## ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT

SCCAS REPORT No. 2009/260

## Land South of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton. <br> (HLN 009)


D. Stirk
© October 2009
www.suffolkcc.gov.uk/e-and-t/archaeology



Planning Application No: DC/08/1249/FUL
Date of Fieldwork: 2009
Grid Reference: ..... TM 397789
Funding Body: Daniel Connal Partnership.
Curatorial Officer: Jess Tipper
Project Officer: Duncan Stirk
Oasis Reference: ..... suffolkc1-64016Digital report submitted to Archaeological Data Service:http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit




## Contents

Summary
Page

1. Introduction ..... 1
2. Geology and topography ..... 1
3. Archaeological and historical background ..... 3
4. Methodology ..... 4
5 Results ..... 6
5.1 Introduction ..... 6
5.2 to 5.41 Trench 1 to Trench 40 ..... 6
5. Finds and environmental evidence (Stephen Benfield) ..... 31
6.1 Introduction ..... 31
6.2 Pottery ..... 31
6.2.1 Prehistoric pottery ..... 32
6.2.2 Roman pottery ..... 32
6.2.3 Post-Roman pottery (Richenda Goffin) ..... 33
6.3 Ceramic building material (CBM) and fired clay ..... 33
6.4 Worked flint (Colin Pendleton) ..... 34
6.5 Burnt flint ..... 34
6.6 Miscellaneous ..... 35
6.7 Animal bone ..... 35
6.8 Plant macrofossils and other remains (Val Fryer) ..... 35
6.9 Discussion of the finds and environmental evidence ..... 36
6. Discussion ..... 37
7.1 to 7.10 Trenches 4, 11,17,18,19,21,22,25 \& 40 ..... 37
7. Conclusions and recommendations for further work ..... 40
8. Archive deposition ..... 41
9. Contributors and acknowledgements ..... 41
10. Bibliography ..... 41
Disclaimer ..... 41

## List of Figures

1. Site location, showing trenches (black) and the development area (red) ..... 2
2. Trench locations, scale 1:2500 ..... 5
3. Trench 4, plans and sections ..... 8
4. Trench 11, plan and section ..... 11
5. Trench 17, plan and section ..... 14
6. Trench 18, plan and section ..... 16
7. Trench 19, plan and section ..... 18
8. Trench 21, plan and section ..... 20
9. Trench 22, plan and section ..... 22
10. Trench 25 , plan and section ..... 24
11. Trench 40, plan and section ..... 29
List of Tables
12. Trench dimensions ..... 6
13. Bulk finds quantities ..... 31
14. Pottery quantities ..... 31
15. Roman pottery fabric quantities ..... 33
16. List of samples ..... 35

## List of Appendices

1. Brief and specification
2. Context list
3. Pottery Catalogue

## Summary

An archaeological evaluation was carried out on land south of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton (TM 397 789); HLN 009.

A trial trench evaluation was carried out at the above site from $7^{\text {th }}$ to 19 th September 2009 in advance of a proposal to redevelop the site. A number of features of archaeological interest were recorded during the work. These were a number of field boundary ditches dating to the Bronze or Iron Age, Roman, and Post-Medieval periods, as well as a scatter of pits and isolated post-holes of similar dates. A large depression or pit of post-medieval or modern date was also recorded.

Duncan Stirk, SCCAS for Suffolk CC (Report no: 2009/260)




## 1. Introduction

A planning application was made for a development of industrial units at land south of Sparrowhawk road, Holton, Suffolk. The site is centred on approximately NGR TM 397 789 and comprises approximately a total of 5.64 hectares.

The site has not been the subject of archaeological investigation in the past, but its position in the landscape and its large size indicate a high potential for archaeological remains to be present. 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 Jess Tipper of the SCCAS Conservation Team (Appendix 1). The SCCAS Field Team was subsequently commissioned to carry out the work by the client, Daniel Connal Partnership.

## 2. Geology and topography

The site of the proposed development is immediately to the north of Halesworth and the village of Holton, beside Sparrowhawk Road. (Figure 1) At the time of the evaluation the site was open pasture with trees on much of the perimeter. A single field boundary divided off a small enclosure in the northern part of the site. The site was located across the side of a hill, with the small enclosure at the northern end of the site being level above the 35 m contour line, and the rest of the site variously sloping down to the field edges which were located between the 25 and 30 m contour lines.

The site was bounded to the north by Sparrowhawk Road and to the east largely by the buildings and associated paddocks for Upper Holton Farm. To the southwest was a ditched field boundary separating the site from agricultural fields.

The drift geology underlying the site is Glacial Till deposited during the Anglian Glaciation; represented here mainly by chalky boulder clay.


Figure 1. Site location, showing trenches (black) and the development area (red)

## 3. Archaeological and historical background

The site is located to the north of the town of Halesworth and northwest of the village of Holton. Little archaeological work has been undertaken in the vicinity of the development site. There are two entries in the Historic Environment Record (HER) in the vicinity of the site. The Roman route between Ilketshall St. John and Spexhall is thought to run about 310 m to the west of the development site (HER number ISL 007). Also, Halesworth Airfield (HLN 007) was located immediately to the northeast and east of the development site. Indeed the northern enclosure of the site is shown to be part of the airfield site. The airfield was constructed in 1942 and began operations in July 1943. The airfield was occupied by a variety of American squadrons before it was taken over by the Royal Navy in 1945, when it became HMS Sparrowhawk, the modern road bounding the site to the north retaining this name.

Examination of historic maps reveals little about the development site. The Hodskinson map of 1783 locates the development site well outside the built up areas of Halesworth and Holton. Later Ordnance survey maps dating to the1880's, 1890's, and 1920's depict the site as fields, presumably attached to the adjoining Upper Holton Farm. The only feature depicted on the plans, that is no longer evident on the ground, is a field boundary comprising a tree lined ditch and adjacent track, that runs from the site entrance to the southern edge of the site.

An aerial photograph dated 1945 shows airfield buildings and related surfaces in the northern enclosure, part of which survives as a concrete raft at the site entrance.

## 4. Methodology

Trial trenching was carried out from the $7^{\text {th }}$ to $19^{\text {th }}$ September 2009. The trenches were excavated using a $360^{\circ}$ mechanical excavator fitted with a 1.5 m 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. In consultation with Jess tipper of SCCAS Conservation team, certain trenches were moved to avoid overhead power cables.

The site covers approximately 5.64 hectares, of which 0.205 hectares was trenched, resulting in a sample of $3.64 \%$. This was less than the specified $5 \%$ because the northern part of site was inaccessible to the machine due to overhead cables, and in one portion, inaccessible because of trees.

The site was allocated the HER number HLN 009. 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. 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 Adobe Illustrator software.


Figure 2. Trench locations, scale 1:2500

## 5. Results

### 5.1 Introduction

The basic trench dimensions were as follows:

|  | Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Area sq. m |  | Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Area sq. m |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trench 1 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 23 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 2 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 24 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 3 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 25 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 4 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 26 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 5 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 27 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 6 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 28 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 7 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 29 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 8 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 30 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 9 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 31 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 10 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 32 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 11 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 33 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 12 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 34 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 13 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 35 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 14 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 36 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 15 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 37 | $42 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 67.2 |
| Trench 16 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 38 | $15.5 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 24.8 |
| Trench 17 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 39 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 18 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 40 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 19 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 41 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |
| Trench 20 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 42 | $27 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 43.2 |
| Trench 21 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 | Trench 43 | $27 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 43.2 |
| Trench 22 | $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ | 48 |  |  |  |

Table 1. Trench dimensions

### 5.2 Trench 1

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0101 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam |
| 0102 | 0.12 to 0.45 m | Subsoil. Mid reddish brown silty sand |
| 0106 | $0.45 \mathrm{~m}^{+}$ | Natural geology. Lt orangy brown sandy clay with frequent flint. |

The deposit sequence for Trench 1 was typical of most of the trenches during the evaluation, with a simple sequence of geological natural overlain by subsoil, and capped by topsoil and turf. The field had clearly been pasture for a considerable period of time, with the turf being well established. The interface between the topsoil and subsoil horizons is likely to reflect the lower limit of the grass root zone, with both contexts representing the topsoil.

### 5.3 Trench 2

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0103 | 0 to 0.22 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0104 | 0.22 to 0.40 m | Subsoil. Reddish brown silty sand. |
| 0105 | $0.40 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt orangy brown sandy clay to It green grey sandy clay <br> with frequent flint and chalk. |

### 5.4 Trench 3

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0107 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0108 | 0.12 to 0.32 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty sand. |
| 0109 | $0.32 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt orange brown to It greenish grey sandy clay with <br> frequent chalk. |

### 5.5 Trench 4

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0110 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0111 | 0.1 to 0.32 m | Subsoil. Grey brown sandy silt. |
| 0112 | $0.32 \mathrm{~m}+$ |  <br> chalk. |

Cutting the natural geology in the south-eastern portion of Trench 4 was a NE-SW aligned linear feature 0133, with shallow concave sides, and a flat base. It was 3.35 m wide and 0.35 m deep. Similar fills of pale grey flecked with dark orange clay sand were present along both edges of the feature, 0135 and 0136 . These were overlain by a mid to pale grey flecked with dark orange clay sand fill 0134. A small assemblage of Roman pottery, animal bone and an iron object were recovered from this fill. The final fill in the feature was mid to pale yellow brown sandy clay 0137, from which a single sherd of Roman pottery and 2 fragments of animal bone were recovered. The top of this feature was located at 30.99 m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) or 0.32 m below ground level (BGL).

