



# • cambridgeshirearchaeology

archaeological field unit

**CAM ARC Report Number 954** 

# Late Medieval and Postmedieval Remains at the Queensgate Centre and Westgate Arcade, Peterborough

### **An Archaeological Excavation**

Rebecca Casa Hatton, Tony Baker and Spencer Cooper

June 2007

Commissioned by Lambert Scott & Innes Architects on behalf of Norwich Union

**CAMARC Report Number 954** 

Late Medieval and Postmedieval Remains at the Queensgate Centre and Westgate Arcade, Peterborough

#### **An Archaeological Excavation**

Rebecca Casa Hatton PhD, Tony Baker and Spencer Cooper MA

With contributions by: Ian Baxter BA MIFA Nina Crummy BA FSA Carole Fletcher MA Val Fryer MA MIFA FSA (Scot) Quita Mould BA MA FSA

Site Code: PET QC 01 Date of works: October-November 2001 Grid Ref: NGR TL 5488 2658

Editor: Elizabeth Shepherd Popescu, PhD and Mo Muldowney BA PIFA Illustrators: Crane Begg BSc (Hons), Carlos Silva and Leomie Willoughby-Ellis

## Summary

Between the 19th October and the 25th November 2001, Cambridgeshire County Council's CAM ARC, carried out an archaeological excavation on land adjacent to Westgate Arcade, Peterborough (NGR TL 5488 2658), in advance of the proposed construction of a single shop unit. The work was commissioned by Lambert Scott & Innes Architects, on behalf of Norwich Union. The excavation followed an earlier phase of evaluation that had produced evidence for late medieval pits and post-medieval yards/surfaces in the northern part of the proposed development site. The southern part had been severely truncated by modern intervention and was therefore excluded from the subsequent phase of excavation.

The excavation targeted a small area of some 15m by 7m adjacent to the covered shopping areas of Queensgate Centre and Westgate Arcade. It revealed up to 1.6m of stratigraphy dating from the late medieval period to the present day, confirming the results from the previous evaluation. The earliest phase of activity (Phase 1) dated to the 15th century and included a boundary/structural wall identified in the northern part of the site, and a cobbled surface which could have represented either a backyard of an unidentified street-frontage property, or an early phase of Cumbergate. Later dumping layers and pits (Phases 2 and 3, respectively) produced a large assemblage of well-preserved leather of late 14th-early 15th century date, the presence of which could suggest a cobbler's workshop in the vicinity of the site. Post-medieval activity (Phase 4) was represented by a series of surfaces probably associated with the construction and maintenance of Cumbergate. Modern features (Phase 5) included a number of service trenches that had truncated the earlier stratigraphic sequences, also causing some degree of contamination.

As a whole, the findings from the excavation appear to be consistent with the presence of a relatively low status urban site characterised by light industrial activities and, in particular, leather craft specialisation (skinning and cobbling), in the later medieval period. The evidence would also suggest that Cumbergate was created in its present form after the middle of the 16th century.

## Contents

1		Introduction					
2		Geolo	gy and Topography	1			
3		Archa	eological and Historical Background	1			
		3.1 3.2	Origins of Peterborough The Site	2 5			
4	Methodology Results						
5		Result	ts	11			
		5.1 5.2	Summary Excavation Results By Phase	11 12			
	6	Discus	ssion	15			
		6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4	Specialist Work (Summaries) Phase Summaries Cumbergate The Site	15 18 20 22			
7		Conclu	usions	23			
		Ackno	owledgements	25			
		Biblio	graphy	25			

## List of Figures

Figure 1:	Site location with previous archaeological investigations	66
Figure 2:	A model for the 'New Town'	67
Figure 3:	Speed's map (1613)	68
Figure 4:	Eyre's map (1721)	69
Figure 5:	Hill's map (1808)	70
Figure 6a:	OS 1st edition (1886)	71
Figure 6b:	OS 1967-78 edition	72
Figure 7a:	Plans of Phases 1 and 2a/b	73
Figure 7b:	Plans of Phases 3 and 4a	74
Figure 8a:	Plans of Phases 4b and 4c	75
Figure 8b:	Plans of Phases 4d and 5	76
Figure 9:	West facing section	77
Figure 10:	Shoe styles found	78
Figure 11:	Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)	79
Figure 12:	Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)	80
Figure 13:	Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)	81
Figure 14:	Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)	82
Figure 15:	Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)	83

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix 1: Context Summary	28
Appendix 2: Finds Summary By Weight	31
Appendix 3: The Pottery, by Carole Fletcher	32
Appendix 4: The Metalwork, by Nina Crummy	38
Appendix 5: Leatherwork, by Quita Mould	41
Appendix 6: Faunal Remains, by Ian Baxter	56
Appendix 7: Environmental Remains, by Val Fryer	59

## **1** Introduction

Between the 19th October and 25th November 2001 Cambridgeshire County Council's CAM ARC carried out an excavation on land opposite The Still Public House and adjacent to the covered shopping areas of Queensgate Centre and Westgate Arcade, Peterborough (NGR TL 5488 2658) (Fig. 1). The work was conducted in advance of the proposed construction of an extension to a shop unit and associated services (Cooper & Baker 2003), and followed an earlier evaluation carried out between the 29th January and the 5th February 2001 (Cooper & Spoerry 2001).

The work was commissioned by Lambert Scott & Innes Architects on behalf of Norwich Union. It undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Ben Robinson of Peterborough City Council Archaeological Service (PCCAS; Planning Application 00/01154/FUL), supplemented by a Specification prepared by CAM ARC (Spoerry 2001).

The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, in accordance with the guidelines set out in *Planning and Policy Guidance 16 - Archaeology and Planning* (Department of the Environment, 1990).

The site archive is currently held by CAM ARC and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

## 2 Geology and Topography

The geology of the site comprises Cornbrash limestone of the Great Oolite group laid down during the Jurassic period. The upper layer consists of weathered Cornbrash, which takes the form of a light brown limestone rubble (Horton 1989).

The site is adjacent to Westgate Arcade and sits within the historic core of medieval Peterborough, at the western end of the former Cumbergate, between Westgate to the north, Exchange Street to the south, Long Causeway to the east and Queen Street to the west (Fig. 1). At the time of the excavation the site comprised a small rectangular area approximately 7m by 15m, covered by brick sets and open to the sky, at an approximate height of 8.5m OD.

## 3 Archaeological and Historical Background

The content of this section draws upon studies produced in advance of, and following, an archaeological excavation at the Still Public House (Meadows in Welsh 1994; Spoerry & Hinman 1998). Additional information has been integrated from research within Peterborough Historic Environment Record (HER), including the results from recent investigations within the city centre.

## 3.1 Origins of Peterborough

## 3.1.1 Anglo-Saxon

Prehistoric and Roman remains within the city centre are scanty, although evidence for occupation in the Peterborough area as a whole, as well as residual material recovered during archaeological investigations and a few stray finds from the city centre itself, might suggest that pre-medieval activity was more widespread than the known evidence would suggest, having been obliterated by the later development of the historic town.

Few Early Saxon remains are also known from within the town. An Anglo-Saxon cemetery appears to have been located to the south of the River Nene where excavations conducted between 1864 and 1920 uncovered inhumations accompanied by personal items and weapons, including brooches, spearheads, shield-bosses and knives dating from *c*. AD 550 (Hatton 2004). A number of finds from uncertain location in the city also suggests the presence of one or more inhumation cemeteries (RCHME 1969).

In the Middle Saxon period a monastery was established at *Medeshamstede* on the site of the present cathedral church of St Peter. The foundation date of the original monastery is uncertain, although Bede (*History of the English Church*) suggests a date around 653-656 AD. The monastery was probably located close to a Mercian Royal centre and became an important focus in both religious and secular life (Mackreth 1994). Its destruction by the Danes in 870 AD is unlikely to have been as catastrophic as some later writers suggest.

The monastery continued as a successful house into the Late Saxon period when the early church and some of its associated buildings were enclosed by a set of defences originally erected by Aethelwold and later refortified in stone by Cenulf. A stonewall foundation cutting into an earlier bank may have been associated with these enclosures (Mackreth 1994).

## 3.1.2 The Medieval 'New Town'

There is some debate concerning the date and the location of the medieval 'new town' (Fig. 2). According to King (1981), there was an early occupation of a pseudo-urban nature west of the abbey precinct, dating from as early as the later 11th century. The development of the proto-town would have been prompted by the settling of sixty knights

on the abbey's land by King William, following the subduing of the Hereward uprising in 1070 AD.

By contrast, Mackreth (1994) argues that King's 'new town' to the west of the precinct, *i.e.* in the area defined to the north by Westgate and to the south by Priestgate, was created in the middle of the 12th century by Abbot Martin de Bec's, as part of the planned expansion of the church. Prior to that date, occupation was confined to the Late Saxon *burh* around the abbey, and to its associated trumpet-shaped market place at *Bondgate* (Boongate) to the north-east where the early *vill* developed. The *burh* was abandoned in the 12th century when a new monastic church, the present cathedral, and its precincts were built. The *focus* of the contemporary town would have shifted from the area of the former *vill* to an open area to the west of the main gate into the precinct. At this time a number of streets were probably laid out, including Cowgate, Westgate and Cumbergate, as part of the 'new town' planned development.

In contrast with the more rigid morphology of the later planned town, the sinuous form of Westgate, a major route out of town to the west, and the parallel Back Lane to the south, would indicate that some early urban elements might have already been in existence by the time of the creation of the 'new town' in the middle of the 12th century. Therefore, Westgate could have served an earlier settlement to the west of the abbey precinct, as postulated by King (1981). Against this argument Mackreth (1994) has suggested that Cowgate further south was the route out of town to the west, and that the apparently 'less formal' and sinuous form of both Westgate and Back Lane was the result of them being sited along, or on top of, pre-existing open-field selions, as part of deliberate planning. Spoerry and Hinman (1998) have argued that Westgate, which leads to St Leonard's Hospital for lepers at TL 187 991 (already in existence by 1112 AD and dissolved in 1539), could represent the upgrading of a former route through the fields to the new hospital. This hypothesis would explain the sinuous form of the street, in contrast with the more regular plan of the rest of the town. Therefore, Westgate could pre-date the 'new town', without necessarily have served an earlier settled area.

## 3.1.3 Bridge Street and the Southern Riverside (briefly)

#### a) Bridge Street

The present Bridge Street, originally known as *Hithegate,* runs perpendicular to Cowgate and represents the continuation of Long Causeway, in turns connecting Cowgate and Westgate. As the toponomastic evidence would suggest, this street was originally a causeway which ran southwards to the River Nene and terminated at a hythe which was probably created by Martin the Bec's during the (re)-organisation of the 'new town' (above). A rental derived from the

Charter of Liberties granted by abbot Robert de Lindsay (1214-1222) shows that Bridge Street was already built-up by the early 13th century (Mackreth in Meadows 2004). Trenching conducted in 1975-1976 along the western side of Bridge Street (TL 1920 9834) (Fig. 1), on a narrow plot vacant since 1928, produced evidence for building activity along the street frontage dating from the 12th century, thus corroborating the historic evidence for the existence of medieval tenements along the frontage. The depth of the stratified deposits ranged from 1.5m at the street front to 2.25m at the back. The main activity on the site was associated with baking during the late medieval and post-medieval periods, and with coopers and tinsmiths during the 19th and 20th century (O'Neill 1978).

In the 12th century the main wharf was located on the eastern side of the later (early 14th century) bridge. At some stage a wharf was created on the western side (Mackreth in Meadows 2004). Recent investigations at 130 Bridge Street, west of the bridge and immediately north of the river (Fig. 1), produced evidence for a post-13th/pre-15th century timber-faced river frontage some 12m long, possibly associated with a wharf (or, as the excavator suggested, a structure to protect the head of a later bridge from scouring). The upright timbers were set along the edge of the river where they cut a (meandering?) palaeo-channel infilling material that contained 13th century artefacts, and were sealed by a 15th century dumping layer (Meadows 2004).

#### b) The Southern Riverside

Unless otherwise referenced, the content of this paragraph draws upon the report by Hatton (2004).

Historic activity south of the river dates from as early as the Anglo-Saxon period, as suggested by excavations conducted between 1864 and 1920, which uncovered remains of an inhumation cemetery (above). During the 16th century 'The Bridge Fair' was held on 50 acres of land within the parish of Fletton. The site is still the location of the modern Peterborough Fairs. Here, Peterborough HER records ridges and furrows that have long since been removed as the result of modern development. The presence of these remains indicates that land immediately to the south of the river was arable and not waterlogged during the medieval period. Archaeological investigations at Marshall's Garage, off Oundle Road and west of the railway line, identified archaeological features ranging from pits, ditches and postholes, to a large silted-up river channel (Hatton 2000; 2003), further corroborating the evidence for medieval activity south of the river.

By contrast, an evaluation conducted at South Bank (Hatton 2004), less than 1km to the south-east of Peterborough city centre, failed to uncover occupational evidence. It revealed a series of post-medieval drainage ditches, together with silted-up river channels, the presence of which would be consistent with episodes of seasonal flooding in this area.

#### 3.2 The Site

### 3.2.1 Cartographic Evidence

The development site is located within the historic core of Peterborough (Fig. 1), *i.e.* within the post-conquest 'new town', and preserves part of the corner of Cumbergate where it originally bent to join Long Causeway. The street does not appear to have moved significantly since John Speed's map of 1610 (Fig. 3). The pre-1610 street line remains unknown. It is possible that it was subject to alterations and re-alignments during successive building programmes of the medieval period. Speed's map shows Cumbergate lined with houses on the northern, western and eastern sides. However, it does not define the *burgage* plots and, therefore, the extent to the rear of these properties is uncertain.

Thomas Eyre's map of 1721 (Fig. 4) shows a similar density of buildings to that depicted by Speed along the various frontages of Cumbergate. Narrow frontage properties along the western and southern sides may have originated as medieval planned units (or *burgage* style plots). The overall impression of Cumbergate from Eyre's map is that the frontage was not densely occupied and that infilling did not occur until later. Low density of occupation may indicate that this part of the town was characterised by activities that required open spaces. One such open space is indicated in the area of the development site.

Hill's map of 1808 (Fig. 5) shows a greater level of building density in the Cumbergate area than that depicted on Eyre's map. However, there are still more open spaces than might be expected, given the position of the site within the historic core of Peterborough.

By the time of the Enclosure Map of 1821 (not illustrated) most of the Cumbergate frontage space had been in-filled. The first edition of the OS Map (1886) shows that substantial building work took place during the middle and later parts of the 19th century (Fig. 6a).

The OS map of 1967-1978 shows Cumbergate in its original layout prior to the construction of the Queensgate Shopping Centre (Fig. 6b).

#### 3.2.2 Documentary Survey

An initial, brief survey of the documentary evidence shows few references to Cumbergate. Cumbergate as an occupation-derived street name has been identified as 'the street of the wool combers' (Meadows in Welsh 1994). However, examination of the documentary sources has produced no evidence of this craft within this area. Additionally, the ecofactual and artefactual remains from excavations at the Still (Spoerry & Hinman 1998, below) do not seem to indicate that wool processing activities were taking place. A reference from 1548 to a dunghill that had to be removed from the Cumbergate 'end' (Mellows 1947) illustrates that this part of the town contained areas that were used for the disposal of refuse. Meadows (in Welsh 1994) points out that this reference, coupled with several others in the 16th century which mention cottage gardens and barns on Cumbergate, gives the impression that this street was not 'very urban' in character. A reference in the Court Roll for 1599 mentions an orchard of a guarter of an acre on land to the western side of the Cumbergate (Mellows & Gifford 1956). The absence of references within the historical records for commercial properties on Cumbergate during the same period is also notable. This lack of references is however symptomatic of the nature of the documents for the period as a whole(Spoerry & Hinman 1998).

## 3.2.3 Previous Archaeological Work

# a) The Still Public House (Welsh 1994; Spoerry & Hinman 1998) (HER 11504, 11685)

The site of The Still Public House was investigated during 1994 and 1995 (Welsh 1994; Spoerry & Hinman 1998) (Fig. 1). Seven phases of activity were identified which spanned the whole of the medieval and post-medieval periods. Of the four excavated areas, Area 4 was located only 5m to the west of the proposed development site, and produced archaeological remains dating from as early as the 11th century. In its comparable phases (Phases 4-7), Area 4 showed evidence for domestic waste pits and the fragmentary remains of several short-lived stone-built structures (Phase 4, 1350-1450), possibly with rebuilding in Phase 5 (1450-1500) and in Phase 7 (1600 onwards).

<u>Phase 1</u> (1000-1150) represented the earliest phase of activity on the site. It was characterised by the presence of quarry pits located close to the Cumbergate frontage (Area 4). The pits contained a great quantity of charred remains from hearth cleaning, indicating occupation nearby. A high incidence of residual Late Saxon pottery from later features across the whole site could suggest a greater level of activity of this date than suggested by the surviving features. <u>Phase 2</u> produced negative evidence within the ceramic sequence. <u>Phase 3</u> (1200-1350) represented the first period of major activity. Quarrying for cornbrash was carried out in most areas of the site. In Area 1 there was also evidence for the formal laying out of the boundaries of properties that fronted onto Westgate (*burgage* style plots). A stone-built baking/malting oven was also recorded. Area 3 was characterised

by rubbish disposal. Area 4 produced evidence for open ground where various (undefined) activities were carried out along the Cumbergate frontage. Here there was evidence for a building, a cess pit, a possible oven of uncertain function and a stone-lined feature (a cistern or a drain for sewerage or industrial waste?). In Phase 4 (1350-1450) pitting was the predominant activity throughout the site. Areas 3 and 4 were also characterised by the fragmentary remains of several temporary structures. A possible domestic dwelling was replaced in Area 4. In Phase 5 (1450-1500) changes occurred in the former plot boundaries along the Westgate frontage (Area 1). A low level of activity was recorded in Areas 2 and 3. There was evidence for at least one building of uncertain function in the northern part of Area 4. Across much of the site quarrying and refuse disposal were the predominant activities. In Phase 6 (1500-1600) pitting ceased other than in the northern part of the site (Areas 1 and 2) where there was a change in the use of the backyard plots of buildings along the Westgate frontage from general domestic activity to rubbish disposal. In Area 1 there was also evidence for a possible domestic building constructed against a former boundary. Area 2 witnessed a later transition from waste ground to formal garden (Eyre's Map of 1721). Very little activity was recorded in Areas 3 and 4. In Phase 7 (post-1600) the Westgate properties were rebuilt and survived into the 20th century. The centre of the site (Area 2) changed from a formal garden to a more domestic garden. In Area 4 a stone drain possibly associated with rebuilding along the Cumbergate frontage was recorded.

In synthesis, during the medieval period (Phases 1-4) activity in the area between Cumbergate and Westgate appears to have been characterised by guarrying, malting or baking and disposal of rubbish consistent with food processing and consumption. The presence of cess pits indicates deliberate deposition of this waste in specific locations; a necessity in the usually cramped urban space. The early post-medieval period witnessed an intensification of the former activities (Phases 5 and 6). The evidence as a whole seems to point to a great density of activity along both frontage properties in the period 1200-1350 (Phase 3), with a short phase of apparent contraction (Phase 4), followed by a second peak of activity after 1450 until circa 1600 (Phases 5 and 6). Immediately after this period the appearance of gardens may indicate a second contraction of urban style activities. The evidence would suggest that Westgate and, possibly, Cumbergate, were in existence by the middle of the 12th century, thus supporting a date before then for the creation of the 'new town' west of the monastic precinct. However, it does not confirm either start date for the 'new town', as proposed by King (1981) and Mackreth (1994) (above), as the early phase of activity on the site (Phase 1) was generically dated to 1000-1150 and characterised by domestic activity and quarrying, not in any way distinctly urban as opposed to rural.

