

# Land to the rear of the Buck Inn, Sadberge, Darlington

---

## Archaeological Evaluation

Planning Ref: 15/00918/FUL

Prepared for:	C G Robinson Ltd, Sandy Leas Lane, Elton, Stockton-On-Tees, Cleveland, TS21 1BT
Prepared by:	Chris Scott BA (Hons), MA, MCifA Solstice Heritage Crabtree Hall Business Centre Little Holtby Northallerton North Yorkshire DL7 9NY
Checked by: Project Ref:	Jim Brightman BA (Hons), MLitt, MCifA SOL1516-52
Document Ref:	<b>DOC1516-38</b>
Dates of Fieldwork:	June 2016
Date of Document:	June 2016



© Solstice Heritage 2016

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Solstice Heritage would like to thank C G Robinson Ltd and their agent, Naomi Gibson at ELG Planning Ltd for commissioning this work and for their assistance throughout the project. We would also like to thank Nick Boldrini, Historic Environment Record Officer at Durham County Council, for his input to and monitoring of the work.



## CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Project Background.....	2
1.2 Site Location.....	2
1.3 Aims and Objectives .....	2
<b>2. Policy and Guidance Framework .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Legislation .....	5
2.2 Policy .....	5
2.2.1 National .....	5
2.2.2 Local .....	6
2.3 Guidance .....	7
2.3.1 National .....	7
2.3.2 Regional.....	7
<b>3. Archaeological and Historical Background.....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Landscape and Geology .....	8
3.2 Previous Work.....	8
3.3 Potential Significance .....	9
<b>4. Methodology .....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Fieldwork .....	9
4.2 Post-Fieldwork.....	10
4.3 Chronology .....	10
4.4 Quality Assurance.....	10
4.5 Assumptions and Limitations.....	10
4.6 Copyright .....	11
<b>5. Results.....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1 Trench 1 .....	12
<b>6. Small Finds Assessment .....</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1 Introduction and Method.....	15
6.2 Glass .....	15
6.3 Clay Pipe.....	15
6.4 Ceramics.....	15
6.4.1 Preserve Jar.....	15
6.4.2 Stoneware Fragment .....	15
6.5 Miscellaneous.....	16
<b>7. Discussion .....</b>	<b>17</b>
7.1 Geology and Geomorphology .....	17
7.2 Industrial to Modern.....	17
<b>8. Conclusions .....</b>	<b>18</b>
8.1 Confidence, Constraints and Limitations .....	18
8.2 Research Potential.....	18
8.3 Potential Impacts on the Archaeological Resource .....	18
8.4 Project Archive .....	18
<b>9. Sources.....</b>	<b>19</b>
9.1 Bibliography .....	19
9.2 Web Sources .....	19
<b>Appendix 1 – Context Register .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 2 – Written Scheme of Investigation .....</b>	<b>21</b>



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Site Location .....	3
Figure 2 Site plan showing trench layout .....	4
Figure 3 Trench 1 after excavation facing east (scale = 2x1m).....	13
Figure 4 Section across gully feature in Trench 1 facing north (scale = 1m) .....	14
Figure 5 Gully feature in Trench 1 facing west (scale = 1m) .....	14
Figure 6 Plan and section of Trench 1 .....	14

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2 Legislation relating to cultural heritage in planning .....	5
Table 3 Key passages of NPPF in reference to cultural heritage (archaeology) .....	6
Table 4 Local planning policy .....	6
Table 5 National guidance documentation consulted .....	7
Table 6 Key principles of the Regional Statement of Good Practice .....	7
Table 7 Context Register .....	20



## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

*This report details the results of a programme of evaluation trenching undertaken on land to the rear of the Buck Inn, Sadberge, Darlington as a requirement of a planning application for the construction of three new dwellings on the site. The trenching was undertaken in order to characterise the potential effects of the proposed development on the archaeological resource, with the trench targeted to the area of ground impact.*

*One trench of 7.5m x 1.5m was excavated by machine under archaeological supervision and any features were further investigated and excavated with hand tools. All recording was undertaken to standards as set out in the relevant Chartered Institute for Archaeologists guidance and in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), included as Appendix 2 below.*

*A single anthropogenic feature was observed within the excavated trench, a gully feature of uncertain, probably modern, date with no clear function. No other anthropogenic features, deposits or artefacts were identified.*

*The results of the evaluation indicate that the potential direct impact of the proposed development on the archaeological resource is likely to be minimal.*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND**

This report has been prepared by Solstice Heritage on behalf of C G Robinson Ltd to outline the results of a programme of archaeological evaluation. The evaluation was undertaken to address a requirement for a planning application (Planning ref. 15/00918/FUL) for the construction of three new dwellings on land to the rear of the Buck Inn in the village of Sadberge, Darlington.

