

# **Fullers Field**

Swan Lane, Westerfield, Suffolk

Client: Peter Wells Architects

## Date:

September 2015

WRF 023 Archaeological Evaluation Report SACIC Report No. 2015/065 Author: Michael Green © SACIC



# Fullers Field, Swan Lane, Westerfield WRF 023

Archaeological Evaluation Report SACIC Report No. 2015/065 Author: Michael Green Contributions By: Richenda Goffin, Ruth Beveridge and Michael Green Illustrator: Ellie Cox Editor: Richenda Goffin Report Date: September/2015

## **HER Information**

Site Code:	WRF 023
Site Name:	Fullers Field, Swan Lane, Westerfield
Report Number	2015/065
Planning Application No:	DC/14/3660/FUL
Date of Fieldwork:	3rd-4th of September 2015
Grid Reference:	TM 1745 4797
Oasis Reference:	Suffolkc1-218670
Curatorial Officer:	Rachael Abraham
Project Officer:	Michael Green
Client/Funding Body:	Peter Wells Architects
Client Reference:	n/a

Digital report submitted to Archaeological Data Service: http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit

#### Disclaimer

Any opinions expressed in this report about the need for further archaeological work are those of Suffolk Archaeology CIC. Ultimately the need for further work will be determined by the Local Planning Authority and its Archaeological Advisors when a planning application is registered. Suffolk Archaeology CIC cannot accept responsibility for inconvenience caused to the clients should the Planning Authority take a different view to that expressed in the report.

Prepared By:	Michael Green
Date:	10/09/2015
Approved By:	*****
Position:	*****
Date:	*****
Signed:	********

## Contents

Sum	nmary	
Drav	wing Conventions	
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Geology and topography	2
3.	Archaeology and historical background	3
<b>4.</b> 4.1.	Methodology Management	<b>8</b> 8
4.2.	Project preparation	8
4.3.	Fieldwork	8
	Introduction	8
	Finds recovery and metal detecting	8
	Trial trenching	9
4.4.	Post-excavation	9
4.5.	Project archive	10
5.	Results	11
5.1	Introduction	11
5.2	Trench results	11
	Trench 1	11
	Trench 2	16
	Trench 3	18
	Trench 4	20
	Trench 5	20
	Trench 6	24
	Trench 7	24
	Trench 8	24
	Trench 9	25

6.	Finds and environmental evidence	29
6.1	Introduction	29
6.2	The Pottery	29
	Introduction	29
	The pottery	29
	Discussion	30
6.3	Ceramic building material	30
	Introduction	30
	The assemblage	31
	Discussion	31
6.4	Struck flint	31
	Methodology	31
	Introduction	31
	Discussion	32
6.5	Post-medieval glass	32
6.6	Iron nails	32
6.7	Slag	32
6.8	Shell	32
6.9	Animal bone	32
6.10	The small finds	33
	Introduction and recording method	33
	Small finds by period	33
	Discussion	34
6.11	Finds Discussion	34
7.	Discussion	35
8.	Conclusions and recommendations for further work 3	
9.	Archive deposition	36

10.	Acknowledgements	37
11.	Bibliography	38

## List of Figures

Figure 1.	Location map	5
Figure 2.	Trench plan	6
Figure 3.	HER data from the surrounding area	7
Figure 4.	Trench 1 plan and sections	15
Figure 5.	Trench 5 plan and sections	23
-		

#### List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of HER entries	3
Table 2. Finds quantities	29
Table 3. Flint summarised by type	31
Table 4. Summary of quantities of small finds	33

#### List of Plates

Plate 1. Trench 1	13
Plate 2. Trench 1, showing ditches 0005, 0007 and pit 0010	14
Plate 3. Trench 2, showing layer 0014	17
Plate 4. Trench 3	19
Plate 5. Trench 5	21
Plate 6. Trench 5, showing ditch 0024	22
Plate 7. Trench 9, showing modern disturbance	27
Plate 8. Trench 9, showing made ground 0017 and hollow 0018	28

### List of Appendices

- Appendix 1. Context List
- Appendix 2. Oasis form

- Appendix 2.Guide formAppendix 3.Bulk FindsAppendix 4.Catalogue of Pottery and CBMAppendix 5.Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)

## Summary

An archaeological evaluation by trial trenching was carried out by Suffolk Archaeology CIC at Fullers Field, Swan Lane, Westerfield, in Suffolk. The evaluation assessed 5% of two small paddocks covering *c*.1.0ha for archaeological evidence. The works consisted of nine trenches spread across the site to sample all areas of the development. The works found little evidence of archaeological features with one post-medieval to modern pit found in Trench 1, a post-medieval to modern ditch seen in Trenches 1 and 5 and various geological features seen in Trenches 2, 8 and 9.

The geological feature seen in Trench 2 contained sparse finds of prehistoric struck flint on the surface with other geological features seen in Trenches 8 and 9 showing no archaeological content.

The ditches seen in Trenches 1 and 5 is most likely the same ditch containing finds of post-medieval and modern pottery, CBM (Ceramic Building Material) and animal bone and is most likely linked to the former use of the land as pig pens. The pit seen in Trench 1 is also most likely linked to this phase and contained the same date and type of material.

The western-most field also contained a made ground deposit above the topsoil layer and two features dated to the late 1990s containing dumps of modern waste from construction of the nearby properties. For this reason Trench 9 was stopped short so that this material was not disturbed contaminating the topsoil.

# **Drawing Conventions**

F	Plans
Limit of Excavation	
Features	
Break of Slope	
Features - Conjectured	
Natural Features	
Sondages/Machine Strip	
Intrusion/Truncation	
Illustrated Section	S.14
Cut Number	0008
Archaeological Features	

#### Sections

Limit of Excavation -	
Cut -	
Modern Cut	
Cut - Conjectured	
Deposit Horizon	
Deposit Horizon - Conjectured	3
Intrusion/Truncation-	
Top of Natural	
Top Surface-	
Break in Section-	
Cut Number	0008
Deposit Number	0007
Ordnance Datum	18.45m OD ☆

## 1. Introduction

An archaeological evaluation by trial trenching was carried out by Suffolk Archaeology CIC (SACIC) to assess the impact of proposed development on potential heritage assets at Fullers Field, Swan Lane, Westerfield (Fig. 1). The project was carried out on the 3rd to the 4th of September 2015 to meet a condition on planning application DC/14/3660/FUL, in accordance with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The work required was detailed in a Brief (dated 19/05/2015), produced by the archaeological adviser to the Local Planning Authority (LPA), Rachael Abraham of Suffolk County Council Historic Environment Team (SCC/HET). The project was commissioned by Peter Wells Architects.

The proposed residential development of fourteen residential properties and associated access, parking spaces and services lies in a current paddock at the end of Fullers Field. The land was short grass and the western field had previously been used as an area to dispose of spoil from adjacent developments, and preceding this was used as pig pens for the nearby pork canning plant.

## 2. Geology and topography

The underlying geology in this area consists of a silty clay of the Thames Group and sands of the Red Crag Formation. These are overlain by a pocket of sand and gravel of the Lowestoft Formation in an area that is otherwise predominately clay (British Geological Survey website).

The local topography gently undulates and is typical of a rolling clay land landscape. The development site is located at 37-41m above sea level on a gentle southwest facing slope. The nearest watercourse is that of the River Flynn which lies approximately 12km to the northeast.

## 3. Archaeology and historical background

A small number of archaeological sites or findspots are recorded on the Historic Environment Record (HER) within the vicinity of the development site. A summary of these entries is presented in the following table; the recorded locations are marked in Figure 3.

