



# **A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements Nottinghamshire**

## **Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief Report**

**Prepared for:**

Carillion Civil Engineering  
84 Salop Street  
Wolverhampton  
WV3 0SR

**Prepared by:**

Wessex Archaeology  
Unit R6, Sheaf Bank Business Park  
Prospect Road  
Sheffield  
S2 3EN

[www.wessexarch.co.uk](http://www.wessexarch.co.uk)

**February 2015**

**Report Ref 102320.03**



## Quality Assurance

<b>Project Code</b>	102320	<b>Accession Code</b>		<b>Client Ref.</b>	NA
<b>Planning Application Ref.</b>	n/a	<b>Ordnance Survey (OS) national grid reference (NGR)</b>	46812 37597		

<b>Version</b>	<b>Status*</b>	<b>Prepared by</b>	<b>Checked and Approved By</b>	<b>Approver's Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
v01	I	SDB, BU, MT & AR			
File:	S:\PROJECTS\102320 (A1 Elkesley Junction Improvement_Carillion)\Report				
V02	E	AWT	RJO		29/8/2014
File:	S:\PROJECTS\102320 (A1 Elkesley Junction Improvement_Carillion)\Report\V2\				
V03	E	AWT			
File:	S:\PROJECTS\102320 (A1 Elkesley Junction Improvement_Carillion)\Report\V3\				
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.



# A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements Nottinghamshire

## Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief Report

### Contents

Summary .....	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
<b>1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Project background .....	5
1.2 Location, topography and geology.....	5
<b>2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	5
2.2 Prehistoric, Roman and medieval.....	6
2.3 Post-medieval and modern.....	6
<b>3 METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 General .....	6
3.2 Aims and objectives .....	7
<b>4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Evaluation .....	7
4.2 General stratigraphy.....	7
4.3 Romano-British .....	7
4.4 Post-medieval .....	8
4.5 Modern.....	8
<b>5 FINDS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
5.2 Pottery.....	8
5.3 Ceramic Building Material.....	9
5.4 Clay Tobacco Pipes .....	9
5.5 Glass.....	9
5.6 Other Finds .....	9
5.7 Potential and further recommendations .....	9
<b>6 DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>10</b>
6.1 Conclusion .....	10
<b>7 ARCHIVE STORAGE AND CURATION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
7.1 Museum .....	10



7.2	Preparation of archive .....	10
7.3	Discard policy .....	10
7.4	Security Copy .....	10
<b>8</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>12</b>
8.1	Bibliography .....	12
8.2	Online sources .....	12
<b>9</b>	<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>14</b>
9.1	Appendix 1: Context descriptions .....	14
9.2	Appendix 2: OASIS Forms .....	17
	OASIS ID: wessexar1-182095 .....	17

## Tables

Table 1: All finds by context (number / weight in grammes)

## Figures

Figure 1: Site location, trench plan and geophysical survey results

Figure 2: Evaluation and watching brief results

Figure 3: Plan and section of Romano-British field boundary **1606 = 1608**

Figure 4: Plan and section of post-medieval gullies including **1603 = 1604 = 1605**

## Plates

Front cover: Machine excavation of **Trench 9**

Plate 1: General view of **Trench 2** from southeast

Plate 2: South-west facing section of **Trench 7**

Plate 3: Overview of **Area 16**

Plate 4: Representative section of **Trench 11** from northwest

Plate 5: Romano-British field boundary **1606 = 1608** from south

Plate 6: Post-medieval gully **1603** from south

Plate 7: Detail of north-west facing section of **Trench 7** showing upper edge of modern machine cut feature (**704**) filled with sterile, imported sand (**705**)



# **A1 Elkesley Junction Nottinghamshire**

## **Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief Report**

### **Summary**

Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Carillion Civil Engineering to undertake an archaeological investigation in advance of the A1 junction improvements at Elkesley, Nottinghamshire, National Grid Reference 457762 376000. The investigation comprised an initial geophysical survey followed by the excavation of fourteen targeted evaluation trenches and concluded with an archaeological watching brief on the topsoil stripping.

