Centre for Archaeology Report 86/2001

Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Hallgarth Manor Cottages, Hallgarth, Pittington, Co Durham

R E Howard, Dr R R Laxton and Dr C D Litton

© English Heritage 2001

ISSN 1473-9224

The Centre for Archaeology Reports Series incorporates the former Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report Series. Copies of Ancient Monuments Laboratory Reports will continue to be available from the Centre for Archaeology (see back of cover for details). Centre for Archaeology Report 86/2001

Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Hallgarth Manor Cottages, Hallgarth, Pittington, Co Durham

R E Howard¹, Dr R R Laxton² and Dr C D Litton²

Summary

Twenty samples were obtained from the roof of numbers 1 and 3 Hallgarth Manor Cottages (number 2 being unavailable for sampling), and analysed by dendrochronology.

This analysis produced two site chronologies. The first site chronology, consisting of seventeen samples, has 289 rings spanning the period AD 1336 - AD 1624. Interpretation of the sapwood would indicate that the timbers of number 1 Hallgarth Manor Cottage, the southern cottage, have an estimated felling date in the range AD 1660 - 70. The timbers of number 3, the northern cottage, are earlier, having an estimated felling date in the range AD 1565 - 70.

The second site chronology consists of two samples having 125 rings. This site chronology cannot be dated, but there are structural reasons to believe that the timbers represented are of a different, probably later, phase of felling.

Keywords

Dendrochronology Standing Buildings

Authors' addresses

¹University Of Nottingham, Archaeology Department, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD. ²University Of Nottingham, Department of Mathematics, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD,

Many CfA reports are interim reports which make available the results of specialist investigations in advance of full publication. They are not subject to external refereeing, and their conclusions may sometimes have to be modified in the light of archaeological information that was not available at the time of the investigation. Readers are therefore advised to consult the author before citing the report in any publication and to consult the final excavation report when available.

Opinions expressed in CfA reports are those of the author and are not necessarily those of English Heritage.

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM HALLGARTH MANOR COTTAGES, HALLGARTH PITTINGTON, CO DURHAM

Introduction

Hallgarth Manor, Hallgarth Pittington (NZ 328 437; Fig 1), is a large agricultural site and although its date is uncertain, it is probably of ancient origin. It may be a survivor of the medieval monastic manor house and grange farm belonging to the Priory of Durham Cathedral, which developed north of the Church of St Lawrence, which itself dates from the eleventh century. The surviving monastic records show considerable building activity here and indicate a large farm group attached to a manor house; works to over thirty different buildings or parts of buildings are mentioned. A plan of the site and the surrounding area is provided in Figure 2.

In AD 1550 the site was described as comprising two back courts and a front court. The front court was occupied by the principal manorial hall, whilst the back courts would have been enclosed by the farm buildings.

Of particular interest to this report is a single-storey range of three cottages, standing in what would have been one of the back courts. The site history and evidence of the roof structure suggest that this building is a rare survivor of the Prior's estate farm. It may have been a barn, but its small size, as originally built, suggests it may have had an unknown agricultural function. Given the greater survival of the larger barns, its small size gives this building a greater rarity value.

The three cottages reveal an almost complete roof structure, with only the north and south gable trusses missing. The building comprises nine bays of eight trusses, the southern four trusses having carpenters marks I - IIII running consecutively from north to south, while the northern four trusses are numbered I - IIII running consecutively from south to north. It is thus suggested that the building began as a five-bay structure, enlarged later to nine bays by being added to on the south side.

Sampling and analysis by tree-ring dating was commissioned by English Heritage, the purpose of this being to inform a listing proposal. Evidence from the roof trusses suggests that the building is a very rare late medieval agricultural survival and its dating and chronological development are important for the wider significance of the site.

The Laboratory would like to take this opportunity to thank Michael Phillips of number 1 Hallgarth Manor Cottages, and Frances Clough of number 3, for allowing sampling and for their enthusiasm for the project. We would also like to thank Martin Roberts of English Heritage North East Region for arranging access and for assisting during sampling, and for providing notes used in the above introduction.