### **1.2 SITE LOCATION**

The proposed works are situated within the area of a rear car park and area of waste ground to the immediate east of the Buck Inn, Middleton Road, Sadberge, centred at grid reference NGR NZ 34272 16871 (Figure 1). The locations of the evaluation trench is shown on Figure 2 below.

### **1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

Archaeological field evaluation is defined as:

“A limited programme of non-intrusive and/or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified area or site on land, inter-tidal zone or underwater. If such archaeological remains are present field evaluation defines their character, extent, quality and preservation, and enables an assessment of their worth in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate” (Cifa 2014, 2).

The overarching aim of the evaluation was:

- To assess, through a programme of intrusive trenching, the potential physical impact of the proposed development on the archaeological resource.

The objectives of the evaluation were:

- To determine (where possible) the nature, depth, extent, significance and date of buried archaeological remains that may be located within the proposed development area
- To determine the condition or state of preservation of any archaeological deposits or features encountered
- To determine the likely range, quality and quantity of artefactual and environmental evidence present
- To answer any relevant research questions
- To inform the scope of archaeological mitigation works if required
- To produce a report on the findings at the site.

Figure 1 Site Location



Figure 2 Trench location

## 2. POLICY AND GUIDANCE FRAMEWORK

### 2.1 LEGISLATION

National legislation that applies to the consideration of cultural heritage within development and the wider planning process is set out in Table 1 below.

Title	Key Points
Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002)	Scheduled Monuments, as defined under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979), are sites that have been selected by a set of non-statutory criteria to be of national significance. Where scheduled sites are affected by development proposals there is a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. Any works, other than activities receiving class consent under The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1981, as amended by The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1984, which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering-up a Scheduled Monument require consent from the Secretary of State for the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.
Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990	Buildings of national, regional or local historical and architectural importance are protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Buildings designated as 'Listed' are afforded protection from physical alteration or effects on their historical setting.
Hedgerows Regulations 1997	The Hedgerow Regulations (1997) include criteria by which hedgerows can be regarded as historically important (Schedule 1 Part III).

Table 1 Legislation relating to cultural heritage in planning

### 2.2 POLICY

#### 2.2.1 NATIONAL

The principal instrument of national planning policy within England is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (CLG 2012) which outlines the following in relation to cultural heritage within planning and development:

Paragraph	Key Points
7	Contributing to protecting and enhancing the historic environment is specifically noted as being a part of what constitutes 'sustainable development' – the "golden thread" which, when met, can trigger presumption in favour.
17	A core planning principle is to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for the contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations".
128	During the determination of applications "local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting". This information should be proportionate to the significance of the asset and only enough to "understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance".
129	Paragraph 129 identifies that Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise.
132	It is noted that significance – the principal measure of inherent overall heritage worth – can be harmed or lost through development within its setting. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and any adverse effects require "clear and convincing justification" relative to the significance of the asset in question.
135	At paragraph 135 it states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In

	weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
139	At paragraph 139 it states that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.
141	In paragraph 141 amongst other matters it states that planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

Table 2 Key passages of NPPF in reference to cultural heritage (archaeology)

### 2.2.2 LOCAL

Under planning law, the determination of an application must be made, in the first instance, with reference to the policies of the local development plan. For the proposed development this is represented by the *Darlington Local Development Framework Core Strategy* (DBC 2011) and saved policies from the *Borough of Darlington Local Plan* (DBC 1997 amended 2001). Key local policies with reference to cultural heritage and the nature of the proposed development are:

