

new information gained from this. In general all plant material, including charcoal, was nicely preserved, and where charcoal was found to be indeterminate it was usually due to small size rather than poor preservation. Future sampling work at the site therefore has a good potential to produce nicely preserved carbonised plant remains, in reasonably large amounts, but perhaps confined to certain key areas of the site.

Table 11. Carbonised plant macrofossils and charcoal data

Newbridge Quarry (NQE08)	Sample	1	2	3	5	7	8	12	21	23	24	25	27	30	31	33
	Context	107	104	108	113	119	122	135	153	160	163	161	168	189	194	202
	Trench	20	20	22	21	14	15	4	33	33	33	33	5	5	10	10
	Total CV	0	<2.5ml 	<2.5ml	7.5ml	2.5ml	<2.5ml 	2.5ml	20ml	10ml	10ml	10ml	5ml	<2.5ml	<2.5ml	0
	Modern	10ml	10ml	5ml	15ml	5ml	10ml	10ml	10ml	<2.5ml	25ml	15ml	10ml	10ml	5ml	<2.5ml
Carbonised Cereal Grain	Common Name															
<i>Avena</i> sp.	oat															
<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	bread wheat															
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> var. <i>vulgare</i>	six row hulled barley															
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> sl.	barley					1		1					1			
Indeterminate cereal grain (+embryo)					1								4			
Charcoal																
<i>Quercus</i>	oak			1 (0.04g)												
<i>Corylus</i>	hazel									1 (0.07g)		2 (0.11g)				
<i>Betula</i>	birch				1 (0.10g)				4 (0.37g)							
<i>Salix / Populus</i>	willow / poplar															
Indeterminate						1 (0.01g)			1 (0.04g)							
Carbonised Weeds																
<i>Ranunculus</i> sp.	buttercups															
<i>Fallopia convolvulus</i>	black bindweed															
<i>Danthonia decumbens</i>	heathgrass															
<i>Bromus</i> sp.	bromes															
Carbonised Wild Resources																
Burnt peat					1 (0.08g)								1 (0.03g)			
Rhizomes																
<i>Calluna</i> stems (roots+twigs)	heather															
Other Remains																
Bone																
Non-marine mollusc shells		10+	5+	5+	30+	10+	5+	40+	5+	5+	10+	3	30+	10+	10+	10+
Modern (non-carbonised) seeds			2	2			2	1	2			2	10+	3	1	
Modern straw		5														

Newbridge Quarry (NQE08)	Sample	34	35	37	40	41	49	50	52	53	57	58	61	65	67	68
	Context	202	224	211	215	221	261	265	269	268	292	294	300	257	253	307
	Trench	10	19	18	18	10	21	21	26	26	19	16	26	16	16	21
	Total CV	20ml	0	25ml	<2.5ml	<2.5ml	0	<2.5ml	<2.5ml	30ml	<2.5ml	330ml	2.5ml	25ml	2.5ml	<2.5ml
	Modern	20ml	5ml	10ml	5ml	5ml	5ml	10ml	10ml	15ml	10ml	25ml	5ml	20ml	5ml	5ml
Carbonised Cereal Grain	Common Name															
Avena sp.	oat			12												
Triticum aestivum	bread wheat			1												
Hordeum vulgare var. vulgare	six row hulled barley			2									1			
Hordeum vulgare sl.	barley													10		1
Indeterminate cereal grain (+embryo)		2		36					1					17	1	
Charcoal																
Quercus	oak	4 (0.38g)								5 (2.92g)		15 (4.62g)		1 (0.15g)		
Corylus	hazel															
Betula	birch									1 (0.19g)		1 (0.10g)				
Salix / Populus	willow / poplar			2 (0.14g)						1 (0.19g)						
Indeterminate												1 (0.12g)		1 (0.05g)		
Carbonised Weeds																
Ranunculus sp.	buttercups			1												
Fallopia convolvulus	black bindweed													1		
Danthonia decumbens	heathgrass			1												
Bromus sp.	bromes			2												
Carbonised Wild Resources																
Burnt peat		1 (0.08g)														
Rhizomes														4 (0.23g)		
Calluna stems (roots+twigs)	heather													8 (0.19g)		
Other Remains																
Bone														7 (2.16g)		
Non-marine mollusc shells		5+	20+	10+	5+	20+	5+	10+			5+				3	3
Modern (non-carbonised) seeds							3	5+							1	5+
Modern straw										1	4					

