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## Summary

A programme of archaeological work was undertaken on the site of Eastgate Barns, Bury St Edmunds ahead of redevelopment. The work was funded by Proflat Roofing and Orange. The d project consisted of \$eyefi archaeological evaluation trenches followed by an open area excavation to the nerth and south of Trench 1.

The site lay outside of the limits of the main medieval town and to the north of the roadside occupationalong Eastgate Street. The site has been known as Eastgate Barns; Holderness Barns and Giange Farm. It is believed to be the site of one of the three medievalabbey grange sites in Bury St Edmunds and was occupied by the cellarer.

The archaeological work identified the remains of several structures from the medieval and postmedieval periods. These included the trenches for two possible medieval timber buildings, a post-medieval oven, dovecote and two phases of post-medieval domestic buildings. Also identified was the western boundary of the site formed by two phases of ditches in the medieval period followed by two phases of post-medieval walls.

The excavation uncovered activity throughout the medieval and post-medieval periods and identified areas of well preserved archaeological deposits. However it did not identify any substantial medieval structures likely to be the main grange house which was thought to lie further to the east under the existing industrial units.

The in situ preservation of the archaeological deposits was preferred to a full excavation. This meant the site remained largely intact and weHpreserved beneath the new development and any future work on the site would substantially increase our knowledge and understanding of the site and this area of Bury St Edmunds.


## Introduction

An evaluation was conducted on the site of Eastgate Barns, Eastern Way, Bury St Edmunds (TL 8599 6486) ahead off proposed developments (planning application number SE/04/3016/P) (Figure 1). The mainarea of the site was to be developed by Proflat Roofing, creating a new yard and offices, with a second area to be developed by Orange for a new mobile phone mast. The evaluation followed the brief and specification (Appendix 1) prepared by R. Carg (Suffelk County Council Archaeology Service, Conservation Team) who also monitored thegvork. Based ontheresults of the evaluation and consultation with R. Carr and the developers the evaluation Stastextended into an excavation. Although the in situ preservation of the archaeological remains was a priority the excavation allowed the examination of those archaeological features under threat. The excavation work was also monitored by R. Carr.

Located on the site were the remains of a post-medieval farmhouse which were at ground level when the evaluation began. The plan of the farmhouse is still visible on the modern OS map for the area. The present site lies immediately to the east of the A14 embankment which was formerly the Bury to Long Melford/Sudbury railway line opened in 1865. Originally the River Lark, now running to the west of the embankment, would have run along the western side of the farm buildings.

The site has been variously known as Eastgate Barns, Helderness Barns and Grange Farm. The site is believed to be medieval in origin and directly linKedato the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds. The site is one of three grange sites in Bury St. Edmunds and the others are Almoners Barns on the southern edge of Bury and Eldo House Farpitg the south east of the town (BSE 131 - Gill 2003). Eastgate Barns was thought to be theoproperty of the cellarer of the Abbey who controlled and had jurisdiction over the land and peoplécutside of the town limits. The cellarer was responsible for managing the Abbey estates, collecting rent from tenant farmers and providing the Abbey with its subsistence neeđs, Occupation on the site is known from the 13th century onwards and after the dissolution of the monasteries in the 16th century the site continued in importance as an extensive manorial estate.

There has been little previous archaeological work on the site with only one project within the area of the farmyard (BSE 130 - Gill 1999) and one project to the south between the farm yard and Eastgate Street (BSE 229 Area B - Gill 2004) (Figure 1). The evaluation and monitoring work undertaken at BSE 130 showed a robbed out medieval wall, peripheral garden features to the north of the main post-medieval farm buildings with a later structure, possibly a barn, and an associated surface. BSE 229 Area B showed only very dispersed archaeology mainly in the form of boundary ditches aligned more with the property boundaries fronting Eastgate Street than the site of Eastgate Bafns.

©Crown Copyright. All Rights Reserved. Suffolk County Council Licence No. 1000233952005
Figure 1. Site location.

## Historical Search Summary

A full historical search was commissioned as part of this project and undertaken by A. Breen The following sumpary was prepared from this report, a full copy of which is included as Appendix 2.

Manuscript maps from 1736 onwards provided the main source of information fot the site with furtherinformation from manuscripts dating from 1538 onwards. For the medieval period of the site some manuscript sources were consulted along with secondary printed Sources.

The map evidence for the site, from the early 18 th century onwards, is very good including estate maps dated 1736 (HC 539/C1/9) and 1798 (SRO (B) 2198). Other more general maps of Bury St. Edmunds show some detail of the layout and access to the site. These maps include Payne's map (1833), Warren's map (1791), and the 1883-84 OS map (Sheet XLIV.7).

The maps generally show a large farmyard with various barns and outbuildings with the main manor house alongside the river until the river was canalised during the building of the railway embankment. The main access to the site appears to be from Eastgate Street until that access was blocked with the construction of the railway. During the 19th century a secondary entrance leading from Hollow Lane to the east was visible. The route appears to be the farm entrance with the manor house entrance still leading from Eastgate Street. After the construction of the railway embankment the access from Hollow Lane appears to become the main access.

Several manuscript references also exist and ape generally property sales and lease agreement. These sources date from the 17th century. Alletter from 1562 shows the estate being leased by the Abbey in 1538 and then the property) was passed on and leased again.

For the medieval period evidence comes from secondary printed sources. Lobel (1935) describes the cellarer's importance within the Abbey. Lobel also describes the cellarer as holding 260 acres of land in 1295 and by 1342 the holdings were estimated to be 412 acres.

## Methodology

The historical search, conducted by A. Breen, was undertaken at the Suffolk Record Office in Bury St Edmunds. All readily available cartographic and documentary sources were consulted. A full report was written and is reproduced in the report as Appendix 2. Assummary of the full historical report was prepared by J. Duffy for inclusion within the main body of the site report.

The evaluation of the site consisted of the excavation of seven trenches excavated by a 360 degree machinefitted with a 2 m wide to othless bucket. Each trench was excavated to the top of the archaeological features. Any features were then exeavated by hand and all excavated finds were kept. All separate archaeological depositswere recorded with a unique context number starting at 0100 and continuing in sequence thereafter. Allfeatureswere recorded in sectionand plan at a scale of 1:20. A Total Station Theodolite (TST) was also used to plan the site in relation to the National Grid. A profile of each trench was also drawn at a scale of 1:20. All archaeological features were photographed using digital, colour slide and monochrome film.

The full excavation of the site consisted of the stripping of a large area incorporating Trenches 1 and 5. The area was stripped using a 360 degree machine fitted with a 2 m wide toothless bucket. All separate archaeological deposits were given contexts numbers continuing the sequence from the evaluation. All features were hand excavated and all excavated finds were kept. Features were recorded in section and plan and photographed using digital, colour slide and monochrome film. A TST was again used to relate the site to the OS National Grid.

The full site archive is kept at the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Store, Shire Hall, Bury St. Edmunds under site code BSE 229.


Figure 2. Area of excavation and trenches.

## Results

## Introduction

The archaeological work undertaken on the site of the former Eastgate Barns was designed to initially evaluate the archaeological deposits. This was then followed by the exposure of the upper deposits in order to understand the best method for in situ preservation of the archaeological remains. This was accompanied by excavation to allow an understanding of the sequence of deposits and their preservation on the site.

The initial evaluation consisted of seven trenches across the development area. No archaeological deposits were identified in Trenches 3, 6 and 7 with Trenches 6, 7 and the northern half of Trench 4 indicating heavy modern ground disturbance. This area was also thought to be away from the main focus of occupation further to the south. In the southern half of Trench 4 early boundary ditches and a later brick built boundary wall were identified. Two boundary walls, constructed with brick and flint, were excavated at the northern and southern limits of Trench 2 (Figure 2).

The archaeological excavation covered the ruined farmhouse and the area immediately surrounding it and included Trenches 1 and 5 from the evaluation (Figure 2). Several archaeological features were identified in Trench 1 including a boundary wall, boundary ditches and probably the eastern bank of the River Lark before it was redirected. Two isolated pits were identified in Trench 5. Although Trenches 1 and 5 werelsituated in the middle of the postmedieval farm yard they failed to uncover anyof the extensive structural evidence later identified in the excavation. The excavationfitself provided evidence of several structures including various phases of the farmhouse, anpoven, a rectangular flint and mortar structure, boundary walls and a roadway.

The limited evidence recovered during the evaluation meant that the full extent of the archaeological preservation on the site was only understood during the excavation phase of the project. After the initial topsoil strip of the excavation area a decision to preserve, in situ, the majority of the archaeological deposits was made. The decision was reached by the archaeological contractor in consultation with R. Carr, the Archaeological Officer responsible for the site, and Proflat, the developer. Preservation of the archaeological deposits in the area of the site to be developed by Orange was not seen as necessary.

The decision to preserve in situ with limited archaeological excavation meant that detailed stratigraphic analysis across the site would be difficult and earlier structures and deposits below those identified inthe initial site strip would only be excavated in very limited areas, if ataff. e The results of the excavation and evaluation are therefore providing an overview of theidentified deposits and theflevel of preservation on the site rather than a detailed stratigraphielanalysis of the entire site?


Figure 3. Excavation plan (main features labelled).

## Structure 0272 - late post-medieval farmhouse

A sequence of four structures was identified in the area between Trenches 1 and 4. The latest of these was a brick built structure, 0272 , which was the final phase of the farmhouse on the sitel (Figure 3). Thissoftuctire survived as upstanding ruins during the evaluation of Area B to the $\mathrm{C}^{\circ}$ south (Gill 2004) but these were demolished before archaeological work began on the Area A site. The temains were fully exposed and recorded in plan during the excavation phase project. The archaeological evidence was also supported by cartographic evidence, including the eady editions of the OS map (Figure 4).

The early edition OS maps from the 1880's through to the modern OS maps show the same structure throughout the period. It is a backwards ' $L$ ' shape with an east to west running south section and a north-west to south-east running north section. The size and shape appear to remain the same except for a slight narrowing of the north section of the building. An earlier 19th century map by Payne (dated 1834) only shows the north-west to south-east alignment of the building suggesting the east to west southern section is a later 19th century rebuild or extension (Figure 4).

The archaeological remains of Structure 0272 were clearly identified immediately to the north of Trench 1 with heavy truncation of all archaeological deposits further north. The structure was brick built with occasional stone especially in the footings (Figure 5). The surviving footings match up with the plan of the building shown on the earry edition OS maps. Several narrower brick walls survived in places and may have been (infernall walls of the building though due to heavy disturbance in some areas a clear patternacannot be discerned (Figure 5). Several other internal features were also identified including apatch of brick flooring (0293) and the flint base of a fireplace (0136) though due to the dack of stratigraphic evidence it is possible that at least the fireplace belonged to an earlier phaserof structure.

The change in building alignment at the southern end of the structure identified on the historic maps is also visible on the ground with the brick built walls of Structure 0272 running on an east to west alignment. These walls can be seen cutting the flint and mortar walls of the earlier structure, 0270 , which appears to form the southern end of the building aligned north-west to south-east that is visible on Payne's map (Figures 4 and 5).


Figure 4. Historic maps.


Figure 5. Plan of northern area of excavation.

