

INCE RESOURCE RECOVERY PARK

Metal Detector Survey

Peel Environmental Ince Ltd

July 2010

RSK GENERAL NOTES

Project No:	660001	660001						
Title:	Ince Resource Rec Metal Detector Sur	Ince Resource Recovery Park Metal Detector Survey						
Client: Peel Environmental Ince Ltd								
Issue Date:	ssue Date: October 2010							
Issuing Office:	Manchester	Manchester						
Authorised by:	Bed	Project Archaeologist	Date:	14.07.10				
	Owen Raybould	-						
Authorised by:	Brigitte Buss	Project QA Rep	Date:	15.07.10				
		-						

RSK Environment Ltd (RSK) has prepared this report for the sole use of the client, showing reasonable skill and care, for the intended purposes as stated in the agreement under which this work was completed. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and RSK. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Where any data supplied by the client or from other sources have been used it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by RSK for inaccuracies in the data supplied by any other party. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on the assumption that all relevant information has been supplied by those bodies from whom it was requested.

No part of this report may be copied or duplicated without the express permission of RSK and the party for whom it was prepared.

Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work.

This work has been undertaken in accordance with the Quality Management System of RSK Environment Ltd.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	NON- Ackno INTR	TECHNICAL SUMMARY wledgements ODUCTION	iv v 1
	1.1	Project Background	1
	1.2 1.2.1	Site Description Stratigraphical Sequence	2 <i>2</i>
0	1.3 1.3.1 1.3.2 1.3.3	Historical and Archaeological Background Prehistoric - Roman Early Medieval - Medieval Post Medieval - Modern	3 3 3 3
2		AND OBJECTIVES	5
	2.1	General Aims	5
3	2.3 METH	Specific Objectives	6 7
	3.1	Fieldwork	7
	3.1.1	Constraints	8
л	3.2	Interpretation	9
4 5	DISC	USSIONS	. 13
	5.1	Artefact Distribution	. 13
	5.2	Artefact Date	. 13
	5.2.1	Prehistoric	. 13
	5.2.2 5.2.3	Early Medieval	. 13
	5.2.4	Medieval	. 13
	5.2.5 5.2.6	Post-Medieval Twentieth Century	. 14
	5.2.7	World War II	. 15
<u> </u>	5.2.8		. 17
6	CON	CLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	-18
	6.1	Conclusions by Plot	5-18
	6.2	Conclusions by Date6	5-18
	6.3	Recommendations for Further Work6	3-20
7	6.4 BEEE	Archive Deposition6	3-21 7- 22
8	PLAT	ES	-22
9	FIGU	RES	-24
10	APPE	NDICES	-25

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

RSK Environment Ltd (RSK) was commissioned by Peel Environmental Ince Ltd to provide a metal-detector survey of the Ince Park application site in response to planning conditions issued by Cheshire Archaeology Planning Advisory Service (a joint service providing archaeological advice to Cheshire West and Chester Council, and Cheshire East Council).

The programme of fieldwork involved the systematic collection of subsurface metal artefacts as an indicator of past site use and/or the potential presence of subsurface archaeological features and structures and was carried out by a team of appropriately qualified volunteers in the winter of 2010. This report details the results of the metal detector survey complete with analysis of results.

All 36 plots within the application site boundary were subject to metal-detector survey, and the resulting assemblage comprises 392 objects.

The largest group of finds were fragments of ordnance dating from the Second World War (153 fragments) after which coins and tokens were the most common (107 items). It was found that the date range of the finds was very restricted, there was no prehistoric material. There is one Roman brooch and a possible Roman key. This material was followed by a long hiatus during which nothing was deposited on the site until the sixteenth century.

No positive evidence for a Bronze Age votive depositional site, nor a metalwork hoard dating to any period was found to exist in shallow deposits within the proposed application site boundary. However, the fieldwork and subsequent assessment has allowed the opportunity for a unique insight into a previously unstudied class of material, namely anti-aircraft shells.

Analysis according to the distribution of artefacts is flawed in this survey due to the substantial background scatter of modern imported material masking earlier deposits. Thus no concentrations of artefacts recovered have indicated areas of the site as requiring further intrusive archaeological field assessment.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc



Acknowledgements

Thanks to Mark Leah and Julie Edwards at CAPAS for consultation advice, and to Dr Kevin Leahy for research and specialist reporting.

Many thanks must be extended to the Crewe and Nantwich Metal Detecting Society, without whose dedication and enthusiasm to the cause this project would not have been possible, namely:

Robert Nicol, Mike Bull, Kathryn Brennan, Alan Ridgway, James Hurst, Roy Parkes, Roy Steele, Geoff Dickinson, Michael Burt, Andy Jones, Barry Norman, Paul Evans, Reg Baker, Don Cordem, Dave Colclough, Kim Colclough, M. Trow, and Trevor Brown (artefact recovery); Kevin Guest, and Neil Bradley (artefact recovery, processing and identification); and Colin Sharratt (artefact recovery and primary liaison). "Onwards and upwards".

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background

RSK Environment Ltd (RSK) was commissioned in 2005 by Peel Environmental Ince Ltd ('The Client') to provide an archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) for the Ince Resource Recovery Park in Cheshire. The DBA was included in an Environmental Statement (ES) submitted to Cheshire County Council in December 2007. Recommending further stages of archaeological assessment and mitigation measures, the location of the known archaeological resource identified through this DBA is presented on **Figure 1**.

A staged archaeological assessment has been accepted as the most effective way to determine archaeological mitigation measures, gathering information about the archaeological resource before designing and implementing mitigation strategies. This approach is in line with the guidance given in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 5, *Planning and the Historic Environment*.

Through consultation with Mark Leah, Development Control Archaeologist at Cheshire Archaeology Planning Advisory Service (a joint service providing archaeological advice to Cheshire West and Chester Council, and Cheshire East Council) (hereafter referred to as CAPAS), it was agreed that the first stage of further archaeological assessment was to comprise a metal-detector survey of the entire application site.

The programme of fieldwork was project managed by RSK and carried out by volunteers from the Crewe and Nantwich Metal Detecting Society (CNMDS) to a written scheme of investigation (WSI) (RSK October 2009) approved in advance by CAPAS.

RSK is a Registered Organisation (RO) with the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA). The programme of fieldwork was carried out in accordance with the IfA *Code of Conduct* (2008) and *Standard and Guidance for Field Evaluation* (2008), and the Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE) (English Heritage 2006)

Each individual volunteer of the CNMDS are affiliated to the National Council for Metal Detecting (NCMD) North West Region, and agree to the *Metal Detecting on Archaeological Excavations in Cheshire* Guidelines, prepared by the Detectorists and Archaeologists Liaison Group (DALG).

Justification for this stage of archaeological assessment is that an isolated find of a Bronze Age looped Spearhead was found in the area in the last century. The location and circumstance of this find were not properly recorded when it was found but it is thought to lie in the general vicinity of the proposed development.

This report describes the methodology, results, specialist discussions and conclusions of the metal detector fieldwork.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

1.2 Site Description

The site lies within the jurisdiction of Cheshire West and Chester Council (CWAC), located in an area known as Ince Marshes, lying to the east of the village of Ince, and to the north-east of Elton, Cheshire (**Figure 1**). The area of survey is directly adjacent to the Manchester Ship Canal and lies at between 4 – 6m above Ordnance Datum (OD). The approximate National Grid Reference for the site centre-point is **SJ 470 770**.

The site comprises c.134 ha of which, for the overall project, it is proposed to develop c.58 ha, the remainder being utilised for landscape and habitat creation works.

British Geological Survey (Sheet 97) indicates the solid geology of the site is Pebble Beds in the western half of the site and Upper Mottled Sandstone to the east, both of the Sherwood Sandstone Group. The drift geology is indicated as predominantly marine and estuarine alluvium. Drift geology is not indicated in two discrete areas of higher ground: Pebble Beds rise to the surface beneath Holme Farm, and a small island of Permo-Triassic Sandstone (Undifferentiated) is indicated at the location of the former Grinsome Farm.

The site comprises a relatively steep sided buried valley with shallow rock in the south western corner and deep deposits of peat and soft organic clay, over the majority of the site, to the east and north. The peat and soft organic clays and silts are underlain by medium dense to dense sand and stiff clay (WSP 2006).

1.2.1 Stratigraphical Sequence

Geotechnical reporting (WSP 2006 & 2010) recorded two layers of peat deposits across the majority of the development site, excluding the natural rise of the former Grinsome Farm site. An 'upper layer' of peat was recorded lying below between 0.9m and 5.9m; and a 'lower layer' of peat lying below between 6.8m and 12.3m.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

1.3 Historical and Archaeological Background

The locations of the known archaeological resource, identified and documented in previous desk-based archaeological assessments is presented on **Figure 1**.

1.3.1 Prehistoric - Roman

Although there is little evidence for prehistoric activity within the study area, baseline data records a chance find of a Bronze Age Looped Spearhead (RSK Site 16) discovered in 1892 in the vicinity of the site. Bronze Age items are commonly recovered from wetland areas, streams, rivers and inter tidal zones in numerous locations in Britain, ritually deposited as votive offerings in what was probably a wetland area during this period.