Molluscs by J. Carrott

Twenty-five 'flots' from pre-processed bulk sediment samples ('GBA'/'BS' *sensu* Dobney *et al.* 1992), hereafter termed washovers and representing 24 contexts, were assessed to establish their bioarchaeological potential.

Methods

The submitted washovers were examined for their content of mollusc remains. The washovers were scanned and the remains were identified to species by reference to published works (main sources Cameron 2003, Cameron and Redfern 1976, Ellis 1969, Kerney 1999, Kerney and Cameron 1979) where possible.

The assemblages were small so that, in most cases, minimum numbers of individuals could be readily determined and counts were recorded. For the burrowing land snail *Cecilioides acicula* (likely to be intrusive and ignored in the interpretation of the assemblages) and unidentified shell fragments (and also occasionally for more abundant other taxa), abundance was recorded semi-quantitatively on a four-point scale: f – few (up to 3 individuals/fragments); s – some (4 to 20); m – many (21-50); v – very many (more than 50).

Results

Many of the washovers consisted in large part of modern rootlets but each also gave at least a few land snails. However, the most numerous remains, and the entirety of some of the smaller assemblages (from Contexts 153, 160, 161, and 202 (Sample 34)), were of *Cecilioides acicula* which were almost certainly of modern origin and intrusive to the deposits. Some of the deposits also contained other modern plant debris (Contexts 107, 108, 122, 189 and 292) and/or invertebrate remains (beetle sclerites were noted in Contexts 189, 211 and 224). All of the identified remains were of terrestrial snails, with the largest (discounting records of *C. acicula*) and most diverse assemblage from Context 113, a fill of ditch 112, with approximately 125 identified (at least in part) individuals representing at least 11 distinct taxa.

Overall, the snail remains were quite well preserved, but larger forms were often fragmented to some degree and many shells were coated with fine sediment. Definite species level identifications were sometimes prevented by small amounts of encrusted sediment obscuring diagnostic features (e.g. within the mouth of the shell for remains of *Vertigo* species). Details of the snail assemblages are presented in Table 12 in context number order.

Discussion and statement of potential

Only one of the deposits, Context 113, gave an assemblage of identified ancient mollusc remains which was of sufficient size to be of reliable interpretative value but a few others provided some additional hints regarding past habitats at the site.

The snail assemblage from Context 113 (fill of Ditch 112 – Trench 22, eastern edge of Enclosure Z) was of distinctly ‘mixed’ character. It was dominated by three taxa one, *Vallonia ?excentrica*, typical of dry, open, lightly vegetated habitats, such as calcareous, short-turfed grassland, a second, *Discus rotundatus*, indicative of moderately moist and sheltered places (often found in woodland ground litter, other damp herbage and under stones in waste ground – Kerney 1999, 118), and the third, *Trichia ?hispida* which may be found in either of these situations (though more commonly in the latter). Smaller numbers of other taxa provided further supporting evidence for the presence of both habitat types in the vicinity of this feature. *Carychium tridentatum* and *Vitrea* species favour moisture and shade and *Acanthinula aculeata* is mainly found in leaf litter under deciduous woodland, whereas *Pupilla muscorum* is a species of “...dry, exposed calcareous places, especially in stony or sandy ground” (Kerney 1999, 103). Taken as a whole, this assemblage suggests that the ditch was positioned at the edge of a cleared area (presumably within Enclosure Z), with woodland (or perhaps hedgerow/scrub) on the other side, thereby collecting snail taxa from both habitat types.

