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## Summary

An archaeological monitoring was carried out on land at The Former Sue Ryder Care Home, The Old Rectory, High Street, Cavendish (NGR TL 806 464) (HER NO. CAV 049). Monitoring of groundworks associated with the renovation and extension of the care home was undertaken on 4th to 6th and 11th August 2009. A number of postmedieval archaeological features were recorded, including boundary ditches, pits and a single post hole. No further burials were revealed to add to the graves found during work on the site in the 1970's. Finds from the medieval and post-medieval periods were recovered during the fieldwork.







## 1. Introduction

Archaeological monitoring of building work was carried out at the former Sue Ryder Care home, as part of ancarchaeological condition in relation to planning permission for the extension of the existing care home, (Application number: SE/09/0245).

The site lies near the core of medieval Cavendish, near the medieval church of St. Mary. More significantly for the work on the site though, was the discovery of human remains on the care home site in the 1970's. It was felt therefore that the development work would cause ground disturbance with the potential to destroy archaeological deposits, particularly burials, were they present. As such, there was a requirement for archaeological monitoring of the groundworks as outlined in a Brief \& Specification produced by Jess Tipper of the SCCAS Conservation Team (Appendix 1). The SCCAS Field Team was subsequently commissioned to carry out the work by the client Mr R . Bennett. This took place over four visits from the 4th to 6th and 11th August 2009.

## 2. Geology and topography

The site is located in the centre of Cavendish (Fig. 1). The ground prior to the building work was occupied mainly by the care home buildings. The extensions to the buildings were in areas of courtyards, paths and gardens. The ground was relatively level at circa 40 m AOD. The site is located on clay overlying alluvium and peat deposits.
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Figure 1. Site location, showing development area (red), adjacent evaluation CAV 053 and Historic Environment Record entries mentioned in the text (green)

## 3. Archaeological and historical background

The development site is located near the historic core of Cavendish, near to the church of St. Mary (Historic Environment Record (HER) No. CAV 010). Roman brick was used in the construction of the church, which may indicate a Roman site in the vicinity. Beside the church a quantity of Roman pottery and metal finds were found (HER No. CAV 004). The burials (HER No. CAV 012) on the site were presumably uncovered in the 1970's during a phase of construction of the care home. The burials were orientated with their heads to the east, but were of uncertain date. The Old Rectory, a large timber-framed house, is located to the west of the development work, and is part of the same development. Nikolaus Pevsner dates the Grade II listed building (LBS 282903), which is the former home of Sue Ryder and headquarters of her charity, to the 16th century (Pevsner, 1974).

## 4. Methodology

The groundworks for the construction of extensions to the care home were the subject of this monitoring work; which was allocated the HER number CAV 049. The archaeological work was conducted in accordance with a Brief and Specification written by Dr. Jess Tipper of Suffolk County Council's Archaeological Conservation Team (Appendix 1).

Monitoring of the excavation of the foundation trenches and lift pits (Fig. 2) was carried out from the 4th to 6th and 11th August 2009. The work involved excavation of footings to a depth of between 0.9 m and 1.25 m below ground level (BGL). This was done with a $360^{\circ}$ mechanical excavator using a 0.4 m wide toothed bucket. The exposed surfaces were then cleaned by hand to better reveal changes in colour and composition that would indicate the presence of archaeological deposits and features. Finds were collected during this phase of work. All observed deposits were allocated unique context numbers and recorded on pro-forma recording forms, following guidelines set out by SCC Archaeological Service. All archaeological deposits were drawn in a series of sketch sections and 1:50 scale plans, and photographed in digital format. The drawings in this report have been produced using Adobe Illustrator software.


## 5. Results

### 5.1 Trench 1

Trench 1 was located between two existing buildings on the site and was the westernmost of the monitored areas. The trench was 9.2 m long and 0.6 m wide, and was excavated to a depth of between 10.5 m and 1.1 m (BGL). The natural geology was a light brown gravelly sand deposit 0110. This was overlain by a mid grey clayey sandy silt deposit 0108, and a mixed brown grey clay sand and gravel deposit 0111, and a mid brown grey clay sand with frequent gravel deposit 0109. Five fragments of postmedieval ceramic building material (CBM) and some iron slag were recovered from deposit 0108. These deposits were then cut by two features: a pit 0107, and a possible ditch 0103. Pit 0107 had moderate concave sides and an unseen base, measuring 0.75 m by 1.8 m by over 0.6 m deep. It held a mottled light brown gravelly sand and mid grey clay sand fill 0106, from which a fragment of early post-medieval CBM was recovered. Ditch 0103 was roughly E-W aligned and had moderate concave sides and an unseen base, that measured 0.75 m by 1.8 m by over 0.6 m deep. It held a mid grey brown clay sand fill containing frequent CBM and pebbles 0102. A single sherd of residual medieval pottery as well a sherd from the 16th to 18th century, and a fragment of roof tile were recovered from the ditch dating it to the post-medieval period.


