake the project detailed below to a high level of quality and efficiency. OA North is an Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) registered organisation, registration number 17, and all its members of staff operate subject to the IFA Code of Conduct.

2 OBJECTIVES

2.1 The following programme has been designed to provide for accurate recording of any archaeological deposits that are disturbed by the excavation of launch pits and trenches for new connections associated with the refurbishment of the watermains.

2.2 A written report will assess the significance of the data generated by the fieldwork, within a local and regional context.

3 METHOD STATEMENT

3.1 WATCHING BRIEF

3.1.1 Methodology: a programme of field observation will accurately record the location, extent, and character of any surviving archaeological features and/or deposits within the launch pits and trenches for new connections along Market Street. This work will comprise observation during the excavation for these works, the systematic examination of any subsoil horizons exposed during the course of the groundworks, and the accurate recording of all archaeological features and horizons, and any artefacts, identified during observation.

3.1.2 During this phase of work, recording will comprise a full description and preliminary classification of features or materials revealed, and their accurate location (either on plan and/or section, and as grid co-ordinates where appropriate). Features will be planned accurately at appropriate scales and annotated on to a large-scale plan provided by the Client. A photographic record will be undertaken simultaneously.

3.1.3 A plan will be produced of the areas of groundworks showing the location and extent of the ground disturbance and one or more dimensioned sections will be produced.
3.1.4 Putative archaeological features and/or deposits identified by the machining process, together with the immediate vicinity of any such features, will be cleaned by hand, using either hoes, shovel scraping, and/or trowels depending on the subsoil conditions, and where appropriate sections will be studied and drawn. Any such features will be sample excavated (i.e. selected pits and postholes will normally only be half-sectioned, linear features will be subject to no more than a 10% sample, and extensive layers will, where possible, be sampled by partial rather than complete removal).

3.1.5 It is assumed that OA North will have the authority to stop the works for a sufficient time period to enable the recording of important deposits. It may also be necessary to call in additional archaeological support if a find of particular importance is identified or a high density of archaeology is discovered, but this would only be called into effect in agreement with the Client and the County Archaeology Service and will require a variation to costing. Also, should evidence of burials be identified, the 1857 Burial Act would apply and a Home Office Licence would be sought. This would involve all work ceasing until the proper authorities were happy for burials to be removed. In normal circumstances, field recording will also include a continual process of analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of the data, in order to establish the necessity for any further more detailed recording that may prove essential.

3.1.6 **Health and Safety:** OA North 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 (1997). A written risk assessment will be undertaken in advance of project commencement and copies will be made available on request to all interested parties.

3.1.7 OA North has professional indemnity to a value of £2,000,000, employer's liability cover to a value of £10,000,000 and public liability to a value of £15,000,000. Written details of insurance cover can be provided if required.

3.2 ARCHIVE/REPORT

3.2.1 **Archive:** the results of all archaeological work carried out will form the basis for a full archive to professional standards, in accordance with current English Heritage guidelines (*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. OA North conforms to best practice in the preparation of project archives for long-term storage. This archive will be provided in the English Heritage Centre for Archaeology format and a synthesis will be submitted to the CSMR (the index to the archive and a copy of the report). OA North practice is to deposit the original record archive of projects (paper, magnetic and plastic media) with the appropriate County Record Office, and a full copy of the record archive (microform or microfiche) together with the material archive (artefacts, ecofacts, and samples) with an appropriate museum.
Wherever possible, OA North recommends the deposition of such material in a local museum approved by the Museums and Galleries Commission, and would make appropriate arrangements with the designated museum at the outset of the project for the proper labelling, packaging, and accessioning of all material recovered.

3.2.2 The Arts and Humanities Data Service (AHDS) online database *Online Access to index of Archaeological Investigations* (OASIS) will be completed as part of the archiving phase of the project.

3.2.3 **Report:** one bound and one unbound copy of a written synthetic report will be submitted to the client, and a further three copies submitted to the Cumbria SMR within eight weeks of completion of fieldwork. 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 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.

3.2.4 This report will identify areas of defined archaeology. An assessment and statement of the actual and potential archaeological significance of the identified archaeology within the broader context of regional and national archaeological priorities will be made. Illustrative material will include a location map, section drawings, and plans. This report will be in the same basic format as this project design; a copy of the report can be provided on CD-ROM, if required.

3.2.5 Provision will be made for a summary report to be submitted to a suitable regional or national archaeological journal within one year of completion of fieldwork, if relevant results are obtained.

3.2.6 **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. They are not suitable for publication as academic documents or otherwise without amendment or revision.

4 **PROJECT MONITORING**

4.1 Monitoring of this project will be undertaken through the auspices of the CCC Archaeologist, who will be informed of the start and end dates of the work.

5 **WORK TIMETABLE**

5.1 The duration of the watching brief will be dictated by the progress of the contractor.
5.2 The client report will be completed within eight weeks following completion of the fieldwork.

6 STAFFING

6.1 The project will be under the direct management of Alison Plummer BSc (Hons) (OA North Senior Project Manager) to whom all correspondence should be addressed.

6.2 Present timetabling constraints preclude detailing at this stage exactly who will be undertaking the watching brief, but this elements of the project is likely to be supervised by an OA North project supervisor experienced in these types of project. All OA North project officers and supervisors are experienced field archaeologists capable of carrying out projects of all sizes.

7 INSURANCE

7.1 OA North has a professional indemnity cover to a value of £2,000,000; proof of which can be supplied as required.
## APPENDIX 2: LIST OF CONTEXTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cobbled Surface</td>
<td>0.15m</td>
<td>Square cut cobbles measuring 0.15m x 0.10m x 0.10m, sealed with bitumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bedding for cobbles</td>
<td>0.03 – 0.05m</td>
<td>Orangey-brown loose, coarse sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Backfill</td>
<td>1.1m+</td>
<td>Light reddish-grey fine chippings compacted and mixed with sand (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hardcore</td>
<td>0.7m</td>
<td>Light-reddish brown medium sized limestone chippings, compacted mixed with sandy clay (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hardcore</td>
<td>1.1m+</td>
<td>Greyish-brown silty clay soil, 50% inclusion of small sub-angular stones. Contained pockets of small greyish-blue course chippings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hardcore</td>
<td>1.1m+</td>
<td>Light reddish brown course compacted limestone chippings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Backfill</td>
<td>1.1m+</td>
<td>Greyish brown silty-clay soil, inclusions of small sub-angular stones (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Make-up layer</td>
<td>0.9m+</td>
<td>Greyish-brown sandy coarse gravel, occasional medium to large sub-angular stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Make-up layer</td>
<td>0.5m+</td>
<td>Greyish-brown friable silty-clay, inclusion of small sub-rounded stones (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Make-up layer</td>
<td>1m</td>
<td>Light brown firm silty-clay soil, inclusions of medium sub-angular stones (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Road surface</td>
<td>10cm</td>
<td>Tarmacadam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hardcore</td>
<td>1m+</td>
<td>Mix of greyish brown coarse gravel and medium sized chippings, inclusions of medium-to-large sub-rounded stones and slate (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Manhole</td>
<td>1.1m</td>
<td>Construction from red brick and cement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>