

of Ryedale Planning Application
99/0643/ful

NYCC HER	
SNY	7993
ENY	1379, 1380
CNY	
Parish	3026
Rec'd	14/6/99

6
(TT) NYE 1379
NYS 7993
NYE 1380 (DBA)

Whitewall
Norton
North Yorkshire

Archaeological Evaluation

NGR SE 7918 7019

March 1999

MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd

**Whitewall Corner
Norton
North Yorkshire
Archaeological Evaluation**

Contents	Page
Figure List	2
Introduction	3
Desktop Study	4
Historical Background	4
Archaeological Background	5
Geophysical Survey	9
Excavation Methodology	9
Excavation Results	10
Discussion	13
Bibliography	15
Appendices	
1. Context List	16
2. Finds Catalogue	18
3. Archive Listing	19

Figure List**Page**

1.	Site Location Maps (Scale 1:50000 & 1: 10000).	20
2.	Sutton. Pre-Enclosure After Huddleston.	21
3.	First Edition Ordnance Survey Map.	22
4.	Ordnance Survey County Series Map.	23
5.	Cropmark Sites, Spot Finds and Historical Sites.	24
6.	Geophysical Survey Results.	25
7.	Trench Location with Geophysical Anomalies.	26
8.	Trench 6 Plan.	27
9.	Trench 6 Section.	28
10.	Trench 8 Plan.	29
11.	Trench 8 Section.	30
12.	Trench 9 Plan.	31
13.	Trench 9 Section.	32

**Whitewall Corner
Norton
North Yorkshire**

Archaeological Evaluation

Introduction

During February 1999 MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd. undertook an archaeological evaluation of a site at Whitewall Corner, Norton (Fig. 1), this included a Desktop Study of the Historical and Archaeological background of the site, a Geophysical Survey and Trial Trenching, all of which are considered in this report.

The site lies immediately north of Whitewall, Norton, North Yorkshire (SE 7918 7019 : Fig. 1) and forms an area of pasture bounded to the west by houses fronting on to Welham Road and fields to the east. The underlying geology consists of glaciofluvial sands gravel, covering loamy calcareous soils of the Landbeach Association (Mackney *et al*, 1983).

The site has until recently been used as an exercise area for horses from Whitewall Stables. Following the closure of the stables in 1998, proposals are being drawn up for the conversion of the stable premises to retail and leisure use. These proposals include a change of use of the site from paddock to car parking area.

All work was funded by Whitewall Enterprises.

The maps within this report have been produced from the Ordnance Survey with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Crown Copyright, Licence no AL 50453A.

Desktop Study

Historical Background

The evaluation area at Whitewall Corner originally fell within the lands of Sutton Village, formerly situated c. 500m north-east of the site (SE 7960 7044 - Figs. 1 & 2).

There were four landowners at Sutton at the time of the Domesday Survey: the King had two carucates and six bovates, the Archbishop, a half a carucate, Ralph de Mortemer four carucates and Hugh fitz Baldric three carucates.

By the mid 13th century Sutton was a Grange of the Gilbertine Priory of Old Malton. However, in the 1381 Poll Tax, Sutton was taxed with Welham, but three probable Sutton residents were identifiable, John Sutton and wife, taxed at 2s and Cristian De Sutton taxed at 12d.

Old Malton Priory was dissolved in 1540, and Sutton Grange, in the tenure of John Wyth was sold with other Priory land, to Robert Holgate, alias Halgate, Bishop of Llandaff formerly Prior of Watton and head of the Gilbertine Order. The Grange was worth £3 a year and its assets included a fishery. The last Prior of Old Malton, John Crawshaw, retired to Sutton Grange.

Two messuages at Sutton and Welham are mentioned in 1544. In 1583 Henry Hebblethwait acquired lands in Sutton from Richard and John Raysinge. In 1588 half of the manor of Sutton and Welham, and three houses with lands, were acquired by Anthony Wright and William Farrande from George, Earl of Cumberland. In 1599 - 1600, the other half of Sutton and Welham manor was obtained by Lord Eure from George, Earl of Cumberland.

The Eures disposed of these lands and rents in 1607 to John Okely, and in 1613 Sir John Egerton and others acquired half the manor from the same source.

Sutton Grange, house, close and eleven oxgangs under the lord of Sutton were included in a catalogue of lands of the Free School of Robert Holgate at Old Malton in 1666. Sutton was shown on Robert Morden's map of the East Riding (1695).

Sutton was bought by the Bower Family in 1749/50 when the Nendicks disposed of their holdings. By 1750 when the Sutton lands are sold to the Bower family from the Nendicks Sutton was no longer inhabited as the sale mentions footings in Sutton East Garth.

The Sutton Enclosure Award of 1772 mentions Frances Sellers, of Malton, widow, who got one hundred and twenty-two acres as compensation for Sutton Grange and Sutton Farm. The award also describes the setting out of Welham Road at sixty feet wide to the west of the site, and a private road (now Bazleys Lane) twenty feet wide which forms the sites southern boundary (Fig. 2 - after Huddleston 1962).

There are no known early references to the name Whitewall but it is possible that it refers to "white well", a clear spring. Alternatively the name derives from the limestone face exposed by the cutting through of Bazleys Lane.

Horse training has been connected with Norton from at least 1713, when a plate race was founded to be run on 1st October yearly at the Langton Wold racecourse, which was also used as a training ground. Whitewall Stables were established after the enclosure of Sutton and Norton (Figs. 3 & 4). John Scott bought Whitewall House stables in 1825, living there until his death in 1871. Scott trained sixteen winners of the St. Leger, six Derby winners, eight Oaks winners, seven winners of the Two Thousand Guineas, and three of the One Thousand Guineas. The stables remained in operation until 1998, the site itself forming the stable's training paddock during this period. In 1998, the death of Mr. Jim Carr, along with the difficulties faced by the modern racing industry caused the closure of Whitewall Stables, and the decision was made to find an alternative use for the buildings and land.

Archaeological Background

The information in this section is derived from the following sources: aerial photographs, spot finds, previous archaeological excavations and known earthworks.

Aerial Reconnaissance

Archaeological features can become visible from the air due to three main factors: low angled sunlight, differential drying (cropmarks) or plough damage (soil marks).

Low angled sunlight can cause shadows on low earthworks, which can bring into sharp relief monuments that are otherwise difficult to detect on the surface.

Cropmarks form by the differential drying of soils. Where the ground has been disturbed by the digging of negative features such as pits and ditches, the soil is likely to remain more moist which means that vegetation will be more lush and stay greener than the surrounding soils. Conversely, where there are stone walls or other stone features such as banks, the covering soil will become parched, allowing the archaeological features to show as paler areas in the relatively lush surrounding vegetation.

Soilmarks are caused by the plough penetrating the subsoil, and bringing to light the usually darker soils that fill negative archaeological features.

One aerial photograph shows a feature on the Whitewall evaluation site (Sites and Monument Record 1981, TP I55/3), and has been transcribed as a large multiple ring ditch c. 100 m in diameter (Fig. 5 - A). Although, superficially resembling a box rampart hillfort, an example of which was excavated at Paddock Hill, Thwing (Manby 1983), a much more plausible explanation is that it was a horse training ring. The shape of the ring still exists on the ground as a depression c. 90 m in diameter. Given that the Geophysical Survey did not show any anomalies at the position of the ring, this feature is almost certainly a modern creation existing only in the topsoil.

Further cropmarks exist to the west, east and north of the evaluation site.

To the west of the site there are a cluster of linear features and a possible ring ditch (SE 7885 7004 centre - TP I55/3, PVA 76:B.23,24 : Fig. 5 - B). These cropmarks represent field boundaries of unknown date and a possible barrow. The RCHM Aerial Survey of the Yorkshire Wolds plotted a linear feature that forms a north-eastern extension of TP I55/3 at

SE 78957015 (Fig. 5 - C). This double-ditched feature extends as far east as Welham Road, and after a break, apparently reappears 200m east of the site continuing eastward for a further 400m as far as Mill Beck (Fig. 5 - D). There can be little doubt that this feature crosses the site, but does not reveal itself as a cropmark because the field is pasture rather than arable.

The RCHM plots show a probable cemetery with at least eighteen Square Ditch Barrows, 3m to 6m in width at a point c.200 m east of the site (Fig. 5 - E : Sites and Monuments Record 1891 - SE 7947 7022).

Finally, there are three south-west to north-east aligned linear cropmarks that approach the northern boundary of the site, possibly relating to former field boundaries. (Fig. 5 - F).

