Beechenhill Farm, Ilam, Staffordshire

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY 2000

Heidi Robbins

ARCHAEOLOGY SERVICE
PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

The following archaeological report is the result of a field survey of the farm or land undertaken by a Peak District National Park Authority survey archaeologist. It is divided into nine major parts to allow easy access to different aspects of the information.

The Summary describes changes in land use over time and notes the main archaeological features.
Use this section for a brief overview of the survey area as an archaeological landscape.

The Introduction describes when the survey was conducted, for whom, its scale and scope.
Use this section for brief details of the date of survey and other technical details.

Part 1 is a concise description of the types and the date of archaeological features identified and also describes the field boundaries.
Use this section for an overview of the archaeological features within the survey area and an outline of the field boundaries.

Part 2 describes the character of the land and also discusses changes in land use over time, based on the features identified on the ground and from basic documentary work.
Use this section for an outline of the development through time of the survey area as an archaeological landscape and for an assessment of the archaeological character of different parts of the area surveyed.

Part 3 is the map, showing all of the archaeological features recognised by the survey.
Use this section to find out the locations of sites within the survey area.

Part 4 is the catalogue, listing all the archaeological features discovered by the survey.
Use this section for a detailed description and an interpretation of each feature.

Part 5 is an assessment of the relative importance of the features surveyed.
Use this section as a guide to the importance of individual archaeological features in the survey area.

Part 6 is an outline guide to managing the archaeological features.
Use this section for general suggestions on how archaeology can be managed in the landscape without undue interference with usual land management practices.

Part 7 is a glossary.
Use this section for definitions of archaeological terms used in the report.

Part 8 is a bibliography of documents consulted in the writing of this report.
Use this section if more background or detailed information on the types of site found within the survey area is required.

In the Appendices is a description of all the archive material produced in conjunction with the survey, where it is kept, and a note of how the survey information was recorded.

CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS

Beechenhill Farm, Ilam

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY 2000

Heidi Robbins

SUMMARY

Beechenhill Farm is situated on the limestone plateau north of Ilam on land that was part of Ilam Moor. The field boundaries are post-1650 enclosure with regular boundaries and enclosure of unknown date. The earliest map to show these boundaries is the Ilam tithe map dating to 1838.

Part of the farm had a detailed measured survey done by Faith Cleverdon (1995) and this information has not been repeated in this report. In addition there were two excavations carried out in the present survey area.

The earliest archaeological remains are the prehistoric barrow north of the farm which dates to the early Bronze Age. There is also a D-shaped earthwork and enclosure south of the farmhouse which was excavated by Cleverdon and dates to the late Iron Age/Romano-British period.

The other features in the survey area are post-medieval in date and include the farmhouse and barns, dew ponds, a former road, and a possible stack stand.

BEECHENHILL FARM, ILAM

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY 2000

INTRODUCTION

The archaeological survey of this area was carried out in September 2000 for Mr and Mrs Prince, the owners, as part of the assessment for the Farm and Environment Project. The survey area comprised one holding north of the River Manifold. The principal buildings of Beechenhill Farm (feature 1) are located at Ordnance Survey National Grid reference SK 129 525.

The survey comprised a systematic search of the farmland and discoveries were sketch plotted on an Ordnance Survey 1:2500 base (the Peak District National Park Authority's Phase 1 survey standard). Time did not allow an extensive archive search to be undertaken and this report should not be taken as a history of the farmland, but one that largely concentrates on the identified archaeology.

The glossary (Part 7) contains archaeological terms and their meanings, used in the text.

PART 1

BEECHENHILL FARM: ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES

The survey identified 11 archaeological features in 2000. Of these, four had been recorded previously in the Staffordshire Sites and Monuments Record (SMR). These are Beechenhill Farm (SMR 406/feature 1), an enclosure and earthworks (SMR 3208/feature 2), a circular feature (SMR 2452/feature 4) and a barrow (SMR 2451/feature 5).

Six features are of national or regional importance (features 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11) and five features are considered as of local importance.

Of the 11 features identified, two are groups of standing buildings, one of which is recorded in the SMR (feature 1) and is a Listed Building (feature 1).

There are two locations of features identified on historical plans but which could not be identified as physical structures by the survey (feature 6 and 7).

Features of National and Regional Importance

The nationally or regionally important archaeological features that survive on the farmland are of a variety of dates.

Of the important archaeological features on the farm, the earliest is the barrow (feature 5) which dates to the later Neolithic/early Bronze Age (c.4000 years ago). The bank and D shaped enclosure at feature 2 is Romano-British (c.2000-1500 years ago) in date and is part

of a complex of field banks and enclosures south of the survey area which were surveyed by Faith Cleverdon (1995).

The other important remains on the farm are probably of post-medieval date. There is the farmhouse itself (feature 1), a circular earthwork at feature 4, and the field boundaries themselves which are post-1650 enclosure (feature 10) and enclosure of unknown date (feature 11).

Features of Local Importance

The majority of archaeological features of local importance within the survey area are of Post-Medieval date. Some are redundant structures related to past farming, including a dew pond (feature 8), the sites of dew ponds (features 6 and 7) and a former barn, now converted into a house (feature 9). The former route of the Ilam-Alstonefield road (feature 3) also runs across the survey area.

Field Boundaries

Field boundaries are very much a part of the archaeological landscape but are not easily listed in a catalogue because of their large number and variety. Individually, they may seem to be of limited archaeological value, but together they are of crucial importance in understanding the development of the farmland. The current field boundaries, even those which have been abandoned and are now ruinous, are not included in the catalogue of sites given below (Part 4). However, they are shown on the archaeological features plan (illustration 9), and also on the field boundaries plan (illustration 3) where a distinction is made between those boundaries which are in current use and those which are ruined and which appear to have been abandoned, or where they are far from stockproof without supplementary fencing. In addition there may also be other boundaries, termed here as relict, which have been subsequently removed where footings or individual shrubs indicate that these were either walls or hedges.

Because of the archaeological importance of field boundaries in the landscape they are described, briefly, below.

