Cotswold Archaeology

Arbor Lane
Winnersh, Wokingham
Berkshire

Archaeological Evaluation

for
Bellway Homes Ltd.
(Wessex)

CA Project: 770194
CA Report No. 15814
October 2015

Arbor Lane
Winnersh, Wokingham
Berkshire

Archaeological Evaluation

CA Project: 770194

Document Control Grid						
Revision	Date	Author	Checked by	Status	Reasons for revision	Approved by
A	22.10.15	JCC		Internal review		

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

SUMMARY

Project Name:	Arbor Lane, Winnersh
Location:	Wokingham, Berkshire
NGR:	477794 171348
Type:	Evaluation
Date:	13-16 October 2015
Planning Reference:	(F/2014/0704)
Site Code:	ARB 15

An archaeological evaluation was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology in October 2015 on Land at Arbor Lane, Winnersh, Wokingham, Berkshire. Thirteen trenches were excavated.

No features or deposits of archaeological significance were identified during the trial trench evaluation. Several undated gulley-like features were uncovered, that were subsequently interpreted as periglacial solution channels.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 In October 2015 Cotswold Archaeology (CA) carried out an archaeological evaluation for Bellway Homes Ltd. (Wessex) at Arbor Lane, Winnersh, Wokingham, Berkshire (centred on NGR: 477794 171348; Fig. 1), hereafter referred to as the Site. The evaluation was undertaken to accompany a planning application (Ref: **F/2014/0704**) for the demolition of 40 Arbor Lane, the erection of 29 dwellings together with access, car parking, landscaping and public open space, which was subject to a planning condition which required the undertaking of a programme of archaeological investigation.

1.2 The evaluation was carried out in accordance with a brief for an archaeological evaluation prepared by Kathelen Leary the archaeological advisor to Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) and with a subsequent detailed *Written Scheme of Investigation* (WSI) produced by CA (2015) and approved by Kathelen Leary. The fieldwork also followed *Standard and guidance: Archaeological field evaluation* (CIfA 2014), *Berkshire Archaeology's Standards for the Historic Environment,* the *Management of Archaeological Projects* (English Heritage 1991) and the *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MORPHE): Project Manager's Guide* (English Heritage 2006). The fieldwork was monitored by Kathelen Leary, including a site visit on 14 October 2015.

The Site

1.3 The Site is approximately 1.97ha in area, and comprises former arable land now left to rough pasture. It lies at approximately 42m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) on relatively level ground. The Site is bordered by a number of substantial drainage ditches on all sides.

1.4 The underlying bedrock geology of the area is mapped as London Clay Formation - Clay, Silt and Sand. Sedimentary Bedrock formed approximately 34 to 56 million years ago in the Palaeogene Period. Local environment previously dominated by deep seas. Superficial deposits in the vicinity of the Site may comprise River Terrace Deposits (2) Sand and Gravel. These Superficial Deposits formed up to 3 million years ago in the Quaternary Period. The local environment would previously have been dominated by rivers. These rocks were formed from rivers depositing mainly sand and gravel detrital material in channels to form river terrace deposits,

with fine silt and clay from overbank flooding events forming floodplain alluvium, and some bogs depositing peat; includes estuarine and coastal plain deposits mapped as alluvium (http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html).

2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 An archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) was undertaken in 2013 for the Site, and this section represents a summary of those findings (CgMs 2013). The assessment included a study area within 1km of the Site.

Palaeolithic (500,000 BC - 10,000 BC)

2.2 A cordate or ovate hand axe (Acheulian) was recorded from the garden of 442 Reading Road, Winnersh. A further Acheulian hand axe is recorded from the area of Loddonbridge Farm.

Neolithic (4000 BC – 2400 BC)

2.3 A flint Neolithic pick is recorded from a garden at 71 Colemans Moor Road in Woodley. A Neolithic flint arrowhead was recorded during an archaeological evaluation on land adjacent to Winnersh Primary School, Berkshire. These finds were recovered within a 1km radius of the Site.

