

## Title Page

Project code: LBES12

Date of report: June 2012

Client: CgMs Consulting Ltd.

Report Title: Land West of Willow Drive, Little Common, Bexhill

Author: Luke Craddock-Bennett

## Project summary sheet

Client: CgMs Consulting Ltd.

NGR: TQ 70840 08130 (Site Centre)

Address: Land West of Willow Drive, Little Common, Bexhill

Council: East Sussex County Council

Project Manager: James Newbould MifA

Text: Luke Craddock-Bennett AlfA

Fieldwork: Luke Craddock-Bennett AlfA and Nuala Woodley-Marshall AlfA

Fieldwork date: 28<sup>th</sup> May 2012 – 1<sup>st</sup> June 2012

Oasis ref: headland3-127969

Accession number: BEXHM: 2012.30

## ABSTRACT

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd. commissioned by CgMs Consulting Ltd. undertook archaeological trial trenching on a development site on land west of Willow Drive, Little Common, Bexhill, East Sussex. Investigations revealed evidence of locally significant activity from the Prehistoric to post-medieval periods. Prehistoric activity was indicated by a small scatter of flint artefacts associated with alluvial deposits in the northern part of the site and by residual flint artefacts from within subsoil and post-medieval features in the southern part of the site. Roman activity was attested by features containing Roman pottery, iron working residues and daub in the south-east of the site. Low-level activity from the 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries was indicated by pottery within the south-western part of the site. A number of post-medieval field-systems were also revealed in the south-western part of the site.

## 1. INTRODUCTION [heading 1]

### 1.1 Planning background [heading 2]

The Fairfield Partnership has proposed mixed use development of a 25 hectare site to the north-west of Bexhill, East Sussex. In accordance with government guidance on archaeology and heritage (PPS5), and Rother District Council's planning policies, the client commissioned CgMs Consulting Ltd. to produce an archaeological impact assessment in order to establish the archaeological potential of the site. In order to build on the results of this and to further inform the planning process, the East Sussex County

Archaeological Officer requested that the results of an archaeological evaluation be submitted. CgMs Consulting Ltd. (the consultant) commissioned Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd. to undertake a field evaluation of the site in line with a Written Scheme of Investigation (Headland Archaeology 2012) agreed with Rother District Council.

## 1.2 Site location and geology [heading 2]

The proposed development area (DA) comprises an irregular block of land extending to approximately 25 hectares, consisting of 17 principle fields and land parcels 2.5km north-west of Bexhill, west of the village of Little Common (Illus. 1). The site is centred on TQ 70840 08130 and lies at a height of between 4m and 23m AOD. The fields are currently in use as pasture, and are bounded by mature trees and hedgerows.

The geology of the area is identified as the Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation overlain by alluvium around the Picknell Green Stream in the north of the site and soils of the Batcombe association.

### [Illus 1]

## 1.3 Archaeological background [heading 2]

The known archaeological potential of the proposed development area is limited. Known Heritage Assets are confined to metal detecting finds of a 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> century copper alloy token and a post-medieval musket ball (HER MES13054; MES T3295) from the centre of the site. Enclosure field boundaries are present on the site, as is a post 1839 tree lined 'ride'.

Extensive artefactual evidence from the Bexhill area suggests occupation since the Mesolithic period. A trial excavation undertaken 900m to the south-east of the proposed development area recovered a substantial quantity of fire-fractured flint as well as Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age struck flint (HER MES7335).

The Iron Age exploitation of the High Weald area to the north for ironstone, as well as charcoal from the forest, continued throughout the Romano-British period, but the area of exploitation lay well beyond the site itself (Higgs 2011). However, a total of five Romano-British bloomery sites, which comprised a type of furnace used for smelting iron from its oxides, are known to lie within the parish of Bexhill (Harris 2008). The only Romano-British findspot discovered in proximity to the site comprises a possible Roman carved pink granite head (HER MES124). The figurine, thought to represent the Roman god of the underworld Dis Pater, was found almost 2.5km to the south-east of the site.

## 2. METHODOLOGY [heading 1]

### 2.1 Objectives [heading 2]

The objectives of the evaluation were:

- To identify and assess the particular significance of any element of the historic environment that may be affected by the relevant proposal (as well as the affect on setting of a heritage asset);
- To determine and understand the nature, function and character of any remains on the site, in their cultural and environmental setting;
- To analyse any evidence retrieved in light of objectives contained within local and regional research agendas. In this case they are provided by the South East Research Framework which is currently in preparation.