The current boundaries on the farm are drystone walls, all of similar construction and using the local limestone. There is some wall furniture built into the boundaries. Most common are stone gate posts and sheep throughs.

The existing field system is the result of a sequence of enclosure from the Post-Medieval period and this development through time is discussed in Part 2. Since the 19th century there has been no major new enclosure except for the addition of new boundaries to infill larger, earlier fields. Conversely, some boundaries have been removed in recent times to accommodate modern agricultural practices. Walls are constantly being repaired and sometimes rebuilt: consequently, in any field wall the most recent reconstruction work may well have been in this century, even though the line of the boundary may be much older. Often their footings, and other features such as wall furniture, date back to the original construction of the boundary.

PART 2

BEECHENHILL FARM: CHANGES IN LAND USE THROUGH TIME

Archaeology is the study of how humans have used and changed the landscape in the past. This is not restricted to obvious archaeological monuments, such as prehistoric burial barrows, ancient hillforts, churches and castles. It also includes many other forms of human activity which have taken place across the land through time and which survive above or below ground to the present day, whether 5,000 or 50 years old. This archaeological record includes the relics left by farmers, labourers, miners and quarryworkers, which are just as important as those built by the Church and landed gentry.

To help to identify changing land use through time, post-survey searches of published works, archival documents and maps have been undertaken. These have included a search of the previously-published archaeological literature, as well as unpublished material in the SMR and in the Peak District National Park Authority archaeological archive. Relevant texts are listed in the bibliography (Part 8).

A series of large-scale maps was also consulted to assist the dating of boundaries and other features. Those used were the 1838 Ilam tithe map, and the Ordnance Survey 25-inch maps of 1922. These provide established key dates, that allow the development of boundaries and buildings to be assessed. The less detailed 1775 county map of Staffordshire by Yates was also used.

The maps enable the broad development of the enclosed landscape to be plotted for the area surveyed, from the 19th century onwards, and for projections back into the Medieval period to be made.

When looking at the development of the landscape, it should be noted that the level to which archaeological features survive is related to how long they have been subjected to subsequent human activity in the landscape. Older features are far less likely to survive than those which are more recent because the land is constantly being used and altered. Consequently, a lack of surviving archaeological remains from earlier periods does not necessarily mean that the area was little used but only that later farming is likely to have obliterated the surface evidence.

The Archaeology of the Limestone Plateau

Beechenhill Farm is situated in the White Peak on the central limestone plateau of the Peak District. The White Peak is largely a walled landscape. The enclosed fields are now used mainly for pasture but they are occasionally ploughed either for reseeding or for arable crops. Because it has been an important agricultural area since prehistory, much of the surface evidence of thousands of years of human activity has been destroyed by farming activity particularly in the last few hundred years. The process of degradation of archaeological features has been accelerated in the last thirty years or so with the use of modern machinery and agricultural policies/subsidies designed to maximise production but which have also resulted in the destruction of the cultural heritage. Thus, the surface remains of the prehistoric period are largely confined to larger monuments such as barrows and chambered tombs which have often survived because their size made it easier to leave them rather than attempt to destroy them. In other cases they may have survived due to local superstitions regarding the dire consequences of interfering with them.

The Romano-British period may have been one which saw an increase in farming on the limestone plateau, due to the need to supply Roman forts and towns and because of the importance of the area for lead mining. At this time, away from forts/towns, settlement comprised scattered farms wherever the land was suitable for agriculture. The majority of these have been swept away by later agricultural activity, but in a few cases, usually on rocky patches of ground impossible to improve for modern agricultural purposes, there survive banks marking the sites of Romano-British farm buildings and contemporary associated yards and garden plots (but which possibly have prehistoric origins).

The medieval landscape of the limestone plateau was very different from today, while at the same time the roots of the present landscape lie in this period. In the more favourable parts of the plateau, there were villages spaced across the landscape, each with large open fields divided into many narrow cultivation strips, designed to be farmed communally. The villages themselves often appear to be planned settlements, probably imposed on the landscape somewhere between the 9th and the 12th century by the owners of manors and townships; at the time this happened many scattered farms in each township were probably abandoned and people resettled at new village sites. Between each of the open fields there were large expanses of wastes and commons which were a mixture of heather moorland and rough grassland. In less favourable parts of the plateau, mainly to the west, there were a number of hamlets and isolated farms, the latter often owned by abbeys and priories sited in the lowlands surrounding the Peak District. These upland farms and hamlets were surrounded by small areas of bounded fields, some walled, others possibly hedged. While the emphasis here was often on sheep farming, arable cultivation was also practised.

In the mid-14th century, with population decline after the Black Death, associated climatic deterioration and political/social unrest, much of the region placed greater emphasis on pastoral rather than arable farming. From this time onwards the cultivation strips within open fields surrounding villages began to be enclosed piecemeal to create privately-farmed fields. In some cases this process continued into the 18th/early 19th century before all the strips had disappeared. The enclosed strips are one of the most distinctive elements of the present landscape standing out as groups of narrow fields, the sinuous walls of which fossilise the medieval open field system.

Between c.1750 and 1850 most of the wastes and commons of the limestone plateau were enclosed into geometric fields, some by private agreement, others following Parliamentary Enclosure Awards. A relatively small amount of enclosure had encroached onto the commons previously, from the 17th or possibly the 16th centuries. From c.1850 to the present the walled landscape with which we are familiar has remained relatively constant, with only minor modifications taking place. In modern times some boundaries have been removed and gateways have often been widened, but on most farms there has not been the wholesale removal of boundaries seen over large parts of lowland Britain.

Lead mining has been an important part of the limestone plateau society and economy since at least Roman times and was already extensive in the Medieval period. The industry declined in the second half of the 19th century but more recently many of the veins and hillocks have been worked for fluorspar and other minerals which are found with lead ore. Most of the important lead deposits occur in eastern parts of the plateau, while to the west there were mostly narrow veins which have been intermittently worked. To the east some of the larger rakes have been worked to a depth of 200m or more with the aid of soughs and engines for drainage and with winding engines for the removal of ore. Such mining required large capital investment and professional miners were often employed. In contrast, many of the narrow veins were worked nearer the surface by miner/farmers, working underground at slack times of the agricultural year.