#### b) Long Causeway

#### Nos. 37-38 Long Causeway

A watching brief carried out in 1988 at Nos. 37-38 Long Causeway, to the south-east of the Cumbergate site, produced evidence for a Late Saxon cultivation soil sealed beneath up-cast possibly relating to the creation of the medieval monastic precincts (Meadows in Welsh 1994) (Fig. 1)

#### Western Range, Peterborough Cathedral (Meadows 1998?) (HER 51279)

Trenches excavated in 1998 at TL 1927 9868 to test the theory that elements of the monastic and later drain system ran through the area revealed a culvert of mortared bricks which was internally 0.7m high and 0.9m wide. An earlier culvert survived as a mortared limestone wall inserted into an earlier open ditch. An assemblage of Late Saxon, medieval and post-medieval pottery was retrieved.

Remains of a partly open and partly stone-built and roofed culvert were previously found at TL 193 988 (HER 00908).

#### Nos. 25-26 Long Causeway (Jones 1995) (HER 50535, 11742)

In 1995 excavations conducted by Birmingham University Field Archaeology Unit (BUFAU) at Nos. 25/26 Long Causeway produced evidence for four phases of activity dating from the 11th century to the present day. The presence of residual flint flakes in later features suggests some degree of background prehistoric activity. The earliest recognisable phase of activity (Phase 1, 11th-13th century) comprised a broad ditch, possibly defining the western boundary of the monastic precinct. Very few contemporary features and finds were recorded, including a stone-footed building to the west of the ditch and domestic waste. In Phase 2 (14th-15th century) the street frontage was occupied by stone-footed buildings and rubbish pits. The former boundary ditch was redefined by further ditches and a wall, which were moved to the west possibly to accommodate the tenements along the street frontage. The finds included a small leather assemblage with material dating to the 11th to 12th century, along with items of post-medieval date (Quita Mould, Appendix 5). During Phase 3 (16th-17th century) the ditch was in-filled and the area levelled-up. In Phase 4 (18th century-) cellared buildings were erected, including dwellings and premises (Fig. 1).

The excavation results do not appear to have been brought to publication.

8

### c) Queensgate Shopping Centre (Pryor 1977-1978) (HER 01438)

An investigation conducted in advance of the construction of the Queensgate Shopping Centre immediately to the east and south-west of the proposed development site aimed to uncover pits in order to complement the ceramic sequence obtained at Bridge Street (above), as no medieval structures were expected to have survived the rebuilding of later periods. Scatters of pits were recorded which contained material dating from the 12th century. The investigation failed to identify deeply stratified deposits.

One trench excavated approximately 12m to the south of No. 15 Cumbergate revealed recent remains, a 15th-century pit and no earlier features, whilst medieval and later pottery (with no associated features) were recovered from a trench immediately to the north (Meadows in Welsh 1994) (Fig. 1).

## d) Exchange Street (Dallas & Pryor 1975-76) (HER 01654, 8763)

An excavation was conducted on the northern side of Exchange Street, immediately to the north of the parish church of St John the Baptist. The aim was to determine the state of preservation of medieval deposits along the former market frontage. The investigation showed that there was no build-up along the frontage, that the church was purposely erected below ground level and that very little evidence for medieval occupation (no earlier than the 12th-13th century) had survived. Bronze droplets and fragments of moulds indicated the presence of a 17th century industrial workshop on the site. An 18th century well, inglenook fireplace and a bread oven were also recorded (Fig. 1).

#### e) North Westage (York Archaeological Trust)

In 1995 evaluations were carried out on land at North Westgate, some 350m to the north-west of Cumbergate. In the eastern, and bestpreserved, part of the site the investigations produced evidence for residual prehistoric activity, as well as remains of ridge and furrow. The pottery sequence dating from the middle of the 11th century indicated that the area was briefly under cultivation before reverting to pasture during the medieval period. Post-medieval and modern building activity, partly related to the construction of the Queensgate Shopping Centre, was also noted (Ben Robinson, pers. comm.).

The results of the evaluations do not appear to have been brought to publication.

## 3.2.4 The 2001 Evaluation (HER 51149, 51162)

The results from the 2001 evaluation have been incorporated in the present report (below).

The preliminary evaluation conducted between January and February 2001 by CAM ARC (Cooper & Spoerry 2001) produced evidence for late medieval pits, which contained an assemblage of well-preserved leather remains, as well as a clay-lined pit of possible industrial function. The findings would indicate that, despite large-scale disturbance caused by the construction of the Queensgate Shopping Centre nearby, pockets of preserved stratified archaeology survive within the Cumbergate area.

## 4 Methodology

The objective of this excavation was to determine as far as reasonably possible the presence/absence, location, nature, extent, date, quality, condition and significance of any surviving archaeological deposits within the proposed development area

In accordance with the PCCAS Officer's requirements, an area 15m long and 7m wide was excavated under supervision using a mechanical excavator (mini-digger) with a toothless ditching bucket. The area covered the location of a former evaluation trench in the northern part of the proposed development site (Trench 1, Cooper & Spoerry 2001) (Fig. 1).

The excavation area was hand-cleaned to allow the recognition of features and deposits. All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using CAMARC's *pro-forma* sheets.

Both individual plans of features and composite plans were drawn at 1:50 scale. They were later digitally combined and tied into the Ordnance Survey grid to produce a site phase plan (Figs. 7a and 7b, 8a and 8b). Relevant sections were drawn at 1:10 and 1:20 scales, as appropriate, including a west-facing section across the whole of the excavation area (Fig. 9).

A site photographic record was compiled which included monochrome and colour photographs, and colour slides.

All spoil was scanned for finds by eye and with a metal detector.

Environmental samples for macro-environmental analysis were collected from selected features across the site, following consultation with a specialist.

The excavation and post-excavation procedures followed the standard CAM ARC practice, and are in compliance with the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) guidelines.

At the time of the archaeological investigation, modern service trenches underneath the street paving had significantly truncated the archaeological remains, obliterating direct stratigraphic relationships in places, and causing some degree of contamination.

## 5 Results

## 5.1 Summary

The preliminary evaluation conducted during winter 2001 (Cooper & Spoerry 2001) and the subsequent excavation (Cooper & Baker 2003) revealed a stratigraphic sequence up to 1.6m deep, with archaeological deposits and cut features spanning the late medieval, post-medieval and modern periods.

Based on direct stratigraphic evidence and dating provided by the pottery, five main phases of activity were identified, Phases 1-5, with Phase 2 being further subdivided into Phases 2a and 2b, and Phase 4 into Phases 4a-4d,

Phase 1 (1400-1450) represented the earliest phase of activity on the site. It included a cobbled surface laid over natural deposits, and a robbed-out wall on a north to south alignment identified in the northwestern corner of the site. Phase 2 was characterised by a demolition layer possibly associated with the disuse of the earlier wall, by the presence of a new wall on a north-east to south-west alignment (Phase 2a), and by dumping layers (Phase 2b). The dumping layers yielded a large assemblage of well-preserved late 14th to early 15th century leather (Appendix 5), including many fragments of shoes sufficient to suggest the existence of a cobbler's workshop in the vicinity. Phase 3 (1500-1550) was characterised by an extension to the Phase 2 wall, as well as a series of domestic rubbish pits located along the eastern boundary of the excavation area. The pits also contained fragments of leather (Appendix 5). Post-medieval evidence comprised a series of cobbled surfaces with associated make-up layers dating from the middle of the 16th century (Phases 4a-d). These surfaces could have represented sequences of road constructions related to Cumbergate. Alternatively, they could have belonged to adjacent yards of unidentified street-frontage buildings. Modern activity (Phase 5) was characterised by the presence of service trenches which had truncated the earlier stratigraphy across the development area. Earlier demolition layers and a wall originally recorded during the evaluation phase in Trench 2 (Cooper & Spoerry 2001) had almost entirely obliterated the archaeological sequences in the southern part of the proposed development area. A concrete floor and mortar make-up layer for a brick floor recorded in the evaluation Trenches 1 and 2 represented the most recent events on the site.

#### 5.2 Excavation Results by Phase (Figs. 8-10)

#### 5.2.1 Phase 1 (1400-1450)

Phase 1 included the remains of a worn cobbled surface (23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157) and the remains of a later robbed-out wall (**164**).

- 23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157: limestone cobbled surface 0.10m deep. It contained sherds of late medieval pottery (Appendix 3), 15th century leather shoe fragments (Appendix 5), a 15th-17th century copper alloy lid, an iron building staple and a nail (Appendix 4) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Cut by wall **164**, it sealed natural silty clay deposits 106
- 164: wall foundation trench north to south aligned, 1m long (visible length), 0.35m wide and 0.15m deep. Wall 163, compacted dry cornbrash limestone, robbed-out. Sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery (Appendix 3) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Sealed by post-demolition layer 150 (Phase 2), it cut cobbled surface 23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157

#### 5.2.2 Phase 2 (1450-1500)

Phase 2 was characterised by the presence of a post-demolition layer (150) and a later? north-east to south-west aligned wall (120) identified in the northern part of the excavation area (Phase 2a), together with a series of dump layers (104/107/108/145/148/155?/158 and 109) visible in the southern part of the site (Phase 2b).

#### a) Phase 2a

- 120: compacted cornbrash limestone north-east to south-west aligned, 2.20m long, 0.25m wide and 0.30m deep. Sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery (Appendix 3) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Sealed by dump layer 109 (Phase 3), it sealed? post-demolition layer 150
- 150: deposit of light grey silty clay, 0.20m thick. Iron nails (Appendix 4). Sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery and residual sherds of early medieval pottery (Appendix 3). Environmental Sample 12 (Appendix 7). Cut by wall 120, it sealed wall **164** (Phase 1)

#### b) Phase 2b

- 109: dark greyish brown sandy silt, 0.12m thick. Sealed by 104/107/108/145/148/158, it seals cobbled surface 23/46/105/129/149/151/157
- 104/107/108/145/148/155?/158: deposit of dark grey sandy silt, 0.20m thick. It contained sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery and residual sherds of early medieval pottery (Appendix 3), 15th century leather shoe fragments (Appendix 5), a 15th-16th century copper alloy pin, a medieval copper alloy strip, medieval? lead window came and strip, undated iron nails and an undated iron pin (Appendix 4) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Environmental Samples 2, 3, 9, 11 and 13 (Appendix 7). Cut by pits **140** (Phase 3), **141** (Phase 3) and **159** (Phase 3), it sealed dumping layers 109

#### 5.2.3 Phase 3 (1500-1550)

Phase 3 included a series of domestic pits located along the eastern edge of the development site (**12**, **13**, **22**, **29/31**, **39**, **137/139**, **140**, **141** and **159**), as well as an unrelated extension (160) to wall (120) (Phase 2a).

- **12**: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1). Sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery (Appendix 3), 15th century leather shoe fragments (Appendix 5), a 15th-16th century copper alloy furniture handle and undated iron nails and (Appendix 4) and animal bone (Appendix 6)
- **13**: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1). Sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery and residual sherds of early medieval pottery (Appendix 3), 15th century leather shoe fragments (Appendix 5), undated iron nails (Appendix 4) and animal bone (Appendix 6)
- 22: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1)
- **39**: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1)
- 137/139: pit of uncertain shape in plan, only partially exposed, 0.80m long, 0.35m wide (visible width) and 0.25m deep, with stepped 'U'-shaped profile. Filled by 136 and 138. Upper fill 136, a black clayey silt with 15th century leather shoe fragments (Appendix 5) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Environmental Sample 4 (Appendix 7). Lower fill 138, a very dark brown clayey silt. Sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery (Appendix 3), 15th century leather shoe fragments (Appendix 5) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Environmental Sample 5 (Appendix 7). Sealed by make-up layer 125/127 (Phase 4a), it cut pits 140 and 141
- **140**: pit of uncertain shape in plan, only partially exposed, 0.95m long (visible length), 0.70m wide (visible width) and 0.43m deep, with stepped 'U'-shaped profile. Filled by 142, a dark brown clayey silt. Sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery (Appendix 3) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Environmental Sample 6 (Appendix 7). Cut by pit **137/139**, it cut dump layer 104/107/108/145/148/158 (Phase 2b)
- 141: pit of uncertain shape in plan, only partially exposed, 0.80m long (visible length), 0.30m wide (visible width) and 0.40m deep. Filled by 143 and 144. Upper fill 143 a dark greyish brown clayey silt with animal bone (Appendix 6). Environmental Sample 7 (Appendix 7). Lower fill 144, a mottled brown clayey silt. Sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery (Appendix 3) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Environmental Sample 8 (Appendix 7). Cut by pit 137/139, it cut dump layer 104/107/108/145/148/158 (Phase 2b)
- **159**: pit of uncertain shape in plan, only partially exposed 0.88m in diameter (visible), and 0.33m deep. Filled by 153, a dark greyish brown silty clay with animal bone (Appendix 6). Environmental Sample 10 (Appendix 7). Sealed by make-up layer 125/127 (Phase 4a), it cuts dump layer 104/107/108/145/148/158 (Phase 2b)
- 160: dry cornbrash stone wall, north-east to south-west aligned, 0.25m long, 0.30m wide and 0.18m high. Truncated by modern service trench, it sealed wall 120 (Phase 2a)

#### 5.2.4 Phase 4 (1550+)

Phase 4 comprised a series of cobbled surfaces and associated makeup layers spanning the post-medieval and later periods (102/103/112/114/121/124, 113, 119, 122/126/132/134, 123, 125/127, 130, 131 and 133). At least four sub-phases were identified during the excavation (Phases 4a-d). A similar sequence of surfaces (5, 7-9, 17-20, 32-34 and 37) was recorded in Trench 1 during the evaluation (Cooper & Spoerry 2001), though no sub-phasing was attempted there, due to the limited extent of the area under investigation. Furthermore, layers (5, 7-9, 32-34 and 37) observed in the northern part of the west-facing section in Trench 1 might have belonged to the same sequences represented by layers (17-20) in the southern part of the same section, and by layers (102/103/112/114/121/124, 113, 119, 122/126/132/134, 123, 125/127, 130, 131 and 133) uncovered during the subsequent excavation. As a result, the sequence of road construction, as recorded in Trench 1, was generically assigned to Phase 4.

5: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 7: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 8: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 9: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 17: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 18: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 19: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 20: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 27: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 32: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 33: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 34: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 37: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1) 37: (evaluation, Tr. 1, Appendix 1)

#### a) Phase 4a

- 122/126/132/134: cobbled surface, 0.06m-0.22m thick. 15th-16th century copper alloy buckle plate (Appendix 4) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Sealed by make-up layers 131 (Phase 4b) and 133 (Phase 4b), it seals make-up layer 125/127.
- 125/127: mixed deposit of sandy silt and limestone rubble (make-up layer for cobbled surface 122/126/132/134). Sealed by cobbled surface 122/126/132/134, it seals pits **137/139** (Phase 3) and **159** (Phase 3)

#### b) Phase 4b

- 123: pitched limestone surface, 0.18m thick. Sherds of early post-medieval pottery (Appendix 3), an iron nail (Appendix 4) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Sealed by make-up layer 102/103/112/114/121/124 (Phase 4c), it sealed make-up layers 130 and 131.
- 130: mixed deposit of dark grey silt and flint and limestone rubble (make-up layer for pitched limestone surface 123), 0.02m thick. Sherds of post-medieval pottery (appendix 3) and iron nail (Appendix 4) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Sealed by pitched limestone surface 123, it sealed make-up layer 133
- 131: mixed deposit of dark grey silt, flint gravel and limestone rubble (make-up layer for pitched limestone surface 123), 0.05m thick. Sealed by pitched limestone surface 123, it seals cobbled surface 122/126/132/134 (Phase 4a). Same as 130? or 133?
- 133: mixed deposit of dark grey silt and flint and limestone rubble (make-up layer for pitched limestone surface 123). Sealed by make-up layer 130, it sealed cobbled surface 122/126/132/134 (Phase 4a)

#### c) Phase 4c

102/103/112/114/121/124: deposit of light to dark greyish brown sandy clayey silt (make-up layer for cobbled surface 119), 0.10m-0.20m thick. Sherds of postmedieval pottery (Appendix 3), an iron nail (Appendix 4) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Environmental Sample 1 (Appendix 7). Sealed by cobbled surface 119, it seals pitched limestone surface 123 (Phase 4b) 119: cobbled surface with fragments of animal bone (Appendix 6). Sealed by cobbled surface 113 (Phase 4d), it seals make-up layer 102/103/112/114/121/124

#### d) Phase 4d

113: cobbled surface, 0.12m thick. Truncated by modern service trenches, it sealed cobbled surface 119 (Phase 4c)

#### 5.2.5 Phase 5 (Modern)

Phase 5 included modern features, namely service trenches which had truncated the earlier stratigraphic sequences (**15**, **24**, **26**, **36**, **101**, **115** and **117**). In addition, a series of modern demolition layers (43-45), surfaces (1, 2 and 4) and a wall (42) were recorded during the evaluation (Cooper & Spoerry 2001). In Trench 2, in particular, modern disturbance had almost entirely obliterated the archaeological stratigraphic sequence.

- 1: (evaluation Tr. 1 and 2, Appendix 1)
- 2: (evaluation Tr. 1 and 2, Appendix 1)
- 4: (evaluation Tr. 1, Appendix 1)
- 15: (evaluation Tr. 1, Appendix 1)
- 24: (evaluation Tr. 1, Appendix 1)
- **26**: (evaluation Tr. 1, Appendix 1)
- **36**: (evaluation Tr. 1, Appendix 1)
- **41**: (evaluation Tr. 2, Appendix 1)
- 42: (evaluation Tr. 2, Appendix 1)
- **49**: (evaluation Tr. 2, Appendix 1)
- **52**: (evaluation Tr. 2 Appendix 1)
- **54**: (evaluation Tr. 2, Appendix 1) 43: (evaluation Tr. 2, Appendix 1)
- 43. (evaluation Tr. 2, Appendix 1) 44: (evaluation Tr. 2, Appendix 1)
- 45: (evaluation Tr. 2, Appendix 1)
- **101**: service trench, filled by 100. It cut service trench **115**
- 115: service trench, filled by 116. Residual sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery (Appendix 3). Cut by service trench 101, it cut service trench 117
- 117: service trench, filled by 118. Residual sherds of late medieval-early post-medieval pottery (Appendix 3) and animal bone (Appendix 6). Cut by service trench 115, it cut the lower archaeological deposits

## 6 Discussion

#### 6.1 Specialist Work (Summaries)

All the finds submitted to the relevant specialists for analysis included material from both the evaluation and the excavation phases.

#### 6.1.1 The Pottery

The pottery was assessed by Carole Fletcher (Appendix 3).

