

Archaeological Evaluation Report



Ref: 86210.03 September 2013





Archaeological Evaluation Report

Prepared for:

CgMS Consulting Morley House 26 Holborn Viaduct London EC1A 2AT

Prepared by:

Wessex Archaeology Portway House Old Sarum Park Salisbury SP4 6EB

www.wessexarch.co.uk

September 2013

86210.02



Quality Assurance

Project Code	86210	Accession Code		Client Ref.	
Planning Application Ref.		Ordnance Survey (OS) national grid reference (NGR)	505289 156706	i	

Version	Status*	Prepared by	Checked and Approved By	Approver's Signature	Date
v01	I	MK	SF	STE-	11/09/13
File:	\projects	erver\wessex\PROJI	ECTS\86210\Re	port\Working versions\rep01	
	E	SF	ADC	A.D. Croslett	11\09\13
File:	\projects	erver\wessex\PROJI	ECTS\86210\Re	port\Working versions\rep02	'
File:					
File:					
File:					

^{*} I = Internal Draft; E = External Draft; F = Final

DISCLAIMER

THE MATERIAL CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT WAS DESIGNED AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF A REPORT TO AN INDIVIDUAL CLIENT AND WAS PREPARED SOLELY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THAT CLIENT. THE MATERIAL CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT DOES NOT NECESSARILY STAND ON ITS OWN AND IS NOT INTENDED TO NOR SHOULD IT BE RELIED UPON BY ANY THIRD PARTY. TO THE FULLEST EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW WESSEX ARCHAEOLOGY WILL NOT BE LIABLE BY REASON OF BREACH OF CONTRACT NEGLIGENCE OR OTHERWISE FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE (WHETHER DIRECT INDIRECT OR CONSEQUENTIAL) OCCASIONED TO ANY PERSON ACTING OR OMITTING TO ACT OR REFRAINING FROM ACTING IN RELIANCE UPON THE MATERIAL CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT ARISING FROM OR CONNECTED WITH ANY ERROR OR OMISSION IN THE MATERIAL CONTAINED IN THE REPORT. LOSS OR DAMAGE AS REFERRED TO ABOVE SHALL BE DEEMED TO INCLUDE, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, ANY LOSS OF PROFITS OR ANTICIPATED PROFITS DAMAGE TO REPUTATION OR GOODWILL LOSS OF BUSINESS OR ANTICIPATED BUSINESS DAMAGES COSTS EXPENSES INCURRED OR PAYABLE TO ANY THIRD PARTY (IN ALL CASES WHETHER DIRECT INDIRECT OR CONSEQUENTIAL) OR ANY OTHER DIRECT INDIRECT OR CONSEQUENTIAL LOSS OR DAMAGE.



Archaeological Evaluation Report

Contents

	narybwledgements	
1	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	Project background	
1.1	The Site	
2	ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	
2.1	Introduction	
2.2	Prehistoric	
2.3	Romano-British	
2.4	Saxon - Medieval	2
2.5	Post-medieval	2
2.6	Undated	3
3	METHODOLOGY	3
3.1	Aims and objectives	
3.2	Fieldwork methodology	
3.3	Recording	
4	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS	4
4 4.1	Introduction	
4.1	Natural deposits and soil sequences	
4.2	Summary of evaluation results	
4.3	•	
•	Phase 1 (<i>Trenches 3 and 8 – 14</i>)	
•	Phase 2 (Trenches 5 – 7)	5
5	ARTEFACTUAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE	5
5.1	Artefactual Evidence	5
5.2	Environmental Evidence	5
6	DISCUSSION	5
6.1	Summary	
6.2	Conclusions	
7	STORAGE AND CURATION	6
7.1	Museum	



7.2	Prepara	ation of Archive	6
7.3	Discard	l Policy	6
7.4	Security	y Copy	6
7.5			
8	REFERI	ENCES	7
8.1		aphy	
APPENI	DIX 1:	TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS	8
APPENI	DIX 2:	OASIS FORM	12
Figures Figure 1		ite location and trench plan	
Plates			
Plate 1:	Tr	rench 3, viewed from the east.	
Plate 2:		rench 8, viewed from the north.	
Plate 3:		rench 9, viewed from the south.	
Plate 4:		rench 10, viewed from the south.	
Plate 5: Plate 6:		rench 11, viewed from the north. rench 12, viewed from the west.	
Plate 7:		rench 12, viewed from the west.	
Plate 8:		rench 13, viewed from the east.	
Plate 9:		rench 14, representative section, viewed from the north.	
Plate 10	: Tr	rench 5, representative section, viewed from the south.	
Plate 11		it 704, viewed from the east.	
Plate 12	:: Pit	it 704, south facing section.	