## Structure 0270 - post-medieval farmhouse

Cut by the walls of Structure 0272 were the heavily truncated flint and mortar wall remains of Structure 0270 (Figure 5). These walls appeared to form the southern end of a building aligned northwest to southeast which were replaced by the brick built farmhouse, Structure 0272 . Very little of this structure sưrvived and the only evidence for it was preserved under the southern east to west aligned extensioneto the building.

The structurelconsists of a flint and mortar wall, 0133 , running northeast to southwest with some post-medieval brick facing surviving on both elevations. This wall continues to the east where it turns-hinety degrees and runs northwest, 0187 (Figure 5). The western wall of Structure 0270 was wall 0135 which was slightly narrower than 0133 . Further to the west was robbed out footifig trench, 0214, which was aligned with wall 0133 and may have formed the original structure which was then narrowed and wall 0135 was built. Unfortunately the stratigraphic relationship could not be identified between walls 0133 and 0135 .

Located within the area defined by walls 0133 and 0135 was a clay layer, 0132 (Figure 5). This layer respected the walls and appeared to be a deliberately laid surface or bedding layer for the floor of structure 0270 . The clay was approximately 0.15 m thick (Figure 6).


Figure 6. Sections from structures $0134,0163,0270,0271$ and 0272.

## Structure 0134- oven

A small structure, 0134 , was sealed below the clay surface, 0132 , of Structure 0270 and wasicut by the walls of Structure 0272 (Figure 5). The structure was identified as a probable oven and 8 appeared to represent industrial/agricultural activity ahead of the construction of the farmhouse, Structures 0270 and 0272 , on this part of the site.

The'structure consists of two L-shaped walls, 0183 , with a tile lined flue, 0153 and 0154, and a gupity 0287, at the eastern end (Figures 7 and 8). The western end of the stivicture was not preserved and had been destroyed by the construction of the later farmhouses. The walls were constructed using flint and mortar (0183) and were also partly tiled faced, forming a flue running north-east to south-west. The tiles used in the construction were reused glazed rooftiles dating to the 13th-14th century and were high status, and probably recovered from a large domestic building ( 0153 and 0154 )(Anderson this report). At the eastern end of the walls was a shallow semi-circular pit, 0287, filled with rubble, 0155 . Reddened clay and charcoal was identified across the base of the pit, layers 0156 and 0157 , and between the walls suggesting burning. However, the limited extent of the burning suggests that very high temperatures were not used.

The exact use of the oven is unknown though the apparent low temperatures used may suggest something similar to a malting kiln. However, the heavy disturbance by later structures and limited excavation of sưtrounding archaeological deposits make it difficult to understand the oven's context within the $\$ i t e$, its associated features and its date. The reused roof tiles maydhavec come from the former grange house and may indicate a different location of the medieval dwelling to the later post-medieval farmhouse. The structure, after full recording, was preserved in situ.



Figure 8. Photograph of oven 01.34looking west.

## Structures 0163 and 0271 - possible treench-built structures

A series of heavily disturbed trenches, group 0163, was identified below Structures 0134, 0270 and 0272 (Figure 5). The ditches run on an almost identical alignment and are in a similar location to Structure 0270, the earliest phase of the later farmhouse. Group 0163 consisted of ditches $0149,0161,0172,0174$ and 0182 . The ditches were heavily disturbed by later features to the south, Structures 0134, 0270 and 0272, and truncated to the north and east (Figure 5).

The series of ditches may have formed the footing trenches for a timber-framed building with ground beams laid into the trenches. However, due to the restricted excavation very limited evidence to support this theory was recovered. Where sealed below the later structures the ditches were preserved in situ.

A second possible trench built structure was identified further to the south, Structure 0271 , il immediately to the east of Structure 0181 (Figures 3 and 9). Only very limited excavation of this structure was undertaken in its north-west corner. The extent in plan was also not identified as it extended beyond the area of excavation to the south and was sealed by archaeological surfaces to the easf, layers 0252,0254 and 0256 , which were only sample excavated with the majority to be preserved in situ. Excavation included a section of trench 0238 and cornerposthole 0258, both Suexcavated features were sealed below two possible demolition layers of burning, 0240 , and pharcoal, 0245, although both were heavily truncated (Figures 6 and 9). Pít 0228 was also sealed below these layers and was located to east of posthole 0258 . Late medieval and early postmedieval pottery was recovered from pit 0228 and layer 0240 .


Figure 9. Plan of southem area of excavation.

## Structure 0181

Located to the south of the main sequence of farmhouse buildings was a rectangular flint and mortar structure, 0181 (Figures 3, 9 and 10). The structure measured 3.5 m by 2.6 m with walls varying in thickness between 0.58 m and 0.66 m . Across the entire internal area of the structure a red cement floor was identified and measured 3.4 sq m . Although heavily damaged the surface of the red cement floor survived in places showing a smoothed surface. The floor was bedded on identical flint and mortar to the walls and without the presence of the floor would have been indistinguishable (Figures 10 and 11).

Further flint and mortâr work, 0264, was identified on the north-east corner of the structure possibly located withinga large irregular pit, 0262. The purpose of this section of flint workis nót fully understood thoutg it is a later build to the main structure and its location within the pite suggests it may be a repair to the corner of the main structure acting similar to a buttress.

Stracture 0181 was surrounded by several archaeological layers though dueftolinited excavation and heavy disturbance their relationships are difficult to determine (Figure 9) esegment 0241 was excavated to the west of Structure 0181 and identified a sequence of layers including a roughly laid stone surface, 0247 , though very little was identified and excavated within the segment. To the east of Structure 0181 further layers were identified and recorded in plan. A possible cobbled surface survived in two areas, 0255 and 0256 , with clay bedding for cobbles surviving between the two areas, 0254 (Figure 9). The earliest identified layer in this sequence was 0252 , a layer of burning, possibly a continuation of layer 0240 which sealed structure 0271 . As with the layers to the west of the structure the relationship of the cobbled surfaces to the east do not have a clearly
identified relationship to 0181 . However, as these layers appear to be cut by pit 0262 it is believed that the cobbled surface is either contemporary or earlier than Structure 0181 but not later than it.


Figure 10. Plan of structure 0181.
The function of this structure is unknown though two possible interpretations have been suggested The first is that it was a dovecote, and the second possibility is thatit was a structure with a threshing floor, associated with the possible malt oven (structure 0134) to the north.

The interpretation of it being dovecote was based on its relatively small size and location. The smoothed cement floor also supported this idea as the smooth surface would have allowed for easy removal of the pigeon waste which was a useful by-product of a dovecote used for manuring (McCann 1998). The date of the structure was difficult to determine due to the limited excavation of the surrounding deposits. However, the mortar was similar to that used on the postmedieval structure 0270 immediately to the north. Dovecotes were high status features throughout the medieval and post-medieval periods but became more common later in the postmedieval period.

The interpretation as a structure with a threshing floor was suggested by the presence of the possible malt oven (Structure 0134) to the north. The smooth cement surface would be good for threshing and the heavy'wear may be indicative of this, or a similar, activity. This structure alongside the oven could indicate two separate stages within a small scale early post-medieval


Figure 11. Photograph of structure 0181.

## Post-medieval roadway

Located to the west of Structure 0181 was a curvilinear chalk layer, 0220 , which was identified running in a southerly direction from Trench 1 . The chalk was exposed in plan (Figures 3, 9 and 12) and section (Figures 14 and 17 ) and it measured between 2.3 m and 2.8 m wide and a maximum depth of 0.2 m . The layer ran for 11 m though its full extent to the south was not identified but it did notextend into the northern section of Trench 1. The chalk was laid on a series of probable buidd-up layers, $0111,0221,0243,0249$ and 0250 , and was sealed by t gravel layers, 021,9 and 0227 (Figure 14).

The chalkcleposit has been interpreted as the base of a roadway leading from the post-medieval farm tod-Eastgate Street to the south (Figure 1). The chalk would form a stable base onto which grave would be laid to create a weather and wear resistant surface. Gravel dayer0227 appeared to becthe primary gravel surface with the later gravel layer, 0219 , more likely to be a resurfacing. Examples of similar external chalk and gravel surfaces can be seen elsewhere in post-medieval contexts in Bury St Edmunds. Examples include the rear of the Angel Hotel (BSE 231 - Duffy 2006) and to the rear of Greene and Greene, 80 Guildhall Street (BSE 224 - Duffy 2007). The direction of the road indicates it may link up with Barn Lane to the south and therefore extends below the current A14 embankment. This suggests that the road is older than the late 19th century construction of the railway embankment, now the A14 road. A road in a similar location can also be seen on Warren's Map (dated 1747) suggesting this road dates back to at least the
early 18th century (Figure 4). A lack of associated finds evidence makes further dating difficult though finds from the 16th century were found in the build-up layers below it (0243).


Figure 12. Photogràph of chalk 0220 (part of roadway).

## Post-medieval boundary walls

During the evaluation phase of the project four walls were identified in Trenches 1 (0110), 2 (0100 and 0104) and 4 (0269) Figures 2 and 3). Only wall 0110 was further investigated during the excavation phase in a trench extending to the south of Trench 1 Figure 3 and 13).

Wall 0100 was excavated at the southern end of Trench 2 and ran in an approximately east to west direction across the trench (Figures 2 and 14). The wall was constructed using flint bonded with a yellow mortar with a total length of 2.2 m exposed and it measured 0.4 m wide. The wall is cut into layer 0101, mid to dark orangeish brown clayey silt, though no finds were recovered from this later makingdating difficult.

Wall 0104 was excavated at the northern end of Trench 2 and ran in an approximately nerth-east to south-west direction (Figures 2, 3 and 14). It was constructed using mainly flint with some occalasional brick bonded with a yellow mortar. A length of 1.9 m was exposed within the trench and if measured 0.5 m wide. A sherd of early post-medieval pottery was iecovered from a nearby dartk greyish green clay, 0105, and this layer may extend below the wall but due to the limited excavation and high water table in this area their relationship wasn't clear.

Wall 0110 ran in a north to south direction near the western end of Trench 1 (Figures 2, 3, 13 and 14). Further excavation of the wall was undertaken in a trench which ran south of Trench 1 designed to expose the wall and its relationship to the surrounding archaeological deposits and the walls identified in Trench 2. The total length exposed was 15.6 m extending south from the north section of Trench 1 and curved east at its southern limit before terminating. The wall was
flint, with occasional broken bricks, bonded with a yellow mortar, measuring 0.5 m wide. A possible brick lined drain through the wall was identified in Trench 1 (Figure 14). The drain did not appear to have been inserted and was probably part of the original build. A second drain was identified further to the south where bricks, 0223 , were laid against the eastern face of wall 0110 and the wall appeared cuftaway on its western face (Figure 14). Both would have allowed 0 a draining of the lard to the east of the wall into the River Lark to the west. In Trench 1 the wall was sealed bylayero 0111 , which contained 18th century pottery, and by 0221 to the southolThese layers were probably laid to level the area of the farmyard as there was a slight naturaloglope downdo the river to the west. Wall 0110, although of a similar build and size, did not appear related to wall 0104 at the northern end of Trench 4 and was not related tofwallo 00.

Wall 0269 was excavated near the southern limit of Trench 4 and ran approximately north to south (Figures 2 and 3). In order to expose both faces of this wall a small extension was made to the trench. It was constructed with flint and occasional brick bonded by a yellow mortar surviving to a depth of approximately 0.5 m . A later brick wall was then built on the flint work using it as a foundation. The flint and mortar wall appeared identical to wall 0110 and was on the same alignment. It was likely that walls 0110 and 0269 are the same wall and while 0110 went out of use and structures were laid over it, including the roadway made up of chalk 0220 and gravel layers 0219 and 0227 , wall 0269 was rebuilt with brick.


