

# **ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT**

SCCAS REPORT No. 2011/148

# Irrigation Reservoir, Felixstowe Road, Foxhall FXL 060

## **HER Information**

Planning Application:	C/11/1092
Date of Fieldwork:	5th-9th September 2011
Grid Reference:	TM 228 418
Funding Body:	Prime Irrigation Ltd.
Curatorial Officer:	Jess Tipper
Project Officer:	Linzi Everett
OASIS Reference:	Suffolkc1- 110017

# Contents

## Summary

		Page
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Geology and topography	1
3.	Archaeological and historical background	1
4.	Methodology	3
5.	Results	3
6.	Finds evidence	22
7.	Discussion	25
Lis	st of Figures	
1.	Site location	2
2.	Trench locations	4
3.	Trench 2, plan and section	6
4.	Trench 3, plan and sections	7
5.	Trench 6, plan and sections	8
6.	Trench 7, plan and sections	10
7.	Trench 9, plan and section	12
8.	Trench 10, plan and sections	13
9.	Trench 12, plan and section	14
10.	Trench 14, plan and sections	15
11.	Trench 16, plan and section	16
12.	Trench 18, plan and section	18
13.	Trench 19, plan and sections	19
14.	Trench 20, plan and section	20
15.	Trench 24, plan and section	21

# List of Appendices

Ι.	Brief and Specification	27
II.	Bulk finds quantities	34

## Summary

An archaeological evaluation was carried on land off Felixstowe Road, Foxhall (TM 228 418; FXL 060) in advance of the construction of a new reservoir. Ditches associated with a known cropmark complex were identified as well as a series of pits. Finds were sparse, but where present in stratified contexts ranged from Late Neolothic/Early Bronze Age to Lare Bronze Age/Early Iron Age in date.

## 1. Introduction

A planning application has been made for the construction of a farm reservoir on land off Felixstowe Road, Foxhall. The site is centred on TM 228 418 and comprises a total of approximately 2.5 hectares.

The site lies within an area of archaeological activity, recorded in the County Historic Environment Record (HER). It was felt therefore that the development work would cause ground disturbance with the potential to destroy archaeological deposits, were they present. As such, there was an initial requirement for an archaeological evaluation by trial trench, as outlined in a Brief and Specification produced by Jess Tipper of the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) Conservation Team (Appendix I). The SCCAS Field Team was subsequently commissioned to carry out the work by Prime Irrigation Ltd. on behalf of the landowner.

## 2. Geology and topography

The site lies north west of the A12/A14 junction at a height of c.30m OD. The underlying geology of the site comprises glaciofluvial drift (sand and gravel).

## 3. Archaeological and historical background

The development area has not been the subject of any previous archaeological survey but lies close to various prehistoric findspots as well as an extensive cropmark complex which extends into the study area (BUC 012). The Seven Hills Bronze Age barrow complex lies to the south of the site. As such, there is high potential for encountering prehistoric and later deposits at this location and the proposed development will cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exists.



Figure 1. Site location

©Crown Copyright. All Rights Reserved. Suffolk County Council Licence No. 100023395 2011

400m

200

A

241200

## 4. Methodology

Trial trenching was carried out between 5th-9th September 2011. Twenty four trenches were excavated under the supervision of an archaeologist, using a JCB mechanical excavator fitted with a 1.5m wide toothless ditching bucket, removing overburden until the top of the first undisturbed archaeological deposit or natural subsoil was revealed. Hand cleaning of the exposed surfaces was carried out where necessary in order to clarify the nature of the deposits and identify cut features. Both the exposed trench surfaces and upcast spoil were examined visually for artefactual evidence, and both were subject to a metal detector survey.

Identified contexts were allocated numbers within a unique continuous numbering system under the HER code FXL 060. Context information was recorded on SCCAS 'pro-forma' recording sheets.

A photographic record comprising digital shots, was made throughout. The evaluation archive will be deposited in the County HER at Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds.

### 5. Results

Trench locations within the development area are shown in Figure 2. Each trench measured c.30m long and 1.6m wide. The topsoil consisted of a loose mid brown loamy sand and successive deep cultivations had resulted in this forming a uniform layer over the site of between 0.5m and 0.6m thick.



Figure 2. Trench locations

#### Trench 2 (Figure 3)

0006 was a shallow N-S aligned ditch with steep, straight sides breaking sharply to an uneven base with signs of in situ burning. It was filled by 0007, a mid brown friable silty sand with very occasional small rounded stones and moderate charcoal flecks, more frequent towards the base. No finds were recovered from this fill.

