NAU Archaeology





An Archaeological Excavation on Land Adjacent to 33 High Street, Hauxton, Cambridgeshire

Assessment Report and Updated Project Design

ECB 3330

Prepared for: Lovell Partnerships Ltd 69–75 Thorpe Road Norwich NR1 1UA

Peter Crawley BA AlfA

September 2010

BAU2474

© NAU Archaeology









www.nps.co.uk

NAU ARCHAEOLOGY PROJECT CHECKLIST					
Project overseen by	Nigel Page				
Draft completed	Peter Crawley	26/08/2010			
Graphics completed	David Dobson	31/08/2010			
Edit completed	Jayne Bown	03/09/2010			
Signed off	Nigel Page	03/09/2010			
Issue 1					

NAU Archaeology

Scandic House 85 Mountergate Norwich NR1 1PY

T 01603 756150 **F** 01603 756190

E jayne.bown@nps.co.uk

www.nps.co.uk www.nau.org.uk

BAU2474

© NAU Archaeology

Contents

	Sun	nmary	1
1.0	Intro	oduction	1
	1.1	Project Background	3
	1.2	Site Location and background	3
	1.3	Geology and Topography	4
2.0	Arch	naeological and Historical Background	4
3.0	Met	hodology	7
	3.1	Evaluation Methodology	7
	3.2	Excavation Methodology	7
	3.3	Site Conditions	7
	3.4	Summary of Evaluation Results	8
	3.5	Summary of Excavation Results	8
	3.6	Archive Quantification	12
4.0	Ass	essment	13
	4.1	Assessment of the Stratigraphic Data and Site Potential	13
	4.2	Assessment of the Artefactual Material	14
	4.3	Assessment of the Environmental Material	19
5.0	Upd	ated Project Design	20
	5.1	Introduction	20
	5.2	General Aims	20
	5.3	Revised Research Objectives	20
	5.4	Stratigraphic Analysis	20
	5.5	Artefactual Analysis	20
	5.6	Environmental Analysis	20
	5.7	Publication Proposal	21
	5.8	Storage, Curation and Conservation	21
	5.9	Resources and Programming	21
	Ack	nowledgements	22
	Bibl	iography	23
	Арр	endix 1: Excavation context data	24
	Арр	endix 2a: Finds by Context	27
	Арр	endix 2b: OASIS Finds Summary	28
	Арр	endix 3: Small Finds	28
	Арр	endix 4: Animal Bone	29

Appendix 5: Environmental Evidence	30
------------------------------------	----

Figures

Figure 1		Site location
	~	

Figure 2 Site plan

Plates

Plate 1	The site, looking south
Plate 2	Pit [136], looking north-east
Plate 3	Shallow ditch [158], looking north

Tables

Table 1	Archive Quantification
Table 2	Quantification (NISP) of species by feature type

Location:	Land Adjacent to 33 High Street, Hauxton
District:	South Cambridgeshire
Grid Ref.:	TL 4424 5209
HER No.:	ECB 3330
OASIS Ref.:	82020
Client:	Lovell Partnerships Ltd
Dates of Fieldwork:	Evaluation 12–14 January 2010 Excavation 28 June to 22 July 2010

Summary

During the summer of 2010, NAU Archaeology undertook an excavation adjacent to 33 High Street, Hauxton, Cambridgeshire which followed on from an evaluation in January of the same year. The development plot was situated on the north side of the High Street in an area surrounded by extensive cropmark complexes thought to represent activity from the prehistoric through to the Roman period.

Five trenches were excavated during the evaluation phase of works which revealed several irregular gullies and ditches and a collection of shallow pits.

The excavation results consisted of additional linear features and shallow pits. The western half of the site contained two wide ditches of possible Iron Age and medieval date, which had been previously noted during the evaluation. A curving ditch at the north end of the site may also have been of Iron Age date There were a further two small gullies of unknown date in the centre of the site. To the east were a large number of probable quarry pits, which may have been of medieval or later date. (They had also been observed during the evaluation and medieval sandy ware was found within one of the fills during the evaluation.) One sherd of Iron Age pottery and seventeen sherds of Later Iron Age/Roman pottery were found during the excavation.

This report presents the evidence recovered during the 2010 excavation, including data from the evaluation (where relevant) and provides an Assessment of that information. This is followed by an Updated Project Design which identifies further work considered appropriate to complete the Analysis stage of the project including how the project's results may be disseminated.

1.0 Introduction

(Fig 1)

This report begins by summarising the background to the project, the site's location and the project's initial aims. This introductory section is followed by a discussion of the site's archaeological and historical background and the methodologies employed during the work.

The fourth part of the report presents an assessment of the stratigraphic, artefactual and environmental evidence recovered. Each data set has been assessed to determine its potential to yield further information and to identify



aspects that are of wider significance. The results of these individual assessments are then brought together in a general discussion of the site's significance. The relevant results of the evaluation are also brought into this assessment.

The fifth part of the report comprises an Updated Project Design. This describes the research objectives that will underpin subsequent work and details the nature of the additional tasks to be undertaken. The appendices contain the tabular information supplied by the respective specialists for the excavation phase of the work.

1.1 Project Background

This programme of archaeological work was commissioned and funded by Lovell Partnerships.

The excavation was undertaken to fulfil a planning condition set by Cambridgeshire County Council (Planning Ref. S/0554/09/F) and a brief issued by Cambridgeshire Archaeology Planning and Countryside Advice office (CAPCA) (Ref. Eliza Gore 5th June 2008). The initial archaeological evaluation was requested prior to a final planning decision by Cambridgeshire County Council. The work was conducted in accordance with a Project Design and Method Statement prepared by NAU Archaeology (Ref. BAU 2216). A brief for the subsequent excavation was issued by CAPCA (Dan McConnell 7 June 2010). The excavation was conducted in accordance with a Project Design and Method Statement prepared by NAU Archaeology (Ref. BAU 2216). A 2010). The excavation was conducted in accordance with a Project Design and Method Statement prepared by NAU Archaeology (Ref. BAU 2216). A 2474).

The programme of work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, following the guidelines set out in *Planning and Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning* (Department of the Environment 1990).

The site archive is currently held by NAU Archaeology and on completion of the project will be deposited with the relevant Cambridgeshire Museums Service depot, subject to the landowner's approval, following the policy on archiving standards current at the start of the project.

