KENSHAM AVENUE BRADNINCH DEVON

Results of a Desk-Based Appraisal & Archaeological Evaluation





The Old Dairy Hacche Lane Business Park Pathfields Business Park South Molton Devon EX36 3LH

Tel: 01769 573555 Email: <u>mail@swarch.net</u>

> Report No.: 120229 Date: 29.02.2012 Authors: B. Morris N. Rohan S. Walls

Kensham Avenue Bradninch Devon

Results of a Desk-Based Appraisal & Archaeological Evaluation

For

Mr. John Baynes-Reid Hawkcrest Land Ltd.

By



SWARCH project reference: BKA11 National Grid Reference: 300080.103749 Royal Albert Memorial Museum reference no: 11/62 OS Map copying Licence No: 100044808 Devon County HES reference: ARCH/DM/MD.18124 OASIS reference: southwes1-111785 Project Director: Colin Humphreys Desk-Based Appraisal: Bryn Morris; Samuel Walls Fieldwork Managers: Bryn Morris Project Officer: Bryn Morris Fieldwork: Bryn Morris Post-Excavation Co-ordinator: Bryn Morris Report: Bryn Morris; Nicola Rohan; Samuel Walls Report Editing: Deb Laing-Trengove; Bryn Morris Graphics: Bryn Morris; Nicola Rohan; Samuel Walls Finds Processing: Samuel Walls

February 2012

South West Archaeology Ltd. shall retain the copyright of any commissioned reports, tender documents or other project documents, under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 with all rights reserved, excepting that it hereby provides an exclusive licence to the client for the use of such documents by the client in all matters directly relating to the project as described in the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Summary

A series of four evaluation trenches were opened on land adjacent to Kensham Avenue, Bradninch, in Devon. The excavation of seven geotechnical pits was also monitored. Five features were identified – four irregular pits (probably tree-throws), and a possible linear feature – none of which produced any dateable artefacts. The central and lowest part of the site was sealed by a thick (up to 1m) deposit of colluvial material that may seal and protect a buried land surface.

Only a very small number of artefacts of any kind were recovered from the topsoil, and these were largely small, abraded and 18th or 19th century in date. A single late Neolithic/early Bronze Age flint scraper was recovered from one of the geotechnical pits.

Contents

ins				Page No.
	Sum	mary		3
	List	5		
	List of Appendices			5
	Ack	nowledg	gements	5
1.0	Intro	duction	l	6
	1.1	Backg	round	6
	1.2	Histor	ical Background	6
	1.3	Archae	eological Background	6
	1.4	Topog	raphical and Geological Background	8
	1.5	Metho	dology	8
2.0	Results of the Desk-Based Appraisal		9	
	2.1	Cartog	graphic Sources	9
3.0	Resi	ults of th	ne Archaeological Monitoring and Evaluation Trenching	11
	3.1	Introdu	uction	11
	3.2	The G	eotechnical Pits	11
		3.2.1	Geotechnical Pit #1	11
		3.2.2	Geotechnical Pit #2	11
		3.2.3	Geotechnical Pit #3	11
		3.2.4	Geotechnical Pit #4	11
		3.2.5	Geotechnical Pit #5	11
		3.2.6	Geotechnical Pit #6	12
		3.2.7	Geotechnical Pit #/	13
	3.3	The Ev	valuation Trenches	15
		3.3.1	Trench #1	15
		3.3.2	Trench #2	15
		3.3.3	Trench #3	15
		3.3.4	Trench #4	16
4.0	Con	clusion		20
5.0) Bibliography and References		21	

List of Figures

Coverplate: The excavated trenches, viewed from the north-west.	Page no.
Figure 1: Location map.	7
Figure 2: Extract from the Bradninch tithe map of 1839.	9
Figure 3: Extract from the Ordnance Survey First Edition Map of 1889.	10
Figure 4: The development site, showing the location of the GTPs and evaluation trenches.	12
Figure 5: Geotechnical Pit #1, showing the depth of topsoil.	13
Figure 6: Geotechnical Pit #6, showing the depth of topsoil and colluvium.	13
Figure 7: The development site, showing the archaeological features encountered.	14
Figure 8: Feature [301], viewed from the south.	15
Figure 9: Sondage through colluvial deposits at the southern end of Trench #4.	16
Figure 10: Features [401] and [403], fully excavated; viewed from the south.	17
Figure 11: Trench plan.	18
Figure 12: Post-excavation plans and sections.	19

List of Appendices

	Page no.
Appendix 1: Brief	22
Appendix 2: Project Design	25
Appendix 3: List of Contexts	28
Appendix 4: Concordance of Finds	28
Appendix 5: List of JPEGs on CD to the rear of the report	29

Acknowledgements

Thanks for assistance are due to:

Mr. John Baynes-Reid The staff of the Devon County Historic Environment Service The staff of the Devon County Records Office

1.0 Introduction

Location:	Land adjacent to the Kensham Avenue
Parish:	Bradninch
District:	Mid Devon
County:	Devon

1.1 Background

This report presents the results of a desk-based appraisal with archaeological evaluation and monitoring carried out by South West Archaeology Ltd. on land adjacent Kensham Avenue, Bradninch, Devon (Figure 1). The work was commissioned by Mr. John Baynes-Reid (the Client) and was undertaken to evaluate the survival of buried archaeological deposits within the area of a proposed development. This work included monitoring the excavation of seven geotechnical (filtration) pits. The archaeological investigations were carried out in accordance with a Project Design (Appendix 2) drawn up in response to a Brief (Appendix 1) issued by Devon County Historic Environment Service (DCHES).

1.2 Historical Background

Bradninch is a small market town which lies c.3.5km south-west of Cullompton and c.13km north-east of Exeter (Figure 1). W.G. Hoskins rather scathingly states that "the town has little to commend it; it consists chiefly of one main street flanked by drab roughcast or red brick, lifeless and unattractive" (1972: 343). Hoskins statement stems from the fact that the town of Bradninch has suffered a series of devastating fires that have destroyed the historic core of the settlement several times, most notably in 1665. In contrast, Pevsner states the town centre "remains attractively unspoilt" (Cherry & Pevsner 1989, 200-2).

The town does, however, have long and interesting history, and *Bradenese* is recorded as a large manor in the Domesday Book held (along with several other manors) by a certain William Cheever. It is recorded as having 42 villagers, 16 smallholders, 15 ploughs and a mill. The manor was created a Borough within the earldom of Cornwall, by a Charter of Henry I, between 1141 and 1175. It was subsequently granted a Thursday market and a three-day fair at the Festival of the Holy Trinity by King Henry III in 1238 (based on Hoskins 1978: 342; Lysons 1822).

1.3 Archaeological Background

Bradninch is argued to have 7th century origins, with the present largely 15th century church thought to be built on the site of an earlier predecessor. There is some evidence for Prehistoric activity within the immediate vicinity of the town, with the cropmark of a ringditch [HER40085] located 200m east-south-east of the site and a fortified double-ditched enclosure [HER1433] located to the east of the town. The discovery of a Roman coin (dated 90BC) at West End [HER1295] also suggests possible Late Iron Age or Roman activity predating the 18th century (Hughes 2009), although earlier work to the north has uncovered medieval material (Collings & Dyer 2000).



Figure 1: Location map (the site is indicated).

1.4 Topographical and Geological Background

The proposed development site is situated south of the town, at approximately 80m AOD. The site lies at the top of a shallow coombe that slopes down to the east, and sits just behind a low eminence that commands wide views across the valley of the River Culme.

