

A SECOND ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF LAND OFF WYPHURST ROAD, CRANLEIGH, SURREY





A SECOND ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF LAND OFF WYPHURST ROAD, CRANLEIGH, SURREY

Surrey County Archaeological Unit Surrey History Centre 130, Goldsworth Road Woking, Surrey, GU21 IND Telephone 01483 594634 Facsimile 01483 594637

Project Manager	Rob Poulton
Author	Mark Dover
Client	Osborne Housing
Date	13/05/2002
NGR	TO 0604 3985

The material contained herein is and remains the sole property of the Surrey County Archaeological Unit and is not for publication to third parties without the prior written consent of Surrey County Council

Introduction

The following is taken from the initial method statement produced by the Surrey County Archaeological Unit (Poulton 2002).

Osborne Housing in partnership with Waverley Borough Council and New Downland Housing Association are shortly to submit a planning application to Waverley Borough Council for a social housing development on land off Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh. Advice from the Principal Archaeologists Office, Surrey County Council, has suggested that any development on this site would require an archaeological investigation. It is likely that an archaeological condition will be applied to any planning permission granted, in the form of 'No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Osborne Housing therefore instructed the Surrey County Archaeological Unit to prepare a preliminary assessment of the archaeological potential of the site (Shaikhley 2002). This concluded that a trial trench evaluation of the site was the appropriate way forward. Between the 10th-14th January 2002, staff of the Surrey County Archaeological Unit carried out the evaluation. Figure 1 shows the location of the development area.

This work resulted in the following conclusion (Dover 2002).

In conclusion then, it seems that the proposed housing development will disturb a Late 1st / early 2nd century Roman farming settlement, possibly a Villa complex, (with possible earlier phases) in an area of Surrey that has not produced much evidence of the Romano-British period.

The archaeological features generally lie under only 0.30 m of plough soil. This suggests that these features will be disturbed by any construction work, including ancillary activities such as the traffic of site vehicles, landscaping works including tree planting etc. The soft and plastic soils developed over weald clay make the site especially vulnerable.

The evaluation has established that an archaeological resource of considerable importance extends over a substantial proportion of the site. Fig. 2 shows the minimal area requiring a preservation strategy.

The appropriate way forward in respect of this proposed development is currently being considered. A further area of land (fig 2) forms part of the land which Waverley Borough Council may be acquiring, and may be the subject of an application for social housing development at some time in the future. WBC would therefore like to determine the archaeological status of this land, and the appropriate way to do this is by a trial trench evaluation."

Between the 4th-6th March, 2002 the Surrey County Archaeological Unit returned to carry out this further archaeological evaluation, primarily to the east of the area examined in January, where further development may take place. Trenches were also excavated in the area of a 'new landscape belt' sited around the previously evaluated social housing development area. A copy of that report (Dover 2002) is given in Appendix A.

The aim of the evaluation was to establish the extent, character, and date of any archaeological deposits threatened by the potential development of the site, in order to enable recommendations to be made for the treatment of any archaeological sites revealed by the work, either for their preservation *in situ* or, if the former is not possible, their preservation by record (that is by detailed excavation).

Methodology

The positions of the trial trenches on site were placed in order to provide a reasonable coverage of the area (Fig 2). The presence of electric power lines in the north-eastern corner of the site meant that no archaeological trenches could be excavated nearby in order to comply with Unit health and safety procedures. The trenches were excavated using a JCB 3CX-4 Site Master backhoe loader equipped with a toothless 1.4m wide bucket. Each trench was approximately 22m in length. Some trenches were extended in order to quantify the nature of the archaeological features encountered, at the discretion of the director. The trenches are shown in Fig. 2.

In each trench excavated the removal of the topsoil and subsoil, down to the level of archaeological interest, was carried out by JCB. The operator of the machine was under the direction of an archaeologist during this process.

The machine removal of these layers was carefully watched during excavation for any stray finds or the presence of archaeological features, including inspection of spoil heaps. Any unstratified artefacts were collected, and archaeological features if

- -

detected were marked on the ground to be sampled by hand excavation and subsequently recorded.

Each trench was backfilled, using the material excavated from that trench, when archaeological interest had been served.

Results

The trenches showed a common stratigraphy, 0.30-0.35 m of plough soil with 0-0.35m of dark brown subsoil, over yellow brown orange clay natural.

