

**Land at Bray Studios  
Water Oakley  
Bray  
Berkshire**

*Archaeological Evaluation*



*for  
CgMs*

*on behalf of  
Farmglade*

CA Project: 770277  
Report No. 15754

October 2015



Land at Bray Studios  
Water Oakley  
Bray  
Berkshire

Archaeological Evaluation

Report No. 15754  
CA Project: 770277



Document Control Grid						
Revision	Date	Author	Checked by	Status	Reasons for revision	Approved by
A	25.09.15	JCC	DDR	Internal review	Edits	DDR
B	09/10/15	JCC	DDR	Draft for issue		DDR

*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.*

## CONTENTS

SUMMARY .....	2
1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.....	5
<i>INTRODUCTION</i> .....	5
<i>PREHISTORIC PERIODS (UP TO 43AD)</i> .....	5
<i>ROMAN</i> .....	6
<i>POST-MEDIEVAL-MODERN</i> .....	7
<i>ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION</i> .....	7
3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.....	8
4. METHODOLOGY .....	8
5. RESULTS (FIGS 2-6).....	10
6. FINDS .....	12
7. DISCUSSION.....	12
8. CA PROJECT TEAM.....	12
9. ARCHIVE .....	13
10.. REFERENCES.....	13
<b>APPENDIX A: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: OASIS REPORT FORM</b> .....	<b>16</b>

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Fig. 1 Site location plan  
 Fig. 2 Trench location plan (1:1500)  
 Fig. 3 Trench 8: plan, section and photographs  
 Fig. 4 Trench 4: photographs  
 Fig. 5 Trenches 3 and 5: photographs  
 Fig. 6 Trenches 6 and 1: photographs

## SUMMARY

<b>Project Name:</b>	Land at Bray Studios, Water Oakley
<b>Location:</b>	Bray, Berkshire
<b>NGR:</b>	SU 920 777
<b>Type:</b>	Evaluation
<b>Date:</b>	21-24 September 2015
<b>Planning Reference:</b>	15/01984/FULL
<b>Location of Archive:</b>	CA Offices, Andover
<b>Site Code:</b>	BRAS 15

An archaeological evaluation was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology in September 2015 at Bray Studios. Eight trenches were excavated.

Despite the identified archaeological potential of the site no archaeological features or deposits of any significance were revealed within the evaluation trenches. The deposit sequence revealed within the trench demonstrated intact deposits directly below the modern made ground surface with little or no modern truncation having impacted upon the deposit sequence. If any archaeological features, in particular cut features of good or significant depth had been present then it could have been anticipated that they would have survived either cutting the intact brickearth or gravel.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In September 2015 Cotswold Archaeology (CA) carried out an archaeological evaluation for CgMs on behalf of Farmglade at Bray Studios (centred on NGR: SU 920 777; Fig. 1).
- 1.2 The evaluation was undertaken to accompany a planning application (Ref: 15/01984/FULL) for the change of use, restoration, conversion and partial demolition of Down Place House including alterations and two storey extension to form 10 residential dwellings. Furthermore, demolition of other existing buildings and removal of hardstanding to enable the construction of 11 detached dwellings and a terrace of 4 dwellings, garaging, car parking provision, open space, landscaping and other associated works.
- 1.3 An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment was prepared by CgMs Consulting (dated February 2010, revised December 2010 and February 2011) and was prepared and submitted in support of a previous, similar, approved application for the site (Ref: 11/00474/FULL).
- 1.4 The DBA along with a recently undertaken archaeological evaluation (CA 2014) on land adjacent to the site enabled Roland Smith the Archaeology Officer at Berkshire Archaeology (BA), the archaeological advisors to the LPA, to concur with the recommendations set out in the DBA that a programme of archaeological investigation should be undertaken at the site. BA recommended that any archaeological investigation should be secured by condition should planning consent be granted for the application
- 1.5 The evaluation was carried out in accordance a detailed *Written Scheme of Investigation* (WSI) produced by CA (2015) and approved by Roland Smith. The fieldwork also followed *Standard and guidance: Archaeological field evaluation* (CIfA 2014), *Berkshire Archaeology (BA) General Standards for Historic Environment Projects* (BA 2014), 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).