In addition to these general aims, it was hoped that the results of the evaluation would:

- Establish the depth and character of archaeologically ‘sterile’ overburden;
- Identify, characterise and date any potential archaeological remains within the site; and
- Define any constraints encountered during the evaluation and any potential constraints for further archaeological work (e.g. areas of disturbance, service locations, etc.)

## 2.2 Fieldwork [heading 2]

The evaluation took the form of a targeted programme of archaeological field survey. Analysis of the site’s geology and topography suggested that only the level ground on the south east of the site and a small stream and associated alluvium on the north of the site were likely to have been significant foci of past human activity. On this basis, all trenches were targeted in these areas.

The fieldwork took place between 28<sup>th</sup> May and 1<sup>st</sup> June 2012. Due to the presence of active badger setts in the south of the site, the trenching amount and layout differed from the proposed trench plan forming part of the Written Scheme of Investigation. A total of 22 trenches were excavated amounting to 540 linear metres. Two trenches were excavated to a width of 3.6m in the north of the site to check for flint scatters in the alluvium adjacent to the Picknell Green Stream. The remainder of the trenches were 1.8m wide.

A 360° tracked mechanical excavator equipped with a flat-bladed bucket was used to remove topsoil under direct archaeological control. Excavation continued until clean geological sediments, alluvial deposits or significant archaeological deposits were encountered.

Further excavation required to satisfy the objectives of the evaluation was continued by hand. A representative sample, sufficient to meet the objectives of the evaluation, of

identified features was investigated by hand and all features were recorded. The stratigraphy of each trench was recorded in full.

### 2.3 Recording [heading 2]

All recording was in accordance with the code of practice of the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA). All trenches and contexts were given unique numbers. All recording was undertaken on *pro forma* record cards that conform to accepted archaeological standards. All stratigraphic relationships were recorded.

An overall site plan at an appropriate scale and relative to the National Grid was recorded by digital survey using a differential GPS.

A full photographic record comprising colour slide and black and white print photographs was taken, supplemented with digital photography. A metric scale was clearly visible in record photographs.

## 3. RESULTS

The following section refers specifically to those deposits and features that assist in interpreting the development of the site and establishing the significance of any archaeological remains uncovered during the trenching exercise. An overall schedule of trench dimensions has been included as Appendix 1.1, with descriptions of all the deposits and features encountered during the project in Appendix 1.2.

### 3.1 Holocene activity

The majority of the site lies within an area of bed rock made up from Tumbridge Wells sand formation. At the far northern end of the site are alluvial deposits associated with Picknell Green Stream. Indeed, alluvial deposits were identified within Trenches 1, 2, 4 and 5 (Appendix 1). However, these are more likely to represent the remains of alluvium sitting within natural hollows, rather than palaeochannels.

### **[Illus 2 and 3]**

In the three land parcels making up the southern part of the investigation area the upper, sandy surface of bedrock was revealed in many of the trenches. Overlying this was a clayey or sandy-clay deposit. There are no alluvial deposits logged here and the differences in deposit might simply reflect different levels of reworking of the upper surface of natural sand bedrock and clays being deposited through more gentle fluvial action.

### 3.2 Prehistoric activity

Clearly there was activity of this date taking place in the area of the site. Fourteen largely undiagnostic flint artefacts were recovered from seven of the trenches (Appendix 2, Illus. 2). The majority of these were spread across trenches in the south of the site. These appeared in subsoil deposits or within post-medieval features are considered to be

residual. However, three of the flints came from the alluvial deposits within Trench 1. Although these are not considered to represent a significant concentration, they nonetheless hint at prehistoric activity in the vicinity.

### 3.3 Roman activity

Two features of early Roman date were identified in the south-east part of the site. The first of these (Illus 4 and 6) comprised a structure of possible beam slot-type construction based on an L-shaped, 0.2m deep, 0.4m wide cut extending over 2m on the west side of Trench 22 [2203]. The excavated sample yielded 36 sherds of Roman pottery alongside evidence for iron working and 16 fragments of daub (Table 1). The other feature (Illus 5 and 6) in this case from Trench 20, was a 0.28m deep, 1m wide and 2m long slot with sloping sides [2003], forming the base of a truncated boundary ditch from which 14 sherds of Roman pottery were recovered. With the exception of a fragment of Samian bowl the remainder of the pottery was probably locally produced course ware. On the basis of the former the occupation of the site could be dated to the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD (Appendix 2), however, the course wares continue in use up to the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD.

### **[Illus 4, 5 and 6]**

### 3.4 Medieval activity

Trench 11 contained the remains of a shallow (0.1m), flat-based feature some 4m in width [1102]. Its deposit (1103) contained five sherds of 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> century pottery and four sherds of 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century pottery, representing the totality of the medieval assemblage from the site (Appendix 2). These remains indicate some form of activity on the site in this period. However, the nature of that activity cannot be determined.

### **[Illus 7]**

### 3.5 Post-medieval activity

Material of this date was found in the southern part of the site. Two sherds of 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> century pottery were recovered from the NE-SW aligned ditch [1203] in Trench 12. Ditch [1104] in Trench 11 followed the same alignment as [1203] and was of similar dimensions. It is considered to represent the continuation of [1203] and is likely to represent the remains of post-medieval field boundary ditch (Illus. 2). The deposits of [1104/1203] each contained a secondary retouched flint flake. However, the presence of post-medieval pottery within the ditch demonstrates that the flint is residual.

Post medieval activity is also attested by a single unstratified sherd of 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> century pottery was recovered from Trench 20.

### 3.6 Undated features

Several undated features were recorded in the south-west part of the site. The NW-SE aligned ditch in Trench 6 contained a single piece of burnt flint but this is not necessarily indicative of a prehistoric date (Illus. 8). Indeed, the fill of [603] was comparable with those of [1104/1203] and (which also continued residual flint material). Furthermore, the alignment of [603] is perpendicular to the post-medieval ditch [1104/1203] indicating it

may form part of the same field system. Trench 13 contained the remains of a shallow, NNW-SSE aligned linear feature [1301]. Its deposit was comparable to those of [603] and [1104/1203] and although it contained a possible flint core, this is considered to be residual.

**[Illus 8]**

**4. THE FINDS** by Julie Franklin, Rob Perrin, Ben Jervis, Julie Lochrie

The earliest activity in the area is of prehistoric date based on the presence of flint tools and debitage which cannot be closely dated. All appeared to be residual, with no significant concentrations within the site.

The Roman finds however, form a coherent group. They are concentrated in Trench 22, associated with the remains of a structure filled by deposit [2204]. The pottery implies a late 1<sup>st</sup> century AD date for this activity. There were not enough finds to suggest any particular function for the building. Further Roman pottery was recovered from a linear feature in Trench 20, including a Samian ware bowl.

Medieval finds came from the fill of a shallow feature [1103] in Trench 11. They indicate 13<sup>th</sup> century activity in the near vicinity. There were also a handful of post-medieval finds from the site.

**[Table 1]**

Trench	Pottery (RB)	Pottery (Medi-PM)	Lithics (PH)	Other Finds	Dating
1	-	-	4	-	Prehistoric
6	-	-	1	-	Prehistoric
10	-	-	1	-	Prehistoric
11	-	9	1	2 burnt stone	13 <sup>th</sup> century
12	-	2	1	1 tile	17 <sup>th</sup> -18 <sup>th</sup> century
13	-	-	1	-	Prehistoric
20	14	1	-	-	Late 1 <sup>st</sup> century AD + 15 <sup>th</sup> /16 <sup>th</sup> century
22	36	-	5	2 iron finds 2g iron-working waste 16 daub fragments	mid-late 1 <sup>st</sup> century AD
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>		

Table 1 – Quantification of finds by trench, with spot dating (quantification by sherd numbers unless otherwise stated)

**4.1 Prehistoric flint and burnt stone**

Fourteen prehistoric flint artefacts were recovered from seven trenches. These are a mixture of tools and debitage, largely undiagnostic in date. Whilst most pieces were fresh in condition they were not associated with any prehistoric features and are likely to be residual, representing background prehistoric activity.

Five pieces were from the subsoil of Trench 22 [2204]. The remaining five were scattered among the trenches in the southern part of the site (Trenches 6, 10, 11, 12 and 13). Although three pieces were found within the alluvial deposits of Trench 1 [101] these are not considered to represent a significant concentration, but nonetheless hint at prehistoric activity in the vicinity.

#### **4.2 Romano-British Pottery**

An assemblage of 50 sherds weighing 200g was recovered from two of 22 evaluation trenches. The finds derived from a 1m wide linear feature [2004] crossing Trench 20 and beam slots [2204] forming the corner of a probable building in Trench 22.

The pottery sherds are abraded and mostly small in size. The exceptions to this are sherds forming around a quarter of an undecorated South Gaulish Samian ware bowl (form 35) from deposit [2004]. Apart from this vessel, the pottery is either in grog-tempered or coarse sandy wares. There are four possible grog-tempered fabrics, although three of these may be the same basic fabric with variations in colour. The other grog fabric is definitely different to the other three, having distinct black inclusions. The sherds in the latter are from the base of a dish or bowl with a noticeable footring and at least one hole pierced pre-firing. Fragments of three jars with simple curved rims occur in a grey-brown coloured grog fabric. The coarse sandy wares comprise a reddish-yellow ware with traces of a cream slip and a pinkish ware with a cream external surface.

