

Old Park Farm Pinhoe Devon

Archaeology Report



for

David Wilson Homes
South West

CA Project: 9180
CA Report: 15292

October 2015



Old Park Farm
Pinhoe
Devon

Archaeology Report

CA Project: 9180
CA Report: 15292

| | |
|-------------|--|
| prepared by | Thomas Weavill (Project Supervisor) |
| date | |
| checked by | Andrew Mudd (Post-Excavation Manager) |
| date | |
| approved by | Karen Walker (Principal Post-excavation Manager) |
| signed | |
| date | |
| issue | 03 |

This report is confidential to the client. Cotswold Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability to any third party to whom this report, or any part of it, is made known. Any such party relies upon this report entirely at their own risk. No part of this report may be reproduced by any means without permission.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Cirencester Building 11 Kemble Enterprise Park Kemble, Cirencester Gloucestershire, GL7 6BQ t. 01285 771022 f. 01285 771033 | Milton Keynes Unit 4 Cromwell Business Centre Howard Way, Newport Pagnell MK16 9QS t. 01908 218320 | Andover Stanley House Walworth Road Andover, Hampshire SP10 5LH t. 01264 347630 |
| e. enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk | | |

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| SUMMARY | 5 |
| 1 INTRODUCTION..... | 6 |
| <i>Location, topography and geology</i> | 6 |
| <i>Archaeological background</i> | 7 |
| 2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES..... | 9 |
| 3 METHODOLOGY | 10 |
| 4 RESULTS | 11 |
| <i>Fieldwork summary</i> | 11 |
| <i>Period 1: Earlier Prehistoric</i> | 12 |
| <i>Period 2: Later prehistoric to Roman</i> | 15 |
| <i>Period 3: Roman</i> | 16 |
| <i>Period 4: Medieval</i> | 17 |
| <i>Period 5: Post-medieval and modern</i> | 18 |
| <i>Undated</i> | 19 |
| 5 FACTUAL DATA AND STATEMENTS OF POTENTIAL..... | 20 |
| <i>Stratigraphic Record: factual data</i> | 20 |
| <i>Stratigraphic record: statement of potential</i> | 20 |
| <i>Artefactual record: data and potential</i> | 21 |
| <i>Biological record: data and potential</i> | 22 |
| 6 SUMMARY STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL..... | 23 |
| 7 STORAGE AND CURATION..... | 25 |
| 8 PUBLICATION | 25 |
| <i>Synopsis of Proposed Report</i> | 26 |
| 9 PROJECT TEAM | 27 |
| 10 TIMETABLE | 28 |

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 11 | REFERENCES..... | 29 |
| | APPENDIX 1: STRATIGRAPHIC ASSESSEMENT BY ANDREW MUDD..... | 32 |
| | APPENDIX 2: LITHICS BY JACKY SOMMERVILLE..... | 33 |
| | APPENDIX 3: POTTERY BY E R MCSLOY..... | 37 |
| | APPENDIX 4: CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL BY E MCSLOY | 42 |
| | APPENDIX 5: COINS BY E R MCSLOY | 44 |
| | APPENDIX 6: METAL FINDS BY E R MCSLOY | 45 |
| | APPENDIX 7: FAUNAL REMAINS BY ANDY CLARKE | 46 |
| | APPENDIX 8: PLANT MACROFOSSILS AND CHARCOAL BY SARAH COBAIN | 47 |
| | APPENDIX 9: RADIOCARBON DATING BY SARAH COBAIN..... | 58 |
| | APPENDIX 10: OASIS REPORT FORM..... | 60 |

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Fig. 1 Site location plan (1:25,000)
- Fig. 2 Excavation and evaluation trench location plan showing archaeological features (1:2500)
- Fig. 3 Area 2: phase plan (1:1000 & 1:100)
- Fig. 4 Areas 7A and 7B: phase plan (1:1000 & 1:100)
- Fig. 5 Ditch AD and pit 700124 (1:100)
- Fig. 6 Ditch AD, pit 700122 and ditch AE (1:100)
- Fig. 7 Ditch AF and possible posthole alignment plan (1:100)
- Fig. 8 Areas 4 and 6: phase plan (1:1000)
- Fig. 9 Ditch D North and pit 400020 (1:100)
- Fig. 10 Ditch D South, plan (1:100)
- Fig. 11 Trench 37 plan (1:200) and Sections AA to JJ (1:20)
- Fig. 12 Sections KK to QQ (1:20)
- Fig. 13 Photographs: a Areas 7A and 7B looking north; b Area 4 looking north. Ditch L, Period 3, in foreground
- Fig. 14 Photographs: a Pottery vessel in Pit 14005 *in situ*, looking south-west (scale 0.5m); b Pit 200003, looking south-east (scale 1m); c Pit 37003 cut by tree-throw 37005, looking south (scale 1m); d Pit 700061 cut by Pit 700063, looking south-west (scale 0.3m)
- Fig. 15 Photographs: a Ditch AD, looking north-west (scale 0.3m); b Ditch AE, looking north (scale 0.3m); c Ditch AF, looking south-east (scale 0.3m); d Pit 700124, looking south (scale 0.2m)
- Fig. 16 Photographs: a Ditch C, looking south-west (scale 0.4m); b Ditch D, looking north (scale 1m); Ditch Q, looking north-west (scales 1m and 0.3m); d Ditch P, looking north-west (scales 1m and 0.2m)
- Fig. 17 Photographs: a Ditch 13003, looking south-east (scale 0.5m); Ditch 14003, looking north-west (scale 0.5m); c Ditch 15004, looking north-west (scale 1m)
- Fig. 18 Photograph: Decorated Samian ware from Ditch Q, in style of Central Gaulish Antonine potter *Paternus* v.
- Fig. 19 Photograph: Roman copper alloy steelyard from Ditch 15004

SUMMARY

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Site Name: | Old Park Farm |
| Location: | Pinhoe, Devon |
| NGR: | SX 9658 9518 |
| Type: | Strip, map and sample |
| Date: | November 2012-May 2014 |
| Location of archive: | To be deposited with Exeter City Museum |
| Accession Number: | RAMM: 12/92 |
| Site Code: | PFP 12 |

A programme of archaeological investigation was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology between November 2012 and May 2014 at the request of David Wilson Homes at Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon. In accordance with an approved Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (CA & Nexus Heritage 2011), five areas were excavated across the development area.

Scattered prehistoric, Roman, medieval and later features were found across 7.4 ha of the 19.7 ha development site. Dating evidence was sparse, but earlier prehistoric activity was represented by scatters of flintwork, particularly in the eastern part of the site. Ditches and a scatter of pits contained evidence of probably Middle Bronze Age occupation. In the north-west area ditches forming part of a double-ditched oval enclosure appear to be late prehistoric, running through into the Roman period. In the south-central area Roman material from ditches shows occupation here, but there were few other Roman features. Medieval pottery also came from ditches here, and there was more widespread post-medieval activity in the form of ditched enclosures probably relating to Old Park Farm. Material remains, including botanical remains were sparse, and animal bone had barely survived.

This document is a report on the archaeological findings. It also presents a quantification and assessment of the evidence recovered from the excavation and earlier evaluation, and a proposal to bring the results to appropriate publication.

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Between November 2012 and May 2014 Cotswold Archaeology (CA) carried out a programme of archaeological recording at the Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon, (centred on NGR: SX 9658 9518; Fig. 1). The work was undertaken at the request of David Wilson Homes in accordance with a brief for archaeological work (DCCHEs 2011) prepared by Stephen Reed, Archaeological Officer, Historic Environment Service (HES), Devon County Council (DCC), the archaeological advisor to East Devon Council (EDC). A subsequent detailed WSI was produced by CA and Nexus Heritage (2011), and approved by the Local Planning Authority acting on the advice of Stephen Reed. The work represented a third stage of archaeological fieldwork, following earlier geophysical survey (Stratscan 2009) and evaluation trenching (CA 2010) undertaken ahead of the planning determination. The present fieldwork followed the *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation* (ClfA 2014). It was monitored by Stephen Reed, including regular site visits.
- 1.2 Planning permission was granted by EDC (ref. 10/0641/MOUT) for development of the land as a mixed-use scheme including residential, school, village centre and retail elements, a park-and-ride site, open space and transport infrastructure. Devon County Council Historic Environment Service (DCC HES) advised that any consent granted should be conditional on a programme of archaeological work being undertaken. Work was undertaken in five out of seven areas examined by the geophysical survey and archaeological evaluation. The excavation areas were those containing significant archaeological remains to be affected by the development, other areas either being shown to have limited archaeology or being designated for open spaces within the development (Fig. 2).

Location, topography and geology

- 1.3 The site is located to the north of the village of Pinhoe, on the northern outskirts of Exeter (Fig. 1). The site is bounded to the north, south and west by agricultural land, to the north-east and south-east by residential buildings and to the east by the B3181 Pinn Hill Road. The west of the site also abuts Ash Copse, an area of Ancient Woodland that extends from the valley floor up the hill slope.

- 1.4 The total development area is approximately 19.7 ha in extent and largely comprises agricultural land. Of this 7.4 ha was subject to a programme of archaeological recording split over five areas (Fig. 2). The majority of the site is located on the valley floor, north-east of the scarp slope of Beacon Hill and Pinn Hill, at approximately 30-40m AOD. The southern extent of the site extends up Beacon Hill to approximately 42m AOD.
- 1.5 Most of the site is located on Mudstone and Sandstone of the Crackington Formation covered by superficial deposits of sand, clay and gravel to the north. Part of the eastern area of the site is located on Sandstone of the Dawlish formation (BGS 2015)

Archaeological background

- 1.6 The full archaeological and historic landscape baseline information is contained within an Archaeology and Heritage chapter prepared for the Environmental Statement accompanying the planning application (Nexus Heritage 2010) and reference should be made to that document for the detail, which is summarised here.

Prehistoric

- 1.7 At the time of the Environmental Statement there was no recorded evidence of Palaeolithic, Mesolithic activity or Neolithic activity within the site. In 1999, a Bronze Age hoard, comprising arm rings and palstaves, was discovered approximately 200m south-west of the proposed development site. The find-spot was subsequently excavated (DHER No: 61837, NGR: SX 9589 9512). The excavation revealed no *in situ* evidence of the original hoard or any evidence of associated occupation debris or structures. However, further fragments of palstaves and arm rings were discovered within the plough soil. At the time there was no evidence of Iron Age activity within the site. A sub-oval enclosure of an unknown date had been identified as a crop mark approximately 100m west of the development site (DHER No: 10170, NGR: SX 9608 9560) and is likely to date to the prehistoric period. A rectangular platform was identified in a field to the south-west of the parish church on Church Lane, approximately 850m from the proposed development site (DHER No: 22852, NGR: SX 9545 9485). It was defined by a slight ditch and bank and was of an unknown date; however, it was thought to be modern.

Anglo-Saxon

- 1.8 In AD 1001, the Danes landed at Exmouth and marched to Exeter, which they besieged but were unable to occupy. They burnt Pinhoe, Broad Clyst, and other surrounding villages. By 1050 AD, the settlement had been rebuilt and was referred to as *Peonho*, (DHER No: 10168 NGR: SX 9542 9536). The settlement has also been recorded as *Peonha*, *Pinnoc*, and *Pinnoch*, which probably derive from the Celtic word 'Pen' and Saxon word 'Hoe', both words meaning the top of the hill.

Medieval

- 1.9 Pinhoe features in Domesday Book (1086) as *Pinnoc*. It is likely that Pinn Hill, the road adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site, was in use as the main road from Exeter to Bath during the medieval period. Although the core of the medieval settlement was to the south of the site (in the same location as the current Pinhoe village), Old Park Farm appears to be one of a number of isolated and dispersed medieval farmsteads. The farmhouse, situated in the centre of the Application Area was built in the 14th or early 15th century (DHER No: 22208, NGR: SX 9649 9524).
- 1.10 About 450m south-east of the proposed development site stands the Grade II Listed building Pinn Court Farmhouse (DHER No: 74267, NGR: SX 96978 94722). This building was originally built in the 14th or early 15th century; however, it may be adjacent to the site of an earlier house, 'Pincourt', which was first mentioned in the 1370s (DHER No: 71571, NGR: SX 9705 9473). According to the Devon Historic Environment Record, the Domesday Book identified Pin Court as the lordship of the manor of Pinnoc. To the north east of Pinn Court Farm, and ~500m east of the proposed development site, stands the medieval farmstead of West Clyst Farm (DHER No: 15879, NGR: SX 9751 9517). This was located in the Manor of *Clista*.

Post-medieval/Modern

- 1.11 Cartographic evidence indicates that during the post-medieval and modern periods the site was used mostly for agricultural purposes. During World War II, on 27th September 1941 a twin engine Wellington Mark II aircraft, serial number W5432, operated by 104 Squadron from RAF Driffield, Yorkshire, crashed in the orchard of Old Park Farm (LF003), in the centre of the proposed development site (DHER No: 67914, SX 9645 9527). The site is a Protected Place, under the terms of the Military Remains Act 1986 and is to be retained as an amenity area (Fig. 2).
- 1.12 In 2009, geophysical survey (detailed magnetometer survey) of c. 15 ha was carried out across the majority of the proposed development area (Stratascan 2009). A

number of anomalies which may have archaeological origins were identified which were then tested by archaeological evaluation.

- 1.13 An archaeological evaluation was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology between May and June 2010. A total of sixty-three trenches was excavated (Fig. 2). The evaluation identified a number of archaeological features within the proposed development area. The majority of these features were concentrated within Areas 4, 6 and 7, with a lessening of archaeological activity within Areas 1, 2, 3 and 5. The earliest features encountered consisted of a pit in Area 7, which contained sherds of Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age pottery, and a ditch in Area 2, which contained prehistoric pottery. Area 2 was also thought to contain a ring-ditch, with a projected internal diameter of 15m; although no closely dateable material was recovered from this feature a Bronze Age date was postulated, but this has now been shown to have been erroneous. Ditches dating to the Roman period were identified in Area 7 in the south-eastern part of the site. These formed a possible north-west/south-east orientated field system. These ditches had a distinctive profile, with steep sides and flat bases. Evidence for medieval activity comprised ditches containing 12th to 14th-century pottery and a later medieval horseshoe, as well as the remains of furrows. Post-medieval or modern features relating to agricultural activity and land division were identified across the site. The evaluation therefore identified previously unrecorded activity of prehistoric, Roman and medieval date within the development area.