Spot Finds

Four artefacts have been found within the vicinity of the site.

A Roman coin was said to have been found on the site following metal detecting approximately ten years ago (Halliday pers com.).

Roman coins were found in house foundations at Whitewall Corner, prior to 1935 (Robinson 1978, No. 360). The published sources are not precise about the exact location of this find, but an annotation on a R.H. Hayes' Ordnance Survey map places this findspot on the west side of Welham Road at SE 7904 7007 (Fig. 5 - G).

The field to the north of the above findspot has been subjected to metal detecting by amateur enthusiasts. Three Roman coins (3rd/4th century) were found, along with a cut silver penny of William I of Scotland, two fragmentary bronze 'jettons' and a small quantity of Roman and medieval pottery (J Halliday pers. comm : Fig. 5 - H).

Finally, on the south side of Mill Beck close to Sutton Grange, foundations, some coins and urns were found in 1820 (Fig. 5 - I), (approximately SE 793 704 - Robinson 1978, No. 359). The fact that the finds included an amphora (with the graffito CAND II) suggests that they relate to Roman activity.

Previous Archaeological Work

No excavations have taken place in the immediate vicinity of the site. The line of a proposed pumping main was projected to pass along the northern boundary of the site and the site's archaeological background was partly considered at that point in a Desktop Study (MAP 1992).

In June 1990, the writer unofficially examined the foundation trenches for a new garage at 183 Welham Road, (SE 7908 7002), but no archaeological deposits or finds were observed. (Fig. 5 - J).

A Watching Brief at Whitewall Quarry (SE 7918 6940) c. 600m south of the site, led to the excavation of a linear boundary, and a double-ditched feature interpreted as the Roman Road from Malton/Norton to Stamford Bridge (MAP 1993 : Fig. 5 - K). To the north-east of the site, this road is visible as a double-ditched cropmark north of Mill Beck (SE 7938 7165 : Fig. 5 - L) and its line is apparently echoed by a present day field boundary and track running c. 90 m east of the site (Fig 5 - M). Known Roman cemeteries are located at the Ridings (SE 7935 7175 : Fig. 5 - N) and 98 Langton Road, c. 50 m to the east of that point (Fig. 5 - O).

The two cemeteries mark the as yet, known limit of activity at Roman Norton. Notable sites within this major Roman settlement include pottery production centre at Grove Cottage (SE 7960 7185 : Fig. 5 - P) and Howe Road (SE 7975 7190 : Fig. 5 - Q) and Roman buildings between St Peters Street and St Nicholas Street (Fig. 5 - R : SE 7935 7219 : Hayes 1988)

Earthworks

The actual remains of the medieval village of Sutton Grange has been obscured by the 19th century buildings of Sutton Farm. Platt identified the earthworks as a cluster of "peasant houses of communal plan" on the west side of the former street, now a sunken trackway ending at the Langton Road situated in former pasture land, that over the past ten or twelve years have been badly disturbed by potato and grain cultivation (Platt 1969, 236 : Fig. 5 - S).

Geophysical Survey

The Geophysical Survey was undertaken by Geophysical Surveys of Bradford (GSB 1999). The results of which are summarised below.

The entire field was scanned with a magnetometer, and a 50% sample was chosen for full survey in those areas that gave the more promising responses. Two strong north-south linear responses were noted (Fig. 6 - A, C, & F), along with more tenuous linear anomalies (Fig. 6 - B, H & I). There were also three areas of increased magnetic 'noise' (Fig. 6 - D, E & G). A large number of more isolated peaks of high magnetic noise were taken to represent modern ferrous objects within the topsoil. Lastly, the south-east course of the modern training gallop provided a clear response.

The geophysical anomalies outlined above provided targets for the archaeological evaluation trenches described below.

Excavation Methodology

The Geophysical Survey identified a number of anomalies, the most significant of which (Fig. 6 : A-I) were selected for evaluation by archaeological excavation. A total of ten trenches were excavated, seven of these (Trenches 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9) were linear in form, and three (Trenches 4, 7 and 10) formed open areas.

The Excavation trenches were sited using the same grid as the Geophysical Survey. Topsoil and overburden were removed by 360 degree mechanical excavator using a wide toothless bucket, under close archaeological supervision. The areas were thereafter cleaned and archaeologically excavated by hand. Written records were compiled on standard forms, under the continuous context recording system (Appendix 1). Plans were drawn at a scale of 1: 20, sections at 1: 10. Photographs were taken in monochrome and colour in 35mm format. Finds were recovered by context (Appendix 2).

