

**LAND WEST OF FISHPONDS WAY,
HAUGHLEY,
SUFFOLK.**

NGR: TM 0304 6166 (centred)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

November 2018
Report No. 1268



ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSULTANCY, MANAGEMENT & FIELD SERVICES

**LAND WEST OF FISHPONDS WAY,
HAUGHLEY,
SUFFOLK.**

NGR: TM 0304 6166 (centred)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

HER SITE CODE: HGH 060



Urn (1003)

November 2018
Report No. 1268

Quality Assurance

This Document has been compiled and authorised in accordance with AMS's Quality Procedures (ISO 9001:2015)

Author: T. Michaels BSc ACIfA, S. McAdams BA PCIfA

Date: 20th November 2018

Approved: R. King BA MCIfA

QA Checked: D. King BA MCIfA

This report has been compiled with all reasonable skill care and attention to detail within the terms of the project as specified by the client and within the general terms and conditions of Archaeological Management Services Ltd trading as Foundations Archaeology but no explicit warranty is provided for information and opinions stated. AMS Ltd accepts no responsibility whatsoever to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies on this report at their own risk. Copyright of this document is retained by AMS Ltd, but unlimited licence to reproduce it in whole or part is granted to the client and/or their agents and/or assignees on payment of invoice.

CONTENTS

Summary

Glossary of Archaeological Terms and Abbreviations

- 1 INTRODUCTION
- 2 PROJECT BACKGROUND
- 3 AIMS
- 4 METHODOLOGY
- 5 RESULTS
- 6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
- 7 BIBLIOGRAPHY
- 8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Stratigraphic Data

Appendix 2: The Ceramics

Appendix 3: OASIS Form

Appendix 4: The Approved WSI

FIGURE LIST

Figure 1: Site Location

Figure 2: Trench Locations

Figure 3: Trench 4, Plan and Sections

Figure 4: Trench 9, Plan

Figure 5: Trench 10, Plan and Sections

Drawing No. BSA 1825/1: Figure 1: Site and Identified Heritage

SUMMARY

Between 1st and 5th October 2018 Foundations Archaeology undertook a programme of archaeological evaluation on land west of Fishponds Way, Haughley (NGR: TM 0304 6166 - centred). The project was commissioned by Ben Stephenson of BSA Heritage on behalf of Catesby Estates PLC.

The evaluation comprised the excavation and recording of fifteen trenches within the area of a proposed residential development.

The evaluation has indicated that preservation conditions, were generally good within the evaluated areas. However due to the high sand content, the visibility of the features varied from good to poor and the edges of cut features were diffuse in nature.

Archaeological features were mainly located along the southwestern boundary of the site in Trenches 4, 8 and 10. A large undated feature, most likely a quarry pit, was located in Trench 9.

Trench 4 contained dating evidence of later Neolithic to early Bronze Age activity, the rest of the features identified across the site were undated. However, two funerary urns of probable Iron Age/Romano British date were recovered from Trench 10, but they did not appear to be associated with a cut feature. It is possible that the urns relate to parallel possible linears [1007] and [1009], which may be related to the cremation cemetery.

The results of the evaluation show archaeological activity which appeared to range from the late Neolithic/early Bronze Age to the Iron Age/Romano British periods.

The geophysical survey by SUMO Geophysics did not indicate many anomalies of archaeological interest and possible features were not identified. The features present in Trenches 4, 8 and 10 were not identified by geophysics, possibly given their limited size and/or sandy soils. However, the large cut feature present in Trench 9 may have been masked by the ferrous spread identified in the same area.

GLOSSARY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Archaeology

For the purpose of this project, archaeology is taken to mean the study of past human societies through their material remains from prehistoric times to the modern era. No rigid upper date limit has been set, but AD 1900 is used as a general cut-off point.

CBM

Ceramic Building Material.

Medieval

The period between AD 1066 and AD 1500.

Natural

In archaeological terms this refers to the undisturbed natural geology of a site.

NGR

National Grid Reference from the Ordnance Survey Grid.

OD

Ordnance datum; used to express a given height above sea-level. (AOD Above Ordnance Datum).

OS

Ordnance Survey.

Post-medieval

The period between AD 1500 and AD 1900.

Prehistoric

The period prior to the Roman invasion of AD 43, traditionally sub divided into; *Palaeolithic* – c. 500,000 BC to c. 12,000 BC; *Mesolithic* – c. 12,000 BC to c. 4,500 BC; *Neolithic* – c. 4,500 BC to c. 2,000 BC; *Bronze Age* – c. 2,000 BC to c. 800 BC; *Iron Age* – c. 800 BC to AD 43.

Roman

The period traditionally dated AD 43 until AD 410.

Saxon

The period between AD 410 and AD 1066.

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report presents the findings of an archaeological evaluation undertaken by Foundations Archaeology between 1st to 5th October 2018 on land west of Fishponds Way, Haughley (NGR: TM 0304 6166 - centred). The project was commissioned by Ben Stephenson of BSA Heritage on behalf of Catesby Estates PLC.
- 1.2 The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), prepared by Foundations Archaeology (2018) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CifA) *Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation* (2014).
- 1.3 The code of conduct of the CifA was adhered to throughout.

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

- 2.1 An outline planning application has been submitted for development of residential units along with related infrastructure, landscaping and drainage on land west of Fishponds Way, Haughley.
- 2.2 The underlying geology of the site consists of *Crag Formation - Sand* with superficial deposits of *Lowestoft Formation – Diamicton* and *Lowestoft Formation - Sand and Gravel* present (BGS online viewer).
- 2.3 The wider site consists of two fallow fields bounded by woodland to the south, a sewage works to the northwest, Fishponds Way to the northeast and residential development to the north and east. However, due to guidance relating to sewage works and new residences, the northern field will not be developed but will provide public open space.
- 2.4 An initial geophysical survey was completed across the site in June 2018 by SUMO Geophysics. This did not identify any anomalies of definite archaeological interest. A number of likely natural or agricultural features were located.
- 2.5 An archaeological and heritage statement for the site was completed by BSA Heritage in 2018 and it should be read in conjunction with this document. However, the results are summarised below.
 - 2.5.1 Just over half a kilometre from the northern boundary of the site lie the Scheduled remains of Haughley Castle (MSF 5472, HGH 001), which was built shortly after the Norman Conquest. The parish church lies close to this and this area is likely to have been the focus of Anglo-Saxon and Medieval settlement.
 - 2.5.2 Within the study area probable ploughed out Bronze Age round barrows have been identified as ring ditch cropmarks on aerial photographs (MSF 22048,

Land West of Fishponds Way, Haughley, Suffolk: Archaeological Evaluation

HGH 020). Prehistoric worked flints were recovered through surface collection northwest of the site (MSF 19112, HGH 017) and works in this area have revealed traces of the later Prehistoric landscape too.

- 2.5.3 Works 400m north of the site identified probable Iron Age ditches (MSF 24911, HGH 033). The excavation of a balancing pond adjacent to the A14 revealed ditches of likely late Prehistoric or Roman date (ESF 22734, HGH 034). Roman finds in the area include a brooch from a survey to the northwest of the site and coins found during a metal detecting survey half a kilometre to the southwest of the site (MSF 10988, HGH 009). Further metal detecting to the south recovered Roman, Neolithic and Bronze Age finds.
- 2.5.4 Suffolk HER are now trying to rationalise the numbering of their records, although this was not required when the desk based assessment was completed for the site. Parish numbers prefixed HGH now take priority. For the avoidance of doubt, a table of the numbers annotated on Figure 1 from the aforementioned assessment (Drawing Number BSA 1825/1 appended to this report) and their corresponding HGH reference is set out below. MSF denotes a monument and ESF an event (ie investigation).