2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- 2.1 The overall aim of the excavation, as stated in the WSI, were to identify, investigate, excavate and record surviving below-ground archaeological artefacts and deposits across the areas to be affected by the proposed development.
- 2.2 More specific objectives were presented in the WSI, as follows:
- To record any evidence of past settlement or other land use
 - To recover artefactual evidence to date any evidence of past settlement that may be identified
 - To sample and analyse environmental remains to create a better understanding of past land use and economy

- To seek to relate any archaeological remains to those found in previous investigations on and near to the site.
- 2.3 Any findings were also to address the research aims of the South West Regional Research Agenda (Webster 2008).
- 2.4 Following discussions with Stephen Reed (*in litt.* 14 April 2014), the scope of the present report has been modified to reflect the generally low level of archaeological remains discovered. Rather than a standard Post-Excavation Assessment (following the procedural model in MAP2 [EH 1991]), this report seeks to present a fuller account of the excavations and the finds. Regard is, however, given to the potential of the site for further work leading to an appropriate level of publication (see Section 8).
- 2.5 It is intended that the present report be sufficient to discharge the planning conditions relating to the archaeology of the site.

3 METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 The Brief issued by DCCHEs required further archaeological mitigation in four of the seven areas evaluated. Other areas had been shown to have little archaeological significance, or were to be left out of the development plan. Investigations were undertaken in Areas 2, 4, 6 and part of 7, with Areas 1, 3 and 5 requiring no further mitigation works. Part of Area 7 is to be occupied by sports pitches, therefore not requiring intrusive groundwork or archaeological mitigation; however the remainder was subject to a programme of strip, map and record. A phased approach to fieldwork was adopted so as to coincide with the contractor's programme of works.
- 3.2 Within each of the mitigation areas topsoil, subsoil and any other archaeologically insignificant overburden was removed by mechanical excavator with a toothless grading bucket under archaeological supervision. The spoil was visually scanned in order to recover any artefacts.
- 3.3 The archaeological features thus exposed were hand-excavated to the bottom of archaeological stratigraphy. All features were planned either by hand or using Leica GPS and recorded in accordance with CA Technical Manual 1: *Fieldwork Recording Manual* (CA 2013) and Technical Manual 4.1: *Survey Manual* (CA 2012).

3.4 Excavation of features concentrated on recovering the plan, stratigraphic sequence and details on the phasing of site. The following sample sizes were employed as a minimum:

- Small discrete features were fully excavated,
- Larger discrete features were half sectioned (50% excavated),
- long linear features were sample excavated along their length including any terminals,
- intersections and relationships with other features,
- potential funerary features and deposits were 100% excavated.
- Where the sample size did not yield sufficient information to allow the form and function of the feature/deposit to be determined additional excavation of the feature/deposit was undertaken.

3.5 Soil samples were taken from a range of features, concentrating on features with a visibly high potential for retrieving environmental and economic information preferably from sealed deposits, but including other archaeologically significant features. Samples were taken in accordance with CA Technical Manual 2: *The taking of samples for paleoenvironmental and palaeoeconomic analysis from archaeological sites* (CA 2012). All artefacts recovered from the excavation were retained in accordance with CA Technical Manual 3: *Treatment of finds immediately after excavation* (CA 1995).

3.6 The archive and artefacts from the evaluation are currently held by CA at their offices in Kemble. Subject to the agreement of the legal landowner the site archive (including artefacts) will be deposited with the Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Exeter, under accession number RAMM 12/92.

4 RESULTS

Fieldwork summary

4.1 Archaeological features were identified across all of the excavation areas. There was little correlation between areas of potential archaeology identified during the preceding geophysical survey (Stratascan 2009) and evaluation trenching and

those identified during subsequent excavations. Many of the features were shallow and appear to have been subject to truncation. The results of the work are discussed by period.

4.2 Features have been assigned to five provisional periods, based on, artefact spot-dating, radiocarbon dating, and the morphology, fill characteristics and spatial distribution of features. A number of features are undated:

- Period 1: Earlier Prehistoric (Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age)
- Period 2: Later Prehistoric/ Early Roman
- Period 3: Roman
- Period 4: medieval
- Period 5: post-medieval and modern
- Undated

Period 1: Earlier Prehistoric

4.3 Earlier Prehistoric archaeology was encountered in Areas 2, 7A and 7B.

Area 2 (Fig. 3)

4.4 A sub-circular isolated pit, 200003 was noted within the southeastern part of Area 2 sealed by subsoil (Figs 11, Section AA; 14b). Pit 200003 measured 1.55m in length, 1.40m in width and 0.80m in depth was filled by two fills, 200004 (lower, 0.09m thick) and 200005 (upper, 0.68m thick) which probably represent the silting up of the feature rather than deliberate backfills. Fill 200005 yielded a chip and burnt fragment of flint. A soil sample taken from fill 200005 produced two fragments of hazelnut shell and an indeterminate cereal grain (Appendix 8, Table 8.1). Further flint flakes, and a possible Bronze Age pot sherd, were recovered from the subsoil within Area 2 during site stripping. In view of the wider evidence for Bronze Age activity, and the character of the finds, it is suggested that the pit is Bronze Age in date, although almost any prehistoric date would be possible.

4.5 Probable prehistoric features were identified during the evaluation (CA 2010) within Area 2 in Trenches 37 and 40. At the centre of Trench 37 was north-west/south-east orientated elongated pit 37003 (previously interpreted as a ditch) which appears to relate to a short linear geophysical anomaly (Figs. 11, plan and Section BB; 14c). The single fill, 37004, contained a sherd of prehistoric pottery and was cut

by an undated tree throw pit 37005. The interpretation of pit 37003 is uncertain but it may have been related to tree clearance. The features in Trench 40 were found to relate to root disturbance from a modern or post-medieval tree or hedge (below para. 4.23) (labelled 'Ditches' A and B in the excavation area).

Area 7A (Fig. 4)

- 4.6 A cluster of pits was identified in the north-eastern part of Area 7A which may date to the earlier prehistoric period. Pit 700061, located in this cluster measured 0.2m in diameter and 0.07m in depth was filled by 700062. Pit fill 700062 was cut by pit 700063 which measured 0.6m in diameter and 0.2m in depth and was filled by two fills 700064 (lower, 0.2m thick) and 700065 (upper 0.1m thick) (Fig. 11, Section CC; Fig. 14d). Fill 700064 contained seven sherds pottery and fill 700065 contained 21 sherds of pottery, all tentatively dated to the Middle Bronze Age. The abundance of probable Middle Bronze Age pottery, particularly in lower sealed fill 700064, makes it appear doubtful that it is residual, rather providing a very secure date for this feature. Given that the remaining two pits within this cluster, 700090 (0.75m in length, 0.6m in width and 0.18m in depth) and 700092 (0.4m in diameter and 0.15m in depth), both have similar fills, it is assumed that these are also of likely Middle Bronze Age date (Fig. 11, Sections DD and EE).

Area 7B (Fig. 4)

- 4.7 Within Area 7B three ditches, AD, AE and AF, were encountered running on north-west/south-east and north-east/south-west alignments parallel to extant field boundaries. Ditch AD (Figs 5 & 6; Fig. 11, Section FF; Fig. 15a) measured a total of 72.5m in length, an average of 0.62m in width and an average of 0.2m in depth, and produced a total of 83 worked lithics ranging from Mesolithic to Neolithic in date (Appendix 2). This assemblage is suggestive of flint working on site, but most of the flint appears to have been redeposited. A soil sample yielded charred hazelnut shells (Appendix 8). Ditch AD had a surviving terminus at its north-western end but shallowed to 0.09m deep at its south-eastern end, suggesting this end was subject to truncation rather than being a genuine terminal end.
- 4.8 It is probable that Ditch AE and Ditch AF originally formed one continuous ditch at right angles to Ditch AD. Ditch AE measured a total of 11.80m in length, an average of 0.47m in width and an average of 0.16m in depth and produced three pieces of flint and a fragment of fired clay (Fig. 6; Fig 11, Section GG;. Fig. 15b). Ditch AF measured 8.20m in length with an average depth of 0.12m and an average width of

0.5m and only produced one piece of flint (Fig. 7; Fig. 11, Section HH; Fig. 15c). A provisional prehistoric date has been given to these ditches due to the presence of flint, including knapping debris, some of which may be *in situ*, and the hazelnut shells; however, the possibility that all these are redeposited cannot be discounted. Their location and alignment, parallel to extant field boundaries, also raises the possibility that they are of a more recent field division, but if so it seems clear that they truncated an area of prehistoric activity because of the quantity of flint and the nature of the botanical remains redeposited, which are typical of the earlier prehistoric period.

- 4.9 Seven pits were also identified within Area 7B: 700122 (0.30m in diameter, 0.05m deep), 700124 (0.25m long, 0.20m wide, 0.03m deep), 700143 (0.45m in diameter, 0.08m deep), 700145 (0.38m long, 0.33m wide, 0.06m deep), 700147 (0.40m in diameter, 0.04m deep), 700149 (0.50m long, 0.30m wide and 0.07m deep) and 700162 (0.50m long, 0.45m wide, 0.20m deep) (Fig. 11, section II). All of these pits contained a sterile grey-brown clayey sand except for pit 700124 (Fig. 11, Section JJ; Fig. 15d), filled by 700125, a deliberately deposited fill which contained a small quantity of oak, hazel and cherry charcoal (Appendix 8). Three of these features, 700143, 700145 and 700147, could conceivably form a north-east/south-west posthole alignment spaced 1.66m and 2.61m apart respectively, although no packing was present in their respective fills therefore this interpretation remains tentative. The remainders are probably the bases of truncated pits. Pits 700149, 700162 and 700122 produced worked flint including a flint knife from pit 700162. The possibility that the flint is residual cannot be overlooked.
- 4.10 Pit 14005 was identified within Trench 14 during the evaluation in Area 7 (Fig 14a). This contained a heavily truncated pottery vessel, likely to originally been deliberately deposited as a complete vessel within this pit. The vessel is imprecisely dated to the Bronze Age/Early Iron Age and may have served as a burial urn; however no burnt bone was recovered from soil samples of the fills and it appears more likely to relate to domestic activity.
- 4.11 Further prehistoric worked flints, as well as possible Bronze Age and Iron Age pottery (6 sherds, 54g) were recovered from the subsoil across both the excavation areas in Area 7.

Period 2: Later prehistoric to Roman

- 4.12 Later prehistoric archaeology to Roman was encountered in Area 4 (Fig. 13b).

Area 4 (Fig. 8)

- 4.13 In the western part of Area 4 probable later prehistoric activity can be stratigraphically divided into two phases, and it is suggested that a third phase is Roman, although absolute dating remains uncertain. The first identifiable phase comprises of two parallel ditches, Ditches C and D, both with a steep-sided, flat-based profile, which appear to form a double-ditched enclosure. Ditch C (134.37m long, an average width of 0.98m, an average depth of 0.20m) formed a continuous curving internal ditch (Fig. 12, Section KK; Fig. 16a). The fills of Ditch C comprised very sterile light brown sandy clays and appear to have originated from a gradual silting of the ditch rather than deliberate deposition or slumped material from a bank. A single sherd of Roman pottery was recovered from fill 400064 at the southern end of the ditch, and worked flint was recovered from throughout the ditch fills. However, a radiocarbon sample of alder/hazel roundwood from fill 400064 returned a date in the earlier part of the middle Iron Age (Appendix 9 – SUERC-58719), and another from fill 400060 yielded a middle Iron Age date (SUERC-58718). Although the dates do not overlap, it is considered probable that the ditches have an Iron Age origin and the Roman sherd was either intrusive or derived from a late stage of silting.
- 4.14 Ditch D formed the outer ditch which was in two sections: the northern segment (37.13m long, an average of 0.90m wide and an average of 0.24m deep) ran on a north-west/south-east alignment and the southern segment (69.60m long, an average of 1.27m wide and an average of 0.37m deep) ran on a roughly north-east/south-west alignment (Fig. 12, Section LL; Fig. 16b). A gap of approximately 20m between the two terminal ends of Ditch D, possibly represents an entrance into the outer ring of the enclosure. The southern ditch was 0.5m deep forming a clear terminal (Fig. 10) and, although by contrast the northern terminal was just 0.1m deep, this did appear to be a deliberate ditch-end (Fig. 9). Within the inner ring of the enclosure was a probable remnant of an internal division Ditch H (31.50m long, an average width of 0.96m and an average depth of 0.31m) which may also have related to this initial phase. The fills of Ditch D comprised very sterile light brown sandy clays and appear to have originated from a gradual silting of the ditch with no evidence of deliberate deposition or slumped material from a bank.

- 4.15 The second phase comprised a series of east/west aligned internal enclosure divisions: Ditches E (19.50m long, an average width of 1.33m and an average depth of 0.25m), F (14.26m long, an average width of 0.57m and an average depth of 0.11m) and G (28.71m long, an average of 0.90m wide and a depth of 0.07m). Ditch E and F both cut and respected Ditch C, suggesting that Ditch C was only partially infilled when these were initially excavated. Ditch G also respected enclosure Ditch C, terminating 2.30m to the west of Ditch C, and cut earlier internal boundary Ditch H.

Period 3: Roman

Area 4 (Fig. 8)

- 4.16 The third and final phase comprised two rectangular enclosures within the southern part of the larger enclosure. The morphology suggests they belonged to the Roman phase, but there is no artefactual dating evidence. The western rectangular enclosure was formed by Ditches I (18.74m long, an average width of 0.49m and an average depth of 0.16m) and J (17.65m long, an average width of 0.47m and an average depth of 0.20m). The eastern rectangular enclosure was formed by Ditches K (15.76m long, an average width of 0.38m and an average depth of 0.20m) and L (24.50m long, an average width of 0.70m and an average depth of 0.26m). Ditches K, L and J cut inner enclosure Ditch C which suggests that it may to have gone out of use by the time the rectangular enclosures were added. It is entirely possible, however that outer Ditch D was still in use at this time.

Area 7A (Fig. 4)

- 4.17 Roman activity within Area 7A was represented by two meandering but approximately parallel ditches 35-40m apart: Ditch P (length of 46m exposed in excavation, average width 1.50m and average depth 0.30m) (Fig. 12, Section NN; Fig. 16d), and Ditch Q (length of 62m exposed in excavation, average width 1.36m and average depth 0.35m) (Fig. 12, Section MM; Fig. 16c). They may represent elements of a former field system. A total of 195 sherds of 2nd- to 4th-century AD pottery was recovered from both ditches, with the majority recovered from Ditch Q. In addition to this, a 3rd to 4th-century coin and a fragment of Roman ceramic building material was also recovered from Ditch Q.
- 4.18 Ditches dating to the Roman period identified within the preceding evaluation in Trenches 13 to 18 in the southern quarter of Area 7 appear to confirm the presence

of an approximately north-west/south-east aligned network of ditches, possibly relating to the continuation of the Roman field system identified in Area 7A, although the pattern is not evident from the evaluation trenches. Substantial amounts of Roman pottery were recovered from the fills of ditches 13003, 14003, 15002, 16004 and 18005. Roman pottery and a steelyard were also recovered from ditch 15004/15006 (Fig. 12, Section QQ); however, this ditch also contained two fragments of later tile, so the Roman material may have been redeposited, although on balance this is considered unlikely. Given that the medieval and post-medieval field boundaries follow a similar alignment to the dated Roman ditches. It is entirely possible that the remaining undated ditches (16005, 17003, 17005, 18003, 18010) identified during the evaluation in Area 7 and also mostly on a north-west/south-east alignment, could be of Roman, medieval or post-medieval origin. There is very little consistency and no characteristic profile to the dated Roman ditches to be able to use them as a basis for dating the undated ditches (Fig. 12, Sections NN, OO, PP; Fig. 17a – c).

Period 4: Medieval

4.19 Medieval archaeology was encountered in Area 7A only.

Area 7A (Fig. 4)

4.20 The remnants of a series of rectangular enclosures (Ditch R) were identified in the eastern corner of Area 7A probably dividing out agricultural plots in the medieval period. The fills of Ditch R produced a total of six sherds of 12th to 14th-century AD pottery. A small amount of modern glass and land drain fragments were also present within the fill which are considered to be intrusive. These enclosures appear to have been remodeled in the early post-medieval period.

4.21 A feature identified as a potential grave, 700005 (1.8m long, 0.58m wide, 0.15m deep) was identified near the north-western edge of Area 7A but was found to be empty upon excavation. It was noted that bone preservation within this geology was generally poor therefore the fill of the grave cut was 100% sampled. 36L of soil processed from this feature yielded only a few fragments of gorse charcoal and no bone (Appendix 8) and the date and purpose of this feature remain unresolved. A provisional medieval date is based on its location within what appears to be a medieval ditched plot.

Period 5: Post-medieval and modern

- 4.22 Post-medieval and modern archaeology were encountered in all excavation areas.

Area 2 (Fig. 3)

- 4.23 Within Area 2 two shallow heavily root-disturbed ditches, 'Ditch' A (20.23m long, an average of 1.38m wide and a depth of between 0.02m and 0.03m) and 'Ditch' B (8.90m long, an average of 0.94 wide and a depth of between 0.04m and 0.01m) within the eastern part of the site appear to represent the remains of recent hedged boundary and appear to be a continuation of a curving ditch, 40003/40007, identified in evaluation Trench 40. Ditch 40003/40007 was originally assigned a prehistoric date during the evaluation. However, as a cumulative total of seven sherds of post-medieval pottery was recovered from 'ditches' A and B and 40003/40007, this date is now rejected. It has also been noted during excavation that ditch 40003/40007 is likely to represent tree root disturbances with post-medieval/modern pottery. Clusters of shallow, truncated, postholes both amongst the ditches and further to the north in Area 2 to further also relate to modern activity.

Area 7A (Fig. 4)

- 4.24 The post-medieval remodeling of medieval plots in Area 7A is represented by ditches S and T. A post-medieval horseshoe was recovered from Ditch T. These may have originally joined with Ditch AC to form a series of irregular boundaries replacing those formed by Ditch R.
- 4.25 Three converging double ditched field boundaries (ditches AA, AB, U, V, W and X) were identified in the south-eastern part of Area 7A (Fig. 13a), which produced late 18th and 19th-century pottery and glass. These are on alignments parallel to modern field boundaries but differ slightly from the alignment of Ditch R which represents the medieval plot boundaries.

Area 4 (Fig. 8)

- 4.26 A double ditched field boundary (Ditch M and N) was also identified in the western part of Area 4 on an approximate north/south alignment. This originally divided the larger field, which extends to the west, beyond the site boundary, into two, as shown on the Pinhoe Tithe Map (1841) (Fig. 2).

Area 6 (Fig. 8)

- 4.27 In Area 6 an east/west aligned field boundary ditch (Ditch O) was encountered. This appears to be an extension of an extant boundary running along the northern edge of Area 6 which divided the northern and southern parts of the field.

Area 5 (Fig. 8)

- 4.28 Within evaluation Trench 47 a post-medieval/modern field boundary (Ditch 47003) was identified which correlates with a boundary depicted on modern OS mapping and was still extant within the field at the time of the evaluation.

Undated

Area 4 (Fig. 8)

- 4.29 Two undated pits, 400020 and 400103 and one undated post hole, 400014, with probable repair, 400017, were encountered in Area 4. Pit 400103 was located adjacent to the inner enclosure ditch (Ditch C) and therefore may be associated. Soil samples were assessed from two of the three pit fills (Appendix 8) and yielded just one unidentified grain. The purpose of the pits remains unclear.
- 4.30 Posthole 400014 was located immediately to the west of outer enclosure Ditch D. It was isolated with regard to any other surrounding structural feature so the interpretation as a posthole is tentative. The proximity to the outer enclosure ditch may suggest a contemporaneous date, but this is very uncertain.
- 4.31 A number of discrete features thought to relate to one or several tree throw pits were identified in the northern part of Area 4 which are very similar to features identified during the preceding evaluation within the western end of Trench 62 (recorded at the time as 'pits'). No dating evidence was recovered from these features.

Area 7 (Fig. 4)

- 4.32 A cluster of three pits towards the centre of Area 7A produced no dateable evidence and no suitable material for radiocarbon dating has been recovered from the processed soil samples.
- 4.33 A number of ditches in evaluation trenches 16, 17 and 18 remain undated. They are within an area of known Roman activity and may be Roman in date, although medieval and later ditches are also present in Area 7A and so the ditches may be later.

5 FACTUAL DATA AND STATEMENTS OF POTENTIAL

Stratigraphic Record: factual data

- 5.1 Following the completion of the fieldwork an ordered, indexed, and internally consistent site archive was compiled in accordance with specifications presented in the *Management of Archaeological Projects* (EH 1991). A database of all contextual and artefactual evidence and a phased site plan was also compiled and cross-referenced to spot-dating. The fieldwork comprises the following records:

| | Evaluation | Excavation | Total |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-------|
| Context sheets | 122 | 367 | 489 |
| Hand-drawn plans (1:5, 1:10) | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Sections (1:10) | 49 | 105 | 154 |
| Sample sheets | 12 | 24 | 36 |
| Monochrome Films | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Digital photographs | 211 | 276 | 487 |

- 5.2 The site survived in plough-truncated form across the areas excavated. There were relatively few stratigraphic relationships and patterns of features remain sporadic and not well defined. Despite a relative paucity of stratigraphic relationships and dating evidence, however, most features have been assigned a period based on context dates and/or spatial associations.

Stratigraphic record: statement of potential

- 5.3 The site stratigraphy has been analysed as far as the evidence allows and features have been dated by associated finds, radiocarbon, stratigraphic relationships and spatial logic where possible.
- 5.4 While the stratigraphic record forms a complete record of the archaeological features uncovered, the relative lack of inter-relationships between these features, and the limited amount of dating evidence available from other datasets, limits the potential for fully elucidating the function and development of the site. While there is some potential for further radiocarbon dates, datable material generally lacks secure context and even if dating were reliable it would provide little significant advance in the understanding of the site.

Artefactual record: data and potential

- 5.5 All finds collected during the evaluation and excavation have been cleaned, marked, quantified and catalogued by context. All metalwork has been x-rayed and stabilised where appropriate.

| Type | Category | Count | Weight (g) |
|------------|----------------------|-------|------------|
| Pottery | Prehistoric | 69 | 314 |
| | Roman | 348 | 4513 |
| | Anglo-Saxon | 0 | 0 |
| | Medieval | 54 | 335 |
| | Post-medieval/modern | 38 | 419 |
| | Total | 509 | 5311 |
| Flint | Worked/burnt | 185 | 1170 |
| Brick/tile | All | 17 | 1644 |
| Coins | Roman | 1 | - |
| Metals | Iron | 4 | - |
| | Copper alloy | 1 | - |

- 5.6 The finds were generally limited in range and quantity, Roman pottery providing the majority of the material. Associated finds were sparse and mostly unremarkable.

Worked flint (Appendix 2)

- 5.7 A relatively large quantity of flintwork indicates intermittent prehistoric activity across the site dating from perhaps as early as the early Mesolithic (before c. 6500 BC) through to the Bronze Age, with most material probably of the later Neolithic and earlier Bronze Age. No features could be positively identified as being earlier than the Middle Bronze Age, so it appears that most material was redeposited in later features or superficially. The material consists mostly of débitage, showing that activity included flint working. Only 18 of the 182 worked items were recognisable tool types. Although the flintwork was widely scattered, of particular interest was a large group from Ditch AD. This included Mesolithic knapping debris as well as less diagnostic material. It appears that the ditch cut through an area of Mesolithic and Neolithic activity, but also probably included Bronze Age flintwork of undiagnostic form.
- 5.8 The material as a whole forms a moderately significant group of flintwork relating to non-specific activities over a long time period. It includes some intrinsically interesting pieces which it is proposed are illustrated in a summary publication. The group takes its place alongside larger collections from the Clyst Valley area, such as the c. 400 lithics from Hayes Farm, Clyst Honiton (Hart *et al.* in press).

Pottery (Appendix 3)

- 5.9 The collection of pottery was small in view of the large area examined, amounting to 69 sherds (314 g) of prehistoric, 348 sherds (4513 g) of Roman, 54 sherds (335 g) of medieval, and a small group of later pottery. As a whole the pottery has importance in providing the primary, and in most cases the only, dating evidence for the features in which it was found, although this was often imprecise. It has little wider significance.
- 5.10 The fragmentary prehistoric pottery provides evidence of some features of probable Middle Bronze Age date, although the dating is uncertain. The Roman pottery is of greater significance, showing the presence of late Roman occupation for which there is little archaeological evidence other than two meandering ditches and a few pits. It is suspected that more substantial evidence lies within the unexcavated part of Area 7.
- 5.11 It is proposed that a summary publication report on the Roman pottery be prepared with particular attention to comparable regional groups. Little more can be said about the other pottery.

Metal and other finds (Appendices 4 – 6)

- 5.12 Other finds include a single copper-alloy Roman coin and small quantity of metalwork and Roman tile. These finds are unremarkable with the exception of a decorated copper-alloy steelyard (Fig. 19). The steelyard deserves illustration for publication and further research on comparative items. It appears to be unusual in a Roman rural 'peasant' context.
- 5.13 The Roman tile is of little significance and cannot be taken as evidence of a Roman-style building on or near the site.

Biological record: data and potential

- 5.14 All ecofacts recovered from the evaluation and excavation have been cleaned, marked, quantified and catalogued by context. Twenty-eight bulk samples were taken for the recovery of environmental remains.

| Type | Category | Count |
|-------------|---------------|-------|
| Animal bone | Fragments | 24 |
| Samples | Environmental | 28 |

Animal bone (Appendix 7)

- 5.15 The faunal remains were very sparse and poorly preserved. They provide negligible information on the nature or economy of any of the periods represented.

Plant macrofossil and charcoal (Appendix 8)

- 5.16 The quantity and quality of botanical remains were meagre and generally unremarkable. The virtual absence of cereals among the prehistoric remains may be significant in suggesting that cereal cultivation was not an aspect of the economy here at this time, but there is nothing else to corroborate this suggestion and the absence may relate to taphonomy. In the later Roman period in Area 7, however, there is good evidence of cereals and arable weeds. This seems to reflect broad changes in land use associated with what seems to have been a small farmstead in Roman times engaged in cereal cultivation.
- 5.17 There is little more that can be done with the environmental remains and a brief summary of the findings will be prepared for publication.

Radiocarbon dating (Appendix 9)

- 5.18 Two radiocarbon dates were obtained on charcoal from Ditch C of the double-ditched enclosure in Area 4. Neither sample was from an ideal context, both comprising essentially stray fragments rather than recognisable infilling events. Both were dated to the earlier part of the Iron Age and, although the dates do not quite overlap, they are on balance considered the best dating evidence available for the use of this ditch. The single Roman potsherd from the ditch is likely to have been intrusive, particularly in view of the common presence of Roman pottery in Area 7 associated with probable settlement. The earlier flintwork in these ditches is considered to be residual here, as it is elsewhere on the site.
- 5.19 There is no material ideal for further radiocarbon dates. It is possible that some material would produce valid results, although the general lack of contextual integrity suggests that much of this material might be residual or intrusive rather than provide helpful results.