Sampling

The site was divided into three separate cottages, only two of which, those at either end, numbers 1 and 3, were accessible at the time of sampling. The timbers of the middle cottage, number 2, were not available for sampling. Only three trusses were available in number 1, the southern cottage, and only two trusses available in number 3, the northern cottage. For the purposes of identification in this report the trusses have been numbered 1 - 8 from south to north. A simple plan of the cottages is given in Figure 3.

Thus, from the timbers available a total of twenty core samples was taken. Each sample was given the code PIT-A (for Pittington, site "A"), and numbered 01 - 20. Ten samples, PIT-A01 - 10, were obtained from trusses 1-3 in the southern cottage (Cottage number 1) with a further ten samples, PIT-A11 - 20, being taken from trusses 7 and 8 in the northern cottage (number 3). The positions of these samples are marked on sketch drawings made by Martin Roberts and provided by English Heritage. These are reproduced here as Figures 4a-e. Details of the samples are given in Table 1.

<u>Analysis</u>

Each of the twenty samples was prepared by sanding and polishing and their growth-ring widths measured. These were then compared with each other by the Litton/Zainodin grouping procedure and at a minimum *t*-value of 4.5 two groups of samples formed. Sixteen samples from trusses in both the sampled cottages cross-matched with each other at relative positions as shown in the bar diagram Figure 5. The growth-ring widths of these sixteen samples were combined at these relative off-set positions to form PITASQ01, a site chronology of 289 rings. Site chronology PITASQ01 was compared with a series of relevant reference chronologies for oak, giving it a first ring date of AD 1336 and a last measured ring date of AD 1624. Evidence for this dating is given in the *t*-values of Table 2.

The second group to form at a *t*-value of 4.5 consists of two samples, PIT-A06 and A07, both from struts in trusses 1 and 2 respectively. These cross-match with each other at positions as shown in the bar diagram of Figure 6. The growth-ring widths of these two samples were combined at these relative off-set positions to form PITASQ02, a site chronology of 125 rings. Site chronology PITASQ02 was compared with a series of relevant reference chronologies for oak, but there was no satisfactory cross-matching at any position and these samples must remain undated. Interestingly there is structural evidence, by way of differences to the joints of these timbers with the tiebeams and rafters, to suggest that they might not be of the same phase of felling as all the other timbers.

For the purpose of checking each site sequence was compared with the other, and with the remaining single ungrouped sample, PIT-A16, but there was no further satisfactory cross-matching. Sample PIT-A16 was compared individually with the reference chronologies but again there was no further satisfactory cross-matching.

Interpretation and conclusion

The bar diagram of site chronology PITASQ01 in Figure 5 strongly suggests that there are two quite distinct phases of felling represented in the timbers of this building; there is a distinct step or time-gap between the last rings of one group of samples and the last rings of the other. The earliest heartwood/sapwood boundary of the later group of timbers is at relative position 269, on sample PIT-A04. The latest heartwood/sapwood boundary on the earlier group of timbers is only at relative position 209, on sample PIT-A12. This is a minimum difference of 60 years and it is very unlikely to be accounted for by a very large number of sapwood rings in the early group of timbers and a very small number of sapwood rings in the later group. Furthermore, each phase of felling is related distinctly to the two phases of construction proposed by the carpenters marks on the timbers, with the timbers of each distinct group all being felled at the same time.

The earliest phase of felling is represented by the cross-matched samples (A11 - 20) entirely from the timbers of the northern cottage, number 3, that is, trusses 7 and 8. The average last heartwood ring date on these samples is AD 1538. Using a 95% confidence limit of 15 - 40 rings for the amount of sapwood on mature oaks from northern England would give these timbers an estimated felling date in the range AD 1553 - 78 (Howard *et al* 1996a).