The grog-tempered wares are likely to part of the category known as East Sussex grog tempered ware (Green 1980) for which a source is still uncertain. There are no known kiln sites producing coarse sandy wares in the area, though similar pottery was produced much further away at Wiggonholt and Hardham in West Sussex, Verulamium in Hertfordshire, Canterbury and London.

East Sussex grog tempered ware was most common in the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD but continued in production into the 4<sup>th</sup> century. Small bowls of form 35 were produced throughout the life of the South Gaulish factories and are difficult to date closely within this, mainly mid-1<sup>st</sup> to early 2<sup>nd</sup> century, period. The coarse sandy wares are likely to date to the later 1<sup>st</sup> century or after.

The assemblage is too small to be able to say anything meaningful about the likely type of occupation and activity on the site, though the presence of the Samian ware vessel does perhaps hint at more than a basic status. Otherwise, the jars are basic multi-purpose types, but the pierced ring base suggests a more specific function.

The assemblage is of local and possibly regional significance, despite its size, as little is known from the area as a whole.

#### **4.3 Medieval and Post-medieval Pottery**

There was a small assemblage of 12 sherds, weighing 57g of post-Roman pottery. Compared to the coastal area of West Sussex this area has received relatively little archaeological attention and our understanding of local pottery remains limited. It has, however, been possible to draw parallels between the material and that from known kiln sites and excavated material from Lydd and Battle.

The earliest of the sherds and the largest concentration was in Trench 11 [1103], the fill of a wide hollow. Nine sherds derive from two vessels, both of oxidised sandy fabric: a coarse jar; and a fine jug. The jar has a thickened, everted rim with a straight edged profile and the presence of sooting around the rim indicates it may have functioned as a cooking pot. This type of fabric can be dated to the 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> century in west Kent and East Sussex, for example at Lydd (Barber 2008a) and Battle (Barber 2008b). The jug has a strap handle with thumbled edges and incised decoration. Fine, oxidised sandy ware jugs are known to have been produced at Rye and Hastings in the medieval period (Barton 1979), the fabric of these sherds being closer to that of Hastings products. The form of the handle finds approximate parallels amongst the Hastings material (Barton 1979, 190). Barton dates these products to the 14<sup>th</sup> century on stylistic grounds and on balance 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century date is appropriate for these sherds (see also Streeten 1985).

Both vessels are likely to be of local manufacture and their association suggests a date in the 13<sup>th</sup> century for this deposit. The presence of a number of sherds from the same vessel suggests the vessels were probably in use in the near vicinity.

The remaining three sherds were post-medieval in date. A single sherd from an everted rimmed jar with a splash of clear glaze on the interior was found unstratified in Trench 20. A brief review of the literature did not reveal any direct parallels for this fabric, but it fits into a group of 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> century hard fired oxidised earthenwares (Streeten 1985, 114; Barber 2008, 122). The final two sherds were of a fine hard fired red earthenware, glazed brown on the exterior, and yellow over a white slip on the interior. Hard fired redwares are typical of 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> century contexts in the area (Barber 2008, 127), with this slipware likely being of 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> century date.

This small assemblage offers a small contribution to our understanding of the medieval pottery of this part of coastal East Sussex in the 13<sup>th</sup> century.

#### **4.4 Other Finds**

Finds associated with Roman activity in Trench 22 include fragments of iron-working waste, an iron nail, a small piece of iron strip, and some fragments of daub. These were all found in the beam slots forming the corner of a building and may be associated with the structure or use of the building.

Two pieces of burnt sandstone are associated with the 13<sup>th</sup> century pottery in Trench 11. Apart from being burnt, they are unmodified from natural stone.

Lastly, three fragments from a single tile were recovered from Trench 12 [1204]. The tile is hard fired, with a rough texture and is oxidised throughout. The only visible inclusions

are ferruginous clay pellets, although the presence of voids indicates the presence of calcareous material. A similar fabric is represented amongst tiles from Battle (James 2008). The form is undiagnostic but is likely to be of post-medieval date, corresponding with the date of the pottery from the same context.

#### 5. The environmental evidence by S. Timpany

The results of the assessment are presented in Appendix 3, Tables 3.1 (Flot samples) and 3 (Retent Samples). All material was preserved through charring. Material suitable for AMS (Accelerated Mass Spectrometry) radiocarbon dating is indicated in the tables.