6 SUMMARY STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL

- 6.1 The site comprised fragments of landscape from a range of periods. Features were generally thinly spread across the site, with no overall pattern for any period over the six excavation areas. Heavy truncation by ploughing had resulted in the survival of only negative features cut into the natural geology.

- 6.2 The earliest features comprise occasional pits of probable Middle Bronze Age date on the basis of small and fragmentary potsherds, and they have little potential for further examination. Ditch AD, AE and AF (Area 7B) are also, on balance, considered likely to be of Middle Bronze Age date, although they provided no conclusive dating evidence. In this case, the absence of Roman or later finds, which were relatively common in Area 7A, suggests an earlier date, as does the possible association with pit 14005. Moreover, Middle Bronze Age enclosures are known from elsewhere in the Clyst Valley so such dating would not be out of place here. There is some carbonised material from Ditch AD that may be suitable for radiocarbon dating, but in view of the prehistoric flintwork from these contexts it might equally be residual.
- 6.3 The date of part of double-ditched oval enclosure in Area 4 is also problematic. The shortage of pottery suggested an earlier prehistoric date, but the single Roman sherd created an ambivalence which prompted the submission of two radiocarbon samples. These two dates in the earlier part of the Iron Age provide a third possibility, and this is considered to be the most likely. The later addition of rectilinear ditches respecting the enclosure ditches is taken to support the suggestion of Roman-period modification to an Iron Age enclosure which had become redundant for its original purpose but still remained visible. There is no prospect of reaching a firmer conclusion with the present site.
- 6.4 The Roman occupation in Area 7A is also enigmatic, the features comprising just a few ditches of irregular ('un-Roman') form and some pits. The amount of pottery, together with charred cereals, does, however, indicate a substantial rural Roman presence here, which would be interpreted as a typical rural farming settlement had there been any evidence for associated structures, enclosures or domestic/agricultural features such as ovens. It is assumed that evidence of shallow-founded structures has been lost to later truncation, while there is also the potential for further remains in the unexcavated part of Area 7 (to be left as open ground within the development). The pottery will be put into its regional context in a summary publication and the unusual steelyard researched for comparanda.
- 6.5 Post-Conquest medieval and post-medieval ditches and enclosures lie within the same general area of the Roman occupation, so there is the suggestion that the Roman arrangements may have had an influence on later activity, but this cannot be explored further within the site. They clearly have an association with Old Park Farm, which is thought to have medieval origins. There is little potential for

additional landscape analysis in the post-medieval period, the Tithe map (1841) showing few differences to the recent and current mapped landscape here. A fuller map regression than that summarised here will enable a firmer narrative of the development of the Old Park Farm landscape.

- 6.6 The original objectives of the excavation were limited to providing a complete record of the surviving archaeology in the areas excavated and an assessment of its context (CA and Nexus Heritage 2011, Section 3), and this has been achieved with a reasonably high confidence rating. The results help add to the picture of landscape usage in the prehistoric and historical periods in the region, but are not of major significance. Perhaps the most significant aspects relate to the ?later prehistoric double-ditched enclosure, and the Roman rural settlement, both of which are not well defined but which perhaps add to an appreciation of the uniqueness of the South-West in these periods – relating to Research Aim 3 of the Regional Research Agenda (Webster 2008).

7 STORAGE AND CURATION

- 7.1 The archive is currently held at CA offices, Kemble, whilst post-excavation work proceeds. Upon completion of the project, and with the agreement of the legal landowners, the artefactual collection will be deposited with Exeter City Museum (accession number: 12/92), which has agreed in principle to accept the complete archive upon completion of the project.

8 PUBLICATION

- 8.1 The results from the investigations of the Old Park Farm, Pinhoe are of regional significance and merit publication. The significance of the site relates to the large double ditched enclosure of probably late prehistoric date and the traces of late Roman settlement both of which are noteworthy findings. It is proposed that a summary report of the results and their wider context is published in the *Devon Archaeological Society Proceedings*.

Synopsis of Proposed Report

**Fragments of a lowland landscape:
Archaeological Investigations at Old Park Farm, Pinhoe**
by Andrew Mudd and Thomas Weavill

| | Words |
|---|-------------------|
| Summary | 200 |
| Introduction | 500 |
| Excavation Results | |
| <i>Site discussions by period</i> | 2000 |
| <i>Flint by Jacky Sommerville</i> | 600 |
| <i>Pottery by E.R. McSloy</i> | 800 |
| <i>Metalwork and tile by E.R. McSloy</i> | 300 |
| <i>Animal bone by Andy Clarke</i> | 50 |
| <i>Plant macrofossil and charcoal by Sarah Cobain</i> | 800 |
| <i>Radiocarbon dating by Sarah Cobain</i> | 100 |
| Discussion | |
| <i>Landscape and activity</i> | 1000 |
| Acknowledgements | 200 |
| Bibliography | 1000 |
| Total words | 7550 |
| Approximate pages @ 700 words/page | 10.5 |
| | Pages |
| Tables | |
| <i>Plant macrofossil and charcoal</i> | 1 |
| <i>Radiocarbon dating results</i> | 0.5 |
| Illustrations | |
| Location of site | 1 |
| Site plan with phasing | 2 |
| Flint | 1 |
| pottery | 1 |
| metalwork | 0.5 |
| Total publication estimate | 17.5 pages |

9 PROJECT TEAM

- 9.1 The analysis and publication programme will be quality assured by **Martin Watts MCIfA, FSA** (Head of Publications: HoP) and managed by **Andrew Mudd MCIfA FSA**; (Post-excavation Manager: PXM), who will contribute to the discussion as senior author and co-ordinate the work of the following personnel:

Thomas Weavill (Project Supervisor: PS):

Post-excavation phasing, draft report preparation, research and archive

Ed McSloy MCIfA (Senior Finds Officer: SFO):

Specialist report preparation and liaison, post-excavation phasing.

Sarah Cobain ACIFA (Senior Environmental Officer: SEO)

Specialist report preparation plant macrofossil and charcoal and liaison

Lucy Martin MPhil MCIfA (Senior Illustrator: ILL):

Production of all site plans, sections, artefact drawings and finds photographs

- 9.2 The final publication report will be edited and reviewed internally by CA senior project management.

10 TIMETABLE

- 10.1 For a journal publication, CA would normally aim to have completed a publication draft within 12 months of commission to undertake the work and of approval of the publication project design. A detailed programme can be produced if desired on approval of the publication project design.

11 REFERENCES

- Anderberg A-L. 1994 *Atlas of seeds: Part 4* Uddevalla, Swedish Museum of Natural History
- Barton, R. N. E., Berridge, P. J., Walker, M. J. C. and Bevins, R. E. 1995 'Persistent Places in the Mesolithic Landscape: an Example from the Black Mountain Uplands of South Wales'. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. **61**, 81–116.
- Berggren, G. 1981 *Atlas of seeds: Part 3* Arlöv, Swedish Museum of Natural History
- BGS 2015 *Geology of Britain Viewer* mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html (accessed May 2015)
- Bronk Ramsey, C. 2009 'Bayesian analysis of radiocarbon dates', *Radiocarbon* **51**, 337–360
- Butler, C. 2005 *Prehistoric Flintwork*. Stroud. Tempus.
- CA and Nexus Heritage 2011 *Old Park Village, Pinhoe, Devon: Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Strip, Map and Recording*, Nexus Heritage Doc. No. 3076.R01/ Cotswold Archaeology Doc. No. 3111
- CIfA 2014 *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation*, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading
- Cappers, R.T.J., Bekker, R.M. and Jans, J.E.A. 2006 *Digital seed atlas of the Netherlands, Groningen Archaeological Studies 4* Eelde, Barkhuis Publishing, www.seedatlas.nl (accessed 12 January 2015)
- Clark, J. G. D. 1934 'The Classification of a Microlithic Culture: The Tardenoisian of Horsham'. *Archaeological Journal*. **90**, 52–77.
- DCCHES 2011 *Brief for Archaeological Strip, Map and Recording*, Devon County Council Historic Environment Service, Ref. ARCH/DM/ED/16132
- Drewitt, P. (ed.) 1978 *Archaeology in Sussex to AD 1500*. CBA Research Report 29. London.

- Edmonds, M. 1995 *Stone Tools and Society. Working Stone in Neolithic and Bronze Age Britain*. B T Batsford Ltd.
- English Heritage 1991 *Management of Archaeological Projects*. Second edition (MAP2), English Heritage, London
- Fulford, M.G. 1975 *New Forest Roman Pottery: manufacture and distribution, with a corpus of pottery types* Oxford, British Archaeological Reports 17
- Gale, R. and Cutler, D. F. 2000 *Plants in Archaeology. Identification Manual of Artefacts of Plant Origin from Europe and the Mediterranean* Otley, Westbury and the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew
- Hart J., Wood I., Barber A., Brett M. and Hardy A. in press 'Prehistoric land Use in the Clyst Valley: excavations at Hayes Farm, Clyst Honiton 1996 – 2012, *Proc. Devon Arch. Soc.* **72**, 1 – 56
- Hillson, S. 1996 *Mammal bones and teeth: An introductory guide to methods of identification* London The Institute of Archaeology, University of London
- Jacobi, R. M. 1976 'Britain Inside and Outside Mesolithic Europe'. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society.* **42**, 67–84.
- Jacobi, R. 1978 'The Mesolithic of Sussex'. In Drewitt, P. (ed.) 1978, 15–22.
- Neef, R., Cappers, R.T.J., and Bekker, R.M. 2012 *Digital atlas of economic plants in archaeology, Groningen Archaeological Studies 17* Elde, Barkhuis, <http://depa.eldoc.ub.rug.nl/> (accessed 12 January 2015)
- Newberry, J. 2002 'Inland Flint in Prehistoric Devon: Sources, Tool-making Quality and Use'. *Proc. Devon Archaeol. Soc.* **60**, 1–36.
- Nexus Heritage 2010 *Pinhoe New Village. Technical Report 4: Archaeology and Heritage Environmental Statement 3024.R01*

- Reimer, P.J., Bard, E., Bayliss, A., Beck, J.W., Blackwell, P.G., Bronk Ramsey, C., Grootes, P.M., Guilderson, T.P., Hafliðason, H., Hajdas, I., HattĹ, C., Heaton, T.J., Hoffmann, D.L., Hogg, A.G., Hughen, K.A., Kaiser, K.F., Kromer, B., Manning, S.W., Niu, M., Reimer, R.W., Richards, D.A., Scott, E.M., Southon, J.R., Staff, R.A., Turney, C.S.M., & van der Plicht, J. 2013 'IntCal13 and Marine13 Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curves 0–50,000 Years cal BP', *Radiocarbon* **55**, 1869–1887
- Schmid, E. 1972 *Atlas of animal bones: For prehistorians, archaeologists and quaternary geologists* Amsterdam, Elsevier Publishing Company
- Schoch, W., Heller, I., Schweingruber, F. H. and Kienast, F., 2004 *Wood anatomy of Central European species*, www.woodanatomy.ch (accessed 12 January 2015)
- Stace, C. 1997 *New flora of the British Isles* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Stratascan 2009 *Pinhoe New Village, Devon: Geophysical Survey*, Report J2655
- Tomber, R. and Dore, J. 1998 *The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection: a handbook* London: Museum of London Archaeology Service
- Webster, C.J. 2008 *The Archaeology of South West England: South West Archaeological Research Framework, Resource Assessment and Research Agenda*, Taunton, Somerset Heritage Services
- Wheeler, E.A., Baas, P., and Gasson, P.E., 1989 'IAWA list of microscopic features for hardwood identification', *IAWA Bulletin n.s.* **10 (3)**, 219–332
- Young, C.J. 1977 *Oxfordshire Roman pottery* Oxford, Brit. Archaeol. Rep. Brit. Series. **43**, British Archaeological Reports

APPENDIX 1: STRATIGRAPHIC ASSESSEMENT BY ANDREW MUDD

A total of 712 contexts was recorded during the evaluation, watching brief and excavations as detailed below:-

| Period | No. of contexts |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| | |
| Natural | 88 |
| 1 Early prehistoric | 80 |
| 2 Later prehistoric to early Roman | 58 |
| 3 Roman | 74 |
| 4 Medieval | 49 |
| 5 post-medieval to modern | 294 |
| Undated | 69 |
| TOTAL | 712 |

The most significant contexts relate to Periods 1 to 4 (261 contexts) representing a relatively small component of the total records. They relate mostly to discrete and linear features without great complexity and little more can be achieved with further analysis. Post-medieval and modern features are widespread, but provide information only on elements of the relatively recent landscape. As such they have little wider value and are not worth any further detailed analysis.

APPENDIX 2: LITHICS BY JACKY SOMMERVILLE

Introduction and methodology

Five worked flints were recovered from the evaluation phase, weighing 20g. A total of 177 lithics, weighing 1022g, was recovered from the excavation. Of these, 21 were recovered from bulk soil sampling of four deposits. Three pieces of burnt, unworked flint weighing 128g were also recorded.

The artefacts were recorded according to broad artefact/débitage type and catalogued directly onto a Microsoft Access database. Full recording was carried out. Attributes recorded included: degree of edge damage, rolling (abrasion) and cortication; colour; cortex description; breakage and burning; and for débitage and tools: dimensions, butt and termination type; hard or soft hammer percussion; evidence of platform preparation and utilisation; and the knapping stage (i.e. primary, secondary or tertiary) unless breakage precluded this.

Excavation

Provenance

The excavated assemblage comprised 177 worked lithics recorded in 33 separate deposits. Of these, 37% (66 items) was recovered from subsoil or as unstratified finds. The remainder (111 items) was recovered from cut features: 98 (88%) from ditches, seven (6%) from pits; two (2%) from pits/postholes; two (2%) from a land drain; one (1%) from a gully and one (1%) from a posthole. With the exception of the ditch fills listed below, the majority of deposits from cut features contain only one to three lithics, which is not sufficient to date the feature.

