3 Cultural Heritage

3.1 Introduction

This chapter considers the likely effects on cultural heritage interests of the proposed improvements to Threapland Junction on the A96, near Lhanbryde.

Cultural heritage resources potentially include sites, monuments, landscapes and portable antiquities ranging from the earliest Holocene human occupation of Scotland, approximately 10,000 years ago, through to 20th century buildings and townscapes. They include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, other unscheduled archaeological sites, Listed Buildings and other buildings of historic or architectural importance, Conservation Areas, Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes and other historical landscapes. Those cultural heritage resources relevant to this study are Scheduled Ancient Monuments; other unscheduled archaeological sites; and Listed Buildings.

The specific objectives of the cultural heritage assessment were to:

- Identify the cultural heritage baseline along the preferred route;
- Assess the proposal area in terms of the archaeological and historic environmental potential;
- Consider the potential and predicted effects of the construction and operation of the proposals on the baseline cultural heritage resource;
- Identify measures, where appropriate, to mitigate any predicted significant adverse effects.

Figure 3.1 depicts the proposed development boundary and the locations of archaeological sites and features identified by the cultural heritage study in the immediate vicinity of the junction. Figure 3.2 shows locations of key cultural heritage receptors (sites with statutory and non-statutory designations) within 1km of the road. Table 3.6 at the end of this chapter provides a gazetteer of the cultural heritage sites and an indication of the importance of each.

The predicted effects on cultural heritage sites and features are identified and appropriate mitigation measures are presented.

3.2 Planning and Legislative Background

3.2.1 Context

The following sections provide information on the legislative and planning policy framework designed to protect these cultural heritage resources relevant to this development. Regional and local planning policy is stated by reference to forthcoming documents (*Moray Structure Plan* - submitted April 2006; *Moray Local Plan* September 2006).

Historic Scotland's overall approach to the sustainable management of the historic environment is set out in its document Passed to the Future (2002). The Moray Structure Plan (forthcoming) contains no specific policies as regards the treatment of archaeological and historic environment sites but states that, "The conservation, enhancement and promotion of Moray's built heritage is therefore important. In particular, this will mean safeguarding listed buildings, ancient monuments, archaeology and designed landscapes and retaining buildings, townscapes and artefacts which are part of Moray's character and identity". Detailed policies are contained in the Local Plan.

Historic Scotland's Scottish Historic Environment Policy 1 – Scotland's Historic Environment (2007) (SHEP1), sets out the Scottish Ministers' vision and policies for the historic environment. It states that the protection of the historic environment is not about preventing change. Ministers believe that change in this dynamic environment should be managed intelligently and with understanding, to achieve the best outcome for the historic environment and for the people of Scotland. The three key aims of the policy are to ensure that:

- The historic environment is cared for, protected and enhanced for the benefit of our own and future generations;
- There is increased public appreciation and enjoyment of the historic environment amongst all the people of Scotland and visitors to the country; and,
- The historic environment's importance as a key asset in Scotland's economic, social and cultural success is recognised and skilfully harnessed.

3.2.2 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other unscheduled archaeological sites

Under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (1979 Act), the Scottish Ministers are required to compile and maintain a Schedule of monuments considered to be of national importance. The statutory consent of the Scottish Ministers is required before any works are carried out which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering up a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM). In addition, effects of proposed development works upon the setting of a SAM form an important consideration in the granting or refusal of planning consent to conduct development

works. Further information on development control procedures relating to SAMs is provided in National Planning Policy Guideline 5, Archaeology and Planning (NPPG 5) and Planning Advice Note 42, Archaeology (PAN 42).

Archaeological sites and monuments without statutory protection are curated by the local planning authority. NPPG 5 and PAN 42 provide national planning policy guidance and advice on the treatment of this resource. PAN 42 indicates that the principle that should underlie all planning decision-making is preservation of cultural resources, in situ where possible, and by record if destruction cannot be avoided. It is recognised in the document that preservation may not always be possible, and where damage is unavoidable various mitigation measures may be proposed.