Bronze Age (2400 BC – 700 BC)

2.4 Six sherds of possibly Bronze Age pottery were recovered during an archaeological evaluation of land at Hatch Farm Dairies, Winnersh, Wokingham, though these were residual in a later context. Three pieces of worked flint from the same site may also have been of Bronze Age date.

Iron Age and Roman (700 BC – AD 410)

2.4 A Romano British enclosed farmstead is recorded from the Hatch Farm Dairies site at Winnersh. The recovery of nine sherds of middle to late Iron Age pottery from the same site indicates that the farmstead here is likely to have originated in the Iron Age or even Bronze Age.

2.5 A possible Iron Age or Romano British enclosed farmstead is recorded from air photographs at and a possibly Iron Age or Roman field system is recorded at Gazelle Close, Winnersh.

2.6 A probable Roman settlement and field systems are recorded at Loddon.

2.7 A possible Roman Road alignment is recorded 150m north of the Site running Northeast/south-west between Silchester and St Albans.

Post Medieval and Modern (AD 1540 – AD 2015)

2.8 John Rocque's map of 1761 and the Ordnance Survey of 1809, indicates that the Site was a relatively isolated area of agricultural land. The Hurst Tithe map of 1840 indicates that the site was exploited for arable usage.

2.9 The Ordnance Survey maps of 1872, 1898, 1910, 1960 and 1988 all identify the Site as agricultural land with only minor changes to the boundaries.

Site Conditions

2.10 The Site comprised unremarkable agricultural land and prior to this trial trench evaluation was utilised as informal pasture.

3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

3.1 The objectives of the evaluation were to provide information about the archaeological resource within the site, including its presence/absence, character, extent, date, integrity, state of preservation and quality. In accordance with Standard and guidance: Archaeological field evaluation (CIfA 2014), the evaluation was designed to be minimally intrusive and minimally destructive to archaeological remains. The information gathered will enable the Kathelen Leary, Archaeological Officer (AO) for Berkshire Archaeology, archaeological advisor to Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset, consider the impact of the proposed development upon it, and to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the development proposal, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012).

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 The evaluation comprised the excavation of 13 trenches in the locations shown on the attached plan (Figure 2). All trenches were 30m long and 1.85m wide. Trenches were set out on OS National Grid (NGR) co-ordinates using Leica GPS, and scanned for live services by trained Cotswold Archaeology staff using CAT and

Genny equipment in accordance with the Cotswold Archaeology Safe System of Work for avoiding underground services. The positions of the trenches were adjusted on site to account for services and other obstructions caused by the simultaneous ecological survey led by Rosie Pope of Aspect Ecology, but with subsequent approval by Kathelen Leary, Archaeological Officer for Berkshire Archaeology, archaeological advisor to Wokingham Borough Council. The final 'as dug' trench plan is as recorded in Figure 2.

4.2 All trenches were excavated by a mechanical excavator equipped with a toothless grading bucket. All machining was conducted under archaeological supervision ceased when the first archaeological horizon or natural substrate was revealed (whichever was encountered first). Topsoil and subsoil were stored separately adjacent to each trench.

4.3 Following machining, all archaeological features revealed were planned and recorded in accordance with Technical Manual 1 Fieldwork Recording Manual. Each context was recorded on a pro-forma context sheet by written and measured description; principal deposits were recorded by drawn plans (scale 1:20 or 1:50, or electronically using Leica GPS or Total Station (TST) as appropriate) and drawn sections (scale 1:10 or 1:20 as appropriate). Where detailed feature planning was undertaken using GPS/TST this was carried out in accordance with Technical Manual 4 Survey Manual. Photographs (digital colour) were taken as appropriate. No finds were found and no samples taken but all artefacts that might have been recovered and retained for processing and analysis, would be done so in accordance with Technical Manual 3 Treatment of Finds Immediately after Excavation.

