

council

Service

Service ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT

Council

SCCAS REPORT No. 2009/194

10 Factory Street, Lowestoft LWT 167



Sufformed and Sufformed an

Endeavour House, Russel Road, Ipswich, IP1 2BX.



HER Information

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Planning Application No:	DC/09/0198/FUL
Date of Fieldwork:	13 th to 14 th July 2009
Grid Reference:	TM 5499 9381
Funding Body:	Pembroke Builders.
Curatorial Officer:	Keith Wade
Project Officer:	Duncan Stirk
Oasis Reference:	suffolkc1-63617
	Digital report submitted to Archaeological Data Service: http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit

Suffolk County Council





Contents

	Summary	Page
1.	Introduction countral se	1
2.	Geology and topography	2
3.	Archaeological and historical background	2
4.	Methodology	4
5	Results	5
	5.1 Introduction	5
	5.2 Trench 1	5
6.	Finds and environmental evidence (Richenda Goffin)	12
	6.1 Introduction	12
	6.2 Pottery	12
	6.2.1 Introduction	12
	6.2.2 Medieval	12
	6.2.3 Late medieval/ Early post-medieval	13
	6.2.4 Post medieval	13
	6.3 Ceramic building material	13
	6.4 Kiln furniture	14
	6.5 Post medieval window glass	14
	6.6 Slag	14
	6.7 Iron Rolk cologic	14
	6.8 Burnt flint	14
	6.9 Animal Bone	14
	6.10Plant macrofossils & other remains (Val Fryer)	15
	6.11Discussion of material evidence	16
7.	Discussion	17
	7.1 Trench 1	17
8.	Conclusions and recommendations for further work	20
9.	Archive deposition	21
10.	Contributors and acknowledgements	21
11.	Bibliography	21
	Disclaimer	21

List of Figures

1.	Site location	1
2.	Figure 2. Site detail and trial trench location relative to factory.	4
3.	Trench plan	10
4.	Section Roll Cologic Roll Cologic	11
5.	Trench location on 1890 plan.	19
Lis	t of Tables	
1.	Bulk finds quantities	12
2.	Plant macrofossils and other remains	16
Lis	t of Plates	
1.	Pits [0035] & [0016]. 0.5m scale	6
2.	Buried soil (0025), clay raft (0024) & foundation (0022). 1m scale.	7
	Sunchae	
Lis	t of Appendices	
1.	Brief and specification	
2.	Context list	
3.	Pottery database	
4.	Monitoring work	
	N Courrice	
	K Countral 5	
	Suffolheolos	
	ATC ATC	
	Councie	
	county se	
	Cuffolk agolog	
	Arch	

Summary

An archaeological evaluation was carried out on land at 10 Factory Street, Lowestoft Council (TM 5499 9381); LWT 167 📣 anice

A trial trench evaluation was carried out at the above site from 13th -14th July 2009 in advance of a proposal to redevelop the site. The redevelopment involves the Suffo Archae construction of a single residential property.

A number of features of archaeological interest were recorded during the work. These were two undated pits, a late medieval buried soil and similarly dated post-holes, and an early post-medieval flint and lime mortar foundation representing a building that remained in use into the 19th century. Evidence for the adjacent Lowestoft Porcelain factory was recovered in the form of two fragments of kiln bars.

Suffolk County Council

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Duncan Stirk, SCCAS for Pembroke Builders. Suffolk CC report no: 2009/194) Suffork County Council

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service



Introduction 1.

A planning application was made for a residential development at land at 10 Factory Street, Lowestoft, Suffolk. The site is centred on approximately NGR TM 5499 9381 uffolk Count and comprises approximately a total of 90.86 square metres.



Figure 1. Site location © Crown Copyright, all rights reserved, Suffolk County Council License No. 100023395 2009 GUI

The site lies on the western fringe of the late medieval town in an area occupied by the Lowestoft Porcelain factory in the late 18th century. It was felt therefore that the development work would cause ground disturbance with the potential to destroy archaeological deposits were they present. As such, there was an initial requirement for an archaeological evaluation by trial trench, as outlined in a Brief and Specification produced by Keith Wade of the SCCAS Conservation Team (Appendix 1). The SCCAS Field Team was subsequently commissioned to carry out the work by the client, Suffolk Archaeolo Pembroke Builders.

2. Geology and topography

The site of the proposed development is in the centre of Lowestoft beside Factory Street. (Figure 1) At the time of the evaluation the plot of land was waste ground. The plot sloped gently down from its northern end to the street front on Factory Street; a drop of 0.36m.

The site is bounded to the south by Factory Street, and to the west and north by residential dwellings. To the east is the major thoroughfare Jubilee Way. The drift geology underlying the site is alluvial sand.

3. Archaeological and historical background

The late medieval development of Lowestoft was related to its role as a port, and in particular the growth of the fishing industry. The historian Edmund Gillingwater writing in 1790 (cited by Breen, 2000) states that "Lowestoft is about a mile in length and consists chiefly of one principle street running in a gradual descent... which is intersected by several smaller streets or lanes from the west. It is probable that the town consists of much the same number of houses (445) now, as it did many years ago; there being very few houses erected upon new foundations, but only rebuilt upon old ones".

