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## Summary

This report details the results of an evaluation carried out on the northern part of Site 126, as part of the Abingdon Reservoir Proposals $93 / 91$; the southern part of Site 126 was evaluated by TVAS in November 1996. The evaluation involved machine excavated trenches of specifically targeted areas chosen as a result of previous cropmark and fieldwalking surveys. It provided information regarding the date, character and condition of archaeological features present (including ditches, gullies, pits, layers, metalled surfaces, burials and postholes). A good correlation was observed between the features revealed by trenching and those indicated by the cropmarks. Sections of several features were excavated by hand and pottery evidence recovered from this process has shown that features in Trenches 1, 2, and 3 are of 2nd to 5th century AD Roman date. Preservation on site was generally good, especially with regard to the pottery, metalwork and faunal remains.
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by Steven D. G. Weaver<br>with contributions by Nicola Clarkson, Sheila Hamilton-Dyer, Steve Ford, John Letts, David Richards, Andy Smith, Jane Timby and David Williams

## 1. Introduction

1.1 This report documents the evaluation of the northern section of site 126 within the proposed Abingdon reservoir development. The site lies north-west of Steventon and approximately 1 km north of the Steventon to East Hanney road (centred on SU 4470 9430) (Figs 1 and 2). The evaluation was commissioned by Thames Water Utilities Limited, Gainsborough House, Manor Farm Road, Reading and was carried out to a specification provided by Thames Water Utilities Limited and approved by the Archaeological Officer for Oxfordshire County Council (see Appendix 1). Previous cropmark and geophysical surveys had already indicated the presence of an extensive archaeological site in this area. The main aim of the evaluation was to further assess the archaeological potential of the site by machine trenching, in accordance with the Department of the Environment's Guidance Note Archaeology and Planning (PPG16, 1990). The fieldwork took place in September 1997 and the site code is 93.91 .

## 2. Aims and Methodology

2.1 The purpose of the evaluation was to discover the extent, condition, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains present to enable an assessment of their worth in a local, regional or national context to be made as appropriate.
2.2 This site is defined by an extensive series of cropmarks showing a series of enclosures interlinked by trackways. A fieldwalking survey carried out over the site produced a large assemblage of unabraded Roman pottery indicative of an area of occupation. The evaluation trenches were located to try and further define the nature of the archaeological activity in this area. Three trenches were excavated (Fig. 2; Appendix 4). Trench 1 ( 80 m . long) was specifically positioned to examine a northwest-southeast orientated trackway and adjacent enclosures, and a north-south aligned linear feature and enclosure at the eastern end of the trench. Trench 2 (60 m . long) was located to define a number of east-west aligned cropmarks, the intersection of four possible trackways, and a ring ditch. Trench 3 ( 80 m . long) was located at the western edge of the site to examine a series of enclosures with northwest-southeast aligned boundaries and to define the western extent of the site.
2.3 The trenches were excavated using a JCB-type excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket approximately 1.80 m . wide. They were surveyed in by Thames Water using GPS and marked out prior to our arrival on site.
2.4 Due to the presence of WW2 ordnance in this field, the areas surrounding the trenches were investigated by the Maintenance Group Defence Agency, RAF Brampton, both prior to and during excavation. This investigation resulted in localised areas of disturbance within the evaluation trenches.

## 3. Results (see also Appendix 5)

### 3.1 Trench 1 (Figs. 3 and 4)

3.2 The trench was orientated east-west within an area of dense cropmarks (Fig. 2). It revealed a variety of archaeological deposits that relate closely to the cropmarks, consisting of two walls ( 279 and 280 ), three metalled surfaces ( $264,285 / 6$ and $441 / 2$ ) seven ditches ( $275,277,281,289,424,430$ and 443 ), two linear features ( 267 and 269), 14 postholes ( $271,273,283,287,300,302,306,308,291,293,295,297,428$ and 445), two pits ( 304 and 265) and seven layers ( $261,262,263,299,348,418$ and 423).
3.3 Initial machine stripping of the topsoil and subsequent hand cleaning revealed a northwest to southeast aligned wall (279) and a possible northeast to southwest return wall (280) at the western end of the trench (Fig. 3). A dark soil 0.50 m . deep (261) had built up against and over the walls and no construction cuts for them were seen. This may indicate that a substantial amount of the walls has survived, perhaps with associated floors.
3.4 The dark layer 261 produced 512 4th-5th century Roman and two sherds of Medieval pottery. This overlay two walls ( 279 and 280 ), three ditches ( 281,289 and 443 ) and three postholes ( 283,287 and 445 ) and was thicker towards the western end. The interpretation of this layer is not easy given the limited nature of the evaluation but it may be a dark earth or perhaps a Medieval headland.
3.5 Two of the four northwest-southeast aligned ditches crossing the western half of the trench were examined by placing a 2 m . slot against the northern baulk (289 and 424; unexcavated - 281 and 443 ) (Fig. 3). The undated ditch 424 cut a metalled surface (286) to the west (see below) and had been recut by ditch 289 (Fig. 4), a 1.08 m . wide ditch, 0.72 m . deep and with a $U$-shaped profile, that contained 13 sherds of 4th-5th century AD Roman pot. A single sherd of 3rd -5th century Roman pot came from the surface of ditch 281, which closely correlates with a northwest-southeast aligned cropmark marking the boundary between an enclosure and a trackway (Fig. 12). Both ditches 281 and 443 were also associated with areas of metalling ( 441 and 442, below). The walls described above lay within the enclosure to the west and the areas of metalling are associated with the trackway. Although the pottery evidence is not substantial, it would appear that the trackway and enclosure ditches have been redefined over time.
3.6 Two areas of metalling (285/286), presumably part of the same metalled surface, were exposed within two of the excavated slots (Fig. 3). The surface was in very good condition and consisted of well compacted flint and pea grit. The metalling within the eastern slot (286) had been laid directly onto natural but in the western slot the metalling (285) overlay a brown sand (423), perhaps a bedding layer. The surface was cut by an
unexcavated posthole (287) and a further unexcavated posthole (283) lay between ditch 281 and metalling 285. The metalled surfaces 441 and 442 , to the west of ditch 281 , are also probably two parts of the same surface. They were also made up of compacted flint and pea grit and in very good condition. The metalling was cut by unexcavated posthole 445 on its western edge. Both areas of metalling appear to be orientated northwestsoutheast, which corresponds with the trackway.
3.7 Linear feature 267 cut a similar feature, 269, towards the centre of the trench (Fig. 3). These are apparently within the middle enclosure crossed by Trench 1. They were both broad and shallow: 269 was 1.35 wide and 0.13 m . deep; the width of 267 was not clear but it was 0.20 m . deep (Fig. 4). Feature 269 contained 37 sherds of Roman pot whereas the 35 sherds from feature 267 are of 4 th- 5 th century AD Roman date. Linear 269 cut two undated postholes (306 and 308) but its relationship with a shallow pit (304) was not clear. The pit produced three sherds of Roman pottery.
3.8 Also in this area were postholes 300,302 and 428. The first two were half-sectioned and posthole 302 contained two sherds of 3rd-5th century AD Roman pot. 428 was partly obscured by the northern baulk and a single sherd of Roman pottery was recovered from its surface. To the west of this was layer 299, an olive green clay (below layer 261). This was not excavated, but surface finds include Roman pottery spanning the 2 nd to 5 th centuries AD.
3.9 Also examined was a series of ditches which coincide with a north-south cropmark at the eastern end of the trench ( 275,277 and 430) (Fig. 3). Here the sequence begins with ditch 430 , from which no finds were recovered. This was recut by ditch 275 which contained six 4th-5th century AD Roman sherds, and which also cuts metalled layer 264 (see below) and layer 263 on its eastern edge (Fig. 4). Both ditches were then cut by a U -shaped pit, 265 . This was 0.94 m . in diameter and 0.80 m . deep and contained 36 sherds of 4 th- 5 th century AD Roman pottery and a complete copper-alloy dish (706). In the section, on the western side of pit 265 and cut by it, was feature 277 (Fig. 4). This was of similar depth to 275 but contained 11 sherds of possibly 2nd century AD Roman pottery. It was thought during excavation that this was a continuation of 275 but the pottery evidence would appear to suggest otherwise. Again, there is evidence to suggest that this boundary has been redefined on at least one occasion.
3.10 Approximately 8 m . of metalled layer 264 were uncovered but its full extent is not known. The surface was in very good condition and consisted of well compacted flint and pea grit laid directly onto natural. It was cut by six postholes ranging in diameter from 0.09 to $0.21 \mathrm{~m} .: 271,273,291,293,295$ and 297 , none of which were excavated. Layer 263 , which lay above these postholes contained a single sherd of Roman and a sherd of possibly intrusive Saxon pottery, and was cut by ditch F275.
3.11 A further layer, 262, possibly a dark earth horizon was present over most of the eastern end of the trench (it overlay 263). It was 0.30 m . deep and produced 21 sherds of ?1st $-2 n d$ century AD Roman pottery (plus c . 91 sherds of 3rd to 5th century AD pot from the surface).