4.4 Sample excavation of archaeological deposits was limited and minimally intrusive, sufficient to achieve the aims and objectives identified in Section 3 above, and at this stage there was no requirement to sample all archaeological features encountered. Where appropriate excavation did not compromise the integrity of the archaeological record, and was undertaken in such a way as to allow for the subsequent protection of remains either for conservation or to allow more detailed investigations to be conducted under better conditions at a later date.

4.5 Artefacts from topsoil and subsoil and un-stratified contexts were noted but not retained unless they were of intrinsic interest (e.g. worked flint or flint debitage,

featured pottery sherds, and other potential 'registered artefacts'). All artefacts were to be collected from stratified excavated contexts, but no archaeological features were identified.

4.6 Human remains were not encountered.

4.7 No archaeological features or deposits were identified from which environmental samples could have been taken.

4.8 Upon completion of the evaluation all trenches were backfilled by mechanical excavator.

4.9 CA complied fully with the provisions of the Treasure Act 1996 and the Code of Practice referred to therein.

5. RESULTS (FIGS 2)

5.1 The trial trench evaluation was undertaken simultaneously with a destructive ecological survey, which Rosie Pope of Aspect Ecology led. This meant that there were piles of topsoil sporadically across site and small fences delineating exclusion zones that obstructed the originally proposed evaluation layout.

5.2 No features or deposits of archaeological significance were identified during trial trenching, only a number of periglacial solution channels were recorded in the south-eastern corner and central area of the site (Figures 2-3). A number of these were hand-investigated and contained similar fills consistently characterised by moderately compacted homogenous, sterile, calacareous deposits, which in many cases had a diffuse interface with the prevailing natural geology, all supporting a natural, periglacial origin for these features.

Geology

5.3 The natural geology dipped gently down to 38m in the north of the site, from higher ground, at 40m aOD, to the south. Because of the prevailing topography of the site, the topsoil and subsoil overburden overlying the natural geology, thickened from 0.43m to 0.7m towards the northern part of the site. The natural geology was

characterised by ≤100mm (mostly ≤80mm) predominantly sub rounded flint, moderately well sorted, in a matrix of light brown coarse sand.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 The trial trench evaluation uncovered no features or deposits of archaeological significance, only several periglacial solution channels. These periglacial were characterised by consistently sterile, homogenous calcareous fills and similar appearance to the natural geology. No finds were recovered.

7. CA PROJECT TEAM

Fieldwork was undertaken by Jeremy Clutterbuck, assisted by Tim Street. The report was written by Jeremy Clutterbuck. The illustrations were prepared by Leo Heatley. The archive has been compiled by Tom Rowley, and prepared for deposition by Hazel O'Neill. The project was managed for CA by Richard Greatorex.

8. REFERENCES

BGS (British Geological Survey) 2015 Geology of Britain Viewer http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/geology viewer_google/googleviewer.html Accessed 9 March 2015

CA (Cotswold Archaeology) 2015 *Arbor Lane, Winnersh, Wokingham, Berkshire: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation*

CgMs 2013 Land at Arbor Lane, Winnersh, Berkshire. RG41 5ED Desk-Based Assessment (Client Report)