1.2 Site Location and background

The proposed development area lay on the north-eastern edge of the village of Hauxton, Cambridgeshire, adjacent to 33 High Street (Fig. 1). The plot measured 0.3ha and had good access. The site had formerly been part of the University Arms Farm, and had been used as pasture due to its propensity to flood. Disused concrete pig sty units lay on the north-east side of the site. It is proposed that seventeen affordable dwellings with associated parking and landscaping be constructed on the site.

1.3 Geology and Topography

The site is situated on West Melbury Chalk overlain by First and Second Terrace River Deposits. (CAPCA brief). The River Cam is located 200m to the north and there is very poor drainage due to the high water table. The site is reasonably flat at 14m OD

The topsoil was a humic dark-brown clayey silt, which was on average 0.30m thick. In places it overlay a stony mid-brown clayey silt subsoil, though the subsoil was patchy, probably due to localised landscaping and farming practices. The subsoil was 0.20m at its thickest.

Specifically the natural substratum was a degraded chalky clay and silt, which was harder, purer chalk towards the western half of the site. The eastern half of the site had more frequent sand and gravel pockets.

2.0 Archaeological and Historical Background

A more comprehensive historical background can be found within the evaluation report (Crawley 2010) and a condensed version is presented here.

A probable Bronze Age fording of the Granta near Hauxton mill was enhanced by a bridge in the 14th century. Nearby settlement, north-east of the mill and partly located in Great Shelford, was indicated by a cemetery containing almost 100 burials indicating probable inhabitation in the area from the Early Iron Age through to the Roman period (VCH 1982). The settlement is mentioned in AD 970, when the Essex *thegn* Edric left four and a half hides at Hauxton and three at the neighbouring estate of Newton to King Edgar (VCH 1982). At the time of the Domesday Survey, the settlement was known as 'Havochestun' and three mills were recorded there. The two vills of Hauxton and Newton together had 27 recorded peasants and 83 landholders in 1086 (VCH 1982). Milling continued to be an important activity in Hauxton until modern times.

An Historic Environment Record search was undertaken for a 1km radius around the site. The two most important HER sites in terms of the present work are those of HERs 04503 and 04496 (Scheduled Monuments 28 and 73), which lay the north and north-east of the site respectively. They comprise two large cropmark complexes which are thought to relate to activity from the Neolithic to the Roman period and which are also considered to be of national importance.

Other similar, but smaller cropmark complexes lay near the site representing a variety of periods. They include HERs 09631 and 09633, which are thought to be mainly drainage channels. To the south-west and south are possible settlements recorded as cropmarks (HERs 09635, 09636 and 09637) and to the north-west there are other similar complexes (HERs 05090 and 09628).

Several historic houses lay close to the site. To the west is the parish church of Saint Edmund (HER 14881), a mainly medieval structure with a Norman entrance. There are several listed buildings of 15th- to 17th-century date including The Old House (HER 51548), 11 High Street (HER 51547), The Tudor House (HER 51546) and The Little Manor House (HER 51545).



© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Local Authority No. 100019340



3.0 Methodology

3.1 Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation Brief required that 5% of the development area be sample excavated via trenching to characterise the type and quantity of the historic remains present. This required five trenches; four measured 25m by 1.80m and one measured 10m by 1.80m.

Machine excavation was carried out with a JCB excavator using a toothless ditching bucket under constant archaeological supervision. All metal-detected and hand-collected finds other than those which were obviously modern, were retained for inspection.

3.2 Excavation Methodology

The excavation methodology required that the development area be stripped and the archaeological features planned, so that decisions could be made about targeting archaeological features in consultation with CAPCA. The level of excavation required to fulfil the condition was also discussed. Machine excavation was undertaken with a large tracked 360° machine using a toothless ditching bucket under constant archaeological supervision.

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

Three environmental samples were taken during the excavation and the results presented below.

All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using NAU Archaeology pro forma, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales. Colour, monochrome and digital photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits where appropriate.

A temporary benchmark with a value of 13.11m OD was located by the entrance to the site and used throughout the fieldwork.

3.3 Site Conditions

Site conditions during the excavation were good, with the work taking place in sunny and dry weather. The conditions were in marked contrast to those of the evaluation, where there was snow, sleet and rain for much of the duration of the work.

3.4 Summary of Evaluation Results

(Fig. 2 and Plates 1, 2 and 3)

The results of the evaluation phase were reported in NAU Archaeology Report 2216 'An Archaeological Evaluation on land adjacent to 33 High Street, Hauxton, Cambridgeshire (Crawley 2010) and are summarised here.

Trench 1

This trench was situated in the south-western corner of the plot and contained a post-hole, a small irregular pit, a large shallow ditch, and two gullies, one of which contained some fragments of medieval pan tile.

Trench 2

This trench was situated in the south–central part of the site and contained a single large pit of unknown date.

Trench 3

This trench was located in the south-eastern part of the site and contained five irregular pits. All of the pits had a similar flat based and steep sided form and only one contained a small sherd of medieval sandy ware.

Trench 4

This trench was located in the north-eastern corner of the site and contained a single undated gully.

Trench 5

This trench was situated in the north-western part of the site and contained three features. There were two interconnected gullies at the north-western end and a shallow ditch at the south-eastern end.

Summary Evaluation Conclusions

The evaluation trenches revealed several irregular gullies and ditches located across the site, the parallel layout of some of which suggests that there had been deliberate organisation of the landscape. These ditches were probably dug to provide drainage in an area prone to flooding. A collection of shallow quarry pits lay largely in the south-eastern corner of the site. A gully and a pit containing medieval artefacts and many of the other undated features may be of the same period.

3.5 Summary of Excavation Results

A series of archaeological features were observed across the stripped area but which were not evenly spread across the site. The site could be neatly divided into two, a western half, largely consisting of dated linear features and an eastern half which contained many intercutting undated pits. There were also two gullies and a ditch of unknown date towards the middle and east of the site. A reasonably modern fence line was situated at the western end of the site. Several modern services were also revealed by the fieldwork.