### 3.12 Trench 2 (Figs. 5 to 8)

3.13 A number of archaeological deposits were located in this trench consisting of 12 ditches $(312,315,320$, $322,337,350,351,360,415,421,454$ and 455 ), the remains of two metalled surfaces ( 358 and 359 ), a linear feature (319), two ditches/pits (414 and 453), a scoop (336), and two deposits/layers (348/?418 and 451) (Fig. 5).
3.14 Deposit 451, at the northern end of the trench, was not investigated and the relationship between this and ditch 322 is unknown.
3.15 Two slots at the northern end of the trench revealed at least four east-west aligned intercutting ditches ( $312,315,320$ and 322 ) which coincide with the cropmark enclosure on Figure 2 (see also Fig. 12). This suggests that the boundary has been redefined a number of times.
3.16 Ditch 322 contained a single tile fragment and was cut by an adjacent ditch, 312 (Fig. 6). The complete profile of 312 was not revealed but it was 1.06 m . deep and had 12 fills ( $313,314,324-27,338-43$ ), six of which contained dating evidence. Fill 313 produced 196 sherds of 4th-5th AD century Roman pottery (and a residual Prehistoric sherd), fill 314 produced 30 sherds of 4 th- 5 th century AD Roman pottery (and an undated sherd), the lower fills (324-327) produced a further 18 sherds of Roman pottery. Further south, ditch 320 was 0.89 m . deep, had four fills ( $321,328,329$ and 334 ) and was clearly cut by ditch 315 (Fig. 7). The latter had been disturbed in places but appeared to have an uneven base. The lower fill (317) contained thirteen 4th to 5th century AD Roman sherds and fill 316 contained 80 sherds of the same date. There was a further cut, 332, on the southern side of ditch 315 (possibly a recut and a posthole?) but this is undated. The disturbance in this section has made it difficult to determine how many times this ditch has been recut.
3.17 Two slots were positioned to investigate the ring ditch cropmark and the intersection of three trackways. The first of these revealed two ditches (337 and 415) and one ditch/pit (414) (Fig. 5). No datable finds came from 414 , which was c. 0.90 m . wide and 0.23 m . deep and could be a pit or a ditch terminal (Fig. 8). This lay below a thin layer of metalling (359) and there was some animal or bomb disturbance on its southern side. Both 414 and metalling 359 were cut by ditch 415 . Ditch 415 was not bottomed but it had three fills $(417,349$ and 419) and just the top fill (419) contained 19 sherds of 3rd-4th century AD Roman pottery. This ditch was in turn cut by a broad flat-bottomed ditch, 337 , c. 3 m . wide and 0.44 m . deep, with three fills ( 345,346 and 347 ). The northern side of this was curved and although the lower fill (347) contained just a single sherd of Roman pot, the upper fill (345) contained 48 sherds of 3rd-5th century AD pot. Another layer of metalling (358) which
lay to the north, was cut by ditch 337 . Layer 348 , which lay above metalling 358 , and layer 418 , which lay above metalling 359 , were very similar in appearance and may constitute the same surface cut by ditch 337 .
3.18 It is possible that ditch 337 represents the northern arm of the ring ditch indicated by the cropmarks. The southern arm of the ring ditch may be ditch 360 , discovered in the second slot with ditches 350,351 and 421 (Fig. 5). Ditch 360 was 1.70 m . wide but was cut by 421 on its southern side. It was similar in depth to 337 ( 0.34 m .) and also had a flat base (Fig. 8). The bottom two fills ( 352 and 412) contained five sherds of Roman pot between them. Part of the fill of this ditch had been disturbed in modern times. Ditch 350 appears to have been recut twice ( 351 and 421 ). Ditch 351 has been disturbed quite heavily but it clearly cut the two fills of 350 ( 355 and 353 ) on the northern side. 421 (the latest recut) was broad and shallow, 2.75 m . wide by c .0 .35 m . deep, and contained 26 sherds of 4th-5th century AD Roman pot.
3.19 Ditches $337,360,454$, recut 421 and feature 453 all cut layer 348 (c. 0.19 m . deep) which runs much of the length of Trench 2 but does not continue past ditch 454 (Fig. 8). This layer produced 67 sherds of 4 th- 5 th century AD Roman pot.
3.20 Five more features were discovered at the southern end of the trench (319, 336, 453, 454 and 455 ) (Fig. 5). Of these, 319 and 336 were investigated. 319 was an undated linear feature 0.69 m . wide and 0.31 m . deep (Fig. 7), with a terminal to the south-east. A shallow scoop, 336, 0.80 m . wide, 1.30 m . long and 0.26 m . deep contained six sherds of Roman pottery (Fig. 7). Feature 453 was only partly visible. Unexcavated ditches 454 and 455 appear to correlate well with cropmarks.
3.21 Trench 3 (Figs 9 to 11)
3.22 Twenty-five archaeological deposits and features were recorded in this trench comprising nine ditches ( $363,366,371,374,376,378,400,431$ and 438), four pits/postholes ( $368,382,398$ and 404), a possible wall (370), the remains of three burials ( $\mathrm{S} 900, \mathrm{~S} 901 / 388$ and $\mathrm{S} 902 / 390$ ) and a series of layers $(386,393,394,395$, 406, 407, 408 and 439) (Fig. 9).
3.23 Beginning at the western end of the trench, the relationship between two layers, 386 and 406 , was not determined but a slot through the former showed it to be c .0 .20 m . deep. This layer produced 19 sherds of $3 \mathrm{rd}-$ 5th century AD Roman pot and 17 residual Iron Age sherds. Although layer 406 was unexcavated, 11 sherds of 3rd-5th century AD Roman pot came from its surface. A small undated posthole, 404, cut layer 406.
3.24 To the east of this, ditch 376 crossed the trench from north-west to south-east (Fig. 9). This was not excavated but 26 sherds of 4th-5th century AD Roman pottery (and a sherd of Prehistoric pottery) came from its surface. In plan this ditch was cut by ditch 371 . Ditch 376 lies outside the area of cropmarks (Fig. 2), suggesting the site extends beyond the area indicated by the cropmark survey. A slot through ditch 371 (aligned roughly north-east to south-west) showed it to be 0.23 m . deep with a single fill (372) which produced 30 4th-

5th century AD Roman pot sherds (Fig. 10). The eastern extent of ditch 371 was not found so it is possible that this is a deposit which continues as far as ditch 366.371 truncated another ditch, 374 , which survived to a depth of 0.36 m . and contained a single sherd of 4 th -5 th century AD Roman pottery.
3.25 Between ditches 376 and 371 was an undated deposit, 407 , which was not excavated and is perhaps a continuation of layer 406. A very shallow undated posthole/pit (368) near ditch 366 was 0.39 m . in diameter but just 0.04 m . deep. A slot was excavated through ditch 366 itself which was 2.21 m . wide and 0.46 m . deep. Its fill (367) produced 95 sherds of 4th-5th century $A D$ Roman pottery. 438 was unexcavated but it appeared to cut layer 408 and six sherds of 3rd-5th century AD Roman pottery came from its surface. Layer 408 was unexcavated, but 11 sherds of Roman pottery were recovered from the surface of the layer. Layer 408 was cut by ditches 400 and 438 .
3.26 A slot to the east of this showed another group of intercutting features (Fig. 11). 431, only a small part of which was visible in the section, was undated but was cut by ditch 400 which produced 10 sherds of 5 th- 6 th century AD Saxon and 125 sherds of 4th-5th century AD Roman pot. The remains of a possible northwestsoutheast aligned wall foundation or tumble, 370, sat within fill 365.370 consisted of two courses of unbonded limestone blocks. This was truncated by ditch 363 which produced four sherds of 5th-6th century AD Saxon and 47 sherds of 4 th-5th century AD Roman pottery.
3.27 Ditches 363 and 378 (further east) cut a thin layer 395 ( 0.11 m . thick) which contained two sherds of 3 rd5th century AD Roman pot. This layer overlay two infant burials. In all, three infant burials (S900, S901/388 and $S 902 / 390$ ) and a disarticulated humerus belonging to another infant (from 382) were discovered in the eastern half of the trench (Figs. 9 and 10). The earliest grave cut, 388, was 0.53 m . wide and 0.22 m . deep and contained a single fill (389) which produced the partial remains of an infant skeleton (S901), as well as five sherds of Roman pottery. 388 cuts layer 411 (perhaps a natural deposit) and was cut by a further grave 390 . The latter was 0.61 m . wide and 0.22 m . deep. It contained a single fill (391) which also contained the partial remains of an infant skeleton (S902, only partially exposed in the evaluation trench), five sherds of Bronze Age and three sherds of Roman pottery and some animal bone. No clear burial cut could be discerned for the remains of the third infant ( S 900 ) which was discovered in the top of ditch 378 (see also human bone report below).
3.28 In the section, to the east of burial 390 , was an area of bomb disturbance and the layers either side of this (393 and 394) appeared to be different; perhaps the disturbance here has obliterated a further cut? Layer 394 contained four sherds of 3 rd- 5 th century AD pottery.
3.29 To the south of burials S 900 and 901 was posthole 398 . This was broader at the top ( 0.61 m . wide) and had a central hole for a post 0.27 m . deep (Fig. 10). Its fill (399) contained large limestone blocks and the
remains of a quern, presumably used as post-packing, together with two sherds of 3rd-4th century $A D$ Roman pot.
3.30 A further ditch (378) was found towards the eastern end of the trench (Fig. 9). A slot through this (Fig. 10) only revealed part of its profile but seven Roman and eight mid-late Iron Age sherds came from its fill (379). The remains of the third infant ( S 900 ) were retrieved from the top of this ditch but no clear cut for the burial could be seen. The eastern side of ditch 378 may be that shown to the east of 382 , where it appears to cut an undated layer 439 (Fig. 9) but the slot through the ditch here produced four potsherds, some of which may be Saxon. Lastly, a pit/posthole 382 , which cut the top of ditch 378 , contained three late 2 nd to 4 th century AD potsherds and the infant humerus.
3.31 No clear definition of the character and nature of layers $386,395,406-8$ and 439 was ascertained during the evaluation. The soil horizons noted in Trench 1 (261 and 262) were distinctly different in composition to the silt clay layers recorded in Trench 3. It is possible that some or all of the layers represent possible occupation activity.

