#### THE CLWYD-POWYS ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST

## Parc Afon Menai, Llanfairpwll, Anglesey

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

**CPAT Report No 657** 

**CPAT Report No 657** 

## Parc Afon Menai, Llanfairpwll, Anglesey

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

R Silvester October 2004

Report for JacobsGIBB Ltd

The Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust 7a Church Street, Welshpool, Powys, SY21 7DL tel (01938) 553670, fax (01938) 552179 © CPAT

#### **CONTENTS**

- 1 INTRODUCTION
- 2 LOCATION
- 3 DESKTOP STUDY
- 4 THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PARC AFON MENAI
- 5 MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS
- 6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
- 7 SOURCES
- Fig. 1 Parc Afon Menai: Proposed development area and known sites of archaeological and historic interest
- Fig. 2 The Tithe Survey of Llanfairpwllgwyngwll from 1842/3
- Fig. 3 The Ordnance Survey 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1:2500 map from 1900

#### **CPAT Report Record**

#### **Report and status**

CPAT Report Title Pa	Parc Afon Menai, Llanfairpwll, Anglesey. An Archaeological Assessment		
CPAT Project Name Pa	arc Afon Menai		
CPAT Project No 1	195	CPAT Report No 657	
Confidential (yes/no)	Yes	draft/final Final	

#### **Internal control**

	name	Signature	Date
prepared by	R.J. Silvester	2.5.5	25/08/2004
checked by	N Jones	1 10 mes	05/10/2004
approved by	R.J. Silvester	R. G. S.	05/10/2004

#### Revisions

no	date	made by	checked by	approved by

#### **Internal memo**

an an an tao an ann an State an tao an Anna an		

**The Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust** 7a Church Street Welshpool Powys SY21 7DL tel (01938) 553670, fax 552179 © CPAT

#### **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 In May 2004 the Field Services Section of the Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust (CPAT) was invited by JacobsGIBB Ltd of Cardiff on behalf of the Welsh Development Agency to prepare a specification and quotation for undertaking an archaeological assessment on land to the north-eastern edge of Llanfairpwllgwyngyll (henceforward shortened to Llanfairpwll) on the south flank of Anglesey (SH537723). The development area had been designated as Parc Afon Menai with a view to creating a business park there.
- 1.2 A design brief had been prepared for the work, to include both a desk-top assessment and a walkover survey, by the Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service. The quotation and specification was submitted to JacobGIBB Ltd on 24 May 2004, and accepted soon after. The specification also allowed for a watching brief while a series of trial pits were excavated, coupled with boreholes. Subsequently, in accordance with accepted practice and as requested, the specification was passed to the Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service for their consideration and was accepted by them as meeting the standard requirements for such work on 21 July 2004.
- 1.3 Later in July a change in the WDA's approach to the project was notified to CPAT, and they were requested by JacobsGIBB to scale down their work programme to a desk-top assessment only. By this time, too, scaled-down trial-pitting had taken place without reference to the archaeological watching brief requirement (Ian Farmer Associates 2004). It is not known at the time of writing as to whether these changes in approach were communicated to the curators, the Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service.

### 2 LOCATION

- 2.1 The area of the proposed assessment lies around the former hotel of Ty Mawr, immediately to the north-east of the A5 trunk road which here by-passes the village of Llanfairpwll in a wide loop. The village centre lies a few hundred metres to the south-west, and the village as a whole sits back a little from the north edge of the Menai Strait which itself lies on the northern side of the Menai Strait, close to where Pont Britannia crosses the narrow channel and a little more than four kilometres to the west of Bangor.
- 2.2 The development area is a greenfield site of approximately 18 hectares, according to JacobGIBB Ltd (but 20 hectares according to the Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service). It comprises a near rectangular group of fields with the former farm and then hotel of Ty Mawr at its centre. The A5 edges the site on the southwest and the A5025 forms its boundary on the south-east. Other land holdings border it to the north-west and the north-east.
- 2.3 Much of the land lies between 50 and 70m above sea level and is gently undulating.

