

**EAST HOUSE,  
MAIN STREET,  
CORBRIDGE,  
NORTHUMBERLAND**



**WATCHING BRIEF REPORT**

**CP. No: 982/09**

**28/10/2009**

NORTH PENNINES ARCHAEOLOGY LTD  
NENTHEAD MINES HERITAGE CENTRE,  
NENTHEAD,  
ALSTON,  
CUMBRIA,  
CA9 3PD  
TEL/FAX: (01434) 382045/043  
WWW.NPARCHAEOLOGY.CO.UK



# NORTH PENNINES ARCHAEOLOGY LTD

**DOCUMENT TITLE:** East House, Main Street, Corbridge, Northumberland.  
**DOCUMENT TYPE:** Watching Brief Report  
**CLIENT:** Peter Barratt  
**CP NUMBER:** 982/09  
**SITE CODE:** EHO-B  
**PLANNING APP. NO:** 20081131  
**OASIS REFERENCE:** northpen3-64111  
**PRINT DATE:** 28/10/2009  
**GRID REFERENCE:** NGR: NY 9908 6435

## *Quality Assurance*

This report covers works as outlined in the brief for the above-named project as issued by the relevant authority, and as outlined in the agreed programme of works. Any deviation to the programme of works has been agreed by all parties. The works have been carried out according to the guidelines set out in the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) Standards, Policy Statements and Codes of Conduct. The report has been prepared in keeping with the guidance set out by North Pennines Archaeology Ltd on the preparation of reports.

REVISION SCHEDULE			
	01	02	03
<b>PREPARED BY:</b>	Helen Noakes	Michael McElligott	
<b>POSITION:</b>	Supervisor	Assistant Supervisor	
<b>DATE:</b>	03/09/09	22/10/09	
<b>EDITED BY:</b>	Martin Railton		
<b>POSITION:</b>	Project Manager		
<b>DATE:</b>	03/09/09		
<b>APPROVED BY:</b>	Matthew Town		
<b>POSITION:</b>	Project Manager		
<b>DATE:</b>	03/09/09		

North Pennines Archaeology Ltd is a wholly owned company of North Pennines Heritage Trust (Company Registration No. 4847034; VAT Registration No. 817 2284 31). All rights reserved.

## *Disclaimer*

No part of this report may be copied or reproduced, stored or transmitted by any means without prior written permission from North Pennines Archaeology Ltd, or the client for whom the work was carried out. The report has been produced specifically for the client's usage, and no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of the report; any person or party using or relying on this document for such purposes agrees, and with such use or reliance be taken to confirm their agreement, to indemnify NPA Ltd for all loss or damage resulting from their action. No liability is accepted by North Pennines Archaeology Ltd for any use of this report other than the use and purpose for which it was originally intended. Information contained in this report is provided by North Pennines Archaeology Ltd using due care and diligence and no explicit warranty is provided as to its accuracy. No independent verification of any information provided to North Pennines Archaeology Ltd has been made.

---

## CONTENTS

---

<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Circumstances of the Project .....	7
<b>2 METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Project Design.....	8
2.2 The Watching Brief.....	8
2.3 The Archive .....	9
<b>3 BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 Location and Geological Context.....	10
3.2 Historical Context.....	10
3.3 Previous Work.....	13
<b>4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF .....</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	14
4.2 Trench 1.....	14
4.3 Trenches 2 and 3.....	16
<b>5 FINDS.....</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1 Finds Assessment.....	17
5.2 Roman Ceramic Vessel.....	17
<b>6 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES.....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1 Introduction.....	18
6.2 Assessment Results.....	19
6.3 Dating .....	19
6.4 Vertebrate Bone.....	19
6.5 Conclusions and Recommendations .....	19
<b>7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
7.1 Conclusions .....	21
7.2 Recommendations .....	21
<b>8 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>22</b>
8.1 Secondary Sources .....	22
<b>APPENDIX 1: CONTEXT TABLE .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS TABLE .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3: FIGURES .....</b>	<b>27</b>

---

## ILLUSTRATIONS

---

### FIGURES (APPENDIX 3)

FIGURE 1: SITE LOCATION

FIGURE 2: LOCATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AREA

FIGURE 3: LOCATION OF TRENCHES SUBJECT TO THE WATCHING BRIEF

FIGURE 4: SECTION DRAWING OF LINEAR FEATURE [105]

FIGURE 5: PLAN OF TRENCH 1

### PLATES

PLATE 1: SHOWING SERVICES, LOOKING NORTH..... 15

PLATE 2: SECTION OF POSSIBLE PIT/LINEAR..... 16

### TABLES

TABLE 1: ARTEFACTS RECOVERED FROM THE WATCHING BRIEF ..... 17

TABLE 2 (APPENDIX 1): CONTEXT TABLE..... 25

TABLE 3 (APPENDIX 2): ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS TABLE..... 26

---

## SUMMARY

---

In August 2009, North Pennines Archaeology Ltd were commissioned by Mr Peter Barratt, to undertake an archaeological watching brief on groundworks relating to an extension to the rear of East House, Main Street, Corbridge, Northumberland (NGR NY 9908 6435).