## 4. THE FINDS

4.1 Pottery Assessment by Jane Timby (see also Appendices 2 and 3)
4.2 The pottery from the site was briefly scanned to assess its likely date range. Site 126 produced a moderately large collection amounting to some 2711 sherds weighing 24278 gms., recovered from 292 recorded contexts/positions. Of these, 260 contexts/positions ( $89 \%$ ) yielded less than ten sherds. Only eight contexts produced more than 50 sherds: $265,315,312,363,366,400,(348)$ and (261). A high proportion of the wares were recovered from the topsoil/subsoil. Most of the sherds appear to date to the later Roman period. Several sherds comprised greywares which as single body sherds do not lend themselves to close dating. A small number of Prehistoric sherds were present, all as redeposited finds. The Prehistoric material was difficult to date but sherds from burial cut 390 may be of Bronze Age date, whilst other pieces are more likely Iron Age. Some difficulty was encountered in discerning Prehistoric from potential subRoman/Saxon material in smaller sherds.
4.3 The bulk of the assemblage comprised wares of Roman date and most of this appears to be specifically later 3rd to later 4th/5th century AD. Several late Roman shell-tempered wares were present, along with many colour-coated wares from the Oxfordshire industries. Other wares included samian, Dorset black-burnished ware, Rhenish colourcoated ware and Nene Valley colour-coated ware, along with a large number of fine sandy greywares from the Oxfordshire industries. Earlier Roman activity is hinted at from a small number of early Roman sherds, mainly as residual or unstratified pieces, but only two contexts, layer 262 and ditch 277 (278) could be of earlier Roman date, based on the pottery content.
4.4 Definite Saxon sherds were present in ditches 363 and 400 with possible sherds in layer 263 and ditch 378 (384 and 385). The Saxon sherds occur in a variety of fabrics, including coarse angular quartz sand, limestone/chalk and organic-tempered, alongside late Roman wares. There were no featured examples.
4.5 Only two sherds of Medieval date were present, both from layer 261, in what is otherwise a strongly late Roman group suggesting possible intrusive disturbance.

### 4.6 Ferrous Metaluork by Nicky Clarkson and David Richards

4.7 A total of 81 pieces or fragments of metalwork were recovered from Site 126 (see Appendix 3). All are ferrous and in very poor condition, making identification of some fragments impossible. The assemblage is numerically dominated by nails. Most (where identification is possible) appear to be of Manning Type I, that is with a square-sectioned stem and flat discoidal or pyramidal head (Manning 1985). None are complete and all are corroded. A number of pieces are of further note:

Several hobnails are included in the assemblage, and the remains of what may be a heel reinforcement (32).
A flat, T- shaped piece of ironwork from Trench 1 (48.7m.) has been identified as a possible brooch bow, but the poor preservation of the piece makes a positive identification difficult (4).

There are several blade fragments and an L-shaped piece from Trench 1 ( 31.15 m .) which may be the remains of a latch-lifter (1.).

A piece of broken fitting, or strap mounting (5), was recovered from Trench 1 (topsoil $15-20 \mathrm{~m}$ ). The remains of a hole at one broken end suggests the piece was fixed, either as door furniture or possibly a bucket or furniture mounting, by at least one nail.

Three pieces from Trench 2 are possibly the heads of styli ( 14 and included in numbers 17 and 19). All heads are upstanding, with two triangular in shape and a third ovoid.

### 4.8 Copper-alloy dish by David Richards

4.9 A plain flat, late Roman dish with straight everted sides and out turned rim was recovered from pit 265. The bottom is convex and has a small central hole, plugged, probably, by a small hollow tube or rivet.
4.10 Although in its present unclean and encrusted state no internal or external detail is visible, there is little doubt that (like other published examples) this vessel was made by spinning or 'raising' by hammer, from a single sheet of alloy (or a combination of both methods). The presence of a central hole favours the former method.
4.11 In size ( 245 mm . external diameter by 45 mm . deep) the dish is somewhat larger than the two found in nearby Sutton Courtenay (Miles 1976) but only slightly bigger than the almost identical vessel from Coombe Down, Wiltshire (Fulford, Entwistle and Raymond, forthcoming). The Coombe Down vessel had an external diameter of 241 mm . and was 44 mm . deep. The likeness between the two latter dishes is striking; they 'nest' neatly together, so that one is tempted to suggest they were made by the same hand.
4.12 Although at present completely intact, the vessel is badly corroded, especially on its outer surface, and expert cleaning and conservation is urgently required. This is an important addition to the corpus of Roman vessels.

### 4.13 Human Remains Assessment by Andy Smith

4.14 A total of 655 fragments ( 424 gms .) of human bone were analysed. These represent the incomplete remains of three infant skeletons ( $\mathbf{S 9 0 0}, \mathrm{S} 901$ and S 902 ) and an isolated humerus fragment from feature 382 (383), all within Trench 3.
4.15 Skeleton S900 has survived well, with all the major long bones intact. S901 is similar, but many of the long bones have been broken in two or more pieces. Burial S 902 only includes the upper part of the body and the cut for this burial (390) may have contributed to the fragmentation of burial S901. All crania have been heavily fragmented.
4.16 The long bones present are small and all epiphyses are absent. There is a distinct lack of vertebral centra ( $\mathrm{n}=1$ from the total) and the arches are in two halves. The presence of Mandibles and Maxillae from S 900 and S902 has allowed a more specific determination of age; the incisors and canines present in both sets of arches were all deciduous and the pattern of eruption suggests an age of 6 months $\pm 3$ months. The maximum length of the complete long bones was measured, which is also a good indicator for juvenile ageing (Sundick 1978). This shows that all three skeletons are within the 0-6 months bracket (Table 1). The isolated Humeral fragment from posthole/pit 382 (383), although not complete, shares the same immature morphology as the other Humeral fragments.
4.17 The sexing of individuals of this age is not possible given our current understanding of juvenile skeletal morphology.
4.18 The isolated Humeral fragment is slightly flared in profile, which could be a normal variation or perhaps the result of an osteogenic change. The distal metaphysis and epiphyses of a juvenile Humerus articulates with the radius and ulna, and in a small child the elbow joint would be vulnerable to stress caused by bearing the infants' weight when crawling.
4.19 An infant is also susceptible to a host of diseases, one of which is rickets, a Vitamin $D$ deficiency resulting from too little exposure to sunlight and insufficient food. With this deficiency the mineralization processes of bone are reduced, causing the bone to become soft, and the load bearing joints will tend to flare out. Although the isolated humerus is not complete, the distal end, in comparison to the other individuals (S900-S901), does have a slightly wider delta form. Although rickets is rare in rural Roman contexts it is possible to speculate that an unwanted child may be deprived of both sunlight and food.
4.20 Table 1: Comparison of long bone measurements to Sundick's statistics for juveniles between 0-6 months (measurements in mm.)

| Bone | $S 900$ | $S 901$ | S902 | Sundick's Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left Humerus | 67.3 | x | x | 78.0 |
| Right Humerus | 66.3 | x | 78.4 | 78.0 |
| Left Ulna | 63.6 | x | x | 71.0 |
| Right Ulna | x | x | x | 71.0 |
| Left Femur | 81.2 | x | x | 93.0 |
| Right Femur | 81.2 | 83.1 | x | 93.0 |
| Left Tibia | 70.7 | 72.6 | x | - |
| Right Tibia | 70.9 | x | x | - |
| Left Fibula | 67.2 | x | x | 79.0 |
| Right Fibula | 66.9 | x | x | 79.0 |

4.21 Faunal Remains Assessment by Sheila Hamilton-Dyer
4.22 A total of 642 bones were recovered from 43 stratified contexts, mainly from ditches, and unstratified spoil and topsoil The number of fragments from each context is correspondingly low. No feature offered as much as 100 bones but over 90 fragments were recovered from two features: ditches 312 and 400 . Most contexts offered well under 20 bones.
4.23 The bones are well preserved with little surface erosion but many of the bones are incomplete. A few had been broken during excavation but most of the damage is from butchery and canid gnawing of ancient origin.
4.24 Half of the bones could be identified to species, with cattle and sheep dominant. Other taxa identified are horse, pig, roe, dog, hare, fowl-sized bird, and amphibian. A summary of the species distribution is given in Table 2.
4.25 Butchery marks are visible on several bones and include filleting marks (contexts 261, 313 and 317) often seen at Roman villas, urban and military sites, but rarely elsewhere. Few bones were measurable but the general impression is of good sized animals consistent with a late Roman date. It is interesting to note that ditch 400 contained a complete cattle radius giving an estimated withers height of 1.238 m . This is acceptable, though large, for both Roman and Saxon assemblages but would be unusually large for lron Age or Medieval assemblages. The amount of horse is very low. Rural sites, and ditches in particular, are often high in horse for most periods. The high proportion of sheep/goat is common at Romano-British rural sites.