#### **3 DESK-TOP STUDY**

3.1 A previous desk-top and walk over survey had been conducted by the Gwynedd Archaeological Trust for Morris Charlton Ltd in 1994 (Davidson and Flook 1994).

This revealed eleven sites of known or potential archaeological interest, including one scheduled ancient monument, in a slightly larger area than that currently earmarked for development. The present study draws heavily on this earlier work, not least because of the fieldwork that was undertaken there.

- 3.2 The present desk-top assessment involved the examination of readily available primary and secondary documentary material held by Regional Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) in Bangor backed by checks in the National Library of Wales in Aberystwyth, the National Monuments Record (NMR) held by the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments in Wales (RCAHMW) in Aberystwyth, and the Anglesey Archives in Llangefni. Cartographic sources were examined in those same repositories in Aberystwyth and Llangefni, and also in the archives of the University of Wales, Bangor. Aerial photographic sources were also consulted in the NMR.
- 3.3 Some of the known sites were given P(rimary) R(ecord) N(umbers), by the regional SMR held by the Gwynedd Archaeological Trust after the earlier, 1994 report was submitted to them, but many of the less significant sites were not treated in that way. New PRNs have now been allocated both to those sites and the small number of new sites identified during the current assessment. However, for ease of reference and to avoid any confusion the same sequence of consecutive numbers from 01 to 11 that was allocated in 1994 have been retained for the present study, and extended to cover the small number of new sites. To avoid any confusion, PRNs are referred to only in Appendix 1, except in the circumstances detailed in para 3.4.
- 3.4 All the recognised sites are described briefly in Appendix 1 of this report where they are listed according to their sequential number. PRNs, where known, appear in the text that follows for those sites which lie beyond the immediate environs of Parc Afon Menai but are relevant to the general appreciation of the archaeology of the area.

#### 4 THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PARC AFON MENAI

Site no	Name	NGR	Cat.	Site type	Site date
01	Ty Mawr burial chamber	SH53877216	A	Burial Chamber	Prehistoric
02	Ty Mawr stone steps	SH53667227	D	Steps	Post Medieval
03	Ty Mawr blocked gateway	SH53457235	D	Gateway	Post Medieval
04	Ty Mawr slate stile	SH53437236	D	Stile	Post Medieval
05	Ty Mawr holloway	SH53607248	C	Hollow Way	Post Medieval
06	Ty Mawr L-shaped feature	SH53637253	E	Earthwork	Unknown
07	Ty Mawr cropmark site I	SH53727251	E	Cropmark	Unknown
08	Ty Mawr cropmark site II	SH53887268	Е	Cropmark	Unknown
09	Slate tank	SH53887268	D	Tank	Post Medieval
10	Tan-y-bryn	SH53817247	C	Building	Post Medieval ?
11	Ty Mawr additional complex	SH53747241	С	Building	Post Medieval?
12	Ty Mawr	SH53687234	Е	Building	Post Medieval
13	Tyddyn y Berth	SH53647223	E	Placename	Post Medieval ?
14	Hendy head	SH54087252	E	Findspot	Unknown

#### Table1 Known sites within and close to the development area

Prehistoric

- 4.1.1 The earliest known feature on the site is the Ty Mawr Neolithic passage grave (site no 01). Despite the fact that only the chamber remains while the passage and the cairn that encapsulated it has gone, the importance of the site is recognised by its statutory designation as a scheduled monument of national importance (SAM An037).
- 4.1.2 This megalithic chamber is the most obvious manifestation of prehistoric activity in the development area, although it is reasonable to assume that in such a potential favourable location other traces of prehistoric settlement and occupation may well exist below turf level. The original report flagged up the presence, in this general area on the southern side of Anglesey, of other finds and sites from the Neolithic era onwards, particularly around Castellior less than two kilometres to the north-east, and by undated field systems, putatively of the later prehistoric period to the southeast, and to this might be added a Neolithic axe (PRN 2705) found in Llanfairpwll.
- 4.1.3 The Hendy head (site no 14) was for many years cemented onto the top of a garden wall at Hendy, the farm immediately to the north-east of Ty Mawr. It was generally thought to have come from somewhere on or close to the farm, and perhaps represent a local Celtic deity, allowing the important possibility that there was an Iron Age (and thus late prehistoric) shrine in the vicinity (Lynch 1991, 316). Recent thinking, however, seems a little more ambivalent about a direct connection with the area around Hendy (Ross 2001, 152), and there is even a belief in some quarters that the head is not late prehistoric but could be medieval in origin.
- 4.1.4 That a round hut with accompanying enclosure (Site no 07) lies within the development area is at present only a possibility. Confirmation may come only from

excavation but, if authentic, could reveal late prehistoric or perhaps even Roman activity on the site.