Policy	Key Text
CS2(b)	"...All development proposals should...reflect and/or enhance Darlington's distinctive natural, built and historic characteristics that positively contribute to the character of the local area" (DBC 2011, 23).
CS14(E)	<p>"The distinctive character of the Borough's built, historic, natural and environmental townscapes, landscapes and strong sense of place will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced by...Protecting, enhancing and promoting the quality and integrity of Darlington's distinctive designated national or nationally significant building heritage and archaeology as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings, their settings and features of historic and archaeological local importance in Conservation Areas;</li> <li>• Buildings, features and landmarks on the local list;</li> <li>• Buildings, and features that reflect Darlington's railway, industrial and Quaker heritage; and</li> <li>• Buildings on the local 'at risk' register" (DBC 2011, 57).</li> </ul>
E9	<p>'Development affecting the parks and gardens of landscape or historic interest listed below will not be permitted where it detracts from their character or appearance or prejudices either the survival or reinstatement of historic features including designed plantations. Planning permission, if granted, will be subject to conditions aimed to ensure that such features are taken into account in the design and implementation of the required landscape works. Where parkland is in more than one ownership, the council will encourage owners to co-operate so that such landscape works, whether on or off the application site, contribute to the safeguarding or rehabilitation of the designed landscape in its entirety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Park, Darlington;</li> <li>• North Lodge Park, Darlington;</li> <li>• Blackwell Grange, Darlington;</li> <li>• Rockcliffe Park, Hurworth;</li> <li>• Middleton Hall, Middleton St. George;</li> <li>• Walworth Castle;</li> <li>• Redworth Hall;</li> <li>• Hall Garth, Coatham Mundeville;</li> <li>• Newbus Grange, Hurworth;</li> <li>• Neasham Hall' (DBC 1997 amended 2001)</li> </ul>

Table 3 Local planning policy

## 2.3 GUIDANCE

### 2.3.1 NATIONAL

During the evaluation and preparation of this document, the following guidance documents have been referred to, where relevant:

Document	Key Points
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (CLG 2014)	The Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) released the guidance to NPPF in March 2014 in a 'live' online format which, it is intended can be amended and responsive to comment, particular as case law develops in relation to the implementation of NPPF. In relation to cultural heritage the NPPG follows previous guidance in wording and 'keys in' with, in particular, extant English Heritage guidance documents. The NPPG references many similar terms to the previous PPS5 Practice Guidance.
Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (HE 2008)	This sets out the guiding principles of conservation as seen by Historic England and also provides a terminology for assessment of significance upon which much that has followed is based.
Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (CIFA 2014)	This document represents non-statutory industry best practice as set out by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. The evaluation work has been undertaken to these standards, as subscribed to by Solstice Heritage.

Table 4 National guidance documentation consulted

### 2.3.2 REGIONAL

Archaeological work within County Durham is often required to comply with *Yorkshire, The Humber and The North East: A Regional Statement of Good Practice for Archaeology in the Development Process* (SYAS 2011). The key principles in relation to the evaluation undertaken are summarised in the table below:

Principle	Key Points
2	Archaeological work should be undertaken by professionally qualified and appropriately experienced archaeologists and organisations.
3	All archaeological work will have a scope agreed in advance with the archaeological curator (this document), and any changes to the scope or methodology will be agreed in writing with the archaeological curator.
4	Monitoring of archaeological work by the local archaeological curator will be the norm, and reasonable notice of commencement of fieldwork will be given.
5	Archaeological work will be undertaken in accordance with the best practice guidance of English Heritage and the IfA.
6	The local Historic Environment Record should be consulted prior to the commencement of fieldwork.
7	Archaeological work in the planning process should have regard to national and local published research agenda (see section 4.2 below)
9	Reports and required data will be submitted to the archaeological curator and local HER in a timely fashion and in accordance with the agreed WSI.
10	Any comments made by the archaeological curator on reports and outputs will be made within a reasonable timetable of receipt.
11	Where appropriate significant archaeological findings will be submitted for publication in a suitable journal or journals.
12	Any archive produced will be deposited in an ordered and acceptable fashion within a reasonable timetable, the details of which will be given in the report.
13	During the course of archaeological work arrangements will be made, where possible, for disseminating information about the site to the general public.

Table 5 Key principles of the Regional Statement of Good Practice

### 3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

#### 3.1 LANDSCAPE AND GEOLOGY

The proposed development site sits within the 'Tees Lowlands' National Character Area (NCA). This landscape is defined as 'a broad, open plain dominated by the meandering lower reaches of the River Tees and its tributaries' (NE 2014, 3). In comparison to the dynamic coastline and large Teeside conurbation, the area around the proposed development site is typically rural: 'agricultural land is intensively farmed, with large fields and sparse woodland, and a settlement pattern influenced both by the river and by past agricultural practices' (ibid. 3).

