

**Land North of 1 Brockley Road,  
Hartest, Suffolk**

**Planning application: DC/18/00821**

**HER Ref: HRT 036**

**Archaeological Evaluation Report**

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

(July 2018)

(Tel: 01473 832896 Email: [johnnewman2@btinternet.com](mailto:johnnewman2@btinternet.com) )

**Site details for HER**

Name: Land north of 1 Brockley Road, Hartest, Suffolk, IP29 4EG

Client: Lewis Morgan Ltd

Planning authority: Babergh DC

Planning application ref: DC/18/00821

Development: Erection of two dwellings with garages

Date of fieldwork: 12 June, 2018

HER ref: HRT 036

OASIS ref: johnnewm1-319410

Grid ref: TL 8320 5320

Site area: c1200m<sup>2</sup>

Recent land use: Paddock

## Contents

Summary

1. Introduction & background

2. Evaluation methodology

3. Results

Table 1: Trench details

4. Conclusion

Fig. 1: Site location

Fig. 2: Location of trenches

## List of appendices

Appendix I- Selected images

Appendix II- Written scheme for evaluation

Appendix III- OASIS data collection form

*Summary: Hartest, land north of 1 Brockley Road (HRT 036, TL 8320 5320) evaluation trenching for a two dwelling development close to recorded evidence for Roman and medieval period activity did not reveal any archaeological features or finds except occasional stray finds of Post medieval date (John Newman Archaeological Services for Lewis Morgan Ltd).*

## 1. Introduction & background

1.1 Dean Pearce Architectural Services on behalf of their client Lewis Morgan Ltd commissioned John Newman Archaeological Services (JNAS) to undertake the archaeological evaluation works for a two dwelling development at land north of 1 Brockley Road, Hartest (see Fig. 1) that has been given planning consent under application DC/18/00821. The evaluation requirements were set by Dr H Cutler of the Suffolk CC Archaeological Service (SCCAS) with the aim of gaining a representative sample by trial trenching of the planned new dwelling footprints. The Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) 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 Hartest parish lies approximately midway between Bury St Edmunds and Sudbury in south Suffolk in a landscape historically characterised by a dispersed settlement pattern partly focused within parishes on the respective church but largely scattered round the numerous greens and along roads and lanes. The planned development site on land north of 1 Brockley Road (see Fig. 1) is located in an area of gentle topography just above the 80 m OD contour 850m north-west of the parish church and just to the north of the historic Cross Green (HER HRT 017).

1.3 The British Geological Survey describes the superficial deposits in this area as being chalky till of the Lowestoft Formation with outwash sands, gravels and silts with site sloping gently down from west to east and at the time of the evaluation it was under a grass cover.

1.3 Archaeological interest in this development was generated by its proximity to a recorded finds scatter indicative of Roman period activity of high status (HER HRT 027) in addition to the site being close to recorded evidence for medieval period activity (HER HRT 011) and north-west of Cross Green (see Fig. 1) where evidence of medieval and early Post medieval activity might be anticipated around it's edges although these are not closely defined.

## 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 1200mm 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 was 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 trenches 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	North-south & east-west (L shaped)	15	250	50 mid brown clay subsoil	Very stiff pale brown chalky clay with flints	No features and two small Pmed brick frags
2	North-south	7.50	250	50 as T1	As T1	No features and a few small Pmed brick/tile frags
3	North-south & east-west (L shaped)	15	250	150 as T1	As T1	No features and a few small Pmed brick/tile frags
4	East-west	7.50	300	200 as T1	As T1	No features, one small (wt. 4g) Pmed whiteware sherd and a 1917 George V penny
		45 (81m <sup>2</sup> )	250-300	50-200		No features and only stray finds of later Pmed date

Table 1: Trench details

3.2 As outlined in table 1 above the deposit profile exposed in the trenches was between 300mm and 500mm deep with 250mm to 300mm of topsoil above 50mm to 300mm of mid brown clay subsoil. The most shallow trenches; at a depth of only 300mm, being trenches 1 and 2 towards the northern part of the site. The locally occurring glaciofluvial drift deposit proved to be stiff chalky clay with flints as anticipated.

3.3 No features of any date were revealed in the four trenches with the only stray finds in the upcast spoil being occasional small fragments of brick and tile of later Post medieval date plus occasional pottery sherds of 19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> century date and a George V penny dated 1917.

## 4. Conclusion

4.1 With largely negative results from the evaluation trenching, save a few stray later Post medieval finds, 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 close to recorded areas of Roman (HER HRT 027) and medieval period (HER HRT 011) activity and close to the northern edge of Cross

Green it did not reveal any archaeological features or any finds of significance. Therefore from these evaluation results it is recommended that no further archaeological works need to be carried out for this planned development at land to the north of 1 Brockley Road, Hartest.

*Archive- to be deposited with the Suffolk CC Archaeological Service under the HER ref: HRT 036.*

*Disclaimer- any opinions regarding the need for further archaeological work in relation to this proposed development are those of the author's 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 everyone from Lewis Morgan Ltd for their close cooperation with regard to this evaluation)*




Fig. 1: Site location

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




Fig. 2: Location of trenches (light blue- planned footprint areas)  
 (Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2018 All rights reserved Licence No 100049722)

## Appendix I- Images



General view from north



Trench 1 east-west arm from west





Trench 1 north-south arm from south



Trench 2 from north



Trench 3 north-south arm from north



Trench 3 east-west arm from west



Trench 4 from east

**Land North of 1 Brockley Road,  
Hartest, Suffolk**

**Written Scheme of Investigation for  
Archaeological Evaluation**

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

(Tel: 01473 832896 Email: [johnnewman2@btinternet.com](mailto:johnnewman2@btinternet.com) )

## **Site details**

Name: Land north of 1 Brockley Road, Hartest, Suffolk, IP29 4EG

Client: Lewis Morgan Ltd

Local planning authority: Babergh DC

Planning application ref: DC/18/00821

Proposed development: Erection of two dwellings with attached garages

Proposed date for evaluation: tbc

Brief ref: tbc

Grid ref: TL 8310 5320

Area: c 1200m<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 Dean Pearce Architectural Services on behalf of their client Lewis Morgan Ltd have commissioned John Newman Archaeological Services (JNAS) to undertake the archaeological site evaluation on a residential development that has received consent to go ahead. This written scheme of investigation (WSI) details the background to the archaeological requirements for planning application DC/18/00821 and how JNAS will implement the requirements of the Brief for Archaeological Evaluation to be set by Dr H Cutler of the Suffolk CC Archaeological Service (SCCAS). The WSI will also set out how potential risks will be mitigated. This overall proposed development concerns the construction of a two dwellings with attached garages at land north of 1 Brockley Road, Hartest.

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 2017 (Suffolk CC)* and nationally in *Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (Institute for Archaeologists 1994, revised 2001 & re-issued 2014)*.

1.3 The evaluation as detailed in this document is the first phase of a programme of archaeological investigation secured by negative condition on planning consent DC/18/00821. 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 1 Hartest parish lies approximately midway between Bury St Edmunds and Sudbury in south Suffolk in a landscape historically characterised by a dispersed settlement pattern partly focused within parishes on the respective church but largely scattered round the numerous greens and along roads and lanes. The proposed development site (PDS) on land north of 1 Brockley Road is located in an area of gentle topography just above the 80 m OD contour 850m north-west of the parish church and just to the north of the historic Cross Green (HER HRT 017).

2.2 The PDS is located in an area described by the British Geological Survey as having superficial deposits of chalky till of the Lowestoft Formation with outwash sands, gravels and silts.

## 3. Archaeological & Historical Background

3.1 Advice from the Suffolk CC Archaeological Service notes that the PDS is located close to the recorded find spot of a large Roman period artefact scatter (HER HRT 027) of high status; in addition there is recorded evidence for activity of medieval date (HER HRT 011) nearby and buildings of Post medieval date in the vicinity. As a result there is high potential for encountering archaeological deposits of Roman date in particular at this location plus possible evidence for activity of medieval and earlier Post medieval date and the advice notes that the proposed works would cause significant ground disturbance that have the potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exist.