#### Roman

4.2.1 The earlier report pointed out that there was no Roman material from the development area or it immediate environs, but that excavations in the Castellior area had identified Roman occupation at no great distance from Parc Afon Menai.

#### Medieval

- 4.3.1 In the historic era there can be little doubt that the area was both farmed and probably settled, but physical traces of this period are presently sparse. The area lay within the Commote of Dindaethwy in the Cantref of Rhosyr, and appears to have been a part of the extensive landholdings of the Bishop of Bangor in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. But whether any of the building locations carry traces of earlier, medieval activity is unknown.
- 4.3.2 Further to the south, one cottage or smallholding is depicted on earlier Ordnance Survey maps as Dryll-y-bowl (but has now been obliterated by a housing estate). The prefix *dryll* is potentially significant as an indicator of medieval open-field cultivation, and it is thus quite possible although it remains unproven that this general area was so farmed in the Middle Ages.

#### Post Medieval

- 4.4.1 In later centuries, after 1500, the land appears to have been acquired by the Plas Llanfair estate. The first detailed documentation shows the land in the ownership of Thomas Williams, whose wealth was based on the copper industry and who purchased land on a large scale in the late eighteenth century. Ty Mawr land was still owned by the same family in the mid nineteenth century, when the recorded owner was his grandson, Thomas Frees Williams.
- 4.4.2 The age of the house at Ty Mawr (site no 12) has not been established. Documents in the Anglesey Record Office provide a limited amount of information about 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>-century owners or occupiers of Ty Mawr, and its value, but nothing apparently on its origins and development. It was certainly in place by the time of the first large-scale Ordnance Survey maps in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century but, while the Tithe map is completely unhelpful, an undated estate map of an adjacent holding which can probably be attributed to the early 19<sup>th</sup> century if not the late 18<sup>th</sup> century does depict the site (site no 12), together with what might be assumed to be an ancillary building, perhaps a barn (site no 13), but not in the detail that would have permitted a more specific interpretation. Because of copyright constraints it is not possible to reproduce this map in the report.
- 4.4.3 The late 17<sup>th</sup> century onwards seems to reflect the period when many of the present houses and farmsteads in this part of Anglesey were constructed, although earlier examples are known. Such an attribution is reasonable for the ruined site at Tan-y-bryn, but by no means certain.
- 4.4.4 Likewise many of the less dramatic elements in the landscape the gateway (site no 03), the stile (site no 04) and probably even the holloway (site no 05)– are also likely to be post-medieval, typical features of an area that will have witnessed continuing development over the centuries.

#### CPAT Report No 657

4.4.5 With the field boundaries, themselves, there can be less certainty as to their origin. The 1994 report noted that the most common type of field boundary in development area was the drystone wall, usually coupled with an adjacent thorn hedge, but that there were also examples of stone-faced banks, often topped by modem fencing. However, the modern pattern of reasonably regularly-shaped fields which can certainly be traced back on the early Ordnance Survey maps at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, finds less coincidence on the updated estate map which depicts a somewhat more irregular pattern. The precision in accuracy of this earlier map is in doubt, but overall the pattern is less regular and the implication is that some of the present boundaries were introduced in the 19<sup>th</sup> century on new alignments.

#### Conclusions

4.5 Parc Afon Menai occupies gently sloping ground in a part of Anglesey which has seen considerable settlement and other activity since the Neolithic six thousand years or more ago, and given the nature of farming activity, it is in no way surprising that much of what is currently discernible is of more recent, post-medieval date. Surveys in adjacent parts of Anglesey tend to confirm that remains exist or are likely to exist in any such areas of comparable size and that from an historic viewpoint what is hidden beneath the turf may be as significant as what survives above it.