Archaeological Evaluation Report

Summary

Wessex Archaeology was appointed by CgMs Consulting to carry out an archaeological evaluation on land at White Hart Court, Ripley, Surrey centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) 505289 156706.

The archaeological evaluation was undertaken as a condition of planning consent for a new housing development and associated car parking and was requested by the Archaeological Officer for Surrey County Council, in advance of development to assess the archaeological potential of the site.

Fourteen evaluation trenches were initially proposed in order to determine the likely archaeological impact of proposed construction works, however, due to site constraints comprising tree cover and service locations, only eleven could excavated across the site. The archaeological work identified a single modern rubbish pit.

Due to the continued use of a car park within the site, the evaluation was carried out in two phases between the 13th August 2012 to 15th August 2012, and 22nd of August 2013.



Archaeological Evaluation Report

Acknowledgements

The archaeological evaluation was commissioned by CgMs Consulting, and the assistance of Duncan Hawkins is gratefully acknowledged in this respect. Wessex Archaeology would also like to thank Tony Howe of Surrey County Council (SCC) who advised on this project on behalf of the local authority.

The archaeological evaluation was directed by David Britchfield and Ray Kennedy with the assistance of Nicki Humphrey and Alan Whitaker.

The report was compiled by Matt Kendall. The finds were assessed by Lorraine Mepham and the report graphics were prepared by Karen Nichols. The project was managed by Sue Farr, who also edited this report.



Archaeological Evaluation Report

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project background

- 1.1.1 Wessex Archaeology (WA) was commissioned by CgMs Consulting to carry out an archaeological evaluation on land at White Hart Court, Ripley, Surrey, hereafter 'the Site' and centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) 505289 156706 (Figure 1).
- 1.1.2 A planning application was submitted to Guildford Borough Council (12/P/00359) for the demolition of White Hart Court and the redevelopment of the Site and adjacent unmade temporary public car park. The development proposed to accommodate a replacement 60 space permanent public car park and 45 dwellings, together with parking spaces and associated highway and landscaping work, on condition that a programme of archaeological work was undertaken.
- 1.1.3 A previous Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (CgMs 2012) concluded there was a moderate potential for medieval and post-medieval remains within the Site and the Archaeological Officer at Surrey County Council (SCC) requested an archaeological evaluation was undertaken to assess the impact of the development on any archaeological remains.
- 1.1.4 The evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI; WA 2012), which was agreed in advance of the fieldwork by the Archaeological Officer at SCC. All works were carried out in accordance with the relevant guidance given in the Institute for Archaeologist's *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation* (2008).

1.2 The Site

- 1.2.1 The Site lies in the centre of Ripley village, located to the north-east of Guildford and to the south-east of Woking and covers an area of approximately 1.2 hectares. The Site is surrounded by residential and commercial development to the north, south and west and lies to the immediate north of White Hart Meadows and to the east of Rose Lane which adjoins the High Street to the north. The Site and surrounding area are generally level and lie at approximately 25m above Ordnance Datum (aOD).
- 1.2.2 The Site lies within the Conservation Area.
- 1.2.3 White Hart Court is currently occupied by disused buildings, formerly sheltered housing and a day centre, which were built on the Site in the late 20th century, and first shown on the 1985 1:2,500 OS map.
- 1.2.4 The British Geological Survey identifies the geology of the Site and the surrounding area as Kempton Park Gravels over London Clay (British Geological Survey).



2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 A Desk-Based Assessment (CgMs 2012) has been prepared which described the archaeological and historical background to the Site, the results of which are summarised below.
- 2.1.2 The recorded historic environment resource within a Study Area of 750m radius around the Site was considered in order to provide a context for the discussion and interpretation of the known and potential resource within the Site.

