Archaeology South-East

ASE

Archaeological Evaluation Report
Nishkam School site, Syon Lane
Hounslow, West London

NGR: 515580 177570
(TQ 1558 7757)

Planning Ref: 01106/152/P3

ASE Project No: 7693
Site Code: NHK15

ASE Report No: 2015329
OASIS id: archaeol6-223828

By Suzanne Westall MA MSc ACIfA

Archaeological Evaluation Report
Nishkam School Site, Syon Lane
Hounslow, West London

NGR: 515580 177570
(TQ 1558 7757)

Planning Ref: 01106/152/P3

ASE Project No: 7693
Site Code: NHK15

ASE Report No: 2015329
OASIS id: archaeol6-223828

Prepared by:	Suzanne Westall	Archaeologist	
Reviewed and approved by:	Dan Swift	Project Manager	
Date of Issue:	September 2015		
Revision:	1		

Archaeology South-East
Units 1 & 2
2 Chapel Place
Portslade
East Sussex
BN41 1DR

Tel: 01273 426830
Fax: 01273 420866
Email: fau@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

This report presents the results of an archaeological evaluation carried out by Archaeology South-East at Syon Lane, Hounslow, West London (NGR 515580 177570), between 1st and 9th September 2015. Twenty-two trenches measuring up to 30m in length were excavated.

The fieldwork was commissioned by CgMs in advance of development of the land for a new school and associated recreational areas.

A few struck flints were recovered from the site, along with several sherds of prehistoric pottery. The majority of finds did not appear to be within archaeological features, however, and the evaluation was largely negative, with just two post-medieval ditches and three possible prehistoric features recorded.

CONTENTS

TABLES

FIGURES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Site Background

1.1.1 Archaeology South-East (ASE) was commissioned by CgMs Consulting to undertake an archaeological evaluation of land at the proposed Nishkam West London Free School site: White Lodge Club, Syon Lane, Wyke Green, London Borough of Hounslow, TW7 5PN (NGR: TQ 1558 7757; Figure 1).

1.2 Geology and Topography

1.2.1 The site is an irregular parcel of land currently occupied by a sports field. It is bounded by Syon Lane to the north, Braybourne Drive to the south and Wood Lane to the west.

1.2.2 The British Geological Survey records the solid geology on this site to be London Clay formation, capped by Langley Silt formation 'brickearths' of clay and silt.

1.2.3 The site is located on gently sloping ground between 24m and 25m AOD. To the east, ground level falls toward the River Brent. In general the site has been levelled at around 24m AOD to allow its use as a sports field.

1.3 Planning Background

1.3.1 A planning application (01106/152/P3) was submitted for the erection of a new four form school for 1,400 pupils, with sports hall, football fields, school play areas, car parking, new and improved access, landscaping, and retained/improved public playing areas.

1.3.2 A desk-based assessment (CgMs 2015) concluded that archaeological remains of local importance may exist on the site.

1.4 Scope of Report

1.4.1 This report details the results of an archaeological evaluation carried out by ASE between the 1st and the 9th of September, 2015. The work was carried out in accordance with CIfA standards and guidance (CIfA 2014) and the Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service's Archaeological Guidance Papers No's. 3-5 (GLAAS 2014).

1.5 Project Aims and Objectives

1.5.1 The aims of the evaluation were:

- To establish the presence or absence of archaeological remains and deposits with palaeo-environmental potential within the footprint of the proposed development
- To determine the survival, extent and minimum depth below modern ground level of any such remains

- To determine the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits
- To enable the archaeological advisor at GLAAS to make an informed decision as to the requirement for any further archaeological work at the site

2.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The following background is paraphrased from the desk-based assessment (CgMs 2015).

2.2 Early Prehistoric

2.2.1 Numerous Prehistoric flint tools, some showing levallois techniques, have been recorded from 'Macklins Pit' in the area now occupied by Wyke Green Golf Course (GLSMR Ref: ML0 2184, TQ 1560 7820). A Palaeolithic chipped axe has been recorded from 'Osterley Park' (GLSMR Ref: MLO 68784; TQ 1510 7830), and a further handaxe from the line of the London Underground railway (GLSMR Ref: MLO 02146; TQ 1500 7730).

2.3 Later Prehistoric

2.3.1 A small 'ring-ditch' crop mark to the east of the site may represent a Bronze Age burial mound (GLSM Ref: MLO1950; TQ 1560 7800), while fragments of a Bronze Age Deverel Rimbury Urn and some struck flints are recorded from 160-162 Wood Lane North, close to the site (GLSMR Ref: MLO2189; TQ 1540 7750).

2.3.2 'Prehistoric pottery' and struck flint are recorded from the former United Biscuits site in Syon Lane (GLSMR Ref: MLO59689; TQ 1600 7760) and a heavy concentration of burnt flint is recorded from Wyke Green Golf Course (GLSMR Ref: MLO2211; TQ 1610 7810).

2.4 Roman

2.4.1 Although Roman settlements are attested at Brentford and Syon Park, in association with the Roman Road from London to Staines, within a 1km radius of the site only a single Roman coin (from the reign of Constantine) has been recorded (GLMSR Ref: MLO2615; TQ 1580 7740).

2.5 Medieval

2.5.1 A late medieval moated site stood c.270m to the north of the study site (GLSMR Ref: MLO10578; TQ 1540 7780). The Manor and House both known as 'Wyke' are first recorded in 1210 and continued in occupation until c.1723.

2.6 Post-Medieval

2.6.1 In 1723, Wyke Manor was purchased by John Way who constructed a new house to the south of the old, in the area now occupied by Crown Tree Close and Stags Way. Following construction of the new House, the old moated enclosure was abandoned and the buildings within it demolished. This had certainly taken place by 1766.

2.6.2 John Rocque's map of 1766 shows the abandoned moated site to the north of the proposed Nishkam School site, and to the south of the site boundary the

new 'Wyke House' (GLSMR Ref: MLO 3286; TQ 1572 7757). This is also how the site is shown on the Ordnance Survey of 1807. By this date, the new 'Wyke House' had been substantially extended into a large mansion. This is believed to have taken place in c.1780-1800.