Although no details accompany the artefact, it was probably recovered from deep stratigraphy during excavations for the Manchester Ship Canal. It is now in the Shaw Museum, and a cast is in the Grosvenor Museum, Chester (NMR Ref 69509).

RSK site 16 presented the possibility that the single artefact was one of many, leading to a suggestion in previous desk-based assessments of further surviving remains from this period within the development site boundary.

RSK Sites 19 & 22 indicate a Roman presence within the study area. The proposed development area was probably marsh in this period reducing the likelihood that settlement, and significant archaeological deposits are located in the vicinity.

1.3.2 Early Medieval - Medieval

There are two sites within the study area whose place names suggest a Viking influence/origin: '*Grinsome*' and '*Holme*' Farms (RSK Sites 25 and 26). Furthermore, the name Ince is derived from the ancient word 'Ynys' or island and probably refers to a dry area or areas within the wetland marshes.

The area around the proposed development site was thought to have been sparsely occupied during the Medieval period, but is known for its Medieval standing manorial remains located at Ince Manor (RSK Site 18). Records from the period also indicate that in the 14th century costly attempts were made to drain and reclaim a marshy and waterlogged area around Ince and Frodsham.

1.3.3 Post Medieval - Modern

The study area is known to have been occupied during the Post-medieval period, and the area was subject to a reclamation programme through land drainage. This assertion is proven by a predominance of Post-medieval artefacts recovered from the site during the metal detector survey. In addition, the construction of the Manchester Ship Canal (RSK Site 20) made an impact on the study area.

World War II 'bomb decoy' sites are recorded in the direct vicinity of the proposed development site. RSK site 15 was commissioned in 1940 to deflect bombing from the city of Liverpool. The 'starfish' decoy operated by lighting a series of controlled fires during an air raid to replicate an urban area targeted

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

by bombs. The decoy site was visible as a series of demolished structures on subsequent air photographs. RSK site 17 was built by the Petroleum Board in 1941 to deflect bombing away from Stanlow oil refinery. This was an oil decoy, where oil was burned in specially-shaped pools and channels lined with brick or clay. No surface features of either decoy survive, although subsurface elements may be preserved.

The latest geotechnical assessment required an 'explosive ordnance threat assessment' (BACTEC for RSK STATS Geoconsult Ltd, February 2010) which was implemented at site-investigation locations only. BACTEC concluded a **medium-high** risk from unexploded ordnance (UXO) at the site.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 Legislation

The 1996 *Treasure Act* defines what constitutes 'Treasure', specifically:

1.—(I) Treasure is— Meaning of:

(a) any object at least 300 years old when found which— "treasure".

(i) is not a coin but has metallic content of which at least 10 per cent by weight is precious metal;

(ii) when found, is one of at least two coins in the same find which are at least 300 years old at that time and have that percentage of precious metal; or

(iii) when found, is one of at least ten coins in the same find which are at least 300 years old at that time;

(b) any object at least 200 years old when found which belongs to a

class designated under section 2(1);

(c) any object which would have been treasure trove if found before

the commencement of section 4;

(d) any object which, when found, is part of the same find as-

(i) an object within paragraph (a), (b) or (c) found at the same time or earlier; or

(ii) an object found earlier which would be within paragraph (a) or (b) if it had been found at the same time.

Any find of 'Treasure' must be reported to the local Coroner.

2.2 General Aims

A metal detector survey is the systematic collection of subsurface metal artefacts as an indicator of past site use and/or the potential presence of subsurface archaeological features and structures.

The general aim of the survey is to assist in the overall impact assessment of the development on known and potential archaeological constraints by:

• Collecting material remains with which to identify and determine the character, importance and date of potential archaeological remains present within the application site; and

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

• Providing an assessment of the potential importance of each plot with regard to archaeological and heritage resources with specific emphasis on identifying the former use of each plot.

2.3 Specific Objectives

Primarily, the specific objective of the metal detector survey was to address this possibility and provide a conclusion regarding the presence of a Bronze Age votive site within the application site boundary.

Secondly, the interpreted Viking site at the former Grinsome Farm was addressed as a particular focus for the metal detector survey, in that artefactual evidence would further support the hypothesis, currently based on place-name evidence only.

Finally, the exact location of WWII 'decoy' sites known in the vicinity are yet to be accurately identified and it was proposed that metal artefacts dating to this period could be used to focus further archaeological assessment.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

3 METHODOLOGY

Nominated metal detectors were required to sign a written agreement to waive all rights to claim any reward under the 1996 *Treasure Act*, in accordance with section 81 of the *Treasure Act Code of Practice*.

3.1 Fieldwork

A site code **IMMD-10** was allocated to the stage of fieldwork. The fieldwork was carried out between February 1st and March 12th 2010. A daily log was maintained recording attending staff and details of topography, land use, artefacts, and survey conditions including constraints.

The survey was undertaken under the supervision of an RSK archaeologist at all times, and covered the entire area of impact within the application site boundary. For the purposes of this report, the site was divided into numbered land-parcels (plots) (**Figure 2**).

The survey team consisted of a pool of 21 volunteer metal detectors. The team operated in one plot at a time, spending as much time as necessary until finds were no longer being retrieved before moving as a unit to the next plot (**Plates 1** – **3**). The project archaeologist divided larger plots into more manageable blocks in order to ensure sufficient time and resources were afforded to the whole survey area in equal measures.

This methodology was implemented following consultation with Colin Sharratt (CNMDS) who advised a phenomenon of magnetic responses of metal artefacts are such that they may be detected when passed in one direction, but not in another. It was, therefore, necessary not to operate the retrieval process in a rigid grid pattern, instead allowing for areas to be surveyed more than once, from multiple orientations in order to ensure a rigorous methodology.

Due to utilisation of GPS hardware neither was a grid system required for recording purposes, allowing retrieved artefacts to be recorded to sub-meter accuracy. A Trimble GeoXT GPS unit was used with Terrasync software.

In addition, an inspection of suitable (i.e. arable) surfaces was made by the onsite archaeologist and volunteers for non-metallic surface artefacts of archaeological significance.

Finds were removed from the ground placed into a sealed bag (**Plate 2**), and marked with a unique identification number ('small finds/SF'). Certain finds recognised as of potential archaeological significance were wrapped in acid-free tissue and stored in an appropriately sized protective case.

On average maximum survey depth for artefacts was found to be c.25cm. This depth was increased for larger objects, and decreased in ploughed fields due to a direct correlation with soil density (**Plate 3**).

Due to large numbers of modern artefacts (e.g. plough fragments) contained within the plough soil, and a primary aim of locating Bronze Age artefacts- a discriminatory search, to exclude iron, was carried out. However, as the survey developed some volunteers opted to utilise a non-discriminatory search in order

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

to assess relative responses across the site. Resultantly, only one ferrous artefact is included in the results.

Due to the possibility of unexploded ordnance (UXO) within the survey area, volunteers were expressly instructed not to dig below the horizon of strata previously disturbed by plough-action.

Certain types of artefact were retrieved in large numbers, specifically modern coinage and WWII projectiles, and it was agreed with CAPAS that these materials would be recorded on a plot basis ('unstratified finds/US'), rather than as individual small finds.

3.1.1 Constraints

Subsurface layers of peat have been confirmed across the development site through geotechnical site investigation, to be dated in forthcoming assessments associated with the mitigation programme for Ince Park. It is likely that one of these layers may date to the Bronze Age, thereby being the most likely location of contemporary votive deposits, however, the designed methodology did not allow for metal detector survey at such depths.

With hindsight, it is now considered most likely that the Bronze Age looped spearhead (RSK site 16) was recovered from these deeply stratified deposits during excavations for the Manchester Ship Canal. However, as this was unknown prior to the survey, and with the possibility that deep ploughing of some of the site could have brought deeper deposits to the surface, the metal detector survey was carried out over shallow deposits only.

Furthermore, numerous plots were found to be 'contaminated' through the importation of surface material containing, amongst other things, abundant tin foil, drinks and food cans. Frequent and uniform metal detector responses from such modern deposits served to mask any pre-modern artefacts stratified below. This was considered non-conducive to the metal detector survey. Following survey of a representative sample, survey in these plots focussed on field boundaries (a focus for historic activities), and especially adjacent to ditches where upcast may have contained early material from buried land-surfaces; and also adjacent to woodlands, considered possibly undisturbed throughout the modern period.

Additionally, the disposal of foul sewage across many plots prematurely ended survey as once identified, these plots were abandoned on health and safety grounds.

Metal-detector survey is not infallible. The nature of the technique means that following the survey, some artefacts are likely to remain undetected beneath the ground surface.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

3.2 Interpretation

Following completion of the fieldwork all artefacts were cleaned, and an initial assessment created an index of artefacts, comprising a provisional ID, material, and date.

All artefacts in the assemblage were marked with the site code, as well as according to the plot in which they were found, and an individual small find number corresponding to numbers in this report.

