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## Summary

Archaeological investigation was carried prior to the preparation of foundations for two new houses on land on the northeast side of Fish Alley, off High Street, Bozeat, Northamptonshire.

The investigation uncovered a large medieval pit, possibly a stone quarry, in the southern part of the new building footprint. There were two fills present, each containing domestic waste. The lowermost fill was dated by pottery to the $11^{\text {th }} / 12^{\text {th }}$ century, the other to the $12^{\text {th }} / 13^{\text {th }}$ century. A gully leading to the pit had also been in-filled in the $12^{\text {th }} / 13^{\text {th }}$ century. Above the features was a layer of garden soil which was dated to the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century.

The $11^{\text {th }}$ to $13^{\text {th }}$ century deposits contained a quantity of burnt cereal grain, together with seeds from a small number of cultivated legumes, enhancing knowledge of the medieval agrarian economy at Bozeat.

Another stone quarry of unknown date occupied the northern and eastern part of the excavation area. The quarry was backfilled in the mid-19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century, when a row of cottages was built on the southeast side of the site. There was evidence of the demolition of the cottages, which took place in the late $20^{\text {th }}$ century.

## 1. SCOPE OF THE REPORT

1.1 This report has been prepared by Souterrain Archaeological Services Ltd (hereafter 'Souterrain') for Simon Richards of SLR Capital Ltd, Clayridge, Hollingdon, LU7 ODN. It presents the results of an archaeological investigation, carried out in compliance with a planning condition during ground preparation for two new houses at land alongside Fish Alley, Bozeat, Northamptonshire (hereafter, 'the Application Site'; Figs. 1 and 2). The investigation was undertaken by Souterrain between the $18^{\text {th }}$ and $22^{\text {nd }}$ of June 2015.
1.2

## 2. PLANNING BACKGROUND

2.1 Planning permission (WP/14/00499/FUL) was granted subject to Conditions on the $17^{\text {th }}$ of September 2014 to Mr Jeff Wood of Mile Street Bozeat, for the demolition of an existing lock-up shop and the construction of two semi-detached dwellings with associated vehicular access and parking.
2.2 In view of the archaeological potential of the site, the grant of planning permission was issued with a Condition (No.7) attached for a programme of archaeological mitigation work. The reason for the Planning Condition is to ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
2.3 The archaeological investigation was subsequently undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation ${ }^{1}$ which was prepared in response to a Brief ${ }^{2}$ provided by Liz Mordue, Archaeological Advisor of Northamptonshire County Council (hereafter 'AAA').

## 3. SITE LOCATION AND ASPECT

3.1 The Application Site is located on the northeast side of Fish Alley, Bozeat (NGR 490575 259025), which is on the north side of High Street (Figs. 1 and 2). Until recently the site has been part of the garden of No. 16 Mile Street. It is bounded on other sides by private houses and gardens. It is defined on the drawing associated with the planning application ${ }^{3}$.
3.2 The building plot is approximately 534sq.m and is an irregular shape. It measures between c .28 .5 m and c .31 .5 m NE to SW and c . 18 m NW to SE . There is a fall in slope NW to SE from c . 75 m AOD to c .73 .98 m AOD, and NE to SW from around 76 m AOD to c .73 .77 m AOD. The underlying solid geology is Great Oolite Limestone/ Blisworth Limestone.

## 4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL \& HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

4.1 Data and archaeological investigation reports held by Northamptonshire County Council's Historic Environment Record (HER) were reviewed on the $12^{\text {th }}$ February 2015, with information obtained from a 500 m radius of the Application Site. The HER numbers in the footnotes refer to the specific record for each monument, find spot, archaeological site or archaeological event.

[^0]
## The Prehistoric period

4.2 Evidence of the prehistoric periods is sparse in the village of Bozeat. The only recorded artefact in the search area is a Late Iron Age gold coin (stater) of Tasciovanus, found a garden in $1991^{4}$. There are however, at least five Iron Age settlement sites in the parish known from either aerial photography or pottery scatters ${ }^{5}$. These are located: c.1.5 km NNE of the Application Site ${ }^{6}$; $c .1 .4 \mathrm{~km}$ to the $\mathrm{S}^{7} ; 1.6$ to the $\mathrm{SSE}^{8} ; 1.25 \mathrm{~km}$ to the $\mathrm{SSE}^{9}$ and 2.5 km to the $\mathrm{SSW}^{10}$.

## The Roman period

4.3 Archaeological remains of Romano-British date were found during the construction of a housing estate (now Wyman Close ${ }^{11}$ ) in 1968, about 226 m SSE of the Application Site. The discoveries comprised three 'non specialist' pottery kilns' of $1^{\text {st }}$ century date ${ }^{12}$ which produced large coarseware vessels, and three rectangular and two circular stone buildings which were dated by coins to the mid $3^{\text {rd }}$ century. On the north edge of the parish (c. 1.5 km NW of the Application Site) extensive Romano-British occupation is known from scatters of pottery and aerial photographs ${ }^{13}$. One of these sites, a settlement of nine hectares, was archaeologically excavated in advance of quarrying in 2001. The discoveries included ditch systems, thirteen pottery kilns, five inhumation burials and a cremation ${ }^{14}$.

## The Early Medieval period

4.4 The place name Bozeat is understood to derive from Old English, meaning 'gate of a man called Bõsa ${ }^{15}$. The Domesday record of Bosiete in $1086^{16}$ is probably a reasonable indicator of the size of the late Saxon village. There were ten heads of households ( 6 villagers, 2 smallholders and 2 slaves), possibly sixty to seventy persons in total. The cultivable land was assessed at 4 ploughlands with other resources comprising 10 acres of meadow and woodland. There were three mens' plough teams and one team belonging to the lord. At the time of the conquest the Saxon lord was Stric, who held the land of Earl Waltheof.
4.5 The location and layout of the Saxon village is not known. At the Wyman Close ${ }^{17}$ site in 1968, three Anglo-Saxon burials of probable $6^{\text {th }}$ century date were found within Roman remains. An unstratified brooch of similar date was found in a back garden in the same road in $1991{ }^{18}$. The HER identifies it as a 'site of uncertain early Saxon activity' ${ }^{\prime 9}$. In addition, a large number of undated earthworks exist around the village that are believed to be of Saxon or medieval origin, although without excavation it is hard to ascribe a date with much certainty.
4.6 In summary, the nature and extent of early Saxon activity at Bozeat is poorly understood. The $6^{\text {th }}$ century evidence found at Wyman Close may point to the origin of the settlement, although the

[^1]village, in its more recognizable form, may have been formally laid out in the mid-10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century during a period of widespread reorganization, whereby dispersed settlements were brought together to be centralized around church and manor surrounded by a planned open field system ${ }^{20}$.