Figure 13. Photograph of wall 0110 looking south.


Figure 14. Plans and sections of walls 0100,0104 and 010.0 .

## Medieval ditches

Although excavation was limited below the level of the main structures ( $0134,0181,0270$ and 0272) several segmentsitwere excavated into the lower deposits (Segments 0138, 0190 and 0216$)^{\prime}$ (Figure 3). The exeavated'segments were to explore any possible medieval deposits and assess the preservation andpotential of these deposits. Earlier features were also identified in Trenehes 1 and 4.

Diteh0014Dwas identified in the southern end of Trench 4 where it was cut bywab0269 and also iđentifed in segment 0138, a small extension in the north-west corner of the excavation area (Figure 3). The ditch ran in an approximately north to south direction and was steep-sided. Only the eastern edge was identified with its western edge beyond the site edge (Figure 15). The base was not identified as excavation became impossible due to the high level of the ground water. It was filled by a dark grey/brown silty clay, 0142 , from which sherds of 15 th century pottery were recovered. The ditch cut another ditch to the east, 0151 , and was cut by a posthole, 0139 . Ditch 0141 followed a similar alignment to wall 0269 and may have formed an earlier western boundary to the site.

Posthole 0139 was circular in plan and was shallow with gently sloping sides and a flat base. It cut ditch 0141 and was filled by a dark grey/brown silty clay, 0140 , which was similar to the underlying ditch fill, 0142 . No finds were recovered from the fill and no other postholes were identified in the vicinity though only limited excavation took place in this area of the development site.

A second ditch, 0151, was excavated in segment 0138 and was cut by ditch 0141 . Ditch 0151 was steep-sided and measured 2 m wide with a total length of 2.2 m exposed in segment 0138 (Figures 3 and 15). It ran approximately north-west to south-east. The base of the ditch was not identified due to the high water table. It was filled by a dark brown/grey silty clay, 0152 , with a 25 sherds of medieval (13th-14th century) pottery recovered from it.

Ditch 0151 appeared to continue through segment 0216 , recorded as ditch 0211 , and segment 0190, recorded as ditch 0194 (Figures 3 and 15). Ditch 0267, identified in section 0116 of Trench 1, was also likely to be a continuation of this same ditch (Figure 16). In segment 0216 it was filled by a brown/orange silty clay, 0212 , and contained a single sherd of medieval pottery (Figure 15). In segment 0190 the ditch ran into a large steep-sided pit, 0191, which due to its depth was not fully excavated (Figure 15). The relationship between the ditch and pit was unknown as the fills were indistinguishable during excavation. The fill was a mid greyish red/brown sandy clay, 0193, and contained several sherds of medieval pottery. In segment 0190 the ditch cut a mid to dark grey clay, 0204 , from which several sherds of medieval pottery were recovered.


Figure 15. Sectionsof medieval ditches.

## Isolated features

Several features were identified across the site with no physical or stratigraphic relationships to the surrounding main archaeological deposits and structures. However, the occasional sherd of medieval pottery was recovered from some of the features.

Hearth 0118 was identified in the middle of the area excavated to the north of Trench 1 (Figure 5). The feature was made up of two clay layers, 0178 and 0179 , in an oval pit with shallow sides and a concave base (Figure 17). Layer 0178 was a dark pink clay where burnt and a light grey elsewhere and was the upper layer of the hearth. Layer 0179 was a dark red burnt clayey silt and was the lower of the two hearth fills. The heavier burning of the lower layer, 0179 , suggests this may have been the øriginal hearth with a later repair, layer 0178 , which had only been used for a short period or at âless intense heat.

Located int the same area as the hearth, 0118, were three postholes, 0125,0127 and 0129 , and a small.pit, 0147 (Figure 5 and 17). Posthole 0125 was circular in plan, 0.3 m in diameter, and steep-sided with a flat base, 0.3 m deep. It was filled by a mid to light grey silty dlay, 0126 , with sno finds. Posthole 0127 was circular in plan, 0.35 m in diameter, and steep-sided with a flat base, 0.48 m deep. It was filled by a mid to light greyish brown silty clay, 0128 , and four sherds of medieval pottery were recovered from it. Posthole 0129 was oval in plan, 0.3 m by 0.18 m , and fairly steep-sided with a flat base, 0.1 m deep. It was filled by a light brownish grey silty clay, 0130, with no finds.


Pit 0147 was circular in plan, 0.55 m in diameter, with fairly gentle sloping sides and a flat base, 0.1 m deep. It was filled by a mid grey clay, 0148 , which contained a single sherd of medieval pottery.

Pit 0160 was subfrectangular in plan though only the north and east sides were visible asjit was cut by walls of staucture 0272 (Figure 5). It had fairly gently sloping sides and a flat base, 0.2 m deep (Figure 17). The upper fill was a mid to dark yellow clay, 0117 , below this was adcharcoal rich black silf, 0158 , from which a single sherd of medieval pottery was recovered dite lowest filbwasca light brownish yellow clay, 0159.

Posthole 0143 was sub-circular in plan, 0.75 m by 0.6 m , with shallow sloping sides becoming near vertical towards the centre and a concave base, 0.38 m deep (Figures 5 and 17). Its upper fill was a mid to dark brown clay, 0144 , with a thin, 0.05 m , layer of charcoal on the surface. The main fill was a mid grey brown silty clay, 0167 , and the lowest fill was a light yellow mortar, 0166. This fill was similar to layer 0168, which appeared to be cut by the posthole in the section. Fill 0166 may have been collapse from layer 0168 while the posthole was still open after initial excavation. The posthole was cut by wall 0208 , which formed part of the late post-medieval structure 0272 . Also it cut ditch 0161 which formed part of structure 0163.

Posthole 0164 was circular in plan, 0.2 m in diameter, and was steep-sided with a flat base, 0.1 m deep (Figures 5 and 17). It was filled by a mid to dark brown silty clay, 0165 , from which no finds were recovered. The posthole cut ditch 0161 which formed part of structure 0163.

Posthole 0184 was square in plan, 0.44 m wide, Withedeeper circular cut in the centre, 0.37 m deep. The sides of both the upper square andlower circular cuts were near vertical with a flat base to the square cut and a concave base to the circular cut. It was filled by a light orangeish brown clayey silt, 0185 , with no findṣ

Posthole 0233 was excavated to the east of structure 0181 and was heavily disturbed by pit 0262 , which was part of the possible repair work to structure 0181 (Figures 9 and 17). The posthole appeared circular in plan, 0.6 m in diameter, with fairly steep sides and a V-shaped base, 0.55 m deep. It was sealed by chalk layer 0253 to the north. Its upper fill was a light yellowish brown clay, 0234 , some of which was lightly burnt. Its lower fill was a light brown clay, 0235. No finds were recovered from this feature.

Pit 0120 was identified in Trench 5 though only 50 percent was visible as it extended beyond the limit of the trench to the east (Figures 9 and 17). It appeared circular in plan, 0.72 m in length, and was steep-sided with a concave base, 0.25 m deep. It was filled by a light brownish yellow clay, 0121 , with noffinds.

Pit 0169 was owa in plan, 1.45 m in length, and had gently sloping sides and a flat base, 0.08 m deep. It was filled mainly by stones, measuring 0.05 m to 0.15 m in size, and a light brownish grey silty dlay, 0170, with no finds (Figures 5 and 17).

SPit0209 was excavated to the south of Structure 0271 and to the west of Structure 0181. It was roughly circular in plan, 1.2 m in diameter, and had sides sloping at $30-50$ degrees with a flat base, 0.3 m deep (Figures 9 and 17).

Pit 0294 was an irregular shaped pit located at the northern limit of the excavation. The pit was in an area of the site that was not at a high risk from development and appeared to be very late in date and therefore remained unexcavated (Figure 5).


Figure 17. Feature sections.


Figure 18. Trench profiles.

## Finds and environmental evidence

By Richenda Goffin with contributions by Sue Anderson and Julie Curl.

## Introduction

Table 1 shows the quantities of finds collected during the excavation. A full quantification by context is meluded as Appendix 4.

| Find type | No. | Wt/kg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Pottery | 155 | 2.208 |
| CBM | 93 | 6.721 |
| Stone | 8 | 1.904 |
| Mortar/plaster | 3 | 0.103 |
| Glass | 2 | 0.03 |
| Clay pipe | 1 | 0.003 |
| Iron nails | 12 | 0.146 |
| Lava quern | 1 | 0.456 |
| Burnt flint/stone | 4 | 0.082 |
| Animal bone | 129 | 2.039 |
| Shell | 26 | 1.01 |

Table 1. Finds quantities.

## Pottery <br> Post-Roman pottery

A total of 155 fragments of pottery weighing 2.208 kg was recovered. The material is medieval and late medieval in date with a small amount of post-medieval wares. The pottery has been catalogued by context and is presented Appendix 5.

## Medieval wares

One hundred and sixteen fragments of medieval pottery were identified from the excavation, weighing 1.101 kg . This material makes up $49.8 \%$ by weight, and $75 \%$ by sherd count of the total assemblage. A considerable quantity of the medieval pottery was recovered from ditchfills (48 sherds at 0.406 kg ) and 7 fragments from pitfills $(0.132 \mathrm{~kg})$. Other sherds were found in layers and spreads, or in features with later, early post-medieval wares.

The largest proportion of the medieval pottery is made up of Bury coarsewares and miscellaneous sandy wares, mainly coarse, of a similar date. The Bury wares include several.jars which have plain flat-topped thickened rims with finger-tipped indentations along the shoulder of the vessel. Inaddition to Bury coarsewares, the finer Bury Sandy Fine ware variant which a red core and contains fine mica was also present. A small quantity of other medievall Sel $^{e}$ coarsewares pyere also identified. Glazed wares were present in the form of two Grimston jugs. One of these is a fragment of a facejug dating to the 13th to 14th century. The base of an early Golchester ware jug present in pitfill 0158 is of a similar date range.

Late medieval/early post-medieval wares

Late medieval wares were recovered from a number of features, sometimes with Glazed red earthenwares of sixteenth century date or later. Sherds of fifteenth century date were found in ditchfill 0142 . These consist of a fragment of Rhenish stoneware of Langerwehe type and a sherd of Late medieval and transitional ware with iron oxide striped decoration. Further ceramics of a similar date present in spread 0215 comprise a fragment of Dutch type red earthenware, two Late

Colchester wares and a sherd of East Anglian redware. Late medieval and transitional wares were also present in pitfill 0229 .

The remains of a glazed whiteware pedestal base from a cup or goblet was recovered from a cobbled surface, which mây have been a yard 0231. The vessel is made out of a fine off-white fabric containingfew wisible inclusions. The base has regular thumbing impressions aroundits and is covered with a yellow green glaze. Although such forms are made in Colchester-type ware in the latefifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Cotter 150), and are known in Late Hedingham ware ( S Anderson, pers comm), the fabric does not seem to be a local one. A possibility is that it is a Getmañhiteware (Hurst et al, 1986, 236). Similar fragments were recovered from 0230.