2.2 Prehistoric

- 2.2.1 Although the evidence for prehistoric activity in the immediate vicinity is limited, flint implements including a possible borer have been found to the south-west of the Site in the garden of the police station.
- 2.2.2 Two prehistoric find spots are recorded on the Surrey Historic Environment Record (SHER) to the north-west of the Site, near to the river at Ripley Sewage Works. Furthermore an evaluation undertaken to the north-east of the Site revealed a single linear feature containing Bronze Age pottery and worked flint.

2.3 Romano-British

2.3.1 No evidence of Romano-British activity is recorded within a 750m radius of the Site. Nevertheless, a possible Roman road, is recorded running broadly north-east to southwest approximately 1km to the north-west of the Site and is one of three possible routes of the London to Winchester Road.

2.4 Saxon - medieval

- 2.4.1 There is no evidence for any Saxon activity recorded within the 750m radius of the Site.
- 2.4.2 Ripley is known from documentary sources to have medieval origins.
- 2.4.3 St Mary's church which is Grade II* listed lies to the west of the Site. The present building is largely Victorian and dated to 1846. However the chancel dates to the 12th century and the windows are also of Norman date. An archaeological evaluation at the church revealed roughly-faced limestone blocks interpreted as the original foundations of the old south wall.
- 2.4.4 An archaeological evaluation at Rio House and Rio Cottage on Church Row to the west of the Site revealed probable evidence for medieval activity. A large number of inhumations and other features of medieval date were recorded, although the dating evidence was limited. The inhumations most likely fell within the former boundary of the adjacent churchyard which is thought to have contracted to its present size in the mid to late 18th century. A subsequent watching brief did not reveal any remains or finds of archaeological significance.

2.5 Post-medieval

2.5.1 Ripley continued to develop through trade during this period, and it's importance as a passing place is indicated by a milestone on the Portsmouth Road to the north-east of the Site.



- 2.5.2 Early maps all show that the Site largely lay within a rural landscape. The 1729 Senex map, 1768 Roque map, 1793 Lindley and Crosley map, 1806 Ordnance Survey Drawing, 1811 Old Series Map and 1823 Greenwood map all show any development concentrated along the main roads to the immediate north and west of the Site allowing the wider surrounding area to remain predominantly as open fields.
- 2.5.3 A row of detached and semi-detached properties is shown on the 1870 1:2500 Surrey Map, on land to the immediate west of the Site. The two spurs to the west (the present access roads from Rose Lane) fall within footprints of this property line. A semi-detached property lay within the southern spur and another building lay within the northern spur. The majority of the Site lay within open land with a treeline to the north and west. A broadly north-south footpath crossed the Site to the east. Land to the north and west of the Site was fairly well developed by this time whilst land to the east and south remained open fields.

2.6 Undated

- 2.6.1 Ring ditches measuring *c*. 30m in diameter have been identified from a cropmark on aerial photographs to the north-west of the Site with another adjoining ring ditch measuring *c*. 20m in diameter is recorded nearby. Further ring ditches have been transcribed from aerial photographs to the south of the Site.
- 2.6.2 A buried palaeochannel on the River Wey has been revealed at a similar location on the northern side of the mill. Buried field banks have also been identified to the north-west of the Site which pre-date the present layout.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Aims and objectives

- 3.1.1 The broad aims of the archaeological field evaluation were to:
 - Clarify the presence/absence and extent of any buried archaeological remains within the Site that may be impacted by development;
 - Identify, within the constraints of the evaluation, the date, character, condition and depth of any surviving remains within the Site;
 - Assess the degree of existing impacts to sub-surface horizons and to document the extent of archaeological survival of buried deposits;
 - Produce a report which will present the results of the evaluation in sufficient detail to allow an informed decision to be made concerning the Site's archaeological potential.

3.2 Fieldwork methodology

- 3.2.1 All works were undertaken in accordance with the methodology set out within the WSI (WA 2012). All fieldwork was conducted in accordance with the guidance and standards outlined in the Institute for Archaeologist's *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation* (IfA 2008).
- 3.2.2 Due to Site constraints, the archaeological evaluation was undertaken in two phases. Trenches in the west of the Site were excavated in August 2012. Three further trenches were proposed in a car park to the east which was still in constant use at the time of the initial evaluation. As a result, trenching in the car park was undertaken in August 2013.