A single degraded Romano-British field boundary was found. This suggests that a Romano-British field system once existed on Site but that survival is very poor.

Nothing was found which correlated with the existing cropmark data covering the Site. Most geophysical anomalies were explained as variations in the natural geological substrate. One geophysical anomaly correlated with a modern intervention and one correlated with a modern service.

A patch of parallel post-medieval gullies was also recorded.

The presence of an unstratified prehistoric flint and three sherds of medieval pottery from the topsoil along with the Romano-British ditch demonstrate a long period of use of the Site. However, deep ploughing has occurred, which likely removed any archaeology that may once have been present.

The archive is currently held at the offices of Wessex Archaeology in Sheffield, under the project code **102320**. It is recommended that the project archive be deposited with Bassetlaw Museum under the contracting unit's site code (**102320**). An OASIS form, ID number wessexar1-182095, has been provisionally completed and will be finally submitted at the time of deposition.



# **A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements Nottinghamshire**

## **Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief Report**

### **Acknowledgements**

This project was commissioned by Carillion Civil Engineering and Wessex Archaeology is grateful to Ian Bingham and Barry Smith in this respect. The scheme was monitored by Dr Chris Robinson, archaeological officer in the conservation team at Nottinghamshire County Council, and Wessex Archaeology is grateful for his help and assistance throughout the works.

The evaluation was carried out by Sean Bell and Jonathan Buttery. The watching brief fieldwork was undertaken by Sean Bell, Laurence Savage, Phillip Maier and Martina Tenzer. Ashley Tuck, Sean Bell, Martina Tenzer, and Andy Reid compiled the report. Illustrations were completed by Alix Sperr and Chris Breeden, and artefacts were analysed by Lorraine Mephram. The project was managed for Wessex Archaeology by Richard O'Neill.



# A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements Nottinghamshire

## Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief Report

### 1 INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Project background

- 1.1.1 Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Carillion Civil Engineering (hereafter ‘the Client’) to undertake an archaeological investigation in advance of the A1 junction improvements at Elkesley, Nottinghamshire, National Grid Reference (NGR) 457762 376000 (hereafter ‘the Site’; **Figure 1**). The Site has previously been subject to a baseline study of the known cultural heritage assets in the area (Mouchel 2008 and 2009).
- 1.1.2 The archaeological work followed on from a geophysical survey (Wessex Archaeology 2014) and consisted of an archaeological evaluation and watching brief. A written scheme of investigation (WSI, Wessex Archaeology 2012) was prepared in accordance with current industry best practice (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, ClfA 2014a and 2014b) and in accordance with ClfA codes of conduct (2014c), and was submitted to Dr Chris Robinson, archaeological officer in the conservation team at Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) for approval.
- 1.1.3 This report summarises the results of both the evaluation and the watching brief. It has been compiled in accordance with MAP2 and MoRPHE guidelines (English Heritage 1991 and 2006).

#### 1.2 Location, topography and geology

- 1.2.1 The Site is located to the north-west of the village of Elkesley, on either side of the A1 Worksop Road, and comprises an irregular parcel of land 6.1ha in size (**Figure 1**). The Site is bounded to the south by Coalpit Lane, and joins on to Cross Lane to the north of the A1, although a small leg extends beyond this. In the east, the Site is bounded by the existing junction between Coalpit Lane and the A1.
- 1.2.2 The Site is located on gently undulating arable land. The underlying geology of the Site is mapped as the Nottingham Castle Sandstone Formation which consists of pebbly/gravelly sandstone. No superficial deposits are recorded (<http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>).

### 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

#### 2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 The following information is a summary of the known and potential cultural heritage assets within a 1km study area of a central point in the scheme. This information is derived from

Mouchel 2008, Mouchel 2009, and from information available online at Heritage Gateway (<http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/Gateway/>).