The soils of this area are the well-drained gritty reddish loamy soils of the Crediton Association (SSEW 1983), overlying the Cadbury Breccia Formation. It is the Cadbury Breccia that gives the subsoil on the site its stony texture and reddish-brown colour. The base of the shallow coombe contains mixed head deposits of sand with clay and gravel (BGS 2012).

1.5 Methodology

The desk-based appraisal was carried out in accordance with IfA guidelines (2008) by Dr. B Morris and Dr. S Walls and was based on material from the Devon County Historic Environment Record and the Devon Record Office.

The excavation of seven geotechnical pits was carried out by a JCB excavator with a 0.6m wide toothless grading bucket under strict archaeological supervision. No features or deposits were uncovered within the pits but a single flint scraper was recovered from Pit #6. This work took place on 13^{th} October 2011.

This was followed by the excavation of four evaluation trenches across the site in accordance with the agreed Project Design (Appendix 2). This work took place on the 5th and 6th December 2011 and was undertaken by Dr B. Morris. The evaluation trenches were opened by a 360° tracked excavator with a 1.8m wide toothless grading bucket under strict archaeological supervision. The site was found to be covered by a thin layer of topsoil 0.3-0.35m thick; the very gritty nature of this topsoil and its similarity to the weathered subsoil is suggestive of heavy plough damage across much of the site.

Surprisingly little artefactual material was recovered from the topsoil. A number of archaeological features were identified in two of the trenches, and these were investigated in accordance with IfA (2008) guidelines and the agreed Project Design (Appendix 2).

For all excavated areas a photographic record, a drawn record at appropriate scales (1:10 to 1:100) and a written record of standard single context sheets was compiled.

2.1 Cartographic Sources

The earliest cartographic record for the Manor of Bradninch is the 1788 Duchy map of the town. However, this map, held by the Duchy, could not be obtained.

Therefore the first detailed cartographic source available is the tithe map of 1839, which depicts the development site as part of a large rectangular field with a small separate enclosure in the south-east corner (Figure 2). An inconvenient tear means that the field number is not legible, but following the pattern of the numbering system it appears to have been 1309, which is listed in the apportionment as *Pond Close*. It seems likely the small sub-rectangular feature in the south-east corner of the field was indeed pond, used for the watering of livestock and perhaps for soaking wooden wagon wheels.

No.	Landowner	Leaseholder	Field Name	State of Cultivation
1308	Mrs Margaret Morhay	Charles Drew	Lambs Close	arable
1309	Mrs Margaret Morhay	Charles Drew	Pond Close	arable
1310	Mrs Margaret Morhay	Charles Drew	Higher Path Field	arable
1311	Mrs Margaret Morhay	Charles Drew	Long Close or Five Act	res arable

Charles Drew was 33 and unmarried in 1839, and is listed in the 1841 Census as resident at *Parsonage Farm*. Fields 1310 and 1311 formed part of the rectorial glebe. Mrs Margaret *Pearse* and Mrs Jane Sainthill are noted as joint patrons of the Vicarage and impropriators of the great tithes, and Mrs Pearse resided at 'the old parsonage house' the 'seat of the Sainthills' (Lysons 1822) – presumably what is now known as The Manor House. That would imply Charles Drew was farming from the 'New Court Buildings', now Manor Farm.



Figure 2: Extract from the Bradninch tithe map of 1839. The approximate area of the proposed development is indicated.

Peter Sainthills leased the Bradninch estate in 1547 and completed a new house (the Manor House) in 1553; elements of this building still survive. The Sainthills were a notable family in the parish and another Peter Sainthill was sequestered after the Civil War.

By 1889 and the Ordnance Survey First Edition Map (Figure 3) the north-east boundary to Pond Close has been removed, creating a single large field from the enclosures numbered 1309 and 1308 on the tithe map. Note that the 'pond' shown in the south-west corner of the 1839 field has disappeared.



Figure 3: Extract from the Ordnance Survey First Edition Map of 1889. The approximate area of the site is indicated.

There is thereafter no further change to the layout of the field. The Historic Landscape Characterisation of Devon lists this field as a 'Barton field', suggesting it was probably laid out between the 15^{th} and 18^{th} centuries AD. However, it is not clear why it differs from adjoining fields on three sides listed as 'modern enclosures adapting post-medieval fields', and the curve of the northern field boundary is indicative of the curving strips within a medieval open field system and thus may well be older. A further possibility presents itself in that *Braneys* (Bradninch) is supposed to have contained a (deer)park (Lysons 1822). That being the case, it is possible that, with Parklands and Park (first recorded in 1445 – Gover *et al.* 1932, 557) lying to the south, Pond Close *may* have lain within a park associated with the town or the Manor House.

3.0 Results of the Archaeological Monitoring and Evaluation Trenching

3.1 Introduction

Seven geotechnical (filtration) pits were excavated across the area under development. These pits were opened by a JCB using a 0.6m wide toothless ditching bucket. Subsequently, four evaluation trenches were opened using a tracked mechanical excavator using a 1.8m wide grading bucket. These works took place under strict archaeological supervision. The location of these investigations is shown in Figures 4 and 7 (below).

3.2 The Geotechnical Pits

3.2.1 Geotechnical Pit #1

Geotechnical Pit #1 was orientated north-east to south-west and measured 2.3m in length and 0.6m in width. The topsoil was 0.3-0.35m thick and was composed of friable gritty brownish-red sandy loam with common to abundant sub-angular to sub-rounded pebble inclusions (see Figure 5). The underlying subsoil was composed of brownish-red very gritty sandy weathered breccia with sandy bands. No archaeological features or deposits were uncovered within Pit #1.

3.2.2 Geotechnical Pit #2

Geotechnical Pit #2 was orientated north-east to south-west and measured 2.8m in length and 0.6m in width. The topsoil was 0.3m thick and of a similar composition to Pit #1 but the stones were slightly larger, measuring 40-60mm in diameter and the subsoil was stonier at this location. No archaeological features or deposits were uncovered within Pit #2.

3.2.3 Geotechnical Pit #3

Geotechnical Pit #3 was orientated north-east to south-west and measured 3.1m in length and 0.6m in width. The topsoil was 0.35m thick; it and the subsoil were of the same composition as Pit #2. No archaeological features or deposits were uncovered within Pit #3.

3.2.4 Geotechnical Pit #4

Geotechnical Pit #4 was located close to the centre of the site and was orientated north-west to south-east and measured 3m in length and 0.6m in width. The topsoil was 0.35m thick; it and the subsoil had the same composition as in Pits #2 and #3. No archaeological features or deposits were uncovered within Pit #4.

3.2.5 Geotechnical Pit #5

Geotechnical Pit #5 was located close to the centre of the site and was orientated north-east to south-west. It measured 3.2m in length and 0.6m in width. The topsoil was 0.6m thick and similar to that of the Geotechnical Pits described above, but the uppermost 0.4m of topsoil was less stony and the lower 0.2m was darker in colour, perhaps a buried soil. No archaeological features or deposits were uncovered within Pit #5.



Figure 4: The development site, showing the location of the geotechnical pits and evaluation trenches in relation to the proposed development (contours at 5m intervals).

3.2.6 Geotechnical Pit #6

Geotechnical Pit #6 was located at the north-west end of the site. It was orientated north-east to south-west and measured 3.1m in length and 0.6m in width. The 'topsoil' was 0.75m thick and of a similar composition to the other trial pits described above, but the lower 0.45m of the

stratigraphy was composed of a mixed colluvial deposit (Figure 6). A single late Neolithic/early Bronze Age flint scraper was recovered from the section in this Geotechnical Pit, 0.48m below the surface of the field and thus within the colluvial deposit.