- 3.2.3 The trial trench excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision using a 360° tracked excavator fitted with a toothless grading bucket (1.9m). The mechanical excavation proceeded in spits to the top of the uppermost archaeological horizon or solid geological deposits (Kempton Park Gravels or London Clay), whichever was encountered first. The machine-excavated arisings were stored at a minimum of 1m from the trench edge. The spoil was scanned for artefacts at regular intervals. Upon completion of the evaluation, the trenches were backfilled with the excavated spoil, topsoil last in order to preserve the soil stratigraphy.
- 3.2.4 All trenches were marked out on the ground using a Global Positioning System (GPS) prior to the commencement of work.
- 3.2.5 Once trenches were completed to the satisfaction of the Client and the Archaeological Officer at SCC they were backfilled using the excavated material in the approximate order in which they were excavated and left level on completion. No other reinstatement or surface treatment was undertaken.

3.3 Recording

- 3.3.1 All recording was undertaken using Wessex Archaeology's *pro forma* recording system.
- 3.3.2 All archaeological features and deposits exposed in the evaluation trenches were hand cleaned and excavated to determine their nature, character and date.
- 3.3.3 A complete drawn record of the evaluation trenches comprises both plans and sections, drawn to appropriate scales (1:20 for plans, 1:10 for sections) was undertaken. The plans and sections were annotated with coordinates and aOD heights.
- 3.3.4 Photographs were taken as appropriate, providing a record of excavated features and deposits along with images of the overall trench to illustrate their location and context. The record also includes images of the overall Site. The photographic record comprises black and white, colour images and digital photography. A photographic register of all photographs taken is contained within the project archive.
- 3.3.5 All interventions were surveyed using a GPS tied into the Ordnance Survey.

4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 The following summary details the results of the two phases of trial trench evaluation undertaken within the Site which was carried out on between the 13th to 15th of August 2012 (Phase 1) and 22nd of August 2013 (Phase 2).
- 4.1.2 Due to Site constraints, including existing trees, the location of services and a car park, the layout of the trenches was adjusted and comprised the excavation of twelve trenches of varying lengths (1no. 30m x 1.5m, 1no.15m x 1.5m, 3no. 10m x 1.5m, 1no. 5m x 1.5m, and 6no. 20m x 1.5m). **Trenches 1**, **2**, and **4** were not excavated and **Trench 13** was moved

4.2 Natural deposits and soil sequences

4.2.1 During the first phase of evaluation, the stratigraphic sequence was broadly similar across all eight trenches (**Plates 1-9**).



- 4.2.2 A layer of mid brownish grey silty clay loam topsoil/turf which varied in depth from 0.25m to 0.48m was recorded overlying a layer of subsoil varying from a mid brownish grey to a mid brownish orange silty clay which varied in thickness from 0.20m to 0.45m (**Plate 1**). Under the subsoil, Kempton Park Gravels were encountered, comprising a mixture of sandy silts and flint gravels.
- 4.2.3 The second phase of evaluation (**Trenches 5 7**), located within a temporary car park area, encountered a similar stratigraphic sequence across all three trenches and comprised two distinct layers of made ground deposits measuring up to 0.38m in depth, which overlay terram sheeting (**Plate 10**) and formed the unmade temporary car park. Under the sheeting was a band of landscaped topsoil measuring up to 0.30m and only present in **Trenches 5** and **6**. Subsoil was present in all three trenches and natural was encountered between 0.52m and 0.83m below ground level.

4.3 Summary of evaluation results

Phase 1 (Trenches 3 and 8 – 14)

- 4.3.1 **Trenches 3**, and **8 14** contained no archaeological features. Modern ceramic building material (CBM) was identified in the topsoil and subsoil but was not retained for analysis. Multiple disused water pipes were encountered in a number of the trenches (**Plate 3**) indicating that there was a significant amount of disturbance across the whole of this area of the Site.
- 4.3.2 **Trenches 1, 2** and **4** were not excavated due to various constraints.

Phase 2 (Trenches 5 – 7)

4.3.3 **Trenches 5** and **6** contained no archaeological features. In **Trench 7** a large rubbish pit, **704**, was identified at the western end of the trench (**Plates 11** and **12**). Only partially exposed and measuring 2.46m in length and 1.5m in width, the precise size of the feature is unknown as is the full depth, but it is over 0.5m. As **704** cuts the subsoil, **1705**, and modern artefacts dating from the 19th to early 20th centuries were recovered, this is likely to be a Victorian rubbish pit.