Plate1. The site, looking south

Pits

Over fifty pits were recorded at the site, the vast majority of which were confined to the eastern half of the site (only three pits were situated in the western half). Occasionally the pits consisted of single discrete cuts, though mostly they clustered. Initial investigation of the pits showed they had steep sides and roughly flat bases with a consistently shallow depth of between c. 0.30m and 0.50m. Due to the reasonably uniform appearance of the pits it was decided in consultation CAPCA to investigate a sample of them only. As much of the pitting remained unexcavated, the full number of pits can only be estimated. The plan indicated that there were around 50 individual pits and areas of pitting in total. Ten slots were dug through the pits and clusters of pits, and these slots produced a total of 23 individual cuts. Trench 3 of the evaluation had explored some of the pits and a sherd of medieval sandy ware had been recovered. During the excavation a sherd of Iron Age pottery had also been found. The vast majority of the pits are undated and there are only two sherds which present conflicting dating evidence; the date of these pits remains to be determined however it is thought that the pits were of medieval or early post-medieval date (with the Iron Age sherd being residual).

It is initially thought that the pits probably stem from localised, low level quarrying activity, and that they had been concentrated to the east because they were exploiting the sandier and gravelly natural substratum in this part of the site. The reasonably abrupt limit to the area of pitting close to the two gullies at the centre of the site may be the result of a property boundary change. The shallow form of the pits may have been accounted for by the high water table present on the site, especially in winter. In certain areas the pits seemed to respect each other, with less intercutting, and this may have indicated that the pits were open at the same time. The eastern part of the site may have been quarried over a relatively short time frame. The fills were often homogenous, without the tip lines that can be associated with deliberate backfilling; hence the pits may have gradually filled up.



Plate 2. Pit [136], looking north-east

Linear Features

Six linear features (and three modern service trenches) were recorded during the excavation phase, mostly situated in the western and central part of the site, although there was one linear feature observed in the south-eastern corner. Four of them have been described as ditches and two as gullies. At least two of the ditches observed in the excavation had been observed during the evaluation and described as gullies. Three of the linear features were datable.

The curving ditch in the north-western corner of the site contained a sherd of Iron Age pottery in its central fill. The ditch was steep-sided and was on average 1.40m wide and 0.80m deep. During the evaluation stage of the project the same feature had been observed but identified as two intercutting gullies at the point where it began to curve. Four slots were excavated through the ditch during the excavation and the fills appeared to have accumulated gradually.

Two large, generally shallow, north-west to south-east aligned ditches were observed at the centre of the site. The majority of the dating evidence from the site came from these two features. They appeared in plan to be broadly similar with a width of between 3.0m and 3.20m, and they also appeared to be parallel. The dating of the two features was very different however, with the longer ditch containing several medieval horse shoes and a sherd of medieval

pottery (found during the evaluation), and the shorter more westerly of the two ditches containing 15 sherds of Late Iron Age pottery. A shallow pit at the south end of the ditch also contained some fragments of Roman Ceramic Building Material. There is a possibility that both ditches are essentially of medieval date (the Iron Age pottery being residual) perhaps representing the edge of a medieval boundary. However the amount of Iron Age pottery in the fill and the possible Roman tile fragments from a pit to the south might indicate an earlier date for the feature. The longer of the two linear features contained a deeper ditch at its western side with a wider possible hollow way on its eastern side. The fact that the ditches are roughly parallel may be misleading as the orientation of both features irrespective of their date may be due to the prevailing directions of slope. They may have had uses as drainage ditches and/or boundaries which through use possibly became a possible hollow way. The horseshoes, though probably not all lost during travel, might be an indicator of the sort of activity happening here.



Plate 3. Shallow ditch [158], looking north

At the centre of the site were two similar sized north to south orientated narrow gullies. They were 0.52m and 0.62m wide respectively; the easterly gully had a depth of 0.18m whereas the westerly gully was shallower with a depth of 0.09m. They had an observed length of c.13.0. They were undated and probably represented a boundary of some kind. They terminated within the bounds of the site, at roughly the same position, which could suggest a field entrance. A single gully observed to the north during in Evaluation Trench 4 may have been a continuation of one of them, though slightly off line.

A roughly east to west orientated ditch was located in the south east corner of the site. It was 1.0m to 1.45m in width and had a depth of 0.50m. Three slots

were excavated through the ditch and the fills appeared to have occurred through natural silting. The ditch was undated, though it appeared to be truncated by the pitting where they intersected.

Modern Activity

The cut for a large foul drain was observed running south from the children's nursery (situated to the north of the site) across the central part of the site, towards a possible associated cesspit at the south edge of the site. A similar north to south orientated gas pipe and a further small service pipeline of unknown purpose also appeared to be associated with the children's nursery. At the east end of the site a metal gas or water pipe was observed. A line of generally-square post-holes was observed on the western side of the site. Three of these post-holes were excavated to ascertain their age and purpose which indicated the fence line was not very old and probably formed part of a piggery complex situated beyond the north western corner of the site where recent disused concrete pig sties were present.

3.6 Archive Quantification

Table 1 summarises the archive components that were generated during the evaluation and excavation.

Evaluation Archive	
Context records	36
Drawn sections	19
Drawn plans	5
Colour slides	Nos 1–21
Black and white negative and print sets	1
Finds	1 bag

Everyotion Archive	
Excavation Archive	
Context records	167
Drawn sections	31
Drawn plans	23
Colour slides	Nos 22–63
Black and white negative and print sets	2
Finds	1 box

Table 1. Archive quantification.

Following completion of the excavation, all written and drawn records were checked and cross-referenced. Typed versions of context, drawing and sample registers were created. Context information and finds data were combined within a single spreadsheet. All photographic films were processed and a photographic archive assembled, accompanied by typed lists. All finds (where appropriate) were washed, marked and bagged by type.

4.0 Assessment

The following section presents an assessment of the stratigraphic, artefactual and environmental data recovered during this work. This assessment considers the significance of each data set in relation to its potential to address the project's objectives and research aims. It also seeks to identify aspects of the project that are of a wider significance or that can potentially address new research questions.

A variety of sources have been consulted as part of this assessment including *Research and* Archaeology: *A Framework for the Eastern Counties* (Glazebrook 1997; Brown and Glazebrook 2000) which summarises the archaeological resources of East Anglia and presents detailed research agendas for each period.

4.1 Assessment of the Stratigraphic Data and Site Potential

4.1.1 The Stratigraphy

Stratigraphic relationships between the archaeological features on the site were quite straightforward. Of the six linear features, only two intersect with other features (excluding the modern services) and relationships between these features were clear. Where slots were excavated through areas of pitting, the relationships between features are also clear although episodes of pitting may have occurred in a relatively short space of time. The site does not appear to have been subject to much truncation; it has not been suitable for arable purposes and has probably always been given over to pasture and possibly been subject to seasonal waterlogging.