3.2.7 Geotechnical Pit #7

Geotechnical Pit #7 was orientated north-west to south-east and measured 2.25m in length and 0.6m in width. The topsoil was up to 0.55m thick and had the same composition as Pits #2 and #3 but deepened to the north-west end of the trench. The subsoil was also identical in composition to the stony subsoil recorded elsewhere. No archaeological features or deposits were uncovered within the Pit #7.



Figure 5: Geotechnical Pit #1, showing the depth of topsoil (scale 0.5m).



Figure 6: Geotechnical Pit #6, showing the depth of topsoil and colluvium (scale 0.5m).



Figure 7: The development site, showing the archaeological features encountered.

3.3 The Evaluation Trenches

3.3.1 Trench #1

Trench #1 was the southernmost trench, located within the proposed car park. It was 25m long and orientated north-west by south-east. The topsoil was comprised of a clean homogenous friable gritty brownish-red sandy loam 0.3-0.35m thick. The weathered breccia subsoil contained bands of stony gritty clayey sand overlying firm sands that were purplish-brown in colour. There were abundant sub-angular to sub-rounded stones 30-60mm in diameter and occasionally larger. No archaeological features or deposits were observed in Trench #1.

3.3.2 Trench #2

Trench #2 was 50m long and orientated north-north-west by south-south-east. The topsoil was 0.3-0.35m thick and identical to the topsoil in Trench #1, as was the subsoil. No archaeological features or deposits were uncovered within Trench #2.

3.3.3 Trench #3

Trench #3 was 35m long and orientated north-east by south-west. The topsoil was 0.3-0.35m thick. At the western end of the trench the subsoil was composed of very firm buff sand, becoming softer to the east.

Three features – a ?linear feature and two probable tree throws – were observed (see below). These had been sealed by a layer of colluvium (305) composed of firm stony reddish-brown silty-sand containing frequent to abundant sub-angular to sub-rounded stones, most of which were smaller than 40mm in diameter but some measured 40-80mm in size. The thickness of this deposit increased from west to east, reaching a maximum thickness of 0.45m.



Figure 8: Feature [301], viewed from the south (scale 1m & 0.5m).

The slightly curving possible linear feature [301] crossed the trench at almost 90° , 13.5m from the south-west end of the trench (Figures 8 & 11-12). It had an asymmetrical profile with a concave base. It was 0.8m wide and up to 0.4m deep. The fill (302) was composed of a soft gritty slightly reddish grey-brown sandy-silt; the frequent small sub-rounded to sub-angular stone inclusions measured up to 40mm in diameter. It also contained occasional charcoal flecks and became stonier towards the base due to a higher percentage of sub-rounded pebbles. This feature may form part of a relict field system, but given it did not appear in Trench #2 it probably forms part of a more discrete archaeological feature.

A tree throw [303] was located c.1.3m east of linear [301]. It was irregular in plan and extended beneath the northern baulk of the trench. It was observed to measure $0.7m \times 0.6m$ and was filled by (304), a dark greyish-brown sandy-silt with frequent sub-angular to sub-rounded stones measuring 40-80mm in diameter. A second tree throw [306] was located c.3.5m to the east of tree throw [303]. It was irregular in plan and extended beneath the northern baulk of the trench. It was observed to measure $1.2 \times 0.5m$. It was filled with soft-to-firm dark greyish-brown sandy silt (307), containing occasional charcoal flecks and common sub-angular to sub-rounded stones that were up to 40mm in diameter. These two features were not excavated but appeared very similar in character to the features excavated in Trench #4 (see below).

3.3.4 Trench #4

Trench #4, the northernmost trench, was almost 50m long and the topsoil was 0.3-0.35m thick for most of its length. At the northern end of the trench the subsoil consisted of a hard stony purplish-brown gritty sand with abundant sub-rounded stones, giving way to a firm-to-soft slightly whitish-yellow clayey sand. The later was, for the most part, completely concealed beneath a series of colluvial layers that increased in thickness north to south.



Figure 9: Sondage through colluvial deposits at the southern end of Trench #4, viewed from the west (scale 2m).

A sondage 1.22m deep was excavated through these colluvial layers, down to the level of the subsoil at the southern end the trench (Figures 9 & 12). The uppermost layer (405) was up to 0.3m thick and was composed of a compact reddish-brown silty-sand with frequent to abundant

sub-angular to sub-rounded stones. This layer formed a hard cap to the softer colluvial layers below. Three finds – a large fragment of iron slag and two fragments of slate – were recovered from this layer. Layer (405) overlay layer (406), which was up to 0.26m thick. This was composed of soft greyish-brown silty-sand with occasional charcoal flecks and frequent to abundant sub-angular to sub-rounded stones 30-60mm in diameter and occasionally up to 80mm. The layer beneath (407) was 0.18m thick and was composed of soft grey silty-sand with small sub-angular to sub-rounded stones that were less frequent than in the two overlying layers. The lowest colluvial layer – or perhaps an immature buried soil – was (408); this was 0.2m thick and was composed of slightly reddish grey soft sandy-silt with occasional small sub-angular to sub-rounded stones that measured up to 30mm in diameter.

Two irregular pits, perhaps tree-throws, were uncovered c.8m from the northern end of Trench #4 (Figure 10-12). Both features extended beyond the limits of excavation. The first feature [401] was 0.35×0.4m across and 0.35m deep; it had an asymmetrical profile with a steep, almost vertical north-west side. The upper fill (402) was composed of firm buff-brown siltysand up to 0.18m thick. It contained common to frequent sub-angular to sub-rounded stones that measured up to 40mm in diameter. The basal fill (409) was composed of gritty brownishyellow silty-sand with frequent to abundant sub-rounded to sub-angular stones that measured 20-30mm in diameter. The second feature [403] was located adjacent to [401] and measured 1.9×0.7m by 0.4m deep. It was irregular in plan with steep sides and a concave base. It contained largely sterile fills. Fills (411) and (412) were both firm-to-soft brownish yellow silty-sands up to 0.12m deep, containing common to frequent sub-angular to sub-rounded stones measuring up to 40mm in diameter. They were overlain by (404), a firm buff-brown stony silty sand up to 0.3m deep; (404) contained common sub-angular to sub-rounded stone inclusions up to 40mm in diameter. The upper fill (410) was up to 0.16m thick and was composed of soft-to-firm brownish-yellow silty-sand with common to frequent sub-angular to sub-rounded stones that measured up to 40mm in diameter.



Figure 10: Features [401] and [403], fully excavated; viewed from the south (scale 2m, 1m & 0.5m).





Figure 12: Post-excavation plans and sections.

The excavations revealed a single archaeological feature and four irregular pits, probably treethrows, within two of the evaluation trenches.

The depth and character of the topsoil across much of the site suggests that any archaeological features present in those areas will have been heavily plough-damaged, if they survive at all. However, it is notable that a substantial part of the site appears to have been sealed by a colluvial deposit of varying depth that possibly seals a buried land surface. These colluvial layers should have protected any archaeological deposits or features, if they are present.

None of the excavated features produced any finds, so it is not possible to determine function or date with any certainty. The presence of the single flint scraper within the topsoil in Geotechnical Pit #6 does, however, indicate prehistoric activity within or in proximity to the field in which the proposed development is located, as does the presence of the cropmark ringditch 200m to the east-south-east and the location of the site in its landscape.