The other major industry of the plateau is limestone quarrying/lime production. Industrial lime production first grew up in the 17th century around Buxton and Bradwell, with later centres also at Sparrowpit and Dove Holes. With the exception of Bradwell, all are sited conveniently close to coal sources in the nearby gritstone uplands. In the early 19th century, with the introduction of rail transport, the Dove Holes quarries rose to dominance; after the 1860s, when a line was opened through the Wye Valley, further quarries were established there.

The majority of farmers on the limestone plateau produced their own lime, building small field kilns in the fields where lime was required, often at the time of initial improvement of wastes and commons in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Coal was usually brought from the nearest available collieries in the gritstone uplands to the east or west.

For a more detailed introduction to the archaeology of the Peak District, and one that gives the interpretative background, a good starting point is the recently published English Heritage guide to the archaeological landscapes of the region (Barnatt and Smith 1997).

The Character of the land around Beechenhill

Beechenhill Farm is on a south-west facing slope north of Ilam village. It is situated at a height of 285m AOD. To the south of the farm the land slopes steeply down to the River Manifold. To the north of the farm is Beechenhill which rises to over 318m AOD. The geology is limestone.

Prehistoric and Romano-British Occupation

The earliest evidence for human occupation or land-use of the survey area dates from the later Neolithic to earlier Bronze Age periods, approximately 4500 to 3500 years ago. During this period a burial barrow was built in the survey area and there are several more in the immediate vicinity on nearby hilltops. Barrows of this type were built to bury the dead in the Peak District and the rest of Britain during prehistory. They often contained the bodies or cremated remains of one or more individuals, sometimes with accompanying grave goods such as pottery, flint tools and occasionally metal artefacts.

The barrow at feature 5 is a slightly oval earthen mound up to 1.5m high on the downslope side. It is at most 23m across, but is poorly defined on the upslope side. It has a slight dent in the top which may suggest it has been excavated at some time in the past, although there are no records of an excavation here. It has been ploughed at some time.

The barrow makes the locations of the burial(s) prominent features in the landscape. This prominence is heightened by the positioning of barrows on the edge of a deeply incised dale. The deliberate and careful selection of this topographical site makes the burial place of the dead, and from some locations the barrow itself, highly visible from some of the surrounding area. Barrows such as this one have been interpreted as helping to remind the living of their ancestry, of their kinship with their community and of their association with a geographic location.

Feature 2 is an D-shaped earthwork with part of a rectangular enclosure around it. This was excavated by Faith Cleverdon who uncovered a bank of small angular stones and soil which contained occupation debris. Overlying this was a substantial stone wall. The pottery was later Iron Age (2750- 2000 years ago) and Romano-British (2000 – 1500 years ago) in date.

The majority of Romano-British settlement sites have been swept away by later agricultural activity, but in a few cases, usually on rocky patches of ground impossible to improve for modern agricultural purposes, there survive banks marking the sites of Romano-British farm buildings and contemporary associated yards and garden plots (which possibly have prehistoric origins). There are around 80 Romano-British settlement sites in the limestone plateau area of the Peak District.

To the south of the survey area in the area surveyed by Faith Cleverdon there is a series of Romano-British enclosures and field systems and a second barrow (illustration 6).

Ilam in the Anglo-Saxon and Early Medieval periods

During the Anglo-Saxon and Early Medieval periods, the area was almost certainly part of a large estate belonging to a semi-autonomous group known as the *Pecsaetna* (The "Dwellers of the Peak") which was centred on Bakewell (Roffe 1986). This vast estate had sub-centres at Bradbourne, Wirksworth, Hope and possibly at Eyam and Alstonefield. The Beechenhill area probably fell within the administrative area of Alstonefield.

The *Domesday* survey of 1086 does not mention Ilam, but the nearby settlements of Musden and Stanshope are recorded (Morris 1978). Musden has land for one plough and was held by a Saxon thane called Uhtred prior to the Norman Conquest of 1066. In 1086 the land was held by the King. Stanshope is briefly recorded as having land for one or two ploughs, previously having been held by a Saxon thane called Wodi and now held by the King. The short entries for both Musden and Stanshope and lack of reference to any villagers or to the current value of the land may suggest that no one was living there at that time and it was uncultivated land.

The Development of Medieval and Post-Medieval Farming and Enclosure in Ilam

The open fields of the Peak District villages were extensively used for arable as well as pasture in the 12th to mid 14th centuries, but with the climatic deterioration, and the population loss due to the famines, forced depopulation and the Black Death, in the 14th century, villages began to decline and sheep farming became the norm. From this time onwards the open cultivation strips started to be enclosed, the boundaries frequently retaining the distinctive pattern of the earlier strips in fossilised form, often with between two to ten strips being made into single fields. In many instances the process of enclosure was not complete until the 18th or early 19th century, with small areas of strips still farmed in the traditional way, each strip being rotated between farmers from year to year.

Narrow strip fields characterising fossilised open fields are not in evidence at Ilam. There are, however, surviving earthworks which indicate the areas of former arable fields. The flatter, lower-lying land was ploughed regularly and has pronounced ridge and furrow, in contrast to the upland areas. Cleverdon (1995) suggests that an infield/outfield system of mixed farming was practised in Ilam, so the poorer, higher land was only occasionally ploughed. Part of the land surrounding Beechenhill Farm surveyed by Cleverdon contains some patchy ridge and furrow (illustration 6). The area surveyed for this report was probably part of Ilam Moor, an open common, and there are no signs that this was ever brought into arable cultivation. It was enclosed in the Post-Medieval period, although there are no details about this enclosure.

Communication Routes (illustration 7)

Communication routes in the Peak District are known from the Roman period and through the Medieval. The principal Roman routes in the Peak were those which radiated from the fort at *Navio* (Brough), to Templeborough (near Rotherham), to *Melandra* (near Glossop), to *Aquae Arnemetiae* (Buxton) and southwards onto the limestone plateau (course unknown) (Hart 1981). Another Roman road crossed the plateau from *Aquae Arnemetiae* towards Derby (Little Chester). None of these routes travelled across the area of survey, but apart from the military roads described above, there would have been many other lanes, tracks and routeways which survived into the Roman period of occupation from earlier periods. However, we are yet unable to identify such routes.

