

**Land Adjacent Brackenbury House,  
Marcus Road, Felixstowe, Suffolk**

**Planning application: DC/20/4734/FUL**

**HER Ref: FEX 456**

**Archaeological Evaluation Report**

(© John Newman BA MCIFA, 10 Fitzgerald Road, Bramford, Ipswich, IP8 4AA)

(May 2022)

(Tel: 07754 501033 Email: [johnnewman2@btinternet.com](mailto:johnnewman2@btinternet.com) )

**Site details for HER**

Name: Land adjacent Brackenbury House, Marcus Road, Felixstowe, Suffolk, IP11 7NF

Clients: A M F Builders

Planning authority: East Suffolk DC

Planning application ref: DC/20/4734/FUL

Development: Erection of one dwelling

Date of fieldwork: 30 April, 2022

HER ref: FEX 456

OASIS ref: johnnewm1-503748

Grid ref: TM 3164 3529

Site area: c1100m<sup>2</sup> (plot)

Recent land use: Garden (overgrown)

## Contents

Summary

1. Introduction & background
2. Evaluation methodology
3. Results

Table 1: Trench details

4. Conclusion

Fig. 1: Site location

Fig. 2: Location of evaluation trenches

## List of appendices

Appendix I- Selected images

Appendix II- Written scheme for evaluation

Appendix III- OASIS data collection form

*Summary: Felixstowe, land adjacent Brackenbury, Marcus Road (FEX 456, TM 3164 3529) evaluation trenching for a single dwelling development close to the edge of the large Roman period settlement on the coast, which has largely been lost through erosion, revealed a garden feature pond of 1920s-1930s date but no other features and no finds of pre-20<sup>th</sup> century date suggesting that this site is outside the area of Roman period settlement (John Newman Archaeological Services for A M F Builders).*

## 1. Introduction & background

1.1 A M F Builders commissioned John Newman Archaeological Services (JNAS) to undertake the archaeological evaluation works for a single dwelling development at land adjacent to Brackenbury House, Marcus Road, Felixstowe (see Fig. 1) that has been given planning consent under application DC/20/4734/FUL. The evaluation requirements were set by Mr M Baker of the Suffolk CC Archaeological Service (SCCAS) with the aim of gaining a representative sample by trial trenching of the planned new dwelling footprint. The Written Scheme of Investigation for the archaeological evaluation (see Appendix II) was subsequently prepared by JNAS in order to gain a conditional discharge and allow the trenching to go ahead before any other ground works are undertaken.

1.2 The planned development site adjacent to Brackenbury House, Marcus Road, Felixstowe is located on the southern side of what is known as Old Felixstowe and is c520m south of the parish church which is at the core of the medieval area of settlement that is now subsumed within the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century town growth. The site most recently has been garden some 130m from the current coastline at c16m OD in an area of well drained soils due to the underlying drift geology which the British Geological Survey describes as sands and gravel of the Crag group. At the time of the evaluation the site had been detached from Brackenbury House and was covered by a large number of weeds.

1.3 The relevant archaeological brief from SCCAS outlines how the site is within the area of a large Roman period coastal site (HER FEX 093) with evidence of intense activity; this being the western part of what is termed a small Roman town with the eastern part and Walton Castle, a Saxon Shore Fort, now eroded by the North Sea. In addition the site is close to recorded find spots of Roman coins and pottery (HER FEX 009, 060 & 068). As a result, there was high potential for the discovery of below-ground heritage assets of archaeological importance within this area, and groundworks associated with the development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains which exist.

## 2. Evaluation methodology

2.1 The development area was trenched to an agreed plan (see Fig. 2). The trenching was carried out using a medium sized 360 machine equipped with a 1500mm flat bucket which was under archaeological supervision at all times and any indistinct areas were hand cleaned as necessary to improve clarity with the trenches being 1.80m wide.

2.2 The sides and base of trenches and the upcast spoil were examined visually and scanned with a metal detector for any finds as the evaluation progressed. Site visibility for features and finds is considered to have been good throughout the evaluation which was undertaken under dry weather conditions. At the end of the

evaluation the location of the trenches were plotted from nearby mapped features and as the works progressed a full photographic record in digital format (see Appendix I) was taken.