However, one sample, PIT-A19 (last ring date AD 1537), was obtained from a timber that had complete sapwood, that is, it had the last growth-ring produced by the tree from which the timber was taken, before it was felled. Although this sapwood was lost in coring, observations and estimates made on site at the time of sampling suggest that the lost portion represented approximately 30 sapwood rings. On the basis of this, and allowing for a modest five year margin of error, it is estimated that the felling of the timber represented, and indeed all the other timbers from this phase of construction, took place in the range, say, AD 1565 - 70. It will be seen that this date lies within the estimated felling date range based on the 95% confidence limit for the number of sapwood rings.

The later phase of felling is represented by the cross-matched samples (A01 - 10) entirely from the timbers of the southern cottage, number 1, trusses 1 - 3. The average last heartwood ring date on these samples is AD 1616. Using the same sapwood estimate as above, 15 - 40 rings, would give these timbers an estimated felling date in the range AD 1631 - 56.

Again, however, one sample, PIT-A09, last ring date AD 1624, was obtained from a timber that had complete sapwood. Although this sapwood was also lost in coring, observations and estimates made at the time of sampling suggest that the lost portion represented approximately 40 sapwood rings. On the basis of this loss of sapwood greater than that observed on sample PIT-A19, and thus perhaps requiring a wider margin of error, it is estimated that the felling of the timber represented took place in the range, say, AD 1660 - 70. Given the relative positions of the heartwood/sapwood boundaries on the other samples of this phase this is likely to be the felling date of the other timbers also.

It will be seen that this date, AD 1660 - 70, lies outside the estimated felling date range based on the 95% confidence limit for the number of sapwood rings, AD 1631 - 56. This well illustrates the point that such felling dates ranges are only estimates and that some groups of timbers have a number of sapwood rings greater than the 95% confidence limit.

It thus appears that we do indeed have two phases of construction represented in these cottages. The first is in the mid- to later sixteenth century, the second in the mid- to late seventeenth-century. This supports the suggestion based on structural evidence that the northern structure was later extended

Two observations might be made about the timbers. The first is the number of rings they contain. In many cases these are close to and in one case, in excess of 200. The timbers, while substantial are not particularly large and they must represent trees that were close to 250 years of age when felled. Such an age at felling for oak trees may be considered unusual for the late sixteenth, and particularly the seventeenth centuries when demand for timber meant that trees tended to be felled when younger than this.

The second observation considers the cross-matching between samples. The highest cross-matching occurs between samples of the same felling phase, ie between samples PIT-A01 – 10 and between samples PIT-A11 – 20, rather than between the samples from the two groups. While an exception to this could be found it might suggest that the two sets of timbers are from two separate woods. However, the reduced degree of cross-matching between samples from the two different groups may reflect that they have shorter overlaps.

Bibliography

Baillie, M G L, and Pilcher, J R, 1982 unpubl A master tree-ring chronology for England, unpubl computer file MGB-EOI, Queens Univ, Belfast

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1988 unpubl site chronology for Seaton Holme, Easington, Co Durham, unpubl computer file *EASASQ10*, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1991 List 39 nos 2a, 10 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory results, *Vernacular Architect*, 22, 40 - 3

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University, Thornes, R, and Hook, R, Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, 1992 List 47 no 3 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: Truncated principal trusses project, *Vernacular Architect*, 23, 59 - 61

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University, and Hook, R, Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, 1993 List 50 no 4 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: RCHME joint northern medieval roofs survey, *Vernacular Architect*, 24, 45 - 6

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University, 1996a Lists 65-8 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: sapwood estimates, *Vernacular Architect*, 27, 90

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University, Roberts, M, North East Vernacular Architecture Group, 1996b List 67 no 1 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: Buildings of the religious estates in medieval Durham; dendrochronological survey, 1994 - 5, Vernacular Architect, 27, 85 - 6

Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1988 An East Midlands master tree-ring chronology and its use for dating vernacular buildings, University of Nottingham, Dept of Classical and Archaeol Studies, Monograph Series, III

Table 1: Details of samples from Hallgarth Manor Cottages, Hallgarth Pittington, Co Durham