The topsoil and overburden spoil heaps, plus the surfaces of the excavated areas, were metal detected by A. L. Pacitto.

Excavation Results

Trenches 1, 2 and 3 (Anomalies A, B & C)

These geophysical anomalies were somewhat sinuous, discontinuous features running across the north-west quadrant of the site on a south-west to north-east alignment (Fig. 6). Three trenches (1, 2 and 3) were excavated along the course of anomalies A, B & C (Fig 7).

No archaeological features were present, the anomalies having been caused by a former stream bed, or more accurately, a periglacial channel, filled by reddish sand, and in Trench 1, by silty clay.

Trenches 4, 6 and 10 (Anomalies D, E & G)

Anomalies D, E & G were represented by areas of increased magnetic noise identified by the Geophysical Survey in the central part of the site. Two square areas (Trenches 4 and 10) were excavated at the position of anomalies D & E, with anomaly G being examined by the eastern end of Trench 6 (Fig. 7).

Trenches 4 and 10 showed the natural deposits to consist of gravel with large areas of yellowish red and brownish red sand, and two similar deposits occupied the eastern end of Trench 6. It was these sandy deposits that caused the geophysical anomalies at these locations.

Trench 6 (Anomaly F)

Anomaly F, a slightly sinuous linear feature running on a north-south alignment along the eastern part of the site, and was the strongest of the anomalies revealed by Geophysical Survey. Trench 6 was positioned to intercept this anomaly (Fig. 7).

A linear feature (context 6011) crossed the trench on a north-south alignment, cutting through a colluvial deposit (context 6010) that sealed two pits (Figs. 8 and 9). Ditch 6011 was 2.3m wide, with a V-shaped profile at least 0.70m in depth. The fill (context 6012) consisted of yellowish brown silty clay with many lenses of sandy gravel, which yielded three Roman pottery sherds possibly indicating a Roman date.

A spread of pale brown banded gravely sand (context 6016) overlay the ditch fill extending for a width of at least 6m. The origin of the deposit is open to question, but its gravely nature suggested that it could have been a trackway. The relatively shallow depth of the trackway - immediately below the topsoil suggested that it was of a more recent date.

Pits 6001 & 6003 were situated at the western end of Trench 6, where they were sealed by a colluvial deposit, context 6010. The pits were oval in shape, and steep to vertically sided. Pit 6001 was excavated to its full depth, showing it to have a flat base and to be 0.8m deep. The homogenous fills (context 6002 and 6004) of both pits were identical, context 6002 contained three sherds of Iron Age character pottery, and a struck flint waste flake.

The pits cut into a deposit of reddish brown silty sand (context 6009) which may have been a buried land surface. Context 6009 contained four flint artefacts and three minute sherds of Prehistoric pottery.

Feature 6005, was a shallow, 2m wide linear feature of bowl-shaped profile, situated c. 1m east of Ditch 6011, and like 6011 cut into the colluvial deposit 6010. Its form suggested that it was a furrow.

Trenches 5 and 7 (Anomaly H)

Anomaly H was a north-west to north-east aligned "linear trend" in the south-west corner of the Geophysical Survey grid (Fig. 6). Trenches 5 and 7 were excavated along the course of this anomaly (Fig 7).

No archaeological features were present in the excavated areas. Natural deposits (contexts 5002 and 7002/3) were variable, with patches of silty sand, which tended to be aligned north-south, within the general spread of the sandy gravel natural. The suggestion is that the anomaly was created by trends within the natural deposits.

Trench 8 (Anomaly I)

Anomaly I was a stronger "linear trend" situated adjacent to Anomaly H on a west-east alignment (Fig. 6). A single linear trench (Trench 8) examined this feature (Fig. 7).

The excavation located an east-west aligned linear feature, with evidence of a number of recuts (Figs. 10 and 11). The earliest ditch (context 8013) was 2.5m wide and at least 0.8m deep. The fill was indistinguishable from a deposit that extended north of the ditch (context 8012) suggesting that whilst the ditch was filling up there was an accumulation of soil, possibly wind blown in origin, at the ditch's edge. The ditch fill contained a single sherd of 16th century Cistercian ware. This boundary is of late medieval/post medieval date as shown by the Cistercian Ware sherd from context 8012, and can be seen as an agricultural feature within Sutton's Open Fields.