During the post-Roman and Early Medieval periods it is thought that communications relied on "Portway" tracks which linked areas of principal settlement. “Portway” is probably just another name for a packhorse route which were a principal form of road transport from the early Middle Ages until the 17th century. Packhorse routes were still in use during the 19th century in the Peak District, especially for light transportation. Packhorses generally travelled in a "train" sometimes up to 40 or 50 in single file. Many packhorse routes were paved with large stone slabs to prevent erosion and improve traction in wet weather. These were often known as causeways with rivers negotiated via simple clapper bridges or narrow humped bridges which sometimes date back to the Medieval period (Dodd and Dodd 1980). On steep hillsides various routes often converge together on river crossings forming deep hollow-ways.

In the survey area at feature 3, there are the remains of the former route of the Ilam to Alstonefield road (Cleverdon 1995).

Landscape Characterisation (illustration 8)

The analysis of land use through time allows the farm to be divided into a number of zones which have different archaeological landscape characteristics. Whilst change to the landscape is often inevitable and sometimes desirable, wherever possible the character of each area should be retained (or at least not destroyed thoughtlessly). Archaeological features which are not characteristic of such landscape zones are still regarded as valuable, even though they may be seen as untypical of activities normally associated with each zone.

***Feature 10*: Post-1650 enclosure – regular/piecemeal, no details**

This area was probably part of 'Ilam Moore' as shown on the 17th century sketch plan of the area around Ilam, although the boundaries are not accurately depicted. The Ilam tithe map of c.1838 provides the earliest map evidence of fields. Current fields are assumed to be post-1650 based on their regular shape and straight boundaries.

***Feature 11*: Enclosure of unknown date**

The 17th century sketch plan of the area around Ilam indicates that the village may have had open arable cultivation in this area, but there is no convincing evidence for fossilised strips in the current field boundaries.

PART 3

BEECHENHILL FARM: LOCATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES

The following archaeological features plan records all the archaeological sites identified in the survey area during fieldwork in 2000. The location of each of the survey maps is given in illustration 2. Each archaeological feature is identified by a number which corresponds with that used in the catalogue in Part 4 below.

It should be noted that although the farm was surveyed systematically, this was done rapidly over a short period of time. There may well be some archaeological features which were missed, particularly if the earthworks are low to the ground. This is inevitable since some features are only visible under specific light conditions, for example, when the sun is low or at a particular angle.

A further problem to note is that any archaeological feature visible at the surface may also have buried deposits beneath it. These include foundations, postholes, pits and artefacts. Pits in particular often contain deposits which tell us much about the people who dug them. Where surface earthworks have been levelled, often hundreds of years ago, the buried archaeology can often still remain. Thus, there may well be further important archaeological sites on the farmland that still remain undiscovered.

PART 4

BEECHENHILL FARM: CATALOGUE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES

1. Beechenhill Farm (Grade II Listed Buildings 351/8/109 and 110/SMR 406/illus.9)

A two-storey farmhouse built in mortared limestone rubble with clay tile roof and ashlar quoins and dressings. It has a two room plan with flat-faced mullioned windows. To the east is a former two-storey farmhouse, cowman's cottage and lofted cowhouse, of similar date. They are also built in coursed rubble with ashlar dressings and have a clay tile roof. The farm is not shown on Yates' 1775 county survey of Staffordshire but does appear on the 1838 tithe map and therefore dates to between 1775 and 1838.

2. Enclosure/earthworks (SMR 3208/illus.9)

A rectangular enclosure with D-shaped earthwork. The banks are up to c.1m high. Faith Cleverdon carried out a resistivity survey and excavation of the site (Cleverdon 1995). She uncovered a bank of small angular stones and soil which contained occupation debris. Overlying this were the footings of a substantial stone wall. The pottery suggested a later Iron Age date continuing into the Romano-British period (c.2000-1500 years ago). The type of walling is comparable with Romano-British walls at Roystone Grange, near Ballidon, Derbyshire (Hodges 1991).

The majority of Romano-British settlement sites have been swept away by later agricultural activity, but in a few cases, usually on rocky patches of ground impossible to improve for modern agricultural purposes, there survive banks marking the sites of Romano-British farm buildings and contemporary associated yards and garden plots (which possibly have prehistoric origins). There are around 80 Romano-British settlement sites in the limestone plateau area of the Peak District.

3. Ilam-Alstonefield road (illus.9)

The former route of the Ilam-Alstonefield road, now diverted to the present roadway to the east, is visible as a terraced trackway across the field (Cleverdon 1995). It appears in its present position on the 1838 tithe map and had therefore been moved prior to that date.

4. Circular feature/building foundations (SMR 2452/illus.9)

There is an almost circular feature c.10m in diameter set into a slope which was excavated by Faith Cleverdon in 1983-4 (Cleverdon 1995). The excavation was inconclusive as to the nature and date of the feature, but the foundations of two post-medieval buildings, probably barns, were found to the north-east. Cleverdon suggests the feature is a stack stand for storing hay.

5. Barrow (SMR 2451/SAM 22428/illus.9)

A slightly oval earthen mound up to 1.5m high on the downslope side. It is at most 23m across but is poorly defined on the upslope side. It has a slight dent in the top which may suggest it has been excavated at some time in the past, although there are no records of an excavation here. It has been ploughed at some time.

The barrow makes the locations of the burial(s) prominent features in the landscape. This prominence is heightened by the positioning of barrows on the edge of a deeply incised dale. The deliberate and careful selection of this topographical site makes the burial place of the dead, and from some locations the barrow itself, highly visible from some of the surrounding area. Barrows such as this one have been interpreted as helping to remind the living of their ancestry, of their kinship with their community and of their association with a geographic location.

6. Site of dew pond (illus.9)

A dew pond is shown here on the 1922 Ordnance Survey map, but is no longer extant.