A previous archaeological evaluation, comprising two trenches, was undertaken at the site during September 2008 by North Pennines Archaeology Ltd (Liddell 2008). This was conducted in order to establish the scope of the archaeological work required to fulfil the archaeological conditions of the planning decision.

The evaluation identified a number of post medieval structures and features within the development, which related to demolished outbuildings and potential cellaring situated within the proposed development area. Some indication of medieval occupation was indicated by the presence of medieval pottery found at the site, suggesting that medieval remains were likely to exist within the site environs, and would therefore be impacted on by the development.

As a result, Northumberland County Council granted planning consent for the development (Planning App No: 200807; 20080709), on the condition that an archaeological watching brief be undertaken during the extension to the rear of the house. The watching brief was required as the site lies within the medieval core of Corbridge and within an area derived from a medieval burgage plot, which identified the site to be of archaeological interest.

The archaeological watching brief was undertaken over two days between the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> August 2009. The watching brief monitored the excavation of three trenches, (Trenches 1 to 3), which were located to the north and east of East House, and were excavated for the provision of services into the extension area.

Archaeological remains were identified in the northern limit of Trench 1, and comprised a cut feature, which may represent either a pit or ditch. The narrow dimensions of the trench meant that only the southern extent of this feature could be observed and the true form of the feature remains unknown. Finds of Roman pottery, abraded animal bone and fragments of metallic slag were observed within the various fills of this feature. Further archaeological investigation would better aid the interpretation of the form and dating of this feature.

As this archaeological watching brief was conducted as part of a recommendation to observe groundworks in association with the development of a new garage extension to the rear of the existing property, no further work is deemed necessary. However, given the high archaeological potential of the area, it is recommended that any future work be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

North Pennines Archaeology Ltd would like to thank Mr Peter Barratt for commissioning the project, and for all his assistance throughout the work. NPA Ltd would also like to thank Nick Best, Assistant County Archaeologist for Northumberland County Council, for all his assistance throughout the project.

North Pennines Archaeology Ltd would also like to extend their thanks to John Pattison of D.P Builders, for his help during this project.

The archaeological watching brief was undertaken by Michael McElligott. The report was written by Helen Noakes and Michael McElligott. The drawings were produced by Angus Clark. The project was managed by Martin Railton, Project Manager for NPA Ltd. The report was edited by Matthew Town, Project Manager for NPA Ltd.

---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

---

### 1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PROJECT

- 1.1.1 In August 2009, North Pennines Archaeology were invited by Mr Peter Barratt to maintain an archaeological watching brief at East House, Main Street, Corbridge, Northumberland (NGR: NY 9908 6435; Figures 1 & 2), during groundworks associated with a garage extension to the rear of the existing property. The building lies within the medieval core of Corbridge, within a plot derived from a medieval burgage plot.
- 1.1.2 A previous archaeological evaluation conducted at the rear of an adjacent property (Jones 2004), found evidence of structural remains, boundary ditches, medieval pottery assemblages and the remains of a possible corn-drying kiln.
- 1.1.3 An evaluation conducted for the pre-determination of planning permission for the development and located within the development footprint, found evidence for modern outbuildings and an earlier structure, potentially a cellar (Liddell 2008). Limited medieval remains were encountered during the evaluation, although there was still a strong likelihood that archaeological remains would be encountered within the proposed development area.
- 1.1.4 As a result, Nick Best, Assistant County Archaeologist for Northumberland County Council, requested that all ground reduction be subject to a programme of archaeological observation and investigation. This is in line with government advice as set out in the DoE Planning Policy Guidance on Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16).
- 1.1.5 All groundworks associated with the extension to the rear of the existing house had to be excavated under full archaeological supervision and all stages of the archaeological work were undertaken following approved statutory guidelines (IfA 2002), and were consistent with the specification provided by Northumberland County Council (Best 2009) and generally accepted best practice.
- 1.1.6 This report outlines the monitoring works undertaken on-site, the subsequent programme of post-fieldwork analysis, and the results of this scheme of archaeological works.