## The Medieval period

4.7 A comprehensive study of the layout of the medieval village of Bozeat and its open fields was undertaken in 1973 by the Northamptonshire Field Group (NFG) ${ }^{21}$. Based on the results of the survey, the Application Site is located within the core of the medieval village. The parish church of St Mary' ${ }^{22}$, which is thought to have originated in the $12^{\text {th }}$ century, is located about 210 m to the NNW. The outline of the modern village does not exactly correspond to that of the medieval settlement and there are a number of modern fields which contain earthworks pertaining to the earlier village ${ }^{23}$. The open fields were recorded from ridge and furrow ${ }^{24}$ earthworks and cropmarks. Notably, the whole of the parish surrounding the village (2113-2136 acres / 855-864 hectares) appears to have been under cultivation in the medieval period except for flooding meadows. There was no woodland ${ }^{25}$. A three-field system of cultivation was still in operation in the $17^{\text {th }}$ century. The common fields of the parish were enclosed by Act of Parliament of 1798.
4.8 On the NW side of the village are earthwork remains of a part of the medieval manor of Bozeat ${ }^{26}$. In 1086, the overlordship of the manor was held by Countess Judith, niece of King William I and wife of Waltheof, the Saxon Earl of Huntingdon and Northampton. The Countess' tenant lord was Lanzelin (Lancelin). The overlordship became known as the manor of Latimers and descended with the earldom and honour of Huntingdon. ${ }^{27}$ By the $18^{\text {th }}$ century the manor house had been demolished in the course of quarrying for limestone, though the site was still known as Bery Yard ${ }^{28}$. The site now consists of at least three closes bounded by banks of limestone rubble which cover an area of just over one hectare, but most of the earthworks are of indeterminate form and there are no signs of associated buildings. The site of the manor house ${ }^{29}$, an embanked square enclosure was located to the south of the closes, but little remains. To the east of the closes is a hollow-way ${ }^{30}$ leading from the village and to the northeast is part of a banked enclosure, 72 m by 94 m , which may have been associated with the Bery Yard ${ }^{31}$. The banked enclosure is flanked to the east by a large former pond ${ }^{32}$, which may be of medieval date, created by a dam across the former course of a stream. About 130 m to the NNE of the Bery Yard there is a boundary bank ${ }^{33}$ ( 136 m long) with an entrance midway, which separates the earthworks from the medieval open fields.
4.9 Other signs of the medieval settlement survive as earthworks. On the south side of Dychurch Lane ${ }^{34}$ (c.285m ESE of the Application Site; SP90855895) is a distinct building platform c.15m x 5 m , recessed in the side of a slope. In the 1970s it was mistakenly recorded as the site of

[^2]Latimers manor house. Also on the east side of the village there is part of a rectangular banked enclosure ${ }^{35}, 40 \mathrm{~m}$ by 77 m , its bank between 3 m and 9 m wide and 0.25 m to 1 m high. In the vicinity of the church there are isolated traces of very slight and indistinct earthworks, presumed to represent parts of the 'village ${ }^{36}$.
4.10 Despite the knowledge from documentary research and superficial surveys there have been few medieval finds in the vicinity of the Application Site, although this is considered to be a reflection of the absence of archaeological investigation rather than a genuine absence of archaeology. Stratified medieval pottery sherds have been recovered from the floor layer of a post-medieval building which was demolished on the north side of the High Street in $1979^{37}$ (c.70m to the E) and a copper-alloy seal was found in the garden of the Manor Farm ( c .225 m to the E ) in $1994^{38}$.

## Recent Archaeological Work

4.11 Since 2012 there have been a small number of archaeological investigations at Bozeat, in response to planning applications, all of which have been on the periphery of the historic settlement core. On the east side of the village at Manor Farm Barn ( 200 m E) an evaluation in 2012 revealed nothing earlier than $19^{\text {th }}$ century land-use ${ }^{39}$. Similarly, in 2013, ground work monitoring at a house plot in St Mary's Road, on the south side of the village (c.265m SSW), revealed only negative evidence ${ }^{40}$. During the same year, two geophysical surveys (gradiometer and earth resistance) were carried out at Hillside Close, a small enclosure of extant ridge and furrow, just south of the village ( 345 m SSE of the Application Site), but apart from possible stone or brick building remains within its north-western corner of the field, no definite archaeological remains were identified ${ }^{41}$. In 2014, monitoring of ground works for a new building took place on the north side of Dychurch Lane ${ }^{42}$ ( 225 m ESE of the Application Site), facing the aforementioned building platform (ante.4.8), but there was nothing of archaeological significance. Also during the same year, groundwork for a new house at Easton Lane on the west side of the village ( 250 m W ) revealed nothing of archaeological interest ${ }^{43}$.

## 5. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

5.1 The broad purpose of the investigation was to attempt to:
i. establish the date, nature and extent of activity or occupation in the development site;
ii. establish the relationship of any remains found to the surrounding contemporary landscapes;
iii. recover artefacts to assist in the development of type series within the region;
iv. recover palaeo-environmental remains to determine local environmental conditions; this to be an intrinsic part of the investigation.
5.2 In view of the early medieval discoveries made c. 226 m SSE of the Application Site at Wyman Close in 1968 and 1991 (ante. 4.5), one objective of the investigation was to attempt to clarify whether there was Saxon activity or occupation in this part of Bozeat.

[^3]5.3 The investigation would also attempt to recover evidence that may contribute to understanding of the origin of the nucleated settlement at Bozeat and to determine the function of this part of the village in the medieval period.
5.4 Consideration was also given to research themes and priorities addressed by regional archaeological research agenda ${ }^{44}$. An objective would be to ascertain whether the Application Site contained environmental data pertaining to the medieval agrarian economy which may contribute to research themes such as changes in animal husbandry, diet and living conditions, land-use ${ }^{45}$, the origin of open field farming ${ }^{46}$ and the introduction of new crop species ${ }^{47}$.
5.5 The investigation would also attempt to shed light on the function and nature of this part of the landscape in other periods, in particular the Iron Age and Romano-British period.