### 4.26 Stone by David Williams

4.27 Three pieces of stone have been analysed:

## 1. Trench 2 Layer 348

Part of an upper stone with deep furrowing from a rotary quern [Thickness: 3.1 cm . Weight: 764 gms ]. This is in a coarse millstone grit, probably coming from the Pennine region of northern Britain.
2. Trench 3 Posthole 398

Part of an upper stone with handle-slot from a rotary quern [Thickness: 8.5 cm to 3.5 cm . Weight: $1,610 \mathrm{gms}$ ]. The stone is a dark grey glauconitic sandstone similar to material from the quarry site at Lodsworth, West

Sussex, where the Lower Greensand Hythe beds were utilised for quernstones from the Iron Age to the Roman period (Peacock, 1987).
3. Trench 1 ditch 267 (268)

Small broken piece of fine-grained sandstone, possibly a sarcen [ Weight: 200 gms ].
4.28 Table 2: Species Distribution Summary

| Feature | Context | Horse | Catte | Sheep/ goat | Pig | Roe | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cattle } \\ \text { size } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Sheep size | Dog | Hare | UND bird | Amp | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 262 | - | 6 | 6 | 1 | - | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | $\cdot$ | 20 |
| - | 263 | - | 4 | 2 | 1 | - | 5 | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | 12 |
| - | 264 | 1 | $-$ | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | * | - | - | - | 1 |
| - | 311 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 5 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 10 |
| . | 348 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 12 |
| - | 384 | - | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| - | 386 | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 7 |
| $\cdot$ | 394 | $\cdot$ | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | * | - | - | $\cdot$ | 1 |
| - | 395 | $\cdot$ | - | 1 | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | $\bullet$ | - | 3 |
| - | 261 | 2 | 26 | 17 | 3 | - | 26 | 18 | - | - | 1 | $\cdot$ | 93 |
| 265 | 266 | 1 | 6 | 5 | - | - | 20 | 3 | - | - | 1 | - | 36 |
| 267 | 268 | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 2 | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - | - | 8 |
| 269 | 270 | - | 3 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 5 |
| 275 | 276 | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 7 |
| 277 | 278 | - | 2 | . | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| 281 | 382 | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | 1 |
| 289 | 290 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 302 | 303 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| 312 | 313 | - | 6 | 8 | 2 | - | 21 | 16 | - | - | 1 | - | 54 |
| 312 | 314 | - | 6 | 3 | - | - | 15 | 5 | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | 29 |
| 312 | 324 | - | 1 | - | - | - | $\square$ | - | $\cdot$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | 1 |
| 312 | 326 | - | 2 | 1 | - | $\cdot$ | 1 | 2 | - | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ | 6 |
| 312 | 327 | - | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\cdot$ | 3 |
| 315 | 316 | $\cdot$ | 7 | 2 | 1 | - | 8 | $\bullet$ | - | - | - | - | 18 |
| 315 | 317 | - | 12 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | 14 |
| 319 | 318 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\because$ | 3 |
| 322 | 323 | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 337 | 345 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 10 | 1 | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | 14 |
| 350 | 354 | - | 6 | - | $\cdot$ | - | . | - | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ | - | 6 |
| 360 | 412 | - | - | 1 | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 363 | 364 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 1 | - | 12 | 8 | - | - | - | - | 35 |
| 366 | 367 | - | 3 | 3 | - | - | 7 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 17 |
| 371 | 372 | $\cdot$ | 2 | 2 | - | - | 1 | $\cdot$ | $\bullet$ | $\cdot$ | - | $\bullet$ | 5 |
| 374 | 375 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| 376 | 377 | - | 1 | $\cdot$ | $-$ | - | 1 | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | 2 |
| 378 | 379 | - | 6 | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | $\cdot$ | $-$ | - | $\cdot$ | 13 |
| 380 | 381 | - | - | - | . | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 388 | 389 | - | - | 1 | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | * | $\bullet$ | - | 1 |
| 392 | 393 | $\cdot$ | 1 | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | $\cdot$ | * | $\bullet$ | 8 |
| 398 | 399 | $\cdot$ | $-$ | - | $\stackrel{\square}{-}$ | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | 2 |
| 400 | 365 | 1 | 16 | 15 | 2 | $\cdot$ | 30 | 14 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 80 |
| 415 | 419 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | 9 |
|  | U/S | - | 21 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 34 | 15 | - | - | - | $-$ | 93 |
|  | Total | 7 | 151 | 117 | 16 | 1 | 236 | 107 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 642 |
|  | Percent | 1.1 | 23.5 | 18.2 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 36.8 | 16.7 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 |  |

### 4.29 Worked Flint by Steve Ford

4.30 Three flint flakes and a spall were recovered from the site. The material is not very diagnostic and could belong to the Neolithic period or the Bronze Age:
Trench 1
Subsoil spoil 0-5 m.
Spall
Trench 2
Trench 2
Ditch 312 (314)
Broken flake
Broken flake
Broken flake
4.32 A total of seven contexts were wet sieved for environmental data (see below). A range of volumes from the the whole sample to sub-samples were processed to assess the potential. For deposits containing certain and possible human remains the whole of a sample was processed. For other deposits, a sub-sample only was processed with the buik of the sample retained for further study if required. One of the flotation samples submitted for analysis contained charred seeds. A single grain of what I believe is barley (Hordeum vulgare) survives in sample 825 from pit 265 (266) Trench 1. It is not possible to say whether the grain was 'hulled'. It is not surprising that this crop appears on the site as barley has been a staple crop in Britain for millennia.
4.33 The following is a list of the contexts sampled and the volume of material sub-sampled and submitted for analysis:

| Sample | Volume () | Feature | Quantity sampled <br> /sub-sampled (l) |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 823 | 28 | Ditch 365 (366) Tr 3 | 2 |
| 824 | 36 | Ditch 378 (379) S900 | 36 |
| 825 | 26 | Pit 265 (266) contents of 706 Tr 1 | 2 |
| $826 / 7$ | 32 | (389) Fill of 388, cut for burial S901 Tr 3 | 32 |
| 828 | 40 | (391) Fill of 390, cut for burial S902 Tr 3 | 40 |
| 829 | 20 | (367) Fill of ditch 366 Tr 3 | 2 |
| 830 | 8 | (399) Fill of posthole 398 Tr 3 | 2 |
| 831 | 0.25 | 365 (366) Tr 3 (contents of pot 707) | 0.25 |

4.34 No organic preservation was observed in the excavated features.

### 4.35 Other Finds by Steven Weaver

4.36 These include fragments of tile, fired clay, oyster shell, glass, burnt flint, a single fragment of worked shale ( 96 gms ) from context 365 , Trench 3 and a single limestone tesserae fragment ( 2 gms ) from context 261 Trench 1 (see Tables 3 to 5 ). 78 pieces of tile were found in Trenches 1 and 2 . These comprised small fragments with few, if any diagnostic traits. It is assumed that the majority of the material is roofing tile and as it was recovered from Roman contexts it is presumably of Roman date. 32 pieces of miscellaneous fired clay were found in all three trenches, some of which is likely to be daub. However, fragments are small and identifications are not certain. Two pieces of fired clay ( 71 gms ) from the surface of context 260 , Trench 1 are probably fragments of loomweights. Of the other finds there were 5 pieces of iron slag, 7 pieces of oyster shell, 2 pieces of glass, 12 pieces of burnt flint and one piece of clay pipe.
4.37 Table 3: Summary of finds from features/layers in Trench 1

| Feature/ Layer | Pottery (No.) | Pottery (gms) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CBM } \\ & \text { (No.) } \\ & \text { (gms) } \end{aligned}$ | Animal Bone (gms) | Fired <br> Clay <br> (No.)/ <br> (gms) | Stone (No.)/ (gms) | Burnt <br> flint <br> No.) <br> (gms) | Metal work (No.)/ (gms) | Flint (No.)/ (gms) | Slag (No.)/ (gms) | Shell (No.)/ (gms) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 261 | 710 | 6970 | 9/230 | 1440 | - | - | - | 7/152 | $1 /<1$ | 5/515 | 2/4 |
| 262 | 151 | 1804 | 8/448 | 456 | 2/20 | - | - | - | - | - | 1/16 |
| 263 | 2 | 22 | 4/150 | 530 | . | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 265 | 56 | 642 | - | 1054 | - | - | - | 1/458 | - | - | 1/24 |
| 267 | 66 | 652 | - | 127 | 5/334 | 1/200 | - | 1/14 | - | - | - |
| 269 | 42 | 290 | - | 218 | 1/88 | - | - | 1/6 | - | - | - |
| 275 | 6 | 68 | - | 34 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 277 | 12 | 110 | - | 260 | - | - | - | - | * | - | - |
| 281 | 1 | 42 | $\cdot$ | 8 | - | $\cdot$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | - | $\cdot$ |
| 289 | 13 | 158 | - | 8 | - | - | * | - | - | - | - |
| 299/261 | 13 | 76 | - | 18 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 299 | 109 | 962 | 3/34 | 346 | 2/24 | * | - | - | - | - | 1/17 |
| 300 | - |  | - | - | - | - | 1/10 | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ | - |
| 302 | 2 | 6 | - | 4 | - | $\begin{gathered} 1 / \\ 1228 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - | - | - |
| 304 | 3 | 20 | - | - | $7 / 44$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 428 | 1 | 6 | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - |
| Total No. | 1187 | - | 24 | - | 17 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| gms | - | 11828 | 862 | 4503 | 510 | 1428 | 10 | 630 | $<1$ | 515 | 61 |