The slightly curving feature [301] in Trench #3 may form part of a discrete archaeological feature. The four irregular pits should probably be interpreted as natural tree-throws; however, such features can contain archaeological material and the identification of such irregular pits as tree-throws is questionable in the light of recent discoveries in Cullompton (SWARCH 2012).

Overall, relatively few finds were recovered and these were for the most part small, abraded and unremarkable (see Appendix 3). In general terms, the total assemblage is much smaller than would be expected given the proximity of the medieval town and perhaps gives credence to the idea the field originally lay within a park associated with the Manor House.

Published Sources:

- Cherry, B. & Pevsner, N. 1989: The Buildings of England: Devon. London: Penguin.
- **Collings, A.G. & Dyer, M.J.** 2000: *Archaeological assessment and recording at Culver Close, Bradninch.* Exeter Archaeology report 00.12.
- Gover, J.E.B., Mawer, A. & Stenton, F.M. 1932: *The Place-Names of Devon* 2 vols. English Place-Name Society.
- Hoskins, D.W. 1978 (for 1954): Devon. Newton Abbot: David & Charles Ltd.
- Hughes, S. 2009: Land at the Old School site, Millway, Bradninch, Devon: results of archaeological trench evaluation. AC Archaeology report ACD100/2/0.
- Institute of Field Archaeologists 1994 (Rev. 2001 & 2008): Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessment.
- **Institute of Field Archaeologists** 1994 (Rev. 2001 & 2008): *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation.*
- **Institute of Field Archaeologists** 2001 (Rev. 2008): *Standard and Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials*
- Lysons, D & Lysons S. 1822: Magna Britannia, vol.6. London.
- **Pounds, N.J.G. (ed.)** 1984: *The Parliamentary Survey of the Duchy of Cornwall vol.2*. Devon & Cornwall Record Society.
- **Soil Survey of England and Wales** 1983: Legend for the 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales (a brief explanation of the constituent soil associations).
- SWARCH 2012: Tiverton Road, Cullompton, Devon. Post-Excavation Assessment: Statement of Potential. SWARCH report 120117.

Unpublished Sources:

Historic Landscape Characterisation http://gis.devon.gov.uk/basedata/viewer.asp?DCCService=hlc accessed 13.02.12

BGS British Geological Society Geology of Britain Viewer http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyviewer_google/googleviewer.html accessed 13.02.12

Census information http://www.ancestry.co.uk accessed 13.02.12

Appendix 1

BRIEF FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN IN SUPPORT OF A PLANNING APPLICATION

Location:Kensham Avenue, BradninchParish:BradninchDistrict:Mid DevonCounty:DevonNGR:300080,103749Proposal:affordable housing developmentHistoric Environment Service ref:ARCH/DM/MD/18124

1. INTRODUCTION AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This brief has been prepared by the Devon County Council Historic Environment Service (HES) with regard to the archaeological works to be undertaken in support of a planning application for the development of the above site. This brief has been produced specifically for the above scheme and may require alteration if this scheme is revised or amended in any material way. This document is not transferable to any other scheme or planning application.
- 1.2 This work is being undertaken in accordance with Policy HE6 of Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5) (2010), Devon Structure Plan Policy CO8 and the Local Development Framework Policy on archaeology.
- 1.3 The principal objective of the programme shall be to evaluate the survival of below-ground archaeological deposits across the proposed development site. The results will allow the nature, extent, and date of any surviving archaeological deposits within the application area to be understood and an appropriate planning decision made by the Local Planning Authority (LPA).
- 1.4 The proposed development site lies in a prominent position in the landscape, to the south of the historic settlement of Bradninch and in a landscape that contains evidence of prehistoric settlement and funerary activity. While no archaeological sites have been identified within the area shown on your plan, the proposed development site lies in an area of archaeological potential. A Roman coin has been found in a garden to the west, some 200m to the east the site of a prehistoric funerary monument has been identified through aerial photography and c. 400m further to the east the site of a prehistoric settlement has also been identified again through aerial photography.
- 1.5 This Brief covers the proposed development area as defined on the attached plan.

2. PROJECT DESIGN

- 2.1 This document sets out the scope of the works required to enable the extent, character and significance of any surviving archaeological deposits within the application area to be understood and will form the basis of the Project Design to be prepared by the archaeological consultant. The Project Design will set out the detail and extent of the archaeological works to be undertaken. This will include pre-fieldwork elements (desk-based research), fieldwork, post-excavation specialist analysis and the production of an appropriately detailed and illustrated report.
- 2.2 The Project Design must be submitted by the applicant or on their behalf by their agent or archaeological consultant and approved by the HES prior to any archaeological works commencing.

3. PROGRAMME OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORKS

The archaeological works will include the following elements. However, where it can be demonstrated that there are areas within the area under consideration that will be unaffected by the development of the site or where development will have no below-ground impact, these areas may be excluded from the evaluative archaeological excavations.

3.1 Desk-based assessment

The programme of work shall include a desk-based appraisal of the site to place the development area into its historic and archaeological context. This work will consist of map regression based on the Ordnance Survey maps and the Tithe Map(s) and Apportionments. An examination will also be made of records and aerial photographs held by the HER. The reporting requirements for the desk-based work will be confirmed in consultation with the HES. This desk-based work will be undertaken in advance of any fieldwork commencing. The results of the assessment should be discussed with the HES and based on this consultation may determine the positioning of the evaluative excavations. If a full report is prepared then this information will be presented as part of the final report along with the results of the fieldwork.

3.2 Evaluation of the site

A series of trenches will be excavated across the proposed development area. The location of these excavations will be determined in consideration of the results of the desk-based assessment, the below-ground impact of the proposed development and the site topography. These excavations should investigate 5% of the area affected by the proposed development.

- 3.2.1 The Project Design must include a plan showing areas affected by the proposed development and the location of proposed evaluative trenches.
- 3.2.2 Details of the strategy for positioning trenches must be agreed with the HES. Trenches should be excavated by a 3600 tracked or JCB-type machine fitted with a toothless grading bucket to the surface of archaeological deposits or in situ natural ground whichever is highest in the stratigraphic sequence. Exposed archaeological features and deposits will be cleaned and excavated by hand and fully recorded by context as per the Institute for Archaeologists' Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (1994 revised 2008). All features shall be recorded in plan and section at scales of 1:10, 1:20 or 1:50. All scale drawings shall be undertaken at a scale appropriate to the complexity of the deposit/feature and to allow accurate depiction and interpretation.
- 3.2.3 All archaeological features will be investigated and as a minimum:

i) small discrete features will be fully excavated;

ii) larger discrete features will be half-sectioned (50% excavated); and

iii) long linear features will be sample excavated along their length - with investigative excavations distributed along the exposed length of any such feature and to investigate terminals, junctions and relationships with other features.

iv) one long face of each trench will be cleaned by hand to allow the site stratigraphy to be understood and for the identification of archaeological features.