The fieldwork generated 209 sherds of pottery (weighing 4357g), including some unstratified material. No complete vessels were found

and the material was moderately fragmented. The majority of the assemblage dated to c.1350 to c.1650, with a single sherd of Stamford Ware. Medieval material made up half of the assemblage by count but was mainly residual. Early post-medieval material accounted for much of the remaining assemblage, due to the larger, less abraded nature of the sherds. As a whole, the pottery assemblage appeared to be generally consistent with other assemblages from Peterborough dating to the period AD 1400 to 1650, and to be urban in character.

## 6.1.2 The Metalwork

The metalwork was assessed by Nina Crummy (Appendix 4).

A total of 17 metal small finds were recovered mainly through the use of metal detectors. The group of finds is dominated by a variety of iron nails. Copper alloy and lead off-cuts and casting waste are representative of normal craft waste within urban settlement of the period. In addition, a small number of 15th to 17th century copper alloy personal items are present, including a decorated buckle plate (SF104), the fragmentary remains of a lid (SF118), the back or case of a mirror (SF128) and a pin (SF159), as well as a furniture or box fitting (SF155). As a group the finds indicate general domestic refuse of the period and provide no particular indication of function or activities on the site. In addition, the metalwork recovered indicates a site of low status.

## 6.1.3 The Leatherwork

The leather assemblage was analysed by Quita Mould (Appendix 5)

The assemblage consisted of shoe components of turnshoe construction, along with two straps, a disc and leatherworking waste. The material was associated with pottery from contexts belonging to Phases 1-3 (1400-1550) and dated stylistically to the late 14th and early 15th centuries. Some fragments were recovered from the cobbled surface of Phase 1 (1400-1450). The majority of the leather was found in dumping layers assigned to Phase 2b (1450-1500). A small amount of possibly residual leather was contained in the fill of rubbish pits in Phase 3 (1500-1550). A residual clump sole repair was found in a cobbled surface in Phase 4c (1550+). At least seventeen individual shoes were represented which belong to four shoe-styles popular during late 14th and early 15th centuries, including front tielace fastening ankle shoes, shoes with separate vamps and quarters, a side-lacing shoe and a taller boot. The most commonly found shoe styles, the front tie-lace fastening ankle shoe and the side-lacing shoe, are styles that have been found in the well-dated waterfront deposits in the city of London. In addition to the shoes, two straps were found, along with a disc and a small amount of scrap and waste leather. The quantity of waste leather was extremely small and likely to have derived from cobbling activities. The scrap leather belonged to broken shoe parts. Together with the proportion of highly fragmentary shoe parts, its presence suggested that several of the leather bearing contexts had been reworked. The leather from the Cumbergate site is the second assemblage of waterlogged leather to be recovered from Peterborough in recent years. A small assemblage was found during excavations at Nos. 25/26 Long Causeway in 1995 (above). In synthesis, the leather from the site seems to have represented rubbish disposal in the form of discarded cobbling waste.

## **Preservation?**

## 6.1.4 The Faunal Remains

The animal bone assemblage was assessed by Ian L. Baxter (Appendix 6).

All the bones forming the basis of the assessment were collected by hand (just over 20kg weight) from pits, dump layers, surfaces and a possible robber trench. A high proportion of the bone was waterlogged and, therefore, well-preserved. The assemblage was heavily biased in favour of the domestic mammals, with cattle, sheep/goat, pig and horse being represented. Several domestic cat bones were recovered, mostly belonging to immature animals. The cat bones might have represented waste from small-scale skinning activities. The assemblage as a whole was similar to that recovered from The Still nearby and largely consisted of refuse from butchery and food waste.

## 6.1.5 The Environmental Remains

The environmental remains were assessed by Val Fryer (Appendix 7).

Samples for the extraction of the plant macrofossils were taken from across the excavated area, and thirteen were submitted for assessment. In summary, charred cereal grains and other dietary remains were recovered and associated with burnt domestic refuse. Charred grains were comparatively rare although their presence indicated that cereals (most particularly barley) were being locally utilised, albeit not to any great extent. The lack of cereal chaff would suggest that little or no processing was occurring on the site or in its immediate vicinity. In addition, the presence of waterlogged macrofossils, including seeds/fruits of common weed species, indicated that the site supported a varied local flora which does not appear to have been over-grown. A number of wild species recovered are commonly found in non-agricultural contexts, their presence being simply indicative of ground disturbance (e.g. pit digging and/or horticultural activity). Finally, marginal damp areas were probably present on the site, and some deep features might have been sufficiently water-filled to form semi-permanent or permanent aquatic micro-habitats.

#### 6.2 Phase Summaries (Figs 8-9)

### 6.2.1 Phase 1 (1400–1450)

Features assigned to Phase 1 included a worn cobbled surface (105/129/149/151/156/157), which had already been identified during the evaluation as (23) (Trench 1) and (46) (Trench 2) (Cooper & Spoerry 2001), and the remains of a later robbed-out wall (**164**).

The cobbled surface (23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157) probably extended across the whole excavation area. It was interpreted as representing either the earliest phase of Cumbergate or a courtyard for an unidentified building located on the Cumbergate frontage. The robbed out wall (**164**) may have belonged to the foundation of a building located outside the north-west corner of the excavation site, or to a boundary.

The pottery and leather (Appendices 3 and 5) recovered from the cobbled surface suggest an early 15th century date for the earliest phase of activity on the site.

### 6.2.2 Phase 2 (1450-1500)

2 In the course of Phase both the cobbled surface (23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157) and wall 164 of Phase 1 went out of use. Phase 2 activities were characterised by structural remains in the northern part of the site (Phase 2a) and by rubbish disposal in the form of dump layers in the southern part (Phase 2b). Due to the high degree of truncation caused by modern service trenches, it was not possible to establish with certainty whether the activities assigned to Phase 2a might have been contemporary with those assigned to Phase 2b. Their spatial distribution in two discrete areas and absence of direct stratigraphic relationships could indicate that they were carried out simultaneously. Therefore, sub-phasing of Phase 2 does not necessarily reflect a chronological sequence of events.

#### a) Phase 2a

A new wall (120) was built close to, albeit on a different alignment from, wall (164) of Phase 1. As with wall (164), wall (120) may have represented either the foundation of a building or alteration to walled boundaries. It was built over a post-demolition layer (150) which covered the majority of the northern part of the site and clearly marked a partial change in land-use by sealing the earlier cobbled surface (23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157) and wall (**164**) of Phase 1. Wall 120 appears to have been in use until the end of Phase 3.

#### b) Phase 2b

In this phase, a considerable amount of rubbish (104/107/108/145/148/155?/158 and 109) was dumped above the

cobbled surface (23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157), including leather remains, cess and macrofossils. The leather assemblage included fragments of the uppers and soles of shoes that had been subject to re-use and had been repaired (Appendix 5), pointing to the presence of a cobbler's workshop in the vicinity.

## 6.2.3 Phase 3 (1500-1550)

Phase 3 marked the end of the dumping of rubbish in the southern part of the site. A series of rubbish pits located along the eastern boundary of the excavation area (12, 13, 22, 29/31?, 39, 137/139, 140, 141 and 159) were cut into the earlier midden layers. The pits contained waterlogged material. Wall 120 of Phase 2b continued in use throughout Phase 3, with some evidence of a short extension (160) being added at its north-eastern end.

## 6.2.4 Phase 4 (1550-)

Phase 4 was characterised by a sequence of cobbled surfaces and associated make-up layers dating from the post-medieval period (Phases 4a-d). These surfaces consisted of sub-rounded Cornbrash limestone and pebbles that may have represented either successive surfaces of the Cumbergate road or yards associated with unidentified street-frontage buildings. A similar sequence of surfaces (5, 7-9, 17-20, 27, 32-34 and 37) was recorded during the evaluation in Trench 1 and generically assigned to Phase 4, with no attempt at sub-phasing.

## a) Phase 4a

The fragmentary remains of a cobbled surface (122/126/132/134) and associated make-up layer (125/127) were located in the southern part of the site.

## b) Phase 4b

Fragments of a post-medieval pitched stone surface (123) and associated make up layers (130), (131) and (133) directly sealed the Phase 4a surface in the south-eastern part of the site.

#### c) Phase 4c

A later cobbled surface (119) and associated limestone rubble makeup layer (102/103/112/114/121/124) (Figs 3 and 4) sealed the Phase 4b surface. Surface 119 survived as a small area near the western perimeter of the excavation area, whereas the associated make-up layer spread across the whole of the site.

#### d) Phase 4d

The latest identified post-medieval deposit was another cobbled surface (113) visible along the eastern perimeter of the site where it sealed the Phase 4c layers.

#### 6.2.5 Phase 5 (Modern)

Modern service trenches (**15**, **24**, **26**, **36**, **41**, **49**, **52**, **54**, **101**, **115** and **117**), together with demolition layers (43-45) and a wall (42) originally recorded during the evaluation phase in Trench 2 (Cooper & Spoerry 2001), truncated most of the archaeological deposits encountered in the excavation area. A concrete floor (4) and mortar make-up layer (2) for a brick floor (1) recorded in the evaluation Trenches 1 and 2 represented the most recent events on the site.

## 6.3 Cumbergate

The available archaeological data (above) would point to a date around the 12th century for the beginning of recognisable 'urban' occupation in the form of *burgage*-style tenements and associated occupational/industrial activities within, and immediately outside, the historic town of Peterborough. Earlier remains are elusive and do not appear to be specifically urban, as opposed to rural, in character. In addition, the evidence would indicate that the Westgate area was located on the periphery of the medieval settlement, with the northern part (North Westgate) remaining predominantly rural until the later post-medieval period, and the southern part (Queensgate Shopping Centre, including the former Cumbergate) displaying evidence for zones of open landscape. Islands of dense occupation have also been recorded, as at The Still Public House, between Cumbergate and Westgate, and off Long Causeway. Mackreth (pers. comm. in Spoerry & Hinman 1998) has suggested that the apparent absence of early archaeological evidence to the south of Westgate may be partly due to the nature (and date) of the remains not producing any depth of stratigraphy, as in the case of timber-framed structures. This view is supported by the recovery of medieval pottery during excavations at the Queensgate Shopping Centre where there was no apparent evidence for associated archaeological features. It is therefore possible that during the medieval, and earlier period, occupation density was higher across larger areas of the town centre than the archaeological evidence would suggest.

The Cumbergate excavation has revealed two main periods of activity, late medieval into early post-medieval (Phases 1-3) and post-medieval (Phase 4).

The available evidence would suggest an early 15th century date for the earliest phase of activity on the site, in contrast with the results from a previous excavation at The Still Public House (Spoerry & Hinman 1998, above) (Fig. 1). This site, which is located only 5m to the west, produced evidence for activity as early as the 11th century, also suggesting a 12th or 13th century origin for Cumbergate. Remains at the Still were mainly derived from areas between properties located on the edge of the medieval settlement. At least four properties fronting onto Cumbergate and Westgate were recorded, which dated to the early part of the 13th century. Earlier, pre-mid 12th century, activity was represented by quarrying close to the street frontage at the Cumbergate end of the site. Additionally, an early-mid 13th century zone of quarrying was observed at the rear of the later Westgate properties. The quarries along both street frontages contained pre-1150 pottery and may thus have had an earlier origin. Their location and dating tend to support the existence of the street lines in approximately their later positions, prior to the definition of the individual '*burgage* plot' style properties from the middle of the 13th century along Westgate and, possibly, along Cumbergate (Spoerry & Hinman 1998, 92 ff.).

The results from the 2001 excavation would indicate that during the late medieval period the Cumbergate site was used for light industrial activities, possibly associated with cobbling (Phase 1) and, subsequently, for refuse disposal (Phase 2) and pitting (Phase 3). It is only from the early post-medieval period (Phase 4a) that a sequence of surfaces may have been associated with Cumbergate itself. The excavation site lies in the middle of the later post-medieval road, as known from cartographic sources. The evidence would therefore indicate that Cumbergate, in its present location and form, is no earlier than the mid 16th century, in apparent contrast with the results from the excavation at the Still.

It is tempting to interpret the cobbled surface (23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157) recorded during the 2001 excavation and assigned to Phase 1 as a possible antecedent to Cumbergate. However, evidence would suggest that the Phase 1 features fell into disuse throughout Phases 2 and 3, as suggested by waste dumping and subsequent pitting. Therefore, with disregard for the interpretation of wall 164 (Phase 1), a boundary or part of a structure, which may, or may not, have been associated with the cobbled surface, this latter is unlikely to have represented the earlier phase of Cumbergate.

Cumbergate is wholly a product of urban settlement. The evidence from The Still suggests that it was in existence by the mid 12th century, thus supporting a pre-mid 12th century date for the creation of the 'new town' west of the monastic precinct. By contrast, the evidence from the 2001 excavation would indicate that Cumbergate, as a minor L-shaped road, is post-medieval. In the absence of more conclusive evidence, it is tempting to combine the results from both excavation sites and suggest the possibility that in medieval times Cumbergate was a narrower, north to south aligned road either terminating abruptly without turning eastwards, or continuing northwards to intersect the projected line of Back Lane and Westgate. Both interpretations would be consistent with the presence of a medieval street frontage at The Still accounting, at the same time, for the absence of the road itself 5m further to the east. To support the latter suggestion, a boundary marked on Speed's Map of 1610 and stretching in a northerly direction from the 'dog-leg' corner of Cumbergate to Westgate might have marked a minor lane across the fields (Fig. 3). The cartographic evidence would be consistent with the proposed post-1550/pre-1600 date for the creation of Cumbergate. The excavation at The Still (Spoerrey & Hinman 1998) revealed that during the period 1500-1600 (Phase 6) the backyard plots of the buildings along the Westgate frontage were used for rubbish disposal, and very little activity was recorded at the Cumbergate end, indicative of partial contraction. However, after 1600 the Westgate and Cumbergate properties were rebuilt whereas the centre of the site, which, by then, had become a garden, was not re-developed until the 19th century. It is tempting to suggest that the change in land use in the central part of the site at The Still was due to the 're'-alignment of Cumbergate in its present form and the 'decline' of the postulated north to south aligned route linking-up Cumbergate and Westgate further north.

## 6.4 The Site

A reference from 1548 to a dunghill that had to be removed from the 'Cumbergate end' (Mellows 1947) indicates that in this part of town there were spaces for the disposal of refuse. It may also imply that the dunghill had to be removed in advance of the 're'-routing of Cumbergate after about 1550. In addition, a reference in the Court Roll for 1599 to an orchard of a quarter of an acre on land to the western side of the Cumbergate (Mellows & Gifford 1956), coupled with several others in the 16th century, which refer to cottage gardens and barns on Cumbergate (Meadows in Welsh 1994), gives the impression that this street had plenty of open space.

According to Meadows (*Ibid.*), the available documentary sources would indicate that this part of town was not 'very urban' in character, although from cartographic evidence, dense expansion in this area does not appear to have occurred prior to the mid to late 19th century (above). The comprehensive evidence from the ecofacts and artefacts from the 1991 excavation (Appendices 3-7) appears to be consistent with an urban site, albeit of relatively low status, and points to general domestic refuse of the period. More specifically, the assemblage of faunal remains (namely cattle, sheep/goat, pig and horse) suggests deposition of waste from butchery and food processing/consumption (Appendix 6). The macro-environmental remains indicate that cereals were being locally consumed, though little or no processing was occurring on the site or in the immediate vicinity. The environmental samples also contained a number of wild species commonly found in non-agricultural contexts on disturbed ground (Appendix 7).

Cumbergate appears to be a craft-derived street name meaning the 'street of wool combers' (Meadows in Welsh 1994). The 2001 excavation produced no evidence that wool processing was taking place on the site. However, the presence of a large amount of discarded cobbling waste in contexts dating to the period 1400-1550 (Phases 1-3) provides evidence for shoe manufacture and repair on the site or in the immediate vicinity (Appendix 5).

In addition to cobbling, several domestic cat bones were recovered, mostly immature, which may represent waste from small-scale skinning activities (Appendix 6).

Finally, a late medieval clay-lined pit of possible industrial function (tanning?) was recorded during the preliminary phase of evaluation conducted between January and February 2001 (Cooper & Spoerry 2001).

The evidence for cobbling, combined with that for cat skin processing and, possibly, tanning, would point to leatherworking specialisation on the site. It is uncertain whether the Phase 1 cobbled 'yard' (23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157) and robbed out 'foundation' wall (164) may have been directly associated with any of these identified activities.

## 7 Conclusions

The objective of the project was to establish the character, date, state of preservation and extent of any archaeological remains within the site in advance of development.

The finds indicate that, despite large-scale disturbance caused by the construction of Queensgate Shopping Centre nearby, pockets of preserved stratified archaeology survive within the Cumbergate area.

Based on direct stratigraphic evidence and dating provided by the pottery, two main periods of occupation were identified, late medieval into post-medieval (Phases 1-3) and post-medieval (Phase 4). Modern activity (Phase 5) was represented by service trenches which had truncated the earlier stratigraphic sequence.

The evidence suggests that Cumbergate was created in its present form after *c.* 1550 (Phase 4a). It was suggested (above) that, prior to that period, there might have been a less 'formal' precursor to the postmedieval street, and that this area of the town, including the site at The Still at the western end (Spoerry & Hinman 1998), was urban in style and devoted to light industrial activities. At The Still during the medieval period (Phases 1-4) activity in the area between Cumbergate and Westgate appears to have been characterised by quarrying, malting or baking and disposal of rubbish consistent with food processing and consumption, as well as deposition of cess waste in specific locations. The early post-medieval period witnessed an intensification of the former activities (Phases 5 and 6), with particular reference to malting and brewing. The 2001 excavation site produced evidence for cobbling and, possibly cat-skinning, suggesting a leather craft specialisation in the later medieval period (Phases 1-3).

The archaeological evidence for the later development of the Cumbergate site (Phase 4) is consistent with what is known from cartographic and documentary evidence concerning the history of the planned expansion of the town during the later post-medieval period.

## Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank James Macdonald at Lambert, Scott and Innes who commissioned the archaeological work on behalf of Norwich Union.

Thanks go to staff of CAMARC who worked on the site, and to Leomie Willoughby-Ellis, Crane Begg and Carlos Silva who produced the illustrations for this report.

Thanks are also due to the following specialists for their contributions: lan Baxter (faunal remains), Nina Crummy (metalwork), Carole Fletcher (pottery), Val Fryer (environmental remains) and Quita Mould (leatherwork).

Finally, special thanks go to Ben Robinson (PCCAS) who monitored the archaeological work and offered his assistance during the excavation and post-excavation phases of work.

Spencer Cooper (Supervisor) directed both the evaluation and excavation stages. The project was managed by Paul Spoerry (Unit Manager) who edited early drafts of this report. The final version of the report was edited by Dr Elizabeth Shepherd Popescu (Post-Excavation and Publication Manager).

## **Bibliography**

Cooper, S. & Spoerry, P.,	2001	Waterlogged Medieval Pits and Post-Medieval Surfaces at Unit 8a, Queensgate Centre, Peterborough, CCC Archaeological Field Unit Report No 192
Cooper, S. & Baker, T.,	2003	Late Medieval and Post-Medieval Remains at the Queensgate Centre and Westgate Arcade, Peterborough: Post-Excavation Assessment, CCC AFU Rep. No. PXA41
Dallas, C. & Pryor, A.M.,	1975-76	Peterborough Exchange Street (TL19309865), Nene Valley Research Committee Annual Report 1975-76
Hatton, A.	2000	Prehistoric and Post-Medieval Remains at Marshall's Garage, Peterborough: An Archaeological Evaluation, CCC AFU Rep. No. A166
Hatton, A.	2003	Prehistoric and Post-Medieval Remains at Marshall's Garage, Peterborough: An Archaeological Evaluation, CCC AFU Rep. No.