4.1.2 Site Potential

The results from the work have the potential to add extra detail to the ongoing research question determining the character of rural medieval settlement and land use in the east of England. On a more local level, the excavation gives an opportunity to examine how this part of Hauxton was utilised in the medieval period. The site appears to be situated away from what might have been the centre of the village in earlier periods, for example the parish church of St Edmund is located some distance to the west on the edge of the current village. There was no evidence of settlement activity on site. It was hoped by CAPCA that investigation of this occasionally wet area might give an insight into possible land reclamation techniques in the area in the medieval period. No evidence of reclamation by raising ground levels was encountered, but it is possible that despite a high water table the land may have been sufficiently drained for seasonal activities to take place during part of the year at least.

The evaluation results indicated that much of the archaeological activity on the site would date to the medieval period, and it appears now that the site was utilised as early as the Iron Age. Glazebrook (1997) suggests that there are fewer large Iron Age settlements recorded in south Cambridgeshire than in the northern part of Cambridgeshire where clusters of settlements existed where major rivers entered the Fens (ibid). Locally the importance of the site may lie in its relationship with the Iron Age settlement to the north (HER 04503) and in its position between the large cropmark complexes of (also) HER 04503 and 04496 (Scheduled Monuments 28 and 73) and the Iron Age sherd from the curving ditch to the north of the excavation site may suggest a link with the Iron Age settlement. The relative paucity of finds and the nature of the features indicate that the focus of the settlement is some distance away. The Iron Age features encountered on the site may reveal evidence of how the lower lying, seasonally-waterlogged area was exploited and the environmental samples have the potential for palaeoenvironmental remains to reveal something of the local Iron Age environment and landscape.

4.2 Assessment of the Artefactual Material

Each artefact assemblage was examined by an appropriate specialist who has assessed the significance of the material, both in relation to the site itself and in terms of its wider importance. The results of these assessments are summarised below and information is tabulated in Appendices 2a to 5.

4.2.1 Pottery

by Sarah Percival with additional identification by Alice Lyons

4.2.1.1 Iron Age

A single sherd of handmade shell-tempered pottery weighing 9g was recovered from the central fill of ditch [90]. Shell-tempered fabrics were widely used throughout the Iron Age in Cambridgeshire and were especially prevalent in the west of the county around Huntingdon, Haddenham and St Neots where fossil-shell rich Jurassic clays outcrop (Percival 2008). The use of shell-tempered pottery in the Iron Age at Hauxton fits well with most other sites in the region (Percival 2008). Dating of the sherd within the Iron Age is however uncertain as shell-tempering was used continuously from the earlier through to the later Iron Age and Roman period (Percival 2008).

4.2.1.2 Later Iron Age / Roman

Later Iron Age to Roman pottery was recovered from ditches [57] and [158] and pit [136] as well as from topsoil. A total of seventeen sherds were found weighing 230g. The majority of the assemblage is 'proto-greyware' handmade Iron Age jar forms made of 'Romanising' fabrics which mimic wheelmade greywares. The fabric is similar to examples from Wardy Hill, Ely (Hill 2003) and was also found in small quantities at sites along the A428 Caxton Common to Hardwick Improvement Scheme (Percival 2008) and at Loves Farm (Lyons and Percival forthcoming). A 1st- to early mid 2nd-century AD date is suggested for the pottery.

A small scrap of Samian and a large body sherd from a Horningsea Reduced ware storage jar were also found (Tomber and Dore 116). These early Roman forms also suggest a date around the early mid 2nd century AD for the assemblage.

4.2.2 Ceramic Building Material

by Sarah Percival

4.2.2.1 Roman

A total of two pieces of box flue tile with scratched keying weighing 214g were recovered from the fill of pit [51] and ditch [53].

4.2.2.2 Modern

A small fragment of modern cement roof tile was found in the fill of pit [66].

4.2.3 Flint

by Sarah Percival

Scraps of undiagnostic struck flint were found in topsoil and in the fill of pit [136]. The assemblage, which comprises two flints weighing 9g, is not closely datable.

4.2.4 Stone

by Sarah Percival

A total of two pieces of post-medieval roofing slate were recovered from two features. The slate, which weighed a total of 55g, came from pits [51] and [76].

4.2.5 Lava

by Sarah Percival

A small assemblage of 36 pieces of lava weighing 146g was recovered from the fill of ditch [58]. The pieces are highly abraded with no surviving worked surfaces. Lava is not intrinsically datable however as it was widely imported into England in the Roman period and as other Romano-British finds have been recovered from the site it is likely that this material is of this date.

4.2.6 Small Finds

by Rebecca Sillwood (Appendix 3)

4.2.6.1 Iron Horse shoes

Four iron horseshoes were recovered from the site, all from a single context; ditch fill (99). These horseshoes were allocated small find numbers one to four, and comprise two complete examples, one almost complete, and one fragment.

The largest of these horseshoes is small find number one, a shoe of 'Guildhall' type, or Type 4 in Clark's typology (2004), with a rounded outer edge and arched inner profile. This example has part of its outer edge nibbled by corrosion, making it impossible to know how many nail holes there were originally on one branch of the shoe. The complete branch shows four rectangular nail holes, two of which contain square headed nails *in situ*, the incomplete branch has at least two rectangular nail holes. The shoe measures 145mm by 118mm, although this may be slightly distorted by the amount of encrustation and corrosion present. The x-ray shows the merest hint that there may be a single caulkin on one of the branches, although this is difficult to make out, and certainly cannot be assigned to any particular type. The horseshoe itself is very close to examples seen in Sparkes (1998, p.11, no figure numbers given) and Clark (2004), p. 122, fig.88, no.235.

Small find number two is a complete horseshoe, and although it is unlikely to be of 'Guildhall' type, as is the one above, it is certainly a Clark Type 4, with a rounded outer edge and very slightly pointed inner profile. The shoe has four rectangular nail holes on one branch, and three on the other, with two of these still containing nails. This shoe measures 128mm by 119mm. Very similar, although with a much more rounded internal profile is small find number three. This example is also complete, and has four rectangular nails holes on one branch and three on the other. Two of the nail holes retain their nail. This example measures 124mm by 120mm. This example is very similar to one noted in Clark (2004), p.123, fig.89, no. 274.

