ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS LTD

MANOR FARM, TOSTOCK ROAD, BEYTON, SUFFOLK

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT

Authors: Sophie Unger MA Andrew A.S. Newton MPhil PIFA (Editor)	
NGR: TL 935 634	Report No: 3162
District: Mid Suffolk	Site Code: N/A
Approved: Claire Halpin	Project No: 3254
Signed:	Date: October 2008

CONTENTS

OASIS SUMMARY SHEET

Project name	*Manor Farm, Tostock Road, Beyton, Suffolk. An archaeological desk based assessment.*		

In September 2008, Archaeological Solutions Ltd conducted an archaeological desk based assessment of land at Manor Farm, Tostock Road, Beyton, Suffolk (NGR TL 935 634) in advance of redevelopment of the site for ten residential dwellings with garages and improved access (Planning ref: 1270/05). The assessment was carried out prior to a programme of archaeological trial trench evaluation.

The desk-based assessment demonstrated considerable potential for archaeological remains to be encountered on the assessment site. There is little evidence for Prehistoric and Roman activity in the area of Beyton suggesting there was no permanent settlement in either of these periods, although this lack of evidence could be due to little development instigating any archaeological investigation. Local historians suggest that the Church of All Saints may have been constructed in the Anglo-Saxon period although there is no archaeological evidence of this or of any Saxon activity in Beyton. The early medieval village is likely to have been concentrated close to the Norman church. It is probable that this settlement was later relocated north surrounding the rectangular green at the meeting point of the three roads. The location of Manor Farm, fronting onto the possible medieval green indicates a high potential to discover medieval remains. Similarly, remains associated with the post-medieval Manor Farm are also likely to be encountered.

Cartographic sources suggest that the site was moderately developed in the post-medieval and modern period which will have truncated archaeological remains. However, the northern part of the site is likely to have remained relatively undeveloped and the potential of finding well preserved remains would be enhanced in that area.

Project dates (fieldwork)	*N/A*		
Previous work (Y/N/?)	*N*	Future work (Y/N/?)	*Y*
P. number	*3147*	Site code	*TBC*
Type of project	*Archaeological desk based assessment*		
Site status	*Area of Archaeological Importance*		
Current land use	*Farm and associated land*		
Planned development	*Residential development of ten residential dwellings, garages and improved access.*		
Main features (+dates)	-		
Significant finds (+dates)	-		
Project location			
County/ District/ Parish	*Suffolk*	*Mid Suffolk*	*Beyton*
SMR for area	*Suffolk HER*		
Post code (if known)			
Area of site	*0.56 ha*		
NGR	*TL 935 634*		
Height AOD (max)	*c. 55-60m AOD*		
Project creators			
Brief issued by	*Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service Conservation Team (SCC AS-CT)*		
Project supervisor/s (PO)	*Sophie Unger*		
Funded by	*Chelsteen Homes*		
Full title	*Manor Farm, Tostock Road, Beyton, Suffolk. An archaeological desk based assessment.*		
Authors	*Unger, S,*		
Report no.	*3162*		
Date (of report)	*September 2008*		

MANOR FARM, TOSTOCK ROAD, BEYTON, SUFFOLK

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT

SUMMARY

In September 2008, Archaeological Solutions Ltd conducted an archaeological desk based assessment of land at Manor Farm, Tostock Road, Beyton, Suffolk (NGR TL 935 634). The assessment was undertaken in advance of the redevelopment of the site for ten residential dwellings with garages and improved access (Planning ref: 1270/05).

The desk-based assessment demonstrated considerable potential for archaeological remains to be encountered on the assessment site. There is little evidence for Prehistoric and Roman activity in the area of Beyton suggesting there was no permanent settlement in either of these periods, although this lack of evidence could be due to little development instigating any archaeological investigation. Local historians suggest that the Church of All Saints may have been constructed in the Anglo-Saxon period although there is no archaeological evidence of this, or of any Saxon activity in Beyton. The early medieval village is likely to have been concentrated close to the Norman church. It is probable that this settlement was later relocated north surrounding the rectangular green at the meeting point of the three roads. The location of Manor Farm, fronting onto the possible medieval green indicates a high potential to discover medieval remains. Similarly, remains associated with the post-medieval Manor Farm are also likely to be encountered.