		A219.
Hatton, A.,	2004	Post-Medieval Remains at South Bank, Peterborough: An Archaeological Evaluation, CCC AFU Rep. No. 704
Horton, A.,	1989	Geology of the Peterborough District, Memoir of the British Geological Survey, BGS Sheet 158, 1:50 000, London, HMSO
Jones, A.E.,	1995	25-26 Long Causeway, Peterborough, Cambridge, Archaeological Investigations 1994-1995: A Post- Excavation Assessment and Research Design, BUFAU Rep. No. 317.02
King, E.,	1981	The Town of Peterborough in the Early middle Ages, <i>Northamptonshire Past Present</i> 6(4): 187-95
Mackreth, D.F.,	1994	Peterborough: History and Guide, Stroud, Alan Sutton Meadows, I., (?) 1998 Archaeological Excavations at the Western range, Peterborough Cathedral, Northamptonshire Archaeology Report
Meadows, I.,	2004	Archaeological Evaluation of 130 Bridge Street, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire 2002-2003, Northamptonshire Archaeology Report
Mellows, W.T.,	1947	Peterborough Local Administration, the Last Days of Peterborough Monastery Part 1 of Tudor Documents, Northampton Record Society Vol. XII
Mellows, W.T. & Gifford, D.H.,	1956	Peterborough Local Administration, Elizabethan Peterborough, The Dean and Chapter as Lords of the City, Part iii of Tudor Documents, Northampton Record Society Vol. XVII
O'Neill, F.,	1978	Excavations at Bridge Street, Peterborough, Durobrivae 6: 30-31
Pryor, A.M.,	1977-78	Peterborough Queensgate Centre (TL1913 9873), Nene Valley Research Committee Annual Report 1977-78
RCHME	1969	Archaeological Survey of Peterborough New Town
Spoerry, P.,	2001	Specification for Archaeological Excavation: Peterborough Queensgate Centre, Peterborough (TL 1914 9874), CCC AFU 2001
Spoerry, P. & Hinman, M.,	1998	The Still, Peterborough: Medieval Remains between Cumbergate and Westgate, CCC Archaeological Field Unit Monograph Number 1
Welsh, K.,	1994	The Still, Peterborough; Medieval Deposits behind Cumbergate and Westgate, CCC AFU Archaeological Report 101

## Maps

Speed's Map of Peterborough 1610	(Huntingdon Record Office)
Eyre's Map of Peterborough 1721	(Huntingdon Record Office)
Hill's map of 1808	(Huntingdon Record Office)
Enclosure Map of 1821	(Huntingdon Record Office)

<b>A</b> 10 10 0		1.00		
		Phase		Same as
1		5	modern brick floor, 0.10m thick	
2		5	sandy mortar make-up layer for 1, 0.15m thick	
3	12	3	upper fill of pit, dark grey silty clay	
4		5	modern concrete floor, 0.10m thick	
5		4	cornbrash floor, 0.08m thick	
6	13	3	fill of pit, dark brown silty clay	
7		4	pebble floor, 0.15m thick	
8		4	pebble and cornbrash floor, 0.15m thick	
9		4	gravel make-up, 0.20m thick	
10	12	3	mid fill of pit, dark grey silty clay	
11	12	3	lower fill of pit, light grey sandy silt 0.10m	
12	12	3	pit, 0.70m in diameter and 1m wide	

#### F

9       4       gravel make-up. 0.20m thick       1         10       12       3       mid fill of pit, dark grey silly clay       1         11       12       3       mid fill of pit, light grey sandy silt 0.10m       1         12       12       3       pit, 0.70m in diameter and 1m wide       1         13       13       3       pit, 0.60m deep and 0.60m wide       1         14       15       5       modern service trench, 0.10m wide and       1         16       15       5       modern service trench, 0.60m deep.       1         16       14       pebble floor, 0.02m thick       1       1         17       4       pebble floor, 0.10m thick       1       1         10       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark gravel silly clay       1         22       3       fill of pit, dark gravel silly clay, unexcavated       1         22       3       fill of pit, dark prown silly clay, unexcavated       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1 <th>8</th> <th></th> <th>4</th> <th>pebble and cornbrash floor, 0.15m thick</th> <th></th> <th>1</th>	8		4	pebble and cornbrash floor, 0.15m thick		1	
10       12       3       mid fill of pit, dark grey sitly clay       1         11       12       3       lower fill of pit, light grey sandy sitl 0.10m       1         13       13       3       pit, 0.70m in diameter and 1m wide       1         14       15       5       upper fill of service trench, 0.10m wide and       1         14       15       5       modern service trench, 0.60m deep.       1         15       15       5       modern service trench, 0.60m deep.       1         16       15       5       lower fill of modern service trench       1         18       4       pebble floor, 0.02m thick       1       1         19       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1       1         22       3       pit, 0.41 deep       1       1       1       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m       1       1         25       5	9		4	gravel make-up, 0.20m thick			
11       12       3       [ower fill of pit, light grey sandy silt 0.10m       1         12       13       13       3       pit, 0.70m in diameter and 1m wide       1         13       13       3       pit, 0.60m deep and 0.60m wide       1         14       15       5       upper fill of service trench, 0.10m wide and 0.40m wide end       1         15       15       5       modern service trench       1       1         16       15       5       modern service trench       1       1         17       4       pebble floor, 0.02m thick       1       1         18       4       pebble floor, 0.10m thick       1       1         20       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1       1       1         21       23       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1       1         22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1       1         23       11       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       5       modern drain       1       1       1         25	10	12	3	mid fill of pit, dark grey silty clay			
12       12       3       pit, 0.70m in diameter and 1m wide       1         13       13       pit, 0.80m deep and 0.80m wide       1         14       15       5       upper fill of service trench, 0.10m wide and 0.40m deep       1         15       15       5       modern service trench       1         16       15       5       modern service trench       1         17       4       pebble floor, 0.20m thick       1       1         18       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1       1         20       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silly clay       1       1         22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silly clay       1       1       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/167       1         24       4       5       modern drain       1       1         25       26       5       fill of modern drain       1       1         26       5       modern drain       1       1<	11	12	3	ower fill of pit, light grey sandy silt 0.10m			
13       13       pit, 0.60m deep and 0.60m wide       1         14       15       5       0.40m deep       1         15       15       5       modern service trench, 0.60m deep.       1         16       15       5       lower fill of modern service trench       1         17       4       pebble floor, 0.08m thick       1       1         18       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1       1         19       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silly clay       1       1         22       23       pit, 0.41 deep       1       1       1       2         24       5       modern drain       1       1       1       2       1       cobled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         25       26       5       fill of pit, dark grey silly clay.       1       1       1         26       25       modern drain       1       1       1       1       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m	12	12	3	pit, 0.70m in diameter and 1m wide		1	
14       15       5       upper fill of service trench, 0.10m wide and 0.40m deep       1         15       15       5       modern service trench       1         16       15       5       lower fill of modern service trench       1         17       4       pebble floor, 0.02m thick       1       1         18       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1       1         19       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1       1         20       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1       1         21       22       3       fill of pil, dark grey silly clay       1       1         22       3       pit, 0.41 deep       1       1       1       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       5       modern drain       0.70m deep and 0.80m       1       1         25       26       5       fill of pil, dark brown silly clay, unexcavated       1       1         26       5       modern drain, 0.70m deep, unexcavated       31       1       1	13	13	3	pit, 0.60m deep and 0.60m wide		1	
15       15       5       modern service trench, 0.60m deep.       1         16       15       5       lower fill of modern service trench       1         17       4       pebble floor, 0.08m thick       1         18       4       pebble floor, 0.10m thick       1         19       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1         20       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silly clay       1         22       23       pit, 0.41 deep       1       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.70m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       25       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide       1       1         25       26       5       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       1       1         26       5       modern drain       1       1       1         28       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       31       1         29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       29?       1 <tr< td=""><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>5</td><td>upper fill of service trench, 0.10m wide and 0.40m deep</td><td></td><td>1</td></tr<>	14	15	5	upper fill of service trench, 0.10m wide and 0.40m deep		1	
16       15       5       lower fill of modern service trench       1         17       4       pebble floor, 0.08m thick       1         18       4       pebble floor, 0.10m thick       1         19       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1         20       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silly clay       1         22       3       pit, 0.41 deep       1       1         24       24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide       1         25       26       5       fill of ordern drain       1       1         26       5       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1       1         28       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       317       1         30       31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       1       1         31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       1       1       1	15	15	5	modern service trench, 0.60m deep.		1	
17       4       pebble floor, 0.08m thick       1         18       4       pebble floor, 0.10m thick       1         19       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1         20       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1         22       3       pit, 0.41 deep       1       1         24       24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide       1       1         25       26       5       fill of modern drain       1       1         26       25       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1       1         28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silly clay, unexcavated       1         29       29       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated       29?       1         31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silly clay, unexcavated       1       1         31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silly clay, unexcavated       1       1	16	15	5	lower fill of modern service trench		1	
18       4       pebble floor, 0.10m thick       1         19       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1         20       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silly clay       1         22       23       pit, 0.41 deep       1       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m       1       1         25       26       5       fill of modern drain       1       1         26       5       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1       1         28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silly clay, unexcavated       1       1         30       31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silly clay, unexcavated       1       1         31       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated       29?       1       1         31       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated <t< td=""><td>17</td><td></td><td>4</td><td>pebble floor, 0.08m thick</td><td></td><td>1</td></t<>	17		4	pebble floor, 0.08m thick		1	
19       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1         20       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1         22       22       3       pit, 0.41 deep       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide       1       1         25       26       5       fill of oddem drain       1       1         26       26       5       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1       1         28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       31?       1         29       3       pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated       31?       1       1         31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       1       1         31       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated       29?       1       1         31       4	18		4	pebble floor, 0.10m thick		1	
20       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1         21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silly clay       1         22       23       pit, 0.41 deep       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide       1       1         25       26       5       fill of modern drain       1       1         26       26       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1       1         28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       31?       1         29       3       pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated       29?       1       1         31       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated       29?       1       1         31       31       gravel make-up, 0.08m thick       1       1         34       4       pebble floor, 0.90m thick       1       1         34       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick	19		4	pebble floor, 0.12m thick		1	
21       22       3       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1         22       22       3       pit, 0.41 deep       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m       1       1         25       26       5       fill of modern drain       1       1         26       26       5       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1       1         28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       31?       1         30       31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       29?       1         31       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated       29?       1       1         32       4       pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick       1       1         34       compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick       1       1         34       pebble floor, 0.10m thick       1       1         36       5<	20		4	gravel make-up, 0.12m thick		1	
22       22       3       pit, 0.41 deep       1         23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide       1         25       26       5       fill of modern drain       1         26       5       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1       1         28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       31?       1         30       31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       29?       1         31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       29?       1         31       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated       29?       1         32       4       pebble floor, 0.09m thick       1       1         33       4       compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick       1       1         34       4       pebble floor, 0.12m thick       1       1         35       36       5 <td>21</td> <td>22</td> <td>3</td> <td>fill of pit, dark grey silty clay</td> <td></td> <td>1</td>	21	22	3	fill of pit, dark grey silty clay		1	
23       1       cobbled floor, 0.10m thick       46/105/129/149/151/156/157       1         24       24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide       1         25       26       5       fill of modern drain       1         26       26       5       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1       1         28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       31?       1         29       29       3       pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated       31?       1         30       31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       29?       1         32       4       pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick       1       1         33       4       compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick       1       1         34       4       pebble floor, 0.19m thick       1       1         35       36       5       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1         36       5       modern service trench       1       1         36       5	22	22	3	pit, 0.41 deep		1	
24       24       5       modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide       1         25       26       5       fill of modern drain       1         26       26       5       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1         27       4       cobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1       1         28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       31?       1         29       3       pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated       31?       1       1         30       31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       29?       1         31       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated       29?       1       1         31       3       pebbled make-up, 0.08m thick       1       1         33       4       compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick       1       1         34       4       pebble floor, 0.09m thick       1       1         35       36       5       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1         36       5       modern service trench       80       1         37       4	23		1	cobbled floor, 0.10m thick	46/105/129/149/151/156/157	1	
25     26     5     fill of modern drain     1       26     26     5     modern drain, 0.70m deep     1       27     4     cobbled surface, 0.26m thick     1       28     29     3     fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated     1       29     3     pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated     31?     1       30     31     3     fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated     29?     1       31     3     fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated     29?     1       31     3     pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated     29?     1       32     4     pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick     1     1       33     4     compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick     1     1       34     4     pebble floor, 0.09m thick     1     1       35     36     5     fill of modern service trench     1     1       36     36     5     modern feature     1     1       37     4     gravel make-up, 0.12m thick     1     1       38     39     3     fill of pit, dark gravel	24	24	5	modern service trench, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide		1	
26       26       5       modern drain, 0.70m deep       1         27       4       oobbled surface, 0.26m thick       1         28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       31         29       29       3       pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated       31?       1         30       31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       29?       1         31       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated       29?       1         32       4       pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick       1       1         33       4       compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick       1       1         34       4       pebbled make-up, 0.12m thick       1       1         35       36       5       fill of modern service trench       1       1         36       3       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1       1         37       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1       1         38       39       3       fill of modern feature       1       1         38       39       3       f	25	26	5	fill of modern drain		1	
27     4     cobbled surface, 0.26m thick     1       28     29     3     fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated     31?       29     29     3     pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated     31?     1       30     31     3     fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated     29?     1       31     3     pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated     29?     1       32     4     pebbled make-up, 0.08m thick     1       33     4     compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick     1       34     4     pebble floor, 0.09m thick     1       35     36     5     fill of modern service trench     1       36     36     5     modern service trench     1       37     4     gravel make-up, 0.12m thick     1     1       38     39     3     fill of pit, dark grey silty clay     1     1       38     39     3     fill of pit, dark grey silty clay     1     1       39     3     pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide     2     2     1       40     41     5     modern gravel foundation, 0.2	26	26	5	modern drain, 0.70m deep		1	
28       29       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       1         29       29       3       pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated       31?       1         30       31       3       fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated       29?       1         31       3       pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated       29?       1         32       4       pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick       1       1         33       4       compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick       1       1         34       4       pebble floor, 0.09m thick       1       1         35       36       5       fill of modern service trench       1       1         36       36       5       modern service trench, 0.80m deep       1       1         37       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1       1         38       39       3       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1       1         38       39       3       pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide       1       1         40       41       5       modern feature       2       2	27		4	cobbled surface, 0.26m thick		1	
29     3     pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated     31?     1       30     31     3     fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated     29?     1       31     31     3     pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated     29?     1       32     4     pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick     1     1       33     4     compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick     1     1       34     4     pebble floor, 0.09m thick     1     1       35     36     5     fill of modern service trench     1     1       36     36     5     modern service trench, 0.80m deep     1     1       37     4     gravel make-up, 0.12m thick     1     1       38     39     3     fill of pit, dark grey silty clay     1     1       39     39     3     pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide     1     1       40     41     5     fill of modern feature     2     2     2       41     5     modern uservice french     2     2     2     3     5     modern service french     2       42     <	28	29	3	fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated		1	
30     31     3     fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated     1       31     31     3     pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated     29?     1       32     4     pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick     1     1       33     4     compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick     1     1       34     4     pebble floor, 0.09m thick     1     1       35     36     5     fill of modern service trench     1       36     5     modern service trench, 0. 80m deep     1     1       37     4     gravel make-up, 0.12m thick     1     1       38     39     3     fill of pit, dark grey silty clay     1     1       38     39     3     fill of modern feature     2     2       41     5     fill of modern feature     2     2     2       41     5     modern feature, 0.91m deep     2     2       42     5     modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick     2     2       43     5     modern brick rubble layer, 0.18m thick     2     2       44     5     modern bric	29	29	3	pit, 0.30m deep, unexcavated	31?	1	
31     31     3     pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated     29?     1       32     4     pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick     1       33     4     compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick     1       34     4     pebble floor, 0.09m thick     1       35     36     5     fill of modern service trench     1       36     36     5     modern service trench, 0. 80m deep     1       37     4     gravel make-up, 0.12m thick     1     1       38     39     3     fill of pit, dark grey silty clay     1       39     39     3     pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide     1       40     41     5     fill of modern feature     2       41     5     modern feature, 0.91m deep     2     2       42     5     modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick     2     2       43     5     modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick     2     2       44     5     modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick     2     2       44     5     modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick     2     2	30	31	3	fill of pit, dark brown silty clay, unexcavated		1	
32     4     pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick     1       33     4     compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick     1       34     4     pebble floor, 0.09m thick     1       35     36     5     fill of modern service trench     1       36     36     5     modern service trench, 0. 80m deep     1       37     4     gravel make-up, 0.12m thick     1     1       38     39     3     fill of pit, dark grey silty clay     1     1       39     39     3     pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide     1     1       40     41     5     fill of modern feature     2     2       41     41     5     modern feature, 0.91m deep     2     2       42     5     modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick     2     2       43     5     modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick     2     2       44     5     modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick     2     2       45     5     modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick     2     2       45     5     fill of modern service trench     1	31	31	3	pit, 0.40m deep, unexcavated	29?	1	
33     4     compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick     1       34     4     pebble floor, 0.09m thick     1       35     36     5     fill of modern service trench     1       36     36     5     modern service trench, 0. 80m deep     1       37     4     gravel make-up, 0.12m thick     1     1       38     39     3     fill of pit, dark grey silty clay     1       39     39     3     pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide     1       40     41     5     fill of modern feature     2       41     45     fill of modern feature     2     2       42     5     modern feature, 0.91m deep     2     2       43     5     modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick     2     2       44     5     modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick     2     2       45     5     modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick     2     2       44     5     modern concrete rubble layer, 0.70m thick     2     2       45     5     modern service trench     2     2       46 <t< td=""><td>32</td><td></td><td>4</td><td>pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick</td><td></td><td>1</td></t<>	32		4	pebbled make-up, 0.0 8m thick		1	
34       4       pebble floor, 0.09m thick       1         35       36       5       fill of modern service trench       1         36       36       5       modern service trench, 0. 80m deep       1         37       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1       1         38       39       3       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1       1         39       39       3       pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide       1       1         40       41       5       fill of modern feature       2       2         41       5       modern feature, 0.91m deep       2       2       2         41       5       modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick       2       2         43       5       modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick       2       2         44       5       modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick       2       2         45       5       modern service trench       2       2         46       1       cobbled surface, 0.10m thick       23/105/129/149/151/156/157       2         47       24       5       fill	33		4	compacted silty clay surface, 0.08m thick		1	
35     36     5     fill of modern service trench     1       36     36     5     modern service trench, 0. 80m deep     1       37     4     gravel make-up, 0.12m thick     1       38     39     3     fill of pit, dark grey silty clay     1       39     39     3     pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide     1       40     41     5     fill of modern feature     2       41     41     5     modern feature, 0.91m deep     2       42     5     modern gravel foundation, 0.20m deep     2       43     5     modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick     2       44     5     modern brick rubble layer, 0.18m thick     2       45     5     modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick     2       46     1     cobbled surface, 0.10m thick     23/105/129/149/151/156/157     2       47     24     5     fill of modern service trench     2       48     49     5     fill of modern service trench     2       49     49     5     modern service trench, 0.60m deep     2       50     52     5	34		4	pebble floor, 0.09m thick		1	
36       36       5       modern service trench, 0. 80m deep       1         37       4       gravel make-up, 0.12m thick       1         38       39       3       fill of pit, dark grey silty clay       1         39       39       3       pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide       1         40       41       5       fill of modern feature       2         41       41       5       modern feature, 0.91m deep       2         42       5       modern gravel foundation, 0.20m deep       2         43       5       modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick       2         44       5       modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick       2         44       5       modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick       2         45       5       modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick       2         46       1       cobbled surface, 0.10m thick       23/105/129/149/151/156/157       2         47       24       5       fill of modern service trench       2         48       49       5       fill of modern service trench       2         49       49       5       m	35	36	5	fill of modern service trench		1	
374gravel make-up, 0.12m thick138393fill of pit, dark grey silty clay139393pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide140415fill of modern feature241415modern feature, 0.91m deep2425modern wall, 0.40m wide and 0.20m deep2435modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick2445modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick2455modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick2461cobbled surface, 0.10m thick23/105/129/149/151/156/15747245fill of modern service trench148495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench250525fill of modern service trench2	36	36	5	modern service trench, 0. 80m deep		1	
38393fill of pit, dark grey silty clay139393pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide140415fill of modern feature241415modern feature, 0.91m deep2425modern wall, 0.40m wide and 0.20m deep2435modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick2445modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick2455modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick2461cobbled surface, 0.10m thick23/105/129/149/151/156/15747245fill of modern service trench148495modern service trench249495modern service trench250525fill of modern service trench2	37		4	gravel make-up, 0.12m thick		1	
39393pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide140415fill of modern feature241415modern feature, 0.91m deep2425modern wall, 0.40m wide and 0.20m deep2435modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick2445modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick2455modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick2461cobbled surface, 0.10m thick23/105/129/149/151/156/15747245fill of modern service trench148495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench250525fill of modern service trench2	38	39	3	fill of pit, dark grey silty clay		1	
40415fill of modern feature241415modern feature, 0.91m deep2425modern wall, 0.40m wide and 0.20m deep2435modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick2445modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick2455modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick2461cobbled surface, 0.10m thick23/105/129/149/151/156/15747245fill of modern service trench148495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench250525fill of modern service trench2	39	39	3	pit, 0.70m deep and 0.05m wide		1	
41415modern feature, 0.91m deep2425modern wall, 0.40m wide and 0.20m deep2435modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick2445modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick2455modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick2461cobbled surface, 0.10m thick23/105/129/149/151/156/15747245fill of modern service trench148495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench, 0.60m deep250525fill of modern service trench2	40	41	5	fill of modern feature		2	
425modern wall, 0.40m wide and 0.20m deep2435modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick2445modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick2455modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick2461cobbled surface, 0.10m thick23/105/129/149/151/156/15747245fill of modern service trench148495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench, 0.60m deep250525fill of modern service trench2	41	41	5	modern feature, 0.91m deep		2	
435modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick2445modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick2455modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick2461cobbled surface, 0.10m thick23/105/129/149/151/156/157247245fill of modern service trench148495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench, 0.60m deep250525fill of modern service trench2	42		5	modern wall, 0.40m wide and 0.20m deep		2	
445modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick2455modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick2461cobbled surface, 0.10m thick23/105/129/149/151/156/157247245fill of modern service trecnh148495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench, 0.60m deep250525fill of modern service trench2	43		5	modern gravel foundation, 0.20m thick		2	
455modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick2461cobbled surface, 0.10m thick23/105/129/149/151/156/157247245fill of modern service trench148495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench, 0.60m deep250525fill of modern service trench2	44		5	modern concrete rubble layer, 0.18m thick		2	
46       1       cobbled surface, 0.10m thick       23/105/129/149/151/156/157       2         47       24       5       fill of modern service trench       1         48       49       5       fill of modern service trench       2         49       49       5       modern service trench, 0.60m deep       2         50       52       5       fill of modern service trench       2	45		5	modern brick rubble layer, 0.70m thick		2	
47245fill of modern service trench148495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench, 0.60m deep250525fill of modern service trench2	46		1	cobbled surface, 0.10m thick	23/105/129/149/151/156/157	2	
48495fill of modern service trench249495modern service trench, 0.60m deep250525fill of modern service trench2	47	24	5	fill of modern service trecnh		1	
49       49       5       modern service trench, 0.60m deep       2         50       52       5       fill of modern service trench       2	48	49	5	fill of modern service trench		2	
50 52 5 fill of modern service trench 2	49	49	5	modern service trench, 0.60m deep		2	
	50	52	5	fill of modern service trench		2	