## 3. Results

3.1 The relevant details for the evaluation trench are summarised in the table below (see also Fig. 2 & Appendix I):

Trench	Orientation	Length (m)	Topsoil depth (mm)	Subsoil depth (mm)	Drift geology	Archaeological/natural features & finds
1	Northeast-southwest	10	200	100 mid brown sandy subsoil	Clean orange sand	No features and only a few small 20 <sup>th</sup> C brick fragments
2	Northwest-southeast	10	200	100 as T1	As T1	At southern end an area of concrete and brick hardstanding adjacent to a circular brick built and concrete lined garden pond type feature which has an external diameter of 3m and internal of 2.50m and was 500mm deep with some of the upper walling removed when it went out of use and was backfilled. Of probable 1920s-1930s date in the garden of the adjacent house.
		20 (26m <sup>2</sup> )	200	100		Only one early-mid 20 <sup>th</sup> C garden feature, no finds of pre-20 <sup>th</sup> C date

Table 1: Trench details

3.2 As outlined in table 1 above below 200mm of topsoil and 100mm of mid brown sandy subsoil the locally occurring natural glaciofluvial deposit proved to be clean orange sand with a few small flints. The only feature revealed was the lower part of a circular brick built and concrete lined garden pond that was of 1920s-1930s date in the garden of Brackenbury House and appears to have been partially demolished and back-filled in the mid to later 20<sup>th</sup> century. No evidence was revealed for any features or finds of pre c1900 date.

## 4. Conclusion

4.1 With negative results from the evaluation trenching with regard to archaeological deposits of any significance a search from the County Historic Environment Record for local sites and finds was not commissioned.

4.2 While this site is within the area defined in the County HER (FEX 093) as the Roman period settlement that runs along the nearby coast which forms the western remnant of what was originally a much larger small town/port that by the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD was associated with a now lost Saxon Shore fort no evidence was revealed for



past activity of any date. This lack of evidence in part suggests that this site lies towards, or just beyond, the south-western limits of the Roman period settlement; however, this is a small-scale development being for only one new dwelling so deposits of archaeological significance could exist in other areas around Golf Road and Marcus Road.

4.3 From these evaluation results it is recommended that no further archaeological works need to be carried out for this single dwelling development on land adjacent to Brackenbury House Marcus Road, Felixstowe.

*Archive- to be deposited with the Suffolk CC Archaeological Service under the HER ref: FEX 456.*

*Disclaimer- any opinions regarding the need for further archaeological work in relation to this proposed development are those of the authors alone. Formal comment regarding the need for further work must be sought from the official Archaeological Advisors to the relevant Planning Authority.*

*(Acknowledgements: JNAS is grateful to Sean for his skilled machine operation during this evaluation)*





Fig. 1: Site location

(Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2006 All rights reserved Licence No 100049722)



0m | \_\_\_\_\_ | 30m

Fig. 2: Location of evaluation trenches (blue- planned footprint area) (Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright All Rights reserved Licence No 100079722)



# Appendix I- Images



Trench 1 from southwest



Trench 2 from south





Trench 2- garden pond feature



Trench 2 from north

**Land Adjacent Brackenbury, Marcus Road,  
Felixstowe, Suffolk**

**Written Scheme of Investigation for  
Archaeological Evaluation**

## **Site details**

Name: Land adjacent Brackenbury, Marcus Road, Felixstowe, Suffolk, IP11 7NF

Client: AMF Builders

Local planning authority: East Suffolk DC

Planning application ref: DC/20/473/FUL

Proposed development: Erection of one dwelling

Proposed date for evaluation: tbc

Brief ref: SCCAS\_ (MB)\_20\_4734\_Brief for Trenched Archaeological Evaluation at Land Adjacent Brackenbury House, Marcus Road, Felixstowe

Grid ref: TM 3164 3529

HER ref: tbc

OASIS ref: johnnewm1-503748

Area: 1100m<sup>2</sup>

Current site use: Garden

## **Contents**

1. Introduction
2. Location, Topography & Geology
3. Archaeological & Historical Background
4. Aims of the Site Evaluation
5. Methodology
6. Risk Assessment
7. Specialists

