

567 BATH ROAD, LONGFORD, LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON.  
A POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
EXCAVATION.

1 ABSTRACT

*This report presents an assessment of archaeological investigations undertaken in advance of the development of the 567 Bath Road, Longford, London Borough of Hillingdon, for housing. The report summarises the stratigraphic sequence of the archaeological remains and describes the work that has been done on the archive. Assessments of the finds and samples recovered from the site are presented as an appendix. A principal objective of this report is to refine the research objectives of the project in the light of the findings, and assess the potential of the archive (site records and materials) to address these research objectives.*

*An evaluation had been undertaken by AOC Archaeology in December 2006, the results of which lead to two small open-area excavations which were conducted in February 2007.*

*The earliest significant phase of activity on the site occurred during the medieval period and mainly consisted of a series of linear ditches. Some of these functioned as enclosure ditches whilst one is likely to have functioned as a drainage channel. The lack of associated features suggests the site was not occupied during the medieval period and its sole function was as enclosed farm or pasture land.*

*The most substantial group of archaeological remains found on site belong to the post-medieval period. Two linear ditches were dated to this period which continues the themes of enclosure and drainage. Also dating to this period were a number of small domestic refuse pits and possible cess pits. These suggest that the use of the site changed during the post-medieval period, becoming a dumping area for the local population.*

## 2 INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 The Site

- 2.1.1 This document aims to summarise the results of the archaeological excavation, conducted by AOC Archaeology Group, at 567 Bath Road, Longford, London Borough of Hillingdon (Figure 1), on behalf of Easylives LLP.
- 2.1.2 The site is centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) TQ 0496 7683 and is within land bounded by Bath Road to the north-west, 563 Bath Road to the north-east, open land to the south-east and 575 Bath Road to the south-west. The site is approximately 35m north-east to south-west and north-west to south-east, with an irregular south-east boundary (Figure 2). The area affected by the development covers a total area of approximately 0.1 hectares (1000 m<sup>2</sup>).
- 2.1.3 An archaeological evaluation of the 567 Bath Road development was carried out by AOC Archaeology Group in December 2006. The evaluation consisted of three trenches which identified remains dating to the medieval and post-medieval period (Figure 3). The evaluation did not indicate significant remains in the area of Trench 1. Therefore two open excavation areas were opened up adjacent to Trenches 2 and 3, which indicated well preserved archaeological remains (Figure 3).
- 2.1.4 The site work was allocated the site code BFG 06. The research aims outlined prior to excavation are discussed with reference to the results and the further work to enable full interpretation and publication as outlined. Quantification of the resources needed to fulfil this work has been undertaken in the light of the revised research objectives.

### 2.2 Planning Background

- 2.2.1 The development proposal consisted of a residential development of six studio and six one bedroom flats in two blocks with associated parking and refurbishment of a former blacksmiths workshop to provide bin and cycle storage. The local archaeological advisor to the London Borough of Hillingdon advised that the development lies within a Conservation Area and in the historic centre of Longford; consequently an archaeological condition was placed on the development works.
- 2.2.2 A planning application for the above development was made by Easylives LLP. In accordance with Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16) issued by the Department of the Environment in 1990 (DoE, 1990) and the recommendations of the archaeological advisor to the London Borough of Hillingdon, a condition on planning consent requires an archaeological investigation be carried out, in order to record any archaeological deposits and features exposed during the development (Application No.:59795/APP/2006/796).

2.2.3 This assessment report conforms to the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning (DoE 1990) (PPG16). It has been designed in accordance with local and national standards and guidelines:

- English Heritage – Management of Archaeological Projects (EH 1991).
- Institute of Field Archaeologists – Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations (IFA 1994).
- Institute of Field Archaeologists – Code of Conduct (IFA 1997).

2.2.4 The archaeological condition attached to the planning consent specified:

“No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority”.

Reason : The development of this site is likely to damage archaeological remains. The applicant should therefore submit detailed proposals in the form of an archaeological project design in accordance with appropriate English Heritage guidelines in compliance with policy BE3.

## 2.3 Geology and Topography

2.3.1 The British Geological Survey map (BGS Sheet 286), indicates that the site is situated upon alluvial terrace gravels capped by brickearth. The ground is generally flat located at about 23m OD.

2.3.2 Geotechnical investigations have not been conducted within the proposed development area, but are to be undertaken shortly.

## 2.4 Methodology

2.4.1 The evaluation phase of the work was undertaken in December 2006 by AOC Archaeology Group covering the whole of the 567 Bath Road development (AOC 2006a). The evaluation consisted of three machine-excavated trenches. The mitigation stage of archaeological work composed of two open areas of excavation which were conducted according to the prepared Written Scheme of Investigation (AOC 2006b).

2.4.2 All overburden was removed down to the top of the first recognisable archaeological horizon using a JCB 3CX with a 1.8m wide toothless ditching bucket. All machining was carried out under direct control of an experienced archaeologist. The site and spoil heaps were scanned visually for finds.

2.4.3 A bench mark was located on a residential property opposite the site which was used to level the site. The value of the bench mark was 23.68m OD.

- 2.4.4 In this report cuts are shown in square brackets '[000]' and fills and layers are shown in rounded brackets '(000)'. Linear features which were excavated in slots have been allocated feature or ditch numbers for ease of reference.
- 2.4.5 The evaluation and excavation work undertaken by Catherine Edwards, Project Supervisor, under the overall project management of Ron Humphrey, Project Manager.

### 3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The following archaeological and historical background of the site has been extracted from the Written Scheme of Investigation (AOC 2006b).

#### 3.1 Prehistoric (before c. AD 43)

3.1.1 Numerous archaeological investigations on the West London terrace gravels, including very large excavations at Heathrow and elsewhere, have revealed a prehistoric landscape of great importance. High levels of activity have been recorded across this area, extending across the whole prehistoric period, and including very important ritual and vernacular sites. The 3.5km Stanwell Cursus is the most significant of the local ritual monuments, and dates to the early Neolithic period.

3.1.2 The geology and topography of the area are likely to have made it attractive to prehistoric communities and the light fertile soil would have suited early agricultural practices.

#### 3.2 Roman (c. AD 43 - 450)

3.2.1 A relatively high density of settlement on the river terrace gravels continued into the Roman period and Roman remains have been found on many sites nearby.

#### 3.3 Anglo-Saxon (c.451-1065)

3.3.1 A small Saxon settlement dating from the 5<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> century AD has been identified in an excavation near the northern runway of Heathrow.

#### 3.4 Medieval (c.1066 - 1485) and Post-Medieval (c.1485 - modern)

3.4.1 The first documentary reference to Longford dates to 1337. The area continued in agricultural use up to the modern period. Development of the area, to become incorporated into the residential and industrial area of London, occurred from the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

#### 4 ORIGINAL RESEARCH AIMS

4.1 In general terms the original aim of the investigation was to determine and understand the nature, function and character of the site in its cultural and environmental setting.

4.2 The original research aims are reproduced in the same form as they were within the Written Schemes of Investigation submitted prior to the start of work (AOC 2006b):

- To establish the presence/absence of archaeological remains within the site.
- To determine the extent, condition, nature, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains encountered.
- To record and sample excavate any archaeological remains encountered.
- To assess the ecofactual and environmental potential of any archaeological features and deposits.
- To determine the extent of previous truncations of the archaeological deposits.
- To enable GLAAS to make an informed decision on the status of the condition on the planning permission, and any possible requirement for further work in order to satisfy that condition.
- To make available to interested parties the results of the investigation in order to inform the mitigation strategy as part of the planning process.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Determine the presence of any remains of prehistoric date.
- Determine the presence of any remains of Roman, Saxon, or later date on the site.
- Assess the potential of the site to inform on the development and chronology of Longford.
- Assess the degree and extent of truncation of earlier deposits by the phases of modern buildings on the site.

4.3 Further specific aims were established following the evaluation (AOC 2006a) and are reproduced below:

- To excavate and record archaeological remains of all periods.
- To better understand the layout of the medieval ditches in order to increase our knowledge of the layout and growth of medieval Longford.
- To better understand the green alluvial deposit recorded in Trench 3.

4.4 The final aim is to make public the results of the investigation, subject to any confidentiality restrictions.

## 5 INTERIM SUMMARY OF RESULTS

### 5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The investigation area is centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) TQ 0496 7683 and is within land bounded by Bath Road to the north-west, 563 Bath Road to the north-east, open land to the south-east and 575 Bath Road to the south-west (Figure 1). The site is approximately 35m north-east to south-west and north-west to south-east, with an irregular south-east boundary (Figure 2). The area affected by the development covers a total area of approximately 0.1 hectares (1000 m<sup>2</sup>).

5.1.2 A series of archaeological works was conducted by AOC Archaeology Group during December 2006 and February 2007, prior to the redevelopment of the site. Archaeological deposits were thought to survive in the local area, in varying degrees of preservation, therefore the Archaeological Advisor from the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) advised the local planning authority that an appropriate form of archaeological mitigation was required. The site was previously occupied by a building which had been demolished to ground level. The development plan involved a residential development of six studio and six one bedroom flats in two blocks, with associated parking and refurbishment of a former blacksmiths to provide bin and cycle storage.

5.1.3 The site works began with a three trench evaluation (Figure 2 & 3) which revealed natural London Clay at 21.53m OD overlain by gravel at 21.95m OD, at the base of the trenches. Trenches 2 and 3 revealed that the natural gravel was covered by a layer of alluvial silt which was cut by several ditches spot dated to the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Due to the presence of archaeological remains within Trenches 2 and 3 (Figure 3), the archaeological advisor requested the excavation of two larger areas adjacent to Trenches 2 and 3 to allow a better understanding of the archaeological remains.

5.1.4 This report summarises the results of the both the archaeological evaluation and excavation (Figure 4).

### 5.2 Geology and Topography

5.2.1 The geology on site consisted of London Clay (3/010) which was recorded at a height of 21.53m OD in a sondage excavated in Trench 3. The clay was overlain by a gravel layer (1/005), (2/008), (3/009), (4/033) and (5/029). This is likely to represent a localised gravel deposit rather than the remains of the Terrace Gravels. This was in turn overlaid by a layer of yellow brown silty clay (2/007), (3/008), (4/032) and (5/028).

### 5.3 Medieval

#### *General*

5.1.1 Seven features date to the medieval period. Six were narrow ditches and one was interpreted as a small post hole. Several of the ditches were intercutting demonstrating several phases of activity. No other features dated to this period. All of the medieval features were cut directly into the natural alluvial silty clay, (2/007), (3/008), (4/032) and (5/028).

#### *11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> Century* (Figures 5, 6 and 10)

5.3.2 A series of narrow ditches were excavated during both the evaluation and the excavation phases on site. Two ditches were observed in Trench 2 and adjoining Trench 4 (Figure 5). Ditch 1 consisted of cut [2/004] which measured 2.30m x 0.60m x 0.30m and ran north-south. The ditch was filled by (2/003) a mid grey brown clay silt with inclusions of charcoal and flint but no datable finds.

5.3.3 Another similar ditch was recorded 0.90m to the north (Figure 5). Ditch 2 consisted of cut [4/013] which measured 6.10m x 0.64m x 0.34m and ran north-south. The ditch was filled by (4/012), a green grey brown silty sandy clay with inclusions of flint gravel and three pottery sherds. The pottery recovered from the ditch fill has been identified as two fragments of Early South Hertfordshire-type coarseware (ESHER) dated to the 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century, and one later, intrusive, fragment of late medieval/transitional sandy Redware (LMSR) dated to 16<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century. The 0.90m gap between the two ditches would almost certainly have been a deliberate break, creating an opening allow easy movement between two separate plots of land.

5.3.4 Similar ditches were observed in Trench 3 and the adjoining Trench 5, the earliest of which was Ditch 3 which ran northeast-southwest from Trench 5 to Trench 3, measuring 5.54m x 0.46m x 0.15-0.20m deep (Figure 6). The cut was recorded as [5/017] in Trench 5 and [3/007] in Trench 3. The ditch was backfilled by grey yellow brown sandy clay silt (5/016) and (3/006). Finds recovered during the excavation included a fragment of daub and pottery sherds identified as Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous Ware (H)EMSC) which dates to the 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century. The composite hand and wheel finished manufacture of the vessels suggests a late 12<sup>th</sup> century date.

5.3.5 Ditch 3 was truncated by several features, including Ditch 4 which ran northwest-southeast (Figure 6). Ditch 4 measured 5.00m x 0.75m x 0.38m and consisted of cut [3/005] and fill (3/004). The fill (3/004) was a mid green grey brown clay sandy silt with inclusions of gravel and charcoal as well as fragments of animal bone identified as ox sized and pottery sherds of Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous Ware (H)EMSC) dating to the 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century. Four fragments of a metal knife were also recovered from Ditch 4. The knife has a whittle tang and a broken tip. Due to the condition of the knife no firm date can be established,



- however further conservation work may be able to reveal detail which may help with further identification.
- 5.3.6 The northern extent of Ditch 4 is truncated by a later pit [5/009] (Figure 8) but it is possible that Ditch 4 would have fed into the north-south Ditch 5. Ditch 5 measured 10.00m x 1.50m and was excavated in two slots [5/021] and [5/025]. The depth of the ditch varied between 0.15m in southern slot [5/021] to 0.72m in northern slot [5/025]. The variation in depth may have been functional if the ditch was used as a drainage or irrigation channel. Slot [5/021] was filled by (5/020) a mid dark grey brown clay silt with inclusions of charcoal flecks, gravel, a fragment of horse bone and three sherds of 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century pottery.
- 5.3.7 Slot [5/025] contained three fills (5/022), (5/023) and (5/024). The lowest (primary) fill was (5/024) which was an organic dark brown silty clay deposit with very frequent inclusions of twigs and roots. This deposit, which was environmentally sampled, contained a number of charred pulse seeds and several cereal rachis fragments along with a large assemblage of waterlogged plant remains. Within the assemblage were the remains of roots and wood along with a large number of seeds of disturbed (including cultivated) ground including ground stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*), fool's parsley (*Aethusa cynapium*), common hemp-nettle (*Galeopsis tetrahit*) and hemlock (*Conium maculatum*). Several damp-ground species, such as gypsy wort (*Lycopus europaeus*), sedges (*Carex* spp.) and celery-leaved crowfoot (*Ranunculus sceleratus*) were also represented. The occurrence of sloe (*Prunus spinosa*), blackberry/raspberry (*Rubus fruticosus/idaeus*) and elder (*Sambucus nigra*) seeds within the assemblage may suggest that small trees and shrubs overhung the ditch, or they represent evidence of the local population's diet and waste. No pottery was recovered from the fill (5/024).
- 5.3.8 The other fills for slot [5/025] were a light grey brown sandy clay (5/023) and a mid grey brown sandy clay silt (5/022). Pottery recovered from fill (5/022) was identified as a jar or cooking pot in fabric Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous Ware (H)EMSC, dated to the 11<sup>th</sup> to late 12<sup>th</sup> century.
- 5.3.9 Cutting Ditch 5 and Ditch 3 was later Ditch 6, which ran north-south (Figure 6). Ditch 6 measured 5.10m x 1.18m x 0.27m and was excavated in two slots [5/019] and [5/027]. Both slots were filled by mid grey brown clay silt, (5/018) and (5/026), with inclusions of charcoal flecks, gravel, very small fragments of tile and sherds of a Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous Ware (H)EMSC vessel in (5/018) and a jar or cooking pot in the same fabric in (5/026). The pottery was dated to the 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century.
- 5.3.10 Posthole [2/010] was located in Trench 2 and measured 0.30m x 0.15m x 0.20m (Figure 5). Only part of [2/010] was within the trench and it is possible it was a larger feature than a posthole. It was filled by mid green brown sandy clay silt (2/009) with occasional charcoal and a single fragment of Stamford ware (STAM)

pottery. The sherd is possibly a fragment of a bowl, glazed olive-green both internally and externally and has been dated to the 12<sup>th</sup> century.

- 5.3.11 The remaining feature that dates to the medieval period was an alluvial deposit, (3/003) and (4/025). The layer was first recorded in the original evaluation on site as (3/003) and was also observed during the second phase of work measuring up to approximately 0.20m thick. It was clear from the excavation of Trenches 4 and 5 that the deposit was not universal across the site and only appears in patches suggesting either that the deposit had suffered truncation or that the action that created the deposit such as alluvial or fluvial forces, deposited it in depressions within the underlying gravel or within natural hollows. The deposit was sampled during the excavation of Trench 4 however the organic residues only produced a small amount of charred cereal grain, charred wood and roots. The lack of organic remains limits the amount of information we can gather from this deposit regarding its deposition onto the site. Pottery recovered from the deposit was identified as Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous Ware (H)EMSC and Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware (ESHER) dating to the 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century and there was one intrusive piece of Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware (LMSR). The deposit was a mid greenish brown sandy clay silt which may represent a period of repeated flooding on the site. Due to the patchy nature of the deposit the relationship between (3/003) and (4/025) and the ditches remains unclear. It is likely however that the ditches were no longer in use when this material was deposited.

*Post-Medieval* (Figures 7, 8 and 11)

- 5.3.12 Ditch 7, which was observed in Trenches 2 and 4, measured 7.20m x 0.60m x 0.15-0.20m deep and was excavated in two slots [2/006] and [4/011] (Figure 7). The ditch was filled by a green brown clay silt (2/005) and (4/010) with inclusions of gravel, charcoal, ox bones and pottery sherds identified as fragments of a Cistercian Ware cup, a late medieval/transitional sandy Redware jug and an unidentified vessel. The pottery fragments date from the late 15<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century. Environmental samples taken from ditch slot [4/011] included several hundred cereal grains and over 100 large leguminous seeds which may be peas (*Pisum sativum*). The cereal grains were identified as barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) and free threshing wheat (*Triticum aestivum/turgidum*) with a small amount of oats (*Avena sp.*). Cereal chaff in the form of wheat and barley rachis fragments were also common.
- 5.3.13 Several pits were excavated on site that were dated to the post medieval period. Two pits [4/015] and [4/017] were excavated in Trench 4 (Figure 7). Pit [4/015] measured 1.12m x 1.02m x 0.48m deep and was filled by two fills (4/014) and (4/026). Fill (4/014), was a light grey clay sand with inclusions of charcoal, small fragments of undiagnostic tile and oyster shell. Above (4/014) was fill (4/026), which was a dark grey brown clay sand with inclusions of charcoal, gravel, brick, tile and pottery. The pottery recovered from the pit included the complete lower

- half and most of the upper portion of a large cistern in Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware (LMSR). The vessel appeared to have been deposited whole and was damaged at a later date. The cistern dates to the 16<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century. Other fragments of pottery recovered from the pit included a Brill/Boarstall ware (BRIM) bowl, a Cistercian ware (CSTN) cup and a Tin-glazed Ware (TGW) vessel.
- 5.3.14 Truncating pit [4/015] was pit [4/017] which measured 0.49m x 0.44m x 0.24m deep. The pit was filled by (4/016), a dark brown silty sand with inclusions of charcoal flecks and pottery sherds dated to 1580-1800.
- 5.3.15 Pit [4/029] and associated gully [4/031] were recorded in Trench 4. Pit [4/029] was sub-rectangular and measured 1.55m x 1.00m x 0.35m+. The pit contained four horizontal timber struts (4/028) which together formed a square. The struts appeared to abut each other rather than be fixed or jointed, however the high water level and extreme weather condition limited the extent of the excavation. The feature was planned but not fully excavated due to the lack of access during the course of the site excavation and flooding of Trench 4. The timber struts may have acted as a structural brace for cut [4/029]. The timber struts were recorded approximately 0.40m below the top of the pit, which may suggest that the pit cut [4/029] actually truncated an earlier timber structure for its use as a refuse pit or that the timber formed the brace for a deep feature such as a timber lined well or soakaway with pit cut [4/029] forming the construction cut. The pit was backfilled by (4/027) a mid grey brown silty clay with inclusions of animal bone fragments including ox and pig, brick and pottery identified as Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy redware (LMSR), Surrey Hampshire Border ware (RBOR), Green Glazed Surrey Hampshire Border ware (RBOR) and Yellow ware (YELL). The pottery assemblage ranges in date from 1580-1900. It remains unclear whether the pits function was primarily for the deposition of domestic waste or that the waste was deposited when the original function, possibly a well or soakaway was no longer in use.
- 5.3.16 Gully [4/031] ran east-west and measured 1.20m x 0.90m x 0.25m deep. The gully was filled by (4/030), a mid grey silty clay with inclusions of gravel and charcoal. No datable finds were recovered. The gully appeared to be related to well/pit [4/029] suggesting that the gully may have diverted water into the well.
- 5.3.17 Truncating gully [4/031] and Ditch 7 was Ditch 8, a large north-south ditch which measured 5.28m x 1.60m x 0.30-0.50m deep. The ditch cut [4/006] was filled by (4/005), a dark blue brown sandy clay with inclusions of gravel, ox bone, tile, brick and pottery. The pottery sherds were identified as Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware and white Salt-glazed Stoneware dated to 16<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century, though these are likely to be residual.
- 5.3.18 Several other small pits were recorded in Trench 4, [4/024], [4/023] and [4/021]. The pit fills (4/022) and (4/020) were recorded as dark brown silty sandy clay

- with inclusions of gravel and charcoal. The pits measured 0.50m x 0.45m x 0.09m, 0.52m x 0.52m x 0.09m and 0.19m x 0.23m x 0.08m, respectively. Three small stakeholes were also recorded in Trench 4. These were grouped as [4/019], and measured on average 0.10m x 0.10m x 0.08m deep. They were all filled with (4/018), a light grey sandy clay. They remain undated.
- 5.3.19 Large pit [5/009], in Trench 5, measured 1.42m x 1.00m x 0.27m (Figure 8). The pit was filled by (5/008), a dark green grey brown silt sandy clay with inclusions of charcoal flecks and fragments of a Creamware lid and Transfer printed Refined Whiteware vessel, dated to 1760-1830 and 1750-1900 respectively.
- 5.3.20 Three further pits were recorded in Trench 5, [5/015], [5/011] and [5/013]. Pit [5/015] measured 1.51m x 1.20m x 0.21m deep and was filled by (5/014), an orange and red brown silty sandy clay with inclusions of gravel and charcoal. No dating evidence was recovered from the fill. Pit [5/013] measured 1.20m x 0.80m x 0.25m deep and was filled by (5/012), a mid grey sandy clay silt with inclusions of gravel, charcoal and occasional small fragments of tile. Truncating pit [5/013] was smaller circular pit [5/011] which measured 0.65m in diameter and 0.15m deep. The pit was filled by (5/010), a dark blackish brown silty sand with frequent gravel, occasional charcoal and tile/brick flecks. No dating evidence was recovered from either [5/013] or [5/011].
- 5.3.21 Approximately 1.20m southwest of pit [5/013] and [5/011] were two circular postholes [5/005] and [5/007] and a sub-rectangular feature [5/030] (Figure 8). The postholes measured 0.50m in diameter and 0.15m deep and were filled by (5/004) and (5/006), a dark black brown silty sand with inclusions of gravel and charcoal. A fragment of pan tile and a brick was recovered from fill (5/006) which date roughly to the post-medieval period. Feature [5/030] was interpreted as the remains of disturbance caused when the posts were extracted.
- 5.3.22 Cutting into Ditch 8 was [4/007] a brick lined cess pit measuring 1.30m x 1.30m. The structure was constructed of red frogged bricks bonded with yellow sandy mortar. The backfill of the cess pit was a mixture of brown, grey and green sandy silty clay with inclusions of brick, tile and pottery sherds dated to 1670-1900. Approximately 0.20m west of [4/007] was pit [4/009] which measured 0.60m x 0.60m x 0.15m and was filled by (4/008), a dark brown sandy clay which included sherds identified as a modern plant pot.

## 6 SUMMARY OF SITE ARCHIVE AND WORK CARRIED OUT

### 6.1 Stratigraphic Site Archive

Stratigraphic Site Archive	Quantity
Context Register Sheets	2
Context Sheets	72
Trench Record Sheets	5
Plan Register Sheets	1
Plans	8
Section Register Sheets	1
Sections Sheets	7
Levels Sheets	3
Registered Finds Sheets	1
Photographic Register Sheets	6
Environmental Sample Register Sheets	1
Photographs, Black and White	47
Photographs, Colour	47
Photographs, Digital	47
Stratigraphic Matrices	Yes

### 6.2 Work Carried Out On the Stratigraphic Archive

The site records have been completed and checked. Stratigraphic matrices have been compiled for the site. A cross referenced context register has been completed (Appendix A of this document). Contexts have been placed into preliminary phases, (Section 4) using stratigraphic information and dating provided by specialists. Several illustrations have been constructed to accompany the results showing the location of the phased work and the archaeology discovered within those phases. The photographic archive has been checked, marked and referenced according to Museum of London guidelines.

## 7 SUMMARY OF FINDS AND WORK CARRIED OUT

### 7.1 Quantification of Finds

All of the finds have been washed, quantified and marked where appropriate. The box archive requires ordering and re-listing for deposition in the Museum of London Archive.

Find Type	Quantity
Pottery	4.484kg
Building Material	3.96kg
Animal Bone	1.267kg
Plant Remains	3 Flots
Metalwork	8 Items

### 7.2 Pottery

A total of 153 sherds of pottery, weighing 4.484kg, was recovered from the excavation. The pottery sherds were mainly from individual vessels, although eight vessels comprised more than one sherd, including a single cistern with 105 sherds. This single vessel makes up just over 68% of the total assemblage and weighs 3.639kg. The pottery was recorded by context, fabric and form, where this could be recognised, and quantified by sherd count and weight. The codes in the London ceramic type series (CTS) have been used wherever possible.

The evaluation produced a small assemblage of pottery, ranging in date from the early medieval to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The earliest pottery found on the site is Saxo-Norman in date. A single sherd of Stamford ware (STAM), from a possible bowl glazed olive-green internally and externally, was recovered from Trench 2. The Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous ware (H)EMSC and Early South Hertfordshire-type coarseware (ESHER) are both of 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century date but the composite hand and wheel finished manufacture of the Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous ware (H)EMSC suggests a date in the late 12<sup>th</sup> century. Only two sherds of high medieval pottery were recovered: a sherd of South Hertfordshire-type Greyware (SHER), dated to the late 12<sup>th</sup> to mid-14<sup>th</sup> century, and a sherd of Brill/Boarstall ware (BRIM), dating to the late 13<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> century.

The late medieval/post-medieval transitional period is represented by Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware (LMSR) and Cistercian ware (CSTN), with the unknown oxidised sherd also possibly dating to this period.

Post-medieval wares range from green-glazed Surrey/Hampshire Border Redware (RBORG) and local Post-medieval Redware (PMR), of the late 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> century, to the London Stoneware (LONS), White Salt-glazed wares (SWSG), Creamware (CREA), Yellow (Mocha) ware (YELL), Refined Whiteware (REFW) and Transfer-printed wares (TPW) of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Forms are mainly

table wares, including a tea bowl as well as bowls and jars, and, particularly among the later wares, plates, dishes and a lid.

### 7.3 Building Material

The ceramic building material assemblage from BFG06 comprised 3.96kg (19 fragments) of building material from six contexts. All the building material would appear to be post-medieval in date. Apart from one minute unidentified fragment of ceramic, the assemblage comprises roofing tile and brick. All the building material has been recorded using the standard recording forms used by the Museum of London. This has involved fabric analysis undertaken with a x10 binocular microscope.

None of the building material can be closely dated. Bricks in fabric types 3033 and 3046 in central London date to the period 1450-1666/1700, but they may have an extended date range in Hillingdon. The peg tiles are even less closely dated, although their thickness (13-15 mm) would suggest a post-medieval date.

The building material indicates the types of roofing tile and brick in use in Hillingdon in the post-medieval period. However, the fragmentary nature of the material means that it is only of limited local significance. Its value could be increased by comparing the assemblage to other building material groups found in Hillingdon area.

### 7.4 Animal Bone

Hand-collected animal bone was recorded directly onto Excel spreadsheets. Each context and sample group was described in terms of weight (kg), estimated fragment count, species, carcass-part, fragmentation, preservation, modification, and the recovery of epiphyses, mandibular tooth rows, measurable bones, complete long bones, and sub-adult age groups. The assemblage was not recorded as individual fragments or identified to skeletal element. All identifications referred to the MoLSS reference collection. Fragments not identifiable to species or genus level were allocated to the approximate category, 'ox-sized', as appropriate.

The assemblage included 28 fragments of moderately well-preserved hand-collected animal bone with fragment sizes ranging between <25 and >75 mm and weighed 1.267 kg. The assemblage derived largely from mature ox *Bos taurus* vertebra, upper and lower limb, with ox-sized longbone and rib fragments. There were single finds of sheep/goat *Ovis aries/Capra hircus* adult mandible, pig *Sus scrofa* mandible and horse *Equus caballus* lower limb. There was no recovery of cattle or sheep/goat horncore. There was no definite identification of goat *Capra hircus* and no recovery of poultry, game, scavengers or, indeed, any wild species. There was no recovery of sub-adult animals. Clear evidence of butchery was noted only on an ox foot from [2/005] and a lower limb from 4/005. There was no other evidence for modification. Evidence suitable for age determination was provided by only a single mandibular tooth row and five epiphyses; there was one measurable but incomplete bone.

## 7.5 Plant Remains

Three samples were processed for analysis. The flots were briefly scanned using a low powered binocular microscope, recording the item frequency and species diversity, method of preservation and general nature of the plant macrofossils and any faunal remains in the individual samples.

A large assemblage of charred plant remains was recovered from post-medieval Ditch 7, fill (4/010), and included several hundred cereal grains and at least 100 large leguminous seeds, possibly peas (*Pisum sativum*). The cereal grains consisted mainly of barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) and free-threshing wheat (*Triticum aestivum/turgidum*), with a smaller number of oats (*Avena* sp.). Cereal chaff, in the form of wheat and barley rachis fragments, was also reasonably common, as were culm nodes, probably from cereal straw. A number of charred arable weed seeds were also present in the assemblage, although these were not particularly abundant. Charred remains were much less common in the other two samples, from medieval Ditch 5, fill (5/024) and alluvial deposit (4/025), each of which contained only occasional cereal grains. A number of pulse seeds, possibly peas, and several cereal rachis fragments were also present in the sample from ditch fill (5/024).

Few organic plant remains survived in either of the samples from Trench 4, but a large waterlogged assemblage was recovered from ditch fill (5/024). Large amounts of roots and wood fragments made up the bulk of the sample flot, but many seeds of disturbed (including cultivated) ground, including stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*), fool's parsley (*Aethusa cynapium*), common hemp-nettle (*Galeopsis tetrahit*) and hemlock (*Conium maculatum*) were also present. Several damp-ground species, such as gypsy wort (*Lycopus europaeus*), sedges (*Carex* spp.) and celery-leaved crowfoot (*Ranunculus sceleratus*) were represented, and seeds of sloe (*Prunus spinosa*), blackberry/raspberry (*Rubus fruticosus/idaeus*) and elder (*Sambucus nigra*) may have come from small trees and shrubs overhanging the ditch, although these seeds of edible plants could equally well represent human refuse.

## 7.6 Metalwork

Metalwork from seven contexts, including iron and copper alloy finds, was submitted for assessment. All was examined by eye and by X-ray images. The metalwork is generally in very poor condition, with the soil being unfriendly to the ironwork in particular.

The sole copper alloy artefact recovered from the site is a complete pin. It has a wound-wire head that appears to be of the type with the head wound around the top of the shaft. It would probably have been used to fix a head dress in position or affix some other clothing or accessory. It is likely to be 17th to 18th century in date. Several pieces of ironwork cannot be identified. Finds from contexts (2/003), (4/014) and (5/006) are unclear, even with an X-ray. The remains of a knife, in four pieces, was recovered from context (3/004). It has a whittle tang and the tip is lost. It can only be given a broad medieval to post medieval date.



Despite the heavy corrosion, the X-ray shows some definition where the tang joins the shoulders of the blade, which may benefit from closer examination during conservation.

The remains of two nails were found; one in context (4/014) and the other, which retains part of a head, in context (4/016). Both are heavily corroded, with the section obscured. A third piece of structural ironwork was recovered from context (5/009). It is a U-shaped staple and it appears complete, although heavily corroded, in keeping with the rest of the iron finds.

## 8 REVISED RESEARCH AIMS

The revised research aims are based upon an assessment of the degree to which the original aims were fulfilled by the excavation and what further work should be carried out to enable fulfilment of these, or any new, aims.

### 8.1 Medieval

The excavation confirmed the presence of medieval activity on the site specifically related to activity in the 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century. The archaeological remains were limited to linear ditches and a solitary posthole.

*How do the medieval archaeological remains fit into what we already know about Longford and the local area? Does the local history of Longford help to explain the abandonment of the site after the 12<sup>th</sup> century?*

### 8.2 Post-medieval

The excavation revealed archaeological features dating from the 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century on site. The archaeological remains were recorded as two ditches, pits and a well.

*How do the archaeological remains fit within the known archaeological and historical record of Longford. Does the post-medieval ditches recorded on site, (Ditch 7 and 8) feature on any historical maps of the area.*

### 8.3 Dissemination

The final aim of the recording action was to make the results available to all interested parties through an appropriate form of publication.

The results will be publicised in the following ways:

*An Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS Form) will be completed.*

*The site and research archive together with the finds will be deposited with the Museum of London.*

*A report will be prepared for submission for publication in an appropriate journal. This will probably be in the London Archaeologist.*

## 9 SUMMARY OF FURTHER WORK TASKS

Task No.	Description	Staff	Days
<b>General</b>			
1	Documentary Research.	CAE	1
2	Checking and integrating the matrix.	CAE	0.5
3	Checking context sheets and plans.	CAE	0.5
4	Liaison with specialists.	CAE	0.5
<b>Specialist Reports</b>			
5	Pottery - Closer analysis of pottery including fabric analysis.	AS	3
6	Animal Bone - Recording of complete assemblage onto database.	AP	0.25
7	Animal Bone - Analysis of data/preparation of report/edit/archive.	AP	0.5
8	Building Material - Compare the assemblage with the stratigraphical sequence and all available dating evidence	IB	0.5
9	Building Material - Write publication report	IB	0.5
10	Botany - Sorting, identification and quantification of 1 large & 1 moderate charred plant assemblage.	AD	1.5
11	Botany - Scanning & recording waterlogged plant remains from 1 large sample.	AD	1
12	Botany - Data entry and preparation of table.	AD	0.75
13	Botany - Preparation of report.	AD	2
14	Metalwork - Summary publication Report.	NP	0.5
15	Conservation - Selective removal of corrosion from 3/004 knife	LB	0.5
16	Conservation - Repacking of finds.	PF	0.5
<b>Analysis and Report</b>			
17	Integration of specialist reports.	CAE	0.5
18	Preparation of publication text.	CAE	3
19	Finds illustration	LC	0.5
20	Report illustrations	JM	1
21	Internal edit	MM	1
22	Amendments resulting from internal edit	CE	0.5
23	Archive preparation	PF	1.5
24	Archive microfilming and deposition	PF	1
25	Liaison with publication editor	MM	0.5
26	Project management	MM	1.5
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>25 days</b>

## 10 CATALOGUE OF FURTHER WORK

### General

Research will be carried out into primary sources and documents concerning the site, including any cartographic evidence. The site records will be checked to archive standard along with a full integration of the matrix. The digitised plans will require checking and correcting to ensure it is linked correctly with the contextual database.

### 10.1 Specialist Reports

#### 10.1.1 *Pottery*

The pottery recovered from Bath Road is of local significance. The remains represent early medieval activity as well as post-medieval activity with a significant break between the two. The pottery recovered during the excavation fits into local patterns recorded on other similar sites. The two major groups of pottery occurring on the site are the early medieval wares, specifically Herts Calcareous ware, and the late medieval wares, specifically the Transitional Sandy Redware.

The further work includes a description of these wares and a comparison with other wares from the region. This will include the results of petrological analysis. The cistern should be illustrated as do a selection of the diagnostic sherds in Herts Calcareous ware. No more than four vessels will be illustrated.

#### 10.1.2 *Animal Bone*

The hand-collected animal bone is of very limited local significance only, in terms of the local meat diet, with particular emphasis on carcass-part selection and age composition of cattle, sheep/goat and pig.

Further work includes the recording of the complete assemblage onto a database and the completion of the analysis of the data and the preparation of a report.

#### 10.1.3 *Building Material*

The building material indicates the types of post-medieval roofing tile and brick in use as Hillingdon in the post-medieval period. However, the fragmentary nature of the material means that it is only of limited local significance. Its value could be increased by comparing the assemblage to other building material groups found in the Hillingdon area.

The building material assemblage should be compared to the stratigraphical sequence and all available dating evidence. A publication report will be completed. None of the building material requires illustration.

#### 10.1.4 *Botany*

Further work on the charred plant remains from post-medieval Ditch 7, fill (4/010) and, to a medieval Ditch 5, fill (5/024), will demonstrate the use of cereals and pulses on the site, and analysis of the ratios between grain, chaff and weed

seeds in the assemblage will indicate whether it represents domestic refuse, a burnt storage deposit or agricultural waste.

The large waterlogged plant assemblage from ditch fill 5/024 derives mainly from wild plants, and may have arrived by natural means from the local environment, or in dumped material of various sorts. Analysis of these remains may indicate types of material dumped in the features, and thus activities taking place, as well as helping in the reconstruction of the natural environment on and around the site. Some information about diet and refuse disposal on the site may also be provided.

Further work will include the sorting, identification and quantification of 1 large and 1 moderate charred plant assemblage from 4/010 and 5/024 and scanning and recording waterlogged plant remains from 1 large sample from 5/024. This will be compiled into a report with tables.

#### 10.1.5 *Metalwork*

The finds are of limited local significance, in relation to the site itself. The iron finds probably relate to buildings in or around the area. A brief publication report will be prepared.

#### 10.1.6 *Conservation*

The knife recovered from deposit 4/2004 requires selective cleaning of the area of the blade next to the tang to clarify possible detail that appears on the X-ray image.

#### 10.1.7 *Analysis and Reporting*

The results of the archaeological evaluation and excavation along with the specialist reports will be integrated into a publication report. The report will also include illustration of the archaeological remains and recommended pottery. The publication report is anticipated to be approximately 5-10 pages, including site location, site plans and text. This will be submitted to the London Archaeologist.

Upon completion of the final stages of reporting the site archive, including microfilming will be prepared for deposition with the London Archaeological Archive Resource Centre. It is anticipated this will take place within 6-9 months of completion of the publication report.

The management of the project includes monitoring task budgets, programming tasks, editing draft reports and final productions, checking timetables and liaison with all members of the project team.

## 11 BIBLIOGRAPHY

AOC Archaeology Group, (2006a). *567 Bath Road, Longford, London Borough of Hillingdon. An Archaeological Evaluation Report*. Unpublished Report

AOC Archaeology Group, (2006b). *567 Bath Road, Longford, London Borough of Hillingdon. A Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Excavation*. Unpublished Report.

British Geological Survey, Sheet 286

Department of the Environment, (1990). *Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning (PPG16)*.

English Heritage, (1991). *Management of Archaeological Projects*

Institute of Field Archaeologists, (1994). *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations (IFA)*.

Institute of Field Archaeologists, (1997). *Code of Conduct (IFA)*.

## APPENDIX A – CONTEXT REGISTER

CONTEXT	TYPE	LENGTH	WIDTH	DEPTH
1/001	Topsoil and madeground	Trench	Trench	0.35m
1/002	Tree bowl	1.50m	Trench	0.60m
1/003	Buried soil / plough Soil	Trench	Trench	0.50m
1/004	Dump deposit	4.0m	Trench	0.40m
1/005	River gravels	Trench	Trench	0.15+m
2/001	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.70m
2/002	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.55m
2/003	Fill of [2/004]:mid grey brown clay silt	2.30m	0.60m	0.30m
<b>2/004</b>	<b>Cut of ditch – Ditch 1</b>	<b>2.30m</b>	<b>0.60m</b>	<b>0.30m</b>
2/005	Fill of [2/006]: mid grey brown clay silt	Trench	0.59m	0.20m
<b>2/006</b>	<b>Cut of shallow gully – Ditch 7</b>	<b>Trench</b>	<b>0.59m</b>	<b>0.20m</b>
2/007	Alluvial deposit	Trench	Trench	0.15m
2/008	River gravels	Trench	Trench	-
2/009	Fill of [2/010]: mid grey brown clay silt	0.30m	0.15m	0.20m
<b>2/010</b>	<b>Cut of posthole</b>	<b>0.30m</b>	<b>0.15m</b>	<b>0.20m</b>
3/001	Topsoil	10.0m	2.0m	0.70m
3/002	Subsoil	10.0m	2.0m	0.55m
3/003	Green Alluvial layer	5.0m	2.0m	0.20m
3/004	Fill of [3/005]: mid grey brown clay sandy silt	5.0m	0.75m	0.38m
<b>3/005</b>	<b>Cut of Ditch – Ditch 4</b>	<b>5.0m</b>	<b>0.75m</b>	<b>0.38m</b>
3/006	Fill of [3/007]:green yellow brown sandy clay	4.40m	0.38m	0.20m
<b>3/007</b>	<b>Cut of Ditch – Ditch 3</b>	<b>4.40m</b>	<b>0.38m</b>	<b>0.20m</b>
3/008	Alluvial deposit	5.0m	2.0m	0.10m
3/009	River gravels	1.0m	2.0m	0.15m
3/010	Natural clay	1.90m	1.0m	-
3/011	River gravels	5.0m	2.0m	0.03m
4/001	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.70m
4/002	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.55m

CONTEXT	TYPE	LENGTH	WIDTH	DEPTH
4/003	Backfill of Trench 2	2.5m	Trench	1.20m
4/004	Brick work and demolition rubble	1.50m	1.50m	0.40m
4/005	Fill of [4/006]:dark blue brown sandy clay	5.28m	1.60m	0.30-0.50m
<b>4/006</b>	<b>Cut of ditch – Ditch 8</b>	<b>5.28m</b>	<b>1.60m</b>	<b>0.30-0.50m</b>
4/007	Brick lined cess pit	1.30m	1.30m	-
4/008	Fill of [4/009]:dark brown sandy silt	0.60m	0.60m	0.15m
<b>4/009</b>	<b>Cut of Pit</b>	<b>0.60m</b>	<b>0.60m</b>	<b>0.15m</b>
4/010	Fill of [4/011]:dark brown green sandy clay	5.60m	0.58m	0.14m
<b>4/011</b>	<b>Cut of Ditch – Ditch 7</b>	<b>5.60m</b>	<b>0.58m</b>	<b>0.14m</b>
4/012	Fill of [4/013]:grey and green silty sandy clay	6.10m	0.64m	0.34m
<b>4/013</b>	<b>Cut of Ditch – Ditch 2</b>	<b>6.10m</b>	<b>0.64m</b>	<b>0.34m</b>
4/014	Fill of [4/015]:light grey clayey sand	1.12m	1.02m	0.48m
<b>4/015</b>	<b>Cut of Pit</b>	<b>1.12m</b>	<b>1.02m</b>	<b>0.48m</b>
4/016	Fill of [4/017]:dark brown silty sand	0.49m	0.44m	0.24m
<b>4/017</b>	<b>Cut of Pit</b>	<b>0.49m</b>	<b>0.44m</b>	<b>0.24m</b>
4/018	Fill of [4/019]:light grey sandy clay	0.10m	0.10m	0.08m
<b>4/019</b>	<b>Group of stakeholes</b>	<b>0.10m</b>	<b>0.10m</b>	<b>0.08m</b>
4/020	Fill of [4/021]:dark brown sandy clay	0.19m	0.23m	0.08m
<b>4/021</b>	<b>Cut of Pit</b>	<b>0.19m</b>	<b>0.23m</b>	<b>0.08m</b>
4/022	Fill of [4/023]:dark brown sandy clay	0.52m	0.52m	0.09m
<b>4/023</b>	<b>Cut of Pit</b>	<b>0.52m</b>	<b>0.52m</b>	<b>0.09m</b>
<b>4/024</b>	<b>Feature number: Pit</b>	<b>0.50m</b>	<b>0.45m</b>	<b>0.09m</b>
4/025	Dark green silt clay layer	2.60m	2.10m	0.20m
4/026	Fill of [4/015]:dark grey brown clay sand	1.12m	1.02m	0.30m
4/027	Fill of [4/029]:mid grey brown silty clay	1.55m	1.00m	0.35+m
4/028	Timber structure	1.55m	0.11m	-
<b>4/029</b>	<b>Cut of well</b>	<b>1.55m</b>	<b>1.00m</b>	<b>0.35+m</b>
4/030	Fill of [4/031]:mid grey silty clay	1.20m	0.90m	0.25m
<b>4/031</b>	<b>Cut of Gully</b>	<b>1.20m</b>	<b>0.90m</b>	<b>0.25m</b>
4/032	Alluvial deposit	Trench	Trench	0.15m
4/034	Natural Gravel	Trench	Trench	-
5/001	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.70m
5/002	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.55m



CONTEXT	TYPE	LENGTH	WIDTH	DEPTH
5/003	Gravel	Trench	Trench	-
5/004	Fill of [5/005]:dark black brown silty sand	0.50m	0.50m	0.15m
<b>5/005</b>	<b>Cut of Posthole</b>	<b>0.50m</b>	<b>0.50m</b>	<b>0.15m</b>
5/006	Fill of [5/007]:dark black brown silty sand	0.50m	0.50m	0.15m
<b>5/007</b>	<b>Cut of Posthole</b>	<b>0.50m</b>	<b>0.50m</b>	<b>0.15m</b>
5/008	Fill of [5/009]:green brown silty clay	1.42m	1.00m	0.27m
<b>5/009</b>	<b>Cut of Pit</b>	<b>1.42m</b>	<b>1.00m</b>	<b>0.27m</b>
5/010	Fill of [5/011]:dark blackish brown silty brown	0.65m	0.65m	0.15m
<b>5/011</b>	<b>Cut of Pit</b>	<b>0.65m</b>	<b>0.65m</b>	<b>0.15m</b>
5/012	Fill of [5/013]:mid grey sandy clay silt	1.20m	0.80m	0.25m
<b>5/013</b>	<b>Cut of Pit</b>	<b>1.20m</b>	<b>0.80m</b>	<b>0.25m</b>
5/014	Fill of [5/015]:orange brown silty sandy clay	1.51m	1.20m	0.21m
<b>5/015</b>	<b>Cut of Pit</b>	<b>1.51m</b>	<b>1.20m</b>	<b>0.21m</b>
5/016	Fill of [5/017]:mid grey brown clay silt	1.70m	0.39m	0.15m
<b>5/017</b>	<b>Cut of Gully – Ditch 3</b>	<b>1.70m</b>	<b>0.39m</b>	<b>0.15m</b>
5/018	Fill of [5/019]:mid grey brown clay silt	5.10m	1.18m	0.27m
<b>5/019</b>	<b>Cut of Ditch – Ditch 6</b>	<b>5.10m</b>	<b>1.18m</b>	<b>0.27m</b>
5/020	Fill of [5/021]:mid-dark greyish brown clay silt	10.0m	1.50m	0.15m
<b>5/021</b>	<b>Cut of Ditch – Ditch 5</b>	<b>10.0m</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.15</b>
5/022	Fill of [5/025]:green brown silt clay	10.0m	1.50	0.17
5/023	Fill of [5/025]:organic brown clay silt	10.0m	1.50m	0.35m
5/024	Fill of [5/025]:dark brown silt clay	10.0m	1.50m	0.20m
<b>5/025</b>	<b>Cut of Ditch – Ditch 5</b>	<b>10.0m</b>	<b>1.50m</b>	<b>0.72m</b>
5/026	Fill of [5/027]:grey green silty sandy clay	5.10m	1.18m	0.27m
<b>5/027</b>	<b>Cut of Ditch – Ditch 6</b>	<b>5.10m</b>	<b>1.18m</b>	<b>0.27m</b>
5/028	Alluvial deposit	Trench	Trench	0.15m
5/029	Gravel	Trench	Trench	-
<b>5/030</b>	<b>Sub-oval feature</b>	<b>1.0m</b>	<b>0.40m</b>	<b>0.15m</b>

## APPENDIX B – SPECIALIST REPORTS

### ASSESSMENT OF POTTERY

*A.M.Slowikowski*

#### INTRODUCTION

A total of 153 sherds of pottery, weighing 4.484kg, and a single fragment of ceramic building material (CBM), weighing 7g, was recovered from the excavation. The pottery sherds are mainly from separate vessels, although eight vessels comprised more than one sherd, including a single cistern with 105 sherds, weighing 3.639kg. This single vessel makes up just over 68% of the total assemblage. The pottery was recorded by context, fabric and form, where this could be recognised, and quantified by sherd count and weight. The codes in the London ceramic type series (CTS) have been used wherever possible\* (table 1). The pottery is also presented by context (table 2).

*\* My thanks to Chris Jarrett and Jacqui Pearce for help with identification and coding.*

#### DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT

CTS code	Common name/description	Sherds	Wt (g)
BRIM	Medieval Brill/Boarstall Ware	1	10
CREA	Cream Ware	1	2
CSTN	Cistercian Ware	3	12
(H)EMSC	Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous Ware	13	299
ESHER	Early South Hertfordshire- type Coarseware	6	47
LMSR	Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware	111*	3729
LONS	London Stoneware	1	35
MOD	Modern plant pot	2	71
PMR	Local Post-medieval redware	2	67
RBORG	Green-glazed Surrey-Hampshire Border Redware	2	67
REFW	Refined Whiteware	1	21
RFMS	Relief-moulded White Stoneware	1	8
SHER	South Hertfordshire-type Greyware	1	10
STAM	Stamford Ware	1	2
SWSG	White Salt-glazed Stoneware	1	4
TGW	English Tin-glazed Ware	1	2
TPW	Transfer-printed Refined Whiteware	2	6
UNKNOWN	(Late Medieval?) Oxidised Ware	1	5
YELL	Yellow Ware	2	87

Table 1. Pottery quantification by sherd count and weight (\* comprises six vessels)

The evaluation produced a small assemblage of pottery, ranging in date from the early medieval to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The condition of the pottery is generally good with little

abrasion and a moderately large average sherd: weight ratio (1:17) excluding the large cistern (see Trench 4 below).

The earliest pottery found on the site was a single sherd of Stamford ware (STAM), from a possible bowl glazed olive-green internally and externally, was recovered from Trench 2. This high quality pottery, manufactured in Stamford from the late 9<sup>th</sup> to the mid-13<sup>th</sup> centuries, has a wide distribution over the whole country. The sherd found on the site has characteristics of fabric and glaze which point to a 12<sup>th</sup>-century date (Kilmurray 1980, 134). The Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous ware ((H)EMSC) and Early South Hertfordshire-type coarseware (ESHER) are both of 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century date but the composite hand and wheel finished manufacture of the Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous ware ((H)EMSC) suggests a date in the late 12<sup>th</sup> century. Wasters of Early South Hertfordshire-type coarseware (ESHER) have been excavated in Uxbridge (Pearce forthcoming) and, although they differ somewhat from the BFG06 sherds, Uxbridge could be the source – wasters frequently differ from the same pottery found on consumption sites. All sherds, with the exception of a single rim, are undiagnostic body sherds. The rim fragment comes from an externally sooted cooking pot.

Only two sherds of high medieval pottery were recovered: a sherd of South Hertfordshire-type Greyware (SHER), dated to the late 12<sup>th</sup> to mid-14<sup>th</sup> century, and a sherd of Brill/Boarstall ware (BRIM), dating to the late 13<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> century. Both types were made outside the capital, in the St Albans region and Buckinghamshire respectively, but London was a focus for the marketing of these wares, with particularly the greyware reaching there in large quantities.

The late medieval/post-medieval transitional period is represented by Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware (LMSR) and Cistercian ware (CSTN), with the unknown oxidised sherd also possibly dating to this period. The source of the Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware (LMSR) is not yet known but could be in South Buckinghamshire, and, by the 16<sup>th</sup> century, it was the dominant coarse ware in Uxbridge (Pearce 1993). A variety of new forms was introduced in this period, including the ceramic cup and cistern. Jugs continued to be used in large quantities but the ceramic cooking pot was largely replaced by metal cauldrons, especially in wealthier households. The cups on this site are in Cistercian ware (CSTN), while the cisterns and jugs are in Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware (LMSR). A tiny fragment of English Tin-glazed ware (TGW) was also found.

Post-medieval wares range from green-glazed Surrey/Hampshire Border Redware (RBORG) and local Post-medieval Redware (PMR), of the late 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> century, to the London Stoneware (LONS), White Salt-glazed wares (SWSG), Creamware (CREA), Yellow (Mocha) ware (YELL), Refined Whiteware (REFW) and Transfer-printed wares (TPW) of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Forms are mainly table wares, including a tea bowl as well as bowls and jars, and, particularly among the later wares, plates, dishes and a lid. There is a single ceramic fragment which is not from a vessel: it comes from a small figurine or bust, possibly of Prince Albert, and is in Relief-moulded White Stoneware (RMST), also known as Parian ware.

No pottery was recovered from Trench 1. Trench 2 produced the Stamford ware, from post hole [2/010], dating to the 12<sup>th</sup> century.

Trench 3 contained an assemblage of early medieval pottery, from ditches [3/005] and [3/007]. Most of it is Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous ware ((H)EMSC) dating to the 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> centuries, and includes the sherds from the rim and shoulder of a cooking pot. There is a single sherd in South Hertfordshire-type Greyware (SHER) from ditch [3/007]; its earliest date could be in the late 12<sup>th</sup> century.

The pottery from Trench 4 is of a wider date range than the preceding trenches, with the bulk of it being post-13<sup>th</sup> century. However, there is early medieval pottery from the pit [4/023], dating to the 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> centuries, including an everted rim jar in Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous ware ((H)EMSC). There is also a small sherd of Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware (LMSR), but at only 2g, this is likely to be intrusive. There appears to be a break in occupation with only a single sherd of late 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century date, from a Brill/Boarstall jug, possibly residual in pit [4/015]. Late medieval pottery includes the complete lower half and most of the upper portion of a large cistern in Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy Redware (LMSR). It was found in pit [4/015] and may have been deposited whole. Complete buried pots are known both from the documentary and the archaeological record. They had a variety of purposes, domestic, horticultural and industrial (Moorhouse 1986, 115), but the function of this cistern cannot be determined. Other features in this trench produced a disparate assemblage of post-medieval pottery, ranging in date from the 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> century to the modern period (table 2).

Trench 5 produced both early medieval and post-medieval pottery but no evidence of 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century occupation. The early medieval pottery was recovered from ditch [5/021]-[5/025] and includes 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>-century Hertfordshire Early Medieval Calcareous ware ((H)EMSC) and Early South Hertfordshire-type coarseware (ESHER). Pottery of the same date was recovered from ditch [5/019], but this may be residual. The only other early medieval pottery came from (5/026), and comprises three sherds from the same jar. The fill of pit [5/009] contained only post-medieval pottery dating to the mid-18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> century. A single pantile fragment was recovered from (5/006).

The pottery assemblage warrants no further analysis, with the exception of the near complete cistern. If it can be established that the vessel was deposited whole for a specific purpose, then regional comparanda should be sought to determine its function. Close comparison with the late medieval/transitional pottery from Uxbridge, including fabric analysis, might determine the relationship of pottery from BFG06 to the Late Medieval/Transitional Sandy redware (LMSR) and the local Post-medieval redware (PMR) from Uxbridge.

Cxt	Interpretation	Fab code	Form	Sh	Wt	Fabric date
2/009	fill of post hole 2/010	STAM	BWL	1	2	M11th – M12thC

3/003	Alluvial deposit?	(H)EMSC	JAR/CP	1	73	11th – end 12thC
3/004	fill of ditch 3/005	(H)EMSC	VESS	1	6	11th – end 12thC
3/004	fill of ditch 3/005	(H)EMSC	JAR/CP	1	81	11th – end 12thC
3/006	fill of ditch 3/007	(H)EMSC	VESS	1	2	11th – end 12thC
3/006	fill of ditch 3/007	SHER	VESS	1	10	L12th – M14thC
4/005	fill of ditch 4/006	LMSR	VESS	1	21	16th-17thC
4/005	fill of ditch 4/006	SWSG	TBWL	1	4	1720-80
4/007	fill of brick-lined soakaway 4/007	LONS	JAR	1	35	1670-1900
4/007	fill of brick-lined soakaway 4/007	REFW	DISH	1	21	1830-1900
4/007	fill of brick-lined soakaway 4/007	RFMS	FIG	1	8	1800-1900
4/007	fill of brick-lined soakaway 4/007	TPW	PLAT	1	4	1780-1900
4/007	fill of brick-lined soakaway 4/007	YELL	BWL	1	75	1820-1900
4/008	fill of pit 4/009	MOD	PPOT	2	71	MODERN
4/010	fill of ditch 4/011	CSTN	CUP	1	5	L15th-16thC
4/010	fill of ditch 4/011	LMSR	JUG	2	41	16th-17thC
4/010	fill of ditch 4/011	UNKNOWN	JUG	1	5	POSS LATE MED?
4/012	fill of ditch 4/013	ESHER	VESS	2	23	M11th – end 12thC
4/012	fill of ditch 4/013	LMSR	JUG	1	5	16th-17thC
4/014	fill of pit 4/015	BRIM	BWL	1	10	L13th – end 15thC
4/014	fill of pit 4/015	CSTN	CUP	2	7	L15th-16thC
4/014	fill of pit 4/015	LMSR	CIST	105	3639	16th-17thC
4/014	fill of pit 4/015	TGW	VESS	1	2	L16th – end 17thC
4/016	fill of pit 4/017	RBOR	VESS	1	7	1580-1800
4/016	fill of pit 4/017	RBORG	VESS	1	5	1580-1800
4/023	fill of pit 4/023	(H)EMSC	JAR	1	12	11th – end 12thC
4/023	fill of pit 4/023	ESHER	VESS	3	11	M11th – end 12thC
4/023	fill of pit 4/023	LMSR	VESS	1	2	16th-17thC
4/025	Alluvial deposit?	LMSR	VESS	1	21	16th-17thC
4/025	Alluvial deposit?	RBOR	JAR	1	60	1580-1800
4/025	Alluvial deposit?	RBORG	BWL	1	62	1580-1800
4/025	Alluvial deposit?	YELL	VESS	1	12	1820-1900
5/006	fill of post hole 5/007?	CBM	PANT	1	7	
5/009	fill of pit 5/009	CREA	LID	1	2	1760-1830
5/009	fill of pit 5/009	TPW	VESS	1	2	1780-1900
5/018	fill of ditch 5/019	(H)EMSC	VESS	1	15	11th – end 12thC
5/020	fill of ditch 5/021-5/025	(H)EMSC	VESS	2	27	11th – end 12thC
5/020	fill of ditch 5/021-5/025	ESHER	VESS	1	13	M11th – end 12thC
5/022	fill of ditch 5/021-5/025	(H)EMSC	JAR/CP	1	10	11th – end 12thC
5/024	fill of ditch 5/021-5/025	(H)EMSC	VESS	1	2	11th-end 12thC
5/026	fill of 5/027?? No further description	(H)EMSC	JAR/CP	3	71	11th - end 12thC

Table 2. Pottery and CBM by context

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kilmurray, K., 1980, *The Pottery Industry of Stamford, Lincs. c.AD 850-1250*, BAR  
British Series 84

Moorhouse, S., 1986, 'Non-dating Uses of Medieval Pottery', *Medieval Ceramics* vol.  
10, 85-123

Pearce, J., 1993, *Uxbridge: a medieval and post-medieval market town: post-excavation  
assessment of the medieval and later pottery*, MoLAS unpubl assess rep

Pearce, J., in prep, South Hertfordshire-type Greywares

## ASSESSMENT OF THE HAND-COLLECTED ANIMAL BONES

*Alan Pipe*

### QUANTIFICATION AND EVALUATION

#### Introduction/methodology

Hand-collected animal bone was recorded directly onto Excel spreadsheets. Each context and sample group was described in terms of weight, estimated fragment count, species, carcass-part, fragmentation, preservation, modification, and the recovery of epiphyses, mandibular tooth rows, measurable bones, complete long bones, and sub-adult age groups. The assemblage was not recorded as individual fragments or identified to skeletal element. All identifications referred to the MoLSS reference collection. Fragments not identifiable to species or genus level were allocated to the approximate category, 'ox-sized', as appropriate.

Site archive: finds and environmental, quantification and description

Animal bone	Estimated 28 fragments/estimated total 1.267 kg.
-------------	--------------------------------------------------

*Table 1 Finds and environmental archive general summary*

#### Animal bone

	Weight (g)	No. fragments	No. boxes
Animal bone (hand-collected)	1267	28	one archive quality 'shoebox'

*Table 2 Contents of animal bone archive*

CONTEXT	SAMPLE	WT (kg)	FRAG (mm)	PRES	NOS	LMAM	SMAM	FISH	BIRD	AMPH	MAND	MEAS	EPI	COMPLETE
2/003	0	0.005	25-75	good	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2/005	0	0.25	>75	good	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
3/004	0	0.01	25-75	medium	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4/005	0	0.5	>75	good	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
4/010	0	0.05	>75	good	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4/012	0	0.1	>75	good	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
4/014	0	0.075	>75	good	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
4/014	0	0.002	<25	medium	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4/020	0	0.005	25-75	medium	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4/025	0	0.025	25-75	medium	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4/027	0	0.025	25-75	medium	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
5/018	0	0.02	25-75	good	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/020	0	0.2	>75	medium	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1.267</b>			<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>

*Table 3 gives a summary of the hand-collected context groups in terms of weight (kg), estimated fragment count, fragmentation, preservation, faunal composition, and the recovery of evidence for ageing (mandibular tooth rows and epiphyses) and stature (measurable bones and complete long bones).*



CONTEXT	TAXON	PART	AGE	STATE
2/003	ox-sized	longbone		
2/005	ox	foot		butchered
2/005	ox	vertebra		
3/004	ox-sized	head		
4/005	ox	lower limb	mature	butchered
4/005	ox	upper limb	mature	
4/010	ox-sized	longbone		
4/010	ox-sized	rib		
4/012	horse	foot		
4/014	ox-sized	rib		
4/014	ox-sized	rib		
4/014	sheep/goat	head	mature	
4/020	ox-sized	longbone		
4/025	ox-sized	longbone		
4/027	ox-sized	longbone		
4/027	pig	head		
5/018	ox-sized	head		
5/020	horse	lower limb	mature	

Table 4 gives a detailed summary of the hand-collected context groups in terms of taxon, carcase-part, modification and the recovery of sub-adult age groups).

#### SUMMARY

The assemblage, probably medieval and post-medieval included an estimated 28 fragments of moderately well-preserved hand-collected animal bone with fragment sizes ranging between <25 and >75 mm, weighing 1.267 kg,. The assemblage derived largely from mature ox *Bos taurus* vertebra, upper limb and lower limb with ox-sized longbone and rib fragments. There were single finds of sheep/goat *Ovis aries/Capra hircus* adult mandible, pig *Sus scrofa* mandible and horse *Equus caballus* lower limb. There was no recovery of cattle or sheep/goat horncore. There was no definite identification of goat *Capra hircus* and no recovery of poultry, game, commensals, scavengers or, indeed, any wild species.

There was no recovery of sub-adult animals. Clear evidence of butchery was noted only on ox foot from [2/005] and lower limb from 4/005. There was no other evidence for modification.

Evidence suitable for age determination was provided by only a single mandibular tooth row and five epiphyses; there was one measurable but incomplete bone.

#### ASSESSMENT WORK OUTSTANDING

There is no outstanding assessment work.

## ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL

This very small hand-collected assemblage has only very limited potential for further study of the local meat diet and patterns of waste disposal, particularly with reference to carcass-part selection and, to a lesser extent, age at death, of the major domesticates; cattle, sheep/goat, pig and horse.

In view of the absence of amphibians, small mammals and other wild species from the bone assemblage, there is no potential for interpretation of local habitat.

## SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DATA

The hand-collected animal bone is of very limited local significance only, in terms of the local meat diet, with particular emphasis on carcass-part selection and age composition of cattle, sheep/goat and pig.

There is no significance for interpretation of local habitats.

## REVISED RESEARCH AIMS

*What are the characteristics of the local meat diet in terms of the selection of species, carcass-part and age-group?*

## METHOD STATEMENTS

The material should be recorded, as individual bones, directly onto the MoLAS/MoLSS Oracle 8 animal bone post-assessment database and then analysed as a discrete assemblage with reference to available stratigraphic data.

Resource requirements are-

Task 1: Recording of complete assemblage onto database	0.25 pday
Task 2: Analysis of data/preparation of report/edit/archive	0.50 pday

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.75 pday</b>
--------------	------------------

## BUILDING MATERIAL

*Ian M. Betts*

### QUANTIFICATION

#### Summary/Introduction

The ceramic building material assemblage from BFG06 comprised 3.96kg (19 fragments) of building material from six contexts. All the building material would appear to be post-medieval in date. Apart from one minute unidentified fragment of ceramic, the assemblage comprises roofing tile and brick.

#### Methodology

All the building material has been recorded using the standard recording forms used by the Museum of London. This has involved fabric analysis undertaken with a x10 binocular microscope. The information on the recording forms has been added to an Excel database (bmdata01.xls).

#### Dating

None of the building material can be closely dated. Bricks in fabric types 3033 and 3046 in central London date to the period 1450-1666/1700, but they may have an extended date range in Hillingdon. The peg tiles are even less closely dated, although their thickness (13-15 mm) would suggest a post-medieval date. There are, however, no pantiles present which would indicate a definite mid seventeenth-eighteenth century AD or later date.

#### Post-medieval

##### *Roofing tile*

Fabric types: 2586, 2816, 3094

The roofing tiles are highly fragmented, although one has a breadth of 153 mm a thickness of 13-14 mm. None of the peg tiles are glazed, which suggests all are post-medieval.

##### *Brick*

Fabric types: 3033, 3046

All the brick is similarly fragmented, although one has a breadth of 115 mm and a thickness of about 64 mm. The other bricks are slightly thinner at between 53 mm and 57 mm thick. One (Context 4/010) has a sloping worn surface, the purpose of which is uncertain.

#### Analysis of Potential

The building material is highly fragmentary and provides little indication as to date. There is no higher status building material present, such as floor or wall tiles.

### Significance of data

The building material indicates the types of post-medieval roofing tile and brick in use as Hillingdon in the post-medieval period. However, the fragmentary nature of the material means that it is only of limited local significance. Its value could be increased by comparing the assemblage to other building material groups found in Hillingdon area.

### Method Statements

Task 1: The building material assemblage should be compared with the stratigraphical sequence and all available dating evidence = 0.5 (half) Day

Task 2: Write publication report = 0.5 (half) Day

Total time required = 1 Day

Context	Fabric	Form	Corners	Weight	Length	Breadth	Thickness	Number	Comments
2/005	3033	brick	0	50				1	
2/005	3499	?	0	5				1	unidentified fired ceramic (micaceous 2271)
4/005	2586	peg	0	30			14	1	thi=13-14mm, near fabric 2273, grey core
4/005	3046	brick	0	100				1	
4/010	3094	peg	1	120			15	1	thi=14-15mm, round nail hole 12mm dia
4/010	2586	peg	0	40			13	1	light grey core
4/010	2816	peg	0	100			13	1	
4/010	3033	brick	0	420			53	1	worn slopping face (see sheet)
4/027	3033	brick	2	1580		115	64	3	is c. 64mm, another brick is 60mm thick
4/027	3046	brick	1	1150			57	4	another brick is 54mm thick
4/027	2816	peg	2	220		153	14	1	thi=13-14mm
5/006	3046	brick	0	20				1	
5/022	3046	brick	0	130				2	brown, underfired

## CHARRED AND WATERLOGGED PLANT REMAINS

*Anne Davis*

### QUANTIFICATION

#### Summary/Introduction

Flots from three samples were submitted for assessment from the evaluation and excavation at Bath Road, Hillingdon. Of the two samples taken from Trench 4, one came from ditch fill 4/010, provisionally dated to the 12th century AD, and one from a currently alluvial deposit 4/025. The third sample was taken from another (undated) ditch fill, 5/024, in Trench 5. The excavated features are thought to represent medieval and post-medieval occupational use of the area.

#### Methodology

Sample processing was completed by AOC staff, and the flots were dried and presented to the author for assessment.

The flots were briefly scanned using a low powered binocular microscope and recording the item frequency and species diversity, method of preservation and general nature of the plant macrofossils and any faunal remains in the individual samples. Tables 1 and 2 show details of the biological remains in each sample. Abundance and diversity of botanical remains were estimated using the following scale:

Abundance: 1 = 1 – 10; 2 = c.11-50; 3 = > 50 items

Diversity: 1 = 1 – 5; 2 = 6 – 10; 3 = >10 taxa

### ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL

#### Charred plant remains

A large assemblage of charred plant remains was recovered from ditch fill 4/010, and included several hundred cereal grains and at least 100 large leguminous seeds, possibly peas (*Pisum sativum*). The cereal grains consisted mainly of barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) and free-threshing wheat (*Triticum aestivum/turgidum*), with a smaller number of oats (*Avena* sp.). Cereal chaff, in the form of wheat and barley rachis fragments, was also reasonably common, as were culm nodes, probably from cereal straw. A number of charred arable weed seeds were also present in the assemblage, although these were not particularly abundant. Charred remains were much less common in the other two samples, each of which contained only occasional cereal grains. A number of pulse seeds, possibly peas, and several cereal rachis fragments were also present in the sample from ditch fill 5/024.

#### Waterlogged plant remains

Few organic plant remains survived in either of the samples from Trench 4, but a large waterlogged assemblage was recovered from ditch fill 5/024. Large amounts of roots and wood fragments made up the bulk of the sample flot, but many seeds of disturbed (including cultivated) ground, including stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*), fool's parsley (*Aethusa cynapium*), common hemp-nettle (*Galeopsis tetrahit*) and hemlock (*Conium*

*maculatum*) were also present. Several damp-ground species, such as gypsy wort (*Lycopus europaeus*), sedges (*Carex* spp.) and celery-leaved crowfoot (*Ranunculus sceleratus*) were represented, and seeds of sloe (*Prunus spinosa*), blackberry/raspberry (*Rubus fruticosus/idaeus*) and elder (*Sambucus nigra*) may have come from small trees and shrubs overhanging the ditch, although these seeds of edible plants could equally well represent human refuse.

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF DATA

Further work on the charred plant remains from ditch fill 4/010 and, to a limited extent 5/024, will demonstrate the use of cereals and pulses on the site, and analysis of the ratios between grain, chaff and weed seeds in the assemblage will indicate whether it represents domestic refuse, a burnt storage deposit or agricultural waste.

The large waterlogged plant assemblage from ditch fill 5/024 derives mainly from wild plants, and may have arrived by natural means from the local environment, or in dumped material of various sorts. Analysis of these remains may indicate types of material dumped in the features, and thus activities taking place, as well as helping in the reconstruction of the natural environment on and around the site. Some information about diet and refuse disposal on the site may also be provided.

#### METHOD STATEMENTS

The charred remains from flots of samples 4/010 and 5/024 should be extracted, identified and quantified. In the interests of economy it may be necessary to sub-sample the large charred cereal assemblage from the former sample. The organic flot from sample 5/024 will be scanned for waterlogged plant remains, which will be identified and their estimated abundance scored on a four-point scale. Identification of all plant remains will be carried out using a low- powered binocular microscope and reference materials housed at MoLAS, as well as standard identification manuals.

Analysis of the charred assemblages will include calculating the relative abundance of each of the charred cereals, and of chaff, legumes and weed seeds. Plant taxa from the waterlogged assemblage will be grouped according to their habitat preferences and possible uses, and evaluated to establish their most likely origins. A report and table of results will be prepared, describing the evidence and discussing the results, and comparisons made with other archaeobotanical work carried out in the area.

Sorting, identification and quantification of 1 large & 1 moderate charred plant assemblage:	1.5 days
Scanning & recording waterlogged plant remains from 1 large sample:	1.0 day
Data entry and preparation of table:	0.75 day
Preparation of report:	2.0 days
<b>Total:</b>	<b>5.25 days</b>

*Table 1: Summary of botanical assessment data**A: abundance, D: diversity (1 = occasional, 2 = moderate, 3 = abundant)*

	chd grains	chd chaff	chd seeds	chd misc	chd wood	wlg seeds	wlg misc	comments
flot vol(ml)	A D	A D	A D	A D	A D	A D	A D	
200	3 1	2 1	3 3	3 1	3 1	1 1	1 1	Several 100 chd grains, most wheat & barley. Many ?peas
5	1 1		1 1		2 1		2 1	1 grain, v. few chd seeds
500	1 1	2 1	2 2		1 1	3 3	3 1	Few chd grains & ?peas. Many wlg seeds distbd & wetland plants. Few foods

*Table 2: Details of biological remains*

context	constituent	abundance	diversity	comments
4/010	chd grain	3	1	several 100, most hor & tri, also some ave
	chd chaff	2	1	rachis frags, mostly tri, some hor
	chd seeds	3	3	>100 lge legumes (?peas), gal,agr,latvic,pol,fal,rum,poac
	chd wood	3	1	
	chd misc	3	1	cereal(?) culm nodes
	wlg seeds	1	1	sam
	wlg misc	1	1	rootlets (modern?)
4/025	chd grain	1	1	1 tri(ft) grain
	chd seeds	1	1	trf?, rum
	chd wood	2	1	
	wlg misc	2	1	roots (modern?)
5/024	chd grain	1	1	c.5, hor, tri, sec(?)
	chd chaff	2	1	tri & sec rachis frags
	chd seeds	2	2	several lge legumes (pea?), ele, poac
	chd wood	1	1	
	wlg seeds	3	3	prusp,rub,lyceu,urtdi,sam,ros,ran,aet,ransc, con,car,galte
	wlg misc	3	1	roots, twigs & larger wood frags



## METALWORK

*Nicola Powell*

### QUANTIFICATION

#### Summary/Introduction

Metalwork from seven contexts, including iron and copper alloy finds, was submitted for assessment. All was examined by eye and with the benefit of x-radiography. The metalwork is generally in very poor condition, with the soil being unfriendly to the ironwork in particular.

#### Methodology

With the metal finds being in such poor condition, the x-rays were crucial in helping with any identification. Some of the finds remain unidentified, with the metal being replaced almost entirely by corrosion products and encrustation.

#### *Copper alloy*

The sole copper alloy artefact recovered from the site is a complete pin. It has a wound-wire head that appears to be of the type with the head wound around the top of the shaft. It would probably have been used to fix a head dress in position or affix some other clothing or accessory. It is likely to be 17th to 18th century in date.

#### *Iron*

Several pieces of ironwork cannot be identified. Finds from contexts 2/003, 4/014 and 5/006 are unclear, even with an x-ray. The remains of a knife, in four pieces, was recovered from context 3/004. It has a whittle tang and the tip is lost. It can only be given a broad medieval to post medieval date. Despite the heavy corrosion, the x-ray shows some definition where the tang joins the shoulders of the blade, which may benefit from closer examination during conservation.

The remains of two nails were found; one in context 4/014 and the other, which retains part of a head, in context 4/016. Both are heavily corroded, with the section obscured. A third piece of structural ironwork was recovered from context 5/009. It is a U-shaped staple and it appears complete, although heavily corroded, in keeping with the rest of the iron finds.

### ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL

The metal finds have little potential for helping with the dates from the site. The ironwork is in very poor condition and can general be assigned to structural objects, although it all remains undated. The complete copper alloy pin is a fine personal object and can be given a broad date.

### SIGNIFICANCE OF DATA

The finds are of limited local significance, in relation to the site itself. The iron finds probably relate to buildings in or around the area.

## REVISED RESEARCH AIMS

There are no revised research aims.

## METHOD STATEMENTS

The metalwork should be mentioned in any publication of the site 0.5 day

## CATALOGUE

### Copper alloy

#### *Pin*

4/014

L 55mm; complete, with wound-wire head (appears to be around head of shaft). 17th to 18th century

### Iron

#### *Unidentified*

2/003

Several small pieces heavy corroded iron. Encrusted with gravel etc.

#### *Knife*

3/004

L 133mm; in four pieces; heavily corroded and encrusted. Whittle-tang, with back and cutting edge both tapering to tip (lost). Medieval/post medieval

#### *Unidentified*

4/014

Corroded lump. X-rays shows all corrosion, metal gone.

#### *Nail stem*

4/014

L 35mm; head lost.

#### *Nail*

4/016

L 38mm; heavily corroded.

#### *Unidentified*

5/006

Small lump corroded iron.

#### *Staple*

5/009

Heavily corroded. X-ray shows complete U-shaped.

## CONSERVATION

*Liz Barham*

## QUANTIFICATION

*Table 1 Summary of conservation work of the accessioned finds from BFG06*

	<b>Material</b>	<b>No. accessioned</b>	<b>No. conserved</b>	<b>No. to be treated (see below)</b>
Metals	Iron	8	-	1

## SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

The following assessment of conservation needs for the accessioned and bulk finds from the excavations at Bath Road, Hillingdon, encompasses the requirements for finds analysis, illustration, analytical conservation and long term curation. Work outlined in this document is needed to produce a stable archive in accordance with MAP2 (English Heritage 1992) and the Museum of London's Standards for archive preparation (Museum of London 1999).

Conservation support at the time of the excavation was available from conservators working for the Museum of London Archaeology Service. Records of conservation carried out at the fieldwork stage are held in the conservation department of the Museum of London.

## METHODOLOGY

Treatments are carried out under the guiding principles of minimum intervention and reversibility. Whenever possible preventative rather than interventive conservation strategies are implemented. Procedures aim to obtain and retain the maximum archaeological potential of each object: conservators will therefore work closely with finds specialist and archaeologists.

All conserved objects are packed in archive quality materials and stored in suitable environmental conditions. Records of all conservation work are prepared on paper and on the Museum of London collections management system (Multi MIMSY) and stored at the Museum of London.

## FINDS ANALYSIS/INVESTIGATION

The accessioned finds were assessed by visual examination of both the objects and the X-radiographs, closer examination where necessary was carried out using a binocular microscope at high magnification. The accessioned finds were reviewed with reference to the finds assessment by Nicola Powell.

No items were identified as requiring conservation input to prepare them for the find specialists.

### WORK REQUIRED FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

3/004 knife – clean selectively at area of blade next to tang to clarify possible detail that appears on X-radiograph.

### WORK REQUIRED FOR ILLUSTRATION/PHOTOGRAPHY

No items were identified as requiring conservation input to prepare them for drawing and photography.

### PREPARATION FOR DEPOSITION IN THE ARCHIVE

If the material is to be deposited in the LAARC the Museum of London's archive standards (1999) need to be considered. These state that the accessioned finds need to be appropriately packed and stabilised before the site can be accepted into the archive. The following work is required to bring them into line with the set standards and ensure that the archive is stable before transfer.

The objects in bags need to be supported within the bags with a sheet of "Jiffy" foam, and visible from one side.

Two items need to be repacked, probably in slightly larger "crystal" boxes to give them more tissue support and make them more visible within their boxes without handling. It would be advisable to bag each of the crystal boxes containing the iron items individually, so that if the crystal box is jolted open, the find does not lose all context and physical protection. These are 2/003 and 3/004.

The material otherwise appears to be stable and no interventive conservation work is required.

Repacking of finds as described above

AOC

### TASK LIST FOR RECOMMENDED FUTURE WORK

Task 1 Selective removal of corrosion from 3/004 knife	0.5 day
Task 2 Repackaging for archive deposition	AOC
Total	0.5 day

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

English Heritage 1992 *Management of Archaeological Projects II*

Museum of London 1999 *General standards for the preparation of archaeological archives to be deposited with the Museum of London*

## APPENDIX C

OASIS ID: aocar cha1-33181

### Project details

Project name	567 BATH ROAD, LONGFORD, LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON.
Short description of the project	An evaluation had been undertaken by AOC Archaeology in December 2006, the results of which lead to two small open area excavations which were conducted in February 2007. The earliest significant phase of activity on the site occurred during the medieval period and mainly consisted of a series of linear ditches. Some of these functioned as enclosure ditches whilst one is likely to have functioned as a drainage channel. The lack of associated features suggests the site was not occupied during the medieval period and its sole function was as enclosed farm or pasture land. The most substantial group of archaeological remains found on the site belongs to the post-medieval period. Two linear ditches were dated to this period which continues the themes of enclosure and drainage. Also on site during this period were a number of small domestic refuse pits and possible cess pits. These suggest that the use of the site changed during the post-medieval period, becoming the dumping for the local population.
Project dates	Start: 11-12-2006 End: 12-02-2007
Previous/future work	Yes / No
Any associated project reference codes	BFG06 - Sitecode
Type of project	Recording project
Site status	Local Authority Designated Archaeological Area
Current Land use	Residential 1 - General Residential
Monument type	DITCHES Medieval
Monument type	PITS Post Medieval
Monument type	DITCHES Post Medieval

Monument type	SOAKAWAY Post Medieval
Significant Finds	CERAMIC POTTERY Medieval
Significant Finds	CERAMIC POTTERY Post Medieval
Significant Finds	CERAMIC POTTERY Modern
Significant Finds	BUILDING MATERIAL Post Medieval
Significant Finds	BUILDING MATERIAL Post Medieval
Investigation type	'Open-area excavation'
Prompt	Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG16

### Project location

Country	England
Site location	GREATER LONDON HILLINGDON YIEWSLEY AND WEST DRAYTON 567 BATH ROAD, LONGFORD, LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON
Postcode	UB7 0
Study area	0.10 Hectares
Site coordinates	TQ 0496 7683 51.4801840031 -0.488356288307 51 28 48 N 000 29 18 W Point
Height OD	Min: 21.53m Max: 21.82m

### Project creators

Name of Organisation	AOC Archaeology Group
----------------------	-----------------------

Project brief originator	English Heritage
Project design originator	AOC Archaeology Group
Project director/manager	Tim Carew
Project supervisor	Catherine Edwards
Type of sponsor/funding body	Developer
Name of sponsor/funding body	Easydives LLP

### Project archives

Physical Archive recipient	Museum of London
Physical Contents	'Animal Bones','Ceramics','Environmental','Metal'
Digital Archive recipient	Museum of London
Digital Contents	'Animal Bones','Ceramics','Environmental','Metal','Stratigraphic','Survey'
Digital Media available	'Database','Images raster / digital photography','Spreadsheets','Survey','Text'
Paper Archive recipient	Museum of London
Paper Contents	'Animal Bones','Ceramics','Environmental','Metal','Stratigraphic','Survey'
Paper Media	'Context'

available sheet,'Drawing','Map','Matrices','Microfilm','Photograph','Plan','Report','Section','Survey','Unpublished Text'

### Project bibliography 1

Publication type Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)

Title 567 BATH ROAD, LONGFORD, LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON A POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION.

Author(s)/Editor(s) Edwards, C

Date 2007

Issuer or publisher AOC Archaeology Group

Place of issue or publication London

Description Unpublished report bounded with illustrations and specialist reports.

Entered by catherine edwards (catherine.edwards@aocarchaeology.com)

Entered on 26 October 2007