


AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION ON
BECKLANDS LANE, ROECLIFFE,
NEAR BOROUGHBIDGE,
NORTH YORKSHIRE

APRIL 2011



PRE-CONSTRUCT ARCHAEOLOGY

**An Archaeological Evaluation on Becklands Lane, Roecliffe,
near Boroughbridge, North Yorkshire**

Central National Grid Reference: SE 3850 6572

Site Code: RBO 11

Commissioning Client (on behalf of Reed Bordall):

**Prospect Archaeology Limited
Prospect House
Garden Lane
Sherburn-in-Elmet
North Yorkshire
LS25 6AT**



Tel: 01977 681 885

Contractor:

**Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited
Northern Office
Unit N19a Tursdale Business Park
Durham
DH6 5PG**



Tel: 0191 377 1111

**© Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited
April 2011**

This report is protected by copyright. The report and the information contained herein are and remain the sole property of Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited and are provided on a single site multi-user basis. If provided in paper form, the report may be utilised by a number of individuals within a location, but copying is prohibited under copyright. If provided in an electronic form the report may be utilised in a shared server environment, but copying or installation onto more than one computer is prohibited under copyright, and printing from electronic form is permitted for own, single location, use only. Multiple printing from electronic form for onward distribution is prohibited under copyright. Further distribution and uses of the report in its entirety or part thereof in electronic form is prohibited without prior consent from Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited.

Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited has made every effort to ensure the accuracy of the content of this report. However Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited cannot accept any liability in respect of, or resulting from, errors, inaccuracies, or omissions herein contained.

CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
1. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	1
2. INTRODUCTION	3
3. PROJECT AIMS AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	11
4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY	12
5. RESULTS: THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SEQUENCE	15
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28
7. REFERENCES	30
8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND CREDITS	31

List of Figures

Figure 1	Site Location	4
Figure 2	Detailed Site and Trench Location Plan	5
Figure 3	Plans and Sections from Trenches 11-13, 15, 17 and 18	20
Figure 4	Sections across Features in Trenches 11-13, 15, 17 and 18	21
Figure 5	Sections from Trenches 1-10, 14, 16 and 19	22
Figure 6	All Archaeological Features Plan	23
Figure 7	Trench 11; gully [11.9] and gully [11.7] (<i>photograph</i>)	24
Figure 8	Trench 12; ditch [12.6] (<i>photograph</i>)	24
Figure 9	Trench 12; gully [12.10] (<i>photograph</i>)	25
Figure 10	Trench 13; ditch [13.4] (<i>photograph</i>)	25
Figure 11	Trench 17; ditches [17.8] and [17.14] (<i>photograph</i>)	26
Figure 12	Trench 17; ditch [17.12] (<i>photograph</i>)	26
Figure 13	Trench 17; gully [17.6] (<i>photograph</i>)	27
Figure 14	Trench 18; ditch [18.8] (<i>photograph</i>)	27

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Stratigraphic Matrices
Appendix B	Context Index
Appendix C	Assessment of Ceramic Material

1. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.1 An archaeological evaluation was undertaken in February-March 2011 by Pre-Construct Archaeology at land off Becklands Lane, Roecliffe, North Yorkshire. It was undertaken pre-determination of a planning application for the proposed development of the site as a cold storage facility. The work was commissioned by Prospect Archaeology on behalf of the developer, Reed Boardall.
- 1.2 The site lies to the east of the A1(M) between the village of Roecliffe and the historic market town of Boroughbridge in the Harrogate district of North Yorkshire. Its central National Grid Reference is SE 3850 6572. The site comprises three open pasture fields, bounded to the north by a grassland/woodland area that was formerly Roecliffe Brick and Tile Works, to the west by the line of a dismantled railway and to the south and east by an unmade lane, Becklands Lane.
- 1.3 The main archaeological interest of the site stems from known prehistoric and Roman activity in the vicinity, as established by a desk-based assessment undertaken in 2010. An alignment of prehistoric standing stones - the Devil's Arrows - lies within 1km to the north-east of the site. The Roman tribal town and fort at Aldborough (*Isurium Brigantum*) lay less than 2km to the east, beyond the line of the Roman road Dere Street. In the 1990s, an early Roman fort and settlement was discovered in the vicinity of Roecliffe village, this to the west of Dere Street and only c. 600m to the north of the site. A geophysical survey conducted in 2010 detected several potential archaeological features at the site.
- 1.4 In broad terms, the evaluation aimed to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development site. The trenches were sited either to investigate geophysical anomalies potentially indicative of sub-surface archaeological remains or as 'judgement' trenches. A particular area of interest was the eastern part of Area 2 where the geophysical survey had identified anomalies that appeared to represent a number of archaeological features.
- 1.5 The evaluation comprised 19 machine-excavated trenches (Trenches 1-19), each measuring c. 50m x 2m, with the exception of Trench 19 which measured c. 40m x 2m. Trenches 1-8 were located within the western field (Area 1), Trenches 9-18 were located within the larger of two eastern fields (Area 2) and Trench 19 was located in a smaller strip field (Area 3) to the south of Area 2. The surfaces of Areas 2 and 3 displayed pronounced ridge and furrow earthworks.
- 1.6 The natural sub-stratum was the basal deposit encountered within all 19 trenches. In each case this was stiff, variously coloured clay representing the glaciolacustrine material which is known to form the superficial geology of the site. It was encountered at an average depth of 0.25m below present ground level and generally fell away across the site from south to north.
- 1.7 Trenches 11, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18 all recorded archaeological features of possible late prehistoric, but more probably early Roman, date. Probable boundary ditches were recorded in Trenches 12, 13 and 18, while Trench 17 contained four such features, two of which were intercutting and thus indicative of boundary re-definition. One of the features in Trench 17 produced three abraded sherds of probable early Roman pottery, while a shallow ditch in Trench 13 yielded a fragment of possible Roman roof tile and another ditch in Trench 17 contained a worked flint, probably residual in context but underlining the potential for prehistoric activity at the site.

- 1.8 In terms of location, the majority of the more substantial archaeological features corresponded closely with geophysical anomalies that the evaluation was designed to test. Trenches 11, 12 and 17 contained narrow gullies probably indicative of former structures and potentially being the remains of either wall foundation trenches or eaves drip gullies, while Trenches 11 and 18 contained probable postholes, also suggestive of ancient structural remains.
- 1.9 Evidence of medieval agricultural activity – in the form of broad linear furrows - was recorded in all 19 trenches. These features are derived from the ridge and furrow agricultural system typical of the medieval period and which is manifest on surface of Areas 2 and 3 in particular. Topsoil and its developed turf line formed the existing ground surface at each trench location.
- 1.10 In summary, the evaluation identified archaeological remains of significance within the southern portion of Area 2. The remains are most probably of early Roman date and likely form part of the overall picture of Roman period activity in the Dere Street corridor at Aldborough. The evaluation did not record any archaeological remains of note in the northern part of Area 2, in the whole of Area 1 and in the portion of Area 3 that was investigated.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 General Background


