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Abstract

In February 2013 Britannia Archaeology Ltd (BA) undertook an archaeological trial trench evaluation on land to the rear of 84 High Street, Chatteris, Cambridgeshire (NGR 539180 286401) in advance of the residential development of the site.

Background research for the project indicated that the most likely results would be evidence for development along the street frontage in the late Medieval and early Post-medieval periods. Buildings were present on the First Edition Ordnance Survey (1885 and 1926) maps and backyard activities associated with these structures were also likely.

The evaluation revealed four potential phases of activity including the recent demolition of a 20th century building, a late post-medieval building (1006), fragments of which partially survived two phases of subsequent demolition and the construction of a modern building. Agricultural activity potentially forms the final phase and is evidenced by a gully/plough scar (1018), a homogenous buried soil 1002 and the remains of a robust working pony. The earliest phase of activity dates to the medieval period and comprises two pits (1004 and 1008) associated with domestic waste disposal, however pit 1004 may also be a ditch terminal given its more rectangular shape. Fragments of late medieval brick also suggest building activity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

A single sherd of residual Roman pottery was recovered from the medieval pits and suggests a wider Roman presence in the area rather than any distinct Roman activity in the site.

The site has suffered significant truncation from both 19th century and later 20th century development, however some isolated post-medieval building remains have survived along with deeper medieval features.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

In February 2013 Britannia Archaeology Ltd (BA) undertook an archaeological trial trench evaluation on land to the rear of 84 High Street, Chatteris, Cambridgeshire (NGR 539180 286401) in response to a design brief issued by Cambridgeshire County Council, Historic Environment Team (CCC HET) (McConnell. D, dated 20/07/2012). The work was commissioned to comply with a condition of planning permission reference F/YR10/0242/EXTIME in advance of residential development of the site.

The works comprised the excavation of one trial trench measuring 10.00 x 1.80m (Figure 4).

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The 263m² site is located within a housing estate on the corner of Ash Grove and High Street near to the centre of Chatteris. It is currently under rough grassland, however buildings were present on the First Edition Ordnance Survey (1885 and 1926) maps. A site investigation undertaken in 1994 revealed a degree of ground disturbance, the extent of which is unknown. There is the potential that archaeological remains are still present on the development area.

The site lies at a height of approximately 5m AOD, the bedrock geology is described as West Walton Formation and Ampthill Clay Formation and undifferentiated mudstone formed 154 to 159 million years ago in the Jurassic Period where the local environment was dominated by shallow seas. The superficial geology is described as March Gravels Member, sand and gravel formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary Period when the local environment was dominated by shorelines with sediments deposited in beaches and barrier islands.

3.0 PLANNING POLICIES

The archaeological investigation was carried out on the recommendation of the local planning authority, following guidance laid down by the National Planning and Policy Framework (NPPF, DCLD 2012) which replaces Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5, DCLG 2010). The relevant local planning policy is, Fenland Council’s Fenland Local Plan (1993; 2005 Edition).

3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, DCLG March 2012)

The NPPF recognises that ‘heritage assets’ are an irreplaceable resource and planning authorities should conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance when considering development. It requires developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. The key areas for consideration are:

- The significance of the heritage asset and its setting in relation to the proposed development;
• The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance;
• Significance (of the heritage asset) can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction, or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification;
• Local planning authorities should not permit loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred;
• Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

3.2 Fenland Local Plan (1993; 2005 Edition)

Fenland Council are currently producing a new local plan to replace the existing 1993 Local Plan. The draft Fenland Communities Development Plan (draft Core Strategy) was consulted upon in July-September 2011 and the document is being amended to reflect the comments and bring it into line with the NPPF.

The Fenland Local Plan states that it is important to protect the rich archaeological heritage where necessary to do so, and elsewhere to permit investigation before development takes places. Development which would result in the loss of important archaeological sites will be resisted and where development can be permitted conditions will be imposed on planning permissions to allow for the proper recording of sites before development takes place.

The relevant sections on Archaeology and Planning state the following:

E6 – Planning permission will not normally be granted for development which would adversely affect the preservation or setting of an ancient monument or other important archaeological site. The local planning authority will normally require all planning applications for development on sites of recognised or suspected archaeological importance to be accompanied by an archaeological evaluation.

E7 – Where there is no over-riding case for the preservation of an archaeological site and planning permission is granted for its development that development will be conditional upon the developer making satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of remains. Such excavation and recording will be carried out before development commences in accordance with a project brief prepared by the local planning authority with advice from County Archaeologists. Where appropriate provision shall be made for the sealing and preservation of archaeologically significant layers prior to construction.

4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

The following archaeological background utilises the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER) (1km search centred on the site), English Heritage PastScape (www.pastscape.org.uk), and the Archaeological Data Service (www.ads.ahds.ac.uk)
(ADS) (Figure 2). There are 169 entries within the 1km search area, the majority of which (104) are listed buildings.

Chatteris is first mentioned as Cæeteric in 974 and then later as *Cietriz* in Domesday in 1086. The name may derive from Old English and mean ‘raised strip or ridge of a man named Ceatta, however the first element may refer to the Celtic *ced* which means ‘wood’ (Mills, 2003).

The plot is most likely to contain evidence for development along the street frontage in the late Medieval and early Post-medieval periods. Buildings were present on the First Edition Ordnance Survey (1885 and 1926) maps and backyard activities associated with these structures may be preserved and are expected to include evidence for rubbish disposal, brewing, baking and industrial practices. Chatteris is situated on a fen island that was extensively settled and exploited during the Iron Age and Roman periods, therefore there is a potential for deposits of this date surviving within the development area (Brief 1.3).

There is only one Palaeolithic entry in the record, a primary flint flake (MCB19426) located 780m to the south of the proposed development. The Neolithic period is represented by three polished axeheads (03683, MCB15979, and MCB16699) located 680m south-west, 865m to the east and 860m to the east respectively.

An evaluation in 2000 by CCC Archaeological Field Unit (ECB123, CB15323, MCB18461, MCB18462, MCB18463, MCB18464, MCB18465) north of Chatteris Parish Church and 390m to the south east of the site, revealed a Bronze Age ditch terminal, large Bronze Age vessels associated with antler and a loom weight were possibly related with burials. The subsequent area excavation in 2001 recorded seven broad periods of archaeology, including pits containing collared urns and Beaker ware, three crouched inhumations of possible Bronze Age date excavated to the south of the site where nearby a pit containing late Beaker pottery was recorded.

The Iron Age is also represented to the north of Chatteris Parish Church and 390m to the south east of the site (ECB123, CB15323, MCB18461, MCB18462, MCB18463, MCB18464, MCB18465) where Early Iron Age pits and Late Iron Age features were recorded. A five trench evaluation undertaken by BUFAU in 1996 on land north of 36 Bridge Street (11898) located 560m to the north-west, revealed Iron Age pottery present in a shallow feature. At New Road, located 300m to the south-east, an evaluation (MCB17496) by CCC Archaeological Field Unit and subsequent excavation (ECB2211) recorded a multi-phased site including Iron Age settlement activity.

A Roman coin (CB14730) was found at 21 New Road, 215m to the south-east. At the site to the north of Chatteris Parish Church (ECB123, CB15323, MCB18461, MCB18462, MCB18463, MCB18464, MCB18465) Roman activity was also recorded. Quarry pits (MCB18482) located 760m to the north-west, that were later re-used as rubbish pits containing Roman pottery were recorded during an evaluation at Womb Farm by Cambridge Archaeological Unit in 2009.
Anglo-Saxon activity is present at the evaluation and subsequent excavation site to the north of Chatteris Parish Church and 215m to the south-east (ECB123, CB15323, MCB18461, MCB18462, MCB18463, MCB18464, MCB18465) where a timber framed structure was recorded.

Medieval cultivation activity was present on land behind Bridge Street (11898) located 560m to the north-west during an evaluation by BUFAU. A Medieval drainage pipe (01508) was found at the site of the former St Mary’s Abbey, 440m to the south-east. Various worked stones and brick have been found (01528, CB15351 and MCB15978), possibly from the former Abbey of the Blessed Virgin Mary (03700, 03832), located 515m north-east, 565m south and 620m to the south-east respectively, the Benedictine Nunnery was founded in 1006 and later dissolved in 1538. A portion of the old wall exists and an evaluation by CCC Archaeological Field Unit in 1998 (ECB126) revealed that possible medieval features may still be present at the site located 555m to the south-east. Saint Peter and Saint Paul’s Church (03701) lies 440m to the south-east and dates from the 14th Century. An earthwork survey and aerial photographic assessment have revealed extensive Medieval agricultural remains at Manor Park (08670, ECB573) lying 345m to the north-east of the site. Further Medieval agricultural remains were mapped around Chatteris during the Chatteris to Haddenham water scheme in 2007 (ECB2987). An evaluation at Cox's Lane and Chapel Lane revealed medieval soil horizons (CB15741) 400m to the north-west.

Post-medieval ridge and furrow and property boundaries were recorded during the evaluation on land north of Bridge Street (11898, ECB579) located 560m to the north-west. An icehouse (03685) is present 100 yards east of 19 Wenny Road, 890m to the south-east. Post-medieval quarrying was recorded during an evaluation at Kingsfield School (MCB16931), 345m to the south-west, and also at Womb Farm (MCB18481) 780m to the north-west along with boundary ditches. An archaeological evaluation at Tern Gardens (MCB19100) revealed yard activity associated with the properties fronting. A few sherds of pottery were recovered during evaluation undertaken on land off St. Martin’s (ECB129) located 775m to the south-east. The evaluation at Cox's Lane and Chapel Lane (ECB1427) also recorded some post-medieval soil horizons. To the rear of 32 West Park Street (ECB2406) and 675m to the south of the proposed site, four evaluation trenches were excavated revealing pits, post-holes, quarry pits, ditches and gullies of probable Post-medieval with a few of Medieval date, the site lies to the west of the precinct of Chatteris Priory. Manor House (12046) is an 18th century house with extensive outbuildings lying 525m to the south-east. General Baptist Church (MCB17157) is present 645m to the south-east in Park Street and was built in 1835. Meeks Cemetery (MCB19106) was created in 1850 and is located 415m to the east in New Road. The Parochial Cemetery (MCB19107) is located further to the east on New Road and 780m east of the proposed development, it was formed in 1856. At 9 Bridge Street (ECB1879) 330m to the north-west, Victorian rubbish dumps were recorded in to trenches excavated by CCC Archaeological Field Unit. At 91 High Street (ECB2941) 125m to the north of site, Archaeological Solutions located likely 19th century post-holes, brick foundations and a gully during an evaluation.
Modern records include the former route of The Great Northern and Great Eastern Joint Railway line (03698) between March and St Ives that was opened in February 1848 and completely closed in 1967. A four trench evaluation at Station Road Business Park by Archaeological Solutions (ECB1999) revealed substantial levelling activity associated with the construction of the railway 530m to the south-west. An evaluation at 19A Station Street by Northamptonshire Archaeology (ECB2125) in 2005, 415m to the south-west revealed mid to late 20th century pits and trenches.

Undated and blank records include some stonework from Washway Farm (01504) located 985m to the south-west and Vicarage gardens (12047) present 580m to the south-east. At Black Horse Lane (CB15012), 295m to the north an evaluation revealed an undated boundary ditch. No remains were present during an evaluation at land north-east of 7 Dock Road (ECB127) 495m to the north of site. An evaluation on land north-west of St Martins Road (ECB128) revealed irregular features of probable natural origin 590m to the south-east. At Black Horse Lane (ECB759) an evaluation in 2002 revealed an undated drainage ditch located 295m to the north. An air photograph appraisal on land south-west of Doddington Road (ECB1121) 1000m to the north-west revealed no archaeological features. Another air photograph appraisal on the Chatteris to Haddenham water scheme in 2007 (ECB2987), a 1km wide corridor lying over 1000m to the south-east revealed undated enclosures, ring ditches, double ditched trackways, ridge and furrow and the layout of Mepal Airfield. At 48-56 New Road (ECB1160) 605m to the south-east an evaluation revealed evidence for modern levelling. Test pits dug during a community based project at Furrowfields (ECB3415) recorded no features or finds, 340m to the north-east. At Womb Farm, 875m to the north-west of the site an aerial photo assessment (ECB3131) and geophysical survey (ECB3132) was undertaken identifying areas of quarrying and land drains.

There are 104 listed building present within the 1km search, therefore a 100m search perimeter was located around the centre of the site revealing 7 entries (Figure 3.). The buildings date from the late 17th to 18th century, and the closest is Number 84 High Street (DCB1579) a late 18th century Grade II listed building located only 20m to the north of the proposed development. At Number 74 High Street (DCB1727) 40m to the south-east, is a Grade II listed house built in approximately 1820. Number 94 High Street (DCB1728) 50m to the north-west lie a Grade II listed row of cottages built in the late 18th century. Three properties numbers 59, 61 and 61A High Street (DCB2102) are recorded as Grade II listed shop and dwellings, the earliest of which dates to the 18th century, they lie 50m to the south-east of the site. Number 81 and 83 High Street (DCB2110) are the earliest buildings within the search radius, they are grade II listed late 17th century cottages located 55m to the north of the site. Burnsfield House (DCB1558) is a late 18th century Grade II listed cottage located 75m from the site at 40 Railway Lane.

5.0 PROJECT AIMS

The CCC HET brief stated that the evaluation should aim to determine, the location, extent, date, character, condition, significance and quality of any surviving archaeological...
remains liable to be threatened by the proposed development (McConnell, D. Brief, Section 3.1).

6.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Research objectives for the project are in line with those laid out in Research and Archaeology Revisited: a revised framework for the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 24 (Medlycott, 2011).

Specific objectives outlined in the brief state that a particular importance be placed on:

- the amount of truncation to buried deposits,
- the presence or absence of a palaeosol or ‘B’ horizon,
- the preservation of deposits within negative features,
- site formation processes.

7.0 FIELDWORK METHODOLOGY

A Leica Viva Smart Rover GS08 differential global positioning system (DGPS) was used to accurately set-out the evaluation trench. This was then excavated employing a JCB 3CX 180° mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket under the control of a qualified professional archaeologist. Topsoil and subsoil layers were removed carefully down to the first archaeological horizon, thereafter all excavation was undertaken by hand (Figure 4).

Topographic survey, trench edges, section locations and archaeological and natural feature survey points were accurately recorded using the DGPS to produce a pre and post-excavation plan tied into the Ordnance Survey National Grid. The archaeology was preserved by record using pro-forma sheets, plan and section drawings and appropriate photographic records, as agreed in the Written Scheme of Investigation (Schofield, 2013). All features, finds and samples were given unique context numbers assigned during the recording phases on site.

8.0 DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS (Figs. 5 & 6)

Archaeological features and deposits are described below in trench order. Detailed information on all features and deposits can be found at Appendix 1.

The trench was excavated to a depth of 1.35m and the full stratigraphic sequence was exposed. The natural geological deposits undulated slightly with a possible overall slope to the north-east.

Evidence of medieval pitting and later post-medieval and modern building activity was present with heavier concentrations of features towards the High Street end of the trench.
Demolition layer 1001 showed significant levels of modern demolition activity to a consistent depth of around 0.90m, but was occasionally deeper in places.

8.1 Trench 1 (Figs. 5 & 6)

Trench 1 was located in the centre of the site at right angles to the High Street. Eight archaeological features and three modern features were present.

Two medieval pits, 1004 & 1008, were located in the north-eastern half of the trench and were the oldest features present. Pit 1004 was large and sub-rectangular in plan and its shape may suggest it was a ditch terminal rather than a pit, however it extended beyond the limit of excavation. It contained a single fill, 1005 and the finds recovered comprised a single sherd of residual Roman pottery, 11th – 12th century AD sandy thin-walled fabric pottery, 12th – 14th century AD medieval coarseware pottery, four fragments of early brick dating to the medieval period and butchered pig bone. Pit 1008 was smaller and more circular in plan, but contained a similar fill to 1004. It was truncated by a robbed out wall trench (1010) and the finds comprised 12th – 14th Century AD medieval coarse ware pottery, 13th – 14th Century AD Grimston-type ware jug fragments with iron oxide striped decoration and sheep bone (Goffin, Appendix 2).

A small gully/plough scar, 1018, was located adjacent to the pits. It was irregular and linear in plan and was also cut by the robbed out wall trench (1010). Its fill, 1019, was dark and humic, however no finds were recovered.

A brick structure, 1006, was located in the centre of the trench and comprised a roughly square brick chamber (possibly the base of a chimney or small oven), with the remains of a fragmentary brick surface abutting it to the north. Two sets of 3 parallel bricks to the south west of the structure may also relate to an external path which might have been associated with it. Four courses of irregular stretcher brick work bonded with cement survived in-situ, with the surface and possible path tied into the upper course. The southern side of the structure was packed with a clay lining. The bricks were made from a fine buff fabric with pinkish bands and lumps, with frequent voids. The dimensions and appearance of the brick indicate that it is dated to c. 17th-19th century, and that it is similar to brick type LB9 (Drury 165). The infill of the chamber, 1007, contained CBM rubble from demolition and a complete gilt seal fob charm dating to the early part of the nineteenth century. It has an opaque glass seal, reading ‘Jane’ in reverse and is dated c.1810-30. The structure showed evidence of damage from modern demolition.

Robbed out wall trench 1010 was rectangular in plan and extended beyond the limit of excavation. The original trench and wall may have been associated with the surviving structure 1006, however the wall had been comprehensively removed during demolition and the backfill (1011) contained an early brick fragment made out of a buff, poorly mixed clay with calcareous inclusions and grog which is of a medieval date. The trench cut through the medieval pit 1008 and gully/plough scar 1018 and had also damaged part of the brick structure 1006.
Three small stake holes, 1012, 1014 and 1016 were present to the north east side of brick structure 1006 and formed a rough alignment north-east to south-west. It is likely that these relate to an earlier boundary fence rather than a structure.

Two modern walls relating to a demolished modern 20th century building were located at either end of the trench and a modern ditch/demolition trench was also noted in the south-western area.

**9.0 DEPOSIT MODEL (Fig. 6)**

The deposit model was broadly consistent across the trench and a full section was recorded (Figure 6).

Topsoil 1000 formed the upper most layer in the stratigraphic sequence and sealed all other layers and features.

Demolition layer 1001 was present below the topsoil and related to a recent phase of modern demolition associated with clearing the 20th century building. This layer was encountered to around 0.90m below the current ground surface and truncated all earlier layers and features to this depth. It is likely that layers associated with the later post-medieval building and its own demolition were destroyed during this recent phase of demolition.

Layer 1020 was a compact sand bedding layer associated with the late post-medieval brick structure 1006 and it partially survived below the demolition layer 1001. The brick surface was laid on top of this layer which also abutted the brick chamber and was contemporary with the construction.

Buried soil 1002 was a former ground surface or soil. Initially, it was probably a plough soil (no separate subsoils were noted) that later became a garden soil associated with the late post-medieval structure. It sealed the medieval pits 1004 and 1008, but was similar to the gully/plough scar fill. The finds recovered included two glazed red earthenware jars dating to the 16th-18th century, together with a number of other late medieval and early post-medieval wares (Goffin, Appendix 2) and an adult equid metacarpal from a robust pony of around 13.5 Hands high showing pathology commonly associated with older or working animals used for carrying or traction (Curl –Sylvanus, Appendix 2).

The natural 1003 was encountered below Buried soil 1002. It comprised a mixture of light brown yellow, silty clays with patches of light yellow orange sandy gravel.
10.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The evaluation revealed four potential phases of activity. The most recent phase comprised the demolition of a 20th century building evident on the 1970’s OS maps.

The second phase represents a late post-medieval building (1006), fragments of which partially survived two phases of subsequent demolition activity and the construction of a modern building.

The third phase is related to the potential agricultural use of the site as indicated by the gully/plough scar 1018 and the homogenous nature of the buried soil 1002. No layers or subsoils predating buried soil 1002 were present and it sealed earlier medieval features, which suggests that it was probably a plough soil prior to late post-medieval development. It is also possible that the ground was substantially reduced or truncated before the construction of the post-medieval building. Bones relating to a robust working pony in this layer also support a picture of agricultural activity on the site.

The fourth phase is represented by medieval pits 1004 and 1008. These are likely associated with domestic waste disposal as indicated by the finds, however pit 1004 may actually be a ditch terminal given its more rectangular shape. Fragments of late medieval brick also suggest building activity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

A single sherd of residual Roman pottery suggests a wider Roman presence in the area rather than any distinct Roman activity in the site.

It is clear that the site has suffered significant damage during the two phases of demolition identified, however preservation of features below 0.90m was generally good. The presence of surviving medieval pits is certainly interesting, but not surprising given the location of the site in relation to the High Street and the features tend to be concentrated towards the road.

No features predating the medieval period were encountered.

The finds assemblage shows the medieval pits contained material clearly associated with domestic activity rather than any other, however the possibility that pit 1004 could be a ditch terminal poses some interesting questions. A substantial ditch on this alignment is not consistent with the current location of the High Street which is assumed to be on the same course as its medieval predecessor. Unfortunately, establishing the continuation of the pit/ditch would be difficult on this site given the presence of a modern wall and concrete foundation at the north-east end of the trench which has fully truncated the feature in this direction.

The current development plans propose the use of foundation trenches for the outline and internal walls of the building and trenches for services. Given the density of features, existing truncation and limited size of the foundation/service trenches, the development is likely to have a minimal impact on significant underlying archaeological deposits.
However, in the small area where they do impact on surviving archaeology, the impact will be substantial and the loss is likely to be complete.

11.0 PROJECT ARCHIVE AND DEPOSITION

A full archive will be prepared for all work undertaken in accordance with guidance from the *Selection, Retention and Dispersion of Archaeological Collections*, Archaeological Society for Museum Archaeologists, 1993. Deposition will be with the relevant museum or Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology Store subject to agreement with the legal landowner where finds are concerned and in accordance with *Deposition of Archaeological Archives in the Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology Store*, 2004.

The archive will be quantified, ordered, indexed, cross-referenced and checked for internal consistency. The material will be catalogued, labelled and packaged for transfer and storage in accordance with the guidelines set out in the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation’s *Conservation Guidelines No.2* and the Archaeological Archives Forum’s *Archaeological Archives, A guide to best practice, compilation, transfer and curation* (Brown, 2007).

12.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Britannia Archaeology would like to thanks Ms Jan Portland of All Green Designs for commissioning and funding the project.

We would also like to thank Dan McConnell at Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team for his advice and assistance throughout the project and the CHER team.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


CCC. 2004. *Deposition of Archaeological Archives in the Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology Store*.


**Websites:**

The British Geological Survey (Natural Environment Research Council) – Geology of Britain Viewer - [www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion2=1#maps](http://www.bgs.ac.uk/opengeoscience/home.html?Accordion2=1#maps)

English Heritage PastScape [www.pastscape.org.uk](http://www.pastscape.org.uk)

Archaeological Data Service (ADS) [www.ads.ahds.ac.uk](http://www.ads.ahds.ac.uk)

English Heritage National List for England [www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/protection/process/national-heritage-list-for-england](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/protection/process/national-heritage-list-for-england)

APPENDIX 1  DEPOSIT TABLES AND FEATURE DESCRIPTIONS

TRENCH 1

Deposit Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench No</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Height AOD</th>
<th>Shot No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE-SW</td>
<td>6.88m</td>
<td>DP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Section No</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Facing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>NE Side</td>
<td>SW Facing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Deposit Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.00 – 0.35m</td>
<td>Topsoil. Dark brown grey, loose sandy silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>0.21 – 0.40m</td>
<td>Demolition Layer. Light brown grey, loose cement &amp; CBM rubble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>0.40 – 0.50m</td>
<td>Bedding Layer. Light yellow orange, compact sandy gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>0.50 – 0.83m</td>
<td>Buried Soil. Dark grey brown, compact clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>0.83 – 1.21m</td>
<td>Natural. Light brown yellow, compact silt clay with patches of light yellow orange, compact sandy gravel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Context</th>
<th>Feature Type &amp; Description</th>
<th>Layer/Fill Context</th>
<th>Layer/Fill Description</th>
<th>Spot Date</th>
<th>Finds /g (sherd or number)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Pit (2.30+ x 1.35 x 0.23m) Oval in plan, steep sides, concave base</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Mid yellow brown, compact sand/silt clay</td>
<td>13th – 14th century AD</td>
<td>4 (1) Roman fine sandy body sherd with a grey core and reddish brown external margins - Residual 83(14) 11th – 12th Century AD sandy thin-walled fabric pottery 15th – 16th Century AD medieval coarse ware pottery 1(36) Medieval Brick 1(15) Pig Bone</td>
<td>Aligned NE/SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Brick Structure (1.85+ x 1.10 x 0.31m) Offset square in plan. 4 courses of irregular stretcher brick work bonded with cement with single course surface and possible path tied into the upper course</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Light red grey, loose CBM &amp; cement rubble with moderate charcoal inclusions</td>
<td>1(2571) 17th – 19th Century AD, LB9 type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>Pit (1.15 x 0.65+ x 0.34m) Sub-circular in plan, steep sides, concave base</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Mid yellow brown, compact sandy clay with occasional flint stones</td>
<td>13th – 14th century AD</td>
<td>20 (1) 12th – 14th Century AD medieval coarse ware pottery 20 (1) 13th – 14th Century AD Grimston-type ware jug with iron oxide striped decoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Code</td>
<td>Feature Description</td>
<td>Feature Details</td>
<td>Material and Inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>Robbed Out Wall Trench</td>
<td>(1.40 x 0.38+ x 0.40m) Rectangular in plan, vertical sides, flat base</td>
<td>Light red grey, compact CBM &amp; mortar rubble with lenses of sandy silt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>3(1594) Medieval - Early brick fragment made out of a buff, poorly mixed clay with calcareous inclusions and grog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Stake Hole</td>
<td>(0.07 x 0.08 x 0.18m) Circular in plan, steep tapered sides, pointed concave base</td>
<td>Dark brown grey, loose sandy silt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>Stake Hole</td>
<td>(0.08 x 0.09 x 0.21m) Circular in plan, steep tapered sides, pointed concave base</td>
<td>Dark brown grey, loose sandy silt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1016</td>
<td>Stake Hole</td>
<td>(0.08 x 0.09 x 0.21m) Circular in plan, steep tapered sides, pointed concave base</td>
<td>Dark brown grey, loose sandy silt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Gully/Plough Scar</td>
<td>(2.80+ x 0.35 x 0.11m) Irregular linear in plan, moderate irregular sides, concave base</td>
<td>Dark grey brown, firm clay silt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 SPECIALIST REPORTS

1. THE FINDS

By Richenda Goffin

The Pottery

Introduction

A total of twenty-four fragments of pottery weighing 312g was recovered from the excavation. The assemblage dates to the medieval and post-medieval periods, but a single sherd of residual Roman date was also present.

Methodology

The ceramics were quantified using the recording methods recommended in the MPRG Occasional Paper No 2, Minimum standards for the processing, recording, analysis and publication of Post-Roman ceramics (Slowikowski et al 2001). The number of sherds present in each context by fabric, the estimated number of vessels represented and the weight of each fabric was noted. Other characteristics such as form, decoration and condition were recorded, and an overall date range for the pottery in each context was established. The pottery was catalogued on proforma sheets by context using letter codes based on fabric and form and the records have been inputted as on the database (Appendix *). The fabric codes used are those based on the fabric series established for the Suffolk Archaeological Unit (Sue Anderson, unpublished fabric series).

The pottery by period

Roman

A single fine sandy body sherd with a grey core and reddish brown external margins was present in the fill 1005 of pit 1004 (4g). Its overall condition is slightly worn. It is likely that this is a residual Roman sherd rather than being medieval.

Medieval

Sixteen sherds weighing 123g date to the medieval period. Four fragments of Early medieval ware dating to the 11th-12th century were identified in the fill 1005 of pit 1004. They are made in a sandy thin-walled fabric, and are heavily sooted. The remainder of the pottery in this pitfill consists mainly of fragments of medieval coarseware, also sooted, dating to the late 12th-14th centuries. A sandy ware with a dark grey core and occasional chalk inclusions is likely to be a product from the Fens, and is probably an Ely coarseware variant (Spoerry 2008). The only medieval glazed pottery is a sherd of a Grimston-type ware jug with iron oxide striped decoration dating to the 13th-14th century. This was found with a fragment of medieval coarseware.

Post-medieval

The remainder of the ceramic assemblage is post-medieval (7 sherds weighing 185g). Two Glazed red earthenware jars dating to the 16th-18th century were present in buried soil deposit 1002, together with a number of other late medieval and early post-medieval wares.
Discussion

This small assemblage consists for the most part of pottery from two pits which date to the medieval period, c. 13th-14th century. The group is made up of sherds of heavily sooted cooking vessels, with a single fragment from a glazed jug. A small quantity of earlier wares dating to the 11th-12th century is also present as a residual element, and a single Roman coarseware sherd. Sixteenth century redwares were identified in the buried soil 1002.

The Ceramic building material

Introduction

Five fragments of ceramic building material were recovered in total weighing 1619g. The assemblage dates to the medieval and post-medieval periods.

Methodology

The group was catalogued by fabric type and form, and diagnostic features recorded. The data was inputted onto an access database which forms part of the finds archive. Fabrics and forms are based on the ceramic building material typology established by Drury (1993).

The ceramic building material by period

Medieval

Three very fragmentary and abraded pieces of ? brick were recovered from the fill 1005 of pit 1004. They are made in a fine fabric of buff and pink/orange bands with red clay pellet and chalk inclusions, dating to the late medieval – post-medieval period. The same pitfill contained a small fragment of fired clay in a similar fabric type.

The infill 1011 of the robbed wall 1010 contained an Early brick fragment made out of a buff, poorly mixed clay with calcareous inclusions and grog which is of a medieval date.

Post-medieval

A complete brick (1006) was taken as a sample from the brick structure 1006. It measures 220mm in length, 103mm in width and 64mm in height. It is made in a fine buff fabric with pinkish bands and lumps, with frequent voids. The dimensions and appearance of the brick indicate that it is dated to c. 17th-19th century, and that it is similar to brick type LB9 (Drury 165).

Small finds

SF0001 Context 1007

A complete gilt seal fob charm dating to the early part of the nineteenth century was recovered from the infilling of brick structure 1006. It measures c.23mm in height and weighs 3.12g. The object is slightly misshapen and corroded with a ferrous concretion, but is basically intact. It has an opaque ?glass seal, reading ‘Jane’ in reverse and is dated c.1810-30.

Bibliography
2. THE FAUNAL REMAINS

By Julie Curl –Sylvanus

Methodology

The bone in this assemblage consisted of hand-collected remains. All of the bone was identified to species wherever possible using a variety of comparative reference material. Where a complete identification to species was not possible, bone was assigned to a group, such as ‘sheep/goat’ or ‘mammal’ whenever possible. The bones were recorded using a modified version of guidelines described in Davis (1992).

Any butchering was recorded, noting the type of butchering, such as cut, chopped or sawn and location of butchering. A note was also made of any burnt bone. Pathologies, if present, would be recorded with the type of injury or disease, the element affected and the location on the bone. Other modifications were also recorded, such as any possible working, working waste or animal gnawing. The faunal assemblage contained too few teeth to allow recording of tooth wear. Measurements of suitable bones were taken following Von Den Dreisich, 1976 to allow aid further identification to species and for the archive record and which should be of use if further excavations are carried out at this site.

Weights and total number of pieces counts were also taken for each context, along with the number of pieces for each individual species present (NISP) and these appear in the appendix. As this is a small assemblage, with remains from just one feature, the information was recorded directly into a table in this report. A catalogue is provided in the appendix giving a summary and quantification of all of the faunal remains by context.

The faunal assemblage

Quantification, provenance and preservation

A total of 250g of faunal remains, consisting of six elements, was recovered from excavations at this site. Bone was produced from two pit fills and buried soil, with some of the remains associated with possible medieval finds. Quantification of the bone assemblage by context, feature type and weight can be seen in Table 1 and by species, feature type and NISP in Table 2.
The bone in this assemblage is in generally good condition. Some fragmentation has occurred from butchering. Some further destruction of the bone has occurred from canid gnawing in pit [1006], with gnawing suggesting scavenging or supply of food to domestic dogs and the possibility that some bone has been completely destroyed or removed from site by dogs.

**Species and discussion**

Three species were identified in this assemblage, all of probable domestic origin. Quantification of the species is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Feature Type and NISP</th>
<th>Species Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buried soil</td>
<td>Pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Type Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context (1002) produced an adult equid metacarpal from a robust pony of around 13.5 Hands High. This right metacarpal shows some arthritic growth at the distal end and on the shaft and at the distal end. There is some eburnation on the articular surface, showing the pony was active after the cartilage was destroyed and probably in some pain and limping. Such pathologies are common in older or working animals and this might indicate an animal used for carrying or traction.

A cut juvenile pig calcaneus was produced from (1005) and two adult ovicaprid limb bones were recorded from (1009).

**Butchering**

Two ribs from (1002) showed chopping and cuts, presumably for cutting the ribs into sections, for use in foods like soups. Fine knife cuts were seen on the pig calcaneus from (1005) which are likely to have occurred at the skinning stage. The sheep/goat tibia from (1009) had been chopped on the mid-shaft from dismemberment and carcass division and there are fine knife cuts on the distal end of the bone that are likely to have occurred when the meat was removed.

**Conclusions**
Full interpretation of such a small assemblage is difficult. The assemblage from this site appears to be of mixed origin, with some butchering and food waste along with unbutchered equid bone. The pony remains seen suggest a lame working animal; it is possible that the pony was culled for meat for human or dog consumption and the lack of clear butchering evidence on the single bone in this assemblage does not rule that out. The size of the equid (a larger pony) in this assemblage is common in all periods.

Canid activity at this site may well have caused further destruction or removal of faunal evidence from the site.

**Recommendations for further work**

No further work is required on this assemblage.
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The faunal remains - Appendixes 1 and 2

Appendix 1
Catalogue of the faunal remains recovered from ECB3924

Key:
NISP = Number of Individual Species elements Present
Age – a = adult, j = juvenile (older than 1 month)
Element range: ul = upper limb, r = rib
Butchering = c = cut, ch = chopped (and number of elements affected)
Gnaw = gnawed bone – c = canid
Path = pathology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctxt</th>
<th>Ctxt Qty</th>
<th>Wt (g)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>NISP</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Juv</th>
<th>Element range</th>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Gnaw</th>
<th>R/C/F</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Equid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>ll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>robust pony metacarpal, some arthritic changes and eburnation at distal end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>large chopped rib and fragment of smaller rib with 2-3 cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>ll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ll, ul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2. Measurements following Von Den Dreisch, 1976 in mm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Fusion</th>
<th>Gl</th>
<th>Bd</th>
<th>Dd</th>
<th>BatF</th>
<th>Bfd</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Equid</td>
<td>Metacarpal</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3  CONCORDNACE OF FINDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE CONTEXT</th>
<th>FEATURE TYPE</th>
<th>LAYER/FILL CONTEXT</th>
<th>LAYER/FILL DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SPOT DATE</th>
<th>POTTERY /g(sherds)</th>
<th>CBM /g(number)</th>
<th>ANIMAL BONE /g(number)</th>
<th>HUMAN BONE /g(number)</th>
<th>STRUCK FLINT /g(number)</th>
<th>BURNT FLINT /g(number)</th>
<th>OTHER /g(number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Buried Soil</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td></td>
<td>186(7)</td>
<td>212(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>PIT</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>FILL</td>
<td>MED?</td>
<td>87(15)</td>
<td>36(4)</td>
<td>15(1)</td>
<td>2571(1)</td>
<td>SF1 CU Alloy Stamp</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>BRICK STRUCTURE</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>INFILL</td>
<td>POST MED?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>PIT</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>FILL</td>
<td>MED?</td>
<td>40(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>ROBBED WALL TRENCH</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>INFILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1594(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation revealed four potential phases of activity including the recent construction and demolition of a 20th century building, a late post-medieval building and agricultural activity. A homogenous buried soil and the remains of a robust working pony were also present. The earliest phase of activity dates to the medieval period and comprises two pits (1004 and 1008) associated with domestic waste disposal, however pit 1004 may also be a ditch terminal given its more rectangular shape. Fragments of late medieval brick also suggest building activity in the immediate vicinity of the site. A single sherd of residual Roman pottery was recovered from the medieval pits and suggests a wider Roman presence in the area rather than any distinct Roman activity in the site. The site has suffered significant truncation from both 19th century and later 20th century development, however some isolated post-medieval building remains have survived along with deeper medieval features.
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