

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT

SCCAS REPORT No. 2011/059

Eight Bells PH, 90-92 Angel Street Hadleigh HAD 119

M. Sommers
© April 2011
www.suffolk.gov.uk/environment/archaeology

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

HER Information

Planning Application No: B/08/01334/FUL
Date of Fieldwork: 11th April 2011
Grid Reference: TM 0291 4277
Funding Body: KLH Architects (on behalf of a client)
Curatorial Officer: Keith Wade
Project Officer: M. Sommers
Oasis Reference: suffolkc1-99114

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

Contents

Summary

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

Disclaimer

List of Figures

1. Site location plan	2
2. Hodskinson's map of Suffolk, pub. 1783	3
3. Third Edition Ordnance Survey map of c. 1925	4
4. Trench location plan	6

List of Plates

Plate I. the Eight Bells PH and a general view of the junction of Angel Street and Threadneedle Street, camera facing south-west	9
Plate II. the evaluation trench, camera facing west	9
Plate III. overburden as seen at the north-east end of the trench, camera facing north-west	10
Plate IV. overburden as seen at the north-east end of the trench, camera facing north-west	10

List of Appendices

1. Brief and specification	11
----------------------------	----

Summary

An archaeological evaluation was carried out in the rear garden of the Eight Bells Public House, 90-92 Angel Street, Hadleigh, in advance of a proposed housing development. A single trench, 22m in length, was excavated through the footprint of the proposed structures but no archaeological features of any period were identified and no artefacts were recovered. The natural subsoil lay at a depth of c. 0.6m and consisted of an orange/brown sandy silt with occasional flints. The overburden consisted of a rich garden soil containing occasional fragments of red brick/tile and other fragments of post-medieval debris. (Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service for KLH Architects).

1. Introduction

It has been proposed to construct two houses in the garden to the rear of the Eight Bells Public House, 90-92 Angel Street, Hadleigh (Plate I). Planning permission has been granted but with an attached condition requiring an agreed programme of archaeological work be in place prior to the commencement of the development.

The first stage of the programme of work, as specified in the Brief and Specification produced by Keith Wade of the Suffolk County Council Conservation Team (Appendix 1), was the undertaking of a trenched evaluation in order to ascertain what levels of archaeological evidence may be present within the development area and to inform any mitigation strategies that may then be deemed necessary.

The National Grid Reference for the approximate centre of the site is TM 0291 4277. Figure 1 shows a location plan of the site.

The archaeological evaluation was undertaken by Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service's Field Team who were commissioned by KLH Architects, on the behalf of their client who ultimately funded the project.

2. Geology and topography

The site consists of a level grassed area to the south-east of the public house's car park. It is bounded by Threadneedle Street to the north-east and residential properties to the south-east and south-west. The site lies on the gently sloping north-east side of a valley which is drained by the River Brett, which is located c. 560m to the south-west of the site. The river flows approximately north to south.

This is one of many valleys that cut through the thick layer of chalky till deposited by the retreating icesheet of the Anglian Glaciation in this area of the region. The surface geology within the valley consists of the gravel, sand and silt deposits left by glacial meltwaters.




Figure 1. Site location plan

3. Archaeological and historical background

The town of Hadleigh is at least medieval or possibly Anglo-Saxon in origin. It is presently focussed along the High Street and is centred on St Mary's Church and the adjacent Market Place, an arrangement that was unlikely to have significantly altered from the early medieval period. Angel Street and George Street, which runs parallel, represent a north-east extension of the urban area of Hadleigh. The date of this expansion is likely to be in the late medieval or early post-medieval period. The earliest readily available survey of the town is Hodkinson's map of Suffolk published in 1783 (Figure 2). Although it does not show Hadleigh in any great detail it does indicate that Angel Street and George Street are well developed with what are assumed to be plots or structures marked in red on both sides of both streets. It also shows that Threadneedle Street, which forms a cross passage between the Angel Street and George Street, and the roadway named Long Bessels, are already established.



Figure 2. Hodkinson's map of Suffolk, pub. 1783 (rescaled extract)

This pattern of development remains unchanged right up in the 20th century, as illustrated by Third Edition Ordnance Survey map of the 1925 (Figure 3).




