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Fig. 1 Location of proposed development site. Reduced from a 1;10,000 Ordnance Survey map. reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO © Crown copyright. (LAS Ordnance Survey Licence No. AL 50424A).

Fig. 2 Fieldwalking area with features mapped from aerial photographs.
Fig. 3 Artefact distribution from fieldwalking. Scale 1:1250. (Midland Surveying and Engineering)

Fig. 4 Gradiometer survey areas in relation to artefact distribution from fieldwalking survey. (Reduced scale)

## Plates

Pl. 1 Area A. East end of the field. Looking north.
PI. 2 Area A. Looking north west.
PI. 3 Area B. Note crop either side of ploughed area. Looking south east.
PI. 4 Area D. Looking south west.
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## Summary

A preliminary archaeological assessment identified a triple linear ditch system, showing as a cropmark on aerial photographs, crossing the proposed development site. Of the 383 finds retrieved the majority proved, upon examination, to be either post-medieval in date (later discarded) or undiagnostic. Only a small quantity of Roman tile was retrieved and there was no Roman pottery. The medieval and post-medieval pottery and tile probably represent manuring of cultivated fields rather than evidence of occupation. Concentrations of post medieval brick and tile in the SE corner of the survey area are probably associated with the demolition of the farm complex adjacent to the survey area.

Geophysical survey showed that the ditches cross the eastern half of the development area in a continuous line, possibly underlying colluvium and/or alluvium at the southern limit of the survey area. A ring-form within an oval enclosure may have been deliberately avoided by the triple ditch, suggesting they are of an earlier date. A second ring form was identified south of the triple ditches.

The geophysical survey results elsewhere within the proposed development area show that it is generally quiet with spots of enhanced magnetism revealing a only few possible pits and linear anomalies of unknown date and function.

## Introduction

Lindsey Archaeological Services was commissioned in November 1995 by Smiths Gore Chartered Surveyors (acting on behalf of The Church Commissioners and Mr N . Ward) to carry out a fieldwalking and geophysical survey of land at Bunkers Hill, Lincoln. The evaluation followed a preliminary archaeological assessment, prepared by John Samuels Archaeological Consultants for Smiths Gore Chartered Surveyors in September 1994.

The fieldwork was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Brief prepared by John Samuels Archaeological Consultants (December 1994). The purpose of the evaluatory work was to:

- establish the presence or absence of archaeological remains and their location within the survey area;
- determine the level of further archaeological investigation required prior to development.

This report should be read in conjunction with the results of the geophysical survey carried out by Oxford Archaeotechnics and presented in the accompanying report (Johnson 1997).

Copies of the reports have been sent to Smiths Gore Chartered Surveyors, The Church Commissioners, Mr N. Ward, West Lindsey District Council, Lincoln City Council, the Archaeology Section of Lincolnshire County Council, and the City and County Museum, Lincoln. The paper archive and the artefacts will be lodged with the City and County Museum, Lincoln when the project is completed.

## Archaeological Background

The survey area lies east of the city of Lincoln on the south-east slope of the Jurassic Limestone Scarp known as the Lincoln Edge and overlooking the Witham Valley.

Previous work in the surrounding area has identified archaeological remains of prehistoric, Roman and medieval date. This includes a triple linear ditch boundary, recorded from the air as cropmarks, which crosses the survey area on its east side. These ditches have been traced both north and south of the survey area for a minimum of 5 km but their full extent is not yet known. Staff now working at LAS have excavated two narrow cross-sections through the ditches in 1979 and 1993. Whilst they appear to pre-date Roman features, little clear evidence of their function and date has been obtained so far.

Land to the south of the survey area has been the subject of a separate archaeological survey which has confirmed the continuation of the triple ditch and geophysical survey has identified numerous additional features such as pits and enclosures which appear to overlie the ditches. These features are not visible on existing aerial photographs. Large quantities of associated Roman and medieval pottery and tile have been made.

## Fieldwalking Methodology

The brief prepared by John Samuels Archaeological Consultants treated the proposed development area as one block of land (Fig. 2). For ease of fieldwalking the land was divided into four areas defined by existing field boundaries and trackways (Fig. 3). Except for a narrow strip c. 1 ha in area, Area B contained an oil seed rape crop, which made visibility too poor for fieldwalking (PI. 3). Area D was only partially ploughed and this further reduced the area available for walking.

Fieldwalking was carried out by a team of three archaeologists walking transects across the land at 10 m intervals, giving a $10 \%$ coverage of the ground. All finds were individually and two-dimensionally recorded using a Total Station geodimeter, operated by Midland Surveying and Engineering (MSE). Each fieldwalker was supplied with pre-labelled finds bags, a surveying staff with prism, and a two-way radio. The position of each find was immediately recorded through radio contact with the MSE surveyor. This precluded the need to set out a grid. The use of the geodimeter also allowed
the limits of each area walked, as well as permanent landscape features such as field boundaries, and trackways to be accurately recorded (Fig. 3).

