ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORDING AT RMB CHIVENOR, BARNSTAPLE

Prepared for Black and Veatch Ltd

by M. Leverett

Exeter Archaeology

Report No. 09.80

Project No. 6542

July 2009

Contents

1. Introduction 1.1 The site	1 1
1.2 Archaeological background	1
2. Method	2
 3. Results 3.1 Area 1: western borrow pit and western bank 3.2 Area 2: middle borrow pit and middle bank 3.3 Area 3: eastern borrow pit and eastern bank 3.4 Area 4: north-western bank 3.5 Area 5: bank around building 515 	2 2 3 3 4 4
4. Discussion	4
5. Conclusion	5
6. Finds summary	5
8. Project archive and 'OASIS' report	12
Acknowledgments	12
Bibliography	12

APPENDIX 1: Written Scheme of Investigation

List of Illustrations

Fig. 1 Location of site
rig. I Location of site
Fig. 2 Area 1: features located in western bank and western borrow pit
Fig. 3 Area 2: features located in central bank and central borrow pit
Fig. 4 Area 3: features located in eastern bank and eastern borrow pit
Fig. 5 Area 4: features located in north-western bank
Fig. 6 Area 5: features located in bank around building 515
Fig. 7 Sections across a sample of the features
Fig. 8 The site in 1885-87. Ordnance Survey First Edition
Plate 1 North-facing section across ditch 13

Plate 2 South-facing section across ditch 811 Plate 3 North-facing section across ditch 813 Plate 4 South-facing section across furrow 805

<u>Summary</u>

A programme of archaeological monitoring was carried out by Exeter Archaeology at RMB Chivenor, Barnstaple, Devon (SS 4967 3449) between July 2008 and March 2009.

Twenty two features of post-medieval date were revealed during the topsoil stripping. These consisted of field boundaries, drainage ditches, remnants of ridge and furrow and two probable wheel ruts or plough marks.

The finds assemblage included 11 pieces of worked flint of late prehistoric date and 13 sherds of medieval pottery, although the most remarkable find was a sherd of 17th-century Portuguese faience, a type of ceramics very rarely found outside the main ports.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared for Black and Veatch Ltd and presents the results of a programme of archaeological monitoring undertaken by Exeter Archaeology (EA) at RMB Chivenor, Barnstaple, Devon (SS 4967 3449) between July 2008 and March 2009. The work was required under a condition attached to the grant of planning permission (No. 46028, North Devon District Council) for the construction of a flood defence scheme; the report describes the archaeological fieldwork and reporting work required by the Devon County Historic Environment Service (DCHES).

A desk-based assessment of the site was undertaken by Wessex Archaeology in 2007 (report no. 67300.01). This identified the potential for palaeoenvironmental and archaeological (prehistoric and later) preservation within the alluvial deposits underlying the site. The assessment also indicated evidence of medieval and post-medieval activity within the development area, and the potential for the survival of features and deposits of these dates.

1.1 The site

RMB Chivenor, an active military base, is situated on the northern bank of the Taw Estuary, in the parish of Heanton Punchardon, *c*.6km to the west of Barnstaple. The majority of the site comprises grassed land of the airfield, with tarmac runways and ancillary buildings. The north-eastern corner of the site is occupied by buildings of the military base, including operations, maintenance storage and accommodation. This part of the site is contained within a security fence which divides it from the airfield.

The site covers an area of c.3 sq. km, and lies at c.6m above Ordnance Datum (AOD). It is bounded by mudflats and the river of the Taw estuary to the south and east, and the mudflats and salt marshes of the River Caen to the west. On its southern and eastern boundaries, the site is separated from the foreshore by a higher area and a concrete retaining wall. The northern landward side of the site is bounded by the line of the former Barnstaple and Ilfracombe railway, now the South West Coastal Path.

The underlying geology of the site is characteristic of its estuarine location and comprises recent alluvium overlying river terrace gravel deposits which in turn overlie Pilton Shales. This depositional sequence has been confirmed across the Site by the results of a geotechnical investigation (Wessex Archaeology 2007). The geotechnical survey also indicates the presence of between 0.8m and 1m of 'made ground' in the eastern and southern areas of the Site (Wessex Archaeology 2007).

1.2 Archaeological background

Archaeological investigations within and around the Study Area have recorded archaeological sites and deposits dating from the Mesolithic to the post-medieval period, with much of the known and potential archaeological resource relating to the position of the site within the floodplain of the Taw estuary. It has been assessed that there is an increased potential for the presence and survival of archaeological remains and deposits of prehistoric and/or post-medieval date within the Site (Wessex Archaeology 2007).

2. METHOD

- 2.1 All groundworks associated with:
- the excavation of borrow pits;
- the excavation of borrow trenches; and
- the excavation of service diversions

were monitored and recorded by an EA archaeologist, as per EA standard recording procedures and in accordance with the standards of the Institute of Field Archaeologists. This included all topsoil removal, reduction of ground levels and trenching. Where archaeological remains or deposits were exposed, machining ceased in that area to allow the EA archaeologist sufficient time to investigate and record exposed deposits. Where archaeological deposits needed to be removed, this was done by EA, down to the required formation or invert level, or down to natural subsoil, whichever was higher. Long linear features were excavated to sample 20% of their length and spoil was examined for the recovery of artefacts.

