

An Archaeological Evaluation at 'Denbet', Mill Road, Hengrave, Suffolk.




Prepared for Jon Birrell


Giles Emery
March 2014

Report No: 43

HES No: HNV 034
Job Ref: NVC/2013/GE183
OASIS ID: norvicar1-169064

NORVIC archaeology

 www.norvicarchaeology.com

 07759016372

 giles.emery@norvicarchaeology.com

Contents

1.0	Introduction	2
2.0	Summary of Results	2
3.0	Geology and Topography	4
4.0	Brief Archaeological and Historical Background	4
5.0	Methodology	7
6.0	Results	7
7.0	Finds Analysis	9
8.0	Conclusions	11
9.0	Acknowledgements	12
10.0	Bibliography	12
	Appendix 1a: Context Summary	13
	Appendix 1b: OASIS feature summary table	13
	Appendix 2a: Finds by Context	13
	Appendix 2b: Finds summary table	13
	Appendix 3: Copy of the Specification/WSI	17
	Appendix 4: OASIS Form	18
Figures		
	Figure 1 General location plan	3
	Figure 2 Site location plan (plus HER entries)	4
	Figure 3 Trench location plan	14
	Figure 4 Partial trench plan	15
	Figure 5 Recorded Sections	16
Plates		
	Plate 1 General shot of the trench looking north*	Cover
	Plate 2 Evaluation trench	7
	Plate 3 Ditch [01] & Post-pit [03]	8

*1x2m scale and 2x0.5m scales (NB: Ditch [01])

Archaeological Evaluation at 'Denbet', Mill Road, Hengrave, Suffolk. IP28 6LR.

Location:	Hengrave
Grid Ref:	TL 8277 6872
HES No:	HNV 034
Date of fieldwork:	30 th January 2014

1.0 Introduction

Norvic Archaeology was commissioned by Jon Birrell to undertake an evaluation by trial trench at 'Denbet', Mill Road, Hengrave, Suffolk. A replacement dwelling has been proposed with a new house footprint which measures c.255m², within an overall footprint measuring c.0.1ha (Planning Ref:DC/13/0532/FUL).

The site is situated in the immediate vicinity of the Fornham Cursus (FAS 004), parts of which are a Scheduled Monument (SF 114). The cursus, formerly ditches and banks that are now visible as cropmarks, stretches for over a mile between Fornham and Hengrave. It would have been a significant Neolithic landscape feature and is interpreted as a processional way dating to 3500 - 3000BC.

The archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a brief issued by the Conservation Team of the Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service on behalf of St Edmundsbury Borough Council (Ref: Rachael Monk 08/11/3013/SCCAS). The aim of the evaluation work was to assess the presence/absence, date, nature, and extent of any buried archaeological remains and features. This report presents a brief description of the methodology followed, the results and the archaeological interpretation of the evaluation.

On completion of the project, the site archive will be offered for long term deposition with the Suffolk County Council archive, following the relevant policy on archiving standards. A digital copy of the report will also be submitted for inclusion on the Archaeology Data Service 'OASIS' database.

2.0 Summary of Results

The evaluation trench was placed within the footprint of the proposed new house. The results of this evaluation appear to demonstrate that the area subject to development has the potential to reveal or disturb archaeological deposits, sealed below c.0.4m of well-mixed soil.

Two features were revealed at the south-eastern end of the evaluation trench. They comprised of a shallow V-shaped ditch of possible prehistoric date and a post-pit, which is partly truncated. The post-pit contained a post-setting for an upright timber post of c.0.3m diameter. A freshly preserved assemblage of worked flint was collected from the backfill against the former post. These flints include several bladelets along with a blade core fragment consistent with a Mesolithic tradition of microlith production.

A flake removal was collected which refitted to the core, thus demonstrating that this assemblage is likely to represent evidence of a particular episode of flint knapping within close proximity to the post-pit. No other concentrations of flint were identified by the trial trench and the deposition of this assemblage within the post-pit appears to be contemporary to the feature.




Figure 1: General Location Plan

3.0 Geology and Topography

Hengrave is a small village situated c.3km north-northwest of the town of Bury St Edmunds, within the District of Mid Suffolk.

The development site is located on the western edge of the River Lark valley; c.300m west from the course of the river on well drained land at c. 25m OD.

The underlying geology is Upper (Cretaceous) Chalk, overlain by superficial Quaternary period river terrace deposits of sand and gravel - Geology of Britain Viewer (<http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>).

The sub-surface geology of the site encountered during the fieldwork can be characterised as medium grained orange sands and sandy-gravels.

4.0 Brief Archaeological and Historical Background (Figure 2)

The development site is located within an extensive multi-period landscape along the Lark valley in the village of Hengrave, where significant evidence for a monumental prehistoric landscape has been identified through cropmarks and aerial photography in the form of a Neolithic cursus known as the Fornham All Saints Cursus, parts of which are a Scheduled Monument (SF114). The cursus, formerly ditches and banks that are now visible as cropmarks, stretches for over a mile between Fornham and Hengrave. It would have been a significant landscape feature and is interpreted as a processional way dating to 3500 - 3000BC.

The open field immediately to the north of the development site contains a series of features, identified by cropmarks visible in aerial photographs, which are recorded in the County Historic Environment Record (HER) as HNV 001 and which form part of a Scheduled Monument (SF 170). Although labelled on OS plans as the site of a 'Roman Settlement', these features have been interpreted as possible evidence of Anglo-Saxon occupation.

To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Mill Road, lies an extensive area of cropmarks associated with the Fornham Cursus (HNV 002/FAS004), including four ring ditch cropmarks lying 200m-350m to the south-east (HNV 020, 021, 022 and 023). The cursus, a Scheduled Monument (SF114), begins 2km to the south-east and extends through Fornham All Saints to Hengrave, until terminating in the field c.100m to the south of Mill Cottage.

Archaeological monitoring of a pipeline along Mill Road in 1994 (HNV 025) identified a large possible ditch, which would be broadly in line with a projected continuation of the western side of the cursus. This projected line would then see the cursus pass through the site of Mill Cottage, where a possible continuation was recorded during archaeological monitoring for a new garage in 2009 (HNV 027).

The 1st Edition OS plan of 1884 shows that a square field which now forms part of the outer boundary to the overall plot was already defined, which was later annotated as '*Allotment Gardens*' from the 1904 plan. The trackway which currently serves the existing bungalow was marked on these early plans, which divided the field into two. The area was subdivided further into paddocks/fields by the establishment of the bungalow known as '*Denbet*', which was built by 'Dennis & Beth' in 1953. The area was then marked as a smallholding with pig buildings and associated pig fields occupying the area of development. Plots for modern properties were established in the south-eastern corner of the area by the 1970s.