In accordance with the brief, the presence of post-medieval material was noted but not intentionally picked up. Inevitably, post-medieval pieces were only identified after washing. Animal bone was not collected as this cannot normally be assigned to any specific archaeological period. In the event very few pieces were seen.

Conditions for finds retrieval were generally fair, as Areas $A, C$ and $D$, plus a narrow strip of Area B, had been recently ploughed. Area $C$ and a central band of Area A, c.70m wide (aligned NE - SW), were harrowed. The fields showed little sign of weathering. For most of the two days on site the weather was sunny with little cloud cover, providing poor visibility during the early morning and late afternoon. It is probable, however, that the low recovery rate largely reflects the real quantity of material present and not poor visibility of finds.

## Results

A total of 383 finds were made, the majority of them post-medieval in date (46 pottery, 12 brick, 37 tile and 39 miscellaneous) or non-diagnostic ( 71 tile and 14 pottery sherds). Post-medieval finds were discarded after being recorded in accordance with the brief, (Appendix 1; Fig 3). Undiagnostic tile was also discarded, after being weighed.

Assessment of the finds assemblage (prior to discarding artefacts) showed it to comprise 234 fragments of tile, 12 brick fragments, 90 pieces of pottery, 3 struck flints, 4 pieces of glass, 1 clay pipe stem and 39 miscellaneous artefacts. There was such an abundance of tile on the ground that only a sample was retrieved within the transects, so the proportion of tile to other artefacts was even greater than the figures suggest.

Area A covered the largest area (Pls. 1 and 2), comprising at least three former fields whose boundaries had been removed. The dry ploughsoil contained a moderate, fairly even scatter of limestone fragments, presumably derived from the underlying bedrock. Patches of natural orange brown clay silt were also noted.

Post-medieval brick and tile artefacts were evenly spread across this area. They may have originated from Greetwell North Farm, scattered after its demolition. Post-medieval bricks (complete) were noted on the NE-SW aligned hedge border at the NW corner of Area A, close to the copse. These finds were not retrieved or plotted.

7 fragments of Roman tile were found in this Area together with 17 sherds of pottery and 35 pieces of tile, all of medeival date. One piece of tile of either Roman or medieval date was also retrieved. The remainder of finds in Area A proved to be post-medieval in date.

Two blocks of magnetometer survey were carried out in Area A (Fig. 4). These comprised two grids in the NE corner (Area 3, Johnson 1997, Fig. 9) and a block of 18 grids along the length of the triple linear ditch system, 4 of which extended into Area D (Area 5, Johnson 1997, Fig. 12). These grids covered zones of enhanced magnetism identified on the magnetic susceptibility survey.

Area 3 identified a diffuse linear anomaly, possibly a former field boundary, and a number of small magnetic anomalies indicative of former pits or hollows. Very few finds were made within the two grids although four pieces of Roman tile were found on the periphery.

Area 5 was arranged in a stepped configuration along the triple ditches which were clearly defined. The ditches deviate to the west, as if avoiding an unknown feature. This coincides with a possible oval feature, showing as a negative anomaly, containing a ring-ditch (Johnson 1997, Fig. 12). It is of note that this area of the field produced hardly any finds during the fieldwalking survey. Whilst the triple ditches themselves were not expected to produce finds because of their presumed prehistoric date the lack of medieval and post-medieval finds was more surprising. The reason for this lack of finds may be that banks associated with the ditches may have been ploughed out only relatively recently, masking any earlier remains.

Although the north-eastern extension of the magnetometer survey in Area 5 covered an area within which cropmarks had been observed (Fig. 2) no linear features corresponding with the cropmarks were recorded.

Linear features orientated perpendicular to the triple ditches probably represent the remains of medieval ridge and furrow.

Area B (PI.3) was defined by hedges to the south, east and west, with the southern extent of the sports ground and the car park of the Lincolnshire Poacher Inn backing onto its northern boundary. All but a strip of ploughed land, 0.97 ha, was under a crop of oil seed rape which obscured the ground, making fieldwalking impossible. The ploughsoil contained a low scatter of natural limestone.

As with Area A, few artefacts earlier than post-medieval date were located. They comprised 1 struck flint, 4 pieces of Roman tile, 4 sherds of medieval pottery, and 8 positively identified pieces of medieval tile.

Three magnetometer survey Areas were located in Area B (Fig. 4). Magnetometer Survey Area 1 (Johnson 1997, Fig. 6) revealed 8 pit-like features $3-4 \mathrm{~m}$ in diameter spaced approximately 8 m apart (centre to centre) running on a north west-south east axis. Evidence of possible medieval ridge and furrow was also present. Area 2 (Johnson 1997, Fig. 6) to the west of the triple linear ditch system had several linear features aligned approximately north west-south east. Some of these features might be associated with the
triple linear ditch system. Area 4 (Johnson 1997, Fig. 9) at the south end of Area B contained a single linear feature aligned north east-south west.