HER No.	Date	Nature of Evidence
IPS 090	Saxon, Roman &	Finds spot of Roman and Saxon coin along with post-medieval tokens from
	post-med	metal detecting
IPS 091	Saxon	Caterpillar brooch from metal detecting
IPS 125	Medieval	Church of St Mary Magdelene. Core of tower probably built from <i>c</i> .1300,
		re-built early C15.
		Iron Are minor and Draza Are chiest found motal datasting
122 232	Iron Age	Iron Age mirror and Broze Age object found metal detecting
WRF 001	Roman	Roman coins found in garden. Five sestertii: Two Augustus, Vespasian,
		Hadrian, and Gordian III.
WRF 002	Saxon	Saxon knife found metal detecting
WRF 003	Iron Age	Late Iron Age coin found metal detecting
WRF 006	Bronze Age	Bronze Age axe, awl and fitting found whilst metal detecting
WRF 007	Bronze Age	Bronze Age axe found whilst metal detecting
WRF 008	Saxon	Saxon silver coin found whilst metal detecting
WRF 010	Medieval/	Extent of Village Green as seen on Hodskinsons map of 1783.
	post-med	
WRF 011	Roman, Saxon	Lead sax brooch found whilst metal detecting. Also Roman pottery, post-
	& post-med	med bell and flint flake.
WRF 012	Post-med	Second World War Type 22 pillbox adjacent railway line.
WRF 013	Saxon	Saxon bronze fragment found metal detecting
WRF 015	Saxon	Saxon strap end found
WRF	Medieval	Medieval Penny of Edward found whilst metal detecting
Misc1		
WRF	Post-med	Post-medieval coin found whilst metal detecting
Misc2		
WRF	Neolithic	Flint blade found whilst field walking
Misc3		
WRF	Post-med	Post-med strap found whilst metal detecting
Misc4		
WRF	Medieval	Medieval harness fitting found whilst metal detecting
Misc5		

Table 1. Summary of HER entries

There are a few entries on the County HER located in the vicinity of the development site which together indicate a background of activity from the Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman, Saxon, medieval and post-medieval periods although most evidence is singular finds spots from metal detecting. The Church of St. Mary Magdelene, which lies *c*.300m to the south of the site, is at least medieval in date and would have been the focus of medieval settlement activity in Westerfield.

The development area falls within the recorded limits of the medieval village green (WRF 010). There may be potential for small scale activity in the vicinity dating to this period.

The proximity of this recorded evidence, particularly the medieval church and village green, suggests a reasonable potential for further archaeological deposits to be present within the development area.



Figure 1. Location of site, showing development area (red) and trenches (black)



Figure 2. Location of trenches within the development area



Figure 3. HER data from the surrounding area

 $\sim$ 

## 4. Methodology

## 4.1. Management

• The project was managed by SACIC Managing Director Rhodri Gardner in accordance with the principles of *Management of Research in the Historic Environment* (MoRPHE, English Heritage 2006).

## 4.2. Project preparation

- An event number (ESF 23184) and site code (WRF 023) was obtained from the SHER (Suffolk Historic and Environment Records) and is included on all project documentation.
- An OASIS online record was initiated and key fields in details, location and creator forms completed.
- A pre-site inspection and Risk Assessment was completed.

## 4.3. Fieldwork

## Introduction

- Fieldwork standards were guided by 'Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England', EAA Occasional Papers 14, and the Chartered Institute For Archaeologists (CIFA) paper 'Standard and Guidance for archaeological field evaluation', (2014).
- The archaeological fieldwork was carried out by Michael Green of SACIC. The fieldwork began on the 3rd of September and concluded on the 4th of September 2015.

## Finds recovery and metal detecting

- The topsoil and subsoil from each trench was visually scanned during excavation of the trenches and any finds were recovered. Visual inspection was also carried out of the spoil once it had been excavated from the trenches.
- Metal detecting was carried out on all spoil removed from the trenches and features by an experienced metal detectorist.

## Trial trenching

- The project Brief requires 5% of the 1.0ha application area to be evaluated, with trenches positioned to samples all areas of the site. This amounted to *c*.270m of 1.6m wide trenches. Some minor modifications to the trench plan were made onsite to avoid modern features.
- The Trench location was marked out using an RTK GPS system.
- The trenches was excavated using a machine equipped with a back-acting arm and toothless ditching bucket (measuring 1.9m wide), under the supervision of an archaeologist.
- An overall site plan showing trench locations, feature positions, sections and levels was made using an RTK GPS. An individual detailed trench plan was recorded by hand at 1:50. All excavated sections were recorded at a scale of 1:20.
- All trenches, archaeological features and deposits were recorded using standard pro forma SACIC registers and recording sheets and numbering systems.
- A photographic record, consisting of high resolution digital images was made throughout the evaluation.
- Trenches were backfilled after approval of SCCAS.

## 4.4. Post-excavation

- The post-excavation finds work was managed by the SACIC Finds Team Manager, Richenda Goffin, with the overall post-excavation managed by John Craven.
- All finds were processed and marked (SHER event number and context number) following ICON guidelines and the requirements of the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team.
- All hand drawn site plans and sections were scanned.
- All raw data from GPS or TST surveys was uploaded to the project folder, suitably labelled and kept as part of the project archive.
- All plan drawings were digitised for combination with the results of digital site survey to produce a full site plan, compatible with MapInfo GIS software or export

to .dxf format.

• All hand-drawn sections were digitised using autocad software.

## 4.5. Project archive

- On approval of this report a printed and bound hard copy will be lodged with SCCAS. A hard copy and digital .pdf file will also be supplied to the Cambridgeshire HER, together with a digital and fully georeferenced vector plan showing the application area and trench locations, compatible with MapInfo software.
- The online OASIS form for the project has been completed and a .pdf version of the report uploaded to the OASIS website for online publication by the Archaeological Data Service. A copy of the form is included as Appendix 3.
- The project archive, consisting of the complete artefactual assemblage, and all paper and digital records, will be deposited with the Cambridgeshire County Archaeological Store and ownership transferred within 6 months of completion of fieldwork. If SACIC is engaged to carry out any subsequent stages of fieldwork then deposition of the evaluation archive may be delayed until the full archive is completed. The project archive will be consistent with MoRPHE (English Heritage 2006), and ICON guidelines. The project archive will also meet the requirements of SCCAS (SCCAS 2010).

## 5. Results

Michael Green

### 5.1 Introduction

Nine trenches were excavated to the archaeological horizon or the natural geology of a soft, orange and yellow sand and orange clay (Fig. 2). Cut features could be seen in Trenches 1 and 5. Large geological features were also seen in Trenches 2, 8 and 9 with only the feature in Trench 2 containing archaeological content. The site conditions were fair and access was gained from Fullers Field. A full context list is included in Appendix 2.

## 5.2 Trench results

#### Trench 1

Trench 1 was located at the north-east edge of the site running east to west parallel with the site boundary. It measured 30m in length, 1.6m in width and had a maximum depth of 0.65m and contained one ditch with a re-cut and one pit.

#### Topsoil 0003

Topsoil 0003 was seen across the entire development area but was issued separate unique context numbers for each trench for finds separation. It was a soft mid brown sandy silt with occasional small flint inclusions. It was overlain by overburden 0017 in the western field in places. It measured 0.35m in depth in this trench and contained modern material that was not kept.

#### Subsoil 0004

This layer was also seen throughout the development area. It was a soft light yellow brown silty sand with occasional small flint inclusions. It was very mixed and disturbed with rooting and animal disturbance. It was overlain by topsoil 0001 and overlies the natural geology; it measured 0.25m depth in this trench. No finds were present in this layer in this trench.

#### Ditch 0005

This feature was seen at the western end of the trench and it measured 0.95m in width and had a depth of 0.65m. It was linear in plan with concave sides and a flat base running the entirety of the trench. It was cut by ditch re-cut 0007 and was seen cutting subsoil 0004. It contained one fill 0006 which was a light grey yellow loose sand with frequent gravel inclusions. No dating evidence was recovered.

#### Ditch 0007

This feature was seen at the western end of the trench and it measured 1.50m in width and had a depth of 0.76m with a shallow U shape profile, concave sides and a flat base. It was linear in plan running the entirety of the trench and it was seen cutting subsoil 0004, ditch 0005 and pit 0010. It contained two fills, 0008 which was a mid-grey loose silty sand with frequent small flint inclusions and 0009 which was a compact mid grey orange silty sand with moderate small and large flint inclusions. Only fill 0009 contained finds, which included animal bone, CBM (Ceramic building Material), pottery and iron dating to the post-medieval and modern periods (16th to 20th century).

#### Pit 0010

Pit 0010 was seen at the western end of the trench; it measured 1.50m in width, 0.75m in length was seen and it had a depth of 0.98m. It was sub-oval in plan and was seen cutting subsoil 0004, and was cut by ditch 0007. It contained one fill 0011 which was a mixed orange and grey loose silty sand with frequent small flint inclusions. The fill contained finds of animal bone, CBM (Ceramic building Material) and iron dating to the post-medieval and modern periods.



Plate 1. Trench 1, looking east (1x1m and 1x2m scale)



Plate 2. Trench 1, showing ditches 0005, 0007 and pit 0010. Looking north (1x2m scale)





Trench 2 was located at the east end of the site running east to west. It measured 30m in length, 1.6m in width and had a maximum depth of 1.05m and contained a geological hollow filled with layer 0014.

#### Topsoil 0012

Topsoil 0003 was seen across the entire development area but was issued separate unique context numbers for each trench for finds separation. It was a soft mid brown sandy silt with occasional small flint inclusions. It measured 0.45m in depth in this trench and contained modern material that was not kept.