Some snail records recovered from deposits revealed in other trial trenches located to investigate the ditches of Enclosure Z (Trench 18 on the northern edge, Trench 20 to the west and Trench 21 to the south) also suggested both open and shaded habitats; the individual assemblages were rather small, however. Context 211 (fill of ditch 212 – Trench 18) gave small numbers of *Vallonia ?excentrica*, *Pupilla muscorum* and *Carychium tridentatum*. Context 107 (fill of ditch 106 – Trench 20) gave only 15 identified individuals (other than *Cecilioides acicula*) but these included *Carychium tridentatum*, *Discus rotundatus* and *Vitrea* representing moist, shaded places and *Vallonia ?excentrica* from dry, open areas. This deposit also yielded a single *Ena obscura* (the only record of this species) which, together with records of *Punctum pygmaeum* from two posthole fills in Trench 21, Contexts 361 and 307, provided further evidence suggestive of deciduous woodland/hedgerow in the vicinity.

The only other snail assemblage of some note was that from Context 168 (primary fill of eastern enclosure ditch 169 – Trench 5) from Enclosure X (approximately 150m to the north of Enclosure Z). Though small this was, again, of ‘mixed’ character but here those taxa usually indicative of substantial vegetative cover were absent. *Carychium* and *Vitrea* species were both recorded, as were open ground taxa, and perhaps suggest that, in this area, denser vegetation consisted of no more than longer grass and/or herbaceous weeds.

No aquatic snail taxa were recorded from the deposits at this site which implies that all of the cut features were dry.

Recommendations

No further study of the snail remains from this site is warranted. All of the current material should be retained as part of the physical archive for the site.

Table 12. Land snails recovered in the washovers (flots) from the sediment samples

Key: CN = context number; S = sample number; T = trench number; Description = Context description; f = few (up to 3 individuals); s = some (4 to 20); m = many (21 to 50); v = very many (more than 50); figures give minimum numbers of individuals. Nomenclature and taxonomic order follows Kerney (1999).

CN	S	T	Description	<i>Carychium tridentatum</i> (Risso)	<i>Carychium</i> sp. (apex fragment)	<i>Cochlicopa ?lubrica</i> (Müller)	<i>Cochlicopa ?lubricella</i> (Porro)	<i>Cochlicopa</i> sp. (apex fragment)	<i>Vertigo ?pygmaea</i> (Draparnaud)	<i>Vertigo</i> sp.	<i>Pupilla muscorum</i> (L.)	<i>Pupillidae</i> sp. (apex fragment)	<i>Vallonia ?excentrica</i> Sterki	<i>Acanthinula aculeata</i> (Müller)	<i>Ena obscura</i> (Müller)	<i>Punctum pygmaeum</i>	<i>Discus rotundatus</i> (Müller)	<i>Virea crystallina</i> (Müller)/ <i>V. contracta</i> (Westertund)	<i>?Aegopinella</i> sp.	<i>Oxychilus ?cellarius</i> (Müller)	<i>Ceciloides acicula</i> (Müller)	<i>Trichia ?hispidata</i> (L.)	<i>Cepaeq/Arianta</i> sp.	Unidentified land snail	Notes
104	2	20	Fill of ditch 105																		m			f	Mostly rootlet and sediment 'dust'
107	1	20	Fill of ditch 106	1					1				3		1		2	1	1	2	s	3			Mostly rootlet and other modern plant debris
108	3	22	Fill of ditch 106																		f			s	Mostly rootlet, with a little other modern plant debris and a trace of charred plant material
113	5	22	Fill of ditch 112	2	1		2	1	1	1	4		m	1			m	1		5	m	m	1		Mostly snails (with adhering sediment) and a little modern rootlet
119	7	14	Lower fill of ditch 120	1	1																m	1		f	Mostly rootlet and sediment 'dust'
122	8	15	Fill of ditch 121									1	2				1				s	1		s	Mostly rootlet, other modern plant debris and sediment 'dust', with a little charred plant material