#### 5 MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Site Categories

5.1.1 Each site of archaeological interest, identified during the desktop and earlier field surveys, has been provisionally classified according to its perceived significance as it appears to us at present. The categories are those given in the Cadw: Welsh Historic Monuments draft *Archaeology and the Trunk Road Programme in Wales: a Manual of Best Practice.* These are based in turn - with the exception of Category E - on those given in the Department of Environment, Transport and Regions' *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges* Volume 11 Section 3 Part 2 (1993). Category E (also termed category U in the classifications adopted in some comparable reports) has been introduced to cover archaeological sites and monuments whose existence went unacknowledged in the Design Manual.

i) Category A sites are those which are considered by CPAT to be of primary significance, either potentially of national importance or already designated by Cadw: Welsh Historic Monuments as being of scheduled ancient monument status and thus of national importance. It is presumed that sites in this category will be preserved and protected *in situ* and that their setting may also be a material consideration.

ii) Category B sites are sites of regional importance. These sites are not of sufficient importance to justify scheduling, but are nevertheless important in aiding the understanding and interpretation of the archaeology of the region. Preservation *in situ* is the preferred option for such sites, but if loss or damage is unavoidable, appropriate detailed recording should be undertaken

iii) Category C sites are seen as sites of local importance. These sites are of lesser importance, but are nevertheless useful in aiding the understanding and interpretation of the archaeology of the local area. They are not normally of sufficient importance to justify preservation if threatened, but they do merit adequate recording in advance of loss or damage.

iv) Category D sites are either sites of minor importance or those which are so badly damaged that too little now remains to justify their inclusion in a higher grade. Rapid recording is usually considered sufficient in the event that such sites are threatened by development.

v) *Category E* sites are sites which have been identified, but whose importance cannot be assessed from the desk-top study alone. An archaeological evaluation would generally be required to categorise such a site more accurately if the proposal was likely to affect it in any way.

#### **Terminology**

5.2 The following standard archaeological terms are used as recommended mitigation measures. Some though not necessarily all are adopted in the section that follows.

i) Preservation in situ: where a site is considered to be of sufficient significance it may be considered appropriate to preserve the site in its present form, condition and location.

ii) Preservation by record: where proposals will inevitably lead to the loss of a site, sufficient recording should be undertaken to provide a full, accurate and permanent record of its nature, form, significance and dating. Preservation by record can take a number of forms, depending on the nature of the site in question, and may be achieved with or without excavation and could include any or all of the following: written record; drawn record; photographic record; artefactual record; survey and environmental sampling.

iii) Evaluation: where insufficient information exists for a decision to be made regarding an archaeological sites future management, a programme of investigative work may be proposed. Such investigation may include geophysical survey, topographical survey and trial excavation.

iv) Watching brief: may be recommended to include archaeological monitoring of all relevant groundworks, including topsoiling, in order to identify and record any previously unknown archaeological remains which may be revealed. Sufficient time should be allowed for adequate recording of any remains that are encountered.

v) Landscape assessment: where a proposed development occurs within an area designated as a landscape of historic interest in either of the two published Registers of historic landscapes (Cadw 1998; Cadw 2001), an assessment known as an Assessment of the Significance of Impact of Development on Historic Landscape Areas (ASIDOHL) should be conducted (Cadw 2003). Where a proposed development occurs outside any of the designated areas an ASIDOHL may still be advisable, depending on the scale of the development.

vi) Visual mitigation and setting. Visual impact is to some degree a subjective element of any assessment, if only because of personal perceptions, but should be taken into consideration, at the least, for significant monuments. Setting is deemed to be a material consideration for scheduled ancient monuments under the *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act* (1979), and by extension those monuments that are of similar significance but not scheduled. Planning Policy Wales, section 6.5.1 (2002) notes that .. 'the desirability of preserving an ancient monument and its setting is a material consideration in determining a planning application, whether that monument is scheduled or unscheduled'. Mitigation measures for scheduled sites should be identified by direct contact (consultation)

between the development agency and Cadw and/or other organizations involved directly in the preservation and protection of the historic environment is recommended as being beneficial.