It is unfortunate that all the areas covered by magnetometer survey were under crop at the time of fieldwalking and as such no finds can be related to the recorded anomalies.

Area C. The limit of the fieldwalking survey crossed the field diagonally, the southern part of the field not requiring fieldwalking as it is disturbed by early quarrying activity. The ploughsoil in Area C contained a low, even scatter of limestone which increased in density towards the western end of the walked area.

Archaeological finds amounted to 3 worked flints - 1 piece of core, 1 flake and a scraper; 3 sherds of medieval pottery, 1 Roman and 5 medieval pieces of tile, with a further 4 pieces of tile being non-diagnostic.

The magnetic susceptibility survey results were low and there was no magnetometer survey in this field.

Area D (PI. 4), a wedge-shaped piece of land, south-east of the trackway, of which $c .0 .7$ ha had not been ploughed. Ploughing of the rough grass only extended $c .55 \mathrm{~m}$ south from the trackway. Area D produced a concentration 31 pieces of post-medieval brick and tile, close to the site of Greetwell North Farm. The area also produced 14 pieces of medieval tile and 5 medieval pottery sherds. The densest concentration of Roman material from the fieldwalking survey was found in this area with 4 Roman tile fragments and 6 more pieces being of probable Roman date.

Magnetometer Area 6, at the west end of Area D (Johnson 1997, Fig. 15) located numerous linear anomalies, all of which were thought to be modern in origin. The distribution of Roman finds is thought to reflect outlying material from the known Roman remains which lie beyond the limits of this survey, rather than being an indication of underlying Roman features.

Magnetometer survey Area 5 extended across the trackway into Area D where the triple linear ditch system was recorded but was less substantial possibly due to colluvial cover. As in Area A no concentration of, or unusual, finds were found over the ditches to indicate their presence.

## Discussion

The overall quantity of artefacts retrieved was low, the majority of finds being post-medieval in date with a background scatter of medieval pottery. Their abraded condition and general distribution across the survey area is indicative of manuring associated with land cultivation rather than occupation. The lack of finds from the 16-17th century suggests perhaps a change of land usage to pasture with a return to arable in the 18-19th century.

The complete absence of Roman pottery and the small number of Roman tile fragments recovered is perhaps surprising given the area of known Roman activity south-east of the survey area. Most of the Roman tile fragments came from Area $D$ and are most probably outliers rather than an indication of the presence of Roman features.

The absence of pre-Roman finds over the triple linear ditch system and the associated enclosure to the east was expected as previous excavations of the linear ditches around Lincoln (Palmer-Brown 1993) and at Brauncewell Quarry, Sleaford (Tipper 1994) yielded few artefacts. A 'blank' area over the triple linear ditch system was also evident in the distribution of later finds, suggesting that banks associated with the ditches had been levelled relatively recently.

The small amount of lithic material recovered was concentrated in Area C but were not associated with any area of enhanced magnetic activity. These finds were fashioned from poor quality chert (typical of material found on the limestone) and amounts at best, to a background of prehistoric activity.

The results of the geophysical survey found that, with the exception of the triple ditch system and a possible area of activity immediately east of the ditches, there is little magnetic evidence from either the topsoil magnetic susceptibility mapping, or gradiometer survey, to suggest extensive areas of former settlement with potential archaeological significance. The fieldwalking survey results appear to reinforce this conclusion and the small number of finds must be seen as a real reflection of the low level of human activity within much of the survey area.

The triple ditch system showed up graphically on the gradiometer plot, although paradoxically its potential degree of preservation is greatest at the southern limits of the survey (in Area D) where the plot is less strong. This is because the ditches may be protected by colluvium and/or alluvium. Also of archaeological interest is the ring-form which straddles the trackway in Area D and a second ring-form contained within a possible oval enclosure east of the triple ditches in Area A (Fig. 4). They may have been deliberately avoided by the triple ditch, suggesting they are of an earlier date. The absence of associated finds and their relatively low magnetic signal also suggests that these features may pre-date the triple linear ditches.

## Conclusion

The low level of magnetic enhancement within the survey area, coupled with the small number of finds retrieved during fieldwalking, point to a real absence of archaeological remains over much of the proposed development area. Evidence for archaeological features, other than medieval ridge and furrow or modern field boundaries, is confined to gradiometer survey Areas 1 and 5. Apart from the possible line of pits identified in Area 1, towards the western limit of the proposed development area, the potential for archaeological activity is mainly concentrated in the southern part of the site.