The northern edge of ditch 0103 was cut by a similar E-W aligned ditch 0105. Ditch 0105 had near vertical concave sides and an unseen base, measuring 0.6 m by 1.85 m wide and over 0.6 m deep. It held a very dark grey sandy clay silt with lenses of gravelly sand fill 0104.


Plate 3. Ditch 0105 facing NE. (1m scale)

These features were sealed by a 0.45 m thick deposit of very dark grey sandy clay silt with frequent gravel 0101, that was a remnant topsoil or make-up for the modern paved surface. The deposit was cut by services for the current buildings.

### 5.2 Trench 2

Trench 2 was positioned a few metres to the east of Trench 1. It was 9.05 m long and 0.6 m wide and was excavated to a depth of 1.25 m BGL. The natural geology was not seen in the trench. Instead, the deepest deposit revealed, 0204, was a mid grey clay sandy silt containing frequent CBM and gravel, that was over 0.65 m thick. A single fragment of post-medieval CBM came from this deposit. In the centre of the trench deposit 0204 was cut by a possible E-W aligned ditch 0203, that had vertical sides and an unseen base. Itwas 0.6 m long by 0.82 m wide by 0.6 m deep, and held a mixed fill of orange brown and mid grey gravelly sand and sandy silt 0202. The possible ditch was sealed by a 0.65 m thick deposit of very dark grey clay sand silt topsoil, 0201.


Plate 4. Ditch 0203 facing NE ( $0.5 \mathrm{~m} \& 1 \mathrm{~m}$ scales)

### 5.3 Trench 3

Trench 3 was a Z-shaped trench located to the north of Trenches $1 \& 2$. It was 0.5 m wide and between 0.9 m and 1.2 m deep. The natural geology was seen at the base of the trench where it was an orangy brown gravelly sand 0307 . This was overlain by a possible alluvial deposit of laminated grey sandy silt and black organics interleaved with light grey gravelly silt, 0306 , that was 0.35 m thick. This was overlain by deposit of mixed grey brown sand clay silt with frequent CBM, 0305 , that was 0.45 m thick. Three fragments of CBM were recovered and they date to the late medieval or early postmedieval period. These deposits were cut by a very large feature 0309 measuring over 4.85 m by over 1.4 m , and over 0.7 m deep. This had steep straight sides and an unseen base, and was filled by a mixed fill of mid grey sandy silt and gravelly sand, 0308, from which post-medieval CBM was recovered.

Visible in the north end of the trench was a post-hole, 0304, with steep convex sides and a concave base. It was 0.6 m wide and 0.5 m deep, and held a mixed dark brown grey organic sandy silt as well as light brown gravelly sand in the probable post-pipe 0303. A fragment of post-medieval bottle glass was recovered from the post-hole fill.


Plate 5. Trench 3 elevation, showing post-hole 0304 looking NW 1m scale

These features were sealed by a 0.3 m to 0.45 m thick deposit of very mixed mid grey clay sand silt and orange brown sandy clay with frequent gravel 0302. This was overlain by dark grey brown clay sand silt topsoil and tarmac deposit 0301.

### 5.4 Trench 4

Trench 4 was for another foundation linking two existing buildings, and was to the NE of Trench 3. It was 3.0 m long by 1.0 m wide, and was 1.2 m deep BGL. The natural geology 0405, was seen at a depth of 0.6 m BGL, and was composed of light grey gravelly sand. This was overlain by a 0.6 m thick deposit of mid grey brown sandy silt with frequent gravel subsoil or make-up, 0401. A N-S aligned linear feature, 0404, cut this deposit along the eastern side of the trench. This feature had a steep convex side and an unseen base that was over 0.3 m wide by over 2.2 m long and over 0.95 m deep. It held a banded light brown gravelly sand and grey brown sandy silt fill, 0403. A single pottery sherd dating to the 18th -19th century was recovered from this fill. The feature was overlain by a concrete slab 0402.


