ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT



A REPORT ON THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION, 2004 (Planning app. no. F/2003/726/CR3)

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

John Craven Field Team Suffolk C.C. Archaeological Service

© December 2004

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. 2004/171



Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service





Contents

List of Figures List of Contributors Acknowledgements Summary SMR information

Introduction Methodology Results Finds and environmental evidence Discussion Recommendations

References

Appendix 1: Brief and specification Appendix 2: Trench list Appendix 3: Context list

List of Figures

- 1. Site location plan
- 2. Features plan
- 3. Sections







Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

List of Contributors

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

Gemma Adams

Acknowledgements

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service This project was funded by Allen Newport Ltd and was monitored by Edward Martin (Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Conservation Team).

The excavation was carried out by a number of archaeological staff, (John Craven, James Rolfe and Jonathan Van Jennians) all from Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Field Team.

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

Finds processing and production of site illustrations was carried out by Gemma Adams, the Pological Serv specialist finds report by Cathy Tester.

Summary

Stolk County An evaluation was carried out in advance of development on land within Marston's Pit, Cavenham Heath Quarry. The evaluation consisted of seventeen trenches with a total length of 356.5m, or 5.65% of the total area of 1.01ha.

The trenches showed a high level of preservation of the subsoil, and the presence of a buried soil layer above it, beneath a thick topsoil and modern deposits. One large area of disturbance may be associated with the sites former use as part of Tuddenham airfield. Only a few scattered features were identified, a north-south aligned ditch, two small pits and a possible second ditch. These are thought to be of prehistoric date, despite a lack of dating evidence, but did not indicate any real phase or focus of activity.

SMR information

Planning application no.	F/2003/726/CR3
Date of fieldwork:	8 th -10 th November 2004
Grid Reference:	TL 7634 7157
Oasis Reference:	suffolkc1-4506
Funding body:	Allen Newport Ltd

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council

Introduction

An archaeological evaluation was carried out in advance of further quarrying development within Marston's pit, Cavenham Heath Quarry, Cavenham. The work was carried out to a Brief and Specification issued by Edward Martin (Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Conservation Team – Appendix 1) to fulfil a planning condition on application F/2003/726/CR3. This was in order to assess the archaeological potential of the development area, and to establish any possible archaeological implications for the sites development. The work was funded by the developer, Allen Newport Ltd

The site (Fig. 1) is located at TL 7634 7157 and lies 350m to the west of a linear earthwork called The Black Ditches, a scheduled ancient monument (Suffolk 18) recorded on the County SMR as CAM 001. Previous archaeological work within the quarry had located evidence of prehistoric activity (CAM 040, Gill 1998) and so the site had potential for locating further prehistoric evidence.

The site also lies within the area of Tuddenham airfield, an RAF base in use from 1943-1946. An aerial photograph of 1945 shows the layout of the airfield (Gill 1998) and it is apparent that the site lies to the north of the former runway and immediately to the west of a network of anti-glider trenches.

The 'island' covers an area of c.1.8ha and is the last surviving part of the original landscape within this part of the quarry, now standing above the reduced quarry ground levels and the surrounding modern lake. The island was level ground and covered by a plantation of deciduous and coniferous trees, planted c.20-40 years ago. In many areas there were indications of modern levelling and build up of the ground levels, before the planting of the trees. The underlying natural subsoil was a mix of yellow and orange sands with scattered deposits of gravel.

Methodology

The actual area evaluated was 1.01ha in size, this reduction, from 1.8ha, was mainly due to the fact that large parts of the 'island' were heavily truncated slopes leading down to the surrounding modern lake. Additionally trenches could not be placed too near to these slopes for safety reasons. This adjustment was agreed with the planning conservation team officer, Edward Martin.

The trenches were excavated by a mechanical excavator with a 1.6m ditching bucket, under the supervision of an archaeologist. A total of seventeen trenches was excavated with a total length of 356.5m, or 570.4sqm. This amounted to just over 5.65% of the total 1.01ha area.

The trenches were excavated to a depth varying from 0.4m-1m. This generally consisted of the removal of 0.3m-0.7m of topsoil and often a layer, 0.1m-0.3m thick, of a buried soil layer, until the top of the natural subsoil or archaeological features was exposed.

