

NORTH PENNINES ARCHAEOLOGY LTD

Client Reports No. CP/877/09

**REPORT ON AN
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
FIELD EVALUATION
AT
TENDLEY QUARRY,
BRIGHAM,
COCKERMOUTH,
CUMBRIA**

NGR: NY 089 284

**FOR
TARMAC LTD/TENDLEY QUARRIES LTD**

OASIS Ref: northpen3-57436

David Jackson BA (Hons)
North Pennines Archaeology Ltd
Nenthead Mines Heritage Centre
Nenthead
Alston
Cumbria CA9 3PD
Tel: (01434) 382045
Fax: (01434) 382043
E-mail: d.jackson@nparchaeology.co.uk

March 2009



CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS | ii |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iv |
| 1 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PROJECT..... | 1 |
| 2 METHODOLOGY..... | 2 |
| 2.1 PROJECT DESIGN..... | 2 |
| 2.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD EVALUATION..... | 2 |
| 2.3 ARCHIVE..... | 3 |
| 3 BACKGROUND | 4 |
| 3.1 LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY | 4 |
| 3.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND | 4 |
| 3.3 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK..... | 5 |
| 4 EVALUATION RESULTS | 6 |
| 4.1 INTRODUCTION | 6 |
| 4.2 RESULTS | 6 |
| 5 FINDS ASSESSMENT..... | 14 |
| 5.1 INTRODUCTION | 14 |
| 5.2 ASSESSMENT | 14 |
| 5.3 DISCUSSION | 14 |
| 6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 16 |
| 6.1 CONCLUSIONS..... | 16 |
| 6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS | 16 |
| 7 BIBLIOGRAPHY | 17 |
| 7.1 SECONDARY SOURCES | 17 |
| APPENDIX I: CONTEXT INDEX..... | 18 |
| APPENDIX II: FIGURES | 19 |

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FRONTISPIECE: VIEW SOUTHEAST OVER EVALUATION AREA

PLATES

| | |
|--|----|
| PLATE 1: TRENCH 1 LOOKING SOUTH-SOUTHEAST | 7 |
| PLATE 2: TRENCH 2 LOOKING EAST | 7 |
| PLATE 3: TRENCH 3 LOOKING SOUTHEAST | 7 |
| PLATE 4: TRENCH 4 LOOKING NORTH-NORTHWEST | 7 |
| PLATE 5: TRENCH 5 LOOKING WEST | 8 |
| PLATE 6: NORTH FACING SECTION OF TRENCH 5 | 8 |
| PLATE 7: TRENCH 6 LOOKING SOUTHEAST | 9 |
| PLATE 8: TRENCH 7 LOOKING WEST | 9 |
| PLATE 9: TRENCH 8 LOOKING NORTHWEST | 9 |
| PLATE 10: TRENCH 9 LOOKING SOUTHEAST | 11 |
| PLATE 11: TRENCH 10 LOOKING NORTH-NORTHWEST | 11 |
| PLATE 12: EAST-NORTHEAST FACING SECTION OF TRENCH 10 SHOWING FEATURE (307)..... | 11 |
| PLATE 13: TRENCH 11 LOOKING NORTH..... | 11 |
| PLATE 14: TRENCH 12 LOOKING WEST | 12 |
| PLATE 15: TRENCH 13 LOOKINGSOUTHWEST | 12 |
| PLATE 16: TRENCH 14 LOOKING SOUTH-SOUTHEAST | 13 |
| PLATE 17: TRENCH 15 LOOKING NORTH..... | 13 |
| PLATE 18: TRENCH 16 LOOKING SOUTHEAST | 13 |
| PLATE 19: TRENCH 17 LOOKING WEST | 13 |

TABLES

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| TABLE 1: FINDS INDEX | 15 |
| TABLE 2: CONTEXT INDEX | APPENDIX I |

FIGURES

| | |
|---|-------------|
| FIGURE 1: SITE LOCATION..... | APPENDIX II |
| FIGURE 2: TRENCH LOCATION PLAN..... | APPENDIX II |
| FIGURE 3: PLAN AND NORTHEAST FACING SECTION OF TRENCH 10 | APPENDIX II |
| FIGURE 4: REPRESENTATIVE SECTIONS FROM AREAS A, B AND D | APPENDIX II |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March 2009, North Pennines Archaeology were invited by Tarmac Ltd/Tendley Quarries Ltd, to undertake an archaeological field evaluation on land at Tendley Quarry, Brigham, Cockermouth, Cumbria (centred on NY 089 284). The site has been subject to several programmes of archaeological investigation including three geophysical surveys carried out by Archaeological Services WYAS in 2003, 2007 and 2008, and two programmes of trial trenching carried out by Headland Archaeology in 2003 and Oxford Archaeology North in 2007. Although no significant archaeological remains were revealed during these previous investigations, the site is considered to lie within an area of high archaeological potential due to the discovery of several inhumations within the immediate vicinity of Tendley Hill, one of which included a sword dated to the 10th century (Historic Environment Record nos. 1059 & 11617). Furthermore, one of the suggested routes of the Roman road between the settlements at Papcastle and Ravenglass crosses Tendley Hill (HER 1036) and there are early documentary accounts indicating that a section of it had been uncovered during quarrying. The wider area around the site also contains a series of cropmarks (HER nos. 4714, 5122, 13552 & 13563) and finds (e.g. HER nos. 810, 1057, 1060 & 17812) which are indicative of prehistoric activity.

The area around Tendley Quarry is therefore considered to have significant potential for the survival of below ground remains associated with prehistoric, Roman and Early Medieval settlement and land use. As a result, Cumbria County Council's Historic Environment Service (CCCHES) has placed a condition and section 106 agreement planning consent requiring a scheme of archaeological work to be undertaken during each phase of proposed quarry expansion to assess the archaeological nature and potential of the site.

The archaeological field evaluation comprised the excavation of 15 trial trenches over three adjacent fields, targeting features of potential archaeological interest highlighted during previous geophysical surveys (ASWYAS 2008). All 15 trenches measured 30m in length and 2m in width, covering 900m² of the proposed 46,000m² extraction area. Two further trenches were excavated in a fourth field not previously covered by the geophysical surveys in an area proposed for a bund. The two additional trenches measured 32.5m in length and 2m in width, equating to 5% of the 2600m² area. All trenches were excavated to the top of the natural substrate, with the exception of Trench 4.

Trenches 1-4, 6-9 and 11-17 were devoid of any archaeological features or deposits, whilst Trench 4 revealed a modern dumping ground for general waste. Only Trench 10 retained any evidence of archaeological activity. This was in the form of a linear deposit of loosely packed river worn cobbles which had been sealed by a deposit of crushed brick and mortar. Although its exact function remains uncertain, the best possible interpretation for the feature based on the available evidence is one of a former field boundary.

Although the finds assemblage was comprised of 80 separate items, all of these were classified as relatively modern, many of which probably related to general farming activities or overburden from the modern rubbish tip.

Based upon the evidence retrieved during the present field evaluation and previous archaeological investigations, it would appear that the study area has not been intensively used in the past other than for agricultural purposes. However, given the significance of previous archaeological discoveries within the immediate vicinity of the study area, it is recommended that any future invasive work be subject to a similar programme of archaeological investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. would like to thank Tarmac Ltd/Tendley Quarries Ltd for commissioning the project. Thanks are also due to the staff of Tendley Quarries Ltd for their support during the field evaluation. NPA would also like to thank Bill of Thompson's, machine operator during the evaluation.

Claire Mason, Joanne Wilkinson and Kevin Mounsey carried out the field evaluation, under the supervision of David Jackson. Alan James kindly carried out the metal detecting survey. The report was prepared by David Jackson and edited by Mathew Town, Project Manager for NPA Ltd. The project was managed by Mathew Town, Project Manager for NPA Ltd.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PROJECT

- 1.1.1 In March 2009, North Pennines Archaeology were invited by Tarmac Ltd/Tendley Quarries Ltd, to undertake an archaeological field evaluation on land at Tendley Quarry, Brigham, Cockermouth, Cumbria (NGR NY 089 284, Figure 1) in advance of limestone extraction at the site. The work followed several previous archaeological investigations including geophysical surveys, which highlighted areas of potential archaeological interest. The evaluation trenches were located in order to target these areas of interest, as well as 'sterile' areas which did not produce any geophysical anomalies. The archaeological works were conducted in accordance with a condition and section 106 agreement on planning consent, as set out by Cumbria County Council's Historic Environment Service (CCCHES).
- 1.1.2 All trenches were excavated by mechanical excavator and subsequently cleaned by hand under full archaeological supervision. All stages of the archaeological work were undertaken following approved statutory guidelines (IFA 2002).
- 1.1.3 This report comprises the results of the archaeological field evaluation and post-fieldwork analysis following the work at Tendley Quarry, including a statement of further archaeological potential and recommendations for future work within the area.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 PROJECT DESIGN

- 2.1.1 A project design was submitted by North Pennines Archaeology Ltd in response to a request by Tarmac Ltd/Tendley Quarries Ltd for an archaeological field evaluation of the study area (Town 2009). Following acceptance of the project design by CCCHES, North Pennines Archaeology Ltd was commissioned by the client to undertake the work. The project design was adhered to in full, and the work was consistent with the relevant standards and procedures of the Institute for Archaeologists (IFA), and generally accepted best practice.

2.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD EVALUATION

- 2.2.1 The evaluation consisted of the excavation of 17 trenches covering 1,030m² of the proposed 48,600m² extraction area. The purpose of the evaluation was to establish the nature and extent of below ground archaeological remains within the vicinity, the evaluation trenches being located to target both geophysical anomalies and apparently 'sterile' areas. All work was conducted according to the recommendations of the Institute for Archaeologists (2002).
- 2.2.2 In summary, the main objectives of the field evaluation were:
- to establish the presence/absence, nature, extent and state of preservation of archaeological remains and to record these where they were observed;
 - to establish the character of those features in terms of cuts, soil matrices and interfaces;
 - to recover artefactual material, especially that useful for dating purposes;
 - to recover palaeoenvironmental material where it survives in order to understand site and landscape formation processes.
- 2.2.3 Turf and topsoil was removed by mechanical excavator under close archaeological supervision. The trial trenches were subsequently cleaned by hand and all features were investigated and recording according to the North Pennines Archaeology Ltd standard procedure as set out in the Excavation Manual (Giecco 2003).
- 2.2.4 All finds encountered were retained, including those from excavated topsoil, and were cleaned and packaged according to standard guidelines, and recorded under the supervision of F.Giecco (NPA Ltd Technical Director).
- 2.2.5 All deposits encountered were deemed unsuitable for environmental sampling, and therefore no samples were retained.
- 2.2.6 The 17 evaluation trenches were scheduled to be backfilled at the discretion of the client, following excavation and recording.
- 2.2.7 The fieldwork programme was followed by an assessment of the data as set out in the *Management of Archaeological Projects* (2nd Edition, 1991).

2.3 ARCHIVE

- 2.3.1 A full professional archive has been compiled in accordance with the project design, and in accordance with current UKIC (1990) and English Heritage guidelines (1991), and according to the recommendations in *Archaeological Archives: A Guide to Best Practice in Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Curation* (Brown 2007). The paper and digital archive will be deposited with The Senhouse Museum, Maryport, under the unique project identifier: **NPA 09 TQC-A**.
- 2.3.2 North Pennines Archaeology Ltd supports the Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) project. This project aims to provide an online index and access to the extensive and expanding body of grey literature created as a result of developer-funded archaeological fieldwork. Details of the results of this project will be made available by North Pennines Archaeology as a part of this national project under the unique project identifier: **northpen3-57436**.

3 BACKGROUND

3.1 LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

- 3.1.1 Tendley Quarry is located in the north-west of Cumbria between Brigham and Eaglesfield, approximately 2.5km southwest of Cockermouth within the district of Allerdale (Figure 1). The area is within a narrow belt of country known as the West Cumbrian Coastal Plain which is situated between the Irish Sea to the west and the high fells of the Lake District to the east (Countryside Commission 1998). The site of the proposed works lies at c.114.8m – 130.5m OD, within an open agricultural landscape close to the Rivers Derwent and Cocker.
- 3.1.2 The underlying geology of the site is comprised of Carboniferous Limestone overlain by large areas of boulder clay (glacial till) (Countryside Commission 1998). The overlying soils are of typical brown earths.
- 3.1.3 Presently, the area of the proposed works is situated across several agricultural enclosures, immediately south of the large limestone quarry.

3.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

- 3.2.1 Although there is evidence for prehistoric occupation throughout Cumbria from the Upper Palaeolithic onwards (Young 2002), there is no definitive evidence for prehistoric activity within the immediate vicinity of the study area. However, the wider area around the site contains a series of cropmarks (HER nos. 4714, 5122, 13552 & 13563) and finds (e.g. HER nos. 810, 1057, 1060 & 17812) which are indicative of prehistoric activity.
- 3.2.2 During the Roman period, there was a heavy military presence in Cumbria, and there is considerable evidence for Roman military activity around the study area during this period, most notably the Roman fort at Papcastle. Numerous military roads also traversed the Cumbrian countryside. One of the suggested routes of the Roman road between the settlements at Papcastle and Ravenglass crosses Tendley Hill (HER 1036) and there are early documentary accounts indicating that a section of it had been uncovered during quarrying.
- 3.2.3 The early medieval period is demonstrated by the discovery of a number of inhumation burials in the vicinity of Tendley Hill. Most of the burials contained no artefacts and it has been suggested that these remains represent an early Christian cemetery that was subsequently reused in the Viking period. However, one of the burials did contain a sword which has been dated to the 10th century (HER nos. 1059 & 11617).
- 3.2.4 The post-medieval period usage of the study area appears to have been predominately agricultural, with limestone quarrying being conducted within the area from at least the 19th century onwards.

3.3 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK

3.3.1 Several previous archaeological investigations have taken place within the study area. These include;

- a rapid archaeological desk-based assessment conducted by Headland Archaeology in 2001 (Conolly & Carter 2001),
- three geophysical surveys conducted by Archaeological Services WYAS (Gidman & Webb 2007, Watson 2008 and Webb 2003),
- a programme of trial trenching conducted by Headland Archaeology in 2003 (Dutton 2003) and,
- a programme of trial trenching conducted by Oxford Archaeology North in 2007 (OAN 2007).

3.3.2 No significant archaeological remains were revealed during these surveys.

4 EVALUATION RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

- 4.1.1 The archaeological field evaluation took place between the 11th March 2009 and the 18th March 2009, and comprised the excavation of 17 trenches in four separate fields (Areas A-D) (Figure 2).
- 4.1.2 Area A was an irregular shaped field measuring *c.*13,000m² and contained trenches 1-3 and Trench 5.
- 4.1.3 Area B was a rectangular shaped field measuring *c.*10,000m², and was located immediately east of Area A. Area B contained trenches 6-8 and Trench 4.
- 4.1.4 Area C was a sub-rectangular shaped field immediately north of Area B. Area C measured *c.*23,000m² and contained trenches 9-15.
- 4.1.5 Area D was located within an irregular shaped field, *c.*280m northeast of Area A. Area D measured *c.*2,600m² and contained Trenches 16 and 17.
- 4.1.6 Trenches 1-15 all measured 30m by 2m covering 900m² of the proposed 46,000m² extraction area. Both Trenches 16 and 17 were excavated to a length of 32.5m and a width of 2m equating to 5% of the 2,600m² area proposed for a new bund.
- 4.1.7 The evaluation trenches were excavated by a PC 130 mechanical excavator with a ditching bucket down to the level of either the first encountered archaeological deposit or the natural substrate. All trenches were subsequently cleaned by hand and all archaeological features and deposits were recorded fully. The results of the evaluation are outlined below.

4.2 RESULTS

- 4.2.1 **Trench 1:** Trench 1 was located toward the northwest corner of Area A and was aligned north-northwest to south-southeast across several linear anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.26m revealing fragmented limestone bedrock mixed with clay (**101**) below *c.*0.36m of mid-orange/brown silty clay subsoil (**102**) and *c.*0.4m of dark brown silty topsoil (**100**) (Plate 1).
- 4.2.2 **Trench 2:** Trench 2 was located within the centre of Area A and was aligned east to west across a large magnetic anomaly (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.15m revealing fragmented limestone bedrock mixed with clay and an area of limestone outcrop (**101**) below *c.*0.7m of mid-orange/brown silty clay subsoil (**102**) and *c.*0.3m of dark brown silty topsoil (**100**) (Plate 2).
- 4.2.3 **Trench 3:** Trench 3 was located toward the southwest corner of Area A and was aligned northwest to southeast across several linear anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.1m revealing fragmented limestone bedrock and clay (**101**) below *c.*0.6m of mid-orange/brown silty clay subsoil (**102**) and *c.*0.3m of dark brown silty topsoil (**100**) (Plate 3).
- 4.2.4 **Trench 4:** Trench 4 was located toward the western end of Area B and was aligned north-northwest to south-southeast across several magnetic anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.8m revealing *c.*1m of natural

yellow/pink boulder clay (**201**) below *c.*0.53m of mid-orange/brown silty clay subsoil (**202**) and *c.*0.28m of dark brown silty topsoil (**200**) (Plate 4).



Plate 1: *Trench 1 looking south-southeast*



Plate 2: *Trench 2 looking east*



Plate 3: *Trench 3 looking southeast*



Plate 4: *Trench 4 looking north-northwest*

- 4.2.5 **Trench 5:** Trench 5 was initially located within a small field immediately south of Area A. However, due to the presence of horses within the field, Trench 5 was relocated to the top of a large mound within the southeast corner of Area A (Figure 2). It became apparent when the trench was opened that the large mound was comprised of a modern rubbish tip which measured over 2m in depth (Plate 6). The rubbish tip (**103**) was directly below *c.*0.3m of dark brown silty topsoil (**100**) (Plate 5). Trench 5 was not cleaned by hand due to Health and Safety concerns.
- 4.2.6 **Trench 6:** Trench 6 was located at the western end of Area B and was aligned northwest to southeast across several magnetic and linear anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.2m revealing natural yellow/pink boulder clay (**201**) below *c.*0.4m of mid-orange/brown silty clay subsoil (**202**) and *c.*0.36m of dark brown silty topsoil (**200**) (Plate 7).
- 4.2.7 **Trench 7:** Trench 7 was located within the centre of Area B and was aligned east to west in an area devoid of geophysical anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.8m revealing fragmented limestone bedrock mixed with silty clay (**203**) below *c.*0.32m of mid-orange/brown silty clay subsoil (**202**) and *c.*0.4m of dark brown silty topsoil (**200**) (Plate 8).
- 4.2.8 **Trench 8:** Trench 8 was located toward the northeast corner of Area B and was aligned northwest to southeast across several magnetic anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.4m revealing solid limestone bedrock (**203**) below *c.*0.28m of mid-brown silty clay subsoil (**202**) and *c.*0.35m of dark brown silty topsoil (**200**) (Plate 9).



Plate 5: Trench 5 looking west



Plate 6: North-facing section of Trench 5



Plate 7: *Trench 6 looking southeast*



Plate 8: *Trench 7 looking west*



Plate 9: *Trench 8 looking northwest*

- 4.2.9 **Trench 9:** Trench 9 was located toward the southwest corner of Area C and was aligned northwest to southeast across a single linear anomaly (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.4m revealing fragmented limestone bedrock mixed with clay (301) below a c.0.5m deposit of light grey silty clay (304) and a c.0.16m deposit of compact yellow/orange silty clay (303). This was further below a c.0.3m deposit of reddish brown silty clay subsoil (302) and c.0.22m of dark brown silty topsoil (300) (Plate 10).
- 4.2.10 **Trench 10:** Trench 10 was located at the southern end of Area C and was aligned north-northwest to south-southeast across a large magnetic anomaly (Figure 2). Trench 10 was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.25m and a minimum depth of 0.4m revealing an outcrop of fragmented limestone bedrock (301) within the southernmost c.6m of the trench below c.0.2m of dark brown silty topsoil (300) (Figure 3, Plate 11). Immediately north of the bedrock (301), an east-northeast to west-southwest aligned deposit of loosely packed river worn cobbles had been banked against the north face of the limestone outcrop. The cobbles (307) had been deposited directly above the light grey/brown silty clay (304) and spanned the 2m width of the trench and measured c.0.5m in depth and c.1.5m in width. The cobbles (307) were directly below a deposit of crushed brick and mortar (305) which measured c.2.5m in width and c.0.35m in depth, and was directly below c.0.5m of topsoil (300) (Figure 3, Plate 12). The exact function of the cobbles (307) remains unclear at this time, although given the features appearance, it would not be unreasonable to assume that it represents a former field boundary. It is also possible that the cobbles (307) were deposited within a shallow ditch. However, further investigation failed to reveal any evidence for such a feature, although it is possible that a natural hollow may have been utilised. It is probable that the crushed brick material (305) had been deposited much later than the cobbles (307) as the former appeared to be above a reddish brown silty clay subsoil (302) which had been banked-up against the latter. The subsoil deposit (302) continued throughout most of the trench below the topsoil (300) at a depth of c.1m, reducing in thickness to c.0.2m at the northern end of the trench where it was revealed that the subsoil (302) was directly above the grey/brown silty clay deposit (304). The northern end of Trench 10 also exposed a thin lens of dark grey silt (308) directly above the subsoil (302) which measured c.0.06m in thickness and was below the topsoil (300) (Figure 3).
- 4.2.11 **Trench 11:** Trench 11 was located along the eastern edge of Area C and was aligned north to south across a magnetic anomaly (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.64m revealing solid limestone bedrock (301) below a c.0.37m deposit of reddish brown silty clay subsoil (302) and c.0.17m of dark brown silty topsoil (300) (Plate 13).
- 4.2.12 **Trench 12:** Trench 12 was located within the centre of Area C and was aligned east to west in an area devoid of geophysical anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.2m revealing fragmented limestone bedrock mixed with clay (301) below a c.0.4m deposit of yellow/orange compact silty clay (303). This was further below a c.0.2m deposit of reddish brown silty clay subsoil (302) and a c.0.3m deposit of dark brown silty topsoil (300) (Plate 14).
- 4.2.13 **Trench 13:** Trench 13 was located along the western edge of Area C and was aligned northeast to southwest in an area devoid of any geophysical anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.65m revealing fragmented limestone

bedrock mixed with clay (**301**) below a *c.*0.25m deposit of reddish brown silty clay subsoil (**302**) and *c.*0.3m of dark brown silty topsoil (**300**) (Plate 15).



Plate 10: *Trench 9 looking southeast*



Plate 11: *Trench 10 looking north-northwest*



Plate 12: *East-northeast facing section of Trench 10 showing feature (307)*



Plate 13: *Trench 11 looking north*



Plate 14: *Trench 12 looking west*



Plate 15: *Trench 13 looking southwest*

- 4.2.14 **Trench 14:** Trench 14 was located toward the northwest corner of Area C and was aligned north-northwest to south-southeast across several linear anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.42m revealing fragmented limestone bedrock mixed with clay (**301**) below a c.0.47m deposit of reddish brown silty clay subsoil (**302**) and c.0.33m of dark brown silty topsoil (**300**) (Plate 16).
- 4.2.15 **Trench 15:** Trench 15 was located toward the northern end of Area C and was aligned north to south in an area devoid of any geophysical anomalies (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.6m and revealed fragmented limestone bedrock (**301**) below a c.0.45m deposit of yellow/orange compact silty clay (**303**). This was further below a c.0.35m deposit of reddish brown silty clay subsoil (**302**) and a c.0.32m deposit of dark brown silty topsoil (**300**) (Plate 17). Trench 15 could not be hand cleaned due to the instability of the sides.
- 4.2.16 **Trench 16:** Trench 16 was located at the western end of Area D and was aligned northwest to southeast (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.6m revealing natural orange/grey boulder clay (**401**) below a c.0.3m deposit of dark brown silty topsoil (**400**) (Plate 18). During the mechanical excavation of Trench 16, water began to fill the trench very quickly suggesting that a stone-lined drain or something similar had been breached although this was not noted. Two land drains were noted within Trench 16.
- 4.2.17 **Trench 17:** Trench 17 was located at the eastern end of Area D and was aligned east to west (Figure 2). The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.8m revealing natural orange/grey boulder clay (**401**) below c.0.23m of dark brown silty topsoil (**400**) (Plate 19). Two land drains were noted during the excavation of Trench 17.



Plate 16: *Trench 14 looking south-southeast*



Plate 17: *Trench 15 looking north*



Plate 18: *Trench 16 looking southeast*



Plate 19: *Trench 17 looking west*

5 FINDS ASSESSMENT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

- 5.1.1 A total of 80 finds from four different contexts were retrieved during the archaeological evaluation. All finds were cleaned and packaged according to standard guidelines, and recorded under the supervision of F.Giecco (NPA Ltd Technical Director).

5.2 ASSESSMENT

- 5.2.1 **Trench 1:** a total of 11 finds were recovered from Trench 1. Of the nine finds recovered from the topsoil (100), five can be classified as modern iron nails. Two sherds of red earthenware and a piece of lead were also recovered from the topsoil (100). The other item recovered from the topsoil was a small copper buckle of unknown function (SF#1). Two iron nails were also recovered from the subsoil (102).
- 5.2.2 **Trench 2:** a total of 31 finds were recovered from Trench 2, all of which came from the topsoil (100). 28 of the finds can be classified as iron objects, largely comprised of nails. The other three finds included a modern copper alloy bell, a copper alloy button and a single sherd of red earthenware with a brown slip.
- 5.2.3 **Trench 3:** a total of three finds were recovered from Trench 3, including a possible copper button (SF#2) and a copper clasp (SF#3) from the topsoil (100), and an iron nail from the subsoil (102).
- 5.2.4 **Trenches 6:** a total of four iron nails were recovered from the topsoil (200) within Trench 6.
- 5.2.5 **Trench 7:** a total of nine finds were recovered from both the topsoil (200) and the subsoil (202) within Trench 7. The finds were all iron objects including nails and a single horseshoe.
- 5.2.6 **Trenches 10, 11, 12, & 13:** a total of 22 iron objects were recovered from the topsoil (300) within Trenches 10, 11, 12 and 13 including nails and several horseshoes.

5.3 DISCUSSION

- 5.3.1 The finds assemblage was largely comprised of relatively modern metal waste, probably relating to modern farming activities. This is not surprising given the character of the area, although the general lack of pottery finds is surprising. It is probable that much of the material represents overburden from the southeast corner of Area A, which has been used as a modern dumping ground for general waste for several years.
- 5.3.2 Most, if not all of the finds assemblage can be dated to the 20th century with a relative degree of certainty; the only possible exceptions being the three small finds retrieved from Trenches 1 and 3. However, all three finds were largely un-diagnostic due to their

form and state of preservation. Therefore, given the context they were found in, it would not be unreasonable to also assign them a relatively modern provenance.

5.3.3 All finds were classified as modern and discarded.

| Trench | Context | Material | Quantity | SF no. | Weight (kg) | Period |
|--------|---------|-------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|------------------|
| 1 | 100 | Fe objects-nails | 5 | | 0.038 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 1 | 100 | Pottery | 2 | | 0.007 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 1 | 100 | Pb | 1 | | 0.062 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 1 | 100 | Cu object-buckle | 1 | 1 | 0.002 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 1 | 102 | Fe objects-nails | 2 | | 0.029 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 2 | 100 | Pottery | 1 | | 0.006 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 2 | 100 | Fe objects-nails,clasps | 28 | | 0.289 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 2 | 100 | Cu alloy objects-bell/button? | 2 | | 0.482 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 3 | 100 | Cu object-button? | 1 | 2 | 0.003 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 3 | 100 | Cu object-clasp | 1 | 3 | 0.003 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 3 | 102 | Fe nail | 1 | | 0.066 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 6 | 200 | Fe objects-nails | 4 | | 0.056 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 7 | 200 | Fe objects-nails | 2 | | 0.072 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 7 | 202 | Fe objects-horse shoes, nails | 7 | | 0.511 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 10 | 300 | Fe objects-horse shoes, nails | 9 | | 0.078 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 11 | 300 | Fe objects-nails | 6 | | 0.068 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 12 | 300 | Fe objects-nails | 4 | | 0.141 | Post-Med /Modern |
| 13 | 300 | Fe objects-nails | 3 | | 0.127 | Post-Med /Modern |

Table 1: *Finds Index*

6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1.1 During the archaeological field evaluation at Tendley Quarry, 15 trenches were excavated over three separate areas, covering 900m² of the proposed 46,000m² extraction area. Two additional trenches were excavated in a fourth field in an area proposed for a bund equating to 5% of the 2600m² area. The purpose of the evaluation was to establish the nature and extent of below ground archaeological remains within the vicinity, the evaluation trenches being located to target both geophysical anomalies and apparently 'sterile' areas. All trenches were excavated down to the top of the natural substrate with the exception of Trench 4.
- 6.1.2 Trenches 1-3, 6-9 and 11-17 were devoid of any archaeological features or deposits, whilst Trench 4 revealed a modern dumping ground for general waste. Only Trench 10 retained any evidence of archaeological activity. The archaeological features observed within Trench 10 were comprised of a linear deposit of loosely packed river cobbles which had later been sealed by a deposit of crushed brick and mortar. Although the exact function of the feature remains uncertain at this time, the best possible interpretation for the archaeology based on the available evidence is one of a former field boundary.
- 6.1.3 Although the finds assemblage was comprised of 80 separate items, all of these were classified as relatively modern, many of which probably related to general farming activities or overburden from the modern rubbish tip.
- 6.1.4 The results obtained during the present evaluation, and from previous archaeological investigations suggest that the study area has not been intensively used in the past other than for agricultural purposes.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.2.1 As the purpose of this archaeological field evaluation was to establish the nature and extent of below ground remains within the proposed extraction area according to the condition and section 106 agreement as specified by Cumbria County Council's Historic Environment Service, no further work is deemed necessary associated with the present study. However, given the significance of previous archaeological discoveries within the immediate vicinity of the study area, it is recommended that any future invasive work be subject to a similar programme of archaeological investigation.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

7.1 SECONDARY SOURCES

Brown, D.H. (2007). *Archaeological Archives: A Guide to Best Practice in Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Curation*, Archaeological Archives Forum.

Conolly, R. and Carter, S. (2001). *Tendley Quarry, Brigham, Cumbria: An Archaeological Assessment of a Proposed Extension to the Quarry*, Headland Archaeology Ltd, Unpublished Client Report.

Countryside Commission. (1998). *Countryside Character Volume 2: The North-West*, Cheltenham.

Dutton, A. (2003). *Archaeological Evaluation at Tendley Quarry, Cockermouth, Cumbria*, Headland Archaeology Ltd, Unpublished Client Report.

English Heritage. (1991). *Management of Archaeological Projects (MAP2)*. London: English Heritage.

Gidman, J. And Webb, A. (2007). *North-Western Extension to Tendley Quarry, Brigham, Cumbria*. Archaeological Services WYAS Rep. 1725, Unpublished Client Report.

Giecco, F. O. (2003), *North Pennines Archaeology Excavation Manual*, North Pennines Heritage Trust, Unpublished Document.

IFA. (2002). *Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*. Institute for Archaeologists: Reading.

Oxford Archaeology North. (2007). *Tendley Quarry Extension, Brigham, Cockermouth, Cumbria*, Unpublished Client Report.

Town, M. (2009). *Project Design for an Archaeological Field Evaluation at Tendley Quarry, Brigham, Cockermouth, Cumbria*. North Pennines Archaeology Ltd, Unpublished Project Design.

UKIC. (1990). *Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage*.

Watson, E. (2008). *Proposed Southern Extension to Tendley Quarry, Brigham, Cumbria*, Archaeological Services WYAS Rep. 1851, Unpublished Client Report.

Webb, A. (2003). *Land at Tendley Quarry, near Cockermouth, Cumbria*. Archaeological Services WYAS Rep. 1119, Unpublished Client Report.

Young, R. (2002). *The Palaeolithic and Mesolithic periods in Northern England: An Overview*. In Brooks, C., Daniels, R. and Harding, A, (eds). *Past, Present and Future: The Archaeology of Northern England*, 19-36. Durham: Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland Research Report 5.

APPENDIX I: CONTEXT INDEX

| Context Number | Category | Area | Above | Below | Interpretation |
|----------------|------------|------|-------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| 100 | Deposit | A | 102 | / | Topsoil |
| 101 | Geological | A | / | 102 | Limestone Bedrock/Clay |
| 102 | Deposit | A | 101 | 100 | Subsoil |
| 103 | Deposit | A | 101 | 100 | Modern Rubbish Tip |
| 200 | Deposit | B | 202 | / | Topsoil |
| 201 | Geological | B | 203 | 202 | Natural Boulder Clay |
| 202 | Deposit | B | 201/203 | 200 | Subsoil |
| 203 | Geological | B | / | 201/202 | Limestone Bedrock |
| 300 | Deposit | C | 302/305/308 | / | Topsoil |
| 301 | Geological | C | / | 302/303/304 | Limestone Bedrock/Clay |
| 302 | Deposit | C | 301/303/304 | 300/308 | Mid Red/Brown Subsoil |
| 303 | Deposit | C | 301/303 | 302 | Yellow/Orange Subsoil |
| 304 | Deposit | C | 301 | 302/303/306? | Grey/Yellow Silty Clay |
| 305 | Deposit | C | 307 | 300 | Crushed Brick Material |
| * 306 | Cut? | C | 304 | 307 | Possible Linear Ditch * |
| 307 | Deposit | C | 304 | 305 | Cobbles (Pos. Field Boundary) |
| 308 | Deposit | C | 302 | 300 | Thin Black Deposit |
| 400 | Deposit | D | 401 | / | Topsoil |
| 401 | Geological | D | / | 400 | Natural Boulder Clay |

Table 2: *Context Index*

* Void context

APPENDIX II: FIGURES