7. Site of dew pond (illus.9)

A dew pond is shown situated on this boundary on the 1922 Ordnance Survey map, but is no longer extant.

8. Dew pond (illus.9)

A large concrete-lined dew pond which is shown on the 1922 Ordnance Survey map and therefore pre-dates 1922.

9. Moor Barn (illus.9)

A two-storey building, originally a barn, built in mortared limestone rubble with clay tile roof, now converted into a house. It is shown on the 1838 tithe map and therefore pre-dates 1838.

10. Post-1650 enclosure – regular/piecemeal, no details (illus.8)

This area was probably part of 'Ilam Moore' as shown on the 17th century Sketch Plan of area around Ilam, although the boundaries are not accurately depicted. The Ilam tithe map of c. 1838 provides the earliest map evidence of fields. Current fields are assumed to be post-1650 based on their regular shape and straight boundaries.

11. Enclosure of unknown date (illus.8)

The 17th century Sketch Plan of the areaaround Ilam indicates that Ilam may have had open arable cultivation in this area, but there is no convincing evidence for fossilised strips in the current field boundaries.

PART 5

BEECHENHILL FARM: ASSESSMENT OF RELATIVE SITE IMPORTANCE

The following is an assessment of the relative importance of the archaeological features discovered within the survey area. It is made by the National Park Survey Archaeologists in the light of those archaeological features known throughout the region at the time of the survey.

Features of National or Regional Importance are all important to the understanding of the archaeology of the Peak District and in many cases the wider area. All contain valuable information which ideally should be recorded in greater detail than the brief inspection notes made during the rapid survey described here. This would take the form of at least a more detailed survey. If at some future time a feature in this category comes under threat of damage or destruction, excavation may well be desirable if conservation measures cannot be negotiated. Some of the features in the Nationally or Regionally Important category in the Peak District have been designated as Scheduled Ancient Monuments and are protected by government legislation. There is a scheduled site in the survey area at feature 5.

Locally important features are those which are important to the archaeology of the locality. Such features should not be regarded as of lesser value for they contribute to the development and character of the local landscape.

Standing buildings are listed separately because they present different management problems. In some cases, they are protected under the Listed Building legislation. This separate listing does not mean that many buildings are any less important archaeologically than any of the archaeological features listed as being of National or Regional Importance. Beechenhill farmhouse and barns are Grade II Listed Buildings.

LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE	FEATURE CATALOGUE NUMBERS
Archaeological Features of National or Regional Importance	2, 4, 5, 10, 11
Archaeological Features of Local Importance	3, 6, 7, 8,
Standing Buildings of National or Regional Importance	1
Standing Buildings of Local Importance	9

PART 6

SAFEGUARDING THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE
WHAT YOU CAN DO

Introduction

Many archaeological features have survived for hundreds or thousands of years. Each feature is a unique record of past human activity, even though it may be similar to others. Once destroyed, it is gone forever.

Archaeology covers all the remains of past human activity, from ancient stone circles to tracks used by our grandparents. It not only includes relics such as churches and castles, but also the walls used by farmers, and the mines and quarries that provided wealth from the ground.

An individual archaeological feature is not only important in its own right. Sometimes it is the general archaeological character of a landscape, including its many features of "local importance" that is archaeologically valuable. The 'humps and bumps' identified as archaeology may be the "tip of an iceberg" where more extensive archaeological deposits of settlement or ritual activity are concealed below ground.

Not all archaeological features or landscapes can be conserved, nor is it desirable that the countryside becomes a 'cultural theme park' where everything is fossilised. However, many features can be safeguarded at little or no inconvenience to landowners or tenants.

Many archaeological features have been destroyed in the past due to lack of knowledge of either their nature or value. Once farmers and other land managers realise that collectively such features tell us much about our past, they are usually happy to safeguard them, particularly if there is no significant conflict of interest with the profitable management of the holding.

Only a small number of the most important features are protected by law against ground disturbance and are designated as Scheduled Ancient Monuments by the Department of National Heritage, advised by English Heritage. Other features can be conserved under schemes such as MAFF's Countryside Stewardship Scheme or the Peak District National Park Authority's Farm Conservation Scheme.

Surface Remains

After having survived for hundreds or thousands of years, the safeguarding of archaeological features is often easy - they are usually best left well alone, by continuing the management traditional to the field or moor where they are found. When locating new activities or buildings, conservation of archaeological features can usually be achieved by choosing alternative sites which are of little archaeological importance, but which are no less convenient, agriculturally. Leaving archaeological mounds and hollows, rather than creating flat fields, often has little effect on the way fields are managed or on their profitability. Such a positive approach may be rewarded by conservation payments.

Ploughing and rotovating may sometimes be necessary from a financial point of view, however, fields containing important archaeological features can sometimes be managed as permanent grass and other fields ploughed with equal profit. In some cases, rotovating or

direct drilling cause little damage now, because shallow ploughing has taken place several times over the last two centuries. In contrast, deep ploughing may damage intact burials and other deposits. This said, any ploughing will reduce the height of earthworks.

Livestock damage can be reduced by placing supplementary feeders and licks away from archaeological features, or by moving their locations regularly where remains are extensive, for example, in areas with ridge and furrow.

Tree planting should avoid archaeological features where possible. To avoid damage from pulling or digging out stumps, it is better to cut the trees close to the ground and then to poison the stump and leave it to rot. Trees can seriously damage features through root activity. When trees have to be felled, on or near archaeological features, it is necessary to consider in which direction they will fall, where the brash will be burnt, and the route vehicles will take when removing the timber. With large plantations, archaeological advice should ideally be sought in advance of new planting, replanting, thinning and clear felling. The deep ploughing which is often undertaken when preparing for new moorland planting destroys most archaeological features.

Tipping and dumping (some of which may need planning permission) should be avoided as much as possible as they bury archaeological features, making their recognition and interpretation impossible. If tipping has to take place, a detailed photographic or measured record of archaeological features may be desirable before such takes place.