This comprises three main elements:

- the triple linear ditches, especially in Area $D$, where they may be protected by overlying colluvial or alluvial material
- a ring-form ditch which straddles the trackway in Area D
- a ring-form ditch contained within a possible oval enclosure east of the triple ditches in Area A
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LBH 97:Bunkers Hill Fieldwalking Finds List

| Finds No. | Area | Description | ? Date | Discarded $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}$ | weight/g |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| u/s | C | pot $\times 4$; not plotted | 18-20th | y |  |
| 1 | D | pot | 18/19th | $y$ |  |
| 2 | D | slag |  | y |  |
| 3 | D | tile [pnr] | Rom/med | $y$ | 2 |
| 4 | D | tile [pnr] | med | y | 12 |
| 5 | D | pot | 18/19th | y |  |
| 6 | D | pot | 17/18th | y |  |
| 7 | D | tile [pnr] | $\mathrm{med} / \mathrm{post}-\mathrm{med}$ | y | 3 |
| 8 | D | stone |  | y |  |
| 9 | D | tile [pnr] | post-med/mod | y | 1 |
| 10 | D | clinker |  | y |  |
| 11 | D | drain tile, internal glaze | med-post-med | n |  |
| 12 | D | land drain | mod | y | 11 |
| 13 | D | tile [pnr] | Rom/post-med | y | 27 |
| 14 | D | coal |  | y |  |
| 15 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 1 |
| 16 | D | tile [prr] | ? | y | 2 |
| 17 | D | tile [pnr] | mod | $y$ | 8 |
| 18 | D | clinker |  | $y$ |  |
| 19 | D | pot | 18/19th | $y$ |  |
| 20 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 1 |
| 21 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 1 |
| 22 | D | fe obj |  |  |  |
| 23 | D | pot | 17/18th | $y$ |  |
| 24 | D | tile [pnr], flat; cut post firing | 13-15 | n | 47 |
| 25 | D | animal bone |  | $y$ |  |
| 26 | D | slag |  | $y$ |  |
| 27 | D | pot | 19/20th | y |  |
| 28 | D | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 29 | D | vessel glass | 18/19 | $y$ |  |
| 30 | D | Rom tile (worn) | Rom | y | 23 |
| 31 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 4 |
| 32 | D | land drain | post-med/mod | y | 8 |
| 33 | D | tile [pnr] | Rom/med | y | 11 |
| 34 | D | tile [pnr] | post-med/mod | $y$ | 44 |
| 35 | D | brick | post-med/mod | $y$ | 28 |
| 36 | D | misc tile | ? | $y$ | 3 |
| 37 | D | pot | ? | n |  |
| 38 | D | tile [pnr] | Rom/post-med |  | 39 |
| 39 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | , | 1 |
| 40 | D | Rom imbrex | Rom | $y$ | 18 |
| 41 | D | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 42 | D | tile [pnr] | Imed/post-med | y | 15 |
| 43 | D | fe obj |  |  |  |
| 44 | D | tile [pnr] | med | y | 20 |
| 45 | D | tile [pnr] | med | y | 20 |
| 46 | D | tile [pnr] | med | y | 5 |
| 47 | D | tile [pnr] | med | y | 16 |
| 48 | D | tile [pnr] | Rom/post-med | $y$ | 9 |
| 49 | D | pot | ? | n |  |
| 50 | D | tile [pnr], flat | 14-16 | $y$ | 56 |
| 51 | D | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 72 |
| 52 | D | tile [pnr], flat | Imed/post-med | $y$ | 46 |
| 53 | D | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | y | 5 |
| 54 | D | brick | post-med/mod | $y$ | 14 |
| 55 | D | tile [pnr] | Rom/post-med | $y$ | 23 |

LBH 97:Bunkers Hill Fieldwalking Finds List

| Finds No. | Area | Description | ?Date | Discarded $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}$ | weight/g |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56 | D | Rom tile | Rom | y | 20 |
| 57 | D | pot | ? | y |  |
| 58 | D | tile [pnr] | post-med/ $/ \mathrm{mod}$ | y | 8 |
| 59 | D | tile [pnr] | post-med/mod | $y$ | 55 |
| 60 | D | brick | 18-19 | y | 138 |
| 61 | D | pot | 18/19th | y |  |
| 62 | D | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | y | 13 |
| 63 | D | pot | 18/19th | y |  |
| 64 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 1 |
| 65 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 8 |
| 66 | D | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 21 |
| 67 | D | pot | 15-16th | n |  |
| 68 | D | pot | 18/19th | y |  |
| 69 | D | tile [pnr] $\times 2$ | med | y | 10 |
| 70 | D | pot | 18/19th | y |  |
| 71 | D | tile [pnr] | post-med/mod | y | 15 |
| 72 | D | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 13 |
| 73 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 5 |
| 74 | D | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | y | 14 |
| 75 | D | pot | 19/20th | y |  |
| 76 | D | land drain | mod | y | 11 |
| 77 | D | land drain? | mod | y | 12 |
| 78 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 3 |
| 79 | D | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | $y$ | 26 |
| 80 | D | tile [pnr], Fabric 7 | 12-13 | $y$ | 45 |
| 81 | D | tile [pnr] | 13-15 | y | 11 |
| 82 | D | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 1 |
| 83 | D | Rom tile | Rom | $y$ | 57 |
| 84 | D | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 11 |
| 85 | D | tile [pnr], Fabric 7 | 12-13 | $y$ | 41 |
| 86 | D | pot | 19/20th | y |  |
| 87 | D | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 88 | A | brick | mod | $y$ | 98 |
| 89 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 2 |
| 90 | A | tile [pnr] or Rom tile | ?Rom | $y$ | 10 |
| 91 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 1 |
| 92 | A | tile [pnr], flat | med | y | 35 |
| 93 | A | pot | 16-18th | n |  |
| 94 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y |  |
| 95 | A | tile [pnr] $\times 3$ | ? | y | 13 |
| 96 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 13 |
| 97 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | , | 1 |
| 98 | A | brick | mod | y | 19 |
| 99 | A | brick | mod | y | 12 |
| 100 | A | tile [pnr] | Rom/med | y | 34 |
| 101 | A | clinker |  | , |  |
| 102 | A | tile [pnr] | 14-16 | $y$ | 58 |
| 103 | A | clinker |  | y |  |
| 104 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 11 |
| 105 | A | fe obj |  |  |  |
| 106 | A | pot | post-med | y |  |
| 107 | A | tile [pnr] |  |  |  |
| 108 | A | slag |  | $y$ |  |
| 109 | A | pot | ? | n |  |
| 110 | A | pot | ? | n |  |
| 111 | A | slag |  | y |  |


| Finds No. | Area | Description | ?Date | Discarded $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}$ | weight/g |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 112 | A | slag |  | $y$ |  |
| 113 | A | pot | 18-20th | y |  |
| 114 | A | slag |  | y |  |
| 115 | A | clinker |  | y | 3 |
| 116 | A | vessel glass |  |  |  |
| 117 | A | pot | 19-20th | y |  |
| 118 | A | tile [pnr], flat | 13-14 | y | 20 |
| 119 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 11 |
| 120 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 27 |
| 121 | A | tile [pnr], Fabric 7 | 12-13 | $y$ | 21 |
| 122 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 26 |
| 201 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 6 |
| 202 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 203 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 204 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 9 |
| 205 | A | pot | 17-18th | $y$ |  |
| 206 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 207 | A | tile [pnr] | 14-16 | $y$ | 53 |
| 208 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 8 |
| 209 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 210 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 2 |
| 211 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med/mod | $y$ | 66 |
| 212 | A | tile [pnr] | med | y | 24 |
| 213 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 29 |
| 214 | A | tile [pnr], Fabric 7 | 12-13 | y | 20 |
| 215 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 4 |
| 216 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 7 |
| 217 | A | pot? | ? | n |  |
| 218 | A | tile [pnr] | 12-14 | $y$ | 36 |
| 219 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med/mod | $y$ | 54 |
| 220 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 221 | A | pot | post-med | $y$ |  |
| 222 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 7 |
| 223 | A | Rom tile | Rom | y | 28 |
| 224 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 2. |
| 225 | A | tile [pnr] x 2; ? brick | ? | y | 33 |
| 226 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 13 |
| 227 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 30 |
| 228 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 15 |
| 229 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 17 |
| 230 | A | tile [pnr] | mod | $y$ | 19 |
| 231 | A | pot | ? | n |  |
| 232 | A | tile [pnr] |  | $y$ |  |
| 233 | A | asbestos land drain | mod | y | 15 |
| 234 | A | tile [pnr] | 14-16 | $y$ | 44 |
| 235 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 5 |
| 236 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 237 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 3 |
| 238 | A | tile [pnr], flat | 13 | y | 73 |
| 239 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 8 |
| 240 | A | Rom tile | Rom | $y$ | 30 |
| 241 | A | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | y | 13 |
| 242 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 7 |
| 243 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 4 |
| 244 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 10 |
| 245 | A | brick | mod | y | 56 |