Cartographic sources suggest that the site was moderately developed in the post-medieval and modern period which will have truncated archaeological remains. However, the northern part of the site is likely to have remained undeveloped and the potential of finding well preserved remains would be enhanced in that area.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 In September 2008, Archaeological Solutions Ltd (AS) conducted an archaeological desk based assessment of land at Manor Farm, Tostock Road, Beyton, Suffolk (NGR TL 935 634; Figs. 1 & 2). The assessment was conducted in response to a brief issued by Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service Conservation Team (SCC AS-CT) (dated 07/04/2008) which required an archaeological evaluation in advance of proposed residential development of land at Manor Farm. The desk-based assessment was carried out to form part of a programme of archaeological investigation comprising an archaeological desk-based assessment, aerial photographic assessment and field evaluation, to comply with a planning requirement of the local planning authority on advice from SCC AS-CT. It is proposed to redevelop the site to create ten residential dwellings with garages and improved access (Mid Suffolk DC Planning ref: 1270/05).

1.2 The desk based assessment was conducted in accordance with the SCC AS-CT brief and a specification prepared by AS (dated 19/08/2008) and approved by SCC AS-CT. The project conformed to the procedures outlined in the Institute of Field Archaeologists' (IFA) *Code of Conduct* and *Standard and Guidance for*

Archaeological Desk based Assessment (1994, revised 2001), as well as the relevant sections of the document *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 14 (Gurney 2003).

1.3   The objectives of the desk based assessment were:

- to collate, verify and assess all available information relevant to the presence, survival and character of archaeological remains within the site area;
- to provide a predictive model of the sub-surface deposits likely to be present on the site and assess their archaeological significance; and
- to assess the impact of development proposals for the site on any identified archaeological remains.

1.4   In general, the purpose of this project was to identify the archaeological potential of the site, to describe the likely extent, nature, condition and importance of any archaeological remains and to consider the site within its wider archaeological context. The assessment also aimed to inform the locations of the archaeological evaluation trenches.

Planning policy context

1.5   The relevant planning policies which apply to the effect of development with regard to cultural heritage are Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 'Planning and the Historic Environment' (PPG15) and Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 'Archaeology and Planning' (PPG16) (Department of the Environment).

1.6   PPG16 (1990) is the national Planning Policy Guidance Note which applies to archaeology. It states that there should always be a presumption in favour of preserving nationally important archaeological remains in situ. However, when there is no overriding case for preservation, developers are required to fund opportunities for the recording and, where necessary, the excavation of the site. This condition is widely applied by local authorities.

1.7   PPG15 (1994) is the national Planning Policy Guidance Note which applies to the conservation of the historic environment by protecting the character and appearance of Conservation Areas and protecting listed buildings (of architectural or historical interest) from demolition and unsympathetic change and safeguarding their settings as far as is possible. This condition is also widely applied by local authorities.

2   DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE (Figs. 1 & 2)

2.1   Manor Farm lies in the village of Beyton which is situated in the district of Mid Suffolk, an administrative district in the county of Suffolk. The market town of Bury St Edmunds lies *c*. 7km west of the village and the small settlement of Elmswell lies approximately 5km east of the assessment site. The River Lark, a tributary of the River Ouse, meanders through the centre of Bury St Edmunds (*c*. 8km west of the site) heading towards Mildenhall and Prickwillow.

2.2   The complex of Manor Farm lies in the north eastern part of Beyton to the east of Tostock Road. The development is situated within an area of archaeological importance stipulated by Suffolk County Council due to its location fronting onto the medieval green and backland that may be behind the green. Undeveloped plots of land, agricultural in character, are situated to the north-east of the site. The village green is located to the south-west of the development site with residential housing surrounding the triangular road layout. The probable original settlement surrounding the church of All Saints is located to the south-west of the assessment site. The site is currently occupied by Manor Farm with numerous barns and outbuildings.

3   METHODOLOGY

Information was sought from a variety of available sources in order to meet the objectives of the desk based assessment.

3.1   Archaeological databases

Known archaeological remains in the surrounding area can be indicative of the date and character of archaeological remains likely to be discovered within the site itself. The standard collation of all known archaeological sites and spot-finds within Suffolk comes from the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER). Significant entries within an approximate 1km radius of the site are listed in Appendix 1 and plotted in Fig. 3. Where relevant, these sites and finds are discussed in Section 4.2.

3.2   Historical and cartographic sources

Documentary sources of this kind can help to establish a geographical, topographical and historical context for archaeological remains in the assessment area and its surroundings. The social and economic contexts in terms of land ownership and changes in land use can often also be inferred. The principal source for these types of evidence was the Suffolk Record Office (SRO), Bury St Edmunds. Relevant documents are listed in Appendix 2 and reproduced in Figs. 5-9.