The assemblage was sent in this format to Dr Kevin Leahy, archaeological finds specialist, for analysis and discussion.

Finds were examined at x10 magnification, sketched and described. Materials were identified visually and dimensions were recorded using vernier callipers. Masses were obtained using an electronic balance to an accuracy of 0.01g or 0.1g in the case of large objects. All measurements are given in SI units. With the exception of coins all objects were sketched in pencil at full-size, sections being drawn of complex items. The dimensions recorded were those of the fragments; if the original proportions could be estimated they are given separately. All artefacts were sketch drawn.

With the agreement of CAPAS, no x-radiography was undertaken.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

4 **RESULTS**

All 36 plots within the application site boundary were subject to metal-detector survey (**Figure 2**): three were abandoned prematurely due to surface disposal of foul sewage (plots 4, 5 & 30); and one was found entirely unsuitable for survey due to its recent use as a rubbish dump (the former Grinsome Farm site, plot 35).

A 'background scatter' of post-medieval and modern material was noted and interpreted as indicative of 'night-soiling'/soil improvement only, and these artefacts were noted as such in the daily log and not retained..

The metalwork assemblage comprises 392 objects. The material was found to be in generally poor condition from what must be a severely aggressive environment, copper alloy objects of recent date had suffered loss of surface and older objects, particularly coins, had lost all surface detail could only be identified by module. Ferrous elements of composite objects were found to be poorly preserved.

The entire assemblage is presented as **Appendix A**, with summaries in this Results section, and Discussions regarding trends in the data in Part 5.

Material	Count
Aluminium	9
Cast iron	1
Copper alloy (Ae)	343
Lead	28
Pewter	8
Silver	5

Table 4	.1	Summary	v of	materials	count
1 4 5 10 1	••	Gainna	,	matomato	oount

The largest group of finds were fragments of ordnance dating from the Second World War (153 fragments) after which coins and tokens were the most common (107 items).

It was found that the date range of the finds was very restricted, there was no prehistoric material. No Bronze Age, or potentially Bronze Age, metalwork was present. There is one Roman brooch (Plot 21/SF 008) and a possible Roman key (Plot 21/SF 005). This material was followed by a long hiatus during which nothing was deposited on the site until the sixteenth century, a situation probably explained by the marsh conditions prior to drainage (see Part 1.3.2).

Table 4.2. Summary of survey conditions per plot & artefact count

Plot	Current Land Use	Archaeological Notes/ Constraints	Count: Small Finds	Count: Unstratified	Interpreted Former Land Use
1	Pasture	Uneven ground surface due to possible quarrying in plot SW corner. Also dumped demolition rubble to E boundary. Finds relate to former arable field practice.	2	12	Arable
2	Pasture	Uneven ground surface thought to represent removed former field boundaries/ internal	1	5	

		plot drainage channels.			
3	Pasture		0	3	
4	Silage	Abandoned due to foul sewage.	0	3	
5	Silage	Abandoned due to foul sewage. Modern imported material ploughed in to significant depth. Finds relate to former arable field practice.	4	4	Arable
6	Pasture	Modern imported material masks earlier deposits/artefacts.	0	2	
7	Pasture	Uneven ground surface thought to represent internal plot drainage channels. Finds relate to former arable field practice.	3	10	Arable
8	Arable: Ploughed	Crop marks noted on aerial photo. Evidence of soil-improvement.	5	6	
9	Pasture		0	1	
10	Pasture		1	3	
11	Pasture		1	16	
12	Pasture	Modern imported material masks earlier deposits/artefacts.	2	7	
13	Pasture	Finds relate to former arable field practice.	5	19	Arable
14	Pasture	Finds relate to former arable field practice.	6	10	Arable
15	Pasture		1	9	
16	Arable: Planted	Evidence of soil-improvement.	0	10	
17	Arable: Ploughed	Ground surface not rolled reducing penetration depth of survey. Evidence of soil-improvement.	0	19	
18	Pasture	Ridge and furrow.	0	15	Arable
19	Pasture		2	11	
20	Pasture	Uneven ground surface	0	7	
21	Arable: Planted	Evidence of soil-improvement.	6	20	
22	Arable: Planted	Surface pottery and pipe stem noted – soil improvement. Evidence of soil-improvement.	5	9	Arable
23	Silage	Uneven ground surface thought to represent internal plot drainage channels. Finds relate to former arable field practice.	0	26	Arable
24	Silage	Base of natural raised geology – former accessible interface area to marsh land	2	0	
25	Silage		2	6	
26	Silage		2	9	
27	Silage	Modern imported material masks earlier deposits/artefacts.	1	3	
28	Meadow/ Set-aside		0	4	
29	Arable: Ploughed	Base of natural raised geology – former accessible interface area to marsh land. Evidence of soil-improvement. Finds relate to former arable field practice.	10	23	Arable / Possible dumping ground for Grinsome Farm
30	Arable: Ploughed	Abandoned due to foul sewage. Modern imported material masks earlier deposits/artefacts. Evidence of soil-improvement.	2	1	
31	Mixed – ½ Arable: Ploughed,	Plot incorporates natural high point and falls to base of natural raised geology – former accessible interface area to marsh land.	8	17	Possible dumping ground for

	½ silage	Modern imported material masks earlier deposits/artefacts. Evidence of soil-improvement.			Grinsome Farm
32	Silage		2	0	
33	Silage	Modern imported material masks earlier deposits/artefacts.	0	1	
34	Arable: Planted	Ground level has been significantly raised in comparison to adjacent plots. Also contains abundant plastics: Modern imported material. Evidence of soil-improvement.	3	17	
35	Waste/ woodland	Modern rubbish dump.	0	0	Domestic – Grinsome Farmstead
36	Arable: Ploughed	Modern imported material masks earlier deposits/artefacts. Evidence of soil-improvement.	4	4	

To analyse the finds from the site it was assigned to a series of time-bands, into which the finds were allocated. As many of the objects were poorly preserved it was often possible only to place them into a broad time band, a corroded penny could date to any time from the change to a bronze coinage in 1860 to the last issue of pre-decimal coins in 1967.

Code	Date range	Count
Roman	Roman, AD 43-100	2
T1	Tudor, Early, 1485-1540	1
T2	Tudor, Late, 1540-1603	1
CC	17th century	2
GG	Georgian, 1717-1830	15
G2	George II, 1729-1754	2
G3	George III, 1770-1807	5
GV	George IV-Victoria, 1825-1860	24
V1	Victoria, copper issue, 1837-1860	7
VE	Victoria-Elizabeth II, 1860-1967	20
VG	Victoria-George V, 1860-1935	38
VV	Victoria, 1837-1901	3
V2	Victoria, bronze issue, 1860-1901	16
E7	Edward VII, 1901-1911	5
EG	Edward VII, George VI, 1901-1952	3
G5	George V, 1911-1935	18
G6	George VI, 1936-1952	10
GE	George VI-Elizabeth II, 1936-1967	19
WW	World War II, 1940-1944	153
E2	Elizabeth II, 1953-current	13
ND	Not dated	35

 Table 4.3.
 Summary of artefacts by date (Note Overlaps)

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

5 DISCUSSIONS

5.1 Artefact Distribution

Clusters of artefacts may be taken as an indication for subsurface archaeological features; or linear distributions of artefacts may be interpreted as former trackways – 'hot-spots' for accidental loss of transportable artefacts.

However, analysis according to the distribution of artefacts is flawed in this survey due to the substantial background scatter of modern imported material masking earlier deposits. Spatial patterning is thus an unreliable indicator for the results of this survey.

5.2 Artefact Date

5.2.1 Prehistoric

No Prehistoric artefacts were recovered during the survey.

5.2.2 Roman

Two artefacts were retrieved from Plot 21, one of which was positively dated, the other potentially dated to the Roman period:

(21/008) Brooch, cast copper alloy, end of foot missing, bow plain, terminating in a flat panel on which is the remains of a hook. Underside of arms hollow, pin missing: Roman brooch of 'Polden Hill' type (**Plate 4**).

(21/005) Cast object consisting of a flat, blade-like section (11.5 x 4.0mm) developing from a heavier section that may have consisted of a double loop: Part of a key? Roman? (**Plate 5**).

A third artefact retrieved from Plot 31 was tentatively dated to the Roman period also:

(31/003) Coin, most likely a farthing but it looks asymmetric and could be a Roman radiate.

5.2.3 Early Medieval

No Early Medieval artefacts were recovered during the survey.

5.2.4 Medieval

One artefact retrieved from Plot 19 was tentatively dated to the Medieval period:

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

(19/003) Often described as bird feeders these lead vessels are rather deep for this function and it has been suggested that they could have been holy water holders. The religious symbols on some examples would support this interpretation: C16th? (**Plate 6**).

(34/005) In addition, however, the form of a cast iron cannon ball retrieved from Plot 34 is dated to between 1490 - 1870.