---

## 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 Northumberland County Council (Railton 2009), for an archaeological watching brief of the study area. Following acceptance of the project design by Northumberland County Council, 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 THE WATCHING BRIEF

2.2.1 The works involved a structured watching brief to observe, record and excavate any archaeological deposits from the development site. A watching brief is a formal programme of observation and investigation conducted during any operation carried out for non-archaeological reasons, on a specified area or site on land, inter-tidal zone or underwater, where there is a possibility that archaeological deposits may be disturbed or destroyed (IfA 2002).

2.2.2 The aims and principal methodology of the watching brief can be summarised as follows:

- to establish the presence/absence, nature, extent and state of preservation of archaeological remains and to record them;
- to carry out further excavation and recording work in adequate time, if intact archaeological remains are uncovered during the project;
- to accurately tie the area watched by the archaeologist into the National Grid at an appropriate scale, with any archaeological deposits and features adequately levelled;
- to sample environmental deposits encountered as required, in line with English Heritage (2002) guidelines;
- to produce a photographic record of all contexts using colour digital, 35mm colour slide and monochrome formats as applicable, each photograph including a graduated metric scale;
- to recover artefactual material, especially that useful of dating purposes;



- to produce a site archive in accordance with MAP2 (English Heritage 1991) and MoRPHE standards (English Heritage 2006).

2.2.3 Three trenches were excavated, (Trenches 1-3), which covered a total area of approximately 25m<sup>2</sup>. The trenches were machined using a mechanical tracked digger fitted with a toothless bucket, monitored under close archaeological supervision. The trenches were stripped of topsoil and overburden to the required formation levels. Archaeological monitoring and supervision of groundworks associated with the stripping commenced on Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> August 2009. A summary of the findings of the watching brief is included within this report.

2.2.4 The three trenches were positioned to the north and east of the eastern extent of East House. Trench 1 measured 9.0m in length and was 0.85m in width, Trench 2 measured 13.7m in length, and was 0.85m in width and Trench 3 measured 5.95m in length, and was 0.85m in width (Figure 3).

### 2.3 THE ARCHIVE

2.3.1 A full professional archive has been compiled in accordance with the specification, and in line with current UKIC (1990) and English Heritage Guidelines (1991) and according to the Archaeological Archives Forum recommendations (Brown 2007). The archive will be deposited within an appropriate repository, with copies of the report sent to the County Historic Environment Record at Northumberland County Council available upon request. The archive can be accessed under the unique project identifier NPA 09, EHO-B, CP 982/09.

2.3.2 North Pennines Archaeology, and Northumberland County Council, support the **Online AccesS to the Index of Archaeological InvestigationS (OASIS)** project. This project aims to provide an on-line index and access to the extensive and expanding body of grey literature, created as a result of developer-funded archaeological work. As a result, details of the results of this project will be made available by North Pennines Archaeology, as a part of this national project.

---

## 3 BACKGROUND

---

### 3.1 LOCATION AND GEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

- 3.1.1 East House lies within an urban context on Main Street, located to the south-east of the medieval centre of Corbridge, in the county of Northumberland. The site is situated to the south-east of the Roman fort of Corbridge, and is located north of the course of the River Tyne. The site lies at a height of approximately 39m AOD (Figures 1 & 2).
- 3.1.2 The underlying geology of the area lies on an outcrop of the Stublick Fault System, a belt of faulting which delimitates the northern margins of the Pennines. This fault is underlain by sedimentary rocks of a carboniferous age and comprises limestones, sandstones and shales belonging to the middle or upper limestone groups. During the last glacial period much of the area was further overlain by boulder clays (till).
- 3.1.3 Within the immediate vicinity to the area, the underlying geology comprises sands and gravels, which were also deposited during the last glaciation of the area, and which produced terrace deposits along the Tyne Gap (*ibid*).

### 3.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

- 3.2.1 **Introduction:** this historical background is compiled mostly from secondary sources, and is intended only as a brief summary of historical developments specific to the study area.
- 3.2.2 **Roman:** the area was first settled by the Romans around AD 79, probably by Agricola, during his campaign against the tribes in northern England and Scotland. A fort was established a kilometre west of the present site, at Red House. The fort was used for about 10 years before a new one was built on the present site, which is also west of the modern town. This settlement was known as Coria or Coriosopitum. The latter is the restored from the corrupt version, Corstopitum, though the original form and meaning is not known. This new fort was the first of several that were built or modified over time, starting nearly 10 years after its construction when it was burnt to the ground. After that, changes were made to suit the policies and schemes under various emperors in controlling the area. Corbridge stopped being a garrison town when the Antonine wall was abandoned around AD 163. This policy re-commissioned Hadrian's Wall, and the troops were now stationed there. Slowly over time the fort was

demolished and the town appears to have become a civilian settlement, though there is not much known about this period.