In the north-western portion of Trench 4 the natural geology was cut by a semi-circular feature 0147, with steep concave sides and a concave base. It was 0.98 m long by over 0.4 m wide (extending beyond the trench edge) and 0.44 m deep. This held a mid grey brown silty sand clay primary fill 0151 , and a mid orange brown sandy clay with grey brown flecks, secondary fill 0150. Over this was a mid grey brown silty sand clay fill 0149, and a mid to pale yellow sandy clay upper fill 0148. A moderate assemblage of pottery ( 114 sherds) and animal bone was recovered from fill 0149 dated to the later Iron Age. The top of this feature was at 31.64 m AOD or 0.26 m BGL.

Two fragments of abraded Roman tile were recovered from the topsoil deposit 0110.

Figure 3. Trench 4, plan and sections

### 5.6 Trench 5

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0113 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0114 | 0.1 to 0.3 m | Subsoil. |
| 0115 | $0.3 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. |

### 5.7 Trench 6

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0116 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0117 | 0.1 to 0.3 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown sandy silt. |
| 0118 | $0.3 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt grey sandy clay with frequent chalk and flint. |

### 5.8 Trench 7

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0119 | 0 to 0.12 | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0120 | 0.12 to 0.37 m | Subsoil. Reddish brown silty sand with frequent brick \& coal in places. |
| 0122 | 0.25 to 0.45 m | Hillwash. Lt yellow brown clay sand. |
| 0121 | $0.25-0.45 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mottled orangy brown clay sand with frequent flint. |

Located at the base of the slope on the south-western boundary the deposit sequence was different from the typical sequence in that overlying the natural geology was a 0.25 m thick deposit of light yellow brown clay sand 0122 that was probably the result of colluvial 'hillwash' settling at the base of the slope. This deposit was limited to the north-western portion of the trench, lensing out to the southeast. The only other feature of note was a concentration of brick and coal within the subsoil horizon 0120, that was located in the northwest portion of the trench.

A single fragment of Roman tile was recovered from subsoil deposit 0120.

### 5.9 Trench 8

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0123 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0124 | 0.12 to 0.29 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty sand. |
| 0126 | 0.29 to 0.49 m | Hillwash. Lt yellow brown clay sand and It grey clay. |
| 0125 | $0.49 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt orange brown mottled with It grey clay sand with <br> frequent flint and chalk. |

Similar to Trench 7 a deposit of colluvial hillwash was present in this deposit sequence.

### 5.10 Trench 9

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0127 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0128 | 0.12 to 0.3 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown clay sand silt. |
| 0129 | $0.3 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt grey brown clay with frequent chalk and flint. |

### 5.11 Trench 10

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0130 | 0 to 0.14 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0131 | 0.14 to 0.32 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown to reddish brown sandy silt. |
| 0132 | $0.32 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt grey brown \& orange brown sandy clay with frequent <br> flint and chalk. |

### 5.12 Trench 11

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0155 | 0 to 0.14 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0156 | 0.14 m to 0.3 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty sand. |
| 0157 | $0.3 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mottled It orange brown \& It grey sandy clay. |

In the south-eastern part of the trench the natural geology was cut by a NE-SW aligned ditch 0192, that had moderate to steep convex sides and a flat base, 2.28 m wide and 0.64 m deep. It held a single mid to dark greenish grey and brown silty clay fill 0193. Modern finds were recovered from this ditch, but these don't appear in the finds report. This ditch corresponded with a line of darker green grass running across the entire field. The top of this ditch was at 33.57 m AOD or 0.43 m BGL.

Figure 4. Trench 11, plan and section

### 5.13 Trench 12

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0138 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0139 | 0.1 to 0.3 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty sand. |
| 0140 | $0.3 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt orange brown sandy clay with moderate flint and chalk. |

Trench 12 revealed part of the ditch seen in Trench 11 to the northeast, and this also corresponded with an overlying grass mark. A 1.2 m portion of the ditch (here numbered cut 0200 was visible at the south-eastern end of the trench, containing a mid to dark greenish grey brown silty clay fill 0201. This was not excavated in light of the recent date of the finds recovered from the ditch in Trench 11.

### 5.14 Trench 13

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0141 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0142 | 0.12 to 0.28 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty sand. |
| 0143 | $0.28 \mathrm{~m}+$ |  <br> frequent flint and chalk. |

### 5.15 Trench 14

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0144 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0145 | 0.1 to 0.23 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown clay silt. |
| 0146 | $0.23 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt grey brown clay with frequent chalk and flint. |

### 5.16 Trench 15

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0152 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0153 | 0.1 to 0.29 m | Subsoil. |
| 0224 | 0.29 to 0.56 m | Hillwash. |
| 0154 | $0.56 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. |

This trench was located at the base of the hill and revealed a deposit of colluvial hillwash 0224 over the natural geology.
5.17 Trench 16

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0225 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0226 | 0.12 to 0.4 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty clay. |
| 0227 | $0.4 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. |

### 5.18 Trench 17

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0175 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0176 | 0.12 to 0.26 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark grey brown clay silt |
| 0177 | $0.26 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. |

In the central part of the trench the natural geology was cut by a NW-SE aligned feature 0174. This had steep to vertical sides and a flat base, and was over 1.45 m long (extending beyond the trench edge) by 0.83 m wide, and 0.4 m deep. It held a light grey sand silt primary fill 0173, and an orange brown clay silt secondary fill 0172. A single sherd of prehistoric pot was recovered from fill 0172. This was overlain by a dark grey mottled with light orange brown sandy clay fill 0171, and a light orange brown sandy clay final fill 0170. Fill 0171 produced a small assemblage of prehistoric pot, animal bone, flint and burnt flint, and an iron nail. The angle of the interface between fills 0171 and 0172 may indicate the presence of a re-cut, but this was not certain. The top of this feature was at 32.39 m AOD or 0.26 m BGL.

### 5.19 Trench 18

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0178 | O to 0.12m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0179 | 0.12 m to 0.27 m | Subsoil. Reddish brown clay silt. |
| 0180 | $0.27 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt grey brown clay \& yellow brown clay sand with <br> frequent chalk. |

Cutting the natural geology in the middle of Trench 18 was a NE-SW aligned ditch 0205, that had moderate concave sides and a concave base, and was 0.9 m wide by 0.21 m deep. It held a mid to dark greyish brown silty clay fill 0206. Six sherds of flint tempered pot possibly dated to the Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age came from this fill. The top of this ditch was at 33.75 m AOD or 0.36 m BGL.

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0160 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0161 | 0.12 m to 0.29 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown silty clay. |
| 0162 | $0.29 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt brown grey clay with frequent chalk. |

Cutting the natural geology in the NE end of the trench was a NW-SE aligned ditch 0158. It was 1.12 m wide by over 1.6 m long and 0.38 m deep, and had moderate straight sides and a concave base. The ditch was filled by a mottled mid grey and yellowish brown silty clay fill, 0159. A single abraded Roman pottery sherd and a small fragment of post medieval tile was recovered from this fill.

5.21 Trench 20

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0181 | 0 to 0.09 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0182 | 0.09 to 0.21 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown silty clay. |
| 0183 | $0.21 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid to light grey brown clay with frequent chalk. |

### 5.22 Trench 21

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0184 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0185 | 0.1 to 0.33 m | Subsoil. Dark grey brown sand silt clay. |

A single possible post-hole 0168 was located in the north-eastern part of the trench. It was circular with near vertical sides and a concave base, measuring 0.27 m in diameter by 0.18 m deep. It held a single mottled mid grey and orangy brown sandy silty clay fill 0169.

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0163 | O to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0164 | 0.12 to 0.27 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark grey sandy clay. |
| 0165 | $0.27 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid grey sandy clay with frequent chalk and flint. |

Trench 22 was located across a large depression in the otherwise fairly uniform slope. The cause of this was a very large cut feature 0167 that had moderate concave sides and unseen base. Within the trench the feature was 5.55 m wide by over1.05m deep, and it held a single mid brown silty clay fill 0166. A small assemblage of pottery and CBM was recovered from this fill, dating to the $18^{\text {th }}$ or $19^{\text {th }}$ century at the earliest, but also including residual Roman wares. In the side of this large feature was a small possible post-hole 0191, with moderate concave sides and a sloping base, that was 0.37 m long by 0.32 m wide, and 0.1 m deep. It held a dark brown mottled with dark grey clay fill 0190, from which animal bone and a single flint were recovered. The top of the large pit was located at 33.57 m AOD or 0.36 m BGL.

