



Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline Hills Quarry Route Gloucestershire

Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief



for: AECOM

on behalf of: Thames Water Utilities Ltd

> CA Project: CR0257 CA Report: CR0257_1

> > January 2021



Andover Cirencester Exeter Milton Keynes Suffolk

Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline Hills Quarry Route Gloucestershire

Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief

CA Project: CR0257 CA Report: CR0257_1

	Document Control Grid									
Revision	Date	Author	Checked by	Status	Reasons for	Approved				
					revision	by				
А	7 October	Daniel	Laurent	Internal	QA	Martin				
	2020	Sausins	Coleman	review		Watts				
В	6 January	Daniel	Laurent	Final	To address	Martin				
	2020	Sausins	Coleman		comments from	Watts				
					Loic Boscher					

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	Milton Keynes	Andover	Exeter	Suffolk
Building 11	Unit 8, The IO Centre	Stanley House	Unit 1, Clyst Units	Unit 5, Plot 11
Kemble Enterprise Park	Fingle Drive	Walworth Road	Cofton Road	Maitland Road
Cirencester	Stonebridge	Andover	Marsh Barton	Lion Barn Industrial
Gloucestershire	Milton Keynes	Hampshire	Exeter	Estate
GL7 6BQ	Buckinghamshire	SP10 5LH	EX2 8QW	Needham Market
	MK13 0AT			Suffolk IP6 8NZ
t. 01285 771 022		t. 01264 347 630	t. 01392 573 970	
	t. 01908 564 660			t. 01449 900 120
	e. €	enquiries@cotswoldarchaeo	ogy.co.uk	

CONTENTS

SUMMA	\RY	.3
1.	INTRODUCTION	.4
2.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	.5
3.	AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	.7
4.	METHODOLOGY	.7
5.	RESULTS	.8
6.	THE FINDS	.11
7.	THE BIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE	.13
8.	DISCUSSION	.13
9.	CA PROJECT TEAM	.14
10.	REFERENCES	.14
APPENI	DIX A: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS	.16
APPENI	DIX B: THE FINDS	.21
APPENI	DIX C: THE PALAEOENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE	.22
APPENI	DIX D: OASIS REPORT FORM	.23

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig. 1 Site location plan (1:25,000)

Fig. 2 Trench location plan: northern and central parts of pipeline (1:5000)

- Fig. 3 Trench location plan: central and southern parts of pipeline (1:5000)
- Fig. 4 Trenches 1 to 4: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:1000)
- Fig. 5 Trenches 5 to 8: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 6 Trenches 9 to 12: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 7 Trenches 13 to 15: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 8 Trenches 16 to 24: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 9 Trenches 25 to 27: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 10 Trenches 28 to 30: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 11 Trenches 31 to 33: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 12 Trenches 34 to 36: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 13 Trenches 37 to 38: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 14 Trenches 39 to 41: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 15 Trenches 42 to 44: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 16 Trenches 45 to 48: archaeological features and geophysical survey results (1:750)
- Fig. 17 Trench 24: section (1:20) and photograph
- Fig. 18 Trench 39: section (1:20) and photograph
- Fig. 19 Trench 40: sections (1:20) and photograph
- Fig. 20 Photographs
- Fig. 21 Photographs

SUMMARY

Project name:	Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry Route
Location:	Gloucestershire
NGR:	Northern extent: 402359 200326; Southern extent: 403346 197226
Туре:	Evaluation and Watching Brief
Date:	1 to 28 June and 17 to 18 August 2020
Planning reference:	Permitted development
Location of Archive:	To be deposited with Corinium Museum and the Archaeology Data Service (ADS)
Site Code:	CFF20

In June and August 2020, Cotswold Archaeology carried out an archaeological evaluation and watching brief along the route of the Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Gloucestershire. During the evaluation, a total of 42 trenches was excavated. A limited watching brief was also undertaken in the northern and central parts of the site, where excavation of trial trenches was not possible.

Two ditches were identified; these dated broadly to the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods. Other features include three undated ditches, post-medieval field boundaries, a postmedieval feature, a large post-medieval quarry pit and furrows dating to the medieval and/or post-medieval periods.

3

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. In June and August 2020, Cotswold Archaeology (CA) carried out an archaeological evaluation and watching brief along the route of the Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline (NGR: 402359 200326 (northern extent), 403346 197226 (southern extent); Fig. 1). This archaeological work was undertaken for AECOM, who were acting on behalf of Thames Water Utilities Ltd.
- 1.2. As part of permitted development, a new 3.7km foul water pipeline linking existing sewer systems south-west of Cirencester to the Cirencester Sewage Treatment Works west of South Cerney was undertaken. The archaeological work was undertaken after consultation with the archaeological advisor to Cotswold District Council (CDC).
- 1.3. The scope of the evaluation was defined by Charles Parry, Archaeologist, Gloucestershire County Council (GCC), the archaeological advisor to CDC, and was carried out in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) prepared by AECOM (2019) and approved by Charles Parry. A subsequent Method Statement (MS) was also prepared by CA (2020) and approved by Rachel Foster (Archaeologist, GCC). The evaluation and watching brief were monitored by Rachel Foster.
- 1.4. The evaluation covered most of the pipeline route except in the northern part, which had already been subject to archaeological evaluation, and in the southern part of the site where it crossed a modern quarry that also had been subjected previously to archaeological work. Whilst onsite the pipeline design was changed and, following discussions between AECOM and Rachel Foster, a number of evaluation trenches in the northern and central parts of the site were not excavated. Instead a watching brief was undertaken in these areas, where ground reduction was required.
- 1.5. The evaluation and watching brief was also in line with Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation (ClfA 2014), Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief (ClfA 2014; updated June 2020), Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE) PPN 3: Archaeological Excavation (Historic England 2015) and Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide (Historic England 2015).

The site

- 1.6. The pipeline crossed a number of fields that were under cultivation and separated by hedgerows and ditches forming field boundaries. In the northern part, it crossed the dismantled Great Western Railway Kemble to Cirencester branch line and the disused remains of the Thames and Severn Canal. The southern part crossed a currently operating large open-cast mining operation at Dryleaze Farm. The River Thames is located approximately 1.3km to the south-west of the pipeline, the River Churn is 1km to the east, and the protected landscape of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is 1.5km to the north-west.
- 1.7. The underlying bedrock geology of the site is mapped as Cornbrash, Forest Marble and Kellaway beds, which formed in the Jurassic era. Superficial deposits of Alluvium (Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel), formed in the Quaternary Period, were also recorded (BGS 2020). Limestone brash, gravel and clay were identified during the evaluation and watching brief.