## 6. FIELD PROCEDURE

6.1 The investigation was conducted with due consideration to Health and Safety and in accordance with the requirements of the Written Scheme of Investigation and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Code of Conduct and Standard Guidance for Archaeological Excavation (Rev.2014). Ground reduction was undertaken by mechanical excavator fitted with a smooth bucket under the guidance of an experienced archaeologist. All investigation and recording was carried out in accordance with the written scheme. Archaeological features were surveyed to Ordnance Survey National Grid co-ordinates and height datum by RTK GPS.

## 7. INVESTIGATION RESULTS

7.1 In the descriptions which follow, context numbers in square brackets denote 'cuts' (i.e. features dug in the past), whilst those in round brackets denote layers, deposits, fills or structures.
7.2 Ground reduction took place across the proposed footprint of the new building (Figs. 2 \& 3) where the depth of foundations exceeded modern layers (generally $350-400 \mathrm{~mm}$ thick, though greater in some areas). No archaeological investigation was carried out in the area of the proposed access and driveway in the west and south-western part of the Application Site since the proposed depth of ground formation was 250 mm or less.
7.3 The upper geological horizon was reached at varying levels (Fig. $5 \& 6$, and Fig.16, Section 3), reflecting the natural topography: 74.60 m AOD ( N ); 73.66sm AOD (W); and 73.00 m AOD (S). Notably, over the north to north-western part of the new building footprint, the upper geological stratum (105) was located directly beneath a layer of modern rubble and soil (104). The geology (105) consisted of variable calcareous sandy clay. A geotechnical trial pit near the west corner of the building footprint (Figs.4, 5 \& 6) encountered limestone bedrock at c.72.98m AOD.

[^4]
## Medieval Features and Deposits

7.4 Two medieval features were encountered in the southern part of the excavation area (Fig.5). They consisted of a narrow, shallow linear feature [106/110] (Figs. 5, 7 \& 8) and a large pit or possible quarry [108] (Figs. 5, $10 \& 12$ ), each cut into the geological stratum (105).
7.5 The linear feature [106/110] was aligned NNE/SSW. It was $c .2 .7 m$ in long and $0.5 m-0.56 \mathrm{~m}$ wide with sides sloping at $30^{\circ}$ to a concave base at an overall depth of c.0.2m (Fig. 8; Fig.9, Sections 1 and 2). The function of the linear feature is unclear, although an overall fall in slope of $c .0 .22 \mathrm{~m}$ along its base suggests that it was a drainage gully. There was a terminus to the NNE, while the other end entered the large pit [108]. It contained a single homogeneous fill (107), comprised of loose mid-brown sandy silt with limestone fragments and frequent charcoal flecks. Three sherds of locally-produced pottery were recovered. These consisted of two small fragments from a $12^{\text {th }} / 13^{\text {th }}$ century cooking pot, and a piece of c. $10^{\text {th }} / 11^{\text {th }}$ century St Neots-type ware, also probably from a cooking pot (post. 8.7; Table 1). Soil analysis revealed a small number of carbonised grains of free-threshing type wheat (Triticum aestivum/ turgidum type) and seeds of probable horse bean (cf. Vicia faba var. minor) (post. 8.15 and Appendix 2). The gully appears to have been deliberately in-filled, perhaps using material from a nearby midden.
7.6 A segment [110] excavated at the gully's intersection with the pit [108] revealed no differentiation between its fill (111) and the upper fill (113) of the pit (Fig. 9; Section 2). It is possible, therefore, that the two features were open at the same time and were in-filled in a single event.
7.7 The large pit [108] in the corner of the excavation area could only be partly exposed (Figs.5, 10 \& 12). Its diameter/width was over 2.4 m and its sides sloped between $15^{\circ}$ and $20^{\circ}$. It was investigated to a depth of c.0.4m. The geological stratum, into which the pit had been dug, comprised calcareous sandy clay (see 7.3); the limestone bedrock was not encountered. The pit contained two fills, each clearly discernible (Fig.11, Section 4 \& Fig.13, Section 5).
7.8 The lowermost fill (109) of pit [108] consisted of dark brown to black gritty, sandy silt, c.0.2m in thickness. Two sherds of locally-manufactured St Neots-type pottery were recovered, which date to the $10^{\text {th }}$ or $11^{\text {th }}$ century (post. 8.2; 8.7, Table 1). The soil sample analysis (post. 8.15, 8.17, 8.23 \& Appendix 2) revealed an abundance of burnt cereal grain, particularly of free-threshing type wheat ( $T$ aestivum/ turgidum type), with lesser quantities of hulled barley (Hordeum sp.) and oat (Avena sp.) There were also occasional pea/ bean seeds (Fabaceae).
7.9 The upper fill (113) of pit [108] was c.0.3m in thickness, consisted of loose, mid-brown sandy silty soil, with frequent limestone fragments and charcoal flecks. It appeared to continue into the gully [106/110] (ante. 7.6). There was no indication of silting or water-logging, and it was thus considered to represent a deliberately in-fill of soil and domestic waste, which was derived from a nearby midden. Twenty-seven sherds of locally-manufactured medieval pottery were recovered, representing an estimated thirteen different vessels, probably cooking pots or bowls (post. 8.7, Table $1 ; 8.8$, Table 2). The overall assemblage dates to the $12^{\text {th }} / 13^{\text {th }}$ century, though it includes residual sherds of $c .11^{\text {th }} / 12^{\text {th }}$ century date and a single piece of early to middle Saxon pottery. The deposit also contained a predominance of free-threshing type wheat grains ( $T$ aestivum/ turgidum type), and smaller amounts of hulled barley (Hordeum sp.) and oat (Avena sp.). The absence of chaff indicates that the foodstuff was fully processed (post. 8.16), suggesting that the deposit may have derived from a hearth or a midden. The composition of the deposit and its date, based on the pottery, is comparable with the fill of the gully [106/110].
7.10 Both the gully [106/110] and pit [108] were sealed by a layer of loose, mid to dark brown sandy silty soil (114) containing frequent small pieces of limestone. This layer, which was c. 0.44 m in
thickness above pit [108], gradually thinned out to c .0 .16 m , towards the natural slope to the north and northwest. On account of the layer being greatly disturbed by the roots of modern trees there was lack of differentiation with the topsoil during ground reduction. Pottery recovered from the layer suggests that it may have dated to the $13^{\text {th }}$ or $14^{\text {th }}$ century. It was interpreted as a medieval garden soil.