The last of the horseshoes (SF4) is a fragment of the branch, containing three remaining rectangular nail holes, with one nail *in situ*. An indeterminate lump of iron, which looks as though it was once a part of this horseshoe, was also found. It is not possible to allocate a type to this fragment, although it is likely to be a Type 4 along with the other examples from the same context.

The dating for the London examples catalogued in Clarks' book, *The Medieval Horse and its Equipment*, places the Type 4, or 'Later Medieval' shoes into the 14th- to 15th- centuries. Sparkes (1998) dates the 'Guildhall' type shoe to the late 14th- to early 15th- centuries.

4.2.6.2 Iron Objects

A single iron nail was recovered from the upper fill of pit [67], and measures 57.2mm in height, with a roughly rectangular-head measuring 27.7mm by 21.5mm. The shank appears to be square-sectioned. This object remains undated.

4.2.7 Animal Bone

by Julie Curl (Appendix 4)

4.2.7.1 Methodology

All of the bone studied in this assemblage was hand-collected. No environmental samples were examined. The mammal bones were recorded using a modified version described in Davis (1992).

Measurements (listed in Appendix 4) were taken where appropriate, generally following Von Den Dreisch (1976). Humerus BT and HTC and metapodial "a" and "b" are recorded as suggested by Davis (1992).

Any butchering was also recorded, noting the type of butchering, such as cut, chopped or sawn. A note was also made of any burnt bone. Pathologies were also recorded with the type of injury or disease, the element affected and the location on the bone. Other modifications were also recorded, such as any possible working, working waste or animal gnawing.

Weights and total number of pieces counts were also taken for each context, along with the number of pieces for each individual species present (NISP) and these appear in the appendix.

All information was recorded directly into an Excel database for analysis. A basic catalogue is provided in the appendix giving a summary of all of the faunal remains by context with all other quantifications and measurements, the full database is available in the digital archive.

4.2.7.2 The assemblage, provenance and preservation

A total of 1,844g of faunal remains, consisting of 167 pieces, was recovered from excavations at 33, High Street, Hauxton. Bone was yielded from ten

contexts. Most remains were produced from ditch fills, with small quantities of bone found in a gully and a pit fill. Residual Iron-Age pottery was recovered from one bone producing fill, other features produced artefacts of later Iron Age/ Roman, medieval and Post-Medieval date, giving the possibility of a broad date-range for the faunal material.

The assemblage is quite fragmented from butchering and wear, with some worn and powdery surfaces, which may have been damaged from more acidic soil conditions. A pig/boar femur from the ditch/hollow (99) showed some canid gnawing.

4.2.7.3 Species and butchering – observations and discussion

Four species groups were identified in this assemblage: cattle, equid, sheep/goat and pig/boar. Most remains were of adult individuals. Table 2 shows quantification and distribution of these animals by feature type.

Species	Feature				Total
	Ditch	Gully	Hollow/ditch	Pit	
Cattle	19	3		1	23
Equid	7				7
Mammal	130	4			134
Pig/Boar			1		1
Sheep/goat	3				3
Total	159	7	1	1	168

Table 2. Quantification (NISP) of species by feature type

Cattle were the most frequently recorded and were seen in seven of the ten fills that produced bone. Equid were represented by five teeth in (156) and a talus (ankle bone) in context (92). Three fills produced remains of sheep/goat, including a juvenile tooth from the ditch segment (96), possibly suggesting onsite breeding. A single pig/boar femur was produced from the ditch/hollow (99), this bone was gnawed.

Some chops and cuts were seen, showing processing and meat removal, but some butchering evidence was probably lost due to the poor surfaces on some of the bone.

4.2.7.4 Conclusions and comparisons with other sites

The assemblage at least largely consists of the main domestic food and traction animals, with the possibility of the porcine remains coming from wild boar. Much of the assemblage appears to be derived from food and processing waste. The gnawed pig/boar femur from the ditch/hollow (99) may remains of re-deposited scavenger food.

The lack of small species in this assemblage may be due to a recovery bias with hand-collected remains or due to poorer soil conditions and the destruction of smaller elements. The lack of wild species is also interesting, but may possibly suggest a small settlement that is adequately provided for by a small stock of domestic mammals and with little or no need for hunting.

There is a difficulty in interpretation of a small and fragmentary assemblage such as this that has little dating evidence associated with it. Unsurprisingly this assemblage is similar to that recovered from the evaluation phase of the project (Crawley 2010) which was also in quite poor condition and dominated by cattle.

4.3 Assessment of the Environmental Material

by Val Fryer (Appendix 5)

4.3.1 Plant Macrofossils

4.3.1.1 Introduction and method statement

Excavations at Hauxton, undertaken by NAU Archaeology, recorded a small number of features (including pits, ditches and gullies), the presence of which had initially been identified during the evaluation phase of the project. Samples for the retrieval of the plant macrofossil assemblages were taken from fills within three gullies, two of later prehistoric (probably Iron Age) date, and one of possible medieval date.

The samples were processed by manual water flotation/washover and the flots were collected in a 300 micron mesh sieve. The dried flots were scanned under a binocular microscope at magnifications up to x 16 and the plant macrofossils and other remains noted are listed in Appendix 5. Nomenclature within the table follows Kerney and Cameron (1979) and Macan (1977). Modern contaminants including fibrous roots and seeds were common or abundant within all three assemblages.

4.3.1.2 Results

All three assemblages were extremely small (considerably less than 0.1 litres in volume) and were primarily composed of modern roots and seeds. Shells of both terrestrial and freshwater molluscs were recorded at a moderate density within Samples <1> and <2> although, at the time of writing, it was unclear whether these were contemporary with the contexts from which the samples were taken, or later contaminants. Sample <3> contained an insufficient density of material for close interpretation. With the exception of very rare charcoal/charred wood fragments and a single piece of charred root or stem, plant macrofossils were entirely absent from the assemblages. Other remains were also scarce, although fragments of black porous and tarry material were recorded along with small pieces of coal. However, all of the latter may have been intrusive within the gully fills.

4.3.1.3 Conclusions and recommendations for further work

In summary, it is very difficult to closely interpret the current assemblages as the density of material present is extremely low, and some remains may be intrusive within the contexts. However, assuming that the mollusc shells are contemporary with the gully fills, it appears that the ditch from which Sample <1> was taken was at least seasonally damp at its base and possibly occasionally water filled. In contrast, the assemblage from Sample <2> indicates that this gully was considerably drier and was probably situated within an area of short-turfed grassland.