A further twelve trenches were excavated, trenches 13 to 24. Seven of these contained features that required investigation by archaeological excavation. These trenches were 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 22. These features were allocated archaeological contexts numbers, which followed sequentially from the last number allocated in the first evaluation, and each individual context is discussed below in relation to the trial trench in which it was excavated and recorded (see Fig.3). Detailed measurements of size and depth are generally not discussed here, but can be ascertained from the relevant scale drawings (Fig. 4).

In trench 13, a segment (context 136) through an east west aligned ditch was excavated. The fill consisted of grey clay and contained one sherd of coarse Iron Age/Romano British pottery. A pit or possible posthole (context 135) was also excavated with a grey brown sandy clay fill, which contained calcined flint and a struck flint, appearing to date the feature to the prehistoric period.

In trench 14 numerous features were investigated, all of which appeared to represent the elements of a Roman building or buildings. Sufficient surface cleaning to clarify the character of the features was undertaken, rather than full excavation, though some limited deeper excavation was undertaken where the JCB had removed some of the foundation stones. The walls all appear to be of a similar construction to those encountered in trial trench 8 in the first evaluation.

At the eastern end of the trench, three wall foundations, 148, 149 and 151, appeared to have been constructed of local stone. 148 and 151 were of a north south alignment, 149 was approximately northeast southwest aligned. Two areas of brown sandy clay appeared to represent possible floor or levelling layers, 147, along the western edge of 148 and 150 between walls 148 and 151. Roman tile was collected from 150 and 147.

At the western end of the trench, two further similar wall foundations, 145 and 144 were investigated, along with an area of brown sandy clay 146, similar to 147 and 150. Wall 144 was approximately east west aligned, then appeared to turn a corner, running to the south. At the outside apex of the corner a large semi faced stone was still in place. Wall 145 appeared to be aligned in a northeast-southwest fashion. The alignment of the wall foundations in the trench is somewhat irregular, and suggests that a number of differing phases of building may be present.

In trench 15 a small pit was investigated, context 142. This had two fills, the upper 142a, a mid grey/brown silty clay with much charcoal, lay over a grey brown silty clay with occasional charcoal flecks. No finds came from either of the fills. Context 143, a very shallow gully, had a mid grey/brown silty clay fill, with frequent charcoal flecks. Several sherds of Iron Age pottery were recovered from the feature.

In trench 16 a large pit, context 141was excavated. This had a dark grey/brown sandy clay fill, which contained many fragments of charcoal. No dateable evidence was recovered from the fill.

In trench 18, a segment, context 139, was excavated through a ditch. This had a mid grey brown silty clay fill. No dateable evidence was recovered from the fill

In trench 20, two features were hand sampled. Context 137 appeared to be a pit or posthole. It had a mid grey brown silty clay fill, with frequent fragments of charcoal. No dateable finds were recovered from the fill. Segment 138 appeared to represent a shallow gully terminal. This had a mid grey silty clay fill; though no finds were recovered, frequent fragments of charcoal were recovered.

In trench 22 a segment across a ditch was excavated, context 140. This had a mid grey silty clay fill, with elements of iron panning. This contained calcined flint, but no other dateable finds were recovered.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The sampling of the site as a whole seems adequate, with seven of the twelve trenches containing archaeological features that were sampled by hand excavation and has revealed further archaeological remains. These fall into two categories; features which appear to qualify the extent and nature of the Late 1st / early 2^{nd} century Roman farming settlement (with possible earlier phases) in the area of the social housing

-

development sampled in the first evaluation, and features of an earlier, prehistoric field system consisting primarily of ditches to the east, though evidence from trench 13 suggests a prehistoric phase to the west as well.

The further evidence of a building or buildings, located in trench 14, when combined with those elements identified in trench 8, suggests that there is a very strong possibility that the Late 1st / early 2nd century Roman farming settlement contains a Villa complex, or at the least a number of stone buildings. Further evidence of an earlier prehistoric phase (contexts 135, 136) and further Iron Age settlement features (143, possibly 141,142) that precede the Roman settlement have also been identified. Because of this, and the other archaeological features examined in trenches 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 24, the Preservation Strategy Area outlined for full archaeological excavation can be refined in order to allow for these discoveries. (Fig 2.) In order to avoid confusion with the eastern area, this will be referred to as Preservation Strategy Area A. The increase in the size of Area A does not affect the initial archaeological specification as shown in Appendix A, but further consultation as to the procedures adopted in the archaeological excavation of the Area is needed. Such a large area may be better excavated in a series of separate divisions, with work progressing from one division to the next after completion of that segment. A method statement will need to be prepared for this further archaeological work.