5.2.5 Post-Medieval

Miscellaneous

Two artefacts were retrieved from Plots 21 & 22, one of which was positively identified, the other potentially identified as early post-medieval jettons:

(21/002) Nuremberg jetton or casting counter, Obv. Reichesapfel surrounded by a fictitious inscription 'BM. BA.MBAM BA...Rev. Crown and lys, inscription?: late C16th (**Plate 7**).

(22/014) Jetton? Poor condition, much loss of surface, slightly bent sheet metal disc: Not datable.

The making of 'Love Tokens' is a post Medieval practice which continued into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries:

(24/001) No detail survives but the presence of two fold marks (and the removal of the surface) suggests that this object has been made into a 'Love Token': Not datable.

(29/015) Coin, surfaces removed and bearing double folds. Love Token, probably based on a sixpence: C18th.

The presence of an Ottoman coin may be taken as an indication of longdistance links of the survey area due to the immediate presence of the Manchester Ship Canal:

(31/004) Coin, 'Tughra' (probably of Sultan Abd al-Mejid I) on one face, inscription on other. 1839-1861.

Broken artefacts dated to the post-medieval period, such as the toy gun fragments from Plots 2 & 5, the spoon handles from Plots 2 & 29, or the hat pin from Plot 29 suggest domestic rubbish was spread in these areas during this period.

The presence of post-medieval musket balls (dating 1600+) in Plots 13, 29 & 31 may be the result of hunting or target practice.

Buckles & Buttons

The oldest buckles found on the site dates to the C16th and C18th respectively:

(26/005) Buckle cast in pewter. Originally two frame with central bar, decorative finials on corners and central projection. 1620-1680.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

(13/010) Fragment of copper alloy buckle frame, decorated with clusters of leaves and pellets, axial hole for an iron pin/bar. 1720-1790.

Numerous buckles (Plots 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31 & 36) and buttons (Plots 13, 17, 22, 23, 26, 27, & 29) from clothing were recorded during the survey. Artefacts from clothing were not recovered from every plot, however, such artefacts occurred in all areas across the site.

Although many of these artefacts may represent accidental loss incurred during agricultural work across the subject land, it is known that clothing, being made of entirely organic (rather than synthetic) materials during the postmedieval periods – were composted on arable plots once no longer useful as clothing, forming part of 'soil improvement' processes practised on arable land.

Coins (by Dr Kevin Leahy)

The coin find-spot evidence suggests that there was little activity in the area until the 18th century during which 22 Georgian coins were lost on the site. This could have been a result of drainage, bringing the land into cultivation, but other mechanisms are possible and historical sources would need to be consulted to resolve the issue.

Activity continued into the 19th century, with the loss of 31 coins; the increased number need not necessarily point to an intensification in activity on the site as many more coins were in circulation at this later date.

The coins show a greatly increased level of activity over the survey area during the Second World War, considering that coins as early as 1860 were still in common circulation in the 1940s and could have been lost by staff manning nearby decoy sites (see Part 5.2.7).

5.2.6 Twentieth Century

The presence of three finger rings in the assemblage (Plots 14, 16 & 30) are probably representations of accidental loss.

5.2.7 World War II

Anti-Aircraft Shells (by Dr Kevin Leahy)

There was a great increase in activity at Ince Marshes during the Second World War with the construction of the 'QF' and 'Permanent Starfish' decoys on the site. The term 'QF' probably came from decoy Q ships, the armed merchant vessels which were intended to attract, and destroy, surfaced U boats. This was combined with 'F' for fire, baskets containing flammable materials and oil being set alight on the site. From the air these resembled burning buildings or, as at Ince, an oil refinery onto which the Germans would drop their bombs. The HER entry expresses surprise that the Ince 'QF' decoy was immediately adjacent to the Stanlow oil refinery which it was supposed to be protecting. Decoys were usually located well away from the site they were covering, perhaps there were factors of which we are unaware. 'Starfish' (from 'Special Fire' 'SF' back formed to the code-word 'Starfish') were designed to represent, when seen from the air, a burning city, thus drawing second waves

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

of German bombers away from their real target, which in this case, was Liverpool. The 'Starfish' defences of Liverpool were not seen as a great success and were considered to be too far from the City to be effective (Dobinson, 2000, 213).

The most significant Second World War material on the site are fragments of anti-aircraft shells. These consist, in the main of 91 fragments of copper driving bands which were fitted around the lower parts of the steel shell casings. The rifling was able to bite into the soft copper which also ensured a tight fit between the projectile and the barrel. These are not 'Shrapnel' which consisted of lead balls and was not used after the First World War. The high level of fragmentation made if difficult to obtain measurements but it appears that two types of shell are represented, one with a 50mm wide driving band (50 examples) the other with a 36mm wide driving band the numbers of which cannot be determined.

The other shell fragments found were parts of the time-fuses from shells of which 59 were recovered many of which were small. half weighing less than 20 grams. So far as could be determined these were all of the 'MT' (Mechanical Time) type, the simpler 'combustion' fuses were absent. MT fuses were exploded by a clockwork mechanism while combustion fuses were based on a powder trail within the casing which set to burn for a specified time before setting off the main charge. Despite the platitude that 'the weapon of the artillery is the projectile not the gun' the literature on shell types is not good. Some of the aluminium fuse caps of Type F were marked 'No 209-11 TG CO 5/40' but unfortunately it proved impossible to obtain details of this fuse type. However, it can be seen from the illustration Time Fuse 206 Mark 1 on Figure 3 that most of the components found on Ince Marshes bear a general resemblance to this type. The development of ordnance was rapid during the World War and it is likely that 'No 209' was a type that failed to appear in the sources now available to us. It would seem that this fuse had been manufactured in May, 1940. In order to carry out an assessment of the fuses a local classification was established, the main types being shown of Figure 3.

Type A was the most common type with 23 fragments being identified. Type Q was not a coherent group but is made up of fragments of plates that are likely to have held the clockwork mechanism. There were five examples of the aluminium nose cap, Type F and Type H was also represented by five examples. It is unlikely that these fuses can be linked to a particular shell or calibre as the same fuse could be used on different projectiles. These fragments all come from heavy anti-aircraft guns, 4.5-inch or 3.7-inch, and not from a 40mm Bofors. Records and surviving remains show the presence of a heavy anti-aircraft battery close to the Marsh at Bare Brick House, Ince, (Cheshire HER Number 4144). This was in existence in 1940 and in 1942 this was armed with two 3.7-inch guns. It is, however, unlikely that the fragments found on the site came from this battery, a 3.7-inch gun can fire a shell to a height of 30,000 feet and the fragments will come to earth miles away. In August 1941 anti-aircraft batteries were instructed to put up covering barrages over Starfish sites as the absence of protecting fire would have raised the suspicions of the German bomber crews (Dobinson 2000, 134). It is likely that this was the source of the fragments found at Ince Marshes.

So far as can be determined none of the material found on the site was German. The most likely evidence for German bombs would be presence of

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

the fins from incendiary bombs. These were made from steel but, unfortunately, iron objects were not collected during the survey. The other possible evidence would be fragments from the steel casings of bombs, the curvature of which would have revealed their large size and origin. In view of the 'poor performance' of the Liverpool decoys it is possible that the Ince Marches site was never visited by German bombing raids.

5.2.8 Not Datable

Artefacts that have not been dated following specialist analysis, and can be grouped in to categories are as follows:

Metal-Working

Artefacts thought to have derived from various metal-working processes were retrieved from Plots 1 (numerous), 21, 29 & 34. The material is derived from varied sources such as spillage, casting waste, punching waste, and metal-working off-cuts.

Lead

Examples of unidentified lead objects were recorded across the survey area (Plots 5, 8, 29, 30, 31 & 34). These are thought to derive from building rubble.

Spindle Whorls

Two examples of spindle whorls were recorded during the survey:

(13/001) Annular weight, barrel-shaped, asymmetrical, flat in some areas; and

(32/001) Lead disc with a 10.8mm diameter central hole (Plate 8).

Unfortunately neither of the artefacts could be dated, but examples of lead spindle whorls are known from archaeological contexts in England from the Iron Age period onwards.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusions by Plot

Conclusions cannot be drawn for a number of plots to the practice of dumping modern materials (including tin cans and metal foil) in order to 'improve' the soil. These materials have served to mask underlying deposits, constraining the survey at these locations.

The lack of material pre-dating the post-medieval period in the plots towards the centre of the site is worthy of note, since modern imported material was not present, and survey conditions noted as good in plots 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, & 26. This could reflect the centre of the survey area was the latest area subject to drainage/reclamation.

By far the densest area of artefacts retrieved as part of the metal-detector survey was from the natural mound surmounted by the former Grinsome Farm (plots 29, 30, 31, 35, & 36). The cluster of artefacts from plot 29 has led to the suggestion that it is this direction that rubbish from the post-medieval farm was discarded.

The complete lack of artefacts from the actual site of Grinsome Farm is the result of subsequent use of the site as a tip, which has constrained the metal-detector assessment.

There are no particular differences in the type of artefact retrieved from the plots alongside the Manchester Ship Canal to indicate that the origin of the artefacts / discard methods were different from those across the remainder of the site.