All soil removal and ground level reductions were undertaken by a 360° or wheeled JCB-type excavator fitted with a toothless grading bucket.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Area 1: western borrow pit and western bank (Fig. 2)

Five linear cut features were located in the western borrow, all of which were aligned N-S (807, 805, 803, 811, 813). Features 807 and 805 (Fig. 7.3; Plate 4) ran parallel to each other along the western boundary of the borrow pit. They were *c*.2.5m wide, very shallow and the fills (806 and 808), which appeared to be the result of natural silting, both contained pottery of post-medieval date. They were interpreted as the remains of ridge and furrow. A shallow, but wide (4.5m), linear cut feature (803) located several metres to the east could also represent the remains of ridge and furrow. Its fill (804) contained pottery of 18th century date. However, it continued to the south, into the western bank, where it was recorded as being 0.7m deep (Fig. 7.5). It is possible that 803 could represent the remains of a trackway marked on the 1890 Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 8). It was recut (603) on its western side by a U-shaped ditch (Fig. 7.5), which did not continue northwards into the borrow pit. These were too patchy to be recorded in detail.

At the western end of the borrow pit a 3.4m wide ditch (811) was located (Plate 2). It was 0.5m deep with a gentle to moderately sloping concave profile. Its three fills contained no datable artefacts, but the location of the ditch suggests that it represents a field boundary marked on the 1890 Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 8). The same ditch was recorded in the western bank where it was renumbered as 605. The fills of ditch 811/605 had been cut across their entire length by a modern drainage trench.

To the east of 811 were the remnants of a 1.6m wide, 0.5m deep ditch (813) with moderately sloping edges and a narrow concave base (Plate 3). Pottery recovered from two (814, 815) of the three naturally silted fills dated the feature to post-1770.

Only a 3m length of the ditch survived at the southern end of the borrow pit, but it was also recorded in the western bank where it was renumbered as 607 (Fig. 3.4).

The subsoil (801) which all of these features cut, contained six flint flakes of late Neolithic/Bronze Age date.

3.2 Area 2: middle borrow pit and middle bank (Fig. 3)

A ditch (403) 2.8m wide and aligned N-S was located along the western edge of the middle borrow pit. It was 0.18m in depth with an irregular profile of gently sloping sides and an uneven base. It corresponds to a N-S aligned field boundary on the 1890 Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 8).

The subsoil (401) in the middle borrow pit, which was cut by 403, contained one late Neolithic/Bronze Age flint flake tool and one struck pebble flint. No finds of later date were recovered from the subsoil.

About 35m to the east of the borrow pit, located in the middle bank, was a N-S aligned ditch (304) measuring 1.9m wide and 0.45m deep. No finds were recovered from the two fills, but the location of the ditch corresponds to a field boundary on the 1890 Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 8).

3.3 Area 3: eastern borrow pit and eastern bank (Fig. 4)

Ditch 209 was a N-S aligned ditch located along the western edge of the borrow pit. It was 2.7m in width and 0.52m in depth, with a gently sloping side to the west and a steeper profile to the east. It contained three fills, the uppermost (210) contained pottery and glass which post-dated 1770. It is likely to represent a linear field boundary removed before 1890, since it is not marked on the 1890 Ordnance Survey map.

About 40m to the east of ditch 209 was a pair of parallel, curving ditches (13 and 211), aligned approximately NE-SW and measuring 1.2m and 2.6m wide respectively. Ditch 13 (Plate 1) had a symmetrical profile with steep sides (0.5m in depth) breaking gradually to a flat base, whilst ditch 211 had a shallow (0.16m) and irregular profile. The fills of ditch 13 (14, 15) and the single fill of 211 (212) contained pottery of late $17^{\text{th}}/18^{\text{th}}$ century date. They probably represent drainage ditches or a double ditch and bank field boundary. Both ditches were also identified in the eastern bank.

Just to the east of, and running parallel to, ditch 211 was a pair of narrow, shallow linear cut features (213 and 215) which probably represent wheel ruts or plough marks (Fig. 7.1). Pottery from the fill (214) of 213 was of post-1660 date.

About 45m to the east of ditch 213 was a 2m wide, 0.8m deep field boundary or drainage ditch (205) with an irregular profile and flattish base. It was aligned NE-SW and contained three fills, two of which (206 and 207) contained pottery of late 18th century date. It was also identified in the eastern bank.

A probable drainage ditch (203) aligned N-S was situated between ditches 211 and 205. It was 0.8m wide and 0.07m deep. Its fill (204) contained pottery of post-medieval date.

In the SW corner of the site, a wide (4.1m) NW-SE aligned ditch (220) was located. It was 0.5m in depth and contained three fills, two of which (219 and 221) contained pottery of 18th century date. The ditch appears to represent a field boundary shown on the 1890 Ordnance Survey map.

Parallel and adjacent to ditch 220 was a 1.1m wide, 0.2m deep, linear cut feature (225) which contained the remains of a drystone shillet and slate wall with an earth core (226). It is likely to represent a former field boundary, contemporary with, or replacing, the boundary represented by ditch 220.

