


LAND AT NORTH FIDDINGTON, ASHCURCH,

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT  
ON BEHALF OF ROBERT HITCHINS LTD.



THE OXFORD ARCHAEOLOGICAL UNIT



13979

Source 663



**LAND AT NORTH FIDDINGTON, ASHCURCH**

**GLOUCESTERSHIRE**

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**ON BEHALF OF ROBERT HITCHINS LTD**

The Oxford Archaeological Unit  
February 1992

## CONTENTS

### Evaluation Report

Annexe 1 : Trench Summaries

Annexe 2 : Inventory of Features

Annexe 3 : Pottery Report

Annexe 4 : Letter of 12/12/91 from Gloucestershire County Council  
Archaeological Officer

Annexe 5 : Letter of 20/12/91 from Gloucestershire County Council  
Archaeological Officer

Annexe 6 : North Fiddington Archaeological Evaluation : Detailed Project Design

Figure 1 : Location of Evaluation Trenches

Figure 2 : Location of Archaeological Features found during Trenching

Figure 3 : North Fiddington : Field Names

Figure 4 : Plan of Trenches 83/85

Figure 5 : Trench 85 Sections

Figure 6 : Plan and Sections of Trenches 78/79

Figure 7 : Plan and Sections of Trenches 103/104

## LAND AT NORTH FIDDINGTON, ASHCHURCH, GLOUCESTERSHIRE

### ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT ON BEHALF OF ROBERT HITCHINS LTD

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Oxford Archaeological Unit was commissioned by Robert Hitchins Ltd to carry out an archaeological assessment of the land at North Fiddington, Ashchurch, in line with the recommendations of Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 (PPG 16).
- 1.2 Subsequently, the Archaeological Officer at Gloucestershire County Council recommended to Tewkesbury Borough Council that an archaeological assessment should be requested 'in order that any archaeological implication of the development may be fully evaluated' (cf. PPG 16, paras 21-23) (see letter of 12 December 1991, Annexe 4). A provisional project design was submitted to the County Archaeological Officer and amended following her comments of 20 December 1991.
- 1.3 The agreed evaluation strategy (Annexe 6) was implemented in the field in January 1992.

#### 2. SUMMARY OF FIELD EVALUATION RESULTS

- 2.1 The Archaeological Evaluation exercise carried out by the Oxford Archaeological consisted of a study of historical sources by Dr Anthea Jones and field assessment by fieldwalking and trenching under the direction of D Miles and supervised by A Mudd.
- 2.2 Fieldwalking results were limited because pasture and growing crops obscured the surface in many areas. The visible ploughed surface was confined to the area north of Tirlle Brook (mostly outside the Appeal site). In the visible areas pottery sherds on the field surface are best explained as the residue of medieval and post-medieval manuring. There was no indication of ancient settlement sites.
- 2.3 The Appeal Site (63.36 ha) and the adjacent areas north of Tirlle Brook were sampled by trenching. The proposed 0.75% sample of 99 trenches (30 m x 1.5 m) was increased to a total of 106 trenches in order to clarify the detail of particular areas.
- 2.4 The proposed development area lies between the medieval settlements of Walton Cardiff and Natton, at both of which there are shrunken/deserted village sites. Ashchurch to the north, was simply a church rather than a settlement site. Most of the nearby place-names (Natton, Walton, Fiddington, etc) end in 'ton' indicating that these were farming settlements amidst their arable fields. The Appeal site lies within these medieval arable fields between the ancient settlements. Fiddington and Natton are

mentioned in Domesday Book and the two were merged for taxation purposes in the fourteenth century.

- 2.5 The clearest indication of archaeological features in the area assessed was found in the north-west corner, the angle between the M5 motorway and the A438. This is outside the Appeal site (see Fig. 2). A number of ditches running approximately north-south probably belong to the Romano-British period. Two human inhumations were also found (Trench 85) probably of Romano-British date. These features probably represent outlying enclosures and a small cemetery belonging to the Romano-British settlement observed to the west when the M5 was constructed. The quantity of Romano-British debris (pottery, animal bone, etc) was very limited and suggests that this is the periphery of the settlement area. No Romano-British features were found in trenches to the east (Trenches 84, 75, etc). There was a small medieval component in the Romano-British area of uncertain character. North-south ditches located in Trenches 75, 73, 61 appear to be the remains of field boundaries indicated on post-medieval maps.
- 2.6 In the south-central area of the assessment a scatter of possible archaeological features was located: small pits or postholes. There was little or no dating evidence. A sherd from Trench 104 may indicate a late prehistoric date.

### 3. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The proposed development site lies to the north of Fiddington and is bounded on the east by the railway, on the west by the motorway, on the south by an old road between Walton Cardiff and Pamington, and on the north by the main Tewkesbury-Stow road, the A438. Most of the area is in the parish of Ashchurch but a small part on the western side is in the parish of Walton Cardiff.
- 3.2 The A438 seems to be the focus of Ashchurch, but until comparatively modern times a second east-west road, which may have been equally or more important, used to pass to the north of the church; it joined the Bredon-Cheltenham road at the now disappeared Isabel's Elm. The Tewkesbury Turnpike Trust in the eighteenth century straightened and improved the present road from Aston Cross, south of Isabel's Elm, to near Tewkesbury Secondary School; part of the old road existed as a footpath until 1954 (VCH p. 173). Rudder (p.234) described Ashchurch in 1779:
- 3.3 The evaluation area consists of rich meadow and pasture, with a considerable proportion of deep arable land. The turnpike road from Tewkesbury to London leads through it; before the gates were erected it was almost impassable.
- 3.4 The importance of the A438 was emphasised as a result of Tewkesbury's fight over the route of the Bristol to Birmingham Railway; to prevent Tewkesbury's opposition to the enabling bill before parliament, it was agreed to create a branch line to the town leaving the main line at

## Ashchurch.

### 3.5. THE PARISH OF ASHCHURCH

3.5.1 Historically, Ashchurch was not a settlement name. For example, in the Militia lists for 1608 Ashchurch does not appear but the villages which made up the parish are listed: Fiddington and Natton, Northway and Newton, Aston-on-Carrant and Pamington. Ashchurch was simply the church which provided the vital link between these separate farming communities. It is no accident that all but one of these place-names end in 'ton', as the character of each was a farming settlement or 'town' surrounded by its arable fields. All were within the great estate of Tewkesbury manor, which stretched several miles from east to west, from Forthampton on the west side of the Severn to Oxenton with its outlying Cotswold hill pastures on the east. There were also other 'tons' in Tewkesbury manor, like Walton Cardiff and Tredington, and the fact that there are so many subsidiary 'tons' seems to point to an organisation for effective exploitation of the farmland by a powerful lord rather than settlements located by early inhabitants wherever geographical conditions were favourable. The names of Fiddington, Newton and Pamington are known before the Norman Conquest, and Fiddington, Pamington, Natton and Aston-on-Carrant are mentioned in Domesday Book (Smith 1964, 53-4).

3.5.2 Tewkesbury church controlled the whole extensive manor as one parish, and like other early or primary minster churches, was unwilling to have smaller parishes created within its area, as this would lead to loss of revenue from tithes as well as loss of influence. Ashchurch was not allowed parish status throughout the medieval period and was first recognised as a parish at the end of the sixteenth century (VCH p. 185). The church building existed from at least the middle of the twelfth century as a chapel subordinate to Tewkesbury and had been built in a central position to serve at least five farming communities. In the fourteenth century Natton was merged with Fiddington and from this time there were four "tithings", or separate areas for taxation: Aston-on-Carrant, Fiddington and Natton, Pamington, Northway and Newton. Maps showing the boundaries of the tithings were made in 1829 (GRO/p19/VE1/1-4).