A site evaluation by trial trenching 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 the site's location close to recorded evidence of past activity of Roman and medieval date.

## 5. Methodology

5.1 The proposed development is for the construction of two dwellings with attached garages. 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.

5.2 It is proposed that a 15m long L shaped trench will be excavated across each planned new dwelling footprint plus two 7.50m trenches in the drive/access area. 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 start, or to expose the underlying drift

## John Newman Archaeological Services

---

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. The up cast spoil will also be closely examined for unstratified artefacts as evidence for past activity in rural areas in particular is often as evident via artefact scatters as by undisturbed archaeological deposits.

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 in combination with an event number. 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.

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). Otherwise for discrete, contained, features, sampling will be at 50%, possibly rising to 100% if requested, and 1m wide sampling slots across linear features. If human burial evidence is revealed the SCCAS Officer will be informed and the clear presumption must be to preserve such remains in situ with minimum disturbance during this evaluation 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 low).

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



## John Newman Archaeological Services

---

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 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

## John Newman Archaeological Services

---

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 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 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 2017). As necessary the site digital archive will deposited with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS) within the agreed allowance for the evaluation 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

# John Newman Archaeological Services

---

palaeoenvironmental remains recovered from palaeosols and cut features in relation to both dated and undated features and in terms of patterning across the site.

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 spoil while at the same time allowing efficient use of plant. Suitable clothing will be available to mitigate against extremes of weather.

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. 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 Towergate Risk Solutions covering Public & Products Liability, details can be supplied on request.

# John Newman Archaeological Services

## 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	R Macphail (UCL)
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:	S Benfield (CAT)
Medieval coins:	M Allen (Fitzwilliam Museum)
Post Roman small finds:	JNAS



Proposed location of trial trenches (length 45m)

## OASIS ID: johnnewm1-319410

### Project details

Project name	Land North of 1 Brockley Road, Hartest, Suffolk- Archaeological Evaluation Report
Short description of the project	Hartest, land north of 1 Brockley Road (HRT 036, TL 8320 5320) evaluation trenching for a two dwelling development close to recorded evidence for Roman and medieval period activity did not reveal any archaeological features or finds except occasional stray finds of Post medieval date.
Project dates	Start: 12-06-2018 End: 12-06-2018
Previous/future work	No / No
Any associated project reference codes	HRT 036 - Related HER No.
Any associated project reference codes	DC/18/0082 - Planning Application No.
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Current Land use	Grassland Heathland 3 - Disturbed
Monument type	NONE None
Significant Finds	COIN Modern
Methods & techniques	"Sample Trenches"
Development type	Rural residential
Prompt	Planning condition
Position in the planning process	After full determination (eg. As a condition)
Project location	
Country	England
Site location	SUFFOLK BABERGH HARTEST LAND NORTH OF 1 BROCKLEY ROAD
Postcode	IP29 4EG
Study area	1000 Square metres
Site coordinates	TL 8310 5320 52.146219324671 0.676360220295 52 08 46 N 000 40 34 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 79m Max: 80m
Project creators	
Name of	John Newman Archaeological Services

Organisation	
Project brief originator	Local Authority Archaeologist and/or Planning Authority/advisory body
Project design originator	John Newman
Project director/manager	John Newman
Project supervisor	John Newman
Type of sponsor/funding body	Developer
Project archives	
Physical Archive recipient	Landowner
Physical Contents	"Metal"
Digital Archive recipient	Suffolk CC Archaeological Service
Digital Contents	"Ceramics","Metal"
Digital Media available	"Images raster / digital photography","Text"
Paper Archive recipient	Suffolk CC Archaeological Service
Paper Contents	"Ceramics","Metal"
Paper Media available	"Report"
Project bibliography	
1	
Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	Land North of 1 Brockley Road, Hartest, Suffolk-Archaeological Evaluation Report
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Newman, J
Date	2018
Issuer or publisher	John Newman Archaeological Services
Place of issue or publication	Henely, Suffolk
Description	Loose bound client report and pdf
Entered by	John Newman (johnnewman2@btinternet.com)
Entered on	4 July 2018