- 1.6 It was monitored by Roland Smith of BA on Wednesday 23 September when all trenches had been fully excavated.

### ***The site***

- 1.7 The proposed site comprises approximately 2.2ha and lies between Bray and Windsor. The site is irregular in shape and contains the 18th century buildings of Down Place and modern structures and facilities associated with the Bray Film Studios.
- 1.8 The site lies adjacent and south to the Thames where the floodplain begins to widen between Bray and Dorney. The area is now relatively flat, but to the north of the site the Queen's Eyot and Monkey Island are representative of the gravel islands and numerous channels that would have once defined this area.
- 1.9 The study site is generally flat sloping gently northward to the River. At the site's southern boundary the ground height is approximately 25m AOD, dropping to around 23m AOD as the site reaches the River bank.
- 1.10 The underlying geology of the study site is shown by the British Geological Survey (Windsor: Solid and Drift: Sheet 269) as comprising Kempton Park Gravel. The gravels are River Terrace Deposits of the post-diversionary River Thames and its tributaries deposited during the late Saalian period (c. 140,000 years Before Present). The current trial trench evaluation showed these gravels to dip from 23.62m AOD at the west of the site to 22.54m AOD at the east. A brickearth was found overlying these gravels being generally thicker to the east of the site but having an average depth of approximately 0.4m. Overlying these deposits were lain sporadic deep intrusions of humic clayey silt perhaps from stagnant water logged conditions of the last couple of centuries given the recent CBM inclusions. A buried garden soil was found in Trench 1 (**102**) possibly associated to Down Place House given its proximity.

## 2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

### *Introduction*

- 2.1 A heritage desk-based assessment (DBA) was undertaken (CgMs 2010), which set out the archaeological and historical background of the site. A very brief summary of this is presented below and the DBA should be consulted for more specific detail.

### *Prehistoric Periods (up to 43AD)*

- 2.2 The site lies on a Gravel Terrace classified as the Kempton Park Terrace. The Taplow and Mucking Terrace gravel was deposited during the late Saalian and gravels deposited subsequently (i.e. the Kempton Park Terrace and the alluvium covered lower terraces) do not contain any rich artefact assemblages, suggesting that the valley was no longer occupied by humans.
- 2.3 Excavations in advance of construction of the Eton Rowing Lake on the opposite side of the River Thames at Dorney indicated that the Thames had settled into a relatively stable pattern of multiple channels by the beginning of the Holocene (c.10, 000 BP). This stability encouraged occupation and utilisation of the floodplain and eyots from around this time. The emerging activity in the area is reflected in the evidence for the Mesolithic period where over 400 flint artefacts were found during the excavation of a swimming pool at the house of Willow Bend 50m to the east of the site. Additional nearby Mesolithic finds include a scatter of artefacts found from disturbed topsoil adjacent to the study site at Water Oakley and flint scrapers and worked antler thought to be from a former river channel at Hoveringham Gravel Pit.
- 2.4 Neolithic settlement is known from directly opposite the site at the Eton Rowing Lake. Neolithic waste middens were preserved in shallow hollows and black soil patches. Evidence for settlement was also identified from the Weir Bank Stud Farm to the west of the site. At the north end of Hoveringham Pit, a burial was discovered beneath up to 1.5m of alluvial deposits. Pottery and a saddle quern fragment were also found at the gravel pit. Two Neolithic flint scatters have been discovered to the south of the site, the first adjacent to the site at Down Place and the second at Manor Nurseries.
- 2.5 Two Bronze Age ring ditch features are recorded from nearby cropmarks, the nearest located adjacent to the site at Water Oakley. The second ring ditch is

located to the south-west of the site toward Windsor Marina. A burnt mound of flints is also known from investigations at Manor Nurseries to the south-west of the site and a cremation cemetery was discovered during the construction of Eton Rowing Lake. The work at Eton Rowing Lake also revealed two settlement enclosures dating from the Middle Bronze Age. Excavations revealed evidence of a carefully organised landscape of settlement enclosures and field systems across the series of islands joined by a network of wooden bridges. A number of Bronze Age implements have been retrieved from the River including a spearhead and a leaf shaped sword. A number of Bronze implements have also been recovered from the Hoveringham Gravel Pit including spearheads, swords, knives and a fragmentary cake of copper.