### 3.6 NORTHWAY AND NEWTON, AND NATTON

3.6.1 The southern boundary of Northway and Newton with Fiddington was the old road from Pamington to Walton Cardiff which is also the southern boundary of the development site. The site was therefore entirely outside the boundaries of Fiddington. The railway line was built close to the eastern boundary of Northway and Newton with Pamington. Apart from the western strip in Walton Cardiff, the development site was not well documented. What is discussed in the following paragraphs is speculative and used nineteenth century evidence to throw light retrospectively on the earlier history of the area.

3.6.2 The 'new town' of Newton was nearest the church of Ashchurch and Newton and Northway tithes were used to pay the minister (a 'perpetual

curacy'). Newton should not be confused with Newtown, which was a nineteenth century development round the new Walton House and was subsequently transferred to Tewkesbury parish in 1935. Newton was never treated as a separate township but was always coupled with Northway. Today Newton is a name attached to a single farm, but there is some evidence from the pattern of field boundaries in the early nineteenth century that there may once have been a row of crofts planned along the south side of the modern A438 opposite the junction with the old London Road; here there were four small rectangular fields, whose boundaries were all parallel to each other and also to the Tirlle stream, which would have been typical of a planned settlement. All but one of these plots were pasture land in 1829. Newton had some arable fields to the south and other to the north of the A438, while an area of pasture south of the Tirlle was possibly drawn away from Natton, whose boundary is likely originally to have followed the stream. The open-shared 'common' fields in Newton had all disappeared by mid-seventeenth century (VCH p. 182). Enclosure Act of Parliament did not affect Northway and Newton.

3.6.3 Northway and Newton probably had a slightly larger population than the other tithings in 1608; a gentleman and a few craftsmen (two smiths, two tailors, a joiner and a weaver) amongst the able-bodies liable for service in the Militia, the Home Guard of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, hint at this being a minor village nucleus for Ashchurch. The other tithings were almost completely agricultural; Fiddington had the largest number of prosperous farmers or 'yeomen'.

3.6.4 Able-bodied men in Ashchurch in 1608

Newton and Northway	32
Pamington	27
Fiddington and Natton	21
Aston-on-Carrant	20

3.6.5 Northway was once a single farm enclosure, a 'hay' or park, in the north of the manor, hence its name, though a settlement in Northway certainly existed by the early thirteenth century. Newton may perhaps have been a planned new town to accommodate the inhabitants displaced by the creation of the hay or park. Cowfield in the north of Northway tithing also sounds like an enclosure of a pasture formerly 'open' and shared in common by the farmers. In 1540 Tewkesbury Abbey controlled Northway Park and also Cowfield, which was three closes of pasture amounting to 60 acres with a house and moat (GRO/P329/M15). The Park was still recognised in the seventeenth century when it was said to be decayed, and one field was called 'The Park' in 1829.

3.6.6 Natton was never a large settlement though it had been a separate taxation unit; in 1327 there were five tax payers. Natton probably indicated a farm specialising in the rearing or pasturing of cattle, which was the Anglo-Saxon meaning of 'neat'. There were traces of this specialisation in 1540 when Tewkesbury Abbey's *capital messuage* in Natton had pasturage for twenty-eight oxen at 'The Pen'. This was rather more animals than one farmer,

even a large one, could employ. (It amounted to four or more plough teams of six to a plough). 'The Pen' was presumably an enclosed pasture, because of its name, and probably belonged to the lord of Tewkesbury Manor. A reference to Pamington 'Homepen' seems to link Homedowns and The Pen together. Homedowns, formerly 'Hamondowns', is the name of a hamlet and of a farm south of the development site. A 'down' was usually an open pasture ground. Robert Fitz Hamon was lord of Tewkesbury Manor at the beginning of the twelfth century and the founder of Tewkesbury Abbey; the name is usually associate with him and may indicate that he first started to enclose this pasture. Field names indicate that the 'Homedowns' was an extensive tract of pasture bounded by the road from Oxenton to Walton Cardiff. south of this road was the compact area of Fiddington's open fields, not enclosed until 1814 (GRO/P19/SD4); to the east Pamington's open fields, enclosed by Act of Parliament in 1809. The 'Homedowns' look like Natton's one-time pasture; Natton Pen was apparently enclosed in 1609. In the early nineteenth century Aston-on-Carrant, Pamington and Fiddington were all concerned in the final enclosure of the last 38 acres of the 'Homedowns', showing that part had once been common for all these farming communities.

### 3.7 CONCLUSION

- 3.7.1 It is noticeable how many of the tithing and open field boundaries still exist as roads or tracks, clearly demarcating the old open field territories of each settlement. It would be desirable for these boundaries to be reflected in the layout of any modern development in the area.

### 3.8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Elrington, C R, (ed.), *Victoria History of the County of Gloucester*, Vol. VI (1968).

Morris, J, (ed.), *Domesday Book for Gloucestershire*, (1982).

Smith, A H, *The Place-Names of Gloucestershire* (ii), (1964).

Rudder, S, *A New History of Gloucestershire*, 1779.

## 4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

- 4.1 An archaeological evaluation was undertaken by the Oxford Archaeological Unit on behalf of Robert Hitchens Limited on 80 ha of land at North Fiddington, Ashchurch. The site, which is under option for development, is bounded by the M5 motorway to the west, the Cheltenham-Worcester railway line to the east, the A438 to the north, and a footpath between Homedowns and Walton Cardiff on the southern side. The work was carried out in January 1992.

## 4.2 GEOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

- 4.2.1 The site is low-lying, on a natural geology of Liassic clay. While the clay was everywhere variable, containing pockets of silt, sand and gravel, no evidence was found of the gravel 'island' mentioned in D Miles's 'Evidence to the Local Plan Enquiry' (Para. 38.2). Tirlle Brook flows E-W across the northern part of the site. To its north, the ground rises in a pronounced scarp from around 13 m, to over 19 m OD in the NE corner of the site. To the south of the brook, the ground rises more gradually to a similar height at the site's southern boundary, while there is a slightly lower knoll to the east, west of the present house 'Tyn y Cae'.
- 4.2.2 At the time of the evaluation, most of the land was under a low arable crop, with the exceptions of Fields M, N, C, D, E and F, which were under pasture.

## 4.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

- 4.3.1 No archaeological sites were previously known from the proposed development area. A Romano-British settlement had been reported immediately to the NW (GCC SMR 5481, Grid Ref. SO 91523283), and the NW corner of the evaluation site therefore had some archaeological potential. Documentary research (see Historical Background) did not indicate the likely presence of any sites of the historical period in the area. Taking into account the intractable nature of the soils here, and their consequent unattractiveness to early settlement, the overall archaeological potential of this area was considered to be low.

## 4.4 STRATEGY

- 4.4.1 The evaluation was conducted in two stages; a surface collection survey in Field A (about 10% of the evaluation site), and the machine-excavation of trenches distributed over the entire site (see Fig. 1). The latter strategy represented a sample of about 0.8% of the evaluation area.
- 4.4.2 A surface collection was made in Field A in order to assist the location of the trial trenches by pin-pointing areas of archaeological interest. This was the only field in which the winter cereal crop was low enough to permit inspection of the ground surface. The collection was made in transects walked on a 25 m grid. Large quantities of post-Mediaeval material (principally pottery and brick/tile) were found, together with smaller amounts of Mediaeval pottery and a few Roman sherds. They were distributed in a broad scatter across the field and can probably be accounted for by the practice of manuring fields. These results were of no help in positioning the trial trenches.
- 4.4.3 A total of 106 trenches was excavated using a 360 degree mechanical excavator equipped with a 6-foot toothless bucket. They were generally 30 m long, and arranged so as to cover the site more or less systematically.
- 4.4.4 Additional trenches were excavated in areas of archaeological interest, so as

to define more precisely their nature and extent. In some cases, the original trenches were extended in length. Some trenches were dug discontinuously or repositioned so as to avoid damaging field drains.