APPENDIX A: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS

Trench No.	Context No.	Type	Fill of	Context interpretation	Description	L (m)	W (m)	D (m)	Spot-date
1	100	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown sandy silt with occasional ≤30mm sub rounded flint. Iron mottling at base	30	1.85	0.3	Modern
1	101	Layer		Natural Alluvium	Mid orangey brown clayey sand with patches of grey. Occasional ≤70mm sub rounded flint	30	1.85	0.4	
1	102	Layer		Natural Gravel	Light brown coarse sand with abundant ≤80mm sub rounded flint	30	1.85	>0.1	
2	200	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown sandy silt with occasional ≤30mm sub rounded flint. Iron mottling at base	30	1.85	0.3	Modern
2	201	Layer		Natural Alluvium	Mid orangey brown and light bluish grey clayey sand with sporadic patches of gravel. Occasional ≤40mm sub rounded flint	30	1.85	0.45	
2	202	Layer		Natural Alluvium	Mid orangey brown and light bluish grey clayey sand	30	1.85	0.25	
2	203	Layer		Natural Gravel	Light brown coarse sand with abundant ≤80mm sub rounded flint	30	1.85	>0.15	
3	300	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤50mm sub rounded flint.	30	1.8	0.3	Modern
3	301	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤50mm sub rounded flint.	30	1.8	0.2	
3	302	Layer		Natural Alluvium	Mid orangey brown compact clayey sand with 10% gravel patches	30	1.8	>0.42	
4	400	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤50mm sub rounded flint.	30	1.8	0.32	Modern
4	401	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤80mm sub rounded flint.	30	1.8	0.14	
4	402	Layer		Natural Alluvium	Mid orangey brown compact clayey sand with 1% gravel patches and 5% manganese flecks	30	1.8	>0.16	
5	500	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 5% ≤50mm sub angular flint	30	1.8	0.09	Modern
5	501	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤80mm sub angular flint and 5% ≤20mm ironstone	30	1.8	0.26	
5	502	Layer		Natural Alluvium	Mid orangey brown friable medium sand with 25% ≤100mm sub angular flint and patches of light grey clayey sand	30	1.8	>0.18	
5	503	Cut		Periglacial Solution Channel	U-shaped moderate sided linear feature	>4	0.8	0.18	
5	504	Fill	503	Geological	White and light bluish grey calcareous clayey sand with occasional ≤30mm sub rounded flint	>4	0.8	0.18	
6	600	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤30mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.18	Modern
6	601	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt with 5% ≤50mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.25	
6	602	Layer		Natural Alluvium	Mid orangey brown compact clayey sand with 25% ≤100mm sub angular flint and 10% ≤30mm ironstone	30	1.8	>0.2	
7	700	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤30mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.33	Modern
7	701	Layer		Natural Alluvium	Mid orangey brown compact clayey sand with 25% ≤50mm sub rounded flint and 5% ≤100mm ironstone	30	1.8	>0.19	
8	800	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 10% ≤30mm sub angular flint	30	1.8	0.2	Modern
8	801	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt with 15% ≤50mm sub angular flint	30	1.8	0.28	
8	802	Layer		Natural Gravel	Mid orangey brown friable clayey sand with 50% ≤100mm sub angular flint and 25% and patches of light	30	1.8	>0.15	