Fragments of a similar date were found in spread 0243. A large Late Colchester type ware panchion was identified, with an external downturned flange and a covering of lead glaze inside. The vessel is similar in form to an illustrated example in Cotter (Fig 97 168). Such bowls appear to be more common in the first half of the sixteenth century and are sometimes associated with Frechen stoneware and other post-medieval redwares (Cotter 148). In this excavation it is associated with a large fragment of a Cologne Frechen drinking vessel of sixteenth century date, and other redwares.

## Post-medieval ware

A small quantity of later post-medieval wares were recovered from 0111, a clay silty layer in Trench 1. Three sherds dating to the early 18th century were identified. In addition to a fragment of an English stoneware salt-glazed mug, a Chinese poreélain blue and white decorated teacup was present, and a fragment of a tin-glazed earthenware bowl with a blue and white design of birds and flowers.

## Conclusions



The ceramic assemblage from Eastgate Barns is mainly medieval and late medieval in date. The medieval component is dominated by Bury coarseware fabrics, with the addition of glazed wares from the Grimston ware industry in West Norfolk and also redwares from Essex. Several features contained late medieval and early post-medieval pottery, where a mixture of local and regional redwares were present together with small quantities of Rhenish stoneware, and possible fragments of German whiteware. These groups date to the late 15th to first half of the 16th century and may have been deposited following the Dissolution and subsequent leasing of the property to private individuals.

The remainder of the post-medieval ware consists of a small quantity of eighteenth century pottery comprising two high quality finewares and a fragment of an English stoneware mug

## Ceramie Building Material and Mortar

## Sue Anderson

A tofal of 93 fragments ( 6721 g ) of ceramic building material was collected from twelve contexts. Table 2 shows the quantities (count) by form and fabric group. A full catalogue by context is included as Appendix 6.

The majority of pieces consisted of plain roof tile (RT) in estuarine clay fabrics, most of which had been glazed with a green or brown lead glaze on the lower quarter. These tiles are generally associated with higher status buildings of 13th-14th century date in the town. Two nearcomplete examples were present, collected as samples from wall 0153 . They measured 254-

260 mm in length, $184-185 \mathrm{~mm}$ in width and 15 mm thick; both had a single central circular peg hole and were green-glazed. A lower fragment from layer 0155 was 178 mm wide and 16 mm thick. Other fragments varied in thickness from 15 to 20 mm .


Table 2. CBM quantities (count) by fabric and form.
Red medium sandy tiles with ferrous inclusions are generally fully oxidised and probably of post-medieval date, whilst the medium sandy fabric with few other inclusions tends to have a reduced core and is likely to be late medieval or earlier. Coarser sandy tiles tend to be medieval in Bury. None of the red-firing fabrics were as common in this assemblage as they are in other finds groups from the town. One fragment of a possible ridge tile (RID) was present, and there was a piece of coarse sandy hip tile with a square nail hole.

Three late bricks (LB) were collected. A fragment from fill 0107 was 48 mm thick and had a vitrified header or stretcher. A second was a half-brick from layer 0243 with a worn surface, and measuring at least 45 mm thick. Both were probably of late medieval date. The third brick from 0119 was made from a white sandy fabric devith grog dating to the 18th century. It is likely to have been used in a floor surface ratherthan a wall.

## Mortar

Three fragments $(103 \mathrm{~g})$ of coarse pozzolanic mortar were recovered from layer 0243. This type of mortar was used in brick-built cellars on late medieval date, but also appears in high status masonry buildings of earlier date and was the typical mortar used in the Roman period. On this site the most likely use would be for cellar or brick wall construction.

A fragment $(173 \mathrm{~g})$ of buff-coloured lime mortar containing common large chalk fragments was collected from layer 0244. It had two flat surfaces and measured 30 mm thick. Red brick dust was present on both flat surfaces and it is likely to be of late or post-medieval date.

## Clay pipe

A single fragment of a clay pipe stem was present in clay silty layer 0111.

## guPost-medieval bottle glass

Two fragments of green bottle glass were recovered from layers 0112 and 0244 . Although they are relatively thin-walled, both are from post-medieval wine bottles. The glass is too fragmentary to date further.

## Stone

A total of 16 fragments of worked stone were recorded from the excavation, weighing 18.018 kg , Three flat fragments of cream limestone were present in 0132 . One of them has a hole 12 mm in diameter, and is likely to been used for roofing. All the pieces have evidence of mortar on ohe jic $c^{8}$ surface. Two similarfragments of fine limestone were identified in 0142 , and one has indications of mortar onjone of the surfaces. A third, more rounded fragment from the same context is made from coarser shelly limestone, but has no sign of being actually worked. Two similar fuagments were cecovered from 0145 and 0243.

Three abraded fragments of worked building stone were present in the rubble fill 0155. They are made from clunch, a stone particularly suitable for internal mouldings such as doorways and other internal architectural features, since it is soft and easy to shape but disintegrates upon prolonged exposure to the elements. Two fragments are dressed on two faces, whilst the third is more fragmentary. A similar unstratified block has one worked face. Although not much remains of these fragments, they are likely to have come from an internal feature such as the inside of a door or window, possibly of an ecclesiastical building (R.D. Carr, pers comm).

A small number of other fragments of burnt and unworked stone are recorded in the catalogue of bulk material (Appendix 4).

## Worked flint

A fragment of worked flint was recorded in layer 0204. It is not possible to date such a fragment, as it may not be ancient but could be part of the facing of a structure of medieval or later date.

## Quernstone

A single fragment of Rhenish lava grinding stone was identified in 0132. The stone has one main undressed face, with a worn grinding surface with little evidence of the original furrow patterning. Little of the outer edge of the stone has survived, but the diameter is likely to have been in the region of 320 mm . There is no evidence of re-use. Such fragments are frequently found in post-medieval deposits in Bury, for example at the Angel Hotel and Baxter Street (Duffy 2006 and Tester 2001). It is likely that it may have been associated with the grinding of malt for the brewing industry.

## Nails

Twelve iron nails were recovered from the excavation in total.

## Small Finds

A total ofd 17 small find numbers were catalogued in Appendix 7. The finds date almost entirely to the post-medieval period. Most of the finds are lead, copper alloy and iron, although a stone artefact was also present.

## Coins, jettons and tokens

Two lead alloy tokens were recovered, one of which was unstratified (SF1001). The reverse of this token has been stamped like the reverse side of a medieval long-cross penny, but the obverse face is so worn that further details cannot be identified. It probably dates to the late medieval
period (Faye Minter, pers.comm). The second is a Boy Bishop token dating to the early postmedieval period, which was found in layer 0203. These tokens are peculiar to East Anglia, with many being recovered from Bury St Edmunds (Rigold 1978).

A quartered fragmentfrom a copper alloy Nuremburg token (SF1008) was found in 02430 a co dumping layeflikely to have been deposited in order to level up the ground surface before the construction of the possible chalk road surface 0220. An encrusted coin or jetton ( $\mathrm{SF} 1 \mathrm{Q}^{0} 0$ ) was foundin a cilay layer located east of the wall 0110. Radiography of the artefactshows that it has been perforated with two small holes, and is likely to be re-used as a buttoro There is an illegible Sinscription with a crown.

## Dress accessories

A single complete post-medieval pin with a 'blob' head (Margeson Type 5), probably a small sewing pin, was recovered from 0206, the silty fill of slot deposit 0174.

## Household objects

A fragment of the foot of a copper alloy cast vessel, perhaps a tripod cauldron or skillet was present in clay floor layer 0132. The end of the foot is set at a slight angle to enable the vessel to stand on a flat surface. Examples of similar fragments fronf excavations dating to the fifteenth century have been found in London (Egan 1998, 164-5). Other associated finds include a Boy Bishop token and a fragment of Late medievaland transitional ware dating to the 15th-16th century.

## Miscellaneous tools



A fragment of a sharpening stone (SF1014), possibly made of carborundum was found in 0138. This number was given to the unstratified finds recovered from the northern area of the site, which was machine excavated.

The remainder of the small finds comprise a small number of unidentified iron fragments, and three pieces of lead sheet fragments, possibly waste. A fragment of a copper alloy fitting or mount with impressed wheatear type decoration found in 0219 , a deposit under the topsoil is late post-medieval in date.

## Biological evidence

## Animaluone

Julie Curdg
Adotal of 2.039 kg of faunal remains, consisting of one hundred and twenty-one pieces, was frecovered from the excavation. Although a small assemblage, several species were identified including a range of domestic mammals and birds, cat and fish. The species and butchering identified suggest that this assemblage is predominately from butchering and food waste.

## Methodology

All of the bone was scanned for basic information primarily to determine species, ages and elements present following recording guidelines supplied by English Heritage (Davis 1992). Bones were also examined for
butchering or other modifications, gnawing and pathologies. Ages of animals were estimated from the wear on the teeth and from fusion of the bones. Bones were quantified; total counts were noted for each context and the total for each species in the individual contexts was also recorded, along with the total weight for each context. All information was recorded on the faunal remains recording sheets and a summary of the information is included in Appendix 8.

## Results and discussion

Cattle bonlescyere the most commonly identified species; these included a calcaeneusin 0142 withtknife cut marks indicative of skinning. Adult and juvenile bones were present, suggesting a rangeof uses for these animals, with some culled at a few months old. Butchering was evident throughout in the form of cuts from skinning on some foot bones; some cuts were noted at the ends of bones such as the humerus, these would have been from dismemberment of the carcass and removal of meat.

Sheep/goat were the second most common species in this assemblage. Remains from 0142 included a mandible with very well worn and irregularly worn teeth; the third molar showed extensive wear which would suggest an animal of at least 6 to 8 years at death. Most remains were from adult animals, although a juvenile tibia was recovered from 0145.

Pig bones were identified almost as frequently as sheep/goat, with both adults and juveniles present. Much of the porcine bone may have been domesticipigs, however, the very large tibia recovered from 0230 does suggest a large, male wild boaf. The porcine tibia from 0230 had numerous knife cuts all over the bone, which would have occurred when meat was removed; this bone also showed canid gnawing.

The bird remains consisted of butchered chicken bones in the ditch fill 0142 and in the pit fill 0193; the pit fill 0193 also produced a cut/phopped goose carpometacarpus. A single adult cat femur was found in layer 0225 and an adift Pike vertebra was retrieved from the post-medieval ditch fill 0142 . Pike would have been readily available in local rivers.

Several chopped and cut sections of rib were noted in 0107 , some of which were also split lengthways; it is probable that these were sections of ribs to put into soups or stews, where splitting of the bones helps to release marrow.

Generally the bones are in good condition, although fragmented from butchering. Canid gnawing was noticed on one sheep/goat metacarpal in 0243 and on a butchered boar tibia from 0230 . This could have been from scavenging or waste bones given to domestic dogs.

## Conclusions

The bulk of this assemblage is derived from the processing, butchering and consumption of cattle, sheep/goat and pig. Diet was clearly supplemented by the domestic birds, which hadd probablybeenkept on site to supply eggs and feathers before being culled for mear. The presence offike indicates some locally caught fish in the diet, it is probable that this fish has alwaysbeen present and easily available in rivers within Bury St Edmundslandwas found in the assermblage from the Angel Hotel (BSE231, Curl, 2005). The keeping of domestic animals for pest control, hunting or as pets is indicated by the cat bone, and the canid gnawing observed.

## Shell

26 fragments of shell were recovered from 11 contexts. All were oyster shell apart from one fragment in 0229.

