

LFPH12



LEEN FARM, PEMBRIDGE

Archaeological Evaluation

for The Norman Partnership

August 2012

LEEN FARM, PEMBRIDGE

Archaeological Evaluation

for The Norman Partnership

August 2012

HA Job no.: LFPH12

HAS no.: 947

NGR: SO384592

Parish: Pembridge

Council: Herefordshire County

OASIS ref.: headland3-131299

Archive will be deposited with Hereford Museum
(accession no.: HFD-MG-2012-187)

Project Manager

Mike Kimber

Author

Simon Mayes & Luke Craddock-Bennett

Fieldwork

Luke Craddock-Bennett & Jason Murphy,

Graphics


Anna Sztromwasser

Specialists

Dr Scott Timpany – Environmental
Ian Rowlandson – Finds

Approved by

Mike Kimber – Project Manager



.....

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd
© Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd 2012

Midlands & West

Headland Archaeology
Unit 1, Premier Business Park, Faraday Road
Hereford HR4 9NZ
01432 364 901
hereford@headlandarchaeology.com

www.headlandarchaeology.com



CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	SITE DESCRIPTION	1
3.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	1
4.	OBJECTIVES	1
5.	METHOD	2
	5.1 Trial trenching	2
	5.2 Recording	2
6.	RESULTS	2
	6.1 Romano-British features	2
	6.2 Post-medieval features	3
	6.3 Undated features	3
7.	DISCUSSION	3
8.	CONCLUSION	5
9.	REFERENCES	5
	9.1 Bibliography	5
	9.2 Cartography	5
	APPENDICES	6
	Appendix 1 Site registers	6
	Appendix 2 Finds assessment	9
	<i>Appendix 2.1 References</i>	9
	Appendix 3 Palaeoenvironmental sample assessment	12
	<i>Appendix 3.1 Results</i>	12
	<i>Appendix 3.2 References</i>	12

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<i>Illus 1</i>		viii
<i>Site location</i>		
<i>Illus 2</i>		2
<i>Detail of excavated section through feature [102]</i>		
<i>Illus 3</i>		3
<i>Section showing Romano-British top soil [902]</i>		
<i>Illus 4</i>		4
<i>Detail of excavated section through feature [408]</i>		
<i>Illus 5</i>		4
<i>Detail of excavated section through feature [702]</i>		
<i>Illus 6</i>		4
<i>Detail showing excavated features [704] and [706]</i>		

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table A2.1</i>		9
<i>Ceramic spot date</i>		
<i>Table A2.2</i>		10
<i>Fabric summary</i>		
<i>Table A2.3</i>		10
<i>Ceramic archive</i>		
<i>Table A3.1</i>		12
<i>Retent sample results</i>		
<i>Table A3.2</i>		12
<i>Flotation sample results</i>		



Reproduced using 2007 OS 1:50,000 Landranger Series no. 149 and digital data. Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2012. All rights reserved. Licence no. AL 100013329

Scale 1:1,250 @ A4



Illus 1
Site location

LEEN FARM, PEMBRIDGE

Archaeological Evaluation

Acting on behalf of the Norman Partnership, ADAS UK Ltd commissioned Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd to conduct a programme of archaeological works on land at Leen Farm, Pembridge (NGR 338485, 259440) comprising the excavation of nine evaluation trenches in order to enable the Planning Authority, Herefordshire Council, to make an informed decision on the application

A series of archaeological features containing Romano-British pottery were located within the area designated for development, probably representing the remains of a field system contiguous with an area of organised landscape of Romano-British date known from aerial photographs.

1. INTRODUCTION

Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd acting on behalf ADAS UK Ltd, conducted an archaeological field evaluation in advance of an application to develop land located at Leen Farm, Pembridge (NGR 338485, 259440).

The specification for the archaeological evaluation was produced by Mr John Lord of ADAS UK Ltd and agreed with the Local Planning Authority's Archaeological Advisor, Mr Julian Cotton. The ground works consisted of a field evaluation encompassing the excavation of nine evaluation trenches, within the boundary of the development site.

The archaeological evaluation was conducted between the 17th and 19th of July 2012.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION

Currently the site is used as pasture for the farm's dairy business and comprises a large flat field, with no obvious signs of undulation or earthworks (Site centre NGR 338485, 259440).

The underlying geology is comprised of Raglan Mudstone, a Siltstone and Mudstone formation with Interbedded Sedimentary Bedrock formed approximately 417 to 419 million years ago in the Silurian Period, with superficial glaciofluvial sand and gravel deposits of Devensian date (BGS 1999).