#### Subsoil 0013

This layer was also seen throughout the development area. It was a soft light yellow brown silty sand with occasional small flint inclusions. It was very mixed and disturbed with rooting and animal disturbance. It was overlain by topsoil 00012 and overlies the natural geology, and in this trench it measured 0.35m depth. This layer contained iron objects and SF 1002, a copper alloy object which is possibly a post-medieval cauldron foot.

#### Layer 0014

This layer was present in much of Trench 2; a 2m x 1m slot was excavated at the edge of the deposit. The extent of the deposit measured 0.25m in depth in this trench. The layer was a loose light yellow brown sand with occasional amounts of small sub-rounded flints. Struck flint was found on the surface of this deposited and dated to the prehistoric period.



Plate 3. Trench 2, showing layer 0014. Looking east (1x2m and 1x1m scale)

Trench 3 was located in the central area of the site running north to south. It measured 30m in length, 1.6m in width and had a maximum depth of 0.6m and contained no archaeological cut features.

#### Topsoil 0001

Topsoil 0003 was seen across the entire development area but was issued separate unique context numbers for each trench for finds separation. It was a soft mid brown sandy silt with occasional small flint inclusions. It measured 0.35m in depth in this trench and contained modern material that was not kept.

#### Subsoil 0002

This layer was also seen throughout the development area. It was a soft light yellow brown silty sand with occasional small flint inclusions. It was very mixed and disturbed with rooting and animal disturbance. It was overlain by topsoil 00012 and overlies the natural geology; in this trench it measured 0.25m in depth. This layer contained struck flint dated to the prehistoric period.



Plate 4. Trench 3. Looking south (1x2m and 1x1m scale)

Trench 4 was located at the eastern edge of the site running north to south. It measured 30m in length, 1.6m in width and had a maximum depth of 0.7m and contained no archaeological features.

#### Topsoil 0015

This layer was the same as 0001 and other topsoil contexts. It measured 0.45m in depth in this trench and contained modern plastic which was not kept.

#### Subsoil 0016

The subsoil layer measured 0.25m in depth in this trench. It was the same as other subsoil contexts and contained prehistoric struck flint in this trench.

#### Trench 5

Trench 5 was located in the central area of the site running east to west. It measured 30m in length, 1.6m in width and had a maximum depth of 0.6m. One ditch 0024 was seen cutting the subsoil 0023.

#### Topsoil 0022

This layer was the same as 0001 and other topsoil contexts. It measured 0.45m in depth in this trench and contained modern plastic which was not kept and SF1001, a late George the fifth penny.

#### Subsoil 0023

The subsoil layer measured 0.15m in depth in this trench. It was the same as other subsoil contexts and contained no finds in this trench.

#### Ditch 0024

This feature was seen at the western end of the trench and it measured 2.0m in width and had a depth of 0.7m with a shallow U shape profile, concave sides and a flat base. It was linear in plan running the entirety of the trench; it was seen cutting subsoil 0023. It contained one fill 0025 which was a mid-brown moderately compact sandy silt with occasional small flint inclusions. Finds included animal bone, CBM, pottery, shell and iron dating to the post-medieval and modern periods (16th-20th century).



Plate 5. Trench 5, looking south (1x1m and 1x2m scale)



Plate 6. Trench 5, showing ditch 0024. Looking north (1x1m scale)





Trench 6 was located at the southern end of the site running east to west. It measured 30m in length, 1.6m in width and had a maximum depth of 0.65m and contained no archaeological cut features.

#### Topsoil

The topsoil was not separately numbered for this trench due to the lack of finds. It measured 0.50m in depth in this trench and contained modern material that was not kept.

#### Subsoil

The subsoil was not separately number for this trench due to the lack of finds. It measured 0.15m depth in this trench. This layer contained no finds.

#### Trench 7

Trench 7 was located in the central area of the site running north to south. It measured 30m in length, 1.6m in width and had a maximum depth of 0.7m and contained no archaeological cut features.

#### Topsoil

The topsoil was not separately number for this trench due to the lack of finds. It measured 0.50m in depth in this trench and contained modern material that was not kept.

#### Subsoil

The subsoil was not separately numbered for this trench due to the lack of finds. It measured 0.2m depth in this trench. This layer contained no finds.

## Trench 8

Trench 8 was located at the western end of the site running east to west. It measured 30m in length, 1.6m in width and had a maximum depth of 0.85m and contained geological feature 0020 and made ground 0017.

#### Topsoil

The topsoil was not separately numbered for this trench due to the lack of finds. It measured 0.50m in depth in this trench and contained modern material that was not kept.

#### Subsoil

The subsoil was not separately numbered for this trench due to the lack of finds. It measured 0.2m depth in this trench. This layer contained no finds.

#### Made ground 0017

This layer was seen for 14m from the western end and measured 0.3m in depth. It overlaid the topsoil and was a mid-brown sandy silt with orange clay lumps with frequent concrete and brick fragments. This layer was placed in this area during the construction of the nearby properties in the 1990s to 2000s.

#### Geological hollow 0020

This feature was seen in the centre of the trench measuring 6.8m in width. It was not excavated. It contained one fill 0021 which was a light yellow brown sand with occasional small flint inclusions and contained no finds.

## Trench 9

Trench 9 was located at the western edge of the site running north to south. It measured 24m in length, 1.6m in width and had a maximum depth of 1.0m and contained geological feature 0018 and made ground 0017. It also contained modern cut features at the north end which contained large concrete blocks and steels (Fig. 2). The trench was stopped short of the planned 30m to minimise contamination from the modern features seen.

#### Topsoil

The topsoil was not separately numbered for this trench due to the lack of finds. It measured 0.40m in depth in this trench and contained modern material that was not kept.

#### Subsoil

The subsoil was not separately numbered for this trench due to the lack of finds. It measured 0.15m depth in this trench. This layer contained no finds.

#### Made ground 0017

This layer was seen for 14m from the western end and measured 0.3m in depth. It overlaid the topsoil and was a mid-brown sandy silt with orange clay lumps with frequent concrete and brick fragments. This layer was placed in this area during the construction of the nearby properties in the 1990s to 2000s.

#### Geological hollow 0018

This feature was seen at the southern end of the trench measuring 7.5m in length and 0.15m in depth. It was not excavated fully. It contained one fill 0019 which was a light yellow brown sand with occasional small flint inclusions and contained no finds.


Plate 7. Trench 9, showing modern disturbance. Looking south (1x1m and 1x2m scale)



Plate 8. Trench 9, showing made ground 0017 and hollow 0018. Looking west (1x1m scale)

Richenda Goffin

# 6.1 Introduction

A small quantity of finds dating mainly to the post-medieval period was recovered from the evaluation. Quantities by material type are shown below:

Context	Po	ttery	C	вМ	Fli	int	Anima	l bone	Miscellaneous	Spotdate
	No.	Wt/g	No.	Wt/g	No.	Wt/g	No.	Wt/g		
0002	1	15			2	172				Med but subsoil
0009	4	32	21	1448			2	20	1 p-med glass @2g	M18th-19th C
0011			7	344			2	2	2 nails @ 6g, 1 slag @ 129g	Post-med
0013									1 nail @ 30g	Post-med?
0014					2	91				IA?
0016					1	7				IA?
0025	11	95	10	254			11	14	1 shell @ 4g	L18th-19th C
Total	16	142	38	2046	5	270	15	36		

Table 2. Finds quantities

# 6.2 The Pottery

# Introduction

A total of sixteen fragments of pottery with an overall weight of 142g was recovered from the evaluation. The majority of the assemblage is post-medieval.

The ceramics were quantified using the recording methods recommended in the MPRG Occasional Paper No 2, Minimum standards for the processing, recording, analysis and publication of Post-Roman ceramics (Slowikowski et al 2001). The pottery was catalogued by context using letter codes based on fabric and form (Appendix 5).

The codes used are based mainly on broad fabric and form types identified in *Eighteen centuries of pottery from Norwich* (Jennings 1981), and additional fabric types established by the Suffolk Unit (S Anderson, unpublished fabric list).

The pottery

A single fragment of a medieval coarseware body sherd was present in the subsoil fill 0002 in Trench 3. It has a sandy fabric with silver mica and has a grey core with dark orange margins. A tiny sherd which could also be medieval weighing a single gramme was found as a residual element in the fill 0025 of ditch 0024 (Trench 5).

The remainder of the pottery dates to the post-medieval period. The ceramics present in the fill 0009 of ditch 0007 in Trench 1 include an abraded handle from a late medieval and transitional ware vessel, from a pipkin or a jug, dating to the 15th-16th century. The rest of the sherds from this feature are fully post-medieval and consist mostly of a sherd of Glazed red earthenware and a fragment of Creamware dating from the mid d18th-19th century.