CN	S	T	Description	<i>Carychium tridentatum</i> (Risso)	<i>Carychium</i> sp. (apex fragment)	<i>Cochlicopa ?lubrica</i> (Müller)	<i>Cochlicopa ?lubricella</i> (Porro)	<i>Cochlicopa</i> sp. (apex fragment)	<i>Vertigo ?pygmaea</i> (Draparnaud)	<i>Vertigo</i> sp.	<i>Pupilla muscorum</i> (L.)	Pupillidae sp. (apex fragment)	<i>Vallonia ?excentrica</i> Sterki	<i>Acanthinula aculeata</i> (Müller)	<i>Ena obscura</i> (Müller)	<i>Punctum pygmaeum</i>	<i>Discus rotundatus</i> (Müller)	<i>Vitrea crystallina</i> (Müller)/ <i>V. contracta</i> (Westerlund)	? <i>Aegopinella</i> sp.	<i>Oxychilus ?cellarius</i> (Müller)	<i>Ceciloides acicula</i> (Müller)	<i>Trichia ?hispidata</i> (L.)	<i>Cepaea/Arianta</i> sp.	Unidentified land snail	Notes
135	12	4	Lower fill of gully 136					1	1	1			2					2			v	m	1		Mostly snails (with adhering sediment) and a little modern rootlet
153	21	33	Fill of pit 152																		s				Mostly unidentified charcoal, with some modern rootlet
160	23	33	Primary fill of pit 159																		s				Mostly rootlet, with a little fine unidentified charcoal
161	25	33	Secondary fill of pit 159																		f				Mostly rootlet, with a little fine unidentified charcoal
163	24	33	Fill of pit 162 - possible cremation	1																	m				Mostly rootlet and unidentified charcoal
168	27	5	Primary fill of eastern enclosure ditch 169	5	4	3		2	3	1			5					3		f	v	10	2		Mostly snails (with adhering sediment) and a little modern rootlet
189	30	5	Fill of ditch 190										3								m			s	Mostly rootlet and other modern plant debris, with an occasional beetle sclerite (also modern)

8 Discussion and Conclusions

Feature Visibility

With a few exceptions there was a good correlation between the results of the geophysical survey and the features identified during the evaluation. As suggested by the geophysical survey results, the archaeological features were largely confined to the western side of the site, the most easterly feature detected being the shallow continuation of a field ditch revealed in Trench 12. On excavation, the linear features were often fragmentary and intermittent, due almost certainly to a combination of differential agricultural truncation and geological variation. Despite the evident truncation by ploughing a number of small discrete features, such as pits and post-holes, which are too small to be detected by the geophysical survey, were identified in many of the trenches.

The use of larger 20m by 20m trenches to search for unenclosed settlement evidence was rewarded by some evidence for activity in Trenches 16 and 26. Although no obvious structures were in evidence, pits and post-holes and their finds and environmental content are indicative of settlement activity.

Several potential archaeological features were found upon excavation to be of natural origin. Solution holes and channels were common across the site, and clayey deposits were identified overlying the limestone bedrock in many of the trenches. There was also good correspondence with the geophysically mapped natural linear anomalies which were investigated in Trenches 4, 6, 12, 27 and 33.

Chronology and Phasing

The dating resolution provided by the pottery is broad, but the majority of it is in native tradition and generally belongs to the later Iron Age/early Roman period, the majority no later than the 2nd century. There is little evidence to suggest the 3rd century evidence that was apparent in the sites excavated immediately to the south (see Appendix 5), however there is clearly a small later Roman presence. The case for a 3rd century hiatus in the occupation of the area is a difficult one to sustain in the light of the continuity of native style pottery and the apparent reluctance to adopt Roman wares, but the possibility remains. Five provisional and notional phases of landscape development are proposed on the basis of the available evidence.

Phase 1: Earlier prehistoric activity that is possibly represented by residual flint finds and the potential ring-barrow in Trench 19.

Phase 2: The earliest evidence for enclosure and land division would seem to date to the pre-Roman Iron Age, when it is envisaged that the trackway, the earliest use of Enclosure Z, and possibly the field systems, were established as far north as Trench 10. The trackway at this time may well have veered westwards to the north of Enclosure Y. There is no obvious early unenclosed settlement phase, as was identified to the south, but some possibly unenclosed

features may have an earlier Iron Age origin. This phase may reasonably be equated with the 2003-2006 provisional Phase 2 (see Appendix 5).