At the eastern end of the bank was a 2.22m wide, 0.4m deep, boundary or drainage ditch (10) aligned N-S. It was steep sided to the west with a sloping base which merged into a shallow eastern edge. The single fill (11) contained pottery of post-1770 date.

About 25m to the east of ditch 10 was a NE-SW aligned ditch (7) 2.7m wide and >0.65m deep. The profile was fairly steep-sided and irregular. The two fills (8 and 12) contained pottery of post-medieval date. This feature is depicted on historic mapping as a drainage ditch.

A 2.4m wide, 0.48m deep boundary or drainage ditch (20) aligned N-S was located about 40m to the west of the eastern borrow pit. It probably represents either a boundary or drainage ditch.

All of the features in the eastern borrow pit and bank cut the subsoil (201/5) which contained pottery of 18^{th} century or modern date.

3.4 Area 4: north-western bank (Fig. 5)

About 100m north-west of the western borrow pit was an E-W aligned ditch (611) with moderately sloping sides and a flattish concave base. Its single fill contained no datable artefacts, but it corresponds with an E-W aligned boundary marked on the 1890 Ordnance Survey map (Fig.8).

3.5 Area 5: bank around building 515 (Fig. 6)

A ditch (819) was recorded during the soil strip for the western bank surrounding building 515. It was 1.5m wide and 0.6m deep with a rounded, concave profile. No datable artefacts were recovered from either of the two fills, but it appears to correspond with a boundary on the 1890 Ordnance Survey map (Fig.8).

4. DISCUSSION

The removal of topsoil revealed a total of twenty two individual cut features. The features exposed consisted of field boundaries, drainage ditches, remnants of ridge and furrow and two probable wheel ruts or plough marks. All of the features recorded were post-medieval in date. This was established by the recovery of datable artefacts from the fills of the features or the position of the features in relation to field boundaries marked on earlier maps. In addition, all of the features located in the eastern bank cut the subsoil (201/5) which was of post-medieval date. No associated banks survived for any of the field boundary ditches.

Although no features of pre-18th century date were located during the monitoring work, 13 sherds of medieval pottery and 11 pieces of worked flint were recovered. All of the medieval sherds were residual in later deposits. Two of the flint flakes were residual within later deposits, whilst the remainder were recovered from the subsoil (401 and 801) within the middle and western borrow pits. In addition, an unstratified sherd of 17th century Portuguese faience was recovered from Area 2 (see section 6).

5

5. CONCLUSION

The monitoring revealed that only features of post-medieval date survived within the footprint of the borrow pits and banks. These features related to former agriculture: ploughing (ridge and furrow, as well as probable plough marks) and land division (the numerous former field boundary ditches). The presence of residual medieval pottery within the fills of a number of the former field boundary ditches implies medieval activity in the area and perhaps earlier origins to some of the former field boundaries, which may have been widened and re-cut in the post-medieval period. The presence of worked flint implies late prehistoric activity in the vicinity of the site, although the site itself does not appear to have been utilised during this period. The majority of farming and settlement, and associated monument building, during these periods probably occurred on the higher ground overlooking the valley (Wessex Archaeology 2007).

6. FINDS SUMMARY (by J. Durrant and J. Allan)

Attention should be drawn to the find of Portuguese faience, recovered from the topsoil (400) in Area 2. This type of pottery, made in Lisbon, Coimbra and Oporto, dates to c. 1620-80. It is rarely found outside the major ports (Bristol, Plymouth, Exeter). The find will feature in a consideration of this type of ceramics in Britain by the Portuguese archaeologist Tania Casimiro.

Context Da	ating
context	date/period
003	post 1800
005	18 th century or modern
008	post-medieval
011	post 1770
012	post 1700 (? 18 th century)
014	18 th century
015	late 17 th /18 th century
019	post 1953
200	18 th century
201	mid 17 th century to late 18 th century
204	1690-1720
206	late 18 th century
207	late 18 th century
210	post 1770
212	late 17 th /18 th century
214	post 1660
217	post 1700
219	18 th century
221	late 18 th century
300	18 th century
400	late 17 th to 20 th century
401	?prehistoric (?late neolithic/bronze age)
600	late 17 th /18 th /19 th century
800	late 17 th /18 th /19 th century
801	?prehistoric
804	18 th century
806	post 1750
808	post-medieval

814	post 1770
815	18 th century

Bone-faunal

Done fuun	41		
context	qty	weight	comments
221	1	2	tooth fragment

Brick

context	qty	weight	comments
005	1	2	modern fragment scrap (discarded)
217	1	162	fragment with two vitrified surfaces: post 1700

Clay Pipe

context	bowls	stems	dates/comments
003	0	3	stems: 1660-1720
014	0	1	stem: 1660-1750
201	0	1	stem: 1660-1750
204	1	1	bowl fragment: 1690-1720
206	0	3	stems: 1660-1750
214	0	1	stem: 1660-1750
300	1	0	bowl: 1620-40
400	1	2	bowl with BARVM (Barnstaple) stamped heel mark:
			1690-1730
800	4	3	1 bowl: 1690-1720, 2 bowl frags: late 17th/early 18th
			century, 1 bowl frag & stem 1800-30
804	0	4	stems: 18 th century
unstrat	0	5	stems: 4 stems 1660-1720, 1 stem post 1720