- 4.4.5 The trenches were excavated down as far as recognisable archaeological horizons, or, where these could not be discerned, as far as the natural clay. Selective cleaning of the trenches was carried out. Generally, the bottom of the trench was cleaned by machine-bucket, since experience showed that hand-cleaning did not improve the visibility of soil changes. The trench sides were cleaned in small sections to record the stratigraphy, or more extensively where archaeological features were encountered.
- 4.4.6 A sample of archaeological features (or potential features) was excavated by hand so as to explore their nature and obtain dating evidence. Generally, it was not the policy to investigate relationships between features, since, in the absence of an overall view of the site, key relationships cannot necessarily be recognised and given the attention which they merit.
- 4.4.7 During the course of the evaluation, some modifications were made to the original specification. These were made with the agreement of the acting County Archaeological Officer. Fewer trenches were excavated in the lower land close to the Tirlé Brook, which is less threatened by the development proposal. According to the proposal (Strategic Plan 3), this land is designated as an open space, and therefore not to be subjected to extensive ground disturbances. The high water table also made the excavation of trenches in this area extremely difficult at this time of year.

#### 4.8 PHYSICAL CONDITIONS OF FIELDWORK

- 4.8.1 The conditions under which the evaluation was conducted were far from ideal. Most notably, the high ground-water level resulted in water seepage into most of the trenches to the south of Tirlé Brook. Those in ground near the brook in Field B (especially Trenches 90, 93, 95, 98, 99, and 100) were most severely affected, while all those in Fields M and D (on the eastern side of the site) also presented major problems. Heavy rain at the beginning of January, and frozen ground later in the month added to the difficulty of detailed archaeological work.
- 4.8.2 The clay geology was highly variable in nature, frequently containing patches of silt and gravel. These variations were often liable to be confused with archaeological features. Similarly, Mediaeval/post-Mediaeval plough furrows bore a resemblance to archaeological features where they were deep enough to disturb the natural clay. They could generally be distinguished by their rectilinear patterning and relative shallowness.
- 4.8.3 Field drains were common throughout the evaluation area. Normally, their trenches were easily distinguishable from archaeological features. However, in exception to this, Trenches 38, 87 and 39 (Field J) contained closely spaced and elaborately laid drains in trenches 3 m wide. These were presumably laid in the 19th or early 20th century.

## 4.9 RESULTS

- 4.9.1 The vast majority of trenches contained no archaeological features, and few finds of archaeological significance were discovered during soil-stripping and cleaning.
- 4.9.2 A summary of the features encountered is shown in Figure 2. Three areas of most archaeological promise (in Fields L/O, G and I) are discussed below. Outside these areas, in some of the other trenches, features were also discovered. However, their equivocal nature and the lack of associated finds makes them archaeologically dubious, and they are not dealt with further in this report.
- 4.9.3 A light scatter of pottery of the Romano-British and Mediaeval periods, and three flint tools were found during soil-stripping. Those found away from the concentration of activity in Fields L/O, probably represent stray finds and manuring scatters.
- 4.9.4 Annexe 1 contains a summary of the excavated trenches and an inventory of finds within the soil layers. Some discussion of the less important features is also included.
- 4.9.5 Annexe 2 gives information, in tabular form, on the features encountered, including many which are not considered likely to be of archaeological significance.
- 4.9.6 Annexe 3 contains a specialist's summary of the pottery from the excavations.
- 4.9.7 In these Annexes the following abbreviations are used:
- IA = Iron Age, RB = Romano-British, Med = Mediaeval, PM = post-Mediaeval, US = unstratified, CBM = ceramic building material (brick/tile).

## 5. AREAS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST

### 5.1 FIELD L AND THE WESTERN EDGE OF FIELD O

- 5.1.1 Trench 85 (Figs. 4 & 5). Under 0.2 m of modern ploughsoil and 0.27 m of subsoil were discovered three linear features, 85/4, 85/6 and 85/7, crossing the trench and cutting the natural clay.
- 5.1.2 85/4 was a large ditch running N-S, about 3.0 m wide and 0.35 m deep, with a flattish base. Possibly the feature had been recut, but this was far from clear. The only finds from this feature were the poorly preserved remains of a human burial (85/5) on the eastern side of the ditch. No grave cut was visible, and the burial might have been placed within the ditch. The only surviving bones were two long bones (probably the legs of a child) and some fragments of skull. The arrangement of the surviving bones suggests that

ditch 85/7, and less certainly from 79/5. The burials are technically undated, but their orientation and close relationship to ditches 85/7 and 85/4, suggest that they, and ditch 85/4, are associated with this occupation. It is possible that the burials are evidence of a larger cemetery, but isolated inhumations, or small groups of inhumations, are not uncommon on rural Romano-British sites, and it seems probable that they are examples of this practice.

- 5.1.11 The paucity of finds from this field suggests that the features encountered are related to agricultural land divisions rather than to the nucleus of a settlement. Conceivably, this could be associated with the Romano-British settlement discovered about 600 m to the west during the construction of the motorway (GCC SMR 5481). However, the comparatively large quantities of Romano-British pottery from Trs 78 and 84 (in Field O) suggest that a nearer focus of settlement lay in this direction. It apparently would not have extended as far as Tr 84, but might have lain to the north and north-west of Tr 78. The 'domestic' character of feature 78/4, (ie. its charcoal-rich fill, with comparatively large quantities of rubbish), gives strong indication of settlement here. However, the presence of probable Mediaeval pottery suggests that this might in fact belong to a later occupation. On the other hand, the Mediaeval pottery could perhaps equally be interpreted as intrusive in Romano-British features. Given the small-scale nature of the excavation here, and the small absolute quantities of material recovered, either of the two interpretations can be held.

## 5.2 FIELD G

- 5.2.1 Trench 59. Under 0.2 m of modern ploughsoil and 0.4 m of subsoil was revealed a very shallow, sub-circular pit (59/4), 0.6 m in diameter and 80 mm deep. It contained frequent flecks of charcoal and a lens of fired clay (possibly daub).
- 5.2.2 At the north end of the trench a large feature (59/9), 3.3 m wide and 0.6 m deep, was excavated (not shown on Fig. 2). It was largely filled with a compact grey-brown silty clay with occasional flecks of charcoal, but an upper browner and siltier fill (59/8) might have represented a later recut. No finds came from this feature. It ran N-S across the trench, but did not continue into Trench 104 nor into Trench 103 to the north and its interpretation remains rather enigmatic. It might be a tree throw-hole rather than an archaeological feature. Its stratigraphic position suggests that it is rather earlier than the archaeological features discovered in Trenches 103 and 104, but the stratigraphy in this area might not provide a reliable guide for dating purposes.
- 5.2.3 Trench 104 (Fig. 7). Under 0.1 m of topsoil were revealed a V-shaped ditch (104/3), 1.6 m wide and 0.65 m deep, running N-S, and a flat-based, sub-circular pit (104/4), 1.13 m E-W by 0.96 m N-S and 0.22 m deep. Ditch 104/3, which was completely excavated, contained fired clay (probably daub) and animal bone, while 104/4 also contained a single small sherd of pottery, which is possibly Iron Age in date. These features were cutting a mid-brownish grey silty clay subsoil.

they were in situ rather than redeposited, and belong to an inhumation oriented with its head to the north.