Results similar to the above were obtained from samples taken during the evaluation phase of this project (Fryer in Crawley 2010) and it is again proposed that the extreme low density of charred plant remains present within these assemblages may indicate that this area was largely devoid of human settlement/agricultural/industrial activity during the later prehistoric and subsequent periods.

Further analysis of the current assemblages is unnecessary as they contain an insufficient density of material for quantification. However, if further excavations are ever undertaken within this vicinity, it is recommended that additional samples of

approximately 10 – 20 litres in volume are taken from as wide a range of features as possible, for the potential analysis of the mollusc assemblages.

5.0 Updated Project Design

5.1 Introduction

This Updated Project Design is based on the results of the assessment and details the general aims of the post-excavation programme and its revised research objectives. It also presents a publication proposal that suggests how and where the project's results should be published. This is followed by a breakdown of the individual tasks that need to be undertaken to bring this project to completion.

5.2 General Aims

The aims of the post-excavation programme can be summarised as follows:

- To undertake further analysis of specific data sets where required to meet the initial aims of the project and the revised research objectives that have arisen as a result of the assessment.
- To create an ordered and indexed research archive for deposition with an appropriate curatorial institution.

5.3 Revised Research Objectives

Following the assessment of the evidence recovered during this project it is possible to set out refined research objectives. These are as follows:

- To refine, where possible, the developmental sequence of the site.
- To place the overall site, its individual feature types and its artefactual material within a wider regional context, exploring their potential contribution to Iron Age, medieval and post-medieval studies, particularly in the area of town/village development.
- To disseminate the results of the project via an archive report and summary article.

5.4 Stratigraphic Analysis

The stratigraphic data will be grouped and element re-phased if possible to produce a narrative sequence of activity at the site.

5.5 Artefactual Analysis

A catalogue of each of the material types will be included within the project archive. There is no further analysis to be undertaken on the finds assemblage.

5.6 Environmental Analysis

A catalogue of the sample results will be included within the archive and reference made in the publication to the results of the analysis. No further analysis is required.

5.7 Publication Proposal

It is anticipated that an archive report is produced which will be submitted to Cambridgeshire Archaeology Planning and Countryside Advice office (CAPCA) and a summary of the results of the site be presented in the relevant local periodical.

5.8 Storage, Curation and Conservation

The intended recipient for the artefactual material is the Cambridgeshire Museums Service, subject to the agreement of the landowner. All finds will be packaged according to Cambridgeshire Archaeology Planning and Countryside Advice office (CAPCA) specifications, following the guidelines laid out the Institute for Archaeologists' Standards and Guidelines for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives 2008).

5.9 Resources and Programming

The post-excavation programme will be undertaken by a project team led by a Project Officer responsible for implementation of the Updated Project Design. Elements of the programme will be delegated to nominated staff. The work of each team member will be scheduled and co-ordinated by the Project Officer. To ensure completion of the project to agreed performance targets, monitoring of the project will be carried out by a member of the NAU senior management, who will also provide advice and support to the Project Officer.

5.9.1 Staff

The project team will consist of NAU Archaeology staff and External Specialists where applicable.

Staff	Abbrev.	Role
Peter Crawley	PC	Project Officer, NAU Archaeology
Jayne Bown	JB	Archaeology Manager, NAU Archaeology
Sarah Percival	SP	Finds Specialist, NAU Archaeology
David Dobson	DD	Senior Illustrator, NAU Archaeology

5.9.2 Stratigraphic Analysis Timetable

Task	Task Description	Duration (days)	Staff
1	Grouping of site data and further stratigraphic analysis	0.5	PC

5.9.3 Artefactual Analysis Task List

Task	Task Description	Duration (days)	Staff
4	Prepare a full catalogue of the Finds	0.5	SP

5.9.4 Archive Report Task List

Task	Task Description	Duration (days)	Staff
7	Descriptive text and discussion	2.0	PC
8	Digitising of relevant sections	1.0	PC
9	Additional Graphics	1.0	DD
10	Final Edit	1.0	JB
11	Cross-checking and final preparation of archive	1.0	PC

5.9.5 Preparation of Published Summary Task List

Task	Task Description	Duration (days)	Staff
12	Preparation of Published Summary	0.5	PC/JB

Acknowledgements

The evaluation fieldwork was undertaken by the author with Suzie Westall and Lilly Hodges. The excavation was undertaken by the author with Steve Hickling, Stuart Calow, Michelle Bull, Suzie Westall and Lilly Hodges.

Many thanks are due to Lovell Partnerships Ltd for sponsoring the excavation and this report.

The finds were processed by Lucy Talbot and quantified by Sarah Percival. The Small Finds were analysed by Rebecca Sillwood, the animal bone by Julie Curl and all other finds by Sarah Percival. The environmental soil samples were reported on by Val Fryer after processing by Rob Fryer. The illustrations were prepared by David Dobson after initial digitising by the author.

This report was edited by Jayne Bown and produced by David Dobson. The project was overseen by Nigel Page.