Local Plan Policy BE1 states that 'Development proposals will be refused where they will adversely affect Scheduled Ancient Monuments and nationally important archaeological sites or their settings unless the developer proves that any significant adverse effect on the qualities for which the site has been designated are clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance'. It also states that: 'Development proposals which will adversely affect sites of local archaeological importance, or their settings, will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that; local public benefits clearly outweigh the archaeological value of the site, and there is no suitable alternative site for the development; and any adverse effects can be satisfactorily mitigated at the developers expense. Where, in exceptional circumstances, the primary aim of preservation of archaeological features in situ does not prove feasible, the Council shall require the excavation and researching of a site at the developer's expense'.

3.2.3 Listed Buildings

Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (1997 Act), the Scottish Ministers are required to compile a list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. Such buildings are classified into Categories A, B and C(s), in decreasing order of importance. Sustainable development is the principle underlying Government policy towards the historic environment. Planning authorities and the Scottish Ministers are required to have special regard for the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings and their settings and any features of special architectural or historic importance they possess. The term 'setting' has no definition in the Act, although the Memorandum of Guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas 1998 (Memorandum; published by Historic Scotland) advises planning authorities to interpret the term broadly. The Memorandum states that a Listed Building should at all times remain the focus of its setting, and that attention should not be distracted from it by the presence of any new development. Government policy and guidance is also stated in National Planning Policy Guideline 18, Planning and the Historic Environment (NPPG 18).

Local Plan Policy BE2 covers the protection of listed buildings and amongst a number of provisions states that:

'Development proposals will be refused where they would have a detrimental effect on the character, integrity or setting of the listed building(s). Alterations and extensions to listed buildings or new developments within their curtilage must be of the highest quality, and respect the original structure in terms of setting, scale, materials and design'.

3.3 Methodology

3.3.1 General

The assessment was conducted in accordance with the Institute of Field Archaeologists *Code of Conduct* (IFA 2006) and *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessment* (IFA 2001). The principal methods employed are archival and documentary research, consultation with interested parties, and reconnaissance field survey.

3.3.2 Desk-based Assessment

Up-to-date information was obtained from appropriate sources on the locations and extents of recorded cultural heritage sites within or close to the proposed junction improvement. Site numbers in bold and in brackets in the following text refer to gazetteer entries In Table 3.6.

Details of the locations and extents of Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings and Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes within 1km of the centreline of the road were sought from Historic Scotland.

Information on Conservation Areas and other historic townscape designations was sought in the Local Plan.

Information on non-designated sites was obtained from the National Monuments Record of Scotland (NMRS) and their online database Pastmap (www.pastmap.org). The Moray Council Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) was consulted.

An assessment was made of vertical aerial photographic coverage of the proposed development area held by the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS). Coverage from 1946 to 1995 was available for consolation.

Ordnance Survey maps and other historical maps held by the Map Library of the National Library of Scotland were examined, to provide information on sites of potential archaeological significance.

Full details of all sources consulted are presented in Appendix 2.

3.3.3 Consultations

Table 3.1: Cultural Heritage Consultees

Consultee	Consultee Response Summary
Statutory Consultees	
Ian Shepherd, Principal Archaeologist, Aberdeenshire Council (Moray Council Archaeological Advisor) **10/10/2006**	Noted presence of large D-shaped enclosure (Site 6, Figure 3.1) in two of the fields to the south of the road. Details of its location were provided and it was stated that this should be safeguarded. Noted that there would be a possibility of encountering archaeological features in the land which is to be cut back to improve visibility on the side slopes. Given the topography of this area, the possibility of archaeological features such as short-cist burials being encountered in the crests of such slopes could not be discounted. A pre-construction evaluation of these areas was recommended.
Ian Shepherd, Principal Archaeologist, Aberdeenshire Council (Moray Council Archaeological Advisor) **27/11/2007**	Consulted by telephone regarding the Category B Listed AA Sentry Box (**2**). Agreed that it would be inappropriate to retain the Box at its current location, as the junction improvements will necessitate the removal of the lay-by. Agreed that proposed new location in a lay-by to the east would be appropriate and stated that he would support the proposed resiting of the Box. Expressed his belief that the Box should not go to a museum and that a roadside setting should be considered the only appropriate option.
Historic Scotland **1/11/2006**	Noted that the development has the potential to disturb an unscheduled cropmark. A 10% pre-construction evaluation of the development area was recommended. This would include the excavation of any sites identified and any necessary post-excavation analysis and publication. A watching brief was recommended during topsoil stripping of any areas not excavated as part of the evaluation.
Non-Statutory Consultees	
Alasdair Joyce, Senior Museums Officer, Moray Council Museums Service	Advised that the Moray Council Museums Service is unable to comment on any cultural heritage issues related to this proposed development.