- 2.1.2 According to the Historic Landscape Characterisation undertaken by Nottinghamshire County Council, the study area lies within a landscape characterised by regular geometric fields, irregular fields, modern fields, modified modern fields and semi-irregular fields.

## **2.2 Prehistoric, Roman and medieval**

- 2.2.1 Whilst earlier activity in the general area is represented by a single Late Bronze Age findspot, the most relevant archaeological features for the scheme are a collection of linear crop marks which appear to the west and northwest. From the transcribed plans parts of these features appear to intersect with the proposed layout of the junction improvements where the improvements run parallel to the current A1(T).
- 2.2.2 Crop marks of this type appear to be largely formed through the presence of buried ditches, which form a series of regular and irregular enclosures, track ways and settlement nuclei. These types of enclosures are relatively common in North Nottinghamshire and South Yorkshire and excavation suggests that elements of these may date to the latter part of the first millennium BC and/or the Romano-British period. Roman pottery and coins were reportedly discovered in a field to the north of the A1 and an Iron Age saddle quern was reportedly recovered from a field located between Coal Pit Lane and the A1.
- 2.2.3 Early Medieval activity within the area is characterised by a single stray find, a Viking Age pin found at Elkesley Wood.
- 2.2.4 The Grade I Listed Building within the village, St. Giles Church, which lies within 1km of the Site, presents the earliest definitive evidence for the settlement of Elkesley dating from at least c.1300 with later additions in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century.

## **2.3 Post-medieval and modern**

- 2.3.1 Nearby 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century buildings are considered to be of local historical and architectural interest. This includes listed buildings at Portland Farm and Meadow Farm. An 18<sup>th</sup> century milestone is also recorded on Jockey Lane.
- 2.3.2 A former World War Two and Cold War military airfield is also located to the northeast.

## **3 METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1 General**

- 3.1.1 The Written Scheme of Investigation (Wessex Archaeology 2013) proposed an evaluation comprising a total of fourteen trenches. The locations of these trenches are shown in **Figure 2**. Due to on-site constraints regarding buried services, Trench 13 was not excavated. Trench 5 was reduced in length by 5m due to the presence of an active geotechnical borehole.
- 3.1.2 An archaeological watching brief followed to attempt to find archaeological features or deposits within the Site boundaries. During the watching brief, the Site was divided into



areas 15 through 19 for the purposes of recording (**Figure 2**). Area 19 was not monitored by an archaeologist.

3.1.3 All archaeological features and deposits encountered were recorded using Wessex Archaeology's *pro forma* recording sheets and a continuous unique numbering system.

3.1.4 Topsoil and overburden has been removed using a mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket and monitored by a suitably experienced archaeologist. Possible archaeological features were then investigated by hand excavation. A full photographic record was maintained consisting of digital images.

### 3.2 Aims and objectives

3.2.1 The aims of the archaeological evaluation were:

- *to record, as far as is reasonably possible, the location, extent, date, character, condition, significance and quality of any surviving archaeological remains observed;*
- *to provide sufficient information to enable an informed decision to be made about the need for additional archaeological mitigation;*
- *to investigate geophysical anomalies revealed by the previous survey, and;*
- *to make available the results of the work.*

3.2.2 The watching brief addressed two specific aims:

- *to determine the extent, condition, character, importance and date of any archaeological deposit encountered;*
- *to produce an accurate comprehensive record and report.*

## 4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS

### 4.1 Evaluation

4.1.1 The following section provides a summary of the information held in the Site archive, with a full list of context numbers and context descriptions within each trench contained in **Appendix 1**.