Cu alloy

eu unoj			
context	SF	qty	comments
400	-	1	spent bullet shell casing; modern
206	-	1	strip casing
600	-	1	shell casing

Glass

Oldbb		
context	qty	comments
012	1	green bottle fragment: post 1700
019	1	complete 2oz Bovril bottle (discarded): modern
206	1	green bottle fragment: 18 th century
210	1	green bottle fragment: post 1750
400	3	2 green bottle base fragments: 1 st ½ 18 th century, 1 green bottle
		fragment: post 1750
800	1	clear ?vessel/window fragment: post 1800
804	3	1 green bottle fragment: 1 st ½ 18 th century, 2 green bottle
		fragments: post 1800 (?intrusive)
806	1	green bottle fragment: post 1750
814	1	green bottle fragment: post 1750

Ironwork

context	SF	qty	comments	
003	-	2	1 modern nail (discarded), 1 hook	
800	-	1	1 spur fragment, 1 hook	
Lithics				
context	qty	со	comments	
221	1	str	struck pebble flint	
401	2	1 1	1 flint flake tool (?projectile), heavily retouched on two sides	
		?b	?broken: late neolithic/bronze age, 1 struck pebble flint	
600	2	fli	flint: 1 scraper, 1 waste flake	
801	6	fli	flint: 1 utilised blade, 1 utilised flake, 4 waste flakes	

Miscellaneous

context	qty	comments
600	1	brick/tile fragment
806	1	coal fragment

Pottery & Dating Evidence

Abbreviations Listing

bd	body
brd	broad
Brn	brown
Bris	Bristol

bs	base	
bwl	bowl	
С	Century	
chmb pt	chamber pot	
cos	costrel	
ср	cooking pot	
CW	coarseware	
dec	decorated	
Del	Delft	
dsh	dish	
Е	early	
Eng	English	
ext	external	
fslp	feathered slip	
ofw.	gravel-free ware	
gg	green-glazed	
<u>88</u> 989	grev salt-glazed	
ofw	gravel-tempered ware	
hnd	handle	
imp	import	
ind	industrial	
int	internal	
in	internat	
Jg	jug	
jr	jar	
L	late	
Med	medieval	
Mer	Merida-type	
mrb	marbled	
ND	North Devon	
pln	plain	
PM	post-medieval	
Por	Porcelain	
Port	Portuguese	
Pre	Prehistoric	
prgr	porringer	
prs mld	press-moulded	
ptd	painted	
R	Residual	
sgf	sgraffito	
sh	sherd	
slp	slip	
Staffs	Staffordshire	
stnw	stoneware	
tg	tin-glazed	
tkd	tankard	
TP	Transfer Print	
unc	unclassified	
ug	unglazed	
ves	vessel	
W	ware	
wsø	white salt-glazed	
Wstr	Westerwald	
ww	white ware	
Va	vellow_glazed	
15	yenew-glazed	

context	contents/dating evidence	sherds	vessels
002	modern		
	brick: modern		
003	post 1800		
	total sherds: 33		
	total vessels: 25		
	Por (?18C, Chinese imp, dec dsh	1	1
	bs)		
	TP (post 1780)	2	2
	Eng ind ww (post 1800)	1	1
	Eng ind yg ww (L18C/19C)	1	1
	Eng ind yg ww (L18C+, cup sh	2	1
	with ext mrb slp)		
	ND pln yg slp w (L17C/18C, 1	2	2
	dsh rim)		

	ND gfw (PM, 3 jr)	9	7
	ND gtw (PM, 2 bwl rim)	11	8
	ND Med cw (Med R, ug bd sh, 1200-L15C)	2	1
	ND Med cw (Med R, gg jg, 14C/15C)	2	1
	clay pipe: 1660-1720		
005	102		
005	18C or modern		
	total sherds: 5		
	Bris/Staffs vg slp w (18C fslp	1	1
	cup)	1	1
	ND sgf (1660-1720, dsh bs worn yg & sgf)	4	1
	brick: modern		
008	PM		
	total sherds: 1		
	total vessels: 1	1	1
	ND gtw (1500-E19C, ug)	1	1
011	post 1770		
011	total sherds: 2		
	total vessels: 1	1	
	Eng ind ww (post 1770, pln bd	2	1
	sh)		
012	post 1700 (?18C)		
	total sherds: 1		
	total vessels: 1		
	ND gtw (1500-E19C, gg bd sh)	1	1
	glass: post 1700		
014	180		
014	total sherds: 5		
	total vessels: 5		
	Bris/Staffs yg slp w (18C, prs mld	1	1
	dsh)		
	ND gfw (PM, 1 ?jr)	3	3
	ND gtw (PM, bd sh)	1	1
	clay pipe: 1660-1750		
015	1170/190		
015	L1/C/18C		
	total vassals: 2		
	ND plp vg slp w (L17C/18C	1	1
	?small scrap, ?cup sh)	1	1
	ND gtw (PM, bwl rim)	1	1
018	post 1200		
	total sherds: 1		
	total vessels: 1		
	ND Med cw (1200-L15C, cp rim)	1	1
019	post 1953		
017	total sherds: 1		
	total vessels: 1	1	
	Eng ind stnw (modern, cup base,	1	1
	underside printed NAAFI 1953		
	TAMS ENGLAND VITRIFIED)		
	glass: modern		
200	180		
200	total sherds: 6		
	total vessels: 6		
	Eng stnw (post 1700)	1	1
	Bris/Staffs slp w (18C. cup sh	1	1
	reverse slp)		
	ND sgf (1660-1720, 1 dsh bs	2	2
	worn yg with geometric design, 1		
	jg nna)	l	