- 5.1.3 85/7 was another substantial ditch running N-S showing several recuts. Its overall width was 1.5 m and maximum depth 0.4 m. It yielded fragments of 2nd-century Romano-British pottery. An inhumation (85/8) was located on the western side of the ditch, probably in a shallow grave cut into the edge of the ditch rather than within the ditch fill. The bones were again poorly preserved, and had possibly been disturbed by later ploughing. Only the lower arm, cranium fragments and part of a femur were exposed, but this is sufficient to suggest that it was an in situ extended inhumation oriented with the head to the north. The human bones were left in position and not removed from the site.
- 5.1.4 85/6 was a shallow gully lying just to the west of 85/7 and running NW-SE. It was 0.65 m wide and just 0.1 m deep, and its dimensions and alignment suggest that it might be the same as gully 83/4 (Tr. 83).
- 5.1.5 Trench 83. In this trench were found two possible archaeological features, both in the southern extreme. 83/4 was a possible shallow gully, 0.5 m wide and 80 mm deep, running NW-SE. This was cut by a wide but very shallow feature (2.0 m by 0.18 m deep), running E-W, which produced no finds, (83/5). Its date therefore is not known.
- 5.1.6 In addition, the edge of an ill-defined feature (83/6), which was probably the edge of ditch 85/7, produced a few sherds of Roman pottery.
- 5.1.7 Trench 79 (Fig. 6). Under 0.2 m of modern ploughsoil and 0.38 m of subsoil was discovered a large ditch - 79/5 - running N-S. Its overall width was 2.2 m and its depth 0.8 m, and it had a rounded base. There was a possible recut on the eastern side, but a post-Mediaeval sherd from this feature suggested that it had been disturbed by later ploughing. A probable plough-furrow (79/9) lay to the west. A few fragments of pottery came from the secondary fill of ditch 79/5, and, although they are not very diagnostic, they might be Romano-British and/or Iron Age in date.
- 5.1.8 79/6 was an oval pit on the eastern side of ditch 79/5, and probably cut by it. It yielded a few fragments of animal bone.
- 5.1.9 Trench 78 (Fig. 6). Under 0.25-0.28 m of modern ploughsoil and 0.22-0.34 m of subsoil was revealed the edge of a probable ditch (78/4), running NNW-SSE. The upper fill of this feature was a grey silty clay containing charcoal, fragments of bone, and pottery. The pottery includes late Iron Age and 2nd-century Romano-British wares, but a small quantity, which is thought on balance to be Mediaeval, suggests that the feature is actually later. A small excavation reached a depth of 0.5 m, but the feature's position within the trench did not allow for the recording of its dimensions.
- 5.1.10 The evidence from this area suggests a late Iron Age to early/mid Roman occupation, and perhaps some Mediaeval activity as well. In Field L, the dating evidence for the Romano-British occupation comes from pottery in

- 5.2.4 Trench 103 (Fig. 7). A possibly circular pit, or ditch terminal, 103/5, was found in the western side of the trench under 0.2 m of modern ploughsoil and a thin (80 mm - 0.19 m) layer of subsoil. The feature was 0.4 m deep and 2.3 m wide at the top, narrowing to 1.2 m at a flattish base. It contained a reddish-brown upper fill with smears of fired clay and moderately frequent flecks of charcoal.
- 5.2.5 There were two other features running parallel to each other, E-W across the trench. They were 1.75 - 2.0 m wide and their centres were 7.0 m apart. One (103/3) was tested by excavation and proved to be 0.25 m deep, filled with an olive-grey silty clay. They were interpreted as plough furrows.
- 5.2.6 The presence of features containing fired clay in all these trenches, suggests that the features can all be treated as elements of the same complex, notwithstanding the fact that there is no consistent stratigraphic relationship between them and the overlying soil layers. Unfortunately there is no good dating evidence, but, relying on a single sherd of pottery from 104/4, it seems that these features might relate to an Iron Age occupation.
- 5.2.7 The character of the occupation can hardly be evaluated given the meagre evidence. The presence of fired clay, presumably, although not conclusively, from a wattle and daub structure, indicates that a settlement was close by. However, the general paucity of finds suggests that its focus would have lain a little further to the east (ie. between Trenches 57 and 58).

### 5.3 FIELD I

- 5.3.1 Trench 28. A single feature, (28/3), about 1.46 m wide and 0.42 m deep was revealed in the northern section of this trench. It was probably the edge of a pit or ditch terminal. Its fill contained large amounts of charcoal, but there were no finds.
- 5.3.2 Trench 89. This trench, located to the south of Tr. 28, contained a number of possible archaeological features, almost all positioned along the edge of the trench, making their overall forms indefinable. All were sealed by 0.2-0.3 m of modern ploughsoil and 0.15-0.25 m of subsoil. None yielded dating evidence.
- 5.3.3 89/3 was a shallow ovoid pit, or perhaps a gully terminal, about 1.0 m wide and 0.2 m deep with a flattish base.
- 5.3.4 89/5 was a ?sub-circular pit 0.9 m in diameter and 0.34 m deep, containing soil stained deep orange by fired clay.
- 5.3.5 89/6 was a sub-circular feature 0.5 m in diameter and 0.1 m deep. It contained small quantities of fired clay.
- 5.3.6 89/7 was the edge of a possible ovoid feature, about 1.4 m wide and 0.2 m deep, with an irregular base. The fill contained occasional flecks of fired clay

and charcoal.

- 5.3.7 Unfortunately, none of the features in these trenches provided any dating evidence, and neither is it clear what any of them represent. By analogy with Trenches 59, 103 and 104 (Field G), it is again possible that they are evidence of a light prehistoric? occupation. The absence of features or finds in the surrounding trenches (102, 25, 29 and 36) suggests that this occupation would have been a limited one.

#### 5.4 FIELD BOUNDARIES (MEDIAEVAL & POST-MEDIAEVAL)

- 5.4.1 Four trenches crossed broad and relatively shallow ditches which might have acted as field boundaries in the Mediaeval and later periods. Trench 61 (Field A) had one such ditch running across it (61/3) which yielded a single Mediaeval pot sherd. This feature is so closely coincident with the field boundary shown on the 1:2500 OS map that its interpretation seems beyond question. It was not, however, visible in Trench 65 immediately to the south, presumably because of its shallowness. Other features interpreted as field boundaries were 19/5, 73/5, 75/6, 88/4 and 88/6. Feature 19/5 yielded a post-Mediaeval pot sherd.

#### 5.5 CONCLUSION

- 5.5.1 Generally, there were few archaeologically significant features or finds from the evaluation, particularly in view of the size of the area under investigation. This suggests that the chief land use in this area has always been agricultural/pastoral. However, three areas of some archaeological interest were identified.
- 5.5.2 The eastern half of Field L and the western edge of Field O were found to be the location of 1st-3rd century occupation, with a possible Mediaeval component. Most of the area was probably peripheral to actual settlement, and the evidence suggests that the focus of settlement, if it existed within this area, would have lain to the north of the excavated trenches.
- 5.5.3 It is perhaps unexpected that features are present in quite low land in this area (Tr 83 & 85), and it is possible that occupation does also extend beyond the southern field boundary into Field Q. If it does, the potential for preserved environmental evidence would seem to be high.
- 5.5.4 In Field G (Tr 59, 103 & 104), evidence of light occupation, possibly of Iron Age date, was discovered. Fired clay and animal bone suggest a settlement sited on the SW side of a low knoll. For topographic reasons, it seems unlikely to have extended much further onto the lower ground to the south and west, and its extent therefore seems to be quite circumscribed.
- 5.5.5 A similar enigmatic collection of features, found in Field I (Tr 28 & 89), might also indicate a prehistoric occupation, but there is an absence of dating evidence. From a topographic viewpoint, the site's location appears to lack rationale, since this is one of the most low-lying areas of the evaluation.

## 6. POTENTIAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESPONSE ON THE BASIS OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- 6.1 On the basis of the assessment exercise the following course of action is proposed to mitigate the impact of development. The County Archaeological Officer will be consulted to clarify the specification for any further work.
- 6.2 The assessment has not indicated any areas of archaeological deposits for which preservation in situ need be the primary objective. The Romano-British deposits are outside the Appeal site, but even these are not of such rarity or state of preservation that preservation in situ is paramount. The features in the central-southern area are enigmatic, but may indicate prehistoric activity. Preservation need not be the primary objective. However, if development can be planned to have little or no impact this would be desirable.
- 6.3 If development is to have an impact on the central-southern area then archaeological recording should take place prior to any construction or ground works. Area excavation is desirable around Trenches 28/29 (approx. 0.5 ha) and Trenches 103/104 (approx. 0.7 ha). Topsoil should be removed by machine under archaeological supervision. The exposed surface should be cleaned and planned; archaeological features should be sampled to establish the character of the site and to provide sufficient material for dating and for environmental analysis (animal bones, carbonized plants, molluscs, etc).
- 6.4 In addition to area excavations, a detailed survey should be carried out of relict ridge and furrow prior to any development.
- 6.5 A watching brief should be maintained during the initial topsoil stripping phases of groundworks, particularly on the proposed access roads from the A438. Any archaeological features should be planned and sampled.
- 6.6 The Tirl Brook area may contain data of environmental interest, eg waterlogged deposits or alluvial strata. Drainage works, etc, should be observed, sections recorded and samples taken if they are of archaeological interest.
- 6.7 Any archaeological work should be recorded, analysed and published to a standard agreed with the County Archaeological Officer.
- 6.8 Archaeological material and records should be deposited with an appropriate museum.