### 4.2 General stratigraphy

4.2.1 The undisturbed natural geological substrate was typically seen at c.0.5m below ground level (BGL) and comprised orangey- or yellowy-brown sand (e.g. **203**, **Plate 1**). In **Trenches 3, 7, 8** and **11** it was instead red clay or clayey sand (e.g. **703**, **Plate 2**). During the watching brief (**Plate 3**) these red clay areas were seen to form large patches within the brown sand natural. **Trench 14** contained both types of natural (**1403** and **1404**), and the interface between these correlated with a geophysical anomaly. Reddish-brown sand relic ploughsoil subsoil 0.2m deep (e.g. **102**) was present in all trenches except **Trench 11** (**Plate 4**). Topsoil was dark brown sandy silt (e.g. **101**), and was between 0.3m and 0.36m thick.

### 4.3 Romano-British

4.3.1 A linear feature, (**1606 = 1608**, **Figure 3**, **Plate 5**), was recorded as part of the watching brief in **Area 16**. It was clearly visible in plan but was extremely small in section, and was highly disturbed by root action. The feature likely represents a former field boundary and was filled with a deposit of yellow and red sand mixed with patches of topsoil (**1607** and

**1609**). A single sherd of Romano-British pottery was recovered from fill **1607**. This feature did not correlate with any cropmark data although it does correlate with a trend present on the geophysics interpreted as ploughing.

#### **4.4 Post-medieval**

4.4.1 A series of parallel north-south gullies was observed in **Area 16**. These gullies were spaced at approximately 1m intervals and defy interpretation; they are too round and wide for plough scars and too close together to be the remnants of drains. These gullies were all similar and three slots, **1603**, **1604** and **1605** were recorded from one of the gullies. Gully **1603** (**Figure 4, Plate 6**) was 39m long, 0.43m wide and 0.06m deep, with a mid greyish brown silty sand fill. Post medieval pottery and clay pipe from these features was bagged along with topsoil finds as **1601**.

#### **4.5 Modern**

4.5.1 A linear machine-excavated cut (**704, Plate 6**), running from north-east to south-west, was identified in **Trench 7**. This was 1.8m wide, had a U-shaped profile, 1.6m in depth, with very steep sides and a sharp break of slope at the top. It was filled with imported sterile sand (**705**), somewhat mixed with the topsoil (**701**). The location of this feature corresponded with an anomaly and area of increased magnetic response identified by the geophysical survey as **4005**.

## **5 FINDS**

By Lorraine Mepham

5.1.1 A very small quantity of finds was recovered during the watching brief on the Site (no finds were recovered from the preceding evaluation). These finds derived from topsoil in two areas (Areas 15 and 16), and from one cut feature in Area 16; one item was also recovered as an unstratified find in Area 17. Quantities by material type are given in Table 1. The assemblage is predominantly of post-medieval date, with a few earlier items (prehistoric, Romano-British, medieval).

### **5.2 Pottery**

5.2.1 Pottery was the most commonly occurring material type encountered, and therefore provides most of the dating evidence. Of the 50 sherds recovered, one is Romano-British, three are medieval, and the remainder post-medieval.

#### *Romano-British*

5.2.2 A small, very abraded rim sherd from an everted rim jar in a fine, oxidised fabric, possibly Oxfordshire colour coated ware, was recovered from fill 1607 of ditch 1606/1608 in Area 16.

#### *Medieval*

5.2.3 Three medieval sherds were recovered from the topsoil in Area 16 (1601). These comprise two undiagnostic body sherds in coarse sandy fabrics, and a sherd from the neck of a glazed jug in a finer sandy fabric, identified as Nottingham Reduced Green Glazed ware, dated late 13th to early 15th century (Nailor and Young 2001, fabric type NOTGR). All three sherds are heavily abraded.



### *Post-medieval*

- 5.2.4 The remaining 46 sherds are post-medieval, and have a probable date range of late 17th to 20th century. Ware types include coarse redwares (some black-glazed), Staffordshire-type trailed slipware and manganese mottled ware, English stonewares, and later factory produced finewares (creamware, pearlware, whiteware, yellow ware). All post-medieval sherds came from topsoil contexts.

## **5.3 Ceramic Building Material**

- 5.3.1 This category comprises fragments of post-medieval bricks; these are too small to ascertain brick dimensions or overall form. All came from the topsoil in Area 16.

## **5.4 Clay Tobacco Pipes**

- 5.4.1 The clay pipes consist entirely of plain stem fragments, which are not more closely datable within the post-medieval period. All fragments came from the topsoil in Area 16.

## **5.5 Glass**

- 5.5.1 Two bottles were found in the topsoil in Area 15. Both are beverage bottles of late 19th or early 20th century date; the more complete example is embossed with the mark of G W Waugh, mineral water manufacturer of Bromley Street, Sheffield (not listed in Kelly's Directory for 1893, but pre-dating the company's incorporation in 1903, and by 1905 listed in White's Directory in Douglas Road), while the second, of which only the lower part survives, carries a partial mark ([...]STON'S / [...] WINES).

- 5.5.2 The three other fragments of glass recovered comprise one fragment of a similar beverage bottle, one from a green glass wine bottle of 18th century date or later, and a small piece in opaque white glass, possibly from a lampshade.

## **5.6 Other Finds**

- 5.6.1 Other finds comprise one prehistoric worked flint flake (found unstratified in Area 17), and three iron objects from Area 16 topsoil (nail, tapering bar and small strip fragment).

## **5.7 Potential and further recommendations**

- 5.7.1 This is a small assemblage, largely of relatively recent date, containing no items of more than limited local interest, and deriving almost entirely from topsoil contexts. As such, it has little or no potential for further research. Retention for long-term curation is not recommended.

**Table 1: All finds by context (number / weight in grammes)**

<b>Context</b>	<b>CBM</b>	<b>Clay Pipe</b>	<b>Glass</b>	<b>Pottery</b>	<b>Other Finds</b>
1501			3/844	9/195	
1601	8/111	13/25	2/9	40/324	3 iron
1607				1/3	
Area 17 unstrat					1 flint
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>8/111</b>	<b>13/25</b>	<b>5/853</b>	<b>50/522</b>	



## **6 DISCUSSION**

### **6.1 Conclusion**

- 6.1.1 A single degraded Romano-British field boundary was found (**1606** and **1608**). This suggests that a Romano-British field system once existed on Site but that survival is very poor.
- 6.1.2 Nothing was found which correlated with the existing cropmark data covering the Site. Most geophysical anomalies were explained as variations in the natural geological substrate. One geophysical anomaly correlated with a modern intervention and one correlated with a modern service.
- 6.1.3 A patch of parallel post-medieval gullies was also recorded.
- 6.1.4 The presence of an unstratified prehistoric flint and three sherds of medieval pottery from the topsoil along with the Romano-British ditch demonstrate a long period of use of the Site. However, deep ploughing has occurred, which likely removed any archaeology that may once have been present.

## **7 ARCHIVE STORAGE AND CURATION**

### **7.1 Museum**

- 7.1.1 It is recommended that the project archive resulting from the excavation be deposited with Bassetlaw Museum. The Museum has agreed in principle to accept the project archive on completion of the project under site code 102320. Deposition of any finds with the Museum will only be carried out with the full agreement of the landowner.

### **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 Bassetlaw Museum, and in general following nationally recommended guidelines (SMA 1995; ClfA 2014b; Brown 2011; ADS 2013).
- 7.2.2 All archive elements will be marked with the site code, and a full index will be prepared.