3.3   Secondary sources

The principal sources of secondary material were the Suffolk Record Office (SRO), Bury St Edmunds and the Suffolk Historic Environment Record office and AS's own reference library. All referenced materials are listed in the bibliography.

3.4   Geological/geotechnical information

A description of the superficial and solid geology of the local and surrounding area was compiled in order to assess the likely presence and potential condition of any archaeological remains on the site. This information was drawn from appropriate maps based on the work of the Institute of Geological Sciences and the Soil Survey of England and Wales (SSEW 1983). A 2007 site investigation report supplied by the client and carried out by WISER was also consulted.

4   TOPOGRAPHY, GEOLOGY & SOILS

4.1   The site lies at a surface elevation of approximately 55-60m AOD. The solid geology of the site is Upper Cretaceous chalk which is overlain by a glaciofluvial drift geology of deep well drained sand. The soils of the area are of the Melford association (SSEW 1983). These consist of deep well drained fine loamy over clayey soils with some calcareous clayey subsoils (SSEW 1983). Traditionally these soils support the cultivation of cereal, sugar beet and other arable crops (SSEW 1983). The area near to the church has been designated as a county wildlife site by Suffolk County Council due to over fifty types of grasses and wild flower species being discovered in the location (website 1).   The site investigation report suggested the presence of topsoil (where hard surfaces of concrete etc were not present) to a depth of up to 0.50m across the site, above deposits of sand, which overlay head deposits and till (boulder clay).

5   ARCHAEOLOGICAL & HISTORICAL BACKGROUND (Fig. 3)

Prehistoric (750,000 BC – AD 43)

5.1   Suffolk has yielded a considerable quantity of prehistoric artefacts dating to the earliest period of prehistoric activity. There have been numerous Palaeolithic sites discovered in East Anglia including at Clacton, Barnham and Hoxne (the latter is *c.* 22km north-west of Beyton), verifying human presence in the region from as early as 500,000 BP (Nicholson & Breen 2005). Bury St Edmunds, only 7km way of the site, has yielded some of the oldest prehistoric flint implements of a refined Acheulean tradition, including a Levallois hand axe, found during excavations in 1863-7 (SMR BSE 065). Further Palaeolithic artefacts have been discovered in the parish of Bury which has lead to the assumption that a major lower Palaeolithic site was located close by to the town (Wymer 1999, 33). Similarly with the Mesolithic period, dispersed activity has been noted in the surrounding parishes although there are no concentrations of finds which definitely indicate particular areas of activity. The only prehistoric discovery in the parish of Beyton is a complete Mesolithic Tranchet axehead, discovered in a field *c.* 825m east of Manor Farm (SHER TCK 011). This may represent transitory activity in the area although no further evidence in the parish indicates that this is a tentative suggestion. The Neolithic period saw the evolution of more organised farming settlements in Britain. Suffolk has two main concentrations of possible settlement (represented by round barrows, causewayed enclosures and/or flint mines) to the north-west and south-east of the county (Martin 1999, 37). Neither of these concentrations lie close to the site although the surrounding district of Mid Suffolk has some scattered evidence of Neolithic activity.

5.2   The later prehistoric period is also well represented in Suffolk although similarly to the earlier period there is a dearth of evidence in the village of Beyton. Bronze Age metal work has been found surrounding Beyton as well as barrows and ring ditches indicative of Bronze Age settlement (Martin 1999, 40). There is evidence of activity in Suffolk during the Iron Age; a number of possible settlement sites, pottery and coin hoards of the Iceni and some Belgic tribes are known throughout the county (Moore et al 1988: *passim*). The Icknield Way (a possible prehistoric trackway) is located to the north-west of the county. However, the scarcity of finds in

the area of Beyton (with only one recorded within the approximate 1km HER search of the site) suggests that human activity in both the earlier and later prehistoric periods was transitory, and there is no evidence of long term occupation or settlement.

Romano-British (AD43 - 410)

