

Suffolk County Archaeologica **ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT**

SCCAS REPORT No. 2009/270

Cavendish CEVCP Primary School Suffolk County Council **CAV 050**

HER Information

Planning Application No: SE/09/0781

Date of Fieldwork: 1st & 2nd October 2009

Grid Reference: TL 8037 4650

Funding Body: R.M. Property

Curatorial Officer:

Project Officer:

OASIS ID: Archaeo

Linzi Everett

Jess Tipper

suffolkc1-66648





Contents

Summary

	Juncil		Page
1.	Introduction	oth o	sel
2.	Geology and topography	Counce	1
3.	Archaeological and historical background	suffolk eolos	3
4.	Methodology	Arche	3
5.	Results		3
6.	Finds evidence		7
7.	Conclusions and recommendations for further work		8

List of Figures

1.	Site location	2
2.	Trial trench locations	4
3.	Trench plans and sections	5
4.	Trench profiles	6
	Surchae	
Lis	t of Tables	

1.	Trench dimensions	3
2.	Finds quantities	7

List of Appendices

I. Context List	9
II. Brief and Specification	11ce
Suffolk County Service	Suffolk County Coservin Archaeological Servin



Summary

An archaeological evaluation was carried out on land at Cavendish Primary School, Cavendish (TL 8037 4650; CAV 050) in advance of a proposal to build an extension. Two features of archaeological interest were recorded during the work. These were a single ditch dating from the post-medieval period and a small post-hole of possible medieval date. Finds dating from the medieval to post-medieval periods were recovered Arci from a subsoil layer and unstratified contexts.

Introduction 1.

A planning application was made for an extension to Cavendish CEVCP School. Cavendish. The site is centred on approximately TL 8037 4650 and comprises a total of approximately 300 square metres within the school playground and 450 square metres in the adjacent field, the planned location of the contractor's compound.

The site is in an area recognised as being of high archaeological importance as recorded in the County Historic Environment Record (HER). 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 II). The SCCAS Field Team was subsequently commissioned to carry out the work by Pick Everard on behalf of the client, R.M. Property.

Geology and topography 2.

The site lies at approximately 48m OD, on a gentle north-west to south-east slope Suffolk Cologi Archaeologi towards the River Stour. The drift geology underlying the site is deep clay and chalky Archaeologi



[©]Crown Copyright. All Rights Reserved. Suffolk County Council Licence No. 100023395 2009

Figure 1. Site location

3. Archaeological and historical background

The high archaeological potential for the site was based predominantly on its location within the historic settlement core of Cavendish, less than 100m from the church of St. Mary (CAV 010) and situated on the north west edge of the medieval green. In addition, the recorded findspots of a Bronze Age urn, inverted over the cremated remains of a child (CAV 002) and a Roman pottery scatter (CAV 004), lie close to the development area.

4. Methodology

Trial trenching was carried out on 1st and 2nd October 2009. The trenches were excavated under the supervision of an archaeologist, using a JCB mechanical excavator fitted with a 1.5m wide toothless ditching bucket, removing overburden 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.

Identified contexts were allocated 'OP' (Observed Phenomena) numbers within a unique continuous numbering system under the Historic Environment Record (HER) code CAV 050 (Appendix I). Context information was recorded on Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service 'pro-forma' recording sheets.

A photographic record, both monochrome prints and digital shots, was made throughout.

5. Results

N Council

Two trenches were opened within the development area, the basic dimensions of which were as follows. Levels were calculated from the benchmark on St. Mary's Church (45.98m OD) and represent the height of the existing ground level at each end of the trench:

	Length (m)	Area sq. m	Width (m)	Depth	Height (m OD)
Trench 1	15.5	24.8	1.6	S end 0.78m	S end 47.45; N end 47.32
Trench 2	18	28.8	1.6	0.45m (average)	S end 48.58; N end 48.41

Table 1. Trench dimensions

Figure 2 shows the location of the excavated trenches within the development area. More detailed plans of the features within the trenches and drawn sections are shown in Figure 3.







Trench 1

Due to the constricted nature of the site, the trench was opened in two sections. Initially, a *c*.8m long section was excavated from north-east to south-west and subsequently backfilled before the second, *c*.7.5m long, section was excavated from south-west to north-east to meet with the southern end of the first section.

In the initial 8m of trench, the natural subsoil was not revealed as a modern service trench leading to a concrete lined soakaway was encountered at a depth of *c*.0.45m, sealed by 0.3m of tarmac and related sub-base and a thin layer of mid brown chalky clay subsoil *c*.0.15m thick (0002). In the south-western end of the trench the natural subsoil, a compact pale yellowish brown chalky clay with frequent flint pebbles, was revealed at a depth of 0.75m and was cut by a linear feature 0004 aligned north-east to south-west. This feature was shallow, almost disappearing at its western end,

measuring 0.08m deep and 0.45m wide. It had a concave base and was filled by 0005, a compact pale greyish brown chalky clay with regular stones. Fragments of animal bone and late medieval and post medieval CBM were recovered from this fill. This ditch was sealed by 0003, a *c*.0.3m thick layer of pale yellowish brown chalky clay subsoil with regular flint pebbles up to 0.1m and flecked with charcoal. It contained three fragments of CBM of probable late medieval/post-medieval date, but of which one example could be Roman.

0003 was sealed by subsoil layer 0002 which measured c.0.2m thick and was in turn sealed by 0.28m of tarmac and related hardcore sub-base.



Figure 3. Trench plans and sections

Trench 2

A *c*.0.3m thick layer of topsoil was removed along the entire length of the trench, leaving a 3.5m section at the northern end of the trench slightly high where a ceramic water pipe cut diagonally across the trench. A thin layer of mid brown chalky clay subsoil *c*.0.15m thick (0002) was present below the topsoil, sealing the natural subsoil, which consisted of a pale-mid yellowish brown clay with regular chalk flecks and flint pebbles. One feature was recorded cutting the natural subsoil in this trench, a small, oval posthole 0006. This measured *c*.0.3m long and *c*.0.25m wide with steep sides, becoming almost vertical on the southern edge. It was at least 0.18m deep but the full depth and characteristics of the base were uncertain as there appeared to be heavy animal disturbance in the lower part of the feature. The post-hole was filled by 0007, a compact, mid brown clay with regular stones and chalk flecks and occasional charcoal flecks. One sherd of medieval coarseware pottery dating from the 12th to 14th century came from the top of this fill and a small fragment of late medieval/post-medieval pottery was recovered from lower down the fill, possibly where there had been some disturbance.

Two sherds of medieval coarseware plus a glazed sherd of 17th to 18th century date were recovered from the topsoil of Trench 2.





6. Finds evidence (Richenda Goffin)

Introduction

coursice coursice										
Context	Pott	ery	СВ	М	P-med	glass	Animal	bone	Miscellaneous Spotdate	
	No.	Wt/g	No.	Wt/g	No.	Wt/g	No.	Wt/g	ourical	
0001 🔍 🤇	3	22	3	76	1	3			1 iron frag @ L17th-18th C,	
Alos	103								57g unstrat	
0003			3	384					Early p-med	
0005			7	107	2	24	3	22	Post-med	
0007	1	3	1	3					Late/p-med	
Total	4	25	14	570	3	27	3	22		

Finds were collected from 4 contexts, as shown in the table below.

Table 2. Finds quantities

Pottery

Four fragments of pottery were recovered in total (25g). A single fragment of a wheelthrown medieval coarseware was identified in the fill 0007 of the post-hole 0006 in Trench 2, dating to the late 12th-14th century. Two further medieval coarseware sherds were present as unstratified finds in 0001 in Trench 2, accompanied by an abraded body sherd of Speckle Glazed ware dating to the Late 17th to 18th century.