Figure 3. Third Edition Ordnance Survey map of c. 1925 (rescaled extract)

Hodkinson's map colours the entire south-west side of Threadneedle Street in red although it is not known if this is just indicative of an occupied plot or plots rather than actual buildings, or possibly just a presumption of buildings by the surveyors. All three of the early Ordnance Survey maps of the area (1st, 2nd and 3rd editions of 1880, 1900 and 1925 respectively) show the development site as open land that forms part of a large rectangular field behind properties fronting Angel Street.

There are no known archaeological sites recorded on the County Historic Environment Record within the proposed site but it is situated within the boundaries of medieval Hadleigh, as defined on the County Historic Environment Record (HER ref. HAD 046) There is also the potential for Anglo-Saxon cremation burials as indicated by the findspots of a cremation urn some 80m to the north-east of the site (HER ref. HAD 013) and part of an Anglo-Saxon 'cinerary urn' from a spot 200m to the south (HER ref. HAD 044).

There has also been a number of significant Roman and prehistoric sites recorded within, or overlooking, the Brett valley in the locality.

4. Methodology

A trial trench was machine excavated down to the level of the natural subsoil using a small tracked excavator fitted with a 1.6m wide toothless ditching bucket. The location of the trench was in accordance with a plan approved by the County Archaeological Service Conservation Team and was designed to be within the footprint of the proposed houses.

The machining of the trenches was closely observed throughout in order to identify any archaeological features and deposits, and to recover any artefacts, that might be revealed. Excavation continued until the undisturbed natural subsoil was encountered, the exposed surface of which was then examined for cut features or deposits. Had any features/deposits been noted they would have been sampled through hand excavation in order to determine their depth and shape and to recover datable artefacts.

Following excavation of the trench the nature of the overburden was recorded, the trench location was plotted and the depths were noted. A brief photographic record of the work undertaken was also compiled using a 10 megapixel digital camera.

5. Results

A single trench, 22m in length, was excavated across the footprint of the proposed houses (Fig. 4, Plate II).

The natural subsoil consisted of an orange/brown sandy silt with occasional flints and lay at a depth of 0.6m throughout the length of the trench (plates III & IV). The overburden consisted of a dark loamy topsoil, becoming a slightly paler at depth but with no obvious layering. Occasional fragments of red brick and tile as well as other post-medieval debris (glass, glazed ceramics etc.) were located infrequently throughout the overburden.

No archaeological features of any period were revealed in the trench and there was no evidence for any modern disturbance.




Figure 4. Trench location plan

The interface between the overburden and the underlying natural subsoil was generally blurred with no evidence for any truncation of the surface of the subsoil.

6. Finds and environmental evidence

No environmental or artefactual evidence was recovered during the evaluation.

7. Discussion

No evidence for earlier activity was identified during the evaluation. The trench was cleanly cut and had any features or deposits been present it is highly likely they would have been identified. This does not entirely preclude the possibility that some small isolated features could occur outside the actual trenches but given the complete

absence of any significant artefacts of any period recovered during the evaluation this would seem unlikely.

The complete absence of any features suggests that the proposed development area is unlikely to have been the site of any earlier structures, as possibly indicated on Hodkinson's map (Fig. 2).

8. Conclusions and recommendations for further work

It is unlikely that any significant archaeological deposits or features are under threat from the proposed development and consequently no further work is recommended.

9. Archive deposition

Historic Environment Record reference under which the archive is held: HAD 119.

Digital archive: *R:\Environmental Protection\Conservation\Archaeology\Archive\Hadleigh\HAD 119 Evaluation*

Digital photographs are held under the references HGM 72 to HGM 75

A summary has also been entered into OASIS, the online database, ref. suffolkc1-99114

10. List of contributors and acknowledgements

The evaluation was carried out by M. Sommers from Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Field Team. The machine and driver were provided by Holmes Plant Hire Limited

The project was directed by M. Sommers, and managed by Rhodri Gardner, who also provided advice during the production of the report.

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.

Plates (scales are divided into 0.5m sections)



Plate I. the Eight Bells PH and a general view of the junction of Angel Street and Threadneedle Street, camera facing south-west (HGM 72)



Plate II. the evaluation trench, camera facing west (HGM 73)



Plate III. overburden as seen at the north-east end of the trench, camera facing north-west (HGM 74)



Plate IV. overburden as seen at the south-west end of the trench, camera facing north-west (HGM 75)

SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE - CONSERVATION TEAM

Brief and Specification for an Archaeological Evaluation

Evaluation by Trial Trench

EIGHT BELLS PH, 90-92 ANGEL STREET, HADLEIGH

The commissioning body should be aware that it may have Health & Safety and other responsibilities, see paragraphs 1.7 & 1.8.