Context	Cut	Phase	Description	Same as	Trench
51		-	unstratified finds		i i
52	52	5	modern service trench, 0.60m deep and 1.40m wide		2
53	54	5	fill of modern service trench, dark grev silty clay		2
54	54	5	modern service trench. 1.0m deep		2
100	101	5	fill of service trench		
101	101	5	cut of service trench		
102	101	4c	cobbled surface	103/112/114/121/124	
102	<u> </u>	40		102/112/114/121/124	
100	I	2h		107/108/145/148/158	
105	<u> </u>	1		120/140/151/157	
106	I	/	natural	120/140/101/101	
107	<u> </u>	/ 2h	dump laver	104/108/145/148/158	<u> </u>
107	I I	25 26		104/107/145/148/158	
100	<u> </u>	20 2h	dump layer		
112		40		102/103/11//121/12/	
112		40		102/103/114/121/124	
114		40		102/103/112/121/12/	
114	115	5	cut of service trench	102/103/112/121/124	
116	115	5			
110	113	5			
117	117	5			
110		3			
119		40			<u> </u>
120		Za		400/400/440/444404	
121		4C		102/103/112/114/124	
122	<u> </u>	4a		126/132/134	
123		4b	pitched stone surface		
124		4C		102/103/112/114/121	<u> </u>
125	<u> </u>	4a	make-up layer for 122	127	
126		4a		122/132/134	<u> </u>
127	<u> </u>	4a	make-up layer for 122	125	
129	<u> </u>	1		105/149/151/156/157	
130	<u> </u>	4b	make-up layer for 123		<u> </u>
131	<u> </u>	4b	make-up layer for 123		
132	<u> </u>	4a	cobbled surface	122/126/134	
133	<u> </u>	4b	make-up layer for 123		
134		4a	cobbled surface	122/126/132	
136	137	3	upper fill of pit	100	
137	137	3	cut of pit	139	
138	137	3	lower fill of pit		
139	137	3	cut of pit	137	
140	140	3	cut of pit		
141	141	3	cut of pit		
142	140	3	fill of pit		
143	141	3	upper fill of pit		
144	141	3	lower fill of pit		
145		2b	dump layer	104/107/108/148/158	
148	<u> </u>	2b	dump layer	145/104/10//108/158	
149		1	cobble surface	105/129/151/157	
150	<u> </u>	2a	post-demolition? Layer		
151		1	cobbled surface	105/129/149/156/157	
153	159	3	till of pit		<u>                                     </u>
155	<u> </u>	2b	dump layer	104/107/108/145/148/158?	
156	<u> </u>	1	cobbled surface	105/129/149/151/157	ļ
157		1	cobbled surface	105/129/149/151/156	ļ
158		2b	dump layer	104/107/108/145/148	

Context	Cut	Phase	Description	Same as	Trench
159	159	3	cut of pit		
160		3	wall extension to 122		
163	164	1	fill of wall foundation		
164	164	1	cut of wall foundation		

Context	Cut	Pottery	Animal Bone	Brick/tile	Clay Pipe	Fired Clay	Glass	Industrial residues	Shell	Stone	Worked Bone	Worked Stone
3	12	23	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	13	207	1280	483	0	0	0	0	74	0	0	203
10	12	94	771	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	0	0
11	12	0	1161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46		153	58	0	0	0	0	0	59	0	0	0
51		7	216	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
103		7	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
104		601	346	87	0	0	0	0	183	278		20
105		220	764	22	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0
107		207	0	98	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0
108		309	1300	92	0	0	0	21	77	0	0	0
112		129	0	83	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0
114		0	18	0	2	96	0	0	0	4098	0	0
116	115	101	0	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
118	117	267	300	0	9	0	0	0	126	0	0	0
119		0	54	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
120		23	60	34	0	58	0	0	4	0	0	0
123		70	126	121	19	0	37	5	0	0	0	0
124		18	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0
126		0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
130		306	755	368	14	0	0	0	10	62	0	0
132		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
136	137	17	6	0	0	10	0	0	0	11	0	0
138	137	46	353	0	0	6	0	0	0	20	0	0
142	140	21	776	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
143	141	79	331	0	0	0	0	0	133	0	0	0
144	141	0	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
148		358	1854	341	0	0	0	0	91	426	0	0
150		520	752	138	0	0	22	0	34	0		62
151		7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
153	159	0	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
155		438	507	71	0	0	0	0	118	0	0	0
156		0	568	0	0	0	0	0	84	0	0	0
157		43	1084	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
158		52	748	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0
163	164	34	57	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number		4357	14728	2144	53	170	59	26	1118	4895	25	285

## Appendix 2: Finds Summary by Weight
# **Appendix 3: The Pottery**

by Carole Fletcher MA

## 3.1 Introduction

This assessment considers pottery from both the evaluation of the site in 2000 and the excavation in 2001. The basic guidance in the *Management of Archaeological Projects* (MAP2) has been adhered to (English Heritage 1991). In addition, the Medieval Pottery Research Group (MPRG) documents *Guidance for the Processing and Publication of Medieval Pottery from Excavations* (Blake & Davey, 1983), A Guide to the Classification of Medieval Ceramic Forms (MPRG 1998) and *Minimum Standards for the Processing, Recording, Analysis and Publication of Post-Roman Ceramics* (MPRG 2001) act as a standard.

Spot dating was carried out using the CAM ARC (former CCC AFU) inhouse system based on that used at the Museum of London. Standard fabric classification was carried out for all known types. New types were given descriptive identifiers, although full fabric descriptions using binocular microscope and x20 magnification were not carried out. All sherds were counted, classified, weighed and spot dated on a context basis. The resulting information was entered directly onto a relational database (Access 2000), which enables the appending of quantification data.

The pottery and archive are curated by CAM ARC.

## **3.2** Quantity of Material

The fieldwork generated a total of 209 sherds of pottery (weighing 4357g), including unstratified material. The majority of the assemblage dates to *c*.1350 to *c*.1650, with only a single sherd of earlier Stamford Ware. Medieval and late medieval material makes up half of the assemblage by count (103 sherds) but is mainly residual. Early post-medieval material accounts for much of the remaining assemblage. Although there are fewer sherds (80 sherds), this material dominates most contexts due to the larger, less abraded nature of the sherds. In addition, there are 16 sherds of post-medieval Red Ware and Black Glazed Ware, and 7 sherds of Tin-Glazed Earthenware. As a whole, the pottery appears to be generally indicative of Peterborough urban assemblage in the period 1400 to 1650.

Context	Cut	Sherd Weight (g)	Sherd Count
3	12	23	2
6	13	207	13
10	12	94	3
46		153	6
51		7	1
103		7	3
104		601	34

Context	Cut	Sherd Weight (g)	Sherd Count
105		220	4
107		207	6
108		309	19
112		129	4
116	115	101	4
118	117	267	4
120		23	5
123		70	6
124		18	3
130		306	18
136	137	17	2
138	137	46	4
142	140	21	2
143	141	79	3
148		358	16
150		520	30
151		7	1
155		438	10
157		43	1
158		52	2
163	164	34	3
Total		4357	209

Table App.3.1: Quantification of pottery by context

Context	Cut	Phase	Fabric	Earliest Date	Latest Date	Basic Form	Specific Form	Other	Comments
3	12	3	Mel	1250	1500				
			bond	1450	1550				
6	13	3	bond	1450	1650				
			shw2	1150	1350				
			lyst	1200	1350				
10	12	3	lyst	1200	1500				
			bond	1450	1650				
46		1	bond	1450	1650				
			bonb	1250	1450				
			lyst	1200	1500				bond tendencies
51		-	lmr	1350	1500				
103		4c	cist	1470	1600				
			pmr	1550	0				
104		2b	bonb	1300	1450			handls strap	
			bonb	1300	1450				
			lyst	1350	1500				
			bond	1450	1650				
			bondt	1450	1650				
			lmr	1350	1500				
			shw	1150	1350				
			mel	1200	1500				
			cist	1470	1600	Drinking Vessel	Cup	handle strap	
			brill	1250	1500	Jug		handle	
			tudg	1380	1550	Drinking Vessel	Lobed Cup		
			sieburg	1350	1500	Jug			
			unk	0	0	Jug			

Context	Cut	Phase	Fabric	Earliest Date	Latest Date	Basic Form	Specific Form	Other	Comments
			import - iberian	0	0				
105		1	bond?	1450	1650				
			dest?	1150	1250	Jug			
			bonb	1300	1450			handle	
			bonb	1300	1450				
107		2b	lmr	1350	1500				
			grim	1200	1500				
			bond	1450	1650				
			Imt	1450	1600				
			bonb?	1300	1450	Jar	Pipkin		
108		2b	bond	1450	1650		<u> </u>		various
			pmr	1600	1800	Bowl			or Dutch Redware and earlier date
			lyst	1350	1500	Jug		handle	late
			lyst	1200	1500				
			sieburg	1350	1500	Jug			
			grim	1200	1500				
			bonb	1250	1450	Bowl			
			tudg	1380	1550				
112		4c	bonb	1300	1450				
			lyst	1200	1500	Jug			
			bond	1450	1650				
116	115	5	bond	1450	1650				
118	117	5	dutrw	1350	1550	Jar	Pipkin		or Essex Redware
			bonb	1300	1450	Jug			
			grim	1250	1500				
120		2a	import	0	0	Jug			smooth grey sherd with slip under green glaze
			mel	1200	0				
			bont	1250	0				bon A or D
			osw	1350	1500				
123		4b	pmr	1550	0	Bowl			
			cist	1470	1600				
124		4c	bond	1450	1650	Jug			
			tudg	1380	1550				
130		4b	tgw	1650	1800				
			pmr	0	0	Bowl			could be overfired Nottingham
			mel	1250	1400				
			cist	1470	1600				
			pmr	1600	1800				
136	137	3	Imel	1350	1500				
138	137	3	lmt/bon d	14500	1650				
			pmr	1500	1800				
			bond	1450	1650				
142	140	3	bond	14500	1650				
143	141	3	lmt/bon d	1450	1650				
		1	Imel	1350	1500				
			bond	1450	1650				

Context	Cut	Phase	Fabric	Earliest Date	Latest Date	Basic Form	Specific Form	Other	Comments
148		2b	bond	1450	1650	Jug		handle strap	
			bond	1450	1650				various vessels
			bond	1450	1650				from sample 11
			bonb	1250	1500				from sample 11
			grim	1200	1350				
			Imel	1350	1500				
150		2a	bond	1450	1650				various vessels inc. jug
			lyst	1350	1500	Bowl			
			lyst	1350	1500	Jug			
			lyst	1200	1500				
			bonb	1200	1450	Jug		handle	
			tudg	1380	1550	Drinking Vessel	Cup		
			mid purple	1600	0				
			dutrw	1350	1650	Jar	Pipkin	handle	h from tripod pipkin
151		1	grim	1250	1500				
155		2b	bond	1450	1650	Jug			
			bondt	1450	1650				
			bond	1450	1650				
			mel	1350	1500	Jar	Bunghol e Jar		
157		1	bond	1450	1650	Bowl			
158		2b	bond	1450	1650				
			lyst	1350	1500	Jug			
163	164	1	bond	1450	1650				

Table App.3.2: Spot-dating By context and phase

In terms of assemblage, provenience and phasing, the pottery from the Cumbergate investigations would appear to show similarities with the pottery from the excavation conducted at The Still in 1995 (Spoerry & Hinman 1998). There, the assemblage for Phase 5 (AD1450 to AD1500) was characterised by the appearance of the Bourne D type, indicating a greater diversity of sourcing for pottery than in the earlier, medieval phases. Bourne D forms included cisterns, jugs and bowls. The general provenance of the assemblage displayed the dominance of Lincolnshire products (over 50%). Phase 6 (AD1500 to AD1600) was also dominated by Bourne D and supplemented by the introduction of Cistercian Ware, early post-medieval Redware forms and German Stoneware. The Cumbergate assemblage breaks down into very similar groups of fabrics and vessels. The presence of earlier material throughout the site indicates a probable continuity of activity on, and around, the site from the 13th to the 18th century, with the major phase of activity on the site dating to between 1450 and 1550.

## **3.3** Provenance and Contamination

Basic statistics relating to source area for the assemblage are given in Table App.3.2, below. The table shows a local source for the bulk of the assemblage.

The table indicates the source for the bulk of the assemblage to be Lincolnshire. This dominance is no doubt due to the production centres being relatively close to Peterborough. However, proximity alone does not fully explain the poor representation of producers from Northamptonshire and Cambridgeshire. The disproportional large and heavy sherds of the Lincolnshire fabrics in this assemblage are the cause of the bias.

General provenance	Percentage by count	Percentage by weight		
Lincolnshire	46.12%	50.92%		
Northamptonshire	19.41%	13.53%		
Essex	07.77%	09.42%		
Norfolk	07.28%	07.38%		
Fenland (Ely)	05.83%	13.31%		
Midlands	03.40%	00.59%		
Staffordshire	03.40%	00.86%		
Surrey	02.43%	00.13%		
Import	02.90%	03.56%		
Other/Unknown	01.46%	00.30%		

Table App.3.3: General provenance areas for the pottery assemblage

Contamination of the assemblage has been difficult to quantify due to the poor state of knowledge of the local pottery industries. There are, however, relatively few sherds attributable to the period 1150 to 1350 found alongside others whose date range extends between 1200 and 1500. The former are thus assumed to be residual. This is also the case where the post-1450 fabrics dominate the assemblage. An exception is represented by the presence of Bourne B (AD1200 to AD1500) and Bourne D (AD1450 to AD1650) fabrics in the same contexts, which indicates some degree of continuation of the medieval tradition (Spoerry & Hinman 1998, 71), also enabling a narrow date range for those particular contexts to be established.

## 3.4 Sampling Bias

The small open area excavation was carried out by hand and selection made through standard sampling procedures by feature, with reduced sampling bias. During the processing of bulk samples for environmental analysis, only a very small amount of pottery was recovered which has not invalidated the general pottery assessment.

### 3.5 Condition

Although the pottery assemblage is small, the sherd size is large, at an average 21.26g per sherd, due largely to the large un-abraded nature

of many of the medieval and, in particular, post-medieval sherds. No complete vessels were found and the material is moderately fragmented. No preservation bias has been recognised.