2.6.3 The first detailed map of the site is the 1813 Isleworth Enclosure map which shows the bulk of the study site comprised of '120' a field, including some plantation woodland in the ownership of the Earl of Jersey. The first edition Ordnance Survey map of 1868 shows the site as largely unchanged.

2.7 20th Century

2.7.1 By 1945 the study site appears to have been in use as a sports ground. An aerial photograph of that year shows several grassed tennis courts and a cricket pitch.

3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

3.1 Fieldwork Methodology

3.1.1 A total of twenty-two trenches were excavated (Figure 2). The proposed length of all trenches was 30m but several had to be reduced due to unforeseen obstructions. Details of these deviations where they occur are given in the results section. The trenches were distributed across the site, taking into account a Tree Preservation Order covering a tree belt along the southern periphery of the site and the alignment of a newly-lain service trench.

3.1.2 The trenches were excavated under archaeological supervision using a 14 tonne mechanical excavator fitted with a 1.8m wide flat-bladed ditching bucket through undifferentiated topsoil and modern made ground in spits of no more than 0.25m. Machining stopped at the level of archaeological deposits or when clean 'natural' sediments were exposed. Spoil heaps and trench bases were investigated for metal and other finds.

3.1.3 Any exposed archaeological features or deposits were cleaned by hand and recorded in plan and section with contexts recorded on ASE *pro forma* context sheets. A sufficient sampling of archaeological features was undertaken in order to determine their nature, date, condition, character and extent.

3.1.4 No soil samples were collected from the site due to a lack of suitable deposits.

3.1.5 A digital photographic record was made of all archaeological features and evaluation trenches.

3.1.6 Due to an unexpected problem with ASE's DGPS (Differential Global Positioning System) technology, the trenches were laid out using DGPS but archaeological features and deposits were planned by hand.

3.1.7 Provision was made at all stages of the project for CgMs and the GLAAS to monitor progress and standards. The GLAAS Archaeological Advisor attended site once all of the trenches had been opened.

3.2 Archive

3.2.1 ASE informed London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (LAARC) prior to the commencement of fieldwork that a site archive would be generated and this will be deposited with LAARC in due course.

Number of Contexts	94
No. of files/paper record	1
Plan and sections sheets	6
Colour photographs	0
B&W photos	0
Digital photos	135
Permatrace sheets	6
Trench Record Forms	22

Table 1: Quantification of site archive

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 Trench 2

4.1.1 Several features were investigated in Trench 2 but all of them proved to be the result of root disturbance or animal intervention. One of these [2/004] contained prehistoric pottery. This was a curvilinear feature, running into the baulk on the north side of the trench (Figure 3). It contained several large chunks of prehistoric pottery, probably of Middle Bronze Age date and from more than one vessel. It is possible that [2/004] represents a prehistoric deposit disturbed by later rooting, burrowing or ploughing.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
2/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.20-0.28	25.68
2/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.24-0.34	25.43
2/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		25.14
2/004	cut	root disturbance	0.49	0.18	0.08	24.95
2/005	fill	fill	0.49	0.18	0.08	24.95

Table 2: Trench 2 list of recorded contexts

4.2 Trench 4

4.2.1 Trench 4 was oriented north-east to south-west. Due to its location close to some old sheds and heavy overgrowth, the trench was shortened to 14m. A possible post hole [4/004] was identified in the centre of the trench. This was 0.4m by 0.36m in size by 0.12m deep. The fill, [4/005], was a firm, reddish-brown, fine sandy clay containing occasional stones. While in half-section it looked like a convincing post-hole, however, when fully excavated it looked much more like root disturbance. No other similar features were identified within the trench.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
4/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.20-0.28	24.97
4/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.30-0.32	24.73
4/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		24.42
4/004	cut	root disturbance	0.4	0.36	0.12	24.43
4/005	fill	fill	0.4	0.36	0.12	24.43

Table 3: Trench 4 list of recorded contexts

4.3 Trench 5

4.3.1 Two features were identified in Trench 5 (Figure 5). The first of these, [5/004], was a relatively substantial north-north-west to south-south-east oriented ditch which lay beneath and followed the line of a modern concrete path associated with the sports pitches. This ditch also appeared in Trench 8 and is likely to be an old field boundary of relatively recent date: perhaps post-medieval. The ditch was 1.6m wide by 0.46m deep, with gently sloping sides and a bowl-shaped profile. The fill, [5/005], was a compact mid-brown silty clay containing flecks of charcoal and evidence of root disturbance along with tiny smears of CBM or fired clay (not retained). A small fragment of slag or clinker was recovered from the fill.

4.3.2 The second feature was a linear ditch or shallow gully running north-east to south-west along the line of the trench [5/006]. This linear feature was exposed to a length of around 17m, petering out at either end, suggesting that only the deepest part of it remained. It was a very subtle feature but the trenches were, for the most part, reduced in spits of only 0.05m, so it was perhaps truncated by past agricultural activity on the site. The ditch was 0.61m wide by 0.13m deep with a wide u-shaped profile and a hard, light grey-brown silt fill [5/007]. The fill contained occasional flint and very occasional flecks of charcoal. It also contained fire-cracked flint and a struck flint of Early to Middle Neolithic (or possible Mesolithic) date. There were no later finds.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
5/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.23-0.30	25.71
5/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.33-0.42	25.45
5/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		25.08
5/004	cut	ditch	2.15	1.6	0.46	25.12
5/005	fill	fill	2.15	1.6	0.46	25.12
5/006	cut	gully	17.5	0.6	0.13	24.96
5/007	fill	fill	17.5	0.6	0.13	24.96

Table 4: Trench 5 list of recorded contexts

4.4 Trench 6

4.4.1 A narrow gully [6/004] crossed the north end of Trench 6 in a north-east to south-westerly direction (Figure 6). This gully was 0.46m wide by 0.22m deep with steep, very straight, parallel sides and a compact mid-greyish-brown silty clay fill [6/005].