6.2 Conclusions by Date

Prehistoric Artefacts

With reference to the first specified objective of this stage of assessment, the main drive behind the project was the potential identification of a prehistoric archaeological site, no positive evidence for a Bronze Age votive depositional site, nor a metalwork hoard dating to any period was found to exist in shallow deposits within the proposed application site boundary.

Roman Artefacts

The Roman dated artefacts demonstrate a presence in the vicinity prior to drainage activities in the post-medieval period. The location of the artefacts in plot 21 may indicate that, if not wetland, this area was estuarine at this period. Whether wetland or estuarine, exploitation would be expected due to the various foods and other resources available from both landscapes.

Whereas it is interesting that two artefacts potentially dated to the Roman period were retrieved from the same plot (21), the artefact types are not

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

indicative of subsurface features, and are more likely the result of accidental loss/casual discard in a wetland environment.

Viking Artefacts

With reference to the second specified objective of the project, although no artefacts of demonstrated Viking date were recorded from the retrieved assemblage, it is noted that the survey was constrained by considerable background 'noise' of modern material at the location of interpreted Viking presence.

It is tentatively noted, however, that two lead spindle whorls located within the survey area may have been in use in this period.

Medieval Artefacts

Despite documentary sources citing land reclamation of the survey area during the post-medieval period, Medieval artefacts were recovered during the metal detector survey. The artefacts, however, do not indicate a significant presence, so backing up the documentary sources.

The cannonball was likely fired into the marsh land, and the bird feeder/holy water container was likely a relic lost during the post-medieval period.

Post-Medieval Artefacts

Although exclusively agricultural, former land use can be inferred through the metal detector assemblage which differs in places to that of today:

Certain post-medieval artefacts are indicative of a contemporaneous arable land use, such as the lead seal from Plot 5, the palm guard from Plot 7, the traders tokens from Plots 7 & 8, or the traders weights from Plots 13 & 36. The large number of buttons recovered in particular from Plots 13 & 23 suggest arable land use in these plots during this period. Additionally, buckles from (working) animal harnesses were recorded in Plots 1, 7, 14 & 29, also inferring an arable land use.

Furniture fittings were commonly recovered during the survey (Plots 1, 2?, 7, 14, 21?, 22 & 31) may represent where old furniture was burned and the ashes spread on to arable land.

Similarly, certain artefacts indicate a pastoral land use in the post-medieval period, such as the animal bells in retrieved from Plots 29 & 36, however, animals are known to graze on recently harvested arable plots.

Twentieth Century Artefacts

The majority of modern artefacts, such as plumber's waste (Plot 5), thimble (Plot 29), toy cow (Plot 29), or decorative cup (Plot 31) are considered the result of 'manuring' – whereby modern rubbish is thrown or mixed in with manure at the farmyard and later ploughed in to farmland in order to enrich it.

There is a lack of modern discarded artefacts in the assemblage from Plot 18 which can be explained by the preserved (post-medieval) ridge and furrow

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

earthworks, indicating that the plot has not been ploughed or 'improved' in the more recent periods.

Based on the fact that artefacts derived from metal-working comprise various materials, such as copper and aluminium, and that the artefact types are so varied, suggests that rubbish from the various processes, and from various sources has been spread across the site. It is, not considered likely that metal working has historically been carried out on the proposed development site.

WWII 'decoy' sites

With reference to the third specified objective of the project, the distribution of shell fragments have not enabled conclusions to be drawn of the exact location of subsurface elements of World War II 'bomb decoy' sites recorded in the direct vicinity of the proposed development site (RSK sites 15 & 17).

However, the fieldwork and subsequent assessment has allowed the opportunity for a unique insight into a previously unstudied class of material, namely anti-aircraft shells.

6.3 Recommendations for Further Work

Distribution of Artefacts

No concentrations of artefacts recovered have indicated areas of the site as requiring further intrusive archaeological field assessment.

Conservation

It is not considered that any of this material would benefit from cleaning or conservation; unlike most of the other copper alloy found on the site the two Roman objects appear stable.

Anti-Aircraft Shell Assemblage

Further research might reveal more details of the fuses being used and possibly the source of the fragments being found on the site could be traced. It is likely that there will be people in the area who remember the decoys being used, and while recollections of this sort can be unreliable, oral history recordings might prove useful. This is the sort of work that could be undertaken by a local group or military enthusiasts.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

6.4 Archive Deposition

The treatment of artefacts has been in accordance with IfA's 'Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials' (IfA Finds Group 2008).

A permanent archive comprising the metal detector assemblage and Dr Leahy's original notes and sketches will be labelled, packed and stored in accordance with the requirements of Cheshire West and Chester Museum Service.

All archiving requirements will be agreed with CAPAS.

A copy of this report is held at the Cheshire West Historic Environment Record.

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

7 **REFERENCES**

Dobinson, C, 2000, *Fields of Deception: Britain's Bombing Decoys of World War II*, Methuen, London

English Heritage, 2006, *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment*, The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide

WSP, September 2006, *Ince Marshes, Cheshire, Geotechnical and Environmental Site Investigation Interpretive Report*, unpublished report for Peel Investments (North) Ltd

RSK, December 2007, *Ince Resource Recovery Park Environmental Statement*, unpublished report for Peel Environmental Ince Ltd

Institute for Archaeologists, 2008, Code of conduct

Institute for Archaeologists, 2008, *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*

Institute for Archaeologists, 2008, *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials*

RSK, October 2009, *Ince Resource Recovery Park, Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Metal Detector Survey*, unpublished WSI for Peel Environmental Ince Ltd

WSP April 2010, *Ground Investigation Report, Resource Recovery Park, Ince Marshes*, unpublished commercial report for Peel Investments (North) Ltd

BACTEC February 2010, *Explosive Ordnance Threat Assessment in respect of Ince Marshes, Chester, Cheshire,* unpublished commercial report for RSK Stats Geoconsult Ltd

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

8 PLATES

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

9 FIGURES

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

10 APPENDICES

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

APPENDIX A – CATALOGUE

Table 4.4. Summary	ot	artefacts
--------------------	----	-----------

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N
1	SF 003	Ae	Dec mount	38.4	15.02	VE	345887	376884
1	SF004	Ae	Waste	50	18.43	ND	345876	376921
1	US 01	Ae	Farthing	23.9	3.52	G2	345875	376912
1	US 02	Ae	Penny	30.8	7.54	V2	345875	376912
1	US 03	Ae	Half	24.7	4.05	V2	345875	376912
1	US 04	Ae	Farthing	19.9	1.98	V2	345875	376912
1	US 05	Ae	Belt fitting	49	3.45	GE	345875	376912
1	US 06	Ae	Buckle	36.21	10.36	GE	345875	376912
1	US 07	Ae	Buckle	25.03	4.25	GE	345875	376912
1	US 08	Ae	Spillage	40.4	11.8	ND	345875	376912
1	US 09	Ae	DB	48.8	34.02	ww	345875	376912
1	US 10	Ae	DB	49.4	15.85	ww	345875	376912
1	US 11	Ae	DB	49.9	18.25	ww	345875	376912
1	US 12	Ae	TFA	70	36.94	ww	345875	376912
2	SF 003	Pewter	Тоу	44.8	14.51	VE	345908	376964
2	US 01	Ae	Belt fitting	50.6	11.97	GE	345915	376974
2	US 02	Pewter	Spoon	67	8.88	V2	345915	376974
2	US 03	Ae	Penny	30.4	7.93	V2	345915	376974
2	US 04	Ae	Half	27.4	6.05	V1	345915	376974
2	US 05	Ae	Half	27.6	6.32	V1	345915	376974
3	US 01	Ae	TFQ	44	66.7	ww	345955	377046
3	US 02	Ae	DB	35.2	16.85	ww	345955	377046
3	US 03	Ae	Half	27.8	6.36	V1	345955	377046
	-			-			-	
4	US 01	Ae	TFQ	40	15.66	ww	345972	377198
4	US 02	Ae	Half	25	4.44	VE	345972	377198
4	US 03	Ae	Penny	30.5	6.65	VE	345972	377198
	-			-			-	
5	SF 002	Aluminium	Punching	10.3	0.21	GE	346103	377140
5	SF 004	Lead	Unknown	45.3	186.4	ND	346056	377061
5	SF 006	Lead	Waste	28.7	31.14	GE	346064	377049
5	SF 008	Pewter	Тоу	68.1	53.7	V2	346024	377046
5	US 01	Ae	Half	25.4	4.92	E2	346059	377088
5	US 02	Ae	Half	25.4	4.4	V2	346059	377088
5	US 03	Ae	Penny	33.8	6.01	GV	346059	377088
5	US 04	Lead	Seal	21	9.14	VE	346059	377088
6	US 01	Ae	Shilling, fake	23.3	5.43	V2	346161	377263
6	US 02	Ae	TFA	70	547.5	ww	346161	377263
7	SF 002	Ae	Buckle	48.6	10.65	GG	346189	377170