## 7. NORTH FIDDINGTON IN THE CONTEXT OF TEWKESBURY (COMMENTS BY D MILES)

- 7.1 I have considered the North Fiddington site in the context of the potential for development in the Tewkesbury hinterland as a whole. The following sites were considered in evidence given at the Local Plan Inquiry (3 July

1991):

- \* Land south of Tewkesbury (the Gastons) (Part Option 1)
- \* Land to the rear of Gupshill Manor (JJH/Whitbread) (Option 1)
- \* Land at Stonehill (County Council Site) (Option 3)
- \* Land at the Wheatpieces (the Bloor/Bovis Site) (Option 4)
- \* Land east of Walton Cardiff (Gallagher/Westbury) (Option 13)
- \* Land at N and S Fiddington (Robert Hitchins Ltd) (Options 11/12)
- \* Land at Cowfield Farm (Robert Hitchins Ltd) (Option 7)
- \* Land at Gellester's Farm, Mitton (Croome Est. Trust) (Option 6)

7.2 These areas have been subject to desk-top assessment. Aerial photographs, historical maps, records and the County Sites and Monuments Record have been examined. In addition a field evaluation has been carried out at Cowfield Farm and most recently at the present Appeal site of North Fiddington.

7.3 I considered alternative sites around Tewkesbury (Table 7.4) for the Local Plan Enquiry with regards their significance for Archaeology, Historic Landscape and Historic Events (The Battle of Tewkesbury). Those sites (The Gastons, Gupshill Manor and Stonehill) were classified as significant under all three categories and one (Wheatpieces) under two categories. I was concerned about the archaeological significance at Cowfield Farm, but this has been satisfied by the completion of an evaluation exercise in which the site has been investigated and trenched in the field.

7.4 Table: Cultural Heritage Constraints on Tewkesbury Development Sites

<b>Cultural Heritage Constraints on Development</b>				
<b>SITE</b>	<b>OPTION</b>	<b>ARCHAEOLOGY</b>	<b>HISTORIC LANDSCAPE</b>	<b>HISTORIC EVENTS</b>
'The Gastons'	1	*	*	*
Gupshill Manor	1	*	*	*
Stonehill	3	*	*	*
Wheatpieces	4	*	*	-
E of Walton Cardiff	13	-	-	-
S of Fiddington	11	-	-	-
N of Fiddington	12	-	-	-
Cowfield Farm	7	-	-	-
Land at Mitton	6	*	-	-

- 7.5 Following the field evaluation at North Fiddington, I have not changed my opinion of the relative historical and/or archaeological importance of the sites listed in the above table. Development at the Gastons, Gupshill Manor and Stonehill option is, I believe, undesirable because of the impact on the Battlefield of Tewkesbury and the setting of the historic town and ancient monuments and the unevaluated impact on the archaeology of these sites.
- 7.6 Tewkesbury constitutes one of the finest historic towns in Britain. This was recognised in the Council for British Archaeology's 1965 list of 51 towns '*so splendid and so precious that the ultimate responsibility for them should be of national concern*'. The Council for British Archaeology emphasised its continuing commitment to the preservation of Tewkesbury and its setting when its representative, John Steane, gave evidence at the Stonehill/Wheatpieces Enquiry in December last year.
- 7.7 I agree with the Council for British Archaeology that development south of Tewkesbury is undesirable. The archaeological/cultural heritage constraints at North Fiddington are less severe and mitigation is possible in advance of development.

**Annexe 1**

## ANNEXE 1: TRENCH SUMMARIES

The following is a summary of the stratigraphy, and an inventory of the finds from the layers in the excavated trenches. (See Annexe 2 for an inventory of the features encountered.) Post-Mediaeval topsoil finds are not included in this report. Due to the large number of trenches, and the lack of features or finds from most of them, the trenches are grouped by field (Fields A-O), and described and discussed together.

### Field C: Trenches 1-4

Lengths 30 m; depths 0.8 - 1.0 m

#### Stratigraphy

0.1-0.15 m	modern turfline & topsoil
0.1-0.35 m	grey-brown silty clay with occasional fine gravel (upper subsoil)
0.13-0.5 m	greyish brown clay, mottled grey (lower subsoil)
Natural	Compact dark brownish grey clay with reddish brown sandy mottles & frequent weathered ?siltstone.

#### Finds

3/2 (upper subsoil):	1 Med pot, slate, oyster, clay pipe
3/US:	Ag coin (undated - Med?)

#### Features

2/5  
3/6

#### Comments

The field yielded very little material. Finds suggest PM ploughing in this field, which is currently under rough pasture.

### Field D: Trenches 5-12, 106

Lengths 30 m; depths variable, 0.25 - 0.8 m

#### Stratigraphy

0.15-0.2 m	modern turfline & topsoil
0.15-0.38 m	light brown/yellow-brown silty clay (subsoil) grey-brown clay (lower subsoil in Trs. 8 & 9)
Natural	grey-brown clay with yellow-brown patches and weathered flecks of stone.

#### Finds

7/2 (subsoil):	1 PM pot, bone
106/US:	1 Med pot
106/2 (subsoil):	1 flint scraper

#### Features

5/4  
5/5  
8/4

#### Comments

The trenches were shallower than elsewhere (generally not deeper than 0.5 m), but variable due to pronounced E-W ridge-and-furrow. Cutting the natural clay, there was a consistent pattern of furrows running in the direction of the surface ridge-and-furrow, evident particularly in the E-W trenches (7, 10 & 11). One was tested by excavation (7/4), and showed itself to be 0.26 m deep, with moderately steep sides. It is possible that the

land was deliberately deep-ploughed to assist drainage.

In Tr 5, 2 parallel features, 7 m apart, ran NW-SE. They were not traced in Tr 106 and are considered to be either pre-ridge-and-furrow plough marks, or natural variations in the clay.

### Field E: Trenches 13-15

Lengths 30 m; depths 0.5 - 0.75 m

#### Stratigraphy

0.2-0.3 m	modern turfline and topsoil
0.3-0.55 m	light yellow-brown clay (subsoil)
Natural	compact yellow-grey clay

#### Finds

-

#### Features

-

#### Comments

Ridge-and-furrow extant. A very clean subsoil.

### Field F: Trenches 16-18

Lengths 30 m; depths 0.45 - 0.8 m

#### Stratigraphy

0.15-0.2 m	modern turfline and topsoil
0.17-0.5 m	yellow-brown or mid-brown clay (subsoil)
0.1-0.3 m	grey or brown clay (lower subsoil in Trs 16 & 18 only)
Natural	grey-brown clay with sandy lenses and 10-15% fragments of weathered ?siltstone

#### Finds

17/2 (subsoil):	PM pot & CBM
18/2 (upper subsoil):	PM pot & CBM
18/3 (lower subsoil):	PM CBM

#### Features

-

#### Comments

Ridge-and-furrow extant.

### Field H: Trenches 19-24

Lengths 30 m; depths 0.55 - 0.65 m

#### Stratigraphy

0.25 -0.3 m	modern ploughsoil
0.2-0.4 m	yellow-brown silty clay (subsoil)
Natural	compact blue-grey clay with sandy lenses

#### Finds

-

#### Features

19/5

#### Comments

Field very 'clean'. The single feature is almost certainly an old field boundary.