Site no	Name	NGR	Cat.	Impact	Mitigation
01	Ty Mawr burial chamber	SH53877216	A	Potential direct impact	Appropriate planning
				Visual impact	Consultation
02	Ty Mawr stone steps	SH53667227	D	Potential direct impact	Preservation by record
03	Ty Mawr blocked gateway	SH53457235	D	Potential direct impact	Preservation by record
04	Ty Mawr slate stile	SH53437236	D	Potential direct impact	Preservation by record
05	Ty Mawr holloway	SH53607248	C	Potential direct impact	Preservation by record
06	Ty Mawr L-shaped feature	SH53637253	E	Potential direct impact	Evaluation
07	Ty Mawr cropmark site I	SH53727251	E	Potential direct impact	Evaluation
10	Tan-y-bryn	SH53817247	C	Potential direct impact	Preservation by record
11	Ty Mawr additional complex	SH53747241	C	Potential direct impact	Preservation by record
12	Ty Mawr	SH53687234	E	Potential direct impact	Assessment
13	Tyddyn y Berth	SH53647223	E	Potential impact	Fieldwork assessment
	Field boundaries		E	Potential impact	Preservation by record

Table 2 Known sites within the development area: recommended mitigation

- 5.3 In the absence of detailed plans of the proposed development it would be premature to identify specific mitigation for each archaeological and historical feature where a potential impact is predicted.
- 5.4 The Ty Mawr burial chamber requires particular consideration because of its scheduled status, not simply because of any potential physical impact on the monument and on and the immediate surrounding area which is also protected, but also because setting which may be taken to include a visual component is a material consideration under the 1979 Act.
- 5.5 At least two sites will require an evaluation before their true nature and significance can be ascertained.
- 5.6 Eight sites need some level of recording before any development takes place that could result in their damage or destruction.
- 5.7 A programme of recording should be initiated for field boundaries before they are removed.

#### CPAT Report No 657

- 5.8 The visible archaeology within the development area is likely to represent only a fraction, albeit an unknown fraction, of the total archaeological resource. The area has probably seen considerable, if intermittent, agricultural activity over the centuries, one effect of which will have been to level out the remains of past activity, leaving features intact at subsoil level and cultural material in the ploughsoil, but nothing visible on the surface. Other past activity at the time of initiation may have left little surface trace, but traces below the surface.
- 5.9 To identify these buried remnants, there are a variety of approaches. None is guaranteed to produce a positive result, but some or even all are worth trying in order to resolve an otherwise insuperable problem. With the exception of the watching brief, all need to be implemented before the commencement of on-site construction works.
- 5.9.1 *Trial trenching*. Regular trenches excavated within the development area in anticipation that say a 5% sample may reveal some of what exists at subsoil level.
- 5.9.2 *Geophysics*. Conducted over much of the area to determine whether sub-surface anomalies are apparent; the results may be dependent not only on the presence of the archaeology but also on the susceptibility of the soils to produce good results.
- 5.9.3 *Fieldwalking*. Cultural material tends to get 'captured' in the ploughsoil, and consequently this material may be collected from the surface of cultivated fields under the right conditions and give a guide to earlier activity on the site. Forward planning is needed because 'windows of opportunity' for successful fieldwalking are usually limited to the winter and spring months, and of course the approach will only be feasible if any of the development area is under cultivation.
- 5.9.4 *Watching brief.* Undertaken during topsoil stripping at the beginning of the on-site works. This is not ideal because of the difficulties in detecting features that have been obscured by the passage of machines. Furthermore in the event that something of significance is identified, arrangements need to be made for time to investigate it.
- 5.9.5 The archaeological curator in consultation with the client may determine which of these approaches should be adopted for the development area.