The Tees Lowlands, as with the Vale of Mowbray to the south, sits on a bedrock geology which straddles the divide between the Carboniferous, Permian and Triassic periods. The proposed development area sits on the sedimentary sandstone of the Sherwood Sandstone Group (BGS 2016).

In terms of determinant factors on the archaeological remains of the site, however, the more dominant geological influence is that of the overlying superficial deposits. The trenches all sit on glacially derived till and are in areas of noticeably poor drainage given the clay-dominated substrata (BGS 2016).

Online mapping provided by the UK Soil Observatory (2016) characterises the soils across the development site as 'slowly permeable, seasonally wet, slightly acid but base-rich loamy and clayey soils'.

#### 3.2 PREVIOUS WORK

No previous archaeological work is known to have occurred within the proposed development site; however, an archaeological assessment and evaluation was undertaken by Northern Archaeological Associates (1993) on the former site of Town Farm in the south-west area of Sadberge Village, close to the Buck Inn. The assessment indicated that the Town Farm site may have lain close to an area containing the medieval court of Sadberge and may also have contained evidence of the earlier Danish settlement. A number of archaeological features were discovered in three trenches, located between 0.4 to 0.6 m below the existing ground level. The features included two post-in-trench alignments and a large number of shallow trenches which may have been structural or related to plot boundaries. A small assemblage of pottery was recovered which suggested activity on the site between the 12<sup>th</sup> century and the present day. Subsequently, Archaeological Research Services Ltd (2007) explored the area close to Sadberge School to the north of the proposed development site, though no archaeological remains were uncovered, due perhaps to the modern development of the village.

The proposed development site lies c. 180 m to the south of the scheduled monument (SM) covering part of the area of the shrunken medieval village of Sadberge (NHLE 1011073), situated in pasture fields immediately north of the present village. The SM is divided into two separate areas by Middleton Road/Hillhouse Lane, which runs north-south through the modern village. This modern road follows the line of the medieval road, and the surviving remains within the SM demonstrate that the village once extended further north than at present. East of the road, there are a series of land plots, orientated north-east to south-west, formed by parallel earthen banks. A prominent hollow way, orientated north-south, cuts the earthworks and runs towards the present village. To the east of the hollow way there are traces of the medieval fields associated with the village in the form of ridge and furrow cultivation. A rectangular area 11 m by 8.5 m situated on the west side of the hollow way represents the buried foundations of a small building. To the west of the modern road there are further banks and ditches.

The site is also fronted to the west by the putative line of Cade's Road, a conjectured Roman road unconfirmed by field identification, which is thought to travel through Sadberge on its way from the Humber to the Tyne. The findspot of a Roman altar from the gardens of the Rectory of St. Andrew's (SMR 5669), within Sadberge itself, does suggest some potential for Roman activity in the area.

### 3.3 POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE

The scheduled medieval remains to the north of the site are of *de facto* national importance and are recognised as such through their scheduled protection. Adjacent evidence of medieval use of the proposed development site, which has the potential to widen understanding of the nearby scheduled remains and the medieval history of Sadberge, has the potential to be of high significance. Evidence of earlier Danish settlement, connected to the 'wapentake' of Sadberge, would also be highly significant. Any potential evidence, although unlikely, relating to the Roman period road network of northern England would be of national importance.

Given the potential for archaeological remains relating to medieval settlement and agriculture in the proposed development area, the evaluation has the potential to provide information to address the following gaps in knowledge identified in the *North East Regional Research Framework for the Historic Environment* (Petts and Gerrard 2006, 135, 169-75):

- The importance of collecting data from rural settlement sites of the later medieval period, particularly where there may be the potential for palaeoenvironmental or faunal remains.
- Refining the chronology of medieval and post-medieval field systems.
- Understanding the formation processes of ridge and furrow and other medieval field systems.
- Contribution to the corpus of medieval pottery and refinement of chronologies/forms/provenance etc.

Given the lower potential for archaeological remains relating to the Roman road network within the proposed development area, the evaluation has the potential to provide information to address the following gaps in knowledge identified in the *North East Regional Research Framework for the Historic Environment* (Petts and Gerrard 2006):

The understanding of the Roman communication network in the region is poorly understood and an understanding of its development is a research priority.

## 4. METHODOLOGY

### 4.1 FIELDWORK

The single evaluation trench was laid out in the location agreed in the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (Appendix 2) and excavation was undertaken and completed on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2016. The work was undertaken by Chris Scott and Jim Brightman of Solstice Heritage.