Should the above percentage excavation not yield sufficient information to allow the form and function of archaeological features/deposits to be determined full excavation of such features/deposits will be required. Additional excavation may also be required for the taking of palaeoenvironmental samples and recovery of artefacts

- Any variation of the above will be undertaken in agreement with the HES.
- 3.2.4 The full depth of archaeological deposits must be assessed. This need not require excavation to natural deposits if it is clear that complex and deep stratigraphy will be encountered.
- 3.2.5 Should deposits be exposed that contain palaeoenvironmental or datable elements appropriate sampling and postexcavation analysis strategies will be initiated. The project will be organised so that specialist consultants who might be required to conserve or report on finds or advise or report on other aspects of the investigation (e.g. palaeoenvironmental analysis) can be called upon and undertake assessment and analysis of such deposits - if required. On-site sampling and post-excavation assessment and analysis will be undertaken in accordance with English Heritage's guidance in Environmental Archaeology: a guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation 2002.
- An adequate photographic record of the excavation will be prepared. This will include photographs illustrating the 3.2.6 principal features and finds discovered, in detail and in context. The photographic record will also include working shots to illustrate more generally the nature of the archaeological operation mounted. All photographs of archaeological detail will feature an appropriately-sized scale. The photographic record should be made in B/W print supplemented by digital or colour transparency. However, if digital imagery is to be the sole photographic record then suitably archivable prints must be made of the digital images by a photographic laboratory. Laser or inkjet prints of digital images, while acceptable for inclusion in the report, are not an acceptable medium for archives. The drawn and written record will be on an appropriately archivable medium.
- 327 Human remains must initially be left in-situ, covered and protected. Removal can only take place under appropriate Ministry of Justice and environmental health regulations. Such removal must be in compliance with the relevant primary legislation.
- Should any finds identified as treasure or potential treasure, including precious metals, groups of coins or prehistoric 3.2.8 metalwork, be exposed, these will be removed to a safe place and reported to the local coroner according to the procedures relating to the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (2nd Revision). Where removal cannot be effected on the same working day as the discovery suitable security measures will be taken to protect the finds from theft.
- 3.2.9 The results of the desk-based work and a copy of the agreed Project Design must be made available to the site director/ supervisor to enable the adequate interpretation of exposed features/deposits during fieldwork and that the agreed programme of works is understood and undertaken.

4. MONITORING

- 4.1 The archaeological consultant shall agree monitoring arrangements with the County Historic Environment Service and give two weeks notice, unless a shorter period is agreed with the HES, of commencement of the fieldwork. Details will be agreed of any monitoring points where decisions on options within the programme are to be made.
- 4.2 Monitoring will continue until the deposition of the site archive and finds, and the satisfactory completion of an OASIS report see 5.5 below.
- 4.3 The archaeological contractor undertaking the fieldwork will notify the HES upon completion of the fieldwork stage of these works. 5. REPORTING
- 5.1 Upon completion of the fieldwork and required post-excavation analysis an illustrated report will be prepared. The report will collate the written, graphic, visible and recorded information outlined in section 3 above.
 - The report will include:
 - (i) a summary of the project's background;
 - (ii) description and illustration of the site location;
 - (iii) a methodology of the works undertaken;
 - (iv) include plans and reports of all documentary and other research undertaken;
 - (v) a description of the project's results;
 - (vi) an interpretation of the results in the appropriate context;
 - (vii) a summary of the contents of the project archive and its location (including summary catalogues of finds and samples);
 - (viii) a site location plan at an appropriate scale on an Ordnance Survey, or equivalent, base-map;
 - (ix) a plan showing the location of the trenches in relation to the site boundaries;
 - (x) plans of each trench, or part of trench, in which archaeological features are recognised along with adequate OD spot height information. These should be at an appropriate scale to allow the nature of the features exposed to be shown and understood. Plans must show the orientation of trenches in relation to north. Section drawing locations will be shown on these plans. Archaeologically sterile areas need not be illustrated unless this can provide information on the development of the site stratigraphy or show palaeoenvironmental deposits that have influenced the site stratigraphy;
 - (xi) section drawings of trenches and features, with OD heights, at scales appropriate to the stratigraphic detail to be shown and must show the orientation of the drawing in relation to north/south/east/west. Archaeologically sterile trenches need not be illustrated unless they can provide information on the development of the site stratigraphy or show palaeoenvironmental deposits that have influenced the site stratigraphy;
 - (xii) site matrices where appropriate;
 - (xiii) photographs showing the general site layout and exposed significant features and deposits that are referred to in the text. All photographs should contain appropriate scales, the size of which will be noted in the illustration's caption;

 - (xiv) a consideration of evidence within its wider context;
 (xv) a summary table and descriptive text showing the features, classes and numbers of artefacts recovered and soil profiles with interpretation:
 - (xvi) specialist assessment or analysis reports were undertaken:
 - (xvii) an evaluation of the methodology employed and the results obtained (i.e. a confidence rating). It is recommended that a draft report is submitted to the HES for comment prior to its formal submission to the Local Planning Authority.
- 5.2 The timetable for the production of the report must be set out in the Project Design. The HES would normally expect to receive the report within three months of completion of fieldwork - dependant upon the provision of specialist reports, radiocarbon dating results etc the production of which may exceed this period. If a substantial delay is anticipated then the HES must be informed of this and a revised date for the production of the full report agreed between the HES and the archaeological contractor. If a substantial delay is anticipated then an interim report will be produced within three months of the completion of the fieldwork.

- 5.4 Should the development proceed in a staged manner, with each stage requiring archaeological fieldwork, and where a period of more than three months between each stage is anticipated or occurs, then the archaeological contractor shall prepare an interim illustrated summary report at the end of each stage. The report will set out the results of that phase of archaeological works, including the results of any specialist assessment or analysis undertaken. The report will be produced within three months of completion of each phase of fieldwork. At the completion of the final stage of the fieldwork an overarching report setting out the results of all stages of work will be prepared. HES would normally expect to receive the report within three months of completion of fieldwork dependant upon the provision of specialist reports, radiocarbon dating results etc the production of which may exceed this period. If a substantial delay is anticipated then the HES must be informed of this, an interim report will be produced within three months of the completion of the final stage of fieldwork, and a revised date for the production of the full report agreed between the HES and the archaeological contractor.
- 5.5 On completion of the final report, in addition to copies required by the Client, hard copies of the report shall be supplied to the HES on the understanding that one of these copies will be deposited for public reference in the HER. In addition to the hard copies of the report, one copy shall be provided to the County Historic Environment Service in digital format in a format to be agreed in advance with the HES on the understanding that it may in future be made available to researchers via a web-based version of the Historic Environment Record.
- 5.6 The archaeological consultant shall complete an online OASIS (Online AccesS to the Index of archaeological investigationS) form in respect of the archaeological work. This will include a digital version of the report. The report or short entry to the Historic Environment Record will also include the OASIS ID number.

5.7 Publication

Should particularly significant remains, finds and/or deposits be encountered and the evaluative investigations likely to represent the only level of archaeological work undertaken on this site, then these, because of their importance, are likely to merit wider publication in line with government planning guidance. If such remains are encountered, the publication requirements – including any further analysis that may be necessary – will be confirmed with the HES. If further archaeological works are undertaken, then the results of these pre-application evaluative investigations will be incorporated into the publication text resulting from further works.

6. FURTHER WORK

In the light of the results of the archaeological evaluation it will be possible allow the Local Planning Authority to make an informed and reasonable planning decision, which may include the recommendation for refusal of consent if the impact of the proposed development upon the archaeological resource was unacceptable. In all other cases, the results will allow the scope and requirement of any further work needed as mitigation for the impact of the proposed development on the archaeological resource to be determined. This further work may take the form of additional preapplication investigations to refine the initial results or a programme of archaeological work undertaken under a PPS5 archaeological condition imposed on any consent granted. Should the site be demonstrated to be archaeologically sterile then there would be no requirement for further archaeological works.

7. PERSONNEL

- 7.1 The work shall be carried out by a recognised archaeological consultant, agreed with the DCHES. Staff must be suitably qualified and experienced for their project roles. All work should be carried out under the control of a specified Member of the Institute for Archaeologists (MIFA), or by a specified person of equivalent standing and expertise. The Project Design will contain details of key project staff and specialists who may contribute during the course of the works excavation and post-excavation.
- 7.2 Health and Safety matters, including site security, are matters for the consultant. However, adherence to all relevant regulations will be required.
- 7.3 The work shall be carried out in accordance with IfA Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (1994), as amended (2008).

8. CONFLICT WITH STATUTORILY PROTECTED SITES

It is the archaeological contractor's responsibility - in consultation with the applicant or agent – to ensure that the undertaking of the required archaeological works does not conflict with any statutorily protected sites and should also consider any biodiversity issues as covered by the NERC Act 2006. In particular, such conflicts may arise where archaeological investigations/excavations have the potential to have an impact upon protected species and/or natural habitats e.g. SSSIs, National Nature Reserves, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Ramsar sites, County Wildlife Sites etc.

9. DEPOSITION OF ARCHIVE AND FINDS

- 9.1 The archaeological consultant shall contact the Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Exeter, to obtain a reference number in order to agree future conditions for deposition of the site archive. The reference number must be quoted in the Written Scheme of Investigation and within the final report or the short entry to the Historic Environment Record.
- 9.2 The artefact discard policy must be set out in the Project Design.
- 9.3 Archaeological finds resulting from the investigation (which are the property of the landowner), should be deposited with the appropriate museum in a format to be agreed with the museum, and within a timetable to be agreed with the HES. The museum's guidelines for the deposition of archives for long-term storage should be adhered to. If ownership of all or any of the finds is to remain with the landowner, provision and agreement must be made for the time-limited retention of the material and its full analysis and recording, by appropriate specialists.

10. CONTACT NAME AND ADDRESS

Stephen Reed, Archaeological Officer, Devon County Council, Environment, Economy and Culture Directorate, Matford Offices, County Hall, Exeter EX2 4QW Tel: 01392-38303 Email: stephen.reed@devon.gov.uk 22nd June 2011

Appendix 2

PROJECT DESIGN FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION ADJACENT TO KENSHAM AVENUE, BRADNINCH, DEVON,

Location:	Land adjacent to Kensham Avenue
Parish:	Bradninch
District:	Mid Devon
County:	Devon
NGR:	300080,103749
Planning Applic	ation no: n/a (pre-planning)
Proposal:	Affordable housing development
HES ref:	ARCH/DM/MD.18124
PD ref:	SWARCHBKA11
Date:	22.11.2011

INTRODUCTION 1.0

- This document forms a Project Design which has been produced by South West Archaeology (SWARCH) at the request of 1.1 Mr John Baynes-Reid (The Client), and sets out the methodology for archaeological evaluation trenching and recording prior to development and for related off-site analysis and reporting.
- 1.2 The Project Design and the schedule of work it proposes conforms to a brief as supplied by the Devon County Historic Environment Service (DCHES: Stephen Reed 22.06.2011). The work is commissioned in accordance with PPS5 Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (2010), and the Local Development Framework Policy on archaeology

2.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 The site lies in a prominent position in the landscape, situated immediately to the south of the historic town of Bradninch. It sits near the top of a shallow north-east facing combe, perched above the valley of the River Culme and enjoying panoramic views. This landscape contains evidence of Prehistoric settlement and funerary activity.

3.0 AIMS

3.1

- The principal objectives of the work will be:
 - To carry out a desk-based appraisal of the site in order to place it in its historic and archaeological context. 3.1.1
 - 3.1.2 To undertake an archaeological evaluation in order to evaluate the survival of below-ground archaeological deposits within the area of the proposed development. This will include monitoring geotechnical/filtration pits.
- 3.1.3 To analyse and report on the results of the project as appropriate.

METHOD 4.0

- The Client will provide SWARCH with details of the location of existing services and of proposed groundworks within the site 4.1 area, and of the proposed construction programme.
- 4.2 Health and Safety requirements will be observed at all times by any archaeological staff working on site, particularly when working with machinery. As a minimum: high-visibility jackets, safety helmets and protective footwear will be worn.
 - Appropriate PPE will be employed at all times. 421
 - 4.2.2 The site archaeologist will undertake any site safety induction course provided by the Client.
 - 4.2.3 If the depth of any trenching exceeds 1.2 metres the trench sides will need to be shored or stepped to enable the archaeologist to examine and if appropriate record the section of the trench. The provision of such measures will be the responsibility of the client.

4.3 The desk-based appraisal:

The programme of work shall include an element of desk-based research to place the development site into its historic and archaeological context. This will entail map regression based on OS maps and the tithe map with apportionment, together with an examination of other records and aerial photographs held by the Historic Environment Record. The results of the assessment will be discussed with DCHES, and may inform the positioning of evaluation trenches.

If a full report is prepared then this information will be presented as part of the final report along with the results of the fieldwork.

Evaluation Trenching: 4.4

Four evaluation trenches will be positioned in accordance with the attached plan, three 50m and one 25m in length, equivalent to 5% of the site. The evaluation trenching will be undertaken by a 360° tracked or wheeled JCB-type mechanical excavator, fitted with a toothless grading bucket, under the supervision and control of the site archaeologist to the depth of formation, the surface of in situ subsoil/weathered natural or archaeological deposits whichever is highest in the stratigraphic sequence. Should archaeological deposits be exposed machining will cease in that area to allow the site archaeologist to investigate the exposed deposits.

- The archaeological work will be carried out in accordance with the Institute for Archaeologists Standard and 4.4.1 Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation 1994 (revised 2001 & 2008) and Standard and Guidance for an Archaeological Watching Brief 1994 (revised 2001 & 2008).
- 4.4.2 Spoil will be examined for the recovery of artefacts.
- All excavation of exposed archaeological features shall be carried out by hand, stratigraphically, and fully recorded 4.4.3 by context to IfA guidelines. All features shall be recorded in plan and section at scales of 1:10, 1:20 or 1:50. All scale drawings shall be undertaken at a scale appropriate to the complexity of the deposit/feature and to allow accurate depiction and interpretation. An adequate photographic record of the excavation will be prepared. Where digital imagery is the sole photographic record, archivable prints will be prepared by a photographic laboratory.
- 4.4.4 If archaeological features are exposed, then as a minimum:
 - i) small discrete features will be fully excavated; ii)
 - larger discrete features will be half-sectioned (50% excavated);

- iii) long linear features will be sample excavated along their length, with investigative excavations distributed along the exposed length of any such feature, and to investigate terminals, junctions and relationships with other features.
- iv) One long face of each trench will be cleaned by hand to allow site stratigraphy to be understood and for the identification of archaeological features.

Should the above % excavation not yield sufficient information to allow the form and function of archaeological features/deposits to be determined full excavation of such features/deposits will be required. Additional excavation may also be required for the taking of palaeoenvironmental samples and recovery of artefacts. Any variation of the above will be undertaken in consultation with the HES.