Plate 6. Feature 0404 facing NW (1m scale)

### 5.5 Trench 5

Trench 5 was located just to the west of Trench 4. It was 4.65 m long by 0.5 m wide and 1.25 m deep BGL. The natural geology was seen at the base of the trench. It was a deposit of light grey gravelly sand over orange brown gravelly sand, 0504. This was overlain by a 0.23 m to 0.55 m thick deposit of mixed grey clay sand and grey brown sandy silt with frequent CBM and gravel inclusions, 0503. Three fragments of postmedieval CBM came from this deposit. Over this was a 0.1 m to 0.2 m thick make-up deposit of orangy brown clay sand 0502 . Two fragments of CBM including postmedieval pantile and brick came from deposit 0502. The trench was sealed by a 0.65 m thick deposit of very dark grey brown sandy silt topsoil 0501. A sherd of post-medieval pottery was recovered as an unstratified find from this trench.


Plate 7. Trench 5 elevation facing $W(0.5 \mathrm{~m} \& 1 \mathrm{~m}$ scales)

### 5.6 Trench 6

Trench 6 was located to the south of Trenches 4 and 5. It was 4.5 m long by 0.6 m wide and was excavated to a depth of 1.25 m BGL. The geological natural 0606 was seen at the base of the trench. It was a deposit of light orange brown gravelly sand. Cutting this were two roughly E-W aligned linear features. The southernmost, 0605, had moderate concave sides and a concave base measuring 0.7 m by over 0.6 m and 0.3 m deep. It held a grey brown clay silt fill 0604, from which 2 fragments of CBM were recovered. Beside it, to the north, was a slightly wider ditch 0609, that had steep concave sides and a concave base, and measured 1.1 m wide by over 0.6 m by 0.3 m deep. It had a primary fill of mid grey silty gravelly sand 0608 that was 0.25 m thick, and a secondary fill of light brown gravelly sand 0607 that was 0.1 m thick. Three pottery sherds dating to the 16 th to 18 th century and a fragment of CBM came from the primary fill 0608.


Plate 8. Ditch 0605 facing SW ( $0.5 \mathrm{~m} \& 1$ scales)


Plate 9. Ditch 0609 facing NW ( 0.5 m scale)

These features were sealed by a mid brown grey silty clay sand 0603 that was 0.65 m thick. Over this was a deposit of very dark grey clay sand silt with frequent charcoal inclusions 0602, that was 0 to 0.25 m thick. The sequence was completed by deposit of mixed light brown mortar and light brown clay sand 0601. This final deposit also filled the foundation trench for the modern building, and is clearly a modern levelling layer.

### 5.7 Trench 7

Trench 7 was located just to the east of Trench 6 . It was 4.35 m long by 0.6 m wide, and 1.25 m deep BGL. The geological natural was a light brown gravelly sand deposit. This was cut by a generally E-W ditch 0706, that had steep concave sides and a concave base, and was 0.95 m wide by over 0.6 m long, and 0.3 m deep. It held a mid grey sandy silt with frequent gravel and charcoal fill 0705 . Next to ditch 0706 was a large feature 0708 that had steep convex sides and a concave base that was 1.6 m wide and 0.4 m thick. It held a number of fills: 0710 that was light brown gravel and sand and mid brown sandy clay that was 0.47 m thick, 0707 , that was mid brown clay silt 0.4 m thick, and 0703 , that was mid grey clay silt that was 0.47 m thick. The interfaces between fill 0710 and the other fills were vertical, and it was unclear what the sequence of deposition of the fill was. This was suggestive of a robbed out foundation.


Plate 10. Ditch 0706 \& Pit? 0708 facing $N E$ ( $0.5 \mathrm{~m} \& 1 \mathrm{~m}$ scales)

These features were sealed by a 0.15 m thick deposit of mixed light brown sandy gravel and mid grey brown sandy silt. Over it was a 0.4 m thick deposit of mid grey brown clay sand silt. A thin deposit of very dark grey sandy silt 0709 that was 0.25 m thick, lensing out to nothing along its northern edge, was over deposit 0702, and may be a remnant
topsoil layer. Lastly, a 0.3 m thick deposit of modern make-up 0701, that also filled a modern service trench, and was composed of light brown mixed mortar and sandy silt, sealed the trench.

### 5.8 Trench 8

A rectangular lift pit measuring 2.1 m by 1.7 m , and excavated to a depth of 1.5 m BGL was located between Trenches 2 and 3. No archaeological features were present. The natural geology, here seen as light brown gravel and sand 0801, was overlain by a 0.7 m thick deposit of dark grey clay silt and rubble overlain by tarmac 0802.


Plate 11. Trench 8 elevation facing NW ( 0.5 m \& 1 m scales)

## 6. Finds and Environmental Evidence (A. Fawcett)

### 6.1 Introduction

Finds were collected from 13 contexts, as shown in the table below.


### 6.2 Pottery

A total of 7 sherds weighing 113g was recovered from the monitoring at the Sue Ryder Care Home. The majority of this small assemblage is dated to the post-medieval period, the only exception being a single sherd of medieval pottery. The pottery has been fully catalogued (Appendix 3).

The medieval sherd $(21 \mathrm{~g})$ recovered from ditch/pit fill 0102, is part of a cooking pot rim which has a thickened flat top and internal bead, and displays only slight abrasion. Although the fabric is classed as an unsourced coarseware (MCW), the form itself has a date range of late 12 th to 14 th century. Also noted in this context is a Glazed red earthenware body sherd (GRE), which is dated from the 16 th to 18 th century ( 5 g ), which also only suffers from slight abrasion. Ditch fill 0608 yielded 3 abraded body sherds $(21 \mathrm{~g})$, all of which are in fabric GRE and are dated 16th to 18th century. Fill 0403 is described as a modern feature, although it produced one slightly abraded body sherd $(49 \mathrm{~g})$ of LSRW (Late slipped redware). This fabric has a date range of 18 th to 19th century. Finally, an abraded body sherd of GRE $(17 \mathrm{~g})$, has been classed as unstratified in Trench 5 (0500) and is dated from the 16th to 18th century.

### 6.3 Ceramic building material

The CBM collection amounts to 21 fragments with a total weight of 1360 g , and may be described, in terms of condition, as between abraded and slightly abraded.

A fragment of late brick (394g) was recovered from make-up layer 0502. It has a medium sized sandy fabric with common ferrous inclusions (msfe), and is dated to the post-medieval period

A variety of roof tile fabrics have been recorded from across the contexts (see Table 1), which are mostly all medium sandy with further inclusions of mica (msm), clay pellets ( mscp ), and iron ores (msfe). Of note is a post-medieval pan tile (148g) which occurs in make up layer 0502, and 4 pieces of roof tile $(271 \mathrm{~g})$ that are dated from the late medieval to early post-medieval period. These latter fragments occur in ditch/pit 0102 (1 @ 88g) and make-up layer 0305 (3 @ 183g), in fabrics ms and msm respectively.

### 6.4 Slag

Only one piece of iron slag $(39 \mathrm{~g})$ was present, occurring in deposit 0108.

### 6.5 Glass

A posthole/pit 0303 contained a partial base of worn, brown post-medieval bottle glass (39g).

### 6.6 Discussion

The finds assemblage is very small and just two main groups dominate, pottery and CBM. It is considered therefore, that their archaeological value is fairly limited, in terms of interpretation However, the collection demonstrates a possible medieval presence and clear post-medieval utilisation of the area.

## 7. Discussion

The earliest human activity recorded within the monitored excavations was postmedieval and consisted of intentional dumping of thick deposits to raise the ground level. The reasons for this seem obvious given the low lying character of the area and the proximity to the river. An examination of the deposit sequence indicates a more complicated picture however. Alluvial deposits were seen in Trench 3 but not in any other trenches, even the ones closer to the river. Perhaps this was a pond or a small tributary stream leading to the river.

Finds recovered during the monitoring work indicate medieval activity in the vicinity, which is not surprising given the proximity of the site to the village core. No medieval features were recorded during the work however; which probably indicates that the ground was considered too close to the river and therefore prone to flooding to be built upon. The features recorded during the work were mainly ditches, and it is quite likely that the same ditches were seen in more than one trench. These ditches probably marked the boundary between the newly raised ground to the north and the still flood prone ground to the south. Some possible pits were recorded also, which may indicate rubbish disposal in the area to the south of the ditches. A single post-medieval post hole was recorded to the north of the ditches in Trench 3, indicating that the raised area was partly built upon. A very large cut feature near to the post hole is impossible to interpret, but it may be modern and relate to the construction of the care home.