## Discussion of the finds evidence

The limited nature of the archaeological investigation following on from the strategy of preservation in sity parts of the site resulted in a reduced potential for finds recovery. Even so, medieval pottery likery'to be associated with the use of the site as a grange of the nearbyoAbbey was identified, albeit mainly from ditches and spreads and distributed in a few scantpitfiills.

The high status character of the site during the medieval period is suggested by the presence of some ofthe building material, such as the glazed rooftiles, which were probably ised on nearby Sbuildings. In addition the redeposited fragments of moulded clunch arefindicative of a building of some substance in the vicinity, which may be religious rather than secufar.

A number of features also contain pottery dating to the late medieval period, before the Dissolution, and some of the groups containing pottery of 15 th-16th century date are also likely to be pre-dissolution. A number of sixteenth century redwares were identified and small quantities of Rhenish stonewares belonging to this period, together with an unusual fragment which may be a German whiteware.

Few small finds were recovered from the site. Those which are dateable are mainly late medieval and early post-medieval and are mostly domestic in nature.

In spite of the continuation of the site as a manorial estate following the Dissolution, there is little evidence of this in the ceramic record. A smalPuniber of high quality sherds dating to the 18th century, comprising decorated Chinese porcelain and tin-glazed earthenware may be associated with the post-medieval farmhouse.

## General Discussion

The evaluation and excavation at the site of Eastgate Barns produced evidence of extensive structural remains andpreserved deposits. Although heavy truncation had occurred across the development area, especially to the north, a sequence of structures and other features dating from the medieval period onwards were identified. Together with the evidence recovered from the e archaeological york to the east (BSE 130 - Gill 1999) and to the south (BSE 229 Area B $\alpha$ Gill 2004) a fullergidea of the development of this site can be constructed.

The eatifiest phase of the site was identified by several features excavated across the development areat. The most notable of these were the ditches forming the western boundary of the site. These ditches were in two phases with the earliest, ditch 0151 , being replaced by ditch 0141 . Both of these were on slightly different alignments with the later phase slightly further to the west. These ditches would have formed the western boundary of the estate courtyard and buildings with the original course of the River Lark immediately to the west. It is likely that these ditches not only formed the boundary to the occupation area but would have also been in use as drainage ditches for the surrounding fields and occupation area. Similar deep drainage channels have been excavated on the western bank of the River Lark on the site off Cotton Lane (BSE 204 - Duffy 2005). This boundary continued in use throughout the post-medieval period with the construction of wall 0110/0269. Although part of this wall went out of use with the construction of the chalk bedded roadway, 0220 , the northern section was rebuilt with brick and continued in use, 0269 .

The other features dating to the medieval period are the series of pits and postholes identified in northern half of the excavation area. Pits 0147 and 0160 contained sherds of medieval pottery as did posthole 0127 . Although these were the only secarely dateable features the other postholes and hearth 0118 are also probably of a similar date due to their location on the site.
Unfortunately they appeared to form ng identifiable structure but this may have been due to heavy disturbance by later features.

Two undated postholes, 0143 and 0164 , were identified as cutting ditch 0161 , which formed part of structure 0163 . It is likely that both the postholes and structure 0163 were medieval in date and formed two phases of structure within the medieval grange farmyard. A second trench-built structure, 0271 , is also likely to be medieval in date as it was partly sealed by a layer of burning, 0240 , which contained late medieval pottery. This structure was again likely to be a timber structure forming part of the medieval grange farmyard. A third possibly medieval structure was identified as robbed out wall footings in the trenches excavated as part of the project to the northeast, BSE 130 (Gill 1999).

Development continued on the western edge of the grange site along its western boundary. Structure 0163 was repplaced by oven 0134 , which was in part constructed reusing medieal glazed rooftiles. The tiles are likely to have come from a high status building and this thay have been the grangehouse itself, suggesting it was at least no longer in full use. The construction of the oven indieates that this area of the site was still in use as a working area althoughthe use of the ovenas unknown.

The two subsequent structures, 0270 and 0272 , suggest a change in use from working areas to more substantial domestic buildings. These two structures appeared to be post-medieval in date and indicate the abandonment of the former grange house and a reorganisation within the farmyard. The initial construction date for the structures remains unknown but the later, 0272 , was still in use during the late 20th century. Changes in the size and shape of the buildings were identified during the archaeological excavation as well as on the historic maps (Figure 4).

To the south of these buildings was the roadway laid on a chalk bed, 0220 , with a gravel surface. The link to Eastgate Street as Barn Lane has already been mentioned in this report with the end of the roadway's use with the construction of the railway in the mid 19th century. This inevitably switched the main site entrance away from the south to the east beyond the limits of the development areal $\mathrm{ic}^{8}$
The archaeological work on this and nearby sites has also provided some evidence of the local landscape ahd how this has changed. Throughout the medieval period the site was the focal point forthe rural community outside of the town as both an estate centre and as the court of the Seellarer with jurisdiction over the rural population. The estate extendedeastito Hollow Lane, porth towards Babwell Priory and west beyond the River Lark towards Cotton Lane. The site did not appear to extend much further to the south with boundary ditches in this area associated more with the properties fronting Eastgate Street (BSE 229 Area B - Gill 2004). This estate remained largely intact until the industrial development of the mid 19th century, especially the railway (Appendix 2).

## Conclusions

The evaluation and excavation on the site identified extensive disturbance and truncation by modern activity especially in the northern area of the site, Trenches 6,7 and the northern end pf Trench 4. Howeventwithin areas of the development site a sequence of well preserved archaeological deposits were identified. Excavation was undertaken on these deposits tolassess their potential and to understand their nature. Due to the limited impact the development was going to haveon these deposits a decision was made to preserve in situ rather than to excavate.

The archaeological work on this site, and those within its vicinity, has identified long sequence of structures originating in the medieval period. These structures show a changing pattern and use of the farmyard area of the site especially with the new position of the domestic structures along the western boundary of the site. The grange house was not identified during this phase of archaeological work but the robbed out footing trenches to the east may provide a better clue as to its location (Gill 1999). However, the recovered evidence was generally consistent with a high status monastic grange complex.

All the archaeological work already undertaken on this site has shown its high potential for any future work. In fact the limited excavations to date have restricted our understanding of this site. However, the levels of preservation beneath the industrial units to the east are difficult to ascertain and it is in this area that there is the greatest potential for medieval domestic structures. Only after more detailed and comprehensive excavation actoss the entire area of medieval and later occupation would it be possible to completely understand this site.
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## Appendix 1 Brief and Specification

SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE - CONSERVATION TEAM<br>Briefand Specification for an Archaeological Evaluation

EASTGATE BARNS, EASTERN WAY, BURY ST EDMUNDS
The commissioning body should be aware that it may have Health \& Safety responsibilities, see paragraph 1.6.

## 1. Background

1.1 An application [SE/04/3016/P] has been made for detailed consent for an industrial building within the area of an outline consent ( $\mathrm{SE} / 01 / 2813 / \mathrm{P}$ ). This planning consent contains a condition requiring the implementation of a programme of archaeological work before development begins (Planning Policy Guidance 16, paragraph 30 condition). An archaeological evaluation of the consent area is required as the first part of that programme of archaeological work; decisions on the need for, and scope of, any further work will be based upon the evaluation.
1.2 The development area lies within the known site of Eastgate Barns, the medieval grange associated with the Abbey of St Edmund (County Sites and Monuments Record No BSE 130). The farmhouse which occupied part of the site is known to have included medieval and early post medieval materials and there is potential for medieval buildings, surfaces, occupation deposits and enclosure ditches or walls.
1.3 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.
1.4 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.
1.5 In accordande with the standards and guidance produced by the Institute of Field j Archaeologists this brief should not be considered sufficient to enable the tofal execution of the project. A Project Design or Written Scheme of Investigation (PD/WSI) based upon this brief and the accompanying outline specification of minimum requirements, is an essential requirement. This must be stibmitted by the developers, or their agent, to the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2AR; telephone/fax: 01284 352443) for approval. The work must not commence until this office has approved both the archaeological contractor as suitable to undertake the work, and the PD/WSI as satisfactory. The PD/WSI will provide the basis for measurable standards and will be used to establish whether the requirements of the planning condition will be adequately met.
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1.6 Before any archaeological site work can commence it is the responsibility of the developerto provide the archaeological contractor with either the contaminated $\mathrm{cl}^{\mathrm{l}}$ land reportfor the site or a written statement that there is no contamination.

## 2. Brièf for the Archaeological Evaluation

2.1 10 Establish whether any archaeological deposit exists in the area, with particular regard to any which are of sufficient importance to merit preservation in situ [at the discretion of the developer].
2.2 Identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit within the application area, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation.
2.3 Evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.
2.4 Establish whether waterlogged organic deposits are likely to be present in the proposal area.
2.5 Provide sufficient information to construct ${ }^{\circ}$ an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the Grecording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables andorders of cost.
2.6 This project will be carried through in a manner broadly consistent with English Heritage's Management of CArchaeological 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 the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (address as above) five working days notice of the commencement of ground works on the site, in order that the work of the archaeological contractor may be monitored.
2.8 If aphe approved evaluation design is not carried through in dits entirety (particularly in the instance of trenching being incomplete) the evaluation report may be rejected. Alternatively the presence of an archaeologieal deposit may be presumed, and untested areas included on this basis when defining the final mitigation strategy.
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2.9 An outline specification, which defines certain minimum criteria, is set out below.
3. Specification: Field Evaluation
3.10 drial trenches are to be excavated to cover a minimum $5 \%$ by area of the entire site and shall be positioned to sample all parts of the site. Linear trenches are thought to be the most appropriate sampling method. Teenches are to be a minimum of 1.8 m wide unless special circumstances can be demonstrated. If excavation is mechanised a toothless 'ditching bucket' at least 1.2 m wide must be used. The trench design must be approved by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service before field work begins.
3.2 The topsoil may be mechanically removed using an appropriate machine fitted with toothless bucket and other equipment. All machine excavation is to be under the direct control and supervision of an archaeologist. The topsoil should be examined for archaeological material.
3.3 The top of the first archaeological deposit may be cleared by machine, but must then be cleaned off by hand. There is anpresumption 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 maefine. The decision as to the proper method of further excavation will becmade by the senior project archaeologist with regard to the nature of the deposit.
3.4 In all evaluation excavation there is a presumption of the need to cause the minimum disturbance to the site consistent with adequate evaluation; that significant archaeological features, e.g. solid or bonded structural remains, building slots or post-holes, should be preserved intact even if fills are sampled.
3.5 There must be sufficient excavation to give clear evidence for the period, depth and nature of any archaeological deposit. The depth and nature of colluvial or other masking deposits must be established across the site.
3.6 The contractor shall provide details of the sampling strategies for retrieving artefacts, biological remains (for palaeoenvironmental and palaeoeconomic investigations), and samples of sediments and/or soils (for micromorphological and other pedological/sedimentological analyses. Advice oncothe appropriateness of the proposed strategies will be sought from P Murphy, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling archaeological deposits (Murphy andowiltshire 1994) is available.
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3.7 Any natural subsoil surface revealed should be hand cleaned and examined for archaeological deposits and artefacts. Sample excavation of any archaeological features revealed may be necessary in order to gauge their date and character.
3.8 Metal detector searches must take place at all stages of the excavation an experrienced metal detector.
$3.90^{10}$ All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed with the Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service during the course of the evaluation).
3.10 Human remains must be left in situ except in those cases where damage or desecration are to be expected, or in the event that analysis of the remains is shown to be a requirement of satisfactory evaluation of the site. However, the excavator should be aware of, and comply with, the provisions of Section 25 of the Burial Act 1857.
3.11 Plans of any archaeological features on the site are to be drawn at 1:20 or 1:50, depending on the complexity of the data to be recorded. Sections should be drawn at 1:10 or 1:20 again depending on the complexity to be recorded. Any variations from this must be agreed with thet Conservation Team.
3.12 A photographic record of the work gis to be made, consisting of both monochrome photographs and cotout transparencies.
3.13 Topsoil, subsoil and archaeofogical deposit to be kept separate during excavation to allow sequential backfilling of excavations.