- 2.6 Evidence of Iron Age occupation was found at Eton Rowing Lake comprising enclosures, high status objects and a bridge system between the eyots and channels. Iron Age pottery sherds have been discovered next to the Thames at Water Oakley beneath layers of alluvial silt. Two linear features, Iron Age pottery and worked flint were discovered during archaeological evaluation at Manor Nurseries to the south-west of the site. At Hoveringham Gravel Pit, flint cobbling was discovered with Iron Age pottery sherds, fragments of human bone, animal bone and domestic items. Also at the Pit a large quantity of Iron Age pottery and animal bone was discovered in advance of gravel extraction.

### **Roman**

- 2.7 A wealth of Roman material has been recovered within the vicinity of the site. Most relevant to the study site are the remains of building foundations and human remains found within 50m of the site to the west of Down Place. Further Roman remains were located 50m to the west where extensive remains including a cemetery (considered at least 400m in width), settlement activity and a possible jetty were discovered in advance of gravel extraction. At the Hoveringham Pit, late Roman remains were discovered comprising both cremations and inhumations alongside evidence of metal working that appeared to continue into the 5th century. Saxon-early Medieval-Medieval.
- 2.8 In advance of gravel extraction to the west of Water Oakley, Early Saxon pottery was discovered overlying an earlier cobbled surface (probably Roman) that was heavily scarred by vehicular and pedestrian traffic. A Late Saxon/Viking spearhead



was found in the River Thames at Bray and Late Saxon/medieval pottery was discovered at the Hoveringham Pit. It is unclear if settlement in the Water Oakley area came to a hiatus in the Late Saxon and Medieval period as there is a distinct lack of evidence for these periods. It is most likely that the study site occupied agricultural land utilising the rich alluvium of the flood plain although this is not evident in the archaeological record.

### ***Post-Medieval-Modern***

- 2.9 The 1817 Bray Enclosure Map shows the site area at this time as grounds and garden associated with Down Place house. The 1844 Bray Tithe Map portrays a similar situation and the Tithe Apportionment records the site as 'pleasure ground' and 'park and meadow.'
- 2.10 The 1875 Ordnance Survey shows the site incorporating much of the building and some of the open grounds of Down Place, primarily the area to the west of the main driveway. Much of the area is shown as open land, presumed garden, with the main building crossing the site at the northern end close to the Thames. There are few changes to the site until the establishment of Bray Studios in 1952. An aerial photograph taken of the site in 1948 shows the origins of sand and gravel extraction at Hoveringham Pit (now Bray Lake and Marina).
- 2.11 The expansion of the Bray International Film Centre in the late 1960s to early 1970s saw a number of additional buildings constructed to the south of Down Place. The mapping shows fourteen additional buildings mostly within the centre of the site. The southern area is thought to have been to concrete hardstanding at this time. By 1993 construction had extended to the very south of the site and the layout is generally maintained to the present day.

### ***Archaeological Evaluation***

- 2.12 An archaeological evaluation was undertaken on land adjacent to the west of the site (CA 2014). Seventeen trenches were excavated across the site and revealed a low potential for the presence and survival of archaeological features and deposits. Only three trenches revealed the presence of archaeological features comprising a ditch and two post holes likely to be post medieval to modern in date but no dateable artefacts were recovered or present.

- 2.13 With large amounts of modern disturbance occurring across parts of site, particularly in the north as a result of gravel extraction, there is a strong likelihood that any archaeology that may have been present had been truncated and removed. There was in particular no evidence of any Roman features or deposits relating to extensive Roman activity identified in previous work undertaken to the west prior to gravel extraction in the 1960s. However, although modern truncation was less evident in the southern and eastern parts of the site no significant archaeological features or deposits were revealed.