A similar range of post-medieval wares was present in the fill 0025 of ditch 0024 (Trench 5). In addition to two very small fragments of possible LMT, several Glazed red earthenware sherds were recovered, as well as the base of a Yellow ware vessel of late 18th-19th century date and a fragment of Refined white earthenware of a similar date.

# Discussion

A very small quantity of residual medieval pottery was identified, but the majority of this small assemblage dates to the later part of the post-medieval period.

# 6.3 Ceramic building material

## Introduction

Thirty-eight fragments of ceramic building material weighing 2046g were recovered from the evaluation. The assemblage dates entirely to the post-medieval period. It has not been retained following full recording.

The cbm was quantified by count and weight by fabric, and where possible by form. The fragments were catalogued by main fabric type on the basis of microscopic appearance and main inclusions. Fabric types used are those in current use for assemblages within the county of Suffolk (Sue Anderson, SCCAS fabric groups). The data can be seen in Appendix 5.

# The assemblage

Twenty-one fragments of roofing tile and the fragmentary remains of four bricks were present in fill 0009 of ditch 0007 (Trench 1). These are made in a range of standard late medieval/post-medieval fabrics. There was no evidence of mortar on any of the tiles or bricks indicative of use or re-use. Similar fragments of bricks and tiles dating to the same period were present in the fill 0011 of pit 0010. Late medieval/post-medieval roof tiles were recovered also from fill 0025 of ditch 0024 (Trench 5).

# Discussion

The remains of fully oxidised roofing tiles were recovered from the evaluation as well as the fragmentary remains of post-medieval bricks, none of which had any diagnostic measurements surviving.

# 6.4 Struck flint

Michael Green

# Methodology

Each piece of flint was examined and recorded in the table below. The material was classified by type with numbers of pieces and corticated and patinated pieces being recorded and the condition of the flint being commented on in the discussion.

## Introduction

A total of two struck flints was recovered during the excavation.

Context No	Туре	Patination	Number
0002	Core	None	1
0002	Core Fragment	None	1
0014	Core	None	1
0014	Flake	None	1
0016	Flake	None	1
	Total		5

Table 3. Flint summarised by type

A total of three cores and two flakes were found within subsoil layers and layers within hollows 0002, 0014 and 0016. One core fragment from 0002 was a light grey cherty flint; all others were a dark blue black glassy flint. One core from 0002 had 25% cortex and one core from 0014 had 15% cortex and both were a white thick chalky form. All other flint contained no cortex or patination.

# Discussion

Struck flint was recovered from three contexts 0002, 0014 and 0016, all of which were subsoil or layers from separate trenches. The flint was very fresh with pronounced bulbs struck by hard hammer with angular shatter scars on both distal and proximal ends and due to the size, shape and technique used to create the flakes and cores, they are most likely to be Iron Age in date. No edge damage was seen suggesting that the flints may have been deposited within this material when it was exposed as a land surface. Due to the minimal amount of flint found it is not likely that flint knapping was extensive in this area and more likely surface fragments of flint may have been sporadically used and discarded by people passing the area.

# 6.5 Post-medieval glass

A single fragment of late post-medieval window glass was present in the ditch fill 0009 (Trench 1).

# 6.6 Iron nails

The fragmentary remains of iron nails were recovered from pit fill 0011, subsoil deposit 0013 and ditch fill 0025.

# 6.7 Slag

A large fragment of slag/metal working debris weighing 129g was present in the fill 0011 of pit 0010 (Trench 1).

## 6.8 Shell

Part of a fragment of oyster shell was collected from fill 0025 of ditch 0024 but was not retained in the finds archive.

# 6.9 Animal bone

The remains of small quantities of animal bone recovered from fills 0009, 0011 and 0025 are so fragmentary that they cannot be identified to species or individual element.

# 6.10 The small finds

Ruth Beveridge

# Introduction and recording method

Four objects were recorded as small finds and are listed in Table 4 below. The assemblage is overwhelmingly post-medieval in date. The overall condition of the finds is fair, though the ironwork is especially corroded and encrusted.

Material	No of Small finds
Copper alloy	2
Iron	2
Total	4

Table 4. Summary of quantities of small finds

The small finds were measured and catalogued; none of the small finds were chosen for x-ray.

Small finds by period

## Post-medieval

## Copper alloy

SF 1002 is a cast copper alloy leg, retrieved from subsoil layer 0013. The leg has a flat back and is triangular in section. It tapers to a rounded terminal. A fragment of the interior surface of the vessel survives at the broken end. It is likely the foot from a tripod cauldron or ewer. These types of vessels were in use throughout the medieval and post-medieval periods from the 14th century onwards (Margeson, 1993, 90).

## Iron

SF 1003 was recovered from fill 0011 of pit 0010. It is a single ovoid shaped iron link. The frame of the link is corroded and possibly triangular in section. Chains had a variety of uses, both in and around buildings, ranging from supporting cooking vessels to securing gates and doors.

#### Modern

#### Copper alloy

SF 1001 is a George V (1910-36) copper alloy half penny. It was found in 0022, the topsoil layer of Trench 5. Obv: bust facing left. Legend: GEORGIVS V DEI GRA: BRITT: OMN: REX FID: DEF: IND: IMP: The reverse is worn with some corrosion masking the detail but the legend HALF PENNY is visible, as is the outline of a seated Britannia. The date is 1923. Compare to Mitchell and Reeds (1990), 321, no. 4056.

#### Unidentified

#### Iron

SF 1004 is an elongate object, triangular in section. It is very corroded. It was found in the same fill as SF 1003.

#### Discussion

The tripod leg and iron objects are likely to be of post-medieval date but are residual, being from contexts which additionally contain modern material. The George V penny is from the topsoil which contained little else but some modern plastic.

# 6.11 Finds Discussion

A small amount of struck flint was identified which may be of Iron Age date. In spite of the location of the site within the core of the medieval village, there is little evidence of this date in the finds, apart from a very small quantity of medieval pottery recovered mainly from the subsoil in Trench 2. There is some indication of late medieval/early post-medieval artefacts in the form of Late medieval and transitional wares but these are residual and accompany much later wares.

# 7. Discussion

The evaluation produced sparse results with only a single ditch with a re-cut seen in Trenches 1 and 5, a single pit 0010 in Trench 1 and geological features seen in Trenches 3, 8 and 9. The layer 0014 in a geological feature seen spanning the majority of Trench 3 and subsoil layers produced the only finds of note dating to the Iron Age and medieval periods but no cut features could be linked with these artefacts.

The ditches seen in Trenches 1 and 5 are most likely the same ditch due to the similar alignment with an initial cut in the later post-medieval period (16th to 18th century) with a modern (20th century) re-cut linked with the pig pens known to have existed in the area until recently. The pit seen in Trench 1 also most likely is linked to the modern periods along with the re-cut ditch. This is supported by the finds data showing a mixed date ranging from the late post-medieval (16th to18th century) to modern (20th century) for the material found within the ditch and pit.

# 8. Conclusions and recommendations for further work

Based on the results of this evaluation no further archaeological work is recommended for this site although the final decision is at the discretion of the County Conservation Team.

# 9. Archive deposition

Paper and photographic archive: SACIC Store transferrable to SCCAS Bury St Edmunds on completion

Digital archive: R:\Current Recording Projects\Westerfield\WRF 023 Evaluation Fullers Field

Digital photographic archive: R:\Current Recording Projects\Westerfield\WRF 023 Evaluation Fullers Field\Photographs

Finds and environmental archive: SACIC Store transferrable to SCCAS Bury St Edmunds or Unit 4 Ipswich.

# 10. Acknowledgements

The fieldwork was carried out by Hannah Cutler and directed by Michael Green Project management was undertaken by Rhodri Gardener who also provided advice during the production of the report.

Post-excavation management was provided by Richenda Goffin. Finds processing and analysis was undertaken by Jonathan Van Jennins. The specialist finds report was produced by Richenda Goffin and additional specialist advice was provided by Michael Green (lithics) and Ruth Beveridge.

The report illustrations were created by Ellie Cox and the report was edited by Richenda Goffin.

# 11. Bibliography

BGS, 7th September 2015, Information obtained from *http://www.bgs.ac.uk/products/digital maps/ data\_625k.html* and reproduced with the permission of the British Geological Survey ©NERC. All rights Reserved

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014, *Standard and Guidance for archaeological field evaluation.* 

Historic England, 2015, *Management of Research in the Historic Environment* (*MoRPHE*).

Jennings, S., 1981, *Eighteen Centuries of pottery from Norwich*. EAA 13, Norwich Survey/NMS.

Margeson, S., 1993, Norwich Households, East Anglian Archaeology Report No. 58.