The development site is located slightly to the northwest of the core of early Lowestoft ; which was presumably where Gillingswater's "principle street", now the High Street, met the road to Normanston. (HER Number LWT 040) The development site is 130m west of the former, and c. 100m north of the latter. This is well within the town boundary as represented on Hodskinson's map dated 1783.

ice

At the time Gillingwater was writing, the Lowestoft Porcelain factory, trading as Walker & Co., was producing porcelain wares for the Ipswich, Cambridge and London markets. The development site is in the vicinity of the factory works, which operated from approximately 1757 until wound down about 1801 or 1802. (HER number LWT 038)

Local historian Ivan Bunn has done detailed work on the development of the factory over time. (Bunn, 2004 cited in Green, 2007). His records suggest that the

development site was probably the eastern portion of a plot of land that belonged to brothers John and Robert Neale, that had been in the Neale family since the 17th century. The Neale plot consisted of a single dwelling that had subsequently been divided into 4 tenements. The western tenement was purchased by Walker & Co. and incorporated into the growing factory site on 23rd February 1760. The development site, forming the 2 eastern-most tenements was therefore not part of the factory and presumably continued to be owned by the Neale family.

Bunn's work also gives us a flavour of the district of the town prior to the establishment of the factory works in the mid 18th century. A large part of the factory site, located immediately to the west of the development site, was formerly an estate known as the "Tithe Barn Estate", due to the presence of a 15th century barn that was used as a tithe store. In addition to the medieval barn, the estate held two houses, some cottages, stables, and a quantity of open meadow. (Bunn, 2004 cited in Green, 2007) This would seem to suggest that the development site is not in the core of the early town, but rather in outskirts which held the remnants of working farms, and open land as late as the mid 18th century.

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Suffork County Council Suffork County Council

4. Methodology

Trial trenching was carried out on the 13th and 14th April 2009. The trench was excavated using a 360° mechanical excavator fitted with a 0.9m wide flat-bladed ditching bucket. All mechanical excavation was carried out under close archaeological supervision until the top of the first undisturbed archaeological deposit or natural subsoil was revealed. Hand cleaning of the exposed surfaces was carried out where necessary in order to clarify the nature of the deposits and identify cut features

The site covers approximately 90.86 square metres, of which 9.79 square metres was trenched, resulting in a sample of 10.77%.



Figure 2. Site detail and trial trench location relative to factory. © Crown Copyright, all rights reserved, Suffolk County Council License No. 100023395 2009

The site was allocated the HER number LWT 167. All observed deposits were allocated unique context numbers and recorded on pro forma recording sheets. All drawn recording was carried out in a series of 1:50 or 1:20 scale plans and 1:20 or 1:10 scale section drawings, as appropriate. All plans were tied into Ordnance Survey grid and levelled with reference to a Benchmark on the side of the brewery on Factory Street, with a value of 19.54m AOD. A photographic record of representative sections and trenches was made which, along with the written records, forms the archive, stored with SCCAS Bury St Edmunds. The illustrations of individual trenches were rendered using MapInfo mapping software.

Results 5.

5.1 Introduction

The trial trench measured 9.25m by 1.05m by 0.28m to 0.75m deep and was positioned Suffolk County Punun Junital S Archaeological S slightly to the east of the long axis of the site. (Figure 2) Archaeolos

5.2 Trench 1

The geological natural was seen at a depth of 0.75m below ground level (BGL) at 19.15m AOD, at the northern end of the trench and 0.88m BGL or 18.72m AOD, at the deepest portion of the southern end. It was made up of very light grey sand mottled with orange brown clay sand (0008).

The natural geology was cut by a small rectangular probable post-hole [0014], that measured 0.33m by 0.27m by 0.07m deep. It had moderate concave sides and a concave base and had probably been truncated by the machine during the excavation of the trench. It held a dark brown silty sand with mottles of clayey sand (0013) from which a single sherd of 15th -17th century pot was recovered.

Sealing the natural geology across the entire trench was a thin deposit of dark grey clay silt mottled with dark brown peat (0027) varying between 0.02m and 0.12m thick. Deposit (0027) was cut, in the centre of the trench, by a pit-like feature measuring over 0.8m long by over 0.12m wide by 0.14m deep [0035]. It held light grey sand mottled with mid brown organic silt (0034). This was cut by a larger oval pit measuring 0.95m by 0.5m by 0.16m deep [0016]. This held a dark brown silty sand fill (0015), which was very organic towards its base. An environmental sample was taken from this feature.

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service



Plate 1. Pits [0035] & [0016]. 0.5m scale

A lense of very pale brown mottled with light brown sand (0026) overlay deposit (0027) in the southern portion of the trench. This was itself overlain by a deposit of mid brown silty sand containing frequent charcoal inclusions (0025), that was between 0.08 to 0.14m thick. A small assemblage of slag and medieval pot was recovered from this deposit, and an environmental sample was taken.

Two small post-holes cut deposit (0025). The first of these [0012], was at the northern end of the trench. It was oval and had steep sides and a concave base measuring 0.4m by 0.34m by over 0.23m deep. It contained a mid to dark brown clay silt sand fill (0011) from which a single sherd of medieval pot was recovered. A similar feature was seen to cut deposit (0025) in the middle of the trench to the south. Post-hole [0021] was 0.3m wide by over 0.1m wide and was 0.3m deep. It had steep straight sides and a concave base, and held a mid brown silty sandy clay fill (0020) from which 2 fragments of late medieval CBM were recovered.