- 3.2.3 **Early Medieval:** the period immediately following the end of Roman administration from the 5<sup>th</sup> century is little understood. The location of the development of early-medieval Corbridge could have been due to the collapse of the Roman Bridge and its replacement by a fording point further to the east, or it could have been the need to found a new settlement for religious purposes (3.2.7). Craster indicates that it is likely that the bridge had fallen into disrepair by 1130 (Craster 1914, 14). The old Roman settlement was certainly robbed of its stone for the building of the new settlement. The location of the new settlement retained its importance as being at the junction of two major roads, the Stanegate and Dere Street. The Stanegate survived into the early medieval period when it was known as Carelgate and it led east to Tynemouth (Harding 2001, 23). Dere Street was the main route southwards to York.
- 3.2.4 The earliest documentary evidence for Corbridge dates to 786 and is found in the Northumbrian Annals where it is referred to as Et Corabrigē. It is in this document that a monastery at Corbridge is mentioned. Thus the new positioning of Corbridge may have been based on the need for a new religious foundation based on Christianity, and thus wishing to distance itself from the 'pagan' Roman settlement, yet usurp its power by robbing its building materials. The Church of St. Andrew in Corbridge may have its origins in the 7<sup>th</sup> century, based on architectural features and similarities with the churches at Jarrow and Monkwearmouth.
- 3.2.5 **Later Medieval:** the settlement of Corbridge had clearly become a successful one by the 12<sup>th</sup> century, when the fayre at Stagshawn had become legendary from as far afield as Newbiggin-on-the-Sea, Northumberland, a place surely closer to market towns such as Newcastle and Hexham. The border disputes which plagued the area between the 14<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries seem to have had a detrimental effect on the town.
- 3.2.6 The areas of settlement on Fryer's 1777 map include buildings on the street frontages and linear plots extending to the rear. These were called burgage plots, and are characteristic features of settlement of the medieval period.
- 3.2.7 The street names of medieval Corbridge indicate a settlement divided into area of specialised industrial function. Hill Street was known as Fishmarketgate, Horsemarket Street and Hidemarket. The discovery of tan pits and lime-burning confirms the latter use of the area. The iron industry was of particular importance to the town, as it was the most numerous commodities available at the local Stagshaw Fair. There were at

least four forges at one stage of the town's development, but their precise location is not known. Main Street was formerly known as Smithgate, or Smithygate due to the number of iron working shops that were located there, so it is likely that evidence for these must survive sub-surface (Corbridge Village Trust 1983). A document of 1352, states that "*Thomas Fayt of Corbrig, to Thomas Crissar and Agnes his wife, daughter of the said Thomas Fayt, conveyance of a tenement in Corbrig in the Smithygate between a tenement of Sir Hugh de Roghsted, chaplain, and a tenement of Sir Gilbert de Mynsteracres, perpetual vicar of Bywell*" (Dixon 1912, 69). This is early proof of the street name usage of Smithygate, and is also interesting in that it refers to the properties either side of the land spoken of in the deed, as being owned by religious men.

- 3.2.8 **Post-Medieval:** a register document dating to 1676 mentions Charles Cutter. The descendants of Charles Cutter continued to reside in Corbridge until the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. They were smiths, and are known for carrying out work on the church. Old records show that the vane on the church tower, made of iron with brass bushes, was made by them in 1767 (Dixon 1912, 69). The Cutter family held a freehold in the village, until 'The Division', or Act of Inclosure passed in 1776 and implemented by 1779 (Forster 1881, 43), after which they held a portion of land on Corbridge South Common. It is likely that the Cutters resided on Main Street, as that was where the smiths in that period resided.
- 3.2.9 By the mid 18<sup>th</sup> century, Corbridge had become quite unsanitary. Hutchinson, in 1765 or 1766 described the settlement as follows, "*though the town makes a pretty appearance at the foot of the vale where you see it from Hexham, it disappoints the traveller greatly on his entrance to find it dirty and disagreeable*" (in Forster 1881, 71). Hodgson similarly describes a visit to the town, "*Corbridge, 6<sup>th</sup> May 1830, the town (for such its antiquity demands that it be styled) is dirty, and in all the streets except that through which the Newcastle and Carlisle Road passes, is filthy with middens and pigsties.... The population seem half fed; the women sallow and thin armed, the men flabby, pot bellied and tender-footed; but still the place bears the appearance of being ancient. Many of the houses, even in the back streets, are large and should be carefully examined for arms etc*" (Forster 1881, 69). By 1821 there were 230 houses in Corbridge and 1254 inhabitants. Many were employed in industry, particularly shoe-making, by this time having taken over in importance from iron-working.
- 3.2.10 East House holds Listed Building status as a Grade II Building.