Ceramic building material

Fourteen fragments of ceramic building material were collected from the evaluation (570g). A small and abraded piece made in a fine bright orange fabric with ferrous inclusions dates to the late/post-medieval period, but this was found with a sherd of medieval pottery in post-hole 0007. Fragments of late/medieval and post-medieval roofing tile were recovered from ditch fill 0005, but also a coarse sandy roofing tile fragment with moderate small shell inclusions which could be earlier in date. Three larger but abraded fragments found in subsoil deposit 0003 also date to the late or post-medieval periods. One of these which is made in a medium sandy fabric with flint inclusions may be an early brick (Sue Anderson, pers. comm.), whilst a larger thicker fragment made in a medium sandy fabric with ferrous and flint inclusions and an abraded surface could even be Roman but is difficult to date with certainty. The third smaller fragment is particularly abraded and has a fine fabric with clay pellet inclusions which is likely to date to the late/post-medieval period.

Post-medieval bottle glass

Fragments of post-medieval bottle glass were identified in ditch fill 0005 in Trench 1 and also as an unstratified find in Trench 2.

Iron

A single fragment of a curved iron bar, tapering to a narrow point was recovered as an unstratified find. It is likely to be the remains of a whittle-tanged sickle-shaped blade Juney Service used for horticultural or agricultural purposes.

Animal bone

The fragmentary remains of three pieces of animal bone were collected from ditch fill 0005 in Trench 1. The only identifiable piece is a bovine phalange.

Conclusions and recommendations for further work 7.

The majority of the finds recovered from the evaluation date to the post-medieval period, but a small number of medieval coarsewares were identified, reflecting the sites position on the edge of the medieval green. A single large fragment of ceramic building material present in subsoil 0003 may be Roman, but the fragment is abraded and no diagnostic features survive. Roman pottery has been recovered from the area to the east of the school and the church nearby incorporates Roman brick within its fabric so it would not be surprising to find artefacts of this date here.

The evaluation revealed only two cut features, finds from which date both to the late medieval or post-medieval period. Other features could be present within the footprints of the school extension and the contractor's compound to the north, however the evaluation trenches suggest that archaeological levels are found at depths unlikely to be disturbed by the development. As such, the need for further work here appears to be limited.

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.

Appendix I

OPNO	FEATURE	TRENCH	IDENTIFIER	DESCRIPTION	OVER	UNDER
0001	0001	enic2	Deposit	Topsoil. Dark brown clay loam with brick fragments. Uniform 300mm thick throughout trench.	0002	service
0002	0002	1 & 2	Deposit	Subsoil. Mid brown chalky clay subsoil, moderate flint inclusions. Up to 0.2m thick.	0003	0001; tarmac
0003	0003	1	Deposit	Subsoil. Pale yellowish brown chalky clay subsoil with regular flint pebbles and charcoal flecks. Redeposited natural?	0005	0002
0004	0004	1	Ditch cut	NW-SE aligned ditch, fades out as it goes west. Shallow, concave base.		
0005	0004	1	Ditch fill	Compact pale greyish brown chalky clay with regular stones. CBM and animal bone recovered.		0003
0006	0006	2	Post-hole cut	Small oval pit or post hole. Steep sided but disturbed base.		
0007	0006	2	Post-hole fill	Compact, mid brown clay with regular stones and chalk flecks and occasional charcoal flecks. Pottery and CBM recovered.		0002
			Suffo	IK County Councie Ik County Service	1	

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Service



Environment and Transport Service Delivery 9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 2AR

Brief and Specification for Archaeological Evaluation

CAVENDISH CEVCP SCHOOL, THE GREEN, CAVENDISH

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 is to be sought by Suffolk County Council (St Edmundsbury Borough Council application SE/09/0781) for extensions and alterations, at Cavendish CEVCP School, The Green, Cavendish, Sudbury CO10 8BA (TL 804 465). Please contact the developer for an accurate plan of the proposed works.
- 1.2 The Planning Authority has been advised that any consent should be conditional upon an agreed programme of work taking place before development begins (PPG 16, paragraph 30 condition).
- 1.3 The area of the proposed development is located on the west side of Peacocks Road. The soils are deep clay of the Hanslope series, derived from the underlying chalky till at *c*. 45 50.00m AOD.
- 1.4 The school lies in an area of archaeological importance, recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, adjacent to the medieval church (HER: CAV 010) and fronting the medieval green. In addition, the school is located to the east of a Bronze Age burial (CAV 002) and west of a Roman pottery scatter (CAV 004) that are indicative of further occupation deposits in this vicinity. However, the area has not been the subject of systematic archaeological investigation. There is high potential for archaeological remains to be defined at this location, given the proximity to known remains. Any groundworks causing significant ground disturbance have the potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exists.
- 1.5 In order to inform the archaeological mitigation strategy, the following work will be required:
 - A linear trenched evaluation is required of the development area.
- 1.6 The results of this evaluation will enable the archaeological resource, both in quality and extent, to be accurately quantified. Decisions on the need for and scope of any mitigation measures, 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 specification.