All mechanical excavation (through overburden and non-anthropogenic levelling layers) was undertaken with a toothless ditching bucket under constant supervision of a suitably qualified archaeologist. The trench consisted of 1no. 7.5 m x 1.5 m trench.

Where archaeological features and deposits were encountered, these were recorded to the standards outlined in the agreed WSI and the relevant CIfA Standard and Guidance. All features and deposits were recorded on *pro forma* record sheets, drawn in plan and section at a suitable scale, and

photographed. In addition to any specific features or deposits, a general record of the trench stratigraphy was made on *pro forma* record sheets, a plan and section of each trench was made at a suitable scale and photography was completed. Detailed methodology was outlined in the agreed WSI, and this has been included as Appendix 3 below.

Constraints on the fieldwork were significant in limiting the area of the site currently accessible for evaluation works. Existing small outbuildings and in-use tarmac areas meant that the evaluation scheme was necessarily reduced to a single trench. This reduction of the works could be considered to limit the value of the results of the evaluation in terms of their characterisation of deposits across the wider site, particularly in the area of probable service runs towards the frontage of the site. It is, however, considered that the excavated trench is sufficient to characterise deposits within the house plots themselves.

#### 4.2 POST-FIELDWORK

The primary site archive comprises site records and digital photography. This has been used to compile this report, all of which will be deposited with a local repository museum in digital and paper format as the principal record of the evaluation work. The physical archive comprises primary field records (no artefactual material was recovered), and advice will be sought on the detailed requirements for retention and deposition. An OASIS record has been completed for this work, including a digital version of this report, the reference for which is solstice1-244730. Deposition of the physical archive will be undertaken following acceptance of the final project report.

#### 4.3 CHRONOLOGY

Where chronological and archaeological periods are referred to in the text, the relevant date ranges are broadly defined in calendar years as follows:

- Palaeolithic (Old Stone Age): 1 million – 12,000 BP (Before present)
- Mesolithic (Middle Stone Age): 10000 – 4000 BC
- Neolithic (New Stone Age): 4000 – 2400 BC
- Chalcolithic/Beaker Period: 2400 – 2000 BC
- Bronze Age: 2000 – 700 BC
- Iron Age: 700 BC – AD 70
- Roman/Romano-British: AD 70 – 410
- Anglo-Saxon/Anglo-Scandinavian: AD 410 – 1066
- Medieval: AD 1066 – 1540
- Post-medieval: AD 1540 – 1750
- Industrial: AD 1750 – 1900
- Modern: AD 1900 – Present

#### 4.4 QUALITY ASSURANCE

Solstice Heritage commits all fieldwork and post-fieldwork assessment, analysis, reporting and dissemination to be undertaken to the standards stipulated by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CifA) as is outlined in Appendix 2 below. The project has been managed by Chris Scott, who is a fully accredited member of the CifA (MCifA level).

#### 4.5 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Data and information obtained and consulted in the compilation of this report has been derived from a number of secondary sources. Where it has not been practicable to verify the accuracy of secondary information, its accuracy has been assumed in good faith. All statements and opinions arising from

the works undertaken are provided in good faith and compiled according to professional standards. No responsibility can be accepted by the author/s of this report for any errors of fact or opinion resulting from data supplied by any third party, or for loss or other consequence arising from decisions or actions made upon the basis of facts or opinions expressed in any such report(s), howsoever such facts and opinions may have been derived.

#### **4.6 COPYRIGHT**

Solstice Heritage will retain the copyright of all documentary and photographic material under the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act (1988).

## 5. RESULTS

### 5.1 TRENCH 1

Trench 1 was excavated close to the centre of the proposed house plots, roughly aligned east-west, within an area of rough grass to the immediate east of the existing pub car park. The trench measured 7.5 m x 1.5 m in plan (Figure 3). It was excavated through a well-compacted dark grey, silty loam topsoil (001) with an average thickness of c. 0.1 m. The topsoil contained regular inclusions of small, rounded pebbles and modern pottery. Below the topsoil (001) was a disturbed dark grey, clayish silt subsoil (002), with common inclusions of small fragments of brick, pottery, ash and small pebbles. This subsoil (002) had an average thickness of c. 0.25 m. A small assemblage of ceramic, glass and clay pipe artefacts was recovered from the subsoil, all dating to the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Underlying the subsoil (002) the natural mottled, mid-brown glacial clay/till substrate (003) was encountered. The till was generally encountered at a depth of c. 0.35 m below existing ground level and sloped gently downward from west to east with the surrounding ground.