The local geology and topography indicates that the local environment was formed by glacial outwash processes, and is now part of the flood plain of the River Arrow, resulting in the deposition of mainly sand and gravel detrital material in channels to form river terrace deposits, with fine silt and clay deposited during overbank floods, forming floodplain alluvium.

3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

ADAS UK Ltd undertook an archaeological desk based assessment (DBA) of the site in April 2012. The DBA indicated that the site lies within the Arrow Valley, within which there are located a diversity of features indicating the presence of landscape organisation and settlement dating from the prehistoric period.

Further information identified by the DBA indicates that extensive archaeology from the Roman period has been located from crop marks and confirmed by previous excavations in the Middle Field, an area immediately adjacent to the site. Crop marks on the same orientation as those observed nearby and identified during the Middle Field excavations as Romano-British in date were noted to extend into the current evaluation area.

The system of landscape organization is thought likely to have continued its development into the early medieval period, suggested by the conformity of the crop mark features with the orientation of the nearby scheduled Rowe ditch.

Examination of the available evidence suggested that the site has been used for grazing or arable farming throughout the historical period and probably prehistory.

The information identified within the DBA indicated that archaeological and historical assets of significance were likely to be present within the development area.

4. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the project were to ascertain whether any archaeological remains were present within the area of the development, and to characterise them by date, extent, preservation, and significance.



The combined information assembled during the evaluation works was to establish the significance of any previously unknown heritage assets within the site boundary. This will allow the planning authority to determine the potential impact of any development upon the significance of such remains, and to decide the planning application in line with local and national policy.

5. METHOD

5.1 Trial trenching

The evaluation comprised the excavation of nine evaluation trenches of various lengths, 1.6m wide, within the principal area of the proposed development. The evaluation trenches were originally located in a grid pattern and represented an agreed 5% sample of the development site. The ultimate position of the evaluation trenches was determined by the location of easily accessible open ground on the site (Illus 1).

Excavation of the evaluation trenches was undertaken using a mechanical excavator equipped with a wide blade toothless ditching bucket. The mechanical excavator was only used to remove superficial deposits. All mechanical excavation was under direct supervision of an archaeologist and ceased when either the archaeological or the geological horizons were encountered.

The excavated evaluation trenches were closely examined for any features and the spoil was re-examined during excavation in order to collect any artefacts.

5.2 Recording

All recording followed IfA Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation (IfA 2009). A plan of evaluation trenches and features encountered was created using an RTK Trimble GPS and updated onto an AutoCAD base plan of the development area.

Evaluation trenches were photographed with graduated metric scales and include 35mm black-and-white archival prints and digital reference photographs.

6. RESULTS

For the ease of reporting the excavation results, they have been displayed in a tabular form (Appendix 1). A brief, generalised description of the common contexts present in the excavated trenches is given in this section with archaeological features grouped by period.

The general stratigraphic make up the of the site consisted of the present day turfline overlaying a mid brown silty clay topsoil (approx. 0–0.25m) beneath which was a light brown silty clay disturbed subsoil (approx. 0.25–0.65m) overlaying a archaeologically sterile deposit of yellow clay with pink marbling, with bands and patches of gravel dispersed throughout (depth – unknown).

6.1 Romano-British features

Within evaluation trench 1, the edge of what appeared to be a natural hollow [102] on a NE–SW alignment was identified below the subsoil. Feature [102] was approximately 13m in length and 0.2m in depth, although the NE and SW extremities were indistinguishable.

The feature contained a light brown silty clay fill [103], inclusions within the fill included Romano-British pottery and very infrequent charcoal flecks. The pottery remains present within [103] included a mixed group of fragments of Roman Severn Valley ware dated to the 3rd or 4th century AD and fragments of post medieval wares (Appendix 2) indicating that it had remained as a sediment trap for some time.

Excavation of the feature indicated that [102] was probably a natural depression within the landscape, in which sediments had silted. Anthropogenic materials were probably incorporated within these sediments in the course of routine human use of the area. The material is likely to have been preserved as an archaeologically visible feature because the base of it lay below the reach of the plough.

At the eastern limit of evaluation Trench 4, an irregular feature was observed [408] measuring 1.6m NE–SW and 3.5m NW–SE. Excavation and sectioning of [408] indicated that the profile of the feature had multiple breaks in slope reminiscent of a tree-throw pit or a hastily excavated rubbish pit. Within the fill of [408], context [409] was a dark grey silty clay deposit with frequent charcoal inclusions and Romano-British pottery.



Illus 2

Detail of excavated section through feature [102]

An environmental sample was taken from [408]. The information provided by the sample indicated that the fill of [408] contained burnt cereal grains consisting of a type of spelt wheat (*Triticum spelta*) known to have been cultivated during the Roman period (Appendix 3). This feature seems again to result from the incorporation of anthropogenic materials within 'natural' features, reflecting low intensity human use of the landscape but not demonstrating the presence of deliberate structures or enclosures.

Beneath the topsoil and subsoil of evaluation Trench 7, three features were recorded [702], [704], and [706], all indicating the presence of deliberate enclosures or land organisation. All the features contained Romano British pottery assemblages with [702] being provisionally dated within the region of AD120+.

Feature [702] was a linear cut on a NW–SE alignment, its exposed length measured 2m and was 3m wide. When excavated the feature had steep sides (approx. 80°) terminating in a flat base at a depth of 0.62m. The fill of [702], was a mid brown silty clay with infrequent inclusions of charcoal flecking and medium size rounded stones [703].

Towards the southern end of the evaluation trench two linear features ([704], [706]) running parallel to each other, with a NW–SE alignment were recorded. When excavated both features exhibited differing profiles, [704] had a shallow profile with an excavated depth of 0.22m whereas [706] appeared to be more of a shallow depression, exhibiting a maximum depth of only 0.08m, however both features contained similar fills, a clean mid brown silt and both fills ([705], [707]) contained Romano-British pottery.

Evaluation Trench 9, exhibited a different makeup to the other evaluation trenches which may indicate a change in the use of the land towards the northeast corner of the evaluation area. The topsoil and subsoil although similar in consistency to the other evaluation trenches was slightly deeper and overlaid a mid to dark brown silty clay spread [902], approximately 10cm thick with frequent charcoal inclusions and Romano-British pottery. It is probably a remnant of the Roman-British plough soil, preserved because it lay within a large natural depression in the landscape. The pottery assemblage recorded from [902] included a small group of Severn Valley ware and one sherd of a local BB1 type fabric typically dated to the later 4th century AD.

6.2 Post-medieval features

During the excavation of evaluation Trench 4, a number of features were identified. The main feature comprised of a large linear feature [402] aligned NW–SE running approximately 30m in length and 0.6m in width. The fill of [402] comprised of a mid brown silty clay with grey gravel

inclusions [403]. Finds within [403] contained modern red brick, iron and modern ceramics. The variety of finds and the linear character of the feature imply that [402] may have been a post medieval field boundary.

Although containing no datable material, linear feature [903] within Trench 9 was considered most likely to be a continuation of the possible field boundary [402].

6.3 Undated features

Two small linear features in Trench 4, [404] and [406], both aligned NW–SE and running parallel to each other were situated towards the eastern end of the evaluation trench. Both [404] and [406] contained clean sterile gray silt ([405], [407]); there were no artefacts observed in either feature.

The excavation of evaluation Trench 8 identified two linear features ([802], [804]) both aligned on the NE–SW axis of the site. Context [802] consisted of a linear cut with an exposed length of 1.6m and a width of 1.2m, when excavated the feature returned a depth of only 0.13m and appeared to be a natural silted depression rather than a deliberately cut feature. The fill of [802] consisted of a mid brown silt [803], no finds were observed within the fill.

Continuing towards the eastern end of evaluation Trench 8 the second feature identified during excavation [804] exhibited similar characteristics to that of [802] in the sense that both appeared to be very shallow, natural depressions within the historic landscape that had become silted up. The fill within [804] also shared similar characteristics with [803] and consisted of mid brown silt, with no inclusions or finds present [805].

7. DISCUSSION



Illus 3

Section showing Romano-British top soil [902]



◀ **Illus 4**

Detail of excavated section through feature [408]



◀ **Illus 5**

Detail of excavated section through feature [702]



◀ **Illus 6**

Detail showing excavated features [704] and [706]

Assessment of the pottery and environmental sample collected during the evaluation works conducted at Leen Farm, have identified that the majority of the features recorded within the evaluation trenches originate within the Romano-British period.

Examination of the sample taken from [408] for environmental processing has identified that the general area has been associated with farming through the identification of a type of spelt wheat (*Triticum spelta*) known to have been cultivated during the Romano-British period.