## Post-medieval Features and Deposits

7.11 In Section 4, the medieval soil layer (114) had been cut by, what appeared to have been, a foundation trench for a wall [112] (Figs. $10 \& 11$, Section 4). The foundation trench, c.0.95m wide and c. 0.4 m deep, had been dug down to the geological stratum (105) and filled with limestone rubble (115). There were no artefacts present. The north-eastern side of the foundation trench was poorly defined due to $20^{\text {th }}$ century disturbance and made-ground (104).
7.12 A row of mid-19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century stone-built cottages known as Fish Row (Figs. 18 \& 19) is known to have occupied the south-eastern part of the Application Site until the mid-1950s. It is thus possible that the wall foundation (115) was associated with one of these dwellings.
7.13 The quarry [101] extended across the northern and eastern part of the excavation area (Figs.5, 16 and 17). It was evidently dug for building stone, the limestone bedrock being fairly close the ground surface (ante. 7.3). The origin of the quarry is unknown. An exploratory trench was excavated through its fill (102), to an overall depth of c.0.7m (Figs.5, \& 15), recovering pieces of $19^{\text {th }}$ century pottery.
7.14 On the southeast side of the quarry [101] was a localised deposit of limestone rubble (103) (Figs. 5 \& 14). This was $c .3 \mathrm{~m}$ long, c .0 .6 m wide, aligned NW/SE. In view of its form in plan it was initially considered to be fragment of a wall foundation similar to (115), yet on a different alignment to the cottages shown on the first edition OS map of 1885. An exploratory trench revealed that the deposit, more than c. 0.55 m thick, was more likely to have been a pile of limestone fragments stacked randomly against the side of the quarry (Fig.15). A single sherd of $c$. $19^{\text {th }}$ century pottery was recovered from the rubble. The southeast side of the rubble deposit (103) had been scarped, presumably by a mechanical excavator during $20^{\text {th }}$ century demolition works.
7.15 The quarry fill (102) was overlain by $20^{\text {th }}$ century made-up ground (104) comprised of rubble and soil (Fig.16, Section 3), which covered the Application Site varying in thickness between c. 0.16 m $(\mathrm{N})$ and $0.7 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~S})$. In the north and north-western part of the new building footprint, it lay directly above the geological stratum (105). To the south, it lay above the buried medieval soil layer (114) (Fig.11, Section 4). Topsoil varied in thickness across the site between c.0.2 and 0.3m.

## 8. THE FINDS

## Medieval Pottery by Jackie Wells MA \& Martin Wilson

8.1 The medieval pottery sherds in Table 1 are arranged by Context Number. A total of 37 sherds, with an overall weight of 441 grams, were recovered from stratified medieval deposits. The minimum number of vessels (MNV) represented is 20 (Table 2).
8.2 Medieval pottery sherds were recovered from two medieval features in the southern part of the new building footprint: a large pit or quarry [108] and a gully [110]. The earliest pottery is a locally-produced St. Neot's-type ware, which falls within the production date range of the $10^{\text {th }}$ to $12^{\text {th }}$ centuries. There are two St Neot's-type wares present in the assemblage. The first, Fabric F100, is fine-walled, black, unglazed with reduced core and probably dates towards the early part
of the range. Two sherds, derived from either a cooking pot or a jar, were present in the lowermost fill (109) of the large pit [108]. Another sherd was recovered from the fill (107) of the gully [110]. The second type, Fabric F200, is greyish buff or orange, still with reduced core, and is considered to be towards the end of the date range (i.e. c. $12^{\text {th }}$ century). Twelve sherds of this type were recovered from the uppermost fill (113) of the large pit [108].
8.3 A small assemblage (14) of unglazed shelly coarseware sherds (Fabric 330) was also recovered from fill (113). These have an orange and grey outer fabric with a reduced core. They are derived from either cooking pots or bowls and represent household waste deposits. Many of the sherds are abraded, suggesting re-deposition. They were produced locally at some time during the $12^{\text {th }}$ or $13^{\text {th }}$ century, although the actual production site is uncertain, possibly Yardley Hastings (Northants) or Olney Hyde (Bucks).
8.4 The pottery assemblage from gully [110] suggests that it was in-filled in the $12^{\text {th }}$ century. Similarly, the overall assemblage from the upper fill (113) of pit [108] also indicates a deposition date of $c .12^{\text {th }}$ century. Based on the pottery, however, the lower fill (109) of the pit appears to have been much earlier in date.
8.5 A single body sherd of early to middle Saxon pottery was found in the upper fill (113) of the large pit [108].
8.6 A piece of a $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century green-glazed a jug or baluster, from Potterspury (Northants), was recovered from a buried ground layer sealing pit [108], and a single residual sherd of an unprovenanced, $14^{\text {th }}-15^{\text {th }}$ century pot was found in a $20^{\text {th }}$ century demolition layer (104).

### 8.7 Table 1. Medieval pottery types and chronology

(Note: Fabric codes used in descriptions refer to the Northamptonshire Type Series where applicable and the corresponding fabric code in the Bedfordshire Type series).

| Context No. | Remarks | Common name | Fabric Code (Northants) | Fabric Code (Beds) | Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104107 | 1 body sherd, abraded, trace of glaze splashes on interior Fine walled, unglazed, black, reduced core; prob. cooking pot; local product <br> 1 body sherd, orangegrey , reduced core, prob. cooking pot, very abraded 1 rim sherd, everted, orange-grey outer, reduced core, abraded; prob. cooking pot | Late medieval oxidised | F401 | E02 | $\mathrm{C} 14^{\mathrm{th}}-\mathrm{c} 15^{\mathrm{th}}$ |
|  |  | St Neotstype ware T1 (1) | F100 | B01 | $\mathrm{C} 10^{\text {th }}-\mathrm{C} 12^{\text {th }}$ <br> (prob. towards <br> the early part <br> of the range) |
|  |  | Shelly coarseware | F330 | B07 | $\mathrm{C} 12^{\mathrm{th}}-\mathrm{C} 13^{\mathrm{th}}$ |
|  |  | Shelly coarseware | F330 | B07 | $\mathrm{C} 12^{\text {th }}-\mathrm{C} 13^{\text {th }}$ |
| 109 | 2 body sherds, fine walled, unglazed, black, reduced core; prob. cooking pot; local product | St Neotstype ware T1 (1) | F100 | B01 | C $10^{\text {th }}-\mathrm{C} 12^{\text {th }}$ <br> (prob. towards the early part of the range) |
| 113 | Body sherd, black, hard <br> 4 rim sherds, 10 base/body, majority | Sand tempered Shelly coarseware | None <br> F330 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A16/A18 } \\ & \text { B07 } \end{aligned}$ | Early or middle Saxon $\mathrm{C} 12^{\mathrm{th}}-\mathrm{C} 13^{\mathrm{th}}$ |


