ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION & MONITORING REPORT

WALK FARM, LEVINGTON (SMR Ref. TYN 074)

A REPORT ON AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF THE SITE OF A PROPOSED RESERVOIR AT WALK FARM, LEVINGTON, INCLUDING DETAILS OF POST-EVALUATION MONITORING



Partially excavated cremation urn 0010 in cut 0016

M. Sommers ©November 2006

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Field Projects Team Lucy Robinson, County Director of Environment and Transport Endeavour House, Russell Road, Ipswich. IP1 2BX.

> SCCAS REPORT No. 2004/151 Oasis ref. Suffolkc1 – 4413

Contents

Su	mmary	1
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Methodology	2
3.	Results	
	3.1 Evaluation	3
	3.2 Monitoring	3
	Methodology	4
	Results	4
4.	Finds and Environmental Evidence	
	4.1 Finds (C. Tester)	6
	4.2 The cremation burials (S. Anderson)	7
	4.3 Plant macrofossils (V. Fryer)	9
	4.4 Discussion of the finds and environmental evidence (C. Tester)	10
5.	Discussion	10
6.	Bibliography	11

List	of Figures	
T .	1 O' T	

Figure 1: Site Location Plan	1
Figure 2: Evaluation Results	3
Figure 3: Monitoring Results	4
Figure 4: 2 nd Edition Ordnance Survey c. 1900	12

List of Tables

Table 1: Percentages of identified fragments out of total identified to area of skeleton	8
Table 2: Plant macrofossils and other remains	9

List of Plates

Partially excavated cremation urn 0010 in cut 0016	frontcover
Plate I: Continuation of Ditch 0004	5
Plate II: Cremation Burial 0016	5
Plate III: Cremation Burial 0016 – half sectioned	6

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION AND MONITORING REPORT WALK FARM, LEVINGTON

SMR Ref. TYN 074 Application No. PN/04/1725

Summary: An archaeological evaluation was undertaken during October 2004 in order to determine the extent of surviving buried archaeology within the site of a proposed reservoir at Walk Farm, Levington (NGR ref. TM 2542 3990). Four linear trenches were machine excavated to the depth of the natural subsoil and within these three undated ditches were identified. This event is recorded on the County SMR under the existing reference no. TYN 074. The site lies adjacent to an earlier reservoir, the construction of which also revealed a small number of ditches (SCCAS Report No. 2000/28) that are presumably associated. The topsoil strip for the reservoir was then monitored and three cremation burials, one of which was in a Late 1st/Early 2nd century Roman pot, as well as four undated pits were recorded. The evaluation and subsequent monitoring was undertaken by the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service who were commissioned by Prime Irrigation Limited on behalf of Mayhew Farms Limited, who funded the work

1. Introduction

The construction of a further reservoir at Walk Farm, Levington, has been proposed (application no. PN/04/1725). The National Grid Reference for the approximate centre of the site is TM 2542 3990. For a location plan see figure 1 below.



Figure 1: Site Location Plan (including SMR data) © Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Suffolk County Council. Licence No.100023395 2004

SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE

The application was approved conditional upon an agreed programme of archaeological work taking place before development begins (PPG 16, paragraph 30 condition). The site lies within an area of cropmarks interpreted as one or more field systems and thought to be prehistoric in date that are recorded on the County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) under the reference TYN 030. Further interest is generated by a series of probable Bronze Age round barrows which lie *c*. 600m to the northwest (SMR refs. LVT 004-8). The proposed site lies adjacent to two existing reservoirs built in recent years. Construction of the second reservoir, which lies immediately to the southeast, was also the subject of an archaeological condition. This initially comprised an evaluation to assess the level of archaeology present and was followed by archaeological monitoring in April 2000. It revealed a small number of ditches one of which contained a number of Bronze Age pottery sherds (allocated the SMR reference TYN 074). As part of this evaluation a trench was also excavated across the future site of a reservoir (the subject of this report) which indicated the ditches continued to the northwest (see SCCAS Report 2000/28).