Site no	Name	NGR	Cat.	Impact	Mitigation
08	Ty Mawr cropmark site II	SH53887268	E	None under present proposals	None required
09	Slate tank	SH53887268	D	None under present proposals	None required
14	Hendy head	SH54087252	Е	None under present proposals	None required

Table 3 Known sites close to the development area: recommended mitigation

#### 6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

6.1 The writer would like to thank the staff of the regional SMR in Bangor, the National Monument Record in Aberystwyth, the National Library of Wales, the Anglesey Record Office and the archives of the University of Wales, Bangor for the provision of material and general assistance.

#### 7 SOURCES

#### **Printed**

Davidson, A and Flook, H, 1994, *Ty Mawr Leisure Comlex, Llanfairpwllgwyngyll* (GAT 1191) Bangor: Gwynedd Archaeological Trust

GAT, 1993, A5 Anglesey Improvements Stage 1, west of Llanfairpwllgwyngyll to A5114 Nant Turnpike Bangor: Gwynedd Archaeological Trust (Report no 70).

Ian Farmer Associates, 1994, Draft report on test pits at Parc Afon Menai

Lynch, F, 1991, Prehistoric Anglesey, Llangefni: Anglesey Antiquarian Society

Roberts, R M and Davidson, A, 1995, *Menai Bridge – Treborth Sewer Rising Main*, Bangor: Gwynedd Archaeological Trust (Report no 170).

Ross, A, 2001, Folklore of Wales, Stroud: Tempus Publishing Ltd

#### Cartographic

19th Century Estate Map. University of Wales, Bangor archives: Misc 3/159

- 1834/5 Ordnance Survey surveyors' drawing Sheet
- 1842/3 Tithe Survey of Llanfairpwllgwyngwll
- 1889 Ordnance Survey 1<sup>st</sup> edition 1:2500 map. Anglesey 19.10
- 1900 Ordnance Survey 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1:2500 map. Anglesey 19.10

#### Vertical Aerial Photography

RAF/106G/UK/655 32025-3026	13/08/1945
RAF/CPE/UK/1939 4166-4169	19/01/1947
OS 71/163/244-145 From 11,100'	04/05/1971
OS 71/284/163-164 From 11,100'	04/05/1971
OS 95/583/192-193 From 4100'	24/06/1995

### **Appendix 1**

Site noPRNNameNGRSite typeSite period012693Ty Mawr Burial chamberSH53877216Burial ChamberPrehistoricThe collapsed remains of a Neolithic passage grave consisting of a massive capstone with one uprightin situ, two others that have fallen and several other stones. The remains are spread over about 3.5meast to west by 4m north to south, but the surrounding mound has gone. It is a scheduled ancientmonument, the protected area being larger than the visible remains.stitutescheduled

0218371Ty Mawr stone stepsSH53667227StepsPost MedievalA series of stone steps have been incorporated into a wall, and linkTy Mawr with an abandonedfootpath to Bryn Eira. First identified during the original survey in 1994, so the present state of thisfeature is not known.

**03 18372 Ty Mawr blocked gateway SH53457235 Gateway Post Medieval** Three upright stones, two of them originally gateposts, mark the entrance into a field, though it is now blocked off. First identified during the original survey in 1994, so the present state of this feature is not known.

0418373Ty Mawr slate stileSH53437236StilePost MedievalA number of cut slate slabs have been set in the wall at angles, and may possibly represent a crudestile. First identified during the original survey in 1994, so the present state of this feature is notknown.

**05 18374 Ty Mawr holloway SH53607248 Hollow Way Post Medieval** A holloway connected the Ty Mawr/Tan-y-bryn complex with Llain Siglan to the north-west. It was marked on early large-scale Ordnance and also more clearly on the undated estate map. The original survey in 1994 reported that it had been partly filled in to create a throughway from one field to another, nut that near Ty Mawr the edges of the trackway were well defined by steepish banks, walled in places, and topped with fairly large trees. At the south-eastern end the track widened out into a funnel-shaped area.

**06 18375 Ty Mawr L-shaped feature SH53637253 Earthwork Unknown** An L-shaped feature was identified during the survey of 1994 as a break in the slope forming a distinct and large anomaly, perhaps natural. It alos shows on some aerial photographs where it looks more like a smlall rectangular enclosure within the field system. It may, on the other hand be related to one of the cropmark sites listed below (site no 7).