The ditch was apparently recut three times (Fig. 11). It is not possible to say which was the earliest of the first two recuts (contexts 8007 and 8009), but they were of markedly different forms. Context 8007 on the southern edge of the main ditch was trough shaped and relatively insubstantial. In the centre of the main ditch, recut 8009 was more substantial and steep sided, and had a distinct brown clay fill (context 8008).

Recut 8005 clearly cut into the fills of 8007 and 8009, and had a broad U shaped profile c. 2.5 m wide and 0.7m deep. Seven postholes (context 8011) were observed in the base of the recut, tightly packed along its axis. The suggestion is that Recut 8005 was created to hold a fenceline. It then filled up with yellowish brown silty sand (context 8003) which merged with very similar material (context 8002) overlying the entire ditch and extending across the full extent of the trench. This deposit contained a sherd of Humber ware. It seems that as Recut 8005 filled up, cultivation took place on its margins, and plough soil encroached into it.

Trench 9 (Anomaly I)

This trench was laid out to intercept the projected line of Anomaly I, the steep-sided medieval ditch (context 8013) revealed in Trench 8. The trench failed to show the continuation of Ditch 8013 (possibly because the ditch curved to the south) but did locate evidence of three linear features (contexts 9003, 9008 and 9016 : Figs. 12 and 13).

Context 9003 was a positive feature, forming a low "bank", 3m wide underneath colluvial material 9002. This "bank" shared a north-west to south-east alignment with two shallow

linear cuts (contexts 9008 and 9016). Although the fill of the former (context 9007) contained an abraded sherd of Roman Greyware, it would appear that features 9008 and 9016 represented traces of rigg and furrow cultivation.

There were a number of other features in this trench (contexts 9010, 9012 and 9014), whose amorphous forms and sterile fills showed them to be of natural origin (Fig. 13).

Metal Detector Survey

All the spoilheaps, which had been separated into topsoil and subsoil, plus the exposed surfaces of the trenches, were metal detected survey by a professional archaeologist and experienced detector (A. L. Pacitto).

A large number of iron nails and objects were located, particularly from the topsoil. In addition there was a disc-shaped featureless bronze object, possibly a coin, but more likely a late medieval or post medieval token.

Discussion

The Desk Top Study identified the site as lying within the lands of the former village of Sutton, and prior to this period, to have been well outside the perceived limits of the Roman settlement at Norton. There was however, a 19th Century reference to Roman activity and finds c. 200 m north of the site.

The presence of cropmark sites to the west, north and east suggested that there could be limited archaeological activity on the site, a hypothesis that was supported by the results of a magnetometer survey.

Two of the main linear anomalies (A & C), plus an immediately parallel feature (B) were shown to represent former drainage channels that had been created by the flow of water downhill off the limestone escarpment to the south. Three areas of magnetic noise (D, E & G) were created by variations within the natural glaciofluvial gravel and sand, as was another linear anomaly (H).

The strongest anomaly (F), of archaeological origin represented a boundary with a possible associated trackway. The stratigraphic position of these features indicated a relatively recent origin for the trackway, but two pits (contexts 6001 and 6003) were possibly of Prehistoric or Roman date. The pits contained very few finds, which makes it unlikely that they had been dug close to settlement activity; it is possible, though improbable, that they relate to a pit-alignment boundary. Pit-alignments are linear arrangements of adjacent pits, an example of which was excavated at Cat Bableton in 1986 (Cardwell 1989). Some form of Prehistoric activity is suggested in the vicinity of Trench 6, as this area stood out as yielding a relatively large number of struck flakes.

The east-west ditch revealed in Trench 8 was late medieval or post medieval in date. This ditch would appear to relate to the east-west linear feature known from cropmarks both west and east of the site. Other medieval activity was provided by the probable remains of rigg and furrow in Trenches 6 and 9.

The metal detecting survey had almost completely negative results, and this factor, along with the paucity of Roman finds (in particular ceramic building material) from the excavation, apparently confirms the indications of the Desktop Study, that the site was well away from the known focus of Roman settlement activity at Norton.

The picture of the site gained from the evaluation is of a generally archaeologically "quiet" area, with the possible exception of the prehistoric activity hinted at in the vicinity of Trench 6.