### Field I: Trenches 25-37, 86, 89, 102

Lengths 30 m; depths 0.4 - 0.7 m (Tr 29 0.3 m)

Stratigraphy

0.2-0.3 m	modern ploughsoil
0.2-0.4 m	yellow-brown/ brownish orange clay (subsoil)
Natural	compact blue-grey or orange-brown clay, with orange sandy clay lenses. (Tr 30: 80% orange clayey sand. Tr 32: 50% orange sand & gravel).

Finds

86/2 (subsoil):	2 RB pot
89/8 (subsoil):	1 PM pot, 3 PM CBM
102/2 (subsoil):	1 RB pot

Features

28/3  
37/3  
89/3  
89/5  
89/6  
89/7

Comments

Traces of 2 plough-furrows running NNE-SSW were found in Tr 25. They were 3.0 m apart (centre to centre) and 0.6-1.0 m wide. The excavated example (25/3) was 0.2 m deep. There was no trace of ploughing in any of the other trenches.

**Field J: Trenches 38-44 & 87**

Lengths 30 m; Depths 0.3 - 0.8 m

Stratigraphy

0.2-0.4 m	modern ploughsoil
0.2-0.4 m	orange-brown silty clay
Natural	compact blue-grey clay with orange-brown mottles with sandy patches

Finds

38/1 (topsoil):	1 RB pot
38/2 (field drain):	1 RB pot, 3 Med pot, 1 PM CBM, 1 Fe nail, 1 animal bone (unident.)
41/2 (subsoil):	6 Med pot, 3 PM CBM
43/2 (subsoil):	1 animal bone (unident.)
44/2 (subsoil):	1 Med/RB? pot, 3 Med/PM CBM
87/2 (field drain):	1 RB pot, 2 PM CBM
87/3 (field drain):	1 Med pot, 1 PM pot, 1 PM CBM
87/4 (field drain):	1 Med pot, 1 ?CBM
87/6 (field drain):	1 Med pot, 1 ?CBM

Features

38/3  
38/4  
38/5  
38/6  
38/7  
38/8  
87/5

Comments

Subsoil greatly disturbed by field drains in Trs. 38, 39 & 87. These ran N-S, were 2.6 - 3.5

m wide at the top, and spaced at 8 - 9 m intervals. They were a very shallow U- or V-shape in cross-profile. Due to the severe ground disturbances caused by drain-digging, little confidence can be placed in the interpretation of the features in Tr 38. Their date is also not known, although they clearly cut the subsoil 38/9.

### Field K: Trenches 45 - 53 & 88

Lengths 30 m; depths 0.4 - 0.6 m

#### Stratigraphy

0.15-0.3 m	modern ploughsoil
0.25-0.3 m	mid-light grey-brown or yellowish grey-brown clay (subsoil) (grey-brown sandy clay with blue-grey mottles - [lower subsoil in Tr 45]) Natural blue-grey clay with brown clay mottles & orange sandy patches

#### Finds

#### Features

88/4  
88/5  
88/6

#### Comments

Tr 45 shows possible plough-furrows running E-W. They are only 0.85 m apart and unlikely to be truncated ridge-and-furrow. Tr 50 also shows possible E-W plough furrows in section. The possible features in Tr 88 cannot be dated with any certainty.

### Field G: Trenches 54 - 60, 103 & 104

Lengths 30 m (Tr 59 32 m, Tr 104 18.6 m); depths 0.4 -0.7 m

#### Stratigraphy

0.2 m	modern ploughsoil
0.2-0.45 m	yellow-brown silty clay (subsoil) (Tr 103, grey-brown silty clay)
0.2-0.25 m	mid reddish brown silty clay & grey-brown silty clay (Tr 59) olive-grey silty clay & yellowish brown silty clay (Tr 103) (lower subsoils)
Natural	compact yellowish grey/bluish grey clay

#### Finds

54/2 (subsoil):	3 Med/PM CBM
56/2 (subsoil):	1 PM CBM
58/2 (subsoil):	3 PM CBM
59/2 (subsoil):	2 PM CBM
60/2 (subsoil):	2 PM CBM

#### Features

59/4  
59/8  
59/9  
103/5  
103/6  
103/7  
104/3

104/4

Comments

Features in Trs 59, 103 & 104 indicate a possible site here, but none of the features are reliably dated. In Tr 103 there were 2 possible plough-furrows, about 7 m apart, running E-W, and sealed by the subsoil (103/2).

**Field M: Trenches 62 & 63**

Lengths Tr 62 28 m, Tr 63 30 m; depths 0.7 - 1.1 m

Stratigraphy

0.25 m	modern turfline & topsoil
0.4-0.5 m	yellowish grey-brown clay-silt
0.2-0.3 m	bluish grey-brown clay
Natural	blue-grey clay with sandy mottles

Finds

-

Features

-

Comments

Modern stone slab & dumping under topsoil in Tr 62

**Field A: Trenches 61, 64 - 72, 92 & 101**

Lengths 30 m (Tr 61 34 m); depths 0.45 - 0.7 m

Stratigraphy

0.2-0.3 m	modern ploughsoil
0.2-0.4 m	olive-brown/grey-brown silty clay (subsoil)
0.1-0.4 m	variable yellow-brown/olive grey-brown silty clay (lower subsoil)
Natural	variable blue-grey clay with patches of yellow-brown clay, & orange-brown sand

Finds

65/2 (subsoil):	1 uncert. pot, 1 RB? pot, 1 PM? pot
71/2 (subsoil):	1 Med pot
101/2 (subsoil):	1 RB pot

Features

61/3  
65/6  
65/7  
92/3  
92/4

Comments

Traces of probable N-S ridge-and-furrow found in Trs 65 & 66, and of a possible E-W headland? in Tr 64. Not encountered in other trenches. Tr 92 contained 2 probable plough furrows running NW-SE and 4 m apart.

**Field O: Trenches 73 - 78 & 84**

Lengths 30 m (Tr 73 33 m); depths 0.4 - 0.76 m  
(Tr 84 0.78 - 0.83 m)

Stratigraphy

0.2-0.3 m	modern ploughsoil
0.15-0.4 m	grey-brown/olive grey silty clay (subsoil)

0.1-0.35 m yellow/olive grey-brown clay (lower subsoil  
in all trenches except Tr 78 & 76)  
(Tr 76 - layer of redeposited natural clay, 0.2 m thick, over orange-  
brown sandy clay lower subsoil)  
Natural blue-grey clay with gravelly lenses, or orange-brown clay (Trs  
78 & 76)

#### Finds

76/2 (subsoil):	3 animal bones (unident.)
78/US:	1 RB pot
78/2 (subsoil):	3 RB pot, 5 CBM
78/3 (surface of layer):	4 RB pot, 1 Med pot
78/4 (surface of feature):	5 RB pot, 3 Med pot, 1 PM pot
84/2 (subsoil):	1 RB pot, 1 CBM
84/3 (lower subsoil):	5 RB pot, 1 flint flake

#### Features

73/5  
75/5  
75/6  
78/4

#### Comments

RB/late IA occupation suggested at W edge of field, but Med finds also from this area.  
Ditches 73/5, 75/6 & 75/5? may be Med/PM field boundaries, but they appear to be sealed  
by the lower subsoil, and could conceivably be earlier.

#### **Field L: Trenches 79 - 83, 85 & 91**

Lengths 30 m (Tr 83 40.7 m); depths 0.4 - 0.6 m

#### Stratigraphy

0.2 m	modern ploughsoil
0.15-0.2 m	grey-brown/olive grey-brown silty clay (subsoil)
0.1-0.2 m	olive grey-brown clay (Tr 91 yellow-brown clay) (lower subsoil)
Natural	blue-grey clay with patches of orange-brown sandy clay (Tr 79 orange-brown sandy clay with patches of gravel & blue-grey clay)

#### Finds

79/3 (lower subsoil):	2 uncert. pot, 3 RB pot, 3 animal bone (unident.)
79/8 (subsoil/plough furrow):	2 RB pot, 1 PM pot
85/US:	1 RB pot

#### Features

79/5  
79/6  
79/9  
83/4  
83/5  
83/6  
85/4  
85/6  
85/7  
91/4

Comments

Probable RB ditches in this field. All features, except 91/4, apparently sealed by subsoils.