| Finds No. | Area | Description | ?Date | Discarded $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}$ | weight/g |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 246 | A | brick | mod | $y$ | 14 |
| 247 | A | Rom tile | Rom | y | 9 |
| 249 | A | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | $y$ | 13 |
| 250 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 5 |
| 251 | D | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 32 |
| 252 | D | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 14 |
| 253 | D | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 254 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 61 |
| 255 | A | Rom tile | Rom | y | 79 |
| 256 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 12 |
| 257 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 16 |
| 258 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 12 |
| 259 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 6 |
| 260 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 36 |
| 261 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 5 |
| 262 | A | tile [pnr], Fabric 7 | 12-13 | y | 57 |
| 263 | A | tile [pnr] | med | y | 35 |
| 264 | A | pot | ? | n |  |
| 265 | A | pot | 14-15th | n |  |
| 266 | A | brick | mod | y | 11 |
| 267 | A | tile [pnr] | 13 | y | 13 |
| 268 | A | Rom tile, flat | Rom | y | 74 |
| 269 | A | tile [pnr] | med | y | 19 |
| 270 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 16 |
| 271 | A | Rom tegula | Rom | y | 99 |
| 272 | A | tile [pnr] | med | y | 16 |
| 273 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 4 |
| 274 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 275 | A | nib, Type 3 | 13th | $y$ | 22 |
| 276 | A | tile [pnr], flat | 13 | $y$ | 24 |
| 277 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 42 |
| 278 | A | vessel glass | 18-19 | $y$ |  |
| 279 | A | tile [pnr] | 13-14 | $y$ | 26 |
| 280 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 281 | A | tile [pnr] | 13-14 | y | 22 |
| 282 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 283 | A | brick | mod | y | 15 |
| 284 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 8 |
| 285 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 33 |
| 286 | A | ridge tile | post-med | $y$ | 29 |
| 287 | A | ridge tile | post-med | $y$ | 29 |
| 288 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 289 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 10 |
| 290 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 6 |
| 291 | A | pot | 15-16th | n |  |
| 292 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 10 |
| 293 | B | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 294 | B | tile? |  | y |  |
| 296 | B | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 57 |
| 297 | B | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 26 |
| 298 | B | tile [pnr] | 13 | $y$ | 11 |
| 299 | B | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 2 |
| 300 | B | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | y | 39 |
| 301 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 28 |
| 302 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 50 |
| 303 | A | pot | post-med | y |  |


| Finds No. | Area | Description | ?Date | Discarded $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}$ | weight/g |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 304 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 13 |
| 305 | A | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | y | 46 |
| 306 | A | tile and land drain $\times 11$ | post-med/mod | y | 499 |
| 307 | A | land drain | post-med/mod | y | 15 |
| 308 | A | land drain | $\bmod$ | y | 35 |
| 309 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 18 |
| 310 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 3 |
| 311 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 5 |
| 312 | A | land drain | mod | y | 41 |
| 313 | A | vessel glass | 18-19 | $y$ |  |
| 314 | A | land drain | mod | $y$ | 50 |
| 315 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 57 |
| 316 | A | land drain | mod | y | 44 |
| 317 | A | tile [pnr] |  | y |  |
| 318 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 3 |
| 319 | A | tile [pnr] | mod | y |  |
| 320 | A | land drain? | mod | y | 38 |
| 321 | A | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | $y$ | 32 |
| 322 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 34 |
| 323 | B | pot | post-med | y |  |
| 324 | B | clay tobacco pipe stem |  |  |  |
| 325 | B | pot | post-med | y |  |
| 326 | B | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 1 |
| 327 | B | pot | 15-16th | n |  |
| 328 | B | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 14 |
| 329 | B | pot | ? | n |  |
| 330 | B | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 5 |
| 331 | B | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 29 |
| 332 | C | pot | 19/20th | y |  |
| 333 | C | pot | 18th | y |  |
| 334 | C | ridge tile | post-med | $y$ | 26 |
| 335 | C | pot | 18/19th | $y$ |  |
| 336 | C | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 2 |
| 337 | C | tile [pnr] | med | y | 55 |
| 339 | C | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 340 | C | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 22 |
| 341 | C | tile [pnr] | post-med/mod | $y$ | 56 |
| 349 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 6 |
| 351 | A | slag |  | $y$ |  |
| 352 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 24 |
| 353 | A | pot | post-med | y |  |
| 354 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 26 |
| 355 | A | Rom tile | Rom | y | 75 |
| 356 | A | pot | 18-20th | y |  |
| 357 | A | tile [pnr] | med | y | 6 |
| 358 | A | tile [pnr] | med | y | 12 |
| 359 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 9 |
| 360 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 7 |
| 361 | A | tile [pnr] | med/post-med | $y$ | 84 |
| 362 | A | pot | post-med | y |  |
| 363 | A | nib tile | 13th | y | 32 |
| 364 | A | pot | 12-14th | n |  |
| 365 | A | burnt limestone | ? | $y$ |  |
| 366 | A | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 22 |
| 367 | A | pot | 18/19th | $y$ |  |
| 368 | A | tile [pnr] | 13 | $y$ | 5 |