Phase 3: By the 2nd century the trackway had been realigned, albeit with a dog-leg, to run northwards to link with Enclosure W and beyond. The greatest concentration of activity however seems to have been focussed to the south of the dog-leg in Enclosure Z, the unenclosed area to the north of it and within Enclosure Y. The environmental evidence is consistent with these areas being used for domestic activities and the drying and processing arable crops, with a distinct possibility of a change in agricultural practice occurring being implied by the appearance of oats and wheat in some deposits. Despite its partial excavation the most enigmatic feature remains Feature 216 in Trench 18. This now offers less credibility as a sunken floored building and its fills, which contained a significant amount of fuel ash, give credence to the possibility of it being a lime kiln. This phase would seem to accord well with the 2003-2006 Phase 3 (see Appendix 5).

Phase 4: On the basis of the pottery dating it would appear that later Roman activity was confined to Enclosure X, although there is little evidence to elucidate its function. The presence of small amounts of carbonised cereal grains and evidence for peat fuelled fires (as also found associated with the earlier Enclosures Y and Z) would suggest some domestic activity.

Phase 5: There is no clear-cut evidence for post-Roman evidence in the 2008 data, although the date range of the pottery from Trench 5 (Enclosure X) does encompass the 5th century.

To the south there was good evidence for the two trackway ditches having different histories in terms of their re-cutting and later use for cremation deposition. In this area the two sides of the ditch do appear to be morphologically quite different (Trench 27), although elsewhere any differences were less obvious due to the trackway being partly defined by the sides of different enclosures. There was no evidence of any later Roman cremations in the trackway ditches, although it might be noted that there is apparently relatively little evidence for any later Roman activity here.

Not surprisingly, many features remain un-phased. The majority of these lie within the enclosure complexes, or adjacent to them, and may eventually (after stripping) appear in a more coherent spatial context that will allow for better interpretation. A group of outlying features in Trench 33 are, so far, undated and represent the only known focus of activity away from the trackway. One of these features is notable for including the remains of a human cremation, and some well-preserved carbonised plant remains, though whether the two are associated is unclear.

Environmental potential

Whilst the enclosures and field systems at Newbridge Quarry undoubtedly represent a heavy investment in animal husbandry in the Iron Age and early Roman period, the degree of

preservation of animal bone from the site does not promise to offer much potential for future analysis. However, the recovery of carbonised seeds and other plant remains from a significant number of contexts has provided some insight into the economy of the settlement and a possible change to the arable regime by the Roman period. The mollusc data would appear to have only limited potential, but the assemblage from the Enclosure Z ditch is significant in that it is consistent with a linear tract of clearance to accommodate the enclosures, with the edge of a deciduous woodland or scrub being quite close. This might explain why no evidence for enclosures and field boundaries has been found extending into the eastern part of the site.

Significance and Potential of the Site

Earlier Prehistoric (Phase 1)

In keeping with the investigations to the south the evaluation produced a modest assemblage of flint fragments. Although none of the flints are diagnostically early forms, and could have seen use in other periods, it is for the moment assumed that they have an earlier prehistoric date. It is perhaps notable that, whilst residual, over half the flint was recovered from a localised area to the north-east of the putative ring barrow in Trench 19, the remainder coming from the features in Trench 23. These possibly reflect foci of early prehistoric activity, long since ploughed out. The function of the ring-ditch remains unconfirmed and undated, although pottery in the upper fill would seem to confirm it as a pre-Roman feature. Although the site, as presently understood, is unlikely to be able to significantly enhance understanding of specific aspects of the early prehistoric archaeology of the region, the evidence, with that from the site to the south, will supplement a growing corpus of data for the region. The significance of this contribution will depend to a degree on the establishment of a date and function for the ring-ditch in Trench 19 and the confirmation of any similar such features in the excavation areas to the south.