HER Number	Parish Code
MSF10834	HGH 008
MSF36957	HGH 058
MSF24911	HGH 033
MSF24462	HGH 043
MSF27199	HGH 042
ESF20320	HGH 038
ESF21549	HGH 047
MSF19112	HGH 017
ESF22878	N/A
MSF22048	HGH 020
MSF27199	HGH 042
MSF5477	HGH 006
MSF10988	HGH 009
MSF10989	HGH 009
MSF5472	HGH 001
ESF22734	HGH 034
280591	#
280592	#
280561	#

Listed building therefore they do not have a HGH alternative

- 2.6 Due to the identified archaeological potential of the site, the archaeological advisor to Suffolk County Council required an archaeological evaluation.

- 2.7 The main archaeological potential of the site was therefore for the presence of finds and features from the Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman and Medieval periods. This did not prejudice the evaluation against features and finds associated with other periods.

3 AIMS

- 3.1 The aims of the archaeological evaluation were to gather high quality data from the direct observation and recording of archaeological deposits in order to provide sufficient information to establish the nature, extent, preservation and potential of any surviving archaeological remains; as well as to make recommendations for the management of the resource, including further archaeological works, or preservation *in-situ*, if necessary.

- 3.2 These aims were achieved through pursuit of the following objectives:

i) to define and identify the nature of archaeological deposits on site, and date these where possible;

ii) to attempt to characterise the nature and preservation of the archaeological sequence and recover as much information as possible about the spatial patterning and extent of features present on the site;

iii) to recover a well dated stratigraphic sequence which will attempt to determine the complexity of the horizontal and vertical stratigraphy present, and to recover coherent artefact, ecofact and environmental samples;

iv) to determine the potential of the site to provide palaeoenvironmental and/or economic evidence and the forms in which such evidence may be present.

- 3.3 The site investigations will also seek to address the following site-specific research objectives in-line with the *East Anglian Research Framework* (2008, revised 2011):

i) to achieve a phased description for all periods represented within the site and to tie these into their relevant local and, where appropriate, regional contexts.

4 METHODOLOGY

- 4.1 A total of fifteen trenches were excavated within the site, as shown in Figure 2. This constituted a 4% sample of the potentially affected parts of the site. The trenches were located in order to test possible archaeological features which had been identified by the previous geophysical survey and to provide a representative sample across the site.

- 4.1.1 Non-significant overburden was removed under constant archaeological supervision, to the top of archaeological remains or the underlying natural

deposits, whichever was encountered first. This was achieved through the use of a mechanical excavator, equipped with a toothless grading bucket. Spoil tips and the excavated trenches were scanned for finds by use of a metal detector.

- 4.2 All excavation and recording work was undertaken in accordance with the WSI and the Foundations Archaeology Technical Manual 3: Excavation Manual.

5 RESULTS

- 5.1 A full description of all contexts identified during the course of the evaluation is presented in Appendix 1, along with a note on the analysed ceramics in Appendix 2. A summary of the results is given below.
- 5.2 The natural sands and clays were present at a depth of between 0.35m to 1.32m below Modern ground, with the natural sloping down from 44.22 OD in Trench 3 in the northeast to 37.58m OD in Trench 14 to the southeast. The general stratigraphic sequence overlying the natural substrates comprised subsoil, overlaid by topsoil. However, subsoil was not present within Trenches 3, 6, 7 and 9, which were located in the northeast and central parts of the site.
- 5.3 Archaeological features were identified in Trenches 4, 8 and 10, with a large quarry type feature present in Trench 9.
- 5.4 Trench 4 contained three discrete features, [403], [405] and [407]. Features [403] and [407] were either postholes or small pits. Feature [405] was only partly contained within the evaluation trench and may have been a ditch terminus or a steep sided pit. All three features contained pottery sherds of later Neolithic/early Bronze Age Beaker, as well as frequent charcoal inclusions. The three features all contained a similar dark brown grey firm silty sand with rare stone inclusions and it is likely that these features were contemporary.
- 5.5 Trench 8 contained two discrete features [803] and [805]. Cut [803] was a small elongated pit on a northwest-southeast alignment, which contained charcoal flecks, but no further artefactual evidence. Cut [805] was a sub-circular pit with steep sides and a flat base. This feature also only contained charcoal flecks.
- 5.6 Trench 9 contained a substantial cut feature [903], which was over 9.5m in length, more than 1.2m wide and over 0.95m deep. The feature contained multiple mixed fills and was most likely a quarry pit. The feature did not contain any artefactual deposits and therefore remains undated.
- 5.7 Trench 10 contained two probable linear features [1007] and [1009], along with a probable animal burrow [1005]. Also present within the trench were two cremation urns (1003) and (1004), which were located next to each other. Urn (1003) was almost complete, but, only the base of urn (1004) survived

and the edges of the surviving base suggest that the breakage happened in antiquity.