Medlycott, M. (Ed), 2011, *Research and Archaeology Revisited: A revised framework for the East of England.* EAA Occasional Paper 24.

Mitchell, S., and Reeds, B. (eds.), 1990, Coins of England and the United Kingdom, 26th Edition. Seaby, London

SCCAS, 2010, Deposition of Archaeological Archives in Suffolk.

SCCAS, 2011, Requirements for Trenched Archaeological Evaluation 2011, ver 1.2.

Slowikowski, A., Nenk, B., and Pearce, J., 2001, *Minimum standards for the processing, recording, analysis and publication of post-Roman ceramics*, MPRG Occasional Paper No 2.

Context No	Feature No	Feature Type	Description/Interpretation	Finds	Overall Date Env. Sample Tren	nch
0001		topsoil Layer	Dark brown grey sandy silt topsoil, clear clarity, moderatly compact	No	No 3	
			Topsoil in trench 3, contained modern material (not kept)			
0002		subsoil Layer	yellow orange brown silty sand with a soft compaction, occasional small flint inclusion, diffuce horizon with natural	Yes	No 3	
			Subsoil in trench 3, numbered for finds			
0003		topsoil Layer	Dark brown grey sandy silt topsoil, clear clarity, moderatly compact	No	No	
			Topsoil in trench 1, contained modern material (not kept)			
0004		subsoil Layer	yellow orange brown silty sand with a soft compaction, occasional small flint inclusion, diffuce horizon with natural	No	No 1	
			Subsoil in trench 1, cut by dicthes 0005, 0007 and pit 0010			
0005	0005	Ditch Cut	linear in plan, n-s alligned with a U shape profile concave sides and a wide flat base. Cut by ditch 0007	No	No	
			cut of post-med ditch			
0006	0005	Ditch Fill	light grey yellow loose sand with occasional small flint inclusion, good clarity, single fill	No	No 1	
			single fill of ditch			
2000	2000	Ditch Cut	linear in plan, alligned n-s, U shape in profile with moderate concave sides and a flat base. Cuts ditch 0005 and pit 0010	No	No 1	
			cut of post-med ditch			
0008	2000	Ditch Fill	mid grey loose silty sand with frequent small flint inclusions, clear clarity, basal fill of 2	No	No 1	
			basal fill of 2 in post-med ditch			
6000	2000	Ditch Fill	Dark orange grey compact silty sand with moderate small stones and occasional large flint inclusions. Clear clarity, top fill of 2	Yes	No 1	
			top fill of ditch			
0010	0010	Pit Cut	sub oval in plan, elongated e-w, steep sided with a slight undercut, concave base. Contained one fill and cut by ditch 0007	No	No	
			post-med pit cut			
0011	0010	Pit Fill	mixed mid orange and dark grey loose silty sand, frequent gravel inclusions, clear clarity, single fill	Yes	No	
			single fill of post -med pit.			

Appendix 1. Context list

<b>Context No</b>	Feature Nc	Feature Type	Description/Interpretation	Finds	Overall Date Env. Sample	Trench
0012		topsoil Layer	Dark brown grey sandy silt topsoil, clear clarity, moderatly compact	No	No	7
			Topsoil in trench 2, contained modern material (not kept)			
0013		subsoil Layer	yellow orange brown sitty sand with a soft compaction, occasional small flint inclusion, diffuce horizon with natural	Yes	No	5
			subsoil in trench 2, contained iron and bronze sf. 2002			
0014		silt Layer	light yellow brown loose sand, occasional small flint inclusion, diffuse clarity, geological layer	Yes	No	N
			layer in a geological hollow, contained struck flint on the surface			
0015		topsoil Layer	Dark brown grey sandy silt topsoil, clear clarity, moderatly compact	No	No	4
			Topsoil in trench 4, contained modern material (not kept)			
0016		subsoil Layer	yellow orange brown silty sand with a soft compaction, occasional small flint inclusion, diffuce horizon with natural	Yes	No	4
0017		made ground Layer	mid brown soft sandy silt, frequent cbm and contrete lumps, clear clarity	No	No	8/9
			21st century made ground from construction of near by houses, over the topsoil seen in trenches 8 and 9			
0018	0018	geology Cut	irregular in plan, unexcavated	No	No	0
			natural hollow full of sand and gravel, no archaological content			
0019	0018	geology Fill	light yellow brown loose sand and gravel	No	No	6
			unexcavated geological feature fill			
0020	0020	geology Cut	irregular in plan, unexcavated	No	No	8
			natural hollow full of sand and gravel, no archaological content			
0021			light yellow brown loose sand and gravel	No	No	8
			unexcavated geological feature fill			
0022		topsoil Layer	Dark brown grey sandy silt topsoil, clear clarity, moderatly compact	No	No	5
			Topsoil in trench 5, contained modern material (not kept), contained george V coin sf.1001			
0023		subsoil Layer	yellow orange brown silty sand with a soft compaction, occasional small flint inclusion, diffuce horizon with natural	No	No	5
			subsoil in trench 5			

Context No	Feature No	Feature Type	Description/Interpretation	Finds	Overall Date Env. Sample Trei	ench
0024	0024	Ditch Cut	linear in plan alligned n-s, shallow U in profile with concave sides and a U shape base. Cuts subsoil 0023	No	No	
			cut of post-med ditch			
0025	0024	Ditch Fill	mid brown moderatly compact sandy silt with occasional small flint and cbm inclusion. Clear clarity, single fill	Yes	No	
			single fill of post-0med ditch			

#### **Appendix 2: OASIS Form**

List of Projects | Manage Projects | Search Projects | New project | Change your details | HER coverage | Change country | Log out

#### **Printable version**

#### OASIS ID: suffolka1-218670

#### **Project details**

Project name WRF 023 Fullers Field, Swan Lane, Westerfield

Short description of the project	An archaeological evaluation by trial trenching was carried out by Suffolk Archaeology CIC at Fullers Field, Swan Lane, Westerfield, in Suffolk. The evaluation assessed 5% of two small paddocks covering c.1.0ha for archaeological evidence. The works consisted of nine trenches spread across the site to sample all areas of the development. The works found little evidence of archaeological features with one post-medieval to modern pit found in Trench 1, a post-medieval to modern ditch seen in Trenches 1 and 5 and various geological features seen in Trenches 2, 8 and 9. The geological feature seen in Trench 2 contained sparse finds of prehistoric struck flint on the surface with other geological features seen in Trenches 1 and 5 is most likely the same ditch containing finds of post-medieval and modern pottery, CBM (Ceramic Building Material) and animal bone and is most likely linked to the former use of the land as pig pens. The pit seen in Trench 1 is also most likely linked to this phase and contained the same date and type of material. The western most field also contained a made ground deposit above the topsoil layer and 2 features dated to the late 1990s containing dumps of modern waste from construction of the nearby properties. For this reason Trench 9 was stopped short so that this material was not disturbed contaminating the topsoil.
Project dates	Start: 03-09-2015 End: 05-09-2015
Previous/future work	No / No
Any associated project reference codes	WRF 023 - HER event no.
Any associated project reference codes	ESF23184 - HER event no.
Any associated project reference codes	DC/14/3660/FUL - Planning Application No.
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Current Land use	Other 15 - Other
Monument type	PIT Post Medieval

Monument type DITCH Post Medieval

Significant Finds	POTTERY Post Medieval
Significant Finds	ANIMAL BONE Post Medieval
Significant Finds	COIN Modern
Significant Finds	TRIPOD LEG Post Medieval
Significant Finds	CBM Post Medieval
Methods & techniques	"Sample Trenches", "Targeted Trenches"
Development type	Rural residential
Prompt	Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPS
Position in the planning process	After full determination (eg. As a condition)

#### **Project location**

Country	England
Site location	SUFFOLK SUFFOLK COASTAL WESTERFIELD WRF 023 Fullers Field, Westerfield
Study area	1 Hectares
Site coordinates	TM 1745 4787 52.085855262586 1.174279135354 52 05 09 N 001 10 27 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 37m Max: 41m

#### Project creators

Name of Organisation	Suffolk Archaeology CIC
Project brief originator	Local Authority Archaeologist and/or Planning Authority/advisory body
Project design originator	Rachael Abraham
Project director/manager	Rhodri Gardner
Project supervisor	Michael Green
Type of sponsor/funding body	Client
Name of sponsor/funding body	Peter Wells Architects

#### Project archives

Physical Archive recipient	Suffolk HER
Physical Contents	"Animal Bones", "Ceramics", "Worked stone/lithics"
Digital Archive recipient	Suffolk HER
Digital Contents	"other"