3.3.4 Field survey

Reconnaissance field survey was undertaken on 12th and 13th September 2006 to assess the baseline conditions of the sites, monuments and landscape features identified by the desk-based assessment; to assess the topography, geomorphology and land use of the proposed development area to aid the assessment of its archaeological potential; and to assess the potential effects of the scheme on the cultural heritage resource.

3.3.5 Impact Assessment

The assessment considered potential direct and indirect effects of the proposals in terms of their longevity, reversibility and nature (beneficial / neutral / adverse). Beneficial effects are those that contribute to the value of a receptor through enhancement of desirable characteristics or the introduction of new, positive attributes. Neutral effects occur where the development can be accommodated comfortably by the receiving environment while neither contributing to nor detracting from the value of the receptor. Adverse effects are those that detract from the value of a receptor through a reduction in or disruption of valuable characterising components or patterns, or the introduction of new inappropriate characteristics.

Direct effects are those where there will be a physical effect on a receptor caused by the proposed development. Direct effects may be caused by a range of activities associated with the construction of proposed development features, including ground-disturbing excavations. In addition, above-ground disturbance, such as those caused by vehicle movement, and soil and overburden storage, may produce irreversible effects upon archaeological features.

Indirect effects are those where the setting or amenity of a site may be affected. Indirect effects may relate to new development reducing views to or from cultural heritage features with important landscape settings. Such effects can arise during the construction phase of a development and persist throughout its operating phase.

The assessment of significance of effects was undertaken using two key criteria: sensitivity of receptor and magnitude of effect. The importance of cultural heritage resources was established principally according to the criteria published in NPPG 5, NPPG 18 and the Memorandum. The main thresholds of archaeological importance defined by NPPG 5 are National Importance, Regional and Local Importance, and Lesser Importance. Sites of National Importance comprise Scheduled Ancient Monuments and sites of 'schedulable quality'. Sites of Regional and Local Importance are those that do not merit scheduling, but which have significance within a regional or local context. This may, for example, apply to their importance to regional or local history, or to their survival as the only local example of a monument type. Sites of Lesser Importance may comprise component parts of a landscape rich in archaeological monuments, and thereby gain greater significance. The Memorandum states that Category A Listed Buildings are of national or international importance, Category B buildings are of regional or more than local importance, and Category C(s) structures are of local importance.

Table 3.2 summarises the relative importance of key cultural heritage resources, and provides a concordance between levels of Importance and Sensitivity.

Table 3.3 defines the threshold of magnitude of impact.

Table 3.2: Importance and Sensitivity of key cultural heritage resources

Sensitivity	Importance	Site types
Very High	International	Certain SAMs Certain Category A Listed Buildings
High	National	Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Sites of schedulable quality (NSR codes C and V) Certain Category A Listed Buildings.
Medium	Regional	Archaeological sites and areas of distinctive regional importance. Category B Listed Buildings.
Low	Local	Category C(s) Listed Buildings and unlisted buildings of local historic or architectural interest. Category C Listed Buildings Archaeological sites and areas of local importance.
Negligible	Lesser	Other archaeological sites or buildings. Artefact find spots.

Table 3.3: Definitions of magnitude of impact

Level of Magnitude	Definition
Severe	Major impacts fundamentally changing the baseline condition of the receptor, leading to total or major alteration of character or setting.
Moderate	Moderate impacts changing the baseline condition of the receptor materially but not fundamentally, leading to partial alteration of character or setting.
Slight	Minor detectable impacts which do not alter the baseline condition of the receptor materially.
Negligible	A very slight and barely distinguishable change from baseline conditions, approximating to a 'no change' situation.

