

## **ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT**

---

SCCAS REPORT No. 2010/139

# **21/23 Church Lane, Worlington WGN 039**

R. Brooks  
© August 2010  
[www.suffolkcc.gov.uk/e-and-t/archaeology](http://www.suffolkcc.gov.uk/e-and-t/archaeology)

---

Lucy Robinson, County Director of Economy, Skills and Environment  
Endeavour House, Russel Road, Ipswich, IP1 2BX.

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

## HER Information

---

**Planning Application No:** F/2008/0652/OUT

**Date of Fieldwork:** 22/07/2010

**Grid Reference:** TL 690 737

**Funding Body:** Mr P Knowles

**Curatorial Officer:** Dr. Jess Tipper

**Project Officer:** Rob Brooks

**Oasis Reference:** Suffolkc1-79664

Digital report submitted to Archaeological Data Service:  
<http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit>

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

## Contents

---

### Summary

	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Geology and topography	1
3. Archaeological and historical background	3
4. Methodology	3
5. Results	4
6. Conclusions and recommendations for further work	6
7. Archive deposition	7
8. Contributors and acknowledgements	7
9. Bibliography	7
Disclaimer	

### List of Figures

1. Site location	2
2. Site plan	5

### List of Tables

1. Context list	4
-----------------	---

### List of Appendices

1. Brief and specification	
----------------------------	--

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

## Summary

---

An archaeological evaluation was carried out on land to the rear of an existing property at 21/23 Church Lane, Worlington. No features or finds were uncovered by the work, which revealed an unexpected depth of topsoil and subsoil above the natural geology.

There was slight disturbance relating to a modern pit, which did not truncate the natural, and a concrete cess pit.

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service



## 1. Introduction

---

An archaeological evaluation was carried out immediately to the WNW of the existing property at 21/23 Church Lane, Worlington, Suffolk, prior to the construction of housing (planning application F/2008/0652/OUT). The work was carried out on 22nd July 2010 and undertaken in accordance with a Brief and Specification produced by Dr Jess Tipper of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Conservation Team (SCCAS/CT).

Worlington is located 11.8m north-west of Bury St Edmunds, and 1m south-west of Mildenhall. Church Lane lies at the western edge of the village, running N-S from The Street (Fig. 1).

## 2. Geology and topography

---

The bedrock in the area is a zig zag formation of blocky chalk interspersed with marls and marly chalk overlain by river terrace deposits of sand and gravel and lenses of silt (BGS, 2010). Within the trench, this presented itself as pale-mid orange sand, interspersed with occasional chalk lumps. The development area lies at 8.4m above the Ordnance Datum at the road to 9.8m above the Ordnance Datum at the far WNW end of the garden. Worlington is located in the valley of the River Lark, overlooking the watercourse to the north (Fig. 1).

At the time of the evaluation the site was a garden of grassland, shrubs and trees, with a drive-way running the depth of the existing property on its northern side. The rest of the property had walled boundaries. The southern wall was constructed partially of irregular pale mortar and flint and had originally been part of outbuildings which were now demolished. Relatively recently a circular driveway had run further into the property, slightly truncating the area of the trench and further WNW into the garden.

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service



Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service

Figure 1. Site location showing Historic Environment Record entries mentioned in the text

### **3. Archaeological and historical background**

---

There are several sites listed on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER) which suggest that the development area lies in an area of high archaeological potential. Most of the locally recognised sites are medieval, with the Church of All Saints to the north (WGN 007) as well as a number of medieval pits (WGN 018), as shown on Figure 1. South-east of the development area is a medieval moat (WGN 002), and further pits (WGN 017 and 036). Roman, Saxon and further medieval finds were also uncovered in a field to the south-west (WGN 027).

The HER entries, coupled with the site's location close to the village core and its position overlooking the river valley, suggest that there is a high potential for archaeological deposits to be encountered. These are most likely to be medieval, although Saxon features are found regularly along the River Lark and the close proximity of Roman finds highlights the possibility of earlier remains being uncovered.

### **4. Methodology**

---

To fulfil the Brief and Specification (Appendix 1) a single trench measuring 1.8m-2m wide x 10m long was excavated to the natural geological layer, using a mechanical digger equipped with a toothless bucket. This amounted to an area of >18sqm, or a c.17% sample of the total development area of 105sqm. The line of the trench had to be slightly modified in order to avoid a disused concrete cesspit (Fig. 2).