4.38 Table 4: Summary of finds in features/layers in Trench 2

| Featuref Layer | Pontery (No.) | Pottery (gms) | CBM (No.)/ (gms) | Animal Bone (gms) | Fired <br> Clay <br> (No.) <br> ( $g m s$ ) | Stone (No.)/ (gms) | Flint (No.)/ (gms) | Metal <br> work <br> (No.)/ <br> (gms) | Glass (Nc.) (gms) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 312 | 246 | 1650 | 1/2 | 874 | - | - | $2 / 2$ | 29/132 | - |
| 315 | 94 | 652 | 2/80 | 960 | 4/26 | - | - | 6/46 | - |
| 319 | 18 | 146 | - | 46 | 2/10 | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - | - |
| 320 | - | - | 5/192 | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - |
| 322 | $\bullet$ | $\cdot$ | 1/104 | <1 | - | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| 336 | 6 | 24 | - | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| 337 | 49 | 430 | - | 312 | 1/18 | - | $\cdot$ | 3/62 | $2 /<1$ |
| 348 | 110 | 768 | 1/5 | 110 | - | 1/770 | - | 4/50 | 1/4 |
| 350 | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ |
| 360 | 5 | 33 | 1/22 | 20 | - | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| 415 | 19 | 128 | - | 294 | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - |
| 421 | 26 | 428 | $\cdot$ | 216 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total No. | 573 | - | 11 | - | 7 | 1 | 2 | 42 | 3 |
| gms | - | 4259 | 405 | 2834 | 54 | 770 | 2 | 490 | 4 |

4.39 Table 5: Summary of finds from features/layers in Trench 3

| Feature/ Layer | Pottery (No.) | Pottery (gms) | CBM (No.)/ (gms) | Animal Bone (gms) | Human Bone (gms) | Fired Clay (No.)/ (gms) | Stone (No.)/ (gms) | Fint No. 1 (gms) | Burnt <br> flint <br> (No.) <br> (gms) | Metal <br> work <br> (No.)/ <br> (gms) | Shell (No.) (gms) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 363 | 58 | 518 | - | 364 | - | - | - |  | - | $2 / 2$ | - |
| 366 | 97 | 954 | 7/212 | 317 | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
| 371 | 50 | 500 | $\cdot$ | 135 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 374 | 1 | 4 | - | 4 | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - |
| 376 | 38 | 419 | $\cdot$ | 54 | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |
| 378 | 31 | 303 | - | 380 | 162 | 1/32 | - | - | - | - | -+ |
| 382 | 3 | 16 | - | $\cdot$ | < 1 | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | - |
| 386 | 39 | 380 | - | 54 | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - |
| 388 | 5 | 10 | - | <1 | 146 | - | - | - | 1/2 | - | - |
| 390 | 8 | 14 | - | - | 114 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 392 | - | - | - | 48 | - | - | - | 1/6 | * | - | - |
| 394 | 4 | 16 | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 395 | 7 | 32 | $\cdot$ | <1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 398 | 2 | 14 | 4/50 | 2 | - | $\cdot$ | 4/1620 | - | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ |
| 400 | 151 | 1531 | - | 1966 | - | 3/66 | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | 6/26 | 3/8 |
| Total No. | 494 | - | 11 | - | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 3 |
| gms | . | 4712 | 262 | 3326 | 422 | 98 | 1620 | 6 | 2 | 28 | 8 |

## 5. Discussion

5.1 The evaluation has been successful in locating a number of subsoil features and deposits that correlate well with the cropmarks, as well as identifying a number of features which do not appear as cropmarks. The material assemblage recovered from the evaluation dates from the Prehistoric, Roman, Saxon and Medieval/post-Medieval periods.

### 5.2 Prehistoric

5.3 A number of residual Bronze Age and Iron Age sherds were recovered during the evaluation. In Trenches 1 and 2 a small number of sherds came from within the topsoil and subsoil but a high proportion of the Prehistoric material came from subsoil features in Tiench 3 (390, 378 and 386).
5.4 Although no Prehistoric contexts were identified during the evaluation, the presence of these residual finds and their distinct clustering within Trench 3 would suggest Bronze Age and Iron Age activity on the site.

### 5.5 Roman

5.6 Dating evidence recovered from a series of subsoil features/deposits such as ditches, metalled surfaces, postholes, pits, burials and walls within the three trenches indicates that the main cropmark complex dates from the 3rd-4th centuries AD. An earlier Roman presence on the site is reflected by the residual $1 \mathrm{st}-2 \mathrm{nd}$ century AD sherds from Trench 1 (262 and 277).
5.7 A number of the features in Trench 1 correlate well with cropmarks. The cropmark enclosures were represented by a series of ditches $(275,277,281,289,424,430$ and 443$)$, often with more than one ditch and several recuts, which suggests that these boundaries have been redefined on several occasions. Three well preserved metalled surfaces $(264,285 / 6$ and $441 / 2)$ which had been cut by a number of postholes and later ditches, appear to relate to the northwest-southeast aligned trackway and enclosure.
5.8 Structural evidence within Trench 1 took the form of two walls ( 279 and 280 ) which were not reflected by cropmarks. Wall 279 was on the same alignment as the cropmark enclosure ditch nearby and may be contemporaneous.
5.9 Two dark layers (261 and 262) were also identified. The first of these (261) sloped upwards from east to west and lay above the ditches, metalled surfaces, postholes and walls at the western end of the trench. Pottery from this layer is 4th-5th century AD Roman but the two Medieval sherds from the same layer (if not intrusive) may suggest that it was formed later. The depth of the deposit above the metalled surfaces may have resulted in good preservation of walls and any associated floor surfaces. The second layer (262), which contained residual sherds of Early Roman pottery, covered the eastern half of the trench and a slot excavated through this has shown several features beneath. It is likely that further features exist, for example, two possible natural patches
(260) may define a roughly east-west aligned cropmark (Fig. 3). The shallow intercutting features in the centre of the trench $(267,269,300,302,304,306,308$ and 428$)$ were not indicated by the cropmark survey.
5.10 Cropmarks and subsoil features also correlate well in Trench 2. Five large intercutting ditches (312, 315, 320,322 and 421) at the northern end of the trench all have the same east-west alignment as the cropmark enclosure. As with Trench 1, the enclosure boundary appears to have been redefined on several occasions. The remains of a metalled surface (358), truncated by later features, lay below a 4th-5th century $A D$ layer ( $348 / 2418$ ) and may be the remains of the three trackway junction indicated by the cropmarks. Also, the similar profiles of ditches 360 and 377 and the apparently curvilinear nature of the latter suggests they relate to the possible ring ditch (like penannular cropmark) at the junction of the trackways. However, the cropmarks and the ditches do not match directly.
5.11 The cropmark survey showed two northwest-southeast aligned marks at the southern end of the trench which correlate well with ditches 454 and 455 (not shown on Fig. 2). Four east-west aligned ditches in this trench $(350,351,415$ and 421$)$ did not relate to cropmarks but the intercutting nature of the ditches indicates a well-established boundary.
5.12 Again, the cropmarks in Trench 3 correlate well with subsoil features but a number of features discovered did not relate to cropmarks. Of the nine ditches recorded ( $363,366,371,374,376,378,400,431$ and 438), ditch 431 , subsequently recut by two Saxon ditches ( 363 and 400 ) corresponds with a cropmark at the centre of the trench. The cropmark at the western end of the trench corresponds with a number of intercutting features ( $366,368,371,374$ and 438). As with Trenches 1 and 2, this boundary may have been redefined a number of times and it is likely that further features lie below 371 . Two ditches ( 376 and 378 ) did not correspond with cropmarks. It is interesting to note that the first of these (376) was outside of the western extent of the cropmark enclosure.
5.13 A series of layers ( $386,393,395,406,407,408$ and 439) which may represent occupation deposits were also recorded in Trench 3. These layers were cut by a number of ditches, postholes and burials and were different in character to the dark earth deposits encountered in Trench 1.
5.14 The remains of three infant burials (S900, S901 and S902) and a single humerus fragment from a fourth indicates the use of this area for the disposal of dead infants. Pottery recovered from all four burials dates to the Roman period. Infant mortality was high in this period due to a number of factors such as disease, malnutrition and infanticide, and the presence of infant burials within informal burial contexts on Roman settlement is not uncommon (Smith, pers comm, McWhirr, Viner and Wells, 1982, pp. 136-7 and Jackson, 1988, pp. 86-111).
5.15 To summarise, the dating material recovered from features suggests that the main phase of Roman occupation on the site began around the 3 rd to 4 th centuries AD. The nature of some of these features (eg the
ditches) suggests successive phases of redefinition of the enclosure boundaries, perhaps specifically in the 4th5th centuries AD. The recovery of the copper alloy dish, samian pottery, imported finewares and a single limestone tesserae may indicate a site of high status but the precise nature of the settlement cannot be ascertained within the confines of evaluation trenches.