Ten fills of Ditch AD (fills 700127, 700132, 700134, 700136, 700152, 700153, 700154, 700155, 700156 and 700161) produced a total of 83 worked lithics and a single burnt, unworked flint. The only fills on the site to contain more than ten lithic items are included in these fills. The recovered lithics include a microlith and seven bladelets, all of which are Mesolithic in date, and eight blades, which are likely to date to the Mesolithic or Neolithic periods. The remainder of items (chips, cores, flakes, a scraper and a notched flake) are not closely dateable and it is likely that these fills contain redeposited material. None of the lithics were recovered in association with prehistoric pottery.

Raw material and condition

The primary raw material is flint and four items were made on Greensand chert, which outcrops in the region of the Devon/Somerset border and is often found in Mesolithic assemblages from those counties (Barton *et al.* 1995, 90).

Cortex remains on 76 items. On 54 of these (71%) it is a deep buff colour and 19 of the flints with this cortex are dark grey and were noted to be particularly fine-grained with minimal inclusions. This very good quality flint appears to have derived from the same source. Cortex on 48 items (64%) is abraded or chattered, indicating secondary sources such as river or beach gravels. On 25 items (33%) it is chalky, suggesting a primary source such as chalk. There are several potential sources for the flint at Pinhoe, including the area near Beer Head, Beer and more local areas such as the Bovey and Decoy Basins (Newberry 2002, 1– 19).

Forty-two percent of the lithics have been broken and 13 (7%) are burnt. Half have been corticated to some degree. The majority of the assemblage (59%) is grey in colour and 33% is white (some with a proportion of blue or grey) due to cortication. The remainder of unburnt items display honey-coloured, greenish or brown staining, apart from one which features pinkish staining, which does not appear to have resulted from burning.

Across the unburnt lithics from cut features (excluding chips and those from the land drain), edge damage on 58% was minimal or non-existent and 81% had suffered little or no rolling, suggesting that a proportion of this material may be *in situ*.

Range and variety

The breakdown of the assemblage is detailed in Table 2.1. Retouched items/tools amount to 18 items.

Primary technology

The débitage (blades, bladelets, flakes and chips) totals 159 items. The presence of 17 blades and 13 bladelets (19% of the débitage) indicates activity earlier in the prehistoric period, during the Mesolithic and/or Early Neolithic. These were recovered from ditch fills, subsoil or as unstratified finds.

Of the 90 items where the reduction stage could be established, 58 (64%) are secondary, 32 (36%) are tertiary and none are primary. This large proportion of secondary items, and lack of primary pieces, suggests that the initial stages of flint-knapping were carried out elsewhere and raw material was brought to the site in a partially-reduced state. The presence of cores, however, confirms that flint working did occur on-site and the recovery of 12 chips from bulk soil sampling of fill 700127 of ditch 700126 is also suggestive of *in situ* knapping.

The 15 cores recovered comprise six single-platform, three dual-platform and six multi-platform types. The single-platform cores include two discoidal and one pyramidal types: the latter (retrieved from subsoil) had been used to produce bladelets and four of the others had been made from flakes. Two of the dual-platform cores feature dual-opposed working platforms and had been used to produce flakes, blades and possibly bladelets. The multi-platform cores had all been used to produce flakes. The cores represent the whole of the prehistoric period: a Mesolithic bladelet core; dual-opposed platform blade cores from the Mesolithic or Early Neolithic; Later Neolithic discoidal cores (Edmonds 1995, 82); and some unsystematically reduced multi-platform cores of probable Bronze Age date (Butler 2005, 181).

Secondary technology

The retouched items mostly comprise scrapers, and notched and retouched flakes (see Table 2.1). Scrapers are typically the most commonly found tools on sites of all prehistoric periods (*ibid.*, 49).

The most closely dateable tools are microliths recovered from fill 400128 of ditch 400126 (Ditch C), and from bulk soil sampling of fill 400104 of pit 400103 and fill 700127 of ditch 700126 (Ditch AD). The microlith from fill 400128 is an obliquely blunted point (Jacobi Type 1a) featuring steep, fine, quite regular retouch along the straight, truncated dorsal edge. That from fill 400104 is a scalene micro-triangle (Jacobi Type 7b) which displays very fine, steep retouch along the shorter edge and truncation, and semi-abrupt retouch on the longer, right dorsal edge. The scalene micro-triangle is a Later Mesolithic type (Jacobi 1978, 19–21), dateable to c. 6500–4000 BC. The microlith from fill 700127 (Ditch AD) is a Clark Type B4 obliquely blunted point with the left edge blunted and the opposite edge trimmed with fine, regular semi-abrupt retouch (1934, 56). At 11m wide, this microlith is likely to belong to the Early Mesolithic broad blade microlith industry (10000–6500 BC) (Jacobi 1976, 67).

The knife from fill 700163 of pit 700162 was made on a secondary flake. It features quite shallow, regular, fine but subtle retouch along the neatly shaped right dorsal edge. That from fill 400056 of ditch 400057 was a double-sided type, broken in three pieces and made on a thin flake with semi-abrupt, quite regular retouch on both faces of the proximal and distal edges.

The scrapers had all been made using quite fine and regular, abrupt to semi-abrupt retouch on flake blanks. None are closely dateable types.

Evaluation

Single worked flint items were hand-recovered from five deposits, all of which were ditch fills. The flints comprised three items of débitage and two retouched tools (Table 2.1). The notched flake, from fill 58006 of ditch 58005, is a medial flake fragment with notches formed from fine, regular, steep retouch on both the left dorsal and left ventral edges. None of these items are diagnostic: all are broadly prehistoric in date.

Statement of potential

The excavated lithics assemblage from Old Park Farm, Pinhoe contains a substantial redeposited component, at 55%. Formal tools are mostly undiagnostic types, however, cores and débitage suggest the Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age periods are all represented. The most closely dateable artefacts are the three microliths, one of which was a diagnostic Later Mesolithic type and one of which may be Early Mesolithic in date.

The lithics are of some significance as evidence of Mesolithic and later prehistoric activity. The assemblage has been fully recorded for the purpose of this assessment. A report characterising the lithics assemblage, which may take the form of a modified version of the report presented here, should be included in the publication. This should include catalogue descriptions of selected artefacts and accompanying illustrations.

Six worked flint items should be illustrated: the microliths, double notched flake, end-and-side scraper and double-sided knife.

Table 2.1: Breakdown of the assemblage

| Excavation | |
|-------------------------|----|
| Primary | |
| Blade | 17 |
| Bladelet | 13 |
| Chip | 15 |
| Core | 15 |
| Flake | 99 |
| Secondary | |
| Knife | 2 |
| Microlith | 3 |
| Miscellaneous retouched | 1 |
| Notched flake | 3 |

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Piercer | 1 |
| Retouched flake | 3 |
| Scraper (end) | 3 |
| Scraper (end-and-side) | 1 |
| Scraper (side) | 1 |
| Total | 177 |
| Evaluation | |
| Primary | |
| Chip | 1 |
| Flake | 2 |
| Secondary | |
| Notched flake | 1 |
| Retouched flake | 1 |
| Total | 5 |

APPENDIX 3: POTTERY BY E R MCSLOY

A moderately small hand-recovered assemblage amounting to 508 sherds (5309g) was recorded. For the report, the pottery was fully quantified; scanned by context, sorted by fabric/vessel form and quantified according to sherd count, weight and rim EVEs (estimated Vessel Equivalents).

The pottery assemblage includes material from a trench evaluation undertaken in 2010 in addition to successive phases of area excavation (Table 3.1). The assemblage was derived from 43 deposits, primarily the fills of ditches (78%) and pits/postholes (13%). A total of 45 sherds (9%) were recorded from subsoil type deposits and a further three sherds were unstratified.

Fabric codings utilised for the majority Roman group correlate where appropriate to the National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber and Dore 1998). Codings for prehistoric and post-Roman types are based on primary/secondary inclusion type or aspects of firing/use of glaze. The assemblage is summarised below and according to broad period.

Prehistoric

The Prehistoric group amounts to 69 sherds (314g) and was recorded from five deposits including six sherds which were re-deposited in subsoil deposit 700001. The bulk of the prehistoric group derives from two features: pits 14005 (30 sherds) and 700063 (28 sherds). The original interpretation of feature 14005 as a cremation burial would seem to be invalidated by an absence of associated bone and the group may all relate to domestic activity.

The Prehistoric assemblage is well fragmented, reflected in a low mean sherd weight (4.6g), although surface preservation is good. The small size of the group and a scarcity of featured sherds makes close dating problematical. Fabric PreRO2 which makes up the majority accords with the 'Exeter Volcanic' group of fabrics, which can characterise of Bronze Age and Middle Iron Age pottery groups from south Devon (Quinnell 2014, 54). The group from deposit 14010 consists of 30 sherds (52g) representing a single, small, straight-sided vessel with a simple rim. The second group, that from pit 700063, comprised joining sherds from the lower portion of a jar-like vessel in fabric PreRO2. In this instance the vessel thickness (8mm) and firing characteristics would suit best a Middle Bronze Age dating though this is by no means certain.

Dating for the remaining pottery, which occurs mostly as small numbers of unfeatured bodysherds is within the Middle Bronze Age to Iron Age period.

Roman

Pottery of Roman date makes up the majority of the total, amounting to 348 sherds (4513g). The mean sherd weight is moderately high (12.9g) and not suggestive of a well broken-up group. Surface preservation is typically poor, particularly for some fineware types; this likely an effect of burial environment rather than through abrasion.

The larger part of the assemblage, including large context groups (44–92 sherds) from ditch Q fills 700034, 700040 and 700073, is made up reduced coarsewares of local (type SOD RE) or regional (DOR BB1) origin. Identifiable vessel forms among these types are representative of utilitarian classes: jars (everted-rim forms), plain-rim dishes and conical bowls with flat/grooved or flanged rims. Among the South Devon ware (type SOD

RE) are large storage jars; some with pinched-out or applied strip 'decoration'. Greywares and darker-firing 'black sandy' type fabrics, all of unknown but probable local origin occur in small quantities.

Fineware/specialist ware types all are from regional or continental centres. New Forest colour-coated/slipped types (NFO CC) include a probable bowl (eval deposit 15003) and a substantially complete indented beaker (Fulford form 27.3) from deposit 700040. Oxfordshire whitewares are present as sherds from two mortaria (Young form M22) from deposits 700001 and ditch Q fill 700040 (Young 1977).

Continental finewares are represented by small quantities of Central (LEZ SA2) and east Gaulish samian (EGSA) and Central Gaulish black-slipped ware (CNG BS). Identifiable forms among the samian are limited to decorated bowl sherds (Drag. 37), from ditch Q fills 700034 and 700040, which are described below. The Central Gaulish black slipped vessel, from deposit 700040, represents a beaker of uncertain form.

Discussion/dating

The occurrence of samian and Central Gaulish black-slipped ware is suggestive of some earlier Roman (2nd or earlier 3rd century) activity. All however appears to be re-deposited, occurring from deposits where dating is likely to post-date c. AD 250. The indications of later Roman dating are primarily from regional types. Forms among the local South Devon wares (conical flanged bowls and jars resembling late series Black-burnished wares) are also consistent with later Roman chronology.

Decorated samian catalogue G. Monteil

Three sherds of decorated samian ware were submitted for a report. Each sherd was examined, after taking a small fresh break, under a x 20 binocular microscope as a first mean to differentiate the fabric and production centre. A catalogue was then compiled where each entry consists of a context number alongside form, fabric and decoration identification when possible with a date range.

The three sherds of decorated samian ware are from ditch Q fills (700034) and (700040) and represent one vessel in the style of Central Gaulish Antonine potter *Paternus* v.

The catalogue is organised by context and each entry gives the excavation context number(s) with details of the decoration. The letter and number codes used for the non-figured types on the Central Gaulish material –such as B223, C281, etc are the ones created by Rogers (1974). The figured-types referred to as Os. *** are the ones illustrated by Felix Oswald in his *Index of figure-types on terra sigillata* (1936).

Period 3 ditch fill 700040 (fill of Ditch 700039): one bodysherd; and Period 3 ditch fill 700034 (fill of 700033): two joining rim sherds. Dr.37, Lezoux, in the style of *Paternus* v, AD 150-185 (Fig. 18).

The slip and surface are extremely abraded. Though they do not join, the three fragments are most probably from the same vessel, both display similar fabric and slip and the decoration on each is consistent.

The largest sherd (700040) shows a panelled decoration beneath an ovolo (B135?) and an astragalus border. The panel on the left show Vulcan Os.68 and another unidentified figured type within a large medallion and a rosette, probably C242, in the top right-hand corner. The second panel is split and shows a bird close to Os.2261 in a festoon on top of a small medallion with the same rosette as the large panel. The ovolo, border, medallion,

Vulcan and the rosette all suggest the work of *Paternus* v: a similar medallion with Os.68 are on a number of stamped bowls (Inv. No. 0012113 and Rogers 1999, pl. 77, no.1), the border used both under the ovolo and to separate panels is on a stamped bowl from Geneva (Inv. No. 0012119) and the rosette is known for him (Stanfield and Simpson 1990, pl. 109, no. 1, Inv. No. 0012307). The bird is however unrecorded in his work. The two sherds from deposit 700034 are much more abraded and smaller but seem to show the same ovolo and the top of a similar large medallion.

Medieval

The medieval pottery group amounts to 54 sherds (335g), recorded from six deposits. The assemblage is moderately well broken-up (the mean sherd weight is 6.2g). Surface preservation is however good and there is common survival of external carbonised residues (sooting) resulting from use.

A very narrow range of fabrics is represented (Table 3.1). Both types are variants of the dominant unglazed coarseware tradition of chert-tempered fabrics which is common to the area across the 12th to 14th centuries. Rim sherds were identified only from the largest context group, ditch fill 23011. Three vessels are represented consisting of jars with globular bodies and rims which differ in detail (convex/everted or everted with internally expanded tops).