Table 3.4 combines these criteria to provide an assessment of whether or not an impact is considered to be significant.

Table 3.4: Matrix for assessing significance of impact. Effects falling within shaded boxes are considered to be significant.

Magnitude of Effect	Sensitivity of Receptor				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	NEGLIGIBLE
SEVERE	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
MODERATE	Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible
SLIGHT	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible
NEGLIGIBLE	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

3.4 Baseline

Two cultural heritage sites have been identified within and immediately adjacent to the proposed development boundary (Figure 3.1): a Category B Listed AA Sentry Box (**2**) and the cropmark of a D-shaped enclosure (**6**) recorded from aerial photographs.

One SAM (**1**) and four further Listed Buildings (**3**-**5**) lie within 1km of the centreline of the road (Figure 3.2).

3.4.1 Assessment of Sensitivity of Cultural Heritage Sites

Table 3.5 assesses the sensitivity of each cultural heritage site identified by the study, using the criteria introduced above. One site (**6**) has been judged to be of unknown sensitivity, as its nature and date are unknown. However, based upon the possibility that it is either a prehistoric enclosure, it is considered that this site would be of no more than medium sensitivity. This likely sensitivity has been presented in brackets in Table 3.5.

3.4.2 Archaeological Potential of the area of the Proposed Improvements

Several possible prehistoric cropmark sites and prehistoric artefacts and burial structures have been recorded in the surrounding area. These include a Late Bronze Age sword (SMR No. NJ26SE 0077; NJ 279 610), a bronze axe (NMRS No. NJ26SE 50; NJ 29 61), flint arrowheads (SMR No. NJ26SE 0020; NJ 295 607), two stone axes (NMRS No. NJ26SE 26; NJ 2985 6057), and a cist with a flint knife (NMRS No. NJ26SE 21; NJ 285 610), and two possible prehistoric cropmark enclosures at Lhanbryde (NMRS No. NJ26SE 87; NJ 2818 6100) and Sleepshill Wood (SMR No. NJ26SE0033; NJ 2830 6074).

The Moray Council Archaeological Advisor considers it probable that hitherto undiscovered sites of archaeological importance lie within the area of the proposed improvements. In addition to the cropmark site (**6**), which would lie to the immediate west of the new southern road, he has highlighted the possibility that prehistoric burial sites are preserved in this area. Historic Scotland has a similar opinion of the archaeological potential.

The archaeological potential of the area of the proposed improvement is, therefore, considered to be moderate.

3.4.3 Future Baseline Conditions

If the road improvements did not take place, the baseline condition of the identified cultural heritage sites would remain broadly unchanged. The cropmark site (**6**) would be likely to be subject to continued erosion by ploughing and the listed buildings (**2, 3, 4** and **5**) may change as a result of alteration / renovation, extension or demolition. The scheduled stone circle (**1**) would be unlikely to undergo any noticeable change. If the road improvements took place, they would have no effect on the baseline condition of five of the six known sites (**1, 3, 4, 5** and **6**).

3.5 Environmental Effects

A summary of all potential effects of the proposed scheme on cultural heritage resources is provided in Table 3.5. The assessment is based on the road layout identified on Figure 1.2 and

does not include any works outwith these areas (for instance construction compounds, access roads etc).

3.5.1 Effects of Construction

A neutral direct effect is predicted on one site (**2**) as a result of the construction of the improvements. This Category B Listed Automobile Association (AA) Sentry Box would be moved from its current lay-by location to one of two lay-bys approximately 1km to the east (Figure 3.1). The Box has a working emergency telephone. If it were to remain where it is, the telephone connection to the Box would be severed and the Box would be sat immediately next to a road, as the lay-by is to be removed as part of the junction improvement scheme. The new location for the Box would be similar to its existing utilitarian setting in a lay-by next to a road in a rural location. The emergency telephone would be reconnected at the new location, if required.

3.5.2 Effects of Operation

No operational effects are predicted on any of the sites identified by this study.