Sample number	Sample location	Total rings	*Sapwood rings	First measured ring date	Last heartwood ring date	Last measured ring date	
	Southern cottage	U	U	Ū	Ū.	U U	
PIT-A01	Tiebeam, truss 3	177	h/s	AD 1443	AD 1619	AD 1619	
PIT-A02	Tiebeam, truss 2	167	h/s	AD 1445	AD 1611	AD 1611	
PIT-A03	Tiebeam, truss 1	175	h/s	AD 1443	AD 1617	AD 1617	
PIT-A04	Collar, truss 3	75	h/s	AD 1530	AD 1604	AD 1604	
PIT-A05	Lower west purlin, truss 1-2	102	h/s	AD 1520	AD 1621	AD 1621	
PIT-A06	East strut, truss 1	61	h/s	Sile and Arts and the	*****	****	
PIT-A07	West strut, truss 2	118	no h/s	24 M2 W W W W	******		
PIT-A08	East rafter, truss 1	110	h/s	AD 1501	AD 1610	AD 1610	
PIT-A09	Upper west purlin, truss 3-4	156	h/s(+40C)	AD 1469	AD 1624	AD 1624	
PIT-A10	Lower west purlin, truss 3-4	186	h/s	AD 1438	AD 1623	AD 1623	
	Northern cottage						
PIT-A 11	Lower west purlin, truss 8-north gable	203	h/s	AD 1336	AD 1538	AD 1538	
PIT-A12	Tiebeam, truss 8	169	h/s	AD 1376	AD 1544	AD 1544	
PIT-A13	Tiebeam, truss 7	147	h/s	AD 1392	AD 1538	AD 1538	
PIT-A14	West strut, truss 8	136	h/s	AD 1401	AD 1536	AD 1536	
PIT-A15	Upper west purlin, truss 8-north gable	119	h/s	AD 1418	AD 1536	AD 1536	
PIT-A16	East strut, truss 7	56	no h/s	***		***==*	
PIT-A17	East strut, truss 8	77	h/s	AD 1465	AD 1541	AD 1541	
PIT-A18	Upper east purlin, truss 7-8	91	h/s	AD 1453	AD 1543	AD 1543	
PIT-A19	Lower west purlin, truss 7-8	173	h/s(+30C)	AD 1365	AD 1537	AD 1537	
PIT-A20	Collar truss 8	75	h/s	AD 1461	AD 1535	AD 1535	

*h/s = the heartwood/sapwood boundary is the last ring on the sample (+nC) = the sapwood is complete on the timber but all or part of this has been lost from the sample; the approximate number of sapwood rings lost is estimated

Table 2: Results of the cross-matching of site chronology PITASQ01 and relevant reference chronologies when first ring date is AD 1336 and last ring date is AD 1624

Reference chronology	Span of chronology	t-value				
East Midlands	AD 882 1981	7.7	(Laxton and Litton 1988)			
England	AD 401 - 1981	9.4	(Baillie and Pilcher 1982 unpubl)			
Seaton Holme, Co Durham	AD 1375 - 1489	9.4	(Howard et al 1988 unpubl)			
35 The Close, Newcastle	AD 1365-1513	11.7	(Howard <i>et al</i> 1991)			
Nether Levens Hall, Cumbria	AD 1395 - 1541	7.4	(Howard et al 1991)			
1-2 The College, Durham	AD 1364 – 1531	10.6	(Howard et al 1992)			
Ingleby Greenhow, N Yorks	AD 1429-1563	7.3	(Howard et al 1993)			
Kepier Hospital, Durham	AD 1304 - 1522	10.5	(Howard et al 1996b)			



Figure 1: Map to show general location of Hallgarth Manor

© Crown Copyright and database right 2013. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100024900







trus	s I tru:	ss 2 tru:	ss 3 tru	iss 4 trùi	ss 5 trus	is 6 trus:	s 7 truss	8
	No	b. 1		No	1		No	. 3
	ш	ш	п	I	I	п	ш	ш



٩

Figure 4a: Sketch drawing of truss 1 to show sample locations (viewed from the south)







١

Figure 4c: Sketch drawing of truss 3 to show sample locations (viewed from the south)