#### Trench 3 (Figure 4)

Two parallel ditches approximately 8.5m apart were recorded in Trench 3. Both 0002 and 0004 were NE-SW aligned and of very similar dimensions and profiles. Each was filled by a mid-pale brown friable silty sand with occasional charcoal flecks and occasional small round and sub-angular stones, more frequent towards the base in the case of fill 0003. 0003 contained a blade-like flint flake whilst a single Beaker bodysherd was recovered from 0005.

#### Trench 6 (Figure 5)

0030 was a circular pit with a rounded profile and uneven, possibly disturbed, base. It was filled by 0031, a dark greyish brown charcoal rich sandy silt, with occasional small round pebbles and 0032, a mid brown sandy silt with occasional charcoal flecks and small round pebbles. The contact between the two fills was blurred and no finds were recovered from either fill.

0033 was a circular pit with rounded profile and uneven base which may be due to disturbance of some kind. Its upper fill, 0034, was a dark greyish brown sandy silt confined to the NW part of the pit, up to 0.08m thick. The central fill, 0038 was a fine, mixed pale brown and pale grey silty sand with moderate charcoal flecks and lumps throughout. Basal fill 0039 was a 0.05m thick layer of dense charcoal with some grey ash. No finds were recovered from the pit.

#### Trench 7 (Figure 6)

0024 was a presumed oval pit partially exposed in the western trench edge. It was filled by 0025, a pale brown friable sandy silt with very occasional small round and angular stones from which one Bronze age sherd was recovered.



Figure 3. Trench 2, plan and section







Figure 5. Trench 6, plan and sections

0026 was a shallow, oval pit with a rounded profile and a heat-altered sand base. Its fill, 0027, was a mid brown friable sandy silt with frequent charcoal flecks and lumps, occasional small rounded stones and no finds.

0028 was a shallow, circular pit with rounded profile and heat-altered base. It was filled by 0029, a mid brown friable sandy silt with frequent charcoal flecks and lumps, ashy patches and very occasional small rounded stones. Some animal disturbance was noted and no finds were recovered.

#### Trench 9 (Figure 7)

0008 was a NNE-SSW aligned ditch with rounded profile. It was filled by 0009, a mid brown friable sandy silt with occasional small rounded flints and one flint flake.

#### Trench 10 (Figure 8)

Six features were identified in Trench 10, consisting of one ditch and five pits. The pits were located in the east end of the trench, spread over an area of *c*.12m. 0010 was a small, shallow, circular pit, with a rounded profile, truncated on its western side by deep agricultural activity. It was filled by 0011, a dark greyish brown friable charcoal-rich sandy silt. It contained very few inclusions and no finds.

0012 was a presumed circular pit, almost fully exposed but continuing beyond the southern trench edge. Its fill, 0013, was a mid-dark brown friable sandy silt with occasional charcoal flecks and small round and sub-angular pebbles. Several red/black non-metallic slag nodules were recovered, along with two sherds of Beaker pottery, one of which was highly decorated.

Pits 0014 and 0019 were very similar in form, both shallow with a rounded profile and heat altered base and sides. In each case, two distinct fills were identified, the lower densely packed with charcoal and the upper a mid-dark brown sandy silt with regular charcoal and occasional heat altered stones. 0021, the upper fill of pit 0019, contained one sherd of Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age pottery.

0017 was a deep, sub-circular pit or post-hole located between pits 0014 and 0019. It had a U-shaped profile, steep sloping sides and a slightly rounded base, with a shallow lip on its northern edge. It was filled by 0018, a mid-dark brown friable sandy silt with





occasional charcoal flecks and pebbles. It had been subject to either animal or agricultural disturbance and no finds were recovered.

0022 was a NE-SW aligned ditch with an open U-shaped profile, sloping sides and a generally flat base. Its fill, 0023, was a mid brown sandy silt with occasional charcoal flecks and small-medium pebbles and one small and undiagnostic flint flake.

#### Trench 12 (Figure 9)

0035 was a roughly rectangular shallow pit with rounded corners and steep sides breaking sharply to a flat base. Upper fill 0036 was a mid brown friable sandy silt with moderate charcoal flecks and very occasional small rounded stones. Lower fill 0037 was densely packed with charcoal lumps and some ashy deposits in the south west end of the pit. No finds were recovered.

#### Trench 14 (Figure 10)

0040 was a shallow, circular pit with rounded heat-altered sides and a slightly flattish heat-altered base. Upper fill 0042 was a mid brown sandy silt with moderate charcoal flecks inclusions. Basal fill 0041 was dense with charcoal and some grey ash.

0051 was a NE-SW aligned ditch with an open U-shaped profile. Its fill, 0052, was a friable mid brown silty sand with occasional charcoal flecks and small-medium pebbles. 0053 was a cache of acorns located in a discreet area on the surface of the ditch fill. They were collected as a possible charred deposit, however, closer inspection suggested they had not been burnt, and were more likely to represent a fairly modern cache of food buried by an animal.

0058 was a roughly NW-SE aligned ditch, slightly irregular in plan, with a U-shaped profile. Its fill, 0059, was a mid-pale brown silty sand with lenses of mixed sands. In the SW end, the fill was paler at the top but the change was very gradual with, no clear indication that the ditch contained two distinct fills. no finds were recovered.

#### Trench 16 (Figure 11)

0043 was a NNE-SSW aligned ditch with sloping sides breaking gradually to a flattish base. Fill 0044 was a pale yellowish brown silty sand with occasional small angular flints and charcoal flecks but no finds.



Figure 7. Trench 9, plan and section



Figure 8. Trench 10, plan and sections

 $\overline{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ 



Figure 9. Trench 12, plan and section



Figure 10. Trench 14, plan and sections



Figure 11. Trench 16, plan and section

#### Trench 18 (Figure 12)

0047 was a NE-SW aligned ditch with a rounded profile. It was filled by 0048, a mid brown sandy silt with very occasional charcoal flecks and small flints.

#### Trench 19 (Figure 13)

0054 was a shallow, sub-circular pit with steep sides breaking sharply to a flat heataltered base. Fill 0055 was a mid brown silty sand with moderate-frequent charcoal, very occasional small angular flints and occasional burnt flints but no finds.

0056 was a roughly E-W aligned ditch, curving slightly north at the west end. Its profile was generally rounded, with the north side steeper than the south. Its fill, 0057, was a pale yellowish brown silty sand with occasional charcoal flecks and small angular flints from which no finds were recovered.

#### Trench 20 (Figure 14)

0049 was a small, rounded pit partially exposed in the eastern edge of the trench. It consisted of a shallow scoop with a rounded profile and heat-altered natural base. Fill 0050 was a dark purplish brown silty sand dense with charcoal lumps from which no finds were recovered.

#### Trench 24 (Figure 15)

0045 was a NE-SW aligned ditch with steep sides breaking fairly sharply to a flattish base. Its fill, 0046, was a pale yellowish brown silty sand with occasional charcoal flecks and regular-occasional small angular flints but no finds.



Figure 12. Trench 18, plan and section



Figure 13. Trench 19, plan and sections







Figure 15. Trench 24, plan and section

## 6. Finds evidence

#### 6.1 Introduction

Table 1 shows the quantities of finds collected during the evaluation. A full quantification by context is included as Appendix II.

Find type	No	Wt/g
Pottery	7	45
СВМ	1	51
Fired clay	54	194
Worked flint	20	195
Burnt flint/stone	97	249
Slag	6	5
Animal bone	1	5
Charred material	132	90

Table 1. Finds quantities

#### 6.2 Pottery

A total of seven sherds of pottery (45g) ranging in date from prehistoric to post-medieval was collected from 5 contexts in 3 trenches and one unstratified during the evaluation.

Two Beaker bodysherds, both made in a grog and flint tempered fabric (G2) were recovered from pit 0012 Trench 10 (0013). One is decorated with triple bands of combimpressed dashes separated by a plain band and followed by a band of at least three rows of pinched fingernail impressions beneath. The second sherd is very abraded and appears to be undecorated. Bronze Age, but not closely datable pottery includes an undecorated grog and sand-tempered (G1) bodysherd from pit 0024 in Trench 7 (0025) and a very small abraded grog and flint tempered (G2) bodysherd from ditch 0004 in Trench 3 (0005). A single sherd of flint tempered (F1) from pit 0019 in Trench 10 (0021) could be late BA or Early Iron Age.

The latest pottery includes single sherds of medieval coarseware (MCW) which is late 12th -14th century and glazed red earthenware (GRE) of 16th-18th century date. Both were collected from the topsoil (0001).

#### 6.3 Ceramic building materials (CBM) and fired clay

A fragment of Roman tegula made in a fine to medium sandy fabric with ferrous inclusions (msfe) was collected from the topsoil (0001).

A total of 54 fragments of fired clay (194g) were recovered from within the non-floating residue in Sample 12, pit 0054 in Trench 19 (0055). The material is made in a medium

sandy fabric with few other inclusions. The fragments are quite eroded, soft and crumbling, but several of the larger pieces have one flat surface suggesting that this is the remains of daub.

#### 6.4 Struck Flint Sarah Bates

#### Introduction and methodology

Twenty pieces of struck flint were recovered from four contexts. The flint includes several good quality and smooth textured very dark grey pieces as well some that are slightly mottled grey and mid brownish grey. Cortex ranges from thin to medium thickness. The flint is summarised by type in Table 2 and listed by context n Table 3.

Each piece of flint was examined and recorded by context in an ACCESS database table. The material was classified by category and type (see archive) and quantified by count. Numbers of complete, corticated, patinated and hinge-fractured pieces were recorded as well as the condition of the flint. Additional descriptive comments were made as necessary.

Туре	No
flake	10
blade-like flake	2
scraper	2
backed knife	1
retouched flake	4
utilised blade	1
Total	20

Table 2. Flint by type

#### The assemblage

Ten flakes are present. They are almost all small or quite small and two or three are quite thick. Most of the flakes have clearly been struck by hard hammer. Two pieces, including one from a probable blade-type piece, have cortex on their platforms and there is no clear evidence for platform edge preparation. One thickish piece with a cortical platform and broken at its other end has one surface which has been flaked previously – from a former platform edge. There are two other blade-like flakes; one is a small hard hammer struck piece with irregular overhangs to its platform edge (0003), the other is slightly irregular and curving (0001).

Two pieces have been classified as scrapers. A small thin primary flake, with very thin semi transparent 'cortex', has neat retouch around its distal end; its proximal part is missing. Another very small, thick, irregular flake has some slight retouch around its

distal part. A relatively large, quite thin and slightly irregular 'leaf-shaped' flake has cortex 'backing' its steep right side and quite neat retouch along the opposite edge. It was probably used as a knife although the edge is slightly irregular, almost denticular in places. Four flakes have irregular or slight retouch of their edges. Three of these are irregular cortical pieces, the other is a quite thin tertiary flake. One broken flake may have been utilised. All of the retouched or utilised pieces are from topsoil context 0001.

#### Flint deposition

Single small flakes, including one small hard hammer struck blade-like flake, came from the fills of each of four ditches. The rest of the flint was found in the topsoil (0001). The flint is listed by context in the table below.

Context	Туре	No	Notes
0001	blade-like flake	1	Blade-like flake
	flake	1	Thick, distal end missing hh (hard hammer), has previously flakes surface poss from former platform edge, damge to other edge prob not retouch
	flake	6	Various quite small, hh types
	backed knife	1	Irregular leaf shaped with cortex along steep right side and retouch along opp side - slightly irreg edge w almost dentics
	retouched flake	4	1 quite thin broad, 1 prob blade-like with retouch one side, other two small, irreg, retouch of edge
	scraper	2	1 v small irreg qu thick with slight retouch around irreg distal part, 1 thin prim dist frag with v thin cortex and neat retouc h around distal end
	utilised blade	1	hh, distal broken, poss utilisation of edge
0003	blade-like flake	1	hh, irregular 'overhangs to platform edge, slight damage to one side - prob accidental
0009	flake	1	Squat hh with abr cortex
0023	flake	1	Very small
0048	flake	1	Very small with v sharp narrow distal point - poss split

Table 3. Flint by context

#### Discussion

The flint is not closely dateable but the hard hammer struck nature of most of it suggests that it is likely to be of later Neolithic, or later date. The presence of several blade-like flakes and one or two quite thin flakes as well as small thick and more irregular flakes suggests that material may date to more than one period. This is not inconsistent with the small amount of pottery which was recovered. Most of the flint, including the retouched pieces, has at least some cortex. A possible backed knife might be of earlier Neolithic date although it is somewhat irregular.

#### 6.5 Miscellaneous

#### **Burnt flint**

In total, 97 fragments of burnt or heat-altered flint weighing 249g were recovered from ten contexts in six trenches and one unstratified. This includes material recovered from the non-floating environmental sample residues as well as hand-collected pieces.

#### Slag

Six tiny fragments (5g) of non-metallurgical slag were collected from pit 0012 (0013) in Trench 10.

#### Animal bone

A single fragment of burnt animal bone was collected from the topsoil (0001).

### 6.6 Charred remains

Charred wood was hand-collected from three contexts, pits 0014 and 0019 in Trench 10 (0015 and 0020) and pit 0040 in Trench14 (0041). A concentration of ?charred acorns, 100+ fragments weighing 35g, was collected from the top of ditch 0051 in Trench 14 (0053). The deposit has been provisionally interpreted as a fairly modern animal 'cache'.

## 7. Discussion

Several archaeological features were identified during the evaluation, spread over the entire development area but with some concentration on the eastern side around Trenches 10 and 14. Ditches matching those plotted from aerial photos (BUC 12) were noted in Trench 3 and Trench 9 whilst ditches in Trenches 10, 14, 18 and 24 share roughly same alignment. Ditch sections 0022, 0051, 0048 and 0045 are likely to represent the same feature running approximately NE-SW across the site. A full replotting of aerial photographic results is beyond the scope of this report, but should form part of any further work that is recommended.

Finds were collected from twenty contexts in eighteen features which included eleven pits and seven ditches in eleven evaluation trenches. The largest concentration of finds was from six features in Trench 10, producing Beaker pottery of later Neolithic or Early Bronze Age date. The earliest finds are within the flint assemblage which includes at least one piece which may be Early Neolithic as well as pieces which are likely to be of later Neolithic, or later date. The flint appears to be consistent in date with the small pottery assemblage which includes Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age Beaker as well as less closely datable Bronze Age or Early Iron Age sherds. The only later-dated finds were collected from the topsoil and include a fragment of Roman roofing tile, and single sherds of medieval and post-medieval pottery.

The proposed groundworks for the reservoir would impact on the surviving archaeology revealed by the trenching.

#### Disclaimer

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



9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 2AR

## **Brief and Specification for Archaeological Evaluation**

PROPOSED IRRIGATION RESERVOIR, LAND SOUTH OF EXISTING RESERVOIR, FELIXSTOWE ROAD, FOXHALL (C/11/1092)

The commissioning body should be aware that it may have Health & Safety responsibilities.

#### 1. The nature of the development and archaeological requirements

- 1.1 A planning application has been made to Suffolk Coastal District Council (C/11/1092) for the construction of a new farm reservoir on land south of existing reservoir, Felixstowe Road, Foxhall (TM 228 418). **Please contact the applicant for an accurate plan of the site.**
- 1.2 The applicant has been advised that the location of the proposed reservoir could affect important heritage assets with archaeological interest. The applicant should be required to undertake an archaeological field evaluation prior to consideration of the proposal, in accordance with PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment. This information should be incorporated in the design and access statement, in accordance with policies HE6.1, HE6.2, HE6.3 and HE7.1 of PPS 5, in order for the Local Planning Authority to be able to take into account the particular nature and the significance of the heritage assets at this location.
- 1.3 The proposed reservoir is located on land to the west of the A12 and north of the A14 at Junction 58 near Holly Lodge at *c*.30.00m AOD. The geology is sand and gravel glaciofluvial drift. The area affected by the new reservoir measures *c*.2.62ha. in extent.
- 1.4 The site of the proposed reservoir has high potential for the discovery of important hitherto unknown heritage assets of archaeological interest in view of its location within an extensive cropmark complex recorded in the County Historic Environment Record (HER no. BUC 012). However, the site has not been the subject of previous systematic investigation.
- 1.5 The site has good potential for the discovery of important hitherto unknown archaeological sites and features in view of its proximity to known remains. The proposed development has the potential to cause damage and destruction to any underlying heritage assets.
- 1.6 The following archaeological evaluation work is required across the application area:
  - A linear trenched evaluation is required of the development area.
- 1.7 The results of this evaluation will enable the archaeological resource, both in quality and extent, to be accurately quantified. Decisions on the suitably of the area for development will be based on the results of this work. The evaluation will also provide information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of cost. The need for any further evaluation, for example geophysical survey and fieldwalking/metal detecting, will be based upon the results of this evaluation and will be the subject of an additional specification.
- 1.8 All arrangements for the field evaluation of the site, the timing of the work, access to the site, the definition of the precise area of landholding and area for proposed development are to be defined and negotiated with the commissioning body.

- 1.8 Detailed standards, information and advice to supplement this brief are to be found in *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14, 2003.
- 1.9 In accordance with the standards and guidance produced by the Institute for Archaeologists this brief should not be considered sufficient to enable the total execution of the project. A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) based upon this brief and the accompanying outline specification of minimum requirements, is an essential requirement. This must be submitted by the developers, or their agent, to the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2AR) for approval. The work must not commence until this office has approved both the archaeological contractor as suitable to undertake the work, and the WSI as satisfactory. The WSI will provide the basis for measurable standards and will be used to satisfy the requirements of the planning condition.
- 1.10 Before any archaeological site work can commence it is the responsibility of the developer to provide the archaeological contractor with either the contaminated land report for the site or a written statement that there is no contamination. The developer should be aware that investigative sampling to test for contamination is likely to have an impact on any archaeological deposit which exists; proposals for sampling should be discussed with the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of SCC (SCCAS/CT) before execution.
- 1.12 The responsibility for identifying any constraints on field-work, e.g. Scheduled Monument status, Listed Building status, public utilities or other services, tree preservation orders, SSSIs, wildlife sites &c., ecological considerations rests with the commissioning body and its archaeological contractor. The existence and content of the archaeological brief does not over-ride such constraints or imply that the target area is freely available.
- 1.13 Any changes to the specifications that the project archaeologist may wish to make after approval by this office should be communicated directly to SCCAS/CT and the client for approval.

#### 2. Brief for the Archaeological Evaluation

- 2.1 Establish whether any archaeological deposit exists in the area, with particular regard to any which are of sufficient importance to merit preservation *in situ*.
- 2.2 Identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit within the application area, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation.
- 2.3 Evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.
- 2.4 Establish the potential for the survival of environmental evidence.
- 2.5 Provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of cost.
- 2.6 This project will be carried through in a manner broadly consistent with English Heritage's *Management of Archaeological Projects,* 1991 (*MAP2*), all stages will follow a process of assessment and justification before proceeding to the next phase of the project. Field evaluation is to be followed by the preparation of a full archive, and an assessment of potential. Any further excavation required as mitigation is to be followed by the preparation of a full archive, and an assessment of potential, analysis and final report preparation may follow. Each stage will be the subject of a further brief and updated project design; this document covers only the evaluation stage.

- 2.7 The developer or his archaeologist will give SCCAS/CT (address as above) five working days notice of the commencement of ground works on the site, in order that the work of the archaeological contractor may be monitored.
- 2.8 If the approved evaluation design is not carried through in its entirety (particularly in the instance of trenching being incomplete) the evaluation report may be rejected. Alternatively the presence of an archaeological deposit may be presumed, and untested areas included on this basis when defining the final mitigation strategy.
- 2.9 An outline specification, which defines certain minimum criteria, is set out below.

#### 3. Specification: Trenched Evaluation

- 3.1 Trial trenches are to be excavated to cover 5% by area of the new development, which is 1308.00m<sup>2</sup>. These shall be positioned to sample all parts of the site. Linear trenches are thought to be the most appropriate sampling method. Trenches are to be a minimum of 1.80m wide unless special circumstances can be demonstrated; this will result in a minimum of 727.00m of trenching at 1.80m in width. The exact area and extent of the access road is undefined and this area will also need to be evaluated.
- 3.2 If excavation is mechanised a toothless 'ditching bucket' 1.80m wide must be used. A scale plan showing the proposed locations of the trial trenches should be included in the WSI and the detailed trench design must be approved by SCCAS/CT before field work begins.
- 3.3 The topsoil may be mechanically removed using an appropriate machine with a back-acting arm and fitted with a toothless bucket, down to the interface layer between topsoil and subsoil or other visible archaeological surface. All machine excavation is to be under the direct control and supervision of an archaeologist. The topsoil should be examined for archaeological material.
- 3.4 The top of the first archaeological deposit may be cleared by machine, but must then be cleaned off by hand. There is a presumption that excavation of all archaeological deposits will be done by hand unless it can be shown there will not be a loss of evidence by using a machine. The decision as to the proper method of excavation will be made by the senior project archaeologist with regard to the nature of the deposit.
- 3.5 In all evaluation excavation there is a presumption of the need to cause the minimum disturbance to the site consistent with adequate evaluation; that significant archaeological features, e.g. solid or bonded structural remains, building slots or post-holes, should be preserved intact even if fills are sampled. For guidance:

For linear features, 1.00m wide slots (min.) should be excavated across their width;

For discrete features, such as pits, 50% of their fills should be sampled (in some instances 100% may be requested).

- 3.6 There must be sufficient excavation to give clear evidence for the period, depth and nature of any archaeological deposit. The depth and nature of colluvial or other masking deposits must be established across the site.
- 3.7 Archaeological contexts should, where possible, be sampled for palaeoenvironmental remains. Best practice should allow for sampling of interpretable and datable archaeological deposits and provision should be made for this. The contractor shall show what provision has been made for environmental assessment of the site and must provide details of the sampling strategies for retrieving artefacts, biological remains (for palaeoenvironmental and palaeoeconomic investigations), and samples of sediments and/or soils (for

micromorphological and other pedological/sedimentological analyses. Advice on the appropriateness of the proposed strategies will be sought from Helen Chappell, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling archaeological deposits (Murphy, P.L. and Wiltshire, P.E.J., 1994, *A guide to sampling archaeological deposits for environmental analysis*) is available for viewing from SCCAS.

- 3.8 Any natural subsoil surface revealed should be hand cleaned and examined for archaeological deposits and artefacts. Sample excavation of any archaeological features revealed may be necessary in order to gauge their date and character.
- 3.9 Metal detector searches must take place at all stages of the excavation by an experienced metal detector user.
- 3.10 All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed SCCAS/CT during the course of the evaluation).
- 3.11 Human remains must be left *in situ* except in those cases where damage or desecration are to be expected, or in the event that analysis of the remains is shown to be a requirement of satisfactory evaluation of the site. However, the excavator should be aware of, and comply with, the provisions of Section 25 of the Burial Act 1857.
- 3.12 Plans of any archaeological features on the site are to be drawn at 1:20 or 1:50, depending on the complexity of the data to be recorded. Sections should be drawn at 1:10 or 1:20 again depending on the complexity to be recorded. All levels should relate to Ordnance Datum. Any variations from this must be agreed with SCCAS/CT.
- 3.13 A photographic record of the work is to be made, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies and/or high resolution digital images.
- 3.14 Topsoil, subsoil and archaeological deposit to be kept separate during excavation to allow sequential backfilling of excavations.
- 3.15 Trenches should not be backfilled without the approval of SCCAS/CT. Suitable arrangements should be made with the client to ensure trenches are appropriately backfilled, compacted and consolidated in order to prevent subsequent subsidence.

#### 4. General Management

- 4.1 A timetable for all stages of the project must be agreed before the first stage of work commences, including monitoring by SCCAS/CT. The archaeological contractor will give not less than five days written notice of the commencement of the work so that arrangements for monitoring the project can be made.
- 4.2 The composition of the archaeology contractor staff must be detailed and agreed by this office, including any subcontractors/specialists. For the site director and other staff likely to have a major responsibility for the post-excavation processing of this evaluation there must also be a statement of their responsibilities or a CV for post-excavation work on other archaeological sites and publication record. Ceramic specialists, in particular, must have relevant experience from this region, including knowledge of local ceramic sequences.
- 4.3 It is the archaeological contractor's responsibility to ensure that adequate resources are available to fulfill the Brief.
- 4.4 A detailed risk assessment must be provided for this particular site.
- 4.5 No initial survey to detect public utility or other services has taken place. The responsibility for this rests with the archaeological contractor.

4.6 The Institute for Archaeologists' *Standard and Guidance for archaeological field evaluation* (revised 2001) should be used for additional guidance in the execution of the project and in drawing up the report.

#### 5. Report Requirements

- 5.1 An archive of all records and finds must be prepared consistent with the principles of English Heritage's *Management of Archaeological Projects*, 1991 (particularly Appendix 3.1 and Appendix 4.1).
- 5.2 The report should reflect the aims of the WSI.
- 5.3 The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its archaeological interpretation.
- 5.4 An opinion as to the necessity for further evaluation and its scope may be given. No further site work should be embarked upon until the primary fieldwork results are assessed and the need for further work is established.
- 5.5 Reports on specific areas of specialist study must include sufficient detail to permit assessment of potential for analysis, including tabulation of data by context, and must include non-technical summaries.
- 5.6 The Report must include a discussion and an assessment of the archaeological evidence, including an assessment of palaeoenvironmental remains recovered from palaeosols and cut features. Its conclusions must include a clear statement of the archaeological potential of the site, and the significance of that potential in the context of the Regional Research Framework (*East Anglian Archaeology*, Occasional Papers 3 & 8, 1997 and 2000).
- 5.7 The results of the surveys should be related to the relevant known archaeological information held in the County Historic Environment Record (HER).
- 5.8 A copy of the Specification should be included as an appendix to the report.
- 5.9 The project manager must consult the County HER Officer (Dr Colin Pendleton) to obtain a HER number for the work. This number will be unique for each project or site and must be clearly marked on any documentation relating to the work.
- 5.10 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with *UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines.*
- 5.11 The project manager should consult the intended archive depository before the archive is prepared regarding the specific requirements for the archive deposition and curation, and regarding any specific cost implications of deposition. The intended depository should be stated in the WSI, for approval. The intended depository must be prepared to accept the entire archive resulting from the project (both finds and written archive) in order to create a complete record of the project.
- 5.12 If the County Store is not the intended depository, the project manager should ensure that a duplicate copy of the written archive is deposited with the County HER.
- 5.13 If the County Store is the intended location of the archive, the project manager should consult the SCCAS Archive Guidelines 2010 and also the County Historic Environment Record Officer regarding the requirements for the deposition of the archive (conservation, ordering, organisation, labelling, marking and storage) of excavated material and the archive. A clear statement of the form, intended content, and standards of the archive is to be submitted for approval as an essential requirement of the WSI.

- 5.14 The WSI should state proposals for the deposition of the digital archive relating to this project with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS), and allowance should be made for costs incurred to ensure the proper deposition (<u>http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/policy.html</u>) with ADS or another appropriate archive depository.
- 5.15 Where positive conclusions are drawn from a project (whether it be evaluation or excavation) a summary report, in the established format, suitable for inclusion in the annual 'Archaeology in Suffolk' section of the *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute for Archaeology*, must be prepared. It should be included in the project report, or submitted to SCCAS/CT, by the end of the calendar year in which the evaluation work takes place, whichever is the sooner.
- 5.16 An unbound hardcopy of the evaluation report, clearly marked DRAFT, must be presented to SCCAS/CT for approval within six months of the completion of fieldwork unless other arrangements are negotiated with the project sponsor and SCCAS/CT.

Following acceptance, two hard copies of the report should be submitted to SCCAS/CT together with a digital .pdf version.

- 5.17 Where appropriate, a digital vector trench plan should be included with the report, which must be compatible with MapInfo GIS software, for integration in the County HER. AutoCAD files should be also exported and saved into a format that can be can be imported into MapInfo (for example, as a Drawing Interchange File or .dxf) or already transferred to .TAB files.
- 5.18 At the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record <a href="http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/">http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/</a> must be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators forms.
- 5.19 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the County HER, and a copy should be included with the draft report for approval. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive).

Specification by: Dr Jess Tipper

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Conservation Team 9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 2AR Tel: 01284 741225 Email: jess.tipper@suffolk.gov.uk

Date: 13 June 2011

This brief and specification remains valid for six months from the above date. If work is not carried out in full within that time this document will lapse; the authority should be notified and a revised brief and specification may be issued.

If the work defined by this brief forms a part of a programme of archaeological work required by a Planning Condition, the results must be considered by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council, who have the responsibility for advising the appropriate Planning Authority.

# Appendix II: Bulk finds quantities

Context	Context Pottery		FI	int	Burr	nt flint	Miscellaneous	Spotdates
	No	Ŵt/g	No	Wt/g	No	Wt/g		•
0001	2	15	16	178	2	28	CBM (1-51g) AB 1-5g	PMed Med Rom Preh
0003			1	7				
0005	1	1						Bronze Age
0007					55	85		
0009			1	6				
0011					4	7		
0013	2	11			1	9	Slag (6-5g)	LNEO-EBA
0015							Charcoal (10-13g)	
0016					7	13		
0020							Charcoal (9-3g)	
0021	1	5			1	1		Preh (EIA?)
0023			1	3				
0025	1	13						Bronze Age
0029					6	10		
0034					1	7		
0037					6	6		
0041							Charcoal (13-39g)	
0048			1	1				
0053							Charcoal (100-35g)	
0055					14	83	Fired clay (54-194g)	