- 5.8 Both vessels were wrapped onsite for protection and have not yet been analysed, however, the urns were identified as probably Iron Age/Romano British in date from photographic evidence by our prehistoric pottery specialist. No cut could be ascertained for the cremations, however, the natural varied across the length of the trench, which may have hampered identification. Linear features [1007] and [1009], were both on a northwest-southeast alignment. Neither feature contained charcoal nor any further artefactual evidence and upon excavation were considered to be probable natural bands in the sand. However, as the two cremation urns were located between these 'linears' it is possible that the features are related to each other.

6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The evaluation has indicated that preservation conditions, were generally good within the evaluated areas. However due to the high sand content, the visibility of the features varied from good to poor and the edges of cut features were diffuse in nature.
- 6.2 Archaeological features were mainly located along the southwestern boundary of the site in Trenches 4, 8 and 10. With a large undated feature, most likely a quarry pit, located in Trench 9.
- 6.3 Trench 4 contained dating evidence of later Neolithic to early Bronze Age activity. The rest of the possible archaeological features identified across the site were undated. Two funerary urns of probable Iron Age/Romano British date were recovered from Trench 10, but they did not appear to be associated with a cut feature. It is possible that the urns relate to parallel linears [1007] and [1009], given their proximity.
- 6.4 The results of the evaluation show archaeological activity which appeared to range from the late Neolithic/early Bronze Age to the Iron Age/Romano-British periods.
- 6.4.1 Ring ditch crop marks which are thought to be ploughed out Bronze Age barrows had been identified by aerial photography within the study area (see 2.5.2). The dates of the discrete features present in Trench 4 would correlate well with this phase of activity and are likely to be contemporary. Subsequent works in the vicinity would have the potential to identify further Neolithic/Early Bronze Age activity and should be compared to the research agenda objectives for the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age in the East Anglian Regional Framework.
- 6.4.2 There is evidence for Bronze Age barrows to provide a focus for later activity, it is possible that the presence of Late Iron Age/Romano British funerary urns within Trench 10 could be a continuation of this tradition. If further works are required, it could be useful to tie in the location of the cremations identified in

this phase of works with the ring ditches plotted from aerial photography to see if there is any correlation between the two phases of activity.

- 6.5 The geophysical survey by SUMO Geophysics did not indicate any anomalies of definite archaeological interest. The features present in Trenches 4, 8 and 10 were not identified by geophysics, possibly given their limited size or the sandy soils. However, the large cut feature present in Trench 9 may have been masked by the ferrous spread identified in the same area.
- 6.6 The archive is currently held at the offices of Foundations Archaeology, but will be deposited in due course with the SCCAS. A short note will be submitted for publication in the relevant local archaeological journal and an OASIS form (Ref: foundati-334446) has been submitted.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

BSA Heritage. 2018. *Land West of Fishponds Way, Haughley, Suffolk. Archaeology and Heritage Statement*. Unpublished.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. 2014. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation*. Reading.

Foundations Archaeology. 2018. *Land West of Fishponds Way, Haughley, Suffolk: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation*. Unpublished.

Medlycott, M. 2011. *East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper No.24. Research and Archaeology Revisited: A Revised Framework for the East of England*.

SUMO Geophysics. 2018. *Land off Fishponds Way, Haughley, Suffolk*. Unpublished

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foundations Archaeology would like to thank Rachael Abraham and Hannah Cutler of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service and Ben Stephenson of BSA Heritage for their help during the course of the project.