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N
7	SF 003	Lead	Disc	84.3	410.8	V2	346201	377135
7	SF 007	Ae	Penny	35	23.31	G3	346204	377189
7	US 01	Ae	DB	49.5	22.29	ww	346221	377140
7	US 02	Ae	DB	50	24.48	ww	346221	377140
7	US 03	Ae	DB	22	7.32	ww	346221	377140
7	US 04	Ae	TFA	70	6.51	ww	346221	377140
7	US 05	Ae	Token	25.2	3.87	VG	346221	377140
7	US 06	Ae	Half	25.4	4.9	V2	346221	377140
7	US 07	Ae	Farthing	21.7	4.12	GV	346221	377140
7	US 08	Ae	Buckle	66	44.13	VG	346221	377140
7	US 09	Ae	Buckle	27.8	9.97	VG	346221	377140
7	US 10	Ae	Hasp	81.2	160.3	GV	346221	377140
			1					
8	SF 001	Ae	Weight	20.2	11.47	ND	346393	377156
8	SF 002	Ae	Token	33.9	14.93	G3	346388	377127
8	SF 003	Ae	Half	27.8	5.33	GV	346372	377169
8	SF 004	Ae	Medallion	33.1	13.06	E7	346324	377163
8	SF 005	Lead	Vessel	38.7	64.7	ND	346301	377266
8	US 01	Ae	DB	49.7	36.28	ww	346313	377242
8	US 02	Ae	DB	50	36.55	ww	346313	377242
8	US 03	Ae	DB	49	27.19	ww	346313	377242
8	US 04	Ae	DB	28	11.04	ww	346313	377242
8	US 05	Ae	DB	26	9.72	ww	346313	377242
8	US 06	Ae	DB	46.9	14.75	ww	346313	377242
	-					-		-
9	US 01	Lead	Тоу	43.8	45.21	VG	346423	377229
10	SF 001	Aluminium	Machine part	52.7	7.16	GE	346595	377204
10	US 01	Ae	DB	49.2	18.99	ww	346545	377271
10	US 02	Ae	TFA	60	22.15	ww	346545	377271
10	US 03	Ae	Unknown	24	16.08	GE	346545	377271
			1					
11	SF 003	Ae	Ring, wire	27.8	2.31	GE	346668	377295
11	US 01	Ae	DB	36.4	10.09	ww	346637	377288
11	US 02	Ae	DB	26	8.18	ww	346637	377288
11	US 03	Ae	Half	25.3	5.19	E2	346637	377288
11	US 04	Ae	Half	25.3	4.69	G5	346637	377288
11	US 05	Ae	Penny	30.6	8.6	EG	346637	377288
11	US 06	Ae	Penny	30.8	8.94	G5	346637	377288
11	US 07	Ae	Penny	30.7	8.8	E2	346637	377288
11	US 08	Ae	Penny	30.6	7.6	V2	346637	377288
11	US 09	Ae	Penny	30.9	8.39	G5	346637	377288
11	US 10	Ae	Half	25	4.25	G6	346637	377288
11	US 11	Ae	Half	25.1	4.77	G6	346637	377288
11	US 12	Ae	Quarter dollar	23.7	5.16	E2	346637	377288
11	US 13	Ae	Half	19.9	2.3	G5	346637	377288

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N
11	US 14	Ae	Farthing	19.8	1.6	EG	346637	377288
11	US 15	Ae	Half New penny	17	1.56	E2	346637	377288
11	US 16	Ae	Half New penny	17	1.62	E2	346637	377288
	1		1		T			n
12	SF 001	Ae	Machine part		75.7	ND	346737	377250
12	SF 002	Ae	Unknown	24.5	2	ND	346734	377247
12	US 01	Ae	DB	49	19.68	WW	346744	377318
12	US 02	Ae	DB	37	12.48	WW	346744	377318
12	US 03	Ae	Half-crown	32	12.83	G6	346744	377318
12	US 04	Ae	Penny	30.8	8.53	G5	346744	377318
12	US 05	Ae	Penny	30.6	9.33	VE	346744	377318
12	US 06	Ae	Farthing	22.9	4.18	G3	346744	377318
12	US 07	Ae	Farthing	20.7	2.22	VE	346744	377318
	1		1		1		1	1
13	SF 001	Lead	Weight	20.3	37.47	ND	346074	376616
13	SF 004	Lead	Ball, musket	18.1	34.17	ND	346095	376722
13	SF 006	Pewter	Button	20.8	5.98	CC	346067	376607
13	SF 009	Lead	Disc	26	20.28	ND	346033	376894
13	SF 010	Ae	Buckle	9.9	4.45	GG	346005	376786
13	US 01	Ae	DB	50.6	43.21	ww	346039	376738
13	US 02	Ae	DB	40	15.78	ww	346039	376738
13	US 03	Ae	DB	35.7	12.97	ww	346039	376738
13	US 04	Ae	DB	36.2	12.23	ww	346039	376738
13	US 05	Ae	DB	36	10.71	ww	346039	376738
13	US 06	Ae	DB	26.8	10.01	ww	346039	376738
13	US 07	Ae	TFA	37.4	10.36	ww	346039	376738
13	US 08	Ae	TFQ	34.7	14.98	ww	346039	376738
13	US 09	Ae	TFQ	32	9.35	ww	346039	376738
13	US 10	Ae	TF	20	4.01	ww	346039	376738
13	US 11	Ae	Weight	33.6	25.44	GV	346039	376738
13	US 12	Ae	Button	24.2	4.73	VG	346039	376738
13	US 13	Ae	Button	25	4.94	VG	346039	376738
13	US 14	Ae	Button	23.6	4.12	VG	346039	376738
13	US 15	Ae	Button	24	1.88	VG	346039	376738
13	US 16	Ae	Button	15.6	1.09	VG	346039	376738
13	US 17	Ae	Weight	18	6.06	VV	346039	376738
13	US 18	Ae	Half	27.4	5.87	GV	346039	376738
13	US 19	Ae	Penny	30	8.85	G6	346039	376738
		1	Γ		r	1	1	
14	SF 001	Ae	Medallion	18	0.56	GG	346063	376942
14	SF 003	Ae	Ring, finger	19.4	1.43	GE	346069	376931
14	SF 005	Ae	Buckle	17	2.45	GE	346130	376961
14	SF 006	Lead	Decorative fragment	32	10.42	VG	346102	376839
14	SF 011	Lead	Ingot	80	319.6	ND	346121	376820
14	SF 018	Ae	Buckle	32.4	7.56	GG	346085	376880
14	US 01	Ae	DB	34.7	17.94	WW	346116	376893

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N	
14	US 02	Ae	DB	47.8	7.88	ww	346116	376893	
14	US 03	Ae	Penny	29.9	6.64	EG	346116	376893	
14	US 04	Ae	Half	24.9	4.06	VV	346116	376893	
14	US 05	Ae	Harness	60.8	101.8	VG	346116	376893	
14	US 06	Ae	Handle	61.6	61.4	VG	346116	376893	
14	US 07	Ae	Buckle	27.6	9.68	VG	346116	376893	
14	US 08	Ae	Decorative mount	52.9	6.65	VG	346116	376893	
14	US 09	Lead	Weight	20	12.29	VG	346116	376893	
14	US 10	Lead	Seal	22.8	18.93	VG	346116	376893	
15	SF 004	Ae	Spur	108	54	GE	346191	376653	
15	US 01	Ae	DB	49.7	28.86	ww	346146	376693	
15	US 02	Ae	DB	48.6	30.94	ww	346146	376693	
15	US 03	Ae	DB	51.4	19.44	ww	346146	376693	
15	US 04	Ae	DB	37.5	12.39	ww	346146	376693	
15	US 05	Ae	DB	37.2	11.34	ww	346146	376693	
15	US 06	Ae	TFQ	34.7	20.71	ww	346146	376693	
15	US 07	Ae	TF	24.4	8.53	ww	346146	376693	
15	US 08	Ae	Penny	30.5	8.69	G5	346146	376693	
15	US 09	Ae	Medallion	19.1	1.12	vv	346146	376693	
16	SF 001	Silver	Ring, finger	19	2.59	GE	346668	376699	
16	US 01	Ae	DB	18.7	9.4	ww	346676	376618	
16	US 02	Ae	TFQ	25.8	4.91	ww	346676	376618	
16	US 04	Ae	Penny	30.4	7.76	E2	346676	376618	
16	US 05	Ae	Penny	30.4	8.22	VE	346676	376618	
16	US 06	Ae	Penny	30.4	7.01	VE	346676	376618	
16	US 07	Ae	Half	25	3.69	VE	346676	376618	
16	US 08	Ae	Ten pence	25.2	3.68	E2	346676	376618	
16	US 09	Ae	Farthing	20.8	3.69	VE	346676	376618	
16	US 10	Ae	Half new penny	17	1.53	E2	346676	376618	
17	US 01	Ae	TFC	65	80.2	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 02	Ae	TFA	60	36.8	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 03	Ae	TFQ	35.7	9.91	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 04	Ae	TFQ	29.4	9.73	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 05	Ae	TFQ	19	5.46	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 06	Ae	DB	48	22.16	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 07	Ae	DB	50.4	19	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 08	Ae	DB	48.4	21.76	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 09	Ae	DB	36	24.91	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 10	Ae	DB	30.7	15.76	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 11	Ae	DB	36.7	12.34	WW	346311	376965	
17	US 12	Ae	DB	35.9	13.68	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 13	Ae	DB	36	9.32	ww	346311	376965	
17	US 14	Ae	DB	26	8.07	ww	346311	376965	