5 ARTEFACTUAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE

5.1 Artefactual Evidence

- 5.1.1 Artefacts recovered from pit **704** in included part of a cylindrical stoneware jar, a small glass bottle (Eiffel Tower lemonade), and transfer printed whiteware fragments. These finds suggest a date range in the 19th or early 20th centuries.
- 5.1.2 Given the modern nature of these finds, retention for long-term curation is not recommended, and the finds will be discarded prior to archive deposition.

5.2 Environmental Evidence

5.2.1 No material suitable for environmental sampling was present within the monitored areas and accordingly no samples were taken.

6 DISCUSSION

6.1 Summary

6.1.1 Only a single archaeological feature was encountered during the evaluation. The modern nature of the artefacts recovered is unremarkable given that there have been previous



phase of occupation on this Site in modern history. The feature is likely associated with some aspect of this occupation.

6.2 Conclusions

6.2.1 The absence of any archaeological features in ten of the eleven trenches excavated and the presence of a high number of service trenches and utility pipes indicate that the Site has been disturbed in the recent past. Nevertheless, the presence of an intact subsoil within all twelve trenches on the Site indicates the disturbance caused is isolated and the general lack of archaeological features and deposits is reflective of the low archaeological potential of the Site overall.

7 STORAGE AND CURATION

7.1 Museum

7.1.1 The archive is currently held at Wessex Archaeology's Salisbury and Rochester offices under the site code **86210**. In due course it will be deposited with the local museum. The Museum has agreed in principle to accept the project archive on completion of the project.

7.2 Preparation of Archive

- 7.2.1 The complete site archive, which will include paper records, photographic records, graphics, artefacts, ecofacts and digital data, will be prepared following the standard conditions for the acceptance of excavated archaeological material by the local museum, and in general following nationally recommended guidelines (SMA 1995; IfA 2009; Brown 2011; ADS 2013).
- 7.2.2 All archive elements will be marked with the site code, and a full index will be prepared. The physical archive comprises the following:
 - 1 files/document cases of paper records & A3/A4 graphics

7.3 Discard Policy

- 7.3.1 Wessex Archaeology follows the guidelines set out in Selection, Retention and Dispersal (Society of Museum Archaeologists 1993), which allows for the discard of selected artefact and ecofact categories which are not considered to warrant any future analysis. Any discard of artefacts will be fully documented in the project archive.
- 7.3.2 The discard of environmental remains and samples follows nationally recommended guidelines (SMA 1993; 1995; English Heritage 2002).

7.4 Security Copy

7.4.1 In line with current best practice (e.g. Brown 2011), on completion of the project a security copy of the written records will be prepared, in the form of a digital PDF/A file. PDF/A is an ISO-standardised version of the Portable Document Format (PDF) designed for the digital preservation of electronic documents through omission of features ill-suited to long-term archiving.

7.5 Oasis

7.5.1 An OASIS online record http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/projects/oasis/ will be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators Forms. All appropriate parts of the OASIS online form will be completed for submission to the HER. This will include an



uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy will also be included with the archive).

8 REFERENCES

8.1 Bibliography

- ADS, 2013, Caring for Digital Data in Archaeology: a guide to good practice, Archaeology Data Service & Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice
- British Geological Survey (England and Wales) 1976, Aldershot, Drift Geology. Sheet 275, 1:50,000
- Brown, D.H., 2011, Archaeological archives; a guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation, Archaeological Archives Forum (revised edition)
- CgMs Consulting 2012, White Hart Court, Ripley Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (unpublished client report)
- English Heritage, 2002, Environmental Archaeology; a guide to theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation, Swindon, Centre for Archaeology Guidelines
- IfA 2009, Standard and Guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives, Institute for Archaeologists
- SMA 1993, Selection, Retention and Dispersal of Archaeological Collections, Society of Museum Archaeologists
- SMA 1995, Towards an Accessible Archaeological Archive, Society of Museum Archaeologists
- Wessex Archaeology 2012, White Hart Court, Ripley, Wiltshire, Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation, unpublished client report