### **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.
- 3.2 Specific aims were to assess the impact that the Bray Studios had on the archaeological resource. In particular to identify whether any remains of significant Prehistoric or Roman remains, which the HER and the DBA had indicated were present or survived within the vicinity of the site.
- 3.3 In accordance with the Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (ClfA 2009), the was designed to be minimally intrusive and minimally destructive to archaeological remains. The information gathered will enable BA acting on behalf of the LPA 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 In accordance with the agreed WSI the evaluation was due to comprise of the excavation of 8 no 30m x 1.8m trial trenches. Due to on-site restrictions outlined below, the locations and dimensions of the trenches had to be revised. The number and final layout of the trenches followed consultation with Berkshire Archaeology (BA).

- 4.2 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 and overhead services. The position and location of the trenches were adjusted on site to account for services and other constraints, with the approval of BA and CgMs. The final 'as dug' trench plan was recorded by GPS.
- 4.3 Trenches 2 to 6 were located in areas of reinforced concrete; Trench 7 within a gravel surface; Trench 8 within grass scrub and Trench 1 within tarmac. In order to form Trenches 1 to 7 it was necessary to employ a machine excavator equipped with a breaker.
- 4.4 Following the removal of hardstanding all trenches were subsequently excavated by a mechanical excavator equipped with a toothless grading bucket. All machining was conducted under archaeological supervision and ceased when the first archaeological horizon or natural substrate was revealed (whichever was encountered first).
- 4.5 Following machining, all archaeological features revealed were planned and recorded in accordance with Technical Manual 1 Fieldwork Recording Manual (CA2013). 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 1200 series 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 CA Technical Manual 4 Survey Manual (CA 2012).
- 4.6 Sample excavation of archaeological deposits was limited and minimally intrusive, sufficient to achieve the objectives identified in Section 3 above, and there was no requirement to sample all archaeological features encountered. Where appropriate, excavation did not compromise the integrity of the archaeological record, so 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.
- 4.7 Artefacts from topsoil and subsoil and un-stratified contexts were noted, but not retained as they were not of intrinsic interest (e.g. post medieval CBM). All artefacts

were collected from stratified excavated contexts except for large assemblages of post-medieval or modern material. Such material was noted and not retained, or, if it was appropriate, a representative sample might have been collected and retained.

- 4.8 Due care was taken to identify deposits which may have had environmental potential, and if it had been appropriate, a programme of environmental sampling might have been initiated. If Samples were taken, they would be processed and assessed for potential in accordance with CA Technical Manual 2: The Taking and Processing of Environmental and Other Samples from Archaeological Sites (CA 2003).
- 4.9 A full photographic record was kept. The primary photographic record was captured on Canon digital SLR equipment that at least matches the quality of a 35mm SLR film camera. The record included detailed images of archaeological deposits and features and other images to illustrate their location and context, and the location and context of the separate working areas. The record also included images of the Site overall and working shots to illustrate the general progress of the archaeological investigation.
- 4.10 Any variation to this methodology was agreed in advance with CgMs and BA.
- 4.11 Upon completion of the evaluation all trenches, with the approval of BA, were backfilled by mechanical excavator with the excavated arisings.

## 5. RESULTS (FIGS 2-6)

- 5.1 Detailed context descriptions recorded within the trenches is provided in Appendix A below.
- 5.2 Trench 1 (Figs. 2 and 6) had to be slightly relocated from its original proposed location and was shortened in length to maintain access across the site. The excavated trench measured 12.70m x 1.90m. The natural gravel (**103**) was encountered within a sondage at a depth of 0.75m (23.09m aOD) below ground level. This was overlain by silty clay brickearth (**102**) c.0.23m in depth. This was overlain by modern made ground (**101**) and the tarmac surface (**100**). No archaeological features were revealed.