Figure 9. Trench 22, plan and section

### 5.24 Trench 23

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0187 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0188 | 0.12 m to 0.27 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark grey brown sandy clay. |
| 0189 | $0.27 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt grey \& It orangy brown sandy clay with frequent flint <br> and chalk. |

### 5.25 Trench 24

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0194 | 0 to 0.12m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0195 | 0.12 m to 0.27 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark grey brown silty clay. |
| 0196 | $0.27 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Lt orangy brown \& It grey brown clay with frequent chalk <br> and flint. |

### 5.26 Trench 25

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0209 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0210 | 0.12 to 0.3 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown clay silt sand. |
| 0211 | 0.3 to 0.5 m | Hillwash. Lt orange brown sandy clay. |
| 0212 | $0.5 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mixed orangy brown \& grey brown sandy clay with <br> frequent flint. |

Cutting the natural geology in the southeast end of the trench was a NE-SW aligned ditch 0208. The ditch had moderate convex sides and a concave base, and was 1.15 m wide by 0.43 m deep. It held a mid orange brown silty clay sand fill 0207 , from which a single sherd of Roman pottery was recovered. The top of the ditch was at 27.72 m AOD or 0.58 m BGL. The ditch was sealed by a deposit of colluvial hillwash that was 0.3 m to 0.5 m thick.
5.27 Trench 26

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0197 | 0 to 0.08 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0198 | 0.08 to 0.22 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty clay. |
| 0228 | 0.22 to 0.52 m | Hillwash. Mid orangy brown silty clay. |
| 0199 | $0.52 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid to pale grey silty clay with frequent chalk \& flint. |

The natural geology in this trench was sealed by a deposit of colluvial hillwash 0228.

### 5.28 Trench 27

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0202 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0203 | 0.1 to 0.3 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty clay. |
| 0229 | 0.3 to $0.6-0.8 \mathrm{~m}$ | Hillwash. Mid orangy brown silty clay. |
| 0230 | $0.6-0.8 \mathrm{~m}$ to $0.8-1.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | Buried soil. Dark grey with orangy brown mottles silty clay. |
| 0204 | $0.8-1.0 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology (Alluvial)? Mid orangy brown silty clay with <br> frequent flints. |

The deposit sequence in this trench along the western side of the site was different from the norm, in that the natural geology 0204 in the base of the trench appeared to be alluvial. This deposit was investigated and found to be sterile and thought to date from the last glaciation. It was overlain by a similar deposit 0230, that was sealed by the colluvial hillwash 0229 that was found all along this side of the site.

### 5.29 Trench 28

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0231 | 0 to 0.09 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0232 | 0.09 to 0.25 m | Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty clay. |
| 0233 | 0.25 to $0.25-$ <br> 0.47 m | Hillwash. Mid orangy brown silty clay. |
| 0234 | $0.25-0.47 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid to pale grey silty clay with frequent chalk \& flint. |

The trench was located towards the western side of the site and in common with all the other trenches on this low-lying part of the site revealed a deposit of colluvial hillwash 0233.

### 5.30 Trench 29

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0235 | 0 to 0.11 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0236 | 0.11 to 0.44 m | Subsoil. Mid brown silty clay. |
| 0237 | 0.44 to $0.99-$ | Hillwash. Mid to pale brown silty clay. |
|  | 1.14 m | s |
| 0238 | $0.99-1.14 \mathrm{~m}$ to <br> $1.14-1.44 \mathrm{~m}$ | Natural geology (Alluvial?) Pale blue grey \& creamy brown clay. |
| 0239 | $1.14-1,44 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology (Alluvial?). Mid blue grey clay with frequent flint and stone. |

Like Trench 27, this trench was along the western boundary and revealed a possible alluvial sequence of deposits sealed by colluvial hillwash 0237.

### 5.31 Trench 30

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0240 | 0 to 0.09 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0241 | 0.09 to 0.31 m | Subsoil. Mid brown silty clay. |
| 0242 | 0.31 to 0.51 m | Hillwash. Mid to pale brown silty clay. |
| 0243 | 0.51 to 0.69 m | Natural geology (Alluvial?). Dark greyish brown silty clay with moderate <br> charcoal, flints, stones. Undulating base. |
| 0244 | $0.69 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid blue grey clay with frequent flint and stone. |

Trench 30 was also located in the western extent of the site and like the other trenches in this area, Trenches 27 and 29, revealed possible alluvial deposits sealed by colluvial hillwash 0242.

### 5.32 Trench 31

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0245 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0246 | 0.1 to 0.21 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown clay loam. |
| 0247 | $0.21 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Grey clay with moderate chalk. |

### 5.33 Trench 32

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0248 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0249 | 0.12 to 0.26 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark grey clay loam. |
| 0250 | $0.26 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid grey clay with moderate chalk. |

### 5.34 Trench 33

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0251 | O to 0.14m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0252 | 0.14 m to 0.26 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark grey clay loam. |
| 0253 | $0.26 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid grey clay with moderate chalk. |

### 5.35 Trench 34

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0254 | 0 to 0.08 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0255 | 0.08 to 0.25 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown silty clay. |
| 0256 | 0.25 to 0.6 m | Hillwash. Mid yellowish brown silty clay. |
| 0257 | $0.6 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Greyish brown to brownish grey clay with frequent chalk <br>  |

This trench contained a possible colluvial hillwash deposit sealing the natural geology, which was unusual in that it was not at the base of the slope.

### 5.36 Trench 35

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0258 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0259 | 0.12 to 0.3 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown clay loam. |
| 0260 | $0.3 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid grey sandy clay with frequent flint \& chalk. |

### 5.37 Trench 36

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0261 | 0 to 0.07 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0262 | 0.07 to 0.22 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown clay loam. |
| 0263 | 0.22 to 0.57 m | Hillwash. Mid yellowish brown silty clay. |
| 0264 | $0.57 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid grey clay with moderate chalk. |

The same possible colluvial hillwash deposit seen in Trench 34 was also present in this trench.

### 5.38 Trench 37

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0265 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil Turf. Dark brown clay loam. |
| 0266 | 0.1 to 0.3 m | Redeposited natural. Mixed orange brown \& grey clay with frequent flint, chalk <br> \& CBM. |
| 0267 | 0.3 to 0.5 m | Rubble hardcore. Mixed crushed concrete and brick rubble. |

The deposit sequence in Trench 37 which was within the northern enclosure was very different from that seen in the rest of the site. The general level of the field was much higher than the larger field to the south. This was explained by the thick deposit of hardcore rubble and re-deposited natural clay revealed in the trench, which had raised the ground level by as much as 0.4 m .

### 5.39 Trench 38

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0268 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0269 | 0.1 to 0.4 m | Redeposited natural. Mixed It grey \& orange brown clay with frequent chalk, <br> flint and CBM. |
| 0270 | 0.4 to 0.8 m | Rubble hardcore. Crushed concrete brick and mortar. |
| 0271 | $0.8 \mathrm{~m}+\mathrm{c}^{0}$ | Natural geology. Mid orangy brown sandy clay. |

The same ground raising rubble and clay deposits seen in Trench 37 were present in this trench, here raising the ground by 0.7 m .

### 5.40 Trench 39

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0272 | 0 to 0.15 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0273 | 0.15 to 0.4 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown sandy loam. |
| 0274 | $0.4 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Orange brown clay with frequent stone. |

Five fragments of possible roman tile were unstratified in this trench and were assigned to finds context 0213.

### 5.41 Trench 40

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0275 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0276 | 0.1 to 0.27 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown sandy loam. |
| 0277 | $0.27 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Orange brown clay with frequent stone. |

In the centre of the trench the natural geology was cut by a NE-SW aligned linear feature 0218. This had shallow concave sides and a concave base, and was 2.15 m wide by 0.24 m deep. It held a mid to dark grey and brown silty clay fill 0219 . Three sherds of Roman pottery came from this fill. Beside 0218 to the southeast, was a semicircular pit 0214, with gentle to moderate straight sides and a concave base. It was 3.9 m long by over 1.4 m wide (extending beyond the trench edge), and 0.5 m deep. It held a mid to dark grey silty clay fill 0215 and a slightly lighter fill 0216. A moderately sized assemblage of Roman period pottery (48 sherds), animal bone, fired clay, and burnt flint was recovered from fill 0215; and pottery (17 sherds) and animal bone from fill 0216. Four further fragments of Roman pottery were collected from between features 0218 and 0214 and assigned the finds number 0220. The top of these features was at 31.89 m AOD or 0.4 m BGL.


Figure 11. Trench 40, plan and sections

### 5.42 Trench 41

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0278 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0279 | 0.12 to 0.32 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown sandy clay loam. |
| 0280 | $0.32 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid brown grey sandy clay with chalk. |

### 5.43 Trench 42

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0281 | 0 to 0.1 m | Topsoil \& turf. Dark grey brown clay loam. |
| 0282 | 0.1 to 0.25 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown clay loam. |
| 0283 | $0.25 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mid grey sandy clay with frequent chalk. |

### 5.44 Trench 43

| Context | Depth | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 0284 | 0 to 0.12 m | Topsoil \& Turf. Dark grey brown sandy loam. |
| 0285 | 0.12 to 0.34 m | Subsoil. Mid to dark brown sandy clay loam. |
| 0286 | $0.34 \mathrm{~m}+$ | Natural geology. Mod grey clay \& mid orange brown sandy clay with chalk. |

## 6. Finds and environmental evidence (Stephen Benfield)

### 6.1 Introduction

Finds were collected from 18 contexts in nine evaluation trenches. The quantities by context are shown in the table below.

| Ctxt | Pottery |  | CBM |  | Flint |  | Animal boneNo Wt/g |  | Miscellaneous | Spot Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | Wt/g | No | Wt/g | No | Wt/g |  |  |  |  |
| 0100 | V |  | 5 | 485 | 1 | 9 |  |  | Slag 1-37g | Modern |
| 0110 | + |  | 2 | 109 |  |  |  |  | 3 | Rom |
| 0120 |  |  | 1 | 386 |  |  |  |  |  | Rom |
| 0134 | 6 | 50 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 60 | Iron 1-1g | Rom |
| 0137 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |  | Rom |
| 0149 | 114 | 369 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 3 |  | Iron Age |
| 0159 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  | Charcoal 1-1g | PMed Rom |
| 0166 | 9 | 65 | 5 | 206 |  |  |  |  |  | PMed |
| 0171 | 1 | 13 |  |  | 2 | 16 | 2 | 1 | Bt flint 2-15g, Iron 1-1g | Preh |
| 0172 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Preh |
| 0190 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | $1{ }^{2} 1$ |  |  |
| 0206 | 6 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Preh |
| 0207 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rom |
| 0213 |  |  | 5 | 272 |  |  |  |  |  | Rom |
| 0215 | 48 | 251 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | Fired clay $20-187 \mathrm{~g}$, Bt flint 2-39g, Charc 2-1g | Rom |
| 0216 | 17 | 78 |  |  |  | N | 7 | 10 |  | Rom |
| 0219 | 3 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rom |
| 0220 | 4 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rom |
| Total | 212 | 863 | 19 | 1461 | 4 | 28 | 27 | 85 |  |  |

Table 2. Bulk finds quantities

### 6.2 Pottery

The evaluation produced a total of 212 sherds of pottery weighing 863 g . The majority of the pottery is prehistoric or Roman but a small amount of post-medieval pottery was also recovered. The quantities by period are summarised in the table below and the full catalogue by context is in Appendix 3.

| Period | No. | \%No | Wt/g | \% Wt |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prehistoric | 122 | 57.5 | 397 | 46.0 |
| Roman | 86 | 40.6 | 418 | 48.4 |
| Post-medieval | 4 | 1.9 | 48 | 5.6 |
| Total | 212 | 100.0 | 863 | 100.0 |

Table 3. Pottery quantities by period.
The pottery was quantified by count and weight. Hand-made prehistoric wares were divided into broad fabric groups defined by their main visible inclusions. Roman and post-Roman fabric codes were assigned from the Suffolk Roman and post-Roman fabric series. A x10 binocular microscope was used to identify the fabrics. Details of fabric, form and form element were recorded and decoration and surface treatment were also noted. Each 'sherd family' was given a separate entry on an Access database table and an individual spotdate when possible

### 6.2.1 Prehistoric pottery

One hundred and twenty-two sherds of hand-made prehistoric pottery weighing 397 g were recovered from eight contexts in Evaluation Trenches 4, 17 and 18. Two broad fabric groups were identified, flint tempered and sand tempered.

Eight flint-tempered sherds (HMF) weighing 28 g came from three contexts in ditch 0174 in Trench 17 and ditch 0205 in Trench 18. Two sherds are from ditch 0174. The first, from fill 0171, is a medium-sized (13g) abraded bodysherd with a brown-red oxidised surface. This sherd is quite thick ( 11 mm ) and is tempered with common small to medium crushed burnt flint. The second sherd, from fill 0172, is small and abraded (2g) with predominantly fine flint temper. Six sherds $(26 \mathrm{~g})$ recovered from ditch 0205 (0206) are also tempered with common small-medium flint. Five of these are relatively thinwalled (about 5 mm thick) and are probably all part of one vessel. The remaining sherd is an abraded flake from the wall of another vessel. The sherds cannot be closely dated but are probably later Bronze Age or Iron Age.

One hundred and fourteen sand-tempered sherds (HMS) weighing 369g and representing a minimum of three vessels come from the fill of pit 0147 (0149) in Trench 4 and are the only pottery recovered from this feature. The surfaces of the sherds are dark brown or dark grey-brown and some appear slightly abraded. Among the sherds is a thick abraded everted rim from one vessel and a slightly flared rim with a flat fop from another. There is also a sherd from a well-formed base with a small footring. Some of the body sherds are quite thick (up to 11 mm ) but at least one is from a much thinner walled vessel and is burnished. All of this pottery can be dated to the Later Iron Age, probably 3rd to 1st century BC.

### 6.2.2 Roman pottery

In total, 86 sherds (418g) of Roman pottery were recovered from nine contexts from seven features in five evaluation trenches. Overall, much of the Roman pottery is abraded from a long deposition cycle and some is found with later-dated finds. The latest closely datable pieces are of later 2nd century date. More than $75 \%$ of the Roman pottery ( 65 sherds weighing 329 g ), comes from a single feature, pit 0214 (fills 0215 and 0216) in Trench 40. The other six features contained only a few sherds. The fabric quantities are summarised in Table 4 and the full catalogue by context is included in Appendix 3.

| Fabric | Code | No | \% No. | Wt/g | \% Wt |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Black-surfaced wares | BSW | 36 | 41.9 | 214 | 51.2 |
| Miscellaneous buff wares | BUF | 6 | 7.0 | 7 | 1.7 |
| Grey micaceous wares, black-surfaced | GMB | 3 | 3.5 | 8 | 1.9 |
| Grey micaceous wares, grey--surfaced | GMG | 2 | 2.3 | 11 | 2.6 |
| Miscellaneous sndy grey wares | GX | 35 | 40.7 | 150 | 35.9 |
| Central Gaulish samian | SACG | 4 | 4.7 | 28 | 6.7 |
| Total |  | 86 | 100 | 418 | 100 |

Table 4. Roman pottery fabric quantities
Most of the Roman pottery consists of local or regional coarsewares. Of itself, this material is not closely datable, other than as Roman, and no vessel forms were recorded amongst it which would help provide closer dating. None of the fabrics appear to be early and none are late. The most closely datable of the Roman pottery consists of a small quantity of Central Gaulish samian, recovered from pit 0214 (0215 and 0216), which can be dated to the 2nd century. This includes a sherd from a form $\operatorname{Dr} 33$ cup and a sherd from a Dr 38 flanged bowl, both of which are probably Antonine. These are the latest closely datable Roman sherds recovered; however, it should be noted that it they are quite abraded and may have been deposited some time after that date.

The predominance of utilitarian local coarse wares together with a few imported items of fine ware or specialist products appears typical of assemblages from Roman rural sites in Suffolk.

### 6.2.3 Post-Roman pottery (Richenda Goffin)

Four sherds of post-medieval pottery were recovered. These sherds all came from one context, the fill of the depression or large pit 0167 (0166) in Trench 22. All are fresh and unabraded. Three of the sherds $(41 \mathrm{~g})$ are from the same large Later Slipped Red Ware (LSRW) open vessel which can be dated to the 18th-19th century. The other is a Yellow ware (YELW) sherd $(7 \mathrm{~g})$ that can be dated to the late 18th-19th century.

### 6.3 Ceramic Building Material (CBM) and fired clay

In total, 19 pieces of CBM weighing 1461 g were recovered from six contexts in five evaluation trenches.

Thirteen fragments (973g) are identified as Roman. All of these are abraded, residual in later-dated contexts and could only be broadly classified as Roman brick or tile. Two pieces, one of them 25 mm thick. are from the topsoil in Trench 4 (0110). A large, very abraded piece, 65 mm thick, came from the subsoil in Trench 7 (0120). Another piece
(30mm thick) and several small fragments were residual in the fill of the depression or large pit 0167 (0166) in Trench 22. Finally, there are five heavily abraded joining pieces, which are unstratified finds from Trench 39 (0218). Together, the five pieces (weighing 272g) form part of a larger fragment which has a curved edge and possibly also part of a flat edge, so that the tile appears to from part of a semi-circle. The curved edge is uneven and the brick or tile clearly was not originally manufactured to this shape. The shape may be a product of breakage and very heavy abrasion, but appears more likely to have been cut or chipped to this shape for re-use.

Later material is all unstratified (0100). Included are a piece from a late-medieval or early post-medieval ?floor brick, a piece from a modern land drain, some thin, abraded pieces of tile ( 14 mm thick) which may be peg-tile, a small abraded piece which may be relatively modern brick and a small unabraded fragment.

Twenty fragments of fired clay weighing 187 g were recovered from a single context, pit 0214 (0215) in Trench 40. Four large and 16 smaller fragments are present. The pieces are slightly abraded, although they are very hard-fired and most, if not all, appear to belong together (as they are all hard-fired) or are part of one object of unidentifed form. The largest piece is up to about 35 mm thick.

