LAND AT RAF WYTON, SAWTRY WAY, WYTON, HUNTINGDONSHIRE

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY: HUNTINGDON DISTRICT COUNCIL

PCA REPORT NO: R13844

**EVENT NO: ECB5927** 

**SEPTEMBER 2019** 

PRE-CONSTRUCT ARCHAEOLOGY







#### Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyton: An Archaeological Evaluation.

Local Planning Authority:	Huntingdon District Council
Planning Reference:	N/A
Central National Grid Reference:	TL 28205 75009
Event Number/Site Code:	ECB5927
Oasis reference:	preconst1-367485
Report No.	R13844
Written and researched by:	A G Pullen
Project Manager:	Christiane Meckseper
Commissioning Client:	ENGIE Services Ltd
Contractor:	Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd Central Office The Granary Rectory Farm Brewery Road Pampisford Cambridgeshire CB22 3EN
Tel:	01223 845522
E-mail:	cmeckseper@pre-construct.com
Website:	www.pre-construct.com

#### ©Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd

#### September 2019

The material contained herein is and remains the sole property of Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd and is not for publication to third parties without prior consent. Whilst every effort has been made to provide detailed and accurate information, Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd cannot be held responsible for errors or inaccuracies herein contained.

# CONTENTS

СО	NTENTS
ABS	STRACT
1	INTRODUCTION
2	GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY
3	ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND
4	METHODOLOGY
5	QUANTIFICATION OF ARCHIVE
6	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS 14
7	THE FINDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE
8	DISCUSSION
9	CONCLUSIONS
10	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
11	BIBLIOGRAPHY
12	FIGURES
13	APPENDIX 1: PLATES
14	APPENDIX 2: TRENCH AND CONTEXT INDEX
15	APPENDIX 3 POTTERY CATALOGUE 134
16	APPENDIX 4: OASIS FORM 147
17	APPENDIX 5: BRIEF FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION. RAF WYTON
NW	END OF RUNWAY
18	APPENDIX 6: LAND AT RAF WYTON (NORTHWESTERN AREA
CAI	MBRIDGESHIRE. WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR AN
AR	CHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION 152

FIGURE 1 SITE LOCATION	. 64
FIGURE 2 TRENCH PLAN	. 65
FIGURE 3 EVALUATION TRENCHES WESTERN PART OF SITE	. 66
FIGURE 4 EVALUATION TRENCHES NORTHERN PART OF SITE	. 67
FIGURE 5 EVALUATION TRENCHES EASTERN PART OF SITE	. 68
FIGURE 6 DETAIL OF TRENCHES 26 AND 27	. 69
FIGURE 7 DETAIL OF TRENCHES 33 AND 34	. 70

FIGURE 8 GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY OVERLAIN ON 19TH CENTURY OR	DNANCE
SURVEY MAP	71
FIGURE 9 1918 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF RAF WYTON	72
FIGURE 10 1939-40 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF RAF WYTON. L	
SOUTHEAST	73
FIGURE 11 1941 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF RAF WYTON	74
FIGURE 12 1942 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF RAF WYTON	75
FIGURE 13 SELECTED SECTIONS	76
FIGURE 14 SETTLEMENT CORE	77

PLATE 1: VIEW SE ACROSS SITE, TRENCH 16 IN MIDDLE DISTANCE
PLATE 2: VIEW W ACROSS SITE TOWARDS LORRY PARK
PLATE 3: VIEW NE FROM TRENCH 15 (UNEXCAVATED)
PLATE 4: VIEW NE FROM SW END OF RUNWAY (NOW LORRY PARK)
PLATE 5: VIEW NW, TRENCH 28, DITCH [2806] AND DITCH [2808] 80
PLATE 6: VIEW NW, TRENCH 26, RIGHT PIT [2612] AND LEFT DITCH [2614] 80
PLATE 7: VIEW E, TRENCH 27, DITCH [2706]
PLATE 8: VIEW SW, TRENCH 29, OVERCUT DITCH [2917]81
PLATE 9: VIEW NW, TRENCH 33, DITCH 3330 UNDER EXCAVATION 82
PLATE 10: VIEW W, TRENCH 33, COW SKULL IN DITCH [3330] 82
PLATE 11: VIEW NE, TRENCH 20, CHALK 'T' AT CENTRE OF WWI LANDING
CIRCLE
PLATE 12: CHALK LANDING CIRCLE 13 JULY 1918
PLATE 13: VIEW W, TRENCH 27, WWI CINDER TAXI TRACK (2726)
PLATE 14: TRENCH 28, VIEW NW, LARGE PIT FEATURE [2810]
PLATE 15: TRENCH 29, VIEW N, CONCRETE SUPPORT FOR LANDING LIGHT85
PLATE 16: VIEW E, TRENCH 22, ELECTRICITY SUPPLY FOR 1941 GRASS
RUNWAY

# ABSTRACT

The archaeological evaluation was carried out following a program of Historic Desk Based Assessment, non-intrusive Aerial Photo survey and Geophysical Survey. The evaluation identified an area of Late Iron Age to Roman settlement activity comprising pits and ditches concentrated near the centre of the proposed development site in Trenches 26, 27, 33 and 34.

Other remains from this period were identified in the eastern end of Trench 23, near the centre of Trench 29 and in Trench 40, perhaps suggesting further separate small settlement foci or peripheral activity. Apart from in Trenches 26 and 27, where some possible archaeological anomalies were suggested, there was no indication of these Late Iron Age/Roman archaeological features on the Geophysical or Aerial photo surveys. It seems clear that the Late Iron Age/Roman settlement does not extend for any great distance into the northwest part of the development site; Trenches 8, 9 and 14 were devoid of significant archaeological features.

Extensive post-medieval furrowing and drainage activity was recorded. Small ditch features not aligned with furrows or 19th century drainage/tillage features and field boundaries may be the remains of earlier field/tillage systems associated with the Late Iron Age/Roman settlement although there is limited dating evidence to support this and they could equally be 19th century deep tillage features.

Historic aviation features at RAF Wyton, shown on the Geophysical Survey and historic photographs, were investigated at length. These included a WWI chalk landing circle and laid cinder taxi ways, foundations for WWI-II barracks/hutting at the northern perimeter of the site, and a grass landing strip with runway lighting dating to c.1941. The lighting system accompanying the grass runway is currently thought to be a unique survival and may be of regional importance for aviation archaeology.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 ENGIE Services Ltd are submitting a planning application to Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) for the residential development of a plot of land at RAF Wyton, Cambridgeshire (NGR: TL (5)28205 (2)75009; Fig. 1; Plates 1- 4). The development will provide housing, a school and a community centre with associated access and landscaping.
- 1.2 Due to the archaeological potential of the site and in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 189 and 190 (DCLG 2019), Cambridgeshire County Council's Historic Environment Team (CHET) have advised HDC and the applicant that a programme of archaeological investigation should be carried out to inform the planning decision.
- 1.3 The scope of the programme of archaeological investigation has been outlined in a Brief for Archaeological Evaluation issued by CHET (CHET 2019). The first two stages of the evaluation consisted of a geophysical survey (Magnitude Surveys 2019) and a reassessment and re-plotting of available aerial photographs (Air Photo Services 2019). The results have been presented in the Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (HDBA) that has recently been prepared by PCA (PCA 2019). All reports, including an interim report of this evaluation, were summarised in a chapter in and submitted as appendices to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the site that has been submitted to HDC.
- 1.4 ENGIE Services Ltd commissioned Pre-Construct Archaeology (PCA) to undertake an archaeological evaluation of the site, consisting of the excavation of 2700 linear metres of trial trench (equivalent to c. 2% of the accessible area of the proposed development site; Fig. 2).
- 1.5 The evaluation was carried out in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) prepared by Simon Carlyle of PCA (Carlyle 2019) in response to a Brief for Archaeological Evaluation issued by CHET (Gdaniec 2019).
- 1.6 The aim of the evaluation was to determine the location, date, extent, character,

condition and quality of any archaeological remains on the site, to assess the significance of any such remains in a local, regional, or national context, as appropriate, and to assess the potential impact of the development proposals on the site's archaeology.

1.7 This report describes the results of the evaluation and aims to inform the design of an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy. Following Transfer of Title, the site archive will be deposited at Cambridgeshire Archaeological Stores.

# 2 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

#### 2.1 Geology

2.1.1 The geology within the site consists of Jurassic mudstone of the Oxford Clay Formation, overlain by superficial Quaternary deposits of the Oadby Member (diamicton–poorly sorted sand, clay and gravel of glacial origin; BGS 2019).

#### 2.2 Topography

2.2.1 Topographically, the site is situated on flat ground at c. 26m above Ordnance Datum (aOD).

## 3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The historical and archaeological background of the site has been presented in detail in the desk-based assessment prepared by PCA (PCA 2019). This concluded that apart from entries associated with the airfield there were no known designated assets within the site, although archaeological remains of prehistoric, Roman and medieval date were identified within the surrounding 1km study area.
- 3.2 Geophysical and aerial photographic surveys did identify potential belowground heritage assets within the application area (PCA 2019, Magnitude Surveys 2019, APS 2019).
- 3.3 The following account, which is based on the results of the DBA (ibid.) and information from the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER) that was supplied with the Brief (CHET 2019) summarises the archaeology in the immediate vicinity of the site (CHER numbers in brackets).

## Prehistoric (pre-AD 43)

- 3.4 Neolithic worked flints have been recovered as surface finds at locations 600m to the southwest (MCB2347) and 500m to the west of the site (MCB3509). Further worked flint and a Neolithic/Bronze Age barbed arrowhead (MCB3361) have been found 600m to the southwest.
- 3.5 Approximately 950m to the southeast of the site, a curvilinear ditch and associated features were identified by an evaluation and interpreted as a late prehistoric roundhouse, although no dating evidence was recovered to substantiate this (AOC 2008; MCB18221).
- 3.6 Undated cropmarks in the study area, predominately to the north, northwest and southwest of the site, probably date to the Iron Age or Roman periods (MCB17884, MCB20207, MCB21198, MCB23813, MCB25178 and MCB25179).

## Roman (AD 43 to AD 410)

3.7 In the 19th century, Roman pottery was found at Broughton Lodge or Hungary Hill Farm, c. 200m to the north of the site (MCB3435). Sherds of Roman pottery have also been recovered from fields c. 1.0km to the north, in sufficient quantity to suggest it may be the site of a Roman settlement (MCB5194).

# Anglo-Saxon (AD 410-1066)

3.8 No remains dating to this period have been identified within the vicinity of the site.

# 3.9 Medieval

3.10 No remains dating to this period are recorded within the study area in the CHER, although the remains of medieval ridge and furrow ploughing were identified by the geophysical survey (Magnitude Surveys 2019), indicating that the area formed part of an open field system during this period.

# Post-medieval and modern (1485 to present)

- 3.11 Cartographic evidence shows a number of post-medieval farms and farm buildings in the vicinity of the site that are no longer extant (MCB19693, MCB20548, MCB20549, MCB20551, MCB20552 and MCB21817).
- 3.12 The airfield at Wyton was established by the Royal Flying Corps as a training facility in 1916. It was closed and partially demolished in 1919, with part of the site continuing in use as a sanatorium.
- 3.13 The site was taken over by the RAF in 1939 as a bomber base and from 1942 was used for a pathfinder force. The remains of a previously unrecorded landing strip was identified by the geophysical survey (Magnitude Surveys 2019, fig. 6). The remains of infrastructure associated with the WW2 airfield include pillboxes, air-raid shelters, a rare dome trainer for aerial gunners, a parachute drying tower, control tower and hangers. Other RAF buildings on the site include barracks, offices and technical buildings. Three 1940s Nissan huts, now demolished, formerly stood along the south of the airfield (CB15158).
- 3.14 In 1951 RAF Wyton was the Joint School for Aerial Photographic Interpretation

and then in 2013 the Joint Force Intelligence Group was established there.

## 4 METHODOLOGY

#### 4.1 General

4.1.1 The archaeological evaluation comprised 40 trial trenches, totalling c. 2700 linear metres of trenching. The distribution of the trenches was determined by CHET with a particular focus on targeting geophysical anomalies across the site as well as testing potentially blank areas.

## 4.2 Excavation methodology

- 4.2.1 Ground reduction during the evaluation was carried out using a 21 ton 360°. Topsoil and other overburden of low archaeological value was removed in spits down to the level of the undisturbed natural geological deposits where potential archaeological features could be observed and recorded.
- 4.2.2 Exposed surfaces were cleaned by trowel and hoe as appropriate and all further excavation was undertaken manually using hand tools.

#### 4.3 Recording and Finds Recovery

- 4.3.1 The limits of excavations, heights above Ordnance Datum (m OD) and the locations of archaeological features and interventions were recorded using a Leica 1200 GPS rover unit with RTK differential correction, giving three-dimensional accuracy of 20mm or better.
- 4.3.2 Deposits or the removal of deposits judged by the excavating archaeologist to constitute individual events were each assigned a unique record number (often referred to within British archaeology as 'context numbers') and recorded on individual pre-printed forms (Taylor and Brown 2009). Archaeological processes recognised by the deposition of material are signified in this report by round brackets (thus), while events constituting the removal of deposits are referred to here as 'cuts' and signified by square brackets [thus]. Where more than one slot was excavated through an individual feature, each intervention was assigned additional numbers for the cutting event and for the deposits it contained (these deposits within cut features being referred to here as 'fills'). The record numbers assigned to cuts, deposits and groups are entirely arbitrary and in no way reflect the chronological order in which events took place. All

features and deposits excavated during the evaluation and excavation are listed in Appendix 1. Artefacts recovered during excavation were assigned to the record number of the deposit from which they were retrieved.

- 4.3.3 Metal-detecting was carried out during the topsoil and subsoil stripping and throughout the excavation process. Archaeological features and spoil heaps were scanned by metal-detector periodically.
- 4.3.4 High-resolution digital photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits and were used to keep a record of the excavation process.

## 4.4 Sampling Strategy

- 4.4.1 Discrete features were half-sectioned, photographed and recorded by a crosssection scaled drawing at an appropriate scale (either 1:10 or 1:20).
- 4.4.2 Linear features were investigated by means of 1m wide slots.

## 4.5 Environmental Sampling

4.5.1 A total of 11 bulk samples (40 litres in volume) were taken to extract and identify micro- and macro-botanical remains. The aim of this sampling was to investigate the past environment and economy of the site, the diet of the ancient inhabitants and the agricultural basis of the settlement. An additional aim of the sampling was to recover small objects that are not readily recovered by hand-collection, such as metalworking debris and bones of fish and small animals. These samples were taken from sealed deposits.

# 5 QUANTIFICATION OF ARCHIVE

## 5.1 Paper Archive

Context register sheets	40
Context sheets	320
Plan registers	0
Plans at 1:50	0
Plans at 1:20	0
Plans at 1:10	0
Plans at 1:5	0
Section register sheets	4
Sections at 1:10 & 1:20	70
Trench record sheets	40
Photo register sheets	7
Small finds register sheets	1
Environmental register sheets	1

# 5.2 Digital Archive

Digital photos	610 (RAW &
	JPEG)
GPS survey files	8
Digital plans	1
GIS project	0
Access database	1

## 5.3 Physical Archive

Struck flint	29
Burnt flint	4
Pottery	949 sherds, 8947g
Ceramic building material (CBM)	124 fragments 2.4kg
Glass	1
Small Finds	7
Stone	6
Animal bone	149 fragments
Shell (oyster)	42g
Environmental bulk samples	11

## 6 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS

#### 6.1 Overview

- 6.1.1 Late Iron Age/Roman period features were found concentrated in the central area of the site encompassing Trenches 26, 27, 33 & 34. These features appear to be enclosure ditches with associated settlement features, including drip gulleys and pits. The fills of these features were generally very dark and rich in domestic refuse (cooking pot fragments and animal bone). Burnt daub was recovered from several features. An incomplete copper bracelet was recovered from the fill of Ditch [3307]. The western extent of this occupation may be at the end of Trench 23 (a possible waterhole). No evidence for was found for the continuation of settlement to the north in Trenches 8, 9 and 14. A further, possibly separate area of activity was identified in Trench 29. Here two substantial ditches and three possible cremations (not excavated) were recorded. Two seemingly outlying pit features, one with Late Iron Age pottery, was found in Trench 40.
- 6.1.2 Post-medieval features comprised agricultural furrows, field boundaries and 19th century field drains. The 1888 OS map (Figure 8) shows the site occupied by four fields whose boundaries (presumably hedgerows with ditch) were oriented on a NW-SE and NE-SW. Furrow orientations respect the field boundaries on the 1888 map and are closely tracked by similarly oriented system of mole drains. A number of furrows and drains were tested but did not produce any datable material. Ditch and drainage features associated with the field boundaries were recorded in Trench 33/34,
- 6.1.3 Small ditch features not in alignment with furrows or confirmed as 19th century drainage/tillage features and field boundaries may be the remains of earlier field/tillage systems. These may have been associated with the Late Iron Age/Roman settlement although there is no dating or other evidence to support this; they could equally be 19th century deep tillage features.
- 6.1.4 Military aviation features surviving in the ground from the first half of the 20th century were investigated. A World War I chalk landing circle, which appears on a 1918 photograph and appears as an anomaly on the geophysical survey

in Trench 20 was identified and recorded. Truncated cinder/clinker taxi tracks corresponding to the geophysics survey and aerial photographs were identified just below the turf in Trenches 27, 28 and 33.

- 6.1.5 The large, initially enigmatic, runway feature identified by the geophysical survey was revealed to be parallel electric cables supporting rows of evenly spaced runway lights for a short-lived grass airstrip dating to c.1941. A pre-cast concrete mounting for an airstrip light was identified in the western extension of Trench 29. The airfield was subsequently significantly remodelled c. 1942 and hard runways constructed.
- 6.1.6 A number of metal objects relating to the airfield where recovered across the site during UXO work prior to the evaluation and during the evaluation itself. These objects have been passed to Steve Lloyd at RAF Wyton Heritage Centre for identification. A 1917 .303 incendiary round was recovered during bucket testing in Trench 33. The cartridge was manufactured by the Birmingham Metal and Munitions Company.

# 6.2 Late Iron Age

- 6.2.1 **Trench 33: Pit [3325].** Pit [3325] was irregularly shaped and was considered to be a possible tree feature. It contained pottery mostly dated to the Late Iron Age although some of the pot was identified as Early Roman (this may be intrusive). The pit also contained two small fragments of slag.
- 6.2.2 Trench 40: Pit [4405] & Pit [4009]. Pit [4405] was measured 1.4m x 1m+ and was 0.40m deep. It contained Late Iron Age pottery (350BC+). Nearby Pit [4409] was smaller, somewhat unconvincing as a feature and contained no finds.

# 6.3 Roman

6.3.1 Trench 23: Waterhole [2307]. A large feature with steep irregular sides thought to be a waterhole was recorded at the eastern end of the trench. It was at least 4 m across and was 1.30m deep. Pottery and animal bone were recovered from its fills. The pottery dates from the mid-1st century to the 4th century; the lower fill had a more restricted range dating from mid-1st century to the 3rd century.

This feature was the westernmost Roman feature recorded and may give an indication of the extent of the concentrated settlement seen in Trenches 26, 27, 33 and 34 to the east. This feature was truncated by a post-medieval furrow.

- 6.3.2 Trench 26: Ditch [2606], Ditch [2610] & Ditch [2614]. Ditch [2606] and Ditch [2610] are two elements of the corner of a square, c. 30m wide, enclosure visible on the grey scale geophysics. Ditch [2606] was c. 4m across and 1.0 deep. A quern or hone (SF3), made of Brownstone, a material from the Forest of Dean was found in fill (2604). Ditch [2610] was smaller at 1.0m in width and 0.25m deep. Ditch [2606] appears to be the enclosure boundary. Ditch [2606] is possibly an internal division. Ditches [2606] and [2610] were truncated by Furrow [2608]. To the south of the eastern corner of the square enclosure. In terms of dating, both of these ditches contained a mixed assemblage of Romano-British pottery dating from mid-1st century to the early 5th century.
- 6.3.3 Ditch [2614] was 0.8m wide and 0.43m deep (Plate 6). Ditch [2614] contained a mixed assemblage of Romano-British pottery with sherds dating from the mid-1st century to the 4th century. It recorded as being truncated by Pit [2612]. The mid-to-late-1st century date of Pit [2612] suggests the stratigraphic interpretation is suspect and the pit is in fact the earlier of the two features.
- 6.3.4 **Trench 26: Pit [2612] & Pit [2619].** Pit [2612] was a relatively large pit (1.6m+ long x 1.3 wide x 0.32 deep) containing a dark charcoal stained fill (2611) with domestic refuse, including a large fragment of quernstone (SF4) or millstone of Millstone Grit (Plate 6). This pit is thought to date from the mid-to-late 1st century. Pit [2619] is assumed by its proximity to other features to be Roman although there was no dating material. It contained animal bone. It was c. 0.8 m in diameter and 0.40m deep.
- 6.3.5 Trench 27: Ditch [2706], Ditch [2707], [2710], [2711], Ditch [2715], Ditch [2717], Ditch [2719] & Ditch [2723]. Ditch [2706], Ditch [2707] and Ditch [2715] were three slots in what has tentatively been interpreted as the same ditch and appears to form part of the southern corner of the enclosure seen in Trench 26 and shown on the geophysics (Plate 7). Ditch [2706] was 3m wide and 0.72m deep and seems to represent an equivalent to Ditch [2606] in Trench 26 and

may yet turn out to be a separate feature from Ditch [2707] and [2715]. Ditch [2707] and [2715] may turn out to be sub-enclosures within the larger enclosure defined by Ditch [2706] and Ditch [2606]; the earlier dating of [2715] would suggest otherwise (see below). Ditch [2706] appears to have been cut in the Late Romano-British period. Its upper fill (2704) is dated from the Late Romano-British to Early Saxon period. It contained a quern of Brownstone. The lower fill (2705) of this ditch contained a quernstone of Millstone Grit. Ditch [2707] also contained pottery dating to the Late Romano-British. The dating of material from slot [2715] is earlier, its fills dating from the mid-1st century and early to mid-2nd century. Ditch [2715] contained a fragment of quernstone of Millstone Grit in its upper fill. The lower fill (2714) of Ditch [2715] contained an item of paving made of Alwalton marble. This very shelly black oyster rich limestone is sourced to Peterborough close to the banks of the River Nene. Ditch [2715] may be a separate small curvilinear enclosure depending on one's interpretation of the geophysics.

- 6.3.6 Ditch [2711], which was 0.83m wide and 0.12m deep truncated the feature sampled by Ditch slot [2715] discussed above and Ditch [2710]. It contained material to dating to the early 1st century. Ditch [2723] & Ditch [2710] were recorded in the field as being truncated by the possible enclosure [2707]/[2715]. Ditch [2710] contained mid-1st-century pottery which is consistent with it being an earlier feature. Its fill (2709) also contained three small and irregular lumps of slag. However, Ditch [2723] contained a mixed Romano-British assemblage dating from the mid-3rd to the early 5th century.
- 6.3.7 Ditch [2717] was a north to south oriented ditch recorded towards the eastern end of Trench 27. It was 0.9m wide and quite shallow at 0.18m. It was dated from the mid-1st century to the 4th century.
- 6.3.8 Ditch [2719], 1m wide and 0.22m deep ran parallel to the west boundary of the enclosure [2706] and may be in phase with it. It produced no pottery.
- 6.3.9 **Trench 27: Pit [2725].** This feature appears stratigraphically to be one of the earliest features in Trench 27. It was truncated by Ditch [2723]. It was subcircular and c. 1.4m across, though shallow at 0.21m deep. No pottery was

recovered from this feature, and though it is assumed to be Roman because of its stratigraphic proximity to other features of this period, it could be earlier.

- 6.3.10 **Trench 28: Ditch [2806], Ditch [2808].** Two parallel ditches were recorded running north-west to southeast across Trench 28 (Plate 5). Ditch [2806] was 1.0m wide and 0.35m deep. Its upper fill contained Roman pot dating from the mis-1st century to the 4th century. Ditch [2808] contained Roman pottery dating from the mid-1st to 2nd century. These ditches may have formed part of a field system belonging to the Roman occupation in evidence to the north. They are in broad alignment with the square enclosure in evidence in Trench 26 and Trench 27. Ditch [2912] in Trench 29 & Ditch [3405] in Trench 34 may represent part of the same field system but contained no dating evidence.
- 6.3.11 Trench 29: Ditch 2913, Ditch 2917. Ditch [2917] was a northwest-southeast oriented ditch measuring 2.34m in diameter and 0.86m in depth (Plate 8). Originally interpreted as a pit, this feature was seen to continue to the southeast when Trench 29 was extended and may form part of a settlement enclosure. It contained rich dark fills containing pottery and bone. A short, cylindrical, jet bead (SF 2) was found in fill (2114). The lowest fill of this Ditch (2916) contained early-to-mid-1st-century pottery. The middle and upper fills contained Late Iron Age pottery dating from the 1st century BC to the early 1st century AD. Ditch [2913] was recorded to the north of ditch [2917] and ran parallel to it. No finds were retrieved from this feature, but it may be associated with Ditch [2917]. It is on a similar orientation to Roman Ditch [2806] and [2808] in Trench 28 to the west.
- 6.3.12 Trench 33: Ditch [3315], Ditch [3321] & Ditch [3323] & Posthole [3327]. A number of features signalled the presence of structural features at this area of site. Ditch [3315] appeared to be slightly curvilinear and probably represents a truncated drip gulley for a roundhouse. It produced no finds and was truncated by Ditch [3313] and [3307]. Another drip gulley, Ditch [3321/3323] was located nearby to the east. Ditch [3321/3323] was 0.3m wide and 0.15m deep. It was dated to the LIA/ER period (C1). Posthole [3327] was circular, 0.5m in diameter and 0.2m deep and is probably Late Iron Age or Roman, though contained no

finds.

- 6.3.13 Trench 33: Ditch [3305], Ditch [3307], Ditch [3311], Ditch [3313], Ditch [3319], Ditch [3321], Ditch [3323] & Ditch [3330]. These ditches are assumed to be settlement enclosure ditches or subdivisions thereof because of the relatively rich artefactual content of their fills.
- 6.3.14 Ditch [3305] was a 1.2m wide and 0.7m deep ditch terminus containing Roman pottery, daub, animal bones, a minute fragment of slag and carbonised cereal grains and chaff. It has been dated to the early-to-mid 2nd century.
- 6.3.15 Ditch [3307] was 1.5m wide and 0.5m deep. It contained domestic material including marine shell. A copper alloy bracelet (SF1) was recovered from fill (3306). Ditch [3307] has been dated to the C3.
- 6.3.16 Ditch [3311] contained a very dark grey black fill (3310) containing pottery, bone, CBM, shell and very well preserved environmental remains. A large quantity of wood charcoal was recorded along with abundant grains including spelt/emmer wheat, einkorn wheat, bread wheat, barley and rye. It was 0.6m wide and 0.23 m deep. It may be associated with Ditch [3317] and Ditch [3319] nearby to the west (e.g. part of a small enclosure). The pottery dates the fill (3310) to around the late 1<sup>st</sup> century.
- 6.3.17 Ditch [3313] was situated at the west of Trench 33 and was 2m wide and 1.27m deep and again contained domestic refuse, CBM and pottery. Ditch [3113] truncated part of Ditch [3315]. Ditch [3313] has been provisionally dated to the 3rd to 4th century.
- 6.3.18 Ditch [3330] was a large steep sided ditch measuring 3m in width and 1m in depth (Plate 9). It contained several fills containing domestic material. Fill (3332) was almost black and contained a cow skull (Plate 10). Environmental samples from Ditch [3330] contained grains of spelt/emmer wheat, some of which were sprouted and also barley. Chaff was also common. The lowest fill containing finds in this ditch (3329) dates to sometime around the mid-1st century.

# 6.4 Post-medieval/19th century

- 6.4.1 16 furrows were excavated and recorded during this evaluation. These were located as follows: Trench 17 [1707], Trench 18 [1805], [1811], [1814], Trench 21 [2115], Trench 23 [2309], [2311], [2313], [2317], Trench 24 [2407], Trench 25 [2509], Trench 26, [2608], [2617], Trench 30 [3005], Trench 31 [3105] and Trench 32 [3207]. These were oriented similarly to 19th century land drains on the site and appear to represent post-medieval rather than medieval activity and seem to respect the boundaries of the fields on the late 19th century maps. These furrows may relate to the deliberate attempt to improve drainage. No finds were recovered from these features.
- 6.4.2 Field boundaries (or ditches associated with these) on the 1888 OS maps were recorded in Trench 21 (Ditch [2118] & Ditch [2124]), Trench 23 (Ditch with asbestos, not recorded), Trench 24 (Ditch [2405]) and Trench 33 (Ditch 3309). These features appear to be shallow ditches (c. 0.10 to 0.45m) probably associated with partial hedgerows removed in the early 20th century prior to use of the land for the Wyton airfield. They truncated the subsoil. Clinker/coke filled land drains in line with the field boundaries appear to be largely responsible for the strength of the anomaly on the geophysical survey. The northeast to southwest oriented anomaly at the northern end of Trench 35 was found to be a ceramic land drain.

# 6.5 20th Century Airfield Features

- 6.5.1 **Trench 4 & Trench 7: WWI Hutting.** Trench 4 was abandoned after the first machine pull because of the presence of asbestos below the topsoil. It is assumed that this asbestos derived from the demolished WWI hutting once occupying this location. These buildings were located to the north of the General Service Hangars.
- 6.5.2 Trench 7 revealed an extensive concrete surface (704) which was probably hardstanding surrounding the hutting shown on aerial photographs of 1918. This surface was recorded at 0.4m below the modern ground level. An area of compacted uniform grade angular grey gravel was recorded at the western end of Trench 7 (705). The natural ground (703) was recorded at a maximum depth

of 1.10m below modern ground level either side of the concrete slab (704).

- 6.5.3 Overlying the natural (703) was the 0.3m thick subsoil (702), the top of which was recorded at a depth of between 0.5m and 0.6m below the current ground level. Overlying the subsoil (702), away from the concrete slab area was c. 0.6m of modern made ground deposits (706) associated with the WWI hutting (probably demolition material).
- 6.5.4 **Trench 5 & Trench 6: WWII Disturbed Ground (504) & (505) and Practise Bombs**. Trench 5 showed signs of considerable ground disturbance. Two layers of 20th century made ground, (504) and (505) were recorded. Below these, at a depth of 1.0m clean natural ground was recorded. An aerial photograph from 1942 shows the area around Trench 5 as being heavily disturbed. Trench 6 was abandoned after the discovery of two WWII practise bombs.
- 6.5.5 **Trench 20: Landing Circle/Bombing Circle (2004).** This feature was recorded at the end of Trench 20 and is partly visible on the geophysical survey. The feature comprised the letter 'T' produced in a shallow cut [2005] filled with chalk rubble (2004) and a surrounding circle (only part of which was seen). The shallowness of this feature implies that it has been truncated (generally <0.05m thick). The bar and stem of the 'T' were 4.3m and 4.38m long respectively. The feature was sitting just below the turf (Plates 11 & 12).
- 6.5.6 Trench 27 & Trench 28: Cinder Taxi Tracks (2726) & (2811). The remains of cinder taxi tracks for WWI planes corresponding to the anomalies shown on the geophysical survey were recorded in Trench 27 (2726) and Trench 28 (2811). These were made of a thin layer of cinder which was encountered immediately below the turf (Plate 13). These features appeared to have been heavily truncated; this was probably by ploughing during the inter-war period.
- 6.5.7 Trench 28: Pit [2810]. A large feature, visible on the geophysical survey as an extensive anomaly, was recorded at the northern end of Trench 28 (Plate 14). This feature was at least 10m long and was 2.6m deep (machine tested to the natural). Some metal was observed in the surface of this feature, including a

possible undercarriage support for a biplane (Steve Lloyd pers comm) which was recovered for identification. A modern brick was also observed at a depth of c. 1m. This feature is probably a clay extraction pit.

- 6.5.8 Trench 22, Trench 28 & Trench 29: Lighting system for 1941 runway. The large geophysical anomaly visible on the geophysical survey running across the site was two parallel rows of landing lights for a grass runway dating to 1941. Two sets of parallel cables (two on each side of the runway) supplied electricity to the landing lights set at c.15m intervals. The cables were located at a depth of 0.55 meters below a ceramic warning tile. The internal distance between these two twin sets of cables was between 48.23m (Trench 22) and 49.48m (Trench 29). One of the pre-cast re-enforced supports for the landing lights, Structure (2922) was located and recorded in a western extension to Trench 29 (Plates 15 & 16, Figure 14). Two electric cables could be seen entering the base of the concrete support.
- 6.6 Undated features: Ditch [1105], Ditch [1107], Ditch [1205], Ditch [1405], Pit [2911], Cremation [2919], Cremation [2924], Cremation [2926], Ditch [3317]
  & Ditch [3319].
- 6.6.1 As noted, a number of linear features were recorded on the site which do not align convincingly with the post-medieval furrows shown on the geophysics, 19th century land drains or field boundaries. Some extremely straight and closely space features are visible on the WWI aerial photographs and may possibly be those recorded in Trench 11 and 12. Some of these features are closely and regularly spaced and are suggestive of drainage and/or tillage features. A good example of this is seen in Trench 11, where two similarly sized (c. 0.45 wide by 0.20m deep) parallel small ditch features were recorded ([1105] & [1107]). Ditch [1105] contained a small fragment of mid 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> century pottery.
- 6.6.2 Ditch [1205] in Trench 12 is of similar dimensions and is oriented similarly to the ditches in Trench 11 and may be part of the same agricultural/drainage system. Ditch [1205] produced a single fragment of Roman pottery (mid 1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> century).

- 6.6.3 Ditch [1405] in Trench 14 is of similar size and character to ditches in Trench 11 and Trench 12 but is perpendicular to them and lines up with the orientation of agricultural furrows seen on 1918 aerial photographs. Other undated features do align well with the historic field boundaries though run contrary to the furrows. For example, Ditch [2315] in Trench 23 may be the remains of a drainage ditch at the field edge which would act to gather runoff from the furrows.
- 6.6.4 A pit [2911] and a possible cremation [2919] (not excavated) were recorded in Trench 29 (Figure 14). Pit [2911] was a sub-circular feature measuring 0.62m in length, 0.4m in width and 0.2m in depth. No finds were recovered from this feature. These features are assumed to be Late Iron Age or Roman.
- 6.6.5 Two further possible cremations, Cremation [2924] and Cremation [2926] were seen in the eastern extension of Trench 29 (Figure 14). These were not excavated. Ditch [2928] was recorded in the eastern extension of Trench 29. This feature was not excavated. It was perpendicular to Ditch [2917] and probably dates from the Late Iron Age to Early Roman period. It was truncated by one of the possible cremations (Cremation [2924]).
- 6.6.6 Ditch [3317] was rich in daub and lumps of burnt clay but contained no dating material. It was 0.95m wide and 0.45m deep. Ditch [3317] truncated Ditch [3319], a similar feature also lacking pottery. These features are probably Romano-British.

# 7 THE FINDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE

# 7.1 Lithics Ella Egberts

Introduction

7.1.1 Archaeological investigations at the site resulted in the recovery of quantities of struck flint and unworked burnt stone. The assemblage has been comprehensively catalogued by context and this includes further descriptive details of the material (Catalogue L01). This report summarises the data in the catalogue; it quantifies and describes the material and presents a preliminary assessment and outline of its significance.

Quantification



Table 1: Quantification of the struck and burnt flint from RAF Wyton

7.1.2 A total of six struck flint flakes and blades, 23 pieces of micro-debitage (flakes and flake fragments less than 15mm in maximum dimension), and four pieces (40.1g) of unworked burnt stone were recovered from RAF Wyton. Most of the features containing worked flint and/or unworked burnt flint were identified as ditches. Ditches [2706], [3321], [3330] together contain three struck flints, 11 pieces of micro-debitage and single pieces of unworked burnt flint. One flake was obtained from Post-Medieval furrow [3104], two flakes and one piece of unworked burnt flint were found in the topsoil [3301] and 12 pieces of micro-debitage were obtained from pit [3325].

# The assemblage

Raw material

7.1.3 The struck assemblage is made from a mix of black to light grey flint and some

translucent light grey/yellow flint. Cortex is of thin nodular or weathered nodular character. The raw material may have been obtained from Pleistocene glaciogenic diamicton (Oadby member) found at the location of the site (BGS 2019).

Condition

7.1.4 All the struck flint is in slightly chipped to chipped condition, suggesting the material had moved to some extend after discard. The very small microdebitage pieces appear fresher and may have moved to a lesser extent than the larger knapped pieces, possibly indicating the foci of knapping episodes.

## Description

7.1.5 The small assemblage of struck flint from RAF Wyton is technologically and typologically homogeneous and is characteristic of early prehistoric flintworking. The assemblage contains a well struck blade, which is partly cortical and is likely to represent a core-shaping blade. From the same context, (fill (2718) of ditch [2719]), a flake with a trimmed and dihedral striking platform was obtained. The preparation of striking platforms is most typical for Early Neolithic flintworking though is also occasionally found in earlier flintworking practices. The flakes obtained from the topsoil (context [3301]) can also most likely be dated to the Mesolithic/Early Neolithic period. One flake is thin, well struck with parallel negative blade scars on the dorsal side and a crushed/trimmed striking platform. The other flake seems to be a core-shaping flake; it has parallel negative blade scars that run diagonally over its dorsal face and seems to have been struck to remove an irregularity in the blade core. More difficult to date is the large flake from context [2609]. It is large with an obtuse striking platform but is otherwise well struck and is most likely to date to the Neolithic/Bronze Age period. The other flakes and micro-debitage pieces from the site do not show any diagnostic features and can only generally be dated to the prehistoric period.

Significance

7.1.6 The small flint assemblage from RAF Wyton is technologically and typologically relatively homogeneous and indicative of early prehistoric activity at the site.

Without further phasing of the features from which the flint material has been derived, it is not possible to say whether the material was found in context, though both the condition of the material and the dating of most of the features on site to the Post-Medieval and Modern periods suggests the worked flint is likely residual. The presence of micro-debitage and core-shaping flakes/blades however, suggests flint knapping may have occurred locally and it is possible that the ditches cut through an earlier, modest flint scatter. The material therefore indicates that people were present and possibly knapping flint at the site during the Mesolithic/Neolithic period.

## Recommendations

7.1.7 The struck flint assemblage has been comprehensively catalogued, and no further analytical work is recommended. Nevertheless, it does demonstrate prehistoric activity at the site which further fieldwork could potentially elucidate. The presence of groups of knapping waste indicates that flintworking occurred locally at the site and that there is the potential for the preservation of knapping floors, there where these deposits have not been cut by later features. From the point of view of the lithic material, any further fieldwork should focus on obtaining as large and closely contextually defined lithic assemblage as possible, in order to attempt to understand the nature, extent and chronology of any prehistoric lithic-based activities. Should further work be considered, the assemblage reported here should be re-documented in conjunction with any additional flintwork following the completion of the archaeological programmes.

# 7.2 Pottery

# Alice Lyons

Introduction

7.2.1 A total of 949 sherds, weighing 8947g (8.79 estimated vessel equivalent (EVE)) of Late Iron Age, Early Roman, Romano-British and Early Saxon pottery was recovered during a trenched evaluation at RAF Wyton in north Cambridgeshire (Pot\_table\_1).

Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyton, Huntingdonshire. An Archaeological Evaluation © Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited, September 2019

Ceramic Era: abbreviation	Sherd	Weight	EV	Weigh	EVE
	Count	(g)		ι(/0)	(70)
Late Iron age and Early Roman: LIA/ER	599	4983	5.19	55.69	59.04
Romano-British: RB	346	3892	3.60	43.50	40.96
Early Saxon: ESAX	4	72	0.00	0.81	0.00
	949	8947	8.79	100.0	100.0
Total				0	0

Pot\_table\_1: The pottery quantified in chronological order.

- 7.2.2 The pottery has suffered from post-depositional disturbance, which is usual in an agricultural landscape that has been ploughed, and as a result is significantly abraded with an average sherd weight of only c. 9g.
- 7.2.3 The evaluation identified an area of Late Iron Age to Roman settlement activity primarily comprising ditches, also pits and a waterhole concentrated near the centre of the proposed development site in Trenches 26, 27 and 33 (these trenches are shaded in pot\_table\_2).

Trench	Feature-type	Sherd Count	Weight (g)	Eve	Weight (%)	Eve (%)
11	Ditch	1	4	0.00	0.04	0.00
12	Ditch	1	7	0.00	0.08	0.00
18	Furrow	1	12	0.00	0.13	0.00
23	Waterhole	5	57	0.00	0.64	0.00
26	Ditch, pit and topsoil	133	1738	1.34	19.44	15.24
27	Ditch, topsoil	485	4705	5.87	52.59	66.78
28	Ditch	7	42	0.00	0.47	0.00
29	Ditch	46	471	0.42	5.26	4.78
32	Ditch	55	460	0.24	5.14	2.73
33	Ditch, pit and topsoil	144	1174	0.92	13.12	10.47
34	Topsoil	1	3	0.00	0.03	0.00
40	Pit	70	274	0.00	3.06	0.00
Total		949	8947	8.79	100.00	100.00

Pot\_table\_2: The pottery quantified in Trench order.

Methodology

7.2.4 The pottery was analysed following the guidelines of the Study Group for Roman Pottery (Barclay et al 2016). The total assemblage was studied, and a full catalogue was prepared (Appendix 1). The sherds were examined using a hand lens (x10 magnification) and were divided into fabric groups defined based on inclusion types present. Vessel forms (jar, bowl) were recorded. The sherds were counted and weighed to the nearest whole gram and recorded by context. Decoration, residues and abrasion were also noted. PCA curates the pottery and archive.

The Pottery

7.2.5 This is a multi-period assemblage of Late Iron Age to Early Roman, Romano-British and Early Saxon material. The pottery is discussed by ceramic period in chronological period below.

Late Iron age and Early Roman: mid-4th century BC to early/mid-1st century AD

7.2.6 A total of 599 sherds, weighing 4983g (5.19 EVE) were recovered which dated between the Late Iron Age and Early Roman periods which represent c. 66% by weight of the total assemblage. The pottery is generally significantly abraded with an average sherd weight of only c. 8g. Nine broad fabrics were identified (Pot\_table\_3).

Fabric: abbreviations Publication	Vessel Form	She rd Cou	Wei ght (g)	EV E	Wei ght (%)	EVE (%)
Reduced ware with common quartz inclusions: RW(Q), SGW & SCW Monteil 2013, 93	Beaker , cup, dish, jar, storag e jar, lid	362	330 5	3.5 8	66.3 4	68.9 8
Shelly ware: STW Monteil 2013, 93	Jar, storag e jar	109	654	0.1 8	13.1 2	3.47
Sandy oxidised ware: SOW, SREDW & OW(FINE)	Beaker , flagon, jar/bow I	44	362	0.6 4	7.26	12.3 3
Grey ware with grog inclusions: RW(GROG) & GW(GROG)	Jar	32	346	0.7 4	6.94	14.2 6
White ware with grog inclusions: OW(GROG)	Beaker , jar	24	204	0.0 0	4.10	0.00
Reduced ware with fine flint inclusions: RW(FLINT) & SGW(FLINT)	Jar, storag e jar	4	39	0.0 0	0.78	0.00

Reduced ware RW(ORG)	with	organic	inclusions:	Jar/bo wl, jar/stor age jar	10	38	0.0 0	0.76	0.00
Reduced ware RW(CALC)	with	calciferous	inclusions:	Jar/bo wl	11	18	0.0 0	0.36	0.00
Grey ware: GW				Jar	3	17	0.0 5	0.34	0.96
Total					599	498 3	5.1 9	100. 00	100. 00

Pot\_table\_3: The Late Iron Age and Early Roman pottery, listed in descending order of weight (%)

Late Iron Age

7.2.7 The earliest pottery identified within this assemblage is late Iron Age (350+ BC) in date and was found within two separate pits. In Trench 33 a small deposit (5 sherds, weighing 13g) of handmade low-fired shelly ware scored jar sherds were found (3324 [3325]), while in Trench 40 a larger deposit of contemporary Shelly scored ware jar/bowl was also found (70 pieces, weighing 274g). These are incomplete and fragmentary vessels that do not appear to have been deliberately placed.

## Romanizing coarse wares

7.2.8 The majority of this group comprises locally produced reduced coarse wares, made in a soft sand tempered fabric that has been fired at a low temperature. This material dates to the very end of the Iron Age and is often described as Romanizing (early to mid-1st century AD). Where it can be discerned with certainty the minority was handmade (17% by weight), with most made using a potters' wheel (73% by weight). The majority of diagnostic sherds are from wide mouthed cordoned jars and storage jars (Monteil 2013, p. 92, no. 55), although a small number of finer vessel fragments were also found including a beaker, cup and dish. In addition to the sandy fabrics a small number of contemporary fabrics were found using a range of locally available tempers (or mixing agents) including fine flint, crushed shell (calc), previously fired pot (grog) and organic material (probably included as dung).

Romano-British: late 1st to 4th century

7.2.9 A total of 346 sherds, weighing 3892g (3.60 EVE) of Romano-British pottery

was recovered, which represents 43.5% (by weight) of the entire assemblage. The pottery is moderately abraded with an average sherd weight of c. 11g; some soot residues survive on the exterior surfaces of the vessels. Eleven broad fabrics were identified (Pot\_table\_4).

Fabric: abbreviation Publication	Vessel Form	Sher d Coun t	Weigh t (g)	EV E	Weigh t (%)	EVE (%)
Sandy grey ware: SGW; SCW Monteil 2013, 91	Beaker, bowl, dish, flanged dish, jar, storage jar	204	1853	1.7 7	47.60	49.17
Shelly ware: STW Tomber and Dore 1998, 212 (ROB SH)	Jar, jar/bowl , storage jar	65	873	0.5 8	22.43	16.11
Sandy white ware: SOW &SREDW	Beaker, flagon, jar/bowl	36	356	0.6 3	9.15	17.50
Horningsea reduced ware: HOR RE Tomber and Dore 1998, 116	Storage jar	4	185	0.1 2	4.75	3.33
Lower Nene Valley white ware: LNV WH Tomber and Dore 1998, 119	Mortari a	6	176	0.0 0	4.52	0.00
Lower Nene Valley colour coat: LNV CC Tomber and Dore 1998, 118	Beaker, flanged dish, jar	15	166	0.2 2	4.27	6.11
Oxfordshire red ware: OXF RS Tomber and Dore 1998, 176	Mortari a	2	153	0.0 0	3.93	0.00
Grog tempered grey ware: GW(GROG)	Jar/bow I	9	93	0.0 9	2.39	2.50
Samian: SAM SG Tomber and Dore 1998, 28-29	Cup (Dr33a)	1	12	0.1 9	0.31	5.28
Grog tempered white ware: OW(GROG)	Jar/bow I	2	7	0.0 0	0.18	0.00
Hadham red ware: HAD OX Tomber and Dore 1998, 151	Jar/bow I	1	3	0.0 0	0.08	0.00
Total		346	3892	3.6 0	100.0 0	100.0 0

Pot\_table\_4: The Romano-British pottery, listed in descending order of weight (%)

Coarse wares

7.2.10 Some residual (severely abraded) early Roman grog tempered jar/bowl material was found with the later Roman British wares, but only in small quantities. The majority of the pottery comprises locally produced utilitarian Sandy grey ware globular jars, with smaller quantities of bowls and dishes, also beakers, found. Some of jars retain sooty residues on their exterior surfaces indicating they have been used as cooking pots. This material was supplemented with late Roman shelly wares found in a limited range of globular jars with rilled decoration; notably handmade shelly ware storage jars remained in use throughout the Roman era. A few pieces of the distinctive Horningsea storage jar material, manufactured 24km to the south-east of Wyton, were also identified (Evans et al 2017), indicating that some of the coarse ware material was traded within the region (possibly due to the value of their contents). In addition, Sandy white wares flagon and jars were found in small numbers, the gritty nature of some of the material indicating it may have been produced at nearby Godmanchester, located only 6km to the north-east (Lyons fth).

Fine wares

7.2.11 Only one vessel within the assemblage was imported from the wider Roman Empire. This is a glossy red fine ware South Gaulish samian small conical cup (Dr33), which would have been transported into Britain during the later part of the 1st century AD. Late Roman British fine wares were also found in small numbers and comprise Lower Nene Valley colour coated beaker, jar and flanged dish pieces produced in the 3rd and 4th centuries AD. A single fragment from a Hadham red ware bowl was also found which dates to the 4th century AD.

Specialist wares

7.2.12 Although specialist wares are scarce within the assemblage small quantities of Roman mixing bowls or mortaria were recovered (Tyers 1996, 117-135). Mortaria from two factories were identified. Most (6 fragments) are Lower Nene Valley white ware vessels, with distinctive metal working debris (slag) trituration grits; no diagnostic rim fragments were found. A single late Roman Oxfordshire red slipped ware mortaria base (153g) was also found with numerous rose quartz grits still in place.

Early Saxon: 5th to 7th centuries AD

7.2.13 A single deposit of four sherds (72g) from an Early Saxon jar was found within (2704), ditch [2706]. The vessel was made by hand and the reduced fabric had been tempered with an organic material that had burnt away during firing leaving voids in the surface of the fabric. Only undecorated body sherds were recorded, no diagnostic rim or base fragments were found. The vessel which could date to the early 5th century was found with late Roman, possibly contemporary, pottery.

## Discussion

- 7.2.14 This is a small assemblage of multi-period pottery which mostly comprises late Iron Age to Early Roman and Romano-British pottery; a small quantity of Early Saxon pottery was also found. The material was primarily recovered from silted up ditched field systems and pits associated with contemporary settlement. None of the pottery was deliberately placed, rather it found its way into pits and ditches as part of the rubbish disposal regimes of nearby associated settlement.
- 7.2.15 The mixed nature of the Early Roman and late Roman pottery within some of the ditches (particularly [2606], [2610] and [2614] in Trench 26 and [2723] in Trench 27), may indicate that these ditches were reopened in the later Roman era after a lengthy period of disuse. Indeed, the small quantity of Early Saxon pottery found suggests this activity could have continued beyond the end of Roman rule in c. AD 410.
- 7.2.16 A similar pattern of fabric use can be seen in the Late Iron Age and Early Roman pottery assemblage as in the Later Romano-British material whereby most of the pottery consists of locally produced utilitarian sand tempered reduced wares, supplemented by a small numbers of similar shelly ware vessels and even fewer fine and/or specialist vessels. In the Romano-British period, however, more non-local pottery vessels and a wider range of fabrics and forms were in use indicating the community who deposited them had the surplus of income necessary to make acquiring relatively expensive table wares possible.

7.2.17 This pattern of production and use is typical for rural north Cambridgeshire at this time (Monteil 2013; Lyons and Percival fth). This assemblage, therefore, adds to the growing ceramic corpus of material for the area increasing our knowledge of ceramic use and deposition during this period of dynamic change in the English landscape.

# 7.3 Ceramic Building Material Amparo Valcarel

Introduction and methodology

7.3.1 The application of a 1kg masons hammer and sharp chisel to each example of ceramic building material (CBM) ensured that a small fresh fabric surface was exposed. The fabric was examined at x20 magnification using a long arm stereomicroscope or hand lens (Gowland x10). The main study consisted in:

- Examine the form and date of the ceramic building material and daub and provide a list of spot dates.

- Database cbm ECB5927.mdb accompanies this document.

Context	Cut	Quantity	Weight (g)	Spot date	Period
904	905	1	15	1850-1950	MOD
1204	1205	1	167	50-400	R
1204	1205	2	9	50-400	R
2101	0	1	4	1700-1900	PM
2601	0	2	15	50-400	R
2610	2609	2	80	50-400	R
2610	2609	13	273	50-400	R
2713	2715	13	71	50-400	R
2722	2723	1	382	50-400	R
3304	3305	5	22	50-400	R
3304	3305	1	1	50-400	R
3306	3307	1	170	50-400	R
3308	3309	1	618	1700-1900	PM
3310	3311	67	174	50-400+	UNC
3312	3313	1	17	50-400	R
3312	3313	2	193	50-400	R
3316	3317	7	89	50-400+	R
3316	3317	1	77	50-400+	R
3320	3321	1	2	UNK	UNC
3329	3330	1	29	50-400	R

- Made recommendations for further study.

Table 2: Quantification and spot dates of CBM and daub

- 7.3.2 As there was no Wyton ceramic building material fabric reference collection housed at PCA, consultation of the relevant 1:50000 geological maps for this area provided the local geological background. New tile and brick fabric were prefixed by WYT followed by a number: thus WYT, WYT2, etc. (http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html?location=IP9%203DG).
- 7.3.3 This small sized assemblage (124 fragments, 2.40 kg) is characterised by large groups of Roman material completely swamping the much smaller postmedieval and modern component. The fragmentary condition of the whole assemblage suggests that all the material has been redeposited.

Local Resources of Stone and Clay

7.3.4 The geology within the site consists of Jurassic mudstone of the Oxford Clay Formation, overlain by superficial Quaternary deposits of the Oadby Member (diamicton–poorly sorted sand, clay and gravel of glacial origin; BGS 2019).

CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL (56 examples 2.15 kg)

7.3.5 The ceramic building material assemblage is dominated by fragmentary, sometimes abraded fragments of Roman tile and brick, deposited predominantly into fills of ditches and one layer, with discrete pockets of much later post-medieval and modern brick.

Roman material (51 examples, 1.57 kg.)

- 7.3.6 WYT2 (AD50-400): sandy fabric, abundant quartz inclusions, occasional chalky inclusions, reduced core, 40 fragments, 861 g.
- 7.3.7 WYT3 (50-400): sandy fabric, abundant quartz, frequently with fine black iron oxide, 9 fragments, 104 g.
- 7.3.8 WYT4: (AD50-400), sandy fabric, course moulding sand with flint inclusions, abundant quartz inclusions, reduced core, 2 fragments, 552 g.
- 7.3.9 The small quantities of Roman CBM are found dispersed throughout the site in a fragmentary condition, especially from fills of ditches and often intermixed with a daub assemblage and are made from an amount of local fabric groups. The

assemblage is unremarkable with bricks and tiles and one fragment of combed box flue tile. Fabric WYT2 is the most common fabric, very poorly made, sometimes laminated and with abundant chalky inclusions. The majority of fragments (42 fragments, 742 g) are too small to identify the form, and most of the examples are highly abraded and chipped. Four examples of brick and one undiagnostic tile were recovered from different fills of ditches.

- 7.3.10 None of the forms is associated with a specific fabric. There are no important concentrations of material, tough fill (2610) of Ditch (2609) contains 15 undiagnostic fragments weighting 353 g and fill (2713) of Ditch [2715] preserved 13 undiagnostic fragments weighting 71g.
- 7.3.11 The most important fragment recovered from the site is a combed box flue tile made of fabric WYT4, found in the fill (3306) of Ditch [3307]. The example preserved three combed parallel lines, although the fragment is highly abraded.

Post medieval and modern (3 fragments, 637 g.)

7.3.12 Two post-medieval brick examples from layer (2101) and fill (3308) from Ditch [3309] were collected. The bricks are made of fabrics WYT1, moderate coarse quartz and flint, occasional black iron oxide and yellowish white silty inclusions, dated 1700-1900. A small example of Fletton brick, dated 1850-1950 is possibly intrusive into a Roman fill (904) of Ditch [905].

Undiagnostic fragments (2 fragments, 3 g.)

7.3.13 A group of undiagnostic examples of CBM were recovered from fill (3304) of Ditch [3305] and fill (3320) of Ditch [3321], both located in Trench 33. The fragments are small and undiagnostic, most of them less than 3 cm across, and so are completely un-datable.

Daub and Burnt Clay (68 examples, 251 g)

7.3.14 Fired clay dominated all the Roman features at this site. Accumulations of this material are particularly notable in fill (3310) of Ditch [3311] (67examples) from Trench 33. The fabric recorded is a fine clay with occasional iron oxide inclusions. The fragments are burnt. It is not possible to be absolutely certain whether all of the fragments relate to the binding or sticking earth for timber
framed wattle and daub structures or a kiln. No triangular or circular loom weights could be identified.

Summary

- 7.3.15 The CBM assemblage is dominated by fired clay and Roman ceramic building material (tile and brick). There are just two post-medieval bricks, and a modern Fletton machine brick. Most of the fragments were found in features within Trench 33.
- 7.3.16 The Roman material is highly abraded and is composed of numerous undiagnostic fragments, some bricks and tiles and an abraded combed box flue tile fragment recovered from fill (3306) of Ditch [3307]. Most of the material is made of a local fabric (WIT2), in some cases laminated, possibly due to high temperatures. The condition of the Roman material suggests that has been redeposited.
- 7.3.17 The post-medieval and modern material is only represented by brick fragments.The fired clay is in a fragmentary condition.

#### 7.4 Glass

#### **Chris Jarrett**

- 7.4.1 A single fragment of glass (27g) is reported from the archaeological work and was recovered from a 'bucket sample' of the topsoil (3401), Trench 34. The item consists of a fragment of thick (6mm) green-tinted (clear when held up to the light) machine-made window glass and dated to the 20th century.
- 7.4.2 The glass has no significance as it occurs in such a small quantity with very little meaning, although the item may relate to buildings associated with RAF Wyton located on the study area. The only potential of the glass is to date the context it was recovered from. There are no recommendations for further work on the material, which can be discarded at the archive stage of the project.

# 7.5 Small Finds

# Märit Gaimster and Kevin Hayward

7.5.1 In total, fourteen metal and small finds were retrieved from the evaluation,

together with several lumps and fragments of ironworking slag. These finds are all listed in the table below. All but two, a post-medieval mount from the topsoil in Trench 27 and a modern copper-alloy bullet case from topsoil in Trench 33, can be dated to or likely date from activities on site during the Romano-British period.

- 7.5.2 Mainly collected from Trenches 26–27 and 33–34, the finds correspond well with the concentration of features dating from the Late Iron Age/Roman period. In addition, a small cylindrical jet bead (SF 2) was retrieved from the fill of Ditch [2917] in Trench 29, along with two heavily corroded fragments of iron nail. A further dress accessory is reflected in an incomplete copper-alloy bracelet from the fill of Ditch [3307] in Trench 33 (SF 2). The bracelet is twisted out of shape and heavily corroded; it retains the remains of only one terminal with faint traces of stamped decoration and transverse collars.
- 7.5.3 Besides these objects, a small group of querns and possible querns or stones provide the most significant finds relating to the settlement. Three fragments clearly identifiable as querns are all of Millstone Grit, probably retrieved from quarries in Derbyshire. Millstone Grit is one of the most common materials for querns and millstones in the Roman period (Shaffrey 2015, 60–61), and one of the fragments from RAF Wyton, with a diameter that considerably exceeds 500mm, is likely an example of the latter (SF 4). Recovered from the fill of Pit [2612] the fragment is of a flat quern with a grinding surface dressed with pecking inside a broad edge of parallel radial grooves.
- 7.5.4 The frequency of mills in the Romano-British period, reflecting intensive processing, has recently been addressed by Ruth Shaffrey (Ibid.) a picture added to by the present example. While indicating large-scale grain processing on or near the site, the RAF Wyton fragment, although substantial, does not include any features such as a rynd chase, that might help to determine whether it was used in an animal- or water powered mill.
- 7.5.5 A second Millstone Grit quern (SF 6), an edge fragment of an upper stone from the fill of Ditch [2706] has a flat top and a slightly conical grinding surface which conforms with the frequent so-called Sussex type (Curwen 1837, 142). The

grinding surface is dressed in the same way as the larger millstone, above, with pecking inside an edge of parallel radial grooves. The diameter of this quern is around 400mm, which fits well with the observation of Roman hand querns tend to fall between 300–425mm in diameter (Green 2017, 157).

- 7.5.6 The third Millstone Grit quern (SF 7) was retrieved from the fill of Ditch [2715]. The piece retains no features that would indicate the size, but the slightly concave grinding surface suggests this is also the remains of a Sussex-type quern or millstone.
- 7.5.7 In addition to quern and millstone, two further potential stone objects are not readily identifiable. Both are of Brownstone, a material that would have been exotic to see site as it originates from the Forest of Dean in the western part of Gloucestershire. They are ubiquitous throughout Roman southern Britannia. One piece (SF 3) from the fill of Ditch [2606] consists of a rectangular slice of considerable thickness; all but one surface exhibit secondary breaks and the one smooth surface may be from use or simply weathering. The second piece (SF 5) is thinner and rectangular in shape. Here all sides appear to be weathered, with one of the flat surfaces possibly retaining traces of fine pecking. The piece came from the fill of Ditch [2706]. Either of these two fragments may originally have been functional objects, like stones or querns. However, the material is unusual for these applications, and it is particularly their exotic appearance here that stands out.
- 7.5.8 Finally, part of an item of paving made out of Alwalton marble (Upper Jurassic), this very shelly black oyster rich limestone is sourced to Peterborough close to the banks of the River Nene. It is widely used locally as a paving and tombstone material in Roman Britain.
- 7.5.9 Besides these finds, a handful of iron objects were also retrieved. While dominated by incomplete and heavily corroded nails, there is also a rectangular mount from topsoil layer (2701). The mount is for application on a curved surface; it has a single nail for fixing, which remains in situ. This object is likely post-medieval.

context	trench	SF	description
2601	26		Iron nail; incomplete and heavily corroded
2604	26	3	?Quern or hone of Brownstone; rectangular piece with one surface only showing wear; L 140mm; W 50mm; 45mm thick
2611	26	4	Quern or millstone of Millstone Grit; 150 x 245mm fragment of flat ?upper stone dressed with pecking and parallel radial grooves extending 35mm in from edge; diam. >500mm; 35mm thick
2701	27		Slag; several lumps; largest 50 x 65mm
2701	27		Iron mount; complete rectangular for curved application; one whole for fixing with a single in-situ iron nail; W 30mm; L 42mm
2704	27	5	?Quern of Brownstone; flat rectangular fragment only with all sides weathered; possible fine pecking on one flat surface; W 50–70mm; L 85mm; 25mm thick
2705	27	6	Quern of Millstone Grit; 75 x 130mm fragment of flat upper stone with slightly conical grinding surface; dressed with pecking and parallel radial grooves extending 40mm in from edge; diam. 400mm; 24–28mm thick
2709	27		Slag; three small irregular lumps
2713	27	7	Quern of Millstone Grit; triangular fragment of upper stone with slightly conical and heavily worn grinding surface; W 95mm; L 110mm; 32–35mm thick
2722	27		Iron nail; incomplete and heavily corroded
2901	29		Iron nails; two heavily corroded shank pieces only
2914	29	2	Jet bead; short cylindrical; L 4mm; diam. 3mm
3301	33		Copper-alloy bullet case; spent; end disc marked 'E 17 // VII'; L 56mm
3304	33		Slag; minute fragment only
3306	33	1	Copper-alloy bracelet; two conjoining pieces of fine D-section strap; one terminal present with faint traces of single dots and decorated end; W 2mm; L 127mm+
3324	33		Slag; two small fragments only
3332	33		Iron nail; corroded shank fragment only
3401	34		Slag; three small pieces

Table 3: Small finds, metal and slag

#### Significance

7.5.10 The metal and small finds from RAF Wyton provide a small but significant source for activities on site during the Late Iron Age/Roman period. The stone items reflect rural crop production probably at a Roman farmstead. The item of Alwalton marble (2714) is of greatest interest as it may provide an indicator of status.

# 7.6 Animal Bone

# Karen Deighton

Introduction

7.6.1 A small quantity of animal bone was recovered by hand from pits, ditches and a water hole dated to the Late Iron Age/Early Roman period. Material from the sieved residues (2mm and 10mm mesh) of environmental samples was also collected.

Method

- 7.6.2 The material was firstly sorted into recordable and non-recordable fragments and bones with fresh breaks were reassembled, consequently reducing the number of fragments which were recorded. Identification for large mammals was aided by Schmid (1972 and Lawrence and Brown for small mammals. Sheep/goat distinction follows Boesneck (1969).
- 7.6.3 The following were recorded for each element: context, anatomical element, taxa, proximal fusion, distal fusion, side, burning, butchery, pathology and erosion. Ribs and Vertebra were recorded as horse, pig, dog, sheep size or cattle size but not included in quantification as their multiple numbers introduce bias. Recording of fusion follows Silver (1969). Cattle and pig teeth were aged after Grant (1982) and sheep teeth after Payne (1973). Recognition and recording of butchery are after Binford (1981). Recording of sexing data for pig canines follows von den Driesch (1976). Pathology is described after Baker and Bothwell (1980). The material was recorded onto an access database.

Condition of bone

7.6.4 Fragmentation was reasonable with 63.4 % of bone greater than 25% complete. Fragmentation was often the result of fresh breaks. Heavy surface abrasion was noted in 3 contexts only. The frequency of canid gnawing was low with only 6 examples which could suggest that bone was buried rapidly after deposition. The frequency of butchery evidence was also low with only 2 instances of chopping and one of knife marks noted.

The Taxa F	Present
------------	---------

Cattle	Cattle size	Sheep/goat	Sheep size	Pig	Dog	Horse	Rabbit	Indet.	Total
66	8	41	12	8	3	8	1	2	149

Table 4: Hand collected taxa by fragment count

Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyton, Huntingdonshire. An Archaeological Evaluation © Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited, September 2019

Context	3304	3310	2914	3320	3324	2604	3312	3329	3332
Sample	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	10	11
Cattle			1						
Sheep/goat	1		1		1				1
Sheep size	1					1		1	
Pig							1		
Dog		1							
Mouse sp		1							
Small rodent	5	26				1		1	1
Indeterminate				1					
mammal									
Frog/toad		1						7	
Total	7	29	2	1	1	2	1	9	2

Table 5: Material from samples by fragment count

- 7.6.5 The assemblage is comprised largely of the major domesticates with cattle and cattle sized fragments the most abundant. A dominance of cattle can be seen as an indication of," Romanisation", however with such a small assemblage this assertion must be regarded as tentative. Fusion data suggests that both ovicaprids and cattle were predominantly adults (this statement could be overturned should more data become available), whereas pigs were predominantly juveniles. The predominance of juvenile over adult pigs is a common occurrence in many periods throughout history as the taxa has no secondary product so the majority tended to be slaughtered when the meat weight was at an optimum. Nonmeat taxa were represented by a low frequency of horse and dog.
- 7.6.6 For the wild taxa, the presence of rabbit was possibly intrusive as, although there is debate over the timing of is introduction into Britain, it did not become established until the later Middle ages (Hammon, 2010). The small rodents and frog/ toad remains can be viewed as part of the site's natural fauna. Mouse could be commensal (i.e. living in the human accommodation as a pest) although this statement is tentative as the exact species is unclear and the number of fragments present is very low

#### Significance

7.6.7 The significance and potential of the current assemblage is limited by its moderate size. However, the level of preservation is reasonable suggesting if further bone where collected, should excavation take place in the future, the

bone has the potential to provide information on animal exploitation at the site. Furthermore, the assemblage would to add to the corpus of existing work, provide comparenda for future studies and add to the debate on the level of Romanisation encountered in Late Iron age/early Roman rural assemblages (Albarella 2007). Comparisons could be made with sites such as Job's Lane (Rielly in prep), Edix Hill (Davis 1995), and Baldock (Chaplin and McCormick 1986).

# 7.7 Plant Macrofossils Kate Turner

### INTRODUCTION

- 7.7.1 This report summarises the findings of the assessment of environmental remains recovered from eleven bulk soil samples, taken during archaeological mitigation work on land at RAF Wyton, Cambridgeshire. These samples were taken from the fills of eight ditches, [1105], [2606], [2917], [3305], [3311], [3313], [3321] and [3330], and a pit, [3325]; preliminary dating has suggested that all but one of these features may date to the Late Iron Age/Roman period.
- 7.7.2 The aim of this assessment is to:
  - 1. Give an overview of the contents of the assessed samples;
  - 2. Determine the environmental potential of these samples;
  - 3. Establish whether any further analysis is necessary.

#### METHODOLOGY

7.7.3 Eleven bulk soil samples, of between eight and thirty-six litres in volume, were processed using the flotation method; samples were washed through a modified SIRAF recirculating system, with material being collected using a 300 µm mesh for the light fraction, and a 1 mm mesh for the heavy residue. The heavy residue was dried, sieved at 1, 2 and 4 mm and sorted to extract artefacts and ecofacts. The abundance of each category of material was recorded using a non-linear scale where '1' indicates occasional occurrence (1-10 items), '2'

indicates occurrence is fairly frequent (11-30 items), '3' indicates presence is frequent (31-100 items) and '4' indicates an abundance of material (>100 items). and the clean residue then dried and sorted as described above.

- 7.7.4 The flot (>300 μm), once dried, was scanned under a low-power binocular microscope at 10x magnification, to quantify the level of environmental material, such as seeds, chaff, charred grains, molluscs and charcoal. Abundance was recorded as above. A note was also made of any other significant inclusions, for example roots and modern plant material. Macro-botanical identifications were carried out using standard reference catalogues (Jones, Taylor and Ash, 2004; Jacomet, 2006; Cappers, Bekker and Jans, 2012; Neef, Cappers and Bekker, 2012). Nomenclature for economic plants follows Van Zeist (1984) and for other plant taxa follows Stace (1991). Molluscs were identified with reference to Kerney (1999).
- 7.7.5 Material collected from the heavy residues has been catalogued and passed to the relevant specialists for further assessment. A full account of the sample contents is given in table 1; animal bone will be discussed in detail in a separate report.

RESULTS

Preservation

7.7.6 Archaeobotanical remains in the RAF Wyton assemblage were preserved by carbonisation. Several of the assessed samples were found to contain significant amounts of burnt cereals and weeds, and wood charcoal was common throughout. Terrestrial and freshwater mollusc shells were also abundant in a number of contexts.

# TRENCH 33

Samples <1> & <8>, context (3304) – ditch cut [3305]

7.7.7 Samples <1> and <8> were taken from two fills of a linear ditch, [3305]. Charcoal was abundant in both of the assessed samples, with at least onehundred specimens present in each. Levels of fragmentation were high, with the bulk of the remains being recovered from the lowest sieved fraction, <2mm;</p> less than five pieces of a suitable size for species to be identified were reported (>4mm in length/width), all of which were found in sample <1>. Carbonised cereal grains were also identified in this sample, including low density of barley (Hordeum vulgare), emmer/spelt wheat (Triticum dicoccum/spelta) and grains which have been speculatively identified as einkorn (Triticum monococcum); broken and/or distorted grains, that were too damaged to be identified to species, were relatively common. Chaff was observed in both samples, with glumes of spelt wheat and emmer/spelt wheat found in sample <1>, and indeterminate wheat glumes noted in sample <8>. Along with grains, sample <1> additionally yielded a small number of weed seeds, of wild grasses (Poaceae spp.), such as brome (Bromus spp.), and docks (Rumex spp.).

7.7.8 The mollusc assemblage contained shells of terrestrial snails; specimens of Vallonia and Vertigo were extracted from both samples, along with indeterminate juveniles, with scattered examples of Pupilla muscorum, Trochulus hispidus/striolata and Ashfordia granulata also recognised. Animal bone, pottery, slag and coal was identified in sample <1>, and CBM and struck flint in sample <8>. Both deposits produced a large quantity of fine roots, which suggests the likelihood of post-depositional disturbance amongst smaller remains.

Sample <2>, context (3310) – ditch cut [3311]

7.7.9 Sample <2> was taken from the fill of a flat-based linear ditch, [3311]. Environmental remain were very well preserved in this context; a large quantity of wood charcoal was recorded, between thirty and one-hundred pieces of which were of a suitable size for species identification. Grains were abundant, largely of wheats including spelt/emmer wheat, einkorn wheat, bread wheat aestivum/durum) indeterminate with (Triticum and wheats. lesser concentrations of barley and rye (Secale cereale); several of the barley and wheat grains were observed to be sprouted specimens. Unidentifiable caryopses, seen to be significantly damaged and warped, were frequent. Chaff was common; glumes of spelt wheat were observed, along with glumes and spikelet forks of spelt/emmer wheat, indeterminate rachis fragments and detached sprouts. The weed assemblage contained specimens of brome and

other grasses, and a large quantity of seeds that were too distorted for species to be recognised.

7.7.10 A substantial quantity of, predominantly terrestrial, mollusc shell was recovered; the species profile is generally suggestive of damp or marshy ground, and included examples of Ashfordia granulata, Lymnaea truncatula, Oxychilus, Vallonia and Vertigo. Animal bone and fragmented bone were recovered from both the flot and the retent, along with a small amount of pottery and industrial waste. Roots were common.

Sample <4>, context (3320) – ditch cut [3321]

7.7.11 Sample <4> was taken from the fill of a curvilinear ditch, [3321]. Ecofacts were relatively rare in this sample; charcoal was abundant, though the bulk of the remains were in the lowest sieved fraction (<2mm), and few sizeable specimens were identified. Seeds and cereals were absent, and the mollusc assemblage contained only a small number of shells, all of species of the terrestrial snail genus Vallonia. Animal bone, pottery, burnt clay and burnt flint were identified in the heavy fraction, and roots and modern plant remains in the flot.</p>

Sample <5>, context (3324) – pit cut [3325]

7.7.12 One bulk sample, <5>, was taken from the fill of Pit [3325]. Charcoal was commonly observed in this sample, with moderate to abundant remains present in all of the sieved fractions; between thirty and fifty specimens of a size for species to be identified were reported. Cereals and seeds were not recovered, and no molluscs were observed. A moderate concentration of animal bone was noted, and cultural artefacts included pottery, struck flint and slag. Roots were abundant in the light reside, possibly evidence of disturbance within this context.

Sample <7>, context (3312) – ditch cut [3313]

7.7.13 Sample <7> was taken from the fill of a ditch, [3313], uncovered in Trench 33. Cereals and weeds were poorly preserved; only a small number of grains, of indeterminate wheats and unidentifiable cereals, were recorded, and between eleven and thirty wheat glumes. A moderate amount of charcoal was present, with less than five sizeable specimens. Snails were more frequent; a large quantity of shells of the terrestrial genus Vallonia were recognised, along with lesser numbers of Vertigo, Ashfordia, Trochulus and Pupilla muscorum, the latter being commonly found in areas of dry or exposed ground. Specimens of the freshwater genera Gyraulus, Anisus and Lymnaea were also found.

7.7.14 Finds were limited to a small amount of pottery in the retent; animal bone was also reported in this fraction. Roots and seeds of duckweed (Lemna spp.), which are likely to be intrusive, were observed in the flot.

Samples <10> & <11>, contexts (3329), (3332) - ditch cut [3330]

- 7.7.15 Two environmental samples, <10> and <11>, were taken from fills of ditch [3330]. Preservation of ecofacts was good in both of the sampled deposits; grains of spelt/emmer wheat, some of which were sprouted, and barley were reported throughout, as well as indeterminate wheats and unidentifiable cereals. Sample <11> additionally produced grains of bread wheat, einkorn wheat, and oat (Avena spp.). Chaff was common; preliminary identification of these remains suggests that glumes of emmer and spelt wheat are present, along with a small number of emmer/spelt spikelet forks, and abundant fragments of glume wheat chaff that are too broken for species to be determined. Detached sprouts were found in both samples, which may indicate that a substantial proportion of the recovered grains had germinated prior to burning. A single, exceptionally well preserved, internode of emmer wheat was recognised in sample <11>. Wood charcoal was recorded in both samples, with over one-hundred specimens in each; the bulk of these remains were in the 2-4mm and <2mm fractions, and less than ten sizeable specimens were recovered from each.
- 7.7.16 The snail assemblage contained shells of terrestrial snails, including specimens of Vallonia and Vertigo, along with shells of Anisus, Gyraulus, Planorbis and Succinea, which are wetland/aquatic molluscs. Animal bone was identified in both samples, pottery in sample <10>, and flint in sample <11>. Seeds of duckweed were common, along with moderate to low concentrations of fine roots, which suggests the possibility of post-depositional disturbance in this sequence.

#### TRENCH 29

Sample <3>, context (2914) – ditch cut [2917]

7.7.17 One sample was taken from the fill of Ditch [2917]. Charcoal was, again, abundant in this feature, although significantly fragmented; less than ten identifiable specimens were recovered. Grains were less common, with only a small amount of spelt grains, and indeterminate wheat glumes reported. The snail assemblage contained a large quantity of Vertigo, with lesser numbers of Vallonia and Trochulus, and shells of the aquatic freshwater snails Anisus, Lymnaea and Theodoxus fluviatilis. The finds assemblage consisted of pottery, jet and iron, with animal bone also recorded. Roots were abundant in the flot, which may be an indication of bioturbation.

#### **TRENCH 26**

Sample <6>, context (2604) – ditch cut [2606]

7.7.18 Sample <6> was taken from the fill of a ditch, [2606], in Trench 26. With the exception of a small number of spelt/emmer grains, and spelt glumes, cereal were absent from this deposit. Snails were similarly rare, with only a low concentration of Cepaea hortensis/nemoralis, Oxychilus, Vallonia and Vertigo reported, and less than ten freshwater snails, of the genus Anisus. Wood charcoal was abundant; a large amount of smaller fragments were observed (<2mm), and no more than five sizeable pieces. Pottery, iron and struck flint were extracted from this sample, along with animal bone. Roots were relatively frequent.

#### TRENCH 11

Sample <9>, context (1104) – ditch cut [1105]

7.7.19 A single sample was taken from the fill of ditch [1105], which is currently undated. Both cultural and environmental remains were rare in this sample. Less than thirty pieces of charcoal were encountered, none of which were of identifiable size, and only a small number of snails. Pottery, hammer-scale and animal bone were present in low quantities in the retent, however the bulk of the flot was comprised of fine root material, which is suggestive of bioturbation.

### DISCUSSION

- 7.7.20 There is significant evidence in the RAF Wyton samples to suggest that cereals are being cultivated and/or consumed in this area during the late Iron-Age and Roman use of the site. Glume wheats, including emmer and spelt, appear to be the dominant species in this assemblage; spelt (Triticum spelta) is known to be one of the most commonly cultivated cereal crops in Britain during both the Iron Age and Roman periods (Van der Veen, 2014), with emmer (Triticum dicoccum) being considered a secondary cultivar. Einkorn wheat, also present in this sample set, is thought to be an introduced species, imported into Britain from the Mediterranean region by the Romans (Van der Veen et al., 2008). Free-threshing wheats, including bread wheat (Triticum aestivum/durum), and other cereals such as rye (Secale cereale) and oat (Avena sativa) are also known to have been grown at this time, however, like emmer, these are rarer; due to the low proportion of such remains in these samples, it could be the case that the overall trend is being replicated in this sample-set.
- 7.7.21 A substantial number of the grains recovered were deemed to be too heavily damaged to be identified to species, which is likely to be as a result of the temperature or duration of the fire/s in which these specimens were burnt. Experimental studies have shown that einkorn is relatively robust when carbonised, surviving in temperatures exceeding 250°C, with barley and bread wheats combusting more rapidly and at lower temperatures (Boardman and Jones, 1990); based on this data, it is possible that, depending on the combustion conditions, some cereals may be under-represented in this sample set.
- 7.7.22 As well as grains, a large quantity of cereal chaff was recovered, again, largely of glume wheats; glumes and spikelet forks of both emmer and spelt wheat were identified, along with indeterminate glumes, which could be of spelt/emmer, or perhaps in some cases, einkorn. A significant concentration of such material, in conjunction with the grain assemblage, could be suggestive of several things. As assemblages rich in chaff can be interpreted to be indicative of cereal processing waste, it may be the case some aspect of processing, such as later stage winnowing and sieving is being undertaken on site (Stevens,

2003), potentially daily processing of stored spikelets; glumes are dominant in this assemblage, with culm and rachis material, usually removed in earlier stages of processing, being rarely reported. The magnitude of both the grain and chaff remains can also be used to postulate the level of activity being undertaken on site; Van Der Veen and Jones (2006) have, for example, suggested that a large assemblage of burnt cereal remains would only occur if significant levels of activity were being carried out on site; substantial amounts of grain are considered unlikely to be burnt during routine processing activities, and are more likely to have been accidentally burnt, perhaps during parching or cooking. It may be suggested that the relative proportion of grain to cereals in this sample set suggests that the former is more likely.

- 7.7.23 The presence of both sprouted grains and detached sprouts in these samples may also be a sign that these remains were waste material that was disposed of by burning. Spoiling of grain through poor storage, as evidenced by germination, was a significant problem in Roman Britain (Van der Veen, 2014), and it is possible that unusable grains would have been disposed of in such a fashion. Germinated grains also raise the possibility that activities such as brewing may have been undertaken, whereupon grain would have been deliberately germinated prior to use. The weed assemblage was un-diverse, comprised largely of arable weeds such as brown and other wild grasses; these remains may have been collected with the cereal crop during harvesting, and, like the chaff, been removed during processing.
- 7.7.24 Wood charcoal was present in moderate to abundant amounts in all of the assessed samples, with the highest concentration of viable specimens being reported in the fills of Ditch [3311] and Pit [3325]. These remains may constitute the spent fuel from domestic combustion, with the smaller assemblages, and those containing only heavily fragmented remains, potentially deposited as the result of wind-scatter from larger material dumps.
- 7.7.25 The snail assemblage contained both terrestrial and freshwater species, which may be indicative of rapidly changing environmental conditions on this site; the aquatic specimens are suggestive of marshy ground, or shallow ponds, which

could be a sign that the sampled features experienced periods of extended waterlogging.

#### Taphonomic Considerations

7.7.26 Moderate to high concentrations of fine roots and, occasionally, aquatic seeds, were observed in all of the assessed samples. These remains may be evidence of post depositional disturbance, and the potential for re-working of smaller ecofacts should be considered when using archaeobotanical remains for dating purposes.

### SIGNIFICANCE

- 7.7.27 The assessment has shown that carbonised archaeobotanical remains are well preserved, with an abundance of cereals, seeds and charcoal being recovered. Molluscs were also common. Whilst the wood charcoal assemblage was substantial, the bulk of the observed remains were substantially fragmented, and thus unidentifiable to species.
- 7.7.28 Should future interventions be undertaken the potential for recovery of such material should be reflected in the environmental sampling strategy, and samples should, where possible, be collected from well-sealed deposits, with little evidence for bioturbation. In the eventuality that snail-rich deposits are encountered, contiguous samples should be taken, if sampling conditions allow.

# 7.8 Marine Shell Kate Turner

Introduction

- 7.8.1 A small assemblage of whole oyster shell was recovered from the fills of two ditches, [2614] and [3311].
- 7.8.2 The aim of this assessment is to: (1) determine the degree of fragmentation and preservation of the oyster shell assemblage; (2) quantify the number of oyster shells, and (3) record any other shell that was present in this assemblage.

#### Methodology

7.8.3 Shells were collected via handpicking by on-site archaeologists and hand-

cleaned with a soft toothbrush to remove any residual soil. Oyster shell was recorded using a standardised procedure set out by Winder (2011). The first stage of recording involved identifying and separating the left and right valves, and then sub-classifying these into measurable and un-measurable specimens. Both measurable and un-measurable shells (UMV) were then counted, to determine the minimum number of individuals in the assemblage (MNI), along with the percentage of damaged shells (% UMLV/RV). Measurable shells are those specimens retaining the umbo/ligament scar, the adductor muscle scar and at least two-thirds of the shell body (Winder 2011). MNI is determined as whichever value is greater out of the total number of left valves and the total number of right valves. As the sampled context did not contain a statistically significant (containing over 100 left and right valves) oyster assemblage, shell was therefore quantified, and no further recording was carried out. A summary of the results are presented in table 1.

# Results

7.8.4 This assemblage comprised two complete valves of native oyster (Ostrea edulis). The overall size of the assemblage was small; only two left valves were reported, and no right valves with a combined weight of 42 grams. The MNI for the sample set was two. Both of the recovered valves are considered to be small, less than 50mm in width; the presence of small shells can be an indication that oysters have been harvested before reaching maturity. Evidence of significant parasitic infestation was found on the left valve found in Ditch [2614]; burrows of the polychaete worms Polydora ciliata and Polydora hoplura were recognised, along with the remains of Bryozoa, or sea mat. This assemblage is considered to be too minimal to be of any significant diagnostic value.

# Conclusions

7.8.5 The small size of the shell assemblage means it is of limited interpretive value, though there is some evidence to suggest that native oyster may have been part of diet on site.

# 8 DISCUSSION

#### 8.1 Late Iron Age, Roman and Saxon Settlement

- 8.1.1 The results of this evaluation suggest that there is Late Iron Age to Late Roman/Early Saxon settlement activity located near the centre of the proposed development site, as seen in Trenches 26, 27, 29, 33 and 34 (Figure 14). The western extent of the settlement appears to be no further than the eastern end of Trench 23. The southern extent of this archaeology appears to be in the vicinity of Trench 29 were Ditch [2917] was recorded along with three possible cremations (not excavated). The likely eastern extent of the concentrated settlement would appear to be marked by the large NW-SE oriented Ditch [3330] in Trench 33; the Late Iron Age pit [4005] in Trench 40 being a probable outlier.
- 8.1.2 The generally dark colour of the fills and the character of the finds assemblages and environmental data points to long-lived rural settlement activity in the areas sampled in Trenches 26, 27, 29, 33 and 34. Here, direct evidence for structures is seen in Trench 33 in the form of two Late Iron Age to Early Roman drip gullies and a convincing though undated posthole. Some degree of metal working occurring at the settlement can be inferred from the small quantities of slag found in some of the features.
- 8.1.3 In addition to evidence for milling provided by fragmentary quernstones, environmental data points to cereal production and consumption at RAF Wyton during the Romano-British period. A significant amount of charred plant macrofossils was retrieved from environmental samples. Glume wheats, including emmer and spelt, appear to be the dominant species in the assemblage. As well as grains, a large quantity of cereal chaff was recovered which indicates that cereal processing was taking place.
- 8.1.4 Apart from the pit in Trench 40 which is Late Iron Age (350-100BC), the other Iron Age ceramic material which dates from early in the first century A.D. is transitional to the Early Roman period (i.e. Late Iron Age to Early Roman). The Early Saxon pottery (4 sherds) is found in a single feature [2706] that also contains Late Roman material. The site stratigraphy and pottery dates suggest

the site was occupied throughout the Roman period (if not continuously) with several phases of activity represented.

- 8.1.5 It was assumed by the author that there would be outlying field systems associated with phases of occupation of the rural settlement. However, there seem to be few convincing candidates for this. A single Roman pot sherd was found in Ditch [2806] which together with Ditch [2808] in Trench 28, Ditch [2912] in Trench 29 and Ditch [3405] in Trench 34 may have formed a rectilinear field system contemporary with the Late Iron Age/Roman settlement. Less convincing are the ditches recorded in Trenches 11 and 12 that contained fragments of Roman pottery that may be residual.
- 8.1.6 There is a disjunct between what is visible on the ground and what is visible on the geophysical and aerial surveys; the majority of older archaeological features simply do not register clearly on the geophysics on this site.

### 8.2 Post-medieval/19th century

8.2.1 Many of the undated linear features that are not furrows may relate to deep late 19th/early 20th century ploughing or tillage to improve drainage. Most of the furrows are relatively straight and probably late (post Enclosure). Field boundaries visible on the 1888 OS maps were recorded in several trenches and matched well with the geophysical survey (Figure 8). No other features of specific archaeological significance were found dating to this period.

# 8.3 20th Century Airfield Features

- 8.3.1 The airfield features uncovered during this evaluation were, with the exception of the large pit feature in Trench 28 [2810], in accord with various historic photographs (Figure 9 to Figure 12). The chalk landing circle and hutting at the northern perimeter are shown on the aerial photograph of 1918 (Figure 9).
- 8.3.2 The airfield was closed and partially demolished in 1919, with part of the site continuing in use as a sanatorium. The apparent truncation of some of the WWI features (e.g. the landing circle and cinder taxi tracks) may be due to inter-war ploughing activity or the remodelling of the airfield during the course of WWII.

- 8.3.3 Aerial photos confirm the presence of a grass runway in 1941 which lines up exactly with the remains of the lighting system found by the geophysical survey and confirmed in the trial trenches (Figure 11). This runway was in use for a very short period of time as it is not shown on aerial photographs in 1939/40 (Figure 10) and has disappeared by 1942 (Figure 12). The airfield was remodelled by 1942 and hard runways installed on different alignments.
- 8.3.4 Steve Lloyd of the RAF Wyton Heritage Centre has provided the following information on the grass airstrip and its associated lighting: "Prior to the outbreak of hostilities in 1939, the lighting facilities for night operation of airfields were few and far between and, by later standards, crude by nature. The only standard provision of built-in runway lighting consisted of what this country designated "Contact Lighting". This form of lighting was unshielded i.e it could be observed all round the compass from the air. As such it could only be used in good visibility and in conjunction with 'Lorenz' radio beam approach equipment.
- 8.3.5 The lighting system found in the trenches at Wyton although incomplete does not directly correspond with either that associated with a layout first deployed by the RAF at DREM or that known as Airfield lighting Mk I as illustrated in Chapter 27 of the immediate post WWII Air Historical Branch (RAF) Works narrative AIR 10/5559. This situation opens up the possibility that Wyton's initial runway lighting might as an expedient have been modelled on early civil aviation contact lighting, examples being either Manchester or possibly Croydon. Surviving examples of Mk I airfield lighting are rare as are examples of early civil contact lighting. In June 1940 Wyton was one of just 5 RAF stations where work was in progress installing a Standard Beam Approach system, 10 by the end of the year AIR 14/366 & AIR 2/1932.
- 8.3.6 Elsewhere, early examples of illuminated grass runways essential to the successful night operation of medium and heavy bomber aircraft such as the Vickers Wellington and Short Stirling prior to the introduction of hard runways would have been destroyed when the latter were laid directly over the former. However, at Wyton in the winter of 1941/2 the main metalled runway was

fortuitously laid on a slightly different heading and to one side of the initial operating surface thus leaving it intact and buried under excavated spoil.

8.3.7 The survival of such a system dating from the latter half of 1940 at Wyton is therefore of regional [...] significance".

# 9 CONCLUSIONS

- 9.1.1 The evaluation uncovered regionally significant remains of Late Iron Age/Roman settlement, as well as aviation features related to RAF Wyton's history as an airfield during both World Wars. The identification of the 1941 grass runway features is significant as remains of these lighting systems are rare.
- 9.1.2 No significant archaeology post-dating the Late Roman period and pre-dating the first World War was encountered.

#### 10 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 10.1 Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd would like to thank ENGIE Services Ltd for commissioning and funding the work. PCA would particularly like to thank and acknowledge the expert advice and opinion provided by Steve Lloyd from RAF Wyton Heritage Centre.
- 10.2 PCA are also grateful to Kasia Gdaniec of CHET for monitoring the work on behalf of the Local Planning Authority.
- 10.3 The project was managed by Christiane Meckseper and was supervised by A G Pullen. The author would like to thank the site team: Rita Pedro, Valerio Pinna, Josh Cameron, Tom Learmonth, Tibi Nica, Cleve Roberts, Rachel Thomas for their hard work. Figures accompanying this report were prepared by Rosie Scales of PCA's CAD Department.

#### 11 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albarella, U, 2007 The end of the Sheep Age: people and animals in the Late Iron Age, in C, Haselgrove and T, Moore (eds.), The Later Iron Age in Britain and beyond, Oxbow Books, 389-402AOC (AOC Archaeology Group) 2008 RAF Wyton, Cambridgeshire: An Archaeological Evaluation Report, report 7969

Barclay, A., Knight, D., Booth, P., Evans, J., Brown, D.H., Wood, I., A. 2016. Standard for Pottery Studies in Archaeology, Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group, Study Group for Roman Pottery (Historic England)

BGS 2019 British Geological Survey Geology of Britain Viewer http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html? (accessed 28-08-2019)

Binford, L. 1981 Bones ancient man and modern myths. New York: Academy Press

Boardman, S. and Jones, G. (1990) 'Experiments on the effects of charring on cereal plant components', Journal of archaeological science. Elsevier, 17(1), pp. 1–11

Brothwell, D and Higgs, E. (eds) 1969 Science in Archaeology 283-302 London: Thames and Hudson

Brown, N and Glazebrook, J (eds.) 2000 Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 2. Research Agenda and Strategy, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 8

Cappers, R. T. J., Bekker, R. M. and Jans, J. E. A. (2012) Digital seed atlas of the Netherlands. Barkhuis

Chaplin, R.E. and McCormick, F.1986 The animal bones in I.M. Stead and V. Rigby O'Connor and Sykes, N. (2010) eds. Extinctions and invasions. A social history of British Fauna

CHET (Cambridgeshire County Council's Historic Environment Team) 2019 Brief for Archaeological Evaluation: RAF Wyton, northwest end of runway, dated 16th April 2019

ClfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2014a Code of Conduct

ClfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2014b Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation

Curwen, E. C. 1937. 'Querns', Antiquity 11, 135–51

DCLG (Department for Communities and Local Government) 2018 National Planning Policy Framework

Evans, J., Macaulay, S., and Mills, P. 2017. The Horningsea Roman Pottery Industry in Context, East Anglian Archaeology 162

Glazebrook, J (ed.) 1997 Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 1. Resource Assessment, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 3

Grant, A. 1982 The use of tooth wear as a guide to a guide to the age of domestic ungulates in Wilson, Grigson and Payne

Green, C. 2017. 'Querns and Millstones in Late Iron Age and Roman London and South-East Britain', 156–79 in D. Bird (ed.), Agriculture and Industry in South-Eastern Roman Britain, Oxbow Books

Gurney, D 2003 Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 24

Hammon, A. 2010 in O'Connor and Sykes, N. (2010) eds. Lawrence, M, J and Brown, R.W. 1973 Mammals of Britain their tracks, trails and signs London: Blandford Press HE (Historic England) 2015 Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide

Hobbs, B. (PCA) 2019 Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyton, Huntingdonshire: An Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment

Jacomet, S. (2006) 'Identification of cereal remains from archaeological sites. Unpublished report. Second edition'

Jones, S., Taylor, J. and Ash, F. (2004) Seed Identification Handbook: Agriculture, Horticulture & Weeds. National Institute of Agricultural Botany

Kerney, M. (1999) Atlas of the land and freshwater molluscs of Britain and Ireland. Colchester: Harley Books

Lyons, A., (forthcoming) 'The Roman Pottery' in Rectory Farm, Godmanchester. East Anglian Archaeology

Lyons, A.L., and Percival, S.A. (in prep). The Prehistoric and Roman Pottery from Bobs Wood, Zant, J., and Hinman, M., East Anglian Archaeology

Medlycott, M 2011 (ed.) Research and Archaeology Revisited: A revised framework for the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 24

Monteil, G. 2013. 'Roman Pottery' in Evans, C., Process and History. Romano-British Communities at Colne Fen, Earith. CAU Landscape Archives: The Archaeology of the Lower Ouse Valley, Volume II, pp85-99

Neef, R., Cappers, R. T. J. and Bekker, R. M. (2012) Digital atlas of economic plants in archaeology. Barkhuis

Payne, S. 1973 Kill-off patterns in sheep and goats: the mandibles from Asvan Kale Anatolian Studies 23 281-303

Rielly in prep The animal bone from Job's Lane

Schmid, E 1972 Atlas of animal bones London: Elsevier press

Shaffrey, R. 2015. 'Intensive Milling Practices in the Romano-British Landscape of Southern England: Using Newly Established Criteria for Distinguishing Millstones from Rotary Querns', Britannia 46, 55–92

Silver, I.1969 The ageing of domestic animals in D. Brothwell and E. Higgs (Eds)

Slowikowski et al. 2001 Minimum Standards for the Processing, Recording, Analysis and Publication of Post-Roman Ceramics

Stace, C. (1991) New flora of the British Isles. Cambridge University Press

Stevens, C. J. (2003) 'An Investigation of Agricultural Consumption and Production Models for Prehistoric and Roman Britain', Environmental Archaeology, 8(1), pp. 61–76. doi: 10.1179/env.2003.8.1.61

Taylor, G and Brown, J 2009 Operations Manual I: Fieldwork Induction Manual, unpublished PCA document

Tomber, R. and Dore, J. 1998. The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection: A Handbook. MOLAS monograph 2

Tyers, P. 1996. Roman Pottery in Britain, Batsford

Van Der Veen, M. and Jones, G. 2006. 'A re-analysis of agricultural production and consumption: Implications for understanding the British Iron Age', Vegetation History and Archaeobotany, 15(3), pp. 217–228. doi: 10.1007/s00334-006-0040-3

Van der Veen, M. 2014. 'Arable farming, horticulture, and food: expansion,

innovation, and diversity in Roman Britain', The Oxford handbook of RomanBritain.OxfordUniversityPress,Oxford.https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697713.013, 46

Van der Veen, M., Livarda, A. and Hill, A. 2008. 'New Plant Foods in Roman Britain — Dispersal and Social Access', Environmental Archaeology, 13(1), pp. 11–36. doi: 10.1179/174963108x279193

Van Zeist, W. 1984 'List of names of wild and cultivated cereals', Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture, 1, pp. 8–15

Winder, J. 2011 Oyster Shells from Archaeological Sites: A Brief Guide to Basic Processing Online at: http://oystersetcetera.files.wordpress.com/2011 /03/oystershellmethodsmanualversion11.pdf

#### 12 FIGURES



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2019 © Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2019 06/08/19 RS



06/08/19 RS



Figure 3 Evaluation Trenches Western Part of Site 1:1250 at A3



© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2019 06/08/19 RS

Evaluation Trenches Northern Part of Site 1:1250 at A3



© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2019 06/08/19 RS



Figure 6 Detail of Trenches 26 and 27 1:250 at A4



Figure 7 Detail of Trenches 33 and 34 1:250 at A3



Figure 8 Geophysical Survey overlain on 19th Century Ordnance Survey Map 1:5,000 at A3


Image reproduced with kind permission by RAF Wyton Heritage Centre © Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2019 12/08/19 DV Figure 9 1918 Aerial Photograph of RAF Wyton 1:5,000 at A4





Image provided by the Aerial Research Group from a document generated by the RAF/Air Ministry. Crown Copyright © Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2019 12/08/19 DV Figure 11 1941 Aerial Photograph of RAF Wyton 1:6,250 at A4



Image reproduced with kind permission by RAF Wyton Heritage Centre © Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2019 12/08/19 DV Figure 12 1942 Aerial Photograph of RAF Wyton 1:5,000 at A4



0\_\_\_\_\_2m

Figure 13 Selected Sections 1:40 at A3



<sup>18/09/19</sup> RS

Figure 14 Settlement Core 1:800 at A3

## 13 APPENDIX 1: PLATES



Plate 1: View SE across site, Trench 16 in middle distance



Plate 2: View W across site towards lorry park



Plate 3: View NE from Trench 15 (unexcavated)



Plate 4: View NE from SW end of runway (now lorry park)



Plate 5: View NW, Trench 28, Ditch [2806] and Ditch [2808]



Plate 6: View NW, Trench 26, right Pit [2612] and left Ditch [2614]



Plate 7: View E, Trench 27, Ditch [2706]



Plate 8: View SW, Trench 29, overcut Ditch [2917]



Plate 9: View NW, Trench 33, Ditch 3330 under excavation



Plate 10: View W, Trench 33, cow skull in Ditch [3330]



Plate 11: View NE, Trench 20, chalk 'T' at centre of WWI landing circle



Plate 12: Chalk Landing circle 13 July 1918.

Photo reproduced with kind permission of RAF Wyton Heritage Centre



Plate 13: View W, Trench 27, WWI cinder taxi track (2726)



Plate 14: Trench 28, View NW, large pit feature [2810]



Plate 15: Trench 29, View N, concrete support for landing light



Plate 16: View E, Trench 22, electricity supply for 1941 grass runway

# 14 APPENDIX 2: TRENCH AND CONTEXT INDEX

Trench	1		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.1
Trench length (m)	50	Subsoil depth (m)	0.4	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.7	Natural depth (m OE	0.65	0.5

## Summary of archaeological features

(104) madeground

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
101	Layer	Topsoil			0.1	
102	Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
103	Layer	Natural			0.35	
104	Layer	Made Ground	30	2	0.3	Firm, mid greyish brown silt

Trench	2		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.2
Trench length (m)	30	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.55	Natural depth (m OE	0.55	0.45

### Summary of archaeological features

no features recorded

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
201	Layer	Topsoil			0.2	
202	Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
203	Layer	Natural			0.45	

Trench	3		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NW-SE	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.2
Trench length (m)	75	Subsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.3
Max machine depth (m)	0.6	Natural depth (m OE	0.55	0.5

## Summary of archaeological features

no features recorded

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
301	Layer	Topsoil			0.2	
302	Layer	Subsoil			0.3	
303	Layer	Natural			0.5	

Trench	4		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0	0
Trench length (m)	70	Subsoil depth (m)	0	0
Max machine depth (m)	0	Natural depth (m OD	0]0	0

## Summary of archaeological features

sheet asbestos fragments T4 abandoned

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
401	Layer	Topsoil				
402	Layer	Subsoil				
403	Layer	Natural				

Trench	5		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.1	0.1
Trench length (m)	40	Subsoil depth (m)	0.1	0.5
Max machine depth (m)	0.6	Natural depth (m OD	)]1.4	1

## Summary of archaeological features

(504) made ground; (505) made ground

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
501	Layer	Topsoil			0.1	
502	Layer	Subsoil			0.5	
503	Layer	Natural			0.6	
504	Layer	Made Ground			0.3	Firm, mid greyish brown clayey silt
505	Layer	Made Ground		2	0.3	Firm, mid greyish brown clayey silt

Trench	6		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NW-SE	Topsoil depth (m)	0	0
Trench length (m)	40	Subsoil depth (m)	0	0
Max machine depth (m)	0	Natural depth (m OD	0]0	0

## Summary of archaeological features

practice bombs T6 abandoned

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
601	Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
602	Layer	Subsoil				
603	Layer	Natural				

Trench	7		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.6	0.6
Trench length (m)	70	Subsoil depth (m)	0.5	0.9
Max machine depth (m)	1.2	Natural depth (m OD	)]0.1	0.9

### Summary of archaeological features

(704) concrete; (705) ballast; (706) made ground

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
701	Layer	Topsoil			0.6	
702	Layer	Subsoil			0.9	
703	Layer	Natural			1.5	
704	Layer	Surface				Concrete
705	Layer	Made Ground				
706	Layer	Made Ground	0.6	0.6		

Trench	8		End 1	End 2
Alignment	E-W	Topsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.4
Trench length (m)	60	Subsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.4
Max machine depth (m)	0.8	Natural depth (m OD	0]0.5	0.8

### Summary of archaeological features

[805] ditch

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
801		Layer	Topsoil			0.4	
802		Layer	Subsoil			0.4	
803		Layer	Natural			0.8	
804	805	Fill	Ditch			0.15	Firm, light greyish brown clayey silt
805	805	Cut	Ditch	0.8	0.5	0.15	Linear in plan, gentle sides, concave base

Trench	9		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NW-SE	Topsoil depth (m)	0.4	0.5
Trench length (m)	70	Subsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.45
Max machine depth (m)	0.95	Natural depth (m OD	)]0.7	0.95

## Summary of archaeological features

ditch [905]; posthole [907]

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
901		Layer	Topsoil			0.5	
902		Layer	Subsoil			0.45	
903		Layer	Natural			0.95	
904	905	Fill	Ditch	1	0.3	0.12	Moderate, light yellowish grey, silty clay
905	905	Cut	Ditch	1	0.3	0.12	Linear in plan, moderate sloping, concave base
906	907	Fill	Posthole	0.3	0.3	0.2	Firm, light greyish yellow clay
907	907	Cut	Posthole	0.3	0.3	0.2	Circular in plan, steep sides, concave base
908	907	Fill	Posthole			0.09	Loose, mid greyish brown clayey silt with moderate charcoal

Trench	10		En	d 1 End 2				
Alignment	-	Topsoil dept	t <b>h (m)</b> 0	0				
Trench length (m)	0	Subsoil dep	<b>th (m)</b> 0	0				
Max machine depth (m)	0	Natural dept	<b>h (m OD</b> ]0	0				
Summary of archaeological features								
	trench	not opened						
Context Cut Type	Category	Length Width (m) (m)	Depth (m)	Description				

Trench	11		End 1	End 2
Alignment	N-S	Topsoil depth (m)	0.35	0.5
Trench length (m)	50	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.4
Max machine depth (m)	0.9	Natural depth (m OD	<b>)</b> ]0.55	0.9

## Summary of archaeological features

[1105] ditch; [1107] ditch

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
1101		Layer	Topsoil			0.5	
1102		Layer	Subsoil			0.4	
1103		Layer	Natural			0.9	
1104	1105	Fill	Ditch	1	0.5	0.22	Firm, light brownish grey silty clay
1105	1105	Cut	Ditch	1	0.5	0.22	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
1106	1107	Fill	Ditch			0.21	Moderate, light brownish grey silty clay
1107	1107	Cut	Ditch	1	0.45	0.21	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	12		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.2
Trench length (m)	45	Subsoil depth (m)	0.5	0.3
Max machine depth (m)	0.8	Natural depth (m OD	0.8	0.5

## Summary of archaeological features

[1205] ditch

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
1201		Layer	Topsoil			0.2	
1202		Layer	Subsoil			0.3	
1203		Layer	Natural			0.5	
1204	1205	Fill	Ditch	1	0.55	0.25	Loose, mid greyish brown clayey silt
1205	1205	Cut	Ditch	1	0.55	0.25	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	13		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.45	0.4
Trench length (m)	30	Subsoil depth (m)	0.4	0.5
Max machine depth (m)	0.9	Natural depth (m OE	<b>)</b> ]0.85	0.9

### Summary of archaeological features

no features recorded

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
1301	Layer	Topsoil			0.4	
1302	Layer	Subsoil			0.5	
1303	Layer	Natural			0.9	

Trench	14		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NW-SE	Topsoil depth (m)	0.35	0.4
Trench length (m)	45	Subsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.85	Natural depth (m OD	)0.65	0.85

### Summary of archaeological features

[1405] drainage ditch; (1406) made ground

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
1401		Layer	Topsoil			0.4	
1402		Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
1403		Layer	Natural			0.6	
1404	1405	Fill	Ditch	1		0.4	Moderate, light greyish brown silty clay
1405	1405	Cut	Ditch	1		0.2	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
1406		Layer	Made Ground	30		0.2	Loose, mid greyish brown silt

Trench	15		End 1	End 2
Alignment	N-S	Topsoil depth (m)	0	0
Trench length (m)	0	Subsoil depth (m)	0	0
Max machine depth (m)	0	Natural depth (m OE	<b>)</b> ]O	0

#### Summary of archaeological features

multiple services, live status unknown T15 abandoned

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
1501	Layer	Topsoil				
1502	Layer	Subsoil				
1503	Layer	Natural				

Trench	16		End 1	End 2
Alignment	E-W	Topsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.3
Trench length (m)	70	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.7	Natural depth (m OD	)]0.5	0.7

## Summary of archaeological features

(1604) made ground; (1605) brick made ground

Context C	Sut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
1601		Layer	Topsoil			0.3	
1602		Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
1603		Layer	Natural			0.5	
1604		Layer	Surface	55		0.1	Compact, dark blueish brown gravel with frequent coal
1605		Layer	Surface	30	2	0.2	Compact, mid brownish red crushed bricks with frequent gravel

Trench	17		End 1	End 2
Alignment	E-W	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	55	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.45	Natural depth (m OD	)0.45	0.45

### Summary of archaeological features

[705] tree-throw; [1707] furrow

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
1701		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
1702		Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
1703		Layer	Natural			0.45	
1704	1705	Fill	Treethrow	0.8	0.5	0.5	
1705	1705	Cut	Treethrow	0.8	0.5	0.5	
1706	1707	Fill	Furrow				
1707	1707	Cut	Furrow				

Trench	18		End 1	End 2
Alignment	N-S	Topsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Trench length (m)	55	Subsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.3
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OI	<b>)</b> ]0.5	0.5

#### Summary of archaeological features

[1805] furrow; [1806] natural feature; ditch [1809]; furrow [1811]; furrow [1814]

Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
	Layer	Topsoil			0.2	
	Layer	Subsoil			0.3	
	Layer	Natural			0.5	
1805	Fill	Furrow	1.3	0.55	0.13	Firm, mid greyish brown sandy clay
1805	Cut	Furrow	1.3	0.55	0.13	Linear in plan, moderate sides, flat base
1807	Fill	Treethrow	0.5	0.4	0.11	Firm, light blueish brown silty clay
1807	Cut	Treethrow	0.5	0.4	0.11	Irregular in plan, moderate sides, flat base
1809	Fill	Ditch	1	0.7	0.19	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
1809	Cut	Ditch	1	0.7	0.19	Linear in plan, steep sides, uneven base
1811	Fill	Furrow	1.1	0.46	0.11	Firm, mid greyish brown clay
1811	Cut	Furrow	1.1	0.46	0.11	Linear in plan, moderate sides, flat base
1814	Fill	Furrow	1	0.8	0.15	
1814	Cut	Furrow	1	0.8	0.15	
	Cut 1805 1805 1807 1807 1809 1809 1809 1811 1811 1811	Cut Type   Layer   Layer   Layer   1805 Fill   1805 Cut   1807 Fill   1809 Fill   1809 Cut   1811 Cut   1811 Cut   1814 Fill   1814 Cut	CutTypeCategoryLayerTopsoilLayerSubsoilLayerNatural1805FillFurrow1805CutFurrow1807FillTreethrow1807CutDitch1809FillDitch1811FillFurrow1811FillFurrow1811FillFurrow1811FillFurrow1811FillFurrow1811FillFurrow1814FillFurrow1814FillFurrow	CutTypeCategoryLength (m)LayerTopsoilLayerSubsoilLayerNatural1805FillFurrow1805CutFurrow1807CutTreethrow1807CutTreethrow1809FillDitch1809CutDitch1811FillFurrow1811FillFurrow1814FillFurrow1814FillFurrow1814FillFurrow1814FullKutFurrow1	CutTypeCategoryLength (m)Width (m)LayerTopsoil	Cut   Type   Category   Length (m)   Width (m)   Depth (m)     Layer   Topsoil   0.2   0.3     Layer   Subsoil   0.3   0.3     Layer   Natural   0.5   0.13     1805   Fill   Furrow   1.3   0.55   0.13     1805   Cut   Furrow   1.3   0.55   0.13     1805   Cut   Furrow   0.5   0.4   0.11     1807   Fill   Treethrow   0.5   0.4   0.11     1807   Cut   Treethrow   0.5   0.4   0.11     1807   Fill   Ditch   1   0.7   0.19     1809   Cut   Ditch   1.1   0.46   0.11     1811   Fill   Furrow   1.1   0.46   0.11     1814   Fill   Furrow   1.1   0.8   0.15

Trench	19		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.3
Trench length (m)	50	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OD	<b>)</b> ]0.5	0.5

## Summary of archaeological features

no features recorded

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
1901	Layer	Topsoil			0.3	
1902	Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
1903	Layer	Natural			0.5	

Trench	20		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Trench length (m)	50	Subsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.3
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OE	<b>)</b> ]0.5	0.5

## Summary of archaeological features

[2005] WW1 chalk landing circle

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2001		Layer	Topsoil			0.2	
2002		Layer	Subsoil			0.3	
2003		Layer	Natural			0.5	
2004	2005	Fill	WWI Landing Cir			0.5	
2005	2005	Cut	WWI Landing Cir			0.2	

Trench	21		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.3
Trench length (m)	110	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OE	0.5	0.5

#### Summary of archaeological features

[2104] ditch; [2106] ditch; [2108] pit; [2111] drain; [2113] drain; [2115] furrow; (2117) cinder taxi way WW1; [2118] ditch; [2122] ditch; [2124] ditch; [2126] ditch

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2101		Layer	Topsoil			0.3	
2102		Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
2103		Layer	Natural			0.5	
2104	2104	Cut	Ditch	3	0.7	0.27	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2105	2104	Fill	Ditch	3	0.7	0.27	Firm, light greyish brown silty clay
2106	2106	Cut	Ditch	3	0.6	0.18	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2107	2106	Fill	Ditch	3	0.6	0.18	Firm, light greyish brown silty clay
2108	2108	Cut	Ditch	1.9	0.6	0.4	Sub-circular in plan, steep sides concave base
2109	2108	Fill	Pit	1.9	0.6	0.4	Moderate, mid brownish grey silty clay
2110	2108	Fill	Pit			0.1	Moderate, mid orangeish grey silty clay
2111	2111	Cut	Drain				Linear in plan, vertical sides, concave base
2112	2111	Fill	Drain				Loose, light brown silty clay
------	------	------	--------	---	------	------	--
2113	2113	Cut	Drain				Linear in plan, vertical sides, concave base
2114	2113	Fill	Drain				Loose, light brown silty clay
2115	2115	Cut	Furrow	1	1.9	0.1	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2116	2115	Fill	Furrow	1	1.9	0.1	Moderate, light brownish grey gravelly clay
2118	2118	Cut	Ditch	3	0.6	0.43	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2119	2118	Fill	Ditch	3	0.6	0.2	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
2120	2118	Fill	Ditch	3	0.6	0.3	Firm, light greyish brown silty clay
2121	2122	Fill	Ditch	1	0.55	0.1	Moderate, mid brownish grey silty clay
2122	2122	Cut	Ditch	1	0.55	0.1	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2123	2124	Fill	Ditch	1	0.65	0.23	Moderate, mid brown silty clay
2124	2124	Cut	Ditch	1	0.65	0.23	Linear in plan, steep sides, concave base
2125	2126	Fill	Ditch	1	0.6	0.15	Moderate, light brown clayey silt
2126	2126	Cut	Ditch	1	0.6	0.15	Linear in plan, gentle sides, concave base

Trench	22		End 1	End 2
Alignment	N-S	Topsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Trench length (m)	75	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.4	Natural depth (m OE	<b>)</b> ]0.4	0.4

# Summary of archaeological features

[2205] ditch; [2207] ditch

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2201		Layer	Topsoil			0.2	Moderate, light brown gravelly silt
2202		Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
2203		Layer	Natural			0.4	
2204	2205	Fill	Ditch	1	0.7	0.4	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2205	2205	Fill	Ditch	1	0.7	0.4	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2206	2207	Fill	Ditch	1	0.6	0.5	Moderate, light brown gravelly silt
2207	2207	Cut	Ditch	1	0.6	0.5	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	23		End 1	End 2
Alignment	E-W	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	50	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OD	<b>)</b> ]0.5	0.5

# Summary of archaeological features

[2307] waterhole; [2309] furrow; [2311] furrow; [2313] furrow; [2315] ditch; [2317] furrow

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2301		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
2302		Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
2303		Layer	Natural			0.5	
2304	2307	Fill	Waterhole			0.4	Moderate, dark grey clay
2305	2307	Fill	Waterhole			0.5	Moderate, mid brownish grey silty clay
2306	2307	Fill	Waterhole			0.4	Loose, light brown silt
2307	2307	Cut	Waterhole	2.3	4	1.3	Irregular in plan, steep sides
2308	2309	Fill	Ditch	1	0.55	0.08	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
2309	2309	Cut	Furrow	1	0.55	0.08	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2310	2311	Fill	Furrow	1	0.67	0.24	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
2311	2311	Cut	Furrow	1	0.67	0.24	Linear in plan, steep sides, concave base
2312	2313	Fill	Furrow	1	0.72	0.14	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay

2313	2313	Cut	Furrow	1	0.72	0.14	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2314	2315	Fill	Ditch	1	0.7	0.5	Moderate, light brown silt
2315	2315	Cut	Ditch	1	0.7	0.5	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2316	2317	Fill	Furrow	1	0.75	0.13	Moderate, light brown silt
2317	2317	Cut	Furrow	1	0.75	0.13	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	24		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Trench length (m)	60	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.4	Natural depth (m OE	<b>)</b> ]0.4	0.4

# Summary of archaeological features

[2405] furrow; [2407] furrow

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2401		Layer	Topsoil			0.2	
2402		Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
2403		Layer	Natural			0.4	
2404	2405	Fill	Ditch	2	0.9	0.12	Firm, mid brownish grey silty clay
2405	2405	Cut	Ditch	2	0.9	0.12	Linear in plan,moderate sides, concave base
2406	2407	Fill	Furrow	2	1.2	0.14	Firm, mid brownish grey, silty clay
2407	2407	Cut	Furrow	2	1.2	0.14	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	25		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NW-SE	Topsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.3
Trench length (m)	60	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OD	<b>)</b> ]0.5	0.5

# Summary of archaeological features

[2505] ditch; [2507] ditch; [2509] furrow

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2501		Layer	Topsoil			0.3	
2502		Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
2503		Layer	Natural			0.5	
2504	2505	Fill	Ditch			0.28	Firm, light brownish yellow silty clay
2505	2505	Cut	Ditch	2	1	0.28	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2506	2507	Fill	Ditch			0.4	Firm, light yellowish brown silty clay
2507	2507	Cut	Ditch	1.9	1	0.4	Linear in plan, steep sides, concave base
2508	2509	Fill	Furrow	1	1.54	0.36	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
2509	2509	Cut	Furrow	1	1.54	0.36	Linear in plan, steep sides, concave base

Trench	26		End 1	End 2
Alignment	N-S	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	40	Subsoil depth (m)	0.256	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OE	<b>)</b> ]0.5	0.5

# Summary of archaeological features

[2606] ditch; [2608] furrow; [2610] ditch; [2612] ditch; [2614] ditch; [2617] furrow; [2619] pit

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2601		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
2602		Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
2603		Layer	Natural			0.5	
2604	2606	Fill	Ditch	1.2	1.8	0.1	Moderate, dark blueish brown clayey silt
2605	2606	Fill	Ditch			0.1	Compact, grey silty gravel
2606	2606	Cut	Ditch	1.2	1.8	1	Linear in plan, gentle sides, flat base
2607	2608	Fill	Furrow	2	1.5	0.2	Compact, light brown silty clay
2608	2608	Cut	Furrow	2	1.5	0.2	Linear in plan, gentle sides, flat base
2609	2610	Fill	Ditch	2	1	0.25	Moderate, grey clayey silt
2610	2610	Cut	Ditch	2	1	0.25	Linear in plan, moderate sides, flat base
2611	2612	Fill	Pit	1.6	1.3	0.32	Compact, grey clayey silt
2612	2612	Cut	Pit	1.6	1.3	0.32	Sub-circular in plan, gentle slope, flat base

2613	2614	Fill	Ditch	2	0.8	0.43	Moderate, grey clayey silt
2614	2614	Cut	Ditch	2	0.8	0.43	Linear in plan, moderate sides, flat base
2615	2606	Fill	Ditch			0.2	Moderate, mid grey clay
2616	2617	Fill	Furrow			0.11	Moderate, light brownish grey gravelly clay
2617	2617	Cut	Furrow	1	1	0.11	Linear in plan, moderate sides, flat base
2618	2619	Fill	Pit		0.86	0.4	Compact, dark grey silty clay
2619	2619	Cut	Pit		0.86	0.4	Circular in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	27		End 1	End 2
Alignment	E-W	Topsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.25
Trench length (m)	27	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OD	0.5	0.5

# Summary of archaeological features

[2706] ditch; [2707] ditch; [2710] ditch; [2715] ditch; [2717] ditch; [2719] ditch; [2723] ditch; [2725] ditch

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2701		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
2702		Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
2703		Layer	Natural			0.5	
2704	2706	Fill	Ditch	10	3	0.24	Loose, dark grey clayey silt
2705	2706	Fill	Ditch	10	2.1	0.52	Firm, mid brownish grey silty clay
2706	2706	Cut	Ditch	10	3	0.72	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2707	2707	Cut	Ditch	1	1	0.42	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2708	2707	Fill	Ditch	1	1	0.42	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
2709	2710	Fill	Ditch	2	1	0.2	Loose, mid brownish grey clayey silt
2710	2710	Cut	Ditch	2	1	0.2	Linear in plan. moderate sides concave base
2711	2711	Cut	Ditch	1	0.83	0.12	Linear in plan, gentle sides, concave base

00/101/00	110110001	ogy Ennite					
2712	2711	Fill	Ditch	1	0.83	0.12	Firm, light greyish brown silty clay
2713	2715	Fill	Ditch	10	1.85	0.22	Loose, dark grey clayey silt
2714	2715	Fill	Ditch	10	1.85	0.28	Firm, mid brownish grey silty clay
2715	2715	Cut	Ditch	10	1.85	0.37	Rectilinear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2716	2717	Fill	Ditch	2	0.9	0.18	Loose, mid brownish grey clayey silt
2717	2717	Cut	Ditch	2	0.9	0.18	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2718	2719	Fill	Ditch	2	1	0.22	Loose, mid greyish brown sandy silt
2719	2719	Cut	Ditch	2	1	0.22	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2720	2723	Fill	Ditch	1	1.6	0.2	Firm, dark brownish grey silty clay
2721	2723	Fill	Ditch	1	2.66	0.52	Firm, light brownish grey silty clay
2722	2723	Fill	Ditch	1	2.66	0.54	Firm, dark brownish grey silty clay
2723	2723	Cut	Ditch	1	2.66	0.66	Linear, steep sides, concave base
2724	2725	Fill	Pit	1	1.38	0.21	Firm, mid brownish grey silty clay
2725	2725	Cut	Pit	1	1.38	0.21	Sub-circular in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2726	2726	Layer	Surface	4	2		Firm, black cinder

Trench	28		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	80	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	2.6	Natural depth (m OD	<b>)</b> ]0.5	2.6

# Summary of archaeological features

[2806] ditch; [2808] ditch; [2810] pit

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2801		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
2802		Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
2803		Layer	Natural			0.5	
2804	2806	Fill	Ditch			0.25	Moderate, mid brownish grey silty clay
2805	2806	Fill	Ditch			0.1	Moderate, light brownish grey clay
2806	2806	Cut	Ditch	1	1.05	0.1	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2807	2808	Fill	Ditch			0.25	Compact, mid brown clay
2808	2808	Cut	Ditch	1	0.8	0.25	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2809	2810	Fill	Pit			0	Firm, dark grey clay
2810	2810	Cut	Pit	5	2	0.25	Sub-circular in plan
2811		Layer	Surface				taxi track ww1

Trench	29		End 1	End 2
Alignment	N-S	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	115	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OE	)]0.5	0.5

# Summary of archaeological features

[2905] ditch; [2907] ditch; [2911] pit; [2913] ditch; [2917] ditch; [2919] cremation; [2922] WW2 airfield landing light base

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
2901		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
2902		Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
2903		Layer	Natural			0.5	
2904	2905	Fill	Ditch	1	1.14	0.26	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
2905	2905	Cut	Ditch	1	1.14	0.26	Linear, moderate sides, concave base
2906	2907	Fill	Ditch	1	1.22	0.3	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
2907	2907	Cut	Ditch	1	1.22	0.3	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2908							
2909							
2910	2911	Fill	Pit	0.62	0.4	0.2	Firm, mid greysh brown silty clay
2911	2911	Cut	Pit	0.62	0.4	0.2	Sub-circular in plan, steep sides, concave base
2912	2913	Fill	Ditch	1	1.08	0.3	Firm, mid greyish brwon silty clay
2913	2913	Cut	Ditch	1	1.08	0.3	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry V	ay, Wyton, Huntingdonshire. An Archaeological Eval	uation © Pre-
Construct Archaeology Limite	, September 2019	

001100000			a, eepteniser 2016	*			
2914	2917	Fill	Ditch	1	2.34	0.34	Firm, dark brownish grey silty clay
2915	2917	Fill	Ditch	1	2.26	0.5	Firm, mid greyish brown sandy clay
2916	2917	Fill	Ditch	1	2.04	0.54	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
2917	2917	Cut	Ditch	1	2.34	0.86	Sub-circular in plan, vertical sides, concave base
2918	2919	Fill	Cremation	0.4	0.4	0	Firm, dark brownish grey silty sand with frequent charcoal and occasional burnt bones
2919	2919	Cut	Cremation	0.4	0.4	0	Sub-circular in plan, moderate sides, concave base
2920	2922	Fill	Structure				Pre-cast runway light 1941
2921	2921	Masonry	Structure				Pre-cast runway light 1941
2922	2922	Cut	Construction cut				Pre-cast runway light 1941
2923	2924	Fill	Cremation	0.3	0.3	0	dark charcoal rich fill not excavated
2924	2924	Cut	Cremation	0.3	0.3	0	circular
2925	2926	Fill	Cremation	0.3	0.3	0	dark charcoal rich fill not excavated
2926	2926	Cut	Cremation	0.3	0.3	0	circular
2927	2928	Fill	Ditch	0	0	0	not excavated
2928	2928	Cut	Ditch	0	1.5	0	not excavated

Trench	30		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	50	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.45	Natural depth (m OD	0.45	0.45

# Summary of archaeological features

[3005] furrow

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3001		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
3002		Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
3003		Layer	Natural			0.45	
3004	3005	Fill	Furrow	2	0.8	0.12	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
3005	3005	Cut	Furrow	2	0.8	0.12	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	31		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NW-Se	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	45	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OE	0.5	0.5

# Summary of archaeological features

[3105] ditch

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3101		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
3102		Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
3103		Layer	Natural			0.5	
3104	3105	Fill	Furrow	5	0.45	0.12	Firm, dark grey silty clay
3105	3105	Cut	Furrow	5	0.45	0.12	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	32		End 1	End 2
Alignment	E-W	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	80	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OD	0.5	0.5

# Summary of archaeological features

[3205] ditch; [3207]

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3201		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
3202		Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
3203		Layer	Natural			0.5	
3204	3205	Fill	Ditch	2	0.75	0.36	Firm, mid brownish grey silty clay
3205	3205	Cut	Ditch	2	0.75	0.36	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
3206	3207	Fill	Furrow	2	1.05	0.13	Firm, mid greyish brown silty clay
3207	3207	Cut	Furrow	2	1.05	0.13	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	33		End 1	End 2
Alignment	E-W	Topsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.3
Trench length (m)	110	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.3
Max machine depth (m)	0.6	Natural depth (m OD	)0.55	0.6

#### Summary of archaeological features

[3305] ditch; [3307] ditch; [3309]; [3311] ditch; [3313] ditch; [3315] ditch; [3317] ditch; [3319] ditch; [3321] ditch; [3323] ditch; [3325] pit; [3327] posthole; [3330] ditch

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3301		Layer	Topsoil			0.3	
3302		Layer	Subsoil			0.3	
3303		Layer	Natural			0.6	
3304	3305	Fill	Ditch			0.7	Firm, dark greyish brown silty clay
3305	3305	Cut	Ditch	2.3	1.2	0.7	Linear in plan, steep sides, concave base
3306	3307	Fill	Ditch			0.55	Firm, mid yellowish grey silty clay
3307	3307	Cut	Ditch	2.3	1.5	0.55	Linear in plan, steep side, flat base
3308	3309	Fill	Ditch	1.55	1	0.35	Firm, mid greyish brown clay
3309	3309	Cut	Ditch	1.55	1	0.35	Linear in plan, moderate sides, flat base
3310	3311	Fill	Ditch	0.6	1	0.23	Firm, dark greish brown silty clay
3311	3311	Cut	Ditch	0.6	1	0.23	Linear in plan, moderate sides, flat base
3312	3313	Fill	Ditch			0.47	Moderate, dark grey silty clay

Constitut	A AIGHAEU	iogy Linnie	a, September 201	3			
3313	3313	Cut	Ditch	2.3	2	1.27	Linear in plan, steep sides
3314	3315	Fill	Ditch				Firm, dark grey silty clay
3315	3315	Cut	Ditch				Curvilinear in plan
3316	3317	Fill	Ditch			0.45	Firm, dark brown silty clay
3317	3317	Cut	Ditch	2.1	0.95	0.45	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
3318	3319	Fill	Ditch			0.35	Firm, mid brown silty clay
3319	3319	Cut	Ditch	1.1	0.3	0.35	Curvilinear in plan, moderate sides
3320	3321	Fill	Ditch			0.15	Loose, light brown silty clay
3321	3321	Cut	Ditch	1	0.3	0.15	Curvilinear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
3322	3323	Fill	Ditch	1	0.3	0.1	Loose, light brownish grey silty clay
3323	3323	Cut	Ditch	1	0.4	0.1	Curvilinear in plan, moderate sides, concave base
3324	3325	Fill	Pit			0.1	Moderate, dark grey clayey silt
3325	3325	Cut	Pit	1.4	0.9	0.18	Irregular in plan, moderate sides, flat base
3326	3327	Fill	Posthole		0.5	0.2	Moderate, light brownish grey silty clay
3327	3327	Cut	Posthole		0.5	0.2	Circular in plan, moderate sides, concave base
3328	3330	Fill	Ditch	1.84	0.9	1	Firm, mid yellowish brown clay
3329	3330	Fill	Ditch	3	1	1	Firm, mid brown silty clay

3330	3330	Cut	Ditch	3.05	1	1	Linear in plan, steep sides, flat base
3331	3330	Fill	Ditch	0.6	0.9	0.7	Firm, dark brown clay
3332	3330	Fill	Ditch	0.2	0.9	0.2	Dark brown blueish clay

Trench	34		End 1	End 2
Alignment	N-S	Topsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Trench length (m)	50	Subsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.2
Max machine depth (m)	0.4	Natural depth (m OE	0.4	0.4

# Summary of archaeological features

[3405] ditch

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3401		Layer	Topsoil			0.2	
3402		Layer	Subsoil			0.2	
3403		Layer	Natural			0.4	
3404	3405	Fill	Ditch	1	0.8	0.3	Moderate, mid brown clay
3405	3405	Cut	Ditch	1	0.8	0.3	Linear in plan, moderate sides, concave base

Trench	35		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NW-SE	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	100	Subsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.3
Max machine depth (m)	0.55	Natural depth (m OI	<b>)</b> ]0.55	

#### Summary of archaeological features

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3501	Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
3502	Layer	Subsoil			0.3	
3503	Layer	Natural			0.55	

Trench	36		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	40	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OD)0.5		

# Summary of archaeological features

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3601	Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
3602	Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
3603	Layer	Natural			0.5	

Trench	37		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NW-SE	Topsoil depth (m)	0.2	0.25
Trench length (m)	50	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.35
Max machine depth (m)	0.55	Natural depth (m OE	0.45	0.6

# Summary of archaeological features

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3701	Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
3702	Layer	Subsoil			0.35	
3703	Layer	Natural			0.6	

Trench	38		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	55	Subsoil depth (m)	0.3	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.55	Natural depth (m OD	<b>)</b> ]0.55	0.5

#### Summary of archaeological features

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3801	Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
3802	Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
3803	Layer	Natural			0.5	

Trench	39		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NE-SW	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.3
Trench length (m)	70	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.55	Natural depth (m OD	0.5	0.55

# Summary of archaeological features

Context Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
3901	Layer	Topsoil			0.3	
3902	Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
3903	Layer	Natural			0.55	

Trench	40		End 1	End 2
Alignment	NW-SE	Topsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Trench length (m)	70	Subsoil depth (m)	0.25	0.25
Max machine depth (m)	0.5	Natural depth (m OD)		5

# Summary of archaeological features

[4005] pit; [4007] ditch; [4009] pit; [4011] drain

Context	Cut	Туре	Category	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description
4001		Layer	Topsoil			0.25	
4002		Layer	Subsoil			0.25	
4003		Layer	Natural			0.5	
4004	4005	Fill	Pit			0.4	Moderate, mid brown silty clay
4005	4005	Cut	Pit	1	1.2	0.4	Linear in plan, uneven sides, concave base
4006	4007	Fill	Ditch	1	1.2	0.4	Moderate, mid greyish brown silty clay
4007	4007	Cut	Ditch	1	1.2	0.4	Linear in plan, irregular sides, concave base
4008	4009	Fill	Pit	0.85	0.39	0.2	Moderate, light brownish grey clay
4009	4009	Cut	Pit	0.85	0.39	0.2	Oval in plan, moderate sides, concave base
4010	4011	Fill	Drain	1	0.4	0.4	Loose, grey silty gravel
4011	4011	Cut	Drain	1	0.4	0.4	Linear in plan, vertical sides, concave base

# 15 APPENDIX 3 POTTERY CATALOGUE

Appendix 1. The Pottery Catalogue; listed by trench and then by context

Key: B= base, C= century, D = decorated body sherd, dsc = description, flag = flagon, g = gramme, HM - handmade, E= Early, L = late, M = mid, R = rim, SJAR = storage jar, U = undecorated body sherd, WM = wheelmade

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
11	1104	1105	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	4	MC1-C2
					М						
12	1204	1205	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	7	MC1-C4
					М						
18	1804	1805	Furrow	RB	W	SGW	D	JAR	1	12	MC1-
					М						E/MC2
23	2304	2307	Waterhol	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	3	7	MC1-C4
			е		М						
23	2305	2307	Waterhol	RB	W	SOW	Н	FLAGON	2	50	MC1-C3
			е		М						
26	2601		Topsoil	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	7	73	LC1-C4
					М		U				
							в				
26	2601		Topsoil	RB	W	STW	D	JAR	1	6	MC1-C2
					М						
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	STW	U	JAR	3	1	MC1-C4
					М						
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	6	8	M/LC1-
					М		U				C4
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	22	153	LC1-C4
					М						
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SAM	P	CUP	1	12	MC1-
					М						EC2
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	LNV CC	R	FDISH	1	19	MC3-
					М						EC5
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	LNV CC	U	JAR	1	3	C3-C4
					м						_
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	HORN RE	U	SJAR	1	56	C2-C3
_					м						
				1							

\*For full fabric names see Pot Tables 3 and 4.

PCA Report Number: R13844

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	DISH	1	55	C3-C4
					М						
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	12	MC1-C4
					М						
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	JAR	2	13	MC1-C3
					М						
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	HM	STW	U	SJAR	1	15	C1-C4
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	STW	R	JAR	4	43	C3-C4
					М		U				
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	DISH	1	29	C3-C4
					М						
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	В	DISH	3	49	C3-C4
					М						
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	18	MC1-C4
					М						
26	2604	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR/BEAK	1	7	MC1-C2
					М						
26	2605	2606	Ditch	RB	HM	STW	U	JAR/SJAR	4	231	C1-C2
26	2605	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	6	52	MC1-C4
					М						
26	2605	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	F	FDISH	1	7	MC3-
					М						EC5
26	2605	2606	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	R	JAR	1	13	MC1-C2
					М						
26	2609	2610	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	FDISH	1	10	MC3-
					М		F				EC5
26	2609	2610	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	FLAG	2	33	MC1-C3
					М						
26	2609	2610	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	1	4	MC1-C4
					М						
26	2609	2610	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	2	15	MC1-C2
					М						
26	2609	2610	Ditch	RB	W	SREDW	D	JAR/BOWL	1	6	MC1
					М						
26	2609	2610	Ditch	RB	W	STW	R	JAR	1	6	MC1-C4
					М						

PCA Report Number: R13844

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
26	2609	2610	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	D	JAR	1	3	MC1-C2
					М						
26	2611	2612	Pit	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR	3	17	MC1-
				/ER	М						MC2
26	2611	2612	Pit	LIA	W	OW(GROG	U	JAR	12	144	M/LC1
				/ER	М	)	В				
26	2611	2612	Pit	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR/SJAR	5	80	M/LC1-
				/ER	М		U				C4
							В				
26	2611	2612	Pit	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR	2	44	M/LC1
				/ER	М		В				
26	2611	2612	Pit	LIA	W	SGW	R	FDISH	1	3	MC3-
				/ER	М						EC5
26	2611	2612	Pit	LIA	W	SOW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	18	MC1-C2
				/ER	М		В				
26	2614	2614	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	4	29	MC1
				/ER	М						
26	2614	2614	Ditch	LIA	HM	STW	U	SJAR	7	175	C1
				/ER							
26	2614	2614	Ditch	LIA	W	OW(GROG	U	JAR/BOWL	2	10	M/LC1
				/ER	М	)					
26	2614	2614	Ditch	RB	W	LNV CC	U	JAR	1	6	C3-C4
					М						
26	2614	2614	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	4	29	MC1-C4
					М						
26	2614	2614	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	DISH	1	25	MC2+
					М						
26	2614	2614	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	6	130	LC1-C2
					М						
26	2614	2614	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	5	76	MC1
					М		U				
27	2701		Topsoil	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	2	28	LC1-C4
					М		U				
27	2701		Topsoil	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	3	LC1-C4
					М						
27	2704	2706	Ditch	ES	HM	RW(ORG)	U	JAR/BOWL	4	72	EC5

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
				AX							
27	2704	2706	Ditch	RB	W	LNV WH	U	MORT	1	34	MC2-C4
					М						
27	2704	2706	Ditch	RB	W	LNV CC	U	JAR	2	15	C3-C4
					М						
27	2704	2706	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	BEAK	6	46	MC1-C3
					М						
27	2704	2706	Ditch	RB	W	OX RS	U	MORT	1	15	MC3-C4
					М						
27	2704	2706	Ditch	RB	НМ	STW	U	JAR/SJAR	4	64	MC1-C4
27	2704	2706	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	6	15	MC1-C4
					М						
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	DISH	3	123	MC2+
					М		В				
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	21	135	LC1-C4
					М		В				
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	HAD OX	U	JAR/BOWL	1	3	C4-EC5
					М						
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	LNV CC	U	JAR/BEAK	1	3	MC2-C4
					М						
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	LNV WH	U	MORT	1	11	MC2-C4
					М						
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	STW	U	JAR	11	86	MC3-
					М						EC5
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	2	60	MC2-C4
					М						
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	BEAK/FLA	3	16	MC1-C4
					м			G	_		
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	8	MC1-C4
					м			••••			
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	1	LC1-C4
21	2100	2100	Biton		м	0011		0/11			201 01
27	2705	2706	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	8	LC1-C4
					м			<i></i>	.	Ĭ	
27	2708	2707	Ditch	RR	\\/		q	FDISH	1	43	MC3-
~1	2100	2101			КЛ						FC5
					IVI						L00

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
27	2708	2707	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	9	33	MC1-C4
					М						
27	2708	2707	Ditch	RB	W	OW(GROG	U	JAR/BOWL	2	7	MC1-C4
					М	)					
27	2708	2707	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	17	MC1-C4
					М		В				
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	126	894	MC1
				/ER	М		D				
							В				
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	STW	U	JAR/BOWL	7	24	C1
				/ER	М						
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR	9	26	M/LC1-
				/ER	М						MC2
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	38	MC1
				/ER	М						
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	4	45	MC1
				/ER	М		U				
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	SOW	R	JAR	11	76	MC1
				/ER	М		U				
							D				
							В				
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	31	MC1
				/ER	М						
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	3	122	MC1
				/ER	М		D				
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	7	170	MC1
				/ER	М						
27	2709	2710	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	17	MC1
				/ER	М						
27	2712	2711	Ditch	LIA	HM	STW	U	SJAR	1	19	C1-C4
				/ER							
27	2712	2711	Ditch	LIA	HM	RW(Q)	R	BOWL	1	6	C1BC-
				/ER							ADEC1
27	2712	2711	Ditch	LIA	SW	RW(Q)	U	JAR	1	5	C1
				/ER							
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SREDW	U	BOWL	1	10	MC1-C2

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
				/ER	М		В				
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	STW	R	JAR	1	14	MC1-
				/ER	М						E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	STW	U	JAR	13	118	MC1-C2
				/ER	М		D				
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	STW	R	JAR	1	6	MC1-
				/ER	М						E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR	20	142	MC1-
				/ER	М		D				E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SOW	R	BEAK/FLA	10	61	MC1-C3
				/ER	М		U	G			
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	GW	U	JAR	2	16	M/LC1-
				/ER	М						C2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	8	45	MC1-
				/ER	М		U				E/MC2
							В				
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	24	246	MC1-
				/ER	М		U				E/MC2
							D				
							В				
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	GW	R	JAR	1	1	M/LC1-
				/ER	М						EC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	3	30	MC1-
				/ER	М		D				E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR/BOWL	2	9	MC1-
				/ER	М		U				E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	OW(GROG	U	BEAK	2	9	MC1-
				/ER	М	)					E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SOW	R	BEAK	2	21	MC1-
				/ER	М						E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SOW	R	BEAK	3	9	MC1-
				/ER	М		U				E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	27	MC1-
				/ER	М						E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	9	MC1-
				/ER	Μ						E/MC2

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	BEAK	1	4	MC1-
				/ER	М						E/MC2
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	LID	1	6	MC1-C2
				/ER	М						
27	2713	2715	Ditch	LIA	HM	RW(Q)	U	SJAR	1	8	C1BC-
				/ER							ADE/M
											C1
27	2713	2715	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	3	31	MC1-C2
					М						
27	2713	2715	Ditch	RB	W	HORN RE	R	SJAR	3	129	C2
					М		U				
							В				
27	2713	2715	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	9	128	M/LC1-
					М		D				C2
							В				
27	2713	2715	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	FLAG	3	24	MC1-C3
					М						
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	CUP	3	39	LC1-
				/ER	М						E/MC2
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR	23	153	MC1-C2
				/ER	М		В				
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	RW(Q)	R	SJAR	2	89	MC1
				/ER	М						
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SOW	U	JAR/FLAG	3	15	MC1-C2
				/ER	М						
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	HM	STW	U	JAR/BOWL	2	6	C1-C2
				/ER	/S						
					W						
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	LID	1	6	MC1-C3
				/ER	М						
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	GW(GROG	U	JAR/BOWL	4	44	MC1
				/ER	М	)	В				
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	12	70	MC1+
				/ER	Μ		1				
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	GW(GROG	R	JAR	16	272	MC1
				/ER	М	)	U				

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	2	62	M/LC1
				/ER	М		U				
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	НМ	RW(ORG)	U	JAR/SJAR	1	6	C1BC-
				/ER							ADEC1
27	2714	2715	Ditch	LIA	НМ	RW(Q)	U	JAR/BOWL	1	5	C1BC-
				/ER							ADEC1
27	2716	2717	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	3	16	MC1-C4
					М						
27	2716	2717	Ditch	RB	W	STW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	3	MC1-C4
					М						
27	2716	2717	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	1	12	MC1-C4
					М						
27	2722	2723	Ditch	RB	W	OX RS	U	MORT	1	138	C4-EC5
					М		В				
27	2722	2723	Ditch	RB	W	STW	R	JAR	17	218	MC3-
					М		U				EC5
							D				
							В				
27	2722	2723	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	8	63	MC1-C4
					М		D				
27	2722	2723	Ditch	RB	W	LNV CC	R	BEAK	2	17	MC2-C4
					М		В				
27	2722	2723	Ditch	RB	W	LNV CC	U	JAR	1	8	C3-C4
					Μ						
27	2722	2723	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	3	25	MC1-C4
					Μ		U				
27	2722	2723	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	BOWL	1	5	MC1-C4
					Μ						
27	2722	2723	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	6	MC1-
					Μ						MC2
27	2722	2723	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	BOWL	1	5	MC1-C2
					Μ						
28	2804	2806	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	5	31	MC1-C4
					Μ						
28	2805	2806	Ditch	RB	SW	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	5	MC1-C4
28	2807	2808	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	6	MC1-C2

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
					М						
29	2914	2917	Ditch	LIA	НМ	RW(Q)	R	JAR	32	364	C1BC-
				/ER	/S		U				ADEC1
					W		В				
29	2914	2917	Ditch	LIA	НМ	RW(GROG	R	JAR	9	21	C1BC-
				/ER		)	U				ADEC1
29	2916	2917	Ditch	LIA	W	SOW	R	JAR	5	86	E/MC1
				/ER	М		U				
							В				
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	2	46	E/MC2
				/ER	М		D				
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	W	SREDW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	8	LC1-
				/ER	М		в				E/MC2
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR/BEAK	18	122	LC1-
				/ER	М		U				E/MC2
							D				
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	SW	OW(GROG	U	JAR/BOWL	8	41	MC1
				/ER		)					
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	W	OW(FINE)	U	BEAK	1	5	MC1-C3
				/ER	М						
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	SW	SOW	U	JAR/FLAG	1	1	MC1-C2
				/ER							
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	SW	SOW	U	JAR/BOWL	3	42	E/MC1
				/ER			D				
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR	1	4	MC1
				/ER	М						
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	SW	GW(GROG	D	JAR/BOWL	1	4	E/MC1
				/ER		)					
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	SW	GW(GROG	D	JAR/BOWL	1	4	E/MC1
				/ER		)					
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	HM	RW(Q)	U	JAR/BOWL	5	24	E/MC1
				/ER							
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	НМ	RW(Q)	U	JAR/BOWL	6	8	LC1BC-
				/ER			1				ADEC1
32	3304	3205	Ditch	LIA	НМ	RW(Q)	U	JAR/SJAR	1	11	C1BC-
				/ER			1				ADEC1
							1				

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
32	3304	3205	Ditch	RB	W	STW	U	JAR/SJAR	6	140	MC1-C2
					М		D				
							В				
33	3301		Topsoil	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	5	35	MC1-C2
				/ER	М						
33	3301		Topsoil	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR	1	6	MC1-C2
				/ER	М		В				
33	3301		Topsoil	LIA	W	SGW	R	DISH	1	4	MC1-C2
				/ER	М						
33	3301		Topsoil	LIA	W	SOW	D	JAR	1	6	LC1-C2
				/ER	М						
33	3301		Topsoil	LIA	HM	RW(Q)	U	SJAR	3	168	C1
				/ER			В				
33	3306	3307	Ditch	RB	W	LNV CC	U	JAR/BOWL	3	29	C3-C4
					М		В				
33	3306	3307	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	8	72	MC1-C4
					М						
33	3306	3307	Ditch	RB	W	STW	R	JAR	6	37	MC3-
					М		U				EC5
							В				
33	3306	3307	Ditch	RB	W	LNV WH	U	MORT	1	5	MC2-C4
					М						
33	3306	3307	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	FLAG	3	13	MC1-C3
					М						
33	3306	3307	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	В	DISH	1	7	MC1-C2
					М						
33	3306	3307	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	1	MC1-C2
					М						
33	3308	3309	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	R	JAR	1	8	MC1-C2
				/ER	М						
33	3310	3311	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR	2	4	MC1-C2
				/ER	М						
33	3310	3311	Ditch	LIA	HM	RW(Q)	U	JAR/BOWL	4	10	C1
				/ER							
33	3310	3311	Ditch	LIA	HM	RW(FLINT)	U	SJAR	2	9	C1BC-
				/ER							ADC1
Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyton, Huntingdonshire. An Archaeological Evaluation  $\mbox{\sc C}$  Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited, September 2019

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
33	3310	3311	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	R	FLAG	1	13	LC1-C2
					М						
33	3310	3311	Ditch	RB	W	GW(GROG	R	JAR/BOWL	9	93	MC1-
					М	)	U				E/MC2
33	3310	3311	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	R	JAR	5	26	LC1-C4
					М		U				
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	LNV CC	U	JAR	2	23	C3-C4
					М						
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	9	79	MC1-C4
					М		В				
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	LNV WH	U	MORT	2	87	MC2-C4
					М		В				
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	LNV WH	U	MORT	1	39	MC2-C4
					М						
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	HM	STW	U	SJAR	2	17	MC1-C4
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	STW	D	JAR	1	1	C2-C4
					М						
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	FLAG	2	14	MC1-C2
					М						
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	SREDW	U	FLAG/BEA	1	4	C2-C4
					М			К			
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	SCW	U	JAR	1	15	M/LC1
					М						
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	SJAR	1	8	C1-C2
					М						
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	FLAG	1	4	MC1-C2
					М						
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	HM	STW	U	SJAR	3	5	MC1-C4
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	1	MC1-C4
					М						
33	3312	3313	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	1	MC1-C4
					М						
33	3320	3321	Ditch	LIA	HM	RW(GROG	U	JAR/BOWL	1	1	C1
				/ER		)					
33	3324	3325	Pit	LIA	SW	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	4	E/MC1
				/ER							

Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyton, Huntingdonshire. An Archaeological Evaluation  $\mbox{\sc C}$  Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited, September 2019

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
33	3324	3325	Pit	LIA	HM	STW	D	SJAR	1	3	350BC+
				/ER							
33	3324	3325	Pit	LIA	HM	STW	U	SJAR	4	10	350BC+
				/ER			D				
							В				
33	3324	3325	Pit	LIA	HM	RW(CALC)	U	JAR/BOWL	11	18	350BC+
				/ER							
33	3329	3330	Ditch	LIA	W	SOW	U	JAR/FLAG	1	4	MC1-
				/ER	М		В				MC2
33	3329	3330	Ditch	LIA	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	1	E/MC1
				/ER	М						
33	3329	3330	Ditch	LIA	HM	RW(ORG)	U	JAR/BOWL	6	22	E/MC1
				/ER							
33	3329	3330	Ditch	LIA	HM	STW	R	JAR	1	4	C1
				/ER							
33	3329	3330	Ditch	LIA	HM	RW(ORG)	U	JAR/BOWL	3	10	E/MC1
				/ER							
33	3329	3330	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	4	MC1-C2
					М						
33	3329	3330	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	JAR/FLAG	1	1	MC1-C3
					М						
33	3331	3330	Ditch	LIA	HM	SGW(FLIN	U	JAR	2	30	E/MC1
				/ER		T)					
33	3331	3330	Ditch	LIA	HM	STW	U	JAR	1	1	E/MC1
				/ER							
33	3331	3330	Ditch	LIA	HM	SCW	U	JAR	3	9	M/LC1
				/ER							
33	3331	3330	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	R	JAR	1	86	MC1-C3
					М						
33	3331	3330	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	FLAG	1	1	MC1-C2
					М		D				
							В				
33	3331	3330	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	14	103	M/LC1-
					М		D				MC2
33	3331	3330	Ditch	RB	W	SOW	U	BEAK/FLA	3	8	MC1-C2
					М			G			

Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyton, Huntingdonshire. An Archaeological Evaluation  $\mbox{\sc C}$  Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited, September 2019

Trench	Context	Cut	Category	Era	HM	Fabric	D	Form	Count	Weight	Spot
					/W	Family	s			(g)	date
					М		с				
33	3332	3330	Ditch	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR	1	10	M/LC1-
					М		D				MC2
34	3401		Topsoil	RB	W	SGW	U	JAR/BOWL	1	3	MC1-C2
					М						
40	4004	4005	Pit	LIA	НМ	STW	U	SJAR	70	274	350BC+
				/ER			D				
							В				

Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyton, Huntingdonshire. An Archaeological Evaluation © Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited, September 2019

#### 16 **APPENDIX 4: OASIS FORM**

#### OASIS ID: preconst1-367485

# Project

#### details

of

Project	Land	at	RAF	Wyton,	Sawtry	Way,	Wyton,
name	Huntin	gdo	nshire.	An Archa	aeologica	al Evalu	ation

Short The archaeological evaluation was carried out description following a program of Historic Desk Based the Assessment, non-intrusive Aerial Photo survey project and Geophysical Survey. The evaluation identified an area of Late Iron Age to Roman settlement activity comprising pits and ditches concentrated near the centre of the proposed development site in Trenches 26, 27, 33 and 34. Historic aviation features at RAF Wyton shown on the Geophysical Survey and historic photographs were investigated at length. These included a WWI chalk landing circle and laid cinder taxi ways, foundations for WWI-II barracks/hutting at the northern perimeter of the site, and a grass landing strip with runway lighting dating to c.1941. The lighting system accompanying the grass runway is currently thought to be a unique survival and may be of regional importance for aviation archaeology.

Project dates	Start: 15-07-2019 End: 31-07-2019
Previous/future work	Not known / Not known
Any associated project reference codes	ECB5927 - Sitecode

Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Monument type	DITCH Late Prehistoric
Monument type	DITCH Roman
Monument type	PIT Late Prehistoric
Monument type	PIT Roman
Monument type	AIRFIELD Modern
Significant Finds	POT Late Prehistoric
Significant Finds	POT Roman
Significant Finds	BEAD Roman
Methods & techniques	"Targeted Trenches"
Development type	Urban residential (e.g. flats, houses, etc.)
Prompt	In support of planning application
Position in the planning process	Pre-application
Project location	
Country	England
Site location	CAMBRIDGESHIRE HUNTINGDONSHIRE HOUGHTON AND WYTON RAF Wyton
Study area	400000 Square metres
Site coordinates	TL 28205 75009 52.357728313937 - 0.117187663421 52 21 27 N 000 07 01 W Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 26m Max: 26m

## Project creators

Name Organisati	of on	PCA Central		
Project originator	brief	Cambridge HET		
Project originator	design	Simon Carlyle		
Project director/ma	anager	Christiane Meckseper		
Project su	pervisor	Alexander Pullen		
Type sponsor/fu body	of Inding	Developer		
Project ar	chives			
•				
Physical recipient	Archive	Cambridgeshire Archaeology Store	County	Council
Physical recipient Physical C	Archive Contents	Cambridgeshire Archaeology Store "Animal Bones","Ceramics","E	County Environmental	Council ","Metal"
Physical recipient Physical C Digital recipient	Archive Contents Archive	Cambridgeshire Archaeology Store "Animal Bones","Ceramics","E Cambridgeshire Archaeological Archiv	County Environmental County e Facility	Council ","Metal" Council
Physical recipient Physical C Digital recipient Digital Cor	Archive Contents Archive	Cambridgeshire Archaeology Store "Animal Bones","Ceramics","E Cambridgeshire Archaeological Archiv	County Environmental County e Facility	Council ","Metal" Council
Physical recipient Physical C Digital recipient Digital Cor Digital available	Archive Contents Archive ntents Media	Cambridgeshire Archaeology Store "Animal Bones","Ceramics","E Cambridgeshire Archaeological Archiv "Survey" "Database","Survey"	County Environmental County e Facility	Council ","Metal" Council
Physical recipient Physical C Digital recipient Digital Cor Digital available Paper recipient	Archive Contents Archive ntents Media Archive	Cambridgeshire Archaeology Store "Animal Bones","Ceramics","E Cambridgeshire Archaeological Archiv "Survey" "Database","Survey" Cambridgeshire Archaeological Archiv	County Environmental County e Facility County e Facility	Council ","Metal" Council

## Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey document/m	literature nanuscript)	(unpublished		
Title	Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyto Huntingdonshire. An Archaeologic Evaluation © Pre-Construct Archaeolog Limited, September 2019				
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Pullen, A. G				
Date	2019				
Issuer or publisher	Pre-Constru	ct Archaeology	/		
Place of issue or publication	Pampisford				
Description	a4 grey liter	ature			
Entered by	Alexander construct.cc	Pullen m)	(agpullen@pre-		
Entered on	18 Septemb	er 2019			

## 17 APPENDIX 5: BRIEF FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION. RAF WYTON NW END OF RUNWAY By Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team. Kasia

Gdaniec



#### **BRIEF FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION** Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team

Site:RAF Wyton, NW end of runwayPlanning Application:pre-applicationCompany:ENGIE Services Ltd

Location: NGR TL 2820 7500

This design brief is only valid for six months after the date of issue. After this period the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team (CHET) should be contacted. Any specifications resulting from this brief will only be considered for the same period. <u>Please note that this document</u> is written for archaeological project managers to facilitate the production of an archaeological specification of work; the term project manager is used to denote the archaeological project manager only.

The project manager is strongly advised to visit the site before completing their specification, as there may be implications for accurately costing the project. Historic environment data from the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER) is attached to this brief, but further contact with the CHER for specific information is recommended. Any response to this brief should follow CIfA Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations, 2014.

# NO FIELDWORK MAY COMMENCE UNTIL WRITTEN APPROVAL OF A SPECIFICATION HAS BEEN ISSUED BY THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT TEAM

#### 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 1.1 RAF Wyton is located on Wyton Hill 5km to the north-east of the historic core of Huntingdon, 3km to the north of the River Great Ouse at an approximate elevation of 40mAOD on Boulder Clay (Diamicton) over Oxford Clay.
- 1.2 The airfield was first developed for training pilots by the Royal Flying Corps in 1916, developing as a bomber base during WW2. The Pathfinder Force, created in 1942, disbanded 1945, chose RAF Wyton for its Headquarters, initially with five squadrons flying Stirlings, Halifaxes, Lancasters and Wellingtons. In 1953 the first Photographic Reconnaissance Units occupied the airfield, joined by anti-submarine warfare reconnaissance Nimrods in 1975. After merging with RAF Brampton in 1994, RAF Wyton reformed as an individual RAF station on 2012.
- 1.3 Hangars and other structures were located opposite former Hungry Hall Cottages against the boundary of Old Hurst Road (A141) for the WW1 training ground and an Electricity Works developed on the south-west side of the proposal area prior to the establishment of airfield in the late 1930s. Aspects of military land use are to be expected from the physical examination of this area. This office holds no information on unexploded ordnance or crash sites within the airfield.
- 1.4 Archaeological evidence is fairly poorly known in this area owing to very little archaeological engagement, though scattered evidence of artefacts and cropmarked enclosures are known from the east end of the airfield and (eg MCB19691, 19682). These are undated but morphologically resemble Late Iron Age to Roman farmsteads. A round house gully and ditches (MCB18221) were found to the south of the proposed development area during redevelopment for residential use within the airfield in 2008 (ECB3012).
- 1.5 The results of a CHER search are attached in map and pdf report format. Due to the large amount of data included in the area, this data can also be supplied in a GIS format (MapInfo



TAB. or ESRI ArcGIS shapefile SHP.) at no further cost. If you would like to receive this data, please complete and return the attached GIS licence form (stating the responsible officer and which GIS format you require) to the CHER either by email or post; email and address details are included on the form.

Reproduction of spatial data by any other means is not recommended.

#### 2.0 DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

- 2.1 The proposed development is broadly for:
  - 710 residential units made up of later living, affordable, MOD and private rented housing.
  - Various commercial spaces including restaurant, GP, pharmacy, public house, tech park and live/work units.
  - Extra care facility with 138 bedrooms.
- 2.2 Due to the unknown archaeological potential of the site the applicant is advised to provide information concerning the potential impact of the proposal on archaeological remains. In order to provide this information an archaeological evaluation of the site is necessary. This design brief sets out the requirements for the adequate archaeological evaluation of the site.
- 2.3 The evaluation should include a suitable level of documentary research, including further consultation with information held in the CHER as necessary, to set the results in their geographical, topographical, archaeological and historical context.
- 2.4 The required scheme shall include a field evaluation of the application area.

#### **Non-intrusive methods**

- 2.5 These surveys are required in order to inform planning decisions regarding the impacts of construction upon potential archaeological remains and to determine if there will be a need to conduct a physical evaluation by trenching before the submission of a planning application.
- 2.6 The project manager must arrange, through a suitably qualified specialist, the reassessment and re-plotting of available aerial photographic evidence at a scale of 1:2500. This reassessment should also involve the study of cropmarks lying outside the development, where a clear relationship exists. **Hard and digital copy of the air photograph evidence should be supplied with the report for inclusion in the CHER (see 5.6 below).**
- 2.7 The project manager should consult a suitably qualified geophysical specialist, to assess the viability of various survey techniques on the site. Such work must be preceded by a sample scan to assess the effectiveness of the technique in relation to the site-specific geological/topographical conditions. Survey methods must be recommended by the specialist and presented in a specification of works and submitted to CHET prior to commencement. Any subsequent survey work must be recommended by the specialist and communicated to CHET. A hard and digital (pdf) copy of the geophysical survey report should be supplied to the CHER (see 5.6 below), and arrangements made to upload the report to OASIS.
- 2.8 An Unexploded Ordnance survey should be conducted in advance of archaeological work to inform on potentially hazardous areas. Liaison with relevant RAF Wyton personnel to assist with such surveys and to acquire further information about dangerous areas within the airfield is advised.

#### Intrusive methods

2.9 The evaluation should include a programme of linear trial trenching, or test-pitting in confined areas, to adequately sample the development area. The following sample percentage is provided as a guide: 3% with 75m contingency for judgemental trench use, should this prove



necessary in the field. Archaeological features within the trenches will be sufficiently excavated to conform to section 3.0 below.

NOTE: the timing of the physical evaluation will depend on the results of the nonintrusive survey. Should significant site remains be found through the above methods, trenching to ground truth and date the evidence will be required prior to the submission of any planning applications. If archaeological remains are not apparent or clear, or appear to be of a lower level of significance, trenching can occur as a condition of planning consent. This will be confirmed after the receipt of non-intrusive survey results.

- 2.10 The artefact contents of the ploughsoil and any lower soil horizons should be examined as part of the evaluation and the field data quantified and spatially illustrated within the report. If the field conditions are not conducive for fieldwalking, a bucket sampling or test pit programme should be conducted, whereby 90 litres of spoil is hand sorted for each soil horizon encountered. Bucket sampling points should occur at each end of trenches that are less than 50m in length, or at trench ends and mid-point of 50m and longer trenches. Unstratified artefacts should be sought and recovered from trench spoil heaps.
- 2.11 The use of metal detectors on site to aid the recovery of artefacts is required. The detector should not be set to discriminate against iron.
- 2.12 All features must be investigated and recorded unless otherwise agreed with CHET. Investigation slots through all linear features must be **no less than 1m in width**. Discrete features must be half-sectioned or excavated in quadrants where they are large or found to be deep. The use of a hand held auger (or a power auger where appropriate) is recommended to gain information from very deep deposits/features and should be available in the staff tool kit. Machine assistance may be required for very large/deep features and should be shown as a contingency arrangement in the Written Scheme of Investigation.
- 2.13 The photographic record must consist of high-quality digital uninterpolated images of at least 10 megapixels taken using a camera with an APS-C or larger sensor. Graduated metric scales of appropriate lengths should be used, ensuring the use of vertical scales used against deep sections in combination with horizontal scales. Digital photographs intended for archive purposes must comply with best practice available at the current time i.e. high quality non-proprietary raw files (DNG) or TIFF images. The incorporation of clear digital images within ensuing reports, to augment the drawn record, is expected.

#### 3.0 OBJECTIVES

#### **Character and Significance**

- 3.1 The evaluation should aim to determine, the location, extent, date, character, condition, significance and quality of any surviving archaeological remains liable to be threatened by the proposed development. An adequate representative sample of all areas where archaeological remains are potentially threatened should be studied.
- 3.2 The evaluation results will be used to:a) determine the character, date, condition and significance of the archaeological resource,b) define the nature and extent of any mitigation works that may be required.
- 3.3 Should a scheme of detailed work be required to mitigate construction impacts on archaeological remains identified during this evaluation, the scheme will be outlined in a further design brief for archaeological investigation.

#### **Environment, Economy and Industry**

3.4 Particular study of the following should occur:



- i. presence/absence of palaeosols and old land surface soils/deposits,
- ii. the character of deposits and their contents within negative features
- iii. palaeochannels
- iv. site formation processes generally.
- 3.5 Buried soils and associated deposits should be inspected on site by a suitably qualified geoarchaeologist whose advice should be sought as to whether soil micromorphology or other analytical techniques will enhance understanding of depositional processes and transformations at the site. If so, suitable samples should be taken from relevant deposits or features for assessment and inclusion in the report.
- 3.6 The assessment of the potential to inform on the general environmental and dietary evidence of the inhabitants of the site through examination of suitable deposits must also be arranged with a suitably qualified specialist. Attention should be paid to:
  - i. the retrieval of charred plant macro & microfossils, faunal remains and land molluscs from former dry-land palaeosols and cut features,
  - ii. the retrieval of plant macro & microfossils, insect, faunal remains, molluscs, pollen and other biological remains from waterlogged deposits located;
  - iii. provision for the absolute dating of critical contacts should be made: *eg* the basal contacts of peats over former dryland surfaces; distinct landuse or landmark change in urban contexts.
- 3.7 The evaluation should also carefully consider the retrieval, characterisation and dating (including absolute dating) of artefact, burial or economic evidence to assist in the characterisation of the site's evidence and in the development of future mitigation strategies.
- 3.8 The assessment of environmental & economic potential should follow advice in these and other guidance documents:

- Historic England, 2011, *Environmental Archaeology*: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods, from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation (second edition).

- Historic England, 2014, Animal Bones and Archaeology: Guidelines for Best Practice.

- Historic England, 2015, Geoarchaeology: Using earth sciences to understand the archaeological record

- Historic England, 2004, **Human Bones from Archaeological Sites** A guideline for best practice for producing human osteological assessments and analytical reports

3.9 The Project Manager & field team are also advised to consult the following guidance documents in order to provide an adequate strategy for the excavation, field treatment and conservation of any delicate organic materials:

Historic England, 2012, *Waterlogged Organic Artefacts:* Guidelines on Their Recovery, Analysis and Conservation;

Historic England, 2010, *Waterlogged Wood:* Guidelines on the Recovery, Sampling, Conservation and Curation of Waterlogged Wood.

Historic England, 2008, *Investigative Conservation*: Guidance on How the Detailed Examination of Artefacts from Archaeological Sites Can Shed Light on Their Manufacture and Use;

Reference to other specialist investigation and assessment methodologies for artefact studies should also occur.

3.10 The project manager must ensure that the results of palaeoenvironmental investigation, industrial residue assessments/analyses & scientific analyses are included in a full evaluation report and sent to the Historic England Science Advisor.

#### 4.0 **REQUIREMENTS**

4.1 The evaluation must be undertaken by an archaeological team of recognised competence, fully experienced in work of this character and formally acknowledged by the CHET officers,



advisors to the Local Planning Authority (LPA). Inclusion in the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Register of Archaeological Organisations is recommended. Details, including the name, qualifications and experience, of the site director and all other key project personnel (including specialist staff) will be communicated to CHET within a specification of works, or Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), which must be prepared by the archaeological contractor undertaking the programme. The specification must conform to the guidance in Historic England's MoRPHE publication (*Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment, Historic England, 2006, reissued 2015*). This specification must:

- i. be supported by a research design which sets out the site specific objectives of the archaeological works.
- ii. detail the proposed works as precisely as is reasonably possible, indicating clearly on plan their location and extent.
- iii. provide a timetable for the proposed works including a "safety" margin in the event of bad weather or any other unforeseen circumstances that may effect this timetabling.
- 4.2 All aspects of the evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with
  - Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' *Code of Conduct*
  - Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations (CIfA 2014),
  - Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England (EAA Occasional Paper 14).
    - *Research and Archaeology Revisited: a revised framework for the East of England* (EAA Occ. Paper No 24, 2011), to define research objectives.
- 4.3 Care must be taken in dealing with **human remains** and the appropriate guidance issued by the Ministry of Justice should be followed. Environmental health regulations must also be followed. The CHET officer must be informed immediately upon discovery of human remains. If found during an evaluation, the human remains can be left *in situ*, covered and protected when discovered, depending on the site circumstances and depths of cover soils. Where the reburial of revealed human remains would be considered detrimental to their survival, arrangements for their immediate excavation should be made to establish the date, condition and character of the burial. If removal is essential an exhumation licence should be requested from the MoJ.
- 4.4 Project Managers are reminded of the need to comply with the requirements of the **Treasure Act 1996** (with subsequent amendments). Advice and guidance on compliance with Treasure Act issues can be obtained from the Finds Liaison Office of the Portable Antiquities Scheme at the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team office. Any finds that could be considered treasure under the terms of the Act made during the process of fieldwork **should be immediately reported** to the Finds Liaison Officer, so that it is properly reported to the appropriate Coroner within 14 days of discovery in line with the Treasure Act<sup>1</sup>.
- 4.5 Care must be taken in the siting of offices and other support structures in order to minimise impact on the environment. Extreme care must also be taken in the structure and maintenance of spoil heaps for the same reasons and to facilitate a high quality reinstatement. This is particularly important in relation to pastureland.
- 4.6 The archaeological project manager must satisfy themselves that all constraints to groundworks have been identified, including the siting of live services, Tree Preservation Orders and public footpaths. The CHET officers bear no responsibility for the inclusion or exclusion of such information within this brief.
- 4.7 Before commencing work the project manager must carry out a risk assessment and liaise with the site owner, client and CHET in ensuring that all potential risks are minimised. A copy of this must be given to CHET before the commencement of works.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Please see <u>http://finds.org.uk/treasure</u> for further information.



#### 5.0 **REPORTS**

- 5.1 The evaluation report should include a comprehensive assessment of the regional context and present well described, illustrated (including site and artefact/deposit photos) and tabulated archaeological evidence. It should highlight any relevant research objectives published in themed national and regional research frameworks.
- 5.2 The evaluation report should refer to the CHER evidence submitted with the brief.
- 5.3 The evaluation should provide a predictive model of surviving archaeological remains detailing zones of relative importance against known development proposals. Constraints to the evaluation should be clearly shown and explained. An impact assessment should also be provided.
- 5.4 If any areas of analysis from Section 3 (above) are not considered appropriate for inclusion the report will detail justification for their exclusion.
- 5.5 A digital copy of the report, clearly marked DRAFT, should be prepared and presented to CHET within four weeks of the completion of site works unless there are reasonable grounds for more time. This report should conform to the format contained within the document HET Evaluation report guidance 2016 dealing with the production of archaeological evaluation reports. Copies can be obtained from the address below. CIfA *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation* (2014) Annex 2.
- 5.6 CHET supports the national project: Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS III) project and requires archaeological contractors working in Cambridgeshire to support this initiative. In order that a record is made of all archaeological events within the county occurring through the planning system, the archaeological contractor is required to input details of this project online at the OASIS website<sup>2</sup>: The OASIS reference ID and completed Data Collection Form should be clearly presented in the relevant report. Any report that does not contain this information will not be approved.
- 5.7 Following acceptance, one copy of the approved evaluation report in digital form should be submitted to the CHER via the OASIS website <u>https://oasis.ac.uk/form</u> within two weeks of approval.
  <u>Note</u>: Project Managers must ensure that sub-contracted specialist reports are uploaded at this time (e.g. geophysics and AP reports, geoarchaeological assessment reports).

#### 6.0 ARCHIVE

- 6.1 The site archive specification should conform to the guidelines in MoRPHE (HE 2015), eg section 2.5.3, and the paper and material archive be deposited within the County Council's Archaeological Archive Storage Facility Deep Store on completion of the evaluation programme or following any publication of the evaluation results (see 6.4).
- 6.2 The site digital archive should be deposited with the Archaeological Data Service or another publicly accessible CoreTrustSeal certified repository on completion of the archaeological programme. <u>Note:</u> this will apply to all evaluations that go forward to a mitigation stage.
- 6.3 To assist with the creation and curation of the project's archive, the Project Manager must contact the CHER office to obtain an **Event number (ECB)** at the outset of the project. CHER use this number as a unique identifier linking all physical and digital components of the archive. The unique event number <u>must</u> be clearly indicated on any specification received for this project. It should be shown on all paperwork (context/photo/enviro

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> <u>http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis</u>



sample forms, lists and plans), and on finds bags and sample containers/bags created on site and later shown on ensuing reports and on the OASIS data collection form.

- 6.4 The Project Manager should consult *Deposition of archaeological archives in Cambridgeshire* 2017 regarding the requirements for the deposition of the archive into the County Council's Archaeological Archive Facility at this web link: <u>https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/libraries-leisure-&-</u> <u>culture/archaeology/archaeology-archives/</u>
- 6.5 Arrangements for the long term storage and deposition of all artefacts must be agreed with the landowner and CHET during the reporting stage. Transfer of Title (ownership) of the archive to Cambridgeshire County Council or another local, accredited and publicly accessible depository, needs to be arranged at this time and the arrangements should be indicated in the evaluation report. The archaeological organisation's Transfer of Title form should be signed by the landowner and the archaeological Project Manager and submitted to the CHET officer.
- 6.6 The current archive deposition cost is £75 per box (or minimum £50 per archive). This combined charge covers accessioning and uplift (£15) together with a fee to provide for the long term storage (£60). Further details of charges for the use of the County Archive Facility can be found in Section 5 of the guidelines. Please note, these charges will be periodically reviewed to remain compliant with Deep Store's charging schedule.

#### 7.0 MONITORING & COMMUNICATING CHANGES

- 7.1 CHET officers are responsible for monitoring all archaeological work within Cambridgeshire and will need to inspect site works at an appropriate time during the fieldwork, and review the progress of excavation reports and/or archive preparation. A monitoring visit must be booked with CHET prior to works commencing on site.
- 7.2 Trenches should not be backfilled without the approval of CHET. Further trenching or deposit testing may be a requirement of the site monitoring visit if unclear archaeological remains or geomorphological features present difficulties of interpretation, or to assist with the formulation of a mitigation strategy. Appropriate provision should be made for this eventuality. The project manager must inform CHET in writing **at least one week in advance** of the proposed start date for the project.
- 7.3 Any changes to the specifications that the project manager may wish to make after approval by this office should be communicated directly to CHET for approval.
- 7.4 CHET should be kept regularly informed about developments both during the site works and subsequent post-excavation work.
- 7.5 The archaeological advisory and planning role of Cambridgeshire County Council's Historic Environment Team should be acknowledged in any report or publication generated by this project.

As part of our desire to provide a quality service to all our clients we would welcome any comments you may have on the content or presentation of this design brief. Please address them to the author at the address below.

Kasia Gdaniec

Historic Environment Team Environment & Commercial Services Cambridgeshire County Council SH1011 Shire Hall Cambridge, CB3 0AP If you require this data in a GIS format (at no extra charge), please complete the form on the following page and return to the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record either by email or post. Our email and postal address details are listed on page overleaf.



## Terms and Conditions for the Reproduction and Use of Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record digital data

## Agreement

Cambridgeshire County Council agree to grant a non-exclusive licence to: (organisation or individual)

for the reproduction and use of information supplied from the digital database known as the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record and associated aerial photographic mapping (hereafter referred to as CHER).

## Conditions

- a) No adaptation, alteration or manipulation of the CHER digital dataset is permitted without prior agreement.
- b) This permission applies to the use of the information supplied for 12 months from the date of the licence. The start date of the licence is accepted to be the date you receive the CHER information as pdf documents.
- c) The permission is restricted to the licensee and cannot be assigned, transferred or sub-licenced without the prior written permission of Cambridgeshire County Council.
- d) The copyright of the CHER digital data should be acknowledged to Cambridgeshire County Council whenever they are reproduced.

## **Uses and Updates**

- a) The CHER information is supplied to assist the licensee with the provision of their services. It is supplied for guidance only, and is not the definitive dataset.
- b) The definitive dataset is held by CHER, and any disputes will be resolved using this dataset.
- c) Licensees are requested to supply updated or new CHER information to the definitive dataset for addition to the main record.
- d) Where applicable an update of the CHER will be supplied six months into the licence period. This will take the form of a complete dataset. Upon receipt, the previous dataset is to be deleted.
- e) Upon the expiry of the licence, all supplied data is to be deleted and supply media returned to CHER. If the licence is renewed an updated dataset will be provided.

## Breach

Failure to comply with any of the terms and conditions of this permission will be constructed as a material breach of these terms and conditions and will result in immediate termination of the licence, and the requirement to immediately return the dataset.

#### Disclaimer

CHER aims to provide an accurate data service. However, we cannot be held responsible for the accuracy of the CHER information, nor for decisions made following interpretation of the information supplied.

#### Address

Email: <u>arch.her@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</u>

Postal:

Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record Growth and Economy Box CC 1011 Shire Hall Cambridge CB3 0AP

If you have any queries, please contact us either by email or by phone.

Telephone: 01223 728569/728592/703533

# 18 APPENDIX 6: LAND AT RAF WYTON (NORTHWESTERN AREA) CAMBRIDGESHIRE. WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

By Pre-Construct Archaeology. Simon Carlyle

LAND AT RAF WYTON (NORTHWESTERN AREA) CAMBRIDGESHIRE

WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY: HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CHER EVENT NO: ECB5927

**JULY 2019** 

AMENDED 10TH JULY 2019







PRE-CONSTRUCT ARCHAEOLOGY

Land at RAF Wyton, Cambridgeshire: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation © Pre-Construct Archaeology

## Land at RAF Wyton (Northwestern Area), Cambridgeshire: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation

Local Planning Authority:	Huntingdonshire District Council
Planning Reference:	Pre-application
Central National Grid Reference:	TL (5)28205 (2)75009
Site Code:	ECB5927
CHER Event no:	ECB5927
Written and researched by:	Simon Carlyle
Project Manager:	Christiane Meckseper
Commissioning Client:	ENGIE Services Ltd
Contractor:	Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd Central Office
	The Granary Rectory Farm
	Brewery Road
	Pampisford
	Cambridgeshire
	CB22 3EN
Tel:	01223 492274
E-mail:	scarlyle@pre-construct.com
Website:	www.pre-construct.com

#### © Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd

#### July 2019

The material contained herein is and remains the sole property of Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd and is not for publication to third parties without prior consent. Whilst every effort has been made to provide detailed and accurate information, Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd cannot be held responsible for errors or inaccuracies herein contained.