Based on these previous results an archaeological monitoring condition was placed upon the construction of this new reservoir although the client, Prime Irrigation Limited, requested that an archaeological evaluation be undertaken in order to mitigate against the monitoring condition and for this, a Brief and Specification was produced by the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Conservation Team (see Appendix I). It was hoped that if the evaluation revealed only very low levels of archaeology that the monitoring condition could be reduced or lifted entirely. This was partially successful as, based on the result of the evaluation detailed below, it was agreed with the Conservation Team that the monitoring could be reduced to a single visit, to be made after the main topsoil strip although unfortunately discoveries on the ground resulted in a need to make further visits.

The archaeological work was commissioned and funded by Prime Irrigation Limited. The work was undertaken by the Field Projects Team of the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service and was carried out during October 2004. The evaluation archive is lodged with the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service at its Bury St. Edmunds office under the existing Sites and Monuments Record reference, TYN 074, which was originally allocated to the evaluation and monitoring of the reservoir constructed in 2000.

2. Methodology (Evaluation)

The trial trenches were machine excavated down to the level of the natural subsoil using a 360° tracked excavator fitted with a *c*.1.8m wide, toothless, ditching bucket. Through careful controlled use this left a clean freshly cut surface on the trench base. The machining was closely observed throughout in order to recover artefacts that may be in the topsoil.

The freshly exposed natural subsoil surface was thoroughly examined for archaeological features and a surface plan of any features noted was constructed. Context numbers were issued to each feature starting from 0002, 0001 being reserved for unstratified finds from the site. Sample sections were excavated through the features to assess their depth and in order to recover datable material. These sections

were then drawn and photographed. Following this, the trench locations were plotted and the subsoil depths recorded.

3. Results

See Appendix II for a full list of context numbers allocated during the evaluation and monitoring phases of investigation.

3.1 Evaluation

Four trenches in total were excavated and a small number of features were recorded and these are described below. Figure 2 illustrates the location of the trenches and the features within. The natural subsoil comprised an orange-yellow sand which in places also contained a fair proportion of silt. It was encountered at a depth of c.0.3 to 0.35m.

Trench 1: This trench was 43m in length. A single ditch aligned east-west and numbered [0002] was excavated at the northeast end of the trench. It measured 1.10m wide and cut the natural subsoil to a depth of 0.32m. The fill comprised mid brown silty sand. No finds were recovered.

Trench 2: This trench was 158m in length. Two features were revealed within this trench. At the northeast end of the trench a ditch, aligned northnortheast-southsouthwest and numbered [0004] was excavated. It measured 0.65m wide and cut the natural subsoil to a depth of 0.22m. The fill comprised mid to dark brown silty sand. No finds were recovered. Situated 96m to the southwest a second feature, [0006], was encountered. It measured c.2m in width and cut the natural subsoil to a depth of 0.22m. It has been interpreted as a ditch although its shape was slightly irregular. It was aligned northwest-southeast and its fill comprised mid brown silty sand. No finds were recovered from the fill.





Trench 3: This trench measured 83m in length and revealed one ditch feature, [0008]. This feature was situated *c*.15m to the north of ditch [0006] in trench 2 and lay on the same alignment. The dimensions and fill were similar and it is likely that [0006] and [0008] are parts of the same feature.

Trench 4: This trench measured 42.5m in length. Only one feature was recorded, which was obviously a continuation of ditch [0004] seen in trench 2.

3.2 Monitoring

The evaluation results were discussed with the Suffolk County Council Conservation Team and it was agreed that archaeological monitoring of the topsoil strip associated with the construction of the reservoir would be adequate to record the expected lowlevel of archaeological remains.

Methodology

The topsoil strip followed on almost immediately from the evaluation and was carried out using a box scraper hauled by a bulldozer. This created a relatively clean surface although either side of the strip was then disturbed by the passing of the rear wheels of the scraper (this effect can be seen in Plate I).

The archaeological monitoring was undertaken through occasional visits to examine any newly stripped areas for archaeological features. Any features noted would be sampled by hand excavation. The resultant section would be recorded at 1:20, any finds would be retained for further analysis and the feature's location would be recorded with a handheld global positioning device.

Results

As well as enabling the tracing of two of the ditches noted in the evaluation a further seven features were recorded. also These comprised four undated pits and three cremation burials, of which one was urned. These features are described below; see figure 3 for a plan of all features recorded during the evaluation and monitoring phases of the work.

Ditch 0004 noted during the evaluation could be clearly seen to continue in both directions from where it was recorded in evaluation trenches 2 and 4 (see Plate I). Comparison with the results from the 2000 monitoring indicate this ditch also ran across the site of the adjacent reservoir.

Ditch **0006/8** could also be seen to continue to the northwest and southeast and



Figure 3: Monitoring Results including features recorded during evaluation and previous monitoring © Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Suffolk County Council. Licence No.100023395 2006

it too aligned with a ditch noted during the 2000 monitoring.



Plate I: Continuation of Ditch 0004 in a roughly northern direction

Cuts **0012**, **0013**, **0014** and **0015** were shallow pits roughly circular in plan with diameters of c. 0.6m, 0.4m, 1.2m and 0.7m respectively. All had depths of only 0.05m except 0014 which was 0.1m deep. The fills comprised charcoal rich silty sands from which no finds were recovered.

Cut 0016 was roughly square (measuring 0.44m by 0.47m) with slightly rounded corners. Upon cleaning off the top of the charcoal rich sand fill the circular rim of a truncated pottery vessel could be clearly seen (Plate II). The fill, numbered 0011, was half sectioned to reveal that the cut, which was 0.18m deep, did indeed contain the lower portion of a vessel



Plate II: Cremation Burial 0016 - surface

(numbered 0010 - Plate III). This feature was interpreted as a cremation burial and the vessel and its contents were lifted whole for further analysis; See section 4. 'Finds'

below for results. No bone fragments were noted in the fill and consequently a sample was not retained.

Cut 0017 was situated c. 9m to the south. It was roughly circular in shape with a diameter of 0.3m and 0.12m deep. The fill (0018) comprised black sand containing charcoal and fragments small of burnt bone. This was as interpreted а possible cremation burial and consequently a 100% sample of the fill was retained.

Cut 0020 was situated



Plate III: Cremation Burial 0016- half sectioned

c. 22m to the southwest of the cremation burial 0016. It was roughly rectangular measuring 1m by 0.5m but was very shallow having a depth of only 0.05m. The fill (0021) comprised black sand with charcoal. The machine driver had a collected a bag of black charcoally sand containing fragments of burnt bone which he stated had originated from this cut which he had noted on an earlier pass with the box scraper. Fearing it would be lost completely he had collected this sample (numbered 0019) before continuing with the stripping.

Cut **0002**, which was noted and interpreted as a ditch during the trenched evaluation, was not seen during the monitoring of the topsoil strip suggesting the initial interpretation may have been wrong and that it was in fact an elongated pit.

4. Finds and environmental evidence

Cathy Tester, with contributions by Sue Anderson and Val Fryer

4.1 Finds

Introduction

Three cremation burials, one urned and two un-urned of probable Roman date were excavated during the monitoring. The burials produced cremated human bone, charred plant macrofossils and other environmental evidence as well as the pottery container of the urned cremation.

The cremation vessel

Within cut 0016 a cremation was contained in a sandy greyware jar (numbered 0010) which is Roman but not certainly identifiable or datable because approximately the top third or more of the vessel has been truncated, possibly by 20th century ploughing. The vessel is large with a surviving height of about 210mm, a maximum girth of 265mm and a base diameter of 100mm. It is unburnished, with a single

incised groove at about 'mid body' suggesting that it may belong to wide necked jar type 5.4 in the Pakenham Type series which has this characteristic feature and dates to the late 1st or 2nd century. Alternately, it may be the lower part of a globular narrow-necked jar. Both forms are common domestic jar forms that were often used as cremation urns.

Four irregularly-spaced holes were neatly drilled through the basal exterior and three more were drilled through the vessel wall at about 40mm above the basal floor in approximately the '12, 3 and 6 o'clock' positions. The function of these holes may be ritual but the fact that they are so neat and deliberate suggests that they may be practical, to do perhaps with its use as a cremation urn or possibly its previous use as a strainer.

The practice of drilling holes through the bases of cremation vessels is well documented (Going 1988, Gurney 1998) and the procedure is known as 'ritual killing,,' but is also well-known in non-ritual contexts. More broadly, the practice of drilling holes through the bases of coarseware jars for use as strainers was widespread during the late Iron Age and Roman periods and vessels that have been modified in this way are present in many assemblages.

4.2 The cremation burials

Sue Anderson

Introduction

This report examines the cremated bone collected from three contexts during monitoring. One group (0019) was hand-collected by the machine driver and is believed to originate from cut 0020, one is from a Roman pot (0010 in cut 0016) and the third is from a small pit (0018 in cut 0017).

Methodology

Contexts 0010 and 0018 were collected as bulk samples and sieved, the contents being divided into <5mm and >5mm fractions. Context 0019 was washed. In addition to the cremated bone, the <5mm samples contained pea grit, charcoal fragments and shell, so the bone was hand separated from this residue for weighing.

The bone from each context was sorted into six categories: skull, axial, upper limb, lower limb, unidentified long bone, and unidentified. All fragments in the first five categories were counted and weighed to the nearest tenth of a gram, those in the sixth were weighed only. This allowed an average fragment weight to be calculated. Measurements of maximum skull and long bone fragment sizes were also recorded. These data are listed in Appendix III. Observations were made, where possible, concerning bone colour, age, sex, dental remains and pathology. Identifiable fragments were noted. Methods used follow the Workshop of European Anthropologists (WEA 1980) and McKinley (1994 and 2004). A catalogue of burials is included as Appendix IV.

Quantification, identification, collection and survival

Table 1 shows the bone weights, percentages of identified bone from each burial, and the proportions of bone identified from the four areas of the skeleton (skull, axial, upper limb, lower limb). Expected proportions are provided in the first row.

Context	Total wt/g	% identified	% Skull	% Axial	% U limb	% L limb
Expected*			18.2	20.6	23.1	38.1
0010	199.4	19.2	35.5	-	10.2	54.3
0018	28.7	35.9	100	-	-	-
0019	34.7	75.2	56.3	-	10.7	33.0
Total	262.8	28.4	51.7	-	9.0	39.4

Table 1. Percentages of identified fragments out of total identified to area of skeleton.(*expected proportions from McKinley 1994, 6)

This shows that skull fragments are over-represented amongst the identifiable material, and that other areas of the skeleton are under-represented. It has been suggested that 'it should be possible to recognise any bias in the collection of certain areas of the body after cremation' (McKinley 1994, 6). However there is also some bias inherent in the identification of elements. McKinley notes the ease with which even tiny fragments of skull can be recognised, and conversely the difficulty of identifying long bone fragments. These figures can therefore provide only a rough guide to what was originally collected.

Mays (1998, Table 11.2) notes that the combusted weight of an adult skeleton has a mean of around 1500g for females and 2300g for males. The largest quantity of bone in this assemblage came from context 0010, but it represents only a very small proportion of the combusted weight of an average adult skeleton.

The cremation burials

The three groups all consisted of fragments of skull and long bones of adults, but all three were unsexable and there was no evidence to provide a closer estimate of age. No joint surfaces or margins were present and this, together with the lack of any axial fragments, meant that it was not possible to assess the remains for degenerative changes. No duplication was observed amongst the fragments from each context, and it is possible that the three groups contained the remains of a single individual. The homogenous appearance and size of the bones seem to corroborate this.

The degree of fragmentation, based on average fragment weight, was quite high. The largest fragment, made up from two pieces of tibia in 0019, was 47mm long. All fragments had a chalky texture and showed signs of abrasion.

The majority of bone in this group was fully oxidised and cream to white in colour. The presence of a high proportion of white bone indicates firing temperatures in excess of c.600°C (McKinley 2004, 11). Mays (1999, 159) noted that the uniformity of colour in the surviving bone at Ardleigh in Essex may be due to poor survival of less well cremated bone. The complete lack of any axial skeleton, which tends to be very friable and more susceptible to erosion, suggests that this was probably the case here.

Summary and Discussion

The three groups of bone represent a minimum of one and a maximum of three individuals. There was no evidence for more than one skeleton within any of the groups, and the lack of duplication and similar appearance of the skull fragments suggests they may represent a single individual.

The total weight of bone indicates that the entire skeleton was not present in the burial(s). This may be due to incomplete collection, poor preservation of incompletely cremated material following burial, or possibly retention of some fragments as a *momento mori*. It has been suggested that fragments were sometimes kept back for burial with another family member, and that this is one reason for the appearance of a few fragments of additional individuals in some cremation burials. No evidence of such a practice was found here, however.

Cremations of Roman date are commonly found to be less intact and more crushed than those of the Bronze Age, and this has been attributed to the use of professional 'crematoria'. However, this is more likely to be the case in urban centres, and these burials seem more likely to be so incomplete as a result of poor preservation.

4.3 Plant macrofossils

Val Fryer

Introduction

Samples for the extraction of the plant macrofossil assemblages were taken from both cremation deposits and five were submitted for assessment. The results are listed in Table 3.

OP Number	0010	0010	0018	0019	0021
	Тор	Bottom			
Feature No.	0016	0016	0017	0020	0020
Feature type	Crem.	Crem.	Crem.	?Crem.	?Crem.
Plant macrofossils					
Arrhenatherum sp. (tuber)	xcf	xcf			
Quercus sp. (cupule frags.)	Х				
Charcoal <2mm	XXX	XXX	XXX	Х	XXX
Charcoal >2mm	XXX	XXX	Х		XXX
Charred root/stem	Х	x	Х		
Indet.bud			Х		
Indet.tuber		х			
Other materials					
Black porous 'cokey' material	х		Х		
Black tarry material	Х		Х		
Bone			xb	xb	
Charred arthropod			Х		
Marine mollusc shell			Х		
Small coal frags.			Х		
Vitrified material			Х		
Sample volume (litres)	8	8	8	0.5	8
Volume of flot (litres)	0.4	0.3	0.1	<0.1	0.9
% flot sorted	25%	50%	100%	100%	<12.5%

Table 3. Plant macrofossils and other remains

(Key to Table: x = 1-10 specimens, xxx = 100+ specimens, b =burnt)

Method Statement

The samples were processed by manual water flotation/washover, and the flots were collected in a 500 micron mesh sieve. The dried flots were scanned under a binocular microscope at magnifications up to x 16, and the plant macrofossils and other remains noted are listed on Table 3. Nomenclature within the table follows Stace (1997). All plant macrofossils were charred. The non-floating residues were collected in a 1mm mesh sieve and sorted when dry. All artefacts/ecofacts were retained for further specialist analysis.

Results

Plant macrofossils

With the exception of charcoal fragments, plant macrofossils were very rare. Possible fragmentary onion-couch (*Arrhenatherum* sp.) tubers and pieces of oak (*Quercus* sp.) cupule were recorded from fills within vessel 0010, along with other indeterminate root and tuber fragments. An indeterminate bud was recorded from cut 0017.

Other materials

The fragments of black porous and tarry material noted within vessel 0010 and cut 0017 are commonly seen in cremation deposits and are probable residues of the combustion of organic materials (including fuel/flesh) at very high temperatures. With the exception of small burnt bone fragments, the only other materials noted were from cut 0017, and at present it is not clear whether these may be intrusive within the context.

Conclusions

In summary, wood/charcoal would appear to have been the main fuel used for these cremations, although dried plant material, some of which had been uprooted, may have been used as kindling for the pyres. Parallels for this practice are commonly seen

4.4 Discussion of the finds and environmental evidence

Three groups of cremated bone collected from two excavated contexts and one uncertain context probably represent two individual burials and the main element of the plant macrofossil assemblage extracted from them is wood/charcoal used as fuel for the cremations.

One of the cremations was contained in a large Roman jar and although the vessel is not closely datable due to truncation of its top half by ploughing, its surviving lower half exhibits evidence of a practice of deliberate perforation, whether for ritual or utilitarian reasons, that was widespread during the LIA and Roman period.

5. Discussion

The linear features identified are undoubtedly ditches forming part of a much wider system of fields that is possibly associated with the cropmarks (SMR ref. TYN 030). Two of the ditches, [0004] and [0006], are on similar alignments to ditches identified during the evaluation and monitoring of the adjacent reservoir and are undoubtably continuations of the same ditches. No datable artefacts were recovered from any of the features identified but as the area was former heathland it is unlikely to have been

divided into smaller fields during the medieval or post-medieval periods (figure 4) and we can therefore assume that the ditches are much earlier, probably dating back to the prehistoric period. There is evidence in the locality for activity in the Bronze Age period in the form of a group of burial mounds (SMR refs. LVT 004 to 008), *c*.650m to the northwest and the pottery finds recovered during work on the previously constructed reservoir.

Three separate cremation deposits were recorded during the monitoring which are undoubtedly the related to the deliberate disposal of the dead by cremation on a pyre. It is theorised in the finds and environmental evidence discussion (section 4.4) that the remains may represent less than three individuals although this is unlikely considering they are deposited between 9.5m and 28m apart (a fact that was unfortunately not passed to the human remains specialist). The burials are presumably associated with a nearby but as yet undiscovered Roman settlement or small farm.

One of the three cremations was contained in a vessel that has been dated to the early Roman period and it is likely the two other cremation burials are of a similar date. Cremation burial was practised at this time before falling out fashion in the later Roman period. All three appear to respect ditch 0004. This could be coincidence, although burials respecting a hard boundary, such as a ditch, is common practice in the Roman period. Therefore it is possible that this ditch, and possibly the others, are also Roman in date.

6. Bibliography

Going, C. J., 1988 Excavations at Great Dunmow, Essex. EAA 41

Gurney, D., 1998 Roman Burials in Norfolk. EAA Occ. Paper No.4

- Martin, T.S., 1996 "A group of finds from the vicinity of the Noah's Ark Roman villa at Brightlingsea, Essex", *Essex Archaeol. Hist* **27**, 311-319.
- Mays, S.A., 1998, The Archaeology of Human Bones. Routledge, London.
- Mays, S.A., 1999, 'Cremated bone from CEU excavations, and unpublished bone from earlier work', in Brown, N.R., *The Archaeology of Ardleigh, Essex: Excavations* 1955-1980. E. Anglian Archaeol. 90. Heritage Conservation, Essex County Council.
- McKinley, J.I., 1994, *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Spong Hill, North Elmham Part VIII: the cremations.* E. Anglian Archaeol. 69. Field Archaeology Division, Norfolk Museums Service.
- Stace, C., 1997, New Flora of the British Isles. Second edition. Cambridge

21st November 2006



Figure 4: 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey (extract), c.1900 Illustrating the fact that the area was not divided into small fields but was open sheepwalks. This is unchanged from the 1st Edition of c.1880. Proposed reservoir outlined in red

APPENDIX I

SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE - CONSERVATION TEAM

Brief and Specification for an Archaeological Evaluation

Reservoir adjacent Walk Farm, Trimley St Martin

1. Background

- 1.1 An application [PN/04/1725] has been made to construct an agricultural irrigation reservoir
- 1.2 The Planning Authority has been advised that any consent should be 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 reservoir area has been the subject of some systematic archaeological survey associated with earlier reservoirs to the south east, see SCCAS report 2000/28. There is evidence of Early Bronze Age occupation The scale of the intended works is very large with extensive reduction of levels and will result in the total removal of any archaeological deposit which exists.

The mitigation strategy is to identify archaeological sites by trenched evaluation identified in this brief (using a lower sample area than usual but allowing some flexibility to increase trench frequency should archaeological deposit be identified). Experience with the earlier reservoir suggests that controlled soil stripping by the main contractor coupled with archaeological recording is not practical because of the method of working.

- 1.4 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.
- 1.5 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.

2. Brief for the Archaeological Evaluation

- 2.1 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.
- 2.2 Evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.

- 2.3 Provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of cost.
- 2.4 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.
- 2.5 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.
- 2.6 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 3% by area of the entire site and shall be positioned to sample all parts of the site. A contingency to increase the evaluation sample to 5% shall be allowed, conditional upon demonstrated archaeological discovery and agreed on site with the Archaeological Conservation Team.
- 3.2 The topsoil may be mechanically removed using an appropriate machine fitted with toothless bucket and other equipment. 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 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 P Murphy, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling archaeological deposits (Murphy and Wiltshire 1994) is available.
- 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 All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed with the Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service during the course of the evaluation).

- 3.9 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.
- 3.10 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. Any variations from this must be agreed with the Conservation Team.
- 3.11 A photographic record of the work is to be made, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies.
- 3.12 Topsoil, subsoil and archaeological deposit to be kept separate during excavation to allow sequential backfilling of excavations.

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 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.
- 4.4 No initial survey to detect public utility or other services has taken place. The responsibility for this rests with the archaeological contractor.
- 4.5 The Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessments* and for *Field Evaluations* 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 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.
- 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. 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.
- 5.9 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 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.

Specification by: R D Carr

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

Tel: 01284 352441

Date: 11 10 2004

Reference: /Walk Farm TYN 2004

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.

APPENDIX II

WALK FARM, LEVINGTON (SMR ref. TYN 074) EVALUATION AND MONITORING OCTOBER 2004

CONTEXT LIST

<u>Context</u>	Feature	Identifier	Trench	Description
0001		U/S finds		Allocated for unstratified finds but none recovered.
0002	0002	Ditch Cut	1	Linear feature cut interpreted as a ditch, $c.1.1$ m wide and 0.3 m deep. Aligned approximately E-W.
0003	0002	Ditch Fill	1	Fill of cut 0002 comprising mid brown silty sand.
0004	0004	Ditch Cut	2 & 4	Linear feature cut interpreted as a ditch, $c.0.65$ m wide and 0.2 m deep. Aligned approximately N-S. Seen again in trench 4 but not separately numbered. Visible length quickly excavated to obtain dating evidence but none found. Section similar to that recorded in Trench 2.
0005	0004	Ditch Fill	2 & 4	Fill of cut 0004 comprising mid brown silty sand.
0006	0006	Ditch Cut	2	Linear feature cut interpreted as a ditch, <i>c</i> .0.8m wide and 0.23m deep. Aligned approximately NW-SE. Appears to widen towards the SE. Aligns with cut 0008 in trench 3, likely to be parts of the same feature although profiles differ slightly.
0007	0006	Ditch Fill	2	Fill of cut 0006 comprising mid brown silty sand.
0008	0008	Ditch Cut	3	Linear feature cut interpreted as a ditch, <i>c</i> .1m wide and 0.4m deep. Aligned approximately NW-SE. Aligns with cut 0006 in trench 2, likely to be parts of the same feature although profiles differ slightly.
0009	0008	Ditch Fill	3	Fill of cut 0008 comprising mid brown silty sand.
0010	0016	Cremation Burial	mon.	Near complete pottery vessel believed to contain cremation burial. From within cut 0016. Pot and fill recovered intact, to be excavated/analysed by the finds team.
0011	0016	Cremation Fill	mon.	Fill of cut 0016 around pottery vessel. Comprises black silty sand with a large amount of charcoal.
0012	0012	Pit	mon	Small shallow feature cut interpreted as a pit. Roughly circular in plan with a diameter of $c.0.6m$. Quickly excavated and found to be only 0.1m deep. Fill (not numbered separately) comprised of a charcoal rich silty sand. No finds recovered.
0013	0013	Pit	mon.	Small shallow feature cut interpreted as a pit. Roughly circular in plan with a diameter of $c.0.4m$. Quickly excavated and found to be only 0.05m deep. Fill (not numbered separately) comprised of a charcoal rich silty sand. No finds recovered.
0014	0014	Pit	mon.	Small shallow feature cut interpreted as a pit. Roughly circular in

				plan with a diameter of $c.1.2m$. Quickly excavated and found to be only 0.1m deep. Fill (not numbered separately) comprised of a dark silty loam with frequent charcoal flecks and frags.
0015	0015	Pit	mon.	Small shallow feature cut interpreted as a pit. Roughly circular in plan with a diameter of $c.0.7$ m. Quickly excavated and found to be only 0.05m deep with a 0.1m deep, 0.2m diameter section at the centre although this may be an animal disturbance. Fill (not numbered separately) comprised of a dark silty loam with frequent charcoal flecks and frags.
0016	0016	Cremation Cut	mon.	Rectangular shaped feature cut but with slightly rounded corners. Measures 0.50m by 0.46m and cuts the natural to a depth of 0.18m. Virtually sheer sides for a depth of $c.0.14m$ before curving in to form a flattish base which dips slightly towards the centre. Contains pottery vessel with ?cremation burial (0010).
0017	0017	Cremation	mon.	Small circular feature cut, 0.3m in diameter and 0.12m deep.
0018	0017	Cremation Fill	mon.	Fill of cut 0017. Comprises of black silty sand with much charcoal and small fragments of burnt bone. 100% bulk sample retained.
0019	0020	Finds	mon.	Bag of what appears to be burnt bone. Collected by the machine driver from a charcoal rich feature (0020).
0020	0020	Cremation Cut(?)	mon.	Rectangular feature cut measuring 1m by 0.5m but only 0.05m deep.
0021	0020	Cremation Fill(?)	mon.	Fill of cut 0020 comprising black silty sand with much charcoal. Stated to be the source of burnt bone (0019) and approximately one third had been disturbed. Remainder excavated but no further fragments of burnt bone seen.

Feature	Fill	Frac		Skull			Axial		5	oper lin	ę	Ľ	wer lim	م	Unide.	nt long	роне	Unident	Totals	max skull	max l.b.
			No.	WAYS AV	ve. wt	No.	VVV/g	Ave. wt	No.	WW/B	Ave. wt	No.	WAVG A	Ave. wt	No.	VVV/g 1	Ave. wt	WA/g	VVV/g	(mm)	(mm)
0016	0010T	<5mm	13	1.6	0.1													95.5	1.79		
		>5mm	3	8.6	0.3				7	3.9	9.0	27	19.9	0.7	170	47.6	0.3	1.7	81.7	20	31
	0010B	<5mm	16	6.0	0.1							m	6.0	0.3				11.8	13.6		
		>5mm	ο,	2.5	0.3										16	4.5	0.3		7.0	14	18
Totals			69	13.6	0.2				٢	39	970	30	20.8	0.7	186	52.1	03	109.0	1994		
0017	0018	Smm	3	2.5	0.1													14.1	16.6		
		>5mm	5	7.8	0.5										4	1.7	0.4	2.6	12.1	18	17
Totals			50	103	0.2										4	1.7	0.4	16.7	28.7		
0019	00207	>5mm	73	14.7	0.6				9	2.8	0.9	7	8.6	1.2	20	6.8	0.3	1.8	34.7	28	47
Total if	I=INIW.		142	38.6	03				10	6.7	0.7	37	29.4	0.8	210	909	03	1275	2628		

Cremated bone quantification and measurements

Note: 0010T = top fill; 0010B = bottom fill

APPENDIX III

Report No. 2004/151

APPENDIX IV

Cremated bone catalogue

Cremation burial 0010 (feature 0016): unsexed adult

Quantification:	Total weight 199.4g: Skull 69 (13.6g), axial 0 (0g), upper limb 7 (3.9g), lower
	limb 30 (20.8g), unidentified long bone 186 (52.1g), unidentified (109.0g).
Description:	Urned, excavated in two halves (top and bottom)
Condition:	Fair, a few medium-sized fragments, abraded.
Determination of age:	Skull thickness.
Determination of sex:	No evidence.
Identified elements:	Fragments of humerus, femur, tibia and fibula.
Measurements:	Max skull frag size 20mm, max long bone frag size 31mm.
Colours:	White, a few blue-grey pieces.
Teeth:	None.
Pathology:	Nothing observed.

Cremation burial 0018 (feature 0017): unsexed adult

Quantification:	Total weight 28.7g: Skull 50 (10.3g), axial 0 (0g), upper limb 0 (0g), lower
	limb 0 (0g), unidentified long bone 4 (1.7g), unidentified (16.7g).
Description:	Unurned, small pit.
Condition:	Fair, a few medium-sized fragments, abraded.
Determination of age:	Skull thickness.
Determination of sex:	No evidence.
Identified elements:	
Measurements:	Max skull frag size 18mm, max long bone frag size 17mm.
Colours:	Mostly white.
Teeth:	None
Pathology:	Nothing observed.

Cremation burial 0019 (feature 0020?): unsexed adult

Total weight 34.7g: Skull 23 (14.7g), axial 0 (0g), upper limb 3 (2.8g), lower
limb 7 (8.6g), unidentified long bone 20 (6.8g), unidentified (1.8g).
Collected by digger driver, location uncertain.
Fair, a few medium-sized fragments, abraded.
Skull thickness.
No evidence.
Occipital, humerus, femur, tibia.
Max skull frag size 28mm, max long bone frag size 47mm.
Mostly white.
None
Nothing observed.