| Context <br> No. | Remarks | Common <br> name | Fabric Code <br> (Northants) | Fabric Code <br> (Beds) | Period |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | abraded. cooking pots <br> or bowls; local product <br> e.g. Yardley Hastings or <br> Olney | 11 base/body sherds, 1 <br> rim sherd, cooking <br> pots, unglazed, local <br> products | St Neots- <br> type ware <br> T1 (2) | F200 | B01 |
| 114 | Body sherd, sooted, <br> fine sand inclusions <br> 1 body sherd, green <br> lead glaze; jug <br> 1 rim sherd, finger <br> impressions, <br> bowl/basin; 1 body <br> sherd | Sandy <br> coarseware <br> Potterspury <br> ware <br> Shelly <br> coarseware | F329 | F330 | C $10^{\text {th }}-\mathrm{C} 12^{\text {th }}$ <br> (prob. towards <br> the end of the <br> period) |
|  | C10 | C.C $13^{\text {th }}$ |  |  |  |

### 8.8 Table 2. Medieval Pottery Quantification

(EMNV= estimated minimum number of vessels)

| Context | No. of sherds | Weight (grams) | EMNV |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104 | 1 | 21 | 1 |
| 107 | 3 | 52 | 2 |
| 109 | 2 | 22 | 1 |
| 113 | 27 | 251 | 13 |
| 114 | 4 | 95 | 3 |
| Totals | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ |

## Post-medieval Pottery by Martin Wilson

8.9 Post-medieval pottery was recovered from two stratified deposits: the in-fill of a $19^{\text {th }}$ century quarry and a $20^{\text {th }}$ century demolition layer.
8.10 Table 2. Post-medieval pottery types and chronology

| Context No. | Description | Fabric Code (Northants) | Fabric Code (Beds) | Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 102 | 2 body sherds, black iron-glazed earthenware | F426 | P03 | C $19{ }^{\text {th }}$ |
|  | 1 sherd brown glazed earthen ware | F417 | P01 | C18th - C19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |
|  | 1 sherd, sponge decorated ware | F416 | P45 | Mid-late C19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |
|  | 3 sherds, transfer printed wares, field dots | F416 | P45 | Early-m C19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |
|  | 2 sherds, transfer printed wares, flow colours | F416 | P45 | Mid-late C19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |
| 103 | 1 body sherd, black iron-glazed earthenware | F426 | P03 | C $19{ }^{\text {th }}$ |
| 104 | 2 body sherds, yellow ware | F432 | P39 |  |
|  | Ink bottle stoneware | F1000 | - | C $19^{\text {th }} / \mathrm{C} 20^{\text {th }}$ |
|  | 2 sherds, creamware | F415 | P38 | C $19^{\text {th }} / \mathrm{C} 20^{\text {th }}$ |


| Context No. | Description | Fabric Code (Northants) | Fabric Code (Beds) | Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | White earthenware <br> 1 body sherd, black iron-glazed earthenware | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F430 } \\ & \text { F426 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P55 } \\ & \text { P03 } \end{aligned}$ | Mid-late C19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ $\mathrm{C} 17^{\text {th }} \mathrm{C} 18^{\text {th }}$ |
|  | 1 moulded clay figurine <br> 1 sherd, transfer printed wares <br> 2 sherds, sponge decorated ware, common 1840s-1870s 1 sherd cut sponge ware, chrome colours floral, Common 1840s-1870s (c.f. MDA, Miller G. Cut Sponge, Stoke on Trent / Hanley, 1986) | F1000 F416 F416 F416 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P45 } \\ & \text { P45 } \\ & \text { P45 } \end{aligned}$ | C $19^{\text {th }} / \mathrm{C} 20^{\text {th }}$ <br> Mid-late $\mathrm{C} 19^{\text {th }}$ <br> Mid-late C19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ <br> Mid-late C19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |

### 8.11 Table 4. Other finds

| Context | Type | Suggested <br> date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 102 | Clay pipe bowl ( c.f. Beckley, I, 2104. 'A Group of 1850's Clay Pipe Kiln <br>  <br> Avon Arch Soc http://bristolandavonarchaeology.org.uk/; clay pipe <br> stem | Mid C 19 |

## An Archaeobotanical Assessment of Bulk Sample Light Fractions by Dr John Summers

## Introduction

8.12 Three bulk soil samples for environmental archaeological assessment were taken during excavations at High Street, Bozeat, Northamptonshire, by Souterrain Archaeological Services Ltd. The samples were submitted to Archaeological Solutions Ltd for processing and archaeobotanical assessment. The sampled features (gully [106] and pit [108]) have both been spot dated to the $11^{\text {th }}-12^{\text {th }}$ century AD. This report presents the results from the assessment of the bulk sample light fractions and discusses the significance and potential of any remains recovered.

## Methods

8.13 Samples were processed at the Archaeological Solutions Ltd facilities in Bury St. Edmunds using standard flotation methods. The light fractions were washed onto a mesh of $500 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ (microns), while the heavy fractions were sieved to 1 mm . The dried light fractions were scanned under a low power stereomicroscope (x10-x30 magnification). Botanical and molluscan remains were identified and recorded using a semi-quantitative scale ( $\mathrm{X}=$ present; $\mathrm{XX}=$ common; $\mathrm{XXX}=$ abundant). Reference literature (Cappers et al. 2006; Jacomet 2006; Kerney and Cameron 1979; Kerney 1999) and a reference collection of modern seeds was consulted where necessary. Potential contaminants, such as modern roots, seeds and invertebrate fauna were also recorded in order to gain an insight into possible disturbance of the deposits. The assessment data from the bulk sample light fractions are presented in Appendix 2.