Bibliography

Brown, N. and Glazebrook, J.	2000	Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 2. research agenda and strategy East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional paper 8,			
Clark, J. (ed.)	2004	The Medieval Horse and its Equipment. The Boydell Press			
Crawley, P.	2010	An Archaeological Evaluation on Land Adjacent to 33 High Street, Hauxton, Cambridgeshire. NAU Reports (Unpublished)			
Curl, J.	2010	Assessment of the faunal remains from 33, High Street, Hauxton (BAU2216). Sylvanus – Archaeological, Natural History & Illustration Services specialist report for NAU Archaeology.			
Davis, S.	1992	A Rapid Method For Recording Information About Mammal Bones From Archaeological Sites. English Heritage AML Report 71/92.			
Department of the Environment	1990	Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning. London: HMSO.			
Glazebrook, J.	1997	Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 1. resource assessment. Occasional Paper 3, East Anglian Archaeology			
Hill, J.D. and Horne, L.	2003	'Iron Age and Early Roman pottery' in <i>Power and Island Communities: Excavations at the Wardy Hill Ringwork, Coveney, Ely. East Anglian Archaeology</i> 103.145-184.			
IfA	2008	Standard and Guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives <u>http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/inPages/docs/codes/Archives2009.pdf</u>			
Kerney, M.P. and Cameron, R.A.D.	1979	A Field Guide to the Land Snails of Britain and North-west Europe. Collins.			
Lyons, A. and Percival, S.	Forthcoming	'The Late Pre Roman Iron Age, Early Roman and Romano-British Pottery' in Hinman, M. Loves Farm: Colonisation Conquest and Continuity on the Cambridgeshire Claylands. Earlier Prehistoric evidence, Iron Age, Romano-British and Early Saxon Agriculture and Settlement on land at Loves Farm, St Neots land at Loves Farm, St Neots, Cambridgeshire. East Anglian Archaeology			
Macan, T.T.	1977	British Fresh- and Brackish-Water Gastropods: A Key.			
		Freshwater Biological Association Scientific Publication No. 13.			
Percival, S.	2008	'Pottery (Bronze Age and Iron Age)' in Abrams, J. and Ingham, D. <i>Farming on the Edge: Archaeological Evidence from the Clay Uplands to the West of Cambridge.</i> East Anglian Archaeology 123. (NB Specialist contributions on CD).			
Stace, C.	1997	New Flora of the British Isles. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press.			
Sparkes, I.	1998	Old Horseshoes. Shire Publications Ltd.			
Tomber, R. and Dore, J.	1998	<i>The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection; A Handbook.</i> MoLAS Monograph 2. Museum of London Archaeology Service, English Heritage, British Museum.			
Von Den Driesch, A.	1976	A guide to the measurements of animal bones from archaeological sites. Peabody Museum Bulletin 1, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University.			
VCH	1982	'Parishes: Hauxton and Newton', <i>A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 8.</i> pp. 194–207. www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=66755&strquery=hauxton Date accessed: 02 March 2010.			

Context	Category	Cut Type	Fill Of	Description
50	Deposit			Topsoil
51	Cut	Pit		Pit
52	Deposit		51	Fill of [51]
53	Cut	Ditch		Ditch
54	Deposit		53	Fill of [53]
55	Cut	Ditch		Ditch Terminus
56	Deposit		55	Fill of [55]
57	Cut	Ditch		Ditch Terminus
58	Deposit		57	Top fill of [57]
59	Deposit		57	Base fill of [57]
60	Cut	Ditch		Ditch
61	Deposit		60	Upper fill of ditch [60]
62	Deposit		60	Main fill in ditch [60]
63	Deposit		60	Grey clay fill in ditch [60]
64	Cut	Pit		Elongated pit
65	Deposit		64	Upper fill of [64]
66	Deposit		64	Lower fill of [64]
67	Cut	Pit		Round or oval pit
68	Deposit		67	Upper fill of [67]
69	Deposit		67	Primary fill of [67]
70	Cut	Post-hole		Post hole (modern/Post-med)
71	Deposit		70	Chalky fill of post-hole [70]
72	Deposit		70	Post-pipe in [70]
73	Cut	Post-hole		Post hole (modern/Post-med)
74	Deposit		73	Chalky fill of post-hole [73]
75	Deposit		73	Post pipe in [73]
76	Cut	Pit		Small shallow pit
77	Deposit		76	Fill of pit [76]
78	Cut	Pit		Pit
79	Deposit		78	Fill of [78]
80	Deposit			White sandy fill in ditch [60]
81	Deposit		60	Primary fill of ditch [60]
82	Deposit		67	Slightly stony deposit in pit [67]
83	Deposit		67	Gravel deposit in pit [67]
84	Deposit		67	Redeposited natural in pit [67]
85	Deposit		64	Lower fill of pit [64]
86	Deposit		64	Gravel in base of pit [64]
87	Deposit		67	Gravel in pit [67]
88	Cut	Gas-pipe		Cut of modern gas pipe

Appendix 1: Excavation context data

Context	Category	Cut Type	Fill Of	Description
89	Deposit		88	Fill of [88] (soil and pipe)
90	Cut	Ditch		Ditch segment (same as [94])
91	Deposit		90	Base fill of [90]
92	Deposit		90	Mid fill of [90]
93	Deposit		90	Top fill of [90]
94	Cut	Ditch		Ditch segment (same as [90])
95	Deposit		94	Base fill of [94]
96	Deposit		94	Mid fill of [94]
97	Deposit		94	Top fill of [94]
98	Cut	Ditch		Ditch or hollow way
99	Deposit		98	Fill of [98]
100	Deposit		98	Primary fill of [98]
101	Cut	Hedge line/Gully		Possible hedge line/gully
102	Deposit		101	Fill of [101]
103	Cut	Gully		Small gully
104	Deposit		103	Fill of [103]
105	Cut	Pit		Large pit
106	Deposit		105	Pit fill (of [105])
107	Cut	Pit		large pit
108	Deposit		107	Fill of [107]
109	Deposit		107	Fill of [107]
110	Cut	Pit		Doughnut' shaped pit
111	Deposit		110	Fill of [110]
112	Cut	Pit		Pit
113	Deposit		112	Fill of [112]
114	Cut			Pit (quarry)
115	Deposit		114	Fill of [114]
116	Deposit		114	Fill of [114]
117	Cut	Pit		Pit
118	Deposit		118	Fill of [118]
119	Cut	Pit		Cut of small pit
120	Deposit		119	Fill of [119]
121	Deposit		114	Primary fill of pit [114]
122	Deposit		117	Primary fill of pit [117]
123	Cut	Pit		Pit
124	Deposit		123	Fill of [123]
125	Cut	Pit		Pit
126	Deposit		125	Fill of [125]
127	Cut	Pit		Pit
128	Deposit		127	Fill of [127]
129	Cut	Pit		Pit