Sites in the immediate proximity or of particular relevance or interest which fall in close proximity to the site include:

The following information has been sourced from the Suffolk Historic Environment Record:

Archaeological Interventions:

HNV 027 / ESF19851 / MSF24139: Archaeological monitoring of garage footing trenches at Mill Cottage, Hengrave identified a large, undated ditch. This may relate to Anglo-Saxon settlement activity, identified as cropmarks on aerial photographs, on the adjacent fields to the northwest (Scheduled Monument SF 170) or to the prehistoric Fornham Cursus and its associated features (Scheduled Monument SF 114), which terminates in the field 100m to the south.

HNV 025 / ESF19160 / MSF22938: Archaeological monitoring of a pipeline along Mill Road. This particular section of the pipeline ran along the eastern edge of Mill Road to the south of Mill Farm, in close proximity to HNV 001 & 002. Four archaeological features of uncertain date were identified; two pits, a post hole and a pit/ditch.

HNV 024 / ESF19160 / MSF22937: Archaeological monitoring of a pipeline along Mill Road. This particular section of the pipeline ran along the eastern edge of Mill Road adjacent with Mill Farm, in close proximity to HNV 001 & 002. A single wide/shallow, gravel filled feature of uncertain date was recorded.

HNV 026 / ESF20021: An archaeological evaluation was carried out on land at Hengrave Lodge in 2009 in advance of the construction of a new dwelling on the plot replacing the demolished previous structure. Two modern linear trenches were excavated within the footprint of the proposed structure with no archaeological features of significance encountered.

Sites & Monuments:

HNV 001 / SF 170 / MSF6635: Settlement site west of Mill Farm identified through cropmarks/aerial photography. This Scheduled Monument covers open fields here within which numerous cropmarks indicative of probable Anglo-Saxon settlement have been recorded, which include the corner of a double-ditched enclosure and numerous large pits. The area is labelled as the site of 'Roman Settlement' on OS plans, with no known foundation [located in fields beginning < 100m north of the site].

HNV 002 / SF 114 / MSF6636: The western part of the Fornham cursus. This Scheduled Monument comprises of an extensive area of cropmarks alongside the River Lark first photographed by Prof J K St Joseph of Cambridge. Most of the area is in the adjoining parish of Fornham All Saints (FAS 004). The Hengrave part includes the N end of the cursus (probably Neolithic), at least four ring-ditches, HNV 020, HNV 021, HNV 022, HNV 023 and part of a rectangular enclosure. There are also numerous pits which appear to be mainly confined to the east of the cursus [located in fields c. 85m east and south-east of the site].

HNV 020 / SF 114-b / MSF22930: Cropmark of a ring ditch c. 27m diameter, appears to be open in the SE quarter, located to the West of the northern part of the cursus (FAS 002) in close proximity to three other ring ditches HNV 021 HNV 022 and HNV 023. Previously recorded as part of HNV 002. [c. 240m SE]

HNV 021 / SF 114-b / MSF22931: Cropmark of a ring ditch circa 20m in diameter, located to the West of the northern part of cursus FAS 002 in close proximity to three other ring ditches HNV 020 HNV 022 and HNV 023. [c. 210m SE]

HNV 022 / SF 114-b / MSF22932: Cropmark of a 'teardrop' shaped ring ditch or enclosure c. 37m in diameter, located to the west of the northern part of the cursus FAS 002, in close proximity to three other ring ditches HNV 020 HNV 021 and HNV 023. Previously recorded as part of HNV 002. [c. 175m SE]

HNV023 / SF 114-b / MSF22933: Small ring ditch c. 15m in diameter located to the west of the northern part of the cursus FAS 002, in close proximity to three other ring ditches HNV 020 HNV 021 and HNV 022. [c. 170m ESE]

FAS 002 / SF 114b / MSF6657. Fornham Causewayed Enclosure. A series of cropmarks photographed by K J St Joseph (S7). Interrupted ditch system showing as a cropmark in an arable field, first recorded by Prof J K St Joseph of Cambridge. Partly in Hengrave parish. Consists of a main double ditched enclosure circa 280 x 325m with a subsidiary double-ditched enclosure, possibly 325m in diameter, attached to its S side. The ditches of the main enclosure are circa 30m apart and those of the extension are 8m apart (measuring between the centre lines). The system is crossed by a cursus (FAS 004). Both are probably Neolithic in date. [c. 440m SE]

HNV 008 / MSF12812: St John Lateran church, Hengrave, has a circular tower probably early Norman. The chancel is dates to c. 1300. The rest of the church is circa 1419 & early C16th. A north chapel was built in 1540. In the chancel crowd the monuments of the Kytsons. The church adjoins Hengrave Hall in an emparked area. [c. 350m SW]

HNV 013 / MSF14626: Hengrave Hall - courtyard-plan mansion built circa 1524-40. Includes Grade I & II Listed Buildings. A courtyard-plan brick and limestone mansion built c.1524-40 for Sir Thomas Kytson, a wealthy London merchant. Accounts for much of the work survive, indicating that the main mason up to 1535 was John

Eastawe/Estow and after then, William Ponyard. The kitchen range and a 'high tower' were removed in 1775 with the present N wing built on their site 1897-1900. A rectangular moat surrounding the house was filled in after 1769, most probably in 1775. Accounts in the 1520s refer to both cleansing and digging the moat, suggesting that an existing moat was being extensively remodelled. Other buildings in the complex included a central lodge for keepers and falconers and low surrounding buildings used for offices, including a stable for 'the horses of pleasure'. To the W of the moat were the 'great barn' and a dovecote. This area is now a garden. There was a Bowling Green on the moat N of the house and a garden outside the N side of the moat. [c. 400m SW]

Listed buildings:

HNV 028 - MSF25271 - 283771: Farmhouse and outbuildings at Mill Farm. A Grade II Listed 18th century brick farmhouse with a range of outbuildings which were redeveloped in 1770. There is a timber framed three bay barn and a range of stabling, both covered in weatherboarding. Some of these boards are second hand and appear to have been re-used from an earlier building once present at this site; many of these are also covered in a red ochre pigment. A timber-framed water mill attached to east side was demolished in the early 1900s. [c. 200m NE of the site]

283772: Nos. 2 & 3 Mill Road, Hengrave. A pair of Grade II Listed red brick cottages dating to c.1850. [c. 65m E of the site]




Figure 2. Site location in relation to relevant HER entries

5.0 Methodology (Figure 3)



Plate 2: Evaluation Trench (looking north-west)
[2x2m + 1x1m scale] NB: Ditch [01]

As requested by the Brief, a single evaluation trench measuring 1.8m wide by 10m long was excavated under the control of an experienced archaeologist; using a mechanical excavator fitted with a ditching bucket.