1.70

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 (9 10 The Churchyard, 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*.
- 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 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.
- Suffolk cological An outline specification, which defines certain minimum criteria, is set out below. 2.9

Specification: Trenched Evaluation 3.

- 3.1 A single linear trial trench 13.00m in length, aligned E to W, is to be excavated to cover the area of the new extension on the west side of the school. The trench is to be a minimum of 1.80m wide unless special circumstances can be demonstrated.
- 3.2 If excavation is mechanised a toothless 'ditching bucket' at least 1.50m 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.
- 3.3 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.
- The top of the first archaeological deposit may be cleared by machine, but must then be 3.4 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.
- 3.5 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, 1.00m 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).

- 3.6 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.
- 3.7 Archaeological contexts should, where possible, be sampled for palaeo-environmental 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 palaeo-environmental 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 Rachel Ballantyne, 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.

- 3.8 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.
- 3.9 Metal detector searches must take place at all stages of the excavation by an experienced metal detector user.
- 3.10 All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed SCCAS/CT during the course of the evaluation).
- 3.11 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.
- 3.12 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.
- 3.13 A photographic record of the work is to be made, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies and/or high resolution digital images.
- 3.14 Topsoil, subsoil and archaeological deposit to be kept separate during excavation to allow sequential backfilling of excavations.
- 3.15 Trenches should not be backfilled without the approval of SCCAS/CT.

4. General Management

- 4.1 A timetable for all stages of the project must be agreed before the first stage of work commences, including monitoring by 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.
- 4.2 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.
- 4.3 It is the archaeological contractor's responsibility to ensure that adequate resources are available to fulfill the Brief.
- 4.4 A detailed risk assessment must be provided for this particular site.
- 4.5 No initial survey to detect public utility or other services has taken place. The responsibility for this rests with the archaeological contractor.
- 4.6

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.

5. Report Requirements

- 5.1 An archive of all records and finds must be prepared consistent with the principles of English Heritage's *Management of Archaeological Projects*, 1991 (particularly Appendix 3.1 and Appendix 4.1).
- 5.2 The report should reflect the aims of the WSI.
- 5.3 The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its archaeological interpretation.
- 5.4 An opinion as to the necessity for further evaluation and its scope may be given. No further site work should be embarked upon until the primary fieldwork results are assessed and the need for further work is established.
- 5.5 Reports on specific areas of specialist study must include sufficient detail to permit assessment of potential for analysis, including tabulation of data by context, and must include non-technical summaries.
- 5.6 The Report must include a discussion and an assessment of the archaeological evidence, 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).
- 5.7 The results of the surveys should be related to the relevant known archaeological information held in the County Historic Environment Record (HER).
- 5.8 A copy of the Specification should be included as an appendix to the report.
- 5.9 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.
- 5.10 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines.
- 5.11 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.
- 5.12 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 (<u>http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/policy.html</u>).
- 5.13 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.
- 5.14 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.
- 5.15 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.

- 5.16 County HER sheets must be completed, as per the County HER manual, for all sites where archaeological finds and/or features are located.
- 5.17 An unbound copy of the evaluation report, clearly marked DRAFT, must be presented to SCCAS/CT for approval within six months of the completion of fieldwork unless other arrangements are negotiated with the project sponsor and SCCAS/CT.

Following acceptance, two copies of the report should be submitted to SCCAS/CT together with a digital .pdf version.

- 5.18 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.
- 5.19 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.
- 5.20 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).

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



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 Tel: 01284 352197 Email: jess.tipper@suffolk.gov.uk

Date: 17 September 2009

Reference: / CavendishCEVCPSchool2009

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.

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

Suffolk County Council Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service