Post-medieval/modern

A very small post-medieval/modern group was recovered (38 sherds, weighing 149g). Most material occurs as small groups of sherds (up to 6) from ditch and posthole fills. The earliest material consists of sherds of red-fired glazed earthenwares or slip-decorated glazed earthenwares which may date as early as the later 16th century. A single sherd of Westerwald stoneware (ditch B fill 200039) dateable to the late 17th or 18th centuries is the sole imported type present. The majority of the group consists of clear-glazed white-firing types (crea; whcn) common to the period after c. 1740 and produced on an industrial scale in centres in the midlands and elsewhere.

Statement of potential and recommendations for further analysis

Overall the pottery assemblage is small and of minimal significance beyond at a local level, relating to the chronology and interpretation of the site itself.

The small prehistoric group is limited in its range and merits little further work. A short summary might be adapted for publication based on the report presented here.

The largest component, the Roman material is for the most part consistent in its date range, suggesting that activity is concentrated in the later Roman period, after c. AD 250. The generally good condition and relatively large context group sizes are indications that the excavated features are located in the vicinity of areas of habitation. For the most part the character of the assemblage is typical of the period and for material from the Exeter environs. The level of recording/reporting undertaken for the assessment is sufficient for the purposes of the archive. Limited illustration of pottery vessels is recommended to accompany this publication to comprise up to 6 vessels.

The inclusion of continental types and Romano-British finewares/specialist wares may relate more to the proximity of a major urbanised settlement and the availability of such types rather than being an indication of higher status. Further research into Romano-British groups from the area may help to elucidate this. As already

noted the quantities of Gaulish samian and other types is evidence for some activity at the site pre-dating c. AD 200/250 samian. The large samian sherds from a Drag 37 decorated bowl from ditch Q fills 700034 and 700040 are of interest as a possible 'survival in use'.

The medieval and later groups are of minimal significance, only as broad dating evidence for post-Roman activity at the site. Further recording or analysis is not recommended, although if required a summary report for the purposes of the archive or publication note can be prepared from the report presented here.

Table 3.1: Pottery summary. Quantities in sherd count, weight and rim EVEs.

| Date | Fabric* | Short Description | Eval. | Exc. | Total | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------|------|-------|--------|------|
| | | | Ct. | Ct. | Ct. | Wt.(g) | EVEs |
| Prehist. | preCHq | Sparse chert | | 1 | 1 | 42 | 0 |
| | preRO1 | Sparse rock | | 5 | 5 | 12 | 0 |
| | preRO2 | Common rock (Exeter Volcanic) | 32 | 31 | 63 | 260 | .10 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | | | 32 | 37 | 69 | 314 | .10 |
| Roman (local/ Un sourced) | SOD RE | South Devon reduced ware | 33 | 151 | 185 | 2243 | 1.71 |
| | BS1 | Black sandy sparse rock/clay pellet | | 8 | 8 | 66 | .24 |
| | bs2 | Black sandy | | 6 | 6 | 34 | .08 |
| | GW1 | Greyware; sparse rounded quartz | 8 | 3 | 11 | 36 | .05 |
| | GW2 | Greyware; common quartz/clay pellet | 4 | 3 | 7 | 99 | .15 |
| | GW3 | Greyware; common quartz/organic | | 7 | 7 | 35 | .10 |
| | ves | Vesicular fabric | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| | OX1 | Oxidised | | 3 | 3 | 17 | 0 |
| (Regional) | OXFWH | Oxford whiteware (mortaria) | | 2 | 2 | 127 | .19 |
| | NFO CC | New Forest colour-coated | 1 | 8 | 9 | 52 | .20 |
| | DOR BB1 | Southeast Dorset Black-burnished | 54 | 36 | 90 | 1157 | 1.25 |
| | SOW BB1 | Southwest Black-burnished ware | | 7 | 7 | 241 | .53 |
| (Continental) | LEZ SA2 | Central Gaulish (Lezoux) samian | | 4 | 4 | 199 | .17 |
| | CNG BS | Central Gaulish black-slipped | | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 |
| | egsa | East Gaulish samian | | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| | amph | Misc. amphora | | 5 | 5 | 187 | 0 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | | | 100 | 321 | 348 | 4513 | 4.87 |
| medieval | CH | Chert-tempered | 27 | | 27 | 208 | .15 |
| | CHqz | Quartz/chert-tempered | 2 | 24 | 26 | 127 | .13 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | | | 29 | 24 | 53 | 335 | .28 |
| Post-med/ modern | crea | Creamware | | 14 | 14 | 46 | 0 |
| | whch | Refined whiteware | 1 | 12 | 13 | 50 | 0 |
| | gre | Glazed earthenware (South Somerset?) | | 4 | 4 | 29 | 0 |
| | gslw | Slipware (South Somerset?) | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| | lengsto | Late English stoneware | | 2 | 2 | 14 | 0 |
| | yw | Yellow ware (including Mocha type) | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | westw | Westerwald stoneware | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | | | 1 | 36 | 37 | 149 | |

* types in bold equate to National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber and Dore 1998)

APPENDIX 4: CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL BY E MCSLOY

Small quantities of Roman and later ceramic building material were recovered (Table 4.1). The material was scanned by context and quantified according to date/class and by fragment count/weight. Fabric and features such as thickness and any pre-firing marks were also recorded for the Roman group. The assemblage is described below by broad period.

Roman

The Roman group amounts to seven fragments (1023g), recorded from three deposits. Condition is generally good, although 'powdery' fabric 1 has suffered some of surfaces. The group is limited in size and range and identified classes consist of tegulae (flanged roof tiles) only. Thickness for the tegulae and indeterminate tile fragments is in the range 21-25mm. Joining tegula fragments in fabric 2 from deposit 700099, medieval ditch R, feature a semi-circular signature at the front edge of the tile.

Post-Roman

A total of 10 fragments of medieval/post-medieval and modern material (607g) was recorded from three deposits. Two small and joining flat tile fragments from Trench 15, Ditch 15004 (fill 15005) measure 12mm thick and might date to the medieval or post-medieval period but are considered possibly intrusive in a Roman ditch. Similar or later dating is probable for an unfeathered brick fragment from deposit 700117, ditch V. The remainder of the assemblage consists of modern earthenware drain fragments. Fragments from 700099 are probably intrusive given the medieval dating of this feature.

Statement of potential and recommendations for further analysis

Recording/reporting as part of the assessment is sufficient for the purposes of the archive. No additional work is recommended.

Table 4.1: Ceramic building material summary

| Date | Context | Entity | Classif. | Remarks | Count | Weight(g) |
|--------------------|---------|---------|------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
| Roman | 700054 | 700053 | tile/brick | Fab. 1 flake | 1 | 50 |
| | 700073 | Ditch Q | tegula? | Fab. 1; 21mm th | 1 | 140 |
| | 700099 | Ditch R | tegula | Fab.1; 21mm th | 2 | 399 |
| | 700099 | Ditch R | tegula | Fab. 2; 25mm th | 2 | 410 |
| | 700099 | Ditch R | tile | Fab.1; 21mm th | 1 | 24 |
| medieval/post-med. | 15005 | 15004 | tile | | 2 | 14 |
| Modern | 700099 | Ditch R | pipe | | 3 | 225 |
| | 700117 | Ditch V | brick | frag | 1 | 34 |
| | 700117 | Ditch V | pipe | | 4 | 348 |
| Total | | | | | 17 | 1644 |

Fabric summary (Roman)

F1 Pale orange throughout. Soft, with powdery surfaces. Common fine (silt-sized) quartz; sparse red iron oxide 1-2mm.

F2 Pink-orange with grey core. Hard, with smooth feel. Common yellow unhomogenised clay lumps/streaks; common black ferrous inclusions (1-2mm). Underside sanded with rounded quartz 0.5-0.8mm.

APPENDIX 5: COINS BY E R MCSLOY

A single coin was recovered from Period 2 (Roman) ditch fill 700034, within Ditch Q. The condition of the coin is extremely poor, probably as the result of burial environment, and has resulted in almost the entire original surface.

The poor condition of the coin means that it cannot be identified. On the basis of size (22mm) and general characteristics dating in the later 3rd or early 4th centuries is suggested.

Statement of potential and recommendations for further analysis

Recording/reporting as part of the assessment is sufficient for the purposes of the archive. No additional work is recommended.

APPENDIX 6: METAL FINDS BY E R MCSLOY

A small group of metal finds (five items) was recovered from evaluation and excavation phases (Table 6.1). Most items were recorded from Roman-phased deposits; the exception being iron horseshoe Ra. 2 from Period 4 ditch W fill 23004.

The metalwork is currently stored in airtight plastic containers and with humidity controlled/monitored. The ironwork is heavily corroded/soil-encrusted, but is stable. The copper-alloy steelyard is in good condition and is stable.

A fragmentary nail and strip are not intrinsically dateable although Roman dating is suggested by associated material. An iron object from Period 3 ditch Q, 700033, (fill 700034) is fragmentary and tentatively identified as a double-spiked loop, a common form of Roman buildings fitting. A second item dateable by form is copper-alloy steelyard fragment Ra. 1 (Fig. 19), which was recovered from Period 2 Ditch 15004 (fill 15005). The steelyard balance is asymmetrical utilising a single arm along which a counterweight could be moved and with graded marks indicating the weight. This example features three perforations for the means of suspension and for hooks or other to hold items for weighing. Unusually for this class of object, the terminal with suspension holes features lobed mouldings above and below and a scribed/punched decoration in a criss-cross motif. Steelyards are known across the Roman period, with the lead or copper-alloy weights being more common finds. Later Roman dating is probable for Ra. 1 based on associated pottery.

The single object of post-Roman date is iron horseshoe Ra. 2 which was recorded from Period 4 ditch W fill 23004. Object Ra. 2 is complete; its proportions and the broad branch width are consistent with post-medieval dating.

Statement of potential and recommendations for further analysis

The metalwork represents a small group, the wider significance of which is limited.

A single item, steelyard Ra. 1 is of intrinsic interest, representative of a relatively rare class of object and unusual in being decorated. This object should be described in full and drawn for publication. A short report to include references to known parallels should be prepared to publication standard. To clarify details of form and ensure long-term preservation, this object should be cleaned and stabilised by a specialist conservator.

Table 6.1: Metalwork summary

| Material | Period | Context | Entity | Ra. no. | Description | Date | Action |
|----------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Cu al. | 2 | 15005 | 15004 | 1 | steelyard | Roman | Clean/conserv |
| Fe | 2 | 13004 | 13003 | | nail | Roman | |
| | 2 | 16003 | 16004 | | strip | | |
| | 2 | 700034 | Ditch Q | | double-spiked loop? | | |
| | 4 | 23004 | Ditch W | 2 | horseshoe | post-med/modern | |

APPENDIX 7: FAUNAL REMAINS BY ANDY CLARKE

The animal bone recovered by a mixture of hand excavation and bulk soil sampling from seven deposits. For the purpose of this report, the bones were identified to species and skeletal element using an osteological reference collection (Cotswold Archaeology Ltd) as well as standard reference literature (Schmid 1972, Hillson 1996), and quantified by fragment count and weight. The bone preservation varied, but generally the condition was very poor and the assemblage was highly fragmented. Where modern damage was observed and re-fitting was possible, those fragments were recorded as a single bone.

A total of 24 fragments (68g) were recovered (Table 7.1) of which, only a single cattle (*Bos taurus*) metacarpal was identifiable to species.

Statement of potential and recommendations for further analysis

The amount of potential data that can be obtained from such a small is extremely low. The poor preservation, level of fragmentation has almost entirely removed the osteological landmarks that aid species identification and provide interpretative information. This being the case, no further work is recommended.

Table 7.1: Identified animal species by fragment count (NISP) and weight and context.

| Period | Cut | Fill | Entity | BOS | O/C | MM | un-id SS | Total | Weight (g) |
|--------|---------|--------|----------|-----|-----|----|----------|-------|------------|
| 1 | 700122 | 700123 | posthole | | | 2 | | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 700128 | 700129 | Ditch AD | | | 4 | | 4 | 7 |
| 1 | 700135 | 700136 | Ditch AD | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| 3 | 700039 | 700040 | Ditch Q | | | | 7 | 7 | 1 |
| 3 | 700063 | 700064 | pit | | | | 2 | 2 | 0.5 |
| 4 | 700005 | 700006 | pit | | | | 2 | 2 | 0.5 |
| 5 | Subsoil | 700001 | | 1 | | | | 1 | 48 |
| Total | | | | 1 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 24 | |
| Weight | | | | 48 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 68 | |

BOS = Cattle; MM = medium sized mammal; un-id SS = unidentifiable fragments from environmental samples

APPENDIX 8: PLANT MACROFOSSILS AND CHARCOAL BY SARAH COBAIN

Introduction

A total of 17 bulk soil samples from the excavation and 11 from the evaluation were retrieved for plant macrofossil and charcoal assessment. These were recovered from features dating to the Prehistoric, Roman and medieval periods. The aim of this report was to initially assess the type, preservation and quantity of plant macrofossil and charcoal remains and where appropriate carry out full analysis to provide evidence of socio-economic activities being undertaken on the site (crop husbandry, diet, living conditions of communities, exploitation of woodlands for fuel, woodland management), and to infer the composition of the local flora and woodlands.

Methodology

Following flotation (CA Technical Manual No 2), the residue was dried and sorted by eye, the floated material scanned and seeds identified using a low power stereo-microscope (Brunel MX1) at magnifications of x10 to x40. Identifications were carried out with reference to images and descriptions by Cappers *et al.* (2006), Neef *et al.* (2012) Berggren (1981) and Anderberg (1994). Nomenclature follows Stace (1997). A selection of charcoal fragments were fractured by hand to reveal the wood anatomy on radial, tangential and transverse planes. The pieces were then supported in a sand bath and identified under an epi-illuminating microscope (Brunel SP400) at magnifications from x40 to x400. Identifications were carried out with reference to images and descriptions by Gale and Cutler (2000) and Schoch *et al.* (2004) and Wheeler *et al.* (1989). Nomenclature of species follows Stace (1997).