4.4.2 No finds were recovered from the fill of [6/004]. It is possible that this feature is a field drain but it did not contain a ceramic pipe or stone fill so its nature is not certain.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
6/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.23-0.27	25.48
6/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.34-0.45	25.23
6/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		24.84
6/004	cut	gully	2	0.46	0.22	24.82
6/005	fill	fill	2	0.46	0.22	24.82

Table 5: Trench 6 list of recorded contexts

4.5 Trench 8

4.5.1 Two features were recorded in Trench 8. The first of these was a large animal burrow [8/004], at least 0.7m by 0.6m, sloping downwards from the subsoil into the natural and containing a firm, mid-yellowish-brown silt fill [8/005]. The burrow was given numbers and recorded because the fill contained several fragments of prehistoric pottery. It was situated at the east end of the trench (Figure 7).

4.5.2 The second feature in Trench 8 was a large ditch which crossed the middle of the trench from north-west to south-east [8/006] (Figure 7). This ditch was excavated and recorded in Trench 5 (see [5/004]) so was not excavated here.

4.5.3 A fragment of Roman tile was recovered from the subsoil.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
8/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.18-0.33	25.61
8/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.23-0.35	25.36
8/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		25.07
8/004	cut	animal burrow	0.7	0.6	0.2	25.22
8/005	fill	fill	0.7	0.6	0.2	25.22
8/006	cut	ditch	2.1	1.6		25.07
8/007	fill	fill	2.1	1.6		25.07

Table 6: Trench 8 list of recorded contexts

4.6 Trench 9

4.6.1 Trench 9 was shortened to a length of 19m due to the presence of a concrete footpath with intact scaffolding handrail running right across it. A ditch [9/004] was recorded running north-west to south-east across the east end of the trench (Figure 8). This was 0.6m wide by 0.23m deep with steep sides and a wide, roughly flat base. No finds were recorded from the fill of the ditch [9/005], which was a fine and fairly soft mottled light yellow-brown silt. Thin patches of black towards the base may have been derived from charcoal but could easily have been root decay. Small roots were present in the fill. The feature is thought likely to be a former field boundary and it aligns well with the (probable post-medieval) ditch identified in trenches 5 and 8 so, although it is much narrower and less deep in Trench 9, it could be the same feature. This boundary would thus follow the same alignment as the extant field boundaries to the south-west and north-east.

4.6.2 A second irregularly-shaped feature in Trench 9, [9/006] had uneven edges and an uneven base. Evidence of burning was present in the form of ashes within the fill [9/007], but this was thought to be a root feature – perhaps a tree stump that had been burnt. Sherds of post-medieval pottery and CBM were recovered from the fill.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
9/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.25-0.34	25.25
9/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.45-0.60	24.96
9/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		24.5
9/004	cut	ditch	2.6	0.6	0.23	24.59
9/005	fill	fill	2.6	0.6	0.23	24.59
9/006	cut	root disturbance	1.8	0.9	0.3	24.5
9/007	fill	fill	1.8	0.9	0.3	24.5

Table 7: Trench 9 list of recorded contexts

4.7 Trench 11

4.7.1 Trench 11 contained one feature: a possible gully terminus oriented north-east–south-west [11/004] and containing a firm, yellowish-brown silty clay fill. The exposed extent of this feature was 3.9m and it was 0.2m wide by 0.16m deep with relatively gently sloping sides. A struck flint flake and two fragments of fire-cracked flint were recovered from the fill.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
11/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.25-0.30	24.86
11/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.35-0.60	24.59
11/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		24.19
11/004	cut	gully	3.8	0.46	0.16	24.2
11/005	fill	fill	3.8	0.46	0.16	24.2

Table 8: Trench 11 list of recorded contexts

4.8 Trench 12

4.8.1 Several potential features were identified in Trench 12 but almost all proved to be root or animal disturbance. One small feature was identified as a possible pit and recorded (Figure 10) but no finds were recovered from it and it seems likely that this was also a root feature. The feature [12/004] was roughly circular and 0.65m by 0.7m in size by 0.3m in depth. It was filled with a dark brown clay silt [12/005].

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
12/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.25-0.35	25.47
12/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.30-0.50	25.16
12/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		25.73
12/004	cut	rooting	0.7	0.65	0.3	24.69
12/005	fill	fill	0.7	0.65	0.3	24.69

Table 9: Trench 12 list of recorded contexts

4.9 Trench 14

4.9.1 One feature was recorded in Trench 14 (Figure 11), however, investigation revealed that this was an animal burrow, with a soft, curvilinear shape and upward tapering end [14/004]. The fill [14/005] contained a struck flint of Mesolithic or Early Neolithic date.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
14/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.23-0.33	24.5
14/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.38-0.41	24.25
14/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		23.87
14/004	cut	animal burrow	1.68	0.36	0.15	23.91
14/005	fill	fill	1.68	0.36	0.15	23.91

Table 10: Trench 14 list of recorded contexts

4.10 Trench 16

4.10.1 A small pit or post hole [16/004] containing one fragment of fire-cracked-flint was recorded in Trench 16 (Figure 12). The feature was 0.47m by 0.41m in size and 0.29m deep, narrowing slightly towards the base. The fill, [16/005], was a compact mid-grey clay silt containing flecks of charcoal.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
16/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.25-0.27	24.1
16/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.33-0.35	23.84
16/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		23.49
16/004	cut	posthole	0.47	0.41	0.29	23.46
16/005	fill	fill	0.47	0.41	0.29	23.46

Table 11: Trench 16 list of recorded contexts

4.11 Trench 21

4.11.1 A single ditch [21/004] was recorded crossing Trench 21 (Figure 13). This ran north-east to south-west and was 0.39m wide by 0.08m deep with a flat base. Its fill was markedly different to the surrounding soil and was a mid-grey compacted silt [21/005]. Although the ditch was only shallow it produced a struck flint flake, small fragments of slag or clinker, and ceramic building material (CBM). The latter finds indicate a post-medieval date for the feature.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
21/001	layer	topsoil	trench	trench	0.24-0.41	23.55
21/002	layer	subsoil	trench	trench	0.26-0.29	23.28
21/003	layer	natural	trench	trench		23.02
21/004	cut	ditch	3.4	0.4	0.08	23.02
21/005	fill	fill	3.4	0.4	0.08	23.02

Table 12: Trench 21 list of recorded contexts

4.12 Archaeologically negative trenches

4.12.1 Trenches 1, 3, 7, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 22 produced no features of archaeological interest.