The trench was located within the footprint of the new house in order to assess the impact of the development upon potential archaeological deposits.

Spoil, exposed surfaces and features were scanned with a metal detector (Minelab XTerra 705). All metal-detected and hand-collected finds were retained for inspection, other than those which were obviously modern.

All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using Norvic Archaeology *pro forma* sheets. The trench location, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and digital images were taken of all relevant features and deposits.

Topographic data was supplied by Brown & Scarlett Architects, which shows that the area of the new house is sited on land at c. 25.30m OD.

6.0 Results (Figures 4 & 5; Appendix 1)

- **'Natural deposits'**

Amorphous bands of natural sands and sandy gravels were revealed at a depth of c. 0.5m (09). The sand was mid-orange, medium grained and contained occasional stones, while the sandy-gravels were firm and moderately sorted.

- **?Lower Subsoil Remnant**

Above the natural was a thin and patchy horizon of dirty-sand which may have been subject to some form of modern disturbance (07). This deposit was between 50mm to 150mm deep and shared a diffuse horizon with both the natural geology below. This may be all that remains of possible subsoil prior to modern activity at the site (see below).

- **Modern soils**

Above the ?lower subsoil (07) and natural sands/gravels (09) was mid-grey sandy-loam of c.0.4m depth (08) which was fairly homogenised and appears to represent an actively mixed soil. This horizon of 'garden soil' was populated by pigs for several decades, in addition the area has been mechanically turned, as evidenced by the occurrence of modern 'plough-scars' which had raked down as far as the surface of the natural geology in many places.

- **Ditch (?Prehistoric)**

A single, well defined linear feature was revealed in the south-east end of the evaluation trench ([01]). It measured c.0.55m wide and 0.3m deep, with a concave V-shaped profile and was orientated NW to SE. This shallow ditch contained a single, fairly homogenised fill of mid greyish-brown silty-sand (02). Several fragments of burnt flint and a two flint flakes were collected from this feature, which appeared to truncate a prehistoric post-pit. Although the finds collected from the ditch-fill may be residual, or even sourced to the post-pit, the general character of this feature suggests a ditch of some antiquity. The orientation of the ditch does not match historic OS plans and no residual finds or inclusions of anything other than prehistoric date were present within its fill.

- **Prehistoric Post-pit (Mesolithic)**

A single oval post-pit was recorded, which appeared to have been truncated by the Ditch [01]. Within one end of the post-pit was a clearly defined post-setting ([05]) for a circular post of c. 0.3m in diameter with a bluntly pointed base. The fill of the post-setting consisted of a mid-grey silty-sand with rare flecks of charcoal (06), while the backfill of the post-pit was a mix of stony, dirty-sand (04).

While numerous fragments of burnt flint and worked flint were collected from the pit fill the post-setting was devoid of artefacts. The darker, charcoal flecked fill of the posthole suggests that the post-base may have decayed *in situ*, having comprised of bluntly sharpened post that may have been fire treated to both harden and slow decay. The backfill of the post-pit against the post contained an interesting assemblage of well-preserved worked flints which include bladelets typical of Mesolithic microlith manufacture. The presence of a core fragment found alongside a refitting flake demonstrate that this assemblage is likely to represent evidence of an episode of flint knapping within close proximity, while the presence of burnt flints suggest hearth activity nearby.



Plate 3: Ditch [01] & Post-pit [03] (looking east)
[1x2m + 2x0.5m + 1x0.3m scale]

7.0 Finds Analysis *(Appendix 2)*

- **Flint**

Introduction

Nineteen struck flints were collected during the monitoring work along with 26 fragments of burnt flint. Each piece was examined by eye and with the aid of a hand lens (x6 magnification) before being catalogued according to a basic typology using standard lithic terminology where possible.

Burnt Flint

Twenty-six fragments of non-worked burnt flint of varying size (weighing a total of 227g) were collected from three contexts, which include both heavily calcined and fire-cracked pieces and heavily reddened and granulated pieces. In addition two heat affected struck flints were identified, which are described further with the worked flint below. This small quantity of burnt flint was collected from a prehistoric post-pit ([03]) and a ditch which partly truncated it ([01]).

Context	Context Type	Type	Qty	Weight (g)
02	Ditch fill	Burnt fragment	12	74
02	Ditch fill	Burnt flake	1	5
04	Post-pit fill	Burnt fragment	13	110
04	Post-pit fill	Burnt flake	1	17
08	Post-socket fill	Burnt fragment	1	56
Total			28	262

Table 1. Burnt Flint

Worked flint

This small assemblage is made exclusively from a good quality medium grained opaque flint, with occasional interclasts and few flaws. The mottled grey fabric is a pale yellowish-grey when viewed through a strong white light. Several of the pieces retain cortex, which is very thin. The collection source is uncertain but likely to have been relatively local, with careful selection of surface or sub-surface flints the most likely source.

Context	Context Type	Feature	Type	Qty	Weight (g)
02	Ditch fill	Ditch [01]	Worked flint	2	7
04	Post-pit fill	Post-pit [03]	Worked flint	14	47
07	?Subsoil remnant	-	Worked flint	1	<1
08	Garden soil	-	Worked flint	2	5
Total				19	60

Table 2. Worked Flint by Feature Type

The condition of the assemblage is very good with all examples in fresh condition with no signs of post-depositional weathering or abrasion, excepting a single example collected from the active topsoil. This would normally indicate that they have been recovered close to where they were originally manufactured and discarded/buried. In this case the vast majority of flints were collected from a well-sealed feature, in the form of a post-pit ([03]). It is possible that the few flints collected from the ditch [01] were also sourced from the post-pit, which appears to have been partly truncated by the ditch.