## Plant macrofossils

8.14 The sample from gully fill (107) contained a small number of carbonised macrofossils in the form of free-threshing type wheat grains (Triticum aestivum/ turgidum type) and seeds of probable horse bean (cf. Vicia faba var. minor). It is likely that this feature was receiving carbonised remains from nearby food preparation or crop processing activities. The presence of horse bean may imply a domestic origin for the material, probably being deposited with hearth rake-out and other midden material.
8.15 The samples from pit [108] were much richer and contained a range of cereal and non-cereal taxa. Both samples were largely dominated by abundant grains of free-threshing type wheat ( $T$ aestivum/ turgidum type), accompanied by lesser concentrations of hulled barley (Hordeum sp.) and oat (Avena sp.). Barley grains included occasional asymmetric grains, indicating the cultivation of a hulled, six-row variety (H. vulgare var. vulgare). A small number of pea/ bean seeds (Fabaceae) were present, probably also constituting part of the range of crop taxa.
8.16 A small assemblage of non-cereal taxa was recorded in (109) and (113), with each taxon present as less than five specimens. These included oraches (Atriplex sp.), vetch/ wild pea (Vicia/ Lathyrus sp.), cleavers (Galium aparine), wild carrot (Daucus carota), stinking chamomile (Anthemis cotula) and brome grass (Bromus sp.). All of these can occur as arable weeds. Stinking chamomile is characteristic of heavy, fertile soils, which were regularly exploited for bread wheat cultivation during the medieval period (e.g. Moffett 2006). Cleavers is often considered to reflect autumn sowing of cereals, which would have been common practice for wheat. Both of these taxa imply an association with the free-threshing wheat crop which dominates the two samples from F108. The dominance of cereal grains over non-cereal taxa and the absence of any cereal chaff elements in the samples indicates that the material represents the remains of a fully processed crop.
8.17 The high density of remains in both samples, particularly that from the basal fill (109), indicates that the material represents a discrete dump of debris from a small number of burning episodes. It seems likely that this was an accidental fire that destroyed fully processed grain product in either a storage or drying accident. The similarity of the two samples may suggest that the material may represent remains from the same burning event which have been spread throughout the fills of pit [108]. However, the possibility of more than one episode of accidental burning and deposition cannot be ruled out.

## Charcoal

8.18 A relatively small amount of charcoal was recovered, with an assessment of a sub-sample of vessel patterns only identifying oak (Quercus sp.). This could represent the remains of fuel wood or, in the case of (109) and (113), structural timbers from a storage structure, depending on the origin of the deposit.

## Terrestrial molluscs

8.19 A small range of terrestrial mollusc shells were present in the samples, most reflecting taller grasses, scrub or ground litter. It seems likely that these kinds of habitats existed around the sampled features, although the assemblage is too small to offer a detailed habitat reconstruction. The presence of aquatic taxon Lymnaea truncatula in (109), the basal fill of pit [108], indicates standing water in the base of the feature and the possibility that it remained open for a time prior to infilling.

## Contaminants

8.20 Modern rootlets, seeds and burrowing molluscs (Cecilioides acicula) were recorded in the samples but only in relatively low concentrations. These remains are unlikely to reflect any considerable biological disturbance of the sampled deposits.

## Heavy fractions

8.21 A small number of charcoal fragments were present in the heavy fractions and was comparable to the material already discussed.

## Conclusions and statement of potential

8.22 The archaeobotanical remains from the site demonstrated good preservation of a range of cultivated taxa and associated weed communities. Only a small number of samples were present but the remains recovered demonstrate a strong association of the site with cereals, although no direct evidence for cultivation and processing was apparent. This does not rule out local cultivation and processing, simply that the character of the sampled deposits reflects fully processed grain product.
8.23 The fills of pit [108] were rich in carbonised plant macrofossils, with the material from both fills (109) and (113) most likely representing the remains of a fully processed cereal crop, perhaps destroyed in a storage or drying accident. The main crop plant present was free-threshing type wheat, although there was a significant presence of both hulled barley and oat, as well as a small number of cultivated legumes. This could reflect the mixing of stored products during or after carbonisation, or the presence of barley and oats as a significant, perhaps tolerated, 'weed' component of the wheat crop. Deliberate cultivation of a maslin, where two or more crops are grown simultaneously (e.g. Jones and Halstead 1995), is also possible, although autumn-sown wheat and spring-sown barley and oats might not be entirely compatible. Deliberate mixing of the three cereals for culinary purposes, such as maslin bread, is also a possibility.
8.24 Further identification and quantification of remains from [108] would add detail to the present dataset. However, the value of this for a single feature is uncertain as there is little potential for the wider application of statistical analyses. In addition, the bulk of the remains were cereal grains, with only a small number of associated non-cereal taxa. It is unlikely that the results of further analysis would add significantly more detail to the results or allow a more detailed investigation of crop husbandry regimes or processing methodologies.

## 9. CONCLUSIONS

## Phases of Activity

9.1 In summary, the following phases of activity have been identified at the Application Site:

Phase 1: A background signature of Early to Middle Anglo-Saxon occupation/ activity was present in the form of a single pottery sherd found in a pit fill broadly dated to the $12^{\text {th }}$ century.

Phase 2: In the $11^{\text {th }}$ or $12^{\text {th }}$ century, a large pit [108] was dug, probably to extract stone.

Phase 3: The molluscan evidence shows that the redundant extraction pit [108] remained open with water in its base for some time, and may have become a pond. At some juncture, a gully [106/110] was dug above its northeast side, presumably to channel water to it. During the $11^{\text {th }}$ century, domestic waste - including
smashed cooking vessels, charred cereal grain, and spent wood fuel accumulated in the base of the pond. The cereal grain is considered to have derived from a food storage or preparation area, which may have been located in proximity to the pit.

Phase 4 The pit [108] and the gully [106/110] were both in-filled in the $12^{\text {th }}$ or $13^{\text {th }}$ century using soil containing domestic waste, which probably came from a midden. The infill of each feature appears to have been a single event. The deposit was, again, rich in burnt cereal grain. The fully processed state of the grain reinforces the probability of food storage area and/or dwelling having been nearby.

Phase $5 \quad$ By the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century, the ground above pit [108] had been levelled with soil (114), and may have been the cultivated plot of a tenement.

Phase 6 A stone quarry [101] was dug, to the north and east of the medieval pit [108], breaking through the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century soil layer (114). The date of this activity is uncertain. It was backfilled in the mid-19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century.

Phase 7 A rubble foundation for a wall (115) was prepared on the east side of the Application Site, which was probably for one of the terraced cottages that were built in the mid- $19^{\text {th }}$ century, which is likely to have occurred shortly after the infill of the quarry [101].

Phase 8 The demolition of the Victorian cottages, Fish Row, took place in the mid-1950s. Topsoil appears to have removed from parts of the Application Site at this time. Rubble and waste soil was subsequently spread over site, followed by topsoil, to create the southeast end of the lawned garden of No. 16 Mile Street. Demolition disturbance [116] was identified in the post-medieval quarry fill.

