

Title & subtitle	Technical Appendix 7.3: Land East of Holywell Gutter Lane – Archaeological Evaluation
Client	N Nauth
NGR	SO538390
Address	Holywell Gutter Lane, Hereford
Council	Herefordshire
Accession No	HFDMG1088
SMR No	51620
Project Manager	Mike Kimber AlfA
Text	Kirsty Dingwall AlfA
Illustrations	Anna Sztromwasser
Fieldwork	Kirsty Dingwall David Doyle
Specialists	Jane Timby Sarah-Jane Haston Julie Lochrie
Schedule	
Fieldwork	April 2010
Report	May 2010

Contents

- Introduction
- Site Description
- Background
- Objectives and methodology
- Results
- Discussion
- Appendix 1: Trench Register
- Appendix 2: Context Register
- Appendix 3: Drawing Register
- Appendix 4: Photo Register
- Appendix 5: Sample Register
- Appendix 6: Finds Assessment
- Appendix 7: Environmental Assessment

TECHNICAL APPENDIX 7.3 – ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

1. Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd was commissioned by Foxley Tagg Planning Ltd on behalf of their client to carry out an archaeological evaluation of a 19.6 ha plot of land to the east of Hereford (NGR SO 542 391 centre). The site is currently in use as an orchard and Foxley Tagg are coordinating the production of an Environmental Statement to accompany an outline planning application to construct new rugby pitches, club facilities and residential accommodation on the site.
2. Herefordshire County Archaeology Service advised the planning authority that it required an archaeological evaluation to take place in order to provide sufficient information on the likely impact of the development on any buried archaeological remains within the proposed development, in line with sections 21 and 22 of PPG16 and UDP Policy Arch1. The evaluation was designed to provide this information and a Project Design was agreed in advance with the Archaeological Advisor to Herefordshire County Council.
3. Previous archaeological work had been undertaken in connection with the application. A Desk-Based Assessment completed in 2009 and Geophysical survey in early 2010 provided background to the site and assisted in the placing of trenches across the site.

SITE DESCRIPTION (ILLUS 1)

4. The site occupies an elevated spur between the flood plains of the River Wye and River Lugg. The highest point (northwest of centre) is at 64m OSL, whilst the lowest point (southeast of study area) is at 47m OSL. The spur is formed from a finger of Raglan Mudstone with overlying deposits of sand and gravel from the first terrace of the River Wye and the second and third terraces of the River Lugg and Proto-Wye.
5. The site is currently used as a commercial apple orchard, and planned lanes of pollarded trees cover the majority of the site. Access tracks divide the lanes into blocks and there are some more extensive bands of coniferous trees running east-west across the site and dividing the lower southern part of the site from the higher northern part.
6. An overhead power line runs across the western part of the site from south to north

BACKGROUND

7. The results of the Desk-Based Assessment (**TA 7.1: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment**) and the Geophysical survey (**TA 7.2: Geophysical Survey**) are summarised below. No recorded archaeological sites of any significance are known within the site; however, it sits within an area with a number of known sites. To the north of the site lies a prehistoric cropmark complex, part of which is designated a Scheduled Monument. In the vicinity of the cropmark site a number of findspots of prehistoric flint tools are recorded on the SMR. To the east of the proposed development site are further cropmarks, again thought to be prehistoric in date.
8. Evidence for activity in the Roman period is more limited. Some of the roads surrounding and adjacent to the proposed development site are of some antiquity and there is a suggestion that they may be of Roman origin, although evaluation of one section of the road further to the west found no evidence of

its presence. The route of the road would cut across the south-east corner of the site.

9. In the medieval period, the site was part of two different administrative boundaries and it is difficult to say whether it was being farmed or was part of woodland. Certainly by the post-medieval period the site had been partially enclosed and farming was taking place on the site.
10. The geophysical survey was in part hampered by the lines of trees and the presence of chicken wire around the bases of some of the trees, which interfered with the readings. Despite this, a number of possible features were identified (Illus 2). The most significant and coherent was a possible ditched enclosure on the hilltop in the north part of the site. The anomaly comprised a series of readings in an L-shape, although the report highlights the fact that the anomaly could have extended further to the north and west where the results were not as clear. In the area to the east of this possible enclosure (and therefore outside it) were other possible pits. The only other substantial feature was a linear anomaly, thought to represent a bank or earthwork, running east west across the south-facing slopes of the hill.
11. In terms of potential, the geophysical survey indicated that there were some possible features to target, and the Desk-Based Assessment suggested that the highest potential was for prehistoric remains to be present.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

12. The objectives of the evaluation were as follows –
 - to determine whether any archaeological remains are present within the area of the proposed development,
 - to characterize any remains by date, extent, preservation and significance, and;
 - to produce a report and deposit the archive with a local repository.