4.12.2 The ground in Trench 19 was different to that in all other trenches. The deposits comprised wet clay with some amount of modern disturbance. A post-medieval or modern truncation or ditch appeared to take up much of the northern half end of the trench. This was oriented north-east to south-west and contained modern or late post-medieval CBM, but was quickly obscured as the trench filled with water. No further investigation of this feature therefore took place.

4.2.3 Trench 22 was also different to the rest in that it was located adjacent to the concrete access path, at the northern extent of the site, in the vicinity of the old sports ground clubhouse (now derelict). This area comprised several layers of made ground and although gravels were exposed at a depth of 1.2m below the current ground surface, there were variations in these deposits suggesting that at least some of it was still modern made ground. For health and safety reasons and because it seemed unlikely that any archaeological remains would have survived such deep levels of disturbance, excavation did not exceed 1.2m.

4.2.4 In all other trenches, the deposits comprised a layer of topsoil 0.2m-0.37m deep over a layer of compacted yellow-brown silt mottled with topsoil in a pattern of frequent root and animal disturbance. This layer was generally between 0.25m and 0.5m deep and overlay a very similar but slightly more dense and clayeyer pinkish-orange-brown brickearth. In places, it was necessary to machine away the upper layer of brickearth due to the amount of root and burrow disturbance, the pattern of which made identification of any archaeological features impossible.

4.2.5 Trench 7 was split into two parts due to the presence of a concrete footpath with intact railings running across the middle of it (this footpath also interrupted Trench 9 (which was shortened) and trenches 5 and 8, where the railing was no longer intact and the footpath and broken railings were removed).

4.2.6 For tabulated data on the deposits in each negative trench see Appendix 1.

5.0 THE FINDS

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 A small assemblage of finds was recovered during the evaluation on Syon Lane, Hounslow. All finds were washed and dried or air dried as appropriate. They were subsequently quantified by count and weight and were bagged by material and context (Appendix 2). All finds have been packed and stored following CIfA guidelines (2014). No further conservation is required.

5.2 **The Flintwork** by Karine Le Hégarat

5.2.1 The evaluation produced just five pieces of struck flint weighing 27g. A further 35 fragments of unworked burnt flint (220g) were also recovered. No concentrations were found, with the pieces of struck flint deriving from five trenches, and the burnt fragments coming from ten contexts in seven trenches.

5.2.2 The assemblage comprises two small flakes, a bladelet, a piece of irregular waste and a serrated piece. All of the artefacts are manufactured from a mid to dark grey flint. They display slight to moderate edge damage, implying that the material has undergone negligible post-depositional disturbance. The bladelet from context [14/005] displays parallel edges. It is likely to be Mesolithic or Early Neolithic in date. The serrated piece from context [5/007] is made on a blade-like flake, the proximal end of which is absent. The implement exhibits a series of denticulations along both lateral edges, although these are more regular on the left lateral edge. No gloss was observed. Serrated pieces are principally found in Early to Middle Neolithic assemblages. They have also been recovered from Mesolithic sites. Their function remains unclear. While Curwen concluded from experimental work that these artefacts were used for cutting wood and corn (Curwen 1930) various other substances, such as silicious plants and even meat, have been proposed since (Saville 2002, Fullagar 2006).

5.2.3 The evaluation reveals limited presence during the prehistoric period. Although very small, the assemblage provides evidence for the use of tools during the Mesolithic or Early/Mid Neolithic period.

5.3 **The Prehistoric Pottery** by Louise Rayner

Introduction and overview

5.3.1 A small assemblage of prehistoric pottery was recovered, totalling 24 sherds from three contexts. All of the pottery is flint-tempered and typical of prehistoric pottery from the West London area. The pottery has been examined with a x20 microscope.

5.3.2 The largest collection of sherds and fragments came from context [2/005]. Nineteen fragments, representing 2 or 3 vessels are present, all manufactured in a fairly coarse flint-tempered fabric. This group includes the most diagnostic pieces comprising three large body sherds with fingertip impressed applied cordons. These sherds derive from a Middle Bronze Age Deverel-Rimbury jar of which impressed applied cordons are typical features in the Lower Thames

Valley (Ellison 1975); the coarsely flint-tempered fabric and thick walled sherds are also typical features of these bucket-shaped vessels. Dates ranges currently ascribed to Deverel-Rimbury ceramics places the floruit between the 16th and 12th centuries BC (Needham 1996).

5.3.3 The sherds from [8/005] are also flint-tempered, although using a much finer temper and are probably slightly later in the date, although nothing diagnostic is present; a Later Bronze Age is best attributed to this material.

5.3.4 The tiny fragments from [5/002] are also flint-tempered but too small to define further beyond assigning a general prehistoric date.

Significance and potential

5.3.5 The small collection of prehistoric pottery suggests activity in the Middle Bronze Age and potentially into the Later Bronze Age. The groups are small and not thought to be associated with cut features related to contemporary activity so beyond indicating general activity in the vicinity they do not elucidate the character or nature of this activity any further. Middle Bronze Age Deverel-Rimbury jars are found associated with domestic settlement and funerary use and both uses are evidenced across the West London area such as at Heathrow Terminal 5 (Leviers 2010), Prospect Park, Harmondsworth (Laidlaw and Mepham 1996), Western International Market, Hillingdon (Rayner in prep; PCA unpublished) Bankside Close, Isleworth (Hull 1998), and several others in Middlesex (Barrett 1973).

5.3.6 The small collection of pottery has little potential for further work and requires no further work at this stage.

5.4 The Post-Medieval Pottery by Lucy Whittingham

Introduction

5.4.1 An assemblage of 38 sherds (465g) from 31 vessels has been examined for this report, all of which are post-medieval in date. The pottery has been quantified using sherd count, weight (g) and estimated number of vessels (ENV), and recorded on an Excel spreadsheet, conforming to London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (LAARC) deposition standards. This will form part of the site archive.

5.4.2 All of the pottery is poorly preserved in small abraded sherds. It is all of a domestic nature and would seem to be from household rubbish which has been moved around considerably since first disposal.