Figure 4d: Sketch drawing of truss 7 to show sample locations (viewed from the south)





Figure 4e: Sketch drawing of truss 8 to show sample locations (viewed from the south)

																Relative
Off-															Total	heartwood/sapwood
set															rings	boundary position
															Ũ	
125						TA	20			h/s					75	200
65			Al	4						h/s					136	201
82			L	A	15		,,			h/s		nort	h cottage		119	201
29		A19								h/s		(n)	umber 3)		173	202
00 [A11	1								h/s		truss	es 7 and	8	203	203
56		A	13	<u></u>				····		h/s					147	203
129		L				r	A17			h/s					77	206
117						A18				h/s					91	208
40		A12								h/s	1				169	209
		L									1					
194										A04			h/s		75	269
165									A08	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			h/s		110	275
109		south co	ttage			A02	****						h	/s	167	276
107		(numb	er 1)			A03	-,							h/s	175	282
107		trusses	1-3			A01								h/s	1 77	284
184					1	L			1	A05			A	h/s	102	286
102					A	10								h/s	186	288
133					L		A09							h/s	156	289
ł		1			I		L			I			1		1	
00	20	40 6	50	80	100	120	140	160	180	200	220	240	260	280 2	90 years rel	ative
															•	

Figure 5: Bar diagram of samples in site chronology PITASQ01

White bars = heartwood rings h/s = heartwood/sapwood boundary is last ring on sample



Figure 6: Bar diagram of samples in site chronology PITASQ02

White bars = heartwood rings

h/s = heartwood/sapwood boundary is last ring on sample

62 86 91 85 83 75 73 73 87 67 82 96 63 79 79 61 60 84 60 74 47 66 67 68 70 72 95 76 77 81 120 88 121 PIT-A20A 75 82 99 101 94 105 83 116 157 125 145 163 135 88 114 140 140 163 118 197 144 179 158 159 184 166 132 196 150 156 195 138 146 140 126 128 136 105 95 106 127 136 140 80 93 143 150 114 135 138 188 122 164 167 92 93 91 83 98 143 109 127 134 94 125 131 231 138 112 112 153 164 110 104 101 141 PIT-A20B 75 85 93 100 97 111 80 112 154 123 152 171 132 99 107 130 140 183 120 198 134 177 157 161 177 167 137 201 146 149 203 118 148 148 127 124 140 109 98 100 116 133 134 79 102 132 152 114 131 143 184 135 149 170 100 101 92 84 103 141 110

115 134 84 121 137 229 123 101 121 151 181 102 98 172 121

Report approval form

Part 1 (to be completed by the author)	
Report Title	TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM
	HALLGARTH MANOR COTTAGES, HALLGARTH
	PITTINGTON, CO DURHAM
Author(s)	R E HOWARD
	DR R R LAXTON
	DR C D LITTON
Keyword(s)	DENDROCHRONOLOGY
	STANDING BUILDINGS
CfA Project Number or AML Site Number	3523
No of pages	23
No of figures	6
No of tables	2
Colour copying of . pages required	
Title/Summary etc attached	Yes
One clean copy of text and illustrations as specified in	Yes
notes for contributors attached	
Distribution list for the report of names and addresses	Yes
(preferably on labels), if additional to normal (see Part	
3, below)	
Does this report need to be embargoed. If so, for how	No*
long?	
Can a copy go to the public access library at NMR?	Yes
Signature and date	P.D. Mostal 13.11.01
Part 2 (to be completed by Team Leader)	
Colour copying of pages approved	
Report meets required academic quality	
Report meets/ general layout, grammar, etc	
requirements	
Signature and date	Andonit UDanis 15/11/10
Part 3 (to be completed by IMC/Admin)	
Date received by IMC	
Report no issued	
Information entered on database	Yes/No*
Date received by Admin	
Colour copies obtained	Yes/No*
Copies sent to:	
FC Library/BL/PRO/NMR/Authors x2	
Date original returned to IMC	

* delete as appropriate