The substrate at the base of Trench 1, close to its eastern extent, preserved the truncated remains of a small gully feature (F005), aligned north-south (Figures 4 and 5). The gully was filled with a dark grey/brown clayish silt (004), which contained inclusions of probably modern brick and plaster fragments and small stones. A tiny fragment of utilitarian stoneware was recovered from the fill; it is thought to be of 18<sup>th</sup>- or 19<sup>th</sup>-century date but is too small and fragmentary to be diagnostic. This fill (004) appeared to be quite similar to (002) but was also sealed by that deposit. The fill (004) has been interpreted as a natural infilling of the gully feature. The cut of the gully (005) was investigated and found to be vertically-sided and flat-bottomed in section. The gully measured 0.3 m in width, 0.19 m in depth and was exposed within the trench for an approximate length of 1.5m. No certain function can be suggested for the gully given its seemingly modern date and the lack of any diagnostic finds within it.



Figure 3 Trench 1 after excavation facing east (scale = 2x1m)



Figure 4 Section across gully feature in Trench 1 facing north (scale = 1m)



Figure 5 Gully feature in Trench 1 facing west (scale = 1m)

Figure 6 Plan and section of Trench 1

## 6. SMALL FINDS ASSESSMENT

Jim Brightman

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION AND METHOD

Five small finds were recovered and subjected to assessment. All individual artefacts were cleaned (depending on condition and suitability to various cleaning methods), bagged and assigned individual small find numbers. The bags were marked with site code, small find number, context number and general artefact type. Each artefact was examined on a clean working surface in natural light by both eye and using a x10 and x20 magnification hand lens. Metrical data relevant to the artefact type in question were captured using digital calipers with plastic tines, accurate to 0.1 mm. Weight was measured with a digital balance accurate to 0.1 g. Each artefact was logged into a spreadsheet as it was examined.

### 6.2 GLASS

One piece of glass (SF 1) was recovered from the subsoil (002): a fragment comprising approximately half the base of a bottle. The piece includes small embossed indents from a mould but no discernible mould lines, scars or ejection marks diagnostic of manufacturing process. The base features a small central kick, and the fabric is of a relatively uniform thickness. It is a light green or 'aqua' colour suggestive of iron oxide impurities common within a typical post-medieval to early modern soda-lime glass batch used for utilitarian wares. It is considered most likely that the piece is from a drinks bottle blown in a cup mould, and that it dates to the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. It should be noted that the small size of the piece and lack of diagnostic marks means that the dating remains tentative. No further analysis is recommended for this artefact.

### 6.3 CLAY PIPE

Two small fragments of clay pipe were recovered. Both SF 2 and SF 3 were recovered from the subsoil (002) and are stem fragments with no diagnostic markings or characteristics. SF 3 has been subjected to heat after use, with a noticeable red discolouration to the clay and flecks of ash and clinker fused to the stem. The pieces are too small and undiagnostic in nature to allow a date to be confidently ascribed. No further analysis is recommended for these artefacts.

### 6.4 CERAMICS

#### 6.4.1 PRESERVE JAR

SF4 is a rim fragment from a cylindrical stoneware preserve jar measuring 3 3/8" (86mm) external diameter when complete and recovered from the subsoil (002). The piece is in a uniform grey-white, glazed stoneware fabric with transfer print identifying it as a marmalade jar from James Keiller and Son of Dundee. Keiller marmalade pots are relatively common in 19<sup>th</sup>-century contexts and were exported widely to Europe and even North America (Matthew 2000, 6). The text on this sherd dates it to between the awarding of the Prize Medal for Marmalade at the London International Exhibition of 1862 and the Grand Medal of Merit in Vienna in 1873. No further analysis is recommended for this artefact.

#### 6.4.2 STONEWARE FRAGMENT

The final piece assessed is a tiny fragment of stoneware bowl or mug recovered from the fill of the gully feature (004). It has a uniformly fired grey fabric with brown slip and slightly pearlescent glaze. It is too small a piece to provide any conclusions, but it is clearly of post-medieval to modern manufacture and is considered to be most likely of 18<sup>th</sup>- or 19<sup>th</sup>-century date. No further analysis is recommended for this artefact.