Method

13. Due to the constraints imposed by the working orchard, it was noted that it would not be possible to achieve good even coverage of the proposed development area with evaluation trenches. There was also thought to be potential for damage to the roots of orchard trees. A site meeting on 15th March 2010 between representatives of Herefordshire County Archaeology Service and Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd took place to inspect the areas reasonably available for evaluation, and the locations of the trenches were agreed.
14. The locations of the trenches were designed to give as good coverage of the site as reasonably possible, and to target the different areas of potential development, as much of the northern part of the site is proposed to be retained as orchard. A total of 23 trenches were proposed, some 1.5m wide and excavated with a mini-excavator to fit between the lanes of trees, and some 2m wide excavated with a 14 tonne excavator where this was feasible. In total, a sample of 782.5 m sq was proposed, forming 0.4% of the proposed development area.
15. Hereford County Archaeology Service requested that the evaluation include one 5m long trench to be excavated over the location of the geophysical anomaly interpreted as the remains of a hilltop enclosure. This anomaly lay outside the area of the proposed development and any remains would not be affected by it, however, it was agreed that in view of the small sample size, this

trench would be used to assist in interpreting the results over the remainder of the area. The applicant agreed to evaluate this area.

16. In the event, a total of 22 trenches were excavated as part of the evaluation, with the planned trenches 8 and 9 joined together into one single trench due to the presence of an overhead power line. Trenches 1 – 5, 8/9 – 13 and 15 were excavated using a 14 tonne excavator equipped with a 2m flat edged ditching bucket and Trenches 6, 7, 14 and 16 – 23 were excavated using a 5 tonne mini-excavator equipped with a 1.5m ditching bucket. In all cases the trenches were excavated under archaeological supervision, with topsoil or modern overburden being removed by machine and excavation terminating at the uppermost significant archaeological horizon or when clean geological sediments were encountered.
17. All trenches were planned at 1:50, and long sections of each trench drawn. A record sheet was completed for each trench, even where no features or deposits of archaeological significance were present. Identified archaeological features were subject to sample hand excavation, carried out to a sufficient degree to meet the objectives of the evaluation.
18. All recording followed IfA Standards and Guidance. All contexts, small finds and environmental samples were given unique numbers. All recording was undertaken on *pro forma* record cards. All stratigraphic relationships were recorded. Colour transparencies and black and white print photographs were taken to record archaeological contexts and to illustrate the progress of the trial trenching. A graduated metric scale was clearly visible in record photographs of contexts. All photographs were recorded by individual print number and included information on the context and direction taken. Digital photographs on a 7.2mp camera were taken for illustrative purposes but will not form a part of the site archive.
19. An overall site plan at an appropriate scale and relative to the National Grid was recorded using a combination of digital survey and 1:20 plans of individual features, and sections as required. A digital survey archive will be created using ADS guidance on best practice and will be archived at the ADS.
20. Finds retrieved during the excavation were bagged and labelled by context (see Finds Assessment, Appendix 5). Finds were processed and stored appropriately, according to established archaeological guidelines. Significant archaeological deposits were sampled in accordance with standard environmental sampling practice. Bulk samples were taken for wet sieving and flotation. All samples taken were processed and assessed (see Environmental Assessment, Appendix 6).

RESULTS (ILLUS 2 AND 3)

21. A total of 22 trenches were excavated across the site, with an area of 823.05 sq m. The stratigraphy over the site was generally relatively simple, with mid to light brown clayey silt topsoil [001] (0.1m – 0.2m thick) over a subsoil layer of mid yellowy brown clayey silt [003] (up to 0.6m thick) present over much of the site. The natural subsoil [002] was an orangey red to red silty clay with frequent bands of gravel occurring across the site.
22. The depth of the natural subsoil varied greatly across the site, occurring at around 0.3m in some places and at up to 2m in places. The build up of colluvium appears to have filled in naturally occurring hollows across the site but this is discussed in more detail below.