Proposed location of trial trenches



# John Newman Archaeological Services

---

## 1. Introduction

1.1 AMF Builders have commissioned John Newman Archaeological Services (JNAS) to undertake the archaeological site evaluation for a single dwelling development that has received consent to go ahead under application DC/20/4734/FUL. This written scheme of investigation (WSI) details the background to the archaeological requirements for planning applications DC/20/4734/FUL and how JNAS will implement the requirements of the Brief for Archaeological Evaluation set by Mr M Baker of the Suffolk CC Archaeological Service (SCCAS). The WSI will also set out how potential risks will be mitigated. This overall proposed development site (PDS) concerns the construction of a single dwelling at land adjacent Brackenbury House, Marcus Road, Felixstowe.

1.2 The evaluation will be carried out to the standards set regionally in the *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England (EAA Occ. Papers 14, 2003)*, locally in *Requirements for Trenched Archaeological Evaluation 2021 (Suffolk CC)* and nationally in *Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014 & 2020)*.

1.3 The evaluation as detailed in this document is the first phase of a programme of archaeological investigation secured by negative condition on the planning consent for DC/20/4734/FUL. Where the results of the evaluation indicate the presence of heritage assets further archaeological works will be required to mitigate the impact of the development on the historic environment. The SCCAS officer will identify the type and extent of works in a new brief necessary to adequately mitigate the impact of the proposed development. All further archaeological works, as recommended by SCCAS, must be undertaken in accordance with an additional WSI, submitted and approved by SCCAS and the LPA. All further archaeological investigations must be undertaken prior to commencement of development, unless specifically referenced as monitoring of groundworks in the approved WSI.

## 2. Location, Topography & Geology

2.1 The proposed development site (PDS) at adjacent Brackenbury House, Marcus Road, Felixstowe is located on the southern side of what is known as Old Felixstowe and is c520m south of the parish church which is at the core of the medieval area of settlement that is now subsumed within the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century town growth. The PDS most recently has been garden some 130m from the current coast line at c16m OD in an area of well drained soils due to the underlying drift geology which the British Geological Survey describes as sands and gravel of the Crag group.

## 3. Archaeological & Historical Background

3.1 The relevant archaeological brief from SCCAS outlines how the PDS is within the area of a large Roman period coastal site (HER FEX 093) with evidence of intense activity; this being the western part of what is termed a small Roman town with the



# John Newman Archaeological Services

---

eastern part and Walton Castle, a Saxon Shore Fort, now eroded by the North Sea. In addition the PDS is close to recorded find spots of Roman coins and pottery (HER FEX 009, 060 & 068). As a result, there is high potential for the discovery of below-ground heritage assets of archaeological importance within this area, and groundworks associated with the development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains which exist.

A site evaluation by trial trenching prior to any other works starting is therefore required to:

- Identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation.
- Evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.
- Establish the potential for the survival of environmental evidence.
- Provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of cost.

## 4. Aims of the Site Evaluation

4.1 As outlined in section 3 above the archaeological potential of the PDS relates to its location within the overall area of a major Roman period settlement. The evaluation will examine the specified sample of the site to assess whether further Roman period archaeological deposits extend into this planned development area.

## 5. Methodology

5.1 The proposed development is for the construction of a single dwelling. To inform the results of the evaluation if archaeological deposits are revealed a search will be commissioned from the County HER for the area within 250m of the PDS and the relevant invoice number will be included in the report. Ten days notice of the evaluation starting will be given to SCCAS so a monitoring visit can be agreed. Contact will also be maintained with SCCAS as the evaluation progresses and through the post-excavation study and work with regard to the results from the site, the finds and any samples and the main report preparation.