The excavation of the trench was constantly monitored by an experienced archaeologist and measurements were made as required of the changes in the soil profile, which was recorded via a single continuous numbering system and context record sheets, and a trench record sheet. A single profile of the trench was drawn at 1:20 on gridded A3 permatrace and the site was planned using a Real Time Kinematics Global Positioning System. Although no features were uncovered, site record shots were taken using a digital camera with image resolution of 314 x 314dpi. Spoil from the trench was examined for finds, although none were recovered.

An OASIS form has been completed for the project (reference no. suffolkc1-79664) and a digital copy of the report has been submitted for inclusion on the Archaeology Data Service database (<http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit>). The site archive is kept in the main store of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service at Bury St Edmunds under Historic Environment Record code WGN 039.

## 5. Results

---

The trench was completely devoid of any archaeological features or finds. Whilst there was limited disturbance relating to the cesspit and a modern rubbish pit, the natural geological layer was barely disturbed and there were clearly no cut features within it.

Two layers were encountered above the natural geology, which was found at c.1.3m below ground level. The first of these was topsoil 0001, a mid-dark grey disturbed silty-sand that was c.0.6m thick. Below this was subsoil 0002, which consisted of mid orangish-brown silty-sand. Both these layers appeared to have been slightly worked, either by natural processes or agricultural activity, as well as being somewhat disturbed by the building of the cesspit or the former driveway. There were occasional pieces of modern ceramic building material (CBM) and glass present throughout both.

One modern pit containing glass and ceramic building was visible; this was cut into the subsoil layer 0002 but did not truncate the natural geology. It contained frequent modern CBM and glass.

<b>Context</b>	<b>Description and interpretation</b>
0001	Mid-dark grey silty-sand. Firm compaction. Occasional modern CBM, common small sub-angular flints and small chalk lumps. 0.6m deep. Diffuse horizon clarity. Above 0002. No finds except modern material that was not kept. Interpretation – disturbed topsoil. Very deep, as seen at WGN 036.
0002	Mid orangish-brown silty-sand. Firm compaction. Common small sub-angular flints and occasional modern CBM, glass, etc. 0.7m deep. Diffuse horizon clarity. Above 0003, below 0001. Interpretation – subsoil. Blends diffusely into natural – may be same as bottom 2 layers at WGN 036. Truncated by modern rubbish pit.
0003	Pale-mid orange sand. Firm compaction. Common small sub-angular flints. Below 0002. Interpretation – natural subsoil/geology.

Table 1. Context descriptions



Figure 2. Trench Location

## **6. Conclusions and recommendations for further work**

---

No features or finds were recorded within the trench indicating an absence of archaeological deposits in the immediate area of the proposed development. This may be a reflection of the trench's position back from the street frontage where any medieval buildings would be expected to be located. However the complete absence of any finds material that predates the current 19th century house suggests that the results of the trenching are representative of the site as a whole and possibly implies a gap in the medieval settlement pattern of the village.

The depth of silt/soil is an interesting feature of the area and has been noted at other sites within Worlington (WGN 036); the processes which created this are unknown but are thought to be natural and, at WGN 036, occurred after the medieval period (Caruth 2008). The absence of archaeology within the trench appears to indicate that the proposed development site is likely to be free of features or finds and the depth of the overburden, at 1.3m, means that the impact of building work would be minimal on the level of any potential archaeological horizons, as a result it is recommended that no further work be carried out in relation to this development.

## **7. Archive deposition**

---

Paper and photographic archive: SCCAS Bury St Edmunds T:\Arc\Archive field proj\  
Worlington\WGN 039 21-23 Church Lane Eval

## **8. List of contributors and acknowledgements**

---

The evaluation was carried out by a number of archaeological staff, (Rob Brooks and David Gill with assistance from Dan Bushnell) all from Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Field Team.

The project was directed by Rob Brooks, and managed by David Gill, who also provided advice during the production of the report.

Production of site plans and sections was carried out by Ellie Hillen. The report was checked by David Gill and Richenda Goffin.