1. Background

- 1.1 Planning consent has been granted for the erection of two dwellings to the rear of the Eight Bells Public House, 90-92 Angel Street, Hadleigh (B/08/01334/FUL).
- 1.2 1.2 The planning consent contains a condition requiring the implementation of a programme of archaeological work before development begins (condition 55 in Circular 11/95). In order to establish the full archaeological implications of the proposed development, an archaeological evaluation is required of the site. **The evaluation is the first part of the programme of archaeological work and decisions on the need for, and scope of, any further work will be based upon the results of the evaluation and will be the subject of additional briefs..**
- 1.3 The development area lies within the Area of Archaeological Importance defined for Hadleigh medieval town in the *Babergh Local Plan*. There is a high probability that the development will damage or destroy archaeological deposits.
- 1.4 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.
- 1.5 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.
- 1.6 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 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 submitted by the developers, or their agent, to the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2AR; telephone/fax: 01284 352443) for approval. The work must not commence until this office has approved both the archaeological contractor as suitable to undertake the work, and the 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.
- 1.7 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 this office before execution.
- 1.8 The responsibility for identifying any restraints on field-work (e.g. Scheduled Monument status, Listed Building status, public utilities or other services, tree preservation orders, SSSIs, wildlife

sites &c.) rests with the commissioning body and its archaeological contractor. The existence and content of the archaeological brief does not over-ride such restraints or imply that the target area is freely available.

2. **Brief for the Archaeological Evaluation**

- 2.1 Establish whether any archaeological deposit exists in the area, with particular regard to any which are of sufficient importance to merit preservation *in situ* [at the discretion of the developer].
- 2.2 Identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit within the application area, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation.
- 2.3 Evaluate the likely impact of past land uses and natural soil processes. Define the potential for existing damage to archaeological deposits. Define the potential for colluvial/alluvial deposits, their impact and potential to mask any archaeological deposit. Define the potential for artificial soil deposits and their impact on any archaeological deposit.
- 2.4 Establish the potential for waterlogged organic deposits in the proposal area. Define the location and level of such deposits and their vulnerability to damage by development where this is defined.
- 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 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 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 : Field Evaluation**

- 3.1 Trial trenches are to be excavated to cover a minimum 5% by area of the development area and shall be positioned to sample all parts of the site. A single linear trench, east-west, down the middle of the proposed building footprint is thought to be the most appropriate sampling method. Trenches are to be a minimum of 1.8m wide unless special circumstances can be demonstrated. If excavation is mechanised a toothless 'ditching bucket' 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 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 further excavation will be made 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 on the appropriateness of the proposed strategies will be sought from the English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling archaeological deposits (Murphy and Wiltshire 1994) is available.
- 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 by an experienced metal detector user.
- 3.9 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).
- 3.10.1 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.
“Guidance for best practice for treatment of human remains excavated from Christian burial grounds in England” English Heritage and the Church of England 2005 provides advice and defines a level of practice which should be followed whatever the likely belief of the buried individuals.
- 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 the Conservation Team.
- 3.12 Where appropriate, a digital vector plan showing all the areas observed should be included with the report. This must be compatible with MapInfo GIS software, for integration into 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.

- 3.13 A photographic record of the work is to be made, consisting of both monochrome and colour photographs.
- 3.14 Topsoil, subsoil and archaeological 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 responsibility for this rests with the archaeological contractor.
- 4.5 The Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and 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.

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 data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent with, and approved by, the County Historic Environment Record.
- 5.3.1 The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its archaeological interpretation.
- 5.3.2 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
- 5.3.3 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. 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 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 HER 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 HER 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 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 the Conservation Team, by the end of the calendar year in which the evaluation work takes place, whichever is the sooner.
- 5.10 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.
- 5.11 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the HER. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive).

Specification by: Keith Wade

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

Tel: 01284 352440

Date: 7th January 2011

Reference: Eight Bells PH

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.