5.2 The Brief requires 20m of sample trenching, which will be 1.8m wide, across the area of the overall development footprint. This will be undertaken using a wide toothless ditching bucket on a suitably sized machine operated by an experienced driver with a trench plan as set out below. The machine will be closely supervised by an experienced archaeologist as the overburden is removed in shallow spits to the top of any archaeological deposits that are present, where hand investigation will

## John Newman Archaeological Services

---

start, or to expose the underlying drift geology which will be further hand cleaned and examined as required. The spoil will be stored adjacent to the excavated trench with top and sub soil kept separate to allow for subsequent sequential backfilling. No trenches will be backfilled until the relevant officer at SCCAS has been consulted and should any modification to the trench layout be required due to any unforeseen circumstances, such as local services, then SCCAS will be contacted immediately. A metal detector search will be carried out by an experienced operator at all stages of the evaluation including before the trenches are opened (see specialists section below) for both ferrous and non-ferrous finds and between the trenches. The up cast spoil will also be closely examined for unstratified artefacts as evidence for past activity in past rural areas in particular is often as evident via artefact scatters as by undisturbed archaeological deposits. Allowance has been made for one member staff on site for one day with additional detector survey for half a day plus a machine and operator for one to two days to cover the opening of the trenches plus backfilling once full approval for the latter has been gained from SCCAS following a site monitoring visit. If required further investigation of the trenches will be carried out in particular following a SCCAS monitoring visit and examination of the exposed deposits. Any requirement to vary the related brief requirements and this WSI will only be carried out following communication with SCCAS.

5.3 Site records will be made under a continuous and unique numbering system of contexts under an overall HER number obtained from the Suffolk CC HER beforehand. All contexts will be numbered and finds recorded by context. Conventions compatible with the county HER will be used throughout the monitoring. Site plans will be drawn at 1:20 or 1:50 as appropriate and sections at 1:10 or 1:20 (all on plastic drawing film) and related to OS map cover. Sections will be levelled to a datum OD. A photographic record in high resolution digital images will be made of the site and exposed features (using a Lumix DMC-FZ5 camera with allowance for .jpeg and higher definition .tif images depending on what is revealed).

5.4 As necessary and to define archaeological deposits exposed surfaces will be trowelled clean before appropriate hand investigation and recording. Exposed archaeological features will be sampled at standard levels with care being taken to cause minimum disturbance to the site consistent with evaluation to a level adequate to properly form a subsequent mitigation strategy. Significant features such as solid or bonded structural remains, building slots or post holes (where fills are sampled) will have their integrity maintained (and during backfilling) as will any evidence of pottery production which will be sampled by hand so it can be characterised while left in situ when revealed. Otherwise for discrete, contained, features, sampling will be at 50%- possibly rising to 100% if requested, and 1m wide sampling slots across linear features. These features will be hand investigated unless agreed with SCCAS that larger/more recent features can be partially machine/hand investigated. If human burial evidence is revealed the SCCAS Officer will be informed and the clear presumption is to preserve such remains in situ with minimum disturbance during

## John Newman Archaeological Services

---

this evaluation stage depending on SCCAS advice if lifting remains appears to be sensible at this stage. If this is not possible then a Ministry of Justice licence will be obtained prior to full on site recording (total 100% sampling if a cremation deposit) and removal of the remains followed by examination by the relevant specialist and possibly scientific dating. If human remains do have to be recorded, removed from site and reported on then these works will add an additional cost to the evaluation works which may involve radiocarbon dating (in this case the likelihood of revealing human burial evidence is assessed as being medium given the location within a large Roman period settlement area but low given the scale of the site).

5.5 All finds will be collected and processed unless any variation is agreed with the relevant SCCAS Officer. Finds will be assessed by recognised period specialists and their interpretation will form an integral part of the overall report. Finds will be stored according to ICON guidelines with specialist advice/treatment sought for fragile ones. Every effort will be made to gain the deposit of the site finds to the SCCAS Store under their relevant HER code and site numbering for future reference. If this is not possible then the SCCAS Officer will be consulted over any requirements for additional recording (which may have an additional cost implication). Any discard policy will be discussed and agreed with the relevant SCCAS Officer and any finds that qualify under the Treasure Act will be reported to the local Finds Liaison Officer within 14 days.