## 8. Conclusions and significance of the fieldwork

The fieldwork has demonstrated that prior to the post-medieval period the portion of the site affected by the development was not built upon. Raising of the ground in the postmedieval period is quite likely to have begun after the Old Rectory was built in the 16th century. No burials similar to the ones found nearby (HER No. CAV 012) were present, and the topography of the land and past land use would suggest that it is an unlikely place for burials. In fact the documented position of the burials is even closer to the river that the monitored trenches, and therefore lower lying and probably wetter for the periods prior to the post-medieval period. The presence of burials in such a location will remain unexplained unless further archaeological work is conducted on the site in the future.

## 9. Archive deposition

Paper, digital, and photographic archive: SCCAS Ipswich
Finds and environmental archive: SCCAS Bury St Edmunds

## 10. List of contributors and acknowledgements

The monitoring was carried out by Duncan Stirk, and the project was managed by John Craven from Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Field Team.
Production of site plans was carried out by Duncan Stirk and Gemma Adams, while the specialist finds report was produced by Andy Fawcett.

## 11. Bibliography

Pevsner, N., 1974, The Buildings of England: Suffolk. Penguin Books, London.
Tipper, J., 2009, Former Sue Ryder Home, The Old Rectory, High Street, Cavendish, Suffolk. Brief And Specification for Continuous Archaeological Monitoring. SCCAS Conservation Team.

## Disclaimer

Any opinions expressed in this report about the need for further archaeological work are those of the Field Projects Team alone. Ultimately the need for further work will be determined by the Local Planning Authority and its Archaeological Advisors when a planning application is registered. Suffolk County Council's archaeological contracting services cannot accept responsibility for inconvenience caused to the clients should the Planning Authority take a different view to that expressed in the report.
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#### Abstract

Although this document is fundamental to the work of the specialist archaeological contractor the developer should be aware that certain of its requirements are likely to impinge upon the working practices of a general building contractor and may have financial implications


1.1 Planning permission to erect four extensions at Former Sue Ryder Home, The Old Rectory, High Street, Cavendish CO10 8AZ (TL 806 464), has been granted by St Edmundsbury District Council conditional upon an acceptable programme of archaeological work being carried out (application SE/09/0245).
1.2 Assessment of the available archaeological evidence indicates that the area affected by development can be adequately recorded by continuous archaeological monitoring during all groundworks (Please contact the developer for an accurate plan of the development).
1.3 This application is located in an area of archaeological importance recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, with the significant find of early human remains from this site (HER no. CAV 012). There is a strong possibility that further burials will be encountered at this location. The proposed works would cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exists.
1.4 In accordance with the standards and guidance produced by the Institute of Field Archaeologists this brief should not be considered sufficient to enable the total execution of the project. A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) based upon this brief and the accompanying outline specification of minimum requirements, is an essential requirement. This must be submitted by the developers, or their agent, to the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2AR; telephone/fax: 01284 352443) for approval. The work must not commence until this office has approved both the archaeological contractor as suitable to undertake the work, and the WSI as satisfactory, and until confirmation has been sought by the applicant from the Local Planning Authority. The WSI will provide the basis for measurable standards and will be used to establish whether the requirements of the planning condition will be adequately met.
1.5 Before commencing work the project manager must carry out a risk assessment and liase with the site owner, client and the Conservation Team of SCCAS (SCCAS/CT) in ensuring that all potential risks are minimised.
1.6 All arrangements for the excavation 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 by the archaeological contractor with the commissioning body.
1.7 The responsibility for identifying any constraints on field-work (e.g. Scheduled Monument status, Listed Building status, public utilities or other services, tree preservation orders, SSSIs, wildlife sites \&c., ecological considerations rests with the commissioning body and its archaeological contractor. The existence and content of the archaeological brief does not over-ride such constraints or imply that the target area is freely available.
1.8 Detailed standards, information and advice to supplement this brief are to be found in Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14, 2003.
1.9 The Institute of Field Archaeologists' Standard and Guidance for an archaeological watching brief (revised 2001) should be used for additional guidance in the execution of the project and in drawing up the report.

## 2. Brief for Archaeological Monitoring

2.1 To provide a record of archaeological deposits which are damaged or removed by any development [including services and landscaping] permitted by the current planning consent.
2.2 The significant archaeologically damaging activity in this proposal is the groundworks associated with the new extensions. All groundworks relating to the current planning permission, and the upcast soil, are to be observed during and after they have been excavated by the building contractor. Adequate time is to be allowed for archaeological recording of archaeological deposits during excavation, and of soil sections following excavation.
3. Arrangements for Monitoring
3.1 To carry out the monitoring work the developer will appoint an archaeologist (the archaeological contractor) who must be approved by SCCAS/CT
3.2 The developer or his contracted archaeologist will give SCCAS/CT 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. The method and form of development will also be monitored to ensure that it conforms to previously agreed locations and techniques upon which this brief is based.
3.3 Allowance must be made to cover archaeological costs incurred in monitoring the development works by the contract archaeologist. The size of the contingency should be estimated by the approved archaeological contractor, based upon the outline works in this Brief and Specification and the building contractor's programme of works and time-table.
3.4 If unexpected remains are encountered SCCAS/CT must be informed immediately. Amendments to this specification may beomade to ensure adequate provision for archaeological recording.

## 4. Specification

4.1 The developer shall afford access at all reasonable times to SCCAS/CT and the contracted archaeologist to allow archaeological monitoring of building and engineering operations which disturb the ground.
4.2 Opportunity must be given to the contracted archaeologist to hand excavate any discrete archaeological features which appear during earth moving operations, retrieve finds and make measured records as necessary. Where it is necessary to see archaeological detail one of the soil faces is to be trowelled clean.
4.3 All archaeological features exposed must be planned at a scale of 1:20 of 1:50 on a plan showing the proposed layout of the development, 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.
4.4 A photographic record of the work is to be made of any archaeological features, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies/high resolution digital images.
4.5 All contexts must be numbered and finds recorded by context. All levels should relate to Ordnance Datum.
4.6 Archaeological contexts should, where possible, be sampled for palaeoenvironmental remains. Best practice should allow for sampling of interpretable and datable archaeological deposits and provision should be made for this. Advice on the appropriateness of the proposed strategies will be sought from Rachael Ballantyne, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling archaeological deposits (Murphy, P.L. and Wiltshire, P.E.J., 1994, A guide to sampling archaeological deposits for environmental analysis) is available for viewing from SCCAS.
4.7 All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed with SCCAS/CT during the course of the monitoring).
4.8 The data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent with, and approved by, the County Historic Environment Record.
5. Report Requirements

5.1 An archive of all records and finds is to be prepared consistent with the principles of Management of Archaeological Projects (MAP2), particularly Appendix 3.This must be deposited with the County Historic Environment Record within three months of the completion of work. It will then become publicly accessible.
5.2 The project manager must consult the County Historic Environment Record Officer to obtain an event number for the work. This number will be unique for each project or site and must be clearly marked on any documentation relating to the work.
5.3 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines.
5.4 The project manager should consult the SCC Archive Guidelines 2008 and also the County HER Officer regarding the requirements for the deposition of the archive (conservation, ordering, organisation, labelling, marking and storage) of excavated material and the archive.
5.5 The WSI should state proposals for the deposition of the digital archive relating to this project with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS), and allowance should be made for costs incurred to ensure proper deposition (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/policy.htmil).
5.6 The finds, as an indissoluble part of the site archive, should be deposited with the County Historic Environment Record 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.
5.7 A report on the fieldwork and archive, consistent with the principles of MAP2, particularly Appendix 4, must be provided. The report must summarise the methodology employed, the stratigraphic sequence, and give a period by period description of the contexts recorded, and an inventory of finds. The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its interpretation. The Report must include a discussion and an assessment of the archaeological evidence, including palaeoenvironmental remains recovered from palaeosols and cut features. Its conclusions must include a clear statement of the archaeological value of the results, and their significance in the context of the Regional Research Framework (East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers 3 \& 8, 1997 and 2000).
5.8 An unbound copy of the assessment report, clearly marked DRAFT, must be presented to both SCCAS/CT for approval within six months of the completion of fieldwork unless other arrangements are negotiated with the project sponsor and SCCAS/CT.
5.9 Following acceptance, two copies of the assessment report should be submitted to SCCAS/CT. A single hard copy should be presented to the County Historic Environment Record as well as a digital copy of the approved report.
5.10 A summary report, in the established format, suitable for inclusion in the annual 'Archaeology in Suffolk' section of the Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology, must be prepared and included in the project report.
5.11 Where appropriate, a digital vector trench plan should be included with the report, which must be compatible with MapInfo GIS software, for integration in the County Historic Environment Record AutoCAD files should be also exported and saved into a format that can be can be imported into MapInfo (for example, as a Drawing Interchange File or .dxf) or already transferred to .TAB files.
5.12 At the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/ must be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators forms.
5.13 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to County Historic Environment Record. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive).