Identified features were then cleaned and excavated by hand; generally 50% of pits and postholes and sections across ditches. A single context continuous numbering system was used and trench soil profiles, feature plans and sections were drawn at a scale of 1:20. The site was planned by a Total Station Theodolite. Digital photographs (included in the digital archive) were taken of all stages of the evaluation.

2.4

Site data has been input onto an MS Access database and recorded using the County Sites and Monuments Record code CAM 043, and inked copies of section drawings and plans have been made, but not the trench soil profiles. Bulk finds were washed, marked and quantified, and the resultant data was also entered onto a database.

An OASIS form has been completed for the project (reference no. suffolkc1-4506).

The site archive is kept in the small and main stores of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service at Bury St Edmunds under SMR No. CAM 043.



Figure 1. Site location plan

Results

The majority of the trenches (Appendix 2) showed a consistent soil profile with areas of modern material overlying a 0.3m deep topsoil. This overlaid a buried soil layer of mixed and mottled sands, varying in thickness but seen across the site. The isolated features that were identified lay beneath this layer.

One main area of modern disturbance, over 1.5m deep and backfilled with modern clean, graded sand, was identified in trenches 04-06. With the other areas of modern deposits on the surface this shows that the site had seen some workings and had been artificially levelled prior to the tree planting. However disturbance in the remaining trenches was limited, and the natural subsoil, and the layer of mixed sands above it, was generally undisturbed.

Most of the trenches were also devoid of any archaeological features (01, 02, 04-06, 08, 10, 12-14, 16 and 17). A small scatter of features (Figs. 2 and 3 and Appendix 3) were identified in the remaining trenches (03, 07, 09, 11 and 15) along with one spot find. A lack of firm dating evidence means these features are unphased although it seems most likely that they are of prehistoric date, particularly as they are sealed below the buried soil layer.

0007 was a small, circular pit, measuring 0.7m wide and 0.25m deep, in trench 03. Its fill (0008) was a dark grey sand with a few burnt flints.

0009 was an isolated find, a flint core, lying on the surface of the natural subsoil in trench 03.

0015 was a ditch, aligned north-south, in trench 09 and is possibly the same feature as 0017. It had a possible double cut or recut, with fairly well defined sides and a concave base. It measured 1.2m wide and 0.35m deep and had a fill, 0016, of mixed dark red/brown sands and light/mid brown sands.

0017 was another ditch, also aligned north-south, in trench 07. It had moderate sloping sides with a flat base, measuring 1.1m wide and 0.2m deep. Its fill, 0018 was a pale brown sand.

0023 was a possible ditch, aligned WSW-ENE, in trench 11. It had irregular sloping sides and a concave base and measured 0.8m wide and 0.4m deep. Its fill, 0024, was a dark grey/black sand.

0028 was a small, circular pit with steep straight sides and a flat base. Its fill, 0029, was a mid/dark grey sand.

Finds and environmental evidence

Cathy Tester, November 2004.

county council ents of burnt of

Finds were collected from two contexts. Pit 0007 (0008) produced five fragments of burnt flint (130g) which appear to be of the classic prehistoric "pot-boiler" type. A multi-platform flint core (0009) with well-struck flakes and blades removed was a surface find. The flint is black with no cortex and light retouching from one platform may have occurred prior to removal of flakes and blades. The piece could be Neolithic or Early Bronze Age, but is most likely Neolithic (C. Pendleton, pers. comm.).





Figure 3. Sections

Discussion

The evaluation has shown that the natural subsoil levels are generally well preserved across the site, with the exception of one major area of disturbance. This disturbance, and the apparent levelling of the site and deposition of other modern material is presumably associated with either the operation or closure of Tuddenham airfield. No features, such as anti-glider trenches, associated with the airfield were located.

The good preservation of the subsoil, and the presence of a buried soil layer above it, mean that it is with a high level of confidence that we can show there is only a very low level of archaeological features on the site, albeit loosely grouped in the central trenches. These features, a north-south ditch, two small pits and a possible second ditch are thought to be of prehistoric date but do not indicate any substantial phase or focus of activity.