The southern portion of the trench, including post-hole [0012], was then sealed by a deposit of light grey mottled with orange brown sandy clay (0024). This was 0.38m thick at the southern end of the trench and lensed out 5.6m to the north.



Plate 2. Buried soil (0025), clay raft (0024) & foundation (0022). 1m scale.

Clay deposit (0024) was truncated near the southern end of the trench by a NW-SE aligned foundation cut [0023]. Cut [0023] had vertical sides and a flat base and was over 1.15m long by 0.3m wide and with a maximum depth of 0.33m. It held a flint cobble and light brown lime mortar foundation, that in places was topped by re-used brick fragments (0022). Two sample bricks were recovered from (0022) one of which dates to the17th -18th century, the other to the late medieval/post-medieval period. When a slot was excavated through foundation (0022), flint cobbles fell away from the eastern trench elevation revealing the possible end of this foundation, just beyond the trench edge.

Clay deposit (0024) was sealed by a deposit of dark brown mottled with dark grey sandy silt with frequent charcoal inclusions (0007), that appeared to be bounded on its southern edge by foundation (0022). This varied in depth from 0.22m thick at the north end of the trench to only 0.09m thick near foundation (0022). A small assemblage of pottery dating from the 15th -17th century was recovered from this deposit.

The remainder of the features in the trench appeared to be relatively modern. Butting up against foundation (0022) to the south, the surface of clay (0024) was patched by lumps of mid grey clay containing lenses of brown sand (0036). These initially appeared to be post-holes, but none was deeper than 0.06m thick. This was sealed by

a deposit of black cinders, coal and ash, (0017) that also butted up against the south face of the foundation. Post-medieval pot, tile and a metal object were recovered from this layer, that was 0.05 to 0.08m thick.

Cinder deposit (0017) was cut by a shallow feature with vertical sides and a flat base [0019], only a portion of which, measuring 1.1m by 0.15m by 0.09m deep, was seen in the trench. The edge of this was aligned differently from foundation (0022), on a north-south alignment. It held a light grey mortar lining and a very dark grey ashy sand fill (0018) from which 19th century finds were recovered. Beside foundation (0022), along its northern side, and on a parallel alignment was slot [0029]. This had steep concave sides and a concave base, and was 1.1m long by 0.28m wide and 0.3m deep. This held a dark grey brown sandy silt fill with frequent coal inclusions (0028).

Slot [0029] cut underlying deposit (0007), and appeared to form the boundary to the layer. The remaining features recorded in the trench all similarly cut into deposit (0007). Just to the north of slot (0029), the first of these features was seen in the eastern edge of the trench. This feature had steep straight sides and a flat base and was 0.34m wide and 0.42m deep. This held a dark grey ashy silt sand (0030), and had an obvious post-pipe confirming it as a post-hole feature. Beside it, just to the north, was a shallow brick foundation that was perpendicular to the line of the trench, on a NW-SE alignment. It consisted of orange bricks and a light cream coloured sandy mortar (0009), 0.4m wide and 0.18m deep, held within a construction cut with vertical sides and a flat base [0010].

Further still to the north, another probable post-hole [0033] was seen in the eastern trench edge. This had steep concave sides and a concave base, and was 0.36m wide by 0.4m deep. It held a dark grey sandy silt fill (0032), with fragmentary ceramic building material (CBM) and mortar inclusions. The final feature to cut deposit (0007) was located near the northern end of the trench and was a brick foundation similar to (0009). This was perpendicular to the trench, aligned NW-SE, and held in a construction cut with vertical sides and a flat base [0004] that was 0.33m wide and 0.2m deep. It was made of dark red brick stock bonded with very light grey mortar (0003), of a type probably produced in the 17th or 18th century. Beside the foundation was a crushed light brown mortar and CBM packing fill (0002) from which a single sherd of 16th -18th century pot was recovered.

The stratigraphic sequence within the trial trench was capped by a deposit of light pinkish grey crushed mortar and brick rubble (0006) that was 0.1 to 0.24m thick, followed by a deposit of very dark grey brown sandy silt topsoil (0005), that was 0.14 to 0.22m thick.

Suffolk County Council











Figure 4. Section.

6. Finds and environmental evidence (Richenda Goffin)

6.1	Introdu	ction		11.					-	
Finds	were col	lected fr	om 1	1 conte	exts, as	show	n in the t	table b	pelow.	0
		n	N Ser	Vic	,				unty a servi	
Context	Potte	ery cov	CO CB	Μ	Sla	g	Burnt flin	t	Miscellaneous	Spotdate
	No.	Wt/g	No.	Wt/g	No.	Wt/g	No.	Wt/g	KOW OLOS	
0001	55	56							2 frags kiln furniture	Unstrat,
	(b)	rio						d	@ 103g, 1 frag	med/pmed
0000	A TH	24						(at W	window glass @ 2g	16th 10th C
0002		24	1	3111				1 Sta		P-med
0003	5	68		5111						15th-16th C
0011	1	12								11th-14th C
0013	1	49								15th-17th C
0017			1	238						
0 018	2	19	1	570					1 iron ?nail @ 18g	19th C+
0020			2	6						
0022	_		2	1236			1			
0025	3	32	3	33	3	134	ountice	4	1 burnt bone @ 2g, small frags animal	14th-15th C?
							1 cent		bone, cbm frags	
						oun	als		and slag from	
						K Cud	0		Sample 2	
Total	18	260	10	5194	3	134	1	4		
				Tab	le 1 Bu	lk finds	aquantitie	S		
					4 P					

6.2 Pottery

6.2.1 Introduction

A total of 18 fragments of pottery was recovered from the evaluation (0.260kg). The assemblage dates to the medieval and post-medieval periods. The pottery was fully quantified and catalogued and the information added to the database (Appendix 3). The assemblage consists of small sherds, some of which are abraded, and none of which are worthy of illustration.