One sample was processed from the fill [2204] of a beam slot feature [2203], which during excavation was found to be full of Roman pottery and roughly dated to the 1st or 2nd century AD. The Only material of palaeoenvironmental interest recovered from the samples was charcoal and a very small quantity of burnt bone fragments (see Appendix 3, Tables 3.1 and 3.2). An abundant quantity of charcoal was present in the sample, but most of the fragments were very small in size (<0.5 cm) with only occasional pieces reaching the maximum charcoal size recorded (1.8cm). The charcoal fragments were observed by eye to be representative of a mixture of oak and non-oak species, utilised as fuel wood.

The presence of magnetic residue materials within the sample (see Table 3.1) suggests the charcoal may be related to metal working activity. Such remains have some potential to provide information on the tree types being used for fuel, together with timber size and gathering methods (e.g. coppicing, deliberate selection). Booth (2007) states there is a need for more charcoal data from the East Sussex/Kent Region for the Roman period, particularly from rural locations, observing that wood was both a resource and a commodity during this time.

### 6. DISCUSSION

#### 6.1 Overview

Trial excavation within the targeted evaluation areas successfully recovered a range of evidence from the Prehistoric to post-medieval periods. To the north of the site it would appear that alluvial deposits might be associated with prehistoric activity in the form of three flint finds from the surface of the alluvium. There is also an indication of more activity from this period on the higher ground in the southern part of the site on the basis of a broad spread of a residual few flint finds.

In the south-east of the site there was evidence for Roman activity with two features of this date being identified in two separate trenches. The 50 sherds of pottery recovered from these indicate a moderate level of activity and there was also considerable evidence for iron working within the fill of one of the features.

A single feature of 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century date was located in the south-west part of the site this contained nine sherds of pottery and two pieces of burnt stone.

#### 6.2 The significance of the Heritage Assets

It is difficult to apply anything other than a broad degree of significance to the prehistoric evidence retrieved due to its sporadic and undated nature. The greatest concentration appears to be three lithics within one trench towards the north of the site. This could be associated with the alluvial deposits here and is at least of local significance. The other prehistoric material in the south of the site may simply derive from ploughed out prehistoric horizons and be merely residual in nature as evidenced by those flints found within post-medieval features.

The Roman material is typical of that that would be expected to be associated with a rural farmstead of a type now being widely evidenced in this part of East Sussex. These remains are thought to be of local significance

The medieval feature is considered to be of local significance, on the basis of the presence of pottery rather than the feature itself, the function of which is indeterminate.

## REFERENCES

Barber, L 2008a 'The Pottery' in Barber, L and Priestly-Bell, G (eds) *Medieval Adaptation, Settlement and Economy of a Coastal Wetland. The Evidence from Around Lydd, Romney Marsh, Kent*. Oxbow, Oxford, 113-73

Barber, L 2008b 'The Pottery' in James, R 'Excavations at the Jenner and Simpson Mill Site, Mount Street, Battle, East Sussex', *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 146, 160-66

Barton, K 1979 *Medieval Sussex Pottery*, Phillimore, Chichester

Booth P. 2007 'Rural Settlement'. Notes on the South-East Research Framework public seminar on the Roman period (27/10/07).  
<https://shareweb.kent.gov.uk/Documents/Leisure-and-culture/heritage/serf-seminar-notes/the-roman-period.pdf>

Green, C M 1980 'Hand-made pottery and Society in late Iron Age and Roman East Sussex', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 118, 69-86

Headland Archaeology 2012. WSI for trial trenching on Land West of Willow Drive, Little Common, Bexhill

Streeten, A 1985 'Pottery' in Hare, J (ed) *Battle Abbey. The Eastern Range and the Excavations of 1978-80*, English Heritage, London, 102-26

Waller M. 1993 'Flandrian vegetational history of south-eastern England. Pollen data from Pannel Bridge, East Sussex'. *New Phytologist* 124 2 345-369.

## Appendix 1: Registers

### 1.1: Trench register

Trench	Length (m)	Width (m)	Av. Depth (m)
1	25	3.6	0.4
2	25	1.8	0.35
3	25	1.8	0.35
4	25	1.8	0.3
5	25	3.6	0.5
6	25	1.8	0.6
7	25	1.8	0.37
8	25	1.8	0.6
9	25	1.8	0.5
10	25	1.8	0.45
11	20	1.8	0.55
12	25	1.8	0.4
13	25	1.8	0.5
14	25	1.8	0.6
15	25	1.8	0.6
16	25	1.8	0.45
17	25	1.8	0.5
18	40	1.8	0.6
19	15	1.8	0.5
20	25	1.8	0.6
21	25	1.8	0.55
22	15	1.8	0.5

### 1.2 Context register

Trench	Context	Description	Depth (below surface m)
1	100	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.25
1	101	Grey clayey silt alluvium	0.25-0.35
1	102	Mid orange sandy clay subsoil	0.35-0.45 +
2	200	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.25
2	201	Mid orange sandy clay subsoil	0.25-0.35 +
3	300	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.25
3	301	Mid orange sandy clay subsoil	0.25-0.4 +
4	400	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.3
4	401	Linear cut on E-W orientation. 1.8m wide, 1.8m visible length, 0.24m deep. Channel related to stream activity.	0.3-0.54
4	402	Fill of [401]. Brown and grey sand. Mostly well	0.3-0.54

		defined but a little unclear at base. Alluvium.	
4	403	Mid orange sandy clay subsoil	0.3-0.54 +
5	500	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.25
5	501	Semi-circular depression containing alluvium. 2.5m visible width, 8m visible length, 0.45m deep.	0.25-0.7
5	502	Fill of [501]. Brown sandy clay. Very undefined against edge of cut.	0.25-0.7
6	600	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.3
6	601	Orange/brown clay subsoil (disturbed by ploughing activity).	0.3-0.6
6	602	Mid orange sandy clay subsoil	0.6-0.75 +
6	603	Linear cut on NW-SE orientation. 1m wide, 2m visible length, 0.33m deep. 'V'- shape in profile with flat base. Very clear cut.	0.6-0.93
6	604	Fill of [603]. Mid brown sandy clay.	0.6-0.93
7	700	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.3
7	701	Yellow clay subsoil	0.3-0.37
7	702	Yellow sand natural	0.37 +
8	800	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.3
8	801	Yellow/brown clay subsoil (disturbed by ploughing activity).	0.3-0.6
8	802	Yellow/orange sand natural	0.6-0.7 +
9	900	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.3
9	901	Yellow/brown clay subsoil (disturbed by ploughing activity).	0.3-0.5
9	902	Yellow clay subsoil	0.5 +
10	1000	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.3
10	1001	Orange/brown clay subsoil (disturbed by ploughing activity).	0.3-0.45
10	1002	Orange clay subsoil	0.45 +
10	1003	Linear cut on N-S orientation. 0.77m wide, 1.8m visible length, 0.22m deep. U-shape in profile	0.45-0.77
10	1004	Fill of [1003]. Grey clayey silt.	0.45-0.77
11	1100	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil	0-0.3
11	1101	Light brown/orange subsoil (disturbed by ploughing activity).	0.3-0.55
11	1102	Cut for broad (4m), shallow (0.1m) feature (presumed to be linear).	0.5-0.6
11	1103	Fill of [1102]. Light brown sandy clay. Iron pan mottling throughout deposit.	0.5-0.6
11	1104	Linear cut on NE-SW orientation. 0.7m wide, 2m visible length, 0.1m deep. Shallow U-shape profile.	0.5-0.6
11	1105	Fill of [1104]. Light brown sandy clay.	0.5-0.6
12	1200	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
12	1201	Orange/brown clay subsoil (disturbed by ploughing	0.3-0.4

		activity).	
12	1202	Yellow clay subsoil.	0.4 +
12	1203	Linear cut on NE-SW orientation. 0.7m wide, 2m visible length, 0.17m + deep (excavation discontinued on discovery of PM pottery).	0.4-0.57
12	1204	Fill of [1203]. Mid brown sandy clay.	0.4-0.57
13	1300	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
13	1301	Linear cut on NNW-SSE orientation. 1.6m wide, 14m visible length, 0.16m deep.	0.4-0.56
13	1302	Fill of [1301]. Mid brown sandy clay. Interface with cut unclear.	0.4-0.56
13	1303	Orange/brown sandy clay subsoil (disturbed by ploughing activity).	0.3-0.4
13	1304	Mid orange/yellow clay subsoil.	0.4-0.65+
14	1400	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
14	1401	Yellow sandy clay subsoil.	0.3-0.6
14	1402	Yellow/orange sand natural.	0.6-0.7+
15	1500	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
15	1501	Yellow sandy clay subsoil.	0.3-0.6
15	1502	Yellow/orange sand natural.	0.6+
16	1600	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
16	1601	Yellow sandy clay subsoil.	0.3-0.45+
17	1700	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
17	1701	Yellow sandy clay subsoil	0.3-0.5+
18	1800	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
18	1801	Yellow sandy clay subsoil.	0.3-0.6
18	1802	Yellow/orange sand natural.	0.6-0.7+
19	1900	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
19	1901	Yellow sandy clay subsoil.	0.3-0.6
19	1902	Yellow sand natural	0.6-0.7+
20	2000	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
20	2001	Orange/brown clay subsoil (disturbed by ploughing activity).	0.3-0.6
20	2002	Yellow/orange sand natural.	0.6-0.65 +
20	2003	Linear cut on NW-SE orientation. 1m wide, 2m visible length, 0.28m deep.	0.6-0.88
20	2004	Fill of [2003]. Grey clayey sand.	0.6-0.88
21	2100	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
21	2101	Yellow clay subsoil.	0.3-0.55
21	2102	Orange sand natural.	0.55 +
22	2200	Mid brown sandy clay topsoil.	0-0.3
22	2201	Yellow clay subsoil.	0.3-0.5
22	2202	Yellow sand natural.	0.5 +
22	2203	Linear cut for beam-slot. Forms a right angle. 0.4m wide, 2m max length, 0.2m deep. Becomes indistinct	0.5-0.7