The eastern area, evaluated by trenches 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24, has shown a number of prehistoric features. These remain undated by ceramic evidence, but the presence of calcined flint and charcoal suggests a Prehistoric date. The absence of pottery and the dispersed character of the features suggests that the area is peripheral to the focus of any settlement. These features require an archaeological mitigation strategy, not of the scale of the full archaeological excavation but the number of features warrants more than an archaeological watching brief. As such it appears that a controlled site strip would appear to be appropriate, shown on Fig 2 as Preservation Strategy Area B. In this scenario, as contractors remove the soil from Preservation Strategy Area B, there would be a constant archaeological presence on site, directing the depth of the removal of the soils down to the archaeological level. Any archaeological features would then be hand sampled and recorded. The specification for such work should be prepared once development plans for the area are available. The specification would be broadly similar to that for Area A (included below with

- -

Appendix A), but a much lower density of archaeological features is expected and hence the archaeological recording will occupy a much shorter time span.

Biblography

Poulton, R, 2002 A Method Statement for Further Evaluation of Land off Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh, *Client Report prepared by Surrey County Archaeological Unit*

Dover, M, 2002 An Archaeological Evalauation of the Proposed Development of Land off Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh, Surrey, *Client Report prepared by Surrey County Archaeological Unit* (see Appendix A)

6

Shaikhley, N, 2002 A Preliminary Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Development of Land off Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh, *Client Report prepared by Surrey County Archaeological Unit*

-





Fig. 2 Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh, Second Evaluation: Location of the Trial Trenches, Presevation Strategy Areas and other relevant information ...

Positive Trench Archaeological Features shown in red **Negative Trench** No Archaeological Features Former Boundary of Preservation Strategy Area A(Yellow) Revised Preservation Strategy Area A Preservation Strategy Area B Area of Social Housing Development **Power Lines**



Fig. 3 Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh, Second Evaluation: Trial Trench Plans



Appendix A

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF LAND OFF WYPHURST ROAD, CRANLEIGH , SURREY

Surrey County Archaeological Unit Surrey History Centre 130, Goldsworth Road Woking, Surrey, GU21 IND Telephone 01483 594634 Facsimile 01483 594637

Project ManagerIAuthorIClientIDateINGRI

Rob Poulton Mark Dover Osborne Housing 29/01/2002 TQ 0604 3985

The material contained herein is and remains the sole property of the Surrey County Archaeological Unit and is not for publication to third parties without the prior written consent of Surrey County Council

Introduction

Between the 10th-14th January 2002, staff of the Surrey County Archaeological Unit carried out an evaluation on land off Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh (Fig.1). The work was carried out on behalf of Osborne Housing. SCAU had previously prepared an archaeological desktop assessment of the site. The proposed development consists of a social housing development. The assessment identified the archaeological potential of the site as moderate.

The aim of the evaluation was to establish the extent, character, and date of any archaeological deposits threatened by the development of the site, in order to enable recommendations to be made for the treatment of any archaeological sites revealed by the work, either for their preservation *in situ* or, if the former is not possible, their preservation by record (that is by detailed excavation).

Methodology

The clients representatives had asked that the trial trenches be located so as not to disturb the footprints of the proposed buildings, and a plan placing the trenches in such locations was produced by SCAU. The positions of the trial trenches on site were laid out by surveyor, with the start and end of the trenches marked by posts in the ground.

The archaeological assessment had recommended that a 360 degree tracked machine should excavate 20m by 1.8m wide trenches. Narrow access to the site through the footpath at the end of Wyphurst road precluded the use of this type of machine. The trenches were excavated using a JCB 3CX-4 Site Master backhoe loader equipped with a toothless 1.4m wide bucket. In order to ensure that an adequate sample of the site was evaluated, using the smaller bucket, each trench was extended to a length of 22m. Some trenches were excavated further in order to quantify the nature of the archaeological features encountered, at the discretion of the director. The trenches are shown in Fig. 2.

In each trench excavated the removal of the topsoil and subsoil, down to the level of archaeological interest, was carried out by JCB. The operator of the machine was under the direction of an archaeologist during this process.

The machine removal of these layers was carefully watched during excavation for any stray finds or the presence of archaeological features, including inspection of spoil heaps. Any unstratified artefacts were collected, and archaeological features if detected were marked on the ground to be sampled by hand excavation and subsequently recorded.