	ND gtw (PM, bs sh int gg)	1	1
	ND Med cw (Med R, ug bd sh,	1	1
	1200-L15C)		
201	M17C-L18C		
	total sherds: 15		
	total vessels: 10		
	ND gfw (PM, 1 cup, 1 jr)	11	7
	ND gtw (PM, bs sh int gg)	3	2
	ND Med cw (Med R, ug bd sh.	1	1
	1200-I 15C)	1	1
	clay pipe: 1660-1750		
	Citay pipe. 1000-1750		
204	1600 1720		
204	1090-1720		
	total sherds: 3		
	total vessels: 3		
	ND pln yg slp w ($L17C/18C$, 1	2	2
	chmb pt/jg, 1 dsh)		
	ND Med cw (Med R, cp rim,	1	1
	1200-L15C)		
	clay pipe: 1690-1720		
206	L18C		
	total sherds: 9		
	total vessels: 9		
	Eng ind ww $(I 18C \pm)$	1	1
	Brie/Staffe vg cla vy (19C and c-14	1	1
	deb)	1	1
	USII)		
	ND gIW (PM)	3	3
	ND gtw (PM, 2 bwl)	3	3
	ND Med cw (Med R, ug bd sh,	1	1
	1200-L15C)		
	clay pipe: 1660-1750		
	glass: 18C		
207	L18C		
	total sherds: 3		
	total vessels: 3		
	Englind way $(I 18C_{\perp})$	1	1
	Staffs wsg stnw (post 1740)	1	1
	ND atty (DM hyd)	1	1
	tile: 19C/10C	1	1
	the: 18C/19C		
210	1770		
210	post 1770		
	total sherds: 9		
	total vessels: 6		
	Eng ind ww (post 1770)	3	1
	ND gfw (PM)	3	2
	ND gtw (PM)	2	2
	ND cw (L15C/E16C)	1	- 1
	glass: post 1750	1	
	Suss. post 1750		
212	L 17C/18C		┝───┤
212			l
	total sherds: 3		
	total vessels: 3		
	ND pln yg slp w (L17C/18C, int	1	1
	yg scrap)		
	ND gfw (PM, int gg)	1	1
	ND Med cw (Med R, cp rim,	1	1
	1200-L15C)		
214	post 1660		
	clay pipe: 1660-1750		
	tile: PM		
217	post 1700		
21/	brick: post 1700		<u> </u>
	orick: post 1700		
	100		ļ]
219	18C		
	total sherds: 6		
	total vessels: 5		
	ND gfw (PM, jr)	1	1

	ND gtw (PM, 3 bwl)	5	4
	tile: 18C/19C		
221	L18C		
	total sherds: 17		
	total vessels: 9		
	Eng ind ww (post 1770)	1	1
	Bris/Staffs vg slp w (18C, cup)	1	1
	ND sof (1660-1720) dsh with	3	1
	freehand floral design worn vg)	5	1
	ND afw (PM_int ag)	4	1
	ND gtw (PM, 2 bwl)	7	1
	ND gtw (1 M, 2 0 M)	/ 1	
	ND Med Cw (Med K, gg Jg find, $14C(15C)$	1	1
	140/130)		
200	100		
300	180		
	total sherds: 8		
	total vessels: 8		
	ND pln yg slp w (L17C/18C, 1	3	3
	chmb pt, 1 dsh)		
	ND gfw (PM, int gg)	1	1
	ND gtw (PM, int gg)	4	4
	clay pipe: 1620-40		
	tile: 18C/19C		
400	L17C-20C	1	
	total sherds: 22		
	total vessels: 19		
	Del plp $(I 17C/E18C dsh)$	1	1
	una ta (2Port 17C, dah int floral	1	1
	design out lines)	2	1
	Drie (Staffe and alle and (190) and mild	2	1
	Bris/Stalls yg sip w (18C, prs mid	3	1
	dsn)	~	
	Eng ind ww (L18C/19C)	5	5
	Staffs gsg stnw (post 1720)	1	1
	Staffs wsg stnw (post 1740)	2	2
	ND pln yg slp w (L17C/18C, I	2	2
	cup)		
	ND gfw (PM, int gg)	1	1
	ND gtw (PM, 2 bwl)	5	5
	clay pipe: 1690-1730		
	glass: 1 st 1/2 18C & post 1750		
	tile: 18C/19C		
401	Pre (?L. neolithic/bronze age)		
101	lithics: 21 neolithic/bronze age		
	indites. 12 neonune/bronze age		
600	L 17C/18C/10C		
000	L1/U/10U/19U		
	total sherds: 19		ļ
		-	
	Eng ind ww (post 1780)	5	5
	Bris/Staffs yg slp w (18C, 1 cup	2	2
	bs, 1 prs mld dsh)		
	Por (18C/19C, fluted ves)	1	1
	ND sgf (1660-1720, dsh with	1	1
	freehand design)		
	ND pln yg slp w (L17C/18C,	1	1
	scrap sh)		
	ND gfw (PM, int gg)	2	2
	ND gtw (PM, ?cp rim)	5	5
	ND Med cw (Med R, 1 ug brd	2	2
	strap jg hnd, L13C-L15C)		
	lithics: Pre		
800	L 17C/18C/19C		
000	total shards: 37		
	total vassale: 27		
	total vessels: 27		
	Del pln (L1/C/1 $^{-1}$ /2 18C, dsh)	1	1
	Wstr stnw (L17C/E18C, jg)	1	1
	Bris/Staffs yg slp w (18C, 1 cup,	4	3
	2 prs mld dsh)		

	Eng ind ww (post 1800, sample	4	3
	only) Staffs gsg stnw (post 1720, tkd	1	1
	rim)		-
	Staffs wsg stnw (post 1740)	2	1
	unc dec tg (?Del, ext blue ptd design)	1	1
	ND sgf (1660-1720, 2 dsh, 1 prgr)	5	3
	ND pln yg slp w (L17C/18C, 1	3	3
	ND ofw (PM, 1 ir)	4	2
	ND gtw (PM, 2 bwl)	10	7
	unc cw (PM, worn sh)	1	1
	clay pipe: 1690-1730 (x 1), L17C/E18C (x 1), 1800-30 (x 1)		
	glass: post 1800		
	NB 8 sherds post 1800 discarded		
	Â		
801	?Pre		
	lithics: Pre		
204	190		
804	total sherds: 10		
	total vessels: 9		
	Bris/Staffs yg slp w (18C, cup)	1	1
	ND sgf (1660-1720, dsh rim)	1	1
	ND pln yg slp w (L17C/18C, 1	2	2
	closed ves ?jg)		
	ND gfw (PM, int gg)	2	2
	ND gtw (PM, I bwl)	4	3
	clay pipe: $18C$ glass: 1^{st} 1/2 18C & post 1800		
	(?intrusive)		
000	. 1750		
806	post 1/50 glass: post 1750		
	glass. post 1750		
808	PM		
	total sherds: 2		
	total vessels: 2		
	ND gfw (1500-E19C, int gg)	1	1
	ND gtw (1500-E19C, bwl rim)	1	1
81/	post 1770		
014	total sherds: 5		
	total vessels: 5		
	Eng ind ww (post 1770)	1	1
	Staffs wsg stnw (post 1740)	1	1
	ND gtw (1500-E19C)	3	3
	glass: post 1750		
<u>815</u>	180		
015	total sherds: 2		
	total vessels: 2		
	Bris/Staffs yg slp w (18C, prs mld	1	1
	dsh)		
	ND gtw (1500-E19C)	1	1
unstrat	topsoil surface finds March 2000		
unstrat	total sherds: 25		
	total vessels: 19		
	Mer cw (17C/18C, cos bd sh)	1	1
	Bris/Staffs yg slp w (18C, 1 cup,	3	2
	Eng hrn stnw (18C 2 tkd)	2	2
	Staffs wsg stnw (1730-L18C)	1	
	ND sgf (1660-1700, 1 dsh	4	3
	geometric ?six petal design, 1		-
	type 1A dsh rim, 1 cup bs single		
	point design)	10	
	ND giw (1300-E19C)	10	/

ND gfw (1500-E19C)	4	3
NB 7 sherds 19C wares discarded		

Statistics

total number of sherds: 254 minimum number of vessels: 203 total weight of sherds: 3857 grams

Slag			
context	qty	weight	comments
300	2	18	?clinker fragments
814	1	26	unidentified fragments

Tile			
context	qty	weight	comments
207	1	14	unglazed roof fragments: 18th/19th century
214	1	18	North Devon gravel-tempered green-glazed ridge
			fragment: post-medieval
219	1	124	unglazed roof fragment: 18 th /19 th century
300	1	16	unglazed roof fragment: 18th/19th century
400	1	16	unglazed roof fragment: 18th/19th century

8. PROJECT ARCHIVE AND 'OASIS' REPORT

A project archive has been compiled and will be deposited at Barnstaple museum under museum accession number NDDMS: 2008.67.

A report of the watching brief (including a pdf version of this document) will be submitted to the on-line database OASIS (On-line AccesS to the Index of archaeological investigations), under OASIS ID: exeterar1-60828.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work was commissioned and funded by Black and Veatch Ltd. Thanks are due to Ursula Bycroft, the Principal Environmental Scientist at Black and Veatch. Fieldwork was conducted by C. Hooper, A. Passmore, H. Rance and K. Tyler. The finds were examined and catalogued by J. Durrant and J. Allan. The illustrations were produced by T.Ives. Historical research was carried out by T. Collings. The work was monitored by the Devon Historic Environment Service.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anon 2007 'RMB Chivenor Flood Defence Scheme Barnstaple, Devon Archaeological Desk- based Assessment', WA Heritage report. Ref. 67300.01.