- 2.1.1 This report details the methodology and results of an archaeological evaluation undertaken by Pre-Construct Archaeology (PCA) 22 February - 8 March 2011 on land off Becklands Lane, Roecliffe, North Yorkshire (Figure 1). The work was commissioned on behalf of the developer, Reed Boardall (the Client), by their archaeological consultant, Prospect Archaeology.
- 2.1.2 The evaluation was undertaken pre-determination of a planning application for the proposed development of the site to extend an existing Reed Boardall facility situated to the immediate east. An archaeological desk-based assessment was undertaken in June 2010 by Prospect Archaeology and this established that the site had high potential for archaeological remains.¹ A geophysical survey undertaken in July 2010 by GSB Propection identified anomalies potentially indicative of sub-surface archaeological features.²
- 2.1.3 The site was considered to have archaeological potential for remains of the prehistoric and Roman periods in particular. Prehistoric standing stones - the Devil's Arrows – lie to the north-east, this monument part of a wider prehistoric complex concentrated around the River Ure. Extensive Roman period settlement is known in the wider vicinity of the site, including the Roman tribal town and fort at Aldborough, less than 2km to the east, and a Roman fort and settlement in the vicinity of Roecliffe village, only c. 600m to the north. These lay either side of the Roman road Dere Street. In addition, crossing the site is the projected line of another Roman road, running from the south-west up to Aldborough.
- 2.1.4 A Project Design for the evaluation was prepared by PCA to comprise the 'written scheme of investigation' required as part of the planning process.³ The Project Design followed the format set out in *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE)*.⁴
- 2.1.5 The evaluation comprised 19 machine-excavated archaeological trial trenches located in order to target either potential archaeological remains identified by the geophysical survey or as 'judgment' trenches to assess the archaeological potential of areas where no geophysical anomalies were identified (Figure 2). Approximately 2% of the site area was sampled by the evaluation trenches.
- 2.1.6 The Site Archive (Site Code: RBO 11) is currently held at the Northern Office of PCA and the retained element, comprising the written, drawn and photographic records, as well as a small assemblage of artefactual material, will be deposited at the appropriate museum. The Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) reference number for the project is: preconst1-98249.

¹ Prospect Archaeology Limited 2010.

² GSB Propection Limited 2010.

³ PCA 2011.

⁴ English Heritage 2006.



© Crown copyright 20???. All rights reserved. License number 36110309
 © Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2011

Figure 1
 Site Location
 1:20,000 at A4



Figure 2
 Detailed Site and Trench Location Plan
 1:2,000 at A4

2.2 Site Location and Description

- 2.2.1 The site lies to the east of the A1(M) between the village of Roecliffe and the historic market town of Boroughbridge in the Harrogate district of North Yorkshire, centred at National Grid Reference SE 3850 6572 (Figure 1).
- 2.2.2 The site measures c. 380m east-west by c. 210m north-south, covering an area of c. 9 hectares. It is bounded to the north by a grassland/woodland area which contains water-filled former clay pits representing extraction areas of the former Roecliffe Brick and Tile Works - this being a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC). It is bounded to the west by the line of a dismantled railway, beyond which lies a larger grassland/woodland area also with former clay pits, to the east by an unmade lane, Becklands Lane, beyond which is an existing Reed Boardall cold storage facility accessed from Becklands Close, and to the south by a continuation of Becklands Lane, beyond which lie open arable fields (Figure 2).
- 2.2.3 The site currently comprises three roughly rectangular pasture fields: a western field (hereafter Area 1, as designated during the geophysical survey); a main eastern field (Area 2) and a smaller eastern strip field (Area 3) to the south of Area 2. The three fields are divided by mature hedgerows. Access is via Becklands Lane, either from the north off Bar Lane, the minor road leading into Roecliffe village, or from the south via Thorn's Lane, which runs off Bar Lane at the eastern edge of Roecliffe.
- 2.2.4 At the time of the evaluation, the grassed surfaces of Areas 2 and 3 were notable for ridge and furrow earthworks, with the features in Area 3 being particularly pronounced.

2.3 Geology and Topography

- 2.3.1 The solid geology of the area in which the site lies comprises the Sherwood Sandstone Group with the drift geology of the site formed by glaciolacustrine clay and silt.⁵
- 2.3.2 The site lies in a roughly triangular area of generally flat land below c. 30m OD formed by the meandering courses of the Rivers Ure and Tutt, to the north and south, respectively, with the rivers meeting to the east at Boroughbridge.
- 2.3.3 At the site itself, ground level varies between c. 19m OD and c. 22m OD, with the highest part being the central eastern portion of Area 2 and the lowest part (c. 19.20m OD) being the north-western part of the same area. The surface of Area 1 lay at c. 21m OD to c. 21.75m OD. As previously mentioned, Areas 2 and 3 were notable for ridge and furrow earthworks running ENE-WSW, with the features in Area 3 being particularly pronounced. Area 1 had only very subtle west-east aligned ridge and furrow earthworks.

2.4 Planning Background

- 2.4.1 The proposed development of the site involves construction of additional cold storage facilities to extend the concerns of the Client. The archaeological evaluation was undertaken pre-determination of a planning application.

⁵ Website of *The British Geological Survey*.

- 2.4.2 The requirement to undertake the archaeological investigation is in line with planning policy at a national level, as set out in *Planning Policy Statement 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment'* (PPS5)⁶ and the associated *Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide* (HEPPG),⁷ the practical guide to implementing PPS5. In broad terms, PPS5 provides guidance on the treatment of archaeological remains within the planning process. While it is recognised that important remains should be retained, the benefits of development may be considered to outweigh the benefits of retention, especially where remains of less than national importance are concerned.
- 2.4.3 Through the implementation of PPS5, the Historic Environment Team (HET) of the Countryside Service of North Yorkshire County Council seeks to prevent the unnecessary loss of archaeological remains through development, and does so by provision of information and advice to the seven District Councils – including in this instance, Harrogate Borough Council (HBC) - and North Yorkshire County Council. Former policies in the *Harrogate District Local Plan* (adopted 2001, altered 2004) relating to development affecting archaeological sites and archaeological investigation were not 'saved', beyond September 2007. Therefore, until HBC approves and adopts its Local Development Framework (LDF), PPS5 provides the relevant planning guidance relating to archaeology. HBC is now preparing a *Sites & Policies Development Plan Document* (DPD) which, together with a *Core Strategy DPD*, will form key components of the LDF and replace the Local Plan.⁸ The *Sites & Policies DPD* is scheduled for adoption in late 2012 and at the time of writing it is intended that it will include 'Policy EQ6: Conservation of the Historic Environment'.
- 2.4.4 Policy 'HE6' of PPS5 advises local planning authorities to require applicants to provide early consideration of the potential for 'heritage assets' (those parts of the historic environment that have significance because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest) on their sites, a description of the significance of those heritage assets and an assessment of the potential impact of the proposed development on the significance of those heritage assets. In this instance, the aforementioned DBA provided the required baseline assessment of potential. Policy 'HE6' also advises that where initial research is insufficient to properly assess the archaeological interest, a field evaluation will be required. The aforementioned geophysical survey constituted the first stage of such a programme of field evaluation, with the trial trenching herein described comprising the second stage.
- 2.4.5 In sum, therefore, the archaeological evaluation was required, as part of the planning process, to inform the Local Planning Authority, the County Council HET, the Client and their archaeological consultant, Prospect Archaeology, regarding the character, date, extent and degree of survival of archaeological remains at the site. The aim was to provide results which should inform a decision by the County Council HET regarding further archaeological mitigation measures.

⁶ Department of Communities and Local Government 2010.

⁷ Department of Communities and Local Government, English Heritage and Department for Culture Media and Sport, 2010.

⁸ Website of *Harrogate Borough Council*.

2.5 Archaeological and Historical Background

(Information in this section is largely extracted from the Prospect Archaeology DBA and the research and writing of those responsible is acknowledged. Supplementary information has been added from various sources. North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record entry numbers are distinguished by the MNY prefix).

- 2.5.1 There is clear evidence of Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age activity in the vicinity of the site in the form of the prehistoric standing stones alignment known as the Devil's Arrows, a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM No. 28221, 'Stone alignment west of Boroughbridge known as the Devil's Arrows, including three standing stones and the setting for a fourth'). The SAM entry describes the monument as a stone alignment 174m long, dating from the Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age.
- 2.5.2 The Devil's Arrows includes three of the largest stones of any such alignment in Britain, with the southernmost stone, at 6.90m high, being the second tallest standing stone in Britain. This particular monument is rare as one of the few examples of a stone alignment in a lowland setting. The stones however should not be viewed in isolation, rather they form part of a wider prehistoric complex concentrated around the River Ure at the southern edge of a ritual landscape which includes henge monuments and round barrows extending several kilometres to the north.
- 2.5.3 Numerous ring ditches (MNY 195113-19516) have been identified from air photographic evidence immediately south of the village of Roecliffe. While these remains are essentially undated, they suggest the type of features that are often found to date to the Bronze Age, and are most likely the ditches that encircled burial mounds in that era.
- 2.5.4 Extensive field systems of Iron Age to Roman date (MNY 259235) were identified during work undertaken in advance of the widening of the A1(M) in the vicinity of the site. It is suspected that further such remains extend further afield from those already recorded, including one known to lie in the site itself (MNY 19525). The site lies within what was the tribal territory of the Brigantes, the largest of the pre-Roman tribal groups. The tribe is well attested in the historical record and Aldborough, on the eastern periphery of Boroughbridge, was the site of one of their major settlements, later adopted by the Romans as the tribal capital.
- 2.5.5 In sum, the potential for prehistoric remains at the site was considered medium, with any such remains potentially being of regional importance.
- 2.5.6 The Roman tribal town and fort at Aldborough (*Isurium Brigantum*) lay c. 1.7km to the east of the site. Even closer, and perhaps of more relevance, is the site of an early Roman fort and settlement discovered in the vicinity of Roecliffe village in the 1990s, this only c. 600m to the north of the site. The fort and its associated settlement area is scheduled (SAM No. 29533, 'Site of Roman fort and settlement 400m north of Brickyard Farm'). Dating from the Roman invasion of northern Britain in the AD 70s, it was quickly abandoned in the late 80s when the new fort and then town were established at Aldborough. Its location suggests that it may have been placed to guard the strategically important crossing of the River Ure. The fort at Aldborough probably coincided with construction of the Dere Street Roman road, the line of which is now closely followed by the A1(M).

- 2.5.7 The area around Aldborough was seemingly heavily settled throughout the Roman period. A trackway, hearth and group of cremation burials of Roman date were found on the eastern side of the A1(M) during the aforementioned upgrade works. Numerous roads criss-crossed the landscape during the Roman period, and one of these, leading from Hampsthwaite to Aldborough, is projected to cross the site. Finds of coins (MNY 196468) and a gold torc (MNY 19474) in the area add to the overall picture of intensive Roman period activity in the Dere Street corridor at Aldborough.
- 2.5.8 In sum, the potential for Roman remains was considered high locally, with the strong possibility of a Roman road crossing the site. Remains of the road would likely be of local importance while associated activity, such as roadside settlement, industrial premises or burials, could be of regional importance.
- 2.5.9 The place name for Boroughbridge ('new burg (town) bridge') is derived from the 11th century river crossing constructed on the orders of William the Conqueror. A stone version of the original bridge was built between 1322 and 1582 and in turn this was replaced in the 18th century, this version being the extant structure. Roecliffe village also has medieval origins, being recorded from 1170 and with a medieval chapel recorded there. The name means 'red bank' (MNY 19511).
- 2.5.10 The extant field systems around Roecliffe village retain many ancient boundaries and upstanding ridge and furrow earthworks survive across the landscape, with ancient strip fields suggested by many of the long, narrow fields which extend from ancient roads and lanes and the core of the village. Within the site itself, there is good survival of ridge and furrow aligned roughly SW-NE in the eastern fields, with the southernmost strip field having particularly notable remains of this type.
- 2.5.11 The site probably continued in agricultural use throughout the post-medieval period. The earliest map in the DBA dates from 1765 (a survey to record land in Roecliffe belonging to Sir Thomas Tancred Bart) and this gives a clear indication of the layout of the ancient field system around Roecliffe. The eastern part of the site encompassed the entirety of two fields, the larger 'Trunnelslets Flat' to the south and a strip field 'Littletrunnelslets Flat' to the north. The south-western part of the site took in the easternmost portion part of a large field, 'Middlemoor Flat' and the north-western part took in the eastern end of another strip field, 'Neithermoor Flat'. Enclosure of the parish took place by Act of Parliament in 1841 and a map depicting the effects shows the site with the current boundaries in place (but with the western field sub-divided) and Becklands Lane skirting the site. This arrangement became fixed and, with the exception of the loss of the sub-division of the western field, the site has remained unchanged until the present day.
- 2.5.12 By the mid 19th century, Roecliffe Brick and Tile Works was in place to the north of the site, as depicted on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map of 1855. By 1893 the works occupied the whole of the area between the site and road between Roecliffe and Boroughbridge. The construction of a railway in the second half of the 19th century split the works, with the rump to the east of the line and just an abandoned clay pit to the west. The works continued to develop into the 20th century, necessitating renewed extraction of clay to the west of the railway line; a tramway ran under the railway line to allow access the newly expanded clay pits.

- 2.5.13 The DBA suggested that reduced ground levels in the northernmost portion of the site could indicate that clay extraction actually extended onto the site. By 1964 the clay pits were worked out and the works closed down. The site of the former works is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, with the clay pits now freshwater lakes. The course of the dismantled railway line forms the western boundary of the site which is the subject of the investigation described herein.
- 2.5.14 In sum, apart from the extant ridge and furrow earthworks, the potential for medieval and post-medieval archaeological remains at the site was considered generally low with any such remains being of local importance at best. The ridge and furrow earthworks are of local importance.
- 2.5.15 The aforementioned geophysical survey, undertaken in July 210, detected several ditch-like anomalies in the eastern part of Area 2, possibly representing two or more phases of activity. The alignment of one of these (anomaly 'D') is that which might be expected for the aforementioned Roman road which is projected to cross the site, running between Hampsthwaite (a village to the west of Knaresborough) and Aldborough. In the western part of Area 2 another linear response (anomaly 'E') was recorded, less clear than those to the east, but potentially another archaeological feature, this running on a NNE-SSW alignment. Ridge and furrow was recorded in Area 2 and the results indicated that Area 1 was particularly well-served with field drains. Numerous weak trends in all three areas were interpreted as probable modern agricultural activity, although natural or archaeological causes were not ruled out by the geophysicists.

3. PROJECT AIMS AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Aims

3.1.1 The project is 'threat-led' with potential to disturb or destroy important sub-surface archaeological remains, if present. Therefore, the broad aim of the project was to inform the Local Planning Authority, advised by the County Council HET, the Client and their archaeological consultant, regarding the character, date, extent and degree of survival of archaeological remains at the site.

3.1.2 With the results of the July 2010 geophysical survey available, archaeological trial trenching was selected as the next most appropriate investigative tool to test the archaeological potential of the site.

3.1.3 Additional aims of the project were:

- to compile a Site Archive consisting of all site and project documentary and photographic records, as well as all artefactual and palaeoenvironmental material recovered;
- to compile a report that contains an assessment of the nature and significance of all data categories, stratigraphic, artefactual, *etc.*

3.2 Research Objectives

3.2.1 The project was considered to have good potential to make a significant contribution to existing archaeological knowledge of the Boroughbridge area of North Yorkshire in general.

3.2.2 The 2010 geophysical survey identified specific areas of likely archaeological interest at the site, although the results did not appear to indicate intensive archaeological activity at the site nor did they suggest that the site contains widespread archaeological remains. Most notable amongst the geophysical survey results was a cluster of ditch-like anomalies in the eastern part of Area 2, possibly representing two or more phases of activity. The alignment of one of these (anomaly 'D') is that which might be expected for the aforementioned Roman road to Aldborough. In the western part of the same field another linear response (anomaly 'E') was recorded, less clear than those to the east, but potentially another linear feature running on a NNE-SSW alignment. Therefore, as described above, the evaluation specifically aimed to target these geophysical anomalies to establish whether or not they represent archaeological features.

3.2.3 In sum, the proposed archaeological work has the following site-specific objectives:

- to test the geophysical anomalies which are most likely indicative of buried archaeological remains;
- to establish the presence or absence of prehistoric and Roman activity and, where such remains are identified, to more clearly define the date and nature of the activity;
- to establish the palaeoenvironmental context of any prehistoric or Roman activity;
- to provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological mitigation strategy.

4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

4.1 Fieldwork

4.1.1 The evaluation fieldwork was undertaken 28 February-8 March 2011. All fieldwork was undertaken in accordance with the relevant standard and guidance document of the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA).⁹ PCA is an IfA-Registered Organisation. The evaluation was undertaken according to the aforementioned PCA Project Design which should be consulted for full details of methodologies employed regarding archaeological excavation, recording and sampling.

4.1.2 Nineteen trenches (Trenches 1-19), each measuring c. 50m by 2m, with the exception of Trench 19 which measured c. 40m by 2m, were located across the site on variable alignments and sited to target either potential archaeological features identified by geophysical survey (anomalies 'A-E') or as 'judgment' trenches to test areas where no geophysical anomalies were identified. Approximately 2% sample of the total site area was thus sampled.

4.1.3 A summary of the rationale for the evaluation trenching in each field is set out below:

Western field (Area 1)

- Trench 1 - judgement trench/geophysical anomaly 'trend'
- Trench 2 - judgement trench/geophysical anomaly 'trend'
- Trench 3 - judgement trench/geophysical anomaly 'trend'
- Trench 4 - judgement trench/geophysical anomaly 'trend'
- Trench 5 - judgement trench/geophysical anomaly 'trend'
- Trench 6 - judgement trench/geophysical anomaly 'trend'
- Trench 7 - judgement trench/geophysical anomaly 'trend'
- Trench 8 - judgement trench/geophysical anomaly 'trend'

Main eastern field (Area 2)

- Trench 9 - geophysical anomaly 'E', northern extent
- Trench 10 - geophysical anomaly 'E', central part
- Trench 11 - geophysical anomaly 'E', southern part
- Trench 12 – 'strong trend' continuation of geophysical anomaly 'D'
- Trench 13 - judgement trench/geophysical anomaly 'trend'
- Trench 14 – 'strong trend' continuation of geophysical anomaly 'B'
- Trench 15 – 'strong trend' continuation of geophysical anomaly 'B'
- Trench 16 – judgement trench

⁹ IfA 2008a.

- Trench 17 - geophysical anomalies 'B', 'C' and 'D'
- Trench 18 –geophysical anomaly 'D', south-west extent

Smaller eastern field (Area 3)

- Trench 19 – 'ferrous' geophysical anomaly/cross-section ridge and furrow

- 4.1.4 All trenches were set-out by PCA using a Leica Viva Smart Rover Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS), with pre-programmed co-ordinate data determined by an office-based CAD Technician. The Smart Rover GNSS provides correct Ordnance Survey co-ordinates in real time, to an accuracy of 1cm.
- 4.1.5 All trenches were mechanically-excavated by a 13-tonne 360° tracked machine with toothless ditching bucket under archaeological supervision. The trenches were excavated to the top of the first significant archaeological horizon, or the clearly defined top of the natural sub-stratum, whichever was reached first. All potential archaeological features were identified and marked at the time of machine clearance of overburden.
- 4.1.6 Hand cleaning was undertaken in trenches where archaeological features were identified. All potential features were subject to partial or complete excavation within the trenches with photography and archaeological recording taking place at appropriate stages in the process. All trenches were recorded to some degree, irrespective of whether or not they contained archaeological features.
- 4.1.7 Temporary Bench Marks were established across the site using the Smart Rover GNSS instrument. The height of all principal strata and features were calculated relative to Ordnance Datum and indicated on the appropriate plans and sections.

4.2 Post-excavation

- 4.2.1 The stratigraphic data generated by the project is represented by the written, drawn and photographic records. A total of 109 archaeological contexts were defined in the 19 trenches (Appendix B). Post-excavation work involved checking and collating site records, grouping contexts and phasing the stratigraphic data (Appendix A). A written summary of the archaeological sequence was then compiled, as described below in Section 5.
- 4.2.2 The artefactual material from the evaluation comprised a small assemblage of pottery, ceramic building material and flint. Specialist examination of the artefactual material was undertaken and relevant comments integrated into Section 5, with a report on the ceramic material included as Appendix C. No other categories of organic or inorganic artefactual material were represented. None of the material recovered during the evaluation required specialist stabilisation or an assessment of its potential for conservation research.
- 4.2.3 The palaeoenvironmental sampling strategy of the project was to recover bulk samples where appropriate, from well-dated stratified deposits covering the main periods or phases of occupation and the range of feature types represented, with specific reference to the objectives of the evaluation. To this end, no appropriate deposits were encountered. No other biological material was recovered.

4.2.4 The complete Site Archive will be packaged for long term curation. In preparing the Site Archive for deposition, all relevant standards and guidelines documents referenced in the Archaeological Archives Forum guidelines document¹⁰ will be adhered to, in particular a well-established United Kingdom Institute for Conservation (UKIC) document¹¹ and a recent IfA publication.¹² The depositional requirements of the body to which the Site Archive will be ultimately transferred – Harrogate Museums and Arts - will be met in full.

¹⁰ Brown 2007.

¹¹ Walker, UKIC 1990.

¹² IfA 2008b.

5. RESULTS: THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SEQUENCE

During the evaluation, separate stratigraphic entities were assigned unique and individual 'context' numbers, which are indicated in the following text as, for example [123]. The archaeological sequence is described by placing stratigraphic sequences within broad phases, assigned on a site-wide basis in this case. An attempt has been made to add interpretation to the data, and correlate these phases with recognised historical and geological periods.

5.1 Phase 1: Natural Sub-stratum (Figures 3, 5 and 7-14)

5.1.1 Phase 1 represents natural geological material exposed within the base of each of the 19 trenches. This generally comprised firm clay with few inclusions, ranging in colour from mid yellowish brown or brownish yellow ([1.2] Trench 1; [2.2] Trench 2; [5.2] Trench 5; [6.2] Trench 6; [7.2] Trench 7; [8.2] Trench 8; [9.2] Trench 9; [10.2] Trench 10; [11.3] Trench 11; [13.2] Trench 13; [16.4] Trench 16; [17.4] Trench 17; [18.4] Trench 18; [19.2] Trench 19) to mid greyish brown or brownish yellow ([3.2] Trench 3) to mid greyish yellow ([12.4] Trench 12) to mid yellowish pink ([14.2] Trench 14) to variable colours of pinkish brown, yellowish brown and orange brown ([4.2] Trench 4; [15.2] Trench 15).