5.3   In keeping with the dearth of occupational evidence from the previous archaeological period, the Romano-British era has also yielded little in the vicinity of Beyton. The county of Suffolk saw intensive Roman activity attested by the considerable evidence of settlement at locations such as Long Melford, Pakenham and Icklingham (Plouviez 1999, 43). Pakenham, *c*. 4km north-west of the site, has yielded evidence of military and industrial activity and was one of a presumed network of market centres in the county (Plouviez 1999, 42). Several Roman roads have been identified including the road from Pakenham to Long Melford which runs on a rough north to south alignment *c.* 3.5km south-west of the village of Beyton. A short section of Roman road has also been identified as approaching the south-eastern corner of Beyton, close to Chevin's Wood, running parallel to the Pakenham to Long Melford road. Agriculture dominated the economy which accounts for the overwhelming majority of Roman settlements in Suffolk comprising farmsteads ranging from villa estates to small homesteads (Plouviez 1999, 43). Recent systematic fieldwalking and metal-detecting in Suffolk has confirmed the dense Roman agricultural activity across the Suffolk landscape (Plouviez 1999, 42). Despite the evidence, Beyton only produced one find of Roman date, a Roman brooch found 250m north of the village green (SHER TSH005). Similarly to the prehistoric period, this suggests the area was not occupied on a permanent basis in this period but it saw more transient activity, possibly associated with the routes to and from Pakenham, a settlement located only a small distance to the north.

Anglo-Saxon (AD 410 – 1066) and Medieval (AD 1066 – 1539)

5.4   There is little evidence to suggest that Beyton originated in the early Anglo-Saxon period. The area surrounding has little evidence of Anglo-Saxon activity with the closest town of mid to late Saxon origin being Bury St Edmunds, *c*. 7km west of village. It has been noted that many place names ending in *ton* such as Beyton were thought to be subsidiary or daughter settlements which supported growing parishes (Martin 1999, 51). It is possible that this settlement grew as a daughter settlement to the religious centre at Bury St Edmunds (*c*. 7km west) or the market town of Thorney (*c*. 11km south-east), both late Saxon towns. There is also a possibility that the Church of All Saints in the parish of Beyton may have been of Saxon origin. Despite there no church being mentioned in the Domesday entry for Beyton, the round tower certainly indicates Norman origins and some local historians have suggested it may be Saxon in date (Tricker 1979, 1). However this suggestion must be taken tentatively as there are no archaeological remains to support this statement.

5.5   Beyton (known as *Begatona* and *Beighton*) was mentioned in Domesday Book with one listed estate which was originally held by Edith the Rich and consisted of 40 acres (Copinger 1910, 254). By the time of the survey in 1086, the estate was owned by Hugh de Montfort (Copinger 1910, 254). Although the Church of All Saints was not mentioned in Domesday Book, the remains of a Norman door and archway with the additional feature of a round tower (one of only forty four in the county) suggests

that the church originated in the Norman period (SHER BEY 003). Often churches were the foci of medieval settlements and the location of All Saint's Church (to the south of the modern village) suggests there may have been an earlier settlement surrounding it. Beyton Manor, a known medieval manorial site, was first documented in 1276 as belonging to the Ratlesden family who subsequently passed it to the De Beyton family (Copinger 1910, 254). In 1316, the manor became part of the lands held by the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds (Copinger 1910, 254). The exact location of the medieval Beyton Manor is uncertain at this time but is likely to have encompassed estates such as Beyton House and Beyton Lodge. No manorial records of Beyton Manor exist in the Suffolk Record Office, although sales particulars of Beyton House Estate in 1913, mention the 'Reputed Manor of Beyton' as Lot 30. It was part of the Beyton House estate even though there is no recorded location, tenant or acreage (SRO Ref:E3/30/13.3). This confirms that little was known about the manor at the turn of the century, except that it was located in the village. A possibly medieval moated site, Brook Farm which comprises of a small square moat with a 17th century farmhouse situated in the centre, was located to the *c.* 500m east of the church and may also have been part of the manor (BEY 001). The presence of Manor Farmhouse on the assessment site also indicates this site may be associated with the medieval Beyton Manor. The location of the current village surrounding a green, *c.* 500m north of the church, may also indicate a late medieval date for the possible relocation of the settlement. Many villages, particularly in the adjoining county of Norfolk, were focused around a village green from the 12th century for agricultural purposes (Wade-Martins 1980, 86). It is possible that the green in Beyton originated in the medieval period (post-12th century) surrounded on its three outer sides by a ribbon of farm and domestic buildings as it was in the later periods.

Post-medieval and Modern (AD 1540 to present)

5.6   By the post-medieval period, the settlement surrounding the green (known as Beyton or Beighton Green) was further established. Numerous 16th and 17th century housing was built around the green in this period including Oak Cottage (SHER 281116), Thimble Cottage (SHER 281113) and Little Paddocks (SHER 281114). Many farm buildings, stables and farmhouses are located around the green indicative of the significance of agriculture in the village. Brook Farmhouse (SHER BEY 001), Grange Farmhouse (SHER 281122) and Manor Farmhouse all date from the 17th century although Manor Farmhouse (SHER 281115) has shown indications of earlier origins. Interestingly, medieval limestone surrounding the fireplaces in the Manor Farmhouse has been identified as being taken from the Abbey of St Edmundsbury, the owners of the land until the dissolution of the monasteries in 1539. The population of the village was always meagre but saw an increase throughout this period with one of its highest populations in 1851 shown as 394 inhabitants (Gault 1990). Further residential development between Beyton Green and Beyton House occurred in the 18th to 19th centuries resulting in an almost dispersed settlement pattern with the green being the centre of the village (Gault 1990).