23. Full detailed descriptions of each trench are presented in Appendix 1. Results are summarised below.
24. Trenches 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23 contained no features or deposits of archaeological significance. In all cases, natural subsoil was seen at a depth of around 0.5m under topsoil [001] and a silty subsoil layer [003]. Trench 14 was deliberately located to establish if the edge of the high ground had been artificially enhanced in any fashion, with a ditch or bank, or any cutting in to the slope. No evidence was found to suggest this was the case. From the topsoil within the trench, two fragments of Roman roof tile were recovered.
25. In Trenches 4, 5, 10, 11 and 19, no archaeological features or deposits were present; however, there was a deeper sequence of stratigraphy present in these trenches. In Trench 4, natural subsoil occurred at an average of 0.75m, under topsoil [001] and a subsoil layer [003]. Trench 5 had 0.2m of topsoil [001] over 1m of subsoil [003]. Below this was a layer of light yellow brown sandy clay [010] which was up to 0.4m deep and was an interface layer between the subsoil deposit and the natural geology below, which occurred at a depth of 1.6m.
26. Trenches 10 and 11 lay across the base of a west facing slope and again had a much deeper profile. In both cases, natural subsoil was seen at a depth of up to 1.3m under a thick layer of colluvium [003], which is thought to have moved down slope and filled in what was once a much larger hollow at the base of the slope.
27. Trench 19 ran down a relatively shallow south-facing slope adjacent to an existing pond near one of the bands of coniferous trees bisecting the site. Natural subsoil was seen at 1.1m deep, under topsoil [001] and colluvium [011].
28. Trenches 1 and 2 showed evidence of modern disturbance and deposits. In Trench 1, topsoil [001] lay over 0.5m of modern material within a clayey silt matrix [006] which had been deliberately placed down. The deposit contained fragments of brick, tile, burnt slate and sherds of 19th/20th century ceramic and glass. Below this was 0.4m of redeposited natural sandy clay [007] which had been used as a levelling material and still contained artefacts of relatively recent date. These two deposits formed a made ground which appears to have been brought in to level up what would have been an area of much lower ground in the south-west corner of the site. Below these was a buried soil [008] up to 0.8m in depth which presumably was the former ground surface in this area. Natural subsoil was seen at a depth of 1.9m. The date of the artefacts within the made ground seem to suggest it was deposited in the 20th century, and potentially this may relate to preparation of the ground prior to the planting of the orchard.
29. Trench 16 was located to test the results of the geophysical survey, which picked up an anomaly in this location interpreted as a ditched enclosure. Excavation of the trench revealed a sequence of 0.3m of topsoil [001] over up to 0.6m of subsoil deposit [003], as seen in other trenches. Cutting across the trench and running east-west was feature [027] (Illus 3, Illus 7). With the agreement of the Archaeological Advisor a sondage was excavated through the feature with the mini-excavator and the base was found to be 1.75m below the ground surface. One side of the feature could not be revealed due to the presence of a ceramic field drain; however, the south side of the feature had a very shallow slope which then broke to a steep side (Illus 4:E). The base was broad and curved. The fill of the feature [026] was a very firm brownish grey gravel within a clayey silt matrix, which contained occasional flecks of charcoal. From close to the base of the feature a sherd of pottery was recovered which dates to the

Late Iron Age-early Roman period. The feature in plan, along with the evidence of the geophysics survey, makes it most likely that this is a ditch of some description, which extends further to the east before turning to the north.

30. Trench 15 contained three linear features (Illus 3), all of which ran on an east-west orientation. It was not possible to ascertain whether they were truly parallel within the confines of the trench. At the north end of the trench, ditch [024] was 1.55m wide and 0.61m deep, with steep sides and a narrow base (Illus 4: C, Illus 5)). The fill of the ditch [023] was very gravelly in nature, reflecting the natural gravel bands which occur within the subsoil across the site. It contained moderately frequent flecks of charcoal along with several sherds of pottery. The pottery did not appear to be substantially abraded and comprised at least two different types of ceramic. Analysis of the pottery indicated that they were also of Late Iron Age – early Roman date, and they included some variants of local material which is not previously known. There is a suggestion that some may be the remains of a briquetage vessel (see Finds Assessment, Appendix 5).
31. Around 35m to the south lay two other linear features in close proximity to each other (Illus 4:D). [018] was the northernmost of the two and was 0.3m wide and 0.18m deep. It had moderately steep sides and a broad curved base. The fill [017] was a compact gravelly clayey silt and contained no pottery but a worked flint tool was recovered, which most likely dates to the Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age and might be the broken tip of a knife. Ditch [022] was larger at 1.08m wide and 0.44m deep, and also had moderately steep sides and a broad base, although it was disturbed for nearly its whole length within the trench by a modern ceramic field drain which was cut through the feature on a similar alignment. From the fill [021], relatively large amounts of pottery were recovered. The pottery was a mix of oxidised Severn Valley Wares and local Malvernian wares, along with one sherd of Dorset black burnished ware of 2nd century AD date. This indicates the date of the feature is unlikely to be earlier than the 2nd century AD. Pottery was also recovered from the fill of the field drain cut, which had become displaced from the fill of the ditch.
32. Towards the south of the trench a spread of charcoal rich silt material was identified [025]. The limits of the spread were defined and it could be seen that it partly comprised concentrations of fire-cracked stone, along with patches of potentially burnt natural or clay deposit. The complexity of the feature was such that it was considered inappropriate to investigate it through hand excavation in a narrow trench and therefore it was only recorded in plan and photographed. Early Roman pottery was found on the surface of the feature and this was collected. The spread could represent a dump of burnt material or a midden deposit, however, the presence of burnt stone and potentially of burning in situ may suggest a more complex structural feature such as a kiln.
33. At the north-west corner of the site, proposed Trenches 8 and 9 (both intended to be 10m in length) were combined into a single trench 20m in length due to the presence of an overhead power line which ran across part of the site. The excavated Trench 8/9 was up to 1m in depth, with topsoil [001] lying over up to 0.7m of subsoil material [003]. A linear feature [015] ran east-west across the trench (Illus 4: B, Illus 6). A section excavated across the feature revealed that it was up to 1m wide and 0.56m deep. It had steep sides and a relatively narrow curved base. The fill of the feature was a sandy clay which contained increasing amounts of charcoal towards its base and a concentration of fire-cracked stones within it. The fill contained 3 sherds of oxidised Severn Valley Ware. The presence of a concentration of stones along the edge of the cut might be an

indication that this represents a palisade, with the stones forming packing material, however the reason for them being burnt is not known.

34. To the north of [015] lay pit [012], which was irregular in plan and had very diffuse interfaces with the subsoil [003] it was cut through and natural subsoil [002] below (Illus 4: A). The basal fill of the feature was a light brown sandy clay [014], which contained a number of sherds from a Malvernian-type vessel, again of 2nd century AD date, along with two fragments of what might be nail or metal wire. Above this was a darker brown silty clay containing some charcoal [013]. The feature as a whole was relatively amorphous, but it did appear to have been cut from the level of subsoil deposit [003].

DISCUSSION

35. Archaeological deposits and features were identified in two areas – across the western part of the hilltop and at the north-west corner of the site. The features all seemed to date from Late Iron Age – early Roman period, and although the types of pottery seen were not necessarily diagnostic, this seemed to show a focus in the 2nd century AD. The presence of fragments of roof tile of Roman date in the topsoil on the west-facing slopes of the hilltop is further indication of the extent of activity.
36. Samples taken from selected features contained small amounts of charcoal and burnt bone. There was nothing in the samples to indicate a particularly high level of activity at the site, and the combination of charcoal and bone could indicate a domestic origin, such as from a hearth.
37. The features present are a mix of relatively small linear features, potentially forming rough enclosures, along with at least one much larger ditch feature, which might be considered to be a boundary of some description. In association with the smaller linear features, there may be a number of discrete features, although none were found in the course of the evaluation. The nature of the features, along with the types and range of pottery recovered, would most likely suggest some form of rural settlement and field divisions of local character. There is nothing to suggest any military or formal element to this activity.
38. The two concentrations may well represent evidence of separate parts of the same settlement. The presence of large amounts of colluvium at the base of the west-facing slope masks the fact that potentially there was a fairly deep hollow between the two concentrations and that the two areas may have been geographically more separate than they appear today.
39. The evaluation also established that the original topography within the site was substantially different from how it currently appears. Deep hollows would have been present in the area around Trenches 10 and 11, Trench 1 and 4, and to the south of Trench 9 the ground slopes off steeply towards the wet ground. Due to the small sample size it is entirely possible that there are further hollows in the areas surrounding the hilltop. In archaeological terms this is important as some of the features identified were cut into the colluvial material, and others were only visible at a lower level, cut into the natural subsoil.

APPENDIX 1: TRENCH REGISTER

Trench No	Dimensions (m)	Description	Levels mOD (maximum and minimum)	Contexts
1	2 x 10	Excavated at south-west corner of site through extensive build-up material. The original buried ground surface was seen at the base, over which were layers of redeposited subsoil and made ground containing brick, china, glass and other modern material. It also contained fragments of Roman roof tile, so may have originated from within the site.	Ground surface: 54.030 Natural subsoil: 52.032	001 002 006 007 008
2	2 x 20.7	Excavated at western extent of site through rough scrub/wasteground. No archaeological features/finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over layer of mixed material (topsoil and disturbed subsoil layer).	Ground surface: 56.437 Natural subsoil: 55.132	001 002 009
3	2 x 20.2	Excavated across flat ground at west of site. No archaeological features/finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil layer, over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 57.365 Natural subsoil: 56.771	001 002 003
4	1.5 x 10	Excavated across flat ground at south of site, adjacent to existing housing. No Archaeological features/finds. Pipe service trench runs along length of trench. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil up to 0.9m deep, over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 52.867 Natural subsoil: 51.940	001 002 003
5	2 x 5	Excavated in western part of site adjacent to site boundary. No archaeological finds or features. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over two layer of subsoil, over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 56:800 Natural subsoil: 55.098	001 002 003 010
6	1.5 x 20	Excavated across site of proposed housing. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 54.830 Natural subsoil: 53.635	001 002 003
7	1.5 x 20.4	Excavated across site of proposed housing. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 57.326 Natural subsoil: 55.960	001 002 003
8/9	2 x 20	Excavated at north-west corner of site. Linear feature [015] cuts across trench running EW, and small pit [012] lies to the north of that. Both contain pottery of Roman date. Stratigraphic sequence comprises topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil, and the features are cut from within the subsoil layer at a depth of 0.8 m.	Ground surface: 57.330 Natural subsoil: 56.550	001 002 003 012 013 014 015

				016
10	2 x 20	Excavated at north-west corner of site. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over thick layer of subsoil, up to 0.6 – 0.7 m deep, over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 58.354 Natural subsoil: 57.464	001 002 003
11	2 x 20.2	Excavated at north-west corner of site. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over thick layer of subsoil, up to 1.1m deep, over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 58.241 Natural subsoil: 57.045	001 002 003
12	2 x 20.7	Excavated across south-west facing slope of hilltop. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 60.118 Natural subsoil: 58.062	001 002 003
13	2 x 21.7	Excavated across south-west facing slope of hilltop. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 63.181 Natural subsoil: 61.546	001 002 003
14	1.5 x 10.4	Excavated down west facing slope of hilltop. Located to investigate if break of slope at top of hill is entirely natural or has been enhanced at any point. No archaeological features present, although fragments of Roman roofing tile was recovered from the topsoil. There was nothing to suggest the break of slope had been enhanced. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 66.621 Natural subsoil: 64.689	001 002 003
15	2 x 90.5	Excavated across flat top of hill. Three linear features [018], [022] and [024] ran east-west in the northern half of the trench. To the south of this was a spread [025]. All features bar one of the linears contained Roman pottery. The stratigraphic sequence was topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil, and the features were cut into the subsoil layer.	Ground surface: 67.118 Natural subsoil: 66.393	001, 002, 003, 017 018, 019 020, 021 022, 023 024, 025
16	1.5 x 5.9	Excavated across hilltop. Located to investigate geophysical anomaly interpreted as a possible hilltop enclosure. A broad linear cut feature [027] was identified running east-west across the trench, cut through gravel subsoil. The geophysical survey picked up the northern edge of the cut. Roman pottery was recovered from the base of the cut.	Ground surface: 68.239 Natural subsoil: 67.174	001, 002, 003, 026, 027
17	1.5 x 20	Excavated across lower south-facing slope of hill. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 63.818 Natural subsoil: 62.186	001 002 003
18	1.5 x 20	Excavated across lower south-facing slope of hill. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 56.864 Natural subsoil: 54.970	001 002 003
19	1.5 x 10	Excavated across south-facing slope of hill, adjacent to pond. No	Ground surface: 52.694	001

		archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over a deep layer of colluvium, over natural subsoil.	Natural subsoil: 50.808	002 011
20	1.5 x 20	Excavated across flat ground in eastern half of site. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 58.085 Natural subsoil: 57.010	001 002 003
21	1.5 x 20	Excavated across flat ground in eastern half of site. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 58.461 Natural subsoil: 56.592	001 002 003
22	1.5 x 20	Excavated across flat ground in eastern half of site. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 57.980 Natural subsoil: 57.334	001 002 003
23	1.5 x 20	Excavated across flat ground in eastern half of site. No archaeological features or finds. Stratigraphic sequence of topsoil over subsoil over natural subsoil.	Ground surface: 58.022 Natural subsoil: 57.216	001 002 003

APPENDIX 2: CONTEXT REGISTER

Context No	Trench No	Description	Dimensions (m)
001	All	Topsoil. Present in all trenches, comprising turf and firm mid to light brown clayey silt with occasional small pebbles. Diffuse interface with subsoil below.	D: 0.2 (max)
002	All	Natural subsoil. Firm orangey red silty clay with gravelly bands frequently present, particularly across the hilltop. Interface with subsoil above frequently diffuse.	-
003	All except 1, 2 and 19	Subsoil/B horizon layer. Moderately firm mid yellowy brown clayey silt with moderately frequent small pebbles. Very few finds were recovered from the subsoil horizon.	D: 0.6 (ave)
006	1	Made ground. Broken tar, large lenses of clay, fragments of brick, china, burnt slate and tile, glass and fragments of plastic within a silty matrix. Dumped material intended to fill in hollow in south-west of site.	0.5
007	1	Redeposited natural subsoil. Mix of pale yellow sand and clay, containing modern material such as glass and china. Uniform deposit across the trench, laid down as levelling deposit.	0.4
008	1	Buried garden soil. Mid brown slightly clayey silt with occasional small stones. Original ground level under dumped material in south-west corner of site.	0.8
009	2	Mixed subsoil layer. Moderately compact mid reddish brown clayey silt. Similar to 003 but more disturbed	0.7