# Bibliography

Ayers, B.,	2000	Anglo-Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval (Urban) in Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties 2. Research agenda and strategy. East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 8
Blake, H., and Davey, P.,	1983	<i>Guidelines for the Processing and Publications of</i> <i>Medieval Pottery from Excavations,</i> Directorate of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings Occasional Paper 5
English Heritage	1991	Management of Archaeological Projects
Medieval Pottery Research Group	1998	A Guide to the Classification of Medieval Ceramic Forms, Medieval Pottery Research Group Occasional Paper 1
Medieval Pottery Research Group	2001	<i>Minimum Standards for the Processing, Recording, Analysis and Publication of Post-Roman Ceramics, Medieval Pottery Research Group Occasional Paper 2</i>
Spoerry, P. & Hinman, M.,	1998	The Still Peterborough: Medieval remains Between Cumbergate and Westgate, CCC AFU Monograph 1

## **Appendix 4: The Metalwork**

by Nina Crummy

### Introduction

This small assemblage is largely composed of a variety of copper-alloy and iron fittings, none of which can be closely dated. They are catalogued below by site phase.

The Phase 1 cobbled surface contained an iron nail shank, an iron staple (SF 119) and part of a copper-alloy boss that would have been fitted onto a larger metal object with lead-tin solder.

Several iron nails and shank fragments and a part of an iron ?strapfitting came from the Phase 2b dump layers in the southern part of the site, together with three copper-alloy objects, a dress pin, a disc and part of a strap-end. A fragment of an iron knife blade and a damaged iron arrowhead (150) came from the post-demolition layer in the northern part of the site.

Several iron nails came from Phase 3 pit 12, one of which had a double-lobed head (11), a distinctive late medieval form. Also from pit 12 came a suspension mechanism from an unidentified object (SF 155). Phase 3 pit 13 contained only an iron nail.

The only object from Phase 4 is a copper-alloy strap-plate, probably part of a book-fitting, found in a road construction layer.

### Conclusions

None of these objects provide any information as to the activities on or in the vicinity of the site. They are largely fragmentary and in many cases were found in soil imported onto the site from elsewhere in the town. The material from the phase 3 pits is equally enigmatic, with no distinctive craft tools or domestic equipment present.

(105): Cobbled surface. Phase 1. Iron nail shank fragment. Length 27 mm.

SF 119. (156): Cobbled surface. Phase 1. Iron U-shaped staple. Length 70 mm.

SF 118. (156): Cobbled surface. Phase 1. Fragments of a flanged copper-alloy boss with traces of lead-tin solder on the inner face. The base is distorted but was originally flat. Diameter 68 mm, height 11 mm.

SF 102. (104): Dump layer. Phase 2b. a) Iron nail or punch with damaged head. Length 90 mm. b) Incomplete iron nail and two shank fragments. Lengths 15, 22 and 41 mm.

(104): Dump layer. Phase 2b. Iron nail shank fragment embedded in an amorphous lump, possibly slag. Total length 40 mm.

SF 128 (108): Dump layer. Phase 2b. Fragments of a thin flat copper-alloy disc. There are no surviving rivet holes for attachment. Diameter 58 mm.

SF 150. (108): Dump layer. Phase 2b. Copper-alloy lozenge-shaped terminal from a strap-end. Length 19 mm, width 16 mm.

SF 123. (148): Dump layer. Phase 2b. Iron ?strap-fitting fragment of plano-convex section, broken across a rivet hole at one end. One long edge is straight, the other curved. Length 38 mm, maximum width 23 mm.

SF 159. (148): Dump layer. Phase 2b. Copper-alloy dress pin with globular wound wire head, Norwich Type 1, which cannot be closely dated, but the length is typical of medieval rather than post-medieval examples (Margeson 1993, 11, 13). Length 40 mm.

(150): Post-demolition layer. Phase 2b. Iron knife blade fragment, with straight back and damaged edge. Length 56 mm, maximum width 14 mm.

(150): Post-demolition layer. Phase 2b. Barbed iron arrowhead fragment, with most of the barbs and the full length of the ferrule missing. Length 38 mm, maximum width 13 mm. With so much of it missing, the form cannot be precisely paralleled, but it may have been similar to an arrowhead with straight-sides and very short barbs, which came from a 13th to 14th century context at York (Ottaway & Rogers 2002, fig. 1532, 12833, 12835).

SF 155. (3): Fill of pit 12. Phase 3. Copper-alloy suspension mechanism, consisting of a boss, originally with four rectangular projections set around it of which only two now remain, one complete and one incomplete; the complete one has a rivet hole in the terminal. The boss is attached by a split-pin to an oval suspension ring with damaged riveted join. Maximum dimensions 35 by 32 mm; ring diameter 32 mm.

(11): Fill of pit 12. Phase 3. Iron nail with distinctive double lobed head that is not much wider than the shank. Length 72 mm.

(10): Fill of pit 12. Phase 3. Iron nail with thick square head. Length 64 mm.

(10): Fill of pit 12. Phase 3. Iron nail with flat rectangular head. Length 33 mm.

(6): Fill of pit 13. Phase 3. Iron nail with damaged ?round head. Length 66 mm.

SF 104. (132): Road construction layer. Phase 4. Copper-alloy strap-plate, possibly from a book-fitting. The end is pointed and has a large ring-and-dot motif with pierced centre. There are two rivet holes near the inner edge and one at the point. Length 34 mm, width 24 mm.

#### References

Margeson, S.,	1993	Norwich households: the medieval and post-medieval finds from Norwich Survey excavations 1971-78, East Anglian Archaeology 58 (Gressenhall)					
Ottaway, P. and Rogers N.,	2002	<i>Craft, industry and everyday life: finds from medieval York,</i> The Archaeology of York 7.15 (York)					

## **Appendix 5: Leatherwork**

by Quita Mould

### 5.1 Methodology

The leather was wet when examined and recorded. Currently it is packed wet in double, self-sealed polythene bags or plastic boxes within air tight plastic storage boxes from which the light is excluded. It has not been conserved.

Basic medieval shoe terminology, construction, seams and stitching have been described elsewhere (Grew & de Neergaard 1988; Mould, Carlisle & Cameron 2003). The seam and stitch conventions used in the illustrations are after Goubitz (1984, 188-190, Fig. 1). In the text illustrated items are indicated by a catalogue number in bold (*e.g.* 1) following the small find number. The term shoe is used in its broadest sense to mean shoe, boot, sandal or wooden soled shoe, unless stated otherwise. Cobbling waste refers to shoe parts cut up for re-use or to salvage re-usable leather.

All measurements are in millimetres (mm), + indicates a measurement of an incomplete item. Shoe sizing has been calculated according to the modern English Shoe-Size scale with the sole measurement rounded up to the nearest size as necessary; continental sizing is provided in brackets. The estimation of modern shoe size of examples with long, pointed toes has been calculated from measurement of the sole from the seat to the estimated extent of the big toe, the latter based on consideration of the wear pattern and toe width.

Leather species were identified by hair follicle pattern using low powered magnification. Where the grain surface of the leather was heavily worn identification was not always possible. Where cattle hide could not easily be distinguished from calfskin from the grain pattern the term bovine has been used. Shoe soles and repairs are assumed to be of cattle hide, unless stated otherwise. The species of moss has not been identified.

The fragmentary nature of many of the shoe finds made a total count of shoe parts unrepresentative of the number of complete shoes present. An estimate of the minimum number of individual shoes represented has been calculated from a consideration of the shoe parts recovered within each context. This is based on a count of the minimum number of complete and near complete shoe soles found, to which the number of foreparts and seats of two part shoe soles has been added. The estimated minimum number is likely to be an underrepresentation.

## 5.2 Provenance of the material

## 5.2.1 Phase 1 (AD 1400-1450)

A small amount of leather was found in association with a cobbled surface (23/46/105/129/149/151/156/157), either a courtyard of a building or possibly the earliest phase of the Cumbergate road (Phase 1, AD1400-1450). The leather comprised the remains of at least two shoes (SF134, 139, Fig. 14), a strap (SF137) and a disc (SF134/2, Fig. 14) cut from a shoe sole repair patch.

## 5.2.2 Phase 2 (AD 1450-1500)

The majority of the leather was found in midden or dumping layers above the Phase1-cobbled surface (104/107/108/145/148/155?/158 and 109) (Phase 2b, AD 1450-1500). The largest group, containing parts from at least eight shoes, came from context (148) and represented debris from a cobbler's workshop. At least two shoes and a rolled-up strap came from layer (108). Shoe parts from dump layers (104/155/158) were very fragmentary and likely to represent only a single shoe in each case, which may suggest that these deposits have been reworked.

## 5.2.3 Phase 3 (AD 1500-1550)

A small amount of leather was recovered from four rubbish pits in Phase 3 (AD1500-1550). The diagnostic shoe parts date to the medieval period and there is nothing to distinguish this material from that found in the dump layers of the previous phase. The pits were cut into the dump layers of Phase 2b and it is likely that the leather derives from the earlier layers occurring residually within the pit fills. The largest group came from fill (142) in rubbish pit (**140**) and comprises at least four shoes and the seat cut from a turnshoe sole of 15th century date (SF114). A very small amount of waste leather (SF105, 135) and small fragments broken from shoe parts were found in fills (136 and 138) of rubbish pit (**137/139**). Similarly, a small amount of primary waste leather came from the upper fill (143) of rubbish pit (**141**).

### 5.2.4 Residual Material in Later Deposits

A clump sole repair (SF115) was found in a cobbled surface (102/103/112/114/121/124:) in Phase 4c (1550+) and small fragments of broken shoe parts (SF5, 25) were found unstratified. This material is clearly residual from the earlier phases.

### 5.3 The Shoes

None of the shoes were complete. However, it is estimated that at least seventeen shoes are represented and four shoe styles could be recognised (Fig. 10).

### 5.3.1 Construction

The shoes are of turnshoe construction. The soles were sewn to the uppers with an edge/flesh seam, usually with a rand incorporated within the seam. Examples of two part soles with a separate forepart and seat, joined across the waist with a butted edge/flesh seam, were found in Phase 1 (SF 139, Fig. 14) and Phase 2 (SF9, 19). Two part soles are common in later 14th and early 15th century groups. The shoe soles have short pointed toes (SF 8, 127/1, 139, Fig. 14) or long pointed toes curving outward from the foot (SF 7, 9), the longest (SF 10/15, Fig.12) extending some 70mm beyond the foot. One sole (SF127/1) had moss present that had been used to stuff the toe. A long toe (SF121/1) torn from its sole was found separately. While many of the soles were heavily worn, being worn through at the toe, tread and seat, some examples showed no heavy wear (e.g. SF139, 7, Fig. 14). Only two soles had stitching marking the position of repairs, but clump sole repair patches were found separately (e.g. SF 131, 129/2) and occurred in at least five contexts in Phases 2, 3 and 4.

### 5.3.2 Shoe styles

### a) Front tie-lace fastening ankle shoes

At least four ankle shoes had one-piece uppers of bovine leather being made principally of a single piece of leather that wrapped around the foot, with insert pieces added where necessary to extend the length and raise the height to fit. One came from Phase 1 (SF134/3), three others came from a dump layer (148) from Phase 2b (SF12, 108, 124), along with a fragment (SF17) likely to be torn from a fifth example. Three ankle shoes from the same dump layer (148) in Phase 2b fastened across the instep with tab-ended, divided laces that passed through paired lace holes on one side, out of a matching pair on the other side and were then tied together. Two of the shoes fastened with two pairs of these divided laces (SF 108, 124). Another shoe of calfskin from Phase 1 (SF134/3) did not have the method of fastening preserved. Stitching indicated that a tongue had been sewn to the central opening of the ankle shoes, and a tongue (SF121/5) was found separately. Stitching indicated a heel stiffener had been sewn at centre back of at least three examples. One shoe (SF124) had its large heel stiffener present. In the city of London this style of shoe was commonly worn during the later 14th century but soon fell from fashion in the early 15th century (Grew & de Neergaard 1988, 41). Elsewhere in the country the contexts from which front tie-lace fastening shoes have been recovered have generally not been sufficiently closely dated to allow this detail to be noted, and they are frequently dated to the late 14th and early 15th century. The style was commonly worn throughout Western Europe and on the continent is dated between the mid 14th and the end of the 15th century (Goubitz 2001, 191, type 65).

### b) Shoes with Separate Vamps and Quarters

Other shoes had separate vamps and one-piece quarters. A shoe (SF6, Fig. 11) with a short pointed toe, from pit (**12**) in Phase 3 had a high-throated vamp with short wings and remains of high quarters raised at centre back. The side seams were torn so that the style of fastening, if any, was not preserved. Remains of four other one-piece quarters were found separately in Phases 2b and 3. All were of similar style being raised at centre back, the better preserved examples displaying a distinct peak at one of the side seams (SF 6, 130/1, Fig. 11). Quarters of this shape are found on low shoes fastening across the instep with a strap and buckle or a divided strap, and higher shoes with a tie-lace fastening, all styles popular in the late 14th and early 15th century.

### c) Other styles recognised

A vamp (SF130/2, Fig. 11) from dump layer (148) (Phase 2b) has a high, straight throat with a butted seam and comes from a boot. A small fragment torn from a side-lacing shoe (SF109/4, Fig. 13) of calfskin was found in the same layer. Side-lacing footwear was the most popular style during the early 15th century in the city of London (Grew & de Neergaard 1988, 43). In Europe the style was common around the middle of the century (Goubitz 2001, 175).

### 5.4 Straps

Two strap of cattle hide were found. A piece (SF139, Fig. 14) apparently cut down from a strap with two buckle pinholes present was found on a cobbled surface (157) in Phase 1. A strap with buckle pinholes (SF126), from a layer of dumping (108) in Phase 2b, had been tightly rolled before being discarded. The strap is 28mm wide (*c*. 1in) suitable for a belt or harness. The coiled strap cannot now be unrolled being stuck together with iron corrosion products suggesting that an iron buckle is present in the centre. It is possible that the coils have been deliberately secured with an iron nail. This cannot be confirmed without X-radiography. If this is the case, the rolled strap may have been re-used as a bung.

### 5.5 Disc

A disc (SF134/2, Fig. 14) from a cobbled surface (157) in Phase 1, has tunnel stitching on the flesh side suggesting it had been cut from a clump sole repair. Leather discs have been found in several of the larger medieval leather assemblages (Mould, Carlisle & Cameron 2003, 3412). A large group of discs, comprising at least 60 examples, was found at Whitefriars in the city of London (Mould 2006) where nearly 90% could be closely dated to *c*. AD 1400. Though most of these London examples have a central hole and, often, holes around the perimeter, a proportion lacks a central hole, like the Queensgate disc, and some had been made of leather clearly salvaged from other

items. At present the use of the larger discs has yet to be satisfactorily identified.

## 5.6 Waste and Scrap Leather

Primary waste, *i.e.* unusable parts cut from the hide, was found in Phases 2b and 3. Small pieces of hide edge were found in three contexts (fills 136 and 138 of pit 137/139, and fill 143 of pit 141) (Phase 3). Teats came from fill 136 of pit 137/139 (Phase 3) and from dump layer (148) of Phase 2b, which also contained secondary waste in the form of thin trimmings. Similar waste was found in fill 6 of pit 13 (Phase 3). The quantity of waste leather was extremely small and likely to derive from the cobbling activities suggested by the shoe parts recovered. The scrap leather, *i.e.* fragments with all edges torn and no distinguishing features, appears to be broken shoe parts. Together with the proportion of highly fragmentary shoe parts found the scrap suggests that several of the leather bearing contexts had been reworked, e.g. cobbled surface (156) of Phase 1, dump layer (104/148/155/158) of Phase 2b, as well as fill 6 of pit 13 (Phase 3), fill 10 of pit 12 (Phase 3), fill 136 of pit 137 (Phase 3), fill 143 of pit 141 (Phase 3) and fill 153 of pit 159 (Phase 3).

## 5.7 The Nature of the Assemblage

The tie-lace fastening ankle shoes, high-throated shoe and the boot are all practical working footwear. Two sole seats, one from Phase 2b (SF13) the other from Phase 3 (SF114), had been cut from the rest of the sole. Two seams (SF121/2, 121/4) had been cut from a shoe and thrown away separately, while areas of lasting margin had been cut from a front tie-fastening ankle shoe (SF108, Fig. 12) and a boot vamp (SF130/2, Fig. 11). This, together with the proportion of soles and clump sole repairs in the assemblage, suggests the leather to be discarded cobbling waste. A one-piece quarters from a shoe (SF130/1, Fig. 11) and a strap (SF126) had been rolled up, and a clump repair (SF131, Fig. 12) had been folded, before being discarded, again indicative of waste from a workshop rather than domestic refuse. It is likely that the leather in the dump deposits from Phase 2b is the workshop waste from a cobbler, a repairer of shoes and re-modeller of old shoes for resale.

## 5.8 Dating

The leather assemblage is small and the number of shoes with recognisable shoe styles is limited. The most commonly found shoe style at Queensgate the front tie-lace fastening ankle shoe, and the side-lacing shoe, are styles that have been found in the well-dated waterfront deposits in the city of London in late 14th and early 15th century contexts (Grew & de Neergaard 1988). A small group of leather was found close by at 25/26 Long Causeway, Peterborough in 1995 (LCW95 excavated by BUFAU). Amongst this material, a small amount of apparently contemporary footwear, including a side-lacing

shoe, was found in a ditch (F551) (Mould 1995). Until recently relatively little was known about 15th century leatherwork in this country. With the exception of the early/mid 15th century assemblages from the city of London waterfront sites few groups were available for study. Currently two large and well-dated groups of mid-late 15th century date, one from London and the other from Coventry, are being studied to which the Queensgate assemblage may be compared. The Queensgate group does not include features that are characteristic of this mid and late 15th century material. The majority of the leather from Queensgate comes from rubbish deposits in Phase 2b, securely dated to AD1450-1500. On present knowledge, it would seem that the leather was thrown on to the midden at the beginning of that fifty-year period. It is possible that the shoe styles found in the Queensgate group may have remained popular, particularly in the provinces, for much of the 15th century. However, further work needs to be done on closely dated 15th century leather assemblages before this point can be clarified.