					grey clayey sand				
9	900	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤50mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.16	Modern
9	901	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤70mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.17	
9	902	Layer		Natural Gravel	Mid orangey brown compact clayey sand with 50% ≤100mm sub angular flint	30	1.8	>0.1	
10	1000	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤30mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.22	Modern
10	1001	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt With 5% ≤50mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.08	
10	1002	Layer		Natural Gravel	Light greyish brown friable medium sand with 50% ≤100mm sub angular flint and 10% ≤30mm ironstone	30	1.8	>0.11	
10	1003	Cut		Periglacial Solution Channel	U-shaped steep sided linear feature	>2	0.48	0.19	
10	1004	Fill	1003	Geological	Light grey with some dark grey Speckling, calcareous silty sand with occasional sub rounded ≤ 30mm flint and iron mottling	>2	0.48	0.19	
11	1100	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤50mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.27	Modern
11	1101	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt With 5% ≤50mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.19	
11	1102	Layer		Natural Gravel	Mid orangey brown compact clayey sand with 50% ≤100mm sub angular flint in matrix of grey sand and 25% ≤30mm ironstone	30	1.8	>0.07	
11	1103	Cut		Periglacial Solution Channel	U-shaped moderate sided linear feature	>5	0.59	0.28	
11	1104	Fill	1103	Geological	Light grey and white with some dark grey patches, calcareous silty sand with occasional sub rounded ≤30mm sub rounded flint and iron mottling	>5	0.59	0.28	
12	1200	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤50mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.27	Modern
12	1201	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt With 1% ≤50mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.19	
12	1202	Layer		Natural Gravel	Mid orangey brown compact medium sand with 50% ≤100mm sub angular flint in matrix of grey sand and 25% ≤30mm ironstone	30	1.8	>0.07	
12	1203	Cut		Periglacial Solution Channel	U-shaped moderate sided linear feature	>2	0.56	0.23	
12	1204	Fill	1203	Geological	Light grey and white with some dark grey patches, calcareous silty sand with occasional sub rounded ≤30mm sub rounded flint and iron mottling	>2	0.56	0.23	
12	1205	Cut		Periglacial Solution Channel	U-shaped moderate sided linear feature	>3	0.36	0.2	
12	1206	Fill	1205	Geological	Light grey and white with some dark grey patches, calcareous silty sand with occasional sub rounded ≤30mm sub rounded flint and iron mottling	>3	0.36	0.2	
13	1300	Layer		Topsoil	Dark greyish brown friable sandy silt with 1% ≤50mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.14	Modern
13	1301	Layer		Subsoil	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt With 1% ≤50mm sub rounded flint	30	1.8	0.14	
13	1302	Layer		Natural Gravel	Mid yellowish brown compact medium sand with 50% ≤100mm flint	30	1.8	>0.15	
13	1303	Cut		Periglacial Solution Channel	U-shaped moderate sided linear feature	>2	0.59	0.2	
13	1304	Fill	1303	Geological	Mid greyish brown friable sandy silt with 5% ≤30mm sub rounded flint	>2	0.59	0.2	
13	1305	Layer		Natural	Same as 1302	30	1.8	>0.15	

13	1306	Cut		Periglacial Solution Channel	U-shaped moderate sided linear feature	>3	0.64	0.29	
13	1307	Fill	1306	Geological	Light grey and white with some dark grey patches, calcareous silty sand with occasional sub rounded ≤30mm sub rounded flint and iron mottling	>3	0.64	0.29	

APPENDIX B: OASIS REPORT FORM

PROJECT DETAILS		
Project Name	Arbor Lane, Winnersh, Wokingham, Berkshire	
Short description (250 words maximum)	An archaeological evaluation was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology in October 2015 on land at Arbor Lane, Winnersh, Wokingham, Berkshire. Thirteen trenches were excavated. Several undated gulley-like features were found during trial trenching more probably the result of geological processes of deposition into periglacial solution channels. Otherwise a single undated gulley-like feature was found in the south east of the site.	
Project dates	12-16 October 2015	
Project type	Evaluation	
Previous work	None known other than DBA (CgMs 2013)	
Future work	Unknown	
PROJECT LOCATION		
Site Location	Arbor Lane, Winnersh, Wokingham, Berkshire, RG41 5ED	
Study area (M^2/ha)	1.97ha	
Site co-ordinates	477794 171348	
PROJECT CREATORS		
Name of organisation	Cotswold Archaeology	
Project Brief originator	Kathelen Leary (Archaeological Officer for Berkshire Archaeology)	
Project Design (WSI) originator	Cotswold Archaeology	
Project Manager	Richard Greatorex	
Project Supervisor	Jeremy Clutterbuck	
MONUMENT TYPE	None	
SIGNIFICANT FINDS	None	
PROJECT ARCHIVES		
Physical		Cotswold Archaeology
Paper		Cotswold Archaeology
Digital		Cotswold Archaeology
BIBLIOGRAPHY		
CA (Cotswold Archaeology) 2015 *Arbor Lane, Winnersh, Wokingham, Berkshire: Archaeological Evaluation.* CA typescript report **770194**		

Cotswold Archaeology

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

Exeter Office

Unit 53
Basepoint Business Centre
Yeoford Way
Marsh Barton Trading Estate
Exeter
EX2 8LB

t: 01392 826185

Milton Keynes Office

41 Burners Lane South
Kiln Farm
Milton Keynes
Buckinghamshire
MK11 3HA

t: 01908 564660

e: enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk