



# University of Leicester

## Archaeological Services

**An Archaeological Field Evaluation  
at Swinford Wind Farm,  
Leicestershire.  
NGR: SP 575 815**



Andrew Hyam



ULAS Report No. 2010-195  
©2010

**An Archaeological Field Evaluation  
at Swinford Wind Farm,  
Leicestershire.**

**NGR: SP 575 815**

**Andrew Hyam**

**For: CgMs Consulting Limited**

Checked by
<b>Signed:</b>  .. <b>Date:</b> ...26.10.2010.
<b>Name:</b> .Vicki Score.....
Approved by
<b>Signed:</b>  <b>Date:</b> ...27.10.2010.
<b>Name:</b> Patrick Clay.....

**University of Leicester**  
Archaeological Services  
University Rd., Leicester, LE1 7RH  
Tel: (0116) 2522848 Fax: (0116) 2522614

**ULAS Report Number 2010-195**  
©2010  
**Accession Number XA.177.2010**

## CONTENTS

Summary .....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	2
Archaeological Objectives .....	2
Methodology .....	3
Results.....	4
<b>Trench 01</b> .....	4
<b>Trench 02</b> .....	5
<b>Trench 03</b> .....	5
<b>Trench 04</b> .....	5
<b>Trench 05</b> .....	5
<b>Trench 06</b> .....	5
<b>Trench 07</b> .....	6
<b>Trench 08</b> .....	6
<b>Trench 09</b> .....	6
<b>Trench 10</b> .....	6
<b>Trench 11</b> .....	7
<b>Trench 12</b> .....	7
<b>Trench 13</b> .....	7
<b>Trench 14</b> .....	7
<b>Trench 15</b> .....	8
<b>Trench 16</b> .....	8
<b>Trench 17</b> .....	8
<b>Trench 18</b> .....	8
<b>Trench 19</b> .....	8
<b>Trench 20</b> .....	9
<b>Trench 21</b> .....	9
<b>Trench 22</b> .....	9
<b>Trench 23</b> .....	9
<b>Trench 24</b> .....	10
<b>Trench 25</b> .....	10
<b>Trench 26</b> .....	10
<b>Trench 27</b> .....	10
<b>Trench 28</b> .....	11
<b>Trench 29</b> .....	12
<b>Trench 30</b> .....	13
<b>Trench 31</b> .....	13
<b>Trench 32</b> .....	13
<b>Trench 33</b> .....	14
<b>Trench 34</b> .....	14
<b>Trench 35</b> .....	14
<b>Trench 36</b> .....	14
<b>Trench 37</b> .....	15
<b>Trench 38</b> .....	15
<b>Trench 39</b> .....	15
<b>Trench 40</b> .....	15
Discussion .....	16
Acknowledgements.....	16

Site Archive and Results .....	17
Bibliography .....	17
Appendix I Figures .....	18
Appendix II Trench results .....	35
Appendix III The Ceramic Finds .....	36
Appendix IV Small Finds report.....	39
Appendix V Environmental samples .....	39
Appendix VI OASIS Information.....	40
Appendix VII Digital photographs .....	41

## FIGURES

Figure 1 Location of site .....	18
Figure 2 Turbine locations. ....	19
Figure 3 Turbine trench location.....	20
Figure 4 Trench 25. Gully and post hole. ....	21
Figure 5 Trench 25 features .....	22
Figure 6 Layout of Trenches 27 to 30.....	23
Figure 7 Trench 27 sections of all features.....	24
Figure 8 Trench 27, ditch [42] .....	24
Figure 9 Trench 28 sections of all features.....	25
Figure 10 Trench 28. Pre-excavation view of [15] (16) .....	26
Figure 11 Trench 28. Post-excavation picture of [15] (16) .....	26
Figure 12 Rotary quern fragment from [15] (16).....	27
Figure 13 Trench 29 sections of all features.....	28
Figure 14 Trench 29 pre-excavation of features .....	29
Figure 15 Trench 30 section of gully .....	30
Figure 16 Layout of Trenches 32 to 34.....	30
Figure 17 Trench 31 ditch [05] (06) plan and section .....	31
Figure 18 Trench 31 ditch [05] (06) .....	32
Figure 19 Trench 32 ditch [13] (14) .....	32
Figure 20 Trench 34 gully [11] (12) .....	33
Figure 21 Trench 39 features .....	33
Figure 22 feature locations in Trench 39 .....	34

## **An Archaeological Field Evaluation at Swinford Wind Farm, Leicestershire.**

**NGR: SP 575 815**

Andrew Hyam

### **Summary**

*An archaeological field evaluation was undertaken on the proposed wind farm site at Swinford, Leicestershire by the University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS) between the 29th of September and the 14th of October 2010. Under planning permission number 08/00506/FUL it is proposed to construct eleven wind turbines over a total area covering approximately 350ha. The Senior Planning Archaeologist, as advisor to the planning authority, requested that trial trenching take place at each turbine site and at a temporary construction compound to identify and locate any archaeological remains that may be affected by the development.*

*At each turbine site two trenches following a cruciform plan were excavated along with one located on the site of an associated construction crane. Where geophysical surveying indicated the possibility of archaeological features an additional trench was specified. Two single trenches were located at the construction compound.*

*No archaeological features or deposits were observed within the trenches at Turbine sites 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10 and the construction compound. A number of later 1st and early 2nd century Roman ditches, gullies and other features were identified at Turbine 4 which were possibly associated with settlement activity. A single undated gully was noted at Turbine 5. Two ditches were observed at Turbine 9 which, although undated, were possibly associated with a nearby deserted medieval village. Two shallow post holes were also observed at Turbine 11 one of which contained two abraded sherds of mid 1st century sandy ware.*

*The archive will be deposited with the, Leicestershire Museums Services under Accession Number X.A.177.2010*

### **Introduction**

In accordance with PPS5 (Planning and the Historic Environment, 2010), this document forms the report for an archaeological field evaluation at Swinford Wind Farm, Leicestershire. Under planning permission 08/00506/FUL Nuon UK proposes to erect an 11 turbine wind farm along with access tracks, a control building and a temporary construction compound. Following an appeal against non-determination of the application held by the Planning Inspectorate (ref: APP/F2415/A/09/2096369) one of the resulting conditions, Condition 11, stated that a staged programme of archaeological work should take place in accordance with a written scheme of investigation.

Leicestershire County Council, Historic and Natural Environment Team (LCCHNET) as archaeological advisors to the planning authority requested an evaluation by trial trenching to identify and locate any archaeological remains of significance and

propose suitable treatment to avoid or minimise damage that may be caused by the development. The LCCHNET requirements are detailed in the written scheme of investigation prepared by CgMs Consulting in *Specification for An Archaeological Mitigation Scheme, Swinford Wind Farm, Leicestershire* (Bourn 2010).

The proposed development site is located approximately 4km to the south-west of Lutterworth and 1km to the north of the village of Swinford (fig. 1). Although the layout of the wind farm will cover a total area of approximately 350ha, the actual area of impact caused by the turbines and temporary compound covers a much smaller area of only around 5 ha (fig. 2).

The site lies on a gently rising plateau lying on a south-west to north-east orientation approximately 117 to 154 metres above OD. The site lies predominantly on an area of glacial till.

## **Background**

The archaeological background of the site is discussed in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement produced for Nuon UK by Entec and is summarised in the CgMs Consulting *Specification for an Archaeological Mitigation Scheme*. Although a number of prehistoric and Roman finds have been recovered from the locality there are no recorded sites within the proposed wind farm boundary. A scheduled monument of a deserted medieval village is located within the southern boundary of the site and the remains of ridge and furrow have been recorded across this area. Much of this has now been ploughed within the last 30 years leaving little trace above ground. A gradiometer survey of the compound and turbine sites (excepting Turbine 11 which was under crop) was undertaken in 2009 by Wessex Archaeology which identified a number of anomalies of possible archaeological origin resulting in additional trenches at some turbine locations being included as discussed in the methodology section below. The geophysical survey also identified the remains of ridge and furrow in most of the surveyed areas.

## **Archaeological Objectives**

The main objectives of the evaluation were:

- To identify the presence/absence of any archaeological deposits identified by the geophysical survey.
- To identify the presence or absence of any archaeological deposits and remains not previously identified by geophysical survey.
- To establish the character, extent and date range for any archaeological deposits to be affected by the proposed ground works.
- To produce an archive and report of any results.

Within the stated project objectives, the principal aim of the evaluation was to establish the nature, extent, date, depth, significance and state of preservation of archaeological deposits on the site in order to determine the potential impact upon them from the proposed development. From this an appropriate method of dealing with any archaeological deposits can be formulated or an appropriate mitigation strategy developed.

Trial trenching is an intrusive form of evaluation that will demonstrate the existence of earth-fast archaeological features that may exist within the area.

## **Methodology**

All work followed the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) Code of Conduct in accordance with their *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation* (2008).

Topsoil and subsoil was removed in level spits, under continuous archaeological supervision, down to the uppermost archaeological deposits by a mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket. All spoil heaps were inspected for unstratified archaeological material. All trenches were excavated to a width of 2m and down to the top of archaeological deposits or the natural substratum in the absence of any archaeological deposits. After recording the trenches were backfilled and levelled during the course of the evaluation.

For turbine sites 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8 two 20m x 2m trenches were excavated in a cruciform plan centering on each turbine location with an additional trench located on the construction crane location. For turbine sites 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10 an additional trench was added in each case to target potential anomalies identified during the geophysical survey (fig. 3). Because no geophysical survey took place at the site of Turbine 11 the cruciform trenches measured 40m x 2m and the construction crane trench was 30m x 2m. Two 30m x 2m trenches were excavated in the temporary construction compound area.

Trenches were examined by hand cleaning and any archaeological deposits located were planned at an appropriate scale and sample-excavated by hand as appropriate to establishing the stratigraphic and chronological sequence. All plans were tied into the Ordnance Survey National Grid. Spot heights were taken as appropriate.

Sections of any excavated archaeological features were drawn at an appropriate scale. Each trench was recorded on a standard ULAS pro-forma trench recording sheet noting soil depths and descriptions. One longitudinal face and the base of each trench was recorded in this way. Any drawn sections of archaeological features would be levelled and tied to the Ordnance Survey Datum. Trench locations were recorded and tied in to the Ordnance Survey National Grid.

A photographic record of the investigations was prepared illustrating in both detail and general context the principal features and finds discovered. Colour digital and black and white 35mm photographs were taken throughout the evaluation. The photographic record also included 'working shots' to illustrate more generally the nature of the archaeological operation mounted.

## Results

Trenches were excavated in order of field availability rather than following the order of the turbines. The order was as shown in table 1 below:

Trench No.	Turbine No.	Archaeology present in trench	Trench No.	Turbine No.	Archaeology present in trench
1	3	No	21	6	No
2	3	No	22	6	No
3	3	No	23	5	No
4	2	No	24	5	No
5	2	No	25	5	Yes
6	2	No	26	5	No
7	1	No	27	4	Yes
8	1	No	28	4	Yes
9	1	No	29	4	Yes
10	10	No	30	4	Yes
11	10	No	31	9	Yes
12	10	No	32	9	Yes
13	10	No	33	9	No
14	7	No	34	9	Yes
15	7	No	35	8	No
16	7	No	36	8	No
17	7	No	37	8	No
18	compound	No	38	11	No
19	compound	No	39	11	Yes
20	6	No	40	11	No

Table 1 trench and turbine numbering system.

### ***Trench 01***

#### *Turbine 3 centred on NGR SP57122 80626*

Trenches 1, 2 and 3 were located in the south-western corner of the wind farm site within a small area of pasture. Except for traces of ridge and furrow the geophysical survey suggested little in the way of significant archaeological interest.

Trench 1 was placed over the north-west to south-east oriented base for the construction crane. Between 0.11m and 0.16m of dark brown clay-silt topsoil was removed to reveal a 0.18m to 0.22m deep layer of mid-yellow brown silty-clay subsoil. Beneath this was a mid-orange brown sandy-clay substratum with bands of pale grey silty-clay. Several north-east to south-west oriented plough furrows were revealed as was indicated in the geophysical survey.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.



## ***Trench 02***

### *Turbine 3*

Trench 2 formed the east to west oriented arm of the cruciform trench sited over the turbine base. Similar depths of topsoil and subsoil to that seen in Trench 1 were encountered. The natural substratum contained slightly more sand than in Trench 1. No evidence for plough furrows were seen as the trench ran along a parallel alignment to the furrows.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

## ***Trench 03***

### *Turbine 3*

Trench 3 formed the north to south arm of the cruciform trench. Similar soil descriptions to those in the previous two trenches were noted along with faint remnants of north-east to south-west orientated plough furrows.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

## ***Trench 04***

### *Turbine 2 centred on NGR SP56949 80946*

Trenches 4, 5 and 6 were located on the western edge of the wind farm midway between Turbines 1 and 3. The field had recently been drilled but no crop was visible. The geophysical survey suggested the possibility of pits which may or may not have a natural origin.

Trench 4 was placed over the north-east to south-west oriented base for a construction crane. Between 0.24m and 0.28m of mid-grey brown clay-silt topsoil and between 0.20m and 0.23m of mid-orange brown clay-sand subsoil were removed to reveal a natural substratum of mid-orange brown sandy-clay. Very faint traces of north to south orientated plough furrows were visible along the trench.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

## ***Trench 05***

### *Turbine 2*

Trench 5 formed the east to west arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Similar soil descriptions to those in Trench 4 were noted. Traces of north-west to south-east orientated plough furrows were observed.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

## ***Trench 06***

### *Turbine 2*

Trench 6 formed the north to south arm of the cruciform trench. Similar soil descriptions to those in Trenches 4 and 5 were noted. A post-war terracotta field drain was located at the north end of the trench on an east to west alignment. This was cracked during excavation and repaired with plastic piping. A silted 19th century horseshoe land drain was also observed towards the southern end of the trench.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 07***

*Turbine 1 centred on NGR SP 56832 81320*

Trenches 7, 8 and 9 were located at the north-western corner of the proposed wind farm in a recently drilled field. The geophysical survey indicated the presence of ridge and furrow and possible later drains but with little archaeological potential.

Trench 7 was placed over the north-east to south-west oriented base for a construction crane. Between 0.16m and 0.18m of mid-grey brown clay-silt topsoil and between 0.19m and 0.24m of mid-yellow brown clay-silt subsoil covered a light brown-yellow sandy-clay natural substratum. The cut for two deep and narrow land drains set at 90° to each other could be seen running along and across the trench.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 08***

*Turbine 1*

Trench 8 formed the east to west arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Similar soil descriptions were noted to those in Trench 7.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 09***

*Turbine 1*

Trench 9 formed the north to south arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Similar soil descriptions were noted to those in Trenches 7 and 8. A modern north-east to south-west gravel covered drain was located 11m from the southern end and probably accounts for the geophysical anomalies.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 10***

*Turbine 10 centred on NGR SP58144 81886*

Trenches 10, 11, 12 and 13 were located in the north-eastern corner of the wind farm site in an open field shortly before drilling for crops. The geophysical survey results for Turbine 10 suggested a high potential for archaeological remains in the form linear and curvilinear features and possible pits. Because of this potential two trenches were specified around the crane base and service track.

Trench 10 formed the north to south oriented arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Between 0.18m and 0.20m of mid-grey brown silty-clay topsoil and between 0.18m and 0.22m of mid-yellow-brown silty-clay subsoil was removed to reveal a natural substratum of mid-brownish orange slightly silty-clay with an irregular band of slightly less silty clay running from north-east to south-west.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench and it seems likely that the subtle changes in the natural geology account for the geophysical anomalies detected during the gradiometer survey.

### ***Trench 11***

#### *Turbine 10*

Trench 11 formed the east to west arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Similar topsoil, subsoil and natural substrata to that in trench 10 was observed although no banding was visible in this trench.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 12***

#### *Turbine 10*

Trench 12 was placed over the north-west to south-east oriented crane base. The same soil descriptions as in the previous two trenches were noted along with bands of less silty clay natural substratum running from approximately north-east to south-west.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 13***

#### *Turbine 10*

Trench 13 was placed over the proposed access track to the turbine. Soil descriptions were the same as in the other trenches at this turbine site.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 14***

#### *Turbine 7 centred on NGR SP57696 81604*

Trenches 14, 15, 16 and 17 were located near to the centre of the proposed wind farm in a large open field which had been recently drilled. The geophysical survey for this area was reasonably quiet although possible curvilinear anomalies were of sufficient interest to require an additional trench near to the access track.

Trench 14 formed the eastern crane base trench and was oriented on a north-west to south-east alignment. Between 0.17m and 0.19m of mid-grey brown clay-silt topsoil and between 0.19m and 0.22m of mid-yellow-brown silty-clay subsoil were removed to reveal a mid-brown-yellow silty-clay natural substratum. Faint traces of plough furrows running from north to south were noted within the trench.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### **Trench 15**

#### *Turbine 7*

Trench 15 was placed over the access track on a north-east to south-western orientation. The same soil descriptions and similar depths to those in trench 14 were noted.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### **Trench 16**

#### *Turbine 7*

Trench 16 formed the north to south arm of the turbine cruciform trench and contained similar soil descriptions to the previous two trenches. Faint traces of north-east to south-west plough furrows could be seen along with a land drain running across the trench laid approximately 12.5m from the southern end.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### **Trench 17**

#### *Turbine 7*

Trench 17 formed the east to west arm of the turbine cruciform trench. No traces of ploughing could be seen in this trench although the deposits with it were the same as the in previous trench (16) in all other respects.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### **Trench 18**

#### *Construction compound trenches centred between NGR SP 56350 81690*

Trenches 18 and 19 were located in the north-western corner of a small pasture field at Swinford Corner where the temporary construction compound will be sited. The geophysical survey highlighted a number of curvilinear anomalies which were thought to be associated with geological variations rather than archaeological features.

Trench 18 followed a north-west to south-eastern alignment parallel to the nearby Lutterworth Road. Between 0.28m and 0.39m of pale grey-brown clay-silty sand turf and topsoil and between 40mm and 0.12m of mid-yellowish brown silty-clay sand subsoil were removed to reveal a natural substratum consisting of pale orange brown silty-clay with numerous small patches of orange clay-sand. No evidence of ploughing was present and no indication to account for the geophysical variations.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### **Trench 19**

#### *Construction compound*

Trench 19 was placed approximately 30m to the east of trench 18 on a north-east to south-west alignment. The same soil descriptions as in Trench 18 were noted.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 20***

*Turbine 6 centred on NGR SP 57562 80792*

Trenches 20, 21 and 22 were located towards the south-western corner of the proposed wind farm site near to the southern end of a recently drilled field. Apart from possible remnants of ridge and furrow little of archaeological interest had been highlighted in the geophysical survey.

Trench 20 was placed over the north-east to south-west crane base. Between 0.20m and 0.28m of mid-grey brown clay-silt topsoil and between 0.12m and 0.20m of mid-yellow brown sandy-clay silt subsoil was removed to reveal a pale yellow-brown silty clay natural substratum. Within the natural were irregularly shaped patches of slightly greyer clay and other patches of brown-orange sandy gravel and clay. A modern gravel covered drain was noted 12.8m from the south-western end of the trench.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 21***

*Turbine 6*

Trench 21 formed the north to south arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Similar soil descriptions to those in the previous trench (20) were noted although there were fewer areas of gravel in this trench.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 22***

*Turbine 6*

Trench 22 formed the east to west arm of the turbine cruciform trench. The same soil descriptions to those noted in Trench 21 were observed including the smaller quantity of gravel. At the western end of the trench a circular terracotta land drain was exposed, and cracked, during excavation. This was repaired with plastic drainage pipe before backfilling.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 23***

*Turbine 5 centred on NGR SP5744281142*

Trenches 23, 24 and 25 were located to the west of centre within the wind farm site on a field covered in approximately 50mm high crop. The geophysical survey suggested the presence of ridge and furrow remains and possible geological anomalies. An additional trench was specified in the south-west over the access track to target some of these anomalies.

Trench 23 formed to north to south oriented arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Between 0.22m and 0.28m of mid-grey brown clay-silt topsoil and between 0.17m

and 0.23m of mid-yellow brown sandy clay-silt subsoil was removed to reveal a pale yellow-brown silty-clay natural substratum. Faint traces of north-east to south-west oriented plough furrows were visible.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

#### ***Trench 24***

##### *Turbine 5*

Trench 24 formed the east to west arm of the turbine cruciform trench and contained the same soil descriptions seen in Trench 23. Plough furrows and a land drain, all on a north east to south west alignment, were noted.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

#### ***Trench 25***

##### *Turbine 5*

Trench 25 was the additional trench placed over the proposed access track to the south-west of the turbine. The geophysical survey identified a number of amorphous apparently unrelated features which may have possible archaeological origins to the north-west of the turbine base. None of these possible features was located within the turbine or crane base. Similar soil depths and descriptions to those in trench 24 were noted. A 0.33m wide by 0.12m deep gully [01] (02) extended from the southern edge of the trench for 2.2m before ending in a rounded butt-end (figs. 4 and 5). The mid-grey brown sandy clay-silt fill (02) did not contain any datable artefacts. Near to the terminus of the gully was a small post-hole [03] (04) which appeared to cut the western edge of the gully. The post-hole appeared to be heavily truncated, probably by ploughing, and measured approximately 0.3m in diameter and 0.2m deep. The fill (04) was slightly less sandy than (02) but did not contain any datable material. The shallow nature of these features meant that they would be unlikely to be detected in the geophysical survey.

#### ***Trench 26***

##### *Turbine 5*

Trench 26 was placed over the crane base and ran on a parallel course to, and to the east of, Trench 25. Similar soil descriptions were noted as in the previous trenches although the topsoil and subsoil appeared to slightly thinner towards the north-eastern end of the trench.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

#### ***Trench 27***

##### *Turbine 4 centred on NGR SP 57287 81497*

Trenches 27, 28, 29 and 30 were located to the north and slightly west of centre within the wind farm just below the crest of a south-facing slope on a recently harrowed, but not drilled, field (fig. 6). The geophysical survey highlighted a number of possible archaeological features relating to probable east to west oriented linear

features and increased magnetic background possibly caused by occupation activity. Although environmental samples were taken from the excavated features these were evaluated in the laboratory and found to have a very low or no potential for plants or other environmental remains due to the acidic nature of the soil.

Trench 27 formed the north to south arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Between 0.24m and 0.30m of mid-grey brown clay-silt topsoil and between 0.10m and 0.20m of mid-brown slightly sandy-clay subsoil was removed to expose a natural substratum of mid-yellow brown slightly sandy clay. At the northern and southern ends of the trench remnants of north-west to south-east oriented plough furrows were clearly visible. A similarly aligned narrow cut for a modern drain ran across the intersection between this trench and Trench 30.

A number of linear features and a post-hole were observed within this trench (fig. 7). Approximately 5m from the north end of the trench was a gully [34] running from east to west and measuring 0.45m wide by 0.28m deep. It contained a mottled yellow-brown clay-silt fill with occasional sandy streaks (35) from which no datable material was recovered. To the south of this was a single post-hole (50) [51] 0.35m in diameter and 90mm deep. No datable material was recovered from this feature. Running from east to west across the trench and immediately north of the intersection with Trench 30 was a 1.5m wide by 0.60m deep ditch [42] (fig. 8). It contained an orange-brown sandy-silt fill with occasional grey flecks of silty-clay (43) from which environmental sample number 09 was taken. Unfortunately, as with all samples taken during the evaluation, the potential for plant remains was very low or nil (Appendix IV). Towards the base of the ditch were a number of sub-rounded stones up to 0.15m in diameter. Eleven sherds of a Samian ware dish dating from the early to mid 2nd century were recovered from this fill. Approximately 8m from the south end of the trench was another shallow gully [48] running from east to west and measuring 0.43m wide by 90mm deep. It had a mid-yellow brown silty-clay fill (49) which did not contain any finds or other datable material.

## ***Trench 28***

### *Turbine 4*

Trench 28 was located over the north to south base for the construction crane east of the turbine trench. Soil depths and descriptions were as noted in Trench 27. Although no plough furrows were seen in this trench a modern land drain ran from north-west to south-east across the trench approximately 5m from the northern end.

A number of discrete linear features were observed within this trench most of which followed a generally east to west alignment (fig. 9), consistent with some linear anomalies suggested from the geophysical survey (fig.3). At the north end of the trench was a small gully [17] measuring approximately 0.70m wide by 0.44m deep. Two sherds of mid-1st century sandy ware were recovered from the mid-yellowish grey silty-clay fill (18) of this feature. To the south of gully [17] was the terminus of a small ditch or gully [23] entering the trench from the eastern baulk. It had a maximum width of 1m and a depth of 0.35m. The gully contained a mid-grey brown sandy silty-clay fill (24) from which five small fragments of burnt ceramic building material were recovered. Cut by the modern land drain mentioned above was a shallow gully [45] which had a similar profile to gully [34] in Trench 27 and measured 0.40m in width

and 0.10m in depth. The fill of this feature, (44), consisted of a mottled yellow-brown clay-silt fill with occasional sandy streaks but no datable evidence was recovered. Approximately 8m from the northern end of the trench the terminus of a small ditch [21] extended out from the western baulk. It was one of the deepest features exposed within the turbine area and had a measurement of 1.0m wide by 0.50m deep. The ditch contained a mid- brown-grey clay-silt fill (22) which had a number of yellow-brown silty clay patches. Two sherds of grog-tempered, two sherds of mixed-grit, three sherds of sandy ware, some with combed decoration, and two of grey ware pottery with a date range extending from the mid to the later 1st century were recovered from the fill and an environmental sample (number 01) was taken. Five metres from the southern end of the trench was a dark linear feature running from north-east to south-west with large sub-rounded stones along its northern edge [15] (figs. 10 and 11). A sample excavation through this feature revealed it to have a very irregular base but with the general profile of a narrow gully with large stones laid to one side. No other similarly sized or shaped stones were encountered in any of the trenches on this turbine site suggesting that they have been deliberately imported from elsewhere. Overall it had a width of 1.66m and a maximum depth of 0.43m. The fill (16) consisted of a grey- brown silty-clay with patches of mottled yellow-brown silty-clay which was sampled as environmental sample number 08. Twenty-four sherds of pottery from a number of grog-tempered and Shelly ware vessels and all dating to the mid-1st century were recovered from the fill. Two fragments from the upper section of rotary quern (small find numbers 1 and 2) made of medium grained quartzitic sandstone were also recovered from fill (16) (fig. 12). Such querns are typical of the early Romano-British period.

## ***Trench 29***

### *Turbine 4*

Trench 29 was placed on a north-west to south-east alignment to the south-east of the turbine trenches. Soil depths and descriptions were similar to the previous two trenches. As with the other trenches on this turbine site a number of discrete linear features were observed (figs. 13 and 14), none of which in this case related to any geophysical anomalies.

Running across the northern end of the trench in a generally east to west line was a narrow gully (38) [39] with a small post-hole (40) [41] on its southern edge. The fill of both features consisted of a mid-grey brown silty-clay making it difficult to discern any stratigraphic relationship. No datable evidence was recovered from either feature but an environmental sample (07) was taken from fill (38). Approximately 2.5m to the south of these features was another gully [37] of similar width following the same alignment. The fill of this gully (36) was the same as in features [39] and [41] but in this case 16 sherds of grog-tempered and grey ware pottery dating from the mid 1st to early 2nd century were recovered. An environmental sample (06) was taken from fill (36). Another parallel gully [19] ran approximately 5m to the south of gully [37]. The fill (20) was the same as already described in the two gullies [37] and [39] but did not contain any datable material. Extending from the eastern baulk 5m from the southern end of the trench was the terminus of a small and shallow gully [33] measuring 0.15m in width and 90mm deep. No datable finds were recovered from the mid-grey brown silty-clay fill (32) and an environmental sample (05) was taken. A similarly sized curvilinear gully feature [31] ran from near to the terminus of gully [33] southwards



to cut, or be cut by, a large spread. The gully [31] had a mid-grey brown silty-clay fill (30) from which, although it did not contain any datable material, an environmental sample (04), was taken. The spread contained three distinct layers with the uppermost (27) consisting of a mid-grey brown silty-clay which did not contain any datable material. Sealed by this layer was a darker brown grey silty-clay (28) from which 40 pottery sherds were recovered. The pottery types included grog-tempered, mixed-grit, oxidised, grey, Shelly and Samian wares dating from the mid-1st to the early 2nd centuries. An environmental sample (03) was taken from layer (28). A mid-green-grey brown silty-clay layer (29) formed the interface between layer (28) and the natural substratum. This lower layer did not contain any datable material. In the south-west corner of the trench and sealed by the layers (27), (28) and (29) was a small irregularly shaped pit or post-hole [26] measuring approximately 0.45m in diameter and 50mm deep. The light brown grey sandy-clay fill (25) did not contain any datable material although an environmental sample (02) was taken.