5.1.2 The maximum height record on natural clay was 21.96m OD, this in Trench 17 within the south-eastern portion of Area 2, while the minimum recorded height (on the upper interface of the deposit) was 19.62m OD, this in the north-west extent of Trench 9 within the north-western corner of Area 2. These values reflect the natural topography of the site, with a gradual slope down from south-east to north-west.

5.1.3 The depth at which natural clay was encountered below existing ground level varied across the site, ranging from a minimum of 0.20m in Trenches 10, 12 and 16, all in Area 2, to a maximum of 0.30m in Trench 6, this in Area 1, with the average depth being c. 0.25m.

5.2 Phase 2: Probable Roman and Undated (Figures 3, 4, 6 and 7-14)

5.2.1 Phase 2 represents possible late prehistoric, but more probably Roman period activity, along with several undated but potentially related features, all recorded in the southern half of Area 2 (Trenches 11, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18).

5.2.2 Trench 11 was located in the south-western part of Area 2 to test part of NNE-SSW aligned geophysical anomaly 'E'. To this end, no archaeological features were recorded to account for the anomaly, which may have been caused by the underlying geology. However, a group of four features was recorded in the western part of the trench, all cut into the natural clay sub-stratum, and comprising two similarly NE-SW aligned linear features, [11.7] and [11.9], and two oval discrete features, [11.5] and [11.11]. The maximum height recorded on any of these features was 21.14m OD.

- 5.2.3 Linear feature [11.7] measured at least 1.68m in length, with a rounded terminal to the north-east and continuing to the south-west beyond the limit of excavation. It was 0.25m wide and up to 0.15m deep. Towards the south-western limit of excavation the feature appeared to begin to curve to the south. Parallel to this, and located immediately to the north-west, was linear feature [11.7], which measured c. 2.50m in length, with rounded terminals to the north-east and south-west. It was 0.18m wide and up to 0.16m deep. The purposes of these features are uncertain, but both could represent wall construction trenches or eaves drip gullies associated with a structure of late prehistoric or Roman date.
- 5.2.4 Two sub-oval discrete features, [11.5] and [11.11], were recorded to the east and west, respectively, of the aforementioned linear features and both are interpreted as postholes. To the west, posthole [11.11] measured c. 0.70m in diameter and was 0.20m deep, while to the east, adjacent to the terminal of linear feature [11.7] was posthole [11.5], which measured 0.90m by 0.51m and was 0.10m deep. Both features are interpreted as potentially representing structural elements of late prehistoric or Roman date and they may have been contemporary with the adjacent linear features.
- 5.2.5 The fills of all four features recorded in Trench 11 comprised similar mid grey or mid bluish grey clayey silts, indicating natural silting-up rather than deliberate backfilling. Although no dateable artefactual material was recovered from any of these deposits, the form of the features and composition of the fills are considered to be broadly indicative of late prehistoric or Roman activity.
- 5.2.6 Trench 12 was positioned to test part of NE-SW aligned linear geophysical anomaly 'D'. To this end, a NE-SW aligned linear feature, [12.6], was recorded crossing the south-eastern portion of the trench and cut into the natural clay sub-stratum. This feature probably accounts for the anomaly and it has been interpreted as a boundary ditch. Recorded at a maximum height at 21.66m OD, it had a V-shaped profile with a flat base and was up to c. 2.0m wide and 0.89m deep. No dateable artefactual material was recovered from either its primary mid greyish brown fill, [12.11], or its secondary mid yellowish brown fill, [12.5]. The clayey silt composition and sterile nature of both deposits indicates that this feature had silted-up naturally. It is assumed that this ditch is a continuation of a similar feature, [17.8], recorded to the north-east, in Trench 17, which is also indicative of geophysical anomaly 'D' and produced some dating evidence to suggest that it dates from the late 1st to 2nd century AD date.
- 5.2.7 Within the central portion of Trench 12, parts of two linear features, [12.8] and [12.10], were recorded cutting into the natural clay sub-stratum, with a maximum recorded height of 21.51m OD. The more extensive feature of the two was a slightly curvilinear north-south aligned feature [12.10], recorded extending across the trench for a distance of c. 2.65m. It was up to 0.38m wide and 0.17m deep. Its mid brownish grey clayey silt fill, [12.9], yielded a small fragment of ceramic building material. Based on its slightly curvilinear form, this feature is interpreted as a possible eaves drip gully or wall construction trench associated with a structure of late prehistoric or more likely Roman date.

- 5.2.8 Approximately 2m to the north-east of gully [12.10] was a small portion of a shallow NE-SW aligned linear feature, [12.8]. The exposed portion was 0.80m in length, continuing to the north-east beyond the limit of excavation and with a rounded terminal to the south-west. It was 0.38m wide and just 70mm deep. Given the limited degree to which it was possible to expose this feature, it has been tentatively interpreted as the possible terminal of a drip gully associated with a structure. Its mid greyish brown clayey silt fill, [12.7], yielded no artefactual material. However, a probable Roman date is again surmised, based on the form of the feature and the composition of its fill.
- 5.2.9 Trench 13 was positioned in the south-western part of Area 2 to test a potential archaeological feature represented by a NW-SE aligned linear geophysical anomaly 'trend'. A linear feature, [13.4], interpreted as a probable ditch, was recorded on a NW-SE alignment towards the centre of the trench. Cut into the natural clay sub-stratum, it was recorded at a maximum height of 21.32m OD. It was up to 1.60m wide and 0.15m deep with a broad U-shaped profile. Its light greyish brown silty clay fill, [13.3], yielded two fragments of ceramic building material. The larger of these was a slightly curved fragment with wall thickness suggestive of a Roman imbrex rather than later curved tile. The smaller abraded fragment was similar to the fragment recovered from feature [12.9], as described above. A Roman date is surmised for this broad shallow ditch, probably a boundary feature.
- 5.2.10 Trench 15 was positioned in the central-eastern part of Area 2 to test a potential archaeological feature represented by linear WNW-ESE aligned geophysical anomaly 'B'. A shallow linear feature, [15.4], was recorded on this alignment, although probably lying further north than expected for anomaly 'B'. It was 0.70m wide and up to only 70mm deep with gently sloping sides and a flat base. Its mid greyish brown fill, [15.3], yielded no artefactual material. The feature is tentatively interpreted as the truncated remains of a ditch of possible Roman date. The similarity of alignment with the plough furrows in this trench (see Phase 3) is noteworthy and it may in fact have been associated with later agricultural activity.
- 5.2.11 Trench 17 was positioned in the south-eastern part of Area 2 to test a concentration of potential archaeological features represented by geophysical anomalies. Of note were three linear anomalies: 'B' aligned WNW-ESE; 'C' aligned NNE-SSW; 'D' aligned NE-SW, this with an intermittent sub-oval 'enclosure' anomaly on its south-east side. A group of variously aligned linear features was recorded in the central portion of Trench 17, all cutting into the natural clay sub-stratum and likely representing at least some of the geophysical anomalies. The maximum height recorded on any of these features was 21.78m OD.
- 5.2.12 The southernmost feature recorded in Trench 17 was a roughly east-west aligned linear feature, [17.10]. A length of c. 2.10m of the feature was exposed and it was 0.60m wide and 0.14m deep. It had been horizontally truncated by a plough furrow and it is considered probable that it was far more substantial in its original form. No dateable artefactual material was recovered from its single mid yellowish grey silty clay fill, [17.9]. However, given that this truncated ditch predates the aforementioned furrow, it is considered likely to be medieval or earlier in date, which is generally supported by the composition of its fill. In sum, the ditch is considered to be of probable Roman date and it likely represents the east-west aligned portion of the 'enclosure' anomaly on the south-east side of anomaly 'D' and thus may represent part of an enclosure ditch.