## Specification by: Dr Jess Tipper

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

Tel. : 01284352197
E-mail: jess.tipper@et.suffolkcc.gov.uk
Reference: /FormerSueRyderHome-Cavendish2009

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

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







## Context list



| Context | Type | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0402 |  | Lt grey concrete slab. |
| 0403 |  | Banded light brown gravelly sand \& grey brown sandy silt. $>0.3 \mathrm{~m} x>2.2 \mathrm{mx}>0.95 \mathrm{~m}$ thick. Fill of modern feature [0404]. |
| 0404 |  | Steep convex side \& unseen base. $>0.3 \mathrm{~m} \times 2.2 \mathrm{mx}>0.95 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. Cut of modern feature. |
| 0405 |  | Light brown gravelly sand. Geological natural. |
| 0500 |  |  |
| 0501 |  | Very dark grey brown sandy silt. 0.65 m thick. Topsoil. |
| 0502 |  | Orangy brown clay sand. 0.1-0.2m thick. Make-up layer. |
| 0503 |  | Mixed grey clay sand \& grey brown sandy silt with frequent CBM \& gravel. 0.23-0.55m thick. Make-up layer. |
| 0504 |  | Light grey gravelly sand over orange brown gravelly sand. Geological natural. |
| 0600 |  | U/S finds Trench 6 \%\% |
| 0601 |  | Mixed light brown mortar \& light brown clay sand. Make-up layer. |
| 0602 |  | Very dark grey clay sand silt with frequent charcoal. 0-0.25m thick. Make-up layer. |
| 0603 |  | Mid brown grey silty clay sand 0.65 m thick. Make-up layer. |
| 0604 |  | Grey brown clay silt. $0.7 \mathrm{~m} \times>0.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.3 \mathrm{~m}$ thick. Fill of linear feature [0605]. . . |
| 0605 |  | Moderate concave sides \& concave base. $0.7 \mathrm{~m} \times>0.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.3 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. Cut of possible linear feature. |
| 0606 |  | Light orangy brown gravelly sand. Geological natural. \%\% |
| 0607 |  | Light brown gravelly sand. $1.1 \mathrm{~m} x>0.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.1 \mathrm{~m}$ thick. Secondary fill of possible linear [0609]. |
| 0608 |  | Mid grey silty gravelly sand. $1.1 \mathrm{~m} \times$ ? $0.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.25 \mathrm{~m}$ thick. Primary fill of linelr feature [0609]. |
| 0609 |  | Steep concave sides \& concave base. $1.1 \mathrm{~m} \times>0.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.3 \mathrm{~m}$ deep. Cut of possible linear feature. |
| 0700 |  | U/S finds Trench 7 |








Appendix 3 Pottery Catalogue

| Context No | Ceramic Period | Fabric | Form | Sherd No | Weight (g) | State | Comments $\quad$ F | Fabric date range | Context date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0102 | PMED | GRE | BODY | 1 | 5 | A | Slightly abraded | 16th-18th C | 16th - 18th C |
| 0102 | MED | MCW | CP/JAR | $\%$ | 21 | AS | Slightly abraded, form thickend flat top with internal bead Late 12th -13th C | L12th-14th C |  |
| 0403 | PMED | LSRW | BODY | $1 \frac{2}{2}$ | 49 | A | Slightly abraded, slipped and glazed | 18th - 19th C | $98 \text { th }-19 \text { th } C$ |
| 0500 | PMED | GRE | BODY |  | 17 | A |  | 16th - 18th C | $16 \mathrm{th}-18 \mathrm{th} \mathrm{c}$ |
| 0608 | PMED | GRE | BODY | 3 | 21 | A |  | 16th - 18th C | 16th - 18th C |




[^0]:    Lucy Robinson, County Director of Economy, Skills and Environment Endeavour House, Russel Road, Ipswich, IP1 2BX.