Undated

5.7   One of the only archaeological investigations in the village undertaken at land adjacent to the White Horse public house in 2006 revealed no archaeological features or finds (SHER ESF19478). This may be due to the sites location slightly west of the

green and thus slightly west of the possible late medieval settlement. Alternatively, post-medieval development may have truncated any surviving archaeological remains which may have led to the negative results.

6   CARTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

Hodskinson's map of Suffolk 1783 (Fig. 4)

6.1   This early map detailed the village name as Beighton (not the modern spelling of Beyton) which continued until the late 18th to early 19th century. The distinctive rectangular shape of the green was shown with structures depicted on all three sides. Manor Farm was likely to be shown on the eastern side of Tostock Road with only an indicative site location due to the poor reproduction of the map.

Tithe map of Beyton 1839 (Fig. 5)

6.2   The tithe map of Beyton surveyed in 1839 depicted a more developed settlement surrounding the village green. The site encompassed two pieces of land (Plots 8 and 9). Plot 8 was shown as entirely undeveloped with the tithe apportionment naming it as 'home meadow' and noting the land use as pasture. Plot 9 contained a large L-shaped structure with a small wing added to the western side which was a probable agricultural structure serving the main farmhouse. The location of the 17th century Manor Farmhouse (SHER 281115) lies outside of the assessment site but it was shown within Plot 9 as a small L-shaped building. The tithe apportionment describes Plot 9 as 'yards and premises' but does not name the farm as Manor Farm. Both plots were owned by Major Phillip Bennett, an important land owner in the Beyton area in the 18th and 19th centuries. The remainder of the land on the site was undeveloped.

1st Edition Ordnance Survey map 1880's (Fig.6)

6.3   During the next fifty years, the site saw further development. The site was named as Manorhouse Farm on this map, suggestive of an association with Beyton Manor. The original large L-shaped building was still depicted in the 1880's with further structural extensions to the south some of which lies outside the assessment site boundary. A cross shaped building was newly constructed to the north-east of the assessment site. Several other smaller structures were depicted between Manor Farmhouse and the large L-shaped building. Manor Farmhouse was shown to have been extended to the south west.

2nd Edition Ordnance Survey map 1900's (Fig. 7)

6.4   Within only twenty years the site had changed considerably with numerous buildings constructed and demolished. The cross shaped structure in the north-east of the site no longer existed at this time but instead a small L-shaped structure was constructed slightly west of the original structure's location. Some of the smaller structures shown on the 1st edition map were also no longer depicted. The remainder of the land was undeveloped and likely to have continued in use as pasture land (as

noted in the tithe survey). The later 20th century saw the construction of the farm buildings which are currently on the site.

7   CONSTRAINTS

Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) – There are no Scheduled Ancient Monument's within 1km of the site.

Areas of Archaeological Importance (AAI) – The site lies within an Area of Archaeological Importance as defined by the County Historic Environment Record.

Listed Buildings – The 17th century structure of Manor Farmhouse is located to the south-east of the assessment site (SHER 281115).

Conservation Areas – The assessment site is located within or very close to Beyton Conservation Area as defined by Mid Suffolk District Council.

8   DISCUSSION

8.1   Archaeological background

8.1.1   The prehistory of the Beyton area is poorly understood which limits the interpretation of this period. Only one prehistoric finds of a Mesolithic tranchet flint axehead (SHER TCK 011) to the east of the village indicates perhaps transient activity occurred at this time. However the lack of any other finds in the area suggests that there was little permanent settlement in the area of Beyton in the prehistoric period. This may be due to larger areas of activity or settlements near by (particularly in the area close to Bury St Edmunds because of its proximity to the River Lark and easily cultivated soils) which may have dominated the area. Similarly to the prehistoric evidence, there is also a dearth of evidence of Roman activity with only one find of Roman date (SHER TSH 005) discovered 250m north of the village green. This may be transitory activity associated with the Roman route between Pakenham and Long Melford but it again indicates that there was little permanent occupation in the area. However, consideration has to be given to the lack of development in the village (which often instigates archaeological investigations) which may have limited the opportunities for prehistoric and Roman evidence to have been discovered. Further archaeological investigations in the village may further the knowledge of Beyton's early history.