6.2.2 Medieval

Medieval pottery was present in two contexts, and small quantities were also identified with later wares in the unstratified material (0001), and in buried topsoil (0007).

A single sherd of Local medieval unglazed ware (LMU) was recovered from the fill of post-hole [0012] dating to the 12th -14th century. Further fragments of a similar date were found in buried topsoil (0025), consisting of a coarse sandy glazed ware with oxidised external margins and two fragments of medieval coarseware, one of which was retrieved from an environmental sample.

6.2.3 Late medieval/early post-medieval

A single fragment of the foot of a Dutch-type red earthenware cauldron or pipkin dating to the 15th-17th C was recovered from post-hole fill (0013). The sherd is heavily sooted and abraded. The remains of a Langerwehe Rhenish stoneware jug, and another redware of transitional date were present in (0007), together with a small fragment of Glazed red earthenware, suggesting a date of the 15th century (or possibly 16th C) for the date of deposition. A further sherd of Dutch-type red earthenware and one of Late medieval and transitional ware (15th -16th C) were present as unstratified finds (0001).

6.2.4 Post-medieval

Small numbers of Glazed red earthenware were identified from the evaluation dating to the 16th -18th C (4 sherds @ 0.040kg). A rilled body sherd from a jar or pipkin was found in the packing fill (0002) in the foundation cut. Other fragments of this type of fabric were identified in unstratified deposit (0001), topsoil (0007), and associated with a sherd of a Refined white earthenware bowl with transfer printed decoration dating to the 19th century in the fill (0018) of a shallow, flat-based feature (0019).

6.3 Ceramic building material

Ten fragments of ceramic building material were collected from the evaluation (5.194 kg).

The remains of a small medieval brick was present as a residual find in (0018). It is made in a light purple/pink sandy fabric, slightly poorly mixed with red clay pellet inclusions and occasional voids. There is some evidence of a cream chalk-rich mortar still adhering to one sanded face. The width (120mm) and the height (40mm) and the overall appearance indicate that the brick is medieval (Drury 164).

A complete brick was collected as a sample from the foundation (0003). It is red-fired and unfrogged (fabric type fsfe), and still has the remains of a beige sandy mortar adhering. Its measurements (L235mm, W111mm and H63mm) and appearance indicates that it is similar to a Drury LB 3 dating to the 17th -18th Century.

A fragment of a post-medieval rooftile was recovered from (0017), and two very small fragments of cbm were found in (0020) weighing 0.006kg. The smallest of these,

weighing 0.002kg is made from a fine soft fabric and is medieval to late medieval in date.

Two fragments of reused brick were collected from the foundation (0022). Both are partially covered in a golden sandy mortar, including over broken edges. The largest piece which is maroon/purple in colour with a height of 60mm probably dates to the 17th -18th century. The second brick is made in a finer fabric containing clay pellets (fabric mscp, height 45mm) and is likely to be late medieval/post-medieval.

Two abraded fragments of ?brick made in a soft fine sandy fabric with mica and grog present in (0025) also date to the late medieval or post-medieval period.

6.4 Kiln furniture

Two fragments of kiln furniture were identified amongst the unstratified finds. They are both made in a very highly fired dense white fabric and are covered on one surface with a brown vitrified glaze effect similar to a salt-glaze. These are likely to have originated from the kiln structures for the Lowestoft porcelain factory which was nearby.

6.5 Post-medieval window glass

A small fragment of post-medieval window glass was collected as an unstratified find.

ice

6.6 Slag

Thirty-two fragments of iron slag (0.256kg) were recovered from (0025), both through hand retrieval and from collection through the environmental sampling. The material came from one of the earliest deposits on site and was found with fragments of medieval pottery and late medieval/early post-medieval ceramic building material.

6.7 Iron

A corroded fragment of iron recovered from the deposit (0017) is likely to be a nail. Service

6.8 **Burnt flint**

county A fragment of burnt flint was collected from (0025).

Animal bone 6.9

The remains of a sheep mandible were recovered from (0025) Sample 2, together with many small splinters of bone which were unidentifiable.

6.10 Plant macrofossils and other remains (Val Fryer)

6.10.1 Introduction and methodology

Samples for the evaluation of the content and preservation of the plant macrofossil assemblages were taken from a small number of features of possible prehistoric and Archaeolos Suffolk later date, two of which were submitted for assessment.

The samples were bulk floated in-house by the archaeological service and the flots were collected in a 300 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 in Table 2. Nomenclature within the table follows Stace (1997). All plant remains were charred. Modern contaminants including fibrous and woody roots Molk County Counci zounus zounciné zological Service were present throughout.