- 5.3 Trench 2 (Fig. 2) measured 18.40m by 1.90m. The natural gravel was revealed at a depth of 0.65m BGL (23.12m aOD). This was overlain by silty clay brickearth up to 0.27m in depth. Overlying this deposit was made ground up to 0.18m in depth, which was capped by reinforced concrete. No archaeological features were revealed.
- 5.4 Trench 3 (Figs. 2 and 5) measured 32m x 1.9m and Trench 4 was 23m x 1.9m and both trenches demonstrated the same depositional sequence. Within Trench 3 the natural gravel (**305**) was revealed at a depth of 1.27m (22.54m aOD) and within Trench 4 (**405**) at 0.90m (22.95m aOD). The gravel was overlain by silty clay brickearth between 0.37m to 0.72m in depth (**304** and **404**). The brickearth underlay a dark grey flood plain organic silt up to 0.70m in depth (**302/303** and **402/403**). Post-medieval CBM was recovered from within these deposits. These deposits were overlain by modern made ground and reinforced concrete totalling 0.21m in depth. No archaeological features were revealed.
- 5.4 Trench 5 (Figs 2 and 5) measured 15.5m x 2m and Trench 6 measured 18.2m x 2m. In Trench 5 on the eastern boundary of the site the natural river terrace gravels were encountered at a depth of 0.70m BGL (23.62m aOD) and in Trench 6 to the west at a depth of 1.05m BGL (22.96m aOD). Brickearth (**604**) up to 0.20m in depth overlay the gravel in Trench 6, but within Trench 5 the dark grey flood plain organic silts (**502** and **503**) up to 0.55m in depth were recorded as directly overlying the natural gravel. No brickearth overlying the gravel was observed with trench 5. Both trenches were capped by modern made ground and reinforced concrete up to 0.40m in depth. No archaeological features were revealed.
- 5.5 Trench 7 (Fig. 2) was 13m x 1.9m and was backfilled on health and safety grounds soon after excavation due to the possible identification of fibrous material thought to be asbestos in a recent rubbish pit. The trench was excavated to a depth of 1.05m, but natural gravel was not encountered. Silty Clay brickearth (**702**) was recorded at a depth of 0.79m BGL. This was overlain by modern made ground deposits containing rubble. No archaeological features were revealed
- 5.6 Trench 8 (Figs. 2 and 3) was split into two parts (8.1 and 8.2) measuring 8.5m x 10.5m respectively to avoid an identified service. The natural silty clay brickearth (**803**) was recorded at a depth of 0.61m BGL. This was overlain by a mid brown silty

clay subsoil (**802**), which underlay modern made ground garden soil (**801** and **800**). A shallow ditch (**804**) c.0.50 in depth x 2.5m wide containing modern building material in its fills (**805** and **806**) was recorded in Trench 8.2 as underlying the subsoil. No archaeological features were revealed.

## 6. FINDS

- 6.1 No finds suitable for retention were observed. Post-medieval/recent CBM was recovered from a number of the trenches within the recorded organic deposit. The only other finds were of undoubted modern date.

## 7. DISCUSSION

- 7.1 Despite the identified archaeological potential of the site no archaeological features or deposits of any significance were revealed within the evaluation trenches. The deposit sequence revealed within the trench demonstrated intact deposits directly below the modern made ground surface with little or no modern truncation having impacted upon the deposit sequence. If any archaeological features, in particular cut features of good or significant depth had been present then it could have been anticipated that they would have survived either cutting the intact brickearth or gravel.
- 7.2 The evaluation has been able however, to establish a geological and deposit model for the site and indicates that the natural gravels lie higher in the east of the site than in the west. A fall of c.1.10m to the top of the gravel was recorded between Trench 5 at 23.62m aOD and in Trench 6 at 22.54m aOD. It may be as a result of the gradient of the site, which has allowed it to act as a floodplain for the River Thames to the north and allowed for the establishment of the organic deposits that were identified within a number of the trenches and which were greater in depth on the western side of the site. It is likely that the organic deposits are however recent in their establishment as post-medieval CBM was recovered from within the deposit

## 8. CA PROJECT TEAM

Fieldwork was undertaken by Jeremy Clutterbuck, assisted by Colin Forrestal. 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 Damian De Rosa.