Each trench was backfilled, using the material excavated from that trench, when archaeological interest had been served.

Results

The trenches showed a common stratigraphy, 0.30-0.35 m of plough soil with 0-0.15m of dark brown subsoil (absent in trenches in the western area of the site), over yellow brown orange clay natural.

Of the twelve trenches excavated, seven contained features that required investigation by archaeological excavation. These trenches were 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. The list of archaeological

contexts began with an arbitrary figure, 100, and each individual context is discussed below in relation to the trial trench in which it was excavated and recorded. Detailed measurements of size and depth are generally not discussed here, but can be ascertained from the relevant scale drawings (Figs. 4 & 5).

In trench 2, a segment (context 100) through a north south-aligned ditch was excavated. The fill consisted of mid-brown sandy silty clay and contained four sherds of Roman Alice Holt/Farnham (AH/F) standard greyware pottery, dated to the late 1st/early 2nd century, and two sherds of a coarse Iron Age/Romano British pottery. A relatively modern field drain disturbed the eastern side of the ditch. An east west aligned gully appeared to cross the ditch in the trial trench, but its relationship was unclear. A segment (context 101) across this gully was excavated but no finds were recorded from the light brown silty sandy clay fill.

In trench 7 numerous features were investigated. Three pits or possible postholes were sampled, contexts 122, 123 and 133. Context 122 had dark grey/brown sandy clay fill, from which 2 sherds of Roman AH/F greyware pottery, and one fragment of daub were collected. Context 123 had a similar fill, and contained one sherd of Roman AH/F greyware pottery. The excavator noted frequent fragments of charcoal. Context 133 appeared to represent a posthole, with mid-dark grey brown silty clay fill. This contained abundant fragments of sandstone, perhaps as post packing material. Two sherds of Roman Samian pottery were recovered from the fill.

Two further features, Contexts 124 and 131 were excavated. Context 124, a gully segment across a shallow, tapering north south aligned gully (context 105) had dark grey/black sandy silty clay fill. Numerous sherds of Roman pottery were recovered, 13 sherds of AH/F greyware, 5 sherds of AH/F coarse sandy pottery, including one decorated sherd and one sherd of 'Brockley Hill'-type buff sandy pottery. The presence of charcoal fragments was noted. A number of surface finds were also recovered from the surface of 125, two sherds of Roman AH/F greyware pottery and a base sherd of Roman Samian pottery.

Context 131, another segment across a north south aligned gully (context 132), had a dark grey/brown silty clay fill with fragments of charcoal and sandstone. Five sherds of Roman AH/F greyware pottery, one sherd of Roman AH/F coarse sandy ware and one fragment of Roman tile were recovered. Surface finds were also collected from context 132, one further sherd of Roman AH/F greyware pottery and two fragments of Roman tile. A possible posthole was excavated on the east edge of segment 131, though its relationship to the ditch was unclear due to the similarity of their fills. The possible posthole was recorded as context 134.

In trench 8, various features were observed upon machine excavation and marked for later investigation. Unfortunately the flooded condition of the trench meant that only one could be excavated, the others were allocated context numbers. A large linear feature, most probably a ditch, context 130 was present at the southeast end of the trench. Numerous surface finds were collected from this ditch, two sherds of AH/F coarse sandy ware pottery, including a large rim sherd, eight sherds of AH/F greyware pottery, and one decorated sherd of fine greyware pottery, all of Roman date.

In the northeast of trench 8, a number of features were noted. This included a curious Z shaped feature (or features) that may represent a possible robber trench or trenches. Excavation was

- -

possible on one part of the Z, context 126. Primarily, a dark red/brown sandy clay fill, 126a, was removed from the trench. This contained numerous large $(0.10m^3)$ pieces of a natural stone and also contained fragments of Roman tile. Beneath 126a, larger $(0.15-0.20m^3)$ fragments of stone, in a yellow brown clay matrix were encountered. Formal excavation was halted at this stage, due to incoming surface water, but a number of stones were removed to reveal that the fill continued for at least 0.30 m downwards and appeared to continue even deeper. 126b appears to represent a wall foundation of undressed irregular stones, and 126a the backfill from an incident of stone robbing from the upper, presumably worked stone of the wall.