Results

The results are presented in tabular form (Tables 8.1–8.4). SS refers to the Soil Sample number. Taxa have been identified as one of two possibilities (for example emmer/spelt wheat - *Triticum dicoccum/Triticum spelta*) where the two species exhibit similar morphology but the species are not sufficiently well-preserved to observe subtle anatomical differences required for full identification.

Period 1 Earlier Prehistoric

Area 2

Pit 200003 (SS 200001) contained two hazelnut shells (*Corylus avellana*), a false oat-grass tuber (*Arrhenatherum elatius*) and a single indeterminate cereal grain. Charcoal was recorded in small quantities and identified as oak (*Quercus*), hawthorn/rowan/crab apple (*Crataegus monogyna/Sorbus/Malus sylvestris*) and cherry species (*Prunus*).

Tree-throw pit 37005 (SS 8) contained no plant macrofossil material, but did contain a large, moderately well preserved assemblage of charcoal identified as hazel.

Area 7

Pit 700124 (SS 700008), pit/posthole 700149 (SS 700011) and Ditch AF (SS 700016) contained no plant macrofossil material. Charcoal was present in small quantities and identified as oak, alder/hazel (*Alnus glutinosa/Corylus avellana*), hawthorn/rowan/crab apple and cherry species. Fill 700119 (SS 700015) within Ditch AE contained a single hazelnut shell. Fill 700127 (SS 700014) within ditch AD contained 11 hazelnut shells. Charcoal in both ditches was rare and identified as alder/hazel and oak.

Pit 700063 (SS 700002) contained a single hazelnut shell. Charcoal was present in small quantities and identified as oak and cherry species.

Fill 14006 (SS 5 and SS 7) within pit 14005 containing Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age vessel 14010 contained no plant macrofossil material, but did contain a large assemblage of moderately well-preserved charcoal identified as alder.

Period 2 Later Prehistoric to Roman

Area 4

Ditches C (SS 406 and SS 408), D (SS 412 and SS 413) and H (SS 407) contained no plant macrofossil material. Charcoal was present in small quantities and identified as oak with three fragments of alder/hazel within ditch C.

Period 3 Roman

Area 4

Fill 400108 within ditch L (cut 400107) (SS 404) contained four cereal grains identified as wheat (*Triticum*). Charcoal was abundant but poorly preserved and identified as oak, hawthorn/rowan/crab apple, alder/hazel and cherry species.

Area 7

Fill 700040 (SS 700005) of ditch Q (cut 700039) and contained a moderate assemblage of charred plant macrofossils including emmer/spelt wheat and oat (*Avena*) cereal grains, spelt and emmer/spelt wheat glume bases and pale persicaria (*Persicaria lapathifolia*), bromes (*Bromus*), vetches/peas (*Vicia/Lathyrus*) and goosefoots (*Chenopodium*) seeds and a heaths (*Erica*) perianth. Charcoal was abundant but poorly preserved and identified as oak and ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*).

From the evaluation, Ditch 13003 (SS 3) contained a small assemblage of poorly preserved plant macrofossils includes a bromes seed and indeterminate cereal grain. Ditch 15002 (SS 2) contained a larger, moderately well preserved assemblage including spelt and emmer/spelt wheat cereal grains and a spelt wheat glume base. Charcoal from both ditches abundant, but poorly preserved and recorded as maple, alder/hazel, gorse/broom, oak and hawthorn/rowan and crab apple.

Period 4 medieval

Area 7

Fill 700006 (SS 700006) was retrieved from pit 700005 and contained a single carbonised bromes seed. The charcoal was present in small quantities, and poor preservation meant that only three gorse/broom (*Ulex/Cytisus*) fragments were identifiable. The paucity and poor preservation of this material means no further work is recommended.

Undated

Area 4

First fill 400104 (SS 401) and second fill 400105 (SS 402) came from pit 400103. A single indeterminate charred cereal grain was recovered from fill 400104 (SS 401). The charcoal was present in small quantities and identified as oak and maple (*Acer campestre*). Second fill 400105 (SS 402) contained no plant macrofossils and a small amount of poorly preserved charcoal identified as oak and alder/hazel. The residual nature and paucity of this material from these deposits means no further work is recommended.

Discussion

Period 1 Earlier Prehistoric

Pit 14005 containing vessel 14010 was initially considered to be a cremation burial, however no cremated bone was recovered from the sample. The presence of only alder charcoal, a poor fuel which is not typically used as the dominant fuel within cremation pyres, also suggests that this is not a cremation grave. The absence of any other artefactual material within this sample precludes any further interpretation.

Material recovered from other prehistoric features included hazelnut shells, a possible fragment of fruit flesh, a single false oat-grass tuber and wheat species and indeterminate cereal grains. Charcoal, present in small to moderate quantities was identified dominantly as oak with smaller amounts of alder/hazel, hawthorn/rowan/crab apple and cherry species. The small quantity of material recovered suggests this material originates from wind-blown hearth debris, most likely associated with domestic activity.

Hazelnuts are a common find in Prehistoric features and are indicative of locally sourced foodstuffs. The small cereal assemblage means it is not possible to ascertain whether they are suggestive of crop processing or domestic food production. The small amount and/or poor preservation of the charcoal prevented any further work. The only exception to this is charcoal rich fill 37006 within tree-hole 37005 and may represent a burnt out tree root indicative as local woodland clearance. The charcoal was identified as hazel, and although it is a good fuel, the absence of any further ecofactual

or artefactual material means no further interpretation is possible. Charcoal identified across the site suggests fuel was obtained from local woodlands composed of stands of oak along with shrub/scrubby species such as alder/hazel, hawthorn/rowan/crab apple and cherry species.

Period 2 Later Prehistoric to Roman

A small number of wheat species cereal grains were recovered from Ditch AF; however given the small number of remains; these are likely to be residual. Charcoal was abundant but very poorly preserved inhibiting the potential for further analysis, however from that identified, similar to the Earlier Prehistoric fuel was collected from local woodlands.

Period 3 Roman

Evidence for crop processing came from dumps of charcoal rich material within ditch Q and ditch 15002. The cereals identified included spelt and spelt/emmer wheat along with a small number of oat grains and spelt and emmer/spelt wheat glume bases. The small number of oat grains can be attributed to weed intrusions. Herbaceous taxa including pale persicaria, bromes, vetches/peas and goosefoots seeds and a heaths perianith, are all species which readily establish within arable and disturbed areas. The presence of heaths perianith indicates a heathland environment nearby.

The assemblage of cereal grains, chaff and weeds is suggestive of the parching and subsequent winnowing/sieving of crops and thereby suggests some form of farming settlement within this field. However the absence of archaeological features within the evaluation trenches does not support this interpretation. Charcoal from these samples, whilst relatively abundant was poorly preserved. Where identification was possible oak, maple, ash, alder/hazel and hawthorn/rowan/crab apple were recorded. Of interest was the presence of heaths perianith and gorse charcoal which indicates a heathland environment nearby, perhaps suggesting habitation/exploitation of more marginal areas. A small quantity of material also came from ditch L (Area 4).

Table 8.2 Plant macrofossil identifications

| Area | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 7a | 7a | 7a | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|-------|----------|----------|----------|--------|--------|----|---|---|---|
| Context number | 400064 | 400069 | 400118 | 400108 | 13004 | 15003 | 700040 | 700006 | 400104 | 400105 | | | | |
| Feature number | 400063 | 400068 | 400117 | 400107 | 13003 | 15002 | 700039 | 700005 | 400103 | 400103 | | | | |
| Feature label | C | D | H | L | | Q | | | | | | | | |
| Sample number (SS) | 406 | 413 | 407 | 404 | 3 | 2 | 700005 | 700006 | 401 | 402 | | | | |
| Flot volume (ml) | 0.5 | <0.5 | 7 | 2.5 | 82 | 15 | 89 | 2 | 3 | 0.5 | | | | |
| Sample volume processed (l) | 35 | 32 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 35 | 32 | 36 | 19 | 3 | | | | |
| Soil remaining (l) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Period | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | und | und | | | | |
| Plant macrofossil preservation | N/A | N/A | N/A | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Poor | | | | |
| Habitat | Family | Species | Common Name | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D/A | Amaranthaceae | <i>Chenopodium L. (Blitum L.)</i> | Goosefoots | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H/M | Ericaceae | <i>Erica L.</i> | Heaths perianth | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D/A/P | Fabaceae | <i>Vicia L./Lathyrus L.</i> | Vetches/Peas | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | Poaceae | <i>Avena L.</i> | Oats grain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A/D | | <i>Bromus L.</i> | Bromes | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | <i>Hordeum vulgare L.</i> | Barley grain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | <i>Triticum</i> | Wheat species grain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | <i>Triticum spelta</i> | Spelt wheat grain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | <i>Triticum spelta</i> | Spelt wheat glume base | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | <i>Triticum dicoccum/</i> | Emmer/spelt wheat grain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | <i>Triticum spelta</i> | Emmer/spelt wheat | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | <i>Triticum dicoccum/</i> | glume base | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | <i>Triticum spelta</i> | Indeterminate cereal | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | <i>Poaceae</i> | grain (whole) | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Area | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7a | 7a | 7a | 4 | 4 |
|--------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----|----|---|---|
| Context number | 400064 | 400069 | 400118 | 400108 | 13004 | 15003 | 700040 | 700006 | 400104 | 400105 | | | | |
| Feature number | 400063 | 400068 | 400117 | 400107 | 13003 | 15002 | 700039 | 700005 | 400103 | 400103 | | | | |
| Feature label | C | D | H | L | | | Q | | | | | | | |
| Sample number (SS) | 406 | 413 | 407 | 404 | 3 | 2 | 700005 | 700006 | 401 | 402 | | | | |
| Flot volume (ml) | 0.5 | <0.5 | 7 | 2.5 | 82 | 15 | 89 | 2 | 3 | 0.5 | | | | |
| Sample volume processed (l) | 35 | 32 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 35 | 32 | 36 | 19 | 3 | | | | |
| Soil remaining (l) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Period | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | und | und | | | | |
| Plant macrofossil preservation | N/A | N/A | N/A | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Poor | | | | |
| E | | | | | 1 | 9 | 19 | | | | | | | |
| E | | | | | | ++ | +++ | | | | | | | |
| D/AM | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 22 | 52 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | |

Table 8.3 Charcoal identifications

| Area | 2 | 7 | 7a | 7b | 7b | 7b | 7b | 7b | 7b | 4 | 4 |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------|----------|--------|----------|--------|--------|----------|--------|----------|
| Context number | 37006 | 200005 | 14006 | 700064 | 700119 | 700125 | 700127 | 700150 | 700167 | 400058 | 400060 |
| Feature number | 37005 | 200003 | 14005 | 700063 | 700118 | 700124 | 700126 | 700149 | 700166 | 400050 | 400059 |
| Feature label | | | | AE | | | AD | | AF | D | C |
| Sample number (SS) | 8 | 200001 | 5 & 7 | 700002 | 700015 | 700008 | 700014 | 700011 | 700016 | 412 | 408 |
| Flot volume (ml) | 15 | 2.5 | 0 | <0.5 | 2.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1 | <0.5 | <0.5 |
| Sample volume processed (l) | 36 | 30 | 2 | 21 | 35 | 2 | 36 | 6 | 32 | 35 | 36 |
| Soil remaining (l) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Period | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Charcoal quantity | +++++ | +++ | +++++ | +++ | ++ | +++++ | ++ | +++++ | + | ++ | +++ |
| Charcoal preservation | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Moderate |
| Family | Species | Common Name | | | | | | | | | |
| Betulaceae | <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> (L.) Gaertn. | Alder | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> (L.) Gaertn. r/w | Alder r/w | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> (L.) Gaertn./ | Alder/Hazel | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Corylus avellana</i> L. | Hazel | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Corylus avellana</i> L. r/w | Hazel r/w | | | | | | | | | |
| Fagaceae | <i>Quercus petraea</i> (Matt.) | Sessile Oak/Pedunculate Oak | | | | | | | | | |
| | Liebl./ <i>Quercus robur</i> L. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rosaceae | <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> Jacq./ | Hawthorn/Rowans/Crab apple | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Sorbus L./Malus sylvestris</i> (L.) Mill. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Prunus L. r/w</i> | Cherries r/w | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Prunus L.</i> | Cherries | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Indeterminate | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 10 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 10 |

Table 8.4 Charcoal identifications

| Area | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 7a | 7a | 7a | 4 | 4 |
|-----------------------------|--|--------|----------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|----------|------|---|---|
| Context number | 400064 | 400069 | 400118 | 400108 | 13004 | 15003 | 700040 | 700006 | 400104 | 400105 | | | |
| Feature number | 400063 | 400068 | 400117 | 400107 | 13003 | 15002 | 700039 | 700005 | 400103 | 400103 | | | |
| Feature label | C | D | H | L | | | Q | | | | | | |
| Sample number (SS) | 406 | 413 | 407 | 404 | 3 | 2 | 700005 | 700006 | 401 | 402 | | | |
| Flot volume (ml) | 0.5 | <0.5 | 7 | 2.5 | 82 | 15 | 89 | 2 | 3 | 0.5 | | | |
| Sample volume processed (l) | 35 | 32 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 35 | 32 | 36 | 19 | 3 | | | |
| Soil remaining (l) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Period | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | und | und | | | |
| Charcoal quantity | ++++ | ++ | ++++ | ++++ | ++++ | ++++ | ++++ | ++++ | ++++ | +++ | | | |
| Charcoal preservation | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Poor | | |
| Family | Species | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Betulaceae | Common Name | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> (L.) Gaertn. r/w | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> (L.) Gaertn./ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Corylus avellana</i> L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fabaceae | <i>Ulex</i> L./ <i>Cytisus</i> Desf. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fagaceae | <i>Quercus petraea</i> (Matt.) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Liebl./Quercus robur</i> L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Quercus petraea</i> (Matt.) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Liebl./Quercus robur</i> L. r/w | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oleaceae | <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rosaceae | <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> Jacq./ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Sorbus</i> L./ <i>Malus sylvestris</i> (L.) Mill. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Prunus</i> L. r/w | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Prunus</i> L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Salicaceae | <i>Salix</i> L./ <i>Populus</i> L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX 9: RADIOCARBON DATING BY SARAH COBAIN

Radiocarbon dating was undertaken in order to provide information on the dates of Ditch C (ditch cuts 400059 and 400063). The samples were analysed during March 2015 at Scottish Universities Environmental Research Centre (SUERC), Rankine Avenue, Scottish Enterprise Technology Park, East Kilbride, Glasgow, G75 0QF, Scotland.


The uncalibrated dates are conventional radiocarbon ages. The radiocarbon ages were calibrated using the University of Oxford Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit calibration programme OxCal 4.2 (Bronk Ramsey 2009) using the IntCal13 curve (Reimer *et al.* 2013).

9.1 Radiocarbon dating results

| Feature | Lab No. | Material | $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ | Radiocarbon age | Calibrated radiocarbon age 95.4% probability | Calibrated radiocarbon age 68.2% probability |
|--|-------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Context 400060 Ditch C, cut 400059 | SUERC-58718 | Charcoal - <i>Alnus glutinosa/Corylus avellana</i> (alder/hazel twig) | -26.4‰ | 2210 ± 28 yr BP | 366–200 cal BC (95.4% of area) | 358–347 cal BC (7.1% of area) 320–275 cal BC (28.0% of area) 259–207 cal BC (33.1% of area) |
| Context 400064 Ditch C, cut 400063 | SUERC-58719 | Charcoal- <i>Alnus glutinosa/Corylus avellana</i> (alder/hazel roundwood) | -25.2‰ | 2377 ± yr BP | 702–696 cal BC (0.6% of area) 541–392 cal BC (94.8% of area) | 483–399 cal BC (68.2% of area) |

APPENDIX 10: OASIS REPORT FORM

| PROJECT DETAILS | | |
|---|---|---|
| Project Name | Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon | |
| Short description (250 words maximum) | Scattered prehistoric, Roman, medieval and later features were found across 7.4 ha of the 19.7 ha development site. Dating evidence was sparse, but earlier prehistoric activity was represented by scatters of flintwork, particularly in the eastern part of the site. Ditches and a scatter of pits contained evidence of probably Middle Bronze Age occupation. In the north-west area ditches forming part of a double-ditched oval enclosure appear to be late prehistoric, running through into the Roman period. In the south-central area Roman material from ditches shows occupation here, but there were few other Roman features. Medieval pottery also came from ditches here, and there was more widespread post-medieval activity in the form of ditched enclosures probably relating to Old Park Farm. Material remains, including botanical remains were sparse, and animal bone had barely survived. | |
| Project dates | | |
| Project type (e.g. desk-based, field evaluation etc) | Excavation (CA 2012 & CA 2014) and preceding evaluation (CA 2010) | |
| Previous work (reference to organisation or SMR numbers etc) | Environmental Statement (Nexus Heritage 2010), Geophysical survey (Stratascan 2009) | |
| Future work | Unknown | |
| PROJECT LOCATION | | |
| Site Location | Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon | |
| Study area (M ² /ha) | | |
| Site co-ordinates (8 Fig Grid Reference) | SX 9658 9518 | |
| PROJECT CREATORS | | |
| Name of organisation | Cotswold Archaeology | |
| Project Brief originator | None | |
| Project Design (WSI) originator | Cotswold Archaeology & Nexus Heritage | |
| Project Manager | Cliff Bateman | |
| Project Supervisor | Alistair Barber & Tom Weavill | |
| MONUMENT TYPE | | |
| | None | |
| SIGNIFICANT FINDS | | |
| | None | |
| PROJECT ARCHIVES | | |
| | Intended final location of archive. | Content |
| Physical | Exeter City Museum | Metalwork, pottery, flint, glass, CBM |
| Paper | Exeter City Museum | Context sheets, context registers, drawing registers, permatrace drawings, photo registers, photographs |
| Digital | Exeter City Museum | Digital photographs |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | | |
| Cotswold Archaeology 2015 <i>Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon: Archaeology Report</i> , CA typescript report 15292 | | |



Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE

**Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
 Devon**

FIGURE TITLE

Site location plan









Reproduced from the 2007 Ordnance Survey Explorer map with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright Cotswold Archaeology Ltd 100002109


PROJECT NO. 9180 DATE 01/06/2015
 DRAWN BY AO/JB REVISION 00
 APPROVED BY AM SCALE@A4 1:25,000

FIGURE NO.

1



-  site boundary
-  survey area
-  excavation area
-  evaluation trench
-  archaeological feature
-  Tithe map field boundaries c.1841



Produced for the Cotswold Survey Partnership with the permission of Cotswold Survey on behalf of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown copyright Cotswold Archaeology Ltd 100002109



PROJECT TITLE
Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
Devon

FIGURE TITLE
Excavation and evaluation trench location plan showing archaeological features

DRAWN BY
AQJB

CHECKED BY
JB


APPROVED BY
AM


PROJECT NO.
9180

DATE
25/08/2015

SCALE
1:2500

FIGURE NO.
2






Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Digital mapping with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office
 © Crown copyright Cotswold Archaeology Ltd 100002109

0 50m


Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk


Cotswold Archaeology

PROJECT TITLE
**Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
 Devon**

FIGURE TITLE
Area 2: phase plan

| | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------------|----------------|------------|
| DRAWN BY | AO/JB | PROJECT NO. | 9180 | FIGURE NO. |
| CHECKED BY | JB | DATE | 03/06/2015 | |
| APPROVED BY | AM | SCALE@A3 | 1:1000 & 1:100 | 3 |



- site boundary
- survey area
- excavation area
- evaluation trench
- Period 1: earlier prehistoric
- Period 2: Late prehistoric to Roman
- Period 3: Roman
- Period 4: medieval
- Period 5: post-medieval and modern
- undated
- intervention






Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Digital Mapping with the permission of the Ordnance Survey. © Crown copyright. Cotswold Archaeology Ltd 10002109

Cotswold Archaeology
 Andover 01284 347330
 Cirencester 01285 711022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564690
 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
 e: enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk



PROJECT TITLE
 Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
 Devon

FIGURE TITLE
 Area 7A and 7B: phase plan

DRAWN BY ADJ/B **PROJECT NO** 9180 **FIGURE NO** 4
CHECKED BY JB **DATE** 09/10/2015
APPROVED BY AM **SCALE** 1:100 & 1:100





 excavation area
 Period 1: earlier prehistoric




Andover 01284 347630
 Cleveley 01285 771022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564690
 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
 e enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk



PROJECT TITLE
 Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
 Devon

FIGURE TITLE
 Ditch AD and pit 700124 plan

| | | | | | |
|-------------|----|------------|------------|------------|---|
| DRAWN BY | AO | PROJECT NO | 9180 | FIGURE NO. | 5 |
| CHECKED BY | JB | DATE | 09/10/2015 | | |
| APPROVED BY | AM | SCALE | 1:100 | | |



pit 700124






excavation area
 Period 1: earlier prehistoric








Andover 01284 347630
 Cleveley 01285 771022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564690
 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
 e: enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE
 Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
 Devon
FIGURE TITLE
 Ditch AD, pit 700122 and ditch AE
plans

DRAWN BY: ADJ/B PROJECT NO: 91180
 CHECKED BY: JB DATE: 09/10/2015
 APPROVED BY: AM SCALE: 1:100
FIGURE NO.
6





-  excavation area
-  evaluation trench
-  Period 1: earlier Prehistoric
-  Period 5: post-medieval and modern



Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE
 Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
 Devon

FIGURE TITLE
 Ditch AF and possible posthole
 alignment plan

| | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------------|------------|------------|
| DRAWN BY | AO/JB | PROJECT NO. | 9180 | FIGURE NO. |
| CHECKED BY | JB | DATE | 09/10/2015 | |
| APPROVED BY | AM | SCALE@A3 | 1:100 | 7 |



- site boundary
- survey area
- excavation area
- evaluation trench
- Period 1: earlier prehistoric
- Period 2: Late prehistoric to Roman
- Period 3: Roman
- Period 5: post-medieval and modern
- undated
- probable continuation of existing field boundary
- intervention



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Digital Mapping with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of Her Majesty's Stationary Office
 © Crown copyright / Cotswold Archaeology Ltd 10002109

Cotswold Archaeology
 Andover 01284 347330
 Cirencester 01285 711022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564690
 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
 e: enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk


PROJECT TITLE
 Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
 Devon

FIGURE TITLE
 Areas 4 and 6: phase plan

DRAWN BY ADJ/B
CHECKED BY JB
APPROVED BY AM


PROJECT NO 9180
DATE 03/06/2015
SCALE A3 1:1000

FIGURE NO. 8





Period 2: late prehistoric
to Roman
undated



pit
400020

Ditch D

Ditch C


Andover 01284 347630
Cirencester 01285 771022
Exeter 01392 826185
Millom Keynes 01908 564690
www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
e engineries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk



PROJECT TITLE
Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
Devon

FIGURE TITLE
Ditch D North and pit 400020 plan

DRAWN BY AO PROJECT NO 9180
CHECKED BY JB DATE 09/10/2015
APPROVED BY AM SCALE@A3 1:100 FIGURE NO 9



- evaluation trench
- Period 2: late prehistoric to Roman



Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk


PROJECT TITLE
 Old Park Farm, Pinhoe
 Devon

FIGURE TITLE
 Ditch D South, plan




| | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------------|------------|------------|
| DRAWN BY | AO/JB | PROJECT NO. | 9180 | FIGURE NO. |
| CHECKED BY | JB | DATE | 09/10/2015 | 10 |
| APPROVED BY | AM | SCALE@A3 | 1:100 | |


Trench 37, plan




Section AA




Section BB



Section CC



Section DD



Section EE



Section FF



Section GG



Section HH



Section II



Section JJ





 Cotswolds Archaeology

 Andover 01264 347630

 Cirencester 01285 771022

 Exeter 01392 826185

 Milton Keynes 01908 594680

 www.cotswoldsarchaeology.co.uk

 enquiries@cotswoldsarchaeology.co.uk


PROJECT TITLE
 Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon

FIGURE TITLE
 Trench 37, plan
 Sections AA to JJ


DRAWN BY JB PROJECT NO. 9180
 CHECKED BY AM DATE 29/05/2015
 APPROVED BY MW SCALE @A3 1:20 & 1:200

FIGURE NO.
11


Section KK




Section LL




Section MM




Section NN




Section OO



Section PP



Section QQ





a



b

a Areas 7a and 7b looking north

b Area 4, looking north. Ditch L, Period 3, in foreground



Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE

Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon

FIGURE TITLE

Photographs

| | | | | |
|-------------|----|-------------|------------|------------|
| DRAWN BY | JB | PROJECT NO. | 9180 | FIGURE NO. |
| CHECKED BY | AM | DATE | 01/06/2015 | 13 |
| APPROVED BY | AM | SCALE@A4 | NA | |



- a Pottery vessel in pit 14005 in situ, looking south-west (scale 0.5m)
- b Pit 200003, looking south-east (scale 1m)
- c Pit 37003 cut by tree-throw 37005, looking south (scale 1m)
- d Pit 700061 cut by pit 700063, looking south-west (scale 0.3m)



 Archaeologist: 01264 247630
 Client contact: 01264 77022
 Excavator: 01392 826165
 Milan Krizan: 01006 544660
 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
 enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE
 Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon


FIGURE TITLE
Photographs

| | | | | | |
|-------------|----|-------------|------------|------------|----|
| DRAWN BY | JB | PROJECT NO. | 9180 | FIGURE NO. | 14 |
| CHECKED BY | AM | DATE | 01/08/2015 | | |
| APPROVED BY | AM | SCALE | NA | | |




b

- a Ditch AD, looking north-west (scale 0.3m)
- b Ditch AE, looking north (scale 0.3m)
- c Ditch AF, looking south-west (scale 0.3m)
- d Pit 700124, looking south (scale 0.2m)



d



a



c



a



b



c



d

- a Ditch C, looking south-west (scale 0.4m)
- b Ditch D, looking north (scale 1m)
- c Ditch Q, looking north-west (scales 1m and 0.3m)
- d Ditch P, looking north-west (scales 1m and 0.2m)



 Archer 01264 947639
 Clarendon 01265 77022
 Exeter 01392 826165
 Milton Keynes 01908 564680
 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
 enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE
 Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon

FIGURE TITLE
Photographs

| | | | | | |
|-------------|----|-------------|------------|------------|----|
| DRAWN BY | JB | PROJECT NO. | 9180 | FIGURE NO. | 16 |
| CHECKED BY | AM | DATE | 01/08/2015 | | |
| APPROVED BY | AM | SCALE | A3 | | |



- a Ditch 13003, looking south-east (scale 0.5m)
- b Ditch 14003, looking north-west (scale 0.5m)
- c Ditch 15004, looking north-west (scale 1m)



FIGURE TITLE
Photographs



18 Decorated Samian ware from Ditch Q, in style of Central Gaulish Antonine potter *Paternus v.*



Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE

Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon

FIGURE TITLE

Photograph

DRAWN BY JB PROJECT NO. 9180
CHECKED BY AM DATE 01/06/2015
APPROVED BY AM SCALE@A4 NA

FIGURE NO.

18



19 Roman copper alloy steelyard from Ditch 15004



Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Exeter 01392 826185
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE

Old Park Farm, Pinhoe, Devon

FIGURE TITLE

Photograph

DRAWN BY **JB** PROJECT NO. **9180**
 CHECKED BY **AM** DATE **01/06/2015**
 APPROVED BY **AM** SCALE@A4 **NA**

FIGURE NO.

19

Andover Office

Stanley House
Walworth Road
Andover
Hampshire
SP10 5LH

t: 01264 347630

Cirencester Office

Building 11
Kemble Enterprise Park
Cirencester
Gloucestershire
GL7 6BQ

t: 01285 771022

Milton Keynes Office

41 Burners Lane South
Kiln Farm
Milton Keynes
Buckinghamshire
MK1 3HA

t: 01908 564660

e: enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