2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The pipeline route has previously been subjected to a detailed assessment recorded in the WSI (AECOM 2019). The below is a summary of the information within this document.
- 2.2. The pipeline lies within a rich archaeological landscape spanning the prehistoric to the modern era. The northern part lies 1km to the south of the Roman core of *Corinium* (SM 1003426) at Cirencester, and of Cirencester's four Conservation Areas, and 550m east of the Chesterton Farm Scheduled Monument (SM 1003444). The southern part of the pipeline is 1.2km west of the South Cerney Conservation Area which includes South Cerney Castle (SM 1003422) (AECOM 2109).
- 2.3. A Neolithic flint knife was recovered from the Chesterton Farm housing development, located to the north of these works (CA 2013), and a number of features containing prehistoric Grooved Ware and Beaker pottery have been recovered from the Dryleaze Farm Quarry (located approximately 500m east of the pipelines central section). The same investigations also revealed three ring ditches that may date to either the Neolithic or Bronze Age period (AECOM 2019).

- 2.4. Linear features containing Iron Age pottery were recorded at Chesterton Farm (CA 2013) and an extensive series of Iron Age ring ditches suggestive of settlement activities have been uncovered at Dryleaze Farm Quarry (AECOM 2019).
- 2.5. The site is located 500m to the east of the Scheduled Monument of Chesterton Farm (SM 1003444), which consists of a large Roman rural settlement or farmstead. Crossing the site within Hills Quarry at Dryleaze Farm, recent excavations revealed the presence of a Roman trackway leading to Cirencester. Other Roman remains excavated in close proximity to the trackway included enclosures, field system ditches and postholes, containing pottery dated to 1st and 2nd centuries AD. Surface finds of Roman pottery associated with a series of cropmarks in the southern part of the site may indicate another Roman settlement site on the pipeline route (AECOM 2019).
- 2.6. Medieval pottery sherds found as surface finds are probably associated with an undated rectangular enclosure 150m west of the pipeline's central part, and may have indicate the presence of a small medieval settlement or farmstead. A similar rectangular enclosure visible as cropmarks lying 165m east of the pipeline's central section, also may indicate the presence of a medieval settlement or farmstead. The trackway is known to have been in use in both the Roman and post-medieval period and was therefore probably also extant during the medieval period (AECOM 2019).
- 2.7. A geophysical survey undertaken by Archaeological Surveys Ltd (2020) along the proposed route of the pipeline indicated the presence of quarrying within two areas in the northern part of the site along with nearby pit-like anomalies, which could have been of archaeological potential. Evidence for more recent quarrying was also evident in the southern part of the site. Throughout the site, a number of short, weakly positive linear and discrete anomalies were apparent, but the majority lacked a coherent morphology. In the central part of the site, within a dry valley, there was a number of discrete, pit-like responses, some of which appeared in a line or ring. While such responses can relate to natural features, an anthropogenic origin was also considered. In the southern part of the site there was a number of positive responses, but it was not clear if they related to natural or anthropogenic features.

3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- 3.1. The general objective of the evaluation and watching brief was to provide further information on the likely archaeological resource within the site, including its presence/absence, character, extent, date and state of preservation. This information enabled Rachel Foster (GCC) to identify and assess the particular significance of any archaeological heritage assets within the site, consider the impact of the proposed development upon that significance, and develop archaeological mitigation strategies ranging from watching brief to full excavation in line with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (MHCLG 2019).
- 3.2. In the event, no archaeological mitigation was required due to the very limited nature and extent of the archaeological remains identified.

4. METHODOLOGY

- 4.1. The evaluation fieldwork comprised the excavation of 42 trenches (Figs 2 and 3):
 - 41 trenches measured approximately 25m in length and 1.8m in width.
 - 1 trench measured approximately 16m in length and 1.8m in width.
- 4.2. A topsoil strip was undertaken alongside each trench to allow for the segregated storage of subsoil. Natural substrate was not observed within these areas.
- 4.3. The trenches were located to test geophysical anomalies and to provide a representative sample of the remainder of the site. Trench 26 was divided in two parts to avoid disturbing the haul road area. Trench 41 was reduced in length due to overhead cables and agricultural access. Trenches, where needed, were moved by up to 10m from their pre-agreed locations to bring them onto the pipeline route or avoid the easement fence line. These movements were passed daily onto Rachel Foster (GCC) and their new positions are located on Figs 2 and 3.
- 4.4. Trenches 1 to 4 inclusive and Trenches 21 and 22 were not excavated due to the construction levels not impacting upon the natural substrate in these areas. Instead, construction work within these locations (Areas 1 and 2; Fig. 2) were monitoring

during an archaeological watching brief, which observed the removal of topsoil. Natural substrate was not exposed. Where the pipe trench crossed within Area 1, subsoil was removed to the top of natural substrate.

- 4.5. Trenches were set out on OS National Grid co-ordinates using Leica GPS. Overburden was stripped from the trenches by a mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless grading bucket. All machining was conducted under archaeological supervision to the top of the natural substrate, which was the level at which archaeological features were first encountered.
- 4.6. Archaeological features/deposits were investigated, planned and recorded in accordance with CA Technical Manual 1: Fieldwork Recording Manual.
- 4.7. Deposits were assessed for their palaeoenvironmental potential in accordance with CA Technical Manual 2: The Taking and Processing of Environmental and Other Samples from Archaeological Sites. No deposits were identified that required environmental sampling.
- 4.8. Artefacts were processed in accordance with CA Technical Manual 3: Treatment of Finds Immediately after Excavation.
- 4.9. CA will make arrangements with Corinium Museum for the deposition of the project archive and, subject to agreement with the legal landowner(s), the artefact collection. A digital archive will also be prepared and deposited with the Archaeology Data Service (ADS). The archives (museum and digital) will be prepared and deposited in accordance with Standard and Guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives (CIfA 2014; updated June 2020).
- 4.10. A summary of information from this project, as set out in Appendix D, will be entered onto the OASIS online database of archaeological projects in Britain.