## 4. General Management

4.1 A timetable for all stages of the project must be agreed before the first stage of work commences, including monitoring by the Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service.
4.2 The composition of the project staff must be detailed and agreed (this is to include any subcontractors).
4.3 A general Health and Safety Policy must be provided, with detailed risk assessment and management strategy for this particular site.
4.4 No initial survey to detect public utility or other services has taken place The gesponsibility for this rests with the archaeological contractor.

S 4.5 The Institute of Field Archaeologists' Standard End Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessments and for Field Evaluations should be used for additional guidance in the execution of the project and in drawing up the report.
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## 5. Report Requirements

5.1 An archiye 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).

The data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent wath, and approved by, the County Sites and Monuments Record.
5.3 The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its archaeological interpretation.
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
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 assessment of the archaeological evidence. Its conclusions must include a clear statement of the archaeological potential of the site, and the significance of that potential in the context of the Regional Research Framework (East Añglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers 3 \& 8, 1997 and 2000).
5.7 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines. The finds, as an indissoluble part of the site archive, should be deposited with the County SMR if the landowner can be persuaded to agree to this. If this is not possible for all or any part of the finds archive, then provision must be made for additional recording (e.g. photography, illustration, analysis) as appropriate.
5.8 The site archive is to be deposited with the County SMR within three months of the completion of fieldwork. It will then become publicly accessible.
5. 9 Where positive conclusions are drawn from a project (whether it be evaluation or excayation) a summary report, in the established format, suitable for inclusion in the annual 'Archaeology in Suffolk' section of the Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute for Archaeology, must be prepared. It should be included in the project report, or submitted to the Conservation Team, by the end of the calendar gear in W. Wich the evaluation work takes place, whichever is the sooner.
sites where archaeological finds and/or features are located.
5.11 At the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record $\underline{h t t p}: / / a d s . a h d s . a c . u k / p r o j e c t / o a s i s /$ must be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators forms.
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6.12 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the SMR. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy shofitd also be included with the archive).

Specification by: R D Carr
Suffolk County Council
Archaeological Service Conservation Team
Environment and Transport Department
Shire Hall
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk IP33 2AR
Tel: 01284352441

Date: 12 October 2004
Reference: /BSE-EastgateBarns10

This brief and specification remains valid for 12 months from the above date. If work is not carried out in full within that time this document will lapse; the authority should be notified and a revised brief and specification may be issued.

If the work defined by this brief forms a part of a programme of archaeological work required by a Planning Condition, the results must be considered by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council, who have the responsibility for advising the appropriate Planning Authority.
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Eastgate Barns, Bury St Edmunds

by A. Breen

## Introduction

This report has been commissioned by the Suffolk Archaeological Unit to lexanome the readily available cartographic and documentary sources for the history of this site. OTheresearch was carried out at the Suffolk Record Office in Bury St Édmunds.

This report is divided into three sections based on the quality of the surviving material. The most useful material for this report has been a range of printed and manuscript maps covering the period 1736 to the present. These offer considerable details of changes in the range of buildings within the site. The manuscript sources for the history of the site from 1538 to the present are poor and those that have survived are described in detail in this report. The third section deals with printed and manuscript sources for the medieval history of the site.

A town rental for 1295 has been translated and published. Under 'Eastfield' there is a list of lands owned by the cellarer, an official of the former abbey of Bury St Edmunds. The list includes the following entry 'Thè Cellarer holds 21 acres of land which is called Bernecrofte; it is not titheable exceptefor half an acre of land which lies alongside the Almoner's Grange'. This is thevearliest surviving reference to the site now known as Eastgate Barns.

## Maps

The site is shown on the 1:2500 Ordnance Survey maps sheet number XLIV. 7 to the east of the former Great Eastern Railway's Sudbury, Melford \& Bury line. The line was constructed in 1865. The entrance to the site was from the south by a roadway that led from Eastgate Street. Immediately behind the houses that fronted the street a footpath branched off from the roadway to the northeast and crossed the fields to meet with the eastern boundary of the old gravel pits to the east of the farm. The fields continue to the east to join Hollow Road. The farm is named as Grange Farm and then in italics 'on site of Holderness Barn'. There are two ponds, one to the east of the farm buildings and south of old gravel pits. The other is to the south of the house. The first edition of the map surveyed in 1883 - 84 uses pink for the main buildings and grey for the secondary structures. The main dwelling is immediately north of the pond and to the rear of the house there are a series of enclosed gardens, these include another small porid and an orchard at the northwest corner of the site. The main range of agriculturat buildings is immediately to the east of the house, though these seemfo be connected to the gravel pit site. To the south of these buildings and inmediately east of the ponds there is a second dwelling or office. A roadway runhing east west marks the northern boundary of the site. At the western end, there is adoridge under the railway line affording access to the meadowland to the west of the River Lark on the western side of the railway line. At the northeast corner of the old gravel pits, this roadway turns to the north. On the second edition dated 1904, the evidence of the old gravel pits have been removed and that part of the site had become a small field measured at 1.150 acres. The two large fields are subdivided and no longer continue to Hollow Road. This new field boundary marks in part the present eastern boundary of the site. The field is measured at 6.090 acres and the farmhouse and associated
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buildings and gardens at 3.783 acres. On this map the railway is marked as the G.E.R. The 1926 edition does not show any additional features other than the railway was then the L.N.E. R . This line closed in 1965.

In 1867, the field to the east of this site was used as the site of the 'Royal Agriculturab Show as shown on a plan of the borough by John Croft (ref. 373/10). The temporary entrance was on this site to the south of the farm buildings.

Ir 1857, this estate was sold by auction and a coloured sale plan droduced (ref. 373/15). The plan shows the Ipswich \& Bury Railway Line opened in 1846 but not the Melford and Sudbury Line. The map has come to the Suffolk Record Office from the former borough Library and only the plan has been kept and not the sale particulars. The map probably uses green to show those parts of the farm used as pasture and yellow for the arable land. The pond in the field marked ' 2 ' on the plan, that is in the same area as the gravel pits shown on the Ordnance Survey maps suggests that gravel extraction had already begun on this site. On this map there is a roadway to the east that led to Hollow Lane.

Richard Payne's 'Map of the Parishes of Saint Mary and Saint James Bury Saint Edmund's' is dated 1833 (586/2). Again the main entrance is to the east by the roadway adjoining Hollow Lane. On this map there are a number of additional buildings shown on the site. The main difference is to the south of the farmhouse and barns and at the southeast corner of the latge bord a building is shown close to the site of the later entrance to the Royal Agricultural Showground. By the time of the later maps the building had been deimolished. On the northern side of the yard there appears to be a large barn. Similar detall are shown on his 1834 map of borough.
J. G. Lenny's 1823 plan of the borough shows a slightly different arrangement of the farm buildings (586/1).

On Thomas Warren's 1791 'Survey of the Borough' (ref M555/938), the site is named as 'East Gate Barns' and divided between the fields called 'The Pightle' measured at 20 acres 2 roods 30 perches and the yards measured at 4 acres 1 rood and 17 perches. In the gardens to the north of the buildings there is a building running north south between the two areas of garden. On his earlier 'Survey of the Borough of St Edmunds Bury' dated 1776, the site is shown as 'E:Gate Barns'. Only the buildings and gardens to the north are shown on this map. Alexander Downing's 1740 plan of Bury St Edmuñds (ref. 628) three ranges of buildings together with the gardens are shown though not in detail.

There area a series of eighteenth century surveys of this estate. In 1736 two planswere prepared both on 'a scale of perches each $16 \frac{1}{2}$ feet'. The pasturelands are shown in green and the arable in yellow. The fields to the east and south of the site were all pasture and simply called 'The Pightle' number 17 and measure 8 at 21 ' acres 1 rood and 13 perches and the house and yards, number 19 are measured as 3 acres 29 perches. The larger of the two maps shows the buildings in considerable detail. The main house is in the same position as on the Ordnance Survey maps, but behind the building there is another range running north south. At the northeast corner of these domestic buildings there is a large barn with a central entrance. This building had been demolished by the time of the Ordnance Survey maps. Further agricultural
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buildings to the east are in the same position of those shown on the Ordnance Survey maps and suggest a large barn with three entrances. The second undated plan, endorsed 'ThosilCocksedge Esqr' and 'Grosvenors' shows the areas that were titheable 130 acres' 1 rood and 5 perches and 'Tyth Free' 219 acres 3 roods and b1 perches On, these plans the roadway that formed the main entrance to the site is named as 'Spurr Way '(ref. HC 539/C1/9).
-There are no earlier plans or maps of this site.
The Manor of Eastgate Barns


In 1857 'The Grange or Eastgate Barns Farm' was sold under the terms of the will of Rev George John Haggitt to Right Honorable John Thomas, Lord Manners. Lord Manners' main residence was at Fornham St Genevieve, near Bury St Edmunds. There were three separate elements to this sale. The first was the site of Eastgate Farm and its surrounding lands. The second was the title to the lordship of the manor of Holderness alias Eastgate Barns with the income from the manorial courts and jurisdiction over the rights to the commons and wastes of the manor. The third element was the copyhold lands held of the manor that had to be surrendered to the manorial court before any new owner could entry theproperty.

The surviving deeds are amongst the recordS of H. $^{\circ} .^{\circ} \mathrm{R}$. Land of Bury St Edmunds, 'removers and storers' (ref. HC 539/C1). Theseare the business records for the firm founded in 1905 and later taken over by Pickfords in 1979 and closed in 1982. The original proprietor began to acquireproperties around the time of the First World War but there is no evidence in the collection that he had ever acquired or owned this site. The last document in the colleetion details the 1857 sale of the site and manor to Lord Manners. Revd Haggitt had bought the property in 1842.

On 13th March 1838, Thomas Martin Cocksedge leased the farm, consisting of 515 acres, to Charles Harrison for twelve years at an annual rent of $£ 565$. The lease gives details of the respective rights of both the owner and his tenant. Amongst the tenant's rights, there is the following clause that Harrison should 'find and provide sufficient good wheat or rye straw for thatching and repairing the hereby demised buildings during the term of twelve years'. There are other clauses that detail the costs of minor repairs. The main building was ensured with the Suffolk Fire Office. Amongst the conditions relating to the land, pasture could not be broken up and changed into arable use without the expressed permission of the owner. All rights to the trees about the estate werefeserved to the owner. At the end of the document there is a schedukeoof the lands buthe buildings are not described in detail. In April 1842 the propetty was soldto, Revd G. J. Haggitt. In a letter dated 27th October 1845, the new owher Revd. G. JoHaggitt requested Charles Harrison to resign his lease on payment of compensation.