## 9. ARCHIVE

- 9.1 The archive and artefacts from the evaluation are currently held by CA at their offices in Andover. Subject to the agreement of the legal landowner the site archive will be deposited with a designated Museum service, which is currently subject to confirmation. A summary of information from this project, set out within Appendix B, will be entered onto the OASIS online database of archaeological projects in Britain.

## 10.. REFERENCES

BGS (British Geological Survey) 2011 Geology of Britain Viewer [http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/geology\\_viewer\\_google/googleviewer.html](http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/geology_viewer_google/googleviewer.html)

CgMs 2010 (revised December 2010 and February 2011). Bray Film Studios, Down Place, Water Oakley, Windsor. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment. Ref. MS/11590.

Cotswold Archaeology 2014. Archaeological Evaluation. CA Project: 770142. CA Report: 14525

Cotswold Archaeology 2015. *Bray Studios, Water Oakley, Bray, Berkshire: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation*



## 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		Hardstanding	Tarmac	12.7	1.9	0.25	Modern
1	101	Layer		Made Ground	Rubble & stones in a mid-yellowish brown silty clay matrix	12.7	1.9	0.32	Modern
1	102	Layer		Buried Soil	Mid greyish brown silty clay with rare inclusions of stone	12.7	1.9	0.23	Post Med
1	103	Layer		Natural	Terrace gravel in a light yellowish brown sandy silty clay	12.7	1.9	>0.1	
2	200	Layer		Hardstanding	Reinforced Concrete	>1.8	0.65	0.2	Modern
2	201	Layer		Alluvium	Very dark brown silty clay with small stone inclusions	>1.8	0.3	0.18	Post Med
2	202	Layer		Alluvium	Mid greyish brown silty clay	>1.8	3.7	0.27	
2	203	Layer		Natural	Terrace gravel in a light yellowish brown silty clay matrix	0.5	0.5	>0.1	
2	204	Cut		Alluvium	Undulation in gravel	1.9	1.27	0.82	
2	205	Fill	204	Secondary Fill	Mid greyish brown silty clay with rare Stone inclusions	1.9	1.27	0.82	
3	300	Layer		Hardstanding	Reinforced Concrete	32	2	0.16	Modern
3	301	Layer		Made Ground	Dark yellowish brown clayey coarse sand and flint gravel	32	2	0.09	
3	302	Layer		Alluvium	Dark grey and black humic clayey silt with occasional roots, <70mm sub angular flint, and post-medieval CBM.	32	2	0.19	
3	303	Layer		Alluvium	Dark greenish grey clayey silt with occasional roots, <70mm sub angular flint, and post-medieval CBM.	32	2	0.46	
3	304	Layer		Brickearth	Mid orangey brown sandy silt and clayey silt	32	2	0.37	
3	305	Layer		Natural	Mid orangey brown and grey clayey coarse sand and gravel	32	2	>0.16	
4	400	Layer		Hardstanding	Reinforced Concrete	23	2	0.16	Modern
4	401	Layer		Made Ground	Dark yellowish brown clayey coarse sand and flint gravel	23	2	0.05	
4	402	Layer		Alluvium	Dark grey and black humic clayey silt with occasional roots, <70mm sub angular flint, and post-medieval CBM.	23	2	0.34	
4	403	Layer		Alluvium	Dark greenish grey clayey silt with occasional roots, <70mm sub angular flint, and post-medieval CBM.	23	2	0.35	
4	404	Layer		Brickearth	Mid orangey brown sandy silt and clayey silt	23	2	0.72	
4	405	Layer		Natural	Mid orangey brown and grey clayey coarse sand and gravel	23	2	>0.24	
5	500	Layer		Hardstanding	Reinforced Concrete	15.5	2	0.2	Modern
5	501	Layer		Made Ground	Pinkish red and brownish yellow coarse sand and gravel	15.5	2	0.15	
5	502	Layer		Alluvium	Dark grey and black humic clayey silt with occasional roots, <70mm sub angular flint, and post-medieval CBM.	15.5	2	0.15	
5	503	Layer		Alluvium	Dark greenish grey clayey silt with occasional roots, <70mm sub angular flint, and post-medieval CBM.	15.5	2	0.4	
5	504	Layer		Natural	Mid orangey brown and grey clayey coarse sand and gravel	15.5	2	>0.4	
6	600	Layer		Hardstanding	Reinforced Concrete	18.2	2	0.2	Modern
6	601	Layer		Made Ground	Pinkish red and brownish yellow	18.2	2	0.2	