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N
17	US 15	Ae	DB	18	4.39	ww	346311	376965
17	US 16	Pewter	Button	14.4	3.51	GV	346311	376965
17	US 17	Ae	Penny	30.9	8.54	G5	346311	376965
17	US 18	Ae	Half	28.2	5.94	GV	346311	376965
17	US 19	Ae	Token	28.8	6.43	GG	346311	376965
	1	1	1	1	T	1		
18	US 01	Ae	TFA	28	18.63	ww	346283	376742
18	US 02	Ae	TFQ	40	14.55	ww	346283	376742
18	US 03	Ae	DB	49.9	41.44	ww	346283	376742
18	US 04	Ae	DB	50	36.93	WW	346283	376742
18	US 05	Ae	DB	50	38.3	WW	346283	376742
18	US 06	Ae	DB	49.4	21.47	WW	346283	376742
18	US 07	Ae	DB	49.5	29.34	WW	346283	376742
18	US 08	Ae	DB	50.1	28.67	WW	346283	376742
18	US 09	Ae	DB	49.2	31.27	ww	346283	376742
18	US 10	Ae	DB	37.1	31.27	WW	346283	376742
18	US 11	Ae	Penny	33.4	13.85	GV	346283	376742
18	US 12	Ae	Half	29	7.84	GG	346283	376742
18	US 13	Ae	Half	25.3	4.69	V2	346283	376742
18	US 14	Ae	Penny	30.9	8.32	E7	346283	376742
18	US 15	Ae	Half	25.2	4.25	G5	346283	376742
					1		1	
19	SF 003	Lead	Vessel	52.3	124.8	T1	346664	376956
19	SF 007	Ae	Jews Harp	55.3	13.47	VG	346689	376855
19	US 01	Aluminium	TFF	66.8	441.7	WW	346620	376994
19	US 02	Ae	TFA	29.8	22.4	ww	346620	376994
19	US 03	Ae	TFQ	70	30.3	WW	346620	376994
19	US 04	Ae	TFA	70	15.32	WW	346620	376994
19	US 05	Ae	TFQ	70	21.15	WW	346620	376994
19	US 06	Ae	DB	36.4	12.8	WW	346620	376994
19	US 07	Ae	DB	36.7	12.77	WW	346620	376994
19	US 08	Ae	DB	37	12.71	ww	346620	376994
19	US 09	Ae	Half	27.5	4.49	VE	346620	376994
19	US 10	Ae	Farthing	21.4	3.23	V1	346620	376994
19	US 11	Ae	Farthing	21	3	V1	346620	376994
				40			a . a . . a	070000
20		Ae		40	16.18		346742	376999
20	US 02	Ae		68	/3.6	VV VV	346742	376999
20		Ae		24.4	15.49	ww	346742	376999
20	US 04	Ae	DB	50.6	34.2	WW	346742	376999
20		Ae	DB	50	22.88	ww	346742	376999
20	05 06	Ae	Hait	29	9.69	63	346742	376999
20	US 07	Ae	Halt	28	6.38	GG	346742	376999
	07 07		L		4.14	To	o 4	0
21	SF 002	Ae	Jetton	24.3	1.19	12	346788	377160
21	SF 003	Ae	Spillage	15.8	2.05	ND	346818	377158

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N
21	SF 005	Ae	Key?	41	14.63	Roman	346803	377109
21	SF 007	Ae	Rivet	4.4	0.77	ND	346873	377062
21	SF 008	Ae	Brooch	20.6	3.3	Roman	346792	377060
21	SF 010	Ae	Waste	43.9	9.89	ND	346785	377119
21	US 01	Aluminium	TFF	66.7	436	ww	346794	377126
21	US 02	Ae	TFA	40.2	47.76	ww	346794	377126
21	US 03	Ae	TFQ	41	57.97	ww	346794	377126
21	US 04	Ae	TFA	22	12.22	ww	346794	377126
21	US 05	Ae	TFQ	32	8.46	ww	346794	377126
21	US 06	Ae	TFA	26	12.06	ww	346794	377126
21	US 07	Ae	DB	49.8	49.7	ww	346794	377126
21	US 08	Ae	DB	47.4	42.91	ww	346794	377126
21	US 09	Ae	DB	50	34.87	ww	346794	377126
21	US 10	Ae	DB	49.2	23.97	ww	346794	377126
21	US 11	Ae	DB	46.6	12.83	ww	346794	377126
21	US 12	Ae	DB	36	25.29	ww	346794	377126
21	US 13	Ae	DB	36.3	20.09	ww	346794	377126
21	US 14	Ae	DB	36.3	10.82	ww	346794	377126
21	US 15	Ae	DB	36.8	13.28	ww	346794	377126
21	US 16	Ae	Half-Crown	31.9	13.03	G6	346794	377126
21	US 17	Ae	Half	28.3	5.88	GV	346794	377126
21	US 18	Ae	Half	28.7	6.32	GV	346794	377126
21	US 19	Ae	Half	25.5	5	G6	346794	377126
21	US 20	Ae	Penny	30.6	8.82	G5	346794	377126
22	SF 001	Ae	Decorative mount	10	0.5	ND	346841	377002
22	SF 004	Pewter	Button	17	4.41	GV	346897	377021
22	SF 005	Ae	Button	28.8	6.39	GV	346886	377036
22	SF 009	Ae	Button, livery	24.1	4.68	VG	346901	376985
22	SF 014	Ae	Jetton?	26.2	2.64	ND	346858	376977
22	US 01	Ae	TFQ	40	13.29	ww	346871	376966
22	US 02	Ae	DB	17.7	4.63	ww	346871	376966
22	US 03	Ae	Half	27.2	5.26	GV	346871	376966
22	US 04	Ae	Penny	30	6.41	V2	346871	376966
22	US 05	Ae	Half	25.6	5.54	E2	346871	376966
22	US 06	Ae	Farthing, Irish	21.2	3.08	GG	346871	376966
22	US 07	Ae	Half	29.8	8.53	GG	346871	376966
22	US 08	Ae	Farthing	21.4	3.08	GV	346871	376966
22	US 09	Ae	Farthing	21.2	2.98	GV	346871	376966
23	US 01	Aluminium	TFF	65.8	448.8	WW	346498	376771
23	US 02	Ae	TFH	56	159.7	WW	346498	376771
23	US 03	Ae	TFH	56	81.04	WW	346498	376771
23	US 04	Ae	TFA	20.7	16.13	WW	346498	376771
23	US 05	Ae	TFA	43.8	28.8	WW	346498	376771
23	US 06	Ae	TFA	26.5	20.58	WW	346498	376771

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N
23	US 07	Ae	TFA	28.2	6.99	ww	346498	376771
23	US 08	Ae	TFQ	44	30.7	ww	346498	376771
23	US 09	Ae	TFQ	28.2	8.12	ww	346498	376771
23	US 10	Ae	TFA	19	3.16	ww	346498	376771
23	US 11	Ae	DB	50.4	57.88	ww	346498	376771
23	US 12	Ae	DB	49.7	36.72	ww	346498	376771
23	US 13	Ae	DB	49	34.75	ww	346498	376771
23	US 14	Ae	DB	49.3	32.37	ww	346498	376771
23	US 15	Ae	DB	51.4	30.44	ww	346498	376771
23	US 16	Ae	DB	36.4	14.62	ww	346498	376771
23	US 17	Ae	DB	36.5	10.14	ww	346498	376771
23	US 18	Ae	Half	27.3	6.03	GV	346498	376771
23	US 19	Ae	Button	17.7	2.6	VG	346498	376771
23	US 20	Ae	Button	21.2	4.85	VG	346498	376771
23	US 21	Ae	Button	23.8	4.8	VG	346498	376771
23	US 22	Ae	Button	29.2	4.85	VG	346498	376771
23	US 23	Ae	Button	20.6	3.08	VG	346498	376771
23	US 24	Ae	Button	16.8	2.9	VG	346498	376771
23	US 25	Ae	Button	16	2.94	VG	346498	376771
23	US 26	Ae	Button	20.4	1.55	VG	346498	376771
24	SF 001	Ae	Love token	18.7	1.49	GG	346550	376649
24	SF 002	Ae	Buckle	49.2	1.49	GG	346615	376637
25	SF 004	Aluminium	Vessel	90.4	57.88	GE	346640	376551
25	SF 006	Ae	Half	25	5.26	GG	346616	376499
25	US 01	Ae	TFQ	41	35.31	ww	346617	376533
25	US 02	Ae	DB	35.8	19.65	ww	346617	376533
25	US 03	Ae	DB	48.5	16.06	ww	346617	376533
25	US 04	Ae	DB	37.2	11.66	ww	346617	376533
25	US 05	Lead	Bullet	11.4	29.89	VG	346617	376533
25	US 06	Silver	Sixpence	19.3	2.62	V1	346617	376533
26	SF 003	Ae	Curtain ring	80	22.83	VG	346493	377082
26	SF 005	Pewter	Buckle	33.7	3.53	СС	346517	377028
26	US 01	Aluminium	TFF	68	439.8	ww	346482	377000
26	US 02	Aluminium	TFF	66.3	448.8	ww	346482	377000
26	US 03	Ae	DB	50.4	41.64	ww	346482	377000
26	US 04	Ae	DB	50	19.31	ww	346482	377000
26	US 05	Ae	DB	37.1	13.79	ww	346482	377000
26	US 06	Ae	Buckle	24.4	4.18	GE	346482	377000
26	US 07	Ae	Button	24.3	4.18	GG	346482	377000
26	US 08	Ae	Button	19.2	2.06	GV	346482	377000
26	US 09	Ae	Farthting	20	2.58	VE	346482	377000
27	SF 003	Aluminium	Disc, pressed	10.4	0.25	GE	346722	376721

