
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS LTD

62-64 CHURCHGATE, LEICESTER
AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Authors: Iain Williamson BA AIFA | |
| NGR: SK 5864 0482 | Report No. 2005 |
| District: Leicester | Site Code: AS 964 |
| Approved: Claire Halpin MIFA | Project No. 1311 |
| Signed: | Date: March 2006 |

This report is confidential to the client. Archaeological Solutions Ltd accepts no responsibility or liability to any third party to whom this report, or any part of it, is made known. Any such party relies upon this report entirely at their own risk. No part of this report may be reproduced by any means without permission.

CONTENTS

OASIS SUMMARY SHEET

SUMMARY

- 1 INTRODUCTION***
- 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE***
- 3 METHOD OF WORK***
- 4 BACKGROUND***
- 5 DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS***
- 6 CONFIDENCE RATING***
- 7 DEPOSIT MODEL***
- 8 DISCUSSION***

ARCHIVE DEPOSITION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES

- 1 DOCUMENTARY ARCHIVE FORM***
- 2 CONCORDANCE OF FEATURES***
- 3 CONCORDANCE OF FINDS BY FEATURE***
- 4 SPECIALIST FINDS REPORTS***

OASIS SUMMARY SHEET

| | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|-----------|
| Project details | | | |
| Project name | 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester | | |
| Project description (250 words) | | | |
| <p><i>In March 2006, Archaeological Solutions Limited (AS) conducted an archaeological evaluation of land at 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester (NGR SK 5864 0482). The evaluation was commissioned by Apt Design Ltd on behalf of Fara Estates in response to a requirement of Leicester City Council for an archaeological evaluation. It followed a programme of historic building recording carried out by Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust (now Archaeological Solutions Ltd) in August 2001 (Prosser 2001).</i></p> <p><i>Since Roman times Leicester has been a pre-eminent regional settlement. The proposed development site lies outside the Roman city and the medieval town, just beyond the line of the city walls, laid out in the 3rd century AD and almost certainly overlying the outer ditches of the town defences and within the extra-mural suburb of Churchgate.</i></p> <p><i>The archaeological evaluation at 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester, revealed well stratified sequence of deposits (L1001-L1003) at the south-west end of Trench 1 and evidence for a large cut feature (F1027, L1018, L1015) which is likely to be one of the town defensive ditches, truncated by two later ditches/re-cuts on the same alignment (F1011 and F1014), at the north-eastern end of the trench. The centre of the trench was heavily truncated by 19th century cellaring.</i></p> | | | |
| Project dates (fieldwork) | March 2006 | | |
| Previous work (Y/N/?) | Y | Future work (Y/N/?) | |
| P. number | P1311 | Site code | AS964 |
| Type of project | An archaeological evaluation | | |
| Site status | Vacant | | |
| Current land use | Waste ground following demolition | | |
| Planned development | Commercial | | |
| Main features (+dates) | Medieval and post-medieval ditches, 19 th century cellars | | |
| Significant finds (+dates) | Medieval and post-medieval ceramics, residual Roman pottery | | |
| Project location | | | |
| County/ District/ Parish | Leicestershire | Leicester | Leicester |
| HER/ SMR for area | Leicester SMR | | |
| Post code (if known) | | | |
| Area of site | 150m ² | | |
| NGR | SK 5864 0482 | | |
| Height AOD (max/ min) | c. 57.00m AOD | | |
| Project creators | | | |
| Brief issued by | Chris Wardle, Leicester City Archaeologist (30/01/2006) | | |
| Project supervisor/s (PO) | J Williams, I Williamson | | |
| Funded by | Fara Estates | | |
| Full title | 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester: An archaeological evaluation | | |
| Authors | I Williamson | | |
| Report no. | 2005 | | |
| Date (of report) | March 2006 | | |

62-64 CHURCHGATE, LEICESTER AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

SUMMARY

In March 2006, Archaeological Solutions Limited (AS) conducted an archaeological evaluation of land at 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester (NGR SK 5864 0482). The evaluation was commissioned by Apt Design Ltd on behalf of Fara Estates in response to a requirement of Leicester City Council for an archaeological evaluation. It followed a programme of historic building recording carried out by Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust (now Archaeological Solutions Ltd) in August 2001 (Prosser 2001).

Since Roman times Leicester has been a pre-eminent regional settlement. The proposed development site lies outside the Roman city and the medieval town, just beyond the line of the city walls, laid out in the 3rd century AD and almost certainly overlying the outer ditches of the town defences and within the extra-mural suburb of Churchgate.

The archaeological evaluation at 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester, revealed well stratified sequence of deposits (L1001-L1003) at the south-west end of Trench 1 and evidence for a large cut feature (F1027, L1018, L1015) which is likely to be one of the town defensive ditches, truncated by two later ditches/re-cuts on the same alignment (F1011 and F1014), at the north-eastern end of the trench. The centre of the trench was heavily truncated by 19th century cellaring.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 In March 2006, Archaeological Solutions Limited (AS) conducted an archaeological evaluation of land at 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester (NGR SK 5864 0482; Figs. 1 & 2). The evaluation was commissioned by Apt Design Ltd on behalf of Fara Estates in response to a requirement of Leicester City Council for an archaeological evaluation. It followed a programme of historic building recording carried out by Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust (now Archaeological Solutions Ltd) in August 2001 (Prosser 2001).