APPENDIX 1: TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS

TRENCH	3			Type: Evaluation	Mac	chine excavated
Dimensio	Dimensions: 16.40m x 1.50m					
Co-ordina	ates: E 505331	.22 N 156	747.47 and E 505315.20 N	156743.93		
Context	Description					Depth (m)
301	Layer	containir	soil – Mid greyish brown silty ng moderate root disturbance rounded to sub-angular flint	e and occasional chall	k	0 – 0.48m
302	Layer		 Mid brown silty clay (loose hal sub-rounded to sub-angu). 			0.48 – 0.71m
303	Layer		 Mid brown silty sand (firm to patches of flint gravels (<0) 			0.71m+

TRENCH	5		Type: Evaluation I	Machine excavated					
	ns: 20.00m x 1		Ground level: 24.50 -	- 24.84m aOD					
Co-ordina	Co-ordinates: E 505397.01 N 156759.08 and E 505387.65 N 156754.90								
Context	Description			Depth (m)					
501	Layer	Made ground – Dark grey brown silty containing abundant sub-rounded to (<0.03m). Temporary cap park surface	sub-angular flint gravel	s 0 – 0.18m					
502	Layer	Made ground – Light brownish yellov containing abundant sub-angular sto layer from a temporary car park. Lies sheeting.	ne inclusions. A hardco						
503	Layer	Topsoil – Mid brownish grey silty san occasional sub-rounded to sub-angu CBM fragments. Levelled/landscaped the car park.	lar flint (<0.04m) and	0.31 – 0.55m					
504	Layer	Subsoil – Light brownish orange san sub-rounded to sub-angular flint inclu		0.55 – 0.83m					
505	Layer	Natural – Mid orange yellow sand (fir containing rare sub-rounded to sub-a		0.83m+					



TRENCH	6				Type: Evaluation	n Ma	chine excavated	
	Dimensions: 16.20m x 1.50m							
Co-ordina								
Context	Description						Depth (m)	
601	Made ground – Dark grey brown silty clay (loose) containing						0 – 0.16m	
602 Layer Made ground – Light brownish yellow gritty sandy clay (loose) containing abundant sub-angular stone inclusions. A hardcore layer from a temporary car park. Lies directly over terram sheeting.					0.16 – 0.31m			
603	Layer	occasion	 Mid brownish grey silty s nal sub-rounded to sub-an /landscaped for the const 	gul	lar flint (<0.04m).	-	0.31 – 0.61m	
604	Layer	root dist	 Dark yellowish brown saurbance and sparse sub-rost (<0.05m). 				0.61 – 0.72m	
605	Layer	containir	 Mid orange yellow sand ng occasional sub-rounded throughout. 				0.72m+	

TRENCH	7		Type: Evaluation	Mac	hine excavated						
Dimensio	ns: 18.70m x 1	1.50m Max. depth: 0.94m	Ground level: 24.75	5 – 24	I.95m aOD						
Co-ordina	Co-ordinates: E 505391.65 N 156726.53 and E 505374.26 N 156720.25										
Context	Description				Depth (m)						
701	Layer	Made ground – Dark grey brown silty common sub-rounded to sub-angular (<0.03m). Temporary car park surface	flint gravels	ng	0 – 0.19m						
702	Layer	Made ground – Light brownish yellow containing abundant sub-angular sto layer from a temporary car park. Lies sheeting.	ne inclusions. A hardo		0.19 – 0.38m						
703	Deposit	Deliberate backfill of 704 . A dark green (loose to firm) containing sparse subflint inclusions and modern artefacts.	rounded to sub-angu	lar	0.54m+ thick						
704	Cut	Modern rubbish pit. Substantially exposed within Trench 7 at is wes 2.46m in length, 1.50m in diameter Unexcavated but has almost vertice.	tern end. Measures , and is 0.54m+ deep) .	0.54m+ deep						
705	Layer	Subsoil – Dark yellowish brown sand root disturbance and sparse sub-rout inclusions (<0.05m).			0.38 – 0.52m						
706	Layer	Natural – Mid orange yellowish sand occasional sub-angular to sub-round		m).	0.52m+						



TRENCH	8			Type: Evaluation	Mad	chine excavated
	ns: 18.10m x 1		Max. depth: 0.75m	Ground level: 24.89	9 – 2	4.96m aOD
Co-ordina	ates: E 505325	.01 N 156	740.30 and E 505337.91 N	156727.61		
Context	Description					Depth (m)
801	Layer	containir	soil – Mid greyish brown silty ng moderate root disturbance ngular flint inclusions (<0.04	e and rare sub-rounde	ed	0 – 0.35m
802	Layer	containir	 Mid brownish grey silty clang sparse to occasional subsions (<0.05m). 		ar	0.35 – 0.72m
803	Layer	containir	 Mid orange brown silty sang abundant sub-rounded to (<0.06m) 		el	0.72m+