APPENDIX I

WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING AT RMB CHIVENOR, BARNSTAPLE, DEVON

Prepared by Exeter Archaeology for Black and Veatch Ltd

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This document has been produced by Exeter Archaeology (EA) for Black and Veatch Ltd to describe the methods for archaeological monitoring at RMB Chivenor, Barnstaple, Devon (SS 4967 3449). As such, it represents the 'Written Scheme of Investigation' for archaeological work required under condition attached to the grant of planning permission (No. 46028, North Devon District Council) for the construction of a flood defence scheme, and describes the archaeological fieldwork and reporting work required by the Devon County Historic Environment Service (DCHES).
- 1.2 A desk-based assessment of the site was undertaken by Wessex Archaeology in 2007 (report no. 67300.01). This identified the potential for palaeoenvironmental and archaeological (prehistoric and later) preservation within the alluvial deposits underlying the site. The assessment also indicated evidence of medieval and post-medieval activity within the development area, and the potential for the survival of features and deposits of these dates.
- 2. AIMS
- 2.1 The aims of the Watching Brief are to monitor works associated with the development in order to identify any surviving archaeological deposits and to investigate and preserve these remains through record before the continuation of the works.
- 3. METHOD

3.1 Liaison will be established with the client and their contractor prior to works commencing in order to advise on EA requirements.

3.2 All groundworks associated with:

- the excavation of borrow pits;
- the exaction of borrow trenches; and
- the excavation of service diversions

will be monitored and recorded by an EA archaeologist, as per EA standard recording procedures (see below) and in accordance with the standards of the Institute of Field Archaeologists. This will include all topsoil removal, reduction of ground levels and trenching. Where archaeological remains or deposits are exposed, machining will cease in that area to allow the EA archaeologist sufficient time to investigate and record exposed deposits. Where archaeological deposits need to be removed, this will be done by EA, down to the required formation or invert level, or down to natural subsoil, whichever is higher. Hand-excavation of archaeological deposits to these levels will normally comprise:

- The full excavation of small discrete features;
- half-sectioning (50% excavation) of larger discrete features; and,
- long linear features will be excavated to sample 20% of their length with handinvestigations distributed along the exposed length of any such features, specifically targeting any intersections, terminals or overlaps.

Spoil will also be examined for the recovery of artefacts.

Should the above percentage excavation not yield sufficient information to allow the form and function of archaeological features/deposits to be determined full excavation of such features/deposits will be required. Additional excavation may also be required for the taking of palaeoenvironmental samples and recovery of artefacts.

3.3 All soil removal and ground level reductions will be undertaken by a 360° or wheeled JCB-type excavator fitted with a toothless grading bucket. Machines should be kept clear of resultant exposed areas until inspected and recorded by an EA archaeologist.

3.4 *General project methods*

The project will be organised so that specialist consultants who might be required to conserve artefacts or report on other aspects of the investigations can be called upon (see below).

- 3.5 Health and Safety requirements will be observed at all times by any archaeological staff working on site, particularly when machinery is operating nearby. Personal protective equipment (safety boots, helmets and high visibility vests) will be worn by Exeter Archaeology staff when plant is operating on site.
- 3.6 As appropriate, the Exeter Archaeology Scientific Officer will assess deposits on site to determine the possible yield (if any) of environmental or microfaunal evidence, and its potential for radiocarbon dating. If deposits of potential survive, these would be sampled using the EH Guidelines for Environmental Archaeology (EH CfA Guidelines 2002/1).
- 3.7 Initial cleaning, conservation, packaging and any stabilisation or longer term conservation measures will be undertaken in accordance with relevant professional guidance (including *Conservation guidelines No 1* (UKIC, 2001); *First Aid for Finds* (UKIC & RESCUE, 1997).
- 3.8 Should any human remains be exposed, these will initially be left *in situ*. If removal at either this or a later stage in the archaeological works is deemed necessary, these will then be fully excavated and removed from the site subject to the compliance with the relevant Ministry of Justice Licence, which will be obtained by EA on behalf of the client. Any remains will be excavated in accordance with Institute of Field Archaeologist Technical Paper No. 13 (McKinley and Roberts 1993). Where appropriate bulk samples will be collected.
- 3.9 Should gold or silver artefacts be exposed, these will be removed to a safe place and reported to the local coroner according to the procedures relating to the Treasure Act 1996. Where removal cannot be effected on the same working day as the discovery, suitable security measures will be taken to protect the finds from theft.
- 3.10 The project will be monitored by the DCHES, who will be informed of the progress of the work. If significant archaeological deposits are exposed, all works will cease and a meeting will be convened with the client and the DCHES in order to discuss the most appropriate response.

4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORDING

4.1 Standard Exeter Archaeology recording and sampling procedures will be employed, consisting of:

(i) standardised single context record sheets; survey drawings, plans and sections at scales 1:10,1:20, 1:50 as appropriate;

(ii) black and white print and colour digital photography;

(iii) survey and location of finds, deposits or archaeological features, using EDM surveying equipment and software where appropriate; and

(iv) labelling and bagging of finds on site from all excavated levels, post-1800 unstratified pottery may be discarded on site with a small sample retained for dating evidence as required.

