# Coleford Farm, Coleford Bridge Road, Mytchett, Surrey

An Archaeological Evaluation

for Charles Church Southern

by Simon Cass

Thames Valley Archaeological Services Ltd

Site Code CFM 07/59

September 2007

# Summary

Site name: Coleford Farm, Coleford Bridge Road, Mytchett, Surrey

Grid reference: SU 8840 5550

Site activity: Field Evaluation

Date and duration of project: 30th–31st August 2007

Project manager: Steve Ford

Site supervisor: Simon Cass

Site code: CFM 07/59

Area of site: c. 0.75 ha

**Summary of results:** No finds or features of archaeological interest were observed during this evaluation. Several trenches encountered modern disturbance and contamination.

**Location and reference of archive:** The archive is presently held at Thames Valley Archaeological Services, Reading and will be deposited at Woking Museum in due course.

This report may be copied for bona fide research or planning purposes without the explicit permission of the copyright holder

Report edited/checked by: Steve Ford ✓ 24.09.07 Steve Preston ✓ 25.09.07

i

Thames Valley Archaeological Services Ltd, 47–49 De Beauvoir Road, Reading RG1 5NR Tel. (0118) 926 0552; Fax (0118) 926 0553; email <u>tvas@tvas.co.uk;</u> website : www.tvas.co.uk

# Coleford Farm, Coleford Bridge Road, Mytchett, Surrey An Archaeological Evaluation

by Simon Cass

# Report 07/59b

# Introduction

This report documents the results of an archaeological field evaluation carried out at Coleford Farm, Coleford Bridge Road, Mytchett, Surrey (SU 8840 5550) (Fig. 1). The work was commissioned by Mr Karl Endersby of Charles Church Southern, Charles Church House, Knoll Road, Camberley, Surrey GU15 3TQ.

A planning consent (2005/0553) was granted by Surrey Heath Borough Council to demolish existing buildings on the site and construct new houses and flats. This consent is subject to a condition (2) relating to archaeology requiring implementation of a programme of archaeological works. This was to take the form initially of field evaluation by means of trial trenching, based on the results of which an appropriate mitigation strategy could be defined as required.

This is in accordance with the Department of the Environment's Planning Policy Guidance, *Archaeology* and Planning (PPG16 1990), and the Borough Council's policies on archaeology. A desk-based assessment of the site carried out in May 2007 concluded that although the site was situated in an area of little known archaeology, there was moderate potential for prehistoric, Roman or medieval remains (Preston 2007).

The field investigation was carried out to a specification approved by Mr Tony Howe, Archaeological Officer with Surrey County Council. The fieldwork was undertaken by Simon Cass and Illya Sparkes-Santos on 30th and 31st August 2007 and the site code is CFM07/59. The archive is presently held at Thames Valley Archaeological Services, Reading and will be deposited at Woking Museum in due course.

#### Location, topography and geology

The site is located on the floor of the valley of the River Blackwater, at approximately 65m above Ordnance Datum, between Farnborough and Mytchett. The river itself passes approximately 125m to the west of the site (Fig. 1). Currently the site is occupied by run-down former stables, grassy areas and hard standing, along with some more substantial buildings along the north-western edge of the site (Fig. 2). The underlying geology is listed as either alluvium or, further away from the river, Lower Terrace river gravels (BGS 1976). The natural geology observed in the trenches was alluvial silts and sands.

### Archaeological background

The archaeological potential of the site and its environs has recently been assessed in a desk-based assessment for the site (Preston 2007). This observed that the site was located in an area of little known archaeology (cf Cotton *et al.* 2004). This study noted that there was some potential for prehistoric archaeology from the general topography of the area and Coleford Bridge is recorded as being of medieval origin suggesting the possible presence of contemporary occupation.

## **Objectives and methodology**

The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the presence/absence, extent, condition, character, quality and date of any archaeological deposits within the area of development. Specific aims were to determine if archaeologically relevant levels have survived on this site and to determine if archaeological deposits of any period are present.

It was proposed to dig 11 trenches across the site, ten at 15m long and one at 10m, and all 1.6m wide. The trenches were to be dug using a JCB-type machine fitted with a ditching bucket and under constant archaeological supervision. Spoilheaps were to be searched for finds including use of a metal detector.