TRENCH	9			Type: Evaluation	Mac	chine excavated	
Dimensio	Dimensions: 17.80m x 1.50m						
Co-ordina	ates: E 505317	.14 N 156	731.54 and E 505321.76 N	156714.38			
Context	Description					Depth (m)	
901	Layer	containir	soil – Mid greyish brown silty ng moderate root disturbance ngular flint inclusions (<0.04	e and rare sub-rounde	ed	0 – 0.32m	
902	Layer	containir	 Mid brownish grey silty claying sparse to occasional subsions (<0.05m). 		ar	0.32 – 0.56m	
903	Layer	containir	 Mid orange brown silty san ng abundant sub-rounded to (<0.06m) 		el	0.56m+	

TRENCH	10			Type: Evaluation	Mac	hine excavated	
Dimensio	Dimensions: 3.80m x 1.50m						
Co-ordina	ates: E 505295	.99 N 156	709.08 and E 505297.17 N	156705.47			
Context	Description					Depth (m)	
1001	Layer	containir	soil – Mid greyish brown silty ng moderate root disturbance ngular flint inclusions (<0.04	e and rare sub-rounde	ed	0 – 0.45m	
1002	Layer	containir	 Mid brownish grey silty clang sparse to occasional subsions (<0.05m). 		ar	0.45 – 0.65m	
1003	Layer	containir	 Mid orange brown silty san ng sparse to occasional sub- usions (<0.06m) 		ar	0.65m+	



TRENCH	11			Type: Evaluation	Mad	chine excavated
	ns: 10.00m x 1		Max. depth: 0.68m	Ground level: 24.82	2 – 2	4.84m aOD
Co-ordina	ates: E 505303	.66 N 156	683.52 and E 505306.46 N	156673.90		
Context	Description					Depth (m)
1101	Layer	containir	soil – Mid greyish brown silty ng moderate root disturbanc ngular flint inclusions (<0.05	e and rare sub-rounde	ed	0 – 0.25m
1102	Layer	containir	 Mid brownish grey silty clang sparse to occasional subsitions (<0.03m). 		ar	0.25 – 0.62m
1103	Layer		 Mid orange and pale yellow) with pockets of clean orange 			0.62m+

TRENCH	12			Type: Evaluation	Mac	chine excavated
Dimensio	ns: 20.70m x 1	.50m	Max. depth: 0.68m	Ground level: 24.75	5 – 25	5.02m aOD
Co-ordina	Co-ordinates: E 505336.71 N 156726.40 and E 505323.01 N 156722.32					
Context	Description					Depth (m)
1201	Layer	containir	soil – Mid greyish brown silty ng moderate root disturbance ngular flint inclusions (<0.05	e and rare sub-rounde	ed	0 – 0.32m
1202	Layer	Subsoil – Mid brownish grey silty clay (firm to loose) containing sparse to occasional sub-rounded to sub-angular flint inclusions (<0.03m).			ar	0.32 – 0.56m
1203	Layer	Natural – Mid orange silty sand (loose to firm) containing sparse to occasional flint inclusions (<0.04m) mixed with occasional patches of flint gravels (<0.05m).			0.56m+	

TRENCH	13			Type: Evaluation	Mad	chine excavated
Dimensio	Dimensions: 14.30m x 1.50m Max. depth: 0.62m			Ground level: 24.91 – 25.23m aOD		
Co-ordina	ates: E 505334	.30 N 156	694.14 and E 505329.84 N	156679.45		
Context	Description					Depth (m)
1301	Layer	containir	soil – Mid greyish brown silty ng moderate root disturbance ngular flint inclusions (<0.04	e and rare sub-rounde	ed	0 – 0.39m
1302	Layer	containir flint inclu	Subsoil – Mid brownish grey silty clay (firm to loose) containing sparse to occasional sub-rounded to sub-angular flint inclusions (<0.05m) and occasional charcoal and CBM fragments.			
1303	Layer	containir	Natural – Mid orange brown sandy silt (loose to firm) containing frequent flint gravel) and occasional sub-angular flint (<0.07m)			0.59m+