5.6 Where appropriate palaeoenvironmental samples will be taken for processing and assessment by a specialist conversant with regional archaeological standards and research agendas. The sampling, processing and assessment will follow the guidelines as detailed in *Environmental Archaeology: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods, from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation* (English Heritage, 2011). In accordance with standard practice bulk samples of 40 litres (or 100% of the deposit where less) will be taken from a representative cross section of archaeological deposits of all periods (respecting defined fills within features), in consultation with the relevant SCCAS Officer (and the Historic England Regional Scientific Advisor (RSA) if the deposits merit more targeted advice) including deposits that cannot be immediately dated by their artefact content, so the state of preservation and full archaeological and palaeoenvironmental potential of the deposits can be assessed and any further sampling, should further field work take place, be systematically planned and fully costed. Archaeological deposits of all types may reveal valuable data through the processing and assessment of samples with high priority features including the primary fills of pits, wells and cesspits, layers of middens, occupation surfaces and structural features as well as other discrete activity areas, contents of hearths, ovens, and other craft related or industrial structures. In addition more generalised settlement and land use features such as ditches may also yield valuable and informative data when sampling is undertaken systematically as the sum of all the assessment results can add considerably to the interpretation of a site and its landscape. Through an integrated study of all the data

## John Newman Archaeological Services

---

recovered from the evaluation the results from the assessment of the samples will be reviewed in terms of:

- What is the quality and state of preservation of charred plant remains, mineralised plant and animal related remains, small vertebrates and industrial residues such as evidence for iron working (contributing to the fullest interpretation of the evaluation results and to aid the planning of any further field work- if any RC dates are required for features containing suitable material but no easily dateable finds then this will incur an additional cost).
- What is the concentration of macro-remains (to inform sampling strategy in any further field work), in particular how might bulk sampling inform the interpretation of burial deposits.
- Can any patterning or similarities/differences be ascertained between deposits from different periods represented on site, similarly can any useful comparisons be made with undated and unphased deposits (to aid interpretation of the evaluation results and help in the study of undated deposits which may otherwise be overlooked and which may via sampling yield material for RC dating)
- Do waterlogged deposits exist on site, if so is there potential for palaeoenvironmental data from preserved insects or pollen and do such deposits contain organic material suitable for RC dating from samples taken as advised by the relevant soil specialist (who would also coordinate the assessment for pollen and insect remains), the RSA will also be consulted in such cases in conjunction with the relevant SCCAS Officer. Incremental column samples will be taken should waterlogged deposits be revealed in close consultation with the evaluation soils specialist with 10-20 litre sample sizes which will be sub-sampled for preserved pollen, insects, diatoms, preserved parasite eggs etc. If waterlogged wood is encountered it will ideal to leave in situ, if it has to be lifted it will be packed while wet in black polythene and stored at 5C until it can be transferred to a specialist for species identification, assessment and potential for RC dating is undertaken (should RC dating be required in the evaluation on such deposits this will incur an additional cost and will take time to obtain, examination of the topographic location of the site indicates that the presence of waterlogged deposits is unlikely unless deep deposits are revealed).
- Deep blanket type deposits resulting from both natural and human derived actions and events can yield valuable land use and palaeoenvironmental information. In particular such deposits can form at the base of a slope, if located in the evaluation the relevant SCCAS Officer and RSA will be consulted over monolith sampling and assessment by the relevant evaluation specialist (the composition of such deposits may give information on past land



## John Newman Archaeological Services

---

use in the area through a study of the soil matrix notwithstanding additional data if it is waterlogged)

5.7 An archive of all records and finds will be prepared consistent with the principles of *MoRPHE* (and the guidelines in the Archaeological Archives Forum: a guide to best practice 2007). This archive, including the digital content, will be deposited with the Suffolk CC HER within 3 months of working finishing on site under the relevant HER number and following the guidelines outlined in '*Archaeological Archives in Suffolk- Guidelines for preparation and deposition*' (SCCAS Conservation Team revised version 2019). As necessary the site digital archive will be deposited with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS) within the agreed allowance for the monitoring and reporting works.

5.8 The evaluation report will be consistent with the principles of *MoRPHE* and this report will summarise the methodology employed and relate the archaeological record directly to the aims of this WSI and section 4 above in particular. The report will give an objective account of the deposits and stratigraphy recorded and finds recovered with an inventory of the latter. The report will include an assessment of palaeoenvironmental remains recovered from palaeosols and cut features in relation to both dated and undated features and in terms of patterning across the site. Any developments during the site and reporting works will be communicated to SCCAS.