1.2 The trial trench evaluation was conducted in accordance with a brief issued by the Leicester City Archaeologist dated 30th January 2006 and a specification compiled by AS (dated 6th February 2006). The project followed the procedures outlined in the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluation* (revised 1999) in addition to the relevant requirements of the document *Guidelines and Procedures for Archaeological Work in Leicestershire & Rutland*

1.3 The aims of the evaluation were to determine the location, extent, date, character, condition, significance and quality of any surviving archaeological remains liable to be threatened by the proposed development. The evaluation also aimed to identify areas of previous ground disturbance on the site.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

2.1 Church Gate lies adjacent to the medieval core of Leicester, and follows the line of the ancient Roman wall and ditch to the east of the early settlement. The area is now characterised by a mixture of 18th and 19th century buildings which have undergone extensive renovation in the last ten years, producing an attractive commercial streetscape.

2.2 62-64 Church Gate lies on the west side of the street, immediately north of the junction with St Peter's Lane and now comprises an open area of waste ground following demolition of the commercial properties that occupied the site (Figs 1 & 2) encompassing a total area of some 137.3 square metres at 57m AOD. Older buildings to the north and south of the site have been removed leaving the premises relatively isolated, though not divorced from their wider context.

3 METHOD OF WORK

3.1 The trial trench evaluation was conducted in accordance with the brief and specification, and also complied with the Institute of Field Archaeologists' (IFA) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluations* (revised 1999), the *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments* (revised 1999) and the requirements of the document *Guidelines and Procedures for Archaeological Work in Leicestershire & Rutland*.

3.2 As required in the brief, the evaluation comprised the excavation of a single trial trench measuring approximately 12m x 1.6m (c.18m²) in a location agreed with the Leicester City Archaeologist (Fig. 3).

3.3 A 180° back-actor mechanical excavator (JCB) fitted with a wide toothless bucket was used under archaeological supervision to remove topsoil and undifferentiated overburden, to archaeological horizons or the natural substrate, whichever was encountered first. Exposed surfaces were cleaned and planned by hand. Archaeological features revealed were excavated by hand, and deposits recorded using pro-forma record sheets, were drawn to scale and photographed. Excavated spoil was checked for finds and the trenches were scanned by metal detector.

3.4 As stated in the brief, the environmental strategy conducted on the site adhered to the guidelines of the English Heritage document *Environmental Archaeology; A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation*, Centre for Archaeological Guidelines (2002).

4 BACKGROUND

4.1 Archaeological and historical background

Desk-Based Assessment

4.1.1 The history of the assessment site and the surrounding area is presented in an earlier desk-based assessment (Gnanaratnam 1996) however for the sake of context, the main points as summarised by Prosser, 2001 are included below.

4.1.2 Since Roman times Leicester has been a pre-eminent regional settlement. The Brief notes that the site lies outside the Roman city and the medieval town, just beyond the line of the city walls, laid out in the 3rd century AD and almost certainly overlying the outer ditches of the town defences (Wardle C, 2006).

4.1.3 With its castle, abbey and important markets was one of England's foremost medieval towns. The development of merchant guilds illustrates the broad range of trades and craft skills working within the town, principally concerned with the processing of leather and wool and the manufacture of cloth.

4.1.4 The origins of Churchgate are unclear; the 'church' element of the name may refer to the near-by medieval stone church of St Margaret's, which would have stood at the north-eastern corner of the town defences during the medieval period. Although unconfirmed it is thought that St Margaret's may be the location of the Mercian cathedral that was abandoned following Danish raiding. The 'gate' element of the name is probably of Danish origin (Wardle C, 2006).

4.1.5 The suburban area of Churchgate, documented from the late 13th century originally formed one of the more prestigious areas of the town. Tenements are recorded abutting the town walls and ditch in the late 14th century, though the extent of development is not known. Knowledge of the intra-mural area suggests that some areas located within the former Roman walls were given over to orchards and other low-density occupation, suggesting that there was little pressure on suburban development. Certainly by the time of the first maps of Leicester in the early 17th century, the street frontages in the area were discontinuous.

4.1.6 Some shrinkage of the Churchgate area is suggested by 18th century maps, though renewed commercial prosperity soon led to expansion. The first stocking frame was introduced in 1680, launching the hosiery and textile industry for which the town was to become famous. Unlike many other Midland towns, Leicester did not develop heavy industries and extensive factories however, and much of the city's produce continued to be manufactured in small domestic workshops through centrally organised middlemen (Pevsner 1984, 205). Throughout the 19th century, the central part of the city retained much of its commercial identity, and directories of the time suggest that the assessment site housed small-scale commercial concerns, including a corn crushers, a confectioners and haberdashers, with a grocers and hairdressers by the 1940s. Its last use was as a greeting card shop in the late 1990s.

4.2 Previous archaeological work

Historic Building Recording

4.2.1 In 2001 a programme of historic building recording was carried out (Prosser 2001) following an assessment of the building (Finn and Smith 1997). The recording revealed that the building retained a number of distinctive features which indicated an origin as a single domestic property comprising a two-bay baffle- or lobby-entry house of mid- to late seventeenth century date. The original building would have been of timber framed construction but in the early 18th century the building was extensively remodelled when the exterior fabric was replaced in brick and the original house was probably divided into two commercial properties. It is likely that the original chimney stack of the lobby-entry house was removed or at least adapted at this time in order to accommodate a central through passage. The buildings were later embellished in the early nineteenth century with a number of Regency features. Later Victorian and twentieth century piecemeal change is also apparent in later repairs and alterations, though these are of much poorer quality.