010	5	Interface between 002 and 003. Moderately firm light yellow brown sandy clay. Similar to natural subsoil but not as clean.	0.4
011	19	Hillwash. Slightly soft mid to light orangey brown silty clay. Material accumulating at bottom of hill.	0.8
012	8/9	Cut of pit. Irregular in plan, with stepped sides. Pit of unknown purpose	L: 0.55 W: 0.78 D: 0.55
013	8/9	Fill of pit. Firm dark brown silty clay. Deposit very similar to subsoil 003.	D: 0.3
014	8/9	Fill of pit. Firm light brown sandy clay, contains sherds of Roman pottery.	D: 0.35
015	8/9	Cut of possible palisade. Linear in plan, slightly V-shaped profile with steep sides and a relatively narrow base.	L: 2.0 (seen for) W: 1.0 D: 0.65
016	8/9	Fill of possible palisade. Firm light greyish black sandy clay, high charcoal content toward base, along with fire cracked stones along base. Stones may be packing stones and linear could be palisade.	D: 0.65
017	15	Fill of ditch. Firm mid greyish brown clayey silt with large amounts of small gravel. Feature contains flint tool, but is likely to be of Roman date.	D: 0.18
018	15	Cut of ditch. Linear in plan with moderately steep sides and a broad U-shaped base. Moderately sharp breaks of slope.	L: 2.0 (seen for) W: 0.3 D: 0.18
019	15	Fill of modern drainage pipe. Mixed mottled pink and brown clay and silt. Mix of topsoil and natural subsoil filling cut for drainage pipe. Sherds of Roman pottery recovered from fill had been displaced from ditch 022.	D: 0.96
020	15	Cut of drainage pipe trench. Linear in plan, vertical sides, base not seen due to presence of pipe.	L: 2.1 (seen for) W: 0.38 D: 0.96
021	15	Fill of ditch. Firm mid greyish brown clayey silt with frequent small pebbles. Moderately frequent flecks of charcoal throughout and sherds of Roman pottery.	D: 0.44
022	15	Cut of ditch. Linear in plan, with moderately steep sides and a broad flat base. Parallel with 018	L: 2.1 (seen for) W: 1.08 D: 0.44
023	15	Fill of ditch. Firm mid brownish grey clayey silt gravel. Moderately frequent flecks of charcoal and frequent sherds of Roman pottery.	D: 0.61
024	15	Cut of ditch. Linear in plan, V-shaped profile with curved base and moderately steep sides. No evidence of a bank in relation to ditch. Some form of enclosure ditch.	L: 2.0 (seen for) W: 1.55 D: 0.61

025	15	Spread. Firm mid to dark brownish grey clayey silt with flecks of charcoal throughout and some concentrations of burnt stone. Appears not to sit within a cut. Contains Roman pottery.	L: 2.0 (seen for) W: 1.0 (max)
026	16	Fill of ditch. Very firm mid brownish grey medium gravel within a clayey silt matrix. Contains very rare flecks of charcoal but otherwise very similar to natural subsoil in this area. No evidence of silting within deposit, possibly indicating deliberate backfilling after short space of time. Contained sherd of pottery of Roman date at base.	D: 1.2
027	16	Cut of ditch. Probable sub-rectangular in plan, with relatively steep sides and a broad curved base. Only seen in machine excavated slot so sides a little unclear. Lines up with L-shaped geophysical anomaly on hilltop.	L: 2.0 (seen for) W: 1.8 D: 1.2

APPENDIX 3: DRAWING REGISTER

Drawing No	Scale	Plan or Section	Description
1	1:20	Section	W-facing section through ditches 018 and 022
2	1:20	Plan	Plan of 018 and 022
3	1:10	Section	W-facing section through ditch 024
4	1:20	Plan	Plan of ditch 024
5	1:20	Section	E-facing section through ditch 015
6	1:20	Section	E-facing section through pit 012
7	1:50	Section	E-facing section of Trench 8/9
8	1:50	Plan	Plan of Trench 8/9

APPENDIX 4: PHOTOGRAPHIC REGISTER

Photo No	Colour print	Colour slide	Digital	Direction Facing	Description
1	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 16, general shot
2	Y	Y	Y	W	Trench 16, sample section
3	Y	Y	Y	W	Trench 14, general shot
4	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 14, sample section
5	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 7, general shot
6	Y	Y	Y	E	Trench 7, sample section
7	Y	Y	Y	E	Trench 6, sample section
8	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 6, general shot

9	Y	Y	Y	W	Trench 19, sample section
10	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 19, general shot
11	Y	Y	Y	E	Trench 18, sample section
12	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 18, general shot
13	Y	Y	Y	E	Trench 17, sample section
14	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 17, general shot
15			Y	E	Ditch 027 during excavation
16	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 1, sample section showing made ground
17	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 1, sample section showing made ground
18	Y	Y	Y	E	Trench 1, general shot
19	Y	Y	Y	W	Trench 2, sample section
20	Y	Y	Y	B	Trench 2, general shot
21	Y	Y	Y	SW	Trench 3, general shot
22	Y	Y	Y	NW	Trench 3, sample section
23	Y	Y	Y	NW	Trench 5, sample section
24	Y	Y	Y	SW	Trench 5, general shot
25	Y	Y	Y	E	Trench 10, sample section
26	Y	Y	Y	S	Trench 10, general shot
27	Y	Y	Y	W	Trench 11, sample section
28	Y	Y	Y	S	Trench 11, general shot
29	Y	Y	Y	W	Feature 012 in Trench 8/9
30	Y	Y	Y	W	Trench 8/9, sample section
31	Y	Y	Y	S	Trench 8/9, general shot
32	Y	Y	Y	NW	Trench 4, general shot
33	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 4, sample section
34	Y	Y	Y	W	Shot of 015, Trench 8/9
35	Y	Y	Y	W	E-facing section through 015
36	Y	Y	N	-	General site shot
37	Y	Y	N	-	ID shot
38	Y	N	Y	S	Trench 20, general shot
39	Y	N	Y	E	Trench 20, sample section
40	Y	Y	Y	S	Trench 21, general shot
41	Y	Y	Y	E	Trench 21, sample section
42	Y	Y	Y	S	Trench 22, general shot
43	Y	Y	Y	E	Trench 22, sample section
44	Y	Y	Y	S	Trench 23, general shot