#### OASIS FORM - Print view

Digital Media available	"Database","Images raster / digital photography","Survey","Text"
Paper Archive recipient	Suffolk HER
Paper Contents	"other"
Paper Media available	"Context sheet","Drawing","Plan","Report","Section"
Entered by	michael green (michael.green@suffolkarchaeology.co.uk)
Entered on	9 September 2015

finds
bulk
of
Catalogue
<b>ന</b>
Appendix

-			-																			-	
Ceramic	perioa	Med	Med/PMed															Med/PMed					
Notes			Elongate, tapering	strip of iron and	key' shaped iron	object of unknown	annear modern -	to be discarded.	Piece of flat	corroded iron	object with corner.	Likely to be	modern. To be	discarded				Folded length of	copper alloy	corroded iron nail -	both modern. 10 be discarded		
hell	Wt/a	0	0						0						0	0	0	4					4
S	ÖN	0	0						0						0	0	0	٢					-
mal	Wt/a	0	20						7						0	0	0	14					36
Ani	No	0	7						2						0	0	0	11					15
ick flint	Wt/a	172	0						0						0	91	2	0					270
Stru	No	2	0						0						0	2	-	0					5
vinglass	Wt/a	0	2						0						0	0	0	0					2
PMed <b>v</b>	No	0	-						0						0	0	0	0					1
	Wt/a	0	0						129						0	0	0	0					129
Slag	No	0	0						-						0	0	0	0					1
ails	Wt/a	0	0						9						30	0	0	25					61
Iron N	NO	0	0						2						-	0	0	~					4
BM	Wt/a	0	1448						344						0	0	0	254					2046
Ö	No	0	21						7						0	0	0	10					38
ttery	Wt/a	15	32						0						0	0	0	92			 		142
Pot	ON N	-	4						0						0	0	0	11					16
Context		0002	6000						0011						0013	0014	0016	0025					Total

# Appendix 4. Catalogue of pottery

ntext ceramic period	Fabric	Form	sherds	Weight	ENV	Abrasion	Comments	spotdate	spotdate
02 MED/LMED	MCW	ворү	1	15	L		Dk orange outer margins, grey core, silver mica	L12th-14th C	L12th-14th C
09 PMED	GRE	вору	1	10	1	A		16th-18th C	
09 PMED	CRW	вору	1	-	-		Plain, undecorated body sherd		
09 PMED	LPME	вору	1	8	-	AA		18th-20th C	18th-20th C
09 PMED	LMT	HAND	1	18	L	A	Frag strap handle, red. core, ungl. Pip/jg handle	15th-16th C	
25 PMED	YELW	BASE	1	15	1	AA	Plain undecorated footring	L18th-19th C	L18th-20th C
25 PMED	REFW	вору	1	3	-		Plain undecorated	L18th-20th C	
25 PMED	GRE	ворү	5	99	9	AA	Very worn body sherds, different vessels	16th-18th C	
25 PMED	GRE	BOWL	1	15	-	A	cf Jennings, 160, fig, 65, no. 1121	16th-18th C	
25 PMED	LMT	вору	2	5	1	AA	2 joining frags, unglazed	15th-16th C	
25 MED?	MCW?	вору	1	1	1	AA	Sandy ware, poss med?	L12th-14th C?	

# Catalogue of Ceramic building material

Context Per	riod	Fabric	Form	Frag No	Wt (g)	Condition	Description
0009 L/P	M	fsm	RT	1	210	A	
0009 PM	_	msfe	RT	3	72		
0009 L/P	M	fs	RT	3	75		
0000 L/P	M	fsg	RT	1	42		
0009 L/P	M	ms	RT	2	35		
0009 PM	_	msc	LB	2	502	AA	Some surface chalk and voids
0009 L/P	M	bsm	LB	5	194	AA	
0009 L/P	M	msf	LB	1	246	A	
0009 L/P	M	fsfe	LB?	3	74		
0011 PM	_	fsf	RT	1	66		
0011 L/P	M	fsg	LB	1	164	AA	
0011 L/P	M	msg	LB?	3	06		
0011 L/P	M	fsg	NN	2	20	A	2 slivers
0025 L/P	M	fsc	RT	2	49		
0025 L/P	M	ms	RT	4	74		
0025 L/P	Ž	fs	RT	4	130	AA	



# Fullers Field, Swan Lane, Westerfield

# Written Scheme of Investigation

# Trenched Evaluation

Date: July 2015 Prepared by: Simon Cass Issued to: Rachael Abrahams (SCCAS Conservation Team) © SACIC



# Summary Project Details

Site Name	Fullers Field, Swan Lane
Site Location/Parish	Westerfield
Grid Reference	TM 1745 4797
Access	Swan Lane
Planning Application No	DC/14/3660/FUL
HER code	WRF 023
Event No.	ESF23184
OASIS ref.	Suffolkc1-218670
Туре:	Trial trench evaluation
Area	1.0ha
Project start date	TBC
Fieldwork duration	Up to 2 days (estimated)
Number of personnel on site	Up to 3

#### Personnel and contact numbers

SACIC Project Manager	Rhodri Gardner	01449 900120
Project Officer (first point of	ТВС	
on-site contact)		
Curatorial Officer	Rachael Abraham	01284 741232
Consultant		

#### Emergency contacts

Local Police	Ipswich Police Station, 10 Museum Street, Ipswich, IP1 1HT	101
Location of nearest A&E	Ipswich Hospital, Heath Road, Ipswich, IP4 5PD	01473 712233

#### Hire details

Plant:	Holmes Plant & Construction	01473 890766
Toilet Hire	Capel Plant	01206 844004
Tool hire:	n/a	

#### Contents

- 1. Background
- 2. Fieldwork
- 3. Post-excavation
- 4. Additional Considerations
- 5. Staffing

#### Figures

- 1. Site location
- 2. Trench layout

#### Appendices

- 1. Health and Safety Policy
- 2. Insurance Documentation

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 Suffolk Archaeology have been asked by Peter Wells Architects (on behalf of a client) to prepare documentation for a programme of archaeological evaluation by trial trench at the above site (Fig 1). This Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) covers this trenched evaluation only. Any further stages of archaeological work that might be required in relation to the proposed development would be subject to new documentation.
- 1.2 The whole site is covers *c*. 1.0ha, and is located at NGR TM 1745 4797 (Figure 1).
  - 1.3 The present stage of work is being requested as a condition of planning application DC/14/3660/FUL. The LPA has been advised that a programme of archaeological work should take place prior to development, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (Para 141). The purpose of such work being the recording and advancement of understanding of any heritage assets present at the location before they are damaged or destroyed in the course of the development.
- 1.4 The archaeological investigation will be conducted in order to comply with a Brief produced for this specific planning condition by Rachael Abraham of the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) (dated 19<sup>th</sup> May 2015).
  - 1.5 The application is within an area of significant archaeological potential, as suggested by the presence of sites recorded in the County HER. It is situated on the edge of a medieval green (WRF 010) and close to findspots of Saxon, medieval and post-medieval date (WRF 004, 008, 012 and 014). As a result there is believed to be a high potential for encountering early occupation deposits at this location. The proposed works would cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exists.
- 1.6 The development proposal is for the construction of fourteen new houses and ancillary developments. The groundwork such construction would entail is liable to damage or destroy any potential heritage assets that may be present within the site. The purpose of the trial trenching is therefore to assess the archaeological potential of the development site prior to the commencement.
- 1.7 Trial trenching to cover 5% by area of the development site has been specified. This amounts to 280m<sup>2</sup>. Linear trenches arranged in a systematic grid pattern are the most suitable way to sample a site of this nature. The detailed trenching rationale will be outlined in Section 2, below.
- 1.8 This WSI complies with the SCCAS/CT standard Requirements for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation (2012, Ver 1.1), as well as the following national and regional guidance 'Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation' (IFA, 1995, revised 2001) and 'Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England (EAA Occasional Papers 14, 2003).
- 1.9 The research aims of this trial trench evaluation are as follows, as described in Section 4.2 of the SCCAS Conservation Team brief:

- RA1: Identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit within the application area, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation.
- RA2: Evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.
- *RA3: Establish the potential for the survival of environmental evidence.*
- RA4: Provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of cost.

In addition to these specific aims the potential of the site to address any relevant themes outlined in the Regional Research Framework for the Eastern Counties (Brown & Glazebrook, 2000; Medleycott, 2011).