### 5.16 Saxon

5.17 Saxon activity in the area was indicated by two Saxon ditches ( 363 and 400) and some possible Saxon pot from ditch 378, in Trench 3, and a single intrusive sherd from layer 263 in Trench 1. The ditches appear to be recuts of the cropmark defined by ditch 431 . It may be that this boundary was defined by a wall ( 370 ), the stone from which was later robbed by means of ditch 363 .

### 5.18 Medieval/post-Medieval

5.19 The Medieval and post-Medieval periods are both characterised at this site by small numbers of pottery sherds. In Trench 1 layer 261 produced two sherds of Medieval pottery, the presence of which may lend weight to the argument that this deposit is a Medieval headland.
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# APPENDIX 1 - SPECIFICATION FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORKS REQUIRED 

Trial trenches - Archaeological Evaluation Contract Ref. C-07
Site 126

## A1. INTRODUCTION

A1.1 A series of archaeological trial trenches are required within an area of known archaeological potential (Site 126). The archaeological potential of this area has been defined by a combination of sources including aerial photography, fieldwalking and geophysical survey.

## Location and geology

A1.2 The location of Site 126 within the overall reservoir development is shown on Figure 1. The site lies north of the East Hanney to Steventon Road and is centred on SU 44709430 Geologically the area coincides with the flat, lowland clay vale (Gault and Kimmeridge clays) between the chalk downlands (Berkshire Downs) to the south and the Corallian Ridge to the north. The solid geology is overlain with extensive river terrace and alluvial drift deposits. The land-use of Site 126, like nearly all of the surrounding area, is arable agriculture. Soil sampling by auguring indicates a typical soil sequence of c. 0.30 m of clay loam above sandy clays.

## Archaeological background (Figure 2)

A1.3 Site 126 was first defined as an extensive cropmark complex, over several hectares. Some cropmarks were known before TWUL commenced the initial archaeological assessment but recent air photographs have enhanced the information about the plan of the site. The main focus of activity is to the north and appears to represent a single phase of occupation. A series of rectilinear enclosures is evident, apparently delimited to the west by a major north to south boundary. A probable focus of activity is marked at the point where four trackways converge. To the south less coherent cropmarks are evident over a wide area. These cropmarks give the impression that more than one phase of activity is represented. Some of these cropmarks at least are likely to represent former parish and hundred boundaries but there remains the possibility that some elements are directly linked with the focus of activity defined to the north.

A1.4 A programme of systematic fieldwalking commissioned by TWUL has revealed a very dense scatter of Roman pottery over the northern area of cropmarks. This collection comprises a range of local, non-local and imported wares. It should be noted that the fieldwalking assemblage is of very high quality (including large and unabraded sherds), more akin to many excavated assemblages. Non-Roman finds include low levels of prehistoric pottery, possible Saxon sherds, and medieval and later material. The area of cropmarks to the south produced much lower quantities of material, including Roman pottery.

A1.5 Trial geophysical survey has been undertaken on the site but has proved of very limited potential for the detection of subsoil features due to the large amounts of modern ferrous material present in the soil.

A1.6 With the completion of non-invasive evaluation TWUL are commissioning a programme of trial trenching iso that an overall evaluation of the archaeological potential and significance of the site may be made. The aim is to undertake a single phase of trial trenching.

## A2. METHODOLOGY. FOR TRIAL TRENCHING

## Mechanical Excavation

A2.1 All mechanical excavation shall be carried out by means of an appropriate machine with appropriately qualified driver. All excavation shall be undertaken using a 6 feet (c. 1.8 m ) wide, toothless (ditching) bucket. Mechanical excavation shall be supervised at all times by a suitably experienced member of the field team.

A2.2 Topsoil or recent overburden shall be removed first and stored separately from any subsoils/non-humic horizons if the latter are removed subsequently.

A2.3 Mechanical excavation shall proceed onto the uppermost archaeologically significant horizon and shall thereafter proceed by hand (see below). If no archaeological deposits/features are encountered machine excavation shall proceed, in spits, onto the subsoil or underlying 'natural' geological deposits, as appropriate. Care shall be taken not to damage archaeological deposits (or field drains - see below, A6) through excessive use of mechanical excavation.

A2.4 No trenches shall be excavated beyond safe working depths in accordance with Health and Safety regulations (including all those detailed in the Standing Conference on Archaeological Unit Managers Manual, Health and Safety in Field Archaeology). Health and Safety Regulations shall override all archaeological aspects of the field project. If the site Supervisor considers that it is necessary to exceed this depth in order to meet the aims of the evaluation, excavation shall cease at the safe limit and contact made with the MAC Project Manager to discuss the situation in detail. No further excavation shall proceed until written authorisation has been obtained from the MAC Project Manager. Such authorisation will set out the course of action agreed, including details of the safety measures to be implemented before work proceeds.

## Manual Excavation

A2.5 The top of the first significant archaeological horizon may be cleared, with care, by the machine, but shall then be cleaned by hand and inspected for features.

A2.6 Sample excavation of exposed archaeological features, levels and deposits shall be by hand. The extent and number of sample excavations shall be dependent on the number and complexity of the features observed but shall generally aim to be minimally intrusive. Sample excavation shall, however, be of a sufficient level to meet the primary objectives of the evaluation as outlined above.

A2.7 No archaeological deposits should be entirely removed unless this is unavoidable.

A2.8. In the event thattintsitu structural remains are encountered they shall generally be
 rinhtimited sample excavation may be necessary, for example to establish dating and/or the potential for underlying deposits/features. Such excavation shall only proceed with the prior authorisation of the MAC Project Manager who will consult with the County Archaeological Officer.

## Human remains

A2.9 In the event that human remains (inhumation or cremation) are encountered they shall initially be left in silu. The MAC Project Manager shall be informed not later than two hours after the time of discovery of any human remains. If removal is deemed to be necessary the MAC Project Manager shall make the necessary applications to the Home Office and advise the Contractor accordingly and without delay.

## Environmental sampling

A2. 10 If dated/dateable, well stratified and uncontaminated deposits or horizons are encountered a strategy for palaeo-environmental sampling shall be implemented so that the environmental potential of the site may be assessed in accordance with the primary' objectives of the work. If necessary (that is if the Contractor does not have its own inhouse guidelines), a copy of Wessex Archaeology's Environmental Sampling Policy may be supplied for implementation.

## Photographic recording

A2.11 These shall comprise monochrome and colour ( 35 mm transparency) and shall include general and 'working' shots as well as archive record photographs. All photographs are to be regarded as part of the project archive.

A2.12 Photographs of each trench shall be taken, including those which contain no archaeological features. In the latter case a shot from either or both ends of the fully excavated trench, plus a representative shot of the trench section/soil profile shall suffice.
A2.13 It should be noted that in addition to the archaeological photographs the MAC Project Manager will be responsible for recording (by means of time/dated photographs) the general ground conditions before and after the fieldwork, including a photograph of each trench after backfilling and reinstatement.

## Drawings

A2.14 An overall plan showing the position and numbering of the trenches will be supplied to the contractor.

A2.15 All trenches which contain archaeological features shall be planned at 1:50 scale. If appropriate more detailed plans, for example of structural elements, shall be compiled at an appropriate scale.

A2.16 In addition to any section drawings of features subjected to sample excavation and trench sections which contain deposits of archaeological interest, a representative section of the soil profile recorded within each trench shall be drawn at 1:10 scale. This section shall generally be at least 1.0 m wide and shall extend from the current ground surface to the top of the underlying 'natural' deposits (or the maximum extent of excavations in the trench). Where soil profiles are variable within a single trench, two or more of such soil profiles shall be drawn, as appropriate.

A2.17 All section drawings shall be located on the appropriate plan/s.
A2.18 The absolute height ( m . OD) of all principal strata and features, and the section datum lines shall be calculated and indicated on the appropriate plans. Permanent survey markers have been escablished in the area and the Contractor will be advised of the nearest datum points and their values at the pre-start meeting.

## A3. BACKFILLING AND REINSTATEMENT OF TRENCHES

A3.1 All trenches shall be backfilled upon completion. Subsoils and topsoils are to be reinstated sympathetically and compacted as best possible using the mechanical excavator. Spreads or mounds of soil shall not be left across the surrounding area.

A3.2 Trenches shall not be backfilled without the prior approval of the MAC Project Manager who will 'sign off' trenches during site visits, as appropriate. Trenches shall be backfilled and reinstated to the satisfaction of the MAC Project Manager. The landowner will also make site visits with the MAC Project Manager to inspect the backfilling and reinstatement of trenches.

## A4. TEMPORARY SURVEY MARKERS

A4. 1 Survey markers relating to each trench location will be established by the Client's agents immediately prior to the field survey. The markers are likely to comprise two end points (SE, SW or NW corners) for each trench. These points will be established by Ground Position by Satellite (GPS) techniques to provide a high level of accuracy

A4.2 The survey markers shall not be removed unless agreed otherwise with the MAC Project Manager.

