#### **ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT**



A REPORT ON THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION, 2006 (Planning app. no. F/2005/0957/FUL)

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

J.A.Craven Field Team Suffolk C.C. Archaeological Service

© October 2006

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Lucy Robinson, County Director of Environment and Transport Endeavour House, Russel Road, Ipswich, IP1 2BX

SCCAS Report No. 2006/173



Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service





#### **Contents**

List of Figures List of Tables List of Contributors service Acknowledgements Summary SMR information Summary

1. Introduction C 2. Methodology

- 3. Results
- 4. Finds and environmental evidence
  - 4.1. Introduction
  - 4.2. Worked flint
  - 4.3. Metalwork
  - 4.4. Plant macrofossils and other remains
    - 4.4.1. Introduction and Method statement 4.4.2. Results
  - 4.5. Discussion of finds and environmental evidence

5. Discussion

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

References

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Appendix 1: Brief and Specification Appendix 2: Context list

#### **List of Figures**

- 1. Site location plan
- 2. Site on the First Edition OS
- 3. Site plan
- 4. Plans and sections
- 5. Section 0011 and pit 0012

#### List of Tables

- 1. Trench descriptions
- 2. Finds quantities

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

#### **List of Contributors**

All Suffolk C.C. Archaeological Service unless otherwise stated.

John Craven Cathy Tester Colin Pendleton Faye Minter Val Fryer

Assistant Project Officer Finds Officer SMR Officer Portable Antiquities Officer Environmental specialist, Freelance



#### Acknowledgements

This project was commissioned by John Samuels Archaeological Consultants and funded by Bennett Homes. The project was monitored by Jess Tipper (Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Conservation Team).

The excavation was carried out by a number of archaeological staff, (Andy Beverton, John Craven and Michael Green) all from Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Field Team.

The project was directed by John Craven, and managed by David Gill, who also provided advice during the production of the report.

The post-excavation was managed by Richenda Goffin. Finds processing and the producing of site plans and sections was carried out Gemma Adams and Anna West, and the specialist finds and environmental reports by Cathy Tester and Val Fryer. Other specialist identification and advice was provided by Faye Minter and Colin Pendleton.

#### **Summary**

An archaeological evaluation on land to the rear of 6 Eriswell Drive, Lakenheath identified a single small prehistoric pit, indicating the possible presence of widely dispersed prehistoric activity. Since the prehistoric period the site has seen the buildup of a former soil horizon and a thick topsoil associated with the site's 19th-20th century use as domestic allotments.

#### **SMR** information

Planning application no.	F/2005/0957/FUL
Date of fieldwork:	17 <sup>th</sup> -18 <sup>th</sup> October 2006
Grid Reference:	TL 720 819
Funding body:	Bennett Homes
Oasis reference	Suffolkc1-19045

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

#### **1. Introduction**

An archaeological evaluation was carried out in advance of housing development on land to the rear of 6 Eriswell Drive, Lakenheath. The work was carried out to a Brief and Specification issued by Jess Tipper (Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Conservation Team – Appendix 1) to fulfil a planning condition on application F/2005/0957/FUL. The work was commissioned through a further specification by Simon Mortimer of John Samuels Archaeological Consultants (JSAC), on behalf of the developer, Bennett Homes.

The village of Lakenheath lies on the south-eastern edge of the fens, bounded to the north and west by the 'Cut-Off Channel', a drainage channel constructed in the 1960's, which marks the current fen-edge and roughly follows the line of the natural fen-edge. The site lay to the south of the historic core of the village at TL 720 819 (Fig. 1), to the rear of properties fronting on to Eriswell Road. This was upon a gentle west facing slope, which descended from 11m OD to 7m OD, (Fig. 1), overlooking the fen edge and the 'Cut Off Channel' which lay 200m to the west.

The development area measured 0.6ha (Fig. 1), of which 0.064ha was occupied by the property at 6 Eriswell Drive which was awaiting demolition. The remainder of the site mainly consisted of open land, currently unused and covered in grass scrub. The western end of the site contained a long barn in a bad state of disrepair, originally constructed from flint and clunch blocks under a pantile roof, and was partially encroached upon by the gardens and sheds of the properties fronting Eriswell Road.



Figure 1. Site location plan

The First Edition Ordnance Survey of c.1880 (Fig. 2) shows the site as being divided into strips relating to three properties on Eriswell Road. The associated outbuildings include the still extant clunch barn. When compared with the surrounding open fields this indicates that the site was probably in use as domestic plots. This site appears to have remained as agricultural land or allotments throughout the 20th century, gradually being surrounded by new housing estates as the village expanded.



Figure 2. Site on the First Edition OS

The site was of interest as it lay within an Area of Archaeological Importance, as defined in the County Sites and Monuments Record. Its location placed the site broadly within the dense band of multi-period archaeological sites that lie along the fen-edge and its situation, on a low rise overlooking the fens, was thought to be of high archaeological potential. Evaluation and excavation at a similar location, LKH 220, to the north of the village for instance has previously identified a Bronze Age/Iron Age funerary site (Craven 2004).

However in the immediate vicinity of the site known archaeological sites are scarce. This may be due to a lack of archaeological involvement during the development of the surrounding housing estates, which were built pre-1990 and the introduction of PPG 16, as opposed to a genuine absence of archaeological evidence. Metal detected finds, consisting of three Roman brooches, an Anglo-Saxon dress fastener and various medieval items have been found c.100m to the south (LKH 103), but generally there is a relative paucity of known sites in this part of the village in comparison to the wider surrounding area.

As the site lay outside of the historic core of the village, in what was until recently open agricultural land or allotments, the site probably only had low potential for medieval or post-medieval deposits.

The site therefore was deemed to be of high potential for having archaeological deposits, most likely from the prehistoric, Roman or Anglo-Saxon periods, which would be affected by vated b<sup>\*</sup> development. This meant that a programme of archaeological evaluation was required to assess the archaeological potential of the site and to establish any archaeological implications for its Service oun development.

### 2. Methodology

Six trenches, measuring 1.8m wide and 167m length in total, were excavated by a mechanical excavator with a ditching bucket under the supervision of an archaeologist. With a small extension at the end of trench 03 this meant that a total area of 308sqm was evaluated, or just over 5% of the 0.6ha site. The trench plan proposed by Simon Mortimer of JSAC was closely adhered to except for trenches 05 and 06 where changes were to accommodate standing buildings and the gardens to the rear of the properties fronting the High Street which encroached upon the development area.

The trenches were excavated to the top of the natural subsoil surface, which was a mix of mid yellow/orange sands and scattered gravels. This generally involved the removal of 0.3m-0.4m of ploughsoil and a layer, 0020, of mixed grey, brown and yellow sands, which varied from 0.2m-0.6m thick. Excavated soil was examined for unstratified finds and metal-detected by an Nice coun experienced detectorist.

Possible features were cleaned and excavated by hand. The single definite feature was also 100% sampled. A single context continuous numbering system was used and feature sections and soil profiles were drawn at a scale of 1:20. Digital colour and black and white print photographs were taken of all stages of the evaluation and are included in the site archive. The trenches were planned, and site levels were taken using a Total Station Theodolite. Levels were transferred by dumpy level from an OS benchmark at TL 71938187.

Site data has been input onto an MS Access database and recorded using the County Sites and Monuments Record code LKH 269, and inked copies of section drawings and plans have been made. Bulk finds were washed, marked and quantified.

An OASIS form has been completed for the project (reference no. suffolkc1-19045) and a digital copy of the report 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 Suffolk County al Bury St Edmunds under SMR No. LKH 269. Finds are located in one bag in the Parish Box in the Bury Store (**H** 80 5) and the metalwork in the sensitive store (SS 11 4).

uffi uy Stor; Suffolk cologica Archaeologica

#### 3. Results

The excavation of each trench exposed the natural subsoil of glacial sands and gravels, basic trench descriptions are listed in Table 1 below. The natural topography of the subsoil was generally apparent, consisting of an uneven surface with numerous shallow, irregular, hollows that were infilled by the base of an overlying layer, 0020, of mixed sands. There was also frequent evidence of animal and tree root disturbance throughout the trenches and areas of modern disturbance, particularly in trenches 04 and 05, extending into the subsoil.

Layer 0020 consisted of a mix of grey, brown and yellow sands, frequently affected by animal tree and modern disturbance. It formed a broadly homogenous deposit across the entire site, varying in thickness from 0.2m in Trench 02 to 0.6m in Trench 05. The upper part of this deposit was truncated by substantial ploughmarks at the base of the topsoil.

A single unstratified flint waste flake, 0001, was collected during machining and two small finds detected, 1000 was found at the eastern end of Trench 01 and 1001 at the northern end of Trench 02.

Trench	Length	Description	Features	Baulk sections
01	31m	East-west aligned running down natural slope.	0003.	0002.
		0.7m-0.8m deep with 0.4m-0.5m of ploughsoil overlying 0020 which was 0.3m thick.	SF1000	0005
02	32m	North-south aligned, running across natural	0008,	0006,
		slope. 0.6m deep with 0.3m-0.4m of ploughsoil overlying 0020 which was 0.2m-0.3m thick.	SF1001	0007
03	32m	East-west aligned running down natural slope.	0012	0010,
		0.6m deep with 0.3m-0.4m of ploughsoil overlying 0020 which was 0.2m-0.3m thick.		0011
04	30m	East-west aligned running down natural slope.		0015,
		0.6m-0.8m deep with 0.4m-0.5m of ploughsoil overlying 0020 which was 0.3m thick. Frequent modern disturbance to subsoil, mainly in western end.		0016
05	35m	North-south aligned, running across natural		0017,
		slope near its base. 0.8m-0.9m deep with 0.3m- 0.4m of ploughsoil overlying 0020 which was 0.5m-0.6m thick. Heavy modern disturbance		0018
	n	and build up of ground levels at south end.		uncie
06	7m	North-south aligned, running across natural		0019
co	unity ise	slope. 0.6m deep with 0.3m of ploughsoil overlying 0020 which was 0.3m thick.	CO	und al Se
folkeol	09.	Table 1. Trench descriptions	folkeo	103

The majority of the irregular hollows were rapidly investigated but are generally not recorded as they were clearly features of the natural landscape and contained no archaeological material. One small hollow, 0003, which lay in Trench 01was recorded however, as its fill of mixed grey/yellow sands, 0004, contained a single flint waste flake. On the surface it appeared as an elongated pit measuring 1.4m by 0.7m, and excavation showed it to be 0.1m deep with irregular sides and base.



Figure 3. Site plan

A possible oval pit, 0008, measuring 0.6m by 0.5m and 0.25m deep, was seen in Trench 02. It differed from the various natural hollows as its fill, 0009, a light grey/brown sand was different to the overlying mixed sand layer. However its cut was indistinct and no material was identified within it.

0012, a small pit at the eastern end of Trench 03 was the only definite archaeological feature seen during the evaluation. Sealed beneath the layer, 0020, of mixed sands it measured 0.6m by 0.8m and was 0.3m deep. It had moderate sloping sides and a concave base although an animal burrow disturbed its western side. The pit's main fill, 0013, was a blackened sand with charcoal. A second fill lying below this, 0014, consisted of pale-mid orange/red/brown sands and was probably over-excavated natural subsoil that had been affected by leaching or mild heat from the above deposit. There was no real indication of burning to the subsoil around the feature. Initially partially under the trench baulk the pit was recorded in section 0011. The trench was then extended and the pit was fully excavated, with fill 0013 being fully sampled.



Figure 4. Plans and sections







Figure 5. Section 0011 and pit 0012

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

#### 4. Finds and environmental evidence

Compiled by Cathy Tester, with contributions/ identifications from Val Fryer, Colin Pendleton and Faye Minter.

#### 4.1. Introduction

nt Council ntext Finds were collected from five contexts during the evaluation and the quantities by context are 0000 HOIK shown in the table below.

sunchae	Trench	Context	Flint		Flint		Miscellaneous	Spotdate	
P.			No.	Wt/g		Þ.,			
		0001	1	9		BA or later			
	1	0004	1	2		Neolithic			
	3	0013	1	4		BA or later			
	1	1000			Silver coin (SF)	1604-5			
	2	1001			Copper Alloy buckle (SF)	14th c.			
	Total		3	15					

Table 2. Finds quantities

#### **4.2. Worked flint**

(identified by Colin Pendleton)

Three unpatinated struck flint flakes were collected from three contexts.

A fine honey-coloured flake with limited edge retouch on the sides and its end snapped off was found in feature 0003 (0004). It has parallel flake scars on its dorsal face and is probably Neolithic.

A flake with possible slight edge use-wear was unstratified (0001). Cortex forms the distal end and it has a hinge-fractured flake scar. The piece was probably hard hammer struck and is Bronze Age or later.

A hinge-fractured flake with crude edge retouch was found in pit 0012 (0013). It was probably hard hammer struck and is Bronze Age or later.

#### 4.3. Metalwork

(identified by Faye Minter)

A silver half-groat of James I (first coinage, 1604-5) was unstratified in Trench 1. The obverse Service legend reads "IDG ROSA SINE SPINA." On the reverse is a square-topped shield. Lis mintmark. (SF 1000).

A copper alloy pin from an annular buckle (14th c) was unstratified in Trench 2. (SF 1001). Sufformaeol

## 4.4. Plant macrofossils and other remains

Val Fryer

#### 4.4.1. Introduction and method statement

The evaluation at the rear of 6, Eriswell Drive, Lakenheath undertaken by the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, revealed a pit of probable prehistoric date containing a charcoal rich fill. A single sample was taken to evaluate the preservation of the plant macrofossils contained within the assemblage.

The sample was processed by manual water flotation/washover and the flot was collected in a 500 micron mesh sieve. The dried flot was scanned under a binocular microscope at magnifications up to x 16, and the plant macrofossils and other remains noted are listed below on Table 2. All plant remains were charred. The non-floating residue was collected in a 1mm mesh sieve, and will be sorted when dry. All artefacts/ecofacts will be retained for further specialist

4.4.2. Results The assemblage consisted almost entirely of charcoal/charred wood fragments, with no other plant remains being recorded within the sub-sample scanned during the surf. plant remains being recorded within the sub-sample scanned during the evaluation. The only other remains noted were moderate quantities of both black porous and tarry materials, many of which would appear to be derived from the combustion of charcoal/wood at extremely high temperatures. A number of the charcoal fragments within the assemblage also had a very open porous texture and were fringed with tarry droplets.

At present, the reason for this high temperature combustion is not known. Similar 'cokey' and tarry materials have been noted with a number of contemporary cremation deposits although, in the current instance, burnt bone fragments are not recorded, and it is perhaps more likely that the pit contents are related to either 'industrial' or domestic burning.

Although this current assemblage has limited value for the interpretation of the feature, it does clearly illustrate that charred plant remains are extremely well preserved within the archaeological horizon on this site. If further excavations are scheduled within this area, additional plant macrofossil samples should be taken from all recorded features which are dated and well-sealed. If possible, the samples should be stored in cool, dark conditions prior to processing, and the material should be sent to the relevant specialist with all accompanying paperwork at the earliest possible opportunity.

OP No.	0013
Feature No	0012
Charcoal <2mm	XXXX
Charcoal >2mm	XXXX
Black porous 'cokey' material	XX
Black tarry material	XX
Sample volume (litres	10
Volume of flot (litres)	0.5
% flot sorted	25%

Table 2. Plant macrofossils and other remains (Key: xx = 10 - 50 specimens, xxxx 100 + specimens)

#### 4.5. Discussion of finds and environmental evidence

nty Council alfraiservice Limited finds were recovered from three of the six evaluation trenches. The flint belongs to the later Prehistoric period and includes pieces that are Neolithic and Bronze Age or later. Later finds are also sparse and probably related to low level agricultural activity. DI

#### 5. Discussion

The single pit, 0012, identified on the site is thought to be of prehistoric date, possibly Bronze Age or later, with the burnt deposit within it probably originating from a domestic fire or hearth. As the site is positioned overlooking the edge of the fens in a broad area of historic human settlement, evidence such as this of dispersed prehistoric activity is to be expected. For example similar evidence in an evaluation to the north of the village, LKH 220, eventually led to the identification of a small Bronze Age/Iron Age funerary site (Craven 2004). However the charcoal filled pit contained no evidence of cremated bone and, as it is only a single feature, simply indicates that evidence of a phase of very scattered prehistoric activity may exist upon the site. The presence of the feature, and of the numerous natural hollows, also demonstrates a high level of preservation of the natural subsoil surface.

The layer of mixed sands, 0020, appears to have developed since the prehistoric period as it seals pit 0012. It probably represents a former soil horizon and, as its increasing thickness further downslope indicates, is generally a colluvial hillwash deposit while also being mixed by tree and animal disturbance. The total lack of archaeological material identified in this layer, with the exception of the single prehistoric flake from its base in hollow 0003, further demonstrates that this layer has developed through natural processes, again indicating a general lack of human activity on site since the prehistoric period.

Finally the evaluation identified a thick topsoil, which was expected due to the site's recent land use as allotments. The presence of substantial ploughmarks reaching a depth of c.0.4m indicates that the site has probably been subject to modern ploughing at some point, probably post-WWII. The two metal-detected finds, 1000 and 1001, are likely to have come from the topsoil, probably the result of either casual loss or of agricultural manuring processes in the medieval and postmedieval periods.

#### 6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The evaluation trenches were generally unproductive, with only a single prehistoric feature being identified. This indicates that a possible phase of widely dispersed prehistoric features may exist upon the site and, if so, are likely to have survived intact, as preservation of the subsoil surface was good, with it lying beneath a post-prehistoric buried soil horizon. While shallower groundworks for the proposed development may not disturb the archaeological levels, it is likely that footing trenches for the various buildings will, and accordingly a program of archaeological Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Countil Service monitoring of the developments groundworks is recommended to record any further deposits.

John Craven V Service Assistant Proise Field Team, Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service October 2006 Arc

#### References

Craven, J., 2004, The Sandpits, Station Road, Lakenheath, LKH 220 SCCAS Report No. 2004/26.

#### Disclaimer

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

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

#### **Appendix 1**

# SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE - CONSERVATION TEAM Brief and Specification for an Archaeological Evaluation LAND AT AND REAR OF 6 ERISWELL DRIVE, LAKENHEATH

## Suffolk Coun haeologica The commissioning body should be aware that it may have Health & Safety responsibilities, see paragraph 1.7.

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 Planning consent (application F/2005/0957/FUL) has been granted for the erection of 18 dwellings and creation of new vehicular access and access road on land at and to the rear of 6 Eriswell Drive, Lakenheath (TL 720 818) with a PPG 16, paragraph 30 condition requiring an acceptable programme of archaeological work being carried out.
- The Planning Authority (Forest Heath) has been advised that any consent should be 1.2 conditional upon an agreed programme of work taking place before development begins (PPG 16, paragraph 30 condition). An archaeological evaluation of the application area will be required as the first part of such a programme of archaeological work; decisions on the need for, and scope of, any further work will be based upon the evaluation.
- 1.3 The application lies in an area of archaeological importance, defined in the County Sites and Monuments Record. This development lies c. 70m north of the reported findspot of Roman, Anglo-Saxon and medieval metalwork items, indicative of further occupation deposits, recorded in the County Sites and Monuments Record (LKH 103). This evidence demonstrates the high potential for archaeological deposits to be disturbed by this development.
- All arrangements for the field evaluation of the site, the timing of the work, access to the site, 1.3 the definition of the precise area of landholding and area for proposed development are to be defined and negotiated with the commissioning body.
- 1.4 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.
- 1.5 In accordance with the standards and guidance produced by the Institute of Field Archaeologists this brief should not be considered sufficient to enable the total execution of the project. A Project Design or Written Scheme of Investigation (PD/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 (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 PD/WSI as satisfactory. The PD/WSI will provide the basis for measurable standards and will be used to establish whether the requirements of the planning condition will be adequately met.
- 1.6
- 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.

#### 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* [at the discretion of the developer].
- 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 whether waterlogged organic deposits are likely to be present in the proposal area.

- 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 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 the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (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: Field Evaluation

3.1 Trial trenches are to be excavated to cover a minimum 5% by area (*c*. 0.605ha; Figure 1). Trenches are to be a minimum of 1.8m wide unless special circumstances can be demonstrated; this will result in a minimum of *c*. 170m of trenching at 1.8m in width. If excavation is mechanised a toothless 'ditching bucket' at least 1.2m wide must be used. However, areas that are currently built over (parts of the eastern end and the northern extension that gives access to Eriswell Drive) cannot be trenched. Linear trenches are thought to be the most appropriate sampling method. The detailed trench design must be approved by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service before field work begins.

3.2

The topsoil may be mechanically removed using an appropriate machine with a back-acting arm and fitted with a toothless bucket. All machine excavation is to be under the direct control and supervision of an archaeologist. The topsoil should be examined for archaeological material.

3.3 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 further excavation will be made by the senior project archaeologist with regard to the nature of the deposit.

- 3.4 In all evaluation excavation there is a presumption of the need to cause the minimum disturbance to the site consistent with adequate evaluation; that significant archaeological features, e.g. solid or bonded structural remains, building slots or post-holes, should be preserved intact even if fills are sampled.
- 3.5

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.

- 3.6 Archaeological contexts should, where possible, be sampled for palaeoenvironmental remains. Best practice should allow for sampling of interpretable and datable archaeological deposits and provision should be made for this. The contractor shall 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 J. Heathcote, English Heritage A guide to sampling Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). 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.
- 3.7 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.
- 3.8 Metal detector searches must take place at all stages of the excavation by an experienced metal detector user.
- All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed with the 3.9 Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service during the course of the evaluation).
- 3.10 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.
- 3.11 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 the Conservation Team.
- 3.12 A photographic record of the work is to be made, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies.
- Topsoil, subsoil and archaeological deposit to be kept separate during excavation to allow 3.13 eological sequential backfilling of excavations.

#### General Management

Suffolk A timetable for all stages of the project must be agreed before the first stage of work commences, including monitoring by the Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service.

4.2 The composition of the project staff must be detailed and agreed (this is to include any subcontractors).

- 4.3 A general Health and Safety Policy must be provided, with detailed risk assessment and management strategy for this particular site.
- No initial survey to detect public utility or other services has taken place. The responsibility for 4.4 this rests with the archaeological contractor.
- The Institute of Field Archaeologists' Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based 4.5 Assessments and for Field Evaluations should be used for additional guidance in the execution of the project and in drawing up the report. Arc 5.<sup>1C</sup>

#### **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 data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent with, and approved by, the County Sites and Monuments Record.
- 5.3 The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its archaeological interpretation.
- 6.4 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 C.0
- Reports on specific areas of specialist study must include sufficient detail to permit 5.5 assessment of potential for analysis, including tabulation of data by context, and must include non-technical summaries.
- The Report must include a discussion and an assessment of the archaeological evidence, 5.6 including 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 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines. The finds, as an indissoluble part of the site archive, should be deposited with the County SMR if the landowner can be persuaded to agree to this. If this is not possible for all or any part of the finds archive, then provision must be made for additional recording (e.g. photography, illustration, analysis) as appropriate.
- 5.8 The site archive is to be deposited with the County SMR within three months of the completion of fieldwork. It will then become publicly accessible.
- Where positive conclusions are drawn from a project (whether it be evaluation or excavation) 5.9 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 the Conservation Team. by the end of the calendar year in which the evaluation work takes place, whichever is the sooner.
- 5.10 County SMR sheets must be completed, as per the county SMR manual, for all sites where archaeological finds and/or features are located.
- 5.11 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.

. iOU. includer Suffolk County Coentri Suffolk 5.12 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the SMR. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included or with the archive). folk County

eological Specification by: Dr Jess Tipper

Se

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Conservation Team **Environment and Transport Department** Shire Hall **Bury St Edmunds** Suffolk IP33 2AR

Tel: 01284 352197

Date: 30 March 2006 Reference: / 6EriswellDrive-Lakenheath 2006

This brief and specification remains valid for 12 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.

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

## Appendix 2: LKH 269 context list

context	feature	trench no	identifier	description	soil sample	finds over	under	spotdate
0001	0001		Unstratified finds	Unstratified finds from machining of trenches.		Y		preh
0002	0002	01	Trench profile	Trench profile at east end of Trench 01, near feature 0003.				
0003	0003	01	Feature cut	Probable base of natural hollow in subsoil. On the surface it appeared as an elongated pit measuring 1.4m by 0.7m, and excavation showed it to be 0.1m deep with irregular sides and base.				
0004	0003	01	Feature fill	Mixed grey/yellow sands.		Y		preh
0005	0005	01	Trench profile	Trench profile at west end of Trench 01.				
0006	0006	02	Trench profile	Trench profile at south end of Trench 02.				
0007	0007	02	Trench profile	Trench profile at north end of Trench 02.				
0008	0008	02	Feature cut	Possible oval pit, measuring 0.6m by 0.5m and 0.25m deep.				
0009	0008	02	Feature fill	Light grey/brown sand, different to the overlying mixed sand layer.				
0010	0010	03	Trench profile	Trench profile at west end of Trench 03.				
0011	0011	03	Trench profile	Trench profile at east end of Trench 03. Includes section of pit 0012.				
0012	0012	03	Pit cut	Small oval pit sealed beneath the layer of mixed sands. Measured 0.6m by 0.8m and was 0.3m deep. Moderate sloping sides and a concave base, animal burrow on west side. Initially partially under the trench baulk, recorded in section 0011 before trench was extended and was fully excavated.				
0013	0012	03	Pit fill	Blackened sand with charcoal.	01	Y 0014		preh
0014	0012	03	Pit fill	Probably overexcavated natural subsoil affected by leaching or burning from 0013, pale-mid orange/red/brown sands.			0013	
0015	0015	04	Trench profile	Trench profile at east end of Trench 04.				
0016	0016	04	Trench profile	Trench profile at west end of Trench 04.				
0017	0017	05	Trench profile	Trench profile at north end of Trench 05.				
0018	0018	05	Trench profile	Trench profile at south end of Trench 05.				
0019	0019	06	Trench profile	Trench profile at centre of Trench 06.		lia		
0020			Layer	layer of mixed sands - colluvial hillwash deposit, windblown, former soil horizon? Above subsoil and features, below ploughsoil.	County Col	enice		
		SU	fronkeolog	Suffolk	Jeolos			

Suffolk County Service