Field systems are generally organised for the convenience of the farmer, therefore the size of the fields could possibly give an indication as to the type of agricultural processes that have taken place, however the constraints of evaluation trenches unfortunately does not allow the complete pattern of the field system present within the development site to be visualised.

The nature of the features and finds identified during the evaluation work indicate that the archaeological remains can be divided into two distinct phases. The first phase dates to the Romano-British period, the finds and features indicative of debris from nearby occupation and low intensity activity on site being incorporated both into deliberately dug field boundaries, and into natural pockets of preservation. The later features identified within Trenches 4 and 9 indicate the later post-medieval field systems, subsequently erased to create the larger modern fields that can be seen at Leen Farm now.

8. CONCLUSION

While the distinct lack of any evidence for activity within the central portion of the study area suggests that Romano-British activity on the site was not intensive, and probably did not include actual settlement, the development area is located within an area associated with Romano-British agriculture.

The nature of the features recorded indicates that the area, although agricultural, may be within reasonable proximity to the centre of occupation due to the presence of both ceramics and metalwork within the excavated features.

9. REFERENCES

9.1 Bibliography

Archaeological Archives Forum 2007 *A Guide to Best Practice in Creation, Compilation, Transfer, and Curation*, Published by the IfA.

Lord, J 2012 *Specification for Archaeological Evaluation, Leen Farm, Pembridge, Herefordshire. Written Scheme of Investigation*, ADAS UK Ltd.

Institute for Archaeologists 2009 *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*.

9.2 Cartography

1990 British Geological Survey *Mid Wales & Marches*, Scale 1:250,000.



APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Site registers

Trench register

Trench	Length (m)	Width (m)	Av. depth (m)
1	38	1.6	0.6
2	38.5	1.6	0.5
3	37.5	1.6	0.45
4	48	1.6	0.5
5	47	1.6	0.55
6	47	1.6	0.5
7	37	1.6	0.7
8	38.5	1.6	0.5
9	38	1.6	0.6

Context register

Trench	Context	Description	Depth (m below surface)
1	100	Mid brown silty clay topsoil.	0–0.25
1	101	Light brown silty clay disturbed subsoil.	0.25–0.65
6	102	Linear cut gully feature on NE–SW alignment. Approximately 13m in length, although NE and SW ends are indistinct. 0.6m+ wide, running into trench edge. Gradually sloping sides to flat base, 0.15m deep. Potentially a natural depression.	0.65–0.8
1	103	Fill of [102]. Light brown silty clay containing Romano-British pottery and very infrequent charcoal flecks. Appears to be a natural silting deposit.	0.65–0.8
1	104	Clean natural subsoil. Yellow clay with pink marbling. Bands and patches of gravel dispersed throughout.	0.65+
2	200	Topsoil (see [100] for description).	0–0.3
2	201	Subsoil (see [101] for description).	0.3–0.45
2	202	Natural (see [104] for description).	0.45+
3	300	Topsoil (see [100] for description).	0–0.3
3	301	Subsoil (see [101] for description).	0.3–0.45
3	302	Natural (see [104] for description).	0.45+
4	400	Topsoil (see [100] for description).	0–0.4
4	401	Subsoil (see [101] for description).	0.4–0.5
4	402	Linear cut on NW–SE alignment. Exposed length 30m, 0.6m+ wide, 0.27m deep. 80° sides to flat base. Correct alignment for post-med field boundary.	0.5–0.77
4	403	Fill of [402]. Mid brown silty clay with grey gravel inclusions. Contained modern brick, iron, and modern pottery.	0.5–0.77
4	404	Linear cut on NE–SW alignment. Exposed length 1.6m, 0.35m wide, 0.2m deep. Breaking at 90° from NW to V-shaped base, rising at 60° to SE.	0.5–0.7
4	405	Fill of [404]. Clean grey silt. Sterile. Silting deposit.	0.5–0.7
4	406	Linear cut on NE–SW alignment. Exposed length 1.6m, 0.2m wide, 0.2m deep. Vertical sides to flat base.	0.5–0.7
4	407	Fill of [406]. Clean grey silt. Sterile. Silting deposit.	0.5–0.7