Earlier Iron Age (?Phase 2)

Whilst the larger trenches (16 and 26) were able to demonstrate the existence of unenclosed elements of settlement, these do not at present appear to reflect a pre-enclosure phase to the site, as interpreted from the evidence to the south (Appendix 5, Phase 1). The pottery is notoriously difficult to date and, whilst much of it might be ascribed a 'pre-Roman Iron Age', the incidence of 'early Romano-British' material found associated would suggest that the earliest activity probably dates from the later Iron Age. Consequently, the Newbridge Quarry northern extension site presently offers no obvious potential for enhancing our understanding of the earlier Iron Age.

Later Iron Age and Early Roman Period (Phases 2 and 3)

It seems very likely that the positioning enclosures focused on the trackway is a continuation of the pattern found to the south (Appendix 5, Phases 2 and 3). There is little evidence for structures, such as roundhouses, in the northern extension area, but this could be due to a

greater degree of truncation by modern ploughing. Ribbon development along trackways, sometimes termed 'droveway' settlements, seem to have been identified as a common phenomenon in the region in the later Iron Age and Romano-British. It has been supposed that such complexes became increasingly more enclosed and spatially organised with time. However, the evidence from Newbridge Quarry generally, including the extension area, does not strictly fit this model. It is apparent that the ditched trackway, field boundaries and enclosures have all evolved incrementally over a period of time and there is little definite evidence for the coexistence of any of the enclosures. Consequently, the Newbridge Quarry landscape offers the potential to gain some greater insight into the succession and/or migration of what at face value might be interpreted as single entity enclosure complexes, but which appear more likely to be different phases of a dispersed agricultural community communicating along a well established route-way. The northern extension area is significant in that it would appear to contain early Roman elements that are not well represented in the sites investigated to the south and suggests that by the 2nd century some of the enclosures had specific functions (such as lime burning).

Later Roman Period (Phase 3)

The ceramic assemblage from both the Newbridge Quarry northern extension and the sites to the south contains little material that might definitely be attributed to the earlier 3rd century. This might suggest that the native enclosures that had evolved throughout the later Iron Age and early Roman period were abandoned for a time, before the area saw some reoccupation in the late 3rd and 4th centuries (Appendix 5, Phase 3). The reasons behind such a cycle are unclear, but might just reflect settlement movement to an unexploited, and archaeologically un-investigated, part of the landscape for a time, rather than any wholesale abandonment. Investigation of the northern extension site will provide an opportunity to further investigate the reality of the 3rd century hiatus.

Early Post-Roman Period

On the basis of the available evidence, the Newbridge Quarry Extension site would appear to have little or no potential for early post-Roman research. That the exploitation of this landscape seems to have had ended in the later Roman period is further indicated by the assessments of the results of the earlier excavation work carried out to the south, where just two unusual pottery sherds were considered to be considered 'possibly Anglian', whilst a radiocarbon date on one of the cremations inserted into the trackway ditch fill indicates it to be of later Roman date (see Appendix 5, Phase 4).

Site Economy

There is nothing in the available data that argues for an intensification of agriculture, either as a response to the Roman conquest, despite a Roman military presence, for a time at least, in the form of the Cawthorne camps just 3 km to the north, or as result population increase (the greater incidence of pottery in the Roman period being explained to a degree by its greater

availability). Such things are difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain from a single site, especially where environmental preservation is poor. As for most sites of this type and period, the limited picture is one of mixed subsistence farming, where corralling and moving livestock dominates the morphology of settlements, which are also reliant on small-scale arable production. The apparent predominance of sheep in the pre-Roman Iron Age and early Roman period deposits at the northern extension site is typical of the animal husbandry represented on sites of similar date elsewhere. There is a suggestion of a switch to cattle in the later Roman period, but presently the data are too few for meaningful analysis, but the site does offer some potential for further informing on this possible transition.