### ***Trench 30***

#### *Turbine 4*

Trench 30 formed the east to west arm of the turbine cruciform trench. The soil depths and descriptions were as already noted in the previous three trenches. Two plough furrows corresponding to those identified in Trench 27 were noted running to the east and west of the trench intersection. A modern land drain was observed running to the west of the westernmost plough furrow and followed the same alignment as the furrows. Between the drain and the plough furrow was a gully [46] aligned on a north-north-west to south-south-east orientation (fig. 15). It had a width of 0.78m and depth of 0.12m. The fill (47) consisted of a mid-grey brown silty-clay from which a single abraded sherd of mid to late 1st century mixed grit ware jar was recovered.

### ***Trench 31***

#### *Turbine 9 centred on NGR SP 58384 81201*

Trenches 31, 32, 33 and 34 were located in the south-eastern corner of the proposed wind farm site on a large open field sown with rape seed approximately 0.1m high (fig. 16). The geophysical survey identified a branching curvilinear anomaly running down the slope of the field in a generally north to south direction (fig.3).

Trench 31 was the additional trench specified to cover the access track leading in from the north of the turbine. Between 0.22m and 0.28m of mid-grey brown clay-silt topsoil and between 0.19m and 0.23m of mid-yellow brown silty-clay subsoil were removed to reveal a yellow brown sandy-clay natural substratum with patches of sandy-clay and gravel. Running diagonally across the trench from north to south was a 1.23m wide by 0.45m deep ditch [05] (figs. 17 and 18). This was filled with a dark brown grey silty-clay fill (06) which did not contain any datable material or other artefacts.

### ***Trench 32***

#### *Turbine 9*

Trench 32 was placed along an east to west alignment over the crane base to the south of the turbine. Similar topsoil and subsoil depths and descriptions as in Trench 31

were noted but the natural substratum at the western end consisted of a grey stony clay which changed towards the eastern end to a yellow brown sandy-clay with patches of sandy clay and gravel. At the east end a ditch [13] measuring 1.4m wide and 0.45m deep was observed running from north-west to south-east across the trench (fig. 19). This may relate to a geophysical survey anomaly (fig.3). The fill (14) was a dark grey brown silty-clay with occasional sub-rounded stones measuring up to 0.20m in diameter towards the base of the feature. No pottery or other datable evidence was recovered from the feature except for a single cattle tibia which had both ends missing.

### ***Trench 33***

#### *Turbine 9*

Trench 33 formed the east to west arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Similar soil descriptions, depths and natural substratum as in Trench 31 were noted. Faint traces of north-west to south-east aligned plough furrows could be seen.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 34***

#### *Turbine 9*

Trench 34 formed the north to south arm of the turbine cruciform trench. The same soil descriptions and depths as in trenches 31 and 33 were recorded as were traces of north-west to south-east plough furrows. Three metres from the northern end of the trench was an east to west gully [11] measuring 0.50m in width and 0.18m deep (fig. 20). It contained a mid to dark grey brown silty-clay fill (12) which did not contain any datable finds or other artefacts.

### ***Trench 35***

#### *Turbine 8 centred on NGR SP 58160 81500*

Trenches 35, 36 and 37 were located in the central area of the eastern half of the wind farm in a field covered in low crop as noted at Turbine 9. The geophysical survey suggested the presence of ploughed out ridge and furrow but little of archaeological nature origin.

Trench 35 was placed over the north-west to south-east oriented crane base to the south-east of the turbine trenches. Between 0.21m and 0.27m of mid-grey brown clay-silt topsoil and between 0.14m and 0.18m of mid-yellow brown silty-clay subsoil was removed to reveal a natural substratum of yellow brown slightly sandy clay. No evidence for plough furrows was observed.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 36***

#### *Turbine 8*

Trench 36 formed the east to west arm of the turbine cruciform trench. The same soil descriptions and similar soil depths to those in Trench 35 were recorded.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 37***

#### *Turbine 8*

Trench 37 formed the north to south arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Soil descriptions and depths were similar to those observed in the previous two trenches (35 and 36).

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 38***

#### *Turbine 11 centred on NGR SP 58574 81638*

Trenches 38, 39 and 40 were located at the eastern edge of the proposed wind farm within a field of low stubble. Because the field was under crop at the time of the geophysical survey this area was not surveyed so longer trenches than elsewhere were specified.

Trench 38 was located over the crane base and followed a north-east to south-west alignment. Between 0.21m and 0.26m of mid-brown clay-silt topsoil and between 50mm and 0.13m of mid-yellow brown silty-clay subsoil were removed to reveal a natural substratum of mid-yellow brown sandy-clay. Traces of north-west to south-east aligned plough furrows were observed.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 39***

#### *Turbine 11*

Trench 39 formed the east to west oriented arm of the turbine cruciform trench. Similar soil descriptions and depths to those in Trench 38 were noted as were faint traces of east to west plough furrows. Two very shallow pits were identified towards the western end of the trench. Pit [08] measured approximately 0.93m in diameter but was only 90mm deep with a mid-grey brown silty-clay fill (07). Two sherds of heavily abraded early Roman sandy ware dating to around the middle of the 1st century were recovered from the fill. Approximately 0.6m to the east was a second pit (09) [10] with a diameter of 1.15m and a depth of 80mm (fig. 21). The same fill as in pit [08] was noted but no finds were recovered from this feature. No other archaeological remains were observed within this trench.

### ***Trench 40***

#### *Turbine 11*

Trench 40 formed the north to south oriented arm of the turbine cruciform trench. The same soil descriptions and depths as in Trenches 38 and 39 were noted. More faint traces of plough furrows were also observed.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed within this trench.

## Discussion

The four trenches at the Turbine 4 site give the indication that there is a Romano-British settlement site dating from the mid-1st to mid-2nd centuries located within the immediate vicinity. Much of the pottery appears to be reasonably well preserved indicating that it has not travelled very far before deposition. Similarly the presence of the rotary quern may point to a nearby occupation site. The lack of bone within the finds and the fact that the inclusions within the Shelly ware vessels have been dissolved out suggests that the soil is relatively acidic which will have an impact on the recovery of any organic finds. The stone feature [15] in Trench 28 is difficult to explain after seeing such a small length, however it seems probable that this forms the remains of a small wall and ditch boundary feature. That the pottery from this feature is quite tightly grouped around the mid- to late 1st century suggests that it had a relatively short life. It is interesting that [15] (16) does not extend far enough to the west to have been visible in neighbouring Trench 30 and so must either terminate or turn before reaching it. Although nearly 20m apart it is tempting to suggest that gully [34] in Trench 27 and gully [45] in Trench 28 are either the same east to west feature or form part of the same linear boundary. The same suggestion may apply to ditches [42] in Trench 27 and ditch terminus [21] in Trench 28 despite the spread in pottery dates. The indications of possible linear features running across the area may however support this theory. Overall the four trenches suggest an east to west series of boundaries or divisions which may be associated with the magnetic response detected to the south of this area and which has been tentatively identified with human settlement activity.

The isolated and undated gully and post-hole at Turbine 5 give very little indication of any significant activity within the area. Taken with the inconclusive geophysical survey results the area around this turbine appears to be of relatively low potential.

The ditches and gully in the three trenches at Turbine 9 tend to support the idea of medieval field boundaries which was suggested after the geophysical survey. The lack of finds could also indicate that these are indeed field rather than settlement boundaries. It is of note that the sinuous nature of the ditches, as noted both in the geophysical survey and during excavation, does not align with the traces of ridge and furrow and may pre-date this.

As with the Turbine 5 site the two post-holes at the Turbine 11 area would appear to indicate only a low level of activity. However, in this case one of the post-holes does have a possible Roman date albeit from only two poor quality abraded pot sherds.

Overall with the exception of Turbines 4 and 9 the evaluation suggested relatively low potential for, the presence of archaeological deposits. Most trenches revealed the remnants of ridge and furrow which have now been ploughed out and are not longer visible as above ground features. Discussion with the local digger driver suggests that much ridge and furrow in and around the proposed wind farm site has been lost since the 1980s in the change to slightly more profitable arable land.

## Acknowledgements

The fieldwork was carried out by A Hyam, S Baker and L Hunt. The project was managed by Dr P Clay and commissioned on behalf of CgMs by Rob Bourn.

### **Site Archive and Results**

The archive consists of:

This report,

40 pro-forma trench recording sheets,

51 context sheets,

9 drawing sheets: 8 A2 size, 1 A3 size,

168 35mm black and white negative photographs and corresponding contact sheets,

7 contact sheets of 226 colour digital photographs,

Photographic record sheets,

1 environmental sample index sheet,

1 cd of this report and the digital photographs.

The site archive will be deposited with Leicestershire Museums Service under accession code X.A.177.2010. A summary of the work will be submitted for publication in the *Transactions of The Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society* in due course. An OASIS record will also be produced and this report will be uploaded on to the Archaeology Data Service website.

### **Bibliography**

Bourn. 2010. *Specification for an Archaeological Mitigation Scheme. Swinford Wind Farm, Leicestershire*. CgMs Consulting.

Entec, 2008. *Swinford Wind Farm Environmental Statement*. Volumes 1, 2 and 3.

Online at

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/documents\\_info.php?documentID=297&pageNumber=2](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/documents_info.php?documentID=297&pageNumber=2)

IfA 2008 *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations*  
Institute for Archaeologists.

Andrew Hyam

ULAS

University of Leicester

University Road

Leicester LE1 7RH

[ah58@le.ac.uk](mailto:ah58@le.ac.uk)

0116 252 2846

26.10.2010

(revised 23.03.2011)

## Appendix I Figures



Figure 1 Location of site

Reproduced from Entec, 2008. *Swinford Wind Farm Environmental Statement*. Volume 2






Figure 2 Turbine locations.

North to top of map. Modified and reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Crown Copyright 1996. Licence Number AL 10009495




Figure 3 Turbine trench location

Trenches numbered in black. North to top of map in each case.

From CgMs *Specification for an Archaeological Mitigation Scheme, Swinford Wind Farm, Leicestershire*. July 2010.





Figure 4 Trench 25. Gully and post hole.  
Facing west, 2m scale




Figure 5 Trench 25 features




Figure 6 Layout of Trenches 27 to 30






Figure 7 Trench 27 sections of all features



Figure 8 Trench 27, ditch [42]  
Facing east, 1m scale




Figure 9 Trench 28 sections of all features





Figure 10 Trench 28. Pre-excitation view of [15] (16)  
Facing south-west, 2m scale



Figure 11 Trench 28. Post-excitation picture of [15] (16)  
Facing east, 1m scale



Figure 12 Rotary quern fragment from [15] (16)  
30cm scale




Figure 13 Trench 29 sections of all features





Figure 14 Trench 29 pre-excavation of features  
Facing north-west, 2m scale




Figure 15 Trench 30 section of gully




Figure 16 Layout of Trenches 32 to 34




Figure 17 Trench 31 ditch [05] (06) plan and section



Figure 18 Trench 31 ditch [05] (06)  
Facing south-east, 2m scale




Figure 19 Trench 32 ditch [13] (14)






Figure 20 Trench 34 gully [11] (12)




Figure 21 Trench 39 features




Figure 22 feature locations in Trench 39

**Appendix II Trench results**

<b>Trench</b>	<b>Turbine</b>	<b>Features/Contexts</b>
1	3	None
2	3	None
3	3	None
4	2	None
5	2	None
6	2	None
7	1	None
8	1	None
9	1	None
10	10	None
11	10	None
12	10	None
13	10	None
14	7	None
15	7	None
16	7	None
17	7	None
18	Compound	None
19	Compound	None
20	6	None
21	6	None
22	6	None
23	5	None
24	5	None
25	5	Gully [01], Post hole [03],
26	5	None
27	4	Gully [34], ditch [42], gully [49], post hole [51]
28	4	Stony feature (gully) [15], Gully [17], butt-end (gully) [21], butt-end (gully) [23], gully [45]
29	4	Gully [19], pit/post hole [26], spread (27),(28),(29), butt- end gully [31], butt-end gully [33], gully [37], gully [39], post hole [41]
30	4	Gully [46]
31	9	Ditch [05]
32	9	Ditch [13]
33	9	None
34	9	Gully [11]
35	8	None
36	8	None
37	8	None
38	11	None
39	11	Pit [08], pit [10]
40	11	None

## Appendix III The Ceramic Finds

*Elizabeth Johnson*

### Assemblage Size and Condition

An assemblage comprising 105 sherds (1.055kg) of Romano-British pottery was retrieved from the evaluation along with eight sherds (66g) of re-deposited material. Five fragments of ceramic building material were also recovered. The average sherd weight of 10g suggests reasonable levels of preservation, although many surfaces are abraded.

### Methodology

The pottery was classified using the Leicestershire Fabric Series (Pollard 1994) and quantified by sherd count, weight and estimated vessel equivalents (EVEs using rims) as shown in the catalogue below. Vessel forms were also assigned where diagnostic sherds allowed.

### Catalogue

Trn	Cut	Cont	Fabric	Form	Sherds	Weight (g)	Diam (cm)	EVEs	Dating
39	8	7	Sandy	Misc	2	9			mid 1stC
28	15	16	Shelly	Jar	8	69			mid 1stC
28	15	16	Grog-temp	Jar	6	171			mid 1stC
28	15	16	Grog-temp	Jar	2	24			mid 1stC
28	15	16	Sandy	Misc	2	16			mid 1stC
28	15	16	Grog-temp	Jar	5	53			mid 1stC
28	15	16	Grog-temp	Jar	1	20	25	0.07	mid 1stC
28	17	18	Sandy	Jar	1	12			mid 1stC
28	17	18	Sandy	Misc	1	4			mid 1stC
28	21	22	Grog-temp	Misc	2	8			mid 1stC
28	21	22	Mixed-grit	Misc	1	9			mid 1stC
28	21	22	Sandy	Misc	1	3			mid 1stC
28	21	22	Sandy	Jar	2	31			mid 1stC
28	21	22	Grey	Jar	2	16			later 1stC+
29	25	28	Samian	Dish	1	14			early-mid 2ndC
29	25	28	Grey	Jar	17	100			later 1stC+
29	25	28	Grey	Jar	1	9	12	0.125	late 1st-early 2ndC
29	25	28	Shelly	Jar	1	3			mid 1stC+
29	25	28	Grey	Jar	3	22			later 1stC+
29	25	28	Sandy	Jar	5	19			mid-late 1stC
29	25	28	Sandy	Jar	2	16			mid 1stC
29	25	28	Grog-temp	Jar	4	40			mid 1stC
29	25	28	Mixed-grit	Jar	2	9			mid 1stC
29	25	28	Oxidised	Misc	2	1			later 1stC+
29	25	28	Oxidised	Jar	1	31			later 1stC+
29	25	28	Sandy	Jar	1	20	14	0.05	mid-late 1stC
29	37	36	Grog-temp	Jar	2	15	14	0.125	mid-late 1stC
29	37	36	Grey	Jar	1	14	18	0.075	late 1st-2ndC



Trn	Cut	Cont	Fabric	Form	Sherds	Weight (g)	Diam (cm)	EVEs	Dating
29	37	36	Grey	Jar	1	14	14	0.1	late 1st-2ndC
29	37	36	Grog-temp	Jar	5	59			late 1st-early 2ndC
29	37	36	Grey	Jar	1	96			later 1stC+
29	37	36	Grey	Jar	2	4			later 1stC+
29	37	36	Grey	Jar	2	5			later 1stC+
29	37	36	Grey	Jar	2	11			later 1stC+
29	39	38	Grog-temp	Jar	1	2			mid-late 1stC
27	42	43	Samian	Dish	11	101			early-mid 2ndC
30	47	46	Mixed-grit	Jar	1	5			mid-late 1stC

## Stratified Features

### Trench 27

#### *Ditch (43) [42]*

Eleven sherds (101g) of pottery were recovered, comprising a single samian ware Drag. 18/31 dish. The fabric suggests Central Gaul as a source, indicating a date from the early to mid-2nd century. The form ceases production c.AD150 (Webster 1996, 35).

### Trench 28

#### *Feature (16) [15]*

Twenty-four sherds (353g) were recovered from a stony spread or ditch in Trench 28. The pottery comprises a range of shelly, grog-tempered and sandy ware jars, some with combed decoration, dating to the middle of the 1st century. These fabrics are often referred to as “transitional” and, with the exception of the shelly wares, are replaced by grey and oxidised fabrics by the end of the 1st century (Pollard 1994, 74-75).

#### *Gully (18) [17]*

Two sherds (16g) were recovered from this gully representing two sandy ware jars dating to the mid-1st century.

#### *Ditch (22) [21]*

Although only eight sherds (67g) of pottery were found, the range of fabrics comprises transitional grog-tempered, mixed-gritted and sandy wares along with a grey ware jar. The transitional wares are most likely jars or bowls dating to the mid-1st century or possibly mid-late 1st century, whilst the grey ware jar is unlikely to date before the later 1st century.

#### *Ditch (24) [23]*

No pottery was recovered from this feature; however five fragments of Roman ceramic building material weighing 58g were present. Unfortunately they are burnt and in a poor condition and, without any additional finds, are not closely datable.

### Trench 29

#### *Spread (28)*

Forty sherds (284g) were recovered from a spread in Trench 29. The material is slightly more mixed than in other areas, comprising a range of transitional shelly,

grog-tempered and sandy wares but also some grey and oxidised ware and a samian ware dish. The transitional wares are jars dating to the mid- or mid-late 1st century comparable with material found elsewhere on the site. The grey and oxidised wares date from the later 1st or possibly early 2nd century, whilst the samian ware vessel is another Drag. 18/31 dish, dating to the first half of the second century (Pollard 1994, 74-75; Webster 1996, 35). Taken together, the material need not be any later than the early 2nd century.

#### *Gully (36) [37]*

Sixteen sherds (218g) of pottery comprising grog-tempered and grey ware jars were recovered from this gully. Of the two grog-tempered jars, one has an everted rim suggesting a mid-late 1st century date. The grey wares include two roll necked rimmed jars and a complete jar base. These are likely to date from the later 1st century or into the 2nd.

#### *Gully (38) [39]*

One sherd (2g) from a grog-tempered jar dating to the mid-late 1st century was recovered.

### **Trench 30**

#### *Gully (46) [47]*

One sherd (5g) from a transitional mixed-gritted ware jar dating to the mid-late 1st century was recovered.

### **Trench 39**

Trench 39 was located approximately 1 km away from the rest of the trenches discussed in this report, at the proposed site of Turbine 11. Two sherds of pottery weighing 9g were recovered from an isolated pit (7) [8]. The pottery is in very poor condition, but is most likely abraded early Roman sandy ware dating to around the middle of the 1st century.

### **Conclusion**

Most of the pottery comprises early Roman grog-tempered, mixed-gritted, shelly and sandy transitional wares dating from the middle to the end of the 1st century. The grey and oxidised wares also appear to be fairly early, dating from the later 1st century into the first part of the 2nd. The two samian ware dishes are the latest datable vessels, as they could potentially date up to *c.*AD150; however taken together with the rest of the pottery a date earlier in the 2nd century would seem more likely. A scan of the small amount of re-deposited material showed it to be comparable to the stratified assemblage, with material dating from the mid-late 1st century or early 2nd century.

### **Bibliography**

Pollard, R., 1994: The Iron Age and Roman Pottery. in P. Clay and R. Pollard *Iron Age and Roman Occupation in the West Bridge Area, Leicester. Excavations 1962-1971.* pp 51-114. Leicester: Leicestershire County Council Museums, Arts and Records Service.

Webster, P., 1996: *Roman Samian Pottery in Britain. Practical Handbooks in Archaeology no. 3.* York: Council for British Archaeology.

## Appendix IV Small Finds report

*J Thomas*

XA177.2010 (16) [15]: Two fragments from an upper section of rotary quern (small find numbers 1 and 2) made of medium grained quartzitic sandstone. The two portions appear to be from the same quern but do not fit together. This appears generally shaped/prepared by pecking all over. The working surface is worn smooth and concave in profile, the upper surface flat. The thickness of the fragment on the outer edge is c.50mm and the distance to the centre is roughly 160mm indicating that original diameter would have been close to c.320mm. A central (oval?) perforation also incorporates a slight lip/depression which may have served to hold a wooden/bone hopper. A partially surviving shallow groove on the edge of the larger fragment provides evidence for a wooden handle socket. The size and form of the fragments correspond with Curwens classification type for early Romano-British rotary querns (Curwen 1937, 144).