## Review of Research Objectives

9.2 The investigation proved positive in terms of significant archaeological remains being present, and establishing the date, nature and extent of past activity at the development site.
9.3 Significantly, the investigation uncovered archaeological features and deposits which are dated by pottery to the High Medieval period ( $11^{\text {th }}$ to $13^{\text {th }}$ centuries).
9.4 A range of range of crops and weeds were present in a medieval pit and a gully is typical for a site of this date across most of southern Britain (pers.comm. J.Summers). However, the discovery of quantities of burnt cereal grain, present in two distinct phases, considerably augments knowledge of medieval settlement and the agrarian economy at Bozeat during the $11^{\text {th }}$ and $13^{\text {th }}$ centuries (ante. 5.4).
9.5 Albeit very slight, there is evidence of early to middle Anglo-Saxon activity in this part of Bozeat (ante. 4.5); prior to which archaeological finds discoveries have been c.226m SSE of the Application Site.
9.6 Since the medieval pit [108] continues beyond the southern baulk of the new building footprint, there is a high potential for the existence of further archaeological deposits and features in the south-western and south-eastern part of the Application Site. Ground formation for an access
and driveway in the west and south-western part of the Site was of insufficient depth to penetrate buried archaeology.

## 10. ARCHIVE

10.1 The archive from the project is to dealt with in accordance with the Northamptonshire Archaeological Archives Standard of Northamptonshire Archaeological Resource Centre -NARC (June 2014).
10.2 The Historic Environment Record Event Number, ENN108012, is the site code used for the archive.
10.3 The archive comprises plans and section drawings, context records and digital photographs. Artefacts will remain the property of the landowner although he/she will be invited to transfer finds ownership to the county museum facility when this becomes available. Provision is to be made by the Developer for retaining the project archive until such time as a suitable depository is available including financial provision to cover one-off museum storage charges.
10.4 The OASIS (Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations: www.oasis.ac.uk) identification number for this project is souterra1-219569.

## 11. COPYRIGHT

11.1 Souterrain Archaeological Services Ltd retain full copyright of any commissioned reports, tender documents or other project documents under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 with all rights reserved; excepting that it will provide an exclusive licence to the Owner in all matters directly relating to the project as described in the WSI. Souterrain Archaeological Services Ltd retains the right to be identified as the author of all project documentation and reports as defined in the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.
11.2 A licence is to be also granted to Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record for the use of all reports arising from projects for planning purposes and bona fide research requests.
11.3 Souterrain undertakes to respect all requirements for confidentiality about the Applicant's proposals provided that these are clearly stated. It is expected that owners respect Souterrain's and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' general ethical obligations not to suppress significant archaeological data for an unreasonable period.

## 12. ACCESSIBILITY OF THE RECORD

12.1 In accordance with the requirements of WSI, this report is intended as a public-accessible record. A copy is to be available for consultation in the Historic Environment Record. It is also to be made available on appropriate websites (e.g. www.oasis.ac.uk) and summary of the results is to be published in South Midlands Archaeology, the annual round-up of archaeological work in the region.
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## APPENDIX 1: List of Contexts

KEY: Relationships: a. above; abt. abuts; adj. adjoins; b. below; c. cuts; cub. cut by; co. contains; wi within
Dimensions:
le. length; wid. width; de. depth; th. thickness

| Context No. | type | Description and Interpretation | relationships | dimensions | Drawing | Finds | Soil Sample | Date of record |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 | Layer | Topsoil. Dark brown silty clay soil, rooty. Garden soil | a.(104), (105), | De.0.2-0.3m | Section 3 | C $19^{\text {th }}-\mathrm{C} 20^{\text {th }}$ <br> Pottery, brick fragments | - | 19:07:2015 |
| 101 | cut | Very irregular cut of quarry, sometimes, sloping, sometimes vertical. Probably handdug. A machine-dug trench through the material, though un-bottomed. Probably the stone quarry | Co. 101 | De. $>0.4 \mathrm{~m}$ | GPS plan Plan 1 | - | - | 19:07:2015 |
| 102 | fill | Very mixed re-deposited geological material of sand, clay and fragments of limestone. Interpreted as a fill of a quarry - probably in-filled shortly prior to ground preparation for mid C $19^{\text {th }}$ terraced houses | b. (104); Wi.[101]; cub.[116] | th. $>0.55 \mathrm{~m}$ | GPS plan <br> Plan 1, <br> Section 3, | Occasional $\mathrm{C} 18^{\text {th }}-\mathrm{C} 19^{\text {th }}$ pottery; brick fragments | - | 19:07:2015 |
| 103 | structure | Area of limestone rubble forming an approx. rectangle, located on the edge of quarry [101] and partly tipping down into it. Probably a dump. Disturbed by C $20^{\text {th }}$ demolition | $\begin{aligned} & \text { a./abt.(102); } \\ & \text { b.(104); cub.(116] } \end{aligned}$ | Le.c. $3 m$; wid.c. 0.6 m ; th. 0.55 m | GPS plan Plan 1 | C $19^{\text {th }}$ pottery | - | 19:07:2015 |
| 104 | layer | Very mixed deposit of soil, limestone rubble, re-deposited natural. Immediately beneath topsoil and above the fill of a $\mathrm{C} 19^{\text {th }}$ quarry. Interpreted as $\mathrm{C} 20^{\text {th }}$ made ground after demolition of $\mathrm{C} 19^{\text {th }}$ cottages | $\begin{aligned} & \text { a.(105), (102), } \\ & (103),(115),(114) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Th. c.0.6- } \\ & 0.7 \mathrm{~m} . \end{aligned}$ | Section 3 | C15 ${ }^{\text {th }}-\mathrm{C} 20^{\text {th }}$ <br> Pottery, brick fragments | - | 19:07:2015 |
| 105 | Geological layer | Geological stratum. Above limestone bedrock. Approx. 1.1m thick where exposed | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b.(104), (109), } \\ & (113),(114) ; \end{aligned}$ | - | GPS plan Plan 1, | - | - | 19:07:2015 |