### **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 2011).

### **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.



## 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
- Brown, D.H., 2011, Archaeological archives; a guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation, Archaeological Archives Forum (revised edition)
- English Heritage, 1991, Management of Archaeological Projects 2 ('MAP2')
- English Heritage, 2006, Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide
- English Heritage, 2011, Environmental Archaeology; a guide to theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation, Swindon, Centre for Archaeology Guidelines
- ClfA, 2014a, Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation
- ClfA, 2014b, Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials
- ClfA, 2014c, Codes of Conduct
- Mouchel, 2008, A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements, Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Report
- Mouchel, 2009, A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements, Stage 3 Environmental Assessment Report
- Nailor, V. and Young, J., 2001, A fabric type series for post-Roman pottery in Nottingham (5th to 16th centuries), unpublished manuscript
- Society of Museum Archaeologists (SMA), 1993, Selection, Retention and Dispersal of Archaeological Collections, Society of Museum Archaeologists
- Society of Museum Archaeologists (SMA), 1995, Towards an Accessible Archaeological Archive, Society of Museum Archaeologists
- Wessex Archaeology, 2013, A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements, Nottinghamshire. Written Scheme of Investigation for Geophysical Survey and Archaeological Trial Trenching, unpublished client report reference 102320.02
- Wessex Archaeology, 2014. A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements, Nottinghamshire. Geophysical Survey, unpublished client report reference 102320.01

### 8.2 Online sources

- NERC, 2014, Geology of Britain online viewer, accessed 12/08/14, <http://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringgeology/geologyofbritain/viewer.html>



Heritage Gateway, 2014, Heritage Gateway, accessed 29/8/14,  
<http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/gateway/>



## 9 APPENDICES

### 9.1 Appendix 1: Context descriptions

Evaluation			
Trench	Context	Type	Description
1	101	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.3m thick
1	102	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.2m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
1	103	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue.
2	201	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.3m thick
2	202	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.25m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
2	203	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue.
3	301	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.32m thick.
3	302	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.22m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
3	303	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with bands of red-brown sandy clay.
4	401	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.31m thick
4	402	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.19m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
4	403	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue. Isolated, small amorphous coal deposit towards west end of trench.
5	501	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.32m thick.
5	502	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.22m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
5	503	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue.
6	601	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.39m thick.
6	602	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.14m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
6	603	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue.
7	701	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.36m thick.
7	702	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.09m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
7	703	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue.
7	704	Cut	U-shaped cut: 1.8m wide, 1.6m deep.
7	705	Fill	Clean, sorted sand filling [704].
8	801	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.37m thick.
8	802	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.08m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
8	803	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue and bands of pale yellow sand.
9	901	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.31m thick.
9	902	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.33m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
9	903	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue.





10	1001	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.3m thick
10	1002	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.3m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
10	1003	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue and bands of pale yellow sand.
11	1101	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.3m thick
11	1102	Layer	Natural - Dark red-brown clayey sand.
12	1201	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.32m thick.
12	1202	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.38m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
12	1203	Layer	Natural - Red-brown sand with pinkish hue and bands of pale yellow sand.
14	1401	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. 0.36m thick.
14	1402	Layer	Reddish mid-brown sandy silt subsoil, 0.26 to 0.42m thick, with occasional pebbled stones.
14	1403	Layer	Natural - Mottled yellow and red-brown sand.
14	1404	Layer	Natural - Dark red-brown clayey sand.
<b>Watching Brief</b>			
Area	Context	Type	Description
15	1501	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil with red hue, 0.2-0.3m thick.
15	1502	Layer	Yellow sand subsoil with reddish hue, with frequent pebble stone inclusions <0.05m in diameter.
16	1601	Layer	Mid-brown sandy silt topsoil. Finds of pottery, clay pipe stem pieced and CBM within deep ploughing scars running in a north-south alignment. 0.2-0.4m thick.
16	1602	Layer	Natural – light yellowish red sand with patches of red sand and lighter clayey sand. Inclusions of rounded pebbles approximately 1-20cm in diameter. Plough scars also visible.
16	1603	Cut	Linear feature 0.43m wide and 0.06m deep with a shallow side slope, irregular side shape and irregularly shaped base running in a north-south alignment. Interpreted as a plough scar - similar to [1604] and [1605]. Filled with (1601).
16	1604	Cut	Linear feature 0.26m wide and 0.05m deep with a shallow side slope, irregular side shape and irregularly shaped base running in a north-south alignment. Interpreted as a plough scar - similar to [1603] and [1605]. Filled with (1601).
16	1605	Cut	Linear feature 0.39m wide and 0.06m deep with a shallow side slope, irregular side shape and irregularly shaped base running in a north-south alignment. Interpreted as a plough scar - similar to [1603] and [1604]. Filled with (1601).
16	1606	Cut	Linear feature 0.49m wide aligned northwest-southeast. Filled with (1607). Visible in plan but not in section. Feature was in a very disturbed area. Interpreted as a former field boundary/hedgerow.
16	1607	Fill	Mixed deposit of yellow and red sand with patches of red clay and small areas of topsoil. Rounded pebble inclusions. Contained pottery. Fill of [1606]