5. **RESULTS**

5.1. This section provides an overview of the evaluation results. Detailed summaries of the recorded contexts are given in Appendix A. Details of the artefactual material recovered from the site are given in Section 6 and Appendix B.

8

- 5.2. Natural substrate, consisting of limestone brash, yellow and grey clay and gravel, was identified between 0.3m and 0.5m below present ground level (bpgl) throughout the site. Limestone brash was more prevalent in the northern part of the site (Trenches 5 to 20, and 23 to 24) with gravels in the southern part of the site (Trenches 38 to 41, and 44 to 48). Superficial alluvial clay deposits were identified in Trenches 25 to 37, where the site was located within a probable palaeochannel of the River Thames. Natural substrate was sealed by approximately 0.2m of subsoil, in turn overlain by modern plough soil or grass turf approximately 0.2m in depth.
- 5.3. The subsoil was cut by post-medieval ditches within Trenches 27, 28 (Fig. 20), 30, 32 and 36. Medieval and/or post-medieval furrows were identified in Trenches 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 42, 44, 45, 46 and 47). Natural features associated with tree rooting or animal burrowing were identified in Trenches 19 and 45.
- 5.4. Feature 806, identified within Trench 8 (Fig. 5), was partially exposed in plan, and corresponded with an irregular geophysical anomaly. It was broadly aligned north-west/south-east with moderately sloping sides and a concave base, and measured at least 2.0m in length, 1.9m in depth and 0.5m in depth (Fig. 20). It contained three fills: one sherd of late 18th to 19th-century AD pottery was recovered from silty basal fill 805, and 15 sherds of residual Roman pottery, animal bone and post-medieval ceramic building material (CBM) were recovered from rubble-rich secondary fill 804.
- 5.5. Post-medieval limestone quarrying, measuring approximately 1.1m in depth, was identified in Trenches 42 and 43 (Fig. 15), and corresponded with quarrying identified on the geophysical survey. The western extent was recorded in Trench 42 and eastern extent was recorded in Trench 43. Cartographic sources depict the quarrying on the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey Map of 1876 (AECOM 2019). One sherd of heavily abraded Roman pottery and an iron nail were recovered from fill 4304 of the quarry pit within Trench 43.
- 5.6. The following features all cut natural substrate and were sealed by subsoil unless otherwise stated.

Trench 24 (Figs 8 and 17)

5.7. Ditch 2403 (Fig. 17, Section AA) was broadly aligned north-east/south-west with a possible terminus or corner at its north-eastern extent that was partially exposed in

plan. It had moderately sloping sides and a concave base, and measured at least 15m in length, approximately 1.1m in width and 0.2m in depth. It contained basal gravel fill 2404 overlain by silty clay fill 2405 from which one sherd of 5th to 7th-century AD pottery was recovered. The ditch did not correspond with any geophysical anomaly.

Trench 39 (Figs 14, 18 and 20)

5.8. Ditch 3905 (Fig. 18, Section BB) was broadly aligned north-west/south-east with moderately sloping sides and a concave base. It measured at least 10m in length, approximately 0.95m in width and 0.35m in depth, and contained fill 3906 from which one sherd of heavily abraded Roman pottery was recovered. It was recut along its south-western extent by ditch 3907 that had moderately sloping sides and a concave base. Ditch 3907 measured at least 10m in length, approximately 0.7m in width and 0.3m in depth, and contained fill 3908 which remained undated. Neither ditch corresponded with any geophysical anomaly.

Trench 40 (Figs 14 and 19)

- 5.9. Ditch 4003 (Fig. 19, Section CC) was broadly aligned north-east/south-west with moderately sloping sides and an irregular base. It measured at least 3m in length, approximately 1.0m in width and 0.2m in depth, and contained silty clay fill 4004, which remained undated. It was cut at its south-western extent by Ditch 4005, broadly aligned east/west which was not excavated. Ditch 4005 may have been a south-eastern continuation of Ditch 3905 (Trench 39). Neither ditch corresponded with a geophysical anomaly.
- 5.10. Ditch 4007 (Fig. 19, Section DD) was broadly aligned north-west/south-east with moderately sloping sides and a flat base. It measured at least 1.8m in length, 0.85m in width and 0.2m in depth, and contained clay fill 4008, which remained undated. It was recut along its south-western extent by Ditch 4009 (Fig. 19; Section DD) with moderately sloping sides and a flat base. It measured 1.05m in width 0.3m in depth and contained clay fill 4010 which also remained undated. These ditches broadly correspond with a geophysical anomaly on the same alignment but approximately 5m to the south. Alternatively, these may have been south-western continuations of Ditches 3905 and 3907 (Trench 39), rather than Ditch 4005.

Watching Brief (Figs 4 and 8)

5.11. Within the areas of Trenches 1 to 4 (Area 1, Fig. 21) and Trenches 21 to 22 (Area 2, Fig. 20), topsoil was removed to the top of subsoil. No archaeological features were identified.

To the east of Trench 4, subsoil was removed along the route of the pipe trench to the top of natural substrate, along an area that measure d approximately 50m in length and 2m in width. Three furrows broadly aligned north-east/south-west were identified.

6. THE FINDS

6.1. Artefactual material was recovered by hand from ten deposits. The recovered material is listed by context number in Appendix B and further discussed by broad category below. Codes used in the recording of the Roman and later pottery and given in parenthesis in the report are defined in Appendix B. Where appropriate these match the fabric codes of the National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber and Dore 1998). A concordance is also provided (Appendix B, Table 2) matching type codes to those of the Cirencester pottery type series (see Rigby 1982).

Pottery

6.2. A total of 20 sherds (197g) was recovered from six deposits (Appendix B). The majority (17 sherds) can be dated to the Roman period, although almost all of this material is considered residual, occurring in later-dated deposits. The Roman material is well-fragmented, mainly comprising smaller body sherds and some sherds are moderately abraded. The largest group of 15 sherds (165g) is from the secondary filling (deposit 804) of feature 806. This material was clearly redeposited, occurring with material of post-medieval/modern dating. The Roman material comprised a mix of local coarseware and regional, traded ware types, typical of many assemblages from the town. A rim sherd from a Oxfordshire whiteware (OXF WH) mortarium of Young's form M22 (Young 1977) and sherds of New Forest (NFO CC) and local brown colour-coated wares (LBR CC) are dateable to the later Roman period (after *c*. AD 260/270). Other material is more broadly dateable, however a very abraded sherd of Oxfordshire red slipped ware (OXF RS) from fill 4304 of quarry pit 4303 was also of later Roman date, after *c*. AD 240/270.

11

- 6.3. A single sherd (25g) from fill 2405 of ditch 2403 is dateable to the early medieval period, most likely to the later 5th to 7th centuries. It is an unfeatured bodysherd in handmade organic-tempered fabric. Similar fabrics commonly characterise assemblages of this period in the upper Thames valley, though such material is rare from the area of Cirencester.
- 6.4. Pottery of post-medieval/modern dating amounts to two sherds (2g). A small body sherd in a refined whiteware fabric dateable no earlier than the late 18th century was recorded from the primary fill of feature 806 (fill 805). A small body sherd from fill 2804 of ditch 2803 occurs in a white stoneware fabric which probably dates to the 18th or 19th centuries.

Lithics

6.5. Worked flint recorded from Trench 34 topsoil deposit 3401 consists of a fragmentary blade core and a broken flake or blade. Both pieces exhibit edge damage and breakage consistent with extended exposure within the ploughsoil. Both are of good quality grey or dark grey flint, with surfaces a white or mottled white/grey as the result of 'recortication'. The blade/bladelet core appears to be of single platform type and probably dates to the Mesolithic. An area of thick, chalky cortex suggests it was procured from a primary chalk or chalk soil area.

Other finds

6.6. A limited quantity of other finds was recorded, comprising items of iron, glass and leather. The iron items from deposit 804, consisting of fragmentary nails and a L-shaped bar, might be of Roman or later dating. The iron nail from fill 3604 of post-medieval ditch 3603 is probably modern. The single fragment of vessel (bottle) glass from the upper filling (803) of feature 806 is probably modern. The leather item from subsoil deposit 4601 is a button, its front embossed with Gothic or Lombardic style script, although this is not legible. This object's survival in a non-waterlogged deposit would indicate a relatively recent, modern date range.

Summary

6.7. Only small quantities of artefactual material were recorded and the Roman material, which makes up the majority, appears to be largely redeposited. More significant is a sherd of early medieval pottery from ditch 2403. As has been noted, artefactual evidence for this period is uncommon from the Cirencester environs, although settlement evidence dating to the mid or later 6th century has been recorded in the area of Siddington Road, Cirencester (CA 2020), approximately 1km to the west.

7. THE BIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

Animal bone

7.1. Animal bone amounting to 39 fragments (726g) was recovered from fills 803 and 804 of feature 806 alongside artefactual material dating from the post-medieval period (See Table 1, Appendix C). The bone was well preserved but fragmented, however it was possible to identify the remains of cattle (*Bos taurus*), sheep/goat (*Ovis aries/Capra hircus*) and pig (*Sus scrofa sp.*) Where modern damage was present and re-fitting was possible, the fragments are counted as a single bone.

8. **DISCUSSION**

- 8.1. Despite the archaeological potential for the site (see *Archaeological Background*), few archaeological features were identified.
- 8.2. The correlation between the geophysical survey and identified archaeological features was poor. The geophysical survey identified features of possible archaeological interest that were interpreted as either variations in the natural substrate or agricultural features such and furrows and land drains during the evaluation, and archaeological features recorded during the evaluation were not apparent on the geophysical survey.
- 8.3. Two areas of archaeological activity were identified. A ditch (2403) was identified in Trench 24 from which a single sherd of 5th to 7th-century AD pottery was recovered. The recovery of a single sherd of Saxon pottery is of interest as this period is generally under-represented in the area. While a single sherd cannot conclusively date the ditch to the Anglo-Saxon period, its presence adds further evidence to Anglo-Saxon occupation in the area.
- 8.4. A series of ditches were identified in Trenches 39 and 40, with a single sherd of Roman pottery recovered from ditch 3905 in Trench 39. Two of the ditches had been recut at least once, suggesting land management and maintenance of the

site. While the geophysical survey does not indicate how far the ditches may continue, or any possible returns, it is possible these features formed part of a Roman small enclosure or field system.

- 8.5. The undated ditches identified in Trenches 25, 39 and 40 were sealed by subsoil suggesting they pre-date the post-medieval period but the lack of dateable material, which was sought from visually scanning the topsoil and subsoil heaps as well as during excavation, makes it difficult to date these ditches with any certainty. The lack of artefactual material also suggests that these ditches were away from areas of occupation and probably fell within the agricultural hinterland of either the nearby Roman and/or medieval settlements.
- 8.6. Roman material, including 15 sherds of pottery, was recovered from a postmedieval feature within Trench 8. The function of the feature was not identified, with the geophysics suggesting it was a pit-like feature, but no obvious material to quarry was identified within the trench. It is possible that Roman material was imported to backfill the feature and may have derived from either an unidentified nearby Roman settlement, or from Cirencester.

9. CA PROJECT TEAM

9.1. Fieldwork was undertaken by Daniel Sausins, assisted by Kinga Werner, Annabel Johns and Megan Reid. This report was written by Daniel Sausins. The finds and biological evidence reports were written by Ed McSloy and Andrew Clarke respectively. The report illustrations were prepared by Esther Escudero. The project archive has been compiled by Daniel Sausins and prepared for deposition by Hazel O'Neill. The project was managed for CA by Laurie Coleman and Richard Young.

10. **REFERENCES**

AECOM 2019 Written Scheme of Investigation Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline- Hills Quarry Route

- Archaeological Surveys 2020 Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry route, Siddington, Gloucestershire Magnetometer Survey Report. Ref No. J808
- British Geological Survey 2020 *Geology of Britain* Viewer <u>http://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.h</u> <u>tml Accessed 29 June 2020</u>
- CA 2020 'Land at Siddington Road, Cirencester: Archaeological Excavation', CA Report 9277.1
- Cotswold Archaeology 2013 Land West of Cirencester, Gloucestershire, Phase 1: Archaeological Evaluation. CA typescript report **13714**
- Cotswold Archaeology 2020 Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Cirencester, Gloucestershire. Method Statement for an Archaeological Evaluation
- Cooper, N. J. 1998 'The Supply of Pottery to Roman Cirencester', in Holbrook, N. (ed.) 1998, 324–50
- Holbrook, N. (ed.) 1998. *Cirencester: The Roman Town Defences, Public Buildings and Shops.* Cirencester Excavations V. Cirencester. Cotswold Archaeological Trust Ltd
- Tomber, R. and Dore, J. 1998 *The National Roman fabric reference collection: a handbook*, Museum of London / English Heritage/ British Museum
- Young, C.J. 1977 Oxfordshire Roman Pottery. British Archaeological Reports. 43. Oxford

APPENDIX A: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS

Trench	Context No.	Туре	Fill of	Interpretation	Description	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth/ thickness	Spot-date
5	500	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown sandy clay with limestone brash inclusion			0.29	
5	501	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown clay with limestone inclusions			0.18	
5	502	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash with yellow clay patches				
6	600	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown sandy clay with limestone brash inclusion			0.18	
6	601	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown clay with limestone inclusions			0.12	
6	602	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash with yellow clay patches				
7	700	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown sandy clay with limestone brash inclusion			0.2	
7	701	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown clay with limestone inclusions			0.1	
7	702	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash with yellow clay patches				
8	800	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown sandy clay with limestone brash inclusion			0.29	
8	801	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown clay with limestone inclusions			0.18	
8	802	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash with yellow clay patches				
8	803	Fill	806	Upper fill	Mid orange brown silty clay	>2.0	1.63	0.18	LC17-C19
8	804	Fill	806	Secondary fill	Mid grey black ashy silt with limestone rubble	>2.0	0.75	0.13	C18-C19
8	805	Fill	806	Basal fill	Mid orange brown silty clay	>1.0	1.72	0.35	LC18-C19
8	806	Cut		Feature	Partially exposed in plan with moderately sloping sides and concave base	>2.0	1.89	0.51	
9	900	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown sandy clay with limestone inclusions			0.17	
9	901	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown silty clay with limestone inclusions			0.16	
9	902	Layer		Natural substrate	Light grey-yellow and orange clay with limestone brash				
10	1000	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown sandy clay with limestone inclusions			0.15	
10	1001	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown silty clay with limestone inclusions			0.16	
10	1002	Layer		Natural substrate	Light grey-yellow and orange clay with limestone brash				
11	1100	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay with limestone inclusions			0.2	
11	1101	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey brown with orange hew silty clay with limestone brash			0.1	
11	1102	Layer		Natural substrate	Light yellow brown clay and limestone brash				
12	1200	Layer		Topsoil	Dark brown silty clay			0.14	
12	1201	Layer		Subsoil	Dark brown silty clay and with limestone fragments			0.16	
12	1202	Layer		Natural	Light yellow, white and blue				
13	1300	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay with limestone inclusions			0.2	

13	1301	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey brown with orange hew silty clay with limestone brash			0.1	
13	1302	Layer		Natural substrate	Light yellow brown clay with orange patches and limestone brash				
14	1400	Layer		Topsoil	Dark brown silty clay			0.18	
14	1401	Layer		Subsoil	Dark yellow-brown silty clay with limestone inclusions			0.16	
14	1402	Layer		Natural substrate	Light yellow brown limestone brash and white-grey clay patches				
15	1500	Layer		Topsoil	Mid brown grey silty clay with limestone brash			0.19	
15	1501	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay with limestone brash			0.1	
15	1502	Layer		Natural substrate	Light grey yellow clay with limestone brash				
16	1600	Layer		Topsoil	Mid brown silty clay			0.23	
16	1601	Layer		Subsoil	Mid green-grey silty clay			0.18	
16	1602	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash with gravel and clay				
17	1700	Layer		Topsoil	Brown silty clay			0.07	
17	1701	Layer		Subsoil	Mid brown silty clay with limestone inclusions			0.25	
17	1702	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash with yellow sand				
18	1800	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay			0.26	
18	1801	Layer		Subsoil	Mid to light orange brown with limestone inclusions			0.09	
18	1802	Layer		Natural substrate	Plated limestone and light grey brown clay				
18	1803	Layer		Natural feature	Mid red brown clayey silt				
19	1900	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay			0.14	
19	1901	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow grey-brown with limestone inclusions			0.12	
19	1902	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash with yellow sand				
19	1903	Cut		Furrow	Aligned NE/SW, shallow sides and irregular base	>8.0	0.7	0.13	
19	1904	Fill	1903	Furrow fill	Mid yellow brown silty clay with limestone inclusions	>8.0	0.7	0.13	
20	2000	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay			0.19	
20	2001	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow grey-brown silty clay with limestone inclusions			0.4	
20	2002	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash				
20	2003	Layer		Natural substrate	Brown yellow silt clay				
23	2300	Layer		Topsoil	Dark black brown silty clay			0.36	
23	2301	Layer		Subsoil	Mid orange brown silty clay with limestone inclusions			0.1	
23	2302	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash and yellow sand				
23	2303	Cut		Furrow	Aligned N/S. shallow sides, irregular base	>6.0	0.6	0.08	
23	2304	Fill	2303	Furrow fill	Mid brown silty clay	>6.0	0.6	0.08	
23	2305	Layer		Natural substrate	Brown yellow silt clay				
24	2400	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay			0.21	
24	2401	Layer		Subsoil	Light grey brown silty clay			0.15	
24	2402	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash and yellow sand				
24	2403	Cut		Ditch	Aligned NE/SW with moderate sides and concave	>15.0	1.12	0.21	