Trench	Context	Description	Depth (m below surface)
4	408	Irregular feature. Observed dimensions – 1.6m NE–SW, 3.5m NW–SE. Max depth – 0.5m. Multiple breaks of slope identified during excavation, suggesting a tree bole or hastily excavated rubbish pit.	0.5–1
4	409	Fill of [408]. Dark grey silty clay deposit. Frequent charcoal and Romano-British pottery dispersed throughout.	0.5–1
4	410	Natural (see [104] for description).	0.5+
5	500	Topsoil (see [100] for description).	0–0.45
5	501	Subsoil (see [101] for description).	0.45–0.65
5	502	Natural (see [104] for description).	0.65+
6	600	Topsoil (see [100] for description).	0–0.35
6	601	Subsoil (see [101] for description).	0.35–0.5
6	602	Natural (see [104] for description).	0.5+
7	700	Topsoil (see [100] for description).	0–0.3
7	701	Subsoil (see [101] for description).	0.3–0.75
7	702	Linear cut on NW–SE alignment. Exposed length 1.6m, 3m wide, 0.62m deep. 80° sides to flat base.	0.75–1.37
7	703	Fill of [702]. Mid brown silty clay. Infrequent charcoal flecking. Frequent rounded stones (redeposited natural) c50–100mm diameter. Romano-British pottery.	0.75–1.37
7	704	Linear cut on NW–SE alignment. Exposed length 2m, 0.8m wide, 0.22m deep. Shallow concave profile.	0.75–0.97
7	705	Fill of [704]. Clean mid brown silt. Romano-British pottery in fill. Silting deposit.	0.75–0.97
7	706	Linear cut on NW–SE alignment. Exposed length 2.2m, 0.6m wide, 0.08m deep. Shallow depression.	0.75–0.83
7	707	Fill of [706]. Clean mid brown silt. Romano-British pottery in fill. Silting deposit.	0.75–0.83
7	708	Natural (see [104] for description).	0.75+
8	800	Topsoil (see [100] for description).	0–0.3
8	801	Subsoil (see [101] for description).	0.3–0.5
8	802	Linear cut on NE–SW alignment. Exposed length 1.6m, 1.8m wide, 0.27m deep. 70° sides to flat base.	0.5–0.77
8	803	Fill of [802]. Mid brown silt. Sterile, silting deposit.	0.5–0.77
8	804	Linear cut on NE–SW alignment. Exposed length 1.6m, 1.2m wide, 0.13m deep. Shallow depression.	0.5–0.63
8	805	Fill of [804]. Mid brown silt. Sterile, silting deposit.	0.5–0.63
8	806	Natural (see [104] for description).	0.5+
9	900	Topsoil (see [100] for description).	0–0.3
9	901	Subsoil (see [101] for description).	0.3–0.78
9	902	Mid-dark brown silty clay containing infrequent charcoal flecks. Romano-British pottery. Appears to be a silting deposit within a natural depression.	0.78–0.91
9	903	Linear cut on NW–SE alignment. Exposed length 1.8m, 1m wide, 0.15m deep. Possible continuation of field boundary [402].	0.6–0.75
9	904	Fill of [903]. Mid brown silt.	0.6–0.75
9	905	Natural (see [104] for description).	0.6+

7

Photographic register

Photo	Colour slide Film 668	B&W Film 681	Digital	Direction facing	Description
1	1	1	1	NW	Trench 2 – post-ex plan
2	2	2	2	SW	Trench 2 – sample section



Photo	Colour slide Film 668	B&W Film 681	Digital	Direction facing	Description
3	3	3	3	NE	Trench 3 – post-ex plan
4	4	4	4	NW	Trench 3 – sample section
5	5	5	5	SW	Trench 5 – post-ex plan
6	6	6	6	NW	Trench 5 – sample section
7	7	7	7	SE	Trench 6 – post-ex plan
8	8	8	8	NE	Trench 6 – sample section
9	9	9	9	NE	Trench 1 – post-ex plan
10	10	10	10	NE	Slot through feature [102]
11	11	11	11	SE	Trench 4 – post-ex plan
12	12	12	12	SE	Slot through feature [402]
13	13	13	13	SE	Slot through features [404] and [406]
14	14	14	14	W	Section through feature [408]
15	15	15	15	NW	Section through feature [408]
16	16	16	16	SW	Section through feature [408]
17	17	17	17	SW	Trench 9 – post-ex plan
18	18	18	18	NW	Section through deposit [902]
19	19	19	19	SW	Trench 7 – post-ex plan
20	20	20	20	W	Section through feature [702]
21	21	21	21	N	Plan of features [704] and [706]
22	22	22	22	SE	Trench 8 – post-ex plan
23	23	23	23	NE	Section through feature [804]
24	24	24	24	NE	Section through feature [802]

8

Sample register

Sample	Context	Description and reason for sample	Volume
1	409	Fill of irregular feature [408]. Deposit was abundant in Roman pottery and a high charcoal/organic content was evident. Sampled for the purpose of general biological assessment.	c10 litres

Appendix 2 Finds assessment

A small group of Roman pottery was presented for study from the site (91 fragments, 1.091kg). The pottery has been discussed and recorded according to the requirements of the Study Group for Roman Pottery (Darling 2004) using the Worcestershire Ceramics Online Database (henceforth WCOD <http://www.worcestershireceramics.org/>). A single sherd from a post-medieval pancheon was present in context [103] and a fragment from a Roman brick or tile was retrieved from context [200]. This assemblage appears to confirm the anticipated presence of Roman settlement in this area.

The close dating of the pottery from this group is hindered by the broad date range attributed to bodysherds of many of the local fabrics and the presence of few diagnostic forms amongst the assemblage. A small quantity of early Malvern Ware type sherds are present including a fragment from a bead-rimmed jar from context [103] but this group also contains later Roman pottery and a sherd from a post medieval pancheon. Groups [200], [705], [707] could only be broadly be dated to the Roman period with context [703] dated to post AD120 on the presence of a small sherd of BB1. The largest group, [409], should date to the later Roman period, late 3rd–4th century AD, on the basis of cavetto rimmed BB1 jars and a sherd from an Oxford Red-Slipped ware mortarium. A further context, [902], may also be dated to the later Roman period, perhaps to the later 4th century.

There are a limited range of fabrics present in this assemblage. The majority of the pottery present is either from the Severn Valley industries or Malvern production sources. There is also a high proportion of Dorset BB1 and a sherd from a local BB1 type copy (WCOD fabric 149). This assemblage compares well with an assemblage from Court-Y-Park, Pixley in composition and range of dates (Craddock-Bennett 2006).

It is recommended that this group is deposited with the relevant local museum.

Appendix 2.1 References

- Craddock-Bennett, L 2006 *Court-y-Park, Pixley (NGR SO 64 39): Archaeological Evaluation*, Unpublished Developer Report Archaeological Investigations Ltd.
- Darling, MJ 2004 'Guidelines for the Archiving of Roman Pottery', *Journal of Roman Pottery Studies* 11, pp.67–74.
- Gillam, JP 1970 *Types of Coarse Roman Pottery Vessels Found in Northern Britain*, 3rd edition, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Evans, CJ 2006 'The Romano British Pottery from Court-Y-Park' in L, Craddock-Bennett *Court-y-Park, Pixley (NGR SO 64 39): Archaeological Evaluation*, Appendix 3, Unpublished Developer Report Archaeological Investigations Ltd.
- Peacock, DPS 1967 'Romano-British Pottery Production in the Malvern District of Worcestershire', *Trans Worcestershire Archaeol Soc*, 1 (3rd ser), pp.15–28.
- Timby, JR 1990 'Severn Valley Wares: a Reassessment', *Britannia* 21, pp.243–51.
- Webster, PV 1976 'Severn Valley Ware: a Preliminary Study', *TBGAS* 94, pp.18–46.

Table A2.1

Ceramic spot date

Context	Spot date	Comments	Count
103	PMED/3–4C	A small group including a fragment of a pancheon and a mixed? Residual group of Roman pottery. The Roman pottery includes fragments of Severn Valley ware including a shoulder fragment from a necked jar; fragments of BB1 including a jar rim and the base from a bowl or a dish. Also present are handmade fragments from a Malvern Ware jar with a bead rim (Peacock 1967, fig. 1.8) and a curve rimmed jar (<i>ibid</i> fig. 1.13).	14
200	ROM	A small group of Severn Valley ware and a fragment from a Roman brick or tile.	3
409	L3–4C	A medium sized group including a fragment from an Oxfordshire red slipped mortarium. Fragments from BB1 jars (rim and shoulder as Gillam 1970 Types, pp.147–148), and a plain-rimmed dish. Severn Valley ware forms present include fragments of from a wide mouthed bowl (Peacock 1967, fig 3.37), a bowl or dish and a carinated bowl/beaker (Timby 1990, fig. 44). Two sherds of Reduced Severn Valley ware and two fragments of fired clay are also present.	40
703	AD120+	A small group of Severn Valley ware and a sherd of BB1.	18
705	ROM	A small group of Severn Valley ware and a fragment of fired clay.	3
707	ROM	A small group including Severn Valley ware and a sherd of handmade Malvern ware.	3
902	L4?	A small group including Severn Valley ware and a sherd of a local BB1 type fabric typically dated to the later 4th century AD.	7



