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## Summary

The monitoring of footing trenches for housing uncovered intense evidence of settlement activity from the 17-19th centuries. A developed ploughsoil was the only evidence for previous land use and was probably medieval or early post medieval. There was no evidence of the Roman or prehistoric settlement identified on other sites within the vicinity.
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## Introduction

A series of visits was made to the former site of 41 Beeches Road Mildenhall from 25th October to 2 nd November 2007 to monitor the ongoing excavation of footing trenches for four properties and associated garages to be erected on the site. The work was carried out to a Brief and Specification issued by Robert Carr (Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Conservation Team - Appendix 1) to fulfil a planning condition on application F/2007/0460. The work was funded by the developer, Cameron Ventures Ltd. The site lies at TL 674/761 at c. 5.8 m OD.

Interest in the site was based upon, its location within the existing settlement, and earlier finds from the area that are recorded in the Historic Monuments Register for Suffolk. These are plotted below on figure 1 .

MNL 193 Large Roman scatter including pottery and flue tile.
MNL 202 Acheulean hand-Axe
MNL 312 Flint knife and axehead
MNL 538 Large amount of platform gunflint production waste.
A number of wells are also recorded on the first to third editions of the Ordnance Survey maps.


Figure 1. Site location and known archaeological listings

## Methodology

A series of between 0.6 and 1.2 m wide footing trenches was excavated using a toothed bucket (Fig.2). Soil and feature profiles were cleaned by hand an drawn at scales of between 1:20 or 1:50. Plans were also made of clear features at a scale of 1:50. Hand excavation of features was carried out where it was practicable. All trenches were monitored, except for those on Building Plot 1. Upcast soil was also examined for finds. Records made on site have been input into an MS Access database and recorded using the Historic Environment Record code MNL 593. Finds were washed, marked and quantified, and the resultant data was also entered onto a database. Inked copies of profile and feature sections have been made.
An OASIS form has been completed for the project (reference no. suffolkc1-35394) and a digital copy of the report submitted for inclusion on the Archaeology Data Service database (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit).

## Results

(Figs. 3-8)
Excavation of the footing trenches revealed various layers of modern material left over from recent construction on the site, extending down in places to c. $0.3-0.4 \mathrm{~m}$, which was often recorded in the trench profiles. The southern edge of Plot 3 had been disturbed by a recent garden pond and a modern brick structure disturbed the garage footings between plots 2 and 3 .

In undisturbed areas, a layer (c. 0.22 m ) of garden soil remained. This was located above a plough soil 0018 that appeared with a shallow depth in Trench 10, 0025 and contained a low density of artefacts, becoming deeper in Building Plots 3 and 4. Below this the pit features found on the site became visible, cutting slightly into the chalk layer.

## Building plot 4

(Figs. 3, 6, 7 and 8)
The trenches are discussed in the order in which they were excavated. The trenches associated with Plot 4 were the first to be opened and revealed 3 possible pits, numbered 0014, 0016 and 0019. There was also the remainder of a possible wall 0006 . See figure 6 for a soil profile.

Pits 0014 and 0016 only became visible in plan when the natural chalk level was reached, into which they had been partially dug (Fig. 8). They were adjacent to one another, however no relationship could be established between the pits or soil layer 0018. As a result of this it was impossible to establish the dimensions of these features, though it is clear that 0014 was at least 0.75 m wide and 0016 at least 0.8 m , along a NNE-SSW axis. They were also both at least 0.1 m deep and were probably originally much deeper. They were both filled with a relatively uniform light grey/brown sandy silt- numbered as 0015 and 0017 respectively,

Pit 0019 was similar to 0014 and 0016 in that it was also very shallow and filled with a material very similar to layer 0018, numbered 0020 (Fig. 7). However, as the chalk subsoil was higher, and the ground therefore much harder to dig, the feature was shallower. It measured at least 0.6 m wide and had a flat base.

Feature 0006 was a deposit that may have been the foundations of a wall, consisting of a number of whole bricks and other fragmented pieces of ceramic building material with some mortaring and was probably the earliest feature of the site (Fig. 7). These bricks were dated to the medieval to post-medieval period (see the finds discussion) but are likely to be early 17th century. As the structure was poorly bonded and insubstantial it is unlikely to have underpinned a particularly heavy structure. This may not have been a representative sample of the feature, as the area was quite disturbed.

Apart from these features, Trenches 1, 2 and 4 (contexts 0002,0003 and 0005 , respectively) $c^{2}$ produced post-medieval pottery from the 17th century onwards, as well as animal bone and a 19th century glass bottle.

## Building plot 3

(Figs 4,6 and 7)


Building Plot 3 contained four pits, numbered 0008, 0010, 0012 and 0053 , the first three of which were partially excavated.

Pit 0008 fill 0009 was found at the corner of Trench 7 (0022) and Trench 8 (0023) (Fig.7). From what was visible in plan it appears to have been a large, round cut. Like the other pits, this feature only went slightly into the chalk natural and the fill was similar to the make-up of layer 0018. However, it was clear at its north-east corner that it was cutting partly through some material assumed to be from layer 0018, suggesting it to be more recent than this layer. If all the pits on the site were roughly contemporary, which their form and apparent function suggests, this may be the only evidence that they were dug after the build up of ploughsoil 0018. The finds from this pit include 2 fragments of pottery dating to the 19th century.

Pit 0010, fill 0011 and pit 0012 and fill 0013 , were located within Trench 9 (0024) and no relationship was visible between either pits or with layer 0018 (Fig.7). Neither was fully visible in plan or section and as such any dimensions measured were only of the visible extent within the confines of the trench. Pit 0010 was located north-east of pit 0012 and was $100 \%$ excavated. It appeared to be circular in plan. Pit 0012 was very similar in form. The one fragment of pottery and one of ceramic building material from fill 0011 gave pit 0010 an earliest date of the late 17th to 18 th century. The finds of pottery and ceramic building material from fill 0013 meant that pit 0012 had an earlier possible date of infilling from the 16th-18th century. Other finds from this fill included an iron object, animal bone and a piece of clunch-type building material.

Pit 0053 , fill 0054, was not excavated, but appeared to be relatively similar in form to the other pits on the site. It was also filled again with a very similar material to that which made up layer 0018. It was most likely roundor sub-oval in plan. It measured approximately 1.3 m by 1.9 m , but could not be seen fully in plan (Fig. 4).

One other find from this plot came from Trench 5, 0007, and was an unstratified piece of Transfer Printed ware dish from the 19th century.

## Building plot 2

(Figs. $5-8$ )
This was the third building plot to be excavated and again contained a series of pits similar to those in Plots 3 and 4. However, the activity seems to have been more intensive in this area, with a greater number of potential features visible in the sections. Many of these were very difficult to define though, due to the continued difficulty in recognising the interface between cuts and layer 0018 , the interference of modern material and the relative shallowness of the chalk subsoil in this area.

Pit 0038 was a clearly cut feature towards the south end of Trench 14,0029 , (Figs. 7 and 8). It had a slightly unusual form compared to some of the other pits on the site as it had slightly less steeply sloped sides, though its fill and dimensions suggest it was possibly contemporary and for the same function.

Trench 10, 0025 , contained one potential pit, numbered as 0034 (Fig. 8). It was only visible on the east side of the trench, which casts some doubt as to whether it was just an undulation of the chalk. It measured 2.9 m wide by 0.3 m deep and had a largely flat base and one visible, gently sloping side.

The north-west half of Trench 11, 0026, contained 3 potential pits, numbered 0030, 0032 and 0040 (Fig. 8). Pit 0030 was located to the south-east of 0032 on the soutt side of the section, with pit 0040 located opposite both, on the north side of the section. No relationship was visible between the pits or layer 0018 . Pit 0040 however, was wider with a far less clearly defined cut. As such it is hard to identify if either 0030 or 0032 were the same as 0040 . Pit 0030 was approximately 1.55 m wide and at least 0.55 m deep, pit 0032 was 1.45 m wide and at least 0.4 m deep, whilst pit 0040 was 2.7 m wide and at least 0.35 m deep.

The north-east end of Trench 11, 0026, contained a further two potential pits, numbered 0042 and 0044 (Fig. 8). Pit 0042 is located on the south section of Trench 11 and appeared to have a fairly well-defined cut, running quite deeply into the chalk. It measured approximately 1.9 m wide by 0.45 m deep and its east edge bordered onto pit 0036 , though a relationship was not visible. The one edge of pit 0044 that was visible in this trench and in the north section did not line up with pit 0042 and appears to be part of a much larger feature spreading into Trench 12. It had gently sloping, curved sides and was c, 1.45 m wide and 0.55 m deep.

Trench 12, 0027, had three potential pits in it, numbered 0036, 0044 and 0046 (Fig.8). All three have relatively flat bases curving up gently to slightly sloping sides. It is possible that all three features were actually one large, irregular pit. If they are separate features there is no clear relationship between each other or layer 0018. Pit 0036 measures $>2.35 \mathrm{~m}$ wide and $>0.55 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. Pit 0044 measures $>3 \mathrm{~m}$ wide and $>0.4 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. As a possible re-cut (or vice-versa) of pit 0044 , pit 0046 was only c .1 .1 m wide by c .0 .4 m deep.

Trench 13, 0028, contained two possible pits on the south section of the trench, numbered 0048 and 0050 (Fig. 8). It is possible that both were actually only undulations in the chalk, as they had gently sloping sides and gently curved bases and did not appear to be very deep, although this last point was difficult to establish as they were both filled with similar material to layer 0018. As such, no relationship between the features was clear either. Pit 0048 was c .3 m wide and $>0.4 \mathrm{~m}$ deep, whilst pit 0050 was $>2.3 \mathrm{~m}$ wide and $>0.3 \mathrm{~m}$ deep.


## Trench 3 <br> 0004

Trench 4 0005


Figure 3. Building Plot 4 trenches and features


Figure 4. Building Plot 3 trenches and features


Figure 5. Building Plot 2 trenches and features


Figure 6. Trench profiles
8


8


Figure 8. Feature sections at 1:50 scale

## 4. Finds

Richenda Goffin.
Introduction
Finds were collected from nine contexts, as shown in the table below.

| OP | Pottery |  | CBM |  | Animal bone |  | Miscellaneous | Spotdate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | Wt/g | No. | Wt/g | No. | Wt/g |  |  |
| 0001 | 1 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 19th C |
| 0002 | 2 | 50 |  |  | 4 | 162 | 1 glass bottle, (96g) | 19th C+ |
| 0003 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 68 |  | Undated |
| 0005 | 1 | 20 |  |  | 4 | 66 |  | L17th-18th |
| 0006 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 781 |  |  |  | 15th-16th C or earlier |
| 0007 | 1 | 101 |  |  |  |  | N | 19th C |
| 0009 | 2 | 15 | 11 | 605 | 1 |  | Firon frag ( 26 g ) | 19th C |
| 0011 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 9 |  | , |  | L17th-18th C |
| 0013 | 2 | 25 | 1 | 244 |  | $12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { stone }(20 \mathrm{~g}), 1 \\ & \text { iron }(2 \mathrm{~g}) \end{aligned}$ | 16th-18th C |
| Total | 10 | 227 | 14 | 1639 | 11 | 339 |  |  |

Table 1. Finds quantities

## Pottery

A total of ten fragments of pottery was recovered from the monitoring $(0.227 \mathrm{~kg})$. The assemblage is post-medieval in date.

A fragment of Staffordshire combed slipware dish (L17th-18th century) and an abraded Glazed red earthenware sherd (16th-18th C) were collected as unstratified sherds in Trench 1. The base of an English stoneware mug dating to the Late 17th-18th century was present in 0005, a general number allocated to unstratified finds from Trench 4. Part of a Transfer Printed ware dish was recovered from 0007 (Trench 5 topsoil) dating to the nineteenth century. An abraded sherd of 19th century Ironstone china and another fragment of Glazed red earthenware was present in pit fill 009 (Trench 7/8 Building Plot 3). A fragment of Staffordshire combed slipware (L17th-18th C) was found in pit fill 0011 (Trench 9). Two fragments of pottery dating to the 16th-18th C were identified in pit fill 0013 of the same trench.

## Ceramic building material

Fourteen fragments of ceramic building material were collected ( 1.639 kg ). These consisted for the most part of fragments of post-medieval bricks, which were present in pit fill 0009. Half of a particularly small brick was found in 0006, the base of a possible wall foundation (Trench 4). It is made from a buff fabric with maroon streaks and grog lumps. It may be an early brick dating to the 13th-15th century, but it is also possible that it may be a later brick type which is found on sites in Norwich as early as the first half of the sixteenth century (Drury, 1993, 165). The brick has the remains of mortar on one of its surfaces, but none on the broken edge.

## Metalwork

The remains of two iron nails were collected from pit fills 0009 and 0013.

## Miscellaneous

A complete glass lemonade bottle dating to the 19th century was recovered as an unstratified find from Trench 1 (Building Plot 4). The moulding on the side of the bottle reads 'THE CAMBRIDGE LEMONADE...CHIVERS \& SONS LTD, HISTON CAMBRIDGE’.

A very small fragment of fine-grained clunch-type stone was present in pit fill 0013 ( 0.020 kg ).

## Animal bone

The majority of the animal bone fragments were unstratified, but several examples of butchered bones were identified amongst this material. A large and unworn bovine molar was recovered from pit fill 0009 .

## Discussion

No prehistoric or Roman finds were recovered from the monitoring. The majority of the pottery dates to the 18th century or later, but some earlier post-medieval fabrics were also identified, together with some of the ceramic building material.

## 5. Discussion

The earliest evidence for activity on the site is probably provided by layer 0018 that was most evident towards the eastern end of the site where it was cut by several of the pits. It's homogenous appearance leads to an interpretation as a plough soil which could be medieval or early post-medieval in date. The earliest structure was possible wall 0006 , which is tentatively dated to the early 17th century but could be earlier. It may appear on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey of 1882 that has since been demolished.

The many pits that were found across the development are good evidence for continuous occupation of the area from the 17 th to the 19th century. It is in the nature of pits that establishing their purpose can be difficult because the fill may be unrelated to the original function; this would seem to be the case here. A number were probably dug as cess pits and attached to buildings along the street frontage, and later filled with rubbish, (the original contents would often have been spread over fields as manure) others may have been specifically dug for rubbish. Butchered bone and broken pottery identified in the finds are to be expected from domestic cubbish. The proximity of chalk in an area with clunch buildings (a piece of which was found in context 0013) offers a further possibility. The features only penetrated to any great depth into the chalk in Plots 2 and 3 revealing a difference between the east and west end of the site. Despite evidence on the 1882 1st edition Ordnance Survey map for wells in the area, none were identified during the monitoring.

## 6. Conclusion

No evidence, either in the form of features or finds, was found of Roman or prehistoric activity, which is perhaps surprising given the density of such sites within the vicinity. As always with projects of this nature, it is difficult to draw detailed conclusions on the nature of past activity, because of the limited visibility in the trenches and their disjointed pattern. Generally, the monitoring has revealed features suggestive of light industry and domestic occupation over a site formally given over to arable farming.

## Rob Brooks

June 2008
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## Appendix 1:

## SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

# ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE - CONSERVATION TEAM 

## Brief and Specification for Archaeological Monitoring of Development

## 41 BEECHES ROAD, WEST ROW, MILDENHALL


#### Abstract

Although this document is fundamental to the work of the specialist archaeological contractor the developer should be aware that certain of its requirements are likely to impinge upon the working practices of a general building contractor and may have financial implications, for example see paragraphs 2.3 \& 4.3. The commissioning body should also be aware that it may have Health \& Safety responsibilities, see paragraph 1.5.


## 1. Background

1.1 Planning permission to develop on this site has been granted conditional upon an acceptable programme of archaeological work being carried out (application F/2007/0460/OUT). Assessment of the available archaeological evidence indicates that the area affected $b$ y development can be adequately recorded by archaeological monitoring of development as it occurs, coupled with provision for an archaeological record of any archaeology that is observed.
1.2 The application is for four dwellings with access and hard standing within the post medieval settlement core and close to known Roman finds (MNL 193; 160m to southwest) and prehistoric occupation (MNL 312: 110m to the south). The development area has demonstrated archaeological potential.
1.3 In accordance with the standards and guidance produced by the Instifute 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.
1.4 Detailed standards, information and advice to supplement this brief are to be found in "Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England" Occasional Papers 14, East Anglian Archaeology, 2003.
1.5 Before anyoarchaeological 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 this office before execution.

## 2. Brief for Archaeological Monitoring

2.1 To provide a record of archaeological deposits which are damaged or removed by any development [including services and landscaping] permitted by the current planning consent.
2.2 The main academic objective will centre upon the potential of this development to produce evidence for earlier occupation of the site.
2.3 The significant archaeologically damaging activities in this proposal are likely to be the site preparation works involving topsoil stripping (e.g. the construction of access roads, hard standing construction, and landscaping) and the excavation of building footing or ground-beam trenches.

If site preparation works involve topsoil stripping the stripping process and the upcast soil are to be observed by an arehaeologist whilst they are excavated by the building contractor.

In the case of footing trenches the excavation and the upcast soil, are to be observed by an archaeologist after they have been excavated by the building contractor. Adequate time is to be allowed for the recording of archaeological deposits during excavation, and of soil sections following excavation (see 4.3).

## 3. Arrangements for Monitoring

3.1 To carry out the monitoring work the developer will appoint an archaeologist (the archaeological contractor) who must be approved by the Conservation Team of Suffolk County Council's Archaeological Service (SCCAS) - see 1.3 above.
3.2 The developer or his archaeologist will give the Conservation Team of SCCAS 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. The method and form of development will also be monitored to ensure that it conforms to previously agreed locations and techniques upon which this brief is based.
3.3 Allowance must be made to cover archaeological costs incurred in monitoring the development works by the contract archaeologist. The size of the contingency should be estimated by the approved archaeological contractor, based upon the outline works in paragraph 2.3 of the Brief and Specification and the building contractor's programme of works and time-table.
3.4 If unexpected remains are encountered the Conservation Team of SCCAS must be informed immediately. Amendments to this specification may be made to ensure adequate provision for archaeological recording.

## 4. Specification

4. 1 The developer shall afford access at all reasonable times to both the County Council Conservation Team archaeologist and the contracted 'observing archaeologist' to allow archaeological observation of building and engineering operations which disturb the ground.
4.2 Opportunity must be given to the 'observing archaeologist' to hand excavate any discrete archaeological features which appear during earth moving operations, retrieve finds and make measured records as necessary.
4.3 In the case of topsoil stripping for site preparation, access roads, hard standings and landscaping unimpeded access to the stripped area at the rate of one hour per 30 square metres must be allowed for archaeological recording at the interface between topsoil and clean sub-soil surface before the area is further deepened, traversed by machinery or subbase deposited.

In the case of footing trenches unimpeded access at the rate of one and a half hours per 10 metres of trench must be allowed for archaeological recording before concreting or building begin. Where it is necessary to see archaeological detail one of the soil faces is to be trowelled clean.
4.4 All archaeological features exposed must be planned at a minimum scale of 1:50 on a plan showing the proposed layout of the development.
4.5 All contexts must be numbered and finds recorded by context. The data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent with, and approved by, the County Sites and Monuments Record.
4.6 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. Advice on the appropriateness of the proposed strategies will be sought from J Heathcote, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling archaeological deposits (Murphy, P L and Wiltshire, P E J,01994, A guide to susampling archaeological deposits for environmental analysis) is available for viewing from SCCAS.
4.7 Developers should be aware of the possibility of human burials being found. If this eventuality occurs they must comply with the provisions of Section 25 of the Burial Act 1857; and the .archaeologist should be informed by 'Guidance for best practice for treatment of human remains excavated from Christian burial grounds in England' (English Heritage \& the Church of England 2005) which includes sensible baseline standards which are likely to apply whatever the location, age or denomination of a burial.

## 5. Report Requirements

5.1 An archive of all records and finds is to be prepared consistent with the principles of Management of Archaeological Projects (MAP2), particularly Appendix 3.This must be deposited with the County Sites and Monuments Record within 3 months of the completion of work. It will then become publicly accessible.
5.2 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.
5.3 A report on the fieldwork and archive, consistent with the principles of MAP2, particularly Appendix 4, must be provided. The report must summarise the methodology employed, the stratigraphic sequence, and give a period by period description of the contexts recorded, and an inventory of finds. The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its interpretation. The Report must include a discussion and an assessment of the archaeological evidence, including palaeoenvironmental remains recovered from palaeosols and cut features. Its conclusions must include a clear statement of the archaeological value of the results, and their significance in the context of the Regional Research Framework (East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers $3 \& 8,1997$ and 2000).
5.4 A summary report, in the established format, suitable for inclusion in the annual 'Archaeology in Suffolk' section of the Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology, must be prepared and included in the project report.
5.5 County Sites and Monuments Record sheets must be completed, as per the county SMR manual, for all sites where archaeological finds and/or features arelocated.
5.6 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.

5.7 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 copyshould also be included with the archive).

Specification by: Robert Carr

Date: 13 August 2007
Reference: /41 Beeches Road, West Row

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.




| Context | Feature | Trench | Identifier | Type | Description | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Width } \\ & \text { in } \mathrm{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Length } \\ \text { in } m \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Depth } \\ \text { in } m \end{array}$ | Finds | Over Under |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0001 |  |  | Unstratifie d finds |  | Unstratified finds | 0 | 0 | 0 | Y |  |
| 0002 |  | 0002 | Trench 1 |  | Trench numberd, This was the eastern trench in Building Plot 4 and was numbered in order to locate possible pits [0014] and [0016] and for finds distributions. Much of the top of this trench had modern layers of material running through the top 0.35 M . However, the southern half of the trench had intact topsoil coming down to a very light grey/brown sandy silt with frequent chalk flecks ( 0018 ), which the finds under this number came from. Thiswas interpreted as a ploughsoil. Mid-dark brown sandy silt of a similar nature also cut down into parts of this, as recorded in section. Finally these layers came down on to chalk at a depth of 0.9 M at which point [0014] and [0016] became visible. Width measured WNW-ESE, length NNE-SSW. | 0.6 | 6.6 | 0.9 | Y |  |
| 0003 |  | 0003 | Trench 2 |  | Trench number 2. This was the southern trench in Building Plot 4 and was numbered for finds distributions. This trench was far less disturbed than Trench 1 and had topsoil to a depth of 0.22 M before hitting ploughsoil layer ( 0018 ). At between 0.74 and 0.8 M down clean and undulating chalk natural appeared. Width measured NNE-SSW, length ESE-WNW. Excavated to a maximum 1M depth, but sometimes to less. Two soil profiles were drawn of this trench to illustrate the varying depths of excavation and layers. | 0.6 | 9.4 | 1 | Y |  |
| 0004 |  | 0004 | Trench 3 |  | Trench number 3. This was the western trench in Building Plot 4 and was humbered for finds distributions. It had the same layers and depths as trench 2, of topsoil, layer (0018) and then ehalk, but no features. Width measured WNW-ESE, length SSW-NNE. | 0.6 | 6.6 | 0.8 |  |  |
| $0005$ |  | 0005 | Trench 4 |  | Trench number 4. This was the northern trench in Building Plot 4 and was numbered for finds distributions and to locate possible pit [0019]. Some of the modern disturbance seen in Trench 10002 came through into this trench, as recorded in section, and created a mixed topsoil/disturbed layer. There was also a dump of CBM, which may have been the remnants of a wall which cut down into layer (0018). Below this chalk was reached at approximately 0.62 M , at which point [0019] became visible. Width measured SSW-NNE, length ESE-WNW | 0.6 | 9.4 | 0.75 | Y |  |
| 0006 | $0006$ | 0005 | Wall | Structure | Base of possible wall foundation/brick dump in Trench 40005 . This may very possibly have been a fairly modern pit with material that was still somewhat mortared together dumped in it. A brick was kept for dating and number as 0006 . Width measured ESE-WNW. | 0.4 | 0 | 0.14 | Y | 0018 |
| 0007 |  | 007 ㅇ. | Trench 5 |  | Trench number 5. The northern NW-SE running trench in building plot 3 . This trench had topsoil coming down to approximately 0.14 M , before an interface with layer (0018) which was difficult to distinguish. At 0.5 M a dirty yellow chalk layer appeared, before a pure, white chalk layer at 0.6 M . Width measured SW-NE, length NW-SE. | . 0.6 | 6.4 | 0.8 | Y |  |
| 0008 | 0008 | $\begin{aligned} & 0022 \\ & 0023 \end{aligned}$ | Pit | Cut | Pit cut found in the base of trench 70022 and trench 80023 of building plot 3 . Only visible as a separate feature when the chalk natural was reached at an undulating level of 0.62 to 0.82 M from ground level. Appears to have had steeply sloping sides, curving sharply to a fairly flat base. Would possibly have been oval in plan. Visible length measured NW-SE, visible width NE-SW. Interpretation - it would seem that this pit and the others on the site were dug as disposal pits. Whilst the chalk they were dug into might have been used, suggesting a potential quarry pit use, they were only dug to a very shallow depth into this layer. | 0.75 | 1.4 | 0.4 |  |  |
| 0009 | 0008 | $\begin{aligned} & 0022 \\ & 0023 \end{aligned}$ | Pit | Fill | Fill of pit [0008] Light-mid grey, chalky, clayey silty sand with frequent chalk flecks and nodules and occasional stones Blends with browner material (0018) towards the top of the feature, making the cut hard to define. A layer of modern material truncates the feature, as recorded in section. | 0 | 0 | 0 | Y |  |
| 0010 | 0010 | 0024 | Pit | Cut | Pit cut visible in northeast side of trench 90024 of building plot 3 . Only partially visible but had rounded sides in plan and a slightly concave base. Sides slope at approximately $45^{\circ}$. Dimensions represent the visible extent of the feature, with width measured SW-NE and length NW-SE. Cut was only visible in the base of the trench. Relationship with [0012] was not clear. | 0.2 | 1 | 0.42 |  | 0018 |




[^0]occasional charcoal flecks，stones and chalk nodules．






 Possible pit cut in trench 120027 ，of building plot 2．Pit only partly visible as this area was truncated by
modern and the pit is filled with similar material to layer（0018）．Base is flat，curving gently to shallow occasional charcoal flecks，stones and chalk nodules．


 （0018），which made its relationship with other pits in the area impossible to establish as they were also filled
 Fill of possible pit［0040］．The same，or at least indistinguishable from layer（0018）．Mid brown silty－clayey
sand with occasional charcoal flecks，stones and chalk nodules．

 occasional charcoal flecks，stones and chalk nodules．
Possible pit cut towards WNW corner of trench 110026 ．May simply be a chalk undulation filled up with Fill of pit［0038］．The same，or at least indistinguishable from layer（0018）．Mid brown silty－clayey sand with
occasional charcoal flecks，stones and chalk nodules．

 shape to the rest of the pits on site．From what was visible in the trench it was round in plan．The north side of Large pitcut in trench 140029 ，in building plot 2．Not excavated，but appears to be of a similar scale and 1.45 sand with occasional charcoal flecks，stones and chalk nodules． Fill of possible pit［0036］．The
 plot．Width measured SSW－NNE．The depth measurement represents where the cut was visible，but



 southern side．Visible width measured N－S．The depth measurement represents where the cut was visible，but



| II！${ }^{\text {a }}$ | I！d | $2 \mathrm{Lzoo}$ | 00 | L†00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mo | H！d | LZ00 | $\pm 00$ | 9700 |
| II！$]$ | I！d | Lz00 | t＋00 | St00 |
| mo | H！d | Lzoo | t＋00 | ＋00 |
| II！${ }^{\text {d }}$ | H！${ }_{\text {d }}$ | 9700 | てt00 | Et00 |
| mb | ${ }^{1!} \mathrm{d}$ | 9700 | 2t00 | てャ00 |
| II！${ }^{\text {d }}$ | ${ }^{1+\mathrm{d}}$ | 9700 | $0 \downarrow 00$ | It00 |
| mo | ${ }^{\text {H／d }}$ | 9700 | $0 \downarrow 00$ | 0t00 |
| II！${ }^{\text {d }}$ | H！${ }_{\text {d }}$ | 6200 | 8800 | $6 \varepsilon 00$ |
| mo | H！d | 6700 | $8 \varepsilon 00$ | 8 £00 |
| II！${ }^{\text {a }}$ | H！d | $\begin{aligned} & \angle Z 00 \\ & 9 Z 00 \end{aligned}$ | 9 ¢00 | LE00 |
| mo | ${ }^{1+1}$ d |  | $9 \varepsilon 00$ | $9 \varepsilon 00$ |
| II！${ }^{\text {d }}$ | H！d | ¢z00 |  |  |
| mo | H！d | sz00 | † 100 | †E00 |
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