TRENCH	14				Type: Evaluation	Mad	chine excavated
Dimensio	Dimensions: 6.40m x 1.50m Max. depth: 0.83m Ground level: 24.95–25.						i.02m aOD
Co-ordina	ates: E 505317.	.55 N 156	669.05 and E 505311.90 N	1 1	56665.96		
Context Description							Depth (m)
1401	Layer	containir	soil – Mid greyish brown sil ng moderate root disturban ngular flint inclusions (<0.0	ice	and rare sub-rounde	ed	0 – 0.32m
1402	Layer	Subsoil – Mid brownish orange silty clay (firm to loose) containing sparse to occasional sub-rounded to sub-angular flint inclusions (<0.05m).			0.56 – 0.79m		
1403	Layer	Natural – Clean orange yellow sand (loose to firm) with pockets of sub-rounded to sub-angular flint gravels (<0.06m).				0.79m+	

APPENDIX 2: OASIS FORM

White Hart Court, Ripley, Surrey - Wessex Archaeology

OASIS ID - wessexar1-158906

Versions							
View	Version	Completed by	Email	Date			
View 1	1	S Farr	s.farr@wessexarch.co.uk	11 September 2013			
Completed sections in current version							
Details	Location	Creators	Archive	Publications			
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1/1			
Validated s	ections in currer	nt version					
Details	Location	Creators	Archive	Publications			
No	No	No	No	0/1			
File submis	sion and form p	rogress					
Grey literatu submitted?	ire report	No	Grey literature report filename/s				
Report release specified?	ise delay	Yes	Release delay	Release into ADS library once signed off			
Images sub	mitted?	No	Image filename/s				
Boundary fi	le submitted?	No	Boundary filename				
HER signed	off?		NMR signed off?				



Site location and trench plan



Plate 1: Trench 3, viewed from the east.



Plate 2: Trench 8, viewed from the north.

	_		ī
	ı		

This mate	This material is for client report only @ Wessex Archaeology. No unauthorised reproduction.						
Date:	28/08/2012	Revision Number:	0				
Scale:	N/A Illustrator: DBJ						
Path:	Y:\PROJECTS\86210\Drawing Office\Report Figs\Eval\2013_09_11						



Plate 3: Trench 9, viewed from the south.



Plate 4: Trench 10, viewed from the south.

L		

This mate	This material is for client report only ® Wessex Archaeology. No unauthorised reproduction.							
Date:	28/08/2012	Revision Number:	0					
Scale:	N/A Illustrator: DBJ							
Path:	Y:\PROJECTS\86210\Drawing Office\Report Figs\Eval\2013_09_11							



Plate 5: Trench 11, viewed from the north.



Plate 6: Trench 12, viewed from the west.

	Ξ	

This mate	This material is for client report only @ Wessex Archaeology. No unauthorised reproduction.							
Date:	28/08/2012	Revision Number:	0					
Scale:	N/A Illustrator: DBJ							
Path:	Y:\PROJECTS\86210\Drawing Office\Report Figs\Eval\2013_09_11							



Plate 7: Trench 12, viewed from the south.



Plate 8: Trench 13, viewed from the east.

	Г		Ī

This mate	This material is for client report only @ Wessex Archaeology. No unauthorised reproduction.							
Date:	28/08/2012	Revision Number:	0					
Scale:	N/A Illustrator: DBJ							
Path:	Y:\PROJECTS\86210\Drawing Office\Report Figs\Eval\2013_09_11							



Plate 9: Trench 14, representative section, viewed from the north.



Plate 10: Trench 5, representative section, viewed from the south.

	This material is for client report only @ Wessex Archaeology. No unauthorised reproduction.				
	Date:	11/09/2013	Revision Number:	0	
	Scale:	N/A	Illustrator:	KMN	
	Path:	Y:\PROJECTS\86210\Drawing Office\Report Figs\Eval\2013_09_11			



Plate 11: Pit 704, viewed from the east.



Plate 12: Pit 704, south facing section.

	This material is for client report only @ Wessex Archaeology. No unauthorised reproduction.				
	Date:	11/09/2013	Revision Number:	0	
	Scale:	N/A	Illustrator:	KMN	
	Path:	Y:\PROJECTS\86210\Drawing Office\Report Figs\Eval\2013_09_11			