### Bibliography

Goubitz O.,	1984	The drawing and registration of archaeological footwear, <i>Studies in Conservation</i> 29, No 4, 187-196
Goubitz O, van Driel- Murray C, & Groenman- van Waatering W.,	2001	Stepping through Time, Zwolle
Grew, F & de Neergaard, M.,	1988	<i>Shoes and Pattens,</i> Medieval finds from excavations in London: 2 (London HMSO)
Mould, Q.,	1995	25/26 Long Causeway, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire (LCW95) leather assessment. Unpublished typescript submitted toThe University of Birmingham Field Archaeology Unit 28/05/1995
Mould, Q.,	2006	The Leather from Whitefriars, city of London, unpublished typescript submitted to PCA Ltd 5/01/2006
Mould Q, Carlisle I, and Cameron E.,	2003	Craft, Industry and Everyday Life: Leather and Leatherworking in Anglo-Scandinavian and Medieval York. The Archaeology of York: The Small Finds 17/16

#### **Catalogue of Illustrated Objects**

(NB 1:1 sketches are provided, these may be digitally scanned to provide the publication illustrations if required)

**1** Turnshoe two-part sole, left foot. Short pointed toe. Edge/flesh seam, stitch length 6mm. Pieces of matching rand 6mm wide (SF134/3). Child size 11(29). Length 190mm. SF139 [157] Phase 1

**2** Turnshoe sole, right foot. Pointed toe, broken, with moss present. Edge/flesh seam, stitch length 7-8mm, broken away at exterior edge and seat. Adult size 4(37). Length 242+mm SF127/1 [108] Phase 2b

**3** Turnshoe sole, left foot, broken at the seat. Pointed toe, curving outward. Edge/flesh seam, stitch length 7mm. Adult size. Length 208+mm SF 7[10] Phase 2b

**4** Turnshoe sole, right foot, now in two pieces. Long pointed toe, curving outward extending c 70mm. Worn through at tread and seat. Edge/flesh seam, stitch length 8mm. Estimated Adult size 4(37). Length c. 310 mm SF10&15 (Fig. 12)[10] Phase 2b

**5** Clump sole repair forepart, right foot. Pointed toe, tunnel stitching around edge on flesh side. Adult size. Length c 137mm SF 131 [108] Phase 2b

**6** Clump sole repair seat, left foot. Tunnel stitching present on flesh side around the edge and down the centre. Adult size. Length 89mm SF129/2 (Fig. 12) [108] Phase 2b

**7** Front tie-lace fastening ankle shoe, probably right foot. Right side of one-piece upper with lasting margin cut away is some areas and broken off in others, no side seam remains. Right front opening has two pairs of fastening holes, with whip stitching from a lapped seam along the edge to attach a tongue. Leather cattle hide 3mm thick. 272+x150+mm SF108 (Fig. 12) [148] Phase 2b

**8** Front tie-lace fastening ankle shoe, probably right foot. Right side of one-piece upper with part of front opening remaining, left side torn away. Seam close to centre back with butted edge/flesh seam for 30mm above lasting margin changing to whip stitching above, joining to fragment of left side of upper (SF109/7) and insert (SF109/3, Fig. 13). Pair of fastening holes present at front opening, with whip stitching from a lapped seam along the edge, and an insert with divided lace with tab end present. Heel stiffener present at centre back, with corresponding stitching in upper. Leather cattle hide, upper 2.5mm thick, heel stiffener 1.5mm thick. Upper 198+x110mm; insert height 69mm, width 64mm. SF 124 (Fig. 11); 109/3; 109/7 [148] Phase 2b

**9** High-throated shoe, fragmentary. Vamp with short pointed toe, part of butted edge/flesh left side, right side torn away. Stitching above lasting margin from repair. Shallow throat, with line of stitching to attach a strengthening cord on flesh side, and remains of short vamp wings. Part of left side of high quarters present, and other smaller fragments (not illustrated). Adult size. Leather bovine 2mm thick. Vamp length throat to toe 150mm, quarters height 90mm SF6 (Fig. 11) [10] Phase 2b

**10** One-piece quarters with raised top edge. Butted edge/flesh side seams, stitch length 4mm, right seam peaked at the top edge. Lasting margin broken away in some areas. Adult size. Leather cattle hide 3mm thick. Length 165mm, height 80mm SF130/1(Fig. 11) [148] Phase 2b

**11** Vamp, probably from boot. Short length of lasting margin present, cut away at the toe, broken in other areas. Straight throat with butted edge/flesh seam continuing into side seams at each end. Leather bovine 2mm thick. 185x160+mm. SF130/2 (Fig. 11) [148] Phase 2b

Side-lacing shoe fragment, with three lace holes remaining. Part of left side seam with butted edge/flesh seam 20mm above lasting margin and whip stitching along the edge above. Leather calfskin 2mm thick. 60+x70+mm (Fig. 13) [148] Phase 2b

**13** Disc cut from clump sole repair, at least one tunnel stitch present at the edge on the flesh side. Leather cattle hide 4mm thick. 82x78mm SF134/2 (Fig. 14) [157] Phase 1

Context	Phase	SF No	Name	Description	Length	Width (max)	Thickness	Species	Repair	Del Cut	Fragments Number	Other
6	3	SF 1	shoe	one-piece quarters with raised top edge and peaked seam on right	165	75 (Ht)	1.5	bovine			1	
		SF 2	shoe	large clump seat repair, heavily worn down left side, Adult size	114	76					1	
		SF 3	shoe	fragments of turnshoe sole forepart, heavily worn, right foot, Adult size					Ν	Ν	4	drawn
		SF 4	shoe	turnshoe sole, right foot. Adult size. Toe and much of left side missing.	238	83			Υ	Ν	1	drawn; aggressive burial environment
		SF 19	shoe	turnshoe 2 part sole forepart, right foot. Toe missing, heavily worn	123	62			Ν	Ν	1	drawn
		SF 20	shoe	rand	78	7			Ν		1	
		SF 21	shoe	fragment from raised top edge of one- piece quarters	56	30	2	bovine, worn	Ν	Ν	1	
		SF22	shoe	highly fragmentary turnshoe sole, very heavily worn, Adult size. Small fragment from upper				bovine			+	aggressive burial environment
		SF 24/1	waste	fragments of possible waste trimmings				cattle			2	
		SF 24/2	shoe	compacted fragment probably from sole	78	62	3				1	

Context	Phase	SF No	Name	Description	Length	Width (max)	Thickness	Species	Repair	Del Cut	Fragments Number	Other
10	3	SF 6	shoe	turnshoe upper in 7 fragments, Adult size. Vamp with pointed toe, high throat and short wings. Fragment of one-piece quarters with raised top edge	150 (vamp)		2	bovine	Υ	Ν	7+	drawn
		SF 7	shoe	turnshoe sole, end of seat missing, left foot. Adult size	190+	72			Ν	N	1	drawn
		SF 8	shoe	turnshoe sole, end of seat missing, worn through at toe, right foot. Adult size	208+	80			Ν	Ν	1	drawn
		SF 9	shoe	turnshoe 2 part sole, worn through at tread, right foot. Adult	194	82			Υ	Ν	1	drawn
		SF 10	shoe	turnshoe sole, worn through at tread, right foot. Joins to toe SF 15. Adult size	175+	88			N	Ν	1	drawn; joins to SF15
		SF 11	shoe	rand fragments varying in width 6-15mm					Ν	Ν	6	
		SF 12	shoe	turnshoe upper left vamp wing with divided lace through pair of holes insitu	136	91	2	bovine	Ν	Ν	1	drawn
		SF 13	shoe	seat cut from turnshoe sole, left foot. Adult size	58	43			Ν	Y	1	drawn
		SF 14	shoe	turnshoe 2 part sole seat, left footf	68	42			Ν	Ν	1	
		SF 15	shoe	turnshoe sole forepart with long outward curving toe, right foot. Adult size. Joins to SF 10	70	90			Ν	Ν	1	drawn; joins to SF 10

Context	Phase	SF No	Name	Description	Length	Width (max)	Thickness	Species	Repair	Del Cut	Fragments Number	Other
		SF 16	shoe	fragmentary turnshoe sole lower tread and waist, possibly right foot. Adult size	118				Ν	Ν	3+	drawn
		SF 17	shoe	turnshoe upper fragment heel area probably from one- piece upper.	92	87	1.5	calfskin	N	Ν	1	drawn
		SF 18	scrap	fragments likely to come from shoe upper				calfskin (worn)		N	2	
		SF 23/1	scrap	small compacted fragment probably broken from clump repair	48	35	3.5				1	
		SF 23/2	scrap	small fragment, delaminated, prob from upper	32	26		calfskin			1	
51	-	SF 5	scrap	small compacted fragments likely to be broken from sole							5+	
		SF 25	shoe	small fragment upper front opening with circular lace hole and stitching to attach a tongue	52	35	2	calfskin	Ν	Ν	1	
10 4	2b	SF 110	scrap	compacted fragment prob from shoe sole	90	45	3		Ν	N	1	
		SF 111	scrap	small fragments prob from shoe upper			3	bovine	Ν	Ν	3	
		SF 112	shoe	small fragments broken from shoe upper including a lasting margin and a butted edge/flesh seam			2	calfskin	Ν	Ν	16+	
		SF 113	scrap	compacted fragment prob from sole or clump	35	25	4		Ν	N	1	

Context	Phase	SF No	Name	Description	Length	Width (max)	Thickness	Species	Repair	Del Cut	Fragments Number	Other
		SF 117	shoe	forepart of sole or clump, left foot	125	88	4		N	N	1	104 aggressive burial environment
10 5	1	SF 142	scrap	small fragments broken from shoe parts including 2 fragments of lace max 5mm wide			2	bovine	Ν	Ν	8	
10 8	2b	SF 126	strap, rolled	tightly rolled strap, 6 coils secured by either a nail or adhering because of corrosion products from a metal buckle in the middle of the roll	54x50	28	4	cattle	Ν	Ν	1	
		SF 127/ 1	shoe	turnshoe sole, right foot with broken, long pointed toe with moss stuffing. Adult	242	80			Ν	Ν	1	drawn
		SF 127/ 2	shoe	highly fragmentary shoe upper component with area of lasting margin present st length 7mm			1	bovine	Ν	Ν	26+	
		SF 129/ 1	scrap	compacted fragments likely to come from shoe component			2.5	bovine	N	N	5	
		SF 129/ 2	shoe	clump seat repair, left foot, Adult size	89	75	3		Y	Ν	1	drawn
		SF 131	shoe	forepart clump repair with long pointed toe, right foot, Adult size	137 (folded)	86			Ν	N	1	drawn
12 4	4c	SF 115	shoe	forepart clump repair, right foot, worn, Adult size	110	90	4		Ν	N	1	
13 6	3	SF 105/ 1	scrap	fragment possibly torn along a seam	41	35	3	cattle	Ν	N	1	
		SF 105/ 2	waste	primary waste, hide edge	113	32	2.5	cattle			1	
		SF 135	waste	primary waste with teat	58	21	3	bovine			1	

Context	Phase	SF No	Name	Description	Length	Width (max)	Thickness	Species	Repair	Del Cut	Fragments Number	Other
13 8	3	SF 106/ 1	waste	primary waste fragments from two pieces of hide edge				bovine			10	
		SF 106/ 2	shoe	small compacted fragment of turnshoe sole with edge/flesh seam	45	22	2		Ν	Ν	1	
14 2	3	SF 114	shoe	long seat cut from turnshoe sole, right foot, Adult	90	50	4		Ν	Y	1	drawn
14 3	3	SF 7	waste	small fragment of primary waste hide edge	30	12	3.5	cattle			1	
		SF 116	waste	primary waste hide edge	77	41	3	cattle			1	
14 8	2b	SF 108	shoe	right side of one-piece upper ankle shoe with two pairs of fastening holes	272	150	3	cattle	Ν	Y	1	drawn
		SF 109/ 1	shoe	turnshoe sole forepart fragments with broken pointed toe, Adult size	65	86			N	Ν	2	
		SF 109/ 2	shoe	turnshoe sole fragment, Adult size	110	80			Ν	Ν	1	
		SF 109/ 3	shoe	turnshoe upper insert with tab ended divided lace in pair of lace holes	69	64	2	calfskin	N	Ν	1	drawn; belongs with SF124 and 109/7
		SF 109/ 4	shoe	turnshoe side lacing, left front seam of quarters with 3 lace holes present	60	70	2	calfskin	N	Ν	1	drawn
		SF 109/ 5	strap/w aste	secondary waste or possibly poorly cut strap with rounded terminal	53	28	2.5	cattle	Ν	Y	1	
		SF 109/ 6	waste	1 primary waste with teat, 2 trimmings, 2 other waste pieces, 3 fragments of scrap							8	

Context	Phase	SF No	Name	Description	Length	Width (max)	Thickness	Species	Repair	Del Cut	Fragments Number	Other
		SF 109/ 7	shoe	upper fragment, probably from 2 part quarters with edge/flesh seams and stitching to attach a heel stiffener. Likely to belong with SF124	78	45	2	calfskin	Ν	Ν	1	drawn, belongs with SF124 and 109/3
		SF 109/ 8	shoe	2 small fragments of upper, and 4 scrap fragments also probably from upper				bovine	Ν	Ν	6	
		SF 109/ 9	shoe	plain cut, curved top edge broken from one- piece quarters	60	99	2	bovine	Ν	N	1	
		SF 109/ 10	shoe	triangular insert from shoe upper, top edge broken	50	36	2	bovine	Ν	N	1	drawn
		SF 109/ 11	shoe	small fragments of left side of vamp area of upper	95	70	1.5	calfskin	Ν	N	3	
		SF 109/ 12	shoe	small fragments of shoe upper, 3 rand fragments, fragment prob clump repair					Ν	Ν	7	
		SF 121/ 1	shoe	long pointed toe broken from turnshoe sole	36	23	3		Ν	N	1	
		SF 121/ 2	shoe	edge/flesh seam cut from shoe upper	104	12	3	cattle	N	Y	1	
		SF 121/ 3	shoe	rand probably from pointed toe SF121/1	94	6	4		N	N	1	
		SF 121/ 4	shoe	edge/flesh seam cut from shoe upper	50	8	3	bovine	N	Y	1	
		SF 121/ 5	shoe	fragment shoe tongue with whip seam, curled	65	39	2	bovine	Ν	N	1	
		SF 121/ 6	scrap	fragment probably from upper	32	22	2.5	bovine			1	
		SF 121/ 7	scrap	fragments of thin leather	39	16	1	worn			2	

Context	Phase	SF No	Name	Description	Length	Width (max)	Thickness	Species	Repair	Del Cut	Fragments Number	Other
		SF 124	shoe	right side of one-piece upper ankle shoe heel area, with matching heel stiffener	198	110	2.5	cattle	Ν	Ν	2	drawn; belongs with SF109/3 and 109/7
		SF 125	scrap	fragments probably from shoe upper			2.5	calfskin	N	N	2	
		SF 130/ 1	shoe	one-piece quarters raised at centre back with peaked seam on right, rolled	165	80 (Ht)	3	cattle	Ν	Ν	1	drawn
		SF 130/ 2	shoe	vamp with high straight throat with butted edge/flesh seam	185	160	2	bovine	Ν	Y	1	drawn
		SF 130/ 3	scrap	much folded fragment from shoe upper	79	30			Ν	N	1	
		SF 130/ 4	shoe	fragments of clump repair and small fragment with butted edge/flesh seam					Ν	Ν	6	
		SF 138	shoe	curving fragment broken from edge of clump sole repair	55	16	5		N		1	
15 3	3	SF 10	scrap	small fragments fine leather			0.5	calfskin			2	
15 5	2b	SF 120/ 1	scrap	oval toe area of rand		6			N	Ν	1	
		SF 120/ 2	shoe	fragment turnshoe sole edge/flesh seam	49	18			N	N	1	
		SF 120/ 3	shoe	fragment of clump repair patch	67	67	3.5		N	N	1	
		SF 120/ 4	scrap	thick fragment	82	59	4				1	
		SF 120/ 5	scrap	fragments of thick leather possibly from shoe upper			4	bovine			15	
15 6	1	SF 136	scrap	fragment thick, compacted, all edges broken likely to come from	45	31	3	bovine	Ν	N	1	

Context	Phase	SF No	Name	Description	Length	Width (max)	Thickness	Species	Repair	Del Cut	Fragments Number	Other
				shoe sole								
15 7	1	SF 134/ 1	shoe	turnshoe sole forepart, left foot, Adult	138	95			N	N	1	drawn
		SF 134/ 2	disc	circular piece cut from clump repair, tunnel stitching present.	82	78	4	bovine			1	drawn
		SF 134/ 3	shoe	left side of one-piece upper	200	80	1	calfskin	N	N	1	
		SF 134/ 4	shoe	rand from SF 139		6			N	N	6	drawn
		SF 137	strap	terminal of cut down strap with pointed end with two large buckle holes	45	19	3.5	bovine	Ν	Y	1	drawn
		SF 139	shoe	turnshoe 2 part sole, forepart and seat, left foot, hardly worn, complete child size	190	65			Ν	Ν	1	drawn
15 8	2b	SF 132	scrap	fragment probably from shoe upper, Adult size	69	62	1	calfskin	Ν	Ν	1	

Table App.5.1: Leather shoes, shoe fragments and associated waste

# **Appendix 6: Faunal Remains**

by Ian L. Baxter BA MIFA

## 6.1 Introduction

## 6.1.1 Recovery

All the bones forming the basis of this assessment were collected by hand. There are in addition 7 Coarse Fraction (<4mm) and 6 Fine Fraction (>4mm) bags containing small quantities of bone from the sample residues.

## 6.1.2 Residuality and Contamination

There is no evidence of residuality or contamination. However, some contexts contain differentially preserved bones. At least some of these differences in preservation may be due to some bones being waterlogged and others not (see below).

## 6.1.3 Context

Bones were found in pits (including a clay-lined pit which may have originally served an industrial function such as tanning), layers, surfaces, and a possible robber trench.

### 6.1.4 Preservation

A high proportion of the bone was waterlogged and preservation is generally very good, ranging from excellent to fair.

## 6.1.5 Storage and Quantification

The animal bones are stored in 4 cardboard boxes of the following size: 52x26.5x16.5cm. The boxes are at least <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> full. The bones are washed and bagged by context. The total weight of the hand-collected bone is just over 20kg. This assessment is based on one third (33%) by weight of the total assemblage.

### 6.2 Assessment

## 6.2.1 Methodology

One third (33%) by weight of the bone recovered from Phase 1-4 (AD1400-1550+) features has been assessed and estimated total calculated mathematically. Numbers of "countable" bones, ageable mandibles and measurable bones are recorded in Table 1. The

counting system is based on a modified version of the system suggested by Davis (1992) and used by Albarella and Davis (1994).

## 6.2.2 Variety

The assemblage is heavily biased in favour of the domestic mammals, with cattle, sheep/goat, pig, horse and cat represented. Sheep fragments are more frequent than cattle fragments. In one Phase 3 context a polled sheep cranium and a proximal radius with "penning elbow" were seen. The latter injury is due to trauma when the animals are put through races or pens (Baker and Brothwell 1980, 127). Several domestic cat bones were recovered, mostly immature. A large, probably male, fallow deer (*Dama dama*) distal humerus was found in a Phase 3 pit.

Period	Phase	Cattle	Sheep/go at	Pig	Other s	Bird	Total	Fis h	Comme nts
AD1400-1450 assessment	1	3	3	0	1	0	7	0	Includes horse
AD1400-1450 estimated total		9	9	0	3	0	21	0	
AD1450-1500 assessment	2	15	11	6	2	2	36	1	Includes horse,
AD1450-1500 estimated total		45	33	18	6	6	108	3	cat, chicken
AD1500-1550 assessment	3	2	17	3	6	0	28	0	Includes fallow
AD1500-1550 estimated total		6	51	9	18	0	84	0	deer, cat
AD1550 + assessment	4	1	2	0	1	0	4	0	Includes horse
AD1550+ estimated total		3	6	0	3	0	12	0	
Assessment Total		21	33	9	10	2	75	1	
Estimated Total		63	99	27	30	6	225	3	

Table App.6.1: Queensgate Centre, Peterborough. Hand-collected assemblage. Number of "countable" bones (Davis 1992; Albarella and Davis 1994) used for assessment and estimates of their total. The estimated total is calculated on the basis of the proportion of the total used for assessment (approximately 33%).