**07 5759 Ty Mawr cropmark site I SH53727251 Cropmark Unknown** A large round feature was identified on aerial photographs during the 1994 study, as did a smaller round feature to the west of it. Possibly this could represent a hut with a circular enclosure, though it might also be a natural feature.

085760Ty Mawr cropmark site IISH53887268CropmarkUnknownThis possible circular enclosure showed up on aerial photography examined in 1994, but was not<br/>visible on the ground. The field wall appears to bend round the enclosure. The feature is just outside<br/>the proposed development area.

0918376Slate tankSH53887268TankPost MedievalA slate tank used as a drinking trough. There are two others set in the next field (belonging to Hendy),<br/>alongside a small enclosure containing an old hand pump.Post Medieval

# Site noPRNNameNGRSite typeSite period1018377Tan-y-brynSH53817247BuildingPost MedievalRemains of a small-holding known as Tan-y-bryn. The main dwelling has lost its roof, but one gable

still stood to a height of approximately 4m in 1994. The building comprised two rooms, the northern one appearing to be an addition with a small fireplace set in the wall. The main part of the building has a much more substantial fireplace with a sloping chimney breast. Three associated outbuildings, marked on the 1900 Ordnance Survey map had gone, although the boundary around the complex was still visible on the ground as a slightly raised ridge. The trackway from Tan-y-bryn to Ty Mawr was still visible, although much overgrown.

1118378Ty Mawr additional complexSH53747241BuildingPost MedievalThe 1994 report defined an area to the north of Ty Mawr containing the remains of two smallbuildings and a number of associated enclosures, with a stream running through them. The buildings<br/>are depicted on early large-scale Ordnance Survey maps, but no name is given to them, suggesting a<br/>subsidiary and minor function. One of the buildings is also shown on the undated estate map and<br/>reinforces the view that it was an ancillary structure to Ty Mawr.

The holloway (site 5) entered the area and extended into a funnel-shaped enclosure, its entrance marked by two large stone gateposts. The stream ran through this area, with a bridge carrying a track over it from Ty Mawr into the adjacent field. In the field west of the enclosure and constructed in the corner was what appeared to be the remains of a purpose built duck pond, with small holes through the field walls for access. There were two outbuildings associated with the area.

The largest building was a small rectangular structure, with a south gable still standing. The north end has been altered, and the present wall was a later insertion and in a bad state of repair. There was a window in the standing gable end and the remains of a smaller window in the west wall, whilst in the east wall was a doorway. There was evidence of an upper floor, holes for floor joists being clearly visible in the tall gable end.

The second building, of which one wall and part of a small entrance remained, was built against a steep rocky outcrop east of, and across the track to, the building previously described. Its function was unclear.

1218379Ty MawrSH53687234BuildingPost MedievalNo information is available on the present building complex at Ty Mawr. There is nothing to indicatethat it has been listed, and it was not referred to in the previous report compiled in 1994. EarlyOrdnance Survey maps reveal a complex of buildings and enclosures here, as well as associatedfeatures such as ponds, while an undated estate map, probably of later 18th century or earlier 19th-century dateimplies an axially-long building with an extension. No statement can be made on thedate, development or appearance of the building.

1318380Tyddyn y BerthSH53647223PlacenamePost MedievalWhile the name, Tyddyn y Berth, was also given to a smallholding further to the south which now lies<br/>under Llanfairpwll, its appearance on an undated but 19th-century (or slightly earlier) estate map,<br/>hints that there may have been a house or cottage here.Placename

142720Hendy headSH54087252FindspotUnknownThe carved stone head, which for many years comprised part of the garden wall at Hendy, has<br/>variously been considered late prehistoric or medieval. The head is carved from a sandstone block and<br/>has a small hole drilled in one side of the mouth and a flattened head. The head is now on permanent<br/>display in Oriel Ynys Mon.



CPAT Report No 657



Fig 2 The Tithe Survey of Llanfairpwllgwyngwll from 1842/3. The approximate location of the present Ty Mawr is shown by the circle



