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## Summary

An archaeological evaluation was carried out on land to the rear of Thingoe House, Bury St Edmunds. Planning permission is being sought to demolish the redundant office block that occupies the site and build a care complex. The site spans an area of one block within the town's medieval grid between Northgate Street, an axial road that leads to one of the town's five gates and Cotton Lane, a back lane which borders the flood plain of the River Lark.

The earliest feature was the large ditch which formed a substantial boundary on the floodplain edge; the ditch was filled in by the $c .12-13$ th century but the boundary itself, later defined by a fence line, remained in existence until the recent past. Medieval pits, dated to 12-14th century were found within the floodplain and were probably excavated to extract the quality gravels which existed here. A layer of structural clay also indicated that some form of building or workshops existed in this area at this time. Above the floodplain post-built structures and the presence of extensive oven debris were found within what would have been an area of urban backyards.

A square flint-lined well and the remains of an associated outbuilding dating to the late 15th-early 16th and late post-built structures sealed and cut the medieval backyard deposits but there was an absence of later material below the flood plain suggesting that it had become the garden by the $c$. 15 th century. The remains of a post-medieval building shown on Warren's map of 1747 were found to fronting onto Cotton Lane.

## Drawing Conventions



## 1. Introduction

An archaeological evaluation was carried out on land to the rear of Thingoe House, Bury St Edmunds (Fig. 1). Planning permission is being sought (Application no. SE/11/1052) to demolish the redundant office block that occupies the site and build a care complex.

An evaluation was requested in accordance with policies HE6.1, HE6.2 and HE7.1 of PPS 5, prior to determination of the application to establish whether archaeological deposits exist on the site and to assess the impact of the development upon them. This report is intended to accompany a detailed application and inform the Local Planning Authority as to the significance of the heritage assets. A desk based study, which examined the readily available archaeological and historical information of the area, has been prepared by project planning consultants CgMs (Smith 2008). This concluded that there was a high potential for Saxon and medieval deposits to exist on the site.

The work was carried out in accordance with a brief and specification issued by Dr Abby Antrobus of Suffolk County Council's Archaeological Service Conservation Team (SCCASCT) and completed by SCCAS field team during October 2011. The evaluation was commissioned and managed by Suzanne Gailey of CgMs on behalf of their clients McCarthy and Stone who funded the project.

The site was formerly local health authority offices and its associated car park and gardens.

## 2. Geology and topography

The site lies at TL 856 644, within the core of the medieval town. The River Lark runs in a wide floodplain within 150 m and the site occupies the west valley side sloping down to the floodplain edge. The ground level drops over 7 m from its west to east boundaries; the existing office block has been built/cut into the slope and the evaluation area landscaped into two relatively flat terraces. The general ground level of the upper terrace is at 35.10 m OD and the lowered one 33.20 m OD; the trenching sampled both terraces.


Figure 1. Location map showing development area (red), with Anglo-Saxon and medieval sites recorded on the HER (green)

A soil investigation report (2008, Crossfield Consulting Ltd.) identified soil deposits, including a 'relic ground' up to 3.9 m deep. The surface geology is orange sands and gravels of the river terrace; the underlying solid geology is chalk.

## 3. Archaeology and historical background

The historical background of the site has been described in full in the DBA. In summary the site lies within the core of the medieval town. The town as we perceive it today is a Norman 'new town' built over the original Anglo-Saxon settlement which has its origins in the 7th century. The town plan was conceived by Abbot Baldwin (1065-700) who laid out the town on a gridded street pattern orientated on the axis of his redesigned Abbey Church which lay at the centre of the town plan.

The site spans an area of one block within the grid between Northgate Street, an axial road that leads to one of the town's five gates and Cotton Lane, a back lane which borders the flood plain. Cotton Lane, formerly Scurfe Lane, is on the margins of the town. The nearby river was a focus for the tanning industry (BSE 292) and the immediate area was exploited gravel extraction (BSE 193) during the medieval period. The Abbey precinct is situated 70 m to the south of the site (BSE 010) and the crossing point of the River Lark and the medieval East Gate (BSE 068) lies within 100m (Fig. 1).

The original Saxon settlement is thought to be strung out along the river valley and centred somewhere within the area of the abbey precinct complex. Northgate Street, Southgate Street and the irregular streets to the south of the precinct are arguably relics of the Saxon settlement. Middle and Late Saxon find spots near to the site include a 7th century burial at BSE 183 and Saxon pottery (BSE 183, 124 and 208) and a Late Saxon pit (BSE 324).

The earliest map of Bury published in 1747 (Fig. 2) shows the site laid out as a series of gardens and divided between three plots connected to houses fronting onto Mustow Street to the south of the development area. The imposing Grade II listed Mustow House is a 18th century remodelling of an earlier building but retains part of its original 16th-17th structure.


Figure 2. The position of the site shown on Thomas Warren's Map of Bury 1747. ( N to the left)

## 4 Methodology

The site was sampled by three $6 m \times 6 m$ trenches and an existing engineering test hole, excavated in advance of the evaluation, was re-opened and recorded. The evaluation strategy was designed in anticipation of soil depths of up to 4 m , the width of the trench allowing the sides to be stepped to access any deposits below 1.2 m ; the maximum depth advised by the HSE for unshored excavation. Limitation to the placement of the trenches included a belt of trees along the south boundary of the site, the existing building and below ground services which included a large underground tank (soakaway). A trench plan was prepared by CgMs to sample all available areas of the site and the trenches were set out using a RTK GPS uploaded with this data. The test holes (including the re-excavated engineering hole) opened an area of 99sq m c. 4.6\% of the total available area of the site.

The trenches were excavated using a tracked $360^{\circ}$ mechanical excavator equipped with a toothless ditching bucket 1.8 m wide. The machine operated under the supervision of an archaeologist removing overburden to the top of the uppermost archaeological levels. Spoil was stockpiled on the sides of the test holes and excavations and upcast spoil scanned for finds by an experienced metal detectorist.

Archaeological deposits were sampled by hand excavation in order to fulfil the project research aims and in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation. Where the archaeological deposits exceeded 1.2 m , the trenches were stepped in and the lower deposits sampled within smaller sondages. Bulk soil samples were collected from selected contexts for environmental analysis.

The site was recorded under HER site code BSE 378 using a single context continuous numbering system starting at 0001 and small finds at 1001. Trench outlines and section positions and levels were recorded using a Total Station Theodolite and related to the Ordnance Survey grid and datum using RTK GPS. Trench plans and sections were recorded at a scale of 1:20 onto A3 gridded permatrace sheets. Digital colour photographs were taken of all stages of the fieldwork, and are included in the digital and physical archives.

Site data has been input onto an MS Access database. Bulk finds have been washed, marked and quantified, with the resultant data also being entered onto databases.

An OASIS form has been initiated for the project (reference no. suffolkc1-111957) and a digital copy of the report has been submitted for inclusion on the Archaeology Data Service database (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit).

The site archive is kept in the main store of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service at Bury St Edmunds.

## 5 Results

### 5.1 Introduction

Three test holes were excavated within the car park and gardens of Thingoe House. Trench 1 was excavated immediately adjacent to the existing offices within a level, raised terraced garden area retained from the car park below by a brick wall. Trenches 2 and 3 were excavated in the carpark at the lower level and an existing engineering test hole was re-opened close to the plot's eastern boundary and recorded as Trench 4. Datable archaeological features and deposits were found in all of the excavations, ranging from the 11th -17 th centuries. Within the car park the uppermost archaeological

levels were just below the tarmac sub-base at c. 0.4 m below the current ground levels with the top of the geological sand and gravels encountered at about 1 m . In the area of Trench 1 where the original slope of the ground was buried, the depth to the archaeology varied across the trench from $0.3 \mathrm{~m}-0.6 \mathrm{~m}$, and the depth to the geological sand between 0.3 m and 2.10 m . The archaeological deposits were relatively straight forward within the area of the car park but a complex density of features and a long stratigraphic sequence was recorded in Trench 1.

The locations of the trenches are shown in Figure 3 and the findings of the evaluation are described by trench below.

## Trench 1

In the area of Trench 1 the original sloping ground had been re-worked to create a flat terrace (Fig 3). At the west side of the excavation the ground had been truncated and archaeological features cutting into the natural sand were found at 0.3 m immediately below disturbed topsoil. The overburden became progressively deeper across the trench and on the east side the archaeological levels were found at 37.2m OD below 0.8 m of soil. A dense and complex sequence of intercutting features was recorded in Trench 1 which could be separated into the following six distinct phases of activity.

## Phase 6

No modern disturbances were recorded and the latest features were a series of rubble filled pits shown on phase plan 6 (Fig. 4). The pits were all filled with single-dump backfill deposits and the rubble within these features was made up of peg-tile, handmade 'Tudor bricks' and building flint with lime mortar but it included no modern materials (19th century +). The building rubble was mixed in with domestic rubbish deposits which produced pottery and animal bone; the pottery dated to 16th-18th century. The pits intercut on the south edge of the trench but the narrow date range of the finds suggested that they were all broadly contemporary. The pits at the west side were truncated but pits 0019 and 0015 survived to their full depth of 0.8 m and were sealed beneath a layer of buried topsoil (Fig. 5, S14 and S11). A single posthole 0051 in which the post position was packed around with brick fragments was recorded against the north edge of the trench (Fig 4. and Fig. 5, S9).


Figure 4. Trench 1 Phase plans


Pit 0053 was excavated against the side of a flint-built structure 0006 and was probably originally excavated to chase the sides of the masonry. It was excavated to a depth of 1.2 m but was not bottomed (Fig. $5, \mathrm{~S} 10$ ).

## Phase 5

The pits cut a dark organic silt numbered 0002 and 0020 (Fig. 5, S8 and S9) which produced a large assemblage of finds, indicative of a dump of domestic rubbish, which overlay and sealed the Phase 4 features and was dated to the 17 th century.

## Phase 4

A group of four clay packed postholes have been assigned together in Phase 4 and are shown in Figure 4. Although they do not form a coherent plan the postholes were all packed with a similar clay and are of a comparable size. The best preserved of the postholes 0048 measured 0.7 m across $\times 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ deep (Fig. 5, S12). Postholes 0039 and 0061 were truncated by the later Phase 6 pits so that only the base of the postholes remained but the level showed that the bottoms of the postholes were all of equal depth (Fig. 5, S19 and S14). The position of the post was clear in postholes 0048 and 0061 and the clay continues across the bottom of the posthole; this was the only part of the truncated postholes that survived and they showed simply as circles of clay. All of the postholes were sealed by layer 0002 (c.17th century) and posthole 0048 was cut into the top of a flint-built feature 0006.

Pit 0059 was a large rubbish pit which produced 16th-18th century pottery and postmedieval tile. It was cut into very soft natural sand and its irregular shape and undercutting sides were thought to be the result of collapse when originally dug. There was no relationship between this feature and the postholes, it was placed into this phase simply because it was cut by Phase 6 pit, 0053; but it could equally could have placed in Phase 6.

## Phase 3

A sunken box-like structure, 0006, lined with narrow mortared flint wall was the principal feature in Phase 3 (Fig. 4). It was part of the remains of a larger (?)outbuilding which consisted of a wall 0005 and posthole 0003. The box-structure, possibly a well, measured $1.45 \mathrm{~m} \times 2.15 \mathrm{~m}$ internally and was excavated to a depth of 1.30 m without discovering the bottom (Fig. 5,S10). It was well-made with straight and vertical sides, and the walls were 0.18 m thick made from rounded flint cobbles which had been
selected by size ( $8-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ across). The flints were laid in bands 0.2 m deep ( $2-3$ courses) which were separated by a layer of broken roof tiles. A socket or putlog hole measuring $160 \times 200 \mathrm{~mm}$ and framed with tiles was recorded at 600 mm down. This would have secured a timber either as part of an internal structure or part of the formwork used in the wall's construction. The top of the wall was truncated, with at least three courses of flint having been lost from its top. The walls were sealed by soil layer 0002/0020 (C17th) and cut by Phase 4 postholes 0048. The structure was filled with a single fill of homogenous, fine, brown silt-loam 0021, an infilling layer dumped after the structure went out of use and not related to its function. The tile and the mortar in the fabric of the wall suggested a 15th-16th century date for its construction and it was abandoned and filled in during the 17th century.

A second short stub of narrow flint wall 0005 was aligned with west side of (?)well 0006 and is likely to be part of an associated building. The wall was made from large flints; it was 0.18 m (two flints) wide, survived to a maximum height of 0.2 m (two courses) and flared out at its base (Fig. 5, S11). The north end of the wall, as planned, was its full extent and the bottom of the wall tapered to stop alongside posthole 0003. This suggested that the two were related and that the wall was an infill to a post-built frame; the post-setting was 0.8 m deep indicative of a principal post. Only a short length $(0.9 \mathrm{~m})$ of the wall survived and its south end was truncated by a later pit.

A second square posthole, 0064 was excavated alongside (?)well 0006 (Fig. 5, S13). This was as substantial as posthole 0003 and the bottoms of the holes were set at equal depths.

## Phase 2

The component parts of the Phase 3 building were built over, or cut into, two wide shallow pits 0017 and 0041 (Fig. 4). The pits were sealed below soil horizon 0002 and identified after its removal (Fig. 5, S8 and S19). Pit 0017 was recorded as an extensive rectilinear feature which continued beyond the south and east edges of the excavation. The planned extents measured $3 m \times 2 m$ but, as the north side sloped all the way to the south edge of the trench this was thought to be less than half the width of the feature. It was filled with a domestic refuse layer 0016 made up of dark silt with charcoal, ash, animal bone and pottery. The pottery dated to the 12th-14th and included both coarseware and glazed wares. At the base of the pit were two discrete patches of green
clay, but it was unclear whether these were part of the fill or the vestiges of a separate feature. Pit 0017 matched very closely the outline of a large underlying pit 0050 and may be a slumped deposit into the top of the earlier feature.

Pit 0041 which was cut by 0017 was shallow and filled with a green-brown silty sand. It produced only a single sherd of pottery which was dated 12th-14th century (Fig. 5, S8).

## Phase 1

The earliest feature in this area of the site was a large elongated pit 0050, into the bottom of which were cut further pits, 0055 and 0057 (Fig. 5, S19). A distinctive fill, the debris from an oven, ran through all of these features indicating that they were all open at the same time and backfilled with material derived from a single source. This would suggest that the pits found in the bottom of 0050 were a series of secondary workings within a single, extensive, open excavation; one possibly dug for the extraction of sand. The whole feature in plan took the form of an elongated pit, 0050, although this was difficult to appreciate as it was almost entirely cut away by subsequent features. Because of this truncation a full section was not possible but the level difference between the planned top at its west end and the excavated bottom at its east was 1.35 m . The steep sloping ground may account for some of this difference and it is unknown if the bottom of the feature follows the natural slope or was quarried straight into the side of the hill. The fill is made up of burnt and unburnt clay, burnt sand, coarse gritty sand and dark silt, 0046. The clay is red and hard-fired, and broken up into a rubble of small fragments. The material is laid in bands marbled thoughout the fill and, in the case of pits 0055 and 0057, the bands can be traced following from one apparent cut to another. The fill looks like oven debris but there is no indication of burning within any of the cuts or surviving structure and it appears that the material has been dumped from the demolition of an oven elsewhere. The fill is almost completely devoid of finds but a sherd of 12th-13th century pottery was collected from 0056 at the very bottom of cut 0057.

## Trench 2

Trench 2 was located at the west end of the car park close to the wall that retains the upper terrace (Fig. 3). The former sloping ground had been levelled to create the carpark by reducing the ground level, thereby truncating the archaeological deposits at the top of the gradient.

Figure 6. Trench 2, plan and sections

The car park and its formation layers were laid directly onto what remained of the archaeological levels which occurred at $33.10 \mathrm{~m}, 0.4 \mathrm{~m}$ down from the existing ground surface. The uppermost deposit was a dark silt 0009, this was an homogenous worked soil which contained charcoal and mixed clay. The layer did not exist on the west side of the trench but got progressively deeper as it followed the former slope and was recorded at 0.5 m deep at the east side (Fig. 6, S2).

An alignment of four posts (0010, 0012 0071), probably part of a boundary fence, ran north south across the middle of the trench and was sealed by layer 0009 (Fig. 6). The postholes were filled with a dark clay-silt and there was evidence that clay and flints had been packed around the post. Only the bottoms of the postholes were recorded but the overlying soil profile suggested that c.0.5-0.6m had been removed from their full depth.

Two intercutting pits, 0065, were recorded against the south-east corner of the trench 1.3 m below the current surface. The pits were filled with a black clay silt, 0066, and cut into the natural gravel sand. They were sealed by layer 0009 and were identified as discrete features after this layer had been removed. Pottery was collected from their surface which dated to 12th-13th century. The feature when discovered was considered already too deep to excavate further.

## Ditch 0007

All of the features were cut into the top of a very large ditch, 0007. The ditch was centred on the middle of the trench and its width, which was over 5 m , spanned the entire area of the excavation (Fig. 6). The interface between the ditch's fill and the overlying layer 0009 was sharp indicating that the top of the ditch had been truncated in antiquity. The ditch was 1.2 m deep and had a wide V-shaped profile. It was filled with layers of sterile-looking pale-brown and pale-orange sand which appeared devoid of organic material. The sands were stony and the largest flints had tumbled to the bottom of the ditch as it was being infilled. The ditch had been filled in from both sides resulting in the formation of the 'column' of flints recorded in the section (S2, Fig. 6). The ditch was extensively searched for finds but produced only a small quantity of animal bone from near the top of the feature. Analysis of the bone showed it to be weathered and gnawed suggesting that the bone had originally lain exposed on the surface. The assemblage included an articulated horse foot and generally tended towards foot and head bones rather than meat-bearing ones.

The ditch was cut into coarse large-stoned gravel within the flood plain but there was no indication that it had contained water for any sustained period and, at the time of excavation, was completely dry. The bottom of the ditch was at 31.40 m OD.

## Trench 3

The tarmac and sub-base of the car park was laid directly onto a layer of disturbed black silt (the equivalent of layer 0009 in Trench 2) which in turn sealed the archaeological features (Fig. 7, S5). The uppermost archaeological level occurred at 32.04 m OD, 0.5 m below the existing car park surface. The silt slumped into the top of a series of large pits which had been excavated into the natural gravels and at least five intercutting pits were recorded within the trench. The pits were nearly identical, as each measured about 2.4 m across and were excavated to the same 1.6 m depth (? Possibly the ground water level when they were dug). The pits were filled with dense, fine textured, black charcoal silt indicative of domestic rubbish deposits but there was a notable absence of animal bone and pottery normally expected within this type of deposit. A medieval roof tile and two sherds of medieval pottery which dated to the 12th-14th century were collected from pit 0023; these were found in conjunction with a fragment of probable post-medieval roof tile although the latter was thought to be intrusive. A dress hook dated from around the 10th to 11th century and a silver long cross penny of Edward I (1302-10) were found by metal detector from the mixed top fill of the pits, context 0036.

The pits cut through a thick layer of mixed soft yellow and red burnt clay, 0026. The top of the clay was within 0.6 m of the current surface and the clay was laid in a flat horizon 0.2 m thick (Fig. 7, S5). The clay represented the remains of a structure, possibly a floor surface and sealed a layer of dark silt. The clay occurred in the south-east corner and continued beyond the confines of the trench, but it was truncated on all available sides by the later pits and its true extents are unknown.

The surface of the geology was at 31.74 m OD and comprises coarse orange gravels (almost exclusively stone) of the river terrace. The level at the bottom of the pits was 30.78 m at which point the gravels remained dry.

Figure 7. Trench 3, plan and section

## Trench 4

A large engineering test hole excavated and backfilled close to the site's east boundary was re-opened and the section recorded as Trench 4 (Fig. 3). The excavations had cut through the archaeological horizons and into the underlying gravels; only enough of the backfill material to uncover the archaeology was removed.

The archaeological deposits were found at a depth of 32.0 m OD, 0.75 m below the existing ground surface and buried beneath a deep deposit of homogenous dark silt. A well-made block of masonry, made up of flints bonded with pale lime mortar, was found in the south-east corner of the trench (S15 and 16, Fig. 8). Only a $0.7 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.7 \mathrm{~m}$ fragment fell within the area of the trench and whilst it was clearly the wall of a structure, not enough of it was visible to establish what this might be. The mortar was made up with fine sand and was whitish-grey in colour, consistent with post-medieval work and lighter than the brownish coarse mortars used by the town's medieval masons. The (?)wall cut a 0.2 m thick horizon of green/yellow clay, building material from an earlier structure and a layer of crushed post-medieval tile lay directly over the clay (Fig. 8,S15).

At least two pits filled with black silt were visible in the south and west section of the trench (S16, 17 and 18). The pits were truncated at the level of the masonry structure.

Figure 8. Trench 4, plan and sections

## 6. Finds and environmental evidence

Andy Fawcett

### 6.1 Introduction

Table 1 shows the quantities of finds collected from the evaluation. Finds were retrieved from eighteen contexts: one ditch fill, eleven pit fills, four layers, one post hole and a structural fill. Also present are eight small finds which have been recorded separately. A full breakdown of finds per context can be seen in Appendix 3.

| Find type | No | Wt/g |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Pottery | 54 | 1033 |
| CBM | 91 | 7464 |
| Mortar | 3 | 40 |
| Worked flint | 1 | 19 |
| Stone | 1 | 7 |
| Iron nails | 6 | 54 |
| Animal bone | 148 | 2134 |
| Shell | 78 | 880 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 6 3 1}$ |

Table 1. Finds quantities

### 6.2 The pottery

Richenda Goffin

## Introduction

A total of fifty-four fragments of pottery weighing 1.033 kg was recovered from the evaluation. The assemblage is mainly post-medieval, but some medieval pottery was also identified. A breakdown of the pottery by major period is shown below (Table 2), and a full catalogue is presented in Appendix 4.

| Period | No | \% No | $\mathbf{W t} / \mathbf{g}$ | \% Wt |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Medieval | 20 | 37.0 | 247 | 23.9 |
| Post-medieval | 34 | 62.9 | 786 | 76.08 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Table 2. Pottery quantities by period

## Methodology

The ceramics were quantified using the recording methods recommended in the MPRG Occasional Paper No 2, Minimum standards for the processing, recording, analysis and publication of Post-Roman ceramics (Slowikowski et al 2001). The number of sherds present in each context by fabric, the estimated number of vessels represented and the
weight of each fabric was noted. Other characteristics such as form, decoration and condition were recorded, and an overall date range for the pottery in each context was established.

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

## Pottery by period

## Medieval

Twenty fragments of medieval pottery were identified (247g). The earliest sherds are early medieval wares dating to the 11th-12th century which were recovered from a pit cutting the possible late Saxon ditch 0007 in Trench 2 and at the base of the sequence of features in Trench 1. The everted rim of an Early medieval ware cooking vessel or jar was present in pitfill 0058, and a fragment of Yarmouth-type ware was found in pitfill 0066, with a sooted sherd of handmade sandy ware of similar date found in pitfill 0056.

Twelve fragments of Bury coarseware dating to the 12th to 14th century were recovered in total. The standard coarseware variant is the most frequent, but sherds of Bury Sandy Fineware and Bury Medieval Coarseware Gritty were also identified. A cooking vessel with a neckless rim which was a residual find in demolition deposit 0002 dates to the second half of the thirteenth to the fourteenth century (Cotter 94).

A number of medieval glazed wares were also present in the assemblage. Two sherds of Grimston-type ware were identified dating to the 12th-14th century. One of these was found in pitfill 0017, which also included a fragment of a glazed jug similar to a Cheam whiteware dating from the fourteenth to fifteenth century. Four sherds of Essex Sandy Orange ware were also in the pit, and an overall date of the fourteenth century seems likely for the deposition of the pottery.

## Post-medieval

The remainder of the pottery is post-medieval (34 fragments @ 786g), with several features dating to the second half of the sixteenth to seventeenth century.

Four joining fragments of a Glazed red earthenware flanged bowl dating to the 16th18th century were present in post hole 0052.

Pitfill 0019 contained a number of Glazed red earthenwares, including two pipkin rims, together with a large sherd of a small cordoned Köln/Frechen jug dating to the first half of the sixteenth century. However, the presence of fragments of later Frechen stoneware indicates that the pottery deposition within the pit dates from the second half of the sixteenth to seventeenth century.

Pottery spanning the same date range was recovered from pitfill 0060. Here a fragment of later Frechen stoneware was found with the perforated rim of a Late medieval and transitional jar, and another glazed red earthenware of a similar date. Similar wares were identified in layer 0020, but a fragment of decorated blue and white tin-glazed earthenware in this deposit indicates a date of the late seventeenth to eighteenth century

## Discussion

The ceramic assemblage includes a small quantity of early medieval wares from two pits both of which were situated above or on the flooplain edge, but there is no evidence of any Mid to Late Saxon wares which would suggest proximity to the pre-Norman settlement.

Other medieval pottery dating to the 12th-14th century present in three other pits is consistent with the location of the site within the medieval settlement core.

A small number of post-medieval earthenwares was also found in pitfills which are likely to date to the seventeenth century. No eighteenth or nineteenth century wares were identified.

The assemblage is typical of sites located towards the centre of the town of Bury St Edmunds. The medieval coarsewares are dominated by Bury coarseware variants, and the glazed wares also reflect production centres in Essex, although some wares were not fully identified. The post-medieval wares consist of a mixture of regionally produced wares and small quantities of German stoneware. There were no complete vessels and none of the pottery requires illustration.

### 6.3 Ceramic building materials (CBM)

A total of ninety-two fragments of CBM (7406g) was recorded in fourteen contexts, four layers (0002, 0016, 0020, 0068), eight pit fills (0014, 0017, 0019, 0022, 0023, 0038, 0054,0060 ) one structural fill (0021) and one post hole (0052). The assemblage is often quite fragmentary and its condition may be described as between abraded and slightly abraded. The CBM has been divided by form and fabric, counted and weighed. The fabric codes are those currently in use by SCCAS. Other details such as dimensions have been recorded where possible. A full breakdown of the CBM can be seen in Appendix 6.

## Medieval

A total of seven medieval roof tile fragments $(371 \mathrm{~g})$ are present within the assemblage, which were found in layers 0016, 0068, pit fills 0017, 0022, 0038 and structural fill 0021. Three fabrics were identified, medium sandy (ms), with calcite (msc) and an estuarine type (est). The sandy versions are all oxidised with grey cores, whereas the estuarine fabric has a buff/off-white surface with a thick dark grey core. Contexts 0017, 0022, 0038 and 0068 all contain medieval pottery.

## Late medieval/post-medieval

This group is made up of roof tile fragments which are fully oxidised medium sandy fabrics, occasionally containing grog (msg) or ferrous inclusions (msfe). Although most of these are more likely to be dated to the late medieval and post-medieval period several of the contexts in which they occur also contain medieval pottery (0002, 0017, 0020, 0022, 0023 and 0068) some of which are residual.

## Post-medieval

The overwhelming majority of the CBM assemblage is made up of roof tile fragments dated to the post-medieval period. These are all fully oxidised and are either medium sandy (ms) or with ferrous inclusions (msfe). Also present within this group are several examples of late brick (LB), in contexts 0002, 0014, 0019, 0021, 0054 and 0060. The fabrics of the bricks are similar to those of the roof tile, only coarser. Most of the examples have a depth of between 40 and 44 mm although the fragment in fill 0054 has a depth of 60 mm . Contexts $0002,0019,0054,0060$ also contain post-medieval pottery.

### 6.4 Mortar

Three pit fills (0014, 0017 and 0054) contained small and abraded mortar pieces (3 fragments @ 40g). All of the examples are lime based. The fragment in 0017 exhibits a patchy, coarse thin layer of white plaster. Contexts 0017 contains mainly medieval pottery, although a single post-medieval sherd is also present.

### 6.5 Worked flint

Justine Biddle
One piece of struck flint was recovered from ditch fill 0008. It was recorded by type and other descriptive comments about appearance, condition, technology and dating (Table $3)$.

| Context | Type | No | Patinated | Notes/description | Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0008 | Retouched <br> flake | 1 | No | A large, thin, sub-circular flake with <br> negative flake scars on the dorsal <br> surface. There is limited retouch on the <br> distal end suggesting use as a scraper. | Later |

Table 3. Struck flint
The assemblage consists of only one retouched flake which is not definitively diagnostic of any period and therefore a general 'later prehistoric' (Neolithic to Iron Age) date has been assigned.

### 6.6 Iron nails

Iron nail fragments were recovered from four contexts, layers 0002, 0020 and pit fills 0017,0019 . Although several of these contexts contain medieval pottery all of them include post-medieval ceramics too.

### 6.7 Small finds

Identified by Ruth Beveridge
In total eight small finds are present within the finds assemblage of which one is silver, three copper alloy and four are iron. A description and commentary on each find is provided and a full catalogue of small finds can be seen in Appendix 7.

## Saxon

1. A copper alloy lobed hooked tag dated from around the 10th to 11 th century. The tag is complete and in a fair state of preservation. It may have been decorated with ring and dot motifs but the surface is too worn to observe these. A similar type can be seen from Middle Harling (Rogerson 1995, 58; Fig 39). SF1001 (0036).

## Medieval

2. A silver long cross penny of Edward I. It was minted in London and is dated from AD1302-10. The obverse has a head with a low crown and a bifoliate crown with ornaments. The legend reads EDWAR R ANGL DNS hYB. The reverse has a long cross with three pellets in each quarter. The legend reads C IVI/ TAS/ LON/ DON. Similar examples can be seen in the Galata catalogue (Withers and Withers 2006, 10a/b). SF1002 (0036).
3. A possible sieve/strainer fragment (about a quarter survives) made of copper alloy /lead dated to the medieval period. Along the outer edge the sheet is folded under to form the rim. Two smaller holes along the edge may be for rivets or for a hinging mechanism. The fragment is broken and bent in one section. It was likely to have been used for skimming or straining in food preparation. SF1003 (0002).

## Post-medieval

4. A copper alloy pin dated to the post-medieval period. It is a complete dress pin, although the shaft is slightly bent. It has a coiled and globular head. SF1004 (0019).

## Unknown

5. A possible iron shaft of a tool which is rectangular in section. It is encased in the remnants of a wooden handle which is stained/mineralised. SF1005 (0017).
6. A heavily corroded narrow iron blade fragment which also displays part of the tang. The edge and back of the blade appear to be straight, although they widen slightly at one end. SF1006 (0019).
7. An unidentifiable rectangular shaft of iron which is heavily corroded. It is broken at its widest terminal and narrows and tapers to the other at which point it curves slightly. It is possibly a structural piece of ironwork. SF1007 (0019).
8. A possible iron vessel fragment which is thin but heavily corroded. It is rounded on one side and pointed on the other in plan. SF1008 (0002).

### 6.8 Faunal remains

## Mike Feider

## Introduction

The evaluation recovered 148 fragments of animal bone from a series of medieval and post-medieval pits as well as a layer of medieval occupation debris.

## Methodology

The remains from each context were scanned with each element identified to species where possible and otherwise unidentified. The number of fragments and any associated butchery, ageing, and taphonomic information were recorded in a Microsoft Access database which will accompany the site archive.

## Preservation

Overall the remains are in a fairly good state of preservation. There is evidence of canid gnawing and surface weathering in occupation layer 0002 and fill 0008 of ditch 0007, with the latter being more severe. Calcined remains are present in fill 0019 of pit 0018.

## Summary

The assemblage contained 148 fragments, with only thirty-six (24.3\%) identifiable to species (Appendix 5). Cattle remains are the most abundant, with fifteen fragments, followed by sheep/goat with seven, horse with five, pig with three, dog with three, and roe deer and rabbit with one each. There is also a single chicken bone, four other bird bones not identifiable to species, and twenty pieces of fish bone. Fourteen ribs all appearing to be from the same medium-sized mammal are present in layer 0002. Elements of a horse foot in fill 0008 of ditch 0007 appeared to articulate.

There is an unusual concentration of juvenile remains in the assemblage (Appendix 5). Although toothwear data is limited to a single immature sheep/goat mandible, sixteen additional fragments are easily identifiable as being from very young animals due to their porous surface. Species include cattle, the aforementioned sheep/goat, an unidentified bird, dog, and seven additional fragments that are too young or fragmentary to identify to species. Several, the dog in particular (which likely accounts for several of the unidentifiable juvenile fragments from layer 0002) are exceptionally undeveloped, and may represent antenatal remains.

Butchery marks were recorded on a cow radius and tibia in fill 0017 of pit 0017, both displaying chops into the posterior of the shaft. A sheep/goat tibia from fill 0019 of pit 0018 has a chop through the shaft, and two ribs from the same context are also chopped through. A cervical vertebra from this context has vertical chop marks into one side, and the proximal end has been chopped through. Although no marks are present, it also appeared to have been axially split, as have two lumbar vertebrae from this context.

## Conclusion

The Thingoe House assemblage is small, but relatively informative. Most of the assemblage came from medieval occupation layer 0002 and shows signs of weathering and gnawing typical of such a deposit. This context also contained the most juvenile remains, including those of a young bird, probably chicken-sized. Other juvenile remains from pits date to the same approximate period, and are suggestive of a relatively high status site with the consumption of such young animals.

Later bone deposits from medieval to post-medieval pits 0018 and 0059 are not much different from the earlier ones, and show the same high proportion of juvenile remains. This is suggestive of a continuity of practice.

Weathered and gnawed remains from the undated fill of ditch 0007 hint at the deposition of remains from elsewhere as the ditch was filled in, and the presence of a possibly articulated horse foot is intriguing. The rest of the remains tend towards foot and head bones rather than meat-bearing bones, meaning this could be a dump of processed material rather than household waste.

Several fish remains were recovered from layer 0002, but were not identifiable without a comparative collection. Further work on these may indicate whether local fresh water or imported salt water fish were consumed on site.

### 6.9 Shell

Six contexts contained oyster shell, layers 0002, 0020, pit fills 0017, 0019, 0060 and post-hole 0052. The largest collection is present in layer 0002 (70 fragments @ 634g), which contains both medieval and post-medieval pottery.

### 6.10 Plant macrofossils

A 40 litre sample taken from pitfill 0022, was sent for processing and analysis; however, the results are not yet available.

## 7. Discussion

Well dated archaeological features were found in all of the trenches. Some truncation of the archaeological levels has occurred at the west side of the car park but generally they are intact. The archaeological deposits are deepest on the east side of the terrace where they are in excess of 1.2 m below the current ground levels but in the main they occur at depths of between 0.5 m and 0.8 m and there were very few modern disturbances.

The earliest item on the site was a dress fastening dating to 10th-11th century but this was found in a later context and was probably the result of casual loss and indications of activity prior to the development of the Norman town was limited. The evidence
suggests that the occupation of the site started in earnest during the 12th-13th century, the latest features are dated to the 17th century after which time the site was used as a garden.

## Late Saxon- early medieval occupation

The earliest cut feature on the site is probably the large ditch 0007. The fill of the ditch contained virtually no finds or organic material suggesting that this was not an area of habitation when the ditch was open, and that it had been backfilled by the time that the medieval pottery, which is otherwise relatively abundant, was being discarded on the site. The animal bones found in the top of the fill had initially been disposed of elsewhere and are a secondary deposit; the bones are waste from processing carcasses and may derive from the tannery sites which were located alongside the river on Eastgate Street during the medieval period. The ditch ran north-south just below the 35 m contour and was cut into the gravel terrace. It formed a substantial boundary on the floodplain edge and is aligned with the elevated length of Cotton Lane to the north and buildings on the east side of the Great Court of the Abbey (arguably the 12th boundary of the precinct), all of which follow the floodplain edge. The pattern of backfilling within the ditch indicates that it was banked on both sides and therefore it may have acted as a dyke or flood barrier; although indications are than it has never held water.

Although the ditch appears to have been filled in by the $c$.12th-13th century the boundary itself remained in existence until the council offices were built and it is shown on all of the previous OS maps.

## Medieval occupation 12th-14th century

The character of the medieval archaeology reflects the site's location and its physical setting. The sampled areas are set back from the location of the domestic buildings, which would have fronted the existing medieval street, and span the urban backyards and the marginal industrial landscape within the floodplain. High medieval features were recorded either side of the boundary defined previously by large ditch 0007 and in this phase by an alignment of large postholes set along the centre line of the ditch fill. The large pits in the floodplain were thought to date to this period but produced only low levels of dating evidence. The pits were probably excavated to extract the quality gravels which exist here as extensive gravel pits have also been recorded at 'Alandale'
(BSE 193) at the junction of Pump Lane and Cotton Lane; the south end of Cotton Lane was probably originally the access route which directly served the 'Alandale' pits. The smaller pits on the Thingoe House site probably represent a small scale extraction where an individual has taken advantage of the resource; similar small scale workings on private plots can be seen elsewhere in the town where sand or chalk is the prize. The pits were backfilled with uniform black organic silt, which appears to be a rubbish deposit possibly brought to the site for disposal from the town centre but the paucity of cultural material contradicts this. These deposits are intriguing and require further environmental work to understand them. The pits cut a layer of structural clay indicating that buildings also existed in some form in this area.

The medieval features within the backyards above the floodplain were also functional or semi-industrial in nature and the evidence of post-built structures and the presence of extensive oven debris would indicate that outbuildings containing workshops or backhouse kitchens existed here.

## Late medieval-early post medieval

The late and post-medieval features sealed the medieval deposits in the area of Trench 1 and post-medieval building remains were recorded in Trench 4 fronting on to Cotton Lane. There was an absence of evidence from this period in the carpark which may be partly the result of truncation in this area but largely suggests that it had already become the garden depicted on Warren's 1747 map by the $c .15$ th century.

The backyard plot above the floodplain produced evidence of more substantial outbuildings but demonstrates that it was still being used in a way similar to the earlier medieval period. At least two phases of buildings were recorded and the pottery dates their use to between the late 15 th and 17 th centuries. The lined square sunken feature which dates to the late 15 th-early 16th is probably a well and part of an outbuilding; similarly dated stone box-like structures have been found previously in the town on excavation on St Andrew's Street (BSE 252, BSE 295).

## 8. Conclusions

The evaluation has shown that well preserved archaeological deposits exist relatively close to the current ground surface.
The archaeological deposits extend over a large area across an interesting part of the medieval town, which covers the transition between the domestic back yards of the urban centre and marginal 'industrialised' areas of the floodplain. The site in general and the long sequence of archaeological deposits in Trench 1 has the potential to provide evidence towards the study of the use of space within the medieval urban context and how it has changed over time. The potentially early ditch needs closer dating as it may relate to land boundaries of the pre-Norman town and therefore contribute to the knowledge of the origins of Bury St Edmunds. The site is dry and despite its proximity to the floodplain of the river there is no evidence that waterlogged or deep palaeo-environmental deposits exist.

## 9. Archive deposition

The archive is to be stored in the SCCAS archive stores at Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk. The location of the bulk finds within the main store is $\mathrm{J} / 117 / 3$. The digital archive on the SCCAS server: R:\Environmental Protection\Conservation\Archaeology\Archive\Bury\St Edmunds\BSE378.

Copies of the report will be lodged with the Suffolk County Council Historic Environment Record and a digital copy uploaded onto Archaeology Data Service database (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit)

## 10. Acknowledgements

The evaluation was directed by Andrew Tester and carried out by Phil Camps and David Gill all from Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Field Team.

The post-excavation was managed by Richenda Goffin. Finds processing was carried out by Jonathan Van Jennians and the processing of environmental samples by Anna West. The production of digital site plans and sections was managed by Crane Begg
and carried out by Ellie Hillen. The specialist finds report was produced by Andy Fawcett, with specialist identification and advice being provided by Justine Biddle, Mike Feider and Richenda Goffin.

## 11. Bibliography

Cotter, J.P., 2000, Post-Roman Pottery from Excavations in Colchester, 1971-85.
Colchester Archaeol. Rep. 7. English Heritage, London
Jennings, S., 1981, Eighteen Centuries of pottery from Norwich. EAA 13, Norwich Survey/NMS

Rogerson, A., 1995, A Late Neolithic, Saxon and medieval site at Middle Harling, Norfolk, EAA No 74

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

Withers, P and Withers, R., 2006, The Galata guide to the pennies of Edward I and II and the coins of the mint of Berwick-upon-Tweed, CUP

## Plates



Plate 1. Trench 1 General view looking north
C15th -16 th sunken tank/well (0006) is at the top of the picture, the wall in the centre is cut by a phase 4 posthole. The foreground shows the depth to the bottom of medieval pit (0055)


Plate 2. Trench 1 General view looking south
Note depth to natural sand on the right. Burnt red clay, medieval oven debris can be seen at the base of the deep section overlain by C12-14th and C15th-16th deposits


Plate 3. Trench 1 Detail of structure 0006 looking north ( 1 m scale)
Showing flint courses separated by layer of roof tile, and putlog hole for timber.


Plate 4. Trench 2 Ditch 0007 looking north ( 2 m scale)


Plate 5. Trench 3 and 4, Sections
(left) Medieval extraction pits cut into the river terrace gravels. (right) post-medieval building at the base of the section (lower left)


Plate 6. Trench 1 showing depth of archaeology
The top of the archaeological levels can be seen at the centre of the ranging pole, looking south ( 2 m scale)

## Brief and Specification for Archaeological Evaluation (Phase 1)

 DEMOLITION/CONVERSION OF BUILDINGS, ERECTION OF ACCOMODATION TO FORM 56-UNIT CARE-COMPLEX, AND LANDSCAPING. NORTHGATE STREET/COTTON LANE BURY ST EDMUNDS, SUFFOLK (SE/11/1052)
## The commissioning body should be aware that it may have Health \& Safety responsibilities.

1. The nature of the development and archaeological requirements
1.1 Planning permission has been sought from St Edmundsbury District Council for the erection of a 56 unit care complex on land at Cotton Lane/Northgate Street, Bury St Edmunds, following the demolition of Thingoe House (TL 856 644). Please contact the applicant for an accurate plan of the site.
1.2 A phase of archaeological evaluation of the site is required prior to determination of the application, in accordance with policies HE6.1, HE6.2 and HE7.1 of PPS 5. This will enable the impacts of the development to be fully assessed so that the Local Planning Authority can take into account the particular nature and significance of the heritage assets at this location. As pre-determination evaluation will be undertaken in accessible areas only, in order to inform mitigation strategies a second phase of evaluation in other areas of the site may be required, post-determination, to bring the area studied up to $5 \%$ of the development area.
1.3 The site is located on the eastern side of Northgate Street, extending eastwards fully across to Cotton Lane. The site lies on the slope of land down towards the river Lark, from c.39m OD to 35 m OD. There is a degree of terracing. The soil is loam over chalk and chalky drift.
1.4 The background and potential are presented in a Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) by CgMS. These are available to view online with the application at http://www.stedmundsbury.gov.uk, along with the results of a borehole survey.
1.5 The development area (PDA) is in an area of high archaeological importance and potential, within the core of Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Bury St Edmunds (County Historic Environment Record BSE 241). Northgate Street and Cotton Lane, on the floodplain of the Lark, are some of the earliest streets in Bury and there are Middle- and Late Saxon findspots nearby (BSE 208, BSE 324). There may have been occupation on this site from earliest settlement onwards. This relatively large area has remained un-built since the $18^{\text {th }}$ century, and earlier archaeological remains and deposits may remain undisturbed. Past landuses are unknown deposits at varying depth in nearby sites (BSE 125, 193, 194 and 204) have been variably preserved or destroyed by later uses (burial, quarrying). Terracing of the site seems to have involved both build-up and removal of material, but as the nature of the earlier slope down to the river is unknown the date and sequence of terracing is unknown, as is the impact on any remains. The Ground Survey submitted with the application reports the existence of 'made ground' and diverse 'relict deposits' over natural gravel (which is at depths of $1.90-3.90$ below ground level): the archaeological nature of these cannot be ascertained without further investigation. The depth, nature, extent, quality, date and level of preservation of remains on the site is unknown.
1.6 There proposal involves major groundworks: ground stabilisation through piling, footings, services, demolition, site clearance, landscaping and levelling. Any underlying remains that exist have the potential to be damaged or destroyed by the development.
1.7 This large development area has not been subject to systematic archaeological survey beyond desk-based assessment. In order to inform any potential archaeological mitigation strategy, Phase I of trenched archaeological evaluation is required of the development area prior to determination of the application.
1.8 The results of this evaluation will enable the archaeological resource, both in quality and extent, to be accurately quantified. Decisions on the need for and scope of any mitigation measures, should there be any archaeological finds of significance, will be based upon the results of the evaluation and, if necessary, will be the subject of an additional specification.
1.9 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; telephone/fax: 01284 352443) 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 Neither this specification nor the WSI, however, would be a sufficient basis for the discharge of any future planning condition relating to archaeological investigation. Only the full implementation of an agreed scheme, both completion of fieldwork and reporting based on the approved WSI, will enable SCCAS/CT to advise St Edmundsbury District Council that any condition has been adequately fulfilled and can be discharged (assuming planning permission is forthcoming).
1.11 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 An standard requirement is evaluation of $5 \%$ of the area to be affected by development. However, this brief invites a WSI that will adequately evaluate, as far as is possible at this stage, the archaeological deposits across the site through sampling of an area that excludes Thingoe House and current tree cover: Given the potential depth and complexity of deposits, a trench plan proposed by CgMS comprising three 6 m by 6 m test pits across the site is considered acceptable in principle. Any further, targetted evaluation necessary postdetermination will be the subject of an additional specification.
3.2 If excavation is mechanised a toothless 'ditching bucket' 1.50 m 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. Any variation in strategy once evaluation has commenced should be discussed with SCCAS/CT.
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, floors, building slots or post-holes, should be preserved intact even if fills are sampled. For guidance:

For linear features, 1.00 m 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 Buried soils and layers should be sampled according to an appropriate strategy (for example, hand dug test pits).
3.8 Archaeological contexts should be sampled for palaeoenvironmental remains. Best practice should allow for sampling of interpretable and datable archaeological deposits and provision should be made for this. Samples should be taken from buried soils. 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.
3.9 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.
3.10 Metal detector searches must take place at all stages of the excavation by an experienced metal detector user.
3.11 All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed SCCAS/CT during the course of the evaluation).
3.12 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.
3.13 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.
3.14 A photographic record of the work is to be made, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies and/or high resolution digital images.
3.15 Topsoil, subsoil and archaeological deposit to be kept separate during excavation to allow sequential backfilling of excavations.
3.16 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 fulfil 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) with the planning application. This includes available documentary and historic cartographic sources. Please remember that copyright permissions should be sought from Suffolk Record Office, or other relevant institution, for anything included in the report.
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 Every effort must be made to get the agreement of the landowner/developer to the deposition of the full site archive, and transfer of title, with the intended archive depository before the fieldwork commences. If this is not achievable for all or parts of the finds archive then provision must be made for additional recording (e.g. photography, illustration, scientific analysis) as appropriate.
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 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.
5.14 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.
5.15 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 (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/policy.html) with ADS or another appropriate archive depository.
5.16 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.
5.17 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.
5.18 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 Maplnfo (for example, as a Drawing Interchange File or .dxf) or already transferred to .TAB files.
5.19 At the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/ must be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators forms.
5.20 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 Abby Antrobus
Suffolk County Council
Archaeological Service Conservation Team
9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk IP33 2AR
Tel: 01284352444
Email: abby.antrobus@suffolk.gov.uk
Date: 11 October 2011
Reference: Bury St Edmunds/2011_1052
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 2 - Context list

| Appendix 2 - Context list |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Context No | Feature No | Feature Type | Description/Interpretation | Finds | Overall Date | Env. Sample | Trench |
| 0001 |  |  | Unstratified finds | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |  |
| 0002 |  | Layer | Soil horizon. Uppermost archaeological deposit in trench 1. <br> Undifferentiated occupation debris. <br> Brown silty loam with common oyster shell, tile, and pottery. Masks all underlying features, contains mortar rubble from demoliton of wall 0005 and lined structure 0006. | $\checkmark$ | L17th-18th C | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0003 | 0003 | Pit Cut | Occupation/demolition layer, postdates bonded flint structures. <br> Small circular pit with steep and flat base. Cut north end fo wall 0005 and all surrounding features. Latest feature in immediate stratigraphic sequence. No finds. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0004 |  | Pit Fill | Fill of pit 003. Single fill of fine mid-brown silt/sand. Soft fine textured? Clay silt, stoney. Notably finds free. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0005 | 0005 | Wall Other | Short length $(90 \mathrm{~cm})$ of bonded flint wall, truncated both ends. Running N-S, 18 cm wide and survives to height of 20 cm . Two courses of flints high by 2 flints wide. Flints well laid in course flints large $10-15 \mathrm{~cm}$ across. Fine wellmixed lime mortar, sandy with small chalk inclusions. Well finished east face. Flares out at base. Frags of 0005 seen in layer 0001. North end cut by pit 0003. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0006 | 0006 | structure Other | Rectangular, well made masonry structure, lined with a flint and mortar bonded wall, straight and vertical sides. Internal dimensions $2.15 \times 1.45 \mathrm{~m}$. Lining seen to 1.2 m depth. Wall 18 cm thick made from rounded flint cobbles, sorted for size c. $8-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ across. Flints laid in bands 20 cm deep (23 courses), separated by a layer of broken roof tiles. Mortar cream/brown find sand with small well mixed chalk/lime deep-thesh pointing ?buttered top of wall truncated. Cut by posthole 0047 and truncated at east end. Socket for timber at between $58-70 \mathrm{cms}$ from top. Socket $16 \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}$ tile. Sill and lintel large flints forming jambs. Filled with single fill 0020. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |


| Context No | Feature No | Feature Type | Description/Interpretation | Finds | Overall Date | Env. Sample | Trench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0007 | 0007 | Ditch Cut | Very large ditch running N-S across trench 2. Fills the entire width of the trench. Wide V-shaped cut. Truncated and sealed by by 0009 cut by postholes 0010 and 0012 and medieval pit 0065 . <br> Cut into the stonet gravel of the river terrace very stony, flints like large building flint. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 2 |
| 0008 | 0007 | Ditch Fill | Fill of ditch 0007 sterile looking pale sand, very stoney large stones (flints) accumulatedc in the ditch centre. Dug over for finds animal bone only from the top part of the fill | $\checkmark$ |  | $\square$ | 2 |
| 0009 |  | Layer | Dark brown-black silt loam. Homogennous doil horizon overlying 0007. Work soil top of ditch turncated. Layer grades from very thin to 0.5 m thich reflecting the slope of the ground trucated by the car park levelling. Subbase of carpark directly over clean borders with ditch fill below. Some post med tile generally low levl of finds | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 2 |
| 0010 | 0010 | Posthole Cut | Circular posthole part of a north-south alignm, ent of post -a fence- running along the centre line of ditch 0007. PH's truncated by 0009 only the base of cuts survives | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 2 |
| 0011 | 0010 | Posthole Fill | Fill of PH 0010 packed with flints, mortar and green clay- no indication of the post pipe. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 2 |
| 0012 | 0012 | Posthole Cut | Circular posthole part of a north-south alignment of post -a fence- running along the centre line of ditch 0007 with 0010 and 0071 . PH's truncated by 0009 only the base of cuts survives | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 2 |
| 0013 | 0012 | Posthole Fill | Posthole fill brown silty and chalk flecks and packed with flint | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 2 |
| 0014 | 0015 | Pit Fill | Fill of shallow pit 0015. Brown sandy loam with copious amounts of crush plaster, mortar and post med tile. Tudor bricks | $\checkmark$ | Post-medieval | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0015 | 0015 | Pit Cut | Shallow pit on the southh side of trench 1 sealed by buried topsoil layer. Cuts layer 0002 and south end of wall 0005 - post med | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0016 | 0017 | Pit Layer | Fill of pit? 0017, dark grey brown organic silt, occupation debris layer pottery, bone etc. Sealed by 0002 and below wall 0005 | $\checkmark$ | Late med/post | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0017 | 0017 | Pit Cut | Large straight-sided, shallow pit below wall 0005 . extensive continues beyond the south and east sides of the trench. Edges closly mirror latrge pit 0050 beneath it possibly slump. | $\checkmark$ | c Late mediev | $\square$ | 1 |


| Context No | Feature No | Feature Type | Description/Interpretation | Finds | Overall Date | Env. Sample | Trench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0018 | 0018 | Pit Cut | Large, straight sided square pit bisected by east edge of $\operatorname{Tr} 1$. Vertical edges and flat base cuts layer 0002. Late feature cut from high in soil profile. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0019 | 0018 | Pit Fill | Single fill of pit 0018. Dark ashy silt, loose compaction flecked with charcoal in largish lump. Fine debris contain common finds, 17th century. | $\checkmark$ | 1550-1700 | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0020 |  | Layer | Layer overlying and infilling top of 0006. Brown silty loam similar to and probably a continuation of 0002 within confines of 0006 . 0020 overlies truncated section of 0006 walling. | $\checkmark$ | 1550-1700 | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0021 | 0006 | structure Fill | Backfill within box structure 0006. Single dump deposit postdating use of 0006. Brown silt-loam fine homogenous throughout mixed with occupation or demolition debris. Sampled in section in NW corner, excavated to depth of 1.2 m , still going. | $\checkmark$ | Late med/post | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0022 | 0022 | Pit Cut | Large pit cut into the floodplain gravel in trench 3. Cut from just below truncated topsoil layer almost immediately below the carpark base. One of a group of similar intercutting pit | $\checkmark$ | Late med?+ | $\square$ | 3 |
| 0023 | 0022 | Pit Fill | Single fill of black-brown silt with patch of clay, gravelly at the base, gravel as surrounding natural. Pottery and cbm finds. Looks like a domestic rubbish depoist very organic unusual paucity of finds | $\checkmark$ | Late med?+ | $\square$ | 3 |
| 0024 | 0024 | Pit Cut | Pit one of a group of large inter-cutting pitts all the same in trench 3. Cut natrual gravel -extraction pits cut by 0022 | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 3 |
| 0025 | 0024 | Pit Fill | Grey brown silt fill of pit 0024. Largely removed by later pit 0022 | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 3 |
| 0026 |  | floor Layer | Clay surface, yellow soft caly with some burnt caly lies in a flat horizon about 20 cnm thick. Seals layer of black silt an ancient buried soil. Cut by pit 0022 . Structural clay part of a floor?? | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 3 |
| 0027 |  | Layer | Buried soil horizon below 0026 (section 5) black brown work silt clean looking no finds or occupation material seen lies directly over natural gravel sharp interface with gravel. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |  |
| 0028 | 0028 | Pit Cut | Large pit in trench 3 one of the group of inter-cutting pots. Cut through with the machine recorded in plan only. Same depth as 0022 and 0024 and 0030 | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 3 |
| 0029 | 0028 | Pit Fill | Fill of pit 0028 single fill of dark brown silt | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 3 |



| Context No | Feature No | Feature Type | Description/Interpretation | Finds | Overall Date | Env. Sample | Trench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0043 | 0043 | Posthole Cut | Good, deep posthole. Oval in plan on surface, changing to circular hole 50 cm in diameter where post was located on south side of the hole. Vertical sides. Filled in two stages, 0044 and 0045. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0044 | 0043 | Posthole Fill | Top fill of 0043 . Soft pale-mid brown sand. Homogeneous and clean. No finds. <br> Seal layer of blue clay. <br> Some mottled clay mixed burnt and yellow clay debris on south side of hole. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0045 | 0043 | Posthole Fill | Thick layer of compacted blue clay, flecked with chalk packed into base of posthole 0043. Level top comes away cleanly from side of the feature. Occurs only in circular part of lower cut. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0046 | 0050 | Fill | deposit of mixed burnt clay and burnt sand with coarse gritty sand. The clay iis hard fired red, broken up into small frags. This looks like the fabric of a smashed up oven dumped into an extensive ?pit. The edges of the pit are not structure or burnt and the fill looks like a dump layer from elswhere. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0048 | 0048 | Posthole Cut | Good sized clay-lined posthole. External diameter 0.5 m , internal 0.3 m circular in play with central post position cut through south wall of 0006. Sealed below 0002/0020. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0049 | 0048 |  | Clay packing to posthole 0048. Soft yellow/green clay with chalk clay clean. Primary use clay packing covers sides and base of hole to create U-shaped internal profile. Central fill dark brown-black silt, loose soft texture flecked with charcoal, oyster shell. Occupation soil after post pulled out. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0050 | 0050 | Pit Cut | Enlongated pit filled with oven debris extends beyond limits of the trench cut by serveral late and post medival features | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0051 | 0051 | Posthole Cut | Small posthole cutting 0020 with area of 0006. Cut from high in soil profile. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0052 | 0051 | Posthole Fill | Fill of posthole 0051. Dark brown silt, packed with tile and oyster shell. Slightly overdug. Possible contamination with 0020. | $\checkmark$ | 16th-18th C | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0053 | 0053 | Pit Cut | Pit against west edge of 0006. Postdates 0006. Top of west wall truncated by 0053. rectangular in plan. Sides parallel 0006. Pit cut into soft sand undercut. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0054 | 0053 | Pit Fill | Fill of 0054. Mix of occupation debris soil and building rubble. Dark clay silt, loose compation flecked with charcoal, mortar, and patches of soft sand. Bands of sand with tile. | $\checkmark$ | 16th-18th C | $\square$ | 1 |


| Context No | Feature No | Feature Type | Description/Interpretation | Finds | Overall Date | Env. Sample | Trench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0055 | 0055 | Pit Cut | Pit below 0046 part of 0050, one of two adjacent scoops cut into the bottom of a much larger feature | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0056 | 0055 | Pit Fill | Basal fill within pit 0055. Thin layer of black silt along the bottom of the pit. | $\checkmark$ | 12th-13th C | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0057 | 0057 | Pit Cut | Pit below 0046 N of 0055 | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0058 | 0057 | Pit Fill | Fill of 0057 banded layers of dark silt and clay rubble | $\checkmark$ | 11th-12th C | $\square$ |  |
| 0059 | 0059 | Pit Cut | Pit alongside 0006 under 0053 | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |  |
| 0060 | 0059 | Pit Fill |  | $\checkmark$ | 1550-1700 | $\square$ |  |
| 0061 | 0061 | Posthole Cut | Clay packed posthole under 0015 | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0062 | 0061 | Posthole Fill | Fill of 0061 | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |  |
| 0064 | 0064 | Posthole Cut | Posthole, cuts by 0045 , cuts 0046 | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0065 | 0064 | Posthole Fill | Green brown silt and sandy red silt at top | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 1 |
| 0066 | 0066 | Pit Cut | Shallow pit cuts edge of 0007 | $\checkmark$ | 12th-13th C | $\square$ | 2 |
| 0067 | 0066 | Pit Fill | Dark brown silt and 1 sherd of St Neots ware and animal bone | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | 2 |
| 0068 |  | Layer | Finds collected from NW corner of pit? | $\checkmark$ | c Late med | $\square$ | 3 |


Appendix 3. Bulk finds catalogue

| Context | Pottery |  | CBM |  | Plaster/ Mortar |  | Fired Clay |  | Clay Pipe |  | Iron <br> Nails |  | Post-Med Glass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bone |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overall Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Slag | Bottle |  | Window |  | Worked |  | Burnt |  | Stone |  | Animal |  | Human |  |  |  |
|  | No | Wt |  |  | No | Wt |  |  | No | Wt |  |  | No | Wt | No | Wt | No | Wt | No | Wt | No | Wt | No | Wt | No | Wt | No | Wt | No | Wt | No | Wt | No | No | Wt |  |
| 0002 | 6 | 106 | 9 | 514 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 494 | 0 | 70 |  | 34 L17th-18th C |
| 0020 | 5 | 85 | 2 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 48 1550-1700 |
| 0019 | 14 | 289 | 20 | 1456 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 504 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 1550-1700 |
| 0042 | 1 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 L12th-14th C |
| 0017 | 10 | 96 | 10 | 485 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 275 | 0 | 1 |  | 35 c Late medieval |
| 0021 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1046 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 Late med/post-medieval |
| 0052 | 4 | 175 | 3 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 41 16th-18th C |
| 0054 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 1090 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 41 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 16th-18th C |
| 0008 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 588 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 0014 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1098 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 Post-medieval |
| 0016 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 Late med/post-medieval |
| 0022 | 1 | 13 | 2 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 Late med?+ |
| 0023 | 2 | 17 | 3 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 Late med?+ |
| 0038 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 11th-12th C |
| 0056 | 1 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 12th-13th C |
| 0058 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 56 | 6 | 0 |  | 0 11th-12th C |
| 0060 | 3 | 103 | 13 | 921 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 59 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 1550-1700 |
| 0066 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 114 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 12th-13th C |
| 0068 | 3 | 22 | 4 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 c Late med |

Appendix 4. Pottery catalogue

17 November 2011

| 0019 | PM | KOLN/F | JUG |  | 1 | 84 |  | Small cordonned jug | 1500-1550 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0019 | PM | LMT | BODY |  | 1 | 2 | B |  | 15th-16th C |  |
| 0020 | PM | GRE | BODY |  | 2 | 65 |  | 1 very worn base | 16th-18th C |  |
| 0020 | MED | BMCW | BODY |  | 1 | 7 | A |  | L12th-14th C |  |
| 0020 | PM | FREC | BASE |  | 1 | 11 |  | Spiral wire removal marks | 1550-1700 | 1550-1700 |
| 0020 | PM | TGE A | BODY |  | 1 | 1 |  | Plain white tin-glaze, prob 17th C | 16th-18th C |  |
| 0022 | MED | BMCW | BODY |  | 1 | 13 | S |  | L12th-14th C |  |
| 0023 | MED | UPG | BODY |  | 1 | 8 | AB | Spots of lead glaze, v burnt | L12th-14th C |  |
| 0023 | MED | BSFW | BODY |  | 1 | 9 |  |  | L12th-14th C | L12th-14th C |
| 0038 | MED | YARM | BODY | 46 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 11th-12th C | 11th-12th C |
| 0042 | MED | BSFW | BODY |  | 1 | 42 |  |  | L12th-14th C | 112th-14th C |
| 0052 | PM | GRE | BOWL F |  | 4 | 174 | A | 4 joining | 16th-18th C | 16th-18th C |
| 0054 | PM | GRE | BODY |  | 1 | 6 |  | Internal glaze | 16th-18th C | 16th-18th C |
| 0056 | MED | MCW | BODY |  | 0 | 0 |  | Sandy handmade faabric... early | 12th-14th C | 12th-13th C |
| 0058 | MED | EMW | CP/JAR |  | 1 | 11 | A | Flared, everted rim | 11th-12th C | 11th-12th C |
| 0060 | PM | FREC | BODY |  | 1 | 17 |  |  | Prob 17th C | 1550-1700 |
| 0060 | PM | LMT | JAR |  | 1 | 83 |  | Perforated for suspension before firing | 15th-16th C |  |
| 0060 | PM | DUTR? | BODY |  | 1 | 3 |  | Reduced core, rilled, ext gl | 15th-17th C |  |
| 0066 | MED | MCW | BODY |  | 1 | 9 |  | Sandy w silve mica and sparse flint, bit YAR like | 12th-13th C | 12th-13th C |
| 0068 | MED | BMCW | BODY |  | 3 | 0 | 22 | 2 joining | L12th-14th C | L12th-14th C |

Appendix 5. Animal bone catalogue

| Context | Feature | Feature type | Cow | Sheep/ goat | Pig | Deer | Dog | Horse | Rabbit | Chicken | Bird | Fish | Unidentified | Total | Juvenile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0002 |  | Layer | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 47 | 76 | 8 |
| 0008 | 0007 | Ditch | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 25 | 1 |
| 0017 | 0017 | Pit | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| 0019 | 0018 | Pit | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 32 | 4 |
| 0038 | 0037 | Pit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0054 | 0053 | Pit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0058 | 0057 | Pit | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0060 | 0059 | Pit | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0066 | 0066 | Pit | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Total |  |  | 15 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 88 | 148 | 17 |

Appendix 6 CBM catalogue

| Context | Fabric | Form | No | Weight | Height | Re | Abrasion | n Mortar | Notes | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0002 | Ms | Frag | 2 | 16 |  | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Unknown |
| 0002 | Ms | LB | 1 | 160 | 43 | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0002 | Msfe | RT | 1 | 31 | 13 | $\square$ | Sli | One surface | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0002 | Ms | RT | 3 | 164 | 11 | $\checkmark$ | Abr-sli | Two | Two peg partial peg holes | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0002 | Ms | RT | 2 | 140 | 11-13 | $\square$ | Abr-sli |  | One sub-concical hole, partchily reduced (heat affected) | Late med/post-medeival |
| 0014 | Msc | LB? | 1 | 290 |  | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised fragment no depth | Post-medieval |
| 0014 | Ms | LB | 1 | 583 | 44 | $\square$ | Abr | Three sides | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0014 | Ms | Frag | 1 | 12 |  | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Unknown |
| 0014 | Ms | RT | 1 | 84 | 9 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised, very thin | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0014 | Ms | RT | 2 | 128 | 13 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised ill sorted inclusions | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0016 | Ms | RT | 1 | 51 | 13 | $\square$ | Abr | Trace one surfac | Oxidised surface and grey core | Medeival |
| 0016 | Ms | RT | 1 | 30 | 10 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0016 | Msg | RT | 2 | 58 |  | $\square$ | Sli |  | Shattered | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0017 | Ms | RT | 1 | 23 | 14 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised, grey core | Medeival |
| 0017 | Ms | Frag | 2 | 30 |  | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Unknown |
| 0017 | Msfe | RT | 3 | 165 | 11-12 | $\square$ | Abr-sli |  | Oxidised, one with a reduced surface | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0017 | Ms | RT | 3 | 263 | 12-13 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised, occasional sparse large flint present too | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0019 | Ms | Frag | 4 | 73 |  | $\square$ | Abr-sli |  | Oxidised | Unknown |


| Context | Fabric | Form | No | Weight | Height | Re | Abrasion | n Mortar | Notes | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0019 | Ms | ?LB | 1 | 278 | 45 | $\checkmark$ | Abr | Three sides \& br | Oxidised | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0019 | Msfe | RT | 7 | 440 | 12 | $\square$ | Abr-sli | On several | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0019 | Ms | RT | 5 | 557 | 13/14 | $\square$ | Sli | On several | Oxidised, some partial peg holes | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0019 | Ms | RT | 3 | 108 | 13 | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised with one reduced surface | Post-medieval |
| 0019 | Ms | RT | 1 | 64 | 12 | $\checkmark$ | Sli |  | Oxidised, mortar over the break and partial peg hole | Late med/post-medeival |
| 0019 | Msfe | RT | 1 | 38 | 13 | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0020 | Ms | RT | 1 | 64 | 12 | $\checkmark$ | Sli |  | Oxidised, partial peg hole | Late med/post-medeival |
| 0020 | Msfe | RT | 1 | 38 | 13 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0021 | Ms | RT | 2 | 53 | 11 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised, partially heat affected | Late med/post medieval |
| 0021 | Est | RT | 2 | 155 | 12 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Buff/off white surface thick grey core | 13th-15th C |
| 0021 | Msfe | LB | 1 | 838 | 42 | $\square$ | Sli | All sides | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0022 | Est | RT | 1 | 94 | 12 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Same as in 0021 | 13th-15th C |
| 0022 | Msfe | RT | 1 | 50 | 12 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0023 | Ms | RT | 1 | 101 | 12 | $\square$ | Sli | Three sides | Oxidised | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0023 | Msg | RT | 1 | 45 | 11 | $\square$ | Abr | Two sides | Oxidised | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0023 | Ms | Frag | 1 | 18 |  | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Unknown |
| 0038 | Msc | RT | 1 | 32 | 15 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised with grey core | Medieval |
| 0052 | Msfe | RT | 3 | 130 | 13 | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0054 | Ms | Frag | 1 | 11 |  | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Unknown |
| 0054 | Fs | ?LB | 1 | 164 | 60 | $\square$ | Abr |  | Buff surface and peach core | Late med/post-medieval |


| Context | Fabric | Form | No | Weight | Height | Re | Abrasion | n Mortar | Notes | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0054 | Msfe | LB | 1 | 279 | 40 | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Post-medeival |
| 0054 | Ms | RT | 5 | 376 | 12-14 | $\checkmark$ | Sli | Four with mortar | Oxidised, only one with mortar over break | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0054 | Msfe | RT | 2 | 256 | 14-15 | $\square$ | Sli | One with mortar | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0060 | Ms?fe | LB | 1 | 285 |  | $\square$ | Abr |  | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0060 | Msf | RT | 1 | 24 | 12 | $\square$ | Sli | Traces | Oxidised | Late med/post-medieval |
| 0060 | Ms | RT | 4 | 243 | 12-13 | $\square$ | Sli | On three | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0060 | Msfe | RT | 5 | 341 | 13 | $\square$ | Sli | Two with mortar | Oxidised | Post-medieval |
| 0068 | Est | RT | 1 | 16 |  | $\square$ | Sli |  | Off white surface with purple fabric, shattered | 13th-15th C |
| 0068 | Ms | RT | 3 | 65 | 12-14 | $\square$ | Sli |  | Oxidised | Late med/post-medieval |

Appendix 7. Small Finds catalogue
X-Ray No

| SF No | Context | Period | Materia | Object | No. of Frags | Weight (g) | Length | Width | Depth | Description | Cons. | X-Ray No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1005 | 0017 |  | Iron | ?Handle | 1 | 7.5 | 56 | 11 | 0 | Iron shaft of a tool, rectangular in section, encased in the remnants of a wooden ?handle. The wood is iron stained/mineralised. | $\square$ |  |
| 1006 | 0019 |  | Iron | Knife | 1 | 18 | 96 | 21 | 0 | Piece of a blade, probably from a knife. The edge and back of the narrow blade appear to be straight and parallel - slightly widening at one end. Heavily corroded. Part of tang visible. | $\square$ |  |
| 1007 | 0019 |  | Iron | Unident. | 1 | 108 | 165 | 19 | 0 | Heavily corroded shaft of iron, square in section. Broken at the widest terminal; narrows and tapers to a terminal that curves slightly. Possibly a structural piece of iron? | $\square$ |  |
| 1008 | 0002 |  | Iron | ?Vessel | 1 | 24 | 64 | 39 | 0 | Fragment of a heavily corroded, thin piece of iron. Possibly a piece of an iron vessel. Wall of the fragment narrows and curves across its length. | $\square$ |  |
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