					base				
24	2404	Fill	2403	Basal ditch fill	Mid grey brown silty gravel	>1.2	0.78	0.02	
24	2405	Fill	2403	Secondary ditch fill	Mid yellow grey-brown silty	>15.0	1.12	0.19	C5-C7/8
25	2500	Layer		Topsoil	Dark brown silty clay			0.27	
25	2501	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown silty clay			0.32	
25	2502	Layer		Natural substrate	Mid grey yellow clay with manganese flecking				
26	2600	Layer		Topsoil	Mid brown grey clayey silt			0.36	
26	2601	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown silty clay			0.16	
26	2602	Layer		Natural substrate	Mid grey yellow silty clay				
27	2700	Layer		Topsoil	Dark brown silty clay			0.36	
27	2701	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey yellow silty clay			0.18	
27	2702	Layer		Natural substrate	Mid grey yellow clay				
27	2703	Cut		Ditch	Aligned NE/SW unexcavated	>1.8	0.98		
27	2704	Fill	2703	Ditch fill	Dark black grey clayey silt with rooting	>1.8	0.98		
28	2800	Layer		Topsoil	Dark brown silty clay			0.24	
28	2801	Layer		Subsoil	Mid green-grey silty clay			0.19	
28	2802	Layer		Natural substrate	Mottled grey, blue, grey and yellow clay				
28	2803	Cut		Ditch	Aligned N/S with irregular profile	>1.8	0.5	0.2	
28	2804	Fill	2803	Ditch fill	Mid brown grey clay silt	>1.8	0.5	0.2	C18-C19
28	2805				VOID				
28	2806	-			VOID				
28	2807	Cut		Ditch	Aligned NE/SW. not excavated	>1.8	1.8		
28	2808	Fill	2807	Ditch fill	Dark black brown clay silt with rooting	>1.8	1.8		
28	2809	Cut		Ditch	Aligned NE/SW. not excavated	>1.8	0.9		
28	2810	Fill	2809	Ditch fill	Dark black brown clay silt with rooting	>1.8	0.9	0.00	
29	2900	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown clayey silt			0.22	
29	2901	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow grey silty clay			0.16	
29	2902	Layer		Natural substrate	Light brown yellow silt clay				
30	3000	Layer		Topsoil	Dark brown clayey silt			0.12	
30	3001	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown silty clay			0.16	
30	3002	Layer		Natural substrate	Light brown yellow clay				
30	3003	Cut	0000	Ditch	Aligned E/W. unexcavated	>1.8	0.91		
30	3004	Fill	3003	Ditch fill	Dark brown black clayey silt with orange rope	>1.8	0.91		
31	3100	Layer		l'opsoil	Dark black brown silty clay			0.18	
31	3101	Layer		Subsoil	Iviid grey brown silty clay			0.12	
31	3102	Layer		Natural substrate	Light grey-green clay				
32	3200	Layer		I opsoil	Dark black brown silty clay			0.2	
32	3201	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay			0.16	
32	3202	Layer		Natural substrate	Mid grey brown-orange silty clay				
32	3203	Cut		Ditch	Aligned E/W. unexcavated	>1.8	1.4	>0.12	
32	3204	Fill	3203	Ditch fill	Dark black grey silty clay	>1.8	1.4	>0.12	
33	3300	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown-orange silty clay			0.18	

33	3301	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay			0.12	
33	3302	Layer		Natural substrate	Mid grey brown-orange silty clay				
34	3401	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown-orange silty			0.18	
34	3401	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay			0.2	
34	3402	Layer		Natural substrate	Mid grey brown-orange silty				
35	3500	Layer		Topsoil	Dark black brown silty clay			0.2	
35	3501	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay with orange bue			0.16	
35	3502	Layer		Natural substrate	Light orange brown silty clay				
36	3600	Layer		Topsoil	Dark black brown silty clay			0.13	
36	3601	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay with orange hue			0.22	
36	3602	Layer		Natural substrate	Light orange brown silty clay				
36	3603	Cut		Ditch	Aligned E/W with moderate sides and concave base	>1.8	0.7	0.17	
36	3604	Fill	3603	Ditch fill	Mid grey brown silty clay	>1.8	0.7	0.17	RB+
37	3700	Layer		Topsoil	Dark black brown silty clay			0.14	
37	3701	Layer		Subsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay with orange bue			0.11	
37	3702	Layer		Natural substrate	Light orange brown silty clay				
38	3800	Layer		Topsoil	Dark grey brown sandy clay			0.3	
38	3801	Layer		Subsoil	Mid orange brown silty clay			0.35	
38	3802	Layer		Natural substrate	Yellow gravels, limestone brash and light brown yellow clay				
39	3900	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown clayey silt			0.28	
39	3901	Layer		Subsoil	Mid brown yellow silty clay with gravel			0.12	
39	3902	Layer		Natural substrate	Yellow-orange gravel with light yellow silty clay				
39	3903	Cut		Natural feature	Irregular in plan and profile		>0.4	0.2	
39	3904	Fill	3903	Natural feature fill	Sterile brown yellow clay silt		>0.4	0.2	
39	3905	Cut		Ditch	Aligned NW/SE with moderately sloping sides and flat base	>10.0	0.94	0.34	
39	3906	Fill	3605	Ditch fill	Mid orange brown silty clay	>10.0	0.94	0.34	RB
39	3907	Cut		Ditch	Aligned NW/SE with moderately sloping sides and concave base	>10.0	0.68	0.29	
39	3908	Fill	3907	Ditch fill	Mid grey brown silty clay	>10.0	0.68	0.29	
40	4000	Layer		Topsoil	Light grey brown clayey silt			0.26	
40	4001	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown silty clay			0.14	
40	4002	Layer		Natural substrate	Yellow gravel and sand				
40	4003	Cut		Ditch	Aligned NE/SW. moderately sloping sides and irregular base	>1.8	0.97	0.18	
40	4004	Fill	4003	Ditch fill	Mid grey brown silty clay	>1.8	0.97	0.18	
40	4005	Cut		Ditch	Aligned E/W. unexcavated fully	>1.8	0.92	>0.16	
40	4006	Fill	4005	Ditch fill	Mid grey brown silty clay with abundant gravel inclusions	>1.8	0.92	>0.16	
40	4007	Cut		Ditch	Aligned E/W with moderately	>1.8	0.85	0.19	
40	4008	Fill	4007	Ditch fill	Mid brown silty clay with gravel inclusions	>1.8	0.85	0.19	