Context	Type	Qty	Weight (g)	Context Type
02	Burnt flake	1	5	Ditch fill
A calcined flake with pink-scorched cortex. Soft hammer struck.				
02	Flake	1	2	Ditch fill
A narrow flake, fine/narrow butt, soft-hammer/punched – has broken erratically at distal end where met a flaw. Fresh/sharp condition.				
04	Burnt flake	1	17	Post-pit fill
A heavy flake, broken medially with a narrow butt, retains cortex. Heat reddened and cracked.				
04	Core fragment + Refitting flake	2	30g	Post-pit fill
The core fragment (23g) from a slightly triangular shaped (x/s) core retains a thin cortex on one side, along with several scars of parallel, narrow soft hammer removals – one of which is part of this assemblage which has plunged deeply taking with it part of the core 'base', prior to further removals. The core fragment shows that it was reversed 90° prior to these removals. Fresh/sharp condition. A fairly large and only partly decorticated Bladelet Core.				
04	Bladelet (snapped)	1	1	Post-pit fill
A very neat and particularly thin/fine bladelet (crested), snapped medially. Fresh/sharp condition.				
04	Utilised Flake/Side scraper	1	16	Post-pit fill
A relatively broad tertiary convex flake (63L, 22W, 7W), soft hammer struck with a very narrow butt, removed following a miss-strike, retains a small area of thin cortex at the distal end. Has fine unifacial lateral retouch and edge-wear – utilised as an edge scraper prior to discard. Fresh/sharp condition.				
04	Bladelets	6	6	
All are soft hammer/punched with small butts and abraded platforms. Four are neatly made bladelets, two of which are of very similar lengths (23mm), two of these are crested (preparatory bladelets). The thicker bladelet has been snapped medially, the other two are complete but with step fractures and may be rejects. A longer piece is from a large core and measures 41mm long. A piece classified as a bladelet retains cortex. Fresh/sharp condition.				
04	Flakes (narrow)	3	3	
Three narrow flakes with narrow butts and from bladelet cores, two of which retain cortex, while the other is a stepped flake and may be a mis-hit.				
07	Flake (blade-like)	1	<1g	?Subsoil remnant
A fine/thin, sharp narrow blade-like flake, neatly punched or struck from a prepared platform. Fresh/sharp condition.				
08	Flake	2	5	Garden soil
A narrow, small crested flake fragment, slightly patinated and a fresh flake (secondary)				
Totals		19	60	

Table 3. Worked flint description

Discussion

The pieces of burnt flint may have been produced in association with burning or hearth activities. Given their association with prehistoric flint working, they can be attributed to a similar period. Two heat affected struck flints were also collected, which also indicates hearth activity in close association with prehistoric flint knapping.

The selection of good quality flint and the presence of bladelets and a bladelet core fragment indicates a Mesolithic industry at the site. The struck flint has been manufactured from good quality flint, with neatly prepared and abraded platforms maintained through the knapping process, which utilises controlled soft hammer/punch techniques typical for the Mesolithic tradition. The single large flake is convex in form and has been utilised as an *ad hoc* side scraper, although relatively rare on Mesolithic sites, side scrapers are not unknown.

The presence of a bladelet core fragment and bladelets (including two small crested bladelets along with some indication of mishits and preparation flakes retaining cortex) demonstrates that microlith production took place here. No microliths or other diagnostic tools were present and only a broad Mesolithic date can be assigned to the flints.

The majority of the assemblage (both burnt and worked) was collected from the backfill of a post-pit ([03]). The presence of a refitting flake to the core fragment collected from this

feature strongly suggests that the flint assemblage most likely represents a single episode of activity. The flint is in fresh condition, with no signs of weathering or abrasion. No other concentrations of flint were identified by the trial trench and the deposition of this assemblage within the post-pit may well be contemporary to the feature.

- **Metal Artefacts**

Metal detection revealed that the topsoil contained modern ferrous rubbish in the form of scattered nails and fragments. Two copper-alloy objects were collected from the topsoil (08), which are attributable to late post-medieval periods. They amount to a small mould-cast button with a floral design (weighing 0.62g) and a functional livery strap-end of 19th to 20th century date (weighing 9.92g). The button can be dated to the late 18th to early 19th and would have had matched larger counterparts as part of a set.

8.0 Conclusions

The evaluation trench has demonstrated that archaeological features are present within the footprint of the proposed house, sealed below c. 0.4m of well mixed garden soil. No subsoil was present, although a thin and patchy trace of dirty sand may be the remnants of such. The area is known to have been used to raise pigs in recent decades and the soils have been both mechanically turned and thoroughly rooted over by these animals.

Two features were recorded, both at the south-eastern end of the trench. They comprised of a shallow V-shaped ditch of some antiquity but of uncertain date, which partly truncated a post-pit of certain prehistoric date. The post-pit was well-defined and contained the post-setting for a timber post of c. 0.3m diameter. A small assemblage of freshly preserved worked flint was collected from the backfill of the pit, against the former post.

The worked flint includes several bladelets along with a blade core fragment consistent with a Mesolithic tradition of microlith production. A flake removal was collected which refitted to the core, thus demonstrating that this assemblage is likely to represent evidence of a particular episode of flint knapping within close proximity. No other concentrations of flint were identified by the trial trench and the deposition of this assemblage within the post-pit appears to be contemporary to the feature.

The discovery of well-preserved Mesolithic flints collected from a post-pit is highly significant, given the proximity to the Fornham Cursus, which is believed to have been established as part of a ritual prehistoric landscape from the Early Neolithic. Although the flints do not offer a more refined date, it is suspected that they represent Late Mesolithic activity, which could fall into a transitional period of terminal Mesolithic to Neolithic date.

Given the potential for significant levels of disturbance to archaeological deposits at the site as part of the proposed development, a further stage of mitigation work may be necessary to ensure that any further archaeological features revealed can be adequately investigated and recorded.

Any recommendations for further archaeological mitigation ahead of the proposed development will be made by the Conservation Team of the Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service.

9.0 Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Jon Birrell who commissioned Norvic Archaeology to carry out this work and who arranged for suitable machine works. All stages of the monitoring and post-excavation analysis work were carried out by the author. Survey data was kindly supplied by Richard Dilley of Brown & Scarlett Architects. HER data was supplied by James Rolfe of the Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service.

10.0 Bibliography

- | | | |
|----------------|------|--|
| Adkins, L & R. | 1998 | <i>The Handbook of British Archaeology.</i> London. |
| Bailey, G. | 2004 | <i>Buttons & Fasteners, 500BC-AD1840.</i> Greenlight Publishing. |
| Butler, C. | 2005 | <i>Prehistoric Flintwork.</i> Tempus. |
| Jennings, S. | 1981 | <i>Eighteen centuries of pottery from Norwich.</i> East Anglian Archaeology 13. |
| Shopland, N. | 2005 | <i>Archaeological Finds, a guide to identification.</i> Tempus |
| Waddington, C. | 2004 | <i>The joy of flint.</i> Museum of Antiquities, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. |

Appendix 1a: Context Summary

Context	Category	Fill of	Brief Physical Description	Interpretation	Period
01	Cut		Linear, concave V-shaped profile, steep to well-sloping sides, aligned NW-SE. c. 0.3m deep, 0.55m Wide	Ditch	?Prehistoric
02	Deposit	[01]	V.soft (dense), mid greyish-brown silty-sand, homogenous, occ. stones, rare burnt flint	Ditch-fill	?Prehistoric
03	Cut		Oval, flat-based -U-shaped profile, steep/even sides, 0.34m deep, 0.7m W, Est. 0.85m L	Post-pit	Mesolithic+
04	Deposit	[03]	Soft (dense), mid orangey-brown sand (silt<5%), mod. stones, occ. burnt flint, occ. worked flint	Post-pit backfill	Mesolithic+
05	Cut		SET WITHIN [03]: Circular, U-shaped-profile, near vertical sides and a bluntly pointed base, 0.35m diameter, c. 0.6m deep	Post-setting	Mesolithic+
06	Deposit	[05]	Soft (dense), dark greyish-brown silty-sand, occ. stones, rare charcoal flecks	Fill	Mesolithic+
07	Deposit		Soft, mid orangey-brown sand (silt c.5%), freq. stones - ?disturbed horizon 50mm to 150mm thick	?Subsoil remnant	?Prehistoric+
08	Deposit		Friable, mid-grey sandy-loam, occ. charcoal/cbm (modern lumps)/stones, rare bottle glass shards (modern), c. 0.4m deep	'Garden soil'	Modern
09	Deposit		Striations of soft orange sands and firmer sandy-gravels, moderately sorted, sterile	Natural Geology	

Appendix 1b: OASIS feature summary table

Period	Feature type	Quantity
Prehistoric (500000BC to 42AD)	Posthole	1

Appendix 2a: Finds by Context

Context	Material	Quantity	Weight (g)
02	Burnt Flint	12	74
	Flint - worked	2	7
04	Burnt Flint	13	110
	Flint - worked	14	47
07	Flint - worked	1	1
08	Burnt Flint	1	56
	Copper Object – Button	1	1
	Flint – worked	2	5

Appendix 2b: Finds summary table

Period	Material	Quantity
Prehistoric (500000BC to 42AD)	Burnt Flint	1
Mesolithic (10000 to 4001BC)	Flint - worked	19
Post-medieval (1540 to 1900AD)	Copper Alloy – Button	1





Figure 3. Trench location plan. Scale 1:200



0 2 m

Figure 4. Partial trench plan to show features. Scale 1:20




Figure 5. Recorded Sections. Scale 1:20

Proposed Single Residential Development at 'Denbet', Mill Road, Hengrave,
Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk. IP28 6LR.

**APPROVED SPECIFICATION FOR A PROGRAMME OF
ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION BY TRIAL TRENCH**

Prepared for
Jon Birrell

By



November 2013

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	2
2	AIMS	2
3	METHOD STATEMENT	3
3.1	Introduction	3
3.2	Evaluation by Trial Trench	3
3.3	Post-fieldwork & Assessment	6
3.4	Final Analysis, Reporting and Archive	6
4	TIMETABLE AND RESOURCES	7
5	ON SITE AND SPECIALIST STAFFING	7
6.	GENERAL CONDITIONS	8
7.	TRENCH LOCATION FIGURE	9

Planning Authority: St Edmundsbury Borough Council
Planning Application No.: DC/13/0532/FUL
HER No. for this project: to be arranged
Grid Reference: TL 828 687
Development Proposal: Residential (single house)
Archaeological Brief Issued By: Rachael Monk
Date of Issue: 8/11/2013

**'Denbet', Mill Road,
Hengrave,
Bury St Edmunds,
Suffolk.**

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Conservation Team (CT) of Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service (SCCAS) has requested that a Programme of Archaeological Work (hereafter PoAW) be undertaken in response to proposals for the development of a single residential property to replace an existing house off Mill Road, Hengrave, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk (planning ref: DC/13/0532/FUL).
- 1.2 The site is located in an area considered to be of high archaeological potential as highlighted by Rachael Monk of the SCCAS-Conservation Team in the SCCAS Brief and Specification document relating to this planning application:
- This development affects an archaeologically sensitive site in the Lark Valley, within a multi-period historic landscape. The site is less than 100m to the south of a former settlement, identified as Anglo-Saxon in date, which is a statutorily protected Scheduled Monument (SM SF170, County Historic Environment Record HNV 001). It is also immediately to the west of the Neolithic Fornham cursus, another Scheduled Monument (SM SF114, HER 002), and prehistoric sites and features associated with it (HNV 020-025; HNV 027).*
- There is high potential for archaeological deposits to be disturbed by this development. The proposed works would cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exists.*
- The Planning Authority was advised that any consent should be conditional upon an agreed programme of work taking place before development begins in accordance with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets (that might be present at this location) before they are damaged or destroyed.*

Rachael Monk (8.11.13)

- 1.3 The Brief for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation requires an evaluation of the development plot to determine the presence/absence, date, extent, state of preservation and significance of any archaeological layers or subsoil archaeological features. This evaluation may indicate a need for a further phase of Archaeological Evaluation of Excavation Work ahead of development or Archaeological Monitoring during the development if features of importance are found and these cannot be preserved *in situ*.
- 1.4 It is a requirement stipulated by the SCCAS/CT that ground disturbance is avoided during demolition of the existing house. The evaluation is requested to take the form of 1.8m by 10m trial trench, positioned so as to sample the footprint area of the proposed new dwelling.
- 1.5 This document has been prepared in response to an invitation from Jon Birrell. It provides a method statement for a PoAW and details how Norvic Archaeology proposes to implement the requirements of the Brief.

2 AIMS

- 2.1 A defined PoAW, as stipulated by the SCCAS Conservation Team, is required to ensure that any archaeological deposits encountered during the works are recorded via controlled excavation to recognised standards. The general objectives of the evaluation work is to recover information regarding the origins, date, development, phasing, spatial organisation, character, function, status, significance and the nature of social, economic and industrial activities of any archaeological assets encountered.
- 2.2 Period resource assessments set out in the document Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties (Glazebrook 1997; Brown and Glazebrook 2000; Medleycott 2011) pose specific research questions for periods ranging from the Palaeolithic to the Modern period which may be of relevance to this programme of work.