The unexcavated features 127 and 128 of the Z shape appeared the same as 126 before hand excavation commenced, and are probably wall foundations, perhaps of the same phase of wall. Another fragment of Roman tile was recovered from the surface of 127. Context 129, a dark grey spread of silty clay soil, may represent a pit or similar feature, or perhaps a floor surface. One sherd of AH/F greyware Roman pottery was recovered from the surface of 129.

In trench 9 five features were hand sampled, three pits contexts 106, 107 and 116, and two north south aligned gullies, 105 and 115. Context 106, a shallow pit with dark grey-brown sandy silty clay fill, had fragments of charcoal but no dateable finds. Context 107 was similar. Pit 116, had dark brown sandy clay fill, with moderate flecks of charcoal, but no dateable finds. Ditch 105 was sampled in segment 104. It had grey brown silty sandy clay fill and contained four sherds of Roman AH/F greyware pottery and a Struck flint Neolithic flake. Ditch 115 was investigated in segment 114. It had a similar fill to 104, but contained no dateable finds.

Trench 10 had a number of features. Context 112, a pit, appeared to cut a ditch and a segment was excavated with the section placed in order to show the relationship between the two features. Pit 112 had mixed grey/yellow silty clay fill, with frequent charcoal fragments. No dateable finds were recovered. Excavation of 113 at first revealed a Neolithic struck flint utilised flake but a fragment of blue and white china was recovered from well within the light brown silty clay fill, revealing the feature to be Post medieval in date. It was clear from the section that pit 112 cut 113, and is probably of a similar date.

Context 110, a segment excavated across another north south aligned gully, revealed a steep sided flat-bottomed profile. No finds were recorded, but the fill, medium brown sandy silty clay, was sealed by the subsoil and is probably of ancient origin. A small posthole 110a, appeared to be cut into the eastern edge of the ditch, but the similarity between the fills meant that no relationship between the two features could be established.

Pit 111, a shallow pit, contained two possible small stake holes. No dateable finds were recovered from the dark brown sandy silty clay fill, though frequent fragments of charcoal were recorded.

In trench 11, four features were hand sampled. Context 109 appeared to be a pit. It had a mid grey brown silty clay fill, but had a relatively amorphous shape and no finds were recovered from the fill. Segment 103 was excavated across a U shaped gully. This had mid grey brown silty sandy clay fill, though no finds were recovered, the feature was sealed beneath the subsoil. Segment 108, excavated across another North-South aligned ditch, revealed that it had two fills. Context 108a, the upper fill, a grey brown sandy clay soil with patches of mixed orange clay and context 108b, a mid grey silty basal soil appeared to be the primary fill of the ditch. Again no finds were recovered from the fills, but the feature was sealed under the subsoil.

One further feature was investigated in trench 11, which appeared to be another ditch. Excavation revealed a ceramic field drain, which lay in the centre of the gully. This suggests that the gully had been excavated in order to place the sections of ceramic pipe to form the field drain. The field drain position appears in the plan of the trench.

In trench 12, two offshoots extending from the trial trench were machine excavated. These were placed to quantify the nature of two curving gullies, which appeared at first to represent possible ring gullies. The actual sampling of the gullies was restricted to those areas contained within the original area of the trial trench. Segment 117, excavated across one of the gullies proved to be very shallow. The fill, dark black/brown sandy clay, contained large amounts of burnt clay, possibly daub, and many fragments of charcoal. No pottery was recovered from the fill.

The other curving gully was sampled in segment 118, revealing a narrow steep sided profile. Several sherds of Iron Age pottery came from its light-mid grey silty sandy clay fill.

Three other archaeological features were also sampled. Context 120 appeared to a shallow pit, with mid grey brown silty sandy clay fill. No finds were recovered. Context 119 appeared to be a posthole, with dark grey silty sandy clay fill. No finds were recovered, but numerous fragments of charcoal were noted.

At the eastern end of trench 12, a partial large area of fill was revealed. This appeared to be a large feature that extended beyond the bounds of the trial trench. Numerous surface finds of pottery appeared to date the feature to the Roman period. A narrow exploratory segment, context 121, was excavated across the narrowest part of the feature located within the trial trench. This revealed steep vertical sides and a dark brown sandy silty clay fill, containing more examples of Roman pottery, including 3 sherds of AH/F greyware pottery. A fragment of Roman tile and a Neolithic struck flint flake were also recovered. At a depth of 0.70m the excavation was curtailed, as the feature appeared to be continuing downwards and further excavation was impossible. The Roman date of the feature is secure, and further excavation would be preferable when its full extent is visible, rather than in the limited confines of a trial trench.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The sampling of the site as a whole seems adequate, with seven of the twelve trenches containing archaeological features that were sampled by hand excavation. This was carried out in less than perfect conditions, leading to some features being unsampled by hand excavation due to trench flooding, though the collection of surface finds from the majority of the unexcavated features has provided dating material for those features.