Curwen, E.C., 1937 'Querns' *Antiquity* **11**, 133-51.

## Appendix V Environmental samples

*Anita Radini*

Nine samples from nine contexts were chosen for assessment (see tables below). A sub-sample of 250ml from each was examined to assess the potential for plant remains. Samples 1 (28); 3 (22) and 8 (16) which are of early Roman date, indicate a low potential for the recovery of charcoal and plant remains. The remaining samples have no potential for further environmental analysis containing only very sparse charcoal flecks.


Sample No.	Context	Cut	Trench No.	Sample size	Location sampled
1	22	21	28	30 l	S1.10
2	25	26	29	15 l	S5.01
3	28		29	30 l	S5.03
4	30	31	29	30 l	S5.04
5	32	33	29	30 l	S5.05
6	36	37	29	30 l	S5.06
7	38	39	29	30 l	S5.07
8	16	15	28	30 l	S1.08
9	43	42	27	30 l	S6.02


Sample No.	Context	Cut	Feature type	Trench No.	Charcoal	Clay	Mod Root	Potential for plant remains
1	22	21	Ditch	28	flecks	silty	x	low
2	25	26	Pit	29		dominant	xx	none
3	28		Spread	29	flecks	silty	x	low
4	30	31	Gully	29		dominant	xx	none
5	32	33	Gully	29		acid, dominant	x (small)	none
6	36	37	Gully	29		acid, dominant	x (small)	none
7	38	39	Gully	29		dominant	xx	none
8	16	15	Ditch	28	flecks	silty	x	low
9	43	42	Ditch	27		acid, dominant	x (small)	none

### Appendix VI OASIS Information

INFORMATION	
Project Name	Swinford Wind Farm
Project Type	Evaluation
Project Manager	P Clay
Project Supervisor	A Hyam
Previous/Future work	DBA, unknown future work
Current Land Use	Agricultural
Development Type	Wind farm
Reason for Investigation	As a provisional condition
Position in the Planning Process	Preliminary
Site Co ordinates	SP 575 815
Start/end dates of field work	29.09.2010-14.10.2010
Archive Recipient	LCC
Study Area	350ha

## Appendix VII Digital photographs









XA177 2010 (71).JPG



XA177 2010 (72).JPG



XA177 2010 (73).JPG



XA177 2010 (74).JPG



XA177 2010 (75).JPG



XA177 2010 (76).JPG



XA177 2010 (77).JPG



XA177 2010 (78).JPG



XA177 2010 (79).JPG



XA177 2010 (80).JPG



XA177 2010 (81).JPG



XA177 2010 (82).JPG



XA177 2010 (83).JPG



XA177 2010 (84).JPG



XA177 2010 (85).JPG



XA177 2010 (86).JPG



XA177 2010 (87).JPG



XA177 2010 (88).JPG



XA177 2010 (89).JPG



XA177 2010 (90).JPG



XA177 2010 (91).JPG



XA177 2010 (92).JPG



XA177 2010 (93).JPG



XA177 2010 (94).JPG



XA177 2010 (95).JPG



XA177 2010 (96).JPG



XA177 2010 (97).JPG



XA177 2010 (98).JPG



XA177 2010 (99).JPG



XA177 2010 (100).JPG



XA177 2010 (101).JPG



XA177 2010 (102).JPG




XA177 2010 (103).JPG



XA177 2010 (104).JPG



XA177 2010 (105).JPG







XA177 2010 (141).JPG



XA177 2010 (142).JPG



XA177 2010 (143).JPG



XA177 2010 (144).JPG



XA177 2010 (145).JPG



XA177 2010 (146).JPG



XA177 2010 (147).JPG



XA177 2010 (148).JPG



XA177 2010 (149).JPG



XA177 2010 (150).JPG



XA177 2010 (151).JPG



XA177 2010 (152).JPG



XA177 2010 (153).JPG



XA177 2010 (154).JPG



XA177 2010 (155).JPG



XA177 2010 (156).JPG



XA177 2010 (157).JPG



XA177 2010 (158).JPG



XA177 2010 (159).JPG



XA177 2010 (160).JPG



XA177 2010 (161).JPG



XA177 2010 (162).JPG



XA177 2010 (163).JPG



XA177 2010 (164).JPG



XA177 2010 (165).JPG



XA177 2010 (166).JPG



XA177 2010 (167).JPG



XA177 2010 (168).JPG



XA177 2010 (169).JPG



XA177 2010 (170).JPG



XA177 2010 (171).JPG



XA177 2010 (172).JPG



XA177 2010 (173).JPG



XA177 2010 (174).JPG



XA177 2010 (175).JPG



XA177 2010 (176).JPG



XA177 2010 (177).JPG



XA177 2010 (178).JPG



XA177 2010 (179).JPG



XA177 2010 (180).JPG



XA177 2010 (181).JPG



XA177 2010 (182).JPG



XA177 2010 (183).JPG



XA177 2010 (184).JPG



XA177 2010 (185).JPG



XA177 2010 (186).JPG



XA177 2010 (187).JPG



XA177 2010 (188).JPG



XA177 2010 (189).JPG



XA177 2010 (190).JPG



XA177 2010 (191).JPG



XA177 2010 (192).JPG



XA177 2010 (193).JPG



XA177 2010 (194).JPG



XA177 2010 (195).JPG



XA177 2010 (196).JPG



XA177 2010 (197).JPG



XA177 2010 (198).JPG



XA177 2010 (199).JPG



XA177 2010 (200).JPG



XA177 2010 (201).JPG



XA177 2010 (202).JPG



XA177 2010 (203).JPG



XA177 2010 (204).JPG



XA177 2010 (205).JPG



XA177 2010 (206).JPG



XA177 2010 (207).JPG



XA177 2010 (208).JPG



XA177 2010 (209).JPG



XA177 2010 (210).JPG



XA177 2010 (211).JPG



XA177 2010 (212).JPG



XA177 2010 (213).JPG



XA177 2010 (214).JPG



XA177 2010 (215).JPG



XA177 2010 (216).JPG



XA177 2010 (217).JPG



XA177 2010 (218).JPG



XA177 2010 (219).JPG



XA177 2010 (220).JPG



XA177 2010 (221).JPG



XA177 2010 (222).JPG



XA177 2010 (223).JPG



XA177 2010 (224).JPG



XA177 2010 (225).JPG



XA177 2010 (226).JPG



## ULAS Contact Details

Richard Buckley or Patrick Clay  
University of Leicester Archaeological  
Services (ULAS)  
University of Leicester,  
University Road,  
Leicester LE1 7RH

**T:** +44 (0)116 252 2848

**F:** +44 (0)116 252 2614

**E:** [ulas@le.ac.uk](mailto:ulas@le.ac.uk)

**w:** [www.le.ac.uk/ulas](http://www.le.ac.uk/ulas)



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