- 4.4.5 Artefacts will be bagged and labelled on site. Unstratified post-1800 pottery may be discarded on site after a representative sample has been retained. Following post-excavation analysis and recording, further material may be discarded, subject to consultation with the appropriate specialists and Barnstaple Museum;
- 4.4.6 Should archaeological or palaeoenvironmental remains be exposed, the site archaeologist will investigate, record and sample such deposits.
- 4.4.7 The project will be organised so that specialist consultants who might be required to conserve or report on finds or advise or report on other aspects of the investigation (e.g. palaeoenvironmental analysis) can be called upon and undertake assessment and analysis of such deposits if required. On-site sampling and post-excavation assessment and analysis will be undertaken in accordance with English Heritage's guidance in *Environmental Archaeology: a guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation* (2002).
- 4.4.8 Human remains will be left *in-situ*, covered and protected. Removal will only take place under appropriate Ministry of Justice and environmental health regulations. Such removal will be in compliance with the relevant primary legislation.
- 4.4.9 Any finds identified as treasure or potential treasure, including precious metals, groups of coins or prehistoric metalwork, will be dealt with according to the Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (2nd Revision) (Dept for Culture Media and Sport). Where removal cannot be effected on the same working day as the discovery, suitable security measures will be taken to protect the finds from theft.
- 4.4.10 In the event of particularly significant discoveries, the HES will be informed and a site meeting between the consultant, the HES and the client/applicant will be held to determine the appropriate mitigation.
- 4.5 SWARCH will agree monitoring arrangements with DCHES and give two weeks notice, unless a shorter period is agreed, of commencement of the fieldwork. Details will be agreed of any monitoring points where decisions on options within the programme are to be made.

SWARCH will notify the HES upon completion of the fieldwork stage of these works.

Monitoring will continue until the deposition of the site archive and finds, and the satisfactory completion of an OASIS report.

5.0 ARCHIVE AND REPORT

- 5.1 An ordered and integrated site archive will be prepared in accordance with *The Management of Archaeological Projects* (English Heritage, 1991 2nd edition) upon completion of the entire project, in a format to be agreed with the museum and within a timetable to be agreed with the HES. This will include relevant correspondence together with field drawings, and environmental, artefactual and photographic records. The archive and finds will be deposited with the Royal Albert Memorial Museum under reference number 11/62 in lieu of an accession number.
- 5.2 Archaeological finds resulting from the investigation (which are the property of the landowner), will also be deposited with the above museum (under the number above). The museum's guidelines for the deposition of archives for long-term storage will be adhered to and any sampling procedures will be carried out prior to deposition and in consultation with the museum. If ownership of all or any of the finds is to remain with the landowner, provision and agreement will be made for the time-limited retention of the material and its full analysis and recording, by appropriate specialists.
- 5.3 An illustrated summary report will be produced within three months of completion of the fieldwork of fieldwork, a draft report will be submitted to the HES for comment initially and then submitted to the DCHES and the Client (for submission to the Mid Devon District Council Planning Authority). One hard copy and one PDF copy of the report will be provided to the HES on the understanding that the hard copy will be deposited for public reference in the HER. The report will include:
 - 5.3.1 A report number and the OASIS record number;
 - 5.3.2 A copy of the DCHES brief and this Project Design;
 - 5.3.3 A summary of the project's background;
 - 5.3.4 A description and illustration of the site location;
 - 5.3.5 A methodology of the works undertaken;
 - 5.3.6 A site location plan at an appropriate scale on an Ordnance Survey, or equivalent, base-map;
 - 5.3.7 Plans and reports of all documentary and other research undertaken;
 - 5.3.8 A description of the project's results;
 - 5.3.9 An interpretation of the results in the appropriate context;
 - 5.3.10 A summary of the contents of the project archive and its location (including summary catalogues of finds and samples);
 - 5.3.11 A plan showing the location of the trenches in relation to the site boundaries;
 - 5.3.12 Plans of each trench, or part of trench, in which archaeological features are recognised along with adequate OD spot height information. These should be at an appropriate scale to allow the nature of the features exposed to be shown and understood. Plans must show the orientation of trenches in relation to north. Section drawing locations will be shown on these plans. Archaeologically sterile areas need not be illustrated unless this can provide information on the development of the site stratigraphy or show palaeoenvironmental deposits that have influenced the site stratigraphy;
 - 5.3.13 Section drawings of trenches and features, with OD heights, at scales appropriate to the stratigraphic detail to be shown and showing the orientation of the drawing in relation to north/south/east/west. Archaeologically sterile trenches will not be illustrated unless they can provide information on the development of the site stratigraphy or show palaeoenvironmental deposits that have influenced the site stratigraphy;
 - 5.3.14 Site matrices where appropriate;

- 5.3.15 Photographs showing the general site layout and exposed significant features and deposits that are referred to in the text. All photographs should contain appropriate scales, the size of which will be noted in the illustration's caption;
- 5.3.16 Consideration of evidence within its wider context;
- 5.3.17 A summary table and descriptive text showing the features, classes and numbers of artefacts recovered and soil profiles with interpretation;
- 5.3.18 Any specialist assessment or analysis reports undertaken;
- 5.4 DCHES will receive the report within three months of completion of fieldwork, dependant on the provision of specialist reports, radiocarbon dating results etc, the production of which may exceed this period. If a substantial delay is anticipated then an interim report will be produced. The report will be supplied to the HES on the understanding that one of these copies will be deposited for public reference in the HER. In addition to the hard copies of the report, one copy will be provided to the HES in digital format, in a format to be agreed in advance with the HES, on the understanding that it may in future be made available to researchers via a web-based version of the HER.
- 5.5 Should the development proceed in a staged manner, with each stage requiring archaeological fieldwork, and where a period of more than three months between each stage is anticipated or occurs, then the archaeological contractor shall prepare an interim illustrated summary report at the end of each stage.
- 5.6 Should they merit it; the results of these investigations will be published in an appropriate academic journal. If required, after the production of a summary report, a programme and timetable for this will be submitted to the DCHES and the Client for approval.
- 5.7 A copy of the report detailing the results of these investigations will be submitted to the OASIS (*Online AccesS to the Index of archaeological Investigations*) database under OASIS record number southwes1-111785.

6.0 CONFLICT WITH OTHER CONDITIONS AND STATUTORY PROTECTED SPECIES (BATS)

It is SWARCH's responsibility - in consultation with the applicant - to ensure that the undertaking of the required archaeological works does not conflict with any other conditions that have been imposed upon the consent granted and should also consider any biodiversity issues as covered by the NERC Act 2006. In particular, such conflicts may arise where archaeological investigations/excavations have the potential to have an impact upon protected species and/or natural habitats e.g. SSSI's, Habitat Regulations (The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) (Amendment) Regulations 2007), National Nature Reserves, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Ramsar sites, County Wildlife Sites etc.

7.0 PERSONNEL

The project will be managed by Colin Humphreys; any archaeological monitoring required will be carried out by suitably qualified SWARCH personnel directed by Bryn Morris/Sam Walls. Relevant staff of the DCHES will be consulted as appropriate. Where necessary appropriate specialist advice will be sought (see list of consultant specialists in Appendix 1 below).

Bryn Morris/Deb Laing-Trengove

South West Archaeology

The Old Dairy, Hacche Lane Business Park, Pathfields Business Park, South Molton, Devon EX36 3LH Telephone: 01769 573555 email: deblt@swarch.net

List of specialists

Building recording

Richard Parker: 11 Toronto Road, St James, Exeter. EX4 6LE; Tel: 07763 248241

Conservation

Alison Hopper-Bishop: The Royal Albert Memorial Museum Conservation Service; <u>a.hopperbishop@exeter.gov.uk</u>

R. & H . Jaeschke: 2 Bydown Cottages, Swimbridge, Barnstaple EX32 0QD; <u>mrshjaeschke@email.msn.com</u>; Tel: 01271 830891 Curatorial

Thomas Cadbury: Curator of Antiquities Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Bradninch Offices, Bradninch Place, Gandy Street, Exeter,

EX4 3LS; Tel: 01392 665356

Alison Mills: The Museum of Barnstaple and North Devon, The Square, Barnstaple, North Devon, EX32 8LN; Tel: 01271 346747 Bone

Human	Professor Chris Knusel: University of Exeter; <u>c.j.knusel@ex.ac.uk;</u> Tel: 01392 722491
Animal	Wendy Howard: Dept. of Archaeology, Laver Building, University of Exeter, North Park Road, Exeter EX4 4QE;
	w.j.howard@exeter.ac.uk; Tel: 01392 269330

Lithics

Martin Tingle: Higher Brownston, Brownston, Modbury, Devon, PL21 OSQ; <u>martin@mtingle.freeserve.co.uk</u> Metallurgy

Lee Bray: South West Archaeology

Palaeoenvironmental/Organic

Wood identification Dana Challinor: dana.challinor@tiscali.co.uk; Tel: 01869 810150

Plant macro-fossils Julie Jones: juliedjones@blueyonder.co.uk

Pollen analysis Ralph Fyfe: Room 211, 8 Kirkby Place, Drake Circus, Plymouth, Devon, PL4 8AA Pottery

Prehistoric	Henrietta Quinnell		
	39D Polsloe Road, Exeter EX1 2DN; Tel: 01392 433214		
Roman	Alex Croom, Keeper of Archaeology		
	Tyne & Wear Archives & Museums, Arbeia Roman Fort and Museum, Baring Street, South Shields,		
	Tyne and Wear, NE332BB; <u>alex.croom@twmuseums.org.uk;</u> Tel: (0191) 454 4093		
Medieval	John Allen		
	Exeter Archaeology, Custom House, The Quay, Exeter, EX2 4AN; Tel: 01392 665918		
Post Medieval	Graham Langman		
	Exeter, EX1 2UF Tel: 01392 215900 email: su1429@eclipse.co.uk		

Appendix 3

List of Contexts

Context	Description
100	Topsoil, friable and very gritty brownish-red sandy loam
[301]	Cut of linear in Trench #3, traverses trench from south-west to north-east, 0.6m wide and 0.4m deep
(302)	Fill of [301], reddish-grey-brown sandy-silt
[303]	Cut of irregular pit in Trench #3
(304)	Fill of [303], stony greyish-brown sandy-silt
(305)	Colluvial layer overlying natural in Trench #3
[306]	Cut of irregular pit in Trench #3
(307)	Fill of [303], stony dark greyish-brown sandy-silt
[401}	Cut of irregular pit in Trench #4
(402)	Upper fill of [401], buff brown stony silty-sand
[403]	Cut of irregular pit, in Trench #4
(404)	Fill of [403], firm buff brown stony silty-sand
(405)	Uppermost colluvial layer in Trench #4, compact reddish-brown silty-sand
(406)	Colluvial layer, overlain by (405), soft greyish-brown silty-sand
(407)	Colluvial layer, overlain by (406), soft grey sandy-silt
(408)	Colluvial layer, overlain by (407), soft reddish-grey sandy-silt
(409)	Basal fill of [401], gritty brownish-yellow silty-sand
(410)	Upper fill of [403], soft-to-firm brownish-yellow silty-sand
(411)	Basal fill on north-west side of [403], soft-to-firm brownish-yellow silty-sand
(412)	Basal fill on south-east side of [403], soft-to-firm brownish-yellow silty-sand

Appendix 4

Concordance of Finds

Unstratified finds from (101)

frags.	wgt. (kg)	Notes
1	0.004	Late Neolithic/early Bronze Age flint scraper (chalk-derived flint, possibly from Beer Head) Geotechnical Pit #6
1	0.342	frag. Fe slag [probably from upper part of (405)]
3	0.010	C19 th vessel glass
1	0.019	non-ferrous metal bottle stopper, marked "The City of Exeter Brewery"
10	0.090	White refined earthenware post-1720
4	0.056	C19 th stoneware
2	0.005	C19 th bone china
1	0.017	C19 th Jackfield-type ware
1	0.010	C17-18 th Bristol/Staffordshire Yellow slipware dish

Appendix 5

List of jpegs contained on CD to the rear of this report.

Photo Number	Description	From	Scale
1	Geotechnical Pit [GTP] #1 post-ex to subsoil	SW	0.5m
2	GTP #1 in section	W	0.5m
3	Views from GTP#1	WNW	0.5m
4	GTP#2 post-ex to subsoil	WSW	0.5m
5	GTP#2 in section	W	0.5m
6	GTP#3 post-ex to subsoil	WSW	0.5m
7	GTP#3 in section	W	0.5m
8	GTP#4 post-ex to subsoil	SSE	0.5m
9	GTP#4 in section	SW	0.5m
10	GTP#5 post-ex to subsoil	WSW	0.5m
11	GTP#5 in section (and in detail)	W	0.5m
12	GTP#6 post-ex to subsoil	SSE	0.5m
13	GTP#6 in section	SE	0.5m
14	GTP#7 post-ex to subsoil	SSE	0.5m
15	GTP#7 post-ex to subsoil (detail)	SSE	0.5m
16	GTP#7 in section	W	0.5m
17	GTP#6 in section (after cleaning)	ESE	0.5m
18	Trench #1, viewed from the south-east.	SE	2m
19	As above, viewed from the north-west.	NW	2m
20	Trench #2, viewed from the south-east.	SE	2m
21	As above, viewed from the north-west.	NW	2m
22	Trench #3, viewed from the south-west.	SW	2m
23	As above, viewed from the north-east.	NE	2m
24	Trench #3, features [301] and [303], post-strip pre-cleaning.	S	2m
25	Trench #4, viewed from the north-west.	NW	2m
26	As above, viewed from the south-east.	SE	2m
27	Trench #4, features [401] and [403], post-strip pre-cleaning.	S	2m
28	General shot of trenches, viewed from the north-west.	NW	-
29	Trench #4, features [401] and [403], pre-excavation.	SE	1+0.5m
30	Trench #4, feature [401], pre-excavation, with north arrow.	SE	1+0.5m
31	Trench #4, feature [403], pre-excavation, with north arrow.	SW	1+0.5m
32	Trench #4, features [401] and [403], post-excavation.	S	2+1+0.5m
33	Trench #4, feature [401], post-excavation, with north arrow.	SE	0.5m
34	Trench #4, feature [403], post-excavation, with north arrow.	SW	2m
35	Trench #4, south-west facing section of feature [403].	SW	2+1m
36	Trench #4, north-east facing section of feature [401].	NE	0.5m
37	Trench #4, south-west facing section through colluvial deposits at SE end.	SW	2m
38	Trench #3, north-east end, following removal of colluvial deposits.	SW	2m
39	As above, viewed from the north-east.	NE	2m
40	Trench #3, feature [301], pre-excavation.	SE	2m
41	Trench #3, feature [301], post-excavation.	NE	1+0.5m
42	As above, viewed from the south-east.	SE	1+0.5m
43	Trench #3, south-east facing section of feature [301].	SE	1+0.5m



The Old Dairy Hacche Lane Business Park Pathfields Business Park South Molton Devon EX36 3LH Tel: 01769 573555 Email: <u>mail@swarch.net</u>