2

www.norvicarchaeology.com

- 2.3 Evidence for probable Anglo-Saxon settlement is recorded to the immediate north of the site in open fields to the west of Hengrave Mill in the form of cropmarks which include a double-ditched enclosure (SM SF170, County Historic Environment Record HNV 001). Any preserved archaeological data may offer potential for providing information on such land use and settlement while any *in situ* Prehistoric deposits may enhance current understanding relating to the origin and development of a nationally significant prehistoric monument, known as the Fornham Cursus (FAS004) and its contemporary landscape.
- 2.4 The aims of the archaeological work can be summarised as follows:
- 2.4.1 To establish the presence or absence of archaeological remains within the proposed area.
- 2.4.2 To determine the extent, condition, nature, quality and date of any archaeological remains occurring within the site.
- 2.4.3 To ensure that any archaeological features discovered are identified, sampled and recorded.
- 2.4.4 To establish, as far as is reasonably possible within the scope of the project, the extent, character, stratigraphic sequence and date of archaeological features and deposits, and the nature of the activities which occurred at the site during the various periods or phases of its occupation
- 2.4.5 To explore any evidence for social, economic and industrial activity.
- 2.4.6 To present the archaeological data recovered in the form of an evaluation report that may provide the basis for further decisions regarding the impact of any proposed development on any archaeological resource present.

3 METHOD STATEMENT

3.1 Introduction

- 3.1.1 A two-stage strategy will be undertaken to fulfil the requirements of the Evaluation Brief issued by the SCCAS/CT.
- Evaluation by Trial Trench** - Sub-surface archaeological features or deposits will be cleaned and excavated to determine function, form and relative date. Written, drawn and photographic records of all excavated archaeological deposits and features will be produced.
- Post-Fieldwork Processing, Analysis, Reporting & Archive** - The cleaning and cataloguing of any artefactual and ecofactual materials recovered will be carried out upon completion of the fieldwork. The post-fieldwork analysis will be completed detailing the stratigraphic, artefactual and environmental evidence recovered during the fieldwork, presented as an Evaluation Report. A suitable archive of all necessary excavated material and data will be prepared – following current SCCAS Archive Guidelines and advice of the County Historic Environment Officer
- 3.1.2 The procedures and methodology for each of the stages outlined above are described in further detail below.
- 3.2 **Evaluation by Trial Trenching**
- 3.2.1 At the request of the SCCAS/CT a single trial trench, measuring 1.8m by 10m is to be located in the area of the proposed house footprint (as per the figure supplied at the rear of this document. The exact location and orientation of the trenching may be determined on the basis of surface or below ground obstruction.

3

www.norvicarchaeology.com

- 3.2.2 The trial trenching aims to characterise any sequence of *in situ* archaeological deposits down to a practical and safe working depth (c.1.2m) with hand auger tests of any deeper deposits if appropriate. Any requirements to investigate to a greater depth involving hand digging and/or additional machine-work will require consultation and agreement with the SCCAS/CT and the client on an agreed strategy, with the maintenance of a safe-working environment the overarching priority (this may take the form of stepping or shoring methods as ground conditions allow).
- 3.2.3 Norvic Archaeology would expect information on any services crossing the site to be provided by the client if appropriate to the project and accepts no liability if this information is not disclosed.
- 3.2.4 A basic contamination check made on the Environment Agency online database (accessed November 2013) shows no previously listed historic or current landfill or major contamination sites within the immediate area of the site. However, Norvic Archaeology expects the client to provide more detailed information on the nature, extent and level of any likely soil contamination present in the form of a written statement or contamination report specific to the development area.
- Should unanticipated contaminated ground be encountered during the archaeological works, all work will cease in the affected area until an assessment of risks to health has been undertaken and onsite control measures implemented. Norvic Archaeology will not be liable for any costs related to the collection and analysis of soils or other assessment methods, on-site control measures and the removal of contaminated soil or other materials from site.
- 3.2.5 The final location/dimensions of the evaluation trench will be determined by Norvic Archaeology to the satisfaction of the SCCAS/CT, although the exact layout of the footprint is expected to be provided by the client.
- 3.2.6 Modern overburden and makeup deposits will be removed by a suitable mechanical digger fitted with a toothless ditching bucket (ideally 1.5m wide minimum). This will take place under constant archaeological supervision with soil deposits removed in gradual splits until significant archaeological horizons, natural geology or the limits of a safe working depth is encountered (whichever is higher). Where possible topsoil, subsoil and archaeological deposits will be kept separate during excavation to allow sequential backfilling.
- 3.2.7 Spoil from topsoil, subsoil, *in situ* soil horizons and any hand-excavated deposits will be scanned by metal detector.
- 3.2.8 Stripped surfaces will be investigated through manual cleaning, except in areas clearly devoid of archaeological features.
- 3.2.9 Archaeological deposits, features and layers will be recorded using Norvic Archaeology's pro-forma recording system, see <http://www.norvicarchaeology.com/Recording.htm>. The records will include written, graphic and photographic elements. Plans and sections will be made at suitable scales, depending on the complexity of the archaeological deposits and the level of detail required. A suitable digital and monochrome photographic record will be maintained of archaeological deposits, layers and features to record their characteristics and relationships. A photographic record will also be taken to record the pre-excavation condition of the site, the progress of the excavation and the appearance of the site following the completion of the excavation.
- 3.2.10 Artefactual and ecofactual materials will be collected and, where possible, related to the context from which they derived. All retained materials will be stored in stable conditions until arrangements for their processing and analysis are made. Deposit samples will generally only be taken on site from only well dated and well-sealed contexts, sampling will follow the guidelines established by English Heritage (Environmental Archaeology Guide to Theory and Practice of Methods, 2nd ed. 2011).

- 3.2.11 Detailed strategies for levels of sampling of buried soils, structures, pits, post-holes and ditches will be determined on site in line with the specification presented as part of the SCCAS Brief & Specification document, with allowance made for greater recovery rates as appropriate; percentage sampling will normally apply if areas of complex stratified deposits are encountered. In general, the following feature/deposit excavation sampling strategy will be employed wherever site conditions allow in accordance with the document *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England* (Gurney 2003):
- Linear Features:** Will be subject to 10% sample excavation at appropriate intervals to allow an informed interpretation of date and function. Ditch terminals will be targeted as part of such investigation and junctions will also be prioritised for investigation to determine any unclear stratigraphic relationships. Where possible, investigation slots will measure 1m wide or greater, if a large prehistoric ditch suspected to relate to the Fornham Cursus is revealed the investigation strategy will aim to characterise its depth and form as the confines of the evaluation trench allow (see 3.2.2. above).
- Discrete Features** (e.g. pits/postholes): Exposed features will generally be half-sectioned, although individual features may be subject to quarter-sectioning or 100% excavation as necessary dependent upon their scale or significance to the research aims of the project.
- Negative Structural Features** (e.g. SFB-pits, beamslots, etc.): Exposed features recognised as forming elements of more significant structural features will generally be subject to higher sampling percentages than other discrete features.
- Walls and other masonry:** Built features will be exposed and recorded as necessary to assist in characterising and dating their construction, with any further excavation and investigation carried out to target stratigraphic and phase relationships.
- Burial Features:** Any overall strategy targeting features identified or strongly suspected to be burial features will be discussed where possible with the SCCAS/CT prior to implementation. In general burial deposits which cannot be left *in situ* will be subject to 100% excavation of exposed material.
- Buried soils:** If identified, well preserved relict soils will be subject to a suitable sampling and sieving strategy to determine artefact densities.
- Post-medieval and modern features:** To be dealt with summarily in accordance with their archaeological significance or role in any project specific research agenda.
- Colluvial/masking deposits:** Where extensive horizons are encountered of uncertain depth which have the potential to mask earlier episodes of human activity these deposits will be investigated appropriately to a safe working depth, with hand auger tests made of any deeper deposits.
- 3.2.12 Human remains will normally be left *in situ* unless they are likely to suffer damage/disturbance as a result of their exposure or further analysis of the remains is required to meet the aims of the evaluation brief. Any burials subject to removal as part of this evaluation project will be discussed with the SCCAS/CT within each phase of works with details agreed before removal begins. If any human remains or burials are encountered which must be removed an application for a Licence for the Removal of Human Remains will be made in compliance with Section 25 of the Burial Act, 1857. Human remains will be screened from public view during the course of their excavation. Initial backfilling of any graves or excavation areas thought to contain human remains will be done so manually to ensure that the remains are appropriately protected from any damage or disturbance.
- 3.2.13 Where areas of significant archaeological remains are encountered that cannot be recorded safely or to the appropriate standard within the normal limitations of archaeological methods, consultation will take place between the client and the SCCAS/CT to reach an agreement on any need for further archaeological excavation.