Table A2.2
Fabric summary

Fabric code	Fabric group	Fabric details	Sherd	Sherd %	Weight (g)	Weight %
FCLAY	Fired clay	Fired clay	4	4.4%	25	2.29%
PMED	Post Roman	Misc. post-medieval	1	1.1%	13	1.19%
RTMISC	CBM	Roman brick or tile	1	1.1%	104	9.53%
WO003	Rock tempered	Malvern ware: Handmade IA (Peacock Group A)	1	1.1%	15	1.37%
WO003.1	Rock tempered	Malvern ware: late Roman	3	3.3%	38	3.48%
WO003.2	Rock tempered	Malvern ware: LIA- EROM	1	1.1%	11	1.01%
WO012	Oxid.	Oxidised Severn Valley ware	42	46.15%	423	38.77%
WO012.1	Reduced	Reduced Severn Valley ware	5	5.49%	19	1.74%
WO022	Reduced	Black Burnished ware 1	30	32.97%	421	38.59%
WO033.3	Mortarium	Oxfordshire red mortarium with red/brown slip	2	2.2%	5	0.46%
WO149	Reduced	Worcestershire imitation Black Burnished ware	1	1.1%	17	1.56%

Table A2.3
Ceramic archive

10

Context	Fabric	Form	Decoration	Vessels	Alt	Comments	Sherd	Weight	Rim diam.	Rim eve.
103	PMED	–	–	1	–	Rim; pancheon; traches of flaked glaze?	1	13	0	0
103	WO003.1	–	–	2	ABR	BS	2	23	0	0
103	WO003.1	JCUR	–	1	ABR	Rim as Peacock, fig. 1.13.1	1	15	0	0
103	WO003.2	JBR	–	1	–	Rim bead rim as Peacock, fig. 1.8	1	11	0	0
103	WO012	–	–	3	ABR	BS scraps	3	5	0	0
103	WO012	J	–	1	ABR	Rim	1	4	0	0
103	WO012	JB	–	1	ABR	Base	1	13	0	0
103	WO012	JBNK	–	1	–	BS shoulder	2	38	0	0
103	WO022	BD	–	1	BSC	Base	1	55	0	0
103	WO022	JEV	–	1	ABR	Rim	1	9	0	0
200	RTMISC	–	–	1	–	Fragment from a Roman brick or tile	1	104	0	0
200	WO012	–	–	2	ABR	BS	2	20	0	0
409	FCLAY	–	–	2	–	Featureless fired clay frags	2	17	0	0
409	WO012	–	–	5	ABR	BS misc.	5	36	0	0
409	WO012	–	–	1	ABR	Base	1	21	0	0
409	WO012	JBKNK	–	1	–	Rim; ?Beaker perhaps as Timby, fig. 4.44	1	14	0	0
409	WO012	JWM	–	1	–	Rim widemouthed bowl as Webster, fig. 5.24	1	19	0	0
409	WO012.1	CLSD	–	1	ABR	BS	4	12	0	0
409	WO022	JCUR	–	2	–	Rim; as Gillam, pp.147–8	2	17	0	0
409	WO022	JCUR	–	1	–	Rim shldr; as Gillam pp.147–8	1	94	0	0
409	WO022	–	–	12	–	BS; ?Vessel numbers	12	57	0	0
409	WO022	J	–	1	–	Base BS; large proportion of jar base	6	61	0	0

Context	Fabric	Form	Decoration	Vessels	Alt	Comments	Sherd	Weight	Rim diam.	Rim eve.
409	WO022	CLSD	–	1		Soot ext white dep int	2	24	0	0
409	WO022	DPR	–	1	–	Rim	1	18	0	0
409	WO022	BD	–	1		Burnt	1	27	0	0
409	WO022	JCUR	–	1	ABR	Rim shldr; as Gillam, pp.147–8	2	56	0	0
409	WO033.3	M	–	1	ABR	BS small abraded oxford red colour coat mortarium sherds	2	5	0	0
703	WO012	–	–	15	ABR	BS misc.	15	189	0	0
703	WO012	–	–	1	ABR	Base	1	14	0	0
703	WO012.1	–	–	1	ABR	BS	1	7	0	0
703	WO022	CLSD	LA	1	–	BS	1	3	0	0
705	FCLAY	–	–	1	ABR	BS abraded formless fragment	1	5	0	0
705	WO012	–	–	2	ABR	BS	2	11	0	0
707	FCLAY	–	–	1	ABR	Formless fragment of fired clay	1	3	0	0
707	WO003	–	–	1	–	BS handmade ?Date	1	15	0	0
707	WO012	–	–	1	–	BS	1	6	0	0
902	WO012	–	–	5	ABR	BS misc.	6	33	0	0
902	WO149	BD	–	1	ABR	Base; fabric as worcestershire BB1	1	17	0	0