**Field D: Trenches 90, 93 - 100 & 105**

Lengths 30 m; depths Trs 94, 96, 97, 105 0.4 - 0.6 m

Trs 93, 95, 98, 99, 100 0.5 - 1.3 m

Stratigraphy

0.2 m	modern ploughsoil
0.2-0.5 m	light yellow-brown clay (subsoil)
0.15-0.5 m	yellow-brown/olive grey-brown clay, (Trs 95, 96, 97, 100) (lower subsoil)
Natural	compact yellow-grey clay

Finds

94/2 (subsoil):	1 PM CBM
96/2 (subsoil):	1 PM CBM
97/2 (subsoil):	2 PM pot, 3 PM CBM
99/2 (subsoil):	animal bones (unident. frags)
105/2 (subsoil):	1 flint microlith, 1 RB pot

Features

97/5

Comments

Deeper trenches contained a very 'clean' subsoil. Feature 97/5 sealed by upper subsoil (97/2). Not traced in Tr 105.

**Annexe 2**

**ANNEXE 2 : INVENTORY OF FEATURES**

	<b>Type</b>	<b>Shape</b>	<b>Profile</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>Presence of charcoal or fired clay</b>	<b>Find</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Tested by excavation</b>
2/5	?pit/root hole	irregular/ ovoid	steep sides flat bias	0.45	0.24	-	-		yes
3/6	?posthole/ root hole	circular	bowl	0.3	0.18	-	-		yes
5/4	ditch/furrow	linear	shallow U	0.94	0.18	-	-		yes
5/5	ditch/furrow	linear	shallow U	1.2	0.26	-	-		yes
8/4	?gully/root hole	linear	U shaped	0.33	0.09	-	-		yes
19/5	ditch	linear	shallow U	4.0	0.7	charcoal	1 pot	PM	yes
28/3	?pit/ditch	not known	irregular	1.46	0.42	charcoal	-		yes
37/3	?posthole	ovoid	V shaped	0.36	0.12	-	-		yes
38/3	?posthole	triangular	-	0.2	-	charcoal	-		-
38/4	?posthole	ovoid	bowl	0.4	0.1	charcoal	-		yes
38/5	?pit	ovoid	bowl	0.6	0.2	charcoal	-		yes
38/6	?posthole	ovoid	shallow U	0.33	0.1	charcoal	-		yes
38/7	?posthole	ovoid	shallow V	0.28	0.09	charcoal	-		yes
38/8	?posthole	ovoid	irregular U	0.26	0.04-0.1	charcoal	-		yes
59/4	pit	sub-circular	shallow, flat base	0.6	0.08	fired clay	-		yes
59/8	ditch/?tree hole	linear	flat base	1.2	0.34	-	-		yes

Trench/ Feature	Type	Shape	Profile	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Presence of charcoal or fired clay	Findings	Date	Tested by excavation
59/9	ditch/?tree hole	linear	irregular sides, flat base	4.22	0.64	-	-		yes
61/3	ditch	linear	shallow, flat base	3.2	0.31	-	1 ?Med pot	?Med	yes
65/6	?posthole/roo t hole	irregular	U shaped	0.4	0.17	-	13 bones		
65/7	?posthole/ root hole	irregular	U shaped	0.4	0.08	-	1 PM pot	PM	yes
73/5	ditch	linear	shallow U	1.6	0.3	-	-		yes
75/5	?ditch/furrow	linear	shallow, flat base	1.5	0.12	-	-		yes
75/6	ditch	linear	shallow U	2.15	0.30	-	bones		yes
78/4	?ditch	?linear	?	2.0+	0.2+	charcoal	1 IA pot? 8 RB pots 6 Med pots 1 CBM	?Med	yes
79/5	ditch	linear	U shaped	2.2	0.8	-	pottery: 3 uncertain 2 RB	RB	yes
79/6	pit	ovoid	U shaped	0.6	0.45	-	10 bones	?RB	yes
79/9	?ditch/furrow	linear	shallow	1.85	0.22	-	-		yes
83/4	ditch	linear	shallow	0.5	0.08	charcoal flecks	-		yes
83/5	ditch	linear	shallow	2.0	0.18	-	-		yes
83/6	?ditch	?linear	shallow	1.0	0.14	charcoal flecks	3 RB pots	RB	yes

Trench/ Feature	Type	Shape	Profile	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Presence of charcoal or fired clay	Finds	Date	Tested by excavation
85/4	ditch	linear	shallow sided, flat base	3.0	0.35	charcoal	-		yes
85/5	burial	-							
85/6	ditch	linear	shallow sided, flat base	0.65	0.1		-		yes
85/7	ditch	linear	U shaped	2.58	0.4	charcoal	pottery: 1 uncertain 3 RB pots 2 CBM	RB	yes
85/8	burial								
87/5	?posthole	circular	U shaped	0.3	0.1	charcoal	-		yes
88/4	ditch	linear	moderately steep sided, flat base	0.7	0.36	-	pottery: 1 uncertain		yes
88/5	?pit/ditch terminal	ovoid	-	0.8	?	charcoal/ fired clay	1 PM CBM	?PM	
88/6	ditch	linear	-	0.7	-	-	-		
89/3	pit/terminal	ovoid	-	1.04	0.12	charcoal/ fired clay	-		yes
89/5	posthole	sub- circular	irregular U	0.9	0.34	fired clay	-		yes
89/6	posthole	sub- circular	shallow U	0.55	0.1	fired clay	1 ?CBM		yes
89/7	?	irregular ovoid	irregular	1.4	0.2	charcoal/ fired clay	-		yes

Trench/ Feature	Type	Shape	Profile	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Presence of charcoal or fired clay	Findings	Date	Tested by excavation
91/4	pit/terminal	ovoid	U shaped	1.25	0.42	charcoal	-		yes
92/3	furrow?	linear	flat U	0.9	0.10	-	1 Med pot	Med- PM	yes
92/4	furrow?	linear	flat U	0.7	0.10	charcoal/ fired clay	1 Med pot	Med- PM	yes
97/5	ditch	linear	broad U	1.5	0.6	charcoal/ fired clay	bones		yes
103/5	pit/terminal	sub ovoid	flat base	2.35	0.4	charcoal/ fired clay	-		yes
103/6	posthole	ovoid	bowl	0.32	0.17	fired clay	-		yes
103/7	posthole	circular	U shaped	0.25	0.2	-	-		yes
104/4	pit	sub- circular	flat base	0.96	0.22	charcoal fired clay	1 ?IA pot 13 daub? 1 bone	IA?	yes
104/3	ditch	linear	V shpaed	1.62	0.65	charcoal/ fired clay	35 daub? bones		yes

IA Iron Age  
 RB Romano-British  
 Med Medieval  
 PM Post-Medieval  
 CBM Ceramic Building Material

All bones are animal bones

**Annexe 3**

**ANNEXE 3: POTTERY REPORT FOR NORTH FIDDINGTON, ASHCHURCH  
(BY PAUL BOOTH, OAU)**

One hundred and twenty eight sherds of pottery were recovered during the excavation.