6.10.2 Results

Both assemblages were principally composed of charcoal/charred wood fragments and Sample 1 also contained a high density of black porous and tarry residues and small pieces of coal. Other plant remains occurred infrequently, but did include oat (Avena sp.), barley (*Hordeum* sp.) and wheat (*Triticum* sp.) grains, a cotyledon fragment from an indeterminate large pulse (Fabaceae), a grass (Poaceae) fruit and a possible fragment of heather (Ericaceae) stem. With the exception of the materials mentioned above, other remains were scarce, but the assemblage from Sample 2 did contain a Archaeological St Suffolk County moderate density of ferrous globules.

6.10.3 Conclusions and recommendations for further work

In summary, given the possible early date of the feature, it would appear most likely that the fill of pit 0016 (Sample 1) contains a very high density of intrusive materials. However, the seeds, cereals and a proportion of the other plant remains may well be contemporary, although it is strongly advised that such materials are not submitted for either C14 or AMS dating purposes. The assemblage from Sample 2 may well be derived from a small scatter of hearth waste, with the presence of the ferrous globules possibly indicating some nearby smithing activity. Suffo naeo

Although both assemblages are small, they do indicate that plant macrofossils are preserved within the archaeological horizon within this area of Lowestoft. Therefore, if further interventions are planned, it is recommended that additional plant macrofossil

samples of approximately 20 - 40 litres in volume are taken from all well-sealed and dated contexts recorded during excavation.

			10
Sample No.	1	2	Conni
Context No.	0015	0025	unty al Se
Feature No.			orgice
Feature type	Pit	B.soil	2010
▲ S ^W ch [∞] Date	?Prehist.	?Med.	
Cereals and other food plants	A	the bar	
Avena sp. (grains)	X	×	
Large Fabaceae indet.	xcotyfg	Nella -	
Hordeum sp. (grains)		х	
Triticum sp. (grains)		х	
Cereal indet. (grains)	х	х	
Other plant macrofossils			
Small Poaceae indet.		х	
Vicia/Lathyrus sp.	Х		
Ericaceae indet. (stem)	xcf		
Charcoal <2mm	XXX	XXXX	
Charcoal >2mm	XXX	XXX	
Charred root/stem	х	XX	
Other remains			
Black porous 'cokey' material	XXX		
Black tarry material	XXX	х	
Bone	х		
Ferrous globules		XX	
Small coal frags.	XXX	Х	
Sample volume (litres)	20	20	
Volume of flot (litres)	0.1	0.1	
% flot sorted	100%	100%	
Table 2. Plant macrofossils a	and other re	emains	4
Inche			unch
COV ACC Key to Tabl	е		Condi

Key to Table

x = 1 - 10 specimens xx = 11 = 50 specimens xxx = 51 - 100 specimens coty = cotyledon fg = fragment rchaeologic

ologica 6.11

Discussion of the finds and environmental evidence. The earliest finds recovered from the evaluation date to the medieval period, and reflect the location of the site within the area covered by the medieval town, although perhaps on its periphery. A small quantity of medieval pottery was identified in one of the earliest deposits (0025) but two small fragments of ceramic building material dating to the late medieval to post-medieval periods also came from this feature. Other medieval wares gical Service from the evaluation are mostly residual. county

Small quantities of pottery and ceramic building material dating to the late medieval/ early post-medieval periods were identified. The largest group was found in deposit (0007) and included a fragment of a Rhenish stoneware jug. Such finds support the documentary evidence which indicates that the area was used in the late medieval

period for habitation and farming with some open land. The only artefactual evidence of the Lowestoft porcelain factory was two fragments of vitrified kiln material which were Suffolk County Council counci unstratified finds. Discussion logical service

7.

7.1 Trench 1

The earliest features recorded within the trial trench, the peaty layer (0027) and pits [0035] and [0016] are unfortunately un-dated, but seem to have been deposited when the site was a wet environment. The environmental sample from the fill of pit [0016] contained evidence for oat, large pulses, heather and a cereal grain, and a quantity of burnt material and coal. The pits may have been dug at any time prior to the late medieval period when they were sealed by deposit (0025).

Sand deposit (0026) also appears to have been waterlain, as it looks like coarse beach sand. The widespread deposit that seals these layers (0025), looks like a homogenous buried soil horizon that had been ploughed at some point. The finds assemblage recovered from the buried soil suggests this occurred through the medieval period, perhaps into the post-medieval period as indicated by the presence of 2 fragments of CBM. This tallies with evidence documented by local historian Ivan Bunn, showing that the site was in an area occupied by the remnants of a medieval farm, as well as large areas of open meadow and common land as late as the mid 18th century. (Bunn. 2004 cited in Green, 2007) Two post-holes possibly dating to the late medieval period cut this buried soil, and may be part of a modest timber building belonging to this farm. Metalworking was probably being undertaken in the vicinity, as evidenced by the quantity of slag present in the buried soil, and smithing debris found in the environmental sample.

At some point a raft of clay was laid down to level and prepare the ground for the construction of a building represented by the flint cobble foundation (0022). Sadly, this event is undated by finds, and the type of foundation is one that could date from the medieval period to the 20th century. The bricks recovered from the top of this foundation were re-used with one dating to the 17th-18th century and the other to the late medieval/post-medieval transition. Some care should be taken in assigning the whole foundation this date in light of Gillingwater's observation that there were "very few

houses erected upon new foundations, but only rebuilt upon old ones" (Bunn, 2004 cited in Green, 2007).