Post-medieval Assemblage

5.4.3 Two phases of post-medieval pottery are represented in this assemblage. A small quantity (11%) of the assemblage is of an early post-medieval date but is probably residual in an assemblage where the majority of the material is late post-medieval, dating from the late 18th to 19th centuries.

5.4.4 The early post-medieval assemblage is comprised of 4 sherds (82g, 4 ENV), represented by the rim of a Surrey/Hampshire borderware (BORDG) pipkin, a

fragment of London-area post-medieval slipped redware (PMSRY) and part the body of a Frechen stoneware (FREC) Bartman jug. These wares are indicative of activity on or near the site from the mid-16th to late 17th centuries. A larger fragment from a tin-glazed earthenware plate with plain white glaze (TGWC) could also be 17th century in date but these wares continued to be used into the 18th century. Similarly, the finer red earthenware (PMFR) fragments from the base of either deep bowls or dishes could be late 17th century products but were also common in the 18th century.

5.4.5 Later post-medieval pottery dating from the late 18th and 19th centuries forms the larger part of this assemblage (34 sherds, 383g, 27 ENV). The only imported ware is a fragment from the rim of a Chinese Porcelain teabowl (CHPO), probably of 18th century date. A number of sherds of London-area red earthenware (PMR) are undiagnostic sherds with the exception of those that might be from a flowerpot. These coarse utilitarian redwares were produced from the late 16th century through to the 19th and are probably contemporary here with the late 18th and 19th century industrial finewares. English tin-glazed earthenware is represented by two fragments, both with a pale blue glaze (TGW H) which is most commonly found throughout the 18th century in London. One example of a white-slipped earthenware vessel with lead glaze is a Sunderland coarseware-type (SUND) vessel of probable 19th to early 20th century date.

5.4.6 A number of late 18th and 19th century industrial finewares are present in transfer-printed dinner wares, such as plates with a blue transfer decoration (TPW2), with a green transfer (TPW4), and in a transfer-printed flow blue pattern made particularly for export to the American market from the 1840s onwards. Refined white earthenware (REFW), produced from 1800 and throughout the 19th century, is found in several vessels including an ointment or paste pot with lid seating for a lid, part of a soup plate with flanged rim, a bowl, and the base of a saucer.

Significance of the assemblage and Potential for Analysis

5.4.7 This is a small assemblage of typical post-medieval pottery from London and of little significance beyond providing a chronological framework for the stratigraphy. A small number of early post-medieval wares occur residually in the same contexts as 18th and 19th century wares and are all typical of imported or locally produced wares found in London at this time. The majority of this assemblage dates from the late post-medieval period and appears to be household clearance of utilitarian vessels, dinner plates, soup bowls and teawares.

5.4.8 No further research is recommended for this assemblage, nor are any sherds recommended for illustration, and there are no special conservation requirements.

5.5 **The Ceramic Building Materials** by Trista Clifford

5.5.1 A moderate assemblage of 105 fragments of brick and roofing tile was recovered, weighing a total of 2865g. The assemblage predominantly consists of roof tile with a small amount of very abraded brick.

5.5.2 All the ceramic building material has been recorded on a standard recording form, quantified by fabric, form, weight and fragment count using the Museum of London (MoL) type series for fabrics. Six additional fabrics were also recorded (Table 13). The information on the recording sheets has been entered onto an Excel database. Samples of the fabrics and items of interest have been retained; the remainder of the material has been discarded.

Fabric	Description
B1	Abundant well sorted medium/coarse quartz
T1	Abundant medium to coarse sub-rounded milky quartz
T2	Sparse medium rose quartz, underfired, silty fabric
T3	Fine calcareous speckle, sparse coarse red iron oxide, very sparse fine to medium quartz
T4	Abundant fine medium and coarse quartz, well sorted with sparse to moderate calcareous speckle
T5	Fine background quartz, common coarse milky quartz, sparse very coarse red iron oxides, calcareous and clay pellet inclusions

Table 13: NHK15 Fabric descriptions

5.5.3 In fabric descriptions the following conventions are used: the frequency of inclusions is described as being sparse, moderate, common or abundant; the size categories for inclusions are fine (up to 0.25 mm), medium (between 0.25 and 0.5 mm), coarse (between 0.5 and 1 mm), and very coarse (greater than 1 mm).

Roman

5.5.4 A single probable Roman tegula fragment weighing 20g was residual in context [8/002].

Medieval and post medieval tile

5.5.5 The majority of the assemblage (64 fragments weighing 2113g) consists of roofing or peg tile. Medieval fabrics MoL2273 and 2587 are present alongside more loosely dated fabric types MoL3094, 2271 and 2586. Roofing tile in fabric 2275 was recovered, a fabric usually associated with pantile of 17th-19th century date; none of these pieces appear to derive from pantile however, and one from [12/002] exhibited circular peg holes of 12mm and 13mm diameter. A further three fragments also exhibited partial peg holes ranging from 10-13mm in diameter.

Post medieval bricks

5.5.6 Only a very small amount of brick was recovered, without exception in poor abraded condition. Fabrics present include MoL3033 and 3039, both post- fire fabric types. A single local fabric, B1, was also noted in small quantities and is probably of similar date.

5.6 The Fired Clay by Trista Clifford

5.6.1 A small group of 15 fired clay fragments weighing 116g was recovered from context [8/001]. The fabric is reduced with sparse fine quartz and no other visible inclusions. The fragments are amorphous in nature and as such not possible to date.

5.7 The Metallurgical Remains by Trista Clifford

5.7.1 A small assemblage of 6 pieces weighing 40g was recovered from four separate contexts. Contexts [5/001], [5/005] and [21/004] contained small fragments too small to diagnostic, which could be clinker rather than metallurgical remains. Context [17/002] contained an undiagnostic iron slag fragment weighing 36g. All are of post-medieval date.

5.8 The Geological Material by Trista Clifford

5.8.1 A single fragment of burnt roofing slate was recovered from context [10/001].

5.9 The Glass by Elke Raemen

5.9.1 A single green glass wine bottle neck (weight 109g) was recovered during the archaeological work. The piece, with applied rim, is of 18th century date.