Vehicles repeatedly crossing an area will quickly cause damage, especially when the ground is wet. If archaeological features cannot be avoided, different routes should be followed each time they are crossed.

Field Boundaries

Walls and hedges are often on old boundary lineswhich go back hundreds of years, and have archaeological landscape value even when they have recently been rebuilt or replanted. Wall furniture, such as sheep throughs, field stiles, gate posts and water troughs should be retained when walls are rebuilt.

Buildings

A major exception to easy management of the archaeological resource is the care of standing buildings. Once these have become redundant they are expensive to maintain. If alternative uses or sources of repair grant cannot be found, then thereis often little choice but to let them decay or to demolish them. In the sad event of this happening, the Peak Park Survey Archaeologists would welcome the opportunity to do further recording, either by taking photographs, or exceptionally, by making measured drawings.

New buildings (some of which will need planning permission) should, wherever possible, be sited to avoid archaeological features.

Metal Detecting

Metal detecting can cause major damage to a feature and the important information it may contain and should not be allowed to take place on archaeological features. Such activities rarely produce anything of financial value and often the only finds that can date a feature are removed. Knowing that a find is from a feature is usually of little use unless its exact relationship to particular structures and layers is known.

Specialist Advice

The above notes present a few general guidelines on good practice which we hope will help safeguard the archaeology without causing serious inconvenience.

If there are any specific questions about management or planned development then please seek advice from the National Park Archaeology Service. Normally the archaeologists can be contacted through the Farm and Countryside Service advisers, or through Development Control caseworkers.

If buildings have to be demolished or earthworks levelled, then detailed archaeological recording work should ideally be undertaken. If several months notice is given, then this allows a considered course of action to be followed through, and work to be carried out with minimal inconvenience and delay to the landowner.

Ideally a holistic approach to management should be adopted that also includes ecological and landscape considerations. The Authority's Farm and Countryside Service offers guidance on all such issues.

PART 7

GLOSSARY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL TERMS

ANGLO-SAXON — The period of early-English history dominated by the settlement of Northern Europeans in the eastern counties of England. It dates from the collapse of the Roman economy during the early 5th century, to the Norman Conquest of 1066. It also includes influences from occupying Scandinavians during the 200 years before the Normans arrived. The early part of the Saxon period is sometimes known as the *Dark Ages* because of the lack of historical documentation for this period. In the Peak District, there is no evidence for Anglo-Saxon intrusion until the 7th century.

ANGLO-SCANDINAVIAN — That period of Anglo-Saxon history dominated by the settlement of Scandinavians from Denmark, Norway and via the Western Isles of Britain. The height of Scandinavian power was during the 9th and 10th centuries, although north-eastern England, including the Peak District, remained under Scandinavian influence until after the Norman Conquest. There is no evidence for Scandinavian settlement in the Peak District until the 10th century onwards.

BARROW — A burial site covered by a mound of earth or stone. The mounds are usually round and date from the Later Neolithic to Earlier Bronze Age, from about 2500 to 1500 BC. They often contain several burials, some accompanied by simple objects; gold and silver objects are not found in prehistoric round barrows in the Peak District. A few small mounds were built by the ruling families during the Anglo-Saxon period between 600 to 700 AD, and contain the earliest Christian graves known in the region.

BELL PIT — A shallow mine shaft, usually collapsed, surrounded by a mound of spoil. These were commonly used by coal miners and are often found in groups. It was easier to sink a new shaft nearby, rather than transport the coal long distances underground.

BRONZE AGE — The prehistoric period which comes between the Neolithic and the Iron Age, dating roughly from 2000 to 800 BC. This was the time of the introduction of metals and more importantly of permanently laid out field systems used by sedentary farmers. In the first half of the period people continued to use ceremonial sites such as barrows and stone circles. Few if any monuments were built after about 1500 BC.

BUILDING PLATFORM — When buildings are constructed, the ground is often levelled by cutting into a slope, or by building up one end, to create a level building platform or terrace. Often the sites of demolished timber or stone buildings can still be identified by a surviving building platform. Prehistoric examples are commonly circular, while from the Roman period onwards they tend to be rectangular.

CEREMONIAL MONUMENT — In prehistory, in the Neolithic and Earlier Bronze Age from 3500 to 1500 BC, local people built many monuments used for pre-Christian ceremonies and rituals. The most common sites are round barrows and

stone circles, but there are also single standing stones and unusual mounds, some long rather than round (long cairns), others with large stone chambers (chambered tombs).

CLEARANCE CAIRN — A pile of stones gathered during the preparation of the adjacent ground for cultivation. In the Peak District the majority are of prehistoric date. However, later examples are known, including some made in the 20th century.

CROFT — See Deserted Medieval Village.

DESERTED MEDIEVAL VILLAGE — A settlement occupied in the Medieval period and which has since been abandoned, leaving such archaeological remains as building platforms (also known as tofts), enclosure earthworks (also known as crofts), and trackways. When seen together, these can show the plan and nature of the village. Often abbreviated to DMV.

EARLY MEDIEVAL — A term often used for the Anglo-Saxon period, i.e. from the collapse of the Roman occupation during the 5th century AD until the Norman Conquest. However, only the later Anglo-Saxon period can be strictly called "Medieval", a period distinguished by the development of towns, nucleated settlements and an organised agrarian landscape.

EARLIER PREHISTORIC — A term used here to denote the time when humans subsisted by hunter gathering, before the advent of farming around 6000 years ago. This covers both the Palaeolithic and the Mesolithic.

ENCLOSURE AWARD — Between the mid-18th and late-19th centuries a large amount of waste and common land was enclosed in England and Wales. This enclosure movement was undertaken under the strong belief in the need for agricultural improvement amongst landowners at the time. To enclose land the distribution of the newly enclosed fields had to be approved. This approval could be via an Act of Parliament, the central courts or private agreement between local landowners. In all legally ratified cases, and some privately agreed examples, an enclosure award setting down the agreed extent and layout of the enclosure in writing and a corresponding plan was drawn up. The level of accuracy and detail that allotment boundaries were planned to is usually good, but in many cases the subdivisions into individual fields were not shown. Their coverage therefore varies from one area to another. In the case of Parliamentary Awards these were often done on a parish by parish basis.