## Results

Eleven trenches were excavated across the site, ranging in length between 19m and 3.2m and from 0.9m to 1.6m in width (Fig. 3). Several trenches had to be moved from their intended position or orientation due to the presence of live services across the site. Similarly five trenches had to be of reduced width, also due to the presence of services in a narrow portion of the site. Due to the presence of significant modern detritus in the soil it was decided that a metal detector was unsuitable for use on this site.

A complete list of trenches giving lengths, breadths, depths and a description of sections and geology is given in Appendix 1.

#### Trench 1 (Plate 1)

This trench was 13.8m long, 1.6m wide and 0.65m deep, orientated NE–SW. The stratigraphy encountered in the trench consisted of 0.15m of topsoil above 0.4m of subsoil/disturbed natural geology (black/pale grey mottled silty sand) with significant root disturbance, above orange/yellow silty sand natural geology. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

## Trench 2

This trench was 3.2m long, 0.9m wide and 1.32m deep, orientated NW–SE. The stratigraphy encountered in this trench consisted of 0.1m of gravel above 0.2m of hardcore above 0.66m of contaminated sandy silt made ground or modern disturbance. Below this was contaminated silty sand natural geology. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

#### Trench 3

This trench was 14.7m long, 1.6m wide and 1.22m deep, orientated north-south. The stratigraphy encountered consisted of 0.25m of topsoil above 0.33m of made ground with significant amounts of demolition rubble in it. Below this was 0.18m of black sandy silt (contaminated) sealing 0.25m of subsoil/ disturbed natural geology which in turn overlay silty sand natural geology which had been stained a variety of shades of green, presumably by the contaminants. This trench contained a number of regular-shaped (mostly rectangular) apparently modern truncations, also heavily contaminated. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

#### Trench 4

This trench was 14.2m long, 0.9m wide and 0.87m deep, orientated NE–SW. This trench was narrowed to avoid live gas and electricity services on either side of the trench and a possible foul water drain at the south-western end. The stratigraphy encountered in this trench consisted of 0.25m of gravel and hoggin above 0.22m of made ground with building rubble in it (Fig. 4). This lay above 0.25m of dark brown sandy silt subsoil, which overlay mottled yellow/orange silty sand natural geology. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

#### Trench 5 (Plate 2)

This trench was 16.8m long, 1.6m wide and 0.85m deep, orientated roughly north-south. The stratigraphy encountered consisted of 0.12m of topsoil above 0.25m of made ground (brick rubble, Tarmac). This in turn sealed 0.37m of humic sandy silt (subsoil or possibly buried topsoil and subsoil). Below this was silty sand natural geology. As with the adjacent Trench 3, this trench was contaminated and had a number of regular-shaped apparently modern truncations visible against the green-stained natural deposits. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

#### Trench 6

This trench was 14.9m long, 0.9m wide and 1.39m deep, orientated east-west. The stratigraphy encountered in this trench consisted of 0.15m of gravel above 0.25m of rubble hardcore above 0.79m of black silty made ground

with brick, metal and plastic inclusions. Below this was 0.2m of subsoil and contaminated silty sand natural geology. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

#### Trench 7

This trench was 15.2m long, 0.9m wide and 1.29m deep, orientated NE–SW. The stratigraphy encountered comprised 0.1m of gravel surfacing over 0.23m of rubble hardcore which sealed 0.88m of disturbed/made ground deposits. This last layer contained modern detritus including plastic piping, wire and brick fragments. Below this was contaminated silty sand natural geology. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

#### Trench 8 (Plate 3)

This trench was 19.0m long, 1.6m wide and 1.22m deep, orientated NE–SW. The stratigraphy in this trench consisted of 0.1m of topsoil above 0.52m of made ground and building rubble. Below this was 0.24m of yellow/brown sandy silt subsoil above yellow/grey mottled sand natural geology. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

#### Trench 9

This trench was 10.4m long, 1.6m wide and 1.04m deep, orientated roughly east-west. This trench had to be moved slightly from its intended position to avoid a live water pipe. The stratigraphy encountered in this trench consisted of 0.3m of topsoil/made ground (stable sweepings) above 0.33m of dark brown organic sandy silts (buried topsoil). This lay above 0.15m of mid/dark greyish brown silty sand subsoil which sealed pale yellow/grey mottled sand natural geology. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

#### Trench 10 (Plate 4)

This trench was 16.2m long, 1.6m wide and 0.72m deep, orientated NE–SW. The stratigraphy encountered consisted of 0.47m of topsoil above 0.11m of dark greyish brown silty sand subsoil. This in turn overlay pale orange-brown, grey-brown and pale yellow sand natural geology. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

#### Trench 11

This trench was 13.6m long, 0.9m wide and 1.03m deep, orientated NE–SW. The stratigraphy encountered consisted of 0.34m of hardcore and gravel surfacing above 0.57m of dark brown silty sand subsoil above dark brown/yellow sand natural geology. No archaeological deposits or find were revealed.

## Finds

No artefacts of archaeological interest were recovered from this evaluation.

# Conclusion

In conclusion, this evaluation has not revealed any artefacts or deposits of archaeological interest. Large parts of

the site have been buried by modern made ground, with several areas of truncation and disturbance of the natural

geology observed. It is considered therefore that the site has very low archaeological potential.

# References

BGS, 1976, British Geological Survey, 1:50000, Sheet 285, Drift Edition, Keyworth
Cotton, J, Crocker, C and Graham, A (eds), 2004, Aspects of archaeology and history in Surrey, Guildford
PPG16, 1990, Archaeology and Planning, Dept of the Environment Planning Policy Guidance 16, HMSO
Preston, S, 2007, 'Coleford Farm, Coleford Bridge Road, Mytchett, Surrey, an archaeological desk-based assessment', Thames Valley Archaeological Services rep 07/59, Reading

# **APPENDIX 1:** Trench details

# 0m at South or West end

Trench	Length (m)	Breadth (m)	Depth (m)	Comment
1	13.8	1.6	0.65	0-0.15m topsoil; 0.15-0.55m pale grey/black sandy silt subsoil;
				0.55m+ orange/yellow sand natural geology
2	3.2	0.9	1.32	0-0.1m gravel surface; 0.1-0.3m hardcore/rubble; 0.3-0.96m
				contaminated sandy silt subsoil; 0.96m+ contaminated sand natural
				geology
3	14.7	1.6	1.22	0-0.25m topsoil; 0.25-0.58m rubble/made ground; 0.58-0.76m
				contaminated black sandy silt; 0.76-1.11m subsoil/disturbed natural,
				1.11m+ contaminated sand natural geology
4	14.2	0.9	0.87	0-0.25m gravel/hardcore rubble; 0.25-0.47m made ground (brick/tile
				inclusions); 0.47-0.72m dark brown sandy silt subsoil; 0.72m+
				mottled yellow/orange silty sand natural geology
5	16.8	1.6	0.85	0-0.12m topsoil; 0.12-0.37m made ground (brick rubble, old Tarmac,
				gravel); 0.37-0.74m sandy organic silt (buried topsoil/subsoil); 0.74m
				sandy natural geology (with some green staining)
6	14.9	0.9	1.39	0-0.15m gravel; 0.15-0.4m rubble hardcore; 0.4-1.19m black silty
				made ground (metal and plastic inclusions); 1.19m+ contaminated
				sand natural geology
7	15.2	0.9	1.28	0-0.1m gravel; 0.1-0.33m rubble hardcore; 0.33-1.21m
				disturbed/made ground deposits (plastic piping, wire, brick); 1.21m+
	10.0			contaminated silty sand natural geology
8	19.0	1.6	1.04	0-0.1m topsoil; 0.1-0.62m made ground/building rubble; 0.62-0.86m
				yellow/brown sandy silt subsoil; 0.86m yellow/grey mottled sand
	10.4	1.6	0.02	natural geology
9	10.4	1.6	0.92	0-0.3m topsoil/organic deposits; 0.3-0.63m dark brown organic sandy
				silt (buried topsoil); 0.63-0./8m mid/dark greyish brown silty sand
10	160	1.6	0.50	subsoil; 0. /8m+ pale/mid yellow/grey mottled sand natural geology
10	16.2	1.6	0.72	0-0.4/m topsoil; 0.4/-0.58m mid/dark greyish brown mottled sand
				subsoil; 0.58m+ orange-brown, grey-brown and pale yellow sand
	10.6	0.0	1.02	natural geology
11	13.6	0.9	1.03	0-0.34m hardcore/gravel; 0.34-0.91m dark brown silty sand subsoil;
				0.91m dark brown/yellow sand natural geology.







# Coleford Farm, Mytchett, Surrey, 2007





Figure 4. Representative section from Trench 4.

0

1m



Plate 2. Trench 5 looking north, Scales 2m and 1m.

À

F

CFM07/59



Plate 3. Trench 8 looking north Scales 2m and 1m.





Plate 4. Trench 10 looking south west, Scales 2m and 1m.

CFM07/59