45	Y	Y	Y	E	Trench 23, sample section
46	Y	Y	Y	W	Trench 13, general shot
47	Y	Y	Y	N	Trench 13, sample section
48	Y	Y	Y	W	Trench 12, general shot
49	Y	Y	Y	S	Trench 12, sample section
50	Y	Y	Y	E	W-facing section through ditch 022
51	Y	Y	Y	E	W-facing section through ditch 018
52	Y	Y	Y	SW	General shot of ditches 018 and 022
53	Y	Y	Y	E	W-facing section through 024
54	Y	Y	Y	S	General shot, ditch 024
55	Y	Y	Y	W	General shot of spread 025
56	Y	Y	Y	W	E-facing section through ditch 027

APPENDIX 5: SAMPLE REGISTER

Sample No	Context No	Description
1	16	Fill of possible palisade
2	18	Fill of ditch
3	23	Fill of ditch
4	26	Fill of ditch

APPENDIX 6: FINDS ASSESSMENT

Pottery and other ceramic material - Jane Timby

Introduction

40. The archaeological evaluation resulted in the recovery of a small assemblage of 44 sherds of pottery, weighing 764 g, dating to the early Roman and post-medieval periods accompanied by three pieces of ceramic building material (CBM).
41. Pottery was recovered from five trenches (1, 8/9, 14-16); a total of eight defined contexts.
42. The material is of variable condition with some larger well-preserved sherds and other more fragmented pieces. In many cases there were multiple sherds from single vessels. The sherd count took into account fresh breaks. The overall average sherd weight is quite good at 16.3 g.
43. For the purposes of the assessment the assemblage was scanned to assess its likely chronology and quantified by sherd count and weight for each recorded context. The resulting data is summarised in Table 1. The fabric codes listed include the National Roman reference codes (Tomber and Dore 1998) and where relevant a concordance with the Hereford and Worcestershire fabric series. No comparative or library research has been carried out in conjunction with this assessment.

Tr	Context	Fabric	H&W	Form	Wt	No	Date	Comment
16	26	MAL REB	4.1	jar	6	3	LIA- ERO	joins
14	1	CBM		teg	65	2	Roman	tegulae
1	6	CBM		imb	33	1	Roman	imbrex
1	6	CHINA			4	3	19th+	
15	21	DOR BB1	22	jar	17	1	C2	
15	21	MAL REA	3		9	4	C2	
8/9	14	MALV	19	jar	34	8	ERO	1 vessel; some joins
15	23	Malv var			62	4	LIA- ERO	8=4 sherds with fresh breaks
1	6	SVW OX	12		18	2	ERO	
	16	SVW OX	12		17	2	ERO	
15	21	SVW OX	12	bowl	23	1	C2	2=1 fresh break
15	21	SVW OX	12		254	8	C2	
15	23	SVW OX	12		202	3	ERO	5=3 sherds fresh breaks
15	25	SVW OX	12		20	5	ERO	
TOTAL					764	47		

Early Roman

44. Eleven sherds of handmade late Iron Age-early Roman pottery were recovered from contexts Tr 16 (26), Tr 15 (21) and (23). The sherds include examples of Malvernian rock tempered and limestone-tempered ware (fabrics 3 and 4.1) which typically date from the later Iron Age but continued to be used into the early Roman period.
45. The sherds from Tr 15 (23) did not quite conform to the defined range of known local wares. The four sherds were quite thick-walled, very soft and friable with a burnt-out organic temper. Such a fabric is not inconsistent with briquetage but the smooth finish of the sherds suggests pot rather than salt container. The association of the fabric with Roman sherds indicates a likely early Roman date.
46. Of the remaining 30 Roman sherds, 21 are oxidised Severn Valley wares (SVW OX); one is a sherd of Dorset black burnished ware, and eight are a local Malvernian wheelmade variant.
47. The Severn Valley wares mainly comprise bodysherds which include closed forms and at least one flat-rim bowl from (21). The industry is a long-lived one but these sherds appear to be in quite standardized fabrics indicating a date in the later 1st or 2nd centuries.
48. A single sherd of Dorset black burnished ware jar (DOR BB1) was recovered from Tr 15 (21) which is probably of 2nd-century date.
49. The eight sherds of Malvernian-type ware from Tr 8/9 (13) are from a wheelmade necked jar with girth grooves. Again this vessel is likely to date from the 2nd century.

Ceramic building material

50. Three pieces of CBM were recovered, two from Tr 1 (6) and one from Tr 14 (1). All appear to be Roman roofing tile; the former from a tegula; the latter from an imbrex.

Post-medieval

51. Three sherds of post-medieval/ modern date were recovered from Tr 1 (6). The sherds are of refined white earthenware ('china') with transfer-applied decoration indicative of a date from the later 19th century on.