FIELD SYSTEM — Fields can often by recognised as falling within distinct types and into discrete units; these are termed here field systems. In the Peak District early examples can be identified that date back 4000 years to the Bronze Age. Other examples are Romano-British, while much of the present farmed landscape comprises Medieval or Post-Medieval field systems.

FOSSILISED OPEN FIELDS — From at least as early as 1350 AD the cultivation strips within Medieval open fields of the Peak District started to be enclosed. Typically these fields survive today as narrow walled enclosures with distinctive curved sides with a reverse-S plan. Taken together, they often allow the extent and character of the Medieval open field to be recognised, despite the

fact that use of open cultivation strips ceased long ago. Enclosure of the open field usually happened piecemeal, with small parcels created that vary in date from the 14th century (1300s) to the last century.

GIN ENGINES/ GIN CIRCLES — The horse-drawn winding engines used from the early 18th century onwards to extract lead ore or coal from relatively deep mine shafts are called gin engines. These could have been of two basic types. The first to be developed was the cog and rung gin, where the horse went round a shaft which had winding gear above it. The later and more easily used whim gin had the horse circling the winding gear to one side of the shaft. The circular track left by the horse, often still recognisable today, is called the gin circle.

HEADLAND — Usually a low, wide bank running at a right angle to the end of lynchets or ridge and furrow within Medieval open fields. It was the turning area for the oxen (or horses) and plough, at the end of a furlong or stretch of ploughing. It also often doubled as an access route from the village to the cultivation strips within the open field.

HOLLOW-WAY — The line of a trackway, usually disused, eroded into a gully during its use in the past. Some major routes may be extensive networks of braided tracks running parallel to and crossing over each other. They often pre date turnpike roads and were used by packhorse and foot traffic, and in some cases by wagons.

HUNDRED — See Wapentake.

IRON AGE — The prehistoric period which comes between the Bronze Age and the coming of the Romans, in the Peak District dating roughly from 800 BC to the 70s AD. This was a time of settled farming communities living in scattered farms and hamlets, overlooked by hillforts. In the Peak District, there is little direct evidence for Iron Age occupation.

LATER PREHISTORIC — A term used here to denote the last 1500 years of prehistory, covering the later Bronze Age and the Iron Age. A time when ceremonial monuments were abandoned and the landscape was largely inhabited by settled farmers. New areas were cultivated with the introduction of larger, stronger ploughs which could turn heavier soils. The new areas probably included valleys such as that of the Derwent. These may well have become more heavily settled at around the time farming was contracting from uplands, such as the gritstone eastern moors, contemporary with a deterioration in climate.

LYNCHET — An artificial bank formed by a build up or loss of soil against a field boundary, or deliberately produced as the downslope edge of a cultivation terrace along a slope. Lynchets are usually found running along slopes and accumulate soil upslope from downward movement of soil after ploughing which is trapped by the boundary. They lose soil downslope where ploughing cuts into the slope. Where a boundary has later been removed, a lynchet is often the main evidence that a wall or hedge once existed. Those forming cultivation terraces often appear in groups and date from the Medieval period and once lay within open fields.

MEDIEVAL — The period which dates from the Norman Conquest of 1066 AD to approximately 1500 AD. Also known as the Middle Ages.

MESOLITHIC — The prehistoric period which comes between the Palaeolithic (Old Stone Age) and the Neolithic (New Stone Age), dating from the end of the last Ice Age, roughly 10,000 years ago, to the advent of the first farming in about 4000 BC. This was a time when people lived as hunter/gatherers, moving seasonally round the Peak District landscape exploiting wild resources, eating both game and roots, nuts and berries.

NEOLITHIC — The prehistoric period which comes between the Mesolithic (Middle Stone Age) and the Bronze Age, dating roughly from 4000 to 2000 BC. This was the time of the adoption of the first agricultural practices, including cereal cultivation, but more importantly the rearing of domesticated animals, including herds of cattle and flocks of sheep. In the beginning, farmers moved around the landscape with their herds, much as they had in the Mesolithic (except they took animals with them rather than following wild game). It was only after more than a thousand years that they settled in more 'permanent' farms which they surrounded by hedged fields. They built impressive ceremonial monuments, often used to establish traditional right to the use of land, by burying the bones of the ancestors to overlook pastures.

NORSE — A term which refers to the settlement of Norwegian Scandinavians, often arriving in England via the Western Isles of Britain. Sometimes these settlers are referred to as "Hiberno-Norse". Norse settlement was largely unrecorded and such evidence is derived mainly from place-names found, in particular, on the eastern and western on the fringes of the Peak District.

OPEN FIELDS — In the Medieval period, from at least as early as 1100 AD, Peak District villages were surrounded by large open fields. While often bounded at their edges by banks and ditches, internally they were initially divided into a large number of unfenced cultivation strips. The use of strips allowed a fair distribution of different grades of land between lord and villagers. This system was designed to favour the needs of arable cultivation. It seems to have been introduced into the area from the lowlands of the Midlands. In the Peak District, pastoral farming was of equal or greater importance, and individual strips were enclosed from an early date.

PALAEOLITHIC — The prehistoric period known as the Palaeolithic (Old Stone Age) covers the time from the earliest occupation by humans, through several radical changes in climate, to the end of the last Ice Age about 10,000 years ago (see Mesolithic). For the Peak District, little is known of these early hunter/gatherers.

PARISH — The smallest unit of local government is the civil parish. In some areas this covers the same area as an ecclesiastical parish which is the area of jurisdiction covered by the parish church. Ecclesiastical parishes are almost always the remains of Medieval manors especially in rural areas and many have remained unaltered in their boundaries since the Medieval period. However, in the Peak District many parishes became defined by the boundaries of Townships.