Bibliography

- Cardwell, P. (1989) Excavations at Cat Bableton Farm, Ganton, North Yorkshire, 1986. *Yorks Arch. J.* 61. 15 - 28
- GSB (1999) Whitewall, Norton. Report 99/09.
- Hayes, R.H. (1989) North East Yorkshire Studies: Archaeological Papers.
- Hudleston, N.A. (1962) "History of Malton & Norton".
- Mackney, P. *et al.* (1983) Soil survey of England and Wales.
- Manby, T.G. (1980) "Bronze Age Settlement in Eastern Yorkshire" in Barrett J., and Bradley R., "*Settlement and Society in the British Later Bronze Age*". *B.A.R.* 83
- MAP (1992) Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Rillington to Malton Pumping Main. Archive Report.
- MAP (1995) Excavations at Whitewall Quarry, Norton. Archive Report.
- Robinson, J.F. (1978) The Archaeology of Malton and Norton.

APPENDIX 1

Context Listing

Trench 1

- 1001 - 10 YR 3/2 sandy silt - deposit
- 1002 - 10 YR 4/4 sandy silt - deposit
- 1003 - 10 YR 3/4 sandy clay - linear clay deposit
- 1004 - 10 YR 3/4 sandy clay - fill / deposit
- 1005 - 10 YR 3/5 clayey sand - fill / deposit
- 1006 - 10 YR 4/6 slightly clayey silty sand - fill / deposit
- 1007 - 10 YR 4/3 clayey silt - fill
- 1008 - 10 YR 4/1 sandy clay - fill / deposit
- 1009 - 10 YR 6/4 to 10 YR 6/6 limestone fragment gravel - natural deposit
- 1010 - 10 YR 4/2 slightly clayey sandy silt - deposit
- 1011 - 10 YR 4/3 slightly clayey silty sand - deposit
- 1012 - 10 YR 5/6 clayey sand -possible posthole fill or tree bowl

Trench 2

- 2001 - 10 YR 3/2 sandy loam - deposit
- 2002 - 10 YR 4/4 slightly silty sand - deposit
- 2003 - 7.5 YR 4/4 sandy clay - deposit
- 2004 - 10 YR 6/4 slightly clayey sand - deposit
- 2005 - 10 YR 7/6 limestone gravel - deposit

Trench 3

- 3000 - 10 YR 3/2 sandy loam - deposit
- 3001 - 10 YR 4/4 loamy sand - deposit
- 3002 - 7.5 YR 5/6 silty sand\10 YR 6/6 coarse sand, flint gravel\5 YR 4/6 sand - deposit

Trench 4

- 4000 - 10 YR 3/2 turf line - deposit
- 4001 - 10 YR 3/2 silty sand - deposit top soil
- 4002 - 10 YR 4/4 silty sand - subsoil
- 4003 - 7.5 YR 4/6 slightly clayey silty sand - natural deposit
- 4004 - 10 YR 6/4 limestone & flint gravel in sand - natural deposit

Trench 5

- 5000 - 10 YR 3/2 sandy loam - deposit
- 5001 - 10 YR 4/4 slightly silty sand - deposit
- 5002 - 7.5 YR 4/6 sand\10 YR 6/6 coarse sand with flint & limestone gravel

Trench 6

- 6001 - cut
- 6002 - 10 YR 4/4 sandy silt - fill
- 6003 - cut
- 6004 - 10 YR 4/4 sandy silt - fill
- 6005 - cut
- 6006 - 2.5 Y 5/6 silty clay - fill
- 6007 - post hole cut
- 6008 - 10 YR 5/6 silty clay - post hole fill
- 6009 - 5 YR 4/4 silty sand - deposit
- 6010 - 10 YR 4/6 silty sand - deposit
- 6011 - cut
- 6012 - 10 YR 7/8 7.5 YR 4/4 silty clay - deposit

6013 - 10 YR 4/6 silty sand - deposit
6014 - 10 YR 3/2 silty sandy loam - deposit
6015 - 10 YR 4/4 sandy silt - deposit

Trench 7

7000 - 10 YR 3/2 loam - deposit
7001 - 7.5 YR 4/4 sand very slightly silty - deposit
7002 - 7.5 YR 4/6 sand with some clay element - deposit
7003 - 10 YR 6/6 limestone fragments - deposit