| Finds No. | Area | Description | ?Date | Discarded $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}$ | weight/g |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 369 | A | clinker |  | $y$ |  |
| 370 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 371 | A | tile [pnr] | 14-16 | $y$ | 35 |
| 372 | A | gun cartridge | mod | $y$ |  |
| 373 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med/mod | y | 10 |
| 374 | A | pot | ? | n |  |
| 375 | A | land drain | post-med/mod | $y$ | 25 |
| 376 | A | tile [pnr], flat | 13-14 | $y$ | 33 |
| 377 | A | pot | 18-20th | y |  |
| 378 | A | tile [pnr] | 13-14 | y | 10 |
| 379 | A | pot | post-med | $y$ |  |
| 380 | B | Rom tile | Rom | y | 22 |
| 381 | B | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 7 |
| 382 | B | Rom tile | Rom | y | 11 |
| 383 | B | tile [pnr], flat | 13-14 | $y$ | 23 |
| 384 | B | tile [pnr], flat | 13-15 | y | 50 |
| 385 | B | tile [pnr] | 12-13 | y | 24 |
| 386 | B | fe obj |  |  |  |
| 387 | B | pot | 16-18th | n |  |
| 388 | B | fe obj |  |  |  |
| 389 | B | marble tile frag | ? | $y$ |  |
| 390 | A | tile [pnr] | 14-16 | y | 49 |
| 391 | A | tile [pnr], flat | 12-13 | $y$ | 68 |
| 392 | D | tile [pnr], flat | 13-14 | $y$ | 12 |
| 393 | A | brick | mod | $y$ | 10 |
| 394 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 395 | A | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 10 |
| 396 | A | tile [pnr] | post-med/mod | $y$ | 12 |
| 397 | A | pot | 13-15th | n |  |
| 398 | A | tile [pnr] $\times 2$ | post-med | $y$ | 89 |
| 399 | C | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 1 |
| 400 | C | tile [pnr] | ? | $y$ | 8 |
| 401 | B | pot | 18/19th | $y$ |  |
| 402 | B | Rom tile; tile [pnr] | Rom; med | $y$ | 46; 24 |
| 403 | B | tile [pnr] | Imed/post-med | $y$ | 52 |
| 404 | B | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 24 |
| 405 | B | pot | 18-20th | y |  |
| 406 | B | flint |  |  |  |
| 407 | B | Rom tile | Rom | $y$ | 55 |
| 408 | B | pot | 15-16th | n |  |
| 409 | B | tile [pnr] 2 | ? | y | 19 |
| 432 | C | tile [pnr] | post-med | $y$ | 10 |
| 433 | C | pot | 16-17th | n |  |
| 434 | c | pot | ? | n |  |
| 435 | C | tile [pnr] $\times 2$ | med | y | 18 |
| 436 | C | tile [prr] 2 | med | y | 24 |
| 437 | C | tile [pnr] | 14-16 | y | 75 |
| 438 | C | pot | post-med | y |  |
| 439 | c | pot | 18-20th | y |  |
| 440 | C | tile [pnr] | med | y | 9 |
| 441 | C | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 30 |
| 442 | C | pot | ? | n |  |
| 443 | C | tile [pnr] | ? | y | 6 |
| 444 | c | cu alloy hook |  |  |  |
| 445 | C | pot | 18th | $y$ |  |
| 446 | C | pot | post-med | y |  |

LBH 97:Bunkers Hill Fieldwalking Finds List

| Finds No. | Area | Description | ?Date | Discarded $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}$ | weight/g |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 447 | C | clinker |  | y |  |
| 448 | C | pot | 18-19th | $y$ |  |
| 449 | C | tile [pnr] | post-med | y | 10 |
| 450 | C | pot | post-med | $y$ |  |
| 451 | C | Rom imbrex | Rom | $y$ | 30 |
| 452 | C | brick ? tile | mod | $y$ | 38 |
| 453 | C | tile [pnr] | 13-15 | $y$ | 8 |
| 454 | c | pot | 18th? | y |  |
| 455 | C | pot | 18-20th | $y$ |  |
| 470 | C | pot | 14-16th | n |  |
| 471 | c | pot | 18-20th | y |  |
| 472 | C | tile [pnr] | 13-15 | $y$ | 17 |
| 473 | c | pot | ? | n |  |
| 473 | C | pot $\times 2$ | ? |  |  |
| 474 | c | pot | 18-20th | $y$ |  |
| 475 | c | flint |  |  |  |
| 476 | C | pot | post-med | $y$ |  |
| 477 | c | flint |  |  |  |
| 478 | C | tile [pnr] | med | $y$ | 8 |