POST-MEDIEVAL — The period after the Medieval, beginning at approximately 1500 AD and continuing up to the present day. Distinct from the Medieval because of

	the change from a feudal to capitalist society and the rapid development of industrialisation.
PREHISTORY	The period from the first human presence in the region, covering many thousand years, to the coming of the Romans and the first written documents just under two thousand years ago.
RAKE	A vein of lead ore and associated minerals, often several metres wide, extending hundreds of metres deep. Rakes often run across the landscape for several miles. Sometimes discernible on the surface as a line of disturbed ground, including old shafts and waste hillocks. Increasingly these hillocks have been removed for their mineral content and all that remains is a levelled area.
RIDGE AND FURROW	In many fields that have not been ploughed in recent years, the land is corrugated by many parallel ridges, known as ridge and furrow. Earlier examples tend to be wider and more massive and have origins as Medieval cultivation strips (see Open Fields). In some instances they continued to be used and modified until as late as the 18th or 19th centuries. Narrow ridge and furrow tends to be 19th century in date (or from 1939-45), resulting from ploughing using a fixed mouldboard plough. There are rare exceptions to these trends, including pre Medieval ridge and furrow of various forms, wide but straight examples of relatively modern date and hand dug examples of various dates. All ridge and furrow tends to occur on heavier, thicker soils, but is rare on the thin soils of the limestone plateau.
RITUAL MONUMENT	See Ceremonial Monument.
ROMAN	The period covering the occupation of the British Isles by the Roman Empire. In the Peak District beginning in the 70s AD and ending during the early-5th century (400s) AD.
ROMANO-BRITISH	A term used to refer to native activity and settlement during the Roman occupation. Although the local farming people present when the Romans arrived adopted some Roman products, such as superior pottery, their way of life continued much as it had done in the Iron Age.
SCRIN	Smaller version of a rake, usually narrower and shorter, and often branching off from a rake.
SHRUNKEN MEDIEVAL VILLAGE	A settlement occupied in the Medieval period, part of which has since been abandoned. This process often leaves the spaces between currently occupied buildings with such archaeological remains as building platforms (also known as tofts), enclosure boundaries (also known as crofts) and trackways. Often abbreviated to SMV.
SITES AND MONUMENTS RECORDS	Lists of archaeological sites, and summaries of what is known about them, which (in the Peak District) are kept by County Archaeologists.
SOUGH	A near-horizontal tunnel excavated to drain waterlogged mine workings, to allow deeper mineral extraction.

TOFT	See Deserted Medieval Village.
TOWNSHIP	A term given to a subdivision of a Medieval parish which have developed into civil parishes in many areas of the Peak District. Such divisions were usually given the name of the principal settlement therein but also included farmland and open pasture attached to that settlement.
TURNPIKE ROAD	The present road network was built in the 1700s and 1800s, often as toll roads known as turnpikes. These roads were a radical improvement on what went before and allowed the distribution of the commercial products of the industrial revolution. Their routes can still be recognised from their toll houses and distinctive milestones.
WALL FURNITURE	This term is used to cover such details found in drystone walls as gateposts, stiles, sheep throughs and water troughs.
WAPENTAKE	A political division which probably developed during the Anglo-Scandinavian period (see above) and which referred to a unit of land roughly equivalent in size to that of a modern district council. It is a term applied only to former Viking-controlled areas (such as Derbyshire). In English-controlled counties (such as Staffordshire) the same division was known as a Hundred.

PART 8

BIBLIOGRAPHY

anon. 1838 *Ilam Tithe Map*. Stafford Record Office D3729/6/17/14.

Barnatt, J. and Smith, K. 1997 *The English Heritage Book of the Peak District: Landscapes through time*. London: Batsford.

Cleverdon, F. 1995 *Survey and Excavation in the Manifold Valley* Staffordshire Archaeological Studies No.5. City Museum and Art Gallery, Stoke-on-Trent.

Dodd, A. E. and Dodd, E. M. 1980 *Peakland Roads and Trackways* Ashbourne: Moorland. 2nd ed.

Harris, H. 1971 *Industrial Archaeology of the Peak District* Newton Abbot: David and Charles.

Hart, C. R. 1981 *The North Derbyshire Archaeological Survey*. Chesterfield: North Derbyshire Archaeological Trust.

Hodges, R. 1991 *Wall-to-Wall History: the Story of Roystone Grange*. London: Duckworth.

Morris, J. ed. 1978 *Domesday Book: Staffordshire*. Chichester: Phillimore.

Ordnance Survey 1922 Twenty-Five Inch to a Mile maps, First Edition, Derbyshire sheets 37.4

Roffe, D. 1986 *The Derbyshire Domesday*. Matlock: Derbyshire Museums Service.

Yates, T. 1775 *Map of the County of Stafford* Staffordshire Record Office.

APPENDICES

A: BEECHENHILL FARM: DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY ARCHIVE

Documents

This report.

Drawings (as included in reduced form in this report)

Illustration 1 - Location of Beechenhill Farm
Illustartion 2 – Location of survey area and illustration nos.
Illustration 3 – Condition of boundaries
Illustration 4 - The boundaries of the present farm in 1838
Illustration 5 – Present boundary age
Illustration 6 – Plan of feature surveyed by Faith Cleverdon
Illustration 7 – Communication routes
Illustration 8 – Landscape characterisation
Illustration 9 – Location of archaeological features

One folder of field notes (retained by the PDNPA - may be viewed on request).

B: FEATURE RECORDING - SURVEY SPECIFICATION

The survey undertaken to produce this report comprised a systematic and rapid search of the farmland. Every field was inspected from at least one vantage point and care was taken to avoid blind areas by taking in further vantage points. Every potential feature was inspected more closely to plot its extent, form and interpretation.

In enclosed land, and where large scale maps were available, discoveries were sketch plotted on an OS 1:2500 base. This is the National Park's Phase 1 survey standard. The plotting of features under these conditions is relatively accurate because of the scale of the maps and by using nearby features, such as field boundaries, to gauge relative locations between known points. We believe that in these surveys, the normal error in plotting feature locations is limited to plus or minus 5 metres.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to **Mr and Mrs Prince** for giving permission to survey the land. Ken Smith provided information, advice and comment. Angela Johnson carried out the duplication of illustrations and the binding of the report.

Report Completed 27/09/2000

rep00bh