## 9. Bibliography

- BGS, 2010 Information obtained from [http://www.bgs.ac.uk/products/digital\\_maps/data\\_625k.html](http://www.bgs.ac.uk/products/digital_maps/data_625k.html) and reproduced with the permission of the British Geological Survey ©NERC. All rights Reserved
- Caruth, J.C., 2008 Archaeological Evaluation Report: 21 The Street, Worlington  
*SCCAS Report no 2008/277*

### Disclaimer

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

## Appendix 1. Brief and Specification



### The Archaeological Service

---

9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall  
Bury St Edmunds  
Suffolk  
IP33 2AR

## Brief and Specification for Archaeological Evaluation

21/23 CHURCH LANE, WORLINGTON, SUFFOLK (F/2008/0652/OUT)

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

### 1. The nature of the development and archaeological requirements

- 1.1 Planning permission has been granted by Forest Heath District Council (F/2008/0652/OUT) for the construction of two new semi-detached dwellings (following demolition of current cottage) at 21/23 Church Lane, Worlington, IP28 8SG (TL 690 737). **Please contact the applicant for an accurate plan of the site.**
- 1.2 The Planning Authority has been advised that any consent should be conditional upon an agreed programme of work taking place before development begins (PPG 16, paragraph 30 condition No. 6):  
  
'No development shall take place within the area indicated (the whole site) until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority'.
- 1.3 The site is located on the west side of Church Street at c.8.00m AOD. The soils are described as loam over chalk.
- 1.4 This application lies in an area of archaeological interest recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, within the historic settlement core and to the south of the medieval church (HER no. WGN 007). There is high potential for medieval, and possibly earlier, occupation deposits to be located in this area.
- 1.5 In order to inform the archaeological mitigation strategy, the following work will be required:
  - A linear trenched evaluation is required of the development area.
- 1.6 The results of this evaluation will enable the archaeological resource, both in quality and extent, to be accurately quantified. Decisions on the need for and scope of any mitigation measures, should there be any archaeological finds of significance, will be based upon the results of the evaluation and will be the subject of an additional specification.
- 1.7 All arrangements for the field evaluation of the site, the timing of the work, access to the site, the definition of the precise area of landholding and area for proposed development are to be defined and negotiated with the commissioning body.
- 1.8 Detailed standards, information and advice to supplement this brief are to be found in *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14, 2003.
- 1.9 In accordance with the condition on the planning consent, and following the standards and guidance produced by the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA), a Written Scheme of Investigation



(WSI) based upon this brief and specification must be produced by the developers, their agents or archaeological contractors. This must be submitted for scrutiny by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (SCCAS/CT) at 9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2AR; telephone/fax: 01284 352443. 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. The WSI should be compiled with a knowledge of the Regional Research Framework (East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 3, 1997, 'Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties, 1. resource assessment'; Occasional Paper 8, 2000, 'Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties, 2. research agenda and strategy'; and Revised Research Framework for the Eastern Region, 2008, available online at <http://www.eaareports.org.uk/>).

- 1.10 Following receipt of the WSI, SCCAS/CT will advise the Local Planning Authority (LPA) if it is an acceptable scheme of work. Work must not commence until the LPA has approved the WSI. Neither this specification nor the WSI is, however, a sufficient basis for the discharge of the planning condition relating to the archaeological works. Only the full implementation of the approved scheme – that is the completion of the fieldwork, a post-excavation assessment and final reporting – will enable SCCAS/CT to advise the LPA that the condition has been adequately fulfilled and can be discharged.
- 1.11 Before any archaeological site work can commence it is the responsibility of the developer to provide the archaeological contractor with either the contaminated land report for the site or a written statement that there is no contamination. The developer should be aware that investigative sampling to test for contamination is likely to have an impact on any archaeological deposit which exists; proposals for sampling should be discussed with the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of SCC (SCCAS/CT) before execution.
- 1.12 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.
- 1.13 Any changes to the specifications that the project archaeologist may wish to make after approval by this office should be communicated directly to SCCAS/CT and the client for approval.

## **2. Brief for the Archaeological Evaluation**

- 2.1 Establish whether any archaeological deposit exists in the area, with particular regard to any which are of sufficient importance to merit preservation *in situ*.
- 2.2 Identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit within the application area, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation.
- 2.3 Evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.
- 2.4 Establish the potential for the survival of environmental evidence.
- 2.5 Provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of cost.
- 2.6 This project will be carried through in a manner broadly consistent with English Heritage's *Management of Archaeological Projects*, 1991 (MAP2), all stages will follow a process of assessment and justification before proceeding to the next phase of the project. Field

evaluation is to be followed by the preparation of a full archive, and an assessment of potential. Any further excavation required as mitigation is to be followed by the preparation of a full archive, and an assessment of potential, analysis and final report preparation may follow. Each stage will be the subject of a further brief and updated project design; this document covers only the evaluation stage.