40	4009	Cut		Ditch	Aligned E/W with moderately sloping sides and flat base	>1.8	1.05	0.27	
40	4010	Fill	4009	Ditch fill	Mid grey brown silty clay	>1.8	1.05	0.27	
41	4100	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown clayey silt			0.33	
41	4101	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown silty clay			0.11	
41	4102	Layer		Natural substrate	Yellow and grey gravel				
42	4200	Layer		Topsoil	Mid brown silty clay			0.24	
42	4201	Layer		Subsoil	Dark brown silty clay			0.16	
42	4202	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash				
42	4203	Cut		Quarry pit	Partially exposed in plan. Irregular edge, flat base	>8.0	>1.8	1.24	
42	4204	Fill	4203	Upper fill	Mid brown silty clay with limestone brash inclusions	>8.0	>1.8	0.7	
42	4205	Fill	4203	Lower fill	Light yellow orange silty sand with loose limestone brash	>2.0	>1.8	0.5	
43	4300	Layer		Topsoil	Mid grey brown clayey silt			0.19	
43	4301	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown silty clay			0.15	
43	4302	Layer		Natural substrate	Limestone brash				
43	4303	Cut		Quarry pit	Irregular in plan and profile	>13.0	>1.8	>0.36	
43	4304	Fill	4303	Upper fill	Mid reddish-brown silty clay with limestone brash	>13.0	>1.8	0.24	Mod
43	4305	Fill	4303	Lower fill	Mid reddish-brown silty clay	>1.0	>0.5	>0.12	
44	4400	Layer		Topsoil	Mid brown silty clay			0.16	
44	4401	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown silty clay			0.1	
44	4402	Layer		Natural substrate	Compact yellow gravel and grey clay				
45	4500	Layer		Topsoil	Dark brown silty clay			0.21	
45	4501	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown with gravel inclusions			0.18	
45	4502	Layer		Natural substrate	Compact yellow gravels and light grey clay patches				
45	4503	Cut		Tree throw pit	Irregular in plan and profile	>0.5	>0.5	>0.3	
45	4504	Fill	4503	Tree throw pit fill	Mid red brown silt clay	>0.5	>0.5	>0.3	
46	4600	Layer		Topsoil	Mid brown silty clay			0.26	
46	4601	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown with gravel inclusions			0.18	Mod
46	4602	Layer		Natural substrate	Compact yellow gravel and light grey clay				
47	4700	Layer		Topsoil	Mid brown silty clay			0.23	
47	4701	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown with gravel inclusions			0.19	
47	4702	Layer		Natural substrate	Compact yellow and orange gravels with light grey clay patches				
48	4800	Layer		Topsoil	Mid brown silty clay			0.28	
48	4801	Layer		Subsoil	Mid yellow brown with gravel inclusions			0.18	
48	4802	Layer		Natural substrate	Compact yellow and orange with light brown-red silt clay				

APPENDIX B: THE FINDS

Context	Material	Description	Ct.	Wt. (g)	Spot-date
803	glass	Post-medieval green bottle glass	1	2	LC17-C19
804	Roman pottery	OXF WH (rim: mortarium)	1	48	C18-C19
	Roman pottery	NFO CC (body)	1	5	
	Roman pottery	LBR CC (body)	1	9	
	Roman pottery	DOR BB1 (body)	4	38	
	Roman pottery	BBIM (body)	2	21	
	Roman pottery	GW MIC (body)	1	5	
	Roman pottery	LOC GW (body)	5	39	
	CBM (Roman)	Tegula	1	329	
	CBM (Roman)	Imbrex	4	247	
	CBM (Roman)	Misc. brick/tile	21	439	
	CBM (med)	glazed ridge tile	2	134	
	CBM (med/pmed)	glazed ?floor	1	27	
	CBM (pmed)	'malting brick'	1	160	
	CBM (pmed)	brick	1	125	
	Fe obj.	nails	2	-	
	Fe obj.	Staple/bar	1	-	
805	Modern pottery	REF WH (flake)	1	1	LC18-C19
2405	Early Medieval	ORG (body)	1	25	C5-C7/8
0004	pottery	ENO OT			0.10.010
2804	Post-med. pottery	ENG ST	1	1	C18-C19
3401	Worked flint	Blade core (fragment, rolled)	1	21	-
	Worked flint	Broken flake or blade core	1	1	
3604	Fe obj.	nail	1	-	RB+
	Industrial waste	Ironworking slag?	2	2	
3906	Roman pottery	LOC BS (body)	1	2	RB
4304	Roman pottery	OXF WH (body) v. abr.	1	3	mod.
	Fe obj.	Nail	1	-	
4601	Leather	Button (embossed)	1	1	mod.

Table 2: Pottery summary

Period	Code*	Description	Ciren. Type†	Ct.	Wt.(g)
Roman	LOC BS	Local/north Wilts black-firing	5	1	2
	LOC GW	Local/north Wilts greywares	98	5	39
	BBIM	Local/north Wilts Late BB imitations	118	2	21
	MIC GW	Micaceous greyware (Severn Vale type)	-	1	5
	LBR CC	Local brown colour-coated ware	105	1	9
	DOR BB1	Southeast Dorset Black-burnished ware	74	4	38
	OXF WH	Oxfordshire whiteware	90	1	48
	OXF RS	Oxfordshire red slipped ware	83	1	3
	NFO CC	New Forest colour-coated ware	82	1	5
Sub-total				17	170
Early Medieval	ORG	Organic (grass or chaff) tempered	-	1	25
Pmed/ Mod.	REF WH	Refined whiteware	214	1	1
	ENG ST	English white stoneware	237	1	1
Sub-total				2	2
Total				20	197

*codes in bold correspond to NRFRC types (Tomber and Dore 1998) † Cirecester pottery type series codes (see Cooper 1998)

APPENDIX C: THE PALAEOENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE

Cut	Fill	BOS	O/C	SUS	LM	ММ	Ind	Total	Weight (g)
806	803						2	2	8
806	804	5	1	3	26	2		37	718
Total		5	1	3	26	2	2	39	
Weight		290	8	29	387	4	8	726	

Table 1: Identified animal species by fragment count (NISP) and weight and context.