POST-ROMAN POTTERY ARCHIVE: LBH96 WARE TYPES BY CONTEXT
Context Ware Sherds Form Comments

| U/S | BL | 1 | - | 18 TH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U/S | BS | 1 | - | 18-20TH |
| U/S | MP | 1 | - | $15-16 \mathrm{TH}$ |
| U/S | TB | 1 | JUG | LHJ |
| 1 | LERTH | 1 | - | 18/19TH;NO GLZE |
| 5 | LSTON | 1 | - | 18/19TH |
| 6 | BL | 1 | - | $17 / 18 \mathrm{TH}$ |
| 19 | LERTH | 1 | - | 18/19TH |
| 23 | BL | 1 | - | 17/18TH |
| 27 | LERTH | 1 | - | 19/20TH |
| 28 | LSW2/3 | 1 | - | 13-15TH;JUG BASE |
| 37 | MISC | 1 | - | ? DATE;EARTHEN |
| 41 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH;V ODD;THU;? LID |
| 49 | MISC | 1 | - | ? DATE;NO GLZE |
| 57 | R | 1 | - | ? ID;DISC |
| 61 | BL | 1 | BOWL | 18/19TH |
| 63 | LERTH | 1 | - | 18/19TH |
| 67 | TB | 1 | JUG | $15-16 \mathrm{TH}$ |
| 68 | LERTH | 1 | BOWL | 18/19TH |
| 70 | LERTH | 1 | - | 18/19TH |
| 75 | LERTH | 1 | FLOWERPOT | 19/20TH |
| 86 | LSTON | 1 | - | 19/20TH |
| 87 | MEDLOC | 1 | JUG | $13-15 \mathrm{TH}$ |
| 93 | PMX | 1 | BOWL | 16-18TH;? MP |
| 106 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 109 | R | 1 | - | - |
| 110 | R | 1 | - | - |
| 113 | LERTH | 1 | - | 18-20TH |
| 117 | LSTON | 1 | - | 19-20TH |
| 202 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 203 | POTT | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 205 | BL | 1 | - | 17-18TH |
| 206 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 209 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 217 | MISC | 1 | - | ? DATE |
| 220 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 221 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 231 | MISC | 1 | - | ? DATE |
| 236 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 253 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 264 | MISC | 1 | - | ? DATE |
| 265 | LSW3 | 1 | - | 14-15TH |
| 274 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 280 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 282 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 288 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | $13-15 \mathrm{TH}$ |
| 291 | LMLOC | 1 | BOWL | $15-16 \mathrm{TH}$ |


| 293 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 303 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 323 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 325 | LERTH | 1 | FLOWERPOT | 19/20TH |
| 327 | LMLOC | 1 | BOWL | 15-16TH |
| 329 | R | 1 | - | - |
| 332 | LERTH | 1 | - | 19/20TH |
| 333 | WEST | 1 | CHAMBERPOT | 18 TH |
| 335 | LERTH | 1 | - | 18/19TH |
| 339 | MEDLOC | 1 | - | 13-15TH |
| 353 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 356 | BS | 1 | - | 18-20TH |
| 362 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 364 | MEDLOC | 1 | BOWL | 12-14TH |
| 367 | BS | 1 | - | 18/19TH |
| 370 | MEDLOC | 1 | JUG | 13-15TH |
| 374 | R | 1 | - | - |
| 377 | BS | 1 | - | 18-20TH |
| 379 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 387 | PMLOC | 1 | BOWL | 16-18TH |
| 394 | MEDLOC | 1 | JUG | 13-15TH |
| 397 | MEDLOC | 1 | JUG | 13-15TH |
| 401 | BL | 1 | BOWL | 18/19TH |
| 405 | LSTON | 1 | - | 18-20TH |
| 408 | LMLOC | 1 | - | $15-16 \mathrm{TH}$ |
| 433 | BL | 1 | CUP | 16-17TH |
| 434 | MISC | 1 | - | ? DATE |
| 438 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 439 | LERTH | 1 | FLOWERPOT | 18-20TH |
| 442 | R | 1 | - | - |
| 445 | BS | 1 | - | 18TH |
| 446 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 448 | BL | 1 | - | 18-19TH |
| 450 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |
| 454 | LONS | 1 | - | 18TH;? ID |
| 455 | BS | 1 | - | 18-20TH |
| 470 | LMLOC | 1 | - | 14-16TH |
| 471 | LSTON | 1 | - | 18-20TH |
| 473 | MISC | 2 | - | ? DATE |
| 474 | LERTH | 1 | - | 18-20TH |
| 476 | LPMDISC | 1 | - | - |

## APPENDIX 3

## Contents of Site Archive

Fieldwalking Finds
1 box
Finds plot, showing location finds number and material (Fig. 3)
Full archive list of finds
Photographs LAS Film No. 96/65 negs 17 to 19
LAS Film No. 97/67 negs 26 to 30
Correspondence


Fig 1: Location of proposed development site. (Reduced from a $1 ; 10,000$ Ordnance Survey map. Crown Copyright, reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO. LAS Ordnance Survey Licence No. AL 50424A).

## Greetwell, Lincolnshire:

Features mapped from aerial photographs


Fig 2: Fieldwalking area with features mapped from aerial photographs.


Fig. 4 Gradiometer survey areas in relation to artefact distribution from fieldwalking survey. (Reduced scale)


## PI. 1 Area A. East end of the field. Looking north.

PI. 2 Area A. Looking north west.



PI. 3 Area B. Note crop either side of ploughed area. Looking south east.
PI. 4 Area D. Looking south west.