## A5. ACCESS

A5.1 It should be noted that the area is characterised by heavy, clayey, soils. Ground conditions are currently very dry/hard (August 1995) but it is likely that four wheel drive vehicles will be necessary to gain access to the evaluation area.

## A6. FIELD DRAINS

A6.1 The Client has access to data on the location of field drains and wherever possible trenches have been located to avoid known drains. Available information on field drains within the working area will be relayed to the Contractor at the pre-start meeting.

A6.2 When supervising the machine excavation the Contractor shall pay very close attention to the possibility of intercepting the line of field drains so that they may be avoided. In the event that the 'cut' of a field drain is evident (for example by shingle fill etc.), excavation shall proceed no deeper along and across the line of the field drain itself.

A6.3 The Client accepts no responsibility or liability in the event that the Contractor intercepts active field drains. Contractors must ensure that they are fully insured against such circumstances.

## A7. SERVICES AND UTLITIES

A7.1 The Client has access to data on the location of services and utilities within the study area (for example telephone and electricity cables) and wherever possible trenches have been located to avoid known services. Information available on services and utilities within or near the working area will be relayed to the Contractor at the prestart meeting.

A7.2 The Client accepts no responsibility or liability in the event that the Contractor intercepts active services or utilities. Contractors must ensure that they are fully insured against such circumstances.

## A8. FENCING AND DEMARCATION OF TRENCHES

A8.1 The Contractor shall not be required to fence off individual trenches unless where Health and Safety regulations demand such. The Contractor shall have at its disposal quantities of road pins and safety flash tape (or similar) in the event that Health and Safety regulations and trench demarcation become a consideration during the course of the work.

## A9. OFF-SITE WORKS AND DATA PROCESSING

A9.1 All finds and palaeo-environmental bulk samples recovered from the evaluation shall be cleaned/processed after the completion of the fieldwork.

A9.2 All finds shall be marked, packaged and boxed in accordance with the Required Procedures for Transference of Archaeological Archives to Oxfordshire Museums.

A9.3 The paper archive, including drawings, photographs etc. should be prepared, stored, and packaged in accordance with the Required Procedures for Transference of Archaeological Archives to Oxfordshire Museums.

A10. TIMING
A10.1 It is anticipated that mobilisation of the Contractor will be required not more than two weeks after formal notification of the award of the Agreement.

A10.2 It is anticipated that the pre-start meeting for this Agreement will be in Reading not more than one week after notification of the award of the Agreement. It is expected that the meeting may take up to half a day.

A10.3 Shortly after completion of the fieldwork and the processing of finds and samples it is anticipated that a progress meeting will be held at the Contractor's office headquarters to discuss the provisional results. If not already done so, the format of the report will also be discussed and agreed at this meeting.

A10.4 A draft report shall be submitted to Thames Water Utilities Lid not more than two weeks following the progress meeting described in A10.3 above.

A10.5 Following the submission of the draft report it is anticipated that a meeting will be held in Reading to discuss the report and its implications.

A10.6 The final report shall be submitted not more than two weeks following the meeting referred to in A10.5 above.

## A11. TRIAL TRENCHES - SPECIFIC REQUDREMENTS

All.1 The strategy for trial trenching and the location of the individual trenches has been agreed with the County Archaeological Officer.

Al1.2 The overall aim is to excavate a series of transects across the site with the aim of characterising individual features, groups of features, and the overall arciaeological site.

APPENDIX 2: Quantification of Pottery by Number

| Trench | PREH | RBCW | RBFW | SAM | IMFW | MORT | SAX | MED | $P M$ | UNID |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-U/S finds | - | 34 | 23 | 2 | - | 3 | - | - | 1 | - |
| *1-subsoil/dark earth layers | 6 | 782 | 171 | 8 | - | 28 | 1 | 2 | - | 2 |
| 1-stratified material | - | 151 | 43 | 4 | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 - U/S finds | - | 13 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2-subsoil | - | 129 | 32 | 3 | - | 5 | - | - | - | - |
| *2-stratified material | 1 | 424 | 131 | 3 | 1 | 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 3-U/S finds | 3 | 51 | 14 | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | 5 |
| 3-subsoil | 1 | 36 | 64 | 1 | - | 7 | - | - | - | 6 |
| *3-stratified material | 31 | 331 | 103 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 14 | - | - | 4 |
| TOTAL | 42 | 1951 | 585 | 25 | 8 | 63 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 17 |

APPENDIX 3: Quantification of Pottery by Weight in gms.

| Trench | PREH | RBCW | RBFW | SAM | IMFW | MORT | SAX | MED | $P M$ | UNID |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-U/S finds | - | 193 | 131 | 3 | - | 12 | - | - | 4 | - |
| 1-subsoil | 74 | 8020 | 1092 | 14 | - | 343 | 2 | 10 | - | 12 |
| 1 -stratijied material | - | 1528 | 314 | 34 | 3 | 118 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 - U/S finds | - | 66 | 17 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2-subsoil | - | 1080 | 192 | 6 | - | 44 | - | - | - | - |
| *2-stratified material | 22 | 3473 | 605 | 18 | 4 | 137 | - | - | - | - |
| 3-U/S finds | 18 | 321 | 73 | 2 | - | 46 | - | - | 22 | 8 |
| *3-subsoil | 4 | 743 | 332 | 1 | - | 78 | - | - | - | 25 |
| 3-stratified material | 202 | 3678 | 613 | 33 | 49 | 14 | 108 | - | - | 15 |
| TOTAL | 320 | 19102 | 3691 | 111 | 56 | 792 | 110 | 10 | 26 | 60 |

## APPENDIX 4: Metalwork Catalogue



## APPENDIX 4: Metalwork Catalogue (continued)

| 24. | (746-48) | Tr 2 (348) | Nail. Length 35 mm . Type 1. <br> ?Strap piece. Length 76 mm ; Width 15 mm with slight taper to 13 mm Curved piece of ironwork. Length 55 mm . Width 8 mm at widest end, which folds slightly over, tapering to broken tip. Thickness approx. 1.5 mm . Purpose unknown. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25. | (749) | Tr 34.30 mm .0 .40 N 406 | Nail stem. Length 26 mm . Squarish section. |
| 26. | (750) | Tr 3 Subsoil spoil $10-15 \mathrm{~m}$. | ?Nail stem. Length 29 mm . Heavily corroded. |
| 27. | (751) | Tr 3 Topsoil spoil | Blade fragment. Length 45 mm . With an almost straight 20-25 mm back and slightly convex edge. |
| 28. | (752) | Tr 3 Subsoil 30-35m | Unidentified piece of broken ironwork. Length 66 mm . Round cross-section. Possibly a bent nail stem or piece of iron ring or loop. |
| 29. | (753) | Tr 3 Subsoil spoil | Nail stem. Length 52 mm . Square crose-section. Tip $\mathbf{3 5 - 4 0 \mathrm { mm }}$ missing. |
| 30. | (754) | Tr 3 (364) | Hobnail. Length 12 mm . Domed head. Heavily corroded. |
| 31. | (755) | Tr 3 F363 (364) | Flat, thin piece of ironwork. Roughly triangular with sides approx. 20 mm . Purpose unknown. |
| 32. | (756-58) | Tr 3 (365) | Nail stem. Length 38 mm . Square cross-section. <br> Nail. Length 39 mm. Type 1. Tip missing. <br> Nail. Length 46 mm . Square cross-section. Possibly a horseshoe nail. <br> Nail head. Length 19 mm . With small length of stem remaining. <br> Heavily corroded. <br> Hobnail. Length 17 mm . <br> Small hook. Length $\mathbf{2 8} \mathrm{mm}$. Flat piece of ironwork with a hook at one end. |
| 33. | (722) | Tr 1261 | Possibly remains of a hipposandal heel or shoe heel reinforcement. Folded fragment of lead, possibly part of a vessel |

## APPENDIX 5: Trench Details

0 m . at south or west end
All trenches 2 m . wide

| Trench No. | Length $(m)$. | Maximum depth $(m)$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 80 | 0.31 |
| 2 | 60 | 0.36 |
| 3 | 80 | 0.36 |