The high number of archaeological features and artefacts recovered from the sampling suggests that archaeological deposits will be affected by the proposed development. From the pottery

- -

assemblage, the archaeological remains generally appear to be a Late 1st / early 2nd century Romano-British date, though there are examples of Late Iron Age pottery, and one possible Iron age feature, gully 118 in trench 12. There were also a number of features of Post-Medieval or modern date.

The pottery assemblage as a whole appears to consist of domestic wares, including local Alice Holt/Farnham fabrics. The presence of imported Samian Pottery from the continent suggests a relatively prosperous household or households.

The features, ditches, pits and postholes containing Roman pottery appear to show that there is a substantial Romano-British site, perhaps with an earlier Late Iron Age phase. The archaeological features appear to represent activities involved in the construction and operation of a farming settlement, ditches placed in order to define field boundaries or to provide drainage for example.

The probable wall foundations in trench eight, features 126, 127 and 128, though confusing, do seem to show that substantial walls were constructed during the Roman period. It is unclear what type of building the walls belong to, whether something associated with a high status site (Villa) or a humbler farmstead. The latter may be more likely as a Villa is known at Rapseley, near Ewhurst, about 3km distant.

In conclusion then, it seems that the proposed housing development will disturb a Late 1st / early 2nd century Roman farming settlement, possibly a Villa complex, (with possible earlier phases) in an area of Surrey that has not produced much evidence of the Romano-British period.

The archaeological features generally lie under only 0.30 m of plough soil. This suggests that these features will be disturbed by any construction work, including ancillary activities such as the traffic of site vehicles, landscaping works including tree planting etc. The soft and plastic soils developed over weald clay make the site especially vulnerable.

The evaluation has established that an archaeological resource of considerable importance extends over a substantial proportion of the site. Fig. 6 shows the minimal area requiring a preservation strategy. This has been derived from analysis of the archaeological features present in positive trial trenches, and the absence of features in negative trial trenches. It should be noted that the present site plan for the proposed development (Fig. 2) shows a 'new landscape belt' to the north of the site proper. If this area is to be affected by excavation and/or the movement of machinery then an appropriate scheme of works will need to be devised for it.

In principle there are two options for dealing with such an archaeological resource, preservation *in situ* or preservation by record.

Preservation in situ is normally the preferred option. The extent of the area involved would mean that full adoption of this principle would effectively prevent the development; and it may be suggested that the character and importance of the archaeological resource is not sufficient to make preservation in situ an absolute requirement. It is however, an option that might be partially adapted in order to reduce the area required by preservation in situ. The shallow soil cover and the character of the soils mean that this could only be achieved by removing parts of the site from the development area (fencing them off from machine movement) or if a substantial depth of material was placed over the area in order to 'cap' the archaeological deposits, before construction work commenced. This would have to be placed over the present ground surface and as such may not be a practical option.

The other recommendation, preservation by record, would consist of a full archaeological area excavation of all that area shown in fig. 6 as 'Preservation Strategy Area' where adequate arrangements to ensure preservation *in situ* cannot be made. An archaeological specification for the area excavation is given below.