3.3 Post-Fieldwork Processing and Assessment

Initial processing of the site archive

- 3.3.1. The purpose of this phase is to ensure that all elements of the site record from the various phases of fieldwork are cross-referenced and compatible with each other for the post-excavation assessment and reporting phases.
- 3.3.2 All retained materials will be cleaned, marked and packaged in accordance with the requirements of the SCCAS. Finds data will be catalogued to allow summary listings of artefacts by category and context to provide basic quantification.
- 3.3.3 An archive structured in accordance with guidelines laid out in *Archaeological Archives: a guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation* (Brown 2007) will be initiated
- 3.3.4 A provisional stratigraphic matrix and accompanying text sections will be prepared where appropriate in order to establish the stratigraphic sequence and provisional phrasing of the archaeological remains.
- 3.3.5 Analysis of the finds data will be undertaken in line with the procedures set out in the document *Standards and Guidelines for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (Institute of Field Archaeologists 2001). This will involve the identification and summary description of the artefactual materials by relevant specialists. All finds work will follow the procedures set out in the document *Guidelines for Finds Work* (Institute of Field Archaeologists 1992). Where appropriate, finds data will be stored on a database to expedite analysis and report preparation.
- 3.3.6 An assessment of any specific artefact conservation requirements will be undertaken with advice from appropriate specialists/ an ICON registered conservator. In all instances, conservation assessment procedures will follow the frameworks set out in the documents *Excavated Artefacts and Conservation* (UKIC Conservation Guidelines No 1, 1988) and *A Strategy for the Care and Investigation of Finds* (Ancient Monuments Laboratory 1995).
- 3.3.7 Any environmental samples taken during the course of the excavation or selected sub-samples from the overall assemblage will be assessed in relation to the project's stated research objectives. The assessment of environmental material in all instances will follow the guidelines set out in the document *Environmental Archaeology and Archaeological Evaluations* (Association for Environmental Archaeology Working Papers No 2, 1995).

3.4 Final Analysis, Reporting and Archive

Reporting

- 3.4.1 The final post-fieldwork analysis will be undertaken on the stratigraphic, artefactual and environmental evidence recovered during the fieldwork. The results of the analysis will be presented as an Evaluation Report.
- 3.4.2 Background research, commensurate with the results of the field work, will be undertaken to place the results of the work within their local archaeological context. This information will form part of the final report. Guidelines set out in the documents *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments* (Institute of Field Archaeologists 1994) and *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England* (Gurney 2003) will be followed. The study may include the following sources of information as appropriate to the objectives of the research: Historic Environment Records; Historical maps; Aerial Photography Images; other relevant documentary sources.
- 3.4.3 A draft copy of the final report will be supplied to the SCCAS/CT for comments. Following any necessary amendments and as stipulated by the brief, a finalised hard copy and a .pdf copy of the report on CD will be supplied to the SCCAS/CT. A copy will also be submitted to the client at this time.
- 3.4.4 A single integrated archive for all elements of the work will be prepared according to the recommendations set out in Environmental standards for the permanent storage of excavated material from archaeological sites (UKIC, Conservation Guidelines 3, 1984) and Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage (Walker 1990), and in accordance with the recipients own requirements for archive preparation, storage and conservation.
- 3.4.5 Norvic Archaeology will seek to reach a formal agreement with the landowners for the donation of the full site archive, and transfer of title to the intended archive repository or an appropriate educational body. Provision will also be made for additional artefact recording (e.g. photography, illustration, and scientific analysis) for materials where this is not able to be achieved.
- 3.4.6 Norvic Archaeology supports the OASIS project. An online record will be completed when the Archive report is submitted to SCCAS/CT. This will include a .pdf version of the final report.

4 **TIMETABLE AND RESOURCES**

- 4.1 The different stages of archaeological work have different time and staff requirements. The timetable for fieldwork assumes that are no major delays to the work programme caused by factors outside of Norvic Archaeology's reasonable control. The site work is timetable to take a minimum of one to two days, dependent upon the quantity and complexity of archaeological remains encountered.
- 4.2 The absolute duration of the post-excavation work cannot be clearly defined as it involves the processing and analysis of data collected during fieldwork. However, the production of a suitable Evaluation Report is estimated to be available to the client within 6 weeks of the close of fieldwork.

5 **ON SITE AND SPECIALIST STAFFING**

- 5.1 The work will be directed and carried out on-site by Giles Emery, T/A Norvic Archaeology. Any additional staff will also have a similar level of archaeological experience.
- 5.2 Norvic Archaeology reserves the right, because of its developing work programme, to change its nominated personnel at any time. Subcontracted archaeologists will be of a similar level of experience and knowledgeable in this type of project.