Appendix 3 Palaeoenvironmental sample assessment

Appendix 3.1 Results

The results of the assessment are presented in Tables A3.1 (Retent sample results) and A3.2 (Flot sample results). All material was preserved through charring. Material suitable for AMS (Accelerated Mass Spectrometry) radiocarbon dating is denoted in the tables.

One sample was processed for palaeoenvironmental assessment from possible pit feature [408]. A small quantity of charred cereal grain was recovered from the sample, consisting of a single grain of possible wheat sp. (cf. *Triticum* sp.) and a single grain of indeterminate cereal (*Cerealia* indet). Preservation of the grain was found to be extremely poor with both grains being unable to be confidently identified to genus or species level. The grains were observed to have been almost like cinder indicating they had been exposed to high temperatures of a prolonged period. Together with the charred grain a single rachis fragment was recorded in the sample, which was in a good state of preservation, allowing it to be identified as spelt wheat (*Triticum spelta*). The presence of spelt wheat rachis, suggests the wheat sp. grain may also belong to this species. Spelt wheat is known to have been cultivated during the Roman period (eg Monckton 1999) and together with the pottery sherds and hobnail recovered would indicate a Roman date for this feature.

Charcoal fragments were recovered from the sample in common quantities. Maximum charcoal sizes ranged from 0.4cm in the flot sample to 1cm in the retent sample (Tables A3.1 and A3.2). Charcoal fragments were observed by eye to be a mixture of oak sp. (*Quercus* sp.) and non-oak sp. The larger fragments were observed to contain strongly-curved rings suggesting that branch wood was the main timber size used (Marguerie & Hunout 2007).

Appendix 3.2 References

Marguerie, D & Hunout, JY 2007 'Charcoal Analysis and Dendrochronology: Data from Archaeological Sites in North-Western France', *Journal of Archaeological Science* 34, pp.1417–1433.

Monckton, A 1999 'Charred Plant Remains from Corn Driers and Other Contexts of a Romano-British Settlement Site at Billesley Manor Far, Warwickshire', *Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report*, 25/99.

12

Table A3.1

Retent sample results

Context	Sample	Feature	Sample vol (l)	Ceramic	Metal	Industrial waste	Burnt bone	Charcoal		Material available for AMS Dating	Comments
				Pottery Roman	Fe object	Mag res	Mammal	Qty	Max size (cm)		
409	1	Fill of possible pit [408]	5	+	+	+	+	+++	1	Charcoal +	Charcoal is oak and non-oak

Key: + = rare (0–5), ++ = occasional (6–15), +++ = common (15–50) and ++++ = abundant (>50)
NB charcoal over 1cm is suitable for identification and AMS dating

Table A3.2

Flotation sample results

Context	Sample	Feature	Total flot vol (ml)	Cereal grain		Other plant remains	Charcoal		Material available for AMS	Comments
				cf. <i>Triticum</i> sp.	<i>Cerealia</i> indet.		Qty	Max size (cm)		
409	1	Fill of possible pit [408]	15	+	+	T. spelta rachis fragment +	+++	0.4	–	Charcoal is oak and non-oak fragments

Key: + = rare (1–5), ++ = occasional (6–15), +++ = common (15–50) and ++++ = abundant (>50)
NB charcoal over 1cm is suitable for identification and AMS dating



Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd
© Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd 2012

Midlands & West

Headland Archaeology
Unit 1, Premier Business Park, Faraday Road
Hereford HR4 9NZ
01432 364 901
hereford@headlandarchaeology.com

South & East

Headland Archaeology
Technology Centre, Stanbridge Road
Leighton Buzzard LU7 4QH
01525 850878
leighton.buzzard@headlandarchaeology.com

North East

Headland Archaeology
13 Jane Street
Edinburgh EH6 5HE
0131 467 7705
office@headlandarchaeology.com

North West

Headland Archaeology
10 Payne Street
Glasgow G4 0LF
0141 354 8100
glasgowoffice@headlandarchaeology.com

www.headlandarchaeology.com