It is not presently possible to equate any of the later Roman activity at Newbridge Quarry with the 3rd/4th-century Roman villa site at Blansby Park, 2 km to the east (Watts *et al.* 2003), but the existence of the villa suggests a large estate which may have had outlying farms and processing areas. The large enigmatic feature within Trench 18 may have been associated with the burning of lime for mortar or plaster, materials not used in any of the structures found at Newbridge Quarry, but ones definitely associated with villa buildings. However, the two sites do not appear to be contemporary but future investigation might provide better dating resolution and material suitable for analytical comparison with any mortars or plaster samples from the Blansby villa.

Areas of Potential

The cropmark evidence, and particularly the geophysical survey data, indicate that the archaeology lies almost entirely within the western half of the northern extension site. With the exception of the features found in Trench 23, this impression has been borne out by the trial trenching work and there does not seem to any greater depth of soil or other factors which would have rendered archaeological features invisible to remote sensing. Indeed, if anything has prevented detection of the few linear features that ran into the eastern part of the site it is probably the quite serious agricultural erosion. The impression of little or no archaeology in the eastern half of the site, at least in the later Iron Age Roman period, is reinforced by the small mollusc assemblage, particularly from Trench 22, which suggests that woodland/scrub clearance may not have extended much beyond the area of the ditched enclosures.

Mineral extraction is proposed in five stages (see Fig. 2). The western half of the site, within which the known archaeology falls would be extracted as part of Stages 1 and 2 and the western parts of Stages 4 and 5. Stage 3 would at present seem to have no potential.

The Stage 1 extraction area includes the southern extent of the trackway and two field ditches, but also has potential for a number of discrete pits, as found in Trench 26, some of which would seem to be represented by the spread of distinct magnetic anomalies, particularly in the northern part of this area.

The Stage 2 extraction area has probably the greatest archaeological potential of the whole site, containing as it does the potential ring barrow, and the majority of the early prehistoric finds, the trackway, and its relationship to Enclosures Y and Z. Conveniently, Enclosure Z, the best preserved enclosure, which contains a possible lime burning kiln, and which has produced a large proportion of the finds, is situated at the centre of the Stage 2 area and would not have to be investigated over two campaigns. This area has the greatest potential for investigating the early prehistoric and 2nd century Roman archaeology of the site, but also has some potential for informing upon earlier unenclosed settlement activity, as revealed by the discrete features found in Trench 16.

Only the western 'pan handle' of the Stage 4 area contains known archaeology, but this area is very significant for understanding the phasing of the trackway and the field system, the well preserved ditches of which all intersect in this area. This area also has some potential for informing upon earlier unenclosed settlement activity, as revealed by the discrete features found in Trench 16.

The western part of Stage 5 contains the whole of Enclosure X, a short section of the trackway and a small part of Enclosure W. Little else has been detected, but the fact that Trench 33 has produced some archaeological features will necessitate consideration when defining the area that is to be monitored archaeologically.

Although most of Enclosure W lies outside the area of extraction, in the northern stockpiling area, its level of preservation is such that it may not survive the stripping, rutting and compaction of the stockpiling process and this localised area may need to be excavated in advance, or excluded from, and stockpiling or other similar activities in this area.

There would appear to be no archaeological issues associated with the stockpiling area immediately north of New Hambleton Farm in the south-eastern part of the site.

Conclusion

This site's significance rests in its potential to further explore the nature and rate of enclosure in the later prehistoric and Roman periods. Particular significance may be ascribed to the Newbridge Quarry sites generally in that the enclosure process seems to have been focussed upon a route-way and to have been very localised within that linear zone of woodland clearance. The northern extension site includes one of these focal points of enclosure, with several phases of development, at a point where the trackway seems to have been re-orientated. The presence of a well defined later Roman enclosure, possibly dedicated to the production of lime, is an unusual find that presents scope for wider research in the region. The evidence available would suggest that an investigation of the surviving archaeology need only address the western half of the site. The archaeological mitigation involved would, thus, only affect extraction Stages 1 and 2 and the western parts of Stages 4 and 5. Additional work may be required to mitigate any impact on Enclosure W in the stockpiling area in the north-western part of the site.