## APPENDIX 6: Brief Description of Features

| TRENCH 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Context | Length <br> ( $m$ ) | Width' <br> diameter (m) | Depth/Height <br> (m) | Description |
| - | 259 | - | - | 0.28 | Topsoil |
| - | 260 | - | - | - | Natural limestone patches, unexcavated |
| - | 261 | 33 | 1.80 | 0.50+ | Layer, dark earth or Medieval headland |
| - | 262 | c. 20.5 | 1.80 | 0.30-0.40 | Layer, possible occupation spread/dark earth |
| - | 263 |  | 0.50 slot | 0.10 | Layer over metalled surface 264 |
| - | 264 | 8.15 slot | 0.50 slot | 0.02 | Metalled surface |
| 265 | 266 | - | 0.94 | 0.80 | Pit, cuts ditches 275 and 277 |
| 267 | 268 | 1.80 | c. 2.00 | 0.20 | Shallow ditch/gully, cuts 269 |
| 269 | 270 | 1.75 | c. 1.35 | 0.13 | Shallow ditch/gully, cuts 306 |
| 271 | 272 | 0.19 | 0.12 | - | Posthole, unexcavated |
| 273 | 274 | - | 0.16 | - | Posthole, unexcavated |
| 275 | 276 | 0.50 | 0.38 | 0.45 | Ditch, cut by 265 , cuts 263 and 430 |
| 277 | 278 | 0.50 | 0.38 | 0.37 | Possible westerly continuation of ditch 275 |
| 279 | - | 2.40 | 0.80 | 0.03-4 exc | Wall, aligned northwest-southeast (cleaned) |
| 280 | - | c. 0.40 | c. 0.40 | 0.03-4 exc | Wall, aligned northeast-southwest (cleaned) |
| 281 | 282 | c. 0.70 | 1.00 | - | Ditch. unexcavated |
| 283 | 284 | - | 0.13 | - | Posthole, unexcavated |
| - | 285/286 | - | c. 2.00 | c. 0.04 | Metalled surface |
| 287 | 288 | - | 0.16 | - | Posthole, unexcavated |
| 289 | 290 | 0.70 | 1.08 | 0.72 | Ditch, cuts ditch 424 |
| 291 | 292 | - | 0.14 | - | Posthole, unexcavated |
| 293 | 294 | - | 0.21 | - | Posthole, unexcavated |
| 295 | 296 | - | 0.21 | - | Posthole, unexcavated |
| 297 | 298 | - | 0.09 | - | Posthole/stakehole, unexcavated |
| - | 299 | c. 9.00 | 1.80 | - | Layer |
| 300 | 301 | - | 0.25 | 0.08 | Posthole |
| 302 | 303 | - | 0.29 | 0.16 | Posthole |
| 304 | 305 |  |  | 0.09 | Possible remains of small pit |
| 306 | 307 | - | 0.30 | 0.04 | Shallow remains of posthole |
| 308 | 309 | - | 0.24 | 0.06 | Posthole, cut by 269 |
| - | 423 | c. 1.20 | c. $0.25-30$ | - | Layer, possibly bedding for metalling 285/6 |
| 424 | 425 | 0.80 | 0.63 | 0.37 | Ditch, cut by 289 , cuts 285/6 |
| 428 | 427 | - | 0.29 | - | Posthole, unexcavated |
| 430 | 429 | 0.50 | 0.30 | 0.17 | Ditch, cut by 275 |
| - | 441/442 | - | 0.80-0.95 | - | Metalled surface, (cleaned) |
| 443 | 444 | 1.00 | 1.35 exp | - | Ditch, unexcavated |
| 445 | 446 | - | 0.24 | - | Posthole, unexcavated |

APPENDIX 6: Brief Description of Features (continued)

| TRENCH 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Context | Length <br> (m) | Width' diameter ( $m$ ) | Depth/Height $(m)$ | Description |
| - | 310 | - | - | 0.25 | Topsoil |
| - | 311 | - | - | c. 0.11 | Subsoil |
| 312 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 313-4 \\ & 324-7 \\ & 338-344 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0.60 | $2.40 \exp$ | 1.06 | Ditch, cuts 322 |
| 315 | 316-7 | 0.55 | 2.90 | 0.90 | Ditch, cuts 320 , cut by 332 |
| 319 | 318 | 1.50 | 0.69 | 0.31 | Linear feature with terminal |
| 320 | $\begin{array}{r} 321,328 \\ 329,334 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.50 | 1.30 | 0.89 | Ditch, cut by 315 |
| 322 | 323 | 0.50 | 0.40 | 0.70 | Ditch, cut by 312 |
| 332 | 331 | - | 1.25 | 0.38 | Ditch/gully? |
| 336 | 335 | 1.30 | 1.10 | 0.26 | Scoop |
| 337 | 345-7 | 0.70 | 3.30 | 0.44 | Ditch, curvilinear? cuts 358, 348, 418 and 415 |
| - | 348 | - | - | 0.19 | Layer, probably same as 418 |
| 350 | 353, 355 | 0.55 | 2.76 | 0.62 | Ditch, recut by 351 and 421 |
| 351 | 356 | 0.55 | 1.00 | 0.64 | Ditch, recut of 350 and recut by 421 |
| - | 358 | - | 1.60 | - | Metalled surface, lies below 348 (cleaned) |
| - | 359 | - | 0.26 | 0.03 | Metalled surface, lies below 418, possibly same as 358 |
| 360 | 412-3 | 0.55 | I. 70 | 0.34 | Ditch, cuts 348, cut by 421. May be ring ditch |
| 414 | 416 | 0.25 | 0.90 | 0.23 | Ditch terminal/pit, lies below metalling 359 |
| 415 | $\begin{gathered} 349,417 \\ 419 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.55 | 1.26 | 0.50 | Ditch, southern edge undefined, cuts 414,418 and 359 |
| - | 418 | - | 0.26 | 0.15 | Layer, possibly same as 348, overlies 359 |
| 421 | 354 | 0.55 | 2.75 | 0.35 | Ditch, recut of 351 and 350 , cuts 360 |
| - | 451 | 1.80 | 2.50 | - | Possible upper fill/deposit of further linear feature or part of spread, unexcavated |
| 453 | - | $-$ | 1.30 | - | Ditch/pit, cuts 348, unexcavated |
| 454 | - | 2.50 | 1.45 | - | Ditch, unexcavated |
| 455 | - | 2.25 | 1.60 | - | Ditch, unexcavated |

## APPENDIX 6: Brief Description of Features (continued)

| TRENCH 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Context | Length <br> (m) | Width diameter ( $m$ ) | Depth/Height <br> (m) | Description |
| - | 361 | - | - | 0.24 | Topsoil |
| - | 362 | - | - | c. 0.11 | Subsoil |
| 363 | 364 | 3.55 | 1.95 | 0.40 | Ditch, cuts possible wall 370 and ditch 400 |
| 366 | 367 | 2.25 | 2.21 | 0.46 | Ditch, cuts 438 and 372 |
| 368 | 369 | - | 0.39 | 0.04 | Shallow posthole/pit, cuts 372 |
| 370 | - | 1.00 | 0.80 | c. 0.12 | Possible remains of wall foundation or tumble within ditch 400 , cut by 363 |
| 371 | 372 | 1.80 | c. 10 | 0.23 | Possible shallow ditch/spread, cuts 376 and truncates 374 |
| 374 | 375 | 1.80 | 0.94 | 0.36 | Ditch, truncated by 371 |
| 376 | 377 | c. 5 | 3.70 | - | Ditch, cuts 406 and 407 |
| 378 | $\begin{gathered} 379,384 \\ 385 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | c. 6.50 | 1.05 | 0.46 | Possible ditch, cuts 395 , relationship with S 900 not clear |
| 382 | 383 | $-$ | 0.43 | 0.14 | Posthole/pit, cuts ditch 378. |
| - | 386 | c. 3.40 | 1.80 | 0.14-21 | Layer |
| - | 387 | - | - | 0.26 | Natural clay |
| 388 | $\begin{gathered} 389 \text { and } \\ \mathrm{S} 901 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | 0.53 | 0.22 | Cut for burial S901, cut by 390 |
| 390 | $\begin{gathered} 391 \text { and } \\ \mathrm{S} 902 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | 0.61 | 0.22 | Cut for burial S902, cuts 389 |
| - | 393 | - | 0.42 | 0.30 | Dark brown clay possibly fill or deposit. |
| - | 394 | - | - | 0.22 | Natural clay |
| - | 395 | - | - | 0.11 | Layer, possible occupation spread, cut by 363 , 378 and 398 |
| 398 | 399 | - | 0.61 | 0.27 | Posthole with packing stones, cuts 395 |
| 400 | 365, 370 | 4.00 | 1.55 | 0.48 | Ditch, cut by 363 , cuts 431 and 408 |
| 404 | 405 | - | 0.18 | 0.12 | Shallow posthole, cuts 406 |
| - | 406 | 7.30 | 1.80 | - | Layer, possible occupation spread, unexcavated |
| - | 407 | 4.20 | 1.80 | - | Layer, same as 406 and 408, cut by 376 |
| - | 408 | 8.40 | 1.80 | - | Layer, same as 406 and 407 , cut by 400 and 438 |
| - | 411 | - | - | 0.19 | Natural clay |
| 431 | 432 | - | 0.55 | c. 0.80 | Possible ditch, cut by 400 |
| 438 | 461 | 2.10 | 1.00 | - | Ditch, cuts 408 |
| - | 439 | c. 15 | 1.80 | - | Layer, possible occupation spread, cut by 378 |
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Figure 4. Sections, Trench 1.
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Figure 6. Sections, Trench 2.
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## TIME CHART

Calendar Years
Post Medieval AD 1500
Medieval AD 1066
Saxon $\qquad$ AD 410
Roman AD 43 AD 0 BC
Iron Age 750 BC
Bronze Age: Late
1300 BC
Bronze Age: Middle
1700 BC
Bronze Age Early 2100 BC
Neolithic: Late
3300 BC
Neolithic: Early 4300 BC
Mesolithic: Late 6000 BC
Mesolithic: Early ............................................................................. 10,000 BC
Palaeolithic: Upper
$50,000 \mathrm{BC}$
Palaeolithic: Middle $70,000 \mathrm{BC}$
Palaeolithic: Lower 2,000,000 BC
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