## 6.5 MISCELLANEOUS

A number of small fragments of ceramic building material (brick with plaster) were also recovered from the fill of the gully feature (004). These were very small, fragmentary and undiagnostic, and were therefore not given individual small finds numbers. The presence of the material was noted and no further assessment was undertaken.

## **7. DISCUSSION**

### **7.1 GEOLOGY AND GEOMORPHOLOGY**

The evaluation characterised the principal underlying substrate as being typical of the local area and in line with the extant BGS mapping. The observed stratigraphy and deposits are consistent with having been disturbed or reworked and truncated rather than having been part of a wholesale removal and reinstatement. This most likely relates to disturbance caused by the use of the area for gardens and/or allotments in the relatively recent past.

### **7.2 INDUSTRIAL TO MODERN**

The modern gully feature (F005) and the seemingly modern, re-worked, nature of the deposits encountered during the evaluation suggest that the site has been relatively comprehensively disturbed in the recent past, to the level of the natural clay substrate. This seems most likely to be due to allotment gardening practices, suggested in part by the sheds still in place on the site. No significant earlier anthropogenic features, finds or deposits were uncovered during the evaluation. It is considered that the single feature encountered most likely represents industrial or even early modern gardening practices.

## **8. CONCLUSIONS**

### **8.1 CONFIDENCE, CONSTRAINTS AND LIMITATIONS**

Constraints on the fieldwork were significant in limiting the area of the site currently accessible for evaluation works. Existing small outbuildings and in-use tarmac areas meant that the evaluation scheme was necessarily reduced to a single trench. This reduction of the works could be considered to limit the value of the results of the evaluation, in terms of their characterisation of deposits across the wider site, particularly in the area of probable service runs towards the frontage of the site. It is, however, considered that the excavated trench is sufficient to characterise deposits within the house plots themselves.

### **8.2 RESEARCH POTENTIAL**

No features, deposits or artefacts were recovered with which to address any research agenda questions or priorities.

### **8.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE**

The results of the evaluation indicate that the potential direct impact of the proposed development on the archaeological resource is likely to be minimal.

### **8.4 PROJECT ARCHIVE**

The physical and digital archive for this project is currently held by Solstice Heritage pending acceptance of the final evaluation report. Following this, the archive will be prepared and deposited in line with the agreed WSI and CifA Standards and Guidance.

## 9. SOURCES

### 9.1 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archaeological Research Services Ltd. 2007. *An Archaeological Evaluation at Sadberge School, Darlington*. Unpublished Archaeological Report.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CifA). 2014. *Code of Conduct*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CifA). 2014. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CifA). 2014. *Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CifA). 2014. *Standard and Guidance for the Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Deposition of Archaeological Archives*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). 2012. *National Planning Policy Framework*. London, The Stationery Office.

Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). 2014. *National Planning Practice Guidance*. London, The Stationery Office.

Historic England (HE). 2008. *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance*. London, Historic England.

Matthew, B. 2000. The Keiller Connection. *Maling Collectors Society Newsletter* 8: 6-7.

Natural England (NE). 2014. *National Character Area Profile: 23 Tees Lowlands*. London, Natural England.

Northern Archaeological Associates. 1993. *Town Farm, Sadberge: Archaeological Assessment and Evaluation for Darlington Borough Council*. Unpublished Archaeological Report.

Petts, D. and Gerrard, C. 2006. *Shared Visions: The North-East Regional Research Framework for the Historic Environment*. Durham, Durham University and Durham County Council.

South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS). 2011. *Yorkshire, The Humber and the North East: A Regional Statement of Good Practice for Archaeology in the Development Process*.

### 9.2 WEB SOURCES

British Geological Survey (BGS). 2016. *Geology of Britain Viewer*. Available from: <<http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>>. [10<sup>th</sup> May 2016].

United Kingdom Soil Observatory (UKSO). 2016. *Soils Map Viewer*. Available from <<http://mapapps2.bgs.ac.uk/ukso/home.html?layer=NSRISoils>>. [10<sup>th</sup> May 2016].



## APPENDIX 1 – CONTEXT REGISTER

Context Number	Type	Description	Probable Date
001	Deposit	Topsoil in Trench 1	Industrial to Modern
002	Deposit	Disturbed subsoil in Trench 1	Industrial to Modern
003	Deposit	Natural substrate in Trench 1	Glacial
004	Fill	Fill of gully feature (F005)	Industrial to Modern
005	Cut	Cut of gully feature (F005)	Industrial to Modern

Table 6 Context Register

## APPENDIX 2 – WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