Figure 1. Site Location

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2015



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2015 Figure 2. Proposed trench layout (trenches in red)

#### 2 Fieldwork: trial trench evaluation

- 2.1 All archaeological fieldwork will be carried out by full-time professional employees of Suffolk Archaeology. The project team will be led in the field by an experienced member of staff of Project Officer grade/experience. The excavation team will comprise a Project Officer and up to 2 experienced excavators and surveyors (to include metal detectorist).
- 2.2 Evaluation of the development area in this instance will employ nine (9) trenches, each 1.8m by 30m, to give a total length of 270m, with a contingency of an additional 10m of trenching to be inserted in a suitable location to further clarify any features which are located. This will equate to a 5% sample of the development site. The proposed trench location plan is shown in Figure 2.
- 2.4 No information has currently been provided about the presence or otherwise of services by the developer. Therefore if previously unknown services or similar restrictions are encountered during work on site then trench layout may have to be amended accordingly.
- 2.5 The trenches will be excavated by a machine equipped with a toothless ditching bucket, under the constant supervision of an archaeologist. All overburden (topsoil and subsoil) will be removed stratigraphically until either the first archaeological horizon or natural deposits are encountered. Spoil will be stored adjacent to each trench and topsoil, subsoil and concrete/overburden will be kept separate for sequential backfilling.
- 2.6 Archaeological deposits and features will be sampled by hand excavation and the trench bases and sections cleaned as necessary in order to satisfy the project aims and also comply with the SCCAS Requirements for Archaeological Evaluation, 2012.
- 2.7 If a trench requires access by staff for hand excavation and recording, it will not exceed a depth of 1.2m. If this depth is not sufficient to meet the archaeological requirements of the Brief and Specification it will be brought to the attention of the client or their agent and the Archaeological Advisor to the LPA so that further requirements can be established. Deeper excavation can be undertaken provided suitable trench support is used or, where practicable, the trench sides are stepped or battered. However such a variation will incur further costs to the client and time must be allowed for this to be established and agreed.
- 2.8 All features will be investigated and recorded to provide an accurate evaluation of archaeological potential whilst at the same time minimising disturbance to archaeological structures, features and deposits.
- 2.9 A site plan showing all trench locations, feature positions and levels AOD will be recorded using suitable surveying equipment, depending on the specific requirements of the project. A minimum of one to two sections per trench will be recorded at 1:20. Feature sections and plans will be recorded at 1:20 and trench and feature plans at 1:20 or 1:50 as appropriate. All recording conventions used will be compatible with the County HER.

- 2.10 The site will be recorded under a unique HER number acquired from the Suffolk HER Office and archaeological contexts will be recorded using pro forma Context Recording sheets and entered into an associated database.
- 2.11 The HER number in this instance is WRF 023, and the event number ESF23184.
- 2.12 A digital photographic record will be made throughout the evaluation.
- 2.13 Metal detector searches will be made at suitable stages of the excavation works.
- 2.14 All pre-modern finds will be kept and no discard policy will be considered until all the finds have been processed and assessed.
- 2.15 All finds will be brought back to the Suffolk Archaeology premises for processing, preliminary assessment, conservation and packing. Most finds analysis work will be done in house, but in some circumstances it may be necessary to send some categories of finds to specialists working in other parts of the country.
- 2.16 Bulk environmental soil samples (40 litres each) will be taken from suitable features and retained until an appropriate specialist has assessed their potential for palaeoenvironmental remains. Decisions can then be made on the need for further analysis following this assessment. If necessary advice will be sought from English Heritage's Regional Advisor in Archaeological Science on the need for specialist environmental sampling.
- 2.17 In the event of human remains being encountered on the site, guidelines from the Ministry of Justice will be followed. The evaluation will attempt to establish the extent, depth and date of burials whilst leaving remains in situ. During the evaluation any exposed human remains will be securely covered and hidden from the public view at all times when they are not attended by staff. At the conclusion of the work backfilling will be carried out in a manner sensitive to the preservation of such remains.
- 2.18 If circumstances dictate that the lifting of human remains is unavoidable then a Ministry of Justice Licence for their removal will be obtained prior to their removal from site.

#### 3 Post-excavation

- 3.1 A unique HER number will be acquired from the Suffolk HER. This will be clearly marked on all documentation and material relating to the project.
- 3.2 The post-excavation work will be managed by Suffolk Archaeology's Post-excavation and Finds Manager, Richenda Goffin. Specialist finds staff whether in-house personnel or external specialists are experienced in local and regional types of material in their field.
- 3.3 All artefacts and ecofacts will be held by Suffolk Archaeology until analysis of the material is complete.
- 3.4 All site data will be entered on a computerised database compatible with the County HER. All site plans and sections will be copied to form a permanent archive on archivally stable material. Ordnance Datum levels will be on the section sheets. The photographic archive will be fully catalogued.
- 3.5 All finds will be processed, marked and bagged/boxed to County HER requirements. Where appropriate finds will be marked with a site code and a context number.
- 3.6 Bulk finds will be fully quantified on a computerised database compatible with the County HER. Quantification will fully cover weights and numbers of finds by context with a clear statement on the degree of apparent residuality observed.
- 3.7 Metal finds on site will be stored in accordance with ICON guidelines, initially recorded assessed for significance before dispatch to a conservation laboratory within 4 weeks of the end of the excavation. All pre-modern silver, copper alloy and ferrous metal artefacts will be x-rayed and coins will be x-rayed if necessary for identification. Sensitive finds will be conserved if necessary and deposited in bags/boxes suitable for long term storage to ICON standards. All coins will be identified to a standard acceptable to normal numismatic research.
- 3.8 Pottery will be recorded and archived to a standard consistent with the Draft Guidelines of the Medieval Pottery Research Group and Guidelines for the archiving of Roman Pottery, SGRP (ed. M.G. Darling, 1994) and to The Study of Later Prehistoric Pottery: General Policies and Guidelines for analysis and Publications, Occasional Papers No.1 and No. 2, 3rd Edition (Revised 2010, Prehistoric Ceramic Research Group).
- 3.9 Environmental samples will be processed and assessed to standards set by the English Heritage Regional Scientific Advisor with a clear statement of potential for further analysis and significance.
- 3.10 Animal and human bone will be quantified and assessed to a standard acceptable to national and regional English Heritage specialists.
- 3.11 An industrial waste assessment will cover all relevant material (i.e. fired clay finds as well as slag).

- 3.12 A report on the results of the evaluation will be completed within 6 weeks of the completion of the fieldwork. The report will be commensurate with the level of results but will contain sufficient information to stand as an archive report should no further work be required on the site.
- 3.13 The report will include a summary in the established format for inclusion in the annual "Archaeology of Suffolk" section of the *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History*.
- 3.14 The Suffolk HER is registered with the Online Access to Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) project. Suffolk Archaeology will complete a suitable project-specific OASIS form at http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis. The completed form will be reproduced as an appendix to the final report.
- 3.15 A draft of the report will be submitted to SCCAS for approval.
- 3.16 On acknowledgement of approval of the report from SCCAS hard and digital copies will be sent to the Suffolk HER.
- 3.17 Upon completion of reporting works ownership of all archaeological finds will be given over to the relevant authority. There is a presumption that this will be SCCAS, who will hold the material in suitable storage to facilitate future study and ensure its proper preservation.
- 3.18 The project archive shall be compiled in accordance with the guidelines issued by the SCCAS (2010). The client is aware of the costs of archiving and provision will be made to cover these costs in our agreement with them. The archive will be deposited with the County Archaeology Store unless another suitable repository is agreed with SCCAS.
- 3.19 If the client does not agree to transfer ownership to SCCAS they will be required to nominate another suitable repository approved by SCCAS or provide funding for additional recording and analysis of the finds archive (such as, but not limited to, additional photography or illustration of objects).
- 3.20 The law dictates that client can have no claim to the ownership of human remains. Any such remains must be stored by SCCAS, in accordance with the relevant site's Ministry of Justice licence.
- 3.21 In the rare event that artefacts of significant monetary value are discovered separate ownership arrangements may be negotiated, provided they are not subject to Treasure Act legislation.
- 3.22 If an object qualifies as Treasure, under the Treasure Act 1996. The client will be informed as soon as possible if this is the case and the find(s) will be reported to the Suffolk Finds Liaison Officer (who then reports to the Coroner) within 14 days of the

objects discovery and identification. Treasure objects will immediately be removed to secure storage, with appropriate on-site security measures taken if required.

3.23 Any material eventually declared as Treasure by a Coroner's Inquest will, if not acquired by a museum, be returned to the client and/or landowner. Employees of Suffolk Archaeology, their subcontractors or any volunteers under their control will not be eligible for any share of a treasure reward.