5.9 Any interpretation of the evaluation will be clearly separated from the objective account of the evaluation and its results and the results will be discussed with the relevant SCCAS Officer at an early stage in the reporting process following reporting on the day of the immediately apparent conclusions. The report will give a clear statement regarding the results of the site evaluation in relation to both the more detailed aims in section 4 above and their significance in the context of local HER records and of the Regional Research Framework (EAA Occ. Papers 3, 8 & 24, 1997, 2000 & 2011). There will be no further work on site until the evaluation results have been assessed and the SCCAS Officer has considered whether further archaeological works are required if this application receives consent. The report may give an opinion regarding the necessity for further evaluation work as appropriate. A draft copy of the report will be presented to SCCAS following completion of the site works. Once accepted a bound hard copy will be provided for the County HER with a digital version on disc. As required the site evaluation will be registered on the OASIS online archaeological record followed by submission of the final draft in .pdf format. An HER summary sheet will be completed and a summary prepared of any positive results for inclusion in the annual PSIAH round-up.

### 6. Risk Assessment

6.1 Protective clothing will be worn on site (hard hat, high visibility vest/coat, steel-toe cap boots, and ear muffs if required). A safe working method will be agreed with the machine operator for excavation of the trenches and examination of the up cast

## John Newman Archaeological Services

---

spoil while at the same time allowing efficient use of plant. Suitable clothing will be available to mitigate against extremes of weather. COVID guideline requirements will be adhered to with social distancing, no sharing of equipment and separate rest areas.

6.2 Vehicles will be safely parked away from work areas and lines of access.

6.3 Prior to evaluation work starting on site the client will be consulted with regard to any potential contamination at the site. No overhead services impinge on the trench locations and the client will be consulted regarding any possible underground services. Gloves and hand wash/wipes be available and any information on possible ground contamination revealed during the evaluation will be passed to finds and environmental specialists.

6.4 A fully charged mobile phone will be carried and a first aid kit will be taken to site.

6.5 It is unlikely that any trench plus excavated feature depth will go below c1/1.3m from the present ground level. If any excavations need to go deeper measures such as stepping in the sides will be employed.

6.6 JNAS holds full insurance cover for archaeological site works from the specialist provider Tovergate Risk Solutions covering Public & Products Liability, details can be supplied on request.

### 7. Specialists

Conservation:	Conservation Services
Faunal remains:	J Curl (Sylvanus Archaeology)
Human remains:	S Anderson (Freelance)
Metal detecting:	J Armes (experienced freelance)
Palaeoenvironmental samples:	V Fryer (Freelance)
Soils specialist	tbc
Pre-historic flint:	S Bates (Freelance)
Pre-historic pottery:	S Percival (Freelance)
Post Roman ceramics & CBM:	S Anderson (Freelance)
Roman period small finds:	N Crummy (Freelance)
Roman period ceramics:	Colchester Archaeological Trust
Medieval coins:	M Allen (Fitzwilliam Museum)
Post Roman small finds:	JNAS



## Summary for johnnewm1-503748

OASIS ID (UID)	johnnewm1-503748
Project Name	Evaluation at Brackenbury House Marcus Road Felixstowe Suffolk
Sitename	
Activity type	Evaluation
Project Identifier(s)	FEX 456
Planning Id	DC/20/4734/FUL
Reason For Investigation	Planning: Post determination
Organisation Responsible for work	John Newman Archaeological Services
Project Dates	30-Apr-2022 - 30-Apr-2022
Location	Brackenbury House Marcus Road Felixstowe Suffolk NGR : TM 31640 35290 LL : 51.967786108535, 1.37072924411003 12 Fig : 631640,235290
Administrative Areas	Country : England County : Suffolk District : East Suffolk Parish : Felixstowe
Project Methodology	Sample trenching
Project Results	Felixstowe, land adjacent Brackenbury, Marcus Road (FEX 456, TM 3164 3529) evaluation trenching for a single dwelling development close to the edge of the large Roman period settlement on the coast, which has largely been lost through erosion, revealed a garden feature pond of 1920s-1930s date but no other features and no finds of pre-20th century date suggesting that this site is outside the area of Roman period settlement.
Keywords	Pool - 20TH CENTURY - FISH Thesaurus of Monument Types
Funder	
HER	Suffolk HER - unRev - STANDARD
Person Responsible for work	
HER Identifiers	
Archives	