Table 3.5: Predicted effects on cultural heritage features within study area

Site No.	*Feature*	*Potential effect*	*Magnitude of Effect*	*Sensitivity of Receptor*	*Significance of Effect*
1	Bogton, stone circle 250m NW of	None	None	High	None
2	Threapland Wood, AA sentry box	Direct, neutral	None	Medium	None
3	Pittensair House	None	None	High	None
4	Lhanbryde Burial Ground	None	None	Medium	None
5	Lhanbryde Burial Ground, Innes Enclosure	None	None	High	None
6	Larchfield, cropmark enclosure	None	None	Unknown (Medium)	None

3.5.3 Significance of Effects

One site would undergo an adverse direct effect as a result of the construction of the development. A Category B Listed AA Sentry Box (**2**) would be moved from its current lay-by location to one of two lay-bys approximately 1km to the east (Figure 3.1). The effect is judged to be neutral and, hence is considered to be not significant.

The proposed development would have no effect on five sites (**1, 3, 4, 5** and **6**).

The impact of the proposed development on any unrecorded, buried archaeological remains that lie in areas where ground-disturbing works would take place is unknown.

3.6 Mitigation

3.6.1 General

A programmer of archaeological mitigation works would be carried out to offset the predicted adverse impact on the archaeological resource. Except where otherwise stated, all archaeological mitigation works would take place prior to the commencement of construction works. All work would be conducted to a scheme of work detailed in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and approved by the Moray Council Archaeological Advisor. The WSI would make provision for appropriate post-excavation analyses and dissemination of the results of the mitigation works, as well as for archiving of the project materials and records.

3.6.2 Impact offset for construction effects

The Category B Listed AA Sentry Box (**2**) would be moved to its new location prior to construction, to ensure that accidental damage is avoided as far as is possible. The means by which it would be moved would be agreed with Historic Scotland and the Moray Council Archaeological Advisor.

A programme of archaeological evaluation would be carried out in the areas of new landtake required for the junction improvement. The exact sample size for the evaluation would be agreed with the Moray Council Archaeological Advisor, but it is probable that a minimum sample of 10% will be required, in line with the recommendations of Historic Scotland, presented in their letter of 1 November 2006. In consultation with the Moray Council Archaeological Advisor, the evaluation would be used to define the needs for further work, which could include full excavation, watching briefs, post-excavation and publication.

Written guidelines would be issued for use by all construction contractors, outlining the need to avoid causing unnecessary damage to known archaeological sites. Those guidelines would contain arrangements for calling upon retained professional archaeological support in the event that buried archaeological remains of potential archaeological interest (such as building remains, human remains and artefacts) are discovered in areas not subjected to archaeological investigations or monitoring. The guidance would make clear the legal responsibilities placed upon those who disturb artefacts or human remains.

3.6.3 Impact reduction for operational effects

No operational effects have been predicted and, therefore, no mitigation to reduce operational effects is provided.

3.6.4 Residual impacts

It is considered that the completion of a programme of archaeological mitigation works would offset the loss of archaeological resources that would occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed junction improvements. The proposed relocation of the AA Sentry Box (**2**) would place it in an appropriate setting similar to its current setting. Taking the mitigation into account, no significant residual effects are anticipated in relation to cultural heritage interests.

3.7 Summary

The potential effects of the proposed improvements to the Threapland Junction along the A96 on the cultural heritage resources have been assessed through a programme of desk-based assessment, reconnaissance field survey, consultation and impact assessment.

Six cultural heritage sites were identified by the assessment. The sites are a scheduled stone circle, four Listed Buildings, and an unscheduled cropmark site. The proposed junction improvements have been predicted to have an adverse, neutral effect on a Category B Listed AA Sentry Box, which would be relocated approximately 1km to the east to an appropriate roadside setting similar to its current setting. The effect on this site is judged to be not significant.

A programme of mitigation works would be undertaken to offset the predicted adverse effect and to assess the potential that hitherto undiscovered remains of archaeological significance survive within the landtake for the proposed junction improvements. Taking the mitigation into account, no significant residual effects are anticipated in relation to cultural heritage interests and the development proposals are considered to conform with the aims of national, regional and local planning policy as regards cultural heritage.