### 3.3 PREVIOUS WORK

- 3.3.1 Numerous excavations and investigations have occurred in the immediate area around East House, including those undertaken in August 2004 at Eastfield House (Jones 2004). These evaluations revealed evidence for a potential corn-drying kiln, medieval ditches, pits and post holes and a number of 13<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> century pottery and glass fragments.
- 3.3.2 Further afield, local excavations and evaluations within Corbridge have revealed further evidence for Roman and medieval occupation. In 1999 Roman remains, comprising glass slag, pottery and a marble gaming board, were found by Northern Archaeological Associates in Orchard Vale (NY 986 645) (Hexham Courant 1999).
- 3.3.3 Medieval remains have been documented from the evaluations carried out Duke's Cottage, in the form of shallow gullies and pottery assemblages, (ASUD 2001). In January 2007, an evaluation at the Angel Inn in Corbridge found evidence for medieval burials, wall footings and substantial remains relating to a medieval occupation within this area (Liddell 2007).
- 3.3.4 An archaeological evaluation was undertaken in September 2008 by North Pennines Archaeology Ltd (Liddell 2008) in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development which identified the remains of previous outbuildings and a potential cellar, all dating to the post-medieval period, located within the development footprint. It was however considered that the potential for archaeological remains to be encountered remained high, and therefore a programme of further archaeological monitoring was recommended.

---

## 4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF

---

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1 The watching brief monitoring was undertaken in one phase, between Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> and Friday 7<sup>th</sup> August, 2009. This related to the groundworks required for the construction of foundation and service trenches (Figure 3).

### 4.2 TRENCH 1

4.2.1 Trench 1 was located in the south west corner of the area of land to the rear of East House running parallel to a recently constructed wall and measuring c.9m in length (Figure 5).

4.2.2 The trench was excavated by a 3 ton tracked mini excavator using a toothless ditching bucket. To the eastern side of the trench lay a thin layer of tarmac (100) measuring 0.08m thick. Across the rest of the site lay topsoil (101). The topsoil (101) comprised loosely compacted dark brown sandy clay, and was present across the site to a depth of 0.27m. Below the topsoil was the subsoil (102) which was a moderately compacted mid grey/ brown sandy clay measuring to a maximum depth of 0.36m. Both the topsoil (101) and subsoil (102) were heavily disturbed due to a number of service pipes that had been laid throughout the area.



*Plate 1: Trench 1 showing services, looking north.*

- 4.2.3 At the north end of Trench 1 a negative feature [105] was detected but due to the narrow width of the trench it is not possible to determine whether the feature is a pit or part of a more extensive linear feature. Only the deep steep cut of the south side of the feature [105] was visible. The cut [105] has a sharp break of slope at both the top and the bottom and has a predominantly flat base (Figure 4).
- 4.2.4 The feature [105] contained five fills. The primary fill (107) was a moderately compacted mid brown/grey sandy clay with occasional small stone and charcoal inclusions. The secondary fill (106) consisted of moderately compacted brown/dark grey sandy clay with occasional grey clay inclusions. A sherd of Roman pottery and a single piece of animal bone were recovered from this context. The tertiary fill (109) was moderately compacted yellow/ grey clayey sand which was believed to be a redeposited natural slump. Above this sat a moderately compacted grey/ mid brown sandy clay (104) which contained four pieces of slag. Above this sat the final fill which consisted of a loose mid brown sandy clay (108) with occasional animal bone and charcoal fleck inclusions. (Figure 4)



*Plate 2: Section of possible pit or linear feature [105].*

- 4.2.5 A number of services were detected during the excavation of Trench 1. At the northern end of the trench on a NW-SE alignment a 0.67m wide by 0.40m deep cut [110] was recorded, this contained a metal service pipe

and had been backfilled with a mixture of top soil and subsoil (111). Approximately 2m south of the north end of the trench was another service pipe (114) aligned NW-SE, there was no visible cut for this pipe.

#### **4.3 TRENCHES 2 AND 3**

4.3.1 Trench two measured 13.7m in length and 0.85m wide and was aligned east-west. Trench 3 was 5.95m in length and 0.85m wide along a north south alignment with a 0.95m dogleg to the east at its southern end. Both of these trenches were excavated through an area which had been previously evaluated and consisted wholly of backfill.

4.3.2 No archaeological remains were noted in either of these two trenches.



## 5 FINDS

---

### 5.1 FINDS ASSESSMENT

- 5.1.1 A total of 5 finds from two separate contexts were recovered during the watching brief. These included 1 sherd of Roman pottery from context **(106)** and 4 fragments of metallic slag residues, from context **(104)**. Both deposits were fills of the possible pit or ditch observed within Trench 1.
- 5.1.2 The finds were cleaned and packaged according to standard guidelines, and recorded under the supervision of F.Giecco (NPA Ltd Technical Director).

### 5.2 ROMAN CERAMIC VESSEL

- 5.2.1 One sherd of Roman pottery was recovered from the secondary fill **(106)** of the possible pit/ linear feature **(105)**. The sherd was 3<sup>rd</sup>- 4<sup>th</sup> century colour coated ware.

Context	Trench	Material	Quantity	Weight (g)	Period
104	1	Slag	4	498	Poss Med
106	1	Pottery	1	31	3 <sup>rd</sup> - 4 <sup>th</sup> C.

*Table 1: Finds Table of Artefacts Recovered from the Watching Brief.*

---

## 6 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES

---

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

- 6.1.1 During the course of an archaeological watching brief four samples were taken. Samples were taken to extract material, which may be pertinent to understanding the development of these contexts. The methodology employed required that the whole earth samples be broken down and split into their various different components. Both samples were fully processed by being manually floated and sieved through a 'Siraf' style flotation tank
- 6.1.2 The residue from each sample was retained, described and scanned using a magnet for ferrous fragments. The flot was dried slowly and scanned at x40 magnification for charred and uncharred botanical remains. Identification of these was undertaken by comparison with modern reference material held in the Environmental Laboratory at North Pennines Archaeology. Plant taxonomic nomenclature follows Stace (1997).
- 6.1.3 The retent, like the residue from wet sieving, will contain any larger items of bone, heavy (eg waterlogged) ecofacts or artefacts. The flot or floating fraction will generally contain organic material such as plant matter, fine bones, cloth, leather and insect remains. A rapid scan at this stage was done to allow further recommendations to be made as to the potential for further study by entomologists or palaeobotanists, with a view to retrieving vital economic information from the samples. The retent samples were also scanned with a hand magnet to retrieve forms of magnetic material.
- 6.1.4 Favourable preservation conditions can lead to the retrieval of organic remains that may produce a valuable suite of information, in respect of the depositional environment of the material, thus enabling assessment of anthropogenic activity, seasonality and climate and elements of the economy associated with the features from which the samples are removed. In this case the sandy, well drained, base rich nature of the soil would be suitable for the preservation of charred plant remains and bone (should mineral replacement occur to offset the leeching of calcium from deposited bones material).
- 6.1.5 Sample numbers appear in brackets thus < >, whilst context numbers appear in brackets thus ( ) for all analysis and discussion below. Results will be presented by Plot number numerically. Reference to seeds in the text is made using the richness scale of 1 = present, 2 = frequent and 3 = abundant, as seen in the tabular results attached. (See Appendix 2).

## 6.2 ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- 6.2.1 Sample (104) <1> contained a single piece of burnt bone, as well as charcoal, slag like material and magnetic residue in the heavy residue. The flot matrix consisted of modern roots with some charcoal. Low numbers of *Papaver* species and *Sambucus* species (probably *Sambucus nigra*) were recovered from the flot.
- 6.2.2 Sample (106) <2> contained small amounts of magnetic residue in the heavy residue. The flot matrix consisted of modern roots with small amounts of charcoal. Seeds of *Sambucus nigra*, *Montia* species, *Vicia* species and *Gentiana* species, as well as an unidentified seed, were recovered from the flot.
- 6.2.3 Sample (107) <3> contained small amounts of magnetic residue in the heavy residue. The flot matrix consisted of leaf litter. Low numbers of *Poaceae* species and an indeterminate seed (possibly an cereal type grain) were recovered from the flot.
- 6.2.4 Sample (108) <4> contained small amounts of bone (unidentified), magnetic residue and a slag like material in the heavy residue. The slag like material may be a fragment of pig-iron, but its size (c. 1cm x 1cm x 3cm) does not allow further identification at this point. Seeds of a *Rubus* species and *Sambucus nigra* were found along with low numbers of *Ranunculus* species, *Rumex* species and an unidentified seed (possibly a cereal type grain).

## 6.3 DATING

- 6.3.1 It was not thought necessary to carry out any scientific dating methods for the contexts recovered from this site, as the information retrieved from the archaeological features was very limited.

## 6.4 VERTEBRATE BONE

- 6.4.1 No vertebrate bone was recovered from any of the samples or by hand during the watching brief.

## 6.5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.5.1 The seeds encountered from these samples would seem to be consistent with an area which experienced ground disturbances over its history. Plants such as *Rubus*, *Rumex* and *Papaver* are all associated with disturbed or 'waste ground'. Others such as *Poaceae* and *Vicia* are suited to a wide niche and so do not relate specific site information for this site. The presence of *Sambucus nigra* seeds in three of the four contexts suggests an elder tree was growing near by in the

past. The two cereal type grains were not identified as pertaining to a particular economic species, though the occurrence of two grains in two separate contexts does not allow any particular statistically secure conclusions to be drawn as to their use at this site.

- 6.5.2 Of additional note was the presence of magnetic material in the samples analysed. All sample produced some amounts of magnetic material, however samples (104) <1> and (108) <4> produced relatively greater amounts and both contains material indicative of metal working activity, in this case hammer scale. Of note is the fact that these deposits also contained small amounts of slag like material recovered from the heavy residue.
- 6.5.3 Pedologically, it is interesting to note that all samples upon flotting were reduced to between 5-6% of their previous volume and all retents contained approximately one third river rounded medium stones and two thirds coarse sand and small stones. This suggests all contexts came from deposits which have undergone similar depositional formation processes (whether natural or cultural) during their formation.

---

## 7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### 7.1 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1.1 The archaeological monitoring of the site during the construction of new service trenches for a rear extension to the east side of East House found limited archaeological remains.
- 7.1.2 A large cut feature, potentially representing a pit or ditch was found within the northern extent of Trench 1. This contained fragments of metallic slag and one sherd of Roman pottery dated to roughly the 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> century AD. However, the true form and nature of this feature was not fully observed making dating contentious.
- 7.1.3 The environmental analysis produced tentative evidence for metal-working in the vicinity of the site supported by the finds of metallic slag.

### 7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.2.1 As this watching brief was conducted as a condition of groundworks associated with the development of a residential extension, no further archaeological work is deemed necessary.
- 7.2.2 However, given the site's location in relation to the medieval heart of Corbridge, and the ambiguity surrounding the archaeological deposits encountered during this phase of works at the site, it is recommended that any work conducted in the future be subject to a similar programme of archaeological investigation.

---

## 8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

### 8.1 SECONDARY SOURCES

ASUD (2001) Report on an Archaeological Field Evaluation at Duke's Cottages, Corbridge. Archaeological Services at the University of Durham.

Beaty J. and Peters C. (2007) Watching Brief Report on Land to the Rear of Smiths Gore, North Pennines Archaeology Ltd unpublished report.

Best N. (2009) Land to the Rear of East House, Corbridge, Northumberland. Brief for an Archaeological Evaluation.

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

Corbridge Parish Council (1930s) Corbridge, Northumberland: the official guide, Croydon.

Corbridge Village Trust (1983) A Walk Around Corbridge.

Craster, H.H.G. (1914) A History of Northumbria Vol X: The Parish of Corbridge, Andrew Reid and Company Limited: London.

De la Bedoyere G. (1998) *Hadrian's Wall: History and Guide*. Tempus Publishing Ltd, Gloucestershire

Dixon, S.F. (1912) History of the Saxon Royal Town of Corbridge-on-Tyne, Ward and Sons: Newcastle.

DoE (1987) Circular 8/87. Department of the Environment.

DoE (1990) Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment. Department of the Environment.

DoE (1990) Planning Policy Guidance Note No.16: Archaeology and Planning. Department of the Environment.

DoE (1990) The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. Department of the Environment.

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

English Heritage (2002) *Environmental Archaeology: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods from Sampling and Recording to Post-Excavation*. London: English Heritage.

English Heritage (2006) *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment*. London: English Heritage.

English Heritage (1989) *Corbridge Roman Site* (1997 reprint). London: English Heritage.

- English Heritage (2003) Register of Parks and Gardens.
- English Heritage (2003) Register of Battlefields.
- English Heritage (2003) Register of Buildings at Risk.
- Forster, R. (1881) A History of Corbridge and its Antiquities.
- Giecco, F.O. (2003) North Pennines Archaeology Ltd Excavation Manual. Unpublished: North Pennines Heritage Trust
- Graham, F. (1992) Hexham and Corbridge: A Short History(1992 reprint).
- Harding, C. (2001) Corbridge: An Archaeological Assessment and Planning Strategy, draft version dated 13th March 2001.
- Hexham Courant September 17th 1999.
- HMSO (1979) Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act. London: HMSO.
- HMSO (1990) The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. London: HMSO.
- Hudson, J. H. (1986) *Fungal Biology*. London: Edward Arnold.
- IfA (2002) Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluations. Reading: Institute of Field Archaeologists.
- Iley, W. (nd) Corbridge: Border Village, Frank Graham: Newcastle (NRO 942.82CDR).
- Jones, C.J. (2004) 'Report on an Archaeological Watching Brief on Land at Sunnybrae, Stagshaw Road, Corbridge, Northumberland' unpublished archaeological report by North Pennines Archaeology on behalf of Mr and Mrs Jepson.
- Liddell, T. (2007) Archaeological Watching Brief and Excavation of Land at the Angel of Corbridge, Main Street, Corbridge, Northumberland, North Pennines Archaeology Limited unpublished report.
- Liddell, T. (2008) Report of an Archaeological Evaluation at East House, Main Street, Corbridge, Northumberland, North Pennines Archaeology Limited unpublished report.
- Lovell, J.H. (1981) The Sand and Gravel Resources of the Country around Hexham.
- Peters, C. (2007) 'Archaeological Watching Brief on Hexham Water Mains Refurbishment', Northumberland' *unpublished archaeological report by North Pennines Archaeology on behalf of Northumbrian Water Plc.*
- Peters, C. and Sowerby, M. (2008) 'Archaeological Watching Brief on Corbridge Sewer Refurbishment, Northumberland' *unpublished archaeological report by North Pennines Archaeology on behalf of Northumbrian Water Plc.*
- Railton, M, 2009, Project Design for an Archaeological Watching Brief, East House, Main Street, Corbridge, Northumberland. Unpublished: NPA Ltd, CP 774/08.

SCAUM (1986) Health and Safety in Field Archaeology.

TAP (1999) St Helen's Street, Corbridge. Archaeological Assessment, The Archaeological Practice.

TAP (2003) Report on an Archaeological Field Evaluation at Princes Street, Corbridge. Newcastle: The Archaeological Practice.

TWM (2003) Report on an Archaeological Watching Brief at Corbridge, for Northumberland Water. Tyne & Wear Museums Archaeology Department.

Stace, C. (1997). *New Flora of the British Isles*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Cambridge: CUP.

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



---

## APPENDIX 1: CONTEXT TABLE

---

<b>Context Number</b>	<b>Context Type</b>	<b>Description</b>
(100)	Deposit	Tarmac
(101)	Deposit	Topsoil
(102)	Deposit	Subsoil
(103)	Deposit	Natural
(104)	Deposit	2 <sup>nd</sup> fill of [105]
[105]	Cut	Cut of possible pit or linear
(106)	Deposit	3 <sup>rd</sup> fill of [105]
(107)	Deposit	5 <sup>th</sup> fill of [105]
(108)	Deposit	Possible upper fill of [105] or possible spread
(109)	Deposit	4 <sup>th</sup> fill of [105]
[110]	Cut	Cut of a service trench
(111)	Deposit	Fill of [110]
(112)	Deposit	Redeposit Subsoil
(113)	Deposit	Redeposit Topsoil
(114)	Deposit	Fill of a service trench (has no visible cut)

*Table 2: List of contexts issued during Watching Brief*

## APPENDIX 2: ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS TABLE

### ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR: CP982 EAST HOUSE, MAIN STREET, CORBRIDGE, NORTHUMBERLAND

Sample	1	2	3	4
Context	104	106	107	108
<i>Volume processed (litres)</i>	10	10	10	10
<i>Volume of retent(ml)</i>	600	650	650	500
<i>Volume of flot (ml)</i>	20	20	20	20
<i>Samples suitable for radiocarbon dating</i>	-	-	-	-
<b><i>Residue contents (relative abundance)</i></b>				
Bone/teeth, burnt bone	1	-	-	1
Charcoal	1	-	-	-
Magnetic Residue	1	1	1	1
Slag material	1	-	-	1
Stones/gravel	3	3	3	3
<b><i>Flot matrix (relative abundance)</i></b>				
Charcoal	1	1	-	3
Modern roots	3	3	-	2
Leaf litter	-	-	3	-
<b><i>Cereal remains (total counts)</i></b>				
(c) Cerealia indeterminate			1	1
<b><i>Other plant remains (relative abundance)</i></b>				
(t) Sambucus sp	1	1	-	2
(x) Papaver sp (Poppy)	1	-	-	-
(x) <i>Poaceae</i> sp.	1	-	1	-
(x) <i>Rubus</i> sp	-	-	-	2
(x) <i>Rumex</i> sp (Docks)	-	-	-	1
(x) <i>Vicia</i> sp.	-	1	-	-
(w) <i>Montia fontana</i> (Blinks)	-	1	-	-
(x) <i>Gentiana</i> sp.	-	2	-	-
(w) <i>Ranunculus</i> sp (Buttercups)	-	-	-	1
(x) Unidentified sp.	2	1	-	1

(t: trees/shrubs; w: wetland; x: wide niche) Relative abundance is based on a scale from 1 (lowest) to 3 (highest).

Table 3: Details of samples and contexts & contents of flot and retent residues from samples.

## APPENDIX 3: FIGURES

---