The flint walled building presumably faced a thoroughfare to the south, as the area to the north was occupied by thick deposit of organic garden soil dating to the 15th -16th century. This space may also have been occupied by modest timber structures as indicated by a probable structural slot and post-holes. The garden soil may date the construction of the flint walled building, as it clearly respects the wall. Alternatively, the garden soil may be contemporaneous with the structure in slot [0029] with the flint wall being a later structure on the same line.

It is very tempting to say that this is the dwelling owned by John and Robert Neale, and subsequently divided into 4 tenements and part sold to Walker & Co. in 1760. The cinder occupation layer, and associated cut feature [0019] within this building probably represents its latest use and can be dated to the 19th century or later. The cinders, interestingly, were probably a by-product of the porcelain kilns next door.

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Suffork County Council Suffork County Council

The map evidence for the late 19th century confirms that the garden was largely built over by 1880, with both of the brick foundations seen in the trench evident on the 1880 and 1890's OS maps. It is not clear however, whether the building represented by the flint foundation was fossilized within these larger brick buildings or demolished and replaced. These 19th century buildings were demolished themselves during the widespread clearance of this part of Lowestoft in the late 20th century.



Figure 5. Trench location on 1890 plan.



8. Conclusions and recommendations for further work

The evaluation work has produced useful evidence for the development of the town of Lowestoft. The earliest deposits, sealed by a medieval buried soil horizon, are undated, and presumably pre-date the town. The site appears to have been periodically flooded, as evidenced by peaty deposits and waterlain sand in the lowest horizons. Two pits cutting the waterlain layers are undated, but are unlikely to be pre-historic, based on the presence of coal in their fills. They may however date to the Roman to medieval periods.

Evidence from the work fits quite neatly into the documentary evidence for the area. The site appears to have been located on the periphery of the late medieval town, occupied by a scattering of farm buildings and open ground until the middle of the 18th century. After this, the Lowestoft Porcelain factory, trading as Walker & Co., buys up plots of land for the expanding factory works, with the main factory site being located just to the west of the development site. The site itself was not part of the factory works, but may have housed factory workers like many of the nearby cottages. (Bunn, 2004 cited in Green, 2007) By the late 19th century the area was fully built over, and the porcelain factory had been replaced by a brewery.

The findings of this evaluation are that deposits of archaeological importance do survive on the development site, which are likely to be disturbed by the development. It is therefore recommended that a suitable programme of archaeological mitigation be developed (the level of which to be determined by the SCCAS Conservation Officer), to ensure the preservation *In-Situ* or preservation by record of these archaeological deposits. (This work was undertaken on 6th August 2009, and the resulting report is appended as Appendix 4)

Suffolk County Council

9. Archive deposition

Paper and photographic archive: SCCAS Bury St Edmunds. Finds and environmental archive: SCCAS Bury St Edmunds.

10. List of contributors and acknowledgements

The evaluation was carried out by Phil Camps and Duncan Stirk of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Field Team.

Suffolk County Council

The project was managed by Rhodri Gardner and carried out by Duncan Stirk. The post-excavation was managed by Richenda Goffin. The production of site plans and sections was carried out by Duncan Stirk. Other specialist identification and advice was provided by Val Fryer.

11. Bibliography

Brown, D., 2007,. Archaeological archives A guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation, IFA

- Breen, A. 2000 Documentary Report *In* Loader, T. Archaeological Evaluation. The Shoals, Whapload Road, Lowestoft (LWT 042). SCCAS Report No. 41/2000
- Green, R. 2007. Lowestoft Porcelain Index. Available from: http://www.rgreen.org.uk/Lowpor.html [Accessed 15.07.09]
- Stace, C., 1997, New Flora of the British Isles. Second edition. Cambridge University Press

Disclaimer

Any opinions expressed in this report about the need for further archaeological work are those of the Field Projects Team alone. Ultimately 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 services cannot accept responsibility for inconvenience caused to the clients should the Planning Authority take a different view to that expressed in the report.

Suncha



Appendix 1. Brief & Specification

SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL Sunoik Columy Columcians ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE - CONSERVATION TEAM

Brief and Specification for an Archaeological Evaluation Suffolk Co Archaeolog

Evaluation by Trial Trench

Suffolk **10 FACTORY STREET, LOWESTOFT**

The commissioning body should be aware that it may have Health & Safety and other responsibilities, see paragraphs 1.7 & 1.8.

This is the brief for the first part of a programme of archaeological work. There is likely to be a requirement for additional work, this will be the subject of another brief.

1. Background

- enice Planning consent has been granted for the construction of a single house at 10 1.1 Factory street, Lowestoft (DC/09/0198/FUL).
- 1.2 The planning consent contains a condition requiring the implementation of a programme of archaeological work before development begins (Planning Policy Guidance 16, paragraph 30 condition). In order to establish the full archaeological implications of the proposed development, an archaeological evaluation is required of the site. The evaluation is the first part of the programme of archaeological work and decisions on the need for, and scope of, any further work will be based upon the results of the evaluation and will be the subject of additional briefs.
- 1.3 The development area lies within the area occupied by the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory in the late 18th century and is defined in the County Historic Environment Record as an archaeological site of regional importance. There is a high probability that the development will damage or destroy archaeological deposits.
- 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.
- Detailed standards, information and advice to supplement this brief are to be found in 1.5 Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14, 2003.
- 1.6 In accordance with the standards and guidance produced by the Institute of Field Archaeologists this brief should not be considered sufficient to enable the total execution of the project. A Project Design or Written Scheme of Investigation (PD/WSI) based upon this brief and the accompanying outline specification of minimum requirements, is an essential requirement. This must be submitted by the developers, or their agent, to the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2AR; telephone/fax: 01284 352443) for approval. The work must not commence until this office has approved both the archaeological contractor as suitable to undertake the work, and the PD/WSI as satisfactory. The PD/WSI will provide the basis for measurable standards and will

be used to establish whether the requirements of the planning condition will be adequately met.