Amongst the documents there is an abstract of title to this property. It consists of 85 pages of notes extracted from earlier deeds relating to the property. These begin with details from a deed dated 2nd April 1695. The property then owned by William Harvey of Chigwell in Essex is described as 'All that Manor or Farm of Holdernesse otherwise Eastgate Barnes in the County of Suffolk with the rights members \& appurtenances whatsoever thereunto belonging or appertaining late parcel of the
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lands \& possessions of the late dissolved Monastery of Bur St Edmunds in the County of Suffolk. And all that Grange called by the name of Holdernesse alias Eastgate Barnes Parcel of the said Manor. And all that scite of the said Manor or Grange of Holdernessedalias Eastgate Barnes situate \& being in the Town Parish \& Fields of Bury St Edmunds \& elsewhere'.

InCuly 1709 , William and Dorothy Harvey sold the property to Sir Nicholas Le Strange of Hunstanton in Norfolk who in turn sold it to Stephen Skinner of Wanstead, ESsex in May the following year. In September 1727, he passed the property to his son also Stephen Skynner of Low Leighton, Essex. The property was then in the occupation of Martin Cocksedge as undertenant. In 1773, the site is described as ' $a$ manor house called Holderness or Eastgate Barnes two barns or cartlodge, stables, cornchamber and other outhouses and four hundered and thirteen acres land'. In 1763, the site is described as 'two messuages one granary one cornchamber four gardens ...' Martin Cocksedge bought the property in October 1780. Thomas Cocksedge was a brother of Martin Cocksedge and he acquired the property in 1802.

The rest of the collection relates to houses and lands that were part of the copyhold estate of the manor and are not relevant to this report. A photocopy of a survey of the copyhold property dated to c. 1630 is available at Bury but again the details are not relevant to this report (ref. 633/2)

The only other document, relevant to this rêporf, is a manuscript copy of letters patent issued on 20 March 1562. The document like the original letters patent is written in Latin (ref. C7/2/1). The 'site of the manov of Holdernes alias the said Eastgate Barnes with the demesne land to the same belonging together with the grange there' was demised, that is leased, from the abbey of Bury St Edmunds to John Cutteras on 20 September 1538 for a term of thirty years. On 20 August 1558, the property passed to Thomas Gardyner who in turn leased the site to Thomas Boldero and Richard Thorpe in 1562. At the National Archives in Kew, there is an assignment of the lease of this manor and that of Mildenhall from Sir Edward Waldegrave, knight of Borley, Essex to Joan the late wife of Christopher Peyton of Bury St Edmunds. The online index does not offer a date for this document (ref. E210/10264). No doubt details of other transfers of the property were enrolled at the courts in London. These formal documents do not offer useful details of the site.

## Medieval Sources

Lobel has descrifed the importance of the cellarer to the administration of the former abbey in detail in her work. She had the opportunity to study in depth all the surviving medievalanaterial. In 1295 the cellarer held 260 acres of land and 'well over 50-acres of meadow lying with the banleuca besides wood, heath and pastureland'. The banleuca is the area of the borough. 'Later extents of the grangés demesne land reveal a larger acreage it is estimated at $3831 / 2$ acres in the early fourteenth century account to be found in the cellarer's register'. By 1342 the lands were estimated to have consisted of 412 acres.

Rodney M Thomson has described the surviving records of the abbey. Though there are references to the cellarer's lands in some of the customaries, there are only six surviving cellarer's registers. The only one in the possession of the Suffolk Record
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Office is incomplete. Of the other five two are held at Cambridge University Library, another at the National Archive, another at the British Library and the remaining register is in aprivate collection. These documents are the main sources for the history of themedieval site but are unlikely to add significant new information for this report.

## Conclusion

The best surviving evidence for the medieval occupation of this site is the manuscript maps of 1736. The large barns to the north and east of the farmhouse are likely to have been, at least in part, medieval structures. The area of land around 21 acres matches the acreage found in the rental of 1295. This suggests a strong continuity in the history of the site and it's lands use. The surrounding areas are likely to have remained pasture from an early date.

Anthony M Breen
May 2004
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| Context | Feature | Group | Plan no | Section no | Identifier | Description | Cuts | Cutb | Over | Under |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0100 |  |  | 5 | 2 | Wall | Wall running approximately NW-SE across TR2. Located at south end of TR2. Flint and mortar construction. No associated finds. Interpretation - Post-Medieval wall. Width 0.42 m ; Length 2.1 m visible; Depth 0.4 m . Trowel and shovel excavated | 0101 |  |  |  |
| 0101 |  |  | 5 | 2 | Layer | Mid to dark orange/brown clayey silt. Very occasional chalk fragments and occasional flint. Wall 0100 cuts 0101 . No finds. Machined. |  | 0100 |  |  |
| 0102 |  |  | 5 | 2 | Section | Section through layer 0101 and wall 0100 . |  |  |  |  |
| 0103 |  |  | 6 | 7 | Section | Section at northern end of TR2 includes wall 0104. |  |  |  |  |
| 0104 |  |  | 6 | 7 | Wall | Wall running across TR2 near northern end. |  |  |  |  |
| 0105 |  |  |  | 7 | Layer | Layer in section 0103. Dârk grey-green clay with occasional chalk flecks. Pot sherd from this layer. Not fully excavated. Machined. Extends below water level in TR2. |  |  |  |  |
| 0106 | 0106 |  | TST |  | Feature Cut | Cut of possible pit at south end of TR4. Semi circular in plan though extends beyond trench edge. Fairly shallow sloping sides (30-40 degrees). Not bottomed. Same as 0141 |  |  |  | 0107 |
| 0107 | 0106 |  |  |  | Feature Fill | Fill of pit 0106 . Dark grey silty clay with occasional chalk and flint. Not fully excavated. Shovel excavated. |  |  | 0106 |  |
| 0108 | 0108 |  | TST |  | Feature Cut | Large pit/pond at western end TR1. Steep-sided. Not bottomed. Excavated entirely by machine. Possible pond or river edge. |  |  |  | 0109 |
| 0109 | 0108 |  |  |  | Feature Fill | Mid to dark grey silt with frequent flint. Machine excavated. |  |  | 0108 |  |
| 0110 |  |  | 79 | 84344 | Wall | Wall running approximately N-S across western end of TR1. Flint and mortar construction with occasional bricks. Possible remains of brick lined drain through wall-identifiable by lack of mortar over bricks. Bricks measure $231 \mathrm{~mm} \times 112 \mathrm{~mm} \times 38 \mathrm{~mm}$. No visible foundation trench in plan or section. Further exposed by nachine to south of TR1. Continues straight then curves to east (see TST plan). Width $0.5 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{W})$; Length $1.9 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{S})$ as visible in TR1; Depth 0.3 on west facing elevation. Trowel and shovel excavated. | $\begin{aligned} & 0111 \\ & 0112 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 0111 | 0283 |  |  | 8 | Feâture Fill | Dark brown/grey clayey silt layer located to east of wall 0110 in TR1. Possibly fill of cut visible to east (see TST plan) Contains some brick fragments (none kept). Possibly filled up against wall 0110 . Visible in section 0113. Comes down onto similar soil with large quantities of flint and gravel - very compact. Trowel excavated. Build-up behind wall 0110 |  | 0110 | 0284 |  |






| Context | Feature | Group | Plan no | Section no | Identifier | Description | Cuts | Cutb | Over | Under |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0170 | 0169 |  | TST | 34 | Pit Fill | Fill from pit 0169 . Light brown grey silty clay. Lots of stones approximately 0.05 m to 0.15 m in diameter. Fairly hard compaction due to clay. $50 \%$ excavated using all tools. Root disturbance. Cut by modern wall. |  |  | 0169 |  |
| 0171 |  |  | 3 | 11 | Segment | Including cuts 0172 and 0174, layers 0176 and 0177, surface 0132. North facing section. |  |  |  |  |
| 0172 | 0172 | 0163 | 3 | 11 | Slot Cut | Linear in plan.only half width excavated in this intervention. Therfore only west side visible. Slope straight and regular at 45 degrees. Base flat. Width 0.3 m as excavated; length 0.6 m as excavated; depth 0.25 m . |  |  |  | 0173 |
| 0173 | 0172 |  |  | 11 | Slot Fill | Mid yellowish brown sandy clay. Plastic. $1 \%$ flint - angular 0.03-0.05m in diameter. Width 0.3 m as excavated; length 0.6 m as excavated; depth 0.25 m . No finds |  | 0174 | 0172 |  |
| 0174 | 0174 |  | 3 | 1141 | Slot Cut | Linear in plan. Sides slope vertical. Base flat. Width 0.4 m ; length 2.2 m as excavated; depth 0.2 m . | 0173 |  |  | 0175 |
| 0175 | 0174 |  |  | 11 | Slot Fill | Mid grey brown sandy clay. Plastic. $2 \%$ gravel and flint - 0.01-0.03m in diameter. Width 0.4 m ; length 2.2 m as excavated; depthe 0.2 m . No finds. |  |  | 0174 | 0176 |
| 0176 |  |  |  | 11 | Layer | Layer of burning. The upper pargis black and charcoal. The lower half is the scorched top of the deposit below. Burning event - in situ. Width 1.3 m ; length 0.4 m as excavated; depth 0.04 m . No finds. |  |  | 0175 | 0177 |
| 0177 |  |  |  | 11 | Layer | Mixed layet of clay, mortar and burnt material. Width 1.7 m ; length 0.4 m as excavated; depth 0.04 m . No finds. |  |  | 0176 | 0132 |
| 0178 | 0118 |  |  | 35 | Layer | Upper layer in hearth 0118. Light grey clay with several chalk flecks. Where burnt - dark pink clay with chalk flecks. Length 1.08 m ; depth 0.12 m . No finds. |  |  | 0179 |  |
| 0179 | 0118 |  |  | 35 | Layer | Lower layer in hearth 0118. Dark red (burnt) clayey silt (natural?). Width 1.08 m ; depth 0.12 m . No finds. |  |  |  | 0178 |
| 0180 |  |  |  | 2733 | Segment | Two $0.9 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.7 \mathrm{~m}$ squares dug to form segment through gully 0182 and expose west face and south end of flint and mortar wall 0183 . North, south and west facing sections drawn. |  |  |  |  |
| 0181 |  | 0181 | 4 |  | Structure | Component number of building and surrounding features. Situated to the far south of site. Cement floor and flint and mortar walls. |  |  |  |  |
| 0182 | 0182 | 0163 | 3 | 27 | Gully Cut | Cut of N-S gully half visible in north facing section of segment 0180 . Visible width 0.26 m ; depth below wall 0184 is 0.32 m ; visible length approximately 0.95 m . |  |  |  | 0186 |
| 0183 |  | 0134 | 3 | $2733$ | all | N-S running flint and mortar wall. Part of structure 0134 . Northern end joints up with tile wall 0154 . Comes to an end at south facing section of segment 0180 . Surviving height approximately 0.1 m . | e |  | 0183 | 0132 |