### 6.3 Conclusions

The animal bones recovered from the evaluation and excavation largely consist of refuse from butchery and food waste. They appear to have no direct relation to the original function of the Phase 3 industrial clay-lined pit found during the evaluation. The assemblage as a whole is similar to that recovered from The Still nearby (Roberts 1998). The cat bones may represent waste from small scale skinning activities. During the medieval period cats were not generally kept as pets and there was a considerable trade in cat skins, which were also exported to the continent (Luff and Moreno García 1995).

# Bibliography

Albarella, U., and Davis, S.J.M.,	1994	The Saxon and Medieval animal bones excavated 1985-1989 from West Cotton, Northamptonshire (London: English Heritage AML Report 17/94)
Baker, J. and Brothwell, D.,	1980	Animal Diseases in Archaeology (London: Academic Press)
Baxter, I.L.,	2001	Queensgate Centre, Peterborough (PET QC 01): Assessment of the Animal Bones, Unpublished report prepared for CCCAFU
Davis, S.J.M.,	1992	A rapid method for recording information about mammal bones from archaeological sites, (London: English Heritage AML Report 19/92)
Luff, R.M. and Moreno García, M.,	1995	Killing cats in the medieval period. An unusual episode in the history of Cambridge, England', Archaeofauna 4, 93-114
Roberts, A.,	1998	Animal Bone', in Spoerry, P. and Hinman, M. The Still, Peterborough: Medieval Remains Between Cumbergate and Westgate, CCC Archaeological Field Unit Monograph No. 1, 112-116

# **Appendix 7: Environmental Remains**

by Val Fryer

## 7.1 Introduction

Excavations adjacent to the Queensgate Centre, Peterborough revealed contexts of late medieval and post-medieval date including occupation horizons, rubbish pits and middens or dumps. Samples for the extraction of the plant macrofossil assemblages were taken from across the excavated area, and thirteen were submitted for assessment.

## 7.2 Methodology

The samples were processed through a sieve stack by a member of the AFU team and the flots were collected in a 0.3mm mesh sieve. As all samples were seen to contain waterlogged macrofossils, the processed material was stored in water until sorted. The wet retents were scanned under a binocular microscope at magnifications up to x 16, and the plant remains and other materials noted are listed on Tables App.5.1 and App.5.2. Nomenclature within the tables follows Stace (1997). Unless otherwise stated, the tabulated macrofossils were preserved in a waterlogged condition.

As the majority of macrofossils encountered were in a robust condition, the flots were air dried after assessment to facilitate long-term storage.

## 7.3 Results of Assessment

## 7.3.1 Plant Macrofossils

Cereal remains and seeds/fruits of common weed species were present at varying densities in all but sample 12. Both charred and waterlogged macrofossils were present. The cereals and some segetal weed seeds were charred, and although some fragmentation had occurred, preservation was generally good. All other macrofossils were waterlogged, and although some smaller specimens were compressed and/or fragmented, preservation was again good.

## 7.3.2 Cereals and Other Food Plants

Charred oat (*Avena* sp.), barley (*Hordeum* sp.) and wheat (*Triticum* sp.) grains were recovered, with wheat being predominant. Cereal chaff elements were extremely rare, but barley/rye (*Hordeum/Secale cereale*) type rachis nodes were noted in samples 8 and 9. Cotyledon fragments of an indeterminate large pulse (pea/bean) were also found in sample 9. Remains of cultivated fruits were present, although at a very low density. Possible fig (*Ficus carica*) seeds were recovered from

samples 10 and 13 and damson/bullace (*Prunus* sp.) type fruit stone fragments were noted in samples 7 and 8.

## 7.3.3 Wild Flora

Seeds/fruits of segetal and ruderal taxa were noted in all but sample 12. Arable weed species were common and included orache (Atriplex sp.), fat-hen (Chenopodium album), black bindweed (Fallopia convolvulus), nipplewort (Lapsana communis), poppy (Papaver sp.), knotgrass (Polygonum aviculare), wild radish (Raphanus raphanistrum), dock (Rumex sp.), campion (Silene sp.), charlock (Sinapis sp.), chickweed (Stellaria media) and vetch/vetchling (Vicia/Lathyrus sp.). The presence of stinking mayweed (Anthemis cotula) seeds may indicate that some crops were being produced on heavy clay soils. Corn cockle (Agrostemma githago) and/or cabbage/turnip (Brassica sp.) type testa fragments were noted in nine samples. These are commonly found as contaminants of wholemeal bread flour and may be indicative of the presence of human faecal material.

Common ruderal taxa included hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), deadnettle (*Lamium* sp.), hawkbit (*Leontodon* sp.), sow thistle (*Sonchus oleraceus*), stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*) and small nettle (*U. urens*). Grassland and wayside species were also present and included meadow/creeping/bulbous buttercup (*Ranunculus acris/repens/bulbosus*) and lesser stitchwort (*Stellaria graminea*).

Wetland plants included sedge (*Carex* sp.) and spike-rush (*Eleocharis* sp.) nutlets, rush (*Juncus* sp.) fruits and seeds of water plantain (*Alisma plantago-aquatica*), gypsy wort (*Lycopus europaeus*), lesser spearwort (*Ranunculus flammula*) and celery-leaved crowfoot (*R. sceleratus*).

Tree/shrub macrofossils were rare but included hazel (*Corylus avellana*) nutshell fragments, bramble (*Rubus* sect. *Glandulosus*) pips and elderberry (*Sambucus nigra*) seeds.

## 7.3.4 Other plant macrofossils

Charcoal fragments and pieces of waterlogged root, rhizome or stem were present throughout. Other plant macrofossils included indeterminate buds and seeds, moss fragments and thorns.

## 7.3.5 Other Materials

The rare fragments of black porous 'cokey' material and black tarry material are probably derived from the combustion of organic materials at very high temperatures. Possible dietary residues included fragments of large mammal bone, eggshell, fish bones and marine mollusc shell fragments. Faecal concretions were common in sample 8.

### 7.4 Discussion

Although the samples are from varied contexts of 15th and 16th century date, the composition of the assemblages is (with the exception of sample 12) very uniform, which may indicate that few fundamental changes occurred in this area during this period. Most material is derived from either the deposition of refuse in pits or middens, or the local flora. However, sample 12 was taken from a supposed occupation horizon of 15th century date. An extremely low density of material was recovered, but at present, the reason for this is not understood.

Although charred grains are comparatively rare in these assemblages, they do appear to indicate that cereals (most particularly barley) were being locally utilised, although possibly not to any great extent. These grains, along with other dietary remains (see above) are probably derived from low density deposits of domestic refuse and/or hearth waste.

Waterlogged seeds/fruits of common weed species are abundant and indicate a varied local flora. Although ruderal taxa are common, tree/shrub macrofossils are virtually absent, probably indicating that the site was not subject to an uncontrolled overgrowth of colonising plants. Segetal taxa are also common, but it should be noted that a number of these species (most notably black bindweed, nipplewort, poppy, knotgrass and dock) are also commonly found in nonagricultural contexts and may simply be indicative of ground disturbed by pit digging and/or horticultural activity. While some cornfield weeds may be present as contaminants of imported batches of cereal, the lack of cereal chaff probably indicates that little or no processing was occurring on site or in the immediate vicinity.

At the time of writing, no information is available about the soil water levels on the site. It is, therefore, assumed that the wetland plant macrofossils may be indicative damper areas within the site, although they could equally be derived from material imported as litter, bedding or thatch. The occurrence of aquatic taxa may suggest that some of the open features on the site contained sufficient water to form semipermanent or permanent wet micro-habitats.

## 7.5 Conclusions

In summary, the charred cereal grains and other dietary remains recovered are probably derived from the deposition of small quantities of burnt domestic refuse. The waterlogged macrofossils indicate that the site supported a varied flora, although it does not appear to have been overgrown. Marginal damp areas were probably present and some deep features may possibly have been sufficiently water-filled to form aquatic micro-habitats.

Sample No.	1	4	5	6	7	8	10
Context No.	124	136	138	142	143	144	153
Cereals and other food plants							
Avena sp. (grains)						xcfc	
Ficus carica L.							xcf
Hordeum sp. (grains)		хс		хс			xcfc
Hordeum/Secale cereale (rachis nodes)						хс	
Prunus sp. (fruit stone fg.)					x	x	
<i>Triticum</i> sp. (grains)	хс			хс	хс	xcfc	хс
Herbs							
Aethusa cynapium L.	xcf						
Agrostemma githago L.			xtf	xtf	xtf	xtf	xtf
Anagallis arvensis L.	x					x	x
Anthemis cotula L.		x	x	x	x	x	x
Apiaceae indet.	x			x			
Asteraceae indet.							x
Atriplex sp.			x	x	x		x
Beta vulgaris ssp. maritima (L.) Arcang.							xcfsp
Brassicaceae indet.				x			
Carduus sp.				x			
C. cyanus L.							x
Chenopodium album L.	хс			x			x
C. ficifolium Sm.						xcf	
Chenopodiaceae indet.			x			x	x
Cirsium sp.			x	xcf			
Conium maculatum L.	x			x			
Euphorbia sp.						x	
Fallopia convolvulus (L.)A.Love						xtf	xtf
Hyoscyamus niger L.	x			x			
Lamium sp.				x			
Lapsana communis L.	x	x	x		x	x	x
Leontodon sp.			x	x	x		x
<i>Mentha</i> sp.	x	x	x	xcf	x	xcf	
Papaver sp.	x	x		x			x
P. argemone L.				x			
P. somniferum L.							x
Plantago major L.				xcf			
Small Poaceae indet.		xcf	x	xcf			x
Polygonum aviculare L.						x	
Potentilla sp.	x		x	xcf	xcf		x
P. anserina L.	x		x				x
Prunella vulgaris L.					x		x
Ranunculus sp.				x			xcf
R. acris/repens/bulbosus	xx	x	xx	xx	x	x	хх
Raphanus raphanistrum L.(siliqua frgs.)				x	x	x	x
Rumex sp.	x	х хс	x		x	х хс	x xc
Silene sp.	x		x		x	xx	x
Sinapis sp.	xcf	xcf	x	xcf		x	xx

Sample No.	1	4	5	6	7	8	10
Context No.	124	136	138	142	143	144	153
Cereals and other food plants							
Sonchus asper (L.)Hill			xcf				x
Sonchus oleraceus L.					x	x	x
Stellaria graminea L.		x		x			
<i>S. media</i> (L.)Vill.	x	x		x	x	x	x
Urtica dioica L.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
U. urens L.		x					x
Verbena officinalis L.			x				
Vicia/Lathyrus sp.	xcfc	хс	хс	хс			
Viola sp.				x			
Aquatic/wetland plants							
Alisma plantago-aquatica L.		x	x	x		x	x
Apium graveolens L.			xcf			xcf	x
Carex sp.	x	x	x	x	x	xx	x
Cladium mariscus (L.)Pohl.	x			x			
Fleocharis sp	x				x		x
Hydrocotyle yulgaris			x				
Juncus sp	Y	Y	x	x	x	xx	x
	~	^	x v	~	v v	v	v
Ranunculus flammula I	v		^		^	×	^
R sceleratus I	×	v	v			^	v
	^	^	^				^
	vof				vof		
	XCI			×			×
Rubus sp.				×			×
R. sect. Glandulosus (Winnier & Grab.)	X						
			x	x	×	×	
	X	XX	XX	XX	XXX	XX	XX
	X						
				x		x	
		XCT	XCT				
	XX	x	x	xx	x	x	XX
							xc
Indet.fruit stone frg.	X					x	
				x	x		x
	X	X		x	x	x	xc
Indet.thorn							
(Prunus type)		X			x		x
(Rosa type)	X		x				x
Mineral replaced wood							
Waterlogged root/rhizome/stem	xx	XX	xx	xx		xx	xxx
Waterlogged wood	x		x				
Other materials							
Black porous 'cokey' material	x						
Bone	x	x	x	x	x xb	x	
Cledoceran ephippia				x			x

Sample No.	1	4	5	6	7	8	10
Context No.	124	136	138	142	143	144	153
Cereals and other food plants							
Eggshell	x		x	x	x		x
Faecal concretions						xx	
Fish bone			x	x			x
Marine mollusc shell fgs.			x	x	x	x	
Small coal frgs.						x	x
Waterlogged arthropods	x	x		x	x	x	x
Sample volume (litres)	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Volume of flot (litres)	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.2	<0.1	0.3
% flot sorted	100%	50%	50%	100%	50%	100%	50%

Table App.7.1: Plant macrofossils and other remains from contexts 124, 136, 138, 142, 143, 144 & 153

Sample No.	2	3	9	11	12	13
Context No.	104	107	108	148	150	155
Cereals and other food plants						
Cereal indet. (grains)	хс	хс	хс	хс		хс
Large Fabaceae indet.			xcotyc			xtf
Ficus carica L.						xcf
Hordeum sp. (grains)		xcfc	хс	xcfc		хс
Hordeum/Secale cereale (rachis node)			x			
Triticum sp. (grains)	хс	хс		хс		хс
Herbs						
Aethusa cynapium L.	xcf					
Agrostemma githago L.		xtf	xxtf	xtf		x
Anagallis arvensis L.		xcf				
Anthemis cotula L.				x		x
Apiaceae indet.			x			
Asteraceae indet.		x				
Atriplex sp.	x	x	x			x
Brassica sp.		x	xtf			xtf
Centaurea sp.				x		
Chenopodium album L.		x	x			x
<i>C. ficifolium</i> Sm.			x			xcf
Chenopodiaceae indet.			x	x		
Conium maculatum L.						x
Daucus carota L.						x
Fallopia convolvulus (L.)A.Love		x	x			x
Galium aparine L.			xcfc			
Hyoscyamus niger L.	x	x				x
Lamium sp.		x				
Lapsana communis L.			x	x		
Leontodon sp.			x	x		
Linum catharticum L.				x		
Mentha sp.				x		x
Papaver sp.	x	x		x		x
P. argemone L.			x			

Sample No	2	3	9	11	12	13
Context No	104	107	108	148	150	155
Cereals and other food plants	104	107	100	140	100	100
			xcf			
Small Poaceae indet			x			x
Large Poaceae indet			xc			~
Polygonum aviculare			xc	x		x
Potentilla sp		xcf	<u>xo</u>	~		xcf
P anserina l		701		x		701
Prupella vulgaris I				x x		
Ranunculus sp				~		x
R acris/renens/hulhosus		v	v	v		v
Ranhanus ranhanistrum L (siliqua fras.)		×	×	×		×
Reseda sp		^	^	^		^ vcf
Rumey sp	v	v	vv	v		v
R acetosalla I	^	^	^^	xc		^
Scrophullariaceae indet				XC		v
Silone sn		v	vv	vv		×
Sinanis sp		~	xcftf	xcf		x
Sonchus asper (L.)Hill			x	x		x
Sonchus oleraceus L			x	xcf		x
Stellaria graminea L		x		x		x
S media (L) Vill	x	x	x	x		x xxtf
Taraxacum sp	~	~	<u></u>	x		
l Irtica dioica I	x		x	x x		Y
	x		~	x x		~
Vicia/Lathyrus sp	~	xc		xcotvc		
Aquatic/wetland plants						
Alisma plantago-aquatica		x				x
Carex sp.		x	x	x		x
Eleocharis sp.			x	x		x
Juncus sp.	x	x		x		x
	x		x	~		x
Ranunculus flammula L.			x	x		xcf
R. sceleratus L.		x				x
Trees/shrubs						
Corvlus avellana L.		x		xcf		
Rubus sp.	x					
R. sect. Glandulosus (Wimmer & Grab.)				x		
Sambucus nigra L.		x				
Other plant macrofossils						
Charcoal <2mm	xx	xx	x	xx	x	xx
Charred root/rhizome/stem		x				
Indet buds/bud scales	x	x				x
Indet culm nodes						xc
Indet fruit stone fra						x
Indet.moss				x		
Indet.seed		x	x	x xc		x
Indet.thorn (Prunus type)			·	x		x
(Rosa type)		x		· ·		x
Mineral replaced wood		x				

Sample No.	2	3	9	11	12	13
Context No.	104	107	108	148	150	155
Cereals and other food plants						
Waterlogged root/rhizome/stem	xx	xx	xxx	xx	x	xxx
Other materials						
Black porous 'cokey' material					x	
Black tarry material					x	
Bone	x				x xb	
Cledoceran ephippia						
Eggshell		x		x	x	x
Faecal concretions						
Fish bone		x				x
Glass					x	
Marine mollusc shell fgs.					xx	
Small coal frgs.	x				x	
Waterlogged arthropods		x	x	x		x
Sample volume (litres)	1	1	2	2	1	2
Volume of flot (litres)	<0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
% flot sorted	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%

Key: x = 1 - 10 specimens xx = 10 - 100 specimens xxx = 100+ specimens c = charred coty = cotyledon tf = testa fragment b = burnt sp = seed pod

Table App.7.2: Plant macrofossils and other remains from contexts 104, 107, 108, 148, 150 and 155

### **Bibliography**

Stace, C., 1997 New Flora of the British Isles. Second edition

- Figure 2: A model for the 'New Town'
- Figure 3: Speed's map (1613)
- Figure 4: Eyre's map (1721)
- Figure 5: Hill's map (1808)
- Figure 6a: OS 1st edition (1886)
- Figure 6b: OS 1967-78 edition
- Figure 7a: Plans of Phases 1 and 2a/b
- Figure 7b: Plans of Phases 3 and 4a
- Figure 8a: Plans of Phases 4b and 4c
- Figure 8b: Plans of Phases 4d and 5
- Figure 9: West facing section
- Figure 10: Shoe styles found
- Figure 11: Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)
- Figure 12: Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)
- Figure 13: Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)
- Figure 14: Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)
- Figure 15: Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)

Drawing Conventions				
Plans				
Limit of Excavation				
Deposit - Conjectured				
Natural Features				
Sondages/Machine Strip				
Intrusion/Truncation				
Illustrated Section	S.14			
Archaeological Deposit				
Excavated Slot				
Modern Deposit				
Cut Number	118			
Sections				
Limit of Excavation				
Cut				
Cut-Conjectured				
Deposit Horizon				
Deposit Horizon - Conjectured				
Intrusion/Truncation				
Top Surface/Top of Natural				
Break in Section/ Limit of Section Drawing				
Cut Number	118			
Deposit Number	117			
Ordnance Datum	18.45m OD ⊼			
Inclusions	G			


Figure 1: Location of trenches with previous excavations (blue) and development area outlined (red)



Figure 2: A model for the 'New Town,' (after Spoerry & Hinman, 1998)



Figure 3: Speed's map 1613



Figure 4: Eyre's Map 1721



Figure 5: Hill's map 1808







Figure 7a: Plans of Phases 1 and 2a/b



Figure 7b: Plans of Phases 3 and 4a



Figure 8a: Plans of Phases 4b and 4c



Figure 8b: Plans of Phases 4d and 5





Figure 10: Shoe styles found



Figure 11: Leather illustrations. (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)



Figure 12: Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)



Figure 13: Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)



© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved Cambridgeshire County Council 100023205 2007

Figure 14: Leather illustrations (F = Flesh side, G = Grain side)



CAM ARC, Cambridgeshire County Council, 15 Trafalgar Way, Bar Hill, Cambridgeshire, CB3 8SQ

General Enquiries: 01954-204191 Fax: 01954-273376

http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/archaeology