METHODOLOGY OF FURTHER ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK

1 General Considerations

- 1.1 The further fieldwork should aim to gather sufficient information to establish the presence/absence, extent, character, quality and date of any threatened deposits within the site in order to allow definition of an appropriate mitigation strategy.
- 1.2 The methodologies for further work outlined below have been formulated after careful consideration of all the relevant factors, including cost. They are believed to be the most appropriate in the circumstances of the site and its perceived potential.
- 1.3 Where a detailed specification is not given below it is to be assumed that all work should be carried out within high professional standards, with the scope and level of different aspects of the work defined by reference to the advice and practice of English Heritage and the Institute of Field Archaeologists.
- 1.4 Questions relating to access, storage/removal of spoil produced by archaeological work, provision of on-site facilities and health and safety will need to be addressed by the main contractor and the archaeological team.
- 2 Machine Excavation
- 2.1 Archaeological involvement should be timetabled prior to the start of any construction work.
- 2.2 Removal of Deposits not of Archaeological Interest
- 2.2.1 Machine removal of deposits down to the top of surviving significant archaeology will be undertaken entirely under direct archaeological supervision. The machine used should be sufficiently powerful to perform a clean and effective job, and will be of the size of a Komatsu PC210 or larger 360° excavator. A 1.8m or 2m wide toothless ditching bucket will be used for clearance of the topsoil/overburden (0.30-0.45m below the present ground surface in most cases), with the soil placed directly in dump trucks, for storage on site.
- 2.2.2 Work will progress across the sample area, and dump trucks will run outside of the limits of the Preservation Strategy Area shown in fig. 6: no machinery will re-enter the cleared area except under the direction of the archaeological team. It should be noted that the removal of spoil by dumper truck may, considering the relative depth at which archaeological deposits have been encountered during the evaluation, (0.30-0.45m) necessitate the construction of temporary 'haul roads' using material from the excavation to cover the original ground surface. These should prevent damage to the underlying archaeological deposits

3 Hand Excavation

The purpose of this section is to outline the strategy and methods of hand excavation. Six aspects of this may be identified.

- -

3.1 The mapping of surface evidence.

After site stripping, plans will be prepared showing all the surface evidence (at a scale of 1:50 or larger). All contexts will be numbered, record sheets created and surface finds collected.

3.2 Excavation in stratigraphic phases.

Excavation will be by stratigraphic units linked where possible to phase groups, with, so far as practical, work proceeding from latest to earliest material. It is, however, not expected that there will be a great deal of vertical development evident, but the possibility of horizontal development needs to be kept in mind

3.3 A hand excavated sample of all features.

The minimum level of sampling will obviously vary with the type of feature and its perceived capacity to contribute towards the objectives of the excavation. Some minimum levels of excavation for different types of feature may be indicated.

Linear features: enclosure ditches At least a 20% sample of exposed lengths should be fully excavated, resulting in a minimum of a 5m length of excavation

Linear features: ring gullies At least a 40% sample of exposed lengths should be fully excavated

Linear features: other or field boundaries At least a 5% sample of exposed lengths should be fully excavated, resulting in a minimum of a 3m length of excavation

Pits All to be half-sectioned, unless form or size suggests an alternative approach. Excavation to 100% of feature will normally follow, unless size or form suggest this would be of little archaeological value

Post-holes All to be half-sectioned, unless form suggests an alternative approach. Excavation to 100% of feature will follow.

Industrial features Complete excavation, bearing in mind the needs of environmental and scientific sampling, and with the advice of appropriate specialists (unless excavation director and specialists agree a lesser sample adequately serves the objectives)

The above covers the principal types of feature likely to be found. Other types of features if found will be excavated according to good professional practice and their capacity to meet the project objectives.

3.4 Selective further hand excavation.

Sampling as at 3 above may lead to the conclusion that further sampling is required to meet the project objectives. Reasons for this include

Acquisition of further dating evidence Further excavation is needed to clarify statigraphic sequences or to acquire more finds to date a feature.

To allow satisfactory excavation of lower levels Later features may be obscuring earlier evidence

Identification of function, status. Further excavation will help establish, by the form of the feature or the nature of finds within it, the function or status of occupation at a particular period.

Meeting of specialist needs. In the light of on-site advice there may be a need for further sampling to meet the needs of environmental and other specialists.

3.5 The methods of hand excavation.

In general terms the more rapid the excavation method is, the less refined the evidence produced. The Director will need to use his discretion in this, adopting the method that will most economically achieve the desired aim. Pick and shovel will generally provide the best approach to substantial volumes of undifferentiated fill; at the other extreme fragile articulated bone may require delicate tools and enormous care. (Although its discovery here is relatively unlikely). There is no perceived advantage to general sieving of deposits to aid recovery of artefactual evidence. Sieving will occur on a selective basis, largely for environmental purposes.

3.6 Sampling for environmental or other scientific purposes

No detailed methodology can be advanced for this work because, at present, there is little that will obviously require such sampling. Such evidence would, however, have a very high importance if identified, because of the paucity of reliable data from previous excavations of Iron Age sites in Surrey. All possible locations for such samples should be examined by an appropriately qualified specialist, and his/her recommendations for sampling and assessment followed.

4 Recording and Processing.

Recording on-site will take place within the general principle that all structures, deposits and finds will be recorded according to accepted professional standards. Some specific aspects of this are as follows.

a) Plans indicating the location of the excavated area and the location of all archaeological features are to be drawn at an appropriate scale. Plans at an appropriate scale should be related to the National Grid. All plans and sections are to be drawn on polyester based drafting film and clearly labelled.

b) All archaeological contexts (and environmental samples) are to be recorded individually on context record sheets. A further more general record of the work comprising a description and discussion of the archaeology is to be maintained as appropriate. Records will be checked on site.

c) A full black and white and colour (35mm transparency) photographic record of the work is to be kept. The photographic record is to be regarded as part of the site archive.

d) All artefacts recovered during the excavations on the site are to be suitably bagged, boxed and marked in accordance with the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation, Conservation Guidelines No 2.

5 Post-Project Assessment of Results

5.1 A full, detailed methodology for aspects such as environmental sampling is not appropriate in the absence of any precise knowledge of what will be found. These can be detailed as and when identified, in accord with good professional practise.

5.2 Methods for Stratigraphic Assessment

Once the finds have been spot dated it will be possible to produce a summary account of the site, including a matrix and phasing for each context. This in turn will allow the compilation of all the information required to produce an assessment report and postexcavation and publication proposals in the form and to the standards specified in MAP2 (English Heritage 1991).

5.3 Methods for Pottery Assessment

All sherds are to be washed, except those that are too fragile for such cleaning. These will be brushed clean. All sherds will be marked with the site and context codes.

5.4 Spot Dating Record Sheets will be compiled in which:

All single context assemblages will be divided into period and Broad Ware Groups (i.e. greysandy, shelly, calc flint gritty, etc)

Each of the Broad Ware Groups will be quantified by count and weight.

Each assemblage will be spot dated according to the latest datable pottery within it

It should then be possible to decide:

- * Which features or phase of assemblages should be more closely studied
- * Which of the Broad Ware Groups should be more closely studied
- * How much of the pottery should be drawn from the archive
- * What pottery should be prepared for illustration in any final published report
- How long the final report will be

5.5 Methods for other Finds Assessment

5.6

6.1

Any relevant metalwork should be x-rayed as part of the site archive. Material requiring conservation or investigative analysis should be passed on to the Conservator either periodically or as soon after completion of the fieldwork as possible.

After cleaning and conservation an archive listing to standard of the old DUA Level II archive of all finds should be completed.

A quantified assessment will be produced based on the archive listings, looked at by phase and function as well as by material type. It will include a summary of the nature and quantity of each class of material.

A post excavation proposal will be prepared on completion of the assessments in accordance with the standards specified in *MAP2*. This will include a synopsis of the proposed report, a methodology for the required work, and a timetable and costing for its completion.

6 Preparation of Report/Deposition of Project Archive

An interim report should be prepared within two months of the completion of work, and copies supplied to Osborne Homes and to the Principal Archaeological Officer, Surrey County Council. The report should include:

1) A copy of the location plan of the areas examined at an appropriate scale together with a plan of the main archaeological features together with more detailed plans as appropriate and relevant section drawings.

2) A descriptive summary and interpretation of the archaeology of the site.

A full report on the work, containing a level of detail appropriate to the importance of any discoveries made, must be made available for publication in a publicly available journal (normally the Surrey Archaeological Collections) within two years of completion of any fieldwork

6.2 Finds and Archive Deposition

Finds will need to be retained by the archaeological contractor until an appropriate level of study has been completed, and it is anticipated that they will then be placed in the nearest suitable Public Museum. The complete archive, including all site records and drawings and all other relevant background materials should be deposited with, and at the same time as, the finds.

6.3 If the applicant (as legal owner of the finds) wishes to make alternative arrangements for the curation of all or part of the archive such arrangements (including details of storage arrangements) will be agreed in writing with the planning authority. Where the place of deposition is not a Public Museum, a comprehensive record of all materials will need to be made for deposition in the nearest suitable Public Museum.



Fig. 1 Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh: The location of the site



Fig. 2 Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh: Location of the Trial Trenches and the proposed development.



Trench 1

•





Trench 7







Trench 8



W 122 Naturel







8











Fig. 4 Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh: Feature Sections.

Trench 10







Trench 11



•









Archaeological Features shown in red

Negative Trench No Archaeological Features

Fig. 6 Wyphurst Road, Cranleigh: Plan showing the proposed area of full excavation.