- 5.2.13 To the north of ditch [17.10] were intercutting ENE-WSW aligned linear features, [17.8] and [17.14], both interpreted as ditches. To the south was the earlier of the two features, ditch [17.14], which extended the full 1.80m width of the trench and was 0.73m wide and 0.36m deep. No dateable artefactual material was recovered from its single silty clay fill, [17.13], although it pre-dates the other feature, ditch [17.8], which is more certainly of Roman date.
- 5.2.14 Ditch [17.8] was similarly aligned, but was a more substantial feature, 1.90m wide by 0.76m deep. Three sherds of pottery, probably from the same late 1st to 2nd century AD vessel, were recovered from its single clayey silt fill, [17.7], broadly indicating that it was backfilled in the early Roman period. Ditch [17.8] had a similar profile to ditch [12.6] in Trench 12 and probably represents a continuation of the boundary delimited by that ditch, thus also being indicative of geophysical anomaly 'D'.
- 5.2.15 Located only c. 0.60m to the north of ditch [17.8] was a NW-SE aligned, slightly curvilinear feature, [17.6]. A length of c. 2.20m was exposed, continuing into the limit of excavation to the south-east and with a rounded terminal to the north-west. It was 0.30m wide and up to 0.19m deep. This feature is interpreted as part of an eaves drip gully or wall foundation trench possibly associated with a roundhouse structure. Its silty clay fill, [17.5], yielded no dating evidence.
- 5.2.16 A NNE-SSW aligned feature, [17.12], the northernmost feature recorded in Trench 17, has also been interpreted as a ditch. It measured at least 2.20m in length, crossing the full width of the trench, by up to c. 1.50m wide and was 0.40m deep, with a broad U-shaped profile. The feature appeared to narrow at its north-eastern extent, so a terminal potentially lay just beyond the limit of excavation. A single find of a partial flint blade was recovered from its single clayey silt fill, [17.11], suggesting a possible prehistoric date, although the object could be residual in context and the feature is perhaps more likely to be of Roman date. In terms of location, this feature corresponds reasonably closely with geophysical anomaly 'C', which was also likely manifest in Trench 18 as ditch [18.8], as described below.
- 5.2.17 Trench 18 was positioned to test NNE-SSW aligned linear geophysical anomaly 'C' and NE-SW aligned linear geophysical anomaly 'D'. To this end, no archaeological feature was identified in the north-western part of the trench evidence to account for anomaly 'D', although probable medieval plough furrows exposed in this part of the trench may have truncated the feature. As previously described, ditches [12.6] and [17.4], recorded in Trenches 12 and 17, respectively, likely represent anomaly 'D'. In the south-eastern half of Trench 18, a NNE-SSW aligned linear feature, [18.8], was recorded crossing the trench and cutting into the natural clay sub-stratum at a maximum height of 21.60m OD. This feature has also been interpreted as a ditch. It measured 1.04m wide and was 0.48m deep and had a flat-bottomed V-shaped profile. Although no artefactual material was recovered from its single clayey silt fill, [18.7], a Roman date is again surmised for the feature, based on its form and the composition of its fill. This feature is potentially a continuation of ditch [17.12], recorded in Trench 12, both features therefore being representative of geophysical anomaly 'C'.
- 5.2.18 A sub-circular feature, [18.6], measuring c. 0.50m by 0.53m and up to 90mm deep, was recorded in the central portion of Trench 18. No artefactual material was recovered from its single clayey silt fill, [18.5]. The feature is interpreted as a possible posthole of late prehistoric or Roman date based on its fill composition and the form of the feature.


5.3 Phase 3: Medieval (Figures 2, 3 and 5)

- 5.3.1 Phase 3 represents agricultural and land management activity interpreted as being of medieval date. Features assigned to this phase were recorded within all 19 trenches. Within the eastern fields (Areas 2 and 3) linear ridge and furrow earthworks were particularly pronounced and the corresponding ENE-WSW aligned archaeological features were: [9.4] Trench 9; [10.4] Trench 10; [11.12] Trench 11; [12.3] Trench 12; [13.6] Trench 13; [14.4] Trench 14; [15.6] Trench 15; [16.3] Trench 16; [17.3] Trench 17; [18.3] Trench 18; [19.4] Trench 19.
- 5.3.2 Surface earthworks were far less pronounced on the western field (Area 1) with some east-west aligned features noted within the southern portion of this field and the corresponding east-west aligned archaeological features being: [1.4] Trench 1; [2.4] Trench 2 [3.4] Trench 3; [4.4] Trench 4; [5.4] Trench 5; [6.4] Trench 6; [7.4] Trench 7; [8.4] Trench 8. In general, the features representing this activity comprised broad U-shaped linear features, up to 5.20m wide and cutting up to 0.60m deep into the natural clay sub-stratum.
- 5.3.3 The fills of the plough furrows (see Appendix B) generally comprised firm mid grey brown silty clays. Three sherds of medieval pottery were recovered, each from a different furrow fill, two of which had been reworked after breakage to form 'pot discs' (see Appendix C). In general, the furrows were spaced c. 9-10m apart (between the mid-points of adjacent furrow), such spacing being typical of that expected for 'broad' ridge and furrow derived from the agricultural system typical of the medieval period. Therefore, as a group, these features have been interpreted as the surviving portions of medieval plough furrows.

5.4 Phase 4: Modern

- 5.4.1 Topsoil was recorded in all 19 trenches and generally comprised friable mid grey brown clayey silt ([1.1] Trench 1; [2.1] Trench 2; through to [19.1] Trench 19). The maximum thickness recorded for any topsoil layer was 0.30m, this in Trench 6, while the minimum was 0.20m, this in Trenches 6, 10 and 12. All topsoil had a developed turf line, this forming the existing ground surface of the pasture fields on which the work was conducted.












Figure 7. Trench 11; gully [11.9] (in front) and gully [11.7] (to rear), looking south-east (*scale 1m*)



Figure 8: Trench 12; ditch [12.6], looking south-west (*scale 1m*)



Figure 9. Trench 12; gully [12.10] (looking east (scale 1m))



Figure 10: Trench 13; ditch [13.4], looking south-east (scale 1m)



Figure 11. Trench 17; ditches [17.8] and [17.14], looking ENE (scale 1m)




Figure 12: Trench 17; ditch [17.12], looking north-east (scale 1m)



Figure 13: Trench 17; gully [17.6], looking south-east (*scale 1m*)



Figure 14: Trench 18; ditch [18.8], looking north (*scale 1m*)

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusions

6.1.1 Geological deposits and archaeological deposits and features encountered during the evaluation have been assigned to four phases of activity:

- Phase 1. The natural sub-stratum was the basal deposit encountered within all 19 trenches. The stiff, variously coloured clay deposits represent the glaciolacustrine clay which forms the superficial geology of the site.
- Phase 2. Trenches 11, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18 all recorded archaeological features of potential early Roman date. Probable boundary ditches were recorded in Trenches 12, 13 and 18, while Trench 17 contained four such features, two intercutting. One ditch in Trench 17 produced three abraded sherds of probable early Roman pottery, while another yielded a worked flint, possibly residual in context, and the ditch in Trench 13 produced a fragment of probable Roman tile. In terms of location, at least some of the features corresponded closely with geophysical anomalies that the trenching was designed to test. Trenches 11, 12 and 17 contained narrow gullies potentially indicative of structural remains, while Trenches 11 and 18 contained probable postholes, also suggestive of structural remains.
- Phase 3. Evidence of medieval agricultural activity – in the form of broadly-spaced linear plough furrows - was recorded in all 19 trenches. These features are derived from the ridge and furrow agricultural system typical of the medieval period.
- Phase 4. Topsoil was recorded in all 19 trenches; along with its developed turf line this formed the existing ground surface of the pasture fields.

6.1.2 The Phase 2 remains are most probably of early Roman date and likely form part of the overall picture of Roman period activity in the Dere Street corridor at Aldborough. It is concluded that the probable Roman period remains encountered in the southern part of Area 2 are of local to regional archaeological significance.

6.2 Recommendations

6.2.1 Given the archaeological significance of the probable Roman period remains encountered in the southern part of Area 2, it is recommended that construction groundworks for the proposed development should be preceded by further archaeological investigation. Specifically, stripping of topsoil across Area 2 should be archaeologically supervised, followed by instrument survey of all remains exposed, then targeted hand cleaning, sample hand excavation and recording, including photography, and bulk sampling of feature fills and other strata of interest. This 'strip, map and sample' investigation should be designed to address specific research objectives with regard to the date, character, layout and sequence of development of the remains under investigation.

6.2.2 The data collected during the investigation recommended above will initially require a stage of post-excavation 'Assessment', as defined in the aforementioned English Heritage (2006) document *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment*, and the final results of the work may require publication in an appropriate academic outlet.

7. REFERENCES

Bibliography

Brown, D.H., 2007. *Archaeological Archives. A guide to best practice in creation, compilation transfer and curation*, Archaeological Archives Forum.

Department for Communities and Local Government, 2010. *Planning Policy Statement 5, 'Planning for the Historic Environment'*, HMSO.

Department for Communities and Local Government, English Heritage and Department for Culture Media and Sport, 2010. *PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide*, HMSO.

English Heritage, 2006. *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment*, English Heritage.

GSB Prospection Limited, 2010. *Geophysical Survey Report 2010/52. Proposed Cold Store Extension, Reed Boardall, Roecliffe*, GSB unpublished.

Institute for Archaeologists, 2008a. *Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation*, IfA.

Institute for Archaeologists, 2008b. *Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives*, IfA.

Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited, 2011. *Project Design for an Archaeological Evaluation on Becklands Lane, Roecliffe, Boroughbridge, North Yorkshire*, PCA unpublished.

Prospect Archaeology Limited, 2010. *Proposed Cold Store at Becklands Lane, Roecliffe, North Yorkshire*, Prospect Archaeology unpublished.

Walker, K., 1990. *Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long-term Storage*, UKIC.

Online Sources

The *British Geological Survey* website:

http://www.bgs.ac.uk/education/geology_of_britain/home.html

The *Harrogate Borough Council* website:

<http://www.harrogate.gov.uk/Pages/default.aspx>

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND CREDITS

Acknowledgements

Pre-Construct Archaeology would like to thank Prospect Archaeology for commissioning the archaeological evaluation herein described, on behalf of Reed Boardall. The role of Nansi Rosenberg of Prospect Archaeology is acknowledged.

The role of Lucie Hawkins, North Yorkshire County Council Development Management Archaeologist, is acknowledged.

PCA Credits

Project Manager: Robin Taylor-Wilson

Fieldwork: Aaron Goode (Site Supervisor), Calum Cholmondeley (work experience student), Sophie Laidler, Scott Vance

Report: Aaron Goode and Robin Taylor-Wilson

Illustrations: Mark Roughley

Flint Comment: Aaron Goode


Other Credits

Pottery: Chris Cumberpatch, with comment by Ruth Leary


Ceramic Building Material: Phil Mills

APPENDIX A
STRATIGRAPHIC MATRICES


RBO 11: STRATIGRAPHIC MATRICES



RBO 11: STRATIGRAPHIC MATRICES



RBO 11: STRATIGRAPHIC MATRICES



**APPENDIX B
CONTEXT INDEX**

RBO 11: CONTEXT INDEX

Context	Trench	Phase	Type 1	Type 2	Interpretation
1.1	1	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
1.2	1	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
1.3	1	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [1.4]
1.4	1	3	cut	linear	W-E furrows filled by [1.3]
2.1	2	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
2.2	2	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
2.3	2	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [2.4]
2.4	2	3	cut	linear	W-E furrows filled by [2.3]
3.1	3	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
3.2	3	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
3.3	3	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [3.4]
3.4	3	3	cut	linear	W-E furrows filled by [3.3]
4.1	4	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
4.2	4	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
4.3	4	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [4.4]
4.4	4	3	cut	linear	W-E furrows filled by [4.3]
5.1	5	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
5.2	5	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
5.3	5	3	deposit	layer	silty clay fill of furrow [5.4]
5.4	5	3	cut	linear	W-E furrow filled by [5.3]
6.1	6	4	deposit	fill	topsoil
6.2	6	1	cut	linear	natural clay
6.3	6	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrow [6.4]
6.4	6	3	cut	linear	W-E furrow filled by [6.3]
7.1	7	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
7.2	7	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
7.3	7	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [7.4]
7.4	7	3	cut	linear	W-E furrows filled by [7.3]
8.1	8	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
8.2	8	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
8.3	8	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [8.4]
8.4	8	3	cut	linear	W-E furrows filled by [8.3]
9.1	9	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
9.2	9	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
9.3	9	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [9.4]
9.4	9	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled by [9.3]
10.1	10	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
10.2	10	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
10.3	10	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [10.4]
10.4	10	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled by [10.3]
11.1	11	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
11.2	11	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [11.12]
11.3	11	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
11.4	11	2	deposit	fill	clayey silt fill of posthole [11.5]
11.5	11	2	cut	discrete	posthole filled by [11.4]
11.6	11	2	deposit	fill	clayey silt fill of gully [11.7]
11.7	11	2	cut	linear	NE-SW gully filled by [11.6]
11.8	11	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of gully [11.9]
11.9	11	2	cut	linear	NE-SW gully filled by [11.8]
11.10	11	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of posthole [11.11]
11.11	11	2	cut	discrete	posthole filled by [11.10]
11.12	11	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled [12.2]
12.1	12	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
12.2	12	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [12.3]
12.3	12	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled by [12.2]
12.4	12	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
12.5	12	2	deposit	fill	clayey silt fill of ditch [12.6]
12.6	12	2	cut	linear	NE-SW ditch filled by [12.5], [12.11]
12.7	12	2	deposit	fill	clayey silt fill of gully [12.8]
12.8	12	2	cut	linear	north-south gully filled by [12.7]
12.9	12	2	deposit	fill	clayey silt fill of gully [12.10]
12.10	12	2	cut	linear	north-south gully filled by [12.9]