Uncertain	10
?Iron Age	2
Roman	57
Mediaeval	34
Post-Mediaeval	41

In view of the size of the area examined, this is a very small total indeed. Some of the Mediaeval and earlier sherds appeared rather worn, but this might be a result of adverse soil conditions, rather than indicating that they had been abraded by, for example, agricultural activity. Many of the sherds were small, which together with the poor surface condition of some, rendered some of the identification uncertain. In particular, fairly fine oxidised wares with variable amounts of sand tempering were characteristic of the Roman, Mediaeval and post-Mediaeval periods. The more sandy oxidised sherds were usually considered to be of Mediaeval date. A further problem was the coarse quartz (etc) tempered sherds. Only two of these were considered to be of Iron Age date or character, and the remainder were recorded as Mediaeval or uncertain. A small number of rims in these fabrics were of Mediaeval character, but it was impossible to be confident that all sherds of this type were Mediaeval in date. Hence they form (with small oxidised fragments) the bulk of the sherds of uncertain date. Of the two ?Iron Age sherds (both in Malvernian fabrics), one was a bead rim of a rounded jar, which might well have been of Roman date, and the other was a very small fragment. The Roman material consisted largely of Severn Valley ware (at least 40 out of 51 sherds) of fairly local origin. There were single tiny fragments of black-burnished ware and Samian. Three jars, a bowl and a tankard were represented by Severn Valley rims. Most probably fall in the 2nd-3rd century date range.

The Mediaeval sherds were probably of relatively local (and in many cases specifically Malvern) origin. Rim fragments may have been from 2 or 3 cooking pots. The finer oxidised Mediaeval fabrics may also have been of Malvern origin. The post-Mediaeval pottery extended up to the 20th century and is not discussed further here.

The only significant concentration of Roman pottery was in Trenches 78, 79 and 83-87, though only in Trench 78 were there more than 10 sherds. Any settlement indicated by this material was probably therefore of small size, low density and low status, on the basis of the rather limited character of the assemblage.

Mediaeval material was more widely scattered, with the greatest concentration again in Trench 78 (10 sherds). The principal feature in this trench, a ditch (78/4) contained both Roman and Mediaeval pottery. While it is unclear whether the former was residual or the latter intrusive, it is most likely that the feature was of Mediaeval date.

**Annexe 4**

ANNEXE 4.



# GLOUCESTERSHIRE

COUNTY COUNCIL

Borough Planning Officer  
Tewkesbury Borough Council  
Council Offices  
Gloucester Road  
TEWKESBURY  
Glos  
GL20 5TT

CHARLES WATSON,  
DIP.T.P., M.R.T.P.I.  
COUNTY PLANNING OFFICER  
SHIRE HALL  
GLOUCESTER, GL1 2TN  
TELEX: 43155  
FAX: 425356

PLEASE ASK FOR: Ms. J. Isaac

OUR REF: 476.4/JI/PEB

YOUR REF: 91T/8635/02/01

TEL: (0452) 425683

DATE: 12th December 1991

For the attention of Mr. C. Waumsley

Dear Sir,

Land at Fiddington, Ashchurch: Residential development,  
primary school site, roads, sewers, open space and associated works

With reference to the above planning application and to your consultation of 22nd November 1991, I should like to make the following observations.

The application site lies within an area where extensive evidence of prehistoric and Romano-British settlement is recorded in the County Sites and Monuments Record.

I recommend, therefore, that the applicant should be requested to provide an archaeological assessment of the application site, in order that any archaeological implications of the development may be fully evaluated when the application is determined (cf PPG 16, paras. 21-23).

I should welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with you and/or the applicant as soon as is appropriate.

Thank you for consulting me on this application.

Yours faithfully,

*J Isaac*

Jane Isaac  
County Archaeological Officer

TEWKESBURY  
PLANNING

*[Handwritten signature]*

FIDDASHCH



**Annexe 5**

ANNEXE 5



**GLOUCESTERSHIRE**  
COUNTY COUNCIL

Mr J Moore  
Oxford Archaeological Unit  
46 Hythe Bridge Street  
OXFORD  
OX1 2EP

O. A. U. RECEIVED  
30 DEC 1991

CHARLES WATSON,  
DIP.T.P., M.R.T.P.I.  
COUNTY PLANNING OFFICER  
SHIRE HALL  
GLOUCESTER, GL1 2TN  
TELEX: 43155  
FAX: 42 5356

PLEASE ASK FOR: Ms J. Isaac  
OUR REF: 476.4

YOUR REF:

TEL: (0452): 425683  
DATE: 20th December, 1991

Dear Mr Moore,

N Fiddington, Tewkesbury : Archaeological Evaluation

Thank you for your letter of 17th December 1991 enclosing a project design for an archaeological evaluation at the above site. I am broadly content with the proposed strategy and would like to suggest the following additions:-

para 2.2 It would be useful to identify what the particular sources are that will be consulted.

para 2.3 The details of the fieldwalking design should be included with a note that trenching will be undertaken in those areas identified as having significant densities of artefact scatters.

A paragraph stating that details of additional trenches in areas of archaeological activity should be submitted to the County Archaeological Officer for approval.

I should be grateful if you could keep me informed of your presence on site in order that I can arrange to visit.

Yours sincerely,

J Isaac

Jane Isaac  
County Archaeological Officer



**Annexe 6**

## N FIDDINGTON, TEWKESBURY

### ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION - DETAILED PROJECT DESIGN

#### 1 Background

- 1.1 As part of the consideration of various sites for residential development in the Tewkesbury area the OAU has been commissioned by Robert Hitchens Ltd to undertake an archaeological evaluation of the area of N Fiddington, referred to as Option 11.
- 1.2 No known areas of archaeological interest lie within the area under consideration. A possible Roman settlement GCC SMR No 5481 lies just outside the evaluation area W of the M5 motorway. Two areas in the vicinity have produced cropmarks, 400 m to the north-west and to the east, although neither has of yet been attributed to any period. The area lies between the medieval settlement of Natton and the deserted medieval village of Walton Cardiff. Ridge and furrow exists in two fields while old aerial photographs show that the majority of the area was once under ridge and furrow.

#### 2 Strategy

- 2.1 The evaluation to be undertaken as a staged approach.
- 2.2 A historic study of the area to be carried out. The following sources to be examined: VCH, Domesday Book for Glos (ed. Morris, J), the Place-Names of Gloucestershire 1964, relevant documents held by the Record Office, OS, Tithe and Estate maps.
- 2.3 Fieldwalking to be undertaken where landuse permits. On the basis of present crop growth in only one field (marked 1 on the accompanying plan) will conditions be suitable.

The survey to be conducted on 20 m wide transects with collection points every 20 m. Trenches to be located where significant densities of artefact scatter occur.

- 2.4 The area initially to be subject to  $\frac{3}{4}\%$  sample of area by trenching. Machine dug trenches to be excavated by 360° tracked excavator using a six foot ditching bucket. Trenches to be 30 m long. Initially 99 trenches to be excavated.
- 2.5 Additional trenches of the appropriate length to be excavated if the initial sample size indicates archaeological activity. These trenches to clarify character, preservation, date and extent of activity.
- 2.6 All trenches to be mechanically excavated down to archaeological deposits or natural subsoil.
- 2.7 The spoil from the mechanically excavated trenches to be visually inspected for artefacts.
- 2.8 An appropriate number of archaeological features, where encountered, to be sampled by hand excavation to determine character, preservation and date.
- 2.9 The ridge and furrow, where disturbed, to be reinstated during backfilling of trenches in fields 2 and 3 (see plan).
- 2.10 It is envisaged that the fieldwork would be undertaken in 15 days.
- 2.11 The team to consist of a Senior Supervisor, Andy Mudd AIFA, and six technicians under the direction of the OAU Director, David Miles MIFA. Finds and environmental support to be from OAU staff or the Environmental Unit at Oxford University Museum.
- 2.12 The fieldwork to be accessible for inspection by the County

Archaeological Officer by arrangement.

2.13 A report detailing the methodology and results of the evaluation to be submitted to the County Archaeological Officer.

2.14 The archive to be deposited with the relevant Museum within six months of the end of on-site work.

2.15 It is recognised that all finds (subject to the laws of treasure trove) ideally should accompany the site archive. The OAU will recommend that the landowner should donate the finds to the appropriate Museum.

OAU

December 1991












Figure 4

# Trench 85 sections

## Section 85/4





## Section 85/6 & 85/7



Scale for sections 1:40

Figure 5



### Trench 79






Figure 6



### Trench 104



### Section 104/3





Figure 7