- 1.7 Before any archaeological site work can commence it is the responsibility of the developer to provide the archaeological contractor with either the contaminated land report for the site or a written statement that there is no contamination. The developer should be aware that investigative sampling to test for contamination is likely to have an impact on any archaeological deposit which exists; proposals for sampling should be discussed with this office before execution.
- 1.8 The responsibility for identifying any restraints on field-work (e.g. Scheduled Monument status, Listed Building status, public utilities or other services, tree preservation orders, SSSIs, wildlife sites &c.) rests with the commissioning body and its archaeological contractor. The existence and content of the archaeological brief does not over-ride such restraints or imply that the target area is freely available.

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 natural soil processes. Define the potential for existing damage to archaeological deposits. Define the potential for colluvial/alluvial deposits, their impact and potential to mask any archaeological deposit. Define the potential for artificial soil deposits and their impact on any archaeological deposit.
- 2.4 Establish the potential for waterlogged organic deposits in the proposal area. Define the location and level of such deposits and their vulnerability to damage by development where this is defined.
- 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 Evaluation is to proceed sequentially: the desk-based evaluation will normally precede the field evaluation unless agreed otherwise. The results of the desk-based work is to be used to inform the trenching design. This sequence will only be varied if benefit to the evaluation can be demonstrated.
- 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, 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

- 3.1 Consult the County Historic Environment Record (HER), both the computerised record and any backup files.
- 3.2 Examine all the readily available cartographic sources (e.g. those available in the County Record Office). Record any evidence for historic or archaeological sites (e.g. buildings, settlements, field names) and history of previous land uses. Where permitted by the Record Office make either digital photographs, photocopies or traced copies of the document for inclusion in the report.
- 3.3 Assess the potential for documentary research that would contribute to the archaeological investigation of the site.

4 Specification B: Field Evaluation

- 4.1 Trial trenches are to be excavated to cover a minimum 5% by area of the development area and shall be positioned to sample all parts of the site. A single linear trench down the middle of the site is 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' 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.
- 4.3 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.
- 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 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 J Heathcote, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling Servic 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 user.
- 4.9 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).
- 4.10 Human remains must be left in situ except in those cases where damage or desecration are to be expected, or in the event that analysis of the remains is shown to be a requirement of satisfactory evaluation of the site. However, the excavator should be aware of, and comply with, the provisions of Section 25 of the Burial Act 1857.

"Guidance for best practice for treatment of human remains excavated from Christian burial grounds in England" English Heritage and the Church of England 2005 provides advice and defines a level of practice which should be followed whatever the likely belief of the buried individuals.

- 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 and colour photographs.
- 4.13 Topsoil, subsoil and archaeological deposit to be kept separate during excavation to Suffolk Archaeol 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.
- 5.5 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.

6. **Report Requirements**

- 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 Historic Environment 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 assessed and the need for further work is established
- 6.5 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.
- 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).
- 6.7 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 HER 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.
- 6.8 The site archive is to be deposited with the County HER within three months of the 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.
- 6.10 County HER sheets must be completed, as per the county HER manual, for all sites where archaeological finds and/or features are located.
- 6.11 At the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record <u>http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/</u> must be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators forms,
- 6.12 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the HER. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive).

Appendix I.doc

Specification by: Keith Wade

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

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Date: 26th May 2009

Reference: 10 Factory Street, Lowestoft

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





Appendix 2. Context list

Append	dix 2.	Context list
Context	Туре	Description
001		U/S finds
002		Crushed light tan brown mortar & CBM frags. Packing fill in foundation cut [0004]
003		Dark red brick & very light grey mortar. Foundation.
004		Vertical sides and flat base. Foundation cut for (0003).
005		Very dark grey sandy silt. Topsoil deposit.
006		Light pinkish grey crushed mortar & brick rubble with frequent gravel. Demolition rubble make-up layer.
007		Dark mottled brown & dark grey with frequent charcoal and brick frags. Buried topsoil deposit.
008		Very light grey sand mottled with orange brown clay sand. Natural.
009		Orange bricks bonded with light cream mortar. Foundation.
010		Vertical sides & flat base. Foundation cut for (0009)
011		Mid to dark brown silty sand. Fill of post-hole [0012].
012		Circular shape. Steep concave sides & concave base. Cut of post-hole
013		Dark brown silty sand with lumps of clayey sand. Fill of post-hole [0014].
014		Square shape. Irregular sides & base. Cut of post-hole.
015		Dark brown silty sand with peaty inclusions. Fill of pit [0016].
016		Semi-circular shape. Irregular concave sides & irregular concave base. Cut of pit.
017		Black cinders, coal & ash. Occupation layer/floor.
018		Very dark grey ashy sand & light grey mortar lining. Fill of cut [0019].
019		Vertical sides and flat base. Cut feature.
020		Mid brown silty sandy clay. Fill of post-hole [0021].
021		Semi-circular shape. Vertical sides & flat base. Cut of post-hole.
022		Flint cobbles and light brown lime mortar. Foundation.
023		Vertical sides & flat base. Cut for foundation (0022)
024		Light grey mottled with orange brown sandy clay. Make-up raft.
025		Mid brown silty sand with frequent charcoal. Buried soil.
026		Very pale brown mottled with light brown sand. Waterlain coarse sand.
027		Dark grey clay silt with organics. Dessicated peaty deposit.
028		Dark grey brown with frequent coal and CBM. Fill of slot [0029].
029		Steep sides & concave base. Cut of slot.
030		Dark grey ashy silt sand. Fill of post-hole [0031] with post-pipe visible.
031		Vertical sides and concave base. Cut of post-hole.
032		Dark grey sandy silt with mortar & CBM rubble. Fill of post-hole [0033].