Table 3.6 – Cultural Heritage sites and features within 1km of the proposed development

ID	Name	NMRS	SMR	NGR	Status	Source	Class	Description
1	Bogton, stone circle 250m NW of	NJ26SE 11	NJ26SE0007	NJ 274 607	SAM 1215	NMRS; SMR	Stone Circle	The NMRS records that all that remains of this stone circle are two standing stones in an arable field at NJ 2742 6076 and NJ 2744 6077 measuring respectively 1.7m by 1.8m by 0.7m and 1.7m by 1.5m by 0.7m. There are no signs of any other standing stones in the area. The SMR records the remains of a stone circle, of which only two stones survive. There is no sign of any other stones in area, the rest having been destroyed in 1810 to provide materials for the road bridge.
2	Threapland Wood, AA Sentry Box	NJ26SE 127	N/A	NJ 2903 6109	Category B Listed HBNum 49230	NMRS	AA Sentry Box	Historic Scotland records a square-plan timber boarded AA Sentry Box (approximately 2m by 0.75m by 0.75m). The box lies in a scenic location on the A96, with views down the Moray coastal plain. A symbol of national transport heritage, AA sentry boxes played an important role in the development of road communications and safety in Britain from the 1930s until 2002 when AA phones were finally disconnected. AA sentry boxes were first built to protect road patrollers from the weather when they travelled on bicycles and later on motorcycles in the first half of the 20th century. Later boxes had chalkboards on which to leave

ID	Name	NMRS	SMR	NGR	Status	Source	Class	Description
								messages for passing members, and were also used as safety boxes, equipped with sand buckets and fire extinguishers. Eventually, telephones were installed with the development of the national telecommunications network. This box is of the 1956 post-war pattern that was manufactured up until 1967. After 1967 sentry boxes were no longer produced. The designer of this box type is not known; however, the boxes were manufactured by Enham Industries, Alamein, Hampshire, a firm that employed disabled ex-servicemen. At the time of its original installation, this box would have had the AA's winged livery logo; however, boxes were re-badged after 1967 with the introduction of the company's new square logo. In the 1990s, a programme was instituted to return new square-logo badged boxes to the original winged livery, as at Threapland Wood. AA sentry boxes are now very rare. At one time there were approximately 1,000 in service but now there are only 21 remaining in all of Britain, of which eight are listed in England and one in Wales. This box at Threapland Wood is one of seven remaining AA sentry boxes in Scotland, of which six are listed.
3	Pittensair House	NJ26SE 106.0	NJ26SE0057	NJ 2822 6068	Category A Listed HBNum 15803	NMRS; SMR	Residential	Historic Scotland records that this mansion house dated 1735 was built by master

ID	Name	NMRS	SMR	NGR	Status	Source	Class	Description
								mason James Ogilvie for his own use.
4	Lhanbryde Burial Ground	NJ26SE 10.0	NJ26SE 0070	NJ 2715 6126	Category B Listed HBNum 15778	NMRS; SMR	Church and Burial Ground	Historic Scotland records that Lhanbryde burial ground comprises a square walled burial ground on hillside at the site of an earlier church. There are 16th, 17th, 18th century tombstones within the burial ground.
5	Lhanbryde Burial Ground, Innes Enclosure	NJ26SE 10.1	NJ26SE 0047	NJ 2717 6126	Category A Listed HBNum 15797	NMRS; SMR	Funerary Monument	Historic Scotland records that the Innes Enclosure is a 1612 grave slab commemorating Sir Alexander Innes of Coxton who died on 6 October 1612. The effigy, representing a member of the Innes family, is a rare survival. The effigy is of a medieval recumbant knight and bears two mural panels (probably re-set grave-slabs) dated 1580 and 1612.The enclosure itself is a square rubble walled burial enclosure, probably incorporating fragments of earlier church.
6	Larchfield	N/A	NJ26SE0034	NJ 2902 6093		SMR, Maps	Cropmark Enclosure	The SMR records a D shaped enclosure surrounded by a substantial ditch with a possible inner ditch. The site was recorded by aerial photography. Two buildings are recorded on the 1874 Ordnance Survey map at this location and it is possible that the cropmark is related to these buildings.