BOS = Cattle; O/C = sheep/goat; SUS = pig; LM = cattle size mammal; MM = sheep sized mammal; Ind = indeterminate

APPENDIX D: OASIS REPORT FORM

PROJECT DETAILS							
Project name	Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry route,						
Short description	Gloucestershire In June and August 2020, Cotswold Archaeology carried out an archaeological evaluation and watching brief along the route of the Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Gloucestershire. During the evaluation, a total of 42 trenches was excavated. A limited watching brief was also undertaken in the northern and central parts of the site, where excavation of trial trenches was not possible.						
	Two ditches were identified; these dated broadly to the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods. Other features include three undated ditches, post-medieval field boundaries, a post-medieval feature, a large post-medieval quarry pit and furrows dating to the medieval and/or post-medieval periods.						
Project dates	1 to 28 June and 17 to 18 August 2020						
Project type	Field evaluation and watching brief						
Previous work	Geophysical survey (Archaeological Surveys 2020)						
Future work	Unknown						
PROJECT LOCATION							
Site location	Chesterton Farm, Gloucestershire						
Study area (m²/ha)	10.4ha						
Site co-ordinates	Northern extent: 402359 200326 Southern extent: 403346 197226						
PROJECT CREATORS							
Name of organisation	Cotswold Archaeology						
Project brief originator	Gloucestershire County Council						
Project design (WSI) originator	AECOM						
Project Manager	Richard Young						
Project Supervisor	Daniel Sausins						
MONUMENT TYPE	None						
SIGNIFICANT FINDS	None						
PROJECT ARCHIVES	Intended final location of archive	Content					
Physical	Corinium Museum, Cirencester	Pottery, animal bone, lithics, metal objects					
Paper	Corinium Museum, Cirencester	Context sheets, trench sheets, section drawings, photo registers					
Digital	Corinium Museum, Cirencester	digital photos					
BIBLIOGRAPHY							
Cotswold Archaeology 2020 Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry route, Gloucestershire: Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief CA typescript report CR0257_1							













Spratsgate Lane





Ν

Geophysical Survey Results (Archaeological Surveys Ltd 2018)

- ----- Positive linear anomaly / possible ditch-like feature
- ----- Linear anomaly / of agricultural origin
- Linear anomaly / ridge and furrow
- Discrete positive response / cut feature of archaeological potential
- Discrete positive response / possible pit-like feature
- Variable magnetic response / quarrying of archaeological potential
- Variable magnetic response / magnetically enhanced material
- Magnetic disturbance from ferrous material
- Strong multiple dipolar linear anomaly / pipeline/cable/service
- Strong dipoler anomaly / ferrous object



25m

© Crown copyright and database rights 2020 Ordnance Survey 0100031673



Andover 01264 347630 Cirencester 01285 771022 Exeter 01392 573970 Milton Keynes 01908 564660 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk e enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.u

PROJECT TITLE Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry Route, Gloucestershire

FIGURE TITLE Trenches 5 to 8 showing archaeological features and geophysical survey results

 DRAWN BY
 EE
 PROJECT NO.
 CR0257

 CHECKED BY
 DJB
 DATE
 28/08/2020

 APPROVED BY
 REY
 SCALE@A3
 1:750

FIGURE NO. 5



























25m

FIGURE NO. 13

N















Ditch 2403, looking north-east (1m scale)

Andover 01264 347630 Cirencester 01285 771022 Exeter 01392 573970 Milton Keynes 01908 564660 Suffolk 01449 900120 w www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk e enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk			
PROJECT TITLE Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry Route, Gloucestershire			
FIGURE TITLE Trench 24, section and photograph			
DRAWN BY EE PROJECT NO. CR0257 FIGURE NO. CHECKED BY DJB DATE 28/08/2020 170 APPROVED BY REY SCALE®A4 1:20 17			







Ditches 3905 and 3907, looking south-east (1m scale)

Andover 01264 347630 Cirencester 01285 771022 Exeter 01392 573970 Milton Keynes 01908 564660 Suffolk 01449 900120 w www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk e enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk		
Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry Route, Gloucestershire		
FIGURE TITLE Trench 39, section and photograph		
DRAWN BY EE PROJECT NO. CR0257 FIGURE NO. CHECKED BY DJB DATE 28/08/2020 APPROVED BY REY SCALE®A4 1:20 18		









Ditch 4003, looking north-east (1m scale)



Ditches 4007 and 4009, looking south-east (1m scale)





Andover 01264 347630 Cirencester 01285 771022 Exeter 01392 573970 Archaeology Milton Keynes 01908 564660 Suffolk 01449 900120 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk e enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.u

PROJECT TITLE Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry Route, Gloucestershire FIGURE TITLE

Trench 40, sections and photographs

DRAWN BY EE CHECKED BY DJB APPROVED BY REY

 PROJECT NO.
 CR0257

 DATE
 28/08/2020

 SCALE@A3
 1:20

FIGURE NO. 19



Trench 8, post-medieval feature 806, looking north (1m scale)



Trench 39 during machine excavation, looking north-west



Trench 28, Post-medieval ditch 2803, looking south-west (0.3m scale)



Working shot of watching brief Area 2, looking north-east





Andover 01264 347630 Cirencester 01285 771022 Exeter 01392 573970 Milton Keynes 01908 564660 Suffolk 01449 900120 w www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk e enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry Route, Gloucestershire

FIGURE TITLE Photographs

DRAWN BY EE CHECKED BY DJB APPROVED BY REY PROJECT NO. DATE SCALE@A3 CR0257 28/08/2020 NA FIGURE NO.



Watching brief Area 1 pipe trench to top of natural substrate, looking south (1m scale)



Working shot of northern watching brief Area 1, looking east



 Andover
 01264 347630

 Cirencester
 01285 771022

 Exeter
 01392 573970

 Milton Keynes
 01908 564660

 Sutfolk
 01449 900120

 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
 e

 e
 enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE Chesterton Farm Foul Water Pipeline, Hills Quarry Route, Gloucestershire

FIGURE TITLE Photographs

DRAWN BY EE CHECKED BY DJB APPROVED BY REY

PROJECT NO. DATE SCALE@A3

CR0257 28/08/2020 NA FIGURE NO.

21



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 1, Clyst Units Cofton Road Marsh Barton Exeter EX2 8QW

t: 01392 573970

Milton Keynes Office

Unit 8 - The IO Centre Fingle Drive, Stonebridge Milton Keynes Buckinghamshire MK13 0AT

t: 01908 564660

Suffolk Office

Unit 5, Plot 11, Maitland Road Lion Barn Industrial Estate Needham Market Suffolk IP6 8NZ

t: 01449 900120

e: enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk