

**The Cottage, Woodbridge Road, Grundisburgh,
Suffolk**

Planning application: C/10/1923

HER Ref: GRU 039

Archaeological Monitoring Report

(© John Newman BA MIFA, 2 Pearsons Place, Henley, Ipswich, IP6 0RA)

(November 2010)

(Tel: 01473 832896 Email: johnnewman@keme.co.uk)

Site details for HER

Name: The Cottage, Woodbridge Road, Grundisburgh, Suffolk, IP13 6UD

Client: Mr & Mrs R Lewis

Local planning authority: Suffolk Coastal DC

Planning application ref: C/10/1923

Development: Erection of outbuilding

Date of fieldwork: Thursday, 17 November, 2010

HER Ref: GRU 039

OASIS Ref: johnnewm1-87331

Grid ref: TM 2276 5102

Contents

Summary

1. Introduction & background
2. Monitoring methodology
3. Results
4. Conclusion

Fig. 1 Site location

Fig. 2 Monitored outbuilding area

List of appendices

Appendix I – Image of foundation

Appendix II - Brief & Specification

Summary: Grundisburgh, The Cottage, Woodbridge Road (GRU 039, TM 2276 5102) monitoring of foundations for an outbuilding did not reveal any archaeological features or finds. (John Newman Archaeological Services for Mr & Mrs R Lewis).

1. Introduction & background

1.1 Tim Buxbaum Architect on behalf of Mr & Mrs R Lewis commissioned John Newman Archaeological Services (JNAS) to undertake the archaeological monitoring of ground works required under a condition for a programme of archaeological works of the planning decision notice for application C/10/1923. The monitoring requirements were set out in a Brief and Specification set by Ms S Poppy of the Suffolk CC Archaeological Service to satisfy this condition (Appendix II). This development concerns the erection of an outbuilding within the garden of The Cottage, Woodbridge Road, Grundisburgh (see Fig. 1). At the time of the monitoring the area concerned formed part of the garden and edge of the drive on the eastern side of The Cottage.

1.2 Grundisburgh is a large village to the north west of Woodbridge with the historic core of the settlement lying on the southern side of the River Lark with the underlying drift geology varying between lighter sand and gravels near the river and on the eastern side of the parish to heavier boulder clay to the west/north west. While not mentioned in the Domesday Book of the mid 11th century archaeological field survey and excavation has demonstrated a Middle Saxon origin to the village near the parish church, some 400m west of The Cottage, in addition to earlier Iron Age and Roman period activity. Expansion of the settlement is then evidenced by the identification of the earthwork remains of medieval building sites with associated medieval pottery sherds 40-50m south east of The Cottage. The development area therefore lies between the Saxon and medieval core of the village to the west and an area of medieval activity close by to the south east. As in many historic villages little else has been recorded within the built up area as ground disturbance on any scale is rare though it is noticeable that various houses of later medieval or early Post medieval date are located in the general area. Topographically the development area is c50m south of the River Lark at c17mOD.

2. Monitoring methodology

2. A single visit was made to the site to observe ground works, which were undertaken using a moderate sized mini-digger, as they were undertaken and inspect the upcast spoil. The foundation trenches around the perimeter of the proposed structure plus two north-south foundations within the area were observed giving a total length of some 32m with the width being 600mm. Due to the presence of numerous trees in the area the foundations were excavated to a depth of between 1600mm/1700mm and could not be entered due to the loose nature of the overburden, both recent and natural, which led to various section collapses. In addition ground water was encountered at c1400mm leading to further instability. However site visibility with regard to the trench sections was good with even daylight and a large amount of upcast spoil was examined. A small number of digital images were taken to record the monitoring (see Appendix I).

3. Results

3.1 The foundation trenches revealed that the development area had extensive tree root disturbance to a depth of 500mm and in some areas to nearly 1000mm. Topsoil depth across the site varied between 200mm and 400mm with the mid brown sandy subsoil layer underlying this being between 200mm and 500mm thick with the deeper deposits possibly running into former tree root holes with very irregular edges

and roots still visible in places. The southern foundation trench ran along the edge of the existing drive and revealed a moderately uniform subsoil layer running to a depth of 600/700mm below some 200mm of drive make-up; this subsoil layer could represent a deliberate levelling up of the drive area. Across the site under the subsoil a loose sand and gravel drift deposit was exposed; as noted above in order to satisfy the building regulations the trenches were excavated further in to these natural occurring deposits and a fine grey/blue clay was exposed at c1400mm below modern ground level. At the interface of these drift deposits of sand and gravel above clay ground water entered the trenches. No archaeological features were observed in any of the foundation trenches and examination of the upcast spoil noted the presence of occasional brick and pipe fragments of recent date but no finds of any antiquity. The images in Appendix I give a better illustration of the site conditions including the severe root disturbance and uneven depth of subsoil caused, it appears, by tree growth and consequent affects below ground.

5. Conclusion

5.1 While the site is within the area of archaeological importance in Grundisburgh these ground works did not reveal any deposits or finds of interest though the site is close to known foci of medieval activity. Perhaps this area being relatively close to the nearby river was too wet to attract past land use beyond agricultural or arboreal activities which have left little evidence in the ground. While there was some suggestion that a farm structure stood on the site of the proposed outbuilding no evidence for any foundations was recorded.

5.2 In conclusion it is clear that the monitored footings have not impinged on any archaeological deposits with the development area apparently having been peripheral to areas of nearby medieval and earlier settlement.

(Acknowledgements: JNAS is grateful to Tim Buxbaum for supplying site detail and to the contractors for their close cooperation with regard to this site monitoring).

Appendix I – Images



Western north-south trench across central part of footprint from north- in section next to ranging rod showing drive & make-up over 600/700mm overburden- ?levelling up layer



Footing trenches from south-west corner of footprint showing collapse & disturbance from a possible tree root area in corner causing deeper subsoil & loose overburden



Footing trench along northern side of the footprint from west



Footing trench along eastern side of the footprint



General view from north east

9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP33 2AR

Brief and Specification for Continuous Archaeological Recording

THE COTTAGE, WOODBRIDGE ROAD, GRUNDISBURGH (C/09/1923)

Although this document is fundamental to the work of the specialist archaeological contractor the developer should be aware that certain of its requirements are likely to impinge upon the working practices of a general building contractor and may have financial implications

1. Background

- 1.1 Planning permission has been granted by Suffolk Coastal District Council (C/09/1923) for the erection of an outbuilding at The Cottage, Woodbridge Road, Grundisburgh (TM 227 510). **Please contact the applicant for an accurate plan of the site.**
- 1.2 The Planning Authority has been advised that any consent should be conditional upon an agreed programme of work taking place before development begins in accordance with PPS 5 *Planning for the Historic Environment* (Policy HE12.3) (which replaced PPG 16 in March 2010) to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.
- 1.3 This proposal lies within an area of archaeological interest recorded in the County Historic Environment Record. The proposed development lies to the immediate east of medieval house platforms (GRU 012), an area which has also produced scatters of medieval pottery and building material. There is high potential for encountering medieval occupation deposits at this location.
- 1.4 Aspects of the proposed works will cause ground disturbance that has potential to damage any heritage assets of archaeological importance that exists.
- 1.5 Assessment of the available archaeological evidence indicates that the area affected by the erection of the new outbuilding can be adequately recorded by continuous archaeological monitoring and recording during all groundworks (**Please contact the developer for an accurate plan of the development**).
- 1.6 In accordance with the standards and guidance produced by the Institute for Archaeologists this brief should not be considered sufficient to enable the total execution of the project. A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) based upon this brief and the accompanying outline specification of minimum requirements, is an essential requirement. This must be submitted by the developers, or their agent, to the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2AR; telephone/fax: 01284 352443) for approval. The work must not commence until this office has approved both the archaeological contractor as suitable to undertake the work, and the WSI as satisfactory. The WSI will *provide the basis for measurable standards* and will be used to establish whether the requirements of the planning condition will be adequately met.

- 1.7 Following approval of the WSI, our office will advise the Local Planning Authority that an acceptable scheme of work is in place, and therefore we (will) have no objection to the work commencing. Neither this specification nor the WSI, however, is a sufficient basis for the discharge of the planning condition relating to archaeological investigation. Only the full implementation of the scheme, both completion of fieldwork and reporting based on the approved WSI, will enable SCCAS/CT to advise Suffolk Coastal District Council that the condition has been adequately fulfilled and can be discharged.
- 1.8 Before commencing work the project manager must carry out a risk assessment and liaise with the site owner, client and the Conservation Team of SCCAS (SCCAS/CT) in ensuring that all potential risks are minimised.
- 1.9 All arrangements for the excavation of the site, the timing of the work, access to the site, the definition of the precise area of landholding and area for proposed development are to be defined and negotiated by the archaeological contractor with the commissioning body.
- 1.10 The responsibility for identifying any constraints on field-work (e.g. Scheduled Monument status, Listed Building status, public utilities or other services, tree preservation orders, SSSIs, wildlife sites &c., ecological considerations) rests with the commissioning body and its archaeological contractor. The existence and content of the archaeological brief does not over-ride such constraints or imply that the target area is freely available.
- 1.11 Detailed standards, information and advice to supplement this brief are to be found in *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14, 2003.
- 1.12 The Institute for Archaeologists' *Standard and Guidance for an archaeological watching brief* (revised 2001) should be used for additional guidance in the execution of the project and in drawing up the report.

2. Brief for Archaeological Recording

- 2.1 To provide a record of archaeological deposits which are damaged or removed by any development [including services and landscaping] permitted by the current planning consent.
- 2.2 The significant archaeologically damaging activity in this proposal is the ground works associated with the erection of a new outbuilding.
- 2.3 Any ground works and also the upcast soil, are to be closely monitored during and after stripping in order to ensure no damage occurs to the heritage asset. Adequate time is to be allowed for archaeological recording of archaeological deposits during excavation, and of soil sections following excavation.

3. Arrangements for Monitoring

- 3.1 To carry out the monitoring work the developer will appoint an archaeologist (the archaeological contractor) who must be approved by SCCAS/CT.
- 3.2 The developer or his contracted archaeologist will give SCCAS/CT five working days notice of the commencement of ground works on the site, in order that the work of the archaeological contractor may be monitored. The method and form of development will also be monitored to ensure that it conforms to previously agreed locations and techniques upon which this brief is based.

- 3.3 Allowance must be made to cover archaeological costs incurred in monitoring the development works by the contract archaeologist. The size of the contingency should be estimated by the approved archaeological contractor, based upon the outline works in this Brief and Specification and the building contractor's programme of works and time-table.
- 3.4 If unexpected remains are encountered SCCAS/CT must be informed immediately. Amendments to this specification may be made to ensure adequate provision for archaeological recording.

4. Specification

- 4.1 The developer shall afford access at all reasonable times to SCCAS/CT and the contracted archaeologist to allow archaeological monitoring of building and engineering operations which disturb the ground.
- 4.2 Opportunity must be given to the contracted archaeologist to hand excavate any discrete archaeological features which appear during earth moving operations, retrieve finds and make measured records as necessary. Where it is necessary to see archaeological detail one of the soil faces is to be trowelled clean.
- 4.3 All archaeological features exposed must be planned at a scale of 1:20 or 1:50 on a plan showing the proposed layout of the development, depending on the complexity of the data to be recorded. Sections should be drawn at 1:10 or 1:20 again depending on the complexity to be recorded.
- 4.4 A photographic record of the work is to be made of any archaeological features, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies/high resolution digital images.
- 4.5 All contexts must be numbered and finds recorded by context. All levels should relate to Ordnance Datum.
- 4.6 Archaeological contexts should, where possible, be sampled for palaeo-environmental remains. Best practice should allow for sampling of interpretable and datable archaeological deposits and provision should be made for this. Advice on the appropriateness of the proposed strategies will be sought from Helen Chappell, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling archaeological deposits (Murphy, P.L. and Wiltshire, P.E.J., 1994, *A guide to sampling archaeological deposits for environmental analysis*) is available for viewing from SCCAS.
- 4.7 All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed with SCCAS/CT during the course of the monitoring).
- 4.8 The data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent with, and approved by, the County Historic Environment Record.

5. Report Requirements

- 5.1 An archive of all records and finds is to be prepared consistent with the principles of *Management of Archaeological Projects (MAP2)*, particularly Appendix 3. This must be deposited with the County Historic Environment Record within three months of the completion of work. It will then become publicly accessible. It must be adequate to perform the function of a final archive for deposition in the County Historic Environment Record (The County Store) or museum in Suffolk.

- 5.2 The project manager must consult the County Historic Environment Record Officer to obtain an event number for the work. This number will be unique for each project or site and must be clearly marked on any documentation relating to the work.
- 5.3 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with *UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines*.
- 5.4 Every effort must be made to get the agreement of the landowner/developer to the deposition of the full site archive, and transfer of title, with the intended archive depository before the fieldwork commences. If this is not achievable for all or parts of the finds archive then provision must be made for additional recording (e.g. photography, illustration, scientific analysis) as appropriate.
- 5.5 The project manager should consult the intended archive depository before the archive is prepared regarding the specific requirements for the archive deposition and curation, and regarding any specific cost implications of deposition.
- 5.6 If the County Store is the intended location of the archive, the project manager should consult the SCCAS Archive Guidelines 2010 and also the County Historic Environment Record Officer regarding the requirements for the deposition of the archive (conservation, ordering, organisation, labelling, marking and storage) of excavated material and the archive. A clear statement of the form, intended content, and standards of the archive is to be submitted for approval as an essential requirement of the WSI.
- 5.7 The WSI should state proposals for the deposition of the digital archive relating to this project with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS), and allowance should be made for costs incurred to ensure proper deposition (<http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/policy.html>).
- 5.8 A report on the fieldwork and archive, consistent with the principles of *MAP2*, particularly Appendix 4, must be provided. The report must summarise the methodology employed, the stratigraphic sequence, and give a period by period description of the contexts recorded, and an inventory of finds. The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its interpretation. The Report must include a discussion and an assessment of the archaeological evidence, including palaeoenvironmental remains recovered from palaeosols and cut features. Its conclusions must include a clear statement of the archaeological value of the results, and their significance in the context of the Regional Research Framework (*East Anglian Archaeology*, Occasional Papers 3 & 8, 1997 and 2000).
- 5.9 An unbound hardcopy of the report, clearly marked DRAFT, must be presented to SCCAS/CT for approval within six months of the completion of fieldwork unless other arrangements are negotiated with the project sponsor and SCCAS/CT.
- 5.10 Following acceptance, a single copy of the report should be submitted to SCCAS/CT. A single hard copy should be presented to the County Historic Environment Record as well as a digital copy of the approved report.
- 5.11 A summary report, in the established format, suitable for inclusion in the annual 'Archaeology in Suffolk' section of the *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology*, must be prepared and included in the project report.
- 5.12 Where appropriate, a digital vector trench plan should be included with the report, which must be compatible with MapInfo GIS software, for integration in the County Historic Environment Record. AutoCAD files should be also exported and saved into a format that can be imported into MapInfo (for example, as a Drawing Interchange File or .dxf) or already transferred to .TAB files.
- 5.13 At the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/> must be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators forms.

- 5.14 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to County Historic Environment Record. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive).

Specification by: Sarah Poppy

Suffolk County Council
Archaeological Service Conservation Team
9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk IP33 2AR
Tel. : 01284 352199
E-mail: sarah.poppy@suffolk.gov.uk

Date: 17 November 2010

Reference: /TheCottageGrundisburgh2010

This brief and specification remains valid for six months from the above date. If work is not carried out in full within that time this document will lapse; the authority should be notified and a revised brief and specification may be issued.

If the work defined by this brief forms a part of a programme of archaeological work required by a Planning Condition, the results must be considered by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council, who have the responsibility for advising the appropriate Planning Authority.