5.10 The Clay Tobacco Pipe by Elke Raemen

5.10.1 A small assemblage comprising five clay tobacco pipe (CTP) stem fragments was found in five different contexts. Included are four plain stem fragments. The earliest two, both abraded, date to c. 1660-80 ([4/002]) and c. 1660-1710 ([21/002]). The remaining two stem fragments ([1/001] and [13/002]) are only broadly dateable to between c. 1750 and 1910. Context [17/002] contained a small, fairly undiagnostic bowl fragment with a possible date of c. 1680-1710.

5.11 **Animal bone** by Hayley Forsyth

5.11.1 The excavations at the Nishkam School site produced a small assemblage of animal bone containing 5 fragments weighing 74g from context [12/002]. Identified as large mammal long bone fragments, the remains have been hand-collected and are in good condition with minimal signs of surface erosion observable. No evidence of burning, butchery, gnawing or pathology has been noted. Due to the size of this assemblage, it holds no potential for further analysis and no further work is required.

6.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Overview of stratigraphic sequence

6.1.1 Natural brickearth was exposed at a height of 23.5m AOD in the north of the site to 24m AOD in the south-west and 25m AOD in the south-east. In all areas it was overlain by a patchy clay silt subsoil 0.25m to 0.5m deep and capped by topsoil that was, on average, 0.25m to 0.35m deep. The interfaces between all three layers were gradual with much evidence of root interference.

6.1.2 In several trenches, sondages were dug to test the depth of the underlying gravel. In most, this was not far (0.2m – 0.3m) below the surface of the brickearth and, in a few trenches towards the north-east of the site, patches of gravel were exposed at the same level as the brickearth.

6.1.3 Very few archaeological features were identified. A concrete path across the sports fields appears – for most of its length – to follow an old field boundary of post-medieval date marked by a ditch. This ran north-west to south-east and was apparent in trenches 5 and 8. It was probably also the ditch excavated in Trench 9. A second post-medieval ditch was identified running north-east to south-west across Trench 21, to the far north of the site. Again, this is likely to have been an old field boundary.

6.1.4 In Trench 11, a possibly gully terminus was identified which again followed a north-east to south-west alignment but contained only prehistoric finds. A narrow gully running north-east to south-west across Trench 6 produced no dating evidence. In Trench 16, a possible post-hole produced fire cracked flint. Its date is again therefore uncertain but this may be a prehistoric feature. Other features which produced prehistoric material were not thought to be genuinely archaeological.

6.1.5 Four test pits dug for geotechnical purposes into the field boundary and bank and ditch surrounding the site were inspected by the ASE archaeologist but no archaeological deposits or remains were identified. The ditch was filled with modern topsoil and debris and excavations through the bank and footpath on the roadside revealed only modern truncations for the road and services.

6.2 Deposit survival and existing impacts

6.2.1 Several of the recorded discrete features are of dubious archaeological origin and more likely to have been created by tree roots or burrowing animals. The subsoil was heavily mottled with patches of topsoil and while this appeared to indicate long-term disturbance by roots and burrows, it may be that this was an imported soil – a mix of topsoil and subsoil. In many cases, the disturbance appeared continuous from the subsoil into the surface of the underlying brickearth, however, so if the subsoil was an imported deposit it has have been in situ for a relatively long period of time. The field is believed to have been used as a sports ground since at least 1945, so is likely to have been landscaped then, or earlier. Much of the landscape around this area is very flat, however, so any landscaping was probably minimal. In either case, it seems that any potential prehistoric evidence has been heavily truncated, whether by

landscaping or by ploughing and rooting prior to use of the field for recreation, and by subsequent animal activity.

6.3 Prehistoric evidence

6.3.1 The evaluation revealed very limited evidence of activity during the prehistoric period. A few struck flints of Mesolithic or Early/Mid Neolithic date were recovered, as were a few fragments of prehistoric pottery of a later Middle Bronze Age and potentially Late Bronze Age date. The pottery is not thought to be associated with archaeological features, so beyond indicating general activity in the vicinity it does not elucidate the character or nature of any potential prehistoric activity.

6.4 Roman evidence

6.4.1 One fragment of possible Roman tile was recovered from the subsoil in Trench 8.

6.5 Post-medieval evidence

6.5.1 Two ditches were identified which appear to be of post-medieval date and probably represent old field boundaries. These follow a very similar alignment to the extant boundaries of the site.

6.5.1 All of the post-medieval pottery recovered was of a domestic nature and would seem to be from household rubbish which has been moved around considerably since first disposal. A small number of early post-medieval wares occurred residually in the same contexts as 18th and 19th century potsherds all were typical of imported or locally produced wares found in London at that time. A few fragments of clay pipe dating from the 17th to 18th centuries were recovered from the subsoil in various trenches.

6.6 Consideration of research aims

- To establish the presence or absence of archaeological remains and deposits with palaeo-environmental potential within the footprint of the proposed development:

  A few scattered finds were recovered, however, the majority of these did not occur in archaeological features. A few features of possible prehistoric date were identified. Other features are interpreted as post-medieval, of 18th-19th century, or later, date. No features or deposits considered to have palaeo-environmental potential were recorded.

- To determine the survival, extent and minimum depth below modern ground level of any such remains:

  The features were recorded at depths of 0.4m-0.7m below the current ground surface.

- To determine the nature and significance of any archaeological deposits:

There site does seem to have some antiquity, with small quantities of later Mesolithic-Early Neolithic flints and fire-cracked flint and Middle and/or Late Bronze Age pottery recovered. However, very little of this appears to be in situ within archaeological features, but rather occurs in root and/or burrowing disturbance. A few potential prehistoric features with in situ finds may exist, but it is not possible to characterise the nature and/or significance of these from the minimal findings of the evaluation. Other activity is of an 18th, 19th century or later date.

6.7 Conclusions

6.7.1 Prehistoric material, though sparse, was identified and appears to be focussed in two areas of the site: in the region of trenches 2, 5 and 8 (to the south-east), and trenches 11 and 14. Two potentially prehistoric features and those of post-medieval date followed the same approximate north-east to south-west or north-west to south-east alignment.

6.7.2 While there is the possibility that further prehistoric remains exist on the site, the evaluation is not considered to have produced enough evidence to support a model that this represents intensive activity. Other activity is of an 18th, 19th century or later date. The majority of trenches produced nothing of archaeological interest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ASE 2015. Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Evaluation at Nishkam West London Free School, White Lodge Club, Syon Lane, Wyke Green, London Borough of Hounslow.