RBO 11: CONTEXT INDEX

12.11	12	2	deposit	fill	clayey silt fill of ditch [12.6]
13.1	13	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
13.2	13	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
13.3	13	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of ditch [13.4]
13.4	13	2	cut	linear	NW-SE ditch filled by [13.3]
13.5	13	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [13.6]
13.6	13	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrow filled by [13.5]
14.1	14	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
14.2	14	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
14.3	14	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [14.4]
14.4	14	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled by [14.3]
15.1	15	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
15.2	15	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
15.3	15	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of ditch [15.4]
15.4	15	2	cut	linear	east-west ditch filled by [15.3]
15.5	15	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [15.4]
15.6	15	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled by [15.3]
16.1	16	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
16.2	16	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [16.3]
16.3	16	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled by [16.2]
16.4	16	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
17.1	17	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
17.2	17	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [17.3]
17.3	17	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled by [17.2]
17.4	17	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
17.5	17	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of gully [17.6]
17.6	17	2	cut	linear	east-west gully filled by [17.5]
17.7	17	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of ditch [17.8]
17.8	17	2	cut	linear	east-west ditch filled by [17.7]
17.9	17	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of ditch/gully [17.10]
17.10	17	2	cut	linear	east-west ditch/gully filled by [17.9]
17.11	17	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of ditch [17.12]
17.12	17	2	cut	linear	NE-SW ditch filled by [17.11]
17.13	17	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of ditch [17.14]
17.14	17	2	cut	linear	east-west ditch filled by [17.13]
18.1	18	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
18.2	18	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [18.3]
18.3	18	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled by [18.2]
18.4	18	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
18.5	18	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of pit/posthole [18.6]
18.6	18	2	cut	discrete	pit/posthole filled by [18.5]
18.7	18	2	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of ditch [18.8]
18.8	18	2	cut	linear	NNE-SSW ditch filled by [18.7]
19.1	19	4	deposit	layer	topsoil
19.2	19	1	deposit	layer	natural clay
19.3	19	3	deposit	fill	silty clay fill of furrows [19.4]
19.4	19	3	cut	linear	ENE-WSW furrows filled by [19.3]

APPENDIX C
ASSESSMENT OF CERAMIC MATERIAL

ASSESSMENT OF CERAMIC MATERIAL

By Chris Cumberpatch, Ruth Leary and Phil Mills

Introduction

The ceramic assemblage from the evaluation on Becklands Lane, Roecliffe was examined in late March and early April 2011. It consisted of three components; Roman pottery and ceramic building material and medieval pottery. Each group was the subject of a separate report, integrated to form this appendix to the main evaluation report.

Part 1. Roman and Later Pottery

Roman Pottery (Ruth Leary)

Context [17.7]

The assemblage consisted of three sherds (3g) in a moderately quartz-tempered orange fabric. The fabric was fairly soft and had a slightly sandy feel. The inclusions were on the fine to medium border. In addition to quartz, sparse, fine/medium, rounded and sub-rounded brown/orange and white inclusions were present. The red/brown inclusions seem to be clay pellets while the white inclusions were non-reactive. The sherds were thin and probably came from a single vessel which had undulations/corrugations on the external surface but these were not reproduced internally. This effect is found on jars and bowls of Flavian-Trajanic date and although the sherds are not sufficiently diagnostic for precise dating a date range in the later 1st to 2nd century is suggested.

Medieval Pottery (Chris Cumberpatch)

The medieval pottery assemblage consisted of three sherds of pottery, two of which had been reworked after breakage to form pot discs. Pot discs or roundels are a common but probably under-reported category of ceramic object with a very broad range both in date and occurrence. Examples dating to the Iron Age are known to the author from Europe (Aulnat in central France and Stradonice in Bohemia) while more recent examples include those from Sheffield Manor dating to the 19th century. Most examples are relatively crudely made but some have carefully ground edges and polished surfaces. They are generally assumed to be gaming pieces or counters although there is no definite evidence for this.

Context [3.3]

The rim of a jar or cooking pot (19g) in a white to pale buff fabric heavily tempered with rounded and sub-rounded quartz grains. The heavy angular rim has a distinctive pointed lip and hammerhead form, typical of Yorkshire Gritty wares dating to the 11th and 12th centuries. It is similar to Hillam type ware common in West Yorkshire but lacks the red grit that is characteristic of the type and also shares some similarities with Tees Valley ware A. Unlike other sherds in the assemblage, this one was only lightly abraded.

Context [6.3]

An abraded, incomplete and irregular pot disc measuring 53.6 x 49.5mm (32g). The fabric has a coarse sandy texture and contains moderate to abundant inclusions up to 2mm in maximum length. They include abundant round and sub-rounded quartz up to 1mm and sparse to moderate rounded red grit up to 2mm with rare fine-grained sandstone grains of a similar size. The sherd could not be identified to a specific regional type but had all the characteristics of a medieval ware of the 13th to early 15th centuries. Both the internal and external surfaces were abraded and there was no sign of any glaze.

Context [12.2]

An abraded pot disc measuring 35.3 x 37.6mm (15g). The fabric is fine-grained with abundant fine quartz sand up to 0.2mm in size with only sparse larger grains up to 1mm. The surfaces are heavily abraded but fragments of a green-glazed external surface survive. The sherd could not be identified to a specific regional type but had all the characteristics of a medieval sandy ware dating to the 13th to early 15th centuries.

Discussion

The small pottery assemblage was of diverse character and all of the sherds showed evidence of post-depositional abrasion, perhaps suggesting reworking of the assemblage. Further work on the site might reveal more about the history of the deposits and the kinds of post-depositional processes responsible for the condition of the sherds.

Part 2. Ceramic Building Material (Phil Mills)

Introduction

Three fragments of ceramic building material were recovered.

Context [12.9]

1g. An abraded sub-rounded fragment with extant dimensions of c. 15 x 14 x 10 mm. The fabric is soft with a powdery feel and fine fracture. It has inclusions of sparse poorly sorted red grog(?) up to 0.2mm length in a fine matrix with sparse sub-angular quartz at 0.03mm.



Fabric shot at x10

Context [13.3]

1g. A rounded abraded fragment with extant dimensions of c. 8 x 8 x 5mm. Fabric as RB0 11 (12.9)

21g. A slightly curved imbrex wall fragment 16mm thick with extant length of 40mm and extant width of 30mm tapering to 20mm. The thickness suggests a Roman imbrex rather than later curved tile. It is soft with a powdery feel and irregular fracture. It has a sandy matrix of abundant rounded quartz at 0.02mm. Fabric close to T03.2, Crambeck red tile (Mills forthcoming).



Fabric shot of imbrex at x10

Discussion

The colour, condition, the good levitation of the fabrics and the thickness of the imbrex all suggest that this material is of Roman date. Two fabrics have been recognised, although the sample size is such that they could in fact be closely related. The imbrex fabric is possibly Crambeck red tile which is beginning to be noted as a regional export from AD 285 until the end of the Roman period (Mills forthcoming).

The presence of Roman building material does not necessarily indicate a nearby Roman building, as the material lends itself to variety of alternative uses and reuse as hardcore. However, it is unusual to find imbrex on its own in assemblages of reused material.

Bibliography

Mills, P.J.E. forthcoming, 'The Ceramic Building Material from Thwing', in Millett, M. forthcoming, Excavations at Thwing.

PCA

PCA SOUTHERN

UNIT 54

BROCKLEY CROSS BUSINESS CENTRE

96 ENDWELL ROAD

BROCKLEY

LONDON SE4 2PD

TEL: 020 7732 3925 / 020 7639 9091

FAX: 020 7639 9588

EMAIL: info@pre-construct.com

PCA NORTHERN

UNIT 19A

TURSDALE BUSINESS PARK

DURHAM DH6 5PG

TEL: 0191 377 1111

FAX: 0191 377 0101

EMAIL: info.north@pre-construct.com

PCA CENTRAL

7 GRANTA TERRACE

STAPLEFORD

CAMBRIDGESHIRE CB22 5DL

TEL: 01223 845 522

FAX: 01223 845 522

EMAIL: mhinman@pre-construct.com