					coarse sand and gravel				
6	602	Layer		Alluvium	Dark grey and black humic clayey silt with occasional roots, <70mm sub angular flint, and post-medieval CBM.	18.2	2	0.2	
6	603	Layer		Alluvium	Dark greenish grey clayey silt with occasional roots, <70mm sub angular flint, and post-medieval CBM.	18.2	2	0.35	
6	604	Layer		Brickearth	Mid brown clayey silt	18.2	2	0.1	
6	605	Layer		Natural	Mid orangey brown and grey clayey coarse sand and gravel	18.2	2	0.3	
7	700	Layer		Made Ground	Aesthetic gravel, silty clay and builders rubble	13.1	1.9	0.32	Modern
7	701	Layer		Made ground	Disturbed subsoil with builders rubble	13.1	1.9	0.47	
7	702	Layer		Subsoil	Mid brown silty clay	13.1	1.9	0.26	
7	703	Layer		Natural	Mid yellowish brown sandy silty clay with sparse <0.08mm nodules of flint	13.1	1.9	>0.1	
8	800	Layer		Made Ground	Dark greyish brown silt and gravel	18.8	1.9	0.17	Modern
8	801	Layer		Made Ground	Dark greyish brown silt and modern rubble debris	18.8	1.9	0.12	
8	802	Layer		Subsoil	Mid brown silty clay with <0.05 flint	18.8	1.9	0.32	
8	803	Layer		Natural	Mid yellowish brown sandy silty clay with sparse <0.08 nodules of flint	18.8	1.9	0.1	
8	804	Cut		Ditch		>1.9	1	0.5	Modern
8	805	Fill	804	Dumped fill	Light grey and white	>1.9	1	0.25	
8	806	Fill	804	Dumped fill	Mid brown clayey silt	>1.9	1	0.3	

**APPENDIX B: OASIS REPORT FORM**

<b>PROJECT DETAILS</b>		
Project Name	Land at Bray Studios, Water Oakley, Bray, Berkshire	
Short description (250 words maximum)	An archaeological evaluation was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology in September 2015 at Bray Studios. Eight trenches were excavated. Despite the identified archaeological potential of the site no archaeological features or deposits of any significance were revealed within the evaluation trenches. The deposit sequence revealed within the trench demonstrated intact deposits directly below the modern made ground surface with little or no modern truncation having impacted upon the deposit sequence. If any archaeological features, in particular cut features of good or significant depth had been present then it could have been anticipated that they would have survived either cutting the intact brickearth or gravel..	
Project dates	21-24 September 2015	
Project type	Evaluation	
Previous work	DBA (CgMs 2010)	
Future work	Unknown	
<b>PROJECT LOCATION</b>		
Site Location	Bray Studios, Water Oakley, Bray, Berkshire	
Study area (M <sup>2</sup> /ha)	2.2ha	
Site co-ordinates (8 Fig Grid Reference)	SU 920 777	
<b>PROJECT CREATORS</b>		
Name of organisation	Cotswold Archaeology	
Project Brief originator	Roland Smith (Berkshire Archaeology)	
Project Design (WSI) originator	Cotswold Archaeology (CA 2015)	
Project Manager	Damian De Rosa	
Project Supervisor	Jeremy Clutterbuck	
<b>MONUMENT TYPE</b>	Ditch - modern	
<b>SIGNIFICANT FINDS</b>	None	
<b>PROJECT ARCHIVES</b>		
Physical	CA Offices Andover	CBM
Paper	CA Offices Andover	Context sheets, matrices etc
Digital	CA Offices Andover	Database, digital photos etc
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>		
Cotswold Archaeology 2015. Bray Studios, Water Oakley, Bray, Berkshire: Evaluation. CA Project: <b>770277. Report no. 15754</b>		

### **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 8  
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