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

### **3. Specification: Trenched Evaluation**

- 3.1 A single linear trial trench, 10.00m long x 1.80m wide, is to be excavated to cover the area of the proposed new dwellings.
- 3.2 If excavation is mechanised a toothless 'ditching bucket' 1.80m wide must be used. A scale plan showing the proposed locations of the trial trenches should be included in the WSI and the detailed trench design must be approved by SCCAS/CT before field work begins.
- 3.3 The topsoil may be mechanically removed using an appropriate machine with a back-acting arm and fitted with a toothless bucket, down to the interface layer between topsoil and subsoil or other visible archaeological surface. All machine excavation is to be under the direct control and supervision of an archaeologist. The topsoil should be examined for archaeological material.
- 3.4 The top of the first archaeological deposit may be cleared by machine, but must then be cleaned off by hand. There is a presumption that excavation of all archaeological deposits will be done by hand unless it can be shown there will not be a loss of evidence by using a machine. The decision as to the proper method of excavation will be made by the senior project archaeologist with regard to the nature of the deposit.
- 3.5 In all evaluation excavation there is a presumption of the need to cause the minimum disturbance to the site consistent with adequate evaluation; that significant archaeological features, e.g. solid or bonded structural remains, building slots or post-holes, should be preserved intact even if fills are sampled. For guidance:

For linear features, 1.00m wide slots (min.) should be excavated across their width;

For discrete features, such as pits, 50% of their fills should be sampled (in some instances 100% may be requested).

- 3.6 There must be sufficient excavation to give clear evidence for the period, depth and nature of any archaeological deposit. The depth and nature of colluvial or other masking deposits must be established across the site.
- 3.7 Archaeological contexts should, where possible, be sampled for palaeoenvironmental remains. Best practice should allow for sampling of interpretable and datable archaeological deposits and provision should be made for this. The contractor shall show what provision has been made for environmental assessment of the site and must provide details of the sampling strategies for retrieving artefacts, biological remains (for palaeoenvironmental and

- palaeoeconomic investigations), and samples of sediments and/or soils (for micromorphological and other pedological/sedimentological analyses. Advice on the appropriateness of the proposed strategies will be sought from Dr Helen Chappell, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling archaeological deposits (Murphy, P.L. and Wiltshire, P.E.J., 1994, *A guide to sampling archaeological deposits for environmental analysis*) is available for viewing from SCCAS.
- 3.8 Any natural subsoil surface revealed should be hand cleaned and examined for archaeological deposits and artefacts. Sample excavation of any archaeological features revealed may be necessary in order to gauge their date and character.
  - 3.9 Metal detector searches must take place at all stages of the excavation by an experienced metal detector user.
  - 3.10 All finds will be collected and processed (unless variations in this principle are agreed SCCAS/CT during the course of the evaluation).
  - 3.11 Human remains must be left *in situ* except in those cases where damage or desecration are to be expected, or in the event that analysis of the remains is shown to be a requirement of satisfactory evaluation of the site. However, the excavator should be aware of, and comply with, the provisions of Section 25 of the Burial Act 1857.
  - 3.12 Plans of any archaeological features on the site are to be drawn at 1:20 or 1:50, depending on the complexity of the data to be recorded. Sections should be drawn at 1:10 or 1:20 again depending on the complexity to be recorded. All levels should relate to Ordnance Datum. Any variations from this must be agreed with SCCAS/CT.
  - 3.13 A photographic record of the work is to be made, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies and/or high resolution digital images.
  - 3.14 Topsoil, subsoil and archaeological deposit to be kept separate during excavation to allow sequential backfilling of excavations.
  - 3.15 Trenches should not be backfilled without the approval of SCCAS/CT.

#### **4. General Management**

- 4.1 A timetable for all stages of the project must be agreed before the first stage of work commences, including monitoring by SCCAS/CT. The archaeological contractor will give not less than five days written notice of the commencement of the work so that arrangements for monitoring the project can be made.
- 4.2 The composition of the archaeology contractor staff must be detailed and agreed by this office, including any subcontractors/specialists. For the site director and other staff likely to have a major responsibility for the post-excavation processing of this evaluation there must also be a statement of their responsibilities or a CV for post-excavation work on other archaeological sites and publication record. Ceramic specialists, in particular, must have relevant experience from this region, including knowledge of local ceramic sequences.
- 4.3 It is the archaeological contractor's responsibility to ensure that adequate resources are available to fulfill the Brief.
- 4.4 A detailed risk assessment must be provided for this particular site.
- 4.5 No initial survey to detect public utility or other services has taken place. The responsibility for this rests with the archaeological contractor.