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N
27	US 01	Ae	Button, military	23.6	4.75	VG	346769	376737
27	US 02	Ae	Ring	29	1.01	ND	346769	376737
27	US 03	Ae	Button	20.2	2.66	ND	346769	376737
	1	1	T	1	1	1	1	1
28	US 01	Ae	TFQ	41.5	59.6	WW	346944	376642
28	US 02	Ae	TFA	44.6	32.62	WW	346944	376642
28	US 03	Ae	TFA	70	29.35	WW	346944	376642
28	US 04	Ae	TRA	70	20.46	WW	346944	376642
			1				1	
29	SF 013	Ae	Half	26	3.15	VE	346354	376615
29	SF 014	Lead	Ball, musket	16.6	27.49	ND	346357	376651
29	SF 015	Silver	Love token	20.8	2.43	GG	346299	376604
29	SF 027	Lead	Unknown	29.11	45.11	ND	346327	376543
29	SF 031	Ae	Bell	25.5	10.38	VG	346341	376570
29	SF 035	Lead	Ball, pistol	11.6	7.02	ND	346315	376573
29	SF 036	Lead	Spillage?	14.2	12.1	ND	346318	376547
29	SF 039	Ae	Half-penny, Irish issue	27.8	7.37	G3	346362	376637
29	SF 040	Ae	Knob	27.2	47.59	GV	346277	376525
29	SF 043	Ae	Ball, gun	14.4	16.78	ND	346282	376513
29	US 01	Ae •		25.4	17.99	WW	346331	376592
29	US 02	Ae •	DB	49.7	33.15	WW	346331	376592
29		Ae	DB	21.9	5		346331	376592
29	US 04	Ae	DB	50	23.9		346331	376592
29		Ae	DB Dridla hit	49.4	25.12		346331	376592
29		Ae		70 25 0	33.01		340331	376592
29		Ae Ao	Buckle	30.9 22.2	10 42	VG	246221	276502
29		Ae Ao	Thimble	17.0	0.42	VG	246221	276502
29		Ae Load	Тоу	10.8	10.22		346331	376502
29			Spoon	40.0 33 Q	6 1/		346331	376592
29	US 12		Buckle	38.7	4 62		346331	376592
29	US 13	Ae	Hat pin?	20	1 78	V2	346331	376592
29	US 14	Ae	Button	24.2	3.01	VG	346331	376592
29	US 15	Ae	Button	15.3	1.78	VG	346331	376592
29	US 16	Ae	Penny	30.8	8.5	G5	346331	376592
29	US 17	Ae	Penny	30.8	7.58	V2	346331	376592
29	US 18	Ae	Penny	30.8	7.46	VG	346331	376592
29	US 19	Ae	Half	27.4	5.69	GV	346331	376592
29	US 20	Ae	Half	27.5	5.81	GV	346331	376592
29	US 21	Ae	Half	25.5	5.81	V2	346331	376592
29	US 22	Ae	Half	26.2	5.38	VE	346331	376592
29	US 23	Ae	Half	25.3	4.47	VE	346331	376592
					•			•
30	SF 002	Ae	Ring, finger	18.2	1.78	GE	346239	376465
30	SF 007	Ae	Buckle	46.1	19.36	GG	346281	376459
30	US 01	Lead	Weight	34.3	134.2	ND	346213	376444

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N
31	SF 001	Lead	Bullet	15	27.8	VG	346298	376353
31	SF 002	Lead	Weight	16	10.68	ND	346357	376425
31	SF 003	Ae	Coin?	20.5	3.18	ND	346282	376353
31	SF 004	Ae	Coin, Ottoman	31.4	9.85	V1	346462	376231
31	SF 005	Lead	Block	16.9	14.73	ND	346358	376394
31	SF 007	Ae	Handle	24.2	38.29	ND	346382	376370
31	SF 009	Ae	Badge	18.8	2.68	E2	346442	376349
31	SF 011	Ae	Buckle	22.7	3.63	VE	346363	376334
31	US 01	Ae	TFH	50	84.4	ww	346405	376331
31	US 02	Ae	TFH	50	6.02	ww	346405	376331
31	US 03	Ae	TFA	21.8	15.02	ww	346405	376331
31	US 04	Ae	DB	50.1	24.54	ww	346405	376331
31	US 05	Ae	DB	49.5	23.48	ww	346405	376331
31	US 06	Ae	DB	49	22	ww	346405	376331
31	US 07	Ae	DB	35.9	9.19	ww	346405	376331
31	US 08	Ae	Cup, trophy	64	46.14	ww	346405	376331
31	US 09	Ae	Thimble	17	1.92	VE	346405	376331
31	US 10	Pewter	Fitting	29.3	10.86	GV	346405	376331
31	US 11	Ae	Penny	30.8	8.75	G5	346405	376331
31	US 12	Ae	Penny	30.8	7.96	G5	346405	376331
31	US 13	Ae	Penny	30.7	8.43	E7	346405	376331
31	US 14	Ae	Penny	30.8	9.36	E2	346405	376331
31	US 15	Ae	Half	24.8	4.53	E7	346405	376331
31	US 16	Ae	Half	25.2	3.95	E2	346405	376331
31	US 17	Ae	Coin?	26	5.2	ND	346405	376331
	1				1		1	1
32	SF 001	Lead	Weight	31	30.22	ND	346508	376424
32	SF 004	Lead	Ball	18	16.18	ND	346473	376432
					1		1	
33	US 01	Ae	TFD	58.5	78.1	WW	346632	376251
	1				1		1	
34	SF 001	Ae	Waste	31.6	14.51	ND	346597	376366
34	SF 005	Cast iron	Ball, cannon	50.5	523.1	ND	346603	376436
34	SF 006	Lead	Fixing	41.7	55.4	ND	346604	376436
34	US 01	Ae	TFD	66	58.8	WW	346609	376398
34	US 02	Ae	TFH	46	93.5	WW	346609	376398
34	US 03	Ae	TFA	33.8	26.21	WW	346609	376398
34	US 04	Ae	DB	50	37.28	WW	346609	376398
34	US 05	Ae	DB	50	30.06	WW	346609	376398
34	US 06	Ae	DB	36.1	13.06	WW	346609	376398
34	US 07	Ae	DB	36.4	12.8	WW	346609	376398
34	US 08	Ae	Farthing	24.2	3.09	G2	346609	376398
34	US 09	Ae	Half	27	6.08	GV	346609	376398
34	US 10	Ae	Half	24.9	4.75	G5	346609	376398
34	US 11	Ae	Half	26.5	4.71	E7	346609	376398

Plot	Number	Material	Identification	Dimension	Mass	Date	E	N
34	US 12	Ae	Half	26.6	5.25	G6	346609	376398
34	US 13	Ae	Penny	30.9	9.26	G6	346609	376398
34	US 14	Ae	Penny	30.8	8.76	G6	346609	376398
34	US 15	Ae	Penny	30.6	8.23	G5	346609	376398
34	US 16	Ae	Penny	30.4	8.63	G5	346609	376398
34	US 17	Ae	Penny	30.8	8.87	G5	346609	376398
35	No Finds	6						
36	SF 007	Ae	Bell, crotal	36.6	36.7	GV	346502	376568
36	SF 009	Ae	Clasp, clog	26.4	1.49	VG	346488	376508
36	SF 012	Lead	Weight	49.2	63.9	ND	346452	376547
36	SF 013	Ae	Badge	34	4.14	GE	346477	376571
36	US 01	Ae	DB	49.6	29.78	ww	346439	376495
36	US 02	Ae	Badge	45.1	12.87	G6	346439	376495
36	US 03	Ae	Penny	30.7	8.35	G5	346439	376495
36	US 04	Ae	Half	26.6	5.04	G5	346439	376495

D:\Documents and Settings\oraybould\My Documents\PROJECTS\MANCHESTER\660001 Ince\MET DET\Metal Detecting Report rev03.doc