Context	Category	Cut Type	Fill Of	Description
130	Deposit		129	Fill of [129]
131	Cut	Pit		Pit
132	Deposit		131	Fill of [131]
133	Deposit		127	Fill of [127]
134	Deposit		127	Fill of [127]
135	Deposit		127	Fill of [127]
136	Cut	Pit		Pit
137	Deposit		136	Fill of [136]
138	Cut			Small pit
139	Deposit		138	Fill of [138]
140	Cut	Pit		Pit
141	Deposit		140	Fill of pit [140]
142	Cut	Pit		Pit
143	Deposit		142	Fill of pit [142]
144	Cut	Pit		Pit
145	Deposit		144	Fill of [144]
146	Cut	Pit		shallow pit
147	Deposit		146	Fill of pit [146]
148	Cut	Ditch		Ditch
149	Deposit		148	Fill of [148]
150	Cut	Ditch		Ditch
151	Deposit		150	Fill of [150]
152	Deposit		150	Fill of [150]
153	Cut	Ditch		Ditch (north to south)
154	Deposit		153	Primary fill of [153]
155	Deposit		153	Secondary fill of [153]
156	Deposit		153	Top fill of [153]
157	Not Used			Not Used
158	Cut	Ditch		Ditch cut
159	Deposit		158	Fill of [158]
160	Cut	Ditch		Ditch cut
161	Deposit		160	Fill of [160]
162	Deposit		150	Primary fill of [150]
163	Cut	Ditch		Ditch cut
164	Deposit		163	Fill of [163]
165	Cut	Ditch		Ditch slot
166	Deposit		165	Fill of [165]
167	Deposit		165	Fill of [165]

Context	Material	Qty	Wt	Period	Notes
50	Flint – Struck	1	4g	Prehistoric	
50	Pottery	1	1g	Roman	
52	Ceramic Building Material	1	142g	Roman	Tegula
52	Stone	1	5g	Post-medieval	Roof slate
54	Ceramic Building Material	1	72g	Roman	Tegula
58	Pottery	10	58g	Roman	
59	Pottery	2	7g	Roman	
59	Shell	1	15g	Unknown	Oyster (discarded)
61	Animal Bone	41	470g	Unknown	
68	Animal Bone	2	31g	Unknown	
68	Iron	1	23g	Unknown	Nail
77	Stone	1	50g	Post-medieval	
77	Ceramic Building Material	1	33g	Modern	Concrete roof tile (discarded)
92	Pottery	1	9g	Iron Age	
92	Animal Bone	32	186g	Unknown	
96	Animal Bone	56	691g	Unknown	
99	Iron	5	1,380g	Medieval	Horseshoes x 4
99	Animal Bone	1	31g	Unknown	
104	Animal Bone	7	64g	Unknown	
137	Flint – Struck	1	5g	Prehistoric	
137	Pottery	1	3g	Roman	
149	Animal Bone	1	14g	Unknown	
154	Animal Bone	2	132g	Unknown	
156	Animal Bone	5	217g	Unknown	
159	Pottery	3	161g	Roman	
159	Lava	36	146g	Roman	
161	Animal Bone	2	39g	Unknown	

Appendix 2a: Finds by Context

Appendix 2b: OASIS Finds Summary

Period	Material	Total
Prehistoric	Flint – Struck	2
Iron Age	Pottery	1
Roman	Ceramic Building Material	2
	Lava	36
	Pottery	17
Medieval	Iron	5
Post-medieval	Stone	2
Modern	Ceramic Building Material	1
Unknown	Animal Bone	149
	Iron	1
	Shell	1

Appendix 3: Small Finds

Small Find No.	Context	Material	Qty	Wt. (g)	Dimensions	Object Type	Notes	Period
1	99	Iron	1	503	L145 W118	Horseshoe	Complete	Medieval
2	99	Iron	1	328	L128 W119	Horseshoe	Complete	Medieval
3	99	Iron	1	311	L124 W120	Horseshoe	Complete	Medieval
4	99	Iron	2	238	L138	Horseshoe	Two conjoining fragments	Medieval

Context	Qty	Wt (g)	Species	NISP	Age	MNI	Measure	Count	Butchering	Gnaw	Comments
61	56	470	Cattle	6	а	1			c, ch		
61			Sheep/ goat	1					ch		
61			Mammal	49							Fragmentary
68	1	31	Cattle	1	а	1			c, ch		
92	36	186	Cattle	4	а	1					Poor condition, powdering, eroded
92			Equid	2	а	1		1			Talus, 2 pieces
92			Mammal	30							Small frags, poor condition
96	57	691	Cattle	7	а	1	3	3	с		Slight arthritic growth at distal end
96			Sheep/ goat	1	j						
96			Mammal	49							
99	1	31	Pig	1					ch, c	1 Canid	Smallish humerus with cuts on proximal shaft, gnawed at distal
104	7	64	Cattle	3	а	1		1	c, ch		
104			Mammal	4							Fragments of large mammal bone
149	1	14	Sheep/ goat	1	а	1	1	1	ch		
154	2	132	Cattle	1	а	1		1	ch		
154			Mammal	1							
156	5	217	Equid	5	а	1					
161	2	39	Cattle	1	а				ch		
161			Mammal	1							

Appendix 4: Animal Bone

Key:

NISP = Number of Individual Species elements Present.

Measure = measureable bones, See Davis, 1992 and Driesch, A. von den. 1976.

Countable = See Davis, 1992.

Age = Estimate age based on fusion of bones and tooth wear; a = adult, j = juvenile, neo = neonatal, range = range of ages.

Path = Notable pathologies.

Gnaw = gnawing/surface damage - canid = dog/wolf, rodent = rat/vole/mouse, invert = isopods, molluscs, insects.

Butchering = c = cut, ch = chopped

Appendix 5:	Environmental	Evidence
-------------	---------------	----------

Sample No.	1	2	3
Context No.	58	92	137
Date	IA	?IA	Med
Plant macrofossils			
Charcoal <2mm	х	х	х
Charcoal >2mm	х	х	
Charred root/stem			х
Other remains			
Black porous 'cokey' material	х	х	х
Black tarry material	х		
Small coal frags.	х	х	
Molluscs			
Woodland/shade loving species			
Oxychilus sp.		xcf	
Zontidae indet.		х	
Open country species			
Pupilla muscorum	х	х	
Vallonia sp.		XXX	
V.costata	х	ХХ	
V.excentrica		xcf	
Vertigo pygmaea		х	
Catholic species			
Cepaea sp.		х	
Cochlicopa sp.	х	х	
Nesovitrea hammonis		х	
Trichia hispida group	х	XX	х
Marsh/freshwater species			
Anisus leucostoma	ХХ	х	
Carychium sp.	х	х	
Lymnaea sp.	XX	х	
Planorbis planorbis	х		
Valvata cristata		х	
Succinea sp.	х		
Sample volume (litres)	14	14	14
Volume of flot (litres)	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
% flot sorted	100%	100%	100%

Key to Table

x = 1 - 10 specimens xx = 11 - 50 specimens xxx = 51 - 100 specimens cf = compare IA = Iron Age Med = medieval