Barrett, J C, 1973, 'Four Bronze Age Cremation cemeteries from Middlesex ', *TLAMAS* 24, 111-134

CgMs 2015 Desk-Based Assessment of land at Nishkam School Site, Syon Lane Hounslow, West London

Chartered Institute of Archaeologists, 2014 cIFA Standard and Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials, accessed on 03/09/15
http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/node-files/CIfAS&GFinds_1.pdf

CIfA 2014a. *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation,* Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading

CIfA 2014b. *Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Material,* Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading

Curwen, E, C, 1930 Prehistoric Flint Sickles. *Antiquity* 4, 179–186
English Heritage 2008. *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE), Project Planning Notes 3 (PPN3): Archaeological Excavation*

Ellison, A 1975 *Pottery and Settlements of the later Bronze Age in Southern England.* Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Cambridge

Fullagar, R, 2006 Residues and use-wear. In J, Paterson Alistair (ed). *Archaeology in practice: a student guide to archaeological analyses*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing

Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service 2015 Archaeological Guidance Papers No's. 3-5

Hull, G 1998 A Middle Bronze Age field ditch? Excavations at Bankside Close, Isleworth, *TLAMAS* 49, 1–14

Laidlaw, M and Mepham, L 1996 Pottery, in P Andrew and A Crockett *Three excavations along the Thames and its tributaries, 1994*, *Neolithic to Saxon settlement and burial in the Thames, Colne, and Kennet Valleys*, Wessex Archaeology Report no 10, 26–38

Leviers, M 2010, Prehistoric pottery in Framework Archaeology 2008, *Landscape evolution in the Middle Thames Valley: Heathrow Terminal 5,* vol 2, CD Section 1, Framework Archaeology monograph 3

MoLAS 1994. *Site Manual for Archaeological Fieldwork*

Needham, S 1996, 'Chronology and Periodsiation in the British Bronze Age', *Acta Archaeologica* 67, 121-140

Rayner, L in prep The Prehistoric Pottery from Western International Market (HYA01), publication report for PCA

Saville, A, 2002 Lithic artefacts from Neolithic causewayed enclosures: character and meaning. In G, Varnell and P, Topping (eds), *Enclosures in Neolithic Europe.* Oxford, Oxbow Books, 91-105

Watkinson, D E & Neal V, 2001, First Aid for Finds, RESCUE/UKIC Archaeology Section

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ASE would like to thank CgMs Consulting for commissioning the work and for their assistance throughout the project, and Gillian King, GLAAS Archaeologist, for her guidance and monitoring. The excavation was directed by Suzanne Westall with Paolo Clemente providing secondary supervisory cover. The author would like to thank all archaeologists who worked on the excavations. Lauren Gibson produced the figures for this report; Paul Mason project managed the excavations and Jim Stevenson and Dan Swift project managed the post-excavation process.

HER Summary

HER enquiry no.						
Site code	NHK 15					
Project code	7693					
Planning reference	01106/152/P3					
Site address	White Lodge Club, Syon Lane, Wyke Green, London Borough of Hounslow					
District/Borough	Hounslow					
NGR (12 figures)	515580 177570					
Geology	London Clay Formation capped by Langley Silt formation 'brickearth'					
Fieldwork type	Eval					
Date of fieldwork	1/9/2015 – 10/9/2015					
Sponsor/client	CgMs Consulting					
Project manager	Paul Mason					
Project supervisor	Suzie Westall					
Period summary		Mesolithic	Neolithic	Bronze Age		
	Roman			Post-Medieval		
Project summary **(100 word max)**	An archaeological evaluation was conducted at Syon Lane, Hounslow, West London (NGR 515580 177570), between 1st and 9th September 2015. Twenty-two trenches measuring up to 30m in length were excavated. A few struck flints were recovered from the site, along with several sherds of prehistoric pottery. The majority of finds did not appear to be within archaeological features, however, and the evaluation was largely negative, with just a few post-medieval ditches and three possible prehistoric features recorded.					
Museum/Accession No.						

OASIS Form

OASIS ID: archaeol6-223828

Project details

Project name	An Archaeological Evaluation of the Nishkam School Site, Syon Lane, Hounslow, London
Short description of the project	An archaeological evaluation was conducted at Syon Lane, Hounslow, West London (NGR 515580 177570), between 1st and 9th September 2015. Twenty-two trenches measuring up to 30m in length were excavated. A few struck flints were recovered from the site, along with several sherds of prehistoric pottery. The majority of finds did not appear to be within archaeological features, however, and the evaluation was largely negative, with just a few post-medieval ditches and three possible prehistoric features recorded.
Project dates	Start: 01-09-2015 End: 09-09-2015
Previous/future work	No / Not known
Type of project	Field evaluation
Current Land use	Other 14 - Recreational usage
Monument type	DITCH Late Prehistoric
Monument type	DITCH Post Medieval
Significant Finds	POT Middle Bronze Age
Significant Finds	POT Late Iron Age
Significant Finds	POT Post Medieval
Significant Finds	FLINT Neolithic
Methods & techniques	'"Sample Trenches"'
Development type	Public building (e.g. school, church, hospital, medical centre, law courts etc.)
Prompt	National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF

Position in the planning process	Not known / Not recorded

Project location

Country	England
Site location	GREATER LONDON HOUNSLOW HOUNSLOW Nishkam School, Syon Lane, Hounslow
Postcode	TW7 5PN
Site coordinates	TQ 15580 77570 51.484762014805 -0.335229982678 51 29 05 N 000 20 06 W Point

Project creators

Name of Organisation	Archaeology South East
Project brief originator	CgMs Consulting
Project design originator	ASE
Project director/manager	Paul Mason
Project supervisor	Suzie Westall
Type of sponsor/funding body	CgMs Consulting

Project archives

Physical Archive recipient	LAARC
Physical Contents	"Ceramics","Industrial","Metal","Worked stone/lithics"
Digital Archive recipient	LAARC