OASIS DATA COLLECTION FORM:

England

[List of Projects](#) | [Manage Projects](#) | [Search Projects](#) | [New project](#) | [Change your details](#) | [HER coverage](#) | [Change country](#) | [Log out](#)

Printable version

OASIS ID : norvicar1-169064

Project details

Project name	Archaeological Evaluation at 'Denbet', Mill Road, Hengrave, Suffolk.
Short description of the project	Norvic Archaeology was commissioned by Jon Birrell to undertake an evaluation by trial trench at 'Denbet', Mill Road, Hengrave, Suffolk. A replacement dwelling has been proposed with a new house footprint which measures c.255m ² , within an overall footprint measuring c.0.1ha (Planning Ref:DC/13/0532/FUL). The site is situated in the immediate vicinity of the Fornham Cursus (FAS 004), parts of which are a Scheduled Monument (SF 114). The cursus, formerly ditches and banks that are now visible as cropmarks, stretches for over a mile between Fornham and Hengrave. It would have been a significant Neolithic landscape feature and is interpreted as a processional way dating to 3500 - 3000BC. The archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a brief issued by the Conservation Team of the Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service on behalf of St Edmundsbury Borough Council (Ref: Rachael Monk 08/11/3013/SCCAS). Two features were revealed at the south-eastern end of the evaluation trench. They comprised of a shallow V-shaped ditch of possible prehistoric date and a post-pit, which is partly truncated. The post-pit contained a post-setting for an upright timber post of c.0.3m diameter. A freshly preserved assemblage of worked flint was collected from the backfill against the former post. These flints include several bladelets along with a blade core fragment consistent with a Mesolithic tradition of microlith production.
Project dates	Start: 30-01-2014 End: 30-01-2014
Previous/future work	No / Yes
Any associated project reference codes	HNW 034 - HER event no.
Any associated project reference codes	NVC/2013/GE183 - Contracting Unit No.
Any associated project reference codes	DC/13/0532/FUL - Planning Application No.
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None

5.3 The following organisations/individuals may, in principle and if necessary, be used as subcontractors to provide relevant specialist work or advice in respect to detailed analysis and/or reporting on any artefactual and ecofactual materials recovered during the investigation that requires their expert knowledge and advice. Engagement of any particular specialist subcontractor is also dependent on their availability and ability to meet programming requirements. This list is not exhaustive and only seeks to demonstrate that Norvic Archaeology is able to provide access to a network of specialists in order to meet the requirements of the Brief if significant assemblages or materials are recovered.

Specialist

Sue Anderson	Ceramic Building Material, Post-Roman Pottery,
Sarah Percival	Humans Skeletal Remains
Alice Lyons	Prehistoric and Saxon Pottery, Fired Clay, Querns
	Roman ceramics, Kiln materials and Personal Items
Andrew Barnett	Numismatic Items, Portable Artefacts
Adrian Marsden	Numismatic Items
Jane Cowgill	Portable artefacts, Ironworking
Sarah Bates	Lithics
Kate Emery	Lithics (Palaeolithic Specialism)
Matthew Pope	Lithics & Consultancy
Mick Boyle	Post Roman Glass Vessels
Julie Curt	Faunal Remains
Jennifer Wood	Human Remains, Faunal Remains
Francesca Boghi	Human Skeletal Remains
Stephen Heywood	Architectural Stonework
Roland Harris	Architectural analysis and metric survey
John Percival	Metric Survey
Dave Biscooby	Environmental analysis, Geomatics
Val Fryer	Macrotossil Analysis
Fran Green	Pollen & Diatoms and General Environmental
Richard Macphail	Micromorphology & Consultancy
Charly French	Micromorphology
Debbie Forbes	Conservation Services & Consultancy
Julia Park-Newman	Conservation Services & Consultancy
Kenneth Penn	Secondary Source Documentary Material

6. GENERAL CONDITIONS

6.1 Norvic Archaeology fully endorses the *Code of Practice* and the *Code of Practice for the Regulation of Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology* issued by the Institute for Archaeologists (IFA). All staff employed or subcontracted by Norvic Archaeology will be employed in line with The Institute of Field Archaeologists *Code of Practice*.

6.2 All work will be undertaken following statutory Health & Safety requirements in operation at the time of the project.

6.3 Should the Historic Environment Service require any additional investigation beyond the scope of this specification, then the cost and duration of any such supplementary work will be negotiated between the client and Norvic Archaeology. Variations to the proposed scheme of works will only be made following written confirmation of acceptance from the Historic Environment Service.

6.4 Norvic Archaeology currently maintains:

Employers Liability Insurance	£10,000,000
Public Liability Insurance	£2,000,000

Copies of these certificates are available on written request.

Email: giles.emery@norvicarchaeology.com
Tel: 07759016372

Norvic Archaeology is the registered trading name of Giles Emery, Freelance Archaeologist.

Current Land use Residential 1 - General Residential
 Monument type POSTHOLE Late Mesolithic
 Significant Finds BURNT FLINT Palaeolithic
 Significant Finds FLINT Late Mesolithic
 Significant Finds COPPER ALLOY OBJECT Post Medieval
 Methods & techniques "Sample Trenches"
 Development type Rural residential
 Prompt Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG16
 Position in the planning process After full determination (eg. As a condition)

Project location

Country England
 Site location SUFFOLK ST EDMUNDSBURY HENGRAVE Archaeological Evaluation at 'Denbet', Mill Road, Hengrave, Suffolk
 Postcode IP28 6LR
 Study area 255.00 Square metres
 Site coordinates TL 8277 6872 52.2857225369 0.679924527355 52 17 08 N 000 40 47 E P.oint

Project creators

Name of Organisation Novic Archaeology
 Project brief originator Local Authority Archaeologist and/or Planning Authority/advisory body
 Project design originator Novic Archaeology
 Project director/manager Giles Emery
 Project supervisor Giles Emery
 Type of sponsor/funding body Landowner
 Name of sponsor/funding body Mr J Birrell

Project archives

Physical Archive recipient SCCAS
 Physical Contents "Metal","Worked stone/lithics"
 Digital Archive recipient SCCAS
 Digital Contents "Survey"
 Digital Media "Images raster / digital photography","Text"

available
 Paper Archive recipient SCCAS
 Paper Contents "Survey"
 Paper Media available "Context sheet","Photograph","Plan","Report"

Project bibliography 1

Publication type Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
 Title An Archaeological Evaluation at 'Denbet', Mill Road, Hengrave, Suffolk.
 Author(s)/Editor(s) Emery, G.
 Other bibliographic details Novic Archaeology Report No. 43
 Date 2014
 Issuer or publisher Novic Archaeology
 Place of issue or publication Norwich
 Description Spiral Bound

Entered by Giles Emery (giles.emery@novicarchaeology.com)
 Entered on 15 March 2014

OASIS:

Please e-mail English Heritage for OASIS help and advice
 © ADS 1996-2012 Created by Jo Gilham and Jen Mitcham, email Last modified Wednesday 9 May 2012
 Cite only: <http://www.oasis.ac.uk/form/print.cfm> for this page