# Marston Pit, Cavenham, Suffolk.

An Archaeological Evaluation Assessment.



Matthew Collins

CAMBRIDGE ARCHAEOLOGICAL UNIT UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE



#### Marston Pit, Cavenham, Suffolk

An Archaeological Evaluation Assessment

#### **Matthew Collins**

With contributions from Lawrence Billington and Anne de Varielles Illustrations by Bryan Crossan

> Cambridge Archaeological Unit University of Cambridge Department of Archaeology

> > April 2013

Report No. 1161 Event No. CAM 058

### Contents

1.	1	Summary	
2.	Introduction		4
	2.1	Location, Topography and Geology	4
	2.2	Archaeological Background	4
	2.3	Methodology	5
	2.4	Archive	5
3.		Results	
4.		Discussion	7
5.		Acknowledgements	8
6.		Appendices	9
	6.1	Worked Flint – Lawrence Billington	9
	6.2	Bulk Environmental Samples – Anne de Vareilles	
	6.3	Trench and Feature Tables	
7.		References	

### List of Figures

Figure 1 – Location Plan
Figure 2 – Overall Trench Plan
Figure 3 – Trench Plan of Southern Half of Development Area
Figure 4 – Trench Plan of Northern Half of Development Area
Figure 5 – Photograph and Section of Ditch F.101 in Trench 26
Figure 6 – Photograph and Sections of Pits F.104-F.108 in Trench 9

#### 1. Summary

An archaeological trenched evaluation was undertaken by Cambridge Archaeological Unit (CAU) on open farmland and former woodland, to the north of Cavenham, Suffolk in advance of the proposed expansion of Marston Pit sand and gravel quarry. The evaluation identified several small, probably prehistoric, pits together with two moderate sized, undated ditches.

#### 2. Introduction

An archaeological evaluation was carried out by Cambridge Archaeological Unit (CAU) during March 2013 on land to the north of the village of Cavenham, Suffolk. The evaluation was carried out in advance of the proposed expansion of Marston Pit sand and gravel quarry and was commissioned by Andrew Josephs Associates on behalf of Allen Newport Ltd.

The evaluation was carried out and this report was produced in accordance with an archaeological specification written by the CAU (Gibson 2013) in response to a brief issued by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (SCCAS/CT).

#### 2.1 Location, Topography and