| Context | Feature | Group | Plan no | Section no | Identifier | Description | Cuts | Cutb | Over | Under |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0184 | 0184 |  | 8 | 38 | Posthole Cut | Cut of posthole. Round hole in square hole. Fill same throughout. No finds. Feels modern. Length $0.44 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{S})$; depth 0.37 m . Cuts into natural. |  |  |  | 0185 |
| 0185 | 0184 |  | 8 | 38 | Posthole Fill | Light orangey brown clayey silt. No finds. Length 0.44 m ( $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ ); depth 0.37 m . |  |  | 0184 |  |
| 0186 | 0182 |  |  | 27 | Gully Fill | Fill of gully 0182 . Mid brown slightly silty clay. No finds. Depth 0.32 m . Trowel and shovel excavated. |  |  | 0182 | 0183 |
| 0187 |  |  | 3 |  | Wall | SE corner of building. Mortar and flint construction. |  |  |  |  |
| 0188 |  | 0188 |  |  | Surface | Group number for photo of excavated surfaces of mixed compostion to the east of structure 0181. |  |  |  |  |
| 0189 |  | 0189 |  |  | Surface | Group number for photo of excavated surfaces of mixed compostion to the west of structure 0181. |  |  |  |  |
| 0190 |  |  | 3 | 39 | Section | Section through pit 0191 and ditch 0194 |  |  |  |  |
| 0191 | 0191 |  | 3 | 39 | Pit Cut | Circular in plan with possible extension or other pit to north but no visible difference in fills. |  |  | 0199 | 0192 |
| 0192 | 0191 |  |  | 39 | Pit Fill | Chalk with $20 \%$ flint. Where this fill is visible it runs around north and west side of cut only in lower 0.2 m of visible cut. Width 0.6 m and depth 0.2 m as excavated. |  |  | 0191 | 0193 |
| 0193 | 0191 |  |  | 39 | Pit Fill | Mid greyish red brown sandy clay. $5 \%$ flint ( $0.03-0.08 \mathrm{~m}$ in size) Width 1.6 m and depth 0.8 m as excavated. |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0194 \\ & 0197 \end{aligned}$ | 0192 |  |
| 0194 | 0194 |  |  | 39 | Ditch Cut | E-W linear. Only north side visible. Sides slope 45 degrees straight. Base flat. Width 0.4 m as excavated; length 2 m ; depth 0.1 m . Fill indistinguishable from fill 0193 of pit 0191. | 0193 |  |  | 0195 |
| 0195 | 0194 |  |  | 39 | Ditch Fill | Mid grey plastic silty clay. $5 \%$ flint laying along base of feature. Width 0.4 m as excavated; length 2 m ; depth 0.1 m . |  |  | 0194 | 0196 |
| 0196 |  |  |  | 39 | Layer | Light yellow brown plastic clay. $2 \%$ chalk flecks. Length 2 m as excavated; depth 0.08 m . |  |  | 0195 |  |
| 0197 | 0197 |  |  | 39 | Slot Cut | Linear E-W turns north 0.4 m west of this intervention. Only south side visible. Slope 70 degrees straight. Base flat. Width 0.4 m as excavated; length 1.4 m as excavated; depth 0.1 m . Interpretation - robbed out wall. | $\begin{aligned} & 0204 \\ & 0193 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 0198 |
| 0198 | 0197 |  |  | 39 | Slot Fill | Mortar and rubble - flint and brick fragments. Width 0.4 m as excavated; length 1.4 m as excavated; depth 0.1 m |  |  | 0197 | 0200 |
| 0199 |  |  |  | 39 | Layer | Mid green grey plastic clay. Width 0.7 m ; depth 0.15 m . |  | 0191 |  | 0204 |

Cuts Cutb Over Under

|  | Mid grey clay and $10 \%$ mortar. $5 \%$ flint. Length 1 m ; depth 0.8 m . No finds. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0200 |  | Mid brown sandy clay. 20\% pea grit. Length 1 m ; depth 0.04 m . |







Cuts Cutb Over Under


Cuts Cutb Over Under
NW-SE running wall. Brick built. Part of post-medieval farmhouse. Not final phase. Wall (St Wal
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| Context | Pottery No | Pottery Wt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CBM } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CBM } \\ & \text { Wt } \end{aligned}$ | Mortar <br> No | Mortar <br> Wt | Clay pipe No | Clay pipe Wt | Glass No | Glass <br> Wt | Iron No | Iron Wt | Animal bone No | Animal <br> bone Wt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oyster } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Oyster <br> Wt | Misc | Spotdate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0240 | 18 | 0.144 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14th- } 15 \text { th } \\ & \text { C } \end{aligned}$ |
| 0243 | 21 | 0.662 | 12 | 1.159 | 3 | 0.110 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.188 | 14 | 0.492 | 83 | 0.626 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stone; I frag. } \\ & 0.102 \mathrm{~kg} \end{aligned}$ | 16th C |
| 0244 |  |  | 1 | 0.102 | 1 | 0.180 |  |  | 1 | 0.008 |  |  |  |  |  |  | burnt flint; 1 frag. 0.028 kg | P-med |
| 0254 | 5 | 0.115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 0.034 | 1 | 0.004 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15th-16th } \\ & \text { C } \end{aligned}$ |
| un strat |  |  | 2 | 0.464 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | stone; 1 frag. $0.227 \mathrm{~kg}, 1$ @ 2.540 kg |  |






Appendix 5 Pottery catalogue





| Context | Fabric | Form | No | Wt | Length | Width | Height | Abr | Peg shape | Mortar | Notes | Date | Kept? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0153 | est | RT | 12 | 888 | 260 | 185 | 15 |  | 1 XR (1) |  | 1 tile. Lower $1 / 4$ GG, yellow and pink fabric | 13-15 | $\checkmark$ |
| 0155 | est | RT | 1 | 310 |  |  | 20 |  |  |  | v. coarse, lower 1/4 BG | 13-15 | $\checkmark$ |
| 0155 | est | RT | 2 | 212 |  |  | 16 |  |  |  | 1 tile. V. coarse, thick GG lower frag | 13-15 | $\checkmark$ |
| 0155 | est | RT | 2 | 131 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  | 1 tile? GG lower frags | 13-15 | $\checkmark$ |
| 0155 | est | RT | 4 | 384 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 tiles. GG lower frags | 13-15 | $\checkmark$ |
| 0155 | est | RT | 2 | 451 |  | 178 | 16 |  |  |  | 1 tile. Lower 1/4 GG | 13-15 | $\checkmark$ |
| 0195 | ms | RT | 1 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LMed/PMed | $\checkmark$ |
| 0222 | msfe | RT | 4 | 208 |  |  |  |  |  | medium white | 1 tile? | PMed | $\checkmark$ |
| 0230 | est | RT | 2 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | sandy type | 13-15 | $\checkmark$ |
| 0243 | est | RT | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | coarse sandy | 13-15 | $\checkmark$ |
| 0243 | ms | RT | 7 | 263 |  |  | $50^{\circ}$ |  | 1 XR |  | 1 reduced core, rest oxidised | LMed/PMed | $\checkmark$ |
| 0243 | msfe | RT | 3 | 118 |  |  |  |  |  | fine white | 1 appears worn on surface | PMed | $\checkmark$ |
| 0243 | fsm | LB | 1 | 745 |  |  | 45+ |  |  | fine white on underside | large cobble incl., worn surface | LMed? | $\checkmark$ |
| 0244 | msfe | RT | 1 | 92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PMed | $\checkmark$ |



| SF No | Period | Context | Material | Category | Find Type | Number | Weight (g) | Description | Date | XRay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1001 | PMED | 0001 | Pb | CTJ | Token | 1 | 1 | Token, copy of penny on 1 face but other side illegible, 14th C at earliest (Faye Minter pers. comm), diameter 18 mm , reverse better preserved than obverse |  |  |
| 1002 |  | 0243 | Pb | UN |  | 1 | 10 | Fragment of lead waste. |  |  |
| 1003 | PMED | 0243 | Ae | DA | Purse Bar? | 1 | 2 | Possible a fragment of a purse bar. |  |  |
| 1004 | PMED | 0219 | Ae | MF | Fixing | 1 | (1) | Copper Alloy sheet, pressed into the shape of a ear of wheat, now bent. Decorative fitting. |  |  |
| 1005 |  | 0248 | Pb | WM | Weight? | 1 |  | Roughly circular piece of lead, raising to a point in the centre. |  |  |
| 1006 |  | 0111 | Ae | CTJ | Coin? |  |  | Copper alloy coin, jeton or token, with 2 perforations, poss re-used as button? Shows crown and lettering around one side, need additional x-ray of other side | P-Med | SX:1082 |
| 1007 |  | 0112 | Pb | UN | Lead waste | 1 | 15 | Frag of lead sheet, cut or broken and folded over halfway along its length. No obvious function. |  |  |
| 1008 | PMED | 0243 | Ae | CTJ | Token | 1 | 1 | Quartered Nuremburg token, orb | P-med |  |
| 1009 | PMED | 0203 | Pb | CTJ | Token | 1 | 1 | Boy Bishop token, penny size, diameter 15 mm | 15th-16th C |  |
| 1010 |  | 0001 | Pb | UN |  | 1 | 31 | Fragment of lead sheet, 60 mm long by 27 mm wide. |  |  |
| 1011 |  | 0001 | Ae | HO |  | 1 | 30 | Fragment of a copper alloy vessel wall. 50 mm by 35 mm . |  |  |
| 1012 | LMED/PMED | 0132 | Ae | HO | Vessel | 1 | 121 | Foot of a cast copper alloy vessel or cauldron. 70 mm by 36 mm . | P-med | SX:1082 |

SF No Period


Appendix 8 Animal bone catalogue

| Context | Date | Feature Type | Bone Qty | Bone Wt | Species |  | Ages | Butchering | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 107 | Lmed | feature | 19 | 0.18 | Mammal | 19 |  | cut/chopped | most ch/cut rib frags - probably cattle |
| 109 | Lmed | pit | 1 | 0.07 | Pig | 1 | adult | chopped | humerus |
| 111 |  | feature | 1 | 0.03 | Mammal | 1 |  |  |  |
| 112 |  | layer | 1 | 0.05 | Cattle | 1 | juv | chopped | pelvis |
| 132 | Lmed | surface |  |  | Mammal | 3 |  |  |  |
| 132 | Lmed | surface | 4 | 0.05 | Pig | 1 |  | chopped | radius |
| 142 | Pmed | ditch |  |  | Bird - Chicken |  | asdu | chopped | ulna |
| 142 | Pmed | ditch | 50 | 0.45 | Cattle |  | adult | cut/chopped | cut calcaeneus, chopped talus |
| 142 | Pmed | ditch |  |  | Eish |  | adult |  | PIKE vertebrae |
| 142 | Pmed | ditch |  |  | Mapmmal | 37 |  | butchered | inc many chopped/cut rib pieces |
| 142 | Pmed | ditch |  |  | Pig | 4 | juv | cut/chopped | femur, tibia, phalange, tooth |
| 142 | Pmed | ditch |  |  | Sheep/Goat | 5 | adult | cut/chopped | jaw, molars and tibia |
| 145 |  | layer | 1 | 0.01 | Sheep/Goat | 1 | juv | chopped | tibia |
| 152 |  | ditch | 5 | 0.05 | Mammal | 5 |  | butchered |  |
| 193 |  | pit | 3 | 0.03 | Cattle | 1 | adult | chopped | metapodial |
| 193 |  | pit |  |  | Bird - Goose | 1 | adult | cut/chopped | carpometacarpus |
| 193 |  | pit |  |  | Bird - Chicken | 1 | adult | cut/chopped | tibiotarsus |
| 195 | Lmed | ditch |  |  | Cattle |  | juv | chopped | vertebrae fragments |