		towards southern end suggesting presence of additional feature.	
22	2204	Fill of [2203]. Dark brown sandy clay with frequent charcoal inclusions.	0.5-0.7

### 1.3 Photographic register

Photo number	Colour Slide Film 670	B&W Film 678	Digital	Direction facing	Description
-	1	1	1	-	Site ID shot
1	2	2	2	E	Post-ex shot Trench 5
2	3	3	3	W	East facing shot through [501]
3	-	-	4	SE	Working shot of [501]
4	4	4	5	N	Post-ex shot Trench 2
5	5	5	6	N	Post-ex shot Trench 1
6	6	6	7	SW	Post-ex shot Trench 3
7	7	7	8	S	Post-ex shot Trench 4
8	8	8	9	W	East facing section through [401]
9	9	9	10	W	East facing sample section of Trench 4
10	10	10	11	N	Post-ex shot Trench 14
11	-	-	12	E	Sample section Trench 14
12	11	11	13	N	Post-ex shot Trench 15
13	-	-	14	E	Sample section Trench 15
14	12	12	15	E	Post-ex shot Trench 16
15	-	-	16	N	Sample section Trench 16
16	13	13	17	SW	Post-ex shot Trench 17
17	-	-	18	NW	Sample section Trench 17
18	14	14	19	SW	Post-ex shot Trench 18
19	-	-	20	NW	Sample section Trench 18
20	15	15	21	S	Post-ex shot Trench 19
21	-	-	22	W	Sample section Trench 19
22	16	16	23	N	Post-ex shot Trench 13
23	17	17	24	N	South-west facing section through [1301]
24	18	18	25	S	Post-ex shot Trench 12
25	19	19	26	W	Section through linear [1203]
26	20	20	27	S	Post-ex shot Trench 7
27	21	21	28	S	Post-ex shot Trench 11
28	22	22	29	W	Section through (1105)
29	23	23	30	W	Post-ex plan of Trench 10
30	24	24	31	S	Section through (1004)
31	25	25	32	NW	Post-ex plan of Trench 9

32	26	26	33	NW	Post-ex plan of Trench 8
33	27	27	34	S	Post-ex plan of Trench 6
34	28	28	35	NW	Section through (604)
35	29	29	36	NW	Post-ex plan of Trench 20
36	30	30	37	W	Section through (2004)
37	31	31	38	W	Post-ex plan of Trench 21
38	32	32	39	S	Post-ex plan of Trench 22
39	-	-	40	-	Record shots of active badger sett
40	-	-	41	-	“
41	-	-	42	-	“
42	-	-	43	-	“
43	-	-	44	SW	Area C – general shot
44	-	-	45	SW	Area B – general shot
45	33	33	46	N	Beam-slot feature [2203]
46	34	34	47	S	Beam-slot feature [2203]

## Appendix 2: Finds catalogues

### 2.1: Roman Pottery

Trench	Context	Fabric	Rim	Body	Base	Sherds	Weight	Rim%	Base%	Comments	Date
20	2004	Grey-brown grog, oxidised surfaces	1	1		2	8	4		JCR, no neck	M-L1st C
20	2004	Grey-brown grog		1		1	20				M-L1st C
20	2004	Coarse reddish-yellow, cream slip		3		3	6				L1st-2nd C
20	2004	Coarse, pink, cream surface		5		5	6				L1st-2nd C
20	2004	SGS	1	2		3	48	23	24	Dr 35. No decoration	M1st-E2nd C
22	2204	Grey-brown grog	3	15		18	40	18		JCR, medium;	M-L1st C
22	2204	Grey-brown grog, oxidised surface		9		9	16				M-L1st C
22	2204	Grey-brown grog, inc black ?grog		1	1	2	40			D/B footring, at least one hole in base, pierced pre-firing	M-L1st C
22	2204	Buff-reddish-yellow grog		7		7	16				M-L1st C