## 4 Additional considerations

#### 4.1 Health and Safety

- 4.1.1 The project will be carried out in accordance with Suffolk Archaeology's Health and Safety Policy at all times. A copy of this policy is provided in Appendix 1.
- 4.1.2 All Suffolk Archaeology staff are experienced in working under similar conditions and on similar sites to the present site and are aware of Suffolk Archaeology H&S policies. All permanent Suffolk Archaeology excavation staff are holders of CSCS cards.
- 4.1.3 A separate Risk Assessment and Method Statement (RAMS) document will be prepared for the site and provided to the client. Copies will be available to SCCAS on request.
- 4.1.4 All staff will be aware of the project's risk assessment and will receive a safety induction from the Project Officer.
- 4.1.5 It may be necessary for site visits to be made by external specialists or Suffolk County Council monitors. All such staff and visitors must abide by Suffolk Archaeology's H&S requirements for each particular site, and will be inducted as required and made aware of any high risk activities relevant to the site concerned.
- 4.1.6 Site staff, official visitors and volunteers are all covered by Suffolk Archaeology's insurance policies. Policy details are shown in Appendix 2.

#### 4.2 Environmental controls

4.2.1 Suffolk Archaeology is committed to following an EMS policy. All our preferred providers and subcontractors have been issued with environmental guidelines. On site the Project Officer will police environmental concerns. In the event of spillage or contamination reporting procedures will be carried out in accordance with Suffolk Archaeology's EMS policies.

#### 4.3 Plant machinery

4.3.1 A 360° tracked mechanical excavator equipped with a full range of buckets will be required for the trial trenching. The sub-contracted plant machinery will be accompanied by a fully qualified operator who will hold an up-to-date Construction Plant Competence Scheme (CPCS) card (approved by the CITB).

#### 4.4 Site security

- 4.4.1 Unless previously agreed with the client this WSI (and the associated quotation) assumes that the site will be sufficiently secure for archaeological work to be undertaken.
- 4.4.2 In this instance all security requirements including fencing, padlocks for gates etc. are the responsibility of the client.

#### 4.5 Access

- 4.5.3 The client will secure access to the site for Suffolk Archaeology personnel and subcontracted plant, and obtain all necessary permissions from landowners and tenants. This includes the siting of any accommodation units/facilities required for the work.
- 4.5.2 Any costs incurred to secure access, or incurred as a result of access being withheld (for example by a tenant or landowner) will not be the responsibility of Suffolk Archaeology. Such costs or delays incurred will be charged to the client in addition to the archaeological project fees.

#### 4.6 Site preparation

4.6.1 The client is responsible for clearing the site in a manner that enables the archaeological works to go ahead as described. Unless previously agreed the costs of any subsequent preparatory works (such as tree felling, scrub/undergrowth clearance, removal of concrete or hardstanding not previously quoted for, demolition of buildings or sheds, removal of excessive overburden, refuse or dumped material) will be charged to the client in addition to the archaeological project fees.

#### 4.7 Backfilling

- 4.7.1 The trench will be backfilled sequentially in reverse order of deposit removal. Where present topsoil will be returned as the uppermost layer. The backfilled material will then be compacted by the machine tracking along the line of trench.
- 4.7.2 No specialist reinstatement is offered, unless by specific prior agreement.

#### 4.8 Monitoring

4.8.1 Arrangements for monitoring visits by the LPA and its representatives will be made promptly in order to comply with the requirements of the brief and specification.

# 5 Staffing

- 5.1 The following staff will comprise the Project Team:
  - 1 x Project Manager (supervisory only, not based on site full-time)
  - 1 x Project Officer (full time)
  - 2 x Site Assistant (as required)
  - 1 x Site Surveyor (as required)
  - 1 x Finds/Post-excavation manager (part time, as required)
  - 1 x Finds Specialist (part time, as required)
  - 1 x Environmental Supervisor (as required)
  - 1 x Finds Assistant or Supervisor (part time, as required)
  - 1 x Senior Graphics Assistant (part time, as required)
- 5.2 Project Management will be undertaken by Rhodri Gardner and the Project Officer will be confirmed nearer to the project start. All Site Assistants and other staff will be drawn from Suffolk Archaeology's qualified and experienced staff. Suffolk Archaeology will not employ volunteer, amateur or student staff, whether paid or unpaid, to undertake any of the roles outlined in 5.1.
- 5.3 A wide range of external specialists can be employed for artefact assessment and analysis work as circumstances require.

# Appendix 1. Suffolk Archaeology CIC Health and Safety Policy



# HEALTH AND SAFETY POLICY STATEMENT

Suffolk Archaeology Community Interest Company is committed to ensuring the health, safety and welfare of its employees, and it will, so far as is reasonably practicable, establish procedures and systems necessary to implement this commitment and to comply with its statutory obligations on health and safety. Our Personnel are informed of their responsibilities to ensure they take all reasonable precautions, to ensure the safety, health and welfare of those that are likely to be affected by the acts and emissions of our organisations undertakings.

Suffolk Archaeology Community Interest Company understands our duty to identify the significant hazards that may be created by our undertakings and to risk assess these accordingly to ensure that suitable and effective controls are implemented to minimise risk to a suitable level as far as is reasonably practicable.

We also acknowledge our duty, so far as is reasonably practicable:

- To provide a safe working environment for our workforce, fulfil our statutory commitments and actively manage and supervise health and safety at work;
- To identify the risks associated with our business activities and ensure suitable and sufficient control measures are in place.
- Ensure regular consultation with our employees on matters which affect their health and Safety.
- To ensure that all plant and equipment used by our employees is fit for purpose and adequately maintained.
- > To provide suitable storage and ensure safe handling of Hazardous substances.
- To ensure that all workers are competent to undertake their daily work activities by providing all relevant information and training, consideration will also be given to any employees who do not have English as a first language.
- To prevent accidents and cases of work related ill health by ensuring a robust reporting and investigation system is in place.
- To liaise and communicate effectively regarding health and safety matters when working on other persons premises.
- To ensure that there is an effective system of induction, training, communication and supervision to other persons visiting or working on our premises.
- To have access to competent advice, this will be provided by Agility UK (Training and Consultancy) Ltd. Who will assists us in the continuous improvement in our health and safety performance and management through regular review and revision of this policy; and to provide suitable resources required to make this policy and our Health and Safety arrangements effective.

To ensure that the above are met we have developed a 'Health and Safety Management Structure' identifying key personnel responsible for managing health and safety within the organisation and 'Safety Arrangements' to assist the implementation.

Signature:	R.V.Gardner.	Date:	01/02/2015	
Name:	Rhodri Gardner	Position:	Managing Director	

The policy is reviewed on a periodic basis.
# **Appendix 2. Suffolk Archaeology CIC Insurance Policy Details**



## To Whom It May Concern

Our Ref: TMS/

28 January 2015

## Our Client: Suffolk Archaeology CIC

We act as Insurance Brokers for the above mentioned client and confirm the following cover is in force:

# Public Liability

Dear Sir / Madam

Limit of Indemnity - £5,000,000 any one event in respect of Public Liability

INSURER POLICY TYPE POLICY NUMBER EXPIRY DATE Aviva Insurance Limited Public Liability 24765101CHC/UN/010136 01/02/2016

#### Employers Liability

Limit of Indemnity - £10,000,000 any one occurrence.

The cover has been issued on the insurers standard policy form and is subject to their usual terms and conditions. A copy of the policy wording is available on request.

INSURER POLICY TYPE POLICY NUMBER EXPIRY DATE Aviva Insurance Limited Employers Liability 24765101CHC/UN/010136 01/02/2016

### Professional Indemnity

Limit of Indemnity - £1,000,000 in respect of each and every claim

INSURER POLICY TYPE POLICY NUMBER EXPIRY DATE Hiscox Insurance Limited Professional Indemnity HU PI 9129989/1450 01/02/2016

The cover has been issued on the insurers standard policy form and is subject to their usual terms and conditions. A copy of the policy wording is available on request.

The Insurance evidenced by this Certificate is subject to the terms, and conditions and exclusions of the applicable policies which is paramount. This certificate is issued as a matter of information only and evidences coverage as at the date of the certificate. This certificate confers no rights to the holder and imposes no liability on the Insurer. The Insurer assumes no responsibility to the holder of the certificate to provide any notice of any material change in or cancellation of these policies.

Yours\faithfully A,

Tariq Mian Cert CII Senior Account Executive Towergate Insurance



Towergate Insurance Funtley Court, Funtley Hill, Fareham, Hampshire PO16 7UY Tel: 0844 892 1656 Fax: 0844 892 1657 www.towergaterisksolutions.co.uk



BIBA

Par Towergate Insurance is a trading name of Towergate Underwriting Group Limited Registered in England No.4043759 Registered Address: Towergate House, Eclipse Park, Sittingbourne Road, Maidstone, Kent ME14 3EN Authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority



01449 900120