16	1608	Cut	Linear feature aligned northwest-southeast. Filled with (1609). Visible in plan but not in section. Feature was in a very disturbed area. Interpreted as a former field boundary/hedgerow.
16	1609	Fill	Mixed deposit of mainly red sand with rounded pebbles. Fill of [1608].
17	1701	Layer	Light-brown sand with common stone inclusions varying from 5mm to 30-40mm in diameter. 0.3m thick.
17	1702	Layer	Natural – Reddish-brown sand/occasionally clayey-sand with stone inclusions.



## 9.2 Appendix 2: OASIS Forms

### OASIS ID: wessexar1-182095

#### Project details

Project name	A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements
Short description of the project	Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Carillion Civil Engineering to undertake an archaeological evaluation in advance of the A1 junction improvements at Elkesley, Nottinghamshire DN22 8BN. The site has previously been subject to a detailed gradiometer survey covering 8.2ha and demonstrated the presence of a number of anomalies of possible archaeological interest within the survey area, along with regions of increased magnetic response. On the basis of this survey a scheme of archaeological evaluation by trial trenching was devised. This consisted of fourteen machine-excavated trenches located to both the north and south of the A1 carriageway in adjacent agricultural land. No features, deposits or material of archaeological significance were identified during the evaluation fieldwork.
Project dates	Start: 24-03-2014 End: 20-06-2014
Previous/future work	Yes / Not known
Any associated project reference codes	102320 - Sitecode
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Current Land use	Cultivated Land 4 - Character Undetermined
Monument type	FIELD BOUNDARY Roman
Significant Finds	POTTERY Roman
Significant Finds	POTTERY Medieval
Significant Finds	FLINT Uncertain
Methods & techniques	"Targeted Trenches", "Visual Inspection"
Development type	Road scheme (new and widening)
Prompt	Planning condition
Position in the planning process	Not known / Not recorded

#### Project location

Country	England
Site location	NOTTINGHAMSHIRE BASSETLAW ELKESLEY A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements Nottinghamshire



Postcode	DN22 8BN
Study area	6.10 Hectares
Site coordinates	SK 468246 376303 52.9337125138 -1.30326947672 52 56 01 N 001 18 11 W Point

#### Project creators

Name of Organisation	Wessex Archaeology
Project brief originator	Carillion
Project design originator	Wessex Archaeology
Project director/manager	R. O'Neill
Project supervisor	Sean Bell
Type of sponsor/funding body	Developer

#### Project archives

Physical Archive recipient	Bassetlaw Museum
Physical Contents	"Ceramics", "Worked stone/lithics"
Digital Archive recipient	Bassetlaw Museum
Digital Media available	"Images raster / digital photography", "Survey"
Paper Archive recipient	Bassetlaw Museum
Paper Media available	"Context sheet", "Diary", "Drawing", "Notebook - Excavation", ' Research', ' General Notes', "Photograph", "Report"

#### Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	A1 Elkesley Junction Improvements Nottinghamshire Archaeological Assessment Report
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Wessex Archaeology
Date	2015



Issuer or publisher	Wessex Archaeology
Place of issue or publication	Sheffield
Description	A4 comb bound laser printed report
Entered by	Ashley Tuck (a.tuck@wessexarch.co.uk)
Entered on	3 February 2015