Recommendations

While the development of the site will entail the complete removal of the archaeological levels, the evaluation has not located any deposits of sufficient interest to warrant preservation in situ or further excavation. A suitable mitigation strategy may be archaeological monitoring of the development, which could be achieved during the initial stripping of the site, assuming this is st unty council vas P.a. down to the level of the natural subsoil.

References

Jn, Arec Sufformación Gill, D,. 1998. Cavenham Quarry Extension, Areas P46 and C2 North. CAM 040. SCCAS Report No. 98/17.

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 Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council

SUNTY COUNCIL SIGAL SERVICE - CONSERVATION Brief and Specification for an Archaeological Evaluation Evaluation by Trial Trend' THE ISLAND' Brief and Specification for an Archaeological Evaluation Evaluation by Trial Trench 'THE ISLAND', MARSTON'S PIT, CAVENHAM HEATH QUARRY, CAVENHAM

1. Background

- 1.1 An application (F/2003/726/CR3) has been made to extract sand and gravel from the area known as 'the island' (1.8ha) within Marston's Pit.
- 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 development area lies approximately 350m to the west of the linear earthwork called The Black Ditches (Suffolk Sites and Monument Record no. CAM 001, Scheduled Monument no. Suffolk 18). There is also evidence of prehistoric activity in the vicinity. There is therefore a probability that the development will affect archaeological deposits. DI
- 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 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.
- In accordance with the standards and guidance produced by the Institute of Field 1.6 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 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 It is expected that the evaluation will proceed sequentially: the desk-based evaluation will precede the field evaluation (there is a possibility that some aspect of the site's history may indicate limits to the extent of field evaluation required); the results of the desk-based work are to be used to inform the trenching design.
- 2.7 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 and final report 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.
- 2.8 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.
- 2.9 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.

2.10 An outline specification, which defines certain minimum criteria, is set out below.

3. **Specification A: Desk-Based Assessment**

- Consult the County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR), both the computerised 3.1 record and any backup files.
- 3.2 Ascertain whether there are other constraints on the site (e.g. Site of Special Scientific Interest, County Wildlife Site, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Tree Preservation Suffoll Archaeo Order, etc).

Specification B: Field Evaluation

4.rcl

- 4.1 Trial trenches are to be excavated to cover a minimum 5% by area of the entire site and shall be positioned to sample all parts of the site. Linear trenches are thought to be the most appropriate sampling method. Trenches are to be a minimum of 1.8m wide unless special circumstances can be demonstrated. If excavation is mechanised a toothless 'ditching bucket' at least 1.2m wide must be used. The trench design must be approved by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service before field work begins.
- 4.2 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.
- The top of the first archaeological deposit may be cleared by machine, but must then 4.3 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.
- 4.4 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 postholes, should be preserved intact even if fills are sampled.
- 4.5 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 OUT Nic masking deposits must be established across the site.
- 4.6 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.
- 4.7 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.

- 4.8 Metal detector searches must take place at all stages of the excavation by an experienced metal detector.
- All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed 4.9 with the Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service during the course of the evaluation).



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.

- 4.11 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. Any variations from this must be agreed with the Conservation Team.
- 4.12 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 4.13 ical Servic allow sequential backfilling of excavations.

5. **General Management**

- A timetable for all stages of the project must be agreed before the first stage of work 5.1 commences, including monitoring by the Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service.
- 5.2 The composition of the project staff must be detailed and agreed (this is to include any subcontractors).
- 5.3 A general Health and Safety Policy must be provided, with detailed risk assessment and management strategy for this particular site.
- 5.4 No initial survey to detect public utility or other services has taken place. The responsibility for this rests with the archaeological contractor.
- The Institute of Field Archaeologists' Standard and Guidance for Archaeological 5.5 or ad 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.

16,01K C **Report Requirements**

- 6.1 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).
- 6.2 The data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent with, and approved by, the County Sites and Monuments Record.

- 6.3 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 cer assessed and the need for further work is established
- Reports on specific areas of specialist study must include sufficient detail to permit 6.5 assessment of potential for analysis, including tabulation of data by context, and must include non-technical summaries.
- 6.6 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).
- Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with UK Institute of 6.7 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.
- The site archive is to be deposited with the County SMR within three months of the 6.8 completion of fieldwork. It will then become publicly accessible.
- 6.9 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.
- County SMR sheets must be completed, as per the county SMR manual, for all sites 6.10 where archaeological finds and/or features are located.
- 6.11 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.
- All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the SMR. 6.12 Suffolk cer er This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive).

Specification by: Edward Martin

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

Tel: 01284 352442

Date: 6th September 2004

Reference: CavenQuarry.dot

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

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

		Associated OP No's	0004, 0005	0002, 0003	0006-0010				0021, 0022, 0017, 0018	0013, 0014	0011, 0012, 0015, 0016	0019, 0020	0023, 0024, 0028	0025, 0026	0027	0033, 0034	2005-000 Call Se	Page 1 of 2
Suffor	Suffolk	Description	0.3m topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.5m thick, of mid/dark brown/orange/grey sands. Frequent animal/tree disturbance. Natural yellow sand rises slightly to north. Northern 3m totally disturbed.	0.4m of modern sand and topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.3m thick, of dark brown/orange/grey mottled sands. Frequent animal/tree disturbance.	0.3m of topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.5m thick, of dark brown/grey mottled sands. Frequent animal/tree disturbance and large modern pit in centre.	Trench entirely truncated by modern disturbance, at least 1.5m deep.	Trench entirely truncated by modern disturbance seen in trench 04.	Trench entirely truncated by modern disturbance seen in trench 04.	0.3-4m topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.2-3m thick, of dark brown/orange/grey mottled sands.	At NE end, 0.3-4m topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.3m thick, of dark brown/red/grey mottled sands, gradually chaging to yellow natural sand. Gently slopes down to south-west. At SW end 0.4m of modern material, overlaid 0.3m of topsoil. This lay over the 0.3m thick buried soil layer.	At E end, a 0.3m thick layer of modern material overlaid 0.2m of topsoil. This overlaid the buried soil layer, 0.3m thick, of dark brown/orange mottled sands, gradually chaging to yellow natural sand. Gently slopes down to west. At W end 0.5m of modern material, overlaid 0.35m of topsoil. This lay over the buried soil layer.	At S end, a 0.6m thick layer of modern material overlaid 0.3m of topsoil. This overlaid the buried soil layer, 0.2m thick, of dark brown/orange mottled sands, gradually chaging to yellow natural sand. Modern build up fades away to N. At W end, 0.3m of topsoil overlaid the buried soil layer.	0.35m of modern material over 0.3m of topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.3m thick, of dark brown/orange mottled sands gradually mixing into the natural sand. Southern 10m is totally truncated on W side.	0.4m of modern material over 0.2m of topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.2m thick, of dark brown/orange mottled sands gradually mixing into the natural sand. Heavy tree disturbance.	0.6m of modern material over 0.3m of topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.2m thick, of dark brown/orange mottled sands gradually mixing into the natural sand.	0.4-6m of modern material over 0.3m of topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.2m thick, of dark brown/orange mottled sands gradually mixing into the natural sand.	0.1-0.3m of modern material over 0.2-0.3m of topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.15m thick, of dark brown/orange mottled sands gradually mixing into the natural sand.	
		Depth	0.8m	0.7m	0.8m	0.3m	0.3m	0.3m	0.5-0.7m	0.8-1m	0.8-1m	0.6-1.1m	0.95m	0.8m	1.1m	0.9-1m	0.55-0.65m	cil lice
0	rench list	Orientation	s-N	E-W	N-S	NE-SW	N-S	N-S	E-W	NE-SW	E-W	N-S	N-S	S-N	E	S-N S-N	ogical Set	
	dix 2: T	Eength	50.7m	20.3m	32m	17m	lm	lm	38m	19.3m	24m	29.7m	18.5m	18m	M8	26.5m	19m	2004
	Appen	Trench N ₆	01	02	03	04	05	90	07	08	60	10	11	12	13	14	15	03 December

Description	0.2m of modern material over 0.3m of topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.25m thick, of dark brown/orange mottled 0035, 0035, 0036 sands gradually mixing into the natural sand.	0-0. Im of modern material over 0.4m of topsoil over a buried soil layer, 0.2-0.3m thick, of dark brown/orange mottled 0037,0038 sands gradually mixing into the natural sand.	Suffalk County Councile Suffalk County Councile Suffalk County Councile	Suffor County County Suffor County County Archaeological Se	
Depth	0.75m	u council		w Council	ce
Orientation	K S-N	Unical Se		Suffolk Countical S	
o Length	21m	12.5m		POOC	2004
Trench No	16	17		03 December	MULLIAND CU

SUS	foll	Seo.	untiogi	y cal	Se	ncil	∖ c ^e										ed sides and a concave base.		2m deep.			ç	Suf	foll	aer Cr	our	ity Cour gical Se	Page 1 of 2
		00		ast end of trench 02	vest end of trench 02	outh end of trench 01	orth end of trench 01	orth end of trench 01	ar pit, 50% under east baulk. 0.7m wide and 0.25m deep.	007. Dark grey sand with a few burnt flints.	ound on surface of subsoil in trench 03.	outh end of trench 03.	ast end of trench 09.	vest end of trench 09.	outh-west end of trench 08.	orth-east end of trench 08.	ed north-south, possibly same as 0017. It had a possible double cut or recut, with fairly well defin. .2m wide and 0.35m deep.	0015. Mix of dark red/brown sands and light/mid brown sands.	ed north-south, possibly same as 0015. Moderate sloping sides with a flat base, 1.1m wide and 0.2	0017. Pale brown sands.	ast end of trench 10.	vest end of trench 10.	ast end of trench 07.	vest end of trench 07.	ch, aligned WSW-ENE. Irregular sloping sides and a concave base, 0.8m wide and 0.4m deep.	0023. Dark grey/black sand.	orth end of trench 12.	
		descriptic		Section of ea	Section of w	Section of sc	Section of ne	Section of ne	Small circula	Fill of pit 00	Flint core for	Section of so	Section of ea	Section of w	Section of sc	Section of ne	Ditch, aligne Measured 1.	Fill of ditch	Ditch, aligne	Fill of ditch	Section of ea	Section of w	Section of ea	Section of w	Possible ditc	Fill of ditch	Section of ne	
	ext list	h identifier	Unstratified finds	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Pit cut	Pit fill	Surface find	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Ditch cut	Ditch fill	Ditch cut	Ditch fill	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Trench soil profile	Ditch cut	Ditch fill	Trench soil profile	vice
Sut	: cont	Trenc		02	02	01	01	03	03	03	03	03	60	60	08	80	60	60	07	07	10	1000	10	075	Ξ	11	12	
	endix 3	feature							0007	0007							0015	0015	0017	0017					0023	0023		mber 2004
	App	onno	0001	0002	0003	0004	0005	9000	0007	0008	6000	0010	0011	0012	0013	0014	0015	0016	0017	0018	0019	0020	0021	0022	0023	0024	0025	03 Dece

Suffo	NSEOIC	nty	Se	ncil Nice	3						Suffolk County Court Suffolk County Court Archaeological Se	Page 2 of 2
description	Section of south end of trench 12. Section of centre of trench 13.	Section of south end of trench 11. Circular nit staan straight sidas with a flat base. Some animal disturbance	Fill of pit 0029. Mid/dark grey sand.	Section of east end of trench 15.	Section of west end of trench 15. Section of north end of trench 14.	Section of south end of trench 14.	Section of south end of trench 16.	Section of north end of trench 16.	Section of west end of trench 17.	Section of east end of trench 17.		
Greech identifier	Trench soil profileTrench soil profile	1 Trench soil profile	5 Pit fill	5 Trench soil profile	5 Trench soil profile4 Trench soil profile	4 Trench soil profile	6 Trench soil profile	6 Trench soil profile	7 Trench soil profile	7 Trench soil profile	Suffolk County	cil vice
opno feature T	0026 1. 0027 1.	0028 1	0030 0029 1.	0031	0032 1 0033 1.	0034 1.	0035 1.	0036 1.	0037 1	0038	Þ.	03 December 2004