### 2.2: Medieval to Post-Medieval Pottery

Trench	Context	Sherds	Weight	Fabric	Description	Spot Date
11	1103	5		8 Coarse, oxidised sandy ware	Vessel 1. A hard, pimply fabric, which is oxidised throughout. Inclusions consist of moderately abundant, medium sized sand, argillaceous pellets and sub-rounded flint (some patinated). The jar has a thickened, everted rim with a straight edged profile. The presence of sooting around the rim indicates the jar may have functioned as a cooking pot.	12 <sup>th</sup> -13 <sup>th</sup> C
11	1103	4		23 Fine, oxidised sandy ware	Vessel 2. A hard, smooth fabric, which is oxidised throughout. Sparse, fine-medium sand is visible, with sparse, fine-medium black ferruginous inclusions. The fabric has a very fine matrix, but occasional argillaceous pellets are present. The sherds are from a jug and two form a strap handle with thumbled edges and incised decoration.	13 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> C
20	U/S	1		18 Oxidised sandy ware	A very hard, wheel-thrown, oxidised sandy ware. Inclusions consist of moderately abundant, medium sized quartz, some of which is iron stained and rectangular limestone (?) fragments. The sherd is a simple, everted rim with a straight edged profile and slight internal thickening. There is a splash of clear glaze on the interior.	15 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup> C
12	1204	2		8 Red earthenware	Hard fired, fine oxidised earthenware. Inclusions consist of sparse fine-moderately sized quartz with occasional black ferruginous inclusions. The sherds have a clear (brown) glaze on the exterior. The interior is coated in a white slip and yellow glaze.	17 <sup>th</sup> -18 <sup>th</sup> C

### 2.3: Other Finds

Trench	Context	Sample	Quantity	Weight (g)	Material	Object	Description	Period
22	2204	1		2	Industrial Waste	Mag Res		
22	2204		1		Iron	Nail		
22	2204		1		Iron	Object	Flat object with one rounded end and one broken end. One concave, one convex side.	
10	1004		1		Lithics	Tool	Flint. Edge retouched, secondary, hard hammer flake	PH
11	1105		1		Lithics	Tool	Flint. Edge retouched, secondary, hard hammer flake	PH
13	1302		1		Lithics	Debitage	Flint chunk, possible core	PH
12	1204		1		Lithics	Tool	Flint. Edge retouched, secondary, hard hammer flake	PH
22	2204	1	4		Lithics	Debitage	Flint, chunk and four chips. One chip is burnt	PH
22	2201		1		Lithics	Debitage	Flint. Inner flake, possibly bipolar	PH
6	604		1		Lithics	Debitage	Flint, burnt chunk	PH
1	101		1		Lithics	Tool	Flint. Knife, secondary hard hammer blade	PH
1	101		1		Lithics	Tool	Flint. Edge retouched, secondary, hard hammer flake	PH
1	101		1		Lithics	Tool	Flint. Edge retouched, secondary hard hammer flake	PH
11	1103		2		Stone	Sandstone	Discoloured sandstone, burnt	
12	1204		3	74	CBM	Tile	Three fragments from a single tile. Hard fired, with a rough texture and oxidised throughout. The only visible inclusions are ferruginous clay pellets, although the presence of voids indicates the presence of calcareous material.	PM
22	2204		16		CBM	Daub	fragments	

All weights are in grammes

Appendix 3: Environmental

3.1: Flotation Sample Results

Context Number	Sample Number	Feature	Total flot Vol (ml)	Charcoal Quantity	Charcoal Max size (cm)	Material available for AMS	Comments
2204	1	Fill of beam slot	50	++++	1.5	Charcoal ++	Charcoal is a mix of oak and non-oak sp.
<b>Key:</b> + = rare (1-5), ++ = occasional (6-15), +++ = common (16-50) and ++++ = abundant (>50) <b>NB</b> charcoal over 1cm is suitable for identification and AMS dating							

3.2: Retent Sample Results

Context Number	Sample Number	Feature	Sample Vol (l)	Ceramic		Stone	Industrial Waste	Burnt bone	Charcoal		Material available for AMS Dating	Comments
				Pottery	PH				Lithics	Mag res		
				2204	1	Fill of beam slot	10	+++	+	+++		
<b>Key:</b> + = rare (0-5), ++ = occasional (6-15), +++ = common (15-50) and ++++ = abundant (>50) <b>NB</b> charcoal over 1cm is suitable for identification and AMS dating												