5. REPORTING AND ARCHIVING

- 5.1 The reporting requirements will be confirmed with the DCHES on completion of the site work. If few or no archaeological deposits are exposed, the results may be produced as a County Historic Environment Record (HER) entry. More significant archaeological exposures would require the production of a summary illustrated report.
- 5.2 The summary report, if required, will contain the following elements as appropriate:
- i) location plan;
- ii) a written description of the exposed remains and buildings and a discussion and interpretation of their character and significance in the context of any locally available historical evidence;
- iii) copies of relevant historic maps and images;
- iv) plans and sections at appropriate scales showing the buildings and the exact location of any significant archaeological deposits; and
- v) specialist reports as appropriate.
- 5.3 Copies of the report will be produced for distribution to the Client and the County HER, usually within three months of the completion of the fieldwork. A copy will also be deposited with the site archive.
- 5.4 An ordered and integrated site archive will be prepared with reference to *The Management of Archaeological Projects* (English Heritage, 1991 2nd edition) upon completion of the entire project. This will be deposited with the Museum of Barnstaple and North Devon, in consultation with the Curator. The guidelines in the relevant *Procedures for the Deposit of Archaeological Archives* will be followed. The museum accession number is *applied for*.
- 5.5 Details of the project, including a .pdf copy of the summary report, will be submitted to the OASIS (Online AccesS to the Index of Archaeological investigationS) database, and the OASIS ID quoted in the report or HER entry.
- 5.6 A short summary of the results of the project will be prepared for inclusion within the "round up" section of the appropriate national journal, if merited.
- 5.7 Should particularly significant remains, finds and/or deposits be encountered, then these, because of their importance, are likely to merit wider publication in line with government planning guidance. If such remains are encountered, the publication requirements including any further analysis that may be necessary will be confirmed with the DCHES, in consultation with the Client. Exeter Archaeology, on behalf of the Client, will then implement publication in accordance with a timescale agreed with the Client and the DCHES.

6. PROJECT ORGANISATION

6.1 The project will be undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced EA archaeologists, and completed under the general management of Timothy Gent, BA MPhil, who produced this document.

Health & Safety

6.2 Exeter Archaeology operations are subject to Health and Safety policies prepared by Exeter City Council which include all aspects of work covered by the *Health and Safety at Work Act* (1974). All monitoring works within this scheme will be carried out in accordance with current *Safe Working Practices* and a *Risk Assessment* will be prepared in advance.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Specialists contributors and advisors The expertise of the following specialists can be called upon if required: Bone artefact analysis: Ian Riddler; Dating techniques: University of Waikato Radiocarbon Laboratory, NZ; Alex Bayliss (EH); Charcoal identification: Dana Challinor (Oxford); Diatom analysis: Nigel Cameron (UCL); Environmental data: Mike Allen (AEA); Vanessa Straker (English Heritage); Faunal remains: Southampton University Faunal Remains Unit and sub-consultants, Dale Seargantson, Polydora Baker (EH); Lorraine Higbee (Taunton); Fish bone identification: Alison Locker: Foraminifera analysis: Mike Godwin; Finds conservation: Alison Hopper-Bishop (Exeter Museums); Salisbury Conservation Centre: Human remains: Louise Loe (Oxford Archaeology); Dr. James Steele (Centre for Human Ecology, Southampton); Lithic analysis: Dr. Linda Hurcombe (Exeter University); John Newberry (Paignton); Medieval and post-medieval finds: John Allan (Exeter Archaeology) and sub-consultants; Metallurgy: Chris Salter (Oxford University); Ancient Monuments Laboratory (English Heritage) Peter Crew (Snowdonia National Park), Gill Juleff (Exeter University); Molluscan analysis: Terrestrial-Paul Davis (Bristol); Marine- Jan Light (Godalming); Numismatics: Norman Shiel (Exeter); Petrology/geology: Roger Taylor (RAM Museum); Dr R. Scrivener (British Geological Survey); *Plant remains*: Julie Jones (Bristol); Wendy Carruthers (Llantrisant) Pollen: Dr Heather Tinsley (Bristol); Elizabeth Huckerby (Lancaster University Archaeological Unit); Prehistoric pottery: Henrietta Quinnell (Exeter); Radiocarbon dating: University of Waikato, New Zealand: Scottish Universities Research and Reactor Centre, East Kilbride Roman finds: Paul Bidwell & associates (Arbeia Roman Fort, South Shields); Soil Science: Matthew Canti (EH) and sub-consultants; Textiles: Penelope Rogers (York)

Exeter Archaeology, 30th June 2008

Project No. 6542



Fig. 1 Location of site. Scale 1:25000.



Fig. 2 Area 1: features located in the western borrow pit and western bank.



Fig. 3 Area 2: features located in the central borrow pit and central bank.



Fig. 4 Area 3: Features located in the eastern borrow pit and eastern bank.



Fig. 5 Area 4: features located in north-western bank.



Fig. 6 Area 5: features located in bank around building 515.



Fig. 7 Sections across a sample of the features.



Fig. 8 The site in 1885–87. Ordnance Survey First Edition 1:10,560 map sheets VIII.S.E. & XII.N.E., published in 1890. Reduced to 1:12,500.



Plate 1. North-facing section across ditch 1.



Plate 2. South-facing section across ditch 811.



Plate 3. North-facing section across ditch 813.



Plate 4. South-facing section across furrow 805.