8.1.2   There is no evidence of early Anglo-Saxon occupation of Beyton. In the mid to late Saxon period, other large religious centres such as Bury St Edmunds were only just founded. Circumstantial evidence indicates that Beyton may have be founded in this period due to the early features of the medieval church of All Saints which is situated 500m south of the village green (Tricker 1979, 1). However, there is no archaeological or written evidence of this or any other Saxon finds in the parish which help to confirm this theory.

8.1.3   It is possible that the early medieval settlement was focused around the parish church of All Saints and close to Beyton Manor which is known to have been in

existence by 1276. Often medieval settlements developed around the foci of the parish church. The modern village surrounding the green indicates that the main settlement may have moved north in the later medieval period. There are almost no examples of pre-conquest village greens whilst often the medieval phenomenon of settling around triangular green rarely occurred before the 12th century (Wade-Martin 1980, 86). Prime examples of this type of planned settlement occur in the Launditch hundred of Norfolk where in the 12th to 13th centuries, many villages began to arrange themselves around a triangular shaped green usually reflecting the fact that the village was at the meeting of three roads (Wade-Martin 1980, 86). This medieval layout is present in Beyton with three roads, Thurston Road, Tostock Road and Bury Road surrounding the village green. The presence of the green may also indicate the significance of the agricultural economy to the settlement with it often used as pasture land for livestock (Wade-Martin 1980, 88). Concentrating on the site of Manor Farm, located on the eastern side of Tostock Road, it is possible that a farm was in existence at this time and associated with the medieval Beyton Manor (with particular reference to its name in the 19th century of Manorhouse Farm). Often, farmsteads surrounded the village green which indicates a high potential of discovering agricultural and/or domestic settlement remains, possibly associated with an earlier Manor Farm, on the assessment site. The site encompasses the backlands which are situated to the rear of the green and the function of these lands may be confirmed, perhaps revealing evidence of medieval agricultural practise.

8.1.4   The settlement surrounding the green expanded in the 17th and 18th centuries. Cottages, barns and housing were constructed whilst the farming industry continued with Grange Farm and the assessment site of Manor Farm both situated at the edge of the triangular green. The cartographic sources indicate that the farm saw much development throughout the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries.

8.2   Archaeological potential

8.2.1   The site has archaeological potential for multi-phase periods:

- **Prehistoric – low to moderate potential**. Despite the range of prehistoric evidence recorded in Suffolk, only one prehistoric find of a Mesolithic tranchet flint axehead has been found with 1km of the assessment site (SHER TCK011). However, the lack of archaeological investigations in Beyton may be the reason for the dearth of evidence.

- **Roman – low to moderate potential.** Whilst only one find was discovered 250m from the village green (SHER THS 005), there may be the possibility of further transitory evidence associated with the Roman route between Pakenham and Long Melford. The dearth of evidence may be due to the lack of archaeological investigations in Beyton.

- **Anglo-Saxon – low potential**. There is a tentative suggestion that All Saint's Church could have been constructed in the late Saxon period, however, no Anglo-Saxon finds or evidence can confirm Saxon occupation in the village.

- **Medieval –high potential**. Due to the location of the assessment site on the edge of the medieval village green as well as being part of the backlands, there is a high

potential of finding remains of this date, particularly agricultural in character, and for structural activity fronting the green.

- **Post-medieval and modern – moderate to high potential.** Remains of the post-medieval Manor Farm and associated buildings are likely to be encountered on the assessment site.

8.3   Previous ground disturbance and state of preservation

8.3.1   The map regression exercise indicates that some areas of the assessment site at Manor Farm have seen continuous development, suggesting of considerable ground disturbance. The development on the site in the 18th,19th and 20th centuries appeared to comprise of mostly agricultural structures which may have only required shallow foundations (particularly due to the rapidity in which they were constructed and demolished) possibly limiting the ground disturbance in those areas. The land to the north-east and north-west of the site was mostly pasture land up until the 20th century which has positive implications for preservation of archaeological remains. Use as an orchard/garden will have caused some truncation from tree planting/removal and root action, while the construction and demolition of several agricultural structures throughout the 19th and 20th century on the site will have resulted in limited truncation to any underlying archaeological features within their footprint. The drains and inspection chambers scattered across the site may also have caused disturbance to the site's stratigraphy. A majority of the development at the site in the 18th and 19th centuries was concentrated closer to the farmhouse where as the 20th century building on the site extended further onto the previous pasture land which was mostly preserved until that date (see Fig 9). This indicates that a long stretch of land in the north-east and north-west of the site, as well as isolated pockets of land surrounding the 20th century structures, may lie undisturbed. It is likely that any surviving remains will be well preserved in these areas.