Digital Media available	"Database","Images raster / digital photography","Spreadsheets"
Paper Archive recipient	LAARC
Paper Media available	"Context sheet","Drawing","Notebook - Excavation"," Research"," General Notes","Plan","Report","Section","Unpublished Text"

Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	An Archaeological Evaluation of the Nishkam School Site, Syon Lane, Hounslow, West London
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Westall, S.
Date	2015
Issuer or publisher	Archaeology South East
Place of issue or publication	Portslade, East Sussex

Entered by	Dan Swift (d.swift@ucl.ac.uk)
Entered on	17 September 2015

Appendix 1: Context register, negative trenches

Trench	Context	Type	Interpretation	Depth m
1	1/001	layer	topsoil	0.30-0.35
	1/002	layer	subsoil	0.16-0.32
	1/003	layer	natural	
3	3/001	layer	topsoil	0.30-0.37
	3/002	layer	subsoil	0.35-0.46
	3/003	layer	natural	
7	7/001	layer	topsoil	0.20-0.30
	7/002	layer	subsoil	0.23-0.35
	7/003	layer	natural	
10	10/001	layer	topsoil	0.25-0.30
	10/002	layer	subsoil	0.26-0.28
	10/003	layer	natural	
13	13/001	layer	topsoil	0.26-0.30
	13/002	layer	subsoil	0.32-0.50
	13/003	layer	natural	
15	15/001	layer	topsoil	0.25-0.30
	15/002	layer	subsoil	0.22-0.40
	15/003	layer	natural	
17	17/001	layer	topsoil	0.12-0.22
	17/002	layer	subsoil	0.30-0.50
	17/003	layer	natural	
18	18/001	layer	topsoil	0.30-0.36
	18/002	layer	subsoil	0.36-0.46
	18/003	layer	natural	
19	19/001	layer	topsoil	0.16-0.24
	19/002	layer	subsoil	0.28-0.36
	19/003	layer	made ground	0.26-0.37
20	20/001	layer	topsoil	0.23-0.26
	20/002	layer	subsoil	0.32-0.55
	20/003	layer	natural	
22	22/001	layer	made ground	0.30-0.50
	22/002	layer	made ground	0.45-0.73
	22/003	layer	made ground?	

Appendix 2: Overview of the finds assemblage

Context	Pottery	Wt(g)	CBM	Wt(g)	Bone	Wt(g)	Flint	Wt(g)	FCF	Wt(g)	Stone	Wt(g)	CTP	Wt(g)	Slag	Wt(g)	Fired Clay	Wt(g)	Glass	Wt(g)
1/001	1	2	7	118					4	34			1	2						
2/005	35	432																		
4/001	1	20	1	22																
4/002			8	82									1	6						
4/005			1	100																
5/001			10	252											2	4				
5/002	2	<2	7	272															1	108
5/005															1	<2				
5/007							1	3	4	4										
7/001	8	166	8	108																
7/002			2	34			1	10												
8/001			1	70					1	12							15	116		
8/002	3	4	6	95																
8/005	3	54																		
9/001	1	<2	5	106																
9/002	1	32	14	612																
9/007	5	6	1	50																
10/001	4	30	2	50							1	12								
10/002			1	64																
11/002									1	10										
11/005							1	14	2	6										

Context	Pottery	Wt(g)	CBM	Wt(g)	Bone	Wt(g)	Flint	Wt(g)	FCF	Wt(g)	Stone	Wt(g)	CTP	Wt(g)	Slag	Wt(g)	Fired Clay	Wt(g)	Glass	Wt(g)
12/002	1	6	1	98	5	74			7	26										
13/001	1	38	9	120																
13/002	1	22											1	<2						
14/005							1	<1												
15/001			1	42																
15/002	1	<2	3	140					8	38										
16/002	2	2							3	12										
16/005									1	20										
17/002	8	84	10	288									1	<2	1	36				
20/001			3	170																
21/002									2	12			1	4						
21/005			2	22			1	<1							2	<2				
TR08									2	46										
U/S	1	44																		
Total	**79**	**942**	**103**	**2915**	**5**	**74**	**5**	**27**	**35**	**220**	**1**	**12**	**5**	**12**	**6**	**40**	**15**	**116**	**1**	**108**



© **Archaeology South-East**		Niksham School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 1
Project Ref: 7693	September 2015	Site location	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		



© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 2
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench location	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: JLR		

N

515525, 177490

Section 1

2/004

515535, 177480

Section 1

SW NE 24.95mOD

2/005 2/004

0 0.5m

2/004 looking north-west

0 2m

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 3
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 2	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		





4/004 looking north-west

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 4
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 4	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		



5/004 looking north-west

5/006 looking south-west

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 5
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 5	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		



Section 5



0 0.5m

6/004 looking west

0 2m

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 6
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 6	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		



8/004 looking south-east

515575, 177500

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 7
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 8	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		





9/004 looking north-west

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 8
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 9	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		





11/004 looking south-west

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 9
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 11	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		



12/004 looking east

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 10
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 12	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		

N

515544, 177623

14/005

Section 9

515554, 177617

Section 9

NE SW

23.91mOD

14/005 14/004

0 0.5m

14/004 looking south-east

0 2m

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 11
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 14	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		

N

515579, 177658

Section 10

16/004

515589, 177651

Section 10

S N

23.46mOD

16/005

16/004

0 0.5m

16/004 looking west

0 2m

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 12
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 16	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		





21/004 looking north-east

© Archaeology South-East		Nishkam School, Wyke Green, Hounslow	Fig. 13
Project Ref: 7693	Sept 2015	Trench 21	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: LG		

Sussex Office
Units 1 & 2
2 Chapel Place
Portslade
East Sussex BN41 1DR
tel: +44(0)1273 426830
email: fau@ucl.ac.uk
web: www.archaeologyse.co.uk

Essex Office
The Old Magistrates Court
79 South Street
Braintree
Essex CM7 3QD
tel: +44(0)1376 331470
email: fau@ucl.ac.uk
web: www.archaeologyse.co.uk

London Office
Centre for Applied Archaeology
UCL Institute of Archaeology
31-34 Gordon Square
London WC1H 0PY
tel: +44(0)20 7679 4778
email: fau@ucl.ac.uk
web: www.ucl.ac.uk/caa