- 4.6 The Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and Guidance for archaeological field evaluation* (revised 2001) should be used for additional guidance in the execution of the project and in drawing up the report.

## 5. Report Requirements

- 5.1 An archive of all records and finds must be prepared consistent with the principles of English Heritage's *Management of Archaeological Projects*, 1991 (particularly Appendix 3.1 and Appendix 4.1).
- 5.2 The report should reflect the aims of the WSI.
- 5.3 The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its archaeological interpretation.
- 5.4 An opinion as to the necessity for further evaluation and its scope may be given. No further site work should be embarked upon until the primary fieldwork results are assessed and the need for further work is established.
- 5.5 Reports on specific areas of specialist study must include sufficient detail to permit assessment of potential for analysis, including tabulation of data by context, and must include non-technical summaries.
- 5.6 The Report must include a discussion and an assessment of the archaeological evidence, including an assessment of palaeoenvironmental remains recovered from palaeosols and cut features. Its conclusions must include a clear statement of the archaeological potential of the site, and the significance of that potential in the context of the Regional Research Framework (*East Anglian Archaeology*, Occasional Papers 3 & 8, 1997 and 2000).
- 5.7 The results of the surveys should be related to the relevant known archaeological information held in the County Historic Environment Record (HER).
- 5.8 A copy of the Specification should be included as an appendix to the report.
- 5.9 The project manager must consult the County HER Officer (Dr Colin Pendleton) to obtain an HER number for the work. This number will be unique for each project or site and must be clearly marked on any documentation relating to the work.
- 5.10 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with *UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines*.
- 5.11 Every effort must be made to get the agreement of the landowner/developer to the deposition of the full site archive, and transfer of title, with the intended archive repository before the fieldwork commences. If this is not achievable for all or parts of the finds archive then provision must be made for additional recording (e.g. photography, illustration, scientific analysis) as appropriate.
- 5.12 The project manager should consult the intended archive repository before the archive is prepared regarding the specific requirements for the archive deposition and curation, and regarding any specific cost implications of deposition.
- 5.13 If the County Store is the intended location of the archive, the project manager should consult the SCCAS Archive Guidelines 2010 and also the County Historic Environment Record Officer regarding the requirements for the deposition of the archive (conservation, ordering, organisation, labelling, marking and storage) of excavated material and the archive. A clear statement of the form, intended content, and standards of the archive is to be submitted for approval as an essential requirement of the WSI.

5.14 The WSI should state proposals for the deposition of the digital archive relating to this project with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS), and allowance should be made for costs incurred to ensure the proper deposition (<http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/policy.html>).

5.15 Where positive conclusions are drawn from a project (whether it be evaluation or excavation) a summary report, in the established format, suitable for inclusion in the annual 'Archaeology in Suffolk' section of the *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute for Archaeology*, must be prepared. It should be included in the project report, or submitted to SCCAS/CT, by the end of the calendar year in which the evaluation work takes place, whichever is the sooner.

5.17 County HER sheets must be completed, as per the County HER manual, for all sites where archaeological finds and/or features are located.

5.18 An unbound copy of the evaluation report, clearly marked DRAFT, must be presented to SCCAS/CT for approval within six months of the completion of fieldwork unless other arrangements are negotiated with the project sponsor and SCCAS/CT.

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

5.19 Where appropriate, a digital vector trench plan should be included with the report, which must be compatible with MapInfo GIS software, for integration in the County HER. AutoCAD files should be also exported and saved into a format that can be imported into MapInfo (for example, as a Drawing Interchange File or .dxf) or already transferred to .TAB files.

5.20 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.

5.21 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the County HER. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive).

Specification by: Dr Jess Tipper

Suffolk County Council  
Archaeological Service Conservation Team  
9-10 The Churchyard, Shire Hall  
Bury St Edmunds  
Suffolk IP33 2AR  
Tel: 01284 352197  
Email: jess.tipper@suffolk.gov.uk

Date: 3 June 2010

Reference: / ChurchStreet-Worlington2010

**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.**