Summary and recommendations for further work

52. Despite its small size the evaluation assemblage would suggest activity on or near the site investigated in the 2nd century AD. The wares are largely local types typical of this area, which can be quite difficult to date closely when featuring as such small groups. The presence of a single sherd of DOR BB1 suggests that the group from Tr 15 cannot date before the 2nd century and it is probable that the entire assemblage belongs broadly to this phase of activity.
53. The assemblage is too small to warrant further work unless additional material is recovered from the same locality in which case it should be added into any overview.

Reference

Tomber, R, and Dore, J, 1998 *The National Roman fabric reference collection: a handbook*, Museum of London / English Heritage/ British Museum

FLINT - JULIE LOCHRIE

1. There was a single flint find from Trench 15 C017. It is an invasively retouched distal tip. It most likely belonged to a knife. It is possibly a plano-convex type which would place it to around the Late Neolithic to Early Bronze Age.

Catalogue

2. Flint; grey, medium-grained; inner flake; pointed distal fragment; triangular section; abrupt to semi-abrupt, direct, invasive retouch to right and left laterals; there are a couple of long thin flakes detached from the ventral face, each are positioned over a particularly prominent ripple scar and were possibly an attempt to flatten the ventral face.

APPENDIX 7: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Sarah-Jane Haston

Introduction

- Four samples were taken during the evaluation at land east of Holywell Gutter Lane, Hereford and all were processed for palaeoenvironmental assessment. The samples were taken from ditch features discovered during the evaluation. The assessment aims to look at what the palaeoenvironmental potential of the material is and what evidence this material is showing us for the activities which once took place at the site.

Method

- Samples were processed in laboratory conditions using a standard floatation method (cf. Kenward *et al*, 1980). All plant macrofossil samples were analysed using a stereo-microscope at magnifications of x10 and up to x100 where necessary to aid identification. Identifications were confirmed using modern reference material and seed atlases including Cappers *et al* (2006).

Results

- The results of the sample processing are provided in Tables 1 (Retent finds) and 2 (Floatation finds). Suitable material for AMS dating is also identified within each table.

Table 1: HRFC10: Retent Sample Results

Context Number	Sample Number	Sample Vol (l)	Burnt bone	Unburnt bone	Charcoal		Material available for AMS Dating	Comments
			Mammal	Mammal	Quantity	Max Size (cm)		
16	1	10	+		++	1.5cm	Charcoal ++	
18	2	10		+	+	0.5cm		
23	3	10						Archaeologically sterile
26	4	10						Archaeologically sterile

Key: + = rare, ++ = occasional, +++ = common and ++++ = abundant
NB charcoal over 1cm is suitable for identification and AMS dating

Table 2 HRFC10 Flotation Sample Results

Context Number	Sample Number	Total flot Vol (ml)	Charcoal Quantity	Charcoal Max size (cm)	Comments
16	1	25	++	<1	
18	2	20	+	<1	
23	3	15	+	<0.5	
26	4	20	+	<0.5	

Key: + = rare, ++ = occasional, +++ = common and ++++ = abundant
NB charcoal over 1cm is suitable for identification and AMS dating

Plant remains

4. The samples consisted mainly of modern root/weed seeds and insect debris and the carbonised plant remains amounted only to small quantities of wood charcoal. All samples contained varying amounts of wood charcoal with only one sample, Sample 1 containing fragments of a size suitable for identification and/or Accelerated Mass Spectrometry (AMS) dating (see Tables 1 and 2). The primary value of the charcoal will be as a source of dating evidence. If wood charcoal were selected identification of the species represented would need to be undertaken prior to dating.

Other finds

5. The only other find recovered from the processed samples was a small quantity of burnt mammal bone in Sample 1 and a single fragment of unburnt mammal bone in Sample 2 (see Table 1). In both cases the bone was very fragmentary.

Discussion

6. The concentration of archaeological remains recovered from the samples was very low with most samples only containing a small quantity of wood charcoal and occasional fragments of burnt and unburnt mammal bone. No other finds were recovered from the samples indicating that the plant remains are likely to relate to waste from small domestic fires that accumulated in the ditch over time rather than being deliberately dumped materials.

Conclusion

7. The origin of the low concentration of carbonised material within the ditch deposits is uncertain. In the absence of any obvious conflagration deposits the likely source of the charred remains are from the domestic hearth, from which the burnt bone became charred during food preparation and charcoal being the remains of wood used as fuel. The paucity of remains and the poor preservation of the charcoal and bone may suggest that they had been washed or blown into the sampled deposits from the surrounding area.

References

- Cappers R.T.J., Bekker R.M. and Jans J.E.A. (2006) *Digital seed atlas of the Netherlands* (Barkhuis Publishing and Groningen University Library, Groningen).
- Kenward, H. K., Hall, A. R. and Jones, A. K. G. (1980). A tested set of techniques for the extraction of plant and animal macrofossils from waterlogged archaeological deposits. *Science and Archaeology* 22, 3-15.