Trench 8

8001 - 10 YR 4/2 sandy silt - topsoil
8002 - 10 YR 4/6 silty sand - deposit
8003 - 10 YR 4/6 silty sand - deposit
8004 - 10 YR 5/8 clayey sand - deposit
8005 - cut
8006 - 7.5 YR 4/4 silty sand - deposit (fill of cut 8007)
8007 - cut
8008 - 10 YR 6/4 sandy clay - fill / deposit
8009 - cut
8010 - 10 YR 4/6 silty sand - fill of a line of postholes
8011 - cuts of line of postholes
8012 - 10 YR 4/4 silty sand - deposit
8013 - cut

Trench 9

9001 - 10 YR 3/2 sandy loam - deposit
9002 - 10 YR 4/6 silty sand - deposit
9003 - 6 YR 6/8 clean gritty sand - deposit
9004 - 10 YR 8/4/-8/6 slightly clayey gritty sand - deposit
9005 - 10 YR 5/6 fine gritty sand - deposit
9006 - 10 YR 7/4 slightly clayey sand - deposit
9007 - 10 YR 5/6 loose gritty sand some soil inc - deposit
9008 - cut
9009 - 10 YR 3/4 silty sandy subsoil - deposit
9010 - cut
9011 - 10 YR 5/6 slightly silty sand - deposit
9012 - cut
9013 - cut
9014 - 10 YR 5/6 slightly clayey sand - deposit
9015 - 10 YR 4/6 fine silty sand - deposit
9016 - cut

Trench 10

10001 - 7.5 YR 3/2 silty sand - deposit
10002 - 7.5 YR 4/4 silty sand - deposit
10003 - 7.5 YR 4/6 silty sand - deposit
10004 - 2.5 Y 6/6 sand - deposit

APPENDIX 2

Finds Catalogue

Context No	Small Find No.	Type	Description	Weight (kg)
1001		Pottery	1 body sherd, Redware	0.015kg
		Clay Pipe	1 Stem Fragment	0.001kg
2002		Pottery	1 rim sherd, Greyware	0.050kg
			1 body sherd, Staxton type ware	
			1 rim sherd, Redware	
3001		Pottery	1 body sherd, Greyware	0.005kg
6002		Pottery	1 body sherd, Orangeware	0.025kg
	1		1 body sherd, ?Prehistoric	
	9		1 body sherd, ?Prehistoric	
	13		1 body sherd, ?Prehistoric	
	11	Tile	1 Tegula Fragment	
	10	Flint	1 Waste Flake	
6004		Flint	1 Waste Flake	
6009	15	Pottery	3 body sherd, ?Prehistoric	0.010kg
	5	Flint	1 Waste Flake	
	6		1 Waste Flake	
	7		1 Tool Fragment	
	14		1 Waste Flake	
6012		Pottery	1 body sherd, Greyware	0.015kg
			2 body sherd, Calcite-Gritted ware	
6013		Flint	1 Waste Flake	
8002		Pottery	1 body sherd, Humber Ware	0.005kg
8003		Pottery	1 body sherd, Calcite-Gritted ware	0.005kg
8012		Pottery	1 handle, Cistercian ware	0.005kg
9007		Pottery	1 body sherd, Greyware	0.005kg
9011		Pottery	1 body sherd, Greyware	0.020kg
			1 rim sherd, Greyware Rim (Tiny Jar)	
			1 Calcite-Gritted ware	
10001		Pottery	1 body sherd, Greyware	0.030kg
			1 body sherd, Cologne Stoneware	
		C.B.M.	1 Tegula Fragment	0.050kg

Clay Pipe	1 Stem Fragment	0.005kg
Metal	1 Fragment. Lead sheet	

APPENDIX 3

Finds Catalogue

Plan No	Scale	Description
1.	1:1250	Trench layout overlay
2.	1:20	Plan of base of Trench 7
3.	1:10	South facing section. Trench 7.
4.	1:20	Plan of base of Trench 1.
5.	1:20	Trench 6. Pre-excavation plan.
6.	1:20	Plan of base of Trench 9.
7.	1:20	Trench 6. Post-excavation plan.
8.	1:10	Trench 6. Section cut 6001.
9.	1:20	Plan of base of Trench 8.
10.	1:20	South facing section Trench 9.
11.	1:10	North facing section Trench 6.
12.	1:10	West facing section Trench 8.