[^5]| Context No. | type | Description and Interpretation | relationships | dimensions | Drawing | Finds | Soil Sample | Date of record |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | in geotech pit | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cub.[108], [110], } \\ & \text { [101] } \end{aligned}$ |  | Sections 3, $4 \& 5$ |  |  |  |
| 106 | cut | Cut of gully. Gently sloping sides $30^{\circ}$ to concave base. Straight, aligned NW/SE. Terminus present. Two sections excavated. The chronological relationship with pit [108] was indeterminate. The fill and pottery may suggest contemporary with /adjoins pit. <br> Uncertain function - possibly a channel associated with the pit [108] | b.(114); c.(105) | De. c.0.2m; le.c. 2.7 m ; wid. $0.5-0.56 \mathrm{~m}$ | GPS plan <br> Plan 1; <br> Sections 1 <br> \& 2 | - | - | 20:07:2015 |
| 107 | fill | fill of gully and segment, mid-brown sandy silt, homogeneous. Probably a deliberate fill - does not appear to be naturally silted up or waterlogged. Contains domestic waste. | b.(114); wi.[106] | th. c.0.2m | Sections 1 $72$ | Medieval pottery $\mathrm{C} 10^{\text {th }}$ to $\mathrm{C} 13^{\text {th }}$ | V | 20:07:2015 |
| 108 | cut | Cut of a large pit. Sides sloping between $15^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$. Encountered in the SE corner of the new house footprint. Hand-excavated to a depth of c.0.4m. full extent indeterminable, though appeared to be bottoming out. <br> Interpreted as a possible stone quarry. Medieval in date. The fill suggests that it was not a pond. It appears to have been associated with gully [106]/[110] | b.(114); c.(105) | Dia./wid. at least 2.4m; de. at least c.0.4 | GPS plan <br> Plan 1; <br> Sections 4 <br> \& 5 | - |  | 20:07:2015 |
| 109 | fill | Lower fill of large medieval pit. Dark brown to black gritty sandy silt. The interface with the upper fill (113) is more or less horizontal | b.(113); wi.[108] | Th.c.0.2m | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Sections 2, } \\ & 4 \& 5 \end{aligned}$ | Medieval pottery $\mathrm{C} 10^{\text {th }}$ to $\mathrm{C} 12^{\text {th }}$ | V | 20:07:2015 |
| 110 | cut | Cut of gully. Straight, aligned NW/SE. Handdug segment, to ascertain relationship of gully with pit [108] - indeterminable. Uncertain function | c.(111); b.(114) | De. c.0.1m increasing toc.0.3 at pit [108] | GPS plan <br> Plan 1; <br> Section 2 |  | - | 20:07:2015 |
| 111 | fill | fill of gully and segment, mid-brown sandy silt, homogeneous. Probably a deliberate fill - does not appear to be naturally silted up or waterlogged. Contains domestic waste. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b.(114); cub.[108]; } \\ & \text { [110] } \end{aligned}$ | th. c.0.1m increasing toc. 0.3 at pit [108] | GPS plan <br> Plan 1; <br> Section 2 | Medieval pottery $\mathrm{C} 10^{\text {th }}$ to $\mathrm{C} 13^{\text {th }}$ | V | 20:07:2015 |
| 112 | cut | A near-vertical, rectangular cut through a | c.(114); co.(115) | De. c.0.4 - | Section 4 | - | - | 20:07:2015 |


| Context | type | Description and Interpretation | relationships | dimensions | Drawing | Finds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX 2: Assessment data from the bulk sample light fractions

|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | (səлج!!) pəssəวoıd əunן0^ |  | Cereals |  |  | Non-cereal taxa |  | Charcoal |  | Molluscs |  | Contaminants |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbb{N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\infty} \\ & \text { D } \\ & \sim \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \hat{N} \\ & \frac{0}{V} \\ & \tilde{N} \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { zo } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\oplus} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \underline{\bar{N}} \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { zo } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { i } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \frac{0}{\bar{N}} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{D} \\ & \frac{7}{n} \\ & \sim \\ & D \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{W} \\ & \omega \\ & \sim \\ & \underset{\sim}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 107 | 106 | Fill of Gully | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C 11th- } \\ & \text { C12th } \end{aligned}$ | 20 | 20 | 100\% | X | - | FTW (X) | X | cf. Vicia faba $(X)$ | X | Quercus sp. | X | Clausilidae, <br> H. itala | X | X | - | - | - | Fuel <br> ash <br> slag <br> (X) |
| 109 | 108 | Basal <br> Fill of Pit | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C 11th- } \\ & \text { C12th } \end{aligned}$ | 20 | 20 | 100\% | XXX | - | HTB (X), <br> HB (XX), <br> FTW <br> (XXX), <br> Oat (XX) | XX | Large <br> Fabaceae (X), <br> Atriplex sp. <br> (X), Medium <br> Fabaceae (X), <br> Galium <br> aparine ( X ), <br> Daucus carota <br> (X), Anthemis <br> cotula (X), <br> Bromus sp. (X) | XX | Quercus $\mathrm{sp} .$ | XX | Cochlicopa sp., L. truncatula, Oxychilus sp., T. hispida gp., Vallonia sp. | XX | X | X | - | - | - |
| 113 | 108 | Upper <br> Fill of Pit | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C11th- } \\ & \text { C12th } \end{aligned}$ | 20 | 20 | 100\% | XXX | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HB (XX), } \\ & \text { FTW } \\ & (X X X), \\ & \text { Oat (XX) } \end{aligned}$ | XX | Large <br> Fabaceae (X), Vicia/ Lathyrus sp. (X), Medium Fabaceae (X) | XX | Quercus sp . | XX | Cochlicopa sp., D. <br> rotundatus, <br> T. hispida <br> gp., Vallonia sp. | XX | X | X | - | - | - |

## FIGURES




Figure 1. Location of Site
(based on Ordnance Survey mapping, © Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number AL 100015565)


Figure 2. Area of excavation


Figure 3. Overview of the site at commencement of soil strip, facing $S$

Figure 4. Geotechnical test pit in W corner of site, showing depth to bedrock. Facing NW



Figure 5. Plan of archaeological features and location of Sections 1 to 5


Figure 6. Area of excavation with spot heights (m AOD)

Figure 7.
Medieval gully [106/110], pre-excavation, facing ENE


Figure 8. Medieval gully [106/110], facing SW

## Section 1



Section 2


Figure 9. Sections 1 and 2: medieval gully [106/110] and medieval pit [108]


Figure 10. Overview of Section 4, facing SE

Section 4

NE
$\pi$


Figure 11. Section 4. C19th disturbance of medieval deposits


Figure 12. Overview of Section 5, facing SW


Figure 13. Section 5: medieval pit [108] and buried medieval soil (114)


Figure 14. C19th rubble deposit (103) on the edge of the quarry


Figure 15. Exploratory trench through quarry infill (102) and (103)

## Section 3



Figure 16. Section 3: C19th quarry [101] and C20th made-up ground (104)


Figure 17. C19th quarry [101] and Section 3 under investigation Facing SE


Figure 18. Extract of OS 1885 map, showing approximate location of Application Site


Figure 19. View of Fish Row, High Street, Bozeat (c. mid C20 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ ), facing NW.
(photo: courtesy of Gloria Berril, Bozeat)
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