8.3.2   A ground condition report supplied by the client, Chelsteen Homes, indicated the presence of a former pond to the north-west of the site which has been infilled with 'waste' material to an approximate depth of 1.7m. Considerable truncation of archaeological deposits in the vicinity of this feature may therefore be anticipated. The presence of two diesel tanks on site, although causing possible ground contamination, are unlikely to have caused major disturbance to any archaeological deposits as these are not subsurface structures and are stored on brick bases. Ground disturbance will therefore be limited to the impact of the foundations of these bases. The ground condition report confirmed the recent history of land use at the site as low intensity agricultural and storage operations. The ground profiles on site consisted of relatively shallow topsoil above sand and head deposits, above till (boulder clay) at some depth). Sand deposits were thicker towards the south of the site.

8.4   Impact of the proposed development

8.4.1   It is proposed to demolish all current buildings on the site and construct ten detached dwellings with associated garages and improved access (Fig 8). The precise foundation design had not been established at the time of writing the report. However, the type of foundations required for one, two or three storey housing is expected to significantly impact the site. Although areas in both the north and south of the site are

likely to have been previously damaged, any surviving remains (particularly in the north) are likely to be significantly disturbed by the foundations and subsequent services required for the development.

9 CONCLUSIONS

9.1 There is currently a dearth of archaeological and historical information relating to the parish of Beyton which inhibits detailed interpretation of the occupation of the site up until the medieval period. Little previous development in the village has occasioned archaeological investigation, indicating that earlier occupational evidence may yet to be found. The early medieval village is likely to have been situated close to the round-towered Norman parish Church of All Saints. At a later point in the medieval period, it is possible that the village moved north to concentrate around the green. The location of Manor Farm both fronting onto the green and part of the backlands would indicate a high potential of finding medieval remains associated with this possible late medieval settlement. It is also likely that the post-medieval remains of Manor Farm and associated structures would also be encountered on the assessment site. Cartographic sources suggest that the site was moderately developed in the post-medieval and modern period and this may have caused truncation of any underlying archaeological deposits. However, several areas in the north of the site are likely to have remained undeveloped and the potential of finding well preserved remains would be enhanced in these areas. This will be clarified by the forthcoming archaeological evaluation.

DEPOSITION OF THE ARCHIVE

The project archive will be deposited with the Suffolk Historic Environment Record, and copies of this report will be deposited with the Suffolk Historic Environment Record and the National Monuments Record, Swindon.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Copinger, W.A, 1910, *The Manors of Suffolk: notes on their history and devolution, with some illustrations of the old manor houses,* London. Vol 6 p 254.

Gault, W, 1990, *A Survey of Suffolk Parish Histories,* Suffolk County Council.

Gurney, 2003, *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 14.

Institute of Field Archaeologists 1994 (revised 2001) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk based Assessment*

Martin, E, 1999, The Neolithic. In: Dymond, D & Martin, E, 1999, *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, Suffolk County Council Environment and Transport

Martin, E, 1999, The Iron Age. In: Dymond, D & Martin, E, 1999, *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, Suffolk County Council Environment and Transport

Martin, E, 1999, Place Name Patterns. In: Dymond, D & Martin, E, 1999, *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, Suffolk County Council Environment and Transport

Moore, I. et al 1988 *The Archaeology of Roman Suffolk* Ipswich: Suffolk County Council Planning Department

Nicholson, K. & Breen, A. 2005 *Almoners Field, Cullum Road, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk: An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment* Unpublished report for Archaeological Solutions Ltd Report No. 1737

Plouviez, J, 1999, The Roman Period. In: Dymond, D & Martin, E, 1999, *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, Suffolk County Council Environment and Transport

SSEW 1983 *Soil Survey of England and Wales: Soils of South East England (sheet 4)*. Harpenden, Rothamsted Experimental Station/Lawes Agricultural Trust

Tricker, R, 1979, *All Saints Church, Beyton and its parish,* Beyton parish leaflet.

Wade-Martins, P, 1980, *Fieldwork and Excavation on village sites in Launditch Hundred, Norfolk*, East Anglian Archaeology report No. 10.

Wymer, J, 1999, The Palaeolithic Period. In: Dymond, D & Martin, E, 1999, *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, Suffolk County Council Environment and Transport

Website 1
http://www.bbc.co.uk/suffolk/content/articles/2007/05/04/beyton_village_feature.shtml

APPENDIX 1 HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD DATA

The following sites are those that lie within a *c.* 1km radius of the assessment site. The table has been compiled from data held by the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (SHER). The locations of the sites are shown in Fig. 3. Their significance, where relevant, is discussed in Section 4.2.

HER No.	NGR TG	Description
Prehistoric (c. 700,000 BC – AD 43)		
TCK011	94485 63308	A complete Mesolithic tranchet flint axehead as found at this location.
Roman (AD 43- 410)		
THS005	933 638	A Roman Brooch found at this location on the surface.
Anglo-Saxon and Medieval (AD 410 – 1550)		
BEY001	9398 6275	Brook Farm has a small square medieval moat with a 17th century farmhouse in the centre.
BEY003	9339 6277	Church of All Saints is of Norman origin illustrated by the round tower on the church. Later additions of the buttresses at the SW and NW and the decoration of the north doorway are unusual features. Restoration was carried out in 1853-4 which added a gothic arcade and the Norman doorway was reset. It is a Grade I listed building.
Post-medieval (AD 1550 – present)		
BEY001	9398 6275	Brook Farm house is a 17th century Grade II listed building with a medieval moat surrounding.
281116	93373 63530	Oak Cottage is a probably 17th century timber framed house. It is a Grade II listed building.
281115	93550 63427	Manor Farmhouse, a former late 16th century farmhouse with later additions. Medieval limestone surrounds the fireplaces of this house which is thought to have come from the former Abbey of St Edmundsbury.
281119	93281 63584	Dibolds is a 17th century (or earlier) timber framed house. It is a Grade II listed building.
281114	93354 63432	Little Paddocks is a 17th century timber framed house. It is a Grade II listed building.
281276	93391 63406	A K6 Telephone kiosk designed by Sir Giles Gilbert Scott. It is a Grade II listed structure.
281113	93411 63324	Thimble Cottage is two timber framed houses but was built as one in the early 16th century with later additions. It is a Grade II listed building.
281112	93410 63315	Corner Cottage, a late 16th century house which may have been a barn originally and remodelled in the 18th century. It is a Grade II listed building.
281107	93553 63315	An early 19th century timber framed house named Bridge House. It is a Grade II listed building.

281122	93878 63230	Grange Farmhouse was a former farmhouse built in the 17th century with later additions in the mid 19th century. It is a Grade II listed building.
281118	93280 63567	Old Thatch and attached stable range. The house is of 15th or 16th century origin with several alteration periods principally the 17th century. It is a Grade II listed building.
281117	93417 63290	The White Horse Public House is of mostly 19th century date with a 1694 or earlier core. It is a Grade II listed building.
281111	93437 63299	Ellesmere House is of 17th century date and encompasses two houses and a shop. It is a Grade II listed building.
281110	93464 63303	Hope House, an early 19th century house. It is a Grade II listed building.
281109	93480 63306	Montablo House is of early 19th century date. It is a Grade II listed building.
281108	93500 63299	Scott House had a probable 17th century core with a remodeling of the house in the 19th century. It is a Grade II listed building.
Undated		
ESF19478	9337 6326	A watching brief at land adjacent to the White House pub in Beyton revealed no archaeological finds or features despite its proximity to the green.

APPENDIX 2   CARTOGRAPHIC SOURCES

Date	Map	Scale	Location
1783	Hodskinson's map of Suffolk	-	SRO
1839	Tithe map of Beyton	-	SRO
1880's	1st Edition Ordnance Survey map	25"	SRO
1900's	2nd Edition Ordnance Survey map	25"	SRO

APPENDIX 3   TITHE APPORTIONMENT 1839

Plot no.	Owner	Occupier	Plot name	Land use	Area (a.r.p)
5	Phillip Bennett	Abraham Gall	In Brushes	Arable	3.1.20
6	Phillip Bennett	Abraham Gall	The First Drummer	Arable	3.3.32
7	Phillip Bennett	Abraham Gall	Home field	Arable	7.1.14
8	Phillip Bennett	Abraham Gall	Home meadow	Pasture	1.1.14
9	Phillip Bennett	Abraham Gall	Yards and premises	Yards	1.3.17
25	Mrs Anne Cleyton	Robert Tannings	Wells Close	Arable	10.2.31
26	Mrs Nunn	William Guy	House and garden	Garden	0.1.6