Appendix 2. Context List

Append	dix 2.	Context List	untly service
Context	Туре	Description	calk couldice.
033		Steep sides & concave base. Cut of post-hole.	Sunchast
034		Light grey sand mottled with mid brown organic silt. Fill of pit [0035].	
035		Moderate convex sides & flat base. Cut of pit.	
036		Mid grey clay containing lenses of brown sand. Patches of clay over (0024)	

Suffork County Council

Sunol County Council

Suffolk County Council

Suffalk County Council



Appendix 3: Pottery database

LWT167 spotdates

LWT167 s	uffolk co	unty Council ogical Service		s suffolk county council				
Context No Ceramic Per	riod Fabric	Form	Sherd No W	Veight (g)	State	Comments	Fabric date rang	Context date
025 M	MCW	BODY	1	9		Poss degraded glazed? From Sample 2	L12th-14th C	L Med (cbm)
001 M	LMU	BOWL	1	30	S	Deep bowl or dish, probably late	11th-14th C	
01 PM	GRE	BODY	1	6			16th-18th C	16th C but unstratified
001 PM	DUTR	BODY	1	9		Council	15th-17th C	
01 PM	LMT	BODY	1	5	S	W County set	15th-16th C	
01 M	SWW?ST	BODY	1	4	5	Unglazed, fine white fabric	L14th-15th C	
02 PM	GRE	BODY	1	24	and the	Rilled sherd from jar or pipkin	16th-18th C	Prob 16th C
07 M	MCW	JAR	2	15		Looks a bit like late THET	12th C	
07 PM	GRE	BODY	1	1			16th-18th C	
07 M/PM	LANG	JUG	1	24		Handle of small jug, v worn surface	14th-15th C	
007 M/PM	DUTR?	JUG?	1	c29 nice		Thumbed strap handle from ?jug	15th-17th C	15th C
11 M	LMU	BODY	1 Col	ogical 12		Body sherd, prob from bowly courses	11th-14th C	11th-14th C
PM	DUTR/G	PIP	Sunchae	49	S	Tripod pipkin/cauldron leg	15th-16th C	15th-16th C
18 PM	GRE	BODY	1	9		Car Mar	16th-18th C	
18 PM	REFW	BASE	1	10			19th C+	19th C+
25 M	MCW	BODY	1	9	А		L12th-14th C	
)25 M	UPG	JAR?	1	14		Sandy, oxidised ext margins, splashed ld glaze, bit like GRIL but earlier	L12th-14th C	L12th-14th C

A AN



Appendix 4: Monitoring work

Simon Cass (August 2009) service Cour

Introduction and methodology

Holk County Council Planning permission was granted (DC/09/0198/FUL) by Waveney District Council for the construction of a single house at 10 Factory Street (TM 5499 9381). The site was subject to an initial requirement for archaeological trial trenching, and as a result of this the decision was taken to implement a further phase of archaeological works namely continuous monitoring of the footings during excavation. This was carried out County Council on the 6th August 2009.

Results

The footings were excavated to a depth of c. 1m below street level, which was between 0.5 and 0.2m above the ground level within the site. This discrepancy was not present during the evaluation, so it would seem that a significant quantity of soil was removed from the site during clearance of the vegetation. The stratigraphy encountered consisted of between 0.15m - 0.4m of mid brown sandy silt disturbed garden soil with frequent CBM, glass and ceramic inclusions, overlying soft pale yellow/creamy white mottled sand. The undisturbed natural sands were higher towards the rear of the property, although the ground rises naturally in that direction. An area of disturbance on the western side of the rearmost footings contained a large amount of modern rubbish, including bricks, a metal rubbish bin, a metal box/crate, broken glass, but this was outside of the footing.

A further feature on the western side of the main footings comprised a large pit, up to 1.8m deep and with approximate horizontal dimensions of 1.3m east-west and 5.0m north-south. This feature was filled with a mid reddish brown sandy clay deposit, with occasional small-medium stone inclusions. A thin band of blackish grey silty sand was present at the base of the feature, but no dateable finds were located within it. Suffo Archaeol



Plate 1. Section of undated pit, facing southwest



© Crown Copyright, all rights reserved, Suffolk County Council Licence No. 100023395 2009 Figure 2. Monitoring results