## CONTENTS

CO	NTENTS	2
1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	SITE BACKGROUND	5
4	METHODOLOGY	9
5	ACCESS AND SAFETY	. 14
6	TIMETABLE AND STAFFING	. 15
7	REPORTING	. 16
8	OWNERSHIP OF FINDS, STORAGE AND CURATION OF ARCHIVE	. 17
9	INSURANCE	. 18
10	BIBLIOGRAPHY	. 19
AP	PENDIX A: FINDS, ENVIROMENTAL AND OTHER SPECIALIST SERVICES.	. 23

## FIGURES

- Fig. 1 Site location, 1:25,000
- Fig. 2 Trench location plan, 1:2,500

## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 ENGIE Services Ltd are proposing to submit a planning application to Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) for the residential development of a plot of land at RAF Wyton, Cambridgeshire (NGR: TL (5)28205 (2)75009; Fig. 1). The development will provide housing, a school and a community centre with associated access and landscaping.
- 1.2 Due to the archaeological potential of the site and in accordance with *National Planning Policy Framework*, paragraph 189 and 190 (DCLG 2018), Cambridgeshire County Council's Historic Environment Team (CHET) have advised HDC and the applicant that a programme of archaeological investigation should be carried out to inform the planning decision.
- 1.3 The scope of the programme of archaeological investigation has been outlined in a *Brief for Archaeological Evaluation* issued by CHET (CHET 2019). The first two stages of the evaluation consisted of a geophysical survey (Magnitude Surveys 2019) and a reassessment and re-plotting of available aerial photographs (Air Photo Services 2019). The results have been presented in the *Heritage Desk-Based Assessment* (HDBA) that has recently been prepared by PCA (PCA 2019) for inclusion as a chapter in the *Environmental Impact Assessment* (EIA) that is currently being prepared for submission to HDC.
- 1.4 ENGIE Services Ltd have commissioned Pre-Construct Archaeology (PCA) to undertake the next stage of the investigation, the archaeological evaluation of the site, which will consist of the excavation of 2495 linear metres of trial trench (equivalent to *c.* 2% of the accessible area of the proposed development site; Fig. 2).
- 1.5 This *Written Scheme of Investigation* (WSI) has been prepared by PCA with reference to the *Brief* (CHET 2019). This document represents a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the archaeological evaluation ONLY; this document alone will NOT result in the discharge of the archaeological condition. Once approved by CHET, all work relating to this project will be carried out in accordance with this WSI, in addition to those set out in *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England* (Gurney 2003) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' *Code of Conduct* (ClfA 2014a) and *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation*

(ClfA 2014b).

1.6 The project will be managed in accordance with the Historic England procedural document *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE): Project Manager's Guide* (HE 2015).

#### 2 SITE BACKGROUND

#### 2.1 Site location, topography and geology

- 2.1.1 The site is located at RAF Wyton, which lies approximately 2.6km north of the village of Wyton and *c*. 3.5km northeast of Huntingdon town centre (Fig. 1). It extends over approximately 34.9ha in the northwestern part of the airfield, to the north of the main runway and south of Old Hurst Road (A141). Its boundary encompasses part of a disused WW2 runway (currently being used as a plastic pipe storage area), with associated marshaling areas, taxiways and buildings. The areas between the airfield infrastructure are set to grass, which is closely maintained near the main runway but along the northwestern perimeter bordering Old Hurst Road is coarse and only occasionally cut. The total area accessible for trial trenching is 24.4ha in extent.
- 2.1.2 Topographically, the site is situated on flat ground at *c*. 26m above Ordnance Datum (aOD).
- 2.1.3 The geology within the site consists of Jurassic mudstone of the Oxford Clay Formation, overlain by superficial Quaternary deposits of the Oadby Member (diamicton–poorly sorted sand, clay and gravel of glacial origin; BGS 2019).

#### 2.2 Archaeological and historical background

- 2.2.1 The historical and archaeological background of the site has been presented in detail in the desk-based assessment prepared by PCA (PCA 2019). This concluded that apart from entries associated with the airfield there were no known designated assets within the site, although archaeological remains of prehistoric, Roman and medieval date were identified within the surrounding 1km study area. Geophysical and aerial photographic surveys did identify potential undesignated heritage assets within the application area (PCA 2019 see Appendices 3 & 4).
- 2.2.2 The following account, which is based on the results of the DBA (*ibid*.) and information from the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER) that was supplied with the *Brief* (CHET 2019) summarises the archaeology in the immediate vicinity of the site (HER numbers in parentheses).

#### Prehistoric (pre-AD 43)

- 2.2.3 Neolithic worked flints have been recovered as surface finds at locations 600m to the southwest (MCB2347) and 500m to the west of the site (MCB3509). Further worked flint and a Neolithic/Bronze Age barbed arrowhead (MCB3361) have been found 600m to the southwest.
- 2.2.4 Approximately 950m to the southeast of the site, a curvilinear ditch and associated features were identified by an evaluation and interpreted as a late prehistoric roundhouse, although no dating evidence was recovered to substantiate this (AOC 2008; MCB18221).
- 2.2.5 Undated cropmarks in the study area, predominately to the north, northwest and southwest of the site, probably date to the Iron Age or Roman periods (MCB17884, MCB20207, MCB21198, MCB23813, MCB25178 and MCB25179).

#### Roman (AD 43 to AD 410)

2.2.6 In the 19th century, Roman pottery was found at Broughton Lodge or Hungary Hill Farm, *c.* 200m to the north of the site (MCB3435). Sherds of Roman pottery have also been recovered from fields *c.* 1.0km to the north, in sufficient quantity to suggest it may be the site of a Roman settlement (MCB5194).

### Anglo-Saxon (AD 410 to 1066)

2.2.7 No remains dating to this period have been identified within the vicinity of the site.

### Medieval (1066 to 1485)

2.2.8 No remains dating to this period are recorded within the study area in the CHER, although the remains of medieval ridge and furrow ploughing were identified by the geophysical survey (Magnitude Surveys 2019), indicating that the area formed part of an open field system during this period.

#### Post-medieval and modern (1485 to present)

- 2.2.9 Cartographic evidence shows a number of post-medieval farms and farm buildings in the vicinity of the site that are no longer extant (MCB19693, MCB20548 MCB20549, MCB20551, MCB20552 and MCB21817).
- 2.2.10 The airfield at Wyton was established by the Royal Flying Corps as a training facility in 1916. It was closed and partially demolished in 1919, with part of the site continuing in use as a sanatorium. The remains of a previously unrecorded landing strip that probably dates to this period in the airfield's history was identified by the geophysical survey (Magnitude Surveys 2019, fig. 6).
- 2.2.11 The site was taken over by the RAF in 1939 as a bomber base and from 1942 was used for a pathfinder force. The remains of infrastructure associated with the WW2 airfield include pillboxes, air-raid shelters, a rare dome trainer for aerial gunners, a parachute drying tower, control tower and hangers. Other RAF buildings on the site include barracks, offices and technical buildings. Three 1940s Nissan huts, now demolished, formerly stood along the south of the airfield (CB15158).
- 2.2.12 In 1951 RAF Wyton was the Joint School for Aerial Photographic Interpretation and then in 2013 the Joint Force Intelligence Group was established there.

#### AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- 3.1 The aim of the evaluation will be to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site by trial trenching. This will be achieved through the identification, sample excavation and recording of any archaeological remains that may be encountered by the evaluation and determining their location, extent, date, character and state of preservation. The results of the evaluation will assist CHET in determining the nature and extent of any mitigation works that may be required. The project manager will ensure that the results of palaeoenvironmental investigation, industrial residue assessments/analyses & scientific analyses are included in a full evaluation report and sent to the Historic England Science Advisor.
- 3.2 Trial trenches have been positioned to investigate anomalies shown on the geophysical survey results and to test 'blank' areas to test the effectiveness of the geophysical survey technique. Trenches have been positioned in all currently available 'soft' areas. Existing concrete runways and dispersal pens will not be trenched.
- 3.3 Where appropriate, soil samples will be taken for assessment, primarily to establish the palaeoenvironmental potential of the site but also to gain an insight into the range of activities (i.e. domestic, industrial, agricultural) that were undertaken at the site in the past.
- 3.4 To determine their significance in a local, regional and national context (as appropriate), reference will be made to the East Anglian regional research agendas:
  - Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties: 1. Resource Assessment (Glazebrook 1997);
  - Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties: 2. Research Agenda and Strategy (Brown and Glazebrook 2000);
  - Regional Research Framework for the Eastern Region (Medlycott and Brown 2008);
  - Research and Archaeology Revisited: A Revised Framework for the East of England (Medlycott 2011).

## 4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 The evaluation will consist of the excavation of 39 trenches of various lengths at2.0m wide (see table below), the locations of which are shown in Figure 2.

Trench length	No. of	Trench nos.	Total length
(m)	trenches		(m)
30	3	2, 8,13	90
40	5	5, 6, 10, 26, 36	200
45	4	12, 14, 27, 31	180
50	9	1, 11, 15, 19, 20, 23, 30, 34, 37	450
55	2	17, 18, 38	165
60	1	25	60
65	1	24	65
70	6	4, 7, 9, 16, 39, 40	540
75	2	3, 22	150
80	2	28, 32	160
100	1	35	100
110	2	21, 33	220
115	1	29	115
Total	39		2495

- 4.2 Areas currently under concrete (e.g. the runways, dispersal bays etc.) will not be targeted by the current evaluation as these areas are not considered suitable for trenching at this stage. These areas can be considered for evaluation at a later stage if the results of the current evaluation show that they may contain significant archaeological remains. There may also be Health and Safety considerations, with the possibility of asbestos being present in the rubble underlying the concrete surfaces, so a ground investigation survey may be required before evaluation takes place.
- 4.3 There is a contingency for an additional 75m of trial trench, should this be required by CHET to clarify the nature and extent of any particular archaeological remains that may be revealed. All aspects of the investigation shall be conducted in

accordance with *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England* (Gurney 2003) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' *Code of Conduct (ClfA 2014a)* and *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation* (ClfA 2014b).

#### Survey and machine excavation

- 4.4 The trenches will be set out in accordance with the trench plan using Global Positioning System (GPS) equipment. Prior to machine excavation, the locations of each trench will be scanned with a CAT (Cable Avoidance Tool) and Genny to check for services; with the agreement of CHET, trenches may be moved to avoid any services that may be identified.
- 4.5 Using a tracked 360-degree excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket, the overburden will be removed in level spits down to the surface of the geological substrate or first significant archaeological horizon, whichever is encountered first. Topsoil and subsoil will be kept separate and stored in temporary bunds adjacent to each trench.
- 4.6 Exposed archaeological features and deposits will be cleaned using hand tools to define their boundaries and extent within the trenches. Limits and locations of all trenches, pre-excavation and post-excavation plans of archaeological features and heights above Ordnance Datum (m OD) will be recorded using GPS.
- 4.7 The trenches will only be backfilled with the agreement of CHET. The trenches will be simply backfilled, topsoil uppermost, and tracked in by the machine.

### Hand-excavation and recording

- 4.8 Field excavation techniques and recording methods are detailed in the PCA *Operations Manual I: Fieldwork Induction Manual* (Taylor and Brown 2009). All archaeological features and deposits will be sufficiently investigated to fulfil the project aims stated in Section 3 above.
- 4.9 Drawn records will be in the form of survey plans, drawn plans and section drawings of all excavated archaeological features at an appropriate scale (1:10, 1:20, 1:50), while all individual deposits and cuts will be recorded as written records on PCA *pro forma* context sheets.

Land at RAF Wyton, Cambridgeshire: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation © Pre-Construct Archaeology

- 4.10 Linear features will be investigated by means of slots excavated across their width and measuring at least 1m in length, positioned to avoid areas of intercutting/disturbance in order to provide uncontaminated finds assemblages. If stratigraphic relationships between features are not visible in plan, slots will also be positioned to determine inter-feature relationships, although care will be taken not to compromise the integrity of the archaeological record by excavating complex features or groups of features that would be better understood if they were investigated at the mitigation stage. Discrete features such as pits and postholes will be at least 50% excavated and when considered appropriate 100% excavated.
- 4.11 Appropriate photographs of the trenches and the archaeological remains encountered by the evaluation, supported by general photographs of the site, its setting and working shots, will be taken using high resolution digital cameras (minimum 10 megapixels).

#### **Environmental sampling**

- 4.12 Bulk soil samples will be taken, in consultation with the project's environmental specialist where practicable, in order to recover micro- and macro-biological environmental remains and other evidence for past domestic/industrial/economic activity from pre-20<sup>th</sup> century contexts. Particular interest will focus on the presence/absence of buried soil horizons, the character of deposits and their contents within negative features, palaeochannels and site formation processes. Samples will be up to 40 litres in volume, where obtainable. Environmental sampling will be carried out in accordance with *Environmental Archaeology: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation* (EH 2011) and paras 3.4 to 3.11 of the *Brief* (CHET 2019).
- 4.13 If buried soils are encountered, the advice of a suitably qualified geoarchaeologist will be sought as to whether soil micromorphology or other analytical techniques will enhance understanding of depositional processes and transformations at the site. If so, suitable samples should be taken from relevant deposits or features for assessment and inclusion in the report.
- 4.14 Finds from the topsoil and subsoil will be collected by hand-sorting through *c*. 90 litres of soil (a machine bucket's contents) from each deposit at either end of the trench and in the centre of trenches longer than 50m. Finds bags will be labeled so

that the location of the recovered material can be plotted and any spatial distribution patterns identified.

### Metal detecting and Treasure

- 4.15 The spoil heaps, the bases of the trenches (regardless of the presence of any archaeological remains) and the trench sides will be scanned with a metal detector by a competent detectorist to maximise the recovery of metal objects. The metal detector will not be set to discriminate against iron.
- 4.16 If any artefacts defined as 'Treasure' are found, they will be removed to a safe place and reported to the local coroner according to the procedures outlined in the *Treasure Act 1996* (as amended by the *Treasure Designation Order 2002* No. 2666). Where removal cannot be effected on the same working day as the discovery, suitable security measures will be taken to protect the finds from theft. Any finds that could be considered treasure under the terms of the Act made during the process of fieldwork will be immediately reported to the Finds Liaison Officer, so that it is properly reported to the appropriate Coroner within 14 days of discovery, in line with the Treasure Act.

#### Human remains

4.17 If human remains are encountered, CHET and the client will be informed immediately. No further excavation will take place unless removal becomes necessary and will only be carried out in accordance with all appropriate Environmental Health regulations and only after a Ministry of Justice license has been obtained. Excavation may be required where the remains are under imminent threat or dating/preservation information is required for costing purposes.

#### Monitoring

- 4.18 The project manager will inform CHET in writing at least one week in advance of the proposed start date for the project, allowing sufficient notice to arrange a monitoring meeting.
- 4.19 CHET officers are responsible for monitoring all archaeological work within Cambridgeshire and will need to inspect site works at an appropriate time during the fieldwork, and review the progress of excavation reports and/or archive preparation. A monitoring visit must be booked with CHET prior to works commencing on site.

PCA will keep CHET updated on any significant discoveries made during the fieldwork.

- 4.20 Trenches will not be backfilled without the approval of CHET. Further trenching or deposit testing may be a requirement of the site monitoring visit if unclear archaeological remains or geomorphological features present difficulties of interpretation, or to assist with the formulation of a mitigation strategy. Appropriate provision will be made for this eventuality.
- 4.21 Any changes to the specifications that the project manager may wish to make after approval by this office should be communicated directly to CHET for approval.
- 4.22 The archaeological advisory and planning role of Cambridgeshire County Council's Historic Environment Team will be acknowledged in any report or publication generated by this project.

## 5 ACCESS AND SAFETY

- 5.1 Permission to access to the site will be arranged by the client so that the field team can start work promptly on the first day of their arrival at site. It is expected that the site will be suitably clear of vegetation and other obstructions to allow the free movement of plant and the excavation of the trenches.
- 5.2 Welfare facilities will be provided by PCA for the use of their site staff, subcontractors and visitors.
- 5.3 All deep excavations (over *c*. 0.8m deep) will be secured with orange netlon fencing.
- 5.4 All relevant health and safety legislation, regulations and codes of practice will be respected. The Health and Safety policies will be those of PCA and will be in accordance with all statutory regulations. A site-specific *Risk Assessment and Method Statement* (RAMS) will be prepared before fieldwork commences and all staff will be briefed on the content of the RAMS at an induction that they will be required to attend on arrival.
- 5.5 There is a duty of care for the client to provide all information reasonably obtainable on contamination and the location of live services before site works commence.

### 6 TIMETABLE AND STAFFING

- 6.1 The project will be managed by Christiane Meckseper, Project Manager at PCA Cambridge, and the fieldwork will be directed by Sandy Pullen, PCA Senior Supervisor, assisted by up to five Site Assistants drawn from PCA's team of qualified and experienced staff, as required.
- 6.2 The duration of the evaluation is estimated at two weeks (not including backfilling). Working days are based on a 5-day working week, Monday to Friday, 8am–4pm.
- 6.3 The start date for the fieldwork has been provisionally arranged to start on Monday 15th July 2019, subject to approval of this document by CHET.
- 6.4 Where required, the following PCA specialists may be invited to advise on aspects of the project and contribute to the excavation report:

Berni Seddon-medieval pottery Chris Jarrett-medieval pottery Katie Anderson-Roman pottery Barry Bishop-worked flint Matt Brudenell-prehistoric pottery Kevin Haywood-CBM/stone Karen Deighton-animal bone Kate Turner-environmental remains

6.5 Other specialists may be consulted, depending on the types of artefacts recovered or the nature of the deposits encountered by the excavation. A full list of specialists currently used by PCA is presented in Appendix A. Illustrations will be prepared by the PCA Drawing Office.

## 7 REPORTING

- 7.1 Following completion of fieldwork, all artefacts and environmental samples will be processed, assessed, conserved and packaged in accordance with PCA guidelines. The MPRG's *Minimum Standards for the Processing, Recording, Analysis and Publication of Post-Roman Ceramics* (Slowikowski *et al* 2001) will be adhered to. Post-excavation tasks and report writing will take approximately four weeks to complete following the end of fieldwork. Specialists will be employed for consultation and analysis as necessary.
- 7.2 An illustrated report will be prepared to present the results of the fieldwork and the assessment of the artefacts and palaeoenvironmental samples. The report will include: a non-technical summary; an archaeological and historical background to the site, supported by relevant historical maps; a description of the methodology employed; plans and sections showing the location and extent of any archaeology encountered; a site narrative, with a discussion of the archaeological results; specialist reports; photographs supporting the text.
- 7.3 A digital copy of the report, clearly marked DRAFT, will be prepared and presented to CHET within four weeks of the completion of site works unless there are reasonable grounds for more time. A draft copy of the report will be provided to the client for comment prior to its submission to CHET. Once the draft report has been approved by CHET, a final copy and a digital copy (in pdf/A format) will be presented to CHET and the Cambridgeshire HER (CHER), on the understanding that it will become a public document after an appropriate period of time (generally not exceeding six months).
- 7.4 The unique event number for this project (**ECB5927**, the Event Number issued by CHER), will be clearly indicated on relevant ensuing reports and on the OASIS data collection form.
- 7.5 The minimum requirement will be for an appropriate note to be made available in the *Fieldwork in Cambridgeshire* section of the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*. This summary will be included in the project report, or submitted to CHET by the end of the calendar year in which the work takes place, whichever is soonest.

Land at RAF Wyton, Cambridgeshire: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation © Pre-Construct Archaeology

#### 8 OWNERSHIP OF FINDS, STORAGE AND CURATION OF ARCHIVE

- 8.1 The site will use the CHER Event Number as a unique identifier (**ECB5927**). This reference will be used to identify the archive (including finds, paper and digital archive). It will be cross-referenced with any reports and the OASIS data collection form.
- 8.2 The event number will be used to identify any resulting reports and will be added to the OASIS data collection form. Should the evaluation go forward to a mitigation stage, the site digital archive will be deposited with the Archaeological Data Service or another publicly accessible CoreTrustSeal certified repository on completion of the archaeological programme.
- 8.3 All artefactual material will be held in storage by PCA Central until ownership of all such archaeological finds are transferred, and the archive is deposited with the County Archaeological Archive Facility. The archive will be deposited in accordance with the requirements of *Deposition of Archaeological Archives in Cambridgeshire 2017*. Arrangements for the long-term storage and deposition of all artefacts will be agreed with the landowner and CHER before or during the reporting stage. Transfer of title and the transfer of the ownership of the archive to the County Archive Facility or another local registered depository will be arranged at this time, and the arrangements indicated in the evaluation report.
- 8.4 The project archive shall be compiled in accordance with the advice contained in *Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long Term Storage* (UKIC 1990) and *Standards in the Museum Care of Archaeological Collections* (Museum and Galleries Commission 1992).
- 8.5 A copy of the report will accompany the archive when it is deposited with the museum stores.
- 8.6 The CHER is registered with the Online Access to Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) project. PCA will provide appropriate details relating to this project by completing the OASIS form at http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis, in accordance with the guidelines provided by Historic England and the Archaeology Data Service.
# 9 INSURANCE

- 9.1 Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd is covered by is covered by the following insurances:
  - Professional Indemnity £5,000,000, Hiscox Insurance Company Limited, 9446188;
  - Public & Products Liability £10,000,000 Aviva & AIG, 24765101CHC/000133
    & 25035008;
  - Employers Liability £10,000,000 Aviva 24765101CHC/000133.

# 10 BIBLIOGRAPHY

AOC (AOC Archaeology Group) 2008 RAF Wyton, Cambridgeshire: An Archaeological Evaluation Report, report **7969** 

Brown, N and Glazebrook, J (eds.) 2000 Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 2. Research Agenda and Strategy, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper **8** 

CHET (Cambridgeshire County Council's Historic Environment Team) 2019 *Brief for Archaeological Evaluation: RAF Wyton, northwest end of runway,* dated 16th April 2019

ClfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2014a Code of Conduct

ClfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2014b Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation

DCLG (Department for Communities and Local Government) 2018 National Planning Policy Framework

Glazebrook, J (ed.) 1997 *Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 1. Resource Assessment,* East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper **3** 

Gurney, D 2003 Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper **24** 

HE (Historic England) 2015 Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide

Medlycott, M 2011 (ed.) Research and Archaeology Revisited: A revised framework for the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper **24** 

PCA (Pre-Construct Archaeology) 2019 Land at RAF Wyton, Sawtry Way, Wyton, Huntingdonshire: An Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment, Slowikowski et al. 2001 Minimum Standards for the Processing, Recording, Analysis and Publication of Post-Roman Ceramics

Taylor, G and Brown, J 2009 *Operations Manual I: Fieldwork Induction Manual*, unpublished PCA document

# **Online Sources**

BGS (British Geological Survey) 2019 www.bgs.ac.uk, accessed 14th June 2019



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2019 © Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2019 21/05/19 MR



<sup>10/07/19</sup> RS

# APPENDIX A: FINDS, ENVIROMENTAL AND OTHER SPECIALIST SERVICES

**Prehistoric Pottery:** Matt Brudenell, Sarah Percival, Adam Tinsley, Louise Rayner, Jon Cotton, Mike Seager Thomas

**Roman Pottery:** Katie Anderson, Jo Mills (samian), Gwladys Monteil (samian), Joanna Bird (decorated samian), Margaret Darling (North), Brenda Dickinson (samian stamps), Kay Hartley (mortaria), Kayt Marta Brown, David Williams (amphora)

**Post-Roman Pottery:** Chris Jarrett (in house), Berni Seddon (in house), Luke Barber (Sussex)

Clay Tobacco Pipe: Chris Jarrett (in house)

CBM: Berni Seddon (in house), Kevin Hayward (in house) ,Su Pringle, Ian Betts

Stone & Petrological Analysis: Kevin Hayward (in house), Mark Samuel (moulded stone)

**Glass:** John Shepherd, Medieval and Post-medieval Glass, Hugh Wilmott, Medieval Window Glass, Jill Channer

Coins: James Gerrard (in house), Mike Hammerson

Inscriptions & Graffiti: Roger Tomlin

Animal Bone: Kevin Rielly (in house), Philip Armitage, Robin Bendrey

Lithics (inc Palaeolithic): Barry Bishop

Osteology: Aileen Tierney (in house)

Timber: Damian Goodburn, Nigel Nayling (Wales),

Leather: Quita Mould

**Small Finds:** Ruth Beveridge (prehistoric- post Roman) Marit Gaimster (post Roman) (in house), James Gerrard (Roman)(in house), Hilary Major (Roman), Ian Riddler (esp worked bone)

Metal slag: Lynne Keys, David Starley

Textiles: Penelope Walton Rogers

Conservation: Karen Barker, Stefanie White (Colchester Museums), Emma Hogarth

(Colchester Museums)

Dendrochronology: lan Tyers

Archaeomagnetic dating: Mark Noel

Environmental: Val Fryer, QUEST, University of Reading

Documentary Research: Guy Thompson (in house), Chris Phillpotts, Frederick Hamond

(NI), Gillian Draper, Jeremy Haslam, Roger Leech

Industrial Archaeology: David Cranstone

**Finds Illustration:** Cate Davies (in house), Helen Davies (in house), Mark Roughley (in house)

# PCA

### PCA CAMBRIDGE

THE GRANARY, RECTORY FARM BREWERY ROAD, PAMPISFORD CAMBRIDGESHIRE CB22 3EN t: 01223 845 522 e: cambridge@pre-construct.com

### **PCA DURHAM**

UNIT 19A, TURSDALE BUSINESS PARK TURSDALE DURHAM DH6 5PG t: 0191 377 1111 e: durham@pre-construct.com

## PCA LONDON

UNIT 54, BROCKLEY CROSS BUSINESS CENTRE 96 ENDWELL ROAD, BROCKLEY LONDON SE4 2PD t: 020 7732 3925 e: london@pre-construct.com

### PCA NEWARK

OFFICE 8, ROEWOOD COURTYARD WINKBURN, NEWARK NOTTINGHAMSHIRE NG22 8PG t: 01636 370410 e: newark@pre-construct.com

### **PCA NORWICH**

QUARRY WORKS, DEREHAM ROAD HONINGHAM NORWICH NR9 5AP T: 01223 845522 e: cambridge@pre-construct.com

### **PCA WARWICK**

UNIT 9, THE MILL, MILL LANE LITTLE SHREWLEY, WARWICK WARWICKSHIRE CV35 7HN t: 01926 485490 e: warwick@pre-construct.com

### PCA WINCHESTER

5 RED DEER COURT, ELM ROAD WINCHESTER HAMPSHIRE SO22 5LX t: 01962 849 549 e: winchester@pre-construct.com