4.2.2 As a result of the recording, the building was assigned Grade II listed status. However, the stripping of internal fabric has revealed that little of the original timber framed structure existed and it was de-listed and demolition was allowed to proceed.

5 DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS

Individual trench descriptions are presented below.

5.1 Trench 1

| <i>North-east end (Fig. 4)</i> | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| <i>South-east facing section</i> | | | |
| <i>0.00 = 57.05m AOD</i> | | | |
| Depth | Context | Description | Spot Date |
| 0.00–0.08m | L1000 | Pale-Mid grey, very compact, concrete slab. Modern car park/yard surface. | 20 th century |
| 0.08 – 0.34m | L1025 | Mid pinkish-red, compact, crushed and rammed brick rubble. Brick rubble levelling layer for concrete slab. | 20 th century |
| 0.34 – 0.57m | L1001 | Dark grey-brown, firm, silty sand, with moderate sub-round gravel clasts <75mm and occasional charcoal flecks <20mm. Post-medieval garden soil. | 14 th -16 th century (Residual) |
| 0.57 – 1.02m | L1013 | Mid orange-brown, soft and friable, silty sand, with occasional sub-round gravel clasts <60mm. Final fill of Ditch F1014 (See below) | 15 th -17 th century |
| 1.02 – 1.08m | L1016 | Dark brown-grey, firm, clayey silt, with occasional sub-round gravel clasts <60mm and occasional charcoal flecks <20mm. Basal fill of Ditch F1014 (See below) | |
| 1.08 – 1.49m | L1018 | Dark orange mottled, brownish grey, compact, sandy silt, with occasional sub-round gravel clasts <40mm. | 16 th -17 th century (Intrusive?) |
| 1.49 – 1.56m | L1022 | Mid brownish orange, cohesive, slightly clayey sand, with no inclusions. ?Natural Sand. | |

| <i>South-west end (Fig. 4)</i> <i>South-east facing section</i> <i>0.00 = 57.13m AOD</i> | | | |
|--|----------------|---|---|
| Depth | Context | Description | Spot Date |
| 0.00–0.09m | L1000 | Modern car park/yard surface; As above. | 20 th century |
| 0.09 – 0.53m | L1001 | Post-medieval garden soil; As above. | 14 th -16 th century (Residual) |
| 0.53 – 1.35m | L1002 | Dark grey brown, firm but friable, sandy silt, with occasional sub-round gravel clasts <75mm and occasional CBM flecks <20mm. | |
| 1.35 – 1.52m | L1003 | Mid brown, firm/cohesive, sandy silt, with occasional sub-round gravel clasts <60mm and occasional charcoal flecks <10mm. | 14 th -16 th century |

Description

5.1.1 Trench 1 was excavated parallel to and against the northern boundary of the site on a north-east to south-west alignment. The trench was excavated in this location to avoid cellars identified during the programme of historic building recording.

5.1.2 Visible at the base of Trench 1 at its north-east end was L1022 a mid brownish orange, cohesive, slightly clayey sand, with no inclusions; this deposit may represent the natural substrate. L1022 appeared to have been cut by a large feature F1027, although too little of the cut was exposed with the limits of excavation (Fig. 4).

5.1.3 Layer L1018 overlay the sand L1022, and may represent a fill of F1027, it produced pot (4g) 16th-17th century (possible intrusive sherd), and CBM (31g) and was overlain by the deep homogenous deposit L1015. L1015 comprised a dark-mid orange-brown, compact, silty sand, with frequent sub-round gravel clasts <75mm, occasional CBM fragments <50mm and charcoal flecks <10mm. L1015 yielded 14th-16th century pot (49g), animal bone (28g), and CBM (19g). L1015 was cut by Ditches F1011 and F1014 and truncated by the 19th century Cellar F1020/M1010.

5.1.4 Ditch F1011 (Fig. 4; Plate 4) was located approximately 3.0m from the north-eastern end of the trench. It crossed the trench on a north-west to south-east alignment. Linear in plan the south-western edge of F1011 was truncated by Cellar F1020/M1010 and Ditch F1014 at its north-eastern edge; measuring 2.0m+ x 2.0m x 0.38m deep. The sides of the ditch survived with a shallow gradient breaking gradually to a concave base. F1011 contained two fills, the basal fill L1026, formed an interrupted layer of mid orange-pink, compact, burnt clay and CBM fragments <50mm. The secondary fill L1012 was a dark grey-brown, firm, clayey silty sand, with occasional sub-round gravel clasts <75mm, CBM fragments <50mm and charcoal flecks <10mm, which produced pot (141g) dated 12th-15th century, animal bone (118g), CBM (280g) and Slate (60g).

5.1.5 Ditch F1014 truncated F1011 on its north-eastern edge. Linear in plan F1014 was also aligned on a north-west to south-east alignment. Measuring 2.0m+ x 3.06m+ x 0.98m deep, F1014 had steep sides which broke gradually to a concave base (Fig. 4;

Plate 4). It contained three fills L1016, L1017 and L1013. The primary fill L1016 comprised a dark brown-grey, firm, clayey silt, with occasional sub-round and sub-angular gravel clasts <60mm and charcoal flecks <20mm, 0.18m deep, which produced on finds. L1017 formed a tip line of pale yellow-tan, coarse sand with frequent sub-round gravel clasts <50mm, 0.06m deep on the south-western edge of the feature. The final fill of Ditch F1014 was L1013 which comprised a mid orange-brown, soft and friable, silty sand, with occasional sub-round gravel clasts <60mm, which produced 15th-17th century pot (286g), animal bone (513g), CBM (555g) and Iron nails (75g).

5.1.6 Truncating the centre of the trench was an extensive 19th cellar. Cut from the surface of L1001 in the south-western and central part of the trench was F1019, the vertical sided construction cut for the earlier part of the cellar. The main cellar structure comprised external walls M1008 at its north-eastern extent and M1004 at its south-western end, internal wall M1006, truncated wall footing M1005 and brick sill M1023 (Fig. 4; Plates 1 & 3).

5.1.7 Wall M1008 was aligned north-west to south-east, perpendicular to and crossing the line of the trench, measuring 2.0m+ x 0.25m x 0.86m deep. M1008 was two bricks wide and survived to a maximum of eight courses laid in alternating courses, one stretcher bond followed by two of header bond. The bricks were of a mid pinkish red, fairly coarse fabric, were unfrogged and measured 240mm x 120mm x 60mm, and were bonded with a mid yellow, coarse sandy mortar. M1008 butted brick sill M1023 to its south-west.

5.1.8 The brick sill M1023 was visible for a single course at the base of the trench, measuring 0.70m x 0.12m. It comprised eight black, finely finished, decorative bricks (90mm x 120mm) laid in a header bond, on edge. M1023 butted the truncated wall footing M1005 to the south-west.

5.1.9 The truncated wall footing M1005 was aligned north-west to south-east along the northern section edge of Trench 1 measuring 2.80m x 0.25m+ x 0.30m deep. M1005 was constructed from mid orange-red, fairly coarse fabric, unfrogged bricks (240mm x 120mm x 60mm), bonded with a mid yellow, coarse sandy mortar. A maximum of five courses survived laid largely in stretcher bond with occasional headers. Two semi-circular decorative bricks were incorporated into the upper course. M1005 was jointed into the external wall M1004 at its south-western end.

5.1.10 Wall M1004 was aligned north-west to south-east, perpendicular to and crossing the line of the trench and measured 2.0m+ x 0.24m x 0.62m deep (Fig. 4; Plates 1, 3 & 5). M1004 was constructed from mid orange-red, fairly coarse fabric, unfrogged bricks (240mm x 120mm x 60mm), bonded with a mid yellow, coarse sandy mortar, laid two bricks wide. Nine courses of the wall survived laid in alternating courses of stretcher and header bond.

5.1.11 Cellar F1019 appeared to have been extended north-eastwards where the vertical construction cut F1020 contained wall M1010. Wall M1010 was aligned north-west to south-east, crossing the line of the trench measuring 2.0m+ x 0.12m x 1.40m deep (Fig. 4; Plates 1 & 3). M1010 was constructed from mid reddish orange, coarse fabric bricks (235mm x 115mm x 55mm), bonded with a pale yellow fine

grained, sandy mortar. This wall was constructed a single brick wide, in stretcher bond, 15 courses were excavated.

5.1.12 Cellar F1019 was backfilled with recent demolition debris L1024 mid pinkish-grey, compact, CBM, hardcore and demolition rubble. The space between walls M1006 and M1008 was also backfilled with demolition rubble L1007 which comprised mid grey brown, friable, hardcore with a 40% sandy matrix and occasional timbers. Similarly the gap between walls M1008 and M1010 was backfilled with a mid yellowish brown, friable hardcore and brick rubble with a 30% sand matrix (L1009), (Fig. 4; Plates 1 & 3). Backfilling of the cellars occurred during recent demolition of the buildings within the proposed development site.

6 CONFIDENCE RATING

The depth of deposits encountered in Trench 1 exceeded safe working depths, despite stepping the sides of the trench. In agreement with the Leicester City Archaeologist excavation was halted to comply with Health and Safety requirements. It is not felt that any other factors inhibited the recognition of archaeological features and finds during the archaeological evaluation.

7 DEPOSIT MODEL

7.1 A brownish orange, cohesive, slightly clayey sand (L1022) was observed in the base of the north-east end of Trench 1 at a depth of 1.50m below existing ground level (55.51m AOD); this deposit is thought to be the underlying natural substrate.

7.2 L1022 appeared to be cut by a large feature which extended beyond the limits of excavation and was filled by L1018 and the deep homogenous, dark-mid orange-brown, compact, silty sand; L1015. This deposit was truncated Ditches F1011 and F1014, which were sealed by the post-medieval garden soil L1001, which extended across the fill length of the trench.

7.3 The stratigraphic sequence in the centre of the trench was truncated by 19th century cellaring, to the south-west of which a different stratigraphic sequence was observed. The natural substrate was not reached at this end of the trench the earliest deposit recorded was soil horizon L1003 at a depth of 1.35m below existing ground level (55.81m AOD), L1003 was overlain by the deep soil deposit L1002, which was in turn sealed by L1001.

7.4 The stratigraphic sequence was capped by modern levelling layer L1025 and the concrete slab L1000.

8 DISCUSSION

8.1 Summary of the archaeology

8.1.1 The archaeological evaluation at 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester, revealed well stratified sequence of deposits (L1001-L1003) at the south-west end of Trench 1 and evidence for a large cut feature (F1027, L1018, L1015) which is likely to be one of the town defensive ditches, truncated by two later ditches/re-cuts on the same alignment (F1011 and F1014), at the north-eastern end of the trench.

8.1.2 The relationship between the two sets of deposits could not be established as the Trench 1 was bisected by a 19th century cellar which truncated 50% of the area investigated, although both L1003 and L1015 produced pottery sherds which date to the 14th-16th centuries.

8.1.3 The cellar relates to the recently de-listed and demolished Grade II building which existed on the proposed development site.

8.1.4 The earliest part of the cellar was constructed with cut F1019 and comprised walls M1004, M1006, M1008, truncated wall footing M1005 and brick sill M1023 (Fig. 4; Plates 1 & 3). An extension to the cellar comprised construction cut F1020 and wall M1010.

8.2 Interpretation of the site: archaeology and history

8.2.1 The site lies on the line of the outer ditches of the town defences. Limited evidence for a large cut feature; possibly a defensive ditch in the form of cut F1027 was recorded at the north-east end of Trench 1. The fills of this ditch; L1018 and L1015 produced finds dated to the 15th-17th and 14th-16th centuries respectively. It seems likely that this was indeed a large ditch extending beyond the bounds of the site to the north-east and truncated by the 19th century cellar F1020/M1010 to the south-west.

8.2.2 Layers L1018 and L1015 (dated 16th-17th and 14th-16th century respectively) can therefore be interpreted as fills of the ditch. If this were the case F1011 and F1014 may represent later re-cuts of the town defences. It is also possible but less likely that these features formed later boundaries cut on the same line as the town defences.

8.2.3 The fill of Ditch F1011; L1012, contained a significant amount of residual Roman pottery (35g) and a single sherd of Roman roof tile *Tegulae* in addition to 12th-15th century medieval pot sherds. Similarly the fill of Ditch F1014; L1013, contained several fragments of Romano-British *bessalis* brick used in the construction of Roman under-floor heating, alongside 15th-17th century ceramics.

8.2.4 The ditches of the town's defences are known to have remained open into the post-medieval period, on Churchgate they were in-filled when the street was widened. Layer L1003 and fill L1015 (dated 14th-16th century) are likely to represent soil development and slow in-filling of the town ditch during the medieval period. The later re-cuts F1011 and F1014 produced a mixed assemblage of medieval and residual

Roman material. Such mixed deposits could be the result of deliberate backfilling of the ditches with material derived from the post-medieval development of the surrounding plots and Churchgate itself.

8.3 Preservation of archaeology

8.3.1 A deep stratified sequence of archaeological deposits was identified in Trench1. The trench was located to avoid cellars identified during the programme of Historic Building Recording. However, 19th century cellaring extended across the trench truncating 50% of the area investigated.

8.3.2 A post-medieval garden soil (L1001) was sealed beneath modern levelling and concrete yard surfaces suggesting that outside the areas of cellaring the stratigraphic sequence survives relatively undisturbed.

8.3.3 Inter-cutting Ditches F1011 and F1014 survived sealed beneath garden soil L1001, cutting the deep soil layer/fill L1015.

8.4 Finds and environmental evidence

8.4.1 The pottery assemblage recovered from the evaluation was of mixed condition, with sherds predominantly dating from the 13th-16th centuries. Ditch F1011/L1012 produced five considerably abraded sherds of Roman date (3rd-4th century); these sherds are certainly residual and not in their primary context. Residual Stamford and Developed Stamford ware sherds were recovered from the post-medieval garden soil L1001. A full interim statement on the medieval and Roman pottery is given below in Appendix 4.

8.4.2 Animal bone recovered during the evaluation produced a small assemblage of poor condition. As a result only 30% of the assemblage was identifiable to species. Sheep/goat (*Ovis/Capra sp.*) were present in the highest numbers with Cattle (*Bos sp.*) and dog (*canis famailaris*) also present. Evidence of butchery was also recorded in small numbers notably a dog femur present exhibited cut marks on the medial distal condyle suggesting disarticulation, probably for the meat rather than the skin. The assemblage is typical of rubbish/midden material associated with medieval and post-medieval urban occupation.

8.4.3 Environmental samples were taken from four contexts including stratified soil horizons and sealed features fills. These could potentially be informative as to the crop regime, crop processing practices, diet of the medieval and post-medieval urban population as well as providing information about the site environment.

8.5 Research potential

8.5.1 The main archaeological potential for the evaluation carried out at 62-62 Churchgate, Leicester, was for remains associated with the out ditches of the Roman and Medieval town defences and the medieval extra mural settlement of Churchgate itself.

8.5.2 Despite extensive ground disturbance by 19th century cellaring, the evaluation successfully identified possible evidence for one of the town ditches (F1027), two later re-cuts (F1011 and F1014), and buried soil horizons L1003 and L1002.

8.5.3 Evidence for Roman activity was limited to a number of residual pot sherds and CBM fragments recovered from Ditches F1011 and F1014.

8.5.4 The principle research potential of the site lies in the comparison of the evidence for medieval and earlier ditches associated of the town's defences and occupation activity with other excavations from the surrounding area in order provide a more complete model for the development and scale of the town's defences and medieval settlement in the extramural suburb of Churchgate. A synthetic account of previous archaeological work on Churchgate is soon to be published (Cessford, forthcoming). This should further clarify present understanding of historic land use in the area and identify questions that still need answering.

8.5.5 Further analysis of the finds and environmental samples has the potential to further enhance our understanding of the landscape, diet, farming practices and trade associations of this important medieval city.

ARCHIVE DEPOSITION

An archive of all materials produced by the project has been created in accordance with the UK Institute for Conservation's *Conservation Guideline No. 2* and other relevant reference documents. Copies of the report will be lodged with English Heritage, the Jewry Wall Museum in Leicester and The Urban Design Section at Leicester City Council. The archive will be lodged with the Jewry Wall Museum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

AS would like to thank Apt Design Ltd and Fara Estates for commissioning and funding the archaeological works. AS would also like to acknowledge the advice and input of Chris Wardle, Leicester City Council Archaeologist during the programme of archaeological works.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, N & Glazebrook, J (eds.) 2000 *Research and Archaeology: a framework for the eastern counties, 2. research agenda and strategy*. East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper No. 8

Finn, N. and Smith, D. 1997 *A building assessment of Nos. 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester*. Unpublished report 87/18, University of Leicester Archaeological Services, Leicester

Glazebrook, J (ed.) 1997 *Research and Archaeology: a framework for the eastern counties, 1. resource assessment*. East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper No. 2

Gnanaratnam, A.K. 1997 *62 & 64 Churchgate, Leicester; an archaeological desk-based assessment*. Unpublished report 96/94, University of Leicester Archaeological Services, Leicester

Institute of Field Archaeologists (revised 1999) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluations*

Institute of Field Archaeologists 1994 (revised 2001) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments*

Prosser, L. 2001 *62-64 Churchgate, Leicester; An Historic Building Recording*. Unpublished report 938, Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust

Soil Survey of England and Wales (SSEW) 1983 *Legend for the 1:250 000 Soil Map of England and Wales*. Harpenden



**APPENDIX 1
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS
DOCUMENTARY ARCHIVE FORM**

| Site Details | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| County: | Leicestershire | Museum: | Jewry Wall Museum |
| Site Code: | AS964 | AS Project Number: | P1311 |
| Site Name: | 62-64 Churchgate, Leicester, Leicestershire | | |
| NGR: | SK 5864 0482 | Accession Number: | - |
| Site Type: | Evaluation | Date of Work: | March 2006 |
| Planning Ref: | 20052353 | SMR No: | |
| Related Work: Finn, N. and Smith, D. 1997, Gnanaratnam, A.K. 1997, Prosser, L. 2001. | | | |
| Brief Description of Documentary Archive: | | 1 ring binder | |
| Brief Finds Description (Quantity & Date): | | 1 Box; Medieval and residual Roman | |
| Ownership Form Returned: | | Archive Deposited: | |

| Introduction | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Brief/s | | Specification/s | |
| Date | Present | Date | Present |
| 30 th January 2006 | Yes | 6 th February 2006 | Yes |
| | | | |

| A: Reports | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-----------|---------|
| Report Type | | Report No | Present |
| Interim: Text and Illustrations | | 2005 | Yes |

| B: Primary Site Records | | | |
|--|---------|--------------------|------------------|
| Total No. of Files: | | 1 ring binder | |
| Total No. of Site Drawing Sheets: | | 1 A1 sheets | |
| Location of A4 Files (Tick) | | Finds Room: | Corridor: |
| Material | Present | Details | |
| Site Notes | Yes | 1 bundle | |
| Context Register | Yes | 1 sheets | |
| Context Sheets | Yes | 27sheets | |
| Levels Sheets | Yes | 1 sheet | |
| Site Drawings | | | |
| Plan/Section Register | Yes | 1 sheet | |
| Plan Sheets | - | | |
| Section Sheets | - | | |
| Combined Plan/Section Sheets | Yes | 1 A1 sheet | |
| Other Site Drawings | - | | |
| Digital Plans | | | |
| Plans | - | | |
| Data | - | | |
| C: Finds Data | | | |
| Small Finds Register | | | |
| Finds Concordance | Yes | | |
| Finds Box List | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|---|
| X-Rays | | | |
| Conservation Photo Plates | | | |
| Conservation Lab Sheets | | | |
| Other Finds Information (Give Details) | | | |
| Specialist Finds Reports | | | |
| Material | Report Type | Report Present | Specialist Archive Material (Give Details) |
| Pottery | Interim | Yes | |
| CBM | Interim | Yes | |
| Animal Bone | Interim | Yes | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| D: Site Photographs | | | | |
| Photographic Register Present | | Yes | Digital Photo Register Present | Yes |
| Black & White 35mm | | | | |
| Film No | Negative Nos | Shot Nos | Contact Sheet Present | Negatives Present |
| 1784 | 14-23 | 1-9 | | |
| | | | | |
| Colour Slides | | | | |
| Film No | Negative Nos | Shot Nos | Present | |
| 1876 | 14-23 | 1-9 | | |
| | | | | |
| Digital Photos | | | | |
| Shot Nos | Files Present | | Hard Copies Present | |
| 1-10 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|---|-----|
| E: Environmental Data | | | | |
| Sample Register Present: | | Yes | Sample Sheets Present: | Yes |
| Processing Register Present: | | | Sieving Sheets Present: | |
| Sample Concordance Present: | | | | |
| Specialist Environmental Reports | | | | |
| Material | Report Type | Report Present | Specialist Archive Material (Give Details) | |
| | | | | |

| |
|--|
| F: Documentary Records, Press & Publicity; G: Relevant Correspondence; H: Miscellaneous |
| |

APPENDIX 2 CONCORDANCE OF FEATURES

| Feature | Context | Trench | Description | Date |
|---------|---------|--------|---|------|
| | 1000 | 1 | Layer: Concrete surface | |
| | 1001 | 1 | Layer: Garden soil | |
| | 1002 | 1 | Layer: Buried soil horizon | |
| | 1003 | 1 | Layer: Buried soil horizon | |
| M1004 | | 1 | Wall: External cellar wall | |
| M1005 | | 1 | Wall: Cellar wall footing | |
| M1006 | | 1 | Wall: Internal cellar wall | |
| | 1007 | 1 | Layer: Cellar backfill | |
| M1008 | | 1 | Wall: Cellar wall | |
| | 1009 | 1 | Layer: Cellar backfill | |
| M1010 | | 1 | Wall: Cellar wall | |
| F1011 | | 1 | Cut/Re-cut: of Ditch | |
| | 1012 | 1 | Fill: Secondary fill of F1011 | |
| | 1013 | 1 | Fill: Final fill of F1014 | |
| F1014 | | 1 | Cut/Re-cut: ?Defensive ditch | |
| | 1015 | 1 | Layer: Dark soil deposit (poss. fill of F1027) | |
| | 1016 | 1 | Fill: Basal fill of F1014 | |
| | 1017 | 1 | Fill: of F1014 | |
| | 1018 | 1 | Layer: Dark brown-orange soil (poss. fill of F1027) | |
| F1019 | | 1 | Cut: Cellar construction cut | |
| F1020 | | 1 | Cut: Cellar construction cut | |
| M1021 | | 1 | Wall: red-brick wall footing | |
| | 1022 | 1 | Layer: ?Natural, clayey sand, drift | |
| M1023 | | 1 | Wall: Brick sill | |
| | 1024 | 1 | Layer: Cellar backfill | |
| | 1025 | 1 | Layer: Demolition/levelling layer | |
| | 1026 | 1 | Fill: Basal fill of F1011 | |
| F1027 | | 1 | Cut: ?Defensive ditch | |

APPENDIX 3 CONCORDANCE OF FINDS BY FEATURE

| Feature | Context | Description | Spot Date | Pottery | CBM (g) | A.Bone (g) | Other |
|---------|---------|-------------|------------|---------------|---------|------------|----------------------|
| 1001 | | Layer | 14th-16th | (24), 241g | 91 | 44 | |
| 1003 | | Layer | 14th-16th | (5), 60g | 21 | | |
| 1011 | 1012 | Ditch Fill | ?12th-15th | (12), 141g | 280 | 118 | Slate (1), 60g |
| 1014 | 1013 | Ditch Fill | 15th-17th | (14), 268g | 555 | 513 | Fe Nails (2), 75g |
| 1015 | | Layer | 14th-16th | (1), 49g | 19 | 28 | |
| 1018 | | Layer | 16th-17th | (1), 4g | 31 | | |

APPENDIX 4 SPECIALIST FINDS REPORTS

Pottery Report

By Peter Thompson

The evaluation recovered 55 sherds weighing 674g from six contexts. The pottery is in mixed condition with some well-preserved sherds that are probably in a primary context and others that are smaller and more abraded and are possibly residual, as is certainly the case with the Roman sherds. The bulk of the assemblage is medieval to early post-medieval.

L1001 contained 23 sherds, including four that are glazed, in white fabric with moderate to common quartz inclusions. One sherd with yellow glaze is probably Stamford ware of mid 9th to mid 12th century date. Another with yellow-green glaze and an iron slip stripe might also be Stamford ware whilst a third with green glaze could be Developed Stamford ware. However, the fourth sherd is in a different green glaze and probably not a Stamford ware. Two sherds in unusual heavy fabrics are probably proto-stonewares and comprise an everted 22cm jar rim and a hammerhead bowl rim with green glaze on top. A further 15 coarse ware sherds including an everted jar rim contain white limestone, or clear or grey angular mineral clusters that is probably degraded limestone, together with varying amounts of sand. Two further coarseware sherds are in a pinky-orange fabric containing abundant quartz and have splashes of clear glaze. It is likely the proto-stoneware and splash glazed sherds are late medieval to early post-medieval.

L1003 contains four medieval coarse ware sherds mainly in mid-pale grey fabrics with oxidised surfaces. Inclusions comprise either angular to sub-angular white limestone or grey or clear clustered mineral that can be easily scratched which again is probably degraded limestone. Varying amounts of quartz from sand are also present. A similar sherd with external olive green glaze with occasional brown iron speckling completes the assemblage. The fabrics are probably handmade and a date of 13th - 15th century is most likely.

L1012 contained twelve sherds of which five are Roman including grey wares and Oxford colour coats. The remaining sherds are medieval coarse wares including a folded out, almost squared rim in shelly fabric.

L1013 also contained some unusual fabrics that were almost vitrified indicating firing at a high temperature. A 16 cm diameter rim probably from a heavy jar is in a stoneware or proto-stoneware type fabric suggesting a late medieval to early post-medieval date. Three more sherds, including two conjoining flat base sherds, with lustrous brown pimply glaze are also in a proto-stoneware type fabric. Another sherd that can possibly be placed in this category is a piece in a dark grey fine sandy fabric with external groove or 'corrugated' decoration with an over glaze that has been over-fired and the glaze vitrified. Also present is a sherd in an off white to pale grey fine quartz fabric, similar to the examples from L1001, with speckled green glaze. Another rim sherd which has finger tip decoration is in a fine white fabric with a glossy olive green external glaze and a yellow internal one and is likely to be late medieval to early post-medieval. Two probable residual Roman sandy sherds were also recovered. The overall assemblage is probably of 16th-17th century date but possibly could be late medieval depending on when proto-stoneware comes into use in the area.

L1015 yielded a single heavy sherd of very late medieval grey ware that appears to have been overfired. F1018 also produced a single hard oxidised sherd in a fine sandy fabric that is late medieval to early post-medieval. Further research should help to identify some of the wares in a local type series and help refine dates.

| Feature | Context | Quantity | Date | Comment |
|---------|---------|---|--|--|
| | 1001 | 15x137g MCW1 4x23g MGW2 2x40g P-Ston 2x24g MCW3 | 14 th -16 th | MCW1 – everted rim sherd P-Ston – everted ?jar rim 22 cm diam. Also ?hammerhead bowl rim with green glaze on top MCW3 – pinky orange fabric with abundant quartz and splashes of clear glaze on surfaces 1x7g – B Mat? |
| | 1003 | 4x8g MCW1 1x9g MGW1 | 13 th -15 th | MCW1 – limestone and quartz sand MGW1 –limestone fabric |
| | 1012 | 7x105g MCW1 and MCW2 5x35g Roman | 13 th -15 th | MCW1 – but also includes a shelly folded out rim Roman – slip wares and greywares |
| | 1013 | 1x7g MCW1 2x31g MCW 2 1x10g MGW2 4x120g P-Ston 1x54g ?Ston 1x13g PMG 1x6g Roman | 15 th -17 th | MCW1 – limestone MCW2 - sand MGW2 – white fabric, moderate to profuse quartz inclusions Proto-Stoneware?– includes conjoining base sherd with internal clear/brown pimply glaze Ston – stoneware/proto stoneware fabric PMG – glossy yellow glaze inside and green outside, simple rim with finger tip deco. on top. Fine off-white hard fabric. Roman – burnished grey ware 1x12g – B Mat? |
| | 1015 | 1x48g LMU | 15 th -16 th /17 th | LMU –Very hard fabric, almost like stone, possibly overfired. |
| | 1018 | 1x4g PMRE | 16 th -17 th | PMRE -Very hard very fine fabric. |

1001 – 14th-16th – mainly rough coarse wares, late med wheel-made rim, some external

with glaze, one bowl rim with greeny-yellow glaze on top, one sherd

splashes of clear glaze, pink quartz fabric looks c.16th

1003 – 14th-16th – Coarsewares and one glazed sherd

1012 - ?12th-15th – Most of the sherds look Roman with a shelly rim that could be med or

Roman. However, 2 or 3 sherds look medieval.

1013 – 15th-17th – Thick internal lustrous green glazes, one both sides. Some residual

medieval sherds. Possibly residual Roman, one or two sherds

1018 - 16th-17th –
 MCW1 – limestone
 MCW2 – sand
 MCW3 – Quartz profuse

The Romano-British Pottery

By Andrew Peachey

Ditch F1011, L1012 contained five fragments (35g) of residual, considerably abraded Romano-British pottery alongside a larger quantity of medieval pottery. The group contained single sherds of Oxfordshire red colour-coated ware (13g) and Great Casterton colour-coated ware (6g) with three sherds of local sandy grey ware (16g), one of which was decorated with a burnished lattice. There were no diagnostic sherds, but the fabrics probably date to the 3rd-4th centuries.

The Ceramic Building Materials

By Andrew Peachey

A total of 17 fragments (994g) of highly abraded CBM were recovered from five features. All the CBM is highly fired in an oxidised, moderately sand-tempered fabric. Fragments in Layers L1001 (2 fragments, 96g), L1015 (1 fragment, 20g) and L1018 (4 fragments, 32g) are unidentifiable, but are probably late Medieval in date. Ditch F1011 L1012 (7 fragments, 285g) contains similar fragments with one exception that may be derived from the flat body of a Romano-British *tegulae* roof tile. Ditch F1014 L1013 (3 fragments, 561g) contained fragments of 40mm thick brick with a burnt upper surface, that probably derive from Romano-British *bessalis* brick used in the construction of a hypocaust, although these fragments are highly abraded.

The Animal Bone

By Carina Phillips MA

A small animal bone assemblage was recovered from trial trench excavations. The bone came from four contexts spot dated to the 12th (?) -16th century. The bone is of moderate-poor condition, suffering from fragmentation, in some cases hindering identification to species. The hand recovery technique used in excavation may be biased towards the recovery of larger bones, resulting in an under-representation of small bones and species.

Results & Discussion

| | NISP | MNI | Chopped | Cut | Smashed | Gnawed |
|----------------|------|-----|---------|-----|---------|--------|
| Sheep/goat | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Cattle | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dog | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Large sized | 18 | - | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Small sized | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Unidentifiable | 13 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 50 | - | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 |

Table 1: The Number of Identified Specimens/fragments (NISP) and Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI) by species

Only 30% of the assemblage was identifiable to species. Sheep/goat (*Ovis/Capra sp.*) were present in the highest numbers in both NISP and MNI counts. Cattle (*Bos sp.*) and dog (*canis famailaris*) were the only other species present.

Butchery evidence was recorded in small numbers. The dog femur present exhibited cut marks on the medial distal condyle suggesting disarticulation, presumably for meat. The use of dog meat in the medieval periods, could have been to feed other dogs or perhaps even people. However if practice followed modern British trends then dog flesh would not have been consumed. This relates to the close relationship people have with the species (i.e. pets) and perhaps the view that the dog eats impure foods, being a scavenger and predator (Simmons 1994:251). The use of dog skins is common, however the position of the cut marks here are unlikely to have been caused by skin removal.

Potential

Analysis of the evaluation assemblage was greatly restricted by the small size of the assemblage and poor preservation of some of the bone. If further excavation of the area takes place the animal bone excavated is also likely to be restricted by these factors. However it should be possible to indicate the species present in the assemblage.

References

Simmons, F.J. 1994. *Eat Not This Flesh: Food avoidances from prehistory to the present*. Second edition. University of Wisconsin Press: USA