### 6.4 Worked flint (Colin Pendleton)

Four pieces of worked flint (28g) were recovered from three contexts in two evaluation trenches. An unpatinated squat, irregular flake was unstratified (0100). A natural flake with a retouched notch and a squat patinated flake with limited edge retouch were from ditch 0174 (0171) in Trench 17 and an irregular ?lightly patinated squat flake came from post-hole 0191 (190) in Trench 22.

The three non-patinated pieces are very simple and crude and could easily be of Late Bronze Age or Iron Age date. This dating could also fit the patinated flake, although it could equally be earlier in date.

### 6.5 Burnt flint

Four burnt flints weighing 54g were collected from two contexts in Trenches 17 and 40. Two pieces ( 15 g ), one of which had been heated sufficiently to craze it, the other which is white coloured all over and may also have been heated, came from the fill of ditch

0174 (0171) in Trench 17. Two pieces which may have been subjected to lesser heat came from the fill of the pit 0214 (0215) in Trench 40. Heated stones, commonly burnt flints, are often associated with prehistoric activity.

### 6.6 Miscellaneous

Two very small pieces of iron, each weighing less than 1 g , were recovered. One is the lower part of a nail, from ditch 0174 (0171) in Trench 17. The other is a small fragment of probable ferrous material from the fill of the ditch 0133 (0134) in Trench 4.

A small non-diagnostic fragment of iron-rich slag $(37 \mathrm{~g})$ was unstratified (0100).

### 6.7 Animal bone

Small quantities of fragmented animal bone were recovered from seven contexts in four evaluation trenches. In total, there are 27 individual small pieces of bone which together weigh 85 g . This material consists of teeth including sheep teeth, burnt pieces, the ends of small bones and a few degraded pieces from long-bones. These appear to be mostly from small to medium sized mammals, although a single tooth from a large mammal came from ditch 0133 (0134) in Trench 4. A small quantity of burnt bone came from the pit 0214 (0215) in Trench 40. Overall, this suggests that, in general, ancient animal bone probably does not survive well on the site.

### 6.8 Plant macrofossils and other remains (Val Fryer)

Five samples were taken for the retrieval of plant macrofossil assemblages and submitted for assessment.

| Sample | Context | Feature | Trench | Dating? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0134 | Ditch 0133 | 4 | Roman |
| 2 | 0147 | Pit 0147 | 4 | IA |
| 3 | 0169 | Posthole 0168 | 21 |  |
| 4 | 0171 | Ditch 0174 | 17 | Preh |
| 5 | 0215 | Pit 0147 | 40 | Rom |
| Table 5. List of samples |  |  |  |  |

Apart from plant macrofossils a small fragment (1g) of charcoal was collected from ditch 0158 (0159) in Trench 22 and two small fragments from pit 0214 (0215) in Trench 40.

The assessment report is currently being produced and will be included as soon as it is available.

### 6.9 Discussion of the finds and environmental evidence

Finds were recovered from 18 contexts in nine evaluation trenches. As little archaeological work has previously been undertaken in the vicinity, the assemblage, which contains prehistoric, Roman and later material contributes valuable information towards understanding the archaeological potential of the site. The most significant finds recovered during the evaluation are of prehistoric and Roman date.

Prehistoric finds include a small quantity of flint-tempered pottery, some of which can probably be dated to the later Bronze Age or early to mid Iron Age. This pottery comes from two ditches in Trenches 17 and 18. The dating of some of the flint-tempered pottery can be supported by the dating of the small quantity of worked flint from the site which is later prehistoric, Bronze Age or Iron Age. There is a larger quantity of sandtempered pottery, from one feature, pit 0147 in Trench 4 which can be dated to the Later Iron Age (3rd to 1st century BC). This pottery probably represents three or more vessels including a substantial proportion of at least one vessel. Although some of the sherds are slightly abraded it can be considered to be contemporary with the context.

Roman pottery and CBM was recovered from nine evaluation trenches. It is not clear if there may be continuity between the Later Iron Age and the Roman activity as the Later Iron Age and Roman material recovered is not sufficiently closely datable. Much of the Roman tile and pottery is abraded, especially the tile and must represent residual material entering later contexts. In this respect there is some difficulty in closely dating the Roman activity on the site and in dating features which produced only small quantities of abraded Roman material. The latest closely-dated pottery is Central Gaulish samian which belongs to the later 2nd century. This was part of a small group of Roman pottery from pit 0214 in Trench 40 which contained the majority of the Roman pottery assemblage. The sherds were quite abraded, and were probably deposited some time after the period of their main currency. However, it can be noted that none of the fabrics or forms which characterise the late and latest Roman period are present in the assemblage.

There is only a small quantity of material of post-Roman date. Of note is a piece of a brick, possibly a floor brick, of late medieval, or more probably of early post-medieval date. Otherwise, the post-Roman finds, where they can be closely dated are of relatively modern (18th-19th century) date.

## 7. Discussion

### 7.1 Trench 4

The two cut features in Trench 4, pit 0147, and linear feature 0133, are unlikely to be contemporaneous. A moderate assemblage of late Iron Age pottery and animal bone from the pit, including substantial portions of a single vessel, strongly suggests that this was a pit for the disposal of rubbish. Little if any of these finds are likely to be residual so we can fairly confidently assign a late Iron Age date to the pit. The linear feature on the other hand, appears to be considerably later in date, as indicated by the very abraded Roman pottery recovered from its fills. The linear feature also had a profile that is unlike typical V-profile Roman field boundary ditches, in that it was wide and shallow. No alternative interpretations spring to mind from the evidence at hand however.

### 7.2 Trench 11

A single linear feature 0192 was recorded in Trench 11. This feature corresponds with a line of darker turf growth that runs across the entire field. The feature is clearly a field boundary ditch that is depicted on the Ordnance Survey maps dated to the 1880's, 1890's, and 1920's. This appears to be the boundary to a road or track that led to Upper Holton Farm from the southwest, and has now gone out of use.

### 7.3 Trench 17

The feature in Trench 17 is possibly the terminal end of a field boundary ditch. There is a suggestion that the feature had been re-cut at some stage, which might add weight to this interpretation. An alternative interpretation, with the feature being a discrete pit, is also a possibility, but one with little evidence for its purpose. The pottery recovered from the feature is a type produced from the Bronze Age to middle Iron Age, although the iron nail fragment present in fill 0171 indicates a date of deposition in the latter period.

### 7.4 Trench 18

The single SW-NE aligned linear feature, 0205, seen in Trench 18 can confidently be interpreted as a field boundary ditch. The pottery assemblage recovered from its fill indicates that it is a prehistoric feature, possibly dating from the later Bronze-Age to the middle Iron Age. A similar pottery ware was recovered from the ditch in Trench 17 along with an iron nail, so a date in the Iron Age is perhaps more likely.

### 7.5 Trench 19

A single NW-SE aligned linear feature, 0158, was seen in Trench 19. This can be confidently interpreted as a field boundary ditch. A Roman pottery sherd and a Post Medieval tile fragment were recovered from the ditch fill, so the dating of the feature is uncertain. The form and character of the ditch are closer to the Roman period features on the site rather than the modern ditch 0192. On balance therefore, it may be that the tile has been misidentified or is intrusive and the ditch is of early date.

### 7.6 Trench 21

A single small feature was present in Trench 21. This had a form typical of a post-hole, but was undated by finds. The post-hole was however in line with the projected course of ditch 0205 from Trench 18, and may therefore be related to that prehistoric boundary.

### 7.7 Trench 22

A large pit feature 0167 was recorded in Trench 22, that was large enough to be evident on the ground surface. A mixed assemblage of Post Medieval pottery as well as Roman wares was recovered from the fill of this feature indicating it was filled in the late 18th or 19th century at the earliest. A post-hole feature at the edge of the large pit suggests that it was fenced-off, presumably to keep people and livestock out of the pit. A feature of this size is most likely to be related to quarrying of the underlying geology. A problem with this interpretation is that the natural geology in the vicinity is very mixed sandy clay containing large amounts of chalk and flint. It is difficult to imagine how such mixed material would be used without extensive processing.

An alternative interpretation for the feature that may fit its presumed early Modern date, is the feature being a dew-pond. The base of the feature was not reached, so it is not clear whether the clay was puddled or treated in some way so that it retained water.

The proximity to the Second World War airfield raises an intriguing last possibility. Local legend has it that there is a crash site in the field. This is not supported by the records of Suffolk crash sites that are available on the internet. More tellingly, none of the aluminium and other metal fragments typical of crash sites was present in the pit, so that interpretation can probably be ruled out. Alternatively, the feature may be a bomb crater; either from a bombing raid on the airfield, or an intentionally shed bomb from one of the American B24 Liberator bombers that were based at the airfield late in the war.

### 7.8 Trench 25

A SW-NE aligned feature in Trench 25 was almost certainly a field boundary ditch. The ditch is tentatively dated to the Roman period on the basis of a single sherd of Roman period Greyware recovered from its fill.

### 7.9 Trenches 37 and 38

The deposit sequence in these trenches was unlike the sequence across the rest of the site. It indicates that during the construction of the adjacent airfield this small field was excavated down to the natural geology before a hardcore deposit was laid down.

### 7.10 Trench 40

The linear feature 0218 seen within this trench is similar in form and date to the one seen in Trench 4 to the southwest. The alignment and line are the same, which confirms that this is part of the same feature, The presence of the feature in two trenches suggests that despite being unusual in form, the feature is a boundary ditch of some type. Beside it was a large pit 0214 from which the majority of the Roman pottery assemblage was recovered. This assemblage dates the feature to the later 2nd century at the earliest.

## 8. Conclusions and recommendations for further work

The archaeological evaluation on land at Sparrowhawk Road, Holton has produced some important information about an area where little was previously known. Most of the evaluation trenches revealed no archaeological features, particularly in the northern, western, and southern parts of the site. The absence of archaeological features in the northern field however, is mainly a result of the destructive earthworks related to the construction of the airfield. Trenches in the central and eastern parts of the site contained scattered field boundary or enclosure ditches dating possibly from the Bronze Age, Iron Age, and Roman period, as well as a documented 19th century ditch. These features are fairly typical evidence of ancient land use that demonstrate how extensively Suffolk was settled and cultivated.

Also revealed during the evaluation, and more important for our understanding of past settlement, is the cluster of pits and a ditch seen in Trenches 4 and 40, towards the eastern side of the site. These appear to date from the late Iron Age into the Roman period and are likely to represent a settlement in the vicinity. Unfortunately, not much can be said about the nature of this settlement or even if there was continuity between the Late Iron Age activity and the Roman activity.

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. These remains are present mainly in the central and particularly the eastern portion of the site. 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.

## 9. Archive deposition

Paper and photographic archive: SCCAS Bury St Edmunds
Finds and environmental archive: SCCAS Bury St Edmunds. Store Location: Row, Bay and Shelf: H / 80 / 4
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## 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.
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## Brief and Specification for Archaeological Evaluation LAND SOUTH OF SPARROWHAWK ROAD, HOLTON, SUFFOLK (DC/08/1249/FUL)

The commissioning body should be aware that it may have Health \& Safety responsibilities.

1. The nature of the development and archaeological requirements
1.1 Planning permission for the construction of four industrial units, 93 car-parking spaces, and associated landscaping on Land South of Sparrowhawk Road, Holton (TM 397 789), has been granted by Waveney District Council conditional upon an acceptable programme of archaeological work being carried out (application DC/08/1249/FUL).
1.2 The proposed development area measures c. 7.00 ha, on the southern side of Sparrowhawk Road (see accompanying plan). It is situated on chalky till (deep clay) at c. 30-35.00m AOD.
1.3 This large area has not been the subject of systematic archaeological investigation. There is high potential for archaeological remains to be defined at this location, however, given the large size of the proposed area. The proposed works would cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exists.
1.4 Aspects of the proposed works would cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exists.
1.5 In order to inform the archaeological mitigation strategy, and as a first part of a staged scheme of archaeological evaluation work, the following work is required:

- Collation and assessment of historic documentation, including all cartographic sources and aerial photographs, relevant to the whole site (c. 7.00 ha. in area) to identify historic landuse and the siting of old boundaries and which would contribute to the archaeological investigation of the site. Where possible copies should be included in the report.
- A linear trenched evaluation is required of the development area (c. 4.90 ha. in total; see accompanying plan), before any groundworks take place.

This will form part of an integrated evaluation strategy for the project, and may require subsequent geophysical survey; if required, a separate specification will be also issued for this work.
1.6 The results of this evaluation will enable the archaeological resource, both in quality and extent, to be accurately quantified, informing both development methodologies and mitigation measures. Decisions on the need for, and scope of, any further work should there be any archaeological finds of significance will be based upon the results of the evaluation and will be the subject of an additional brief.
1.7 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.
1.8 Detailed standards, information and advice to supplement this brief are to be found in Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14, 2003.
1.9 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 Written Scheme of Investigation (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 WSI as satisfactory. The WSI will provide the basis for measurable standards and will be used to satisfy the requirements of the planning condition.
1.10 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 the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of SCC (SCCAS/CT) before execution.
1.11 The responsibility for identifying any constraints on field-work, e.g. Scheduled Monument status, Listed Building status, public utilities or other services, tree preservation orders, SSSIs, wildlife sites \&c., ecological considerations rests with the commissioning body and its archaeological contractor. The existence and content of the archaeological brief does not over-ride such constraints or imply that the target area is freely available.
1.12 Any changes to the specifications that the project archaeologist may wish to make after approval by this office should be communicated directly to SCCAS/CT and the client for approval.

## 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 the potential for the survival of environmental evidence.
2.5 Provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of cost.
2.6 This project will be carried through in a manner broadly consistent with English Heritage's Management of Archaeological Projects, 1991 (MAP2), all stages will follow a process of assessment and justification before proceeding to the next phase of the project. Field evaluation is to be followed by the preparation of a full archive, and an assessment of potential. Any further excavation required as mitigation is to be followed by the preparation of a full archive, and an assessment of potential, analysis and final report preparation may follow.

Each stage will be the subject of a further brief and updated project design; this document covers only the evaluation stage.
2.7 The developer or his archaeologist will give SCCAS/CT (address as above) five working days notice of the commencement of ground works on the site, in order that the work of the archaeological contractor may be monitored.
2.8 If the approved evaluation design is not carried through in its entirety (particularly in the instance of trenching being incomplete) the evaluation report may be rejected. Alternatively the presence of an archaeological deposit may be presumed, and untested areas included on this basis when defining the final mitigation strategy.
2.9 An outline specification, which defines certain minimum criteria, is set out below.

## 3. Specification: Assessment of Historic Documentation, including Aerial Photographs

3.1 Collation and assessment of all cartographic sources relevant to the site to identify historic landuse, the siting of old boundaries and any earlier buildings. Where possible copies should be included in the report.
3.2 Collation and assessment of historic documentation relevant to the site that would contribute to the archaeological investigation of the site.
3.3 Re-assessment of aerial photographic evidence and, where relevant, a replotting of archaeological and topographic information by a suitably qualified specialist with relevant experience at a scale of $1: 2500$. It should be possible to obtain residual errors of less than $\pm$ 2 m . Rectification of extant mapped features such as field boundaries and buildings shall be undertaken in order to give additional indication of accuracy of the transcription.

## 4. Specification: Trenched Evaluation

4.1 Trial trenches are to be excavated to cover $5 \%$ by area, which is $2,450.00 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (see accompanying plan), These shall be positioned to sample all parts of the development site. Linear trenches are thought to be the most appropriate sampling method. Trenches are to be a minimum of 1.80 m wide unless special circumstances can be demonstrated, this will result in a minimum of $1,361.00 \mathrm{~m}$ of trenching at 1.80 m in width. The exact area and extent of the access road is undefined and this area will also need to be evaluated.
4.2 If excavation is mechanised a toothless 'ditching bucket' at least 1.20 m wide must be used. A scale plan showing the proposed locations of the trial trenches should be included in the WSI and the detailed trench design must be approved by SCCAS/CT before field work begins.
4.3 The topsoil may be mechanically removed using an appropriate machine with a back-acting arm and fitted with a toothless bucket, down to the interface layer between topsoil and subsoil or other visible archaeological surface. All machine excavation is to be under the direct control and supervision of an archaeologist. The topsoil should be examined for archaeological material.
4.4 The top of the first archaeological deposit may becleared 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 excavation will be made by the senior project archaeologist with regard to the nature of the deposit.
4.5 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. For guidance:

For linear features, 1.00 m wide slots (min.) should be excavated across their width;
For discrete features, such as pits, $50 \%$ of their fills should be sampled (in some instances $100 \%$ may be requested).
4.6 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.
4.7 Archaeological contexts should, where possible, be sampled for palaeoenvironmental remains. Best practice should allow for sampling of interpretable and datable archaeological deposits and provision should be made for this. The contractor shall show what provision has been made for environmental assessment of the site and must 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 archaeological deposits (Murphy, P.L. and Wiltshire, P.E.J., 1994, A guide to sampling archaeological deposits for environmental analysis) is available for viewing from SCCAS.
4.8 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.
4.9 Metal detector searches must take place at all stages of the excavation by an experienced metal detector user.
4.10 All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed SCCAS/CT during the course of the evaluation).
4.11 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.
4.12 Plans of any archaeological features on the site are to be drawn at 1:20 or 1:50, depending on the complexity of the data to be recorded. Sections should be drawn at 1:10 or 1:20 again depending on the complexity to be recorded. All levels should relate to Ordnance Datum. Any variations from this must be agreed with SCCAS/CT.
4.13 A photographic record of the work is to be made, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies and/or high resolution digital images.
4.14 Topsoil, subsoil and archaeological deposit to be kept separate during excavation to allow sequential backfilling of excavations.
4.15 Trenches should not be backfilled without the approval of SCCAS/CT.

## 5. General Management

5.1 A timetable for all stages of the project must be agreed before the first stage of work commences, including monitoring by SCCAS/CT. The archaeological contractor will give not
less than five days written notice of the commencement of the work so that arrangements for monitoring the project can be made.
5.2 The composition of the archaeology contractor staff must be detailed and agreed by this office, including any subcontractors/specialists. For the site director and other staff likely to have a major responsibility for the post-excavation processing of this evaluation there must also be a statement of their responsibilities or a CV for post-excavation work on other archaeological sites and publication record. Ceramic specialists, in particular, must have relevant experience from this region, including knowledge of local ceramic sequences.
5.3 It is the archaeological contractor's responsibility to ensure that adequate resources are available to fulfill the Brief.
5.4 A detailed risk assessment must be provided for this particular site.
5.5 No initial survey to detect public utility or other services has taken place. The responsibility for this rests with the archaeological contractor.
5.6 The Institute of Field Archaeologists' Standard and Guidance for archaeological field evaluation (revised 2001) should be used for additional guidance in the execution of the project and in drawing up the report.

## 6. 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 report should reflect the aims of the WSI.
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, including an assessment of palaeoenvironmental remains recovered from palaeosols and cut features. Its conclusions must include a clear statement of the archaeological potential of the site, and the significance of that potential in the context of the Regional Research Framework (East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers 3 \& 8, 1997 and 2000).
6.7 The results of the surveys should be related to the relevant known archaeological information held in the County Historic Environment Record (HER).
6.8 A copy of the Specification should be included as an appendix to the report.
6.9 The project manager must consult the County HER Officer (Dr Colin Pendleton) to obtain an HER number for the work. This number will be unique for each project or site and must be clearly marked on any documentation relating to the work.
6.10 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines.
6.11 The project manager should consult the SCC Archive Guidelines 2008 and also the County HER Officer regarding the requirements for the deposition of the archive (conservation, ordering, organisation, labelling, marking and storage) of excavated material and the archive.
6.12 The WSI should state proposals for the deposition of the digital archive relating to this project with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS), and allowance should be made for costs incurred to ensure the proper deposition (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/policy.html).
6.13 Every effort must be made to get the agreement of the landowner/developer to the deposition of the finds with the County HER or a museum in Suffolk which satisfies Museum and Galleries Commission requirements, as an indissoluble part of the full site archive. If this is not achievable for all or parts of the finds archive then provision must be made for additional recording (e.g. photography, illustration, analysis) as appropriate. If the County HER is the repository for finds there will be a charge made for storage, and it is presumed that this will also be true for storage of the archive in a museum.
6.14 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.
6.15 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 SCCAS/CT, by the end of the calendar year in which the evaluation work takes place, whichever is the sooner.
6.16 County HER sheets must be completed, as per the County HER manual, for all sites where archaeological finds and/or features are located.
6.17 Where appropriate, a digital vector trench plan should be included with the report, which must be compatible with MapInfo GIS software, for integration in the County HER. AutoCAD files should be also exported and saved into a format that can be can be imported into MapInfo (for example, as a Drawing Interchange File or .dxf) or already transferred to .TAB files.
6.18 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.
6.19 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the County HER. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive).

Specification by: Dr Jess Tipper
Suffolk County Council
Archaeological Service Conservation Team
Environment and Transport Service Delivery
9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk IP33 2AR
Email: jess.tipper@et.suffolkcc.gov.uk

Date: 30 April 2009
Reference: / SparrowhawkRoad-Holton2009_revised2

This brief and specification remains valid for six 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.
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Trench 10 Natural.
Trench 4 Cut of ditch. NE-SW aligned. Shallow concave sides, gradual B.O.S. at base, flat base. 3.35 m wide $\times>1.55 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.35 \mathrm{~m}$ deep.
Secondary fill of ditch [0133]. Mid to pale grey flecked with dark orange clay sand. Primary fill of ditch [0133]. Pale grey flecked with dark orange clay sand
Primary fill of ditch [0133]. Pale grey flecked with dark orange clay sand Fill of ditch [0133]. Mid to pale yellow brown sandy clay. Trench 12 Topsoil.
Trench 12 Subsoil.
Trench 12 Natural. Trench 13 Topsoil.
Trench 13 Subsoil.
Trench 13 Natural.
Trench 14 Topsoil.
Trench 14 Subsoil
Trench 14 Natural.
Trench 4. Cut of pit
Top fill of pit [0147]. Mid to pale yellow sandy clay.
Fill of pit [0147]. Mid grey brown silty sand clay.
Secondary fill of pit [0147]. Mid orange brown sandy clay with grey brown flecks.
Primary fill of pit [0147]. Mid grey brown silty sand clay.
Trench 15 Topsoil.
Trench 15 Subsoil.
Trench 15 Natural.
Trench 11 Topsoil.
Trench 11 Subsoil.
Trench 11 Natural.
Trench 19. Cut of ditch. NW-SE aligned. Moderate straight sides and concave base. 1.12 m wide $\times>1.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.38 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. Fill of ditch [0158]. Mottled mid grey \& yellowish brown silty clay. Trench 19 Topsoil.

| Context | Type | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0161 | Subsoil | Trench 19 Subsoil. |
| 0162 | Natural | Trench 19 Natural. |
| 0163 | Topsoil | Trench 22 Topsoil. |
| 0164 | Subsoil | Trench 22 Subsoil. |
| 0165 | Natural | Trench 22 Natural. |
| 0166 | Depression/large pit | Fill of depression/big pit [0167]. Mid brown silty clay. |
| 0167 | Depression/large pit | Trench 22. Cut of depression or large pit. Moderate concave sides \& unseen base. 5.55m x >1.6m $\times \gg 1.05 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. |
| 0168 | Post-hole | Trench 21. Cut of post-hole. Nr. Vertical sides \& concave base. 0.27m diameter x 0.18m deep. |
| 0169 | Post-hole | Mottled mid grey \& orangy brown sandy silty clay. |
| 0170 | Ditch? | Top fill of ditch? Terminal [0174]. Light orange brown sandy clay. |
| 0171 | Ditch? | Fill of ditch terminal? [0174]. Dark grey mottled with light orange brown sandy clay. |
| 0172 | Ditch? | Fill of ditch terminal? [0174]. Orange brown clay silt. |
| 0173 | Ditch? | Primary fill of ditch terminal? [0174]. Light grey sand silt. |
| 0174 | Ditch? | Trench 17. Cut of ditch terminal? Steep to vertical sides \& flat base. NW-SE aligned. $>1.45 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.83 \mathrm{~m}$ wide $\times 0.4 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. |
| 0175 | Topsoil | Trench 17 Topsoil. |
| 0176 | Subsoil | Trench 17 Subsoil. |
| 0177 | Natural | Trench 17 Natural. |
| 0178 | Topsoil | Trench 18 Topsoil. |
| 0179 | Subsoil | Trench 18 Subsoil. |
| 0180 | Natural | Trench 18 Natural. |
| 0181 | Topsoil | Trench 20 Topsoil. |
| 0182 | Subsoil | Trench 20 Subsoil. |
| 0183 | Natural | Trench 20 Natural. |
| 0184 | Topsoil | Trench 21 Topsoil. |
| 0185 | Subsoil | Trench 21 Subsoil. |
| 0186 | Natural | Trench 21 Natural. |
| 0187 | Topsoil | Trench 23 Topsoil. |
| 0188 | Subsoil | Trench 23 Subsoil. |
| 0189 | Natural | Trench 23 Natural. |
| 0190 | Post-hole | Fill of post-hole [0191]. Dark brown clay mottled with dark grey. |
| 0191 | Post-hole | Trench 22. Cut of post-hole. Moderate concave sides \& sloping base. 0.37m $\times 0.32 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.1 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{deep}$. |
| 0192 | Ditch | Trench 11. Cut of ditch. NE-SW aligned. Moderate to steep convex sides \& flat base. $>1.7 \mathrm{~m} \times 2.28 \times 0.64 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. |


| Context | Type | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0193 | Ditch | Fill of ditch [0192]. Mid to dark greenish grey brown silty clay. |
| 0194 | Topsoil | Trench 24 Topsoil. |
| 0195 | Subsoil | Trench 24 Subsoil. |
| 0196 | Natural | Trench 24 Natural. (ty) (ra) |
| 0197 | Topsoil | Trench 26 Topsoil. |
| 0198 | Subsoil | Trench 26 Subsoil. |
| 0199 | Natural | Trench 26 Natural. |
| 0200 | Ditch | Trench 12. Cut of ditch. NE-SW aligned. Unexcavated. $>1.7 \mathrm{~m} \times>1.2 \mathrm{~m}$ wide. |
| 0201 | Ditch | Fill of ditch [0200]. Mid to dark greenish grey brown silty clay. Unexcavated. |
| 0202 | Topsoil | Trench 27 Topsoil. |
| 0203 | Subsoil | Trench 27 Subsoil. |
| 0204 | Natural | Trench 27 Natural. |
| 0205 | Ditch | Trench 18. Cut of Ditch. SW-NE aligned. Moderate concave sides \& concave base. $3.8 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.9 \mathrm{~m}$ wide $\times 0.21 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. |
| 0206 | Ditch | Fill of ditch [0205]. Mid to dark greyish brown silty clay. |
| 0207 | Ditch | Fill of ditch [0208]. Mid orange brown silty clay sand. |
| 0208 | Ditch | Trench 25. Cut of ditch. SW-NE aligned. Moderate convex sides \& concave base. 1.15 m wide $\times .1 .65 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.43 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. |
| 0209 | Topsoil | Trench 25 Topsoil. |
| 0210 | Subsoil | Trench 25 Subsoil. ${ }^{\text {dl }}$ |
| 0211 | Hillwash | Trench 25 Hillwash. |
| 0212 | Natural | Trench 25 Natural. |
| 0213 | Finds Number | Unstratified finds Trench $39{ }^{\circ}$ |
| 0214 | Pit? | Trench 40. Cut of Pit? Circular in plan. Gentle to moderate straight sides \& concave base. $3.9 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.4 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. |
| 0215 | Pit? | Fill of pit [0214]. Mid to dark grey silty clay. |
| 0216 | Pit? | Fill of pit [0214]. Mid grey silty clay. |
| 0217 | Pit? | Fill of pit [0214] possible in-situ burning. Mid reddish brown mottled with greyish brown silty clay. |
| 0218 | Ditch? | Trench 40. Cut of possible ditch. SW-NE aligned. Shallow concave sides and concave base. 2.15 m wide $\times>1.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.24 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. |
| 0219 | Ditch? | Fill of possible ditch [0218]. Mid to dark grey \& brown silty clay. |
| 0220 | Finds Number | Finds from uncertain deposit between ditch [0218] \& pit [0214]. |
| 0221 | Topsoil | Trench 40 Topsoil. |
| 0222 | Subsoil | Trench 40 Subsoil. |
| 0223 | Natural | Trench 40 Natural. A0. ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |
| 0224 | Hillwash | Trench 15 Hillwash. तve |

Trench 16 Topsoil.
Trench 16 Subsoil.
Trench 16 Natural.
Trench 26 Hillwash.
Trench 27 Hillwash.
Trench 27 Buried soi
Tr
Trench 28 Topsoil.
Trench 28 Subsoil.
Trench 28 Hillwash.
Trench 28 Natural.
Trench 29 Topsoil.
Trench 29 Subsoil.
Trench 29 Hillwash.
Trench 29 Alluvial deposit?
Trench 29 Natural.
Trench 30 Topsoil.
Trench 30 Subsoil.
Trench 30 Hillwash.
Trench 30 Alluvial deposit?
Trench 30 Natural.
Trench 31 Topsoil.
Trench 31 Subsoil.
Trench 31 Natural.
Trench 32 Topsoil.
Trench 32 Subsoil.
Trench 32 Natural.
Trench 33 Topsoil.
Trench 33 Subsoil.
Trench 33 Natural.
Trench 34 Topsoil.
Trench 34 Subsoil.
Trench 34 Hillwash?

Context Type | 0225 | Topsoil |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0226 | Subsoil |
| 0227 | Natural |
| 0228 | Hillwash |
| 0229 | Hillwash |
| 0230 | Buried soil |
| 0231 | Topsoil |
| 0232 | Subsoil |
| 0233 | Hillwash |
| 0234 | Natural |
| 0235 | Topsoil |
| 0236 | Subsoil |
| 0237 | Hillwash |
| 0238 | Alluvium? |
| 0239 | Natural |
| 0240 | Topsoil |
| 0241 | Subsoil |
| 0242 | Hillwash |
| 0243 | Alluvium? |
| 0244 | Natural |
| 0245 | Topsoil |
| 0246 | Subsoil |
| 0247 | Natural |
| 0248 | Topsoil |
| 0249 | Subsoil |
| 0250 | Natural |
| 0251 | Topsoil |
| 0252 | Subsoil |
| 0253 | Natural |
| 0254 | Topsoil |
| 0255 | Subsoil |
| 0256 | Hillwash? |

Trench 37 Redeposited Natural Tren Rubble hardcore.
rench 38 Topsoil.
Trench 38 Redeposited natural.
Trench 38 Hardcore rubble.
Trench 38 Natural.
Trench 39 Topsoil.
Trench 39 Subsoil.
Trench 39 Natural.
Trench 40 Topsoil.
Trench 40 Subsoil.
Trench 40 Natural.
Trench 41 Topsoil.
Trench 41 Subsoil.
Trench 41 Natural.
Trench 42 Topsoil.
Trench 42 Subsoil.
Trench 42 Natural.
Trench 43 Topsoil.
Trench 43 Subsoil.
Trench 43 Natural.
Trench 36 Hillwash?
Trench 36 Natura
Trench 37 Topsoil.
Redeposited natural

Context Type | Natural |
| :--- |
| Topsoil |
| Subsoil |
| Natural |
| Topsoil |
| Subsoil |
| Hillwash? |
| Natural |
| Topsoil |
| Redeposit |
| Hardcore |
| Topsoil |
| Redeposit |
| Hardcore |
| Natural |
| Topsoil |
| Subsoil |
| Natural |
| Topsoil |
| Subsoil |
| Natural |
| Topsoil |
| Subsoil |
| Natural |
| Topsoil |
| Subsoil |
| Natural |
| Topsoil |
| Subsoil |
| Natural |



## Appendix 3. Pottery catalogue

| Context | Trench | Period | Fabric | Sherd | No | Wt/g | Notes | Spotdate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0134 | 4 | ROM ROM ROM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BSW } \\ & \text { GX } \\ & \text { GX } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{b} \\ & \mathrm{~b} \\ & \mathrm{r} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 29 \\ 15 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | Abraded <br> Abraded <br> Abraded | Rom Rom E/MC2+ |
| 0137 | 4 ll | ROM | BUF | b | 1 | 1 | thin buff sherd ${ }^{109}$ | C1-C2/3 |
| $0149$ | $4 \mathrm{c}^{\mathrm{c}}$ | PREH PREH PREH PREH | HMS <br> HMS <br> HMS <br> HMS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline r \\ & r \\ & \text { ba } \\ & \text { b } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 109 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 14 \\ 7 \\ 337 \end{array}$ | Abr everted thick rim Flat-topped rim footring base Bodysherds from 2+ vessels, thick dark surfaces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IA } \\ & \text { IA } \\ & \text { IA } \\ & \text { IA } \end{aligned}$ |
| 0159 | 19 | ROM | BSW | b | 1 | 3 | V abr. bodysherd | Rom |
| 0166 | 22 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PMED } \\ & \text { PMED } \\ & \text { ROM } \\ & \text { ROM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LSRW } \\ & \text { YELW } \\ & \text { BSW } \\ & \text { GX } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{b} \\ & \mathrm{~b} \\ & \mathrm{~b} \\ & \mathrm{~b} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 41 7 2 015 | From one large vessel <br> Abraded | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18th-19th C } \\ & \text { L18th-19th C } \\ & \text { Rom } \\ & \text { Rom } \end{aligned}$ |
| 0171 | 17 | PREH | HMF | b | $1$ | $0^{2} 13$ | Up to 10 mm thick, common s-m flint. | Preh |
| 0172 | 17 | PREH | HMF |  | 1 | 2 | abr, flaked sherd | Preh |
| 0206 | 18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PREH } \\ & \text { PREH } \end{aligned}$ | HMF HMF | $b$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 10 \end{array}$ | flake from wall of pot all same pot 5 mm thick | Preh Preh |
| 0207 | 25 | ROM | GX | b | 1 | 3 | Abraded | Rom |
| 0215 | $40$ | ROM ROM <br> ROM <br> ROM <br> ROM <br> ROM <br> ROM <br> ROM <br> ROM <br> ROM | BSW BSW BSW BSW BUF GX GX <br> SACG SACG SACG |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 29 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 9 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ 126 \\ 28 \\ 17 \\ 3 \\ 43 \\ 14 \\ \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | Abraded <br> Abraded <br> Abraded <br> Abraded <br> Abraded <br> Flanged bowl? out-turned rim/flanged bowl <br> Abraded <br> Abraded Dr 38 <br> Dr 33 | Rom Rom C1-C2/3 Rom Rom Rom Rom C2 M/LC2 M/LC2 |
| $0216$ | 40 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ROM } \\ & \text { ROM } \\ & \text { ROM } \\ & \text { ROM } \\ & \text { ROM } \end{aligned}$ | BUF <br> GMG <br> GX <br> GX <br> SACG | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{b} \\ & \mathrm{~b} \\ & \mathrm{~b} \\ & \mathrm{~b} \\ & \mathrm{~b} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 11 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 11 \\ 10 \\ 37 \\ 17 \end{array}$ | V abraded <br> Abraded <br> Miscellaneous bodysherds V abraded dish sherd | Rom <br> Rom <br> Rom <br> Rom <br> 125-200 AD |
| 0219 | 40 | ROM | GMB | b | 3 | 8 |  | Rom |
| 0220 | 40 | ROM | GX | b | 4 | 7 | abr. | Rom |

Key: $\mathrm{b}=$ bodysherd, $\mathrm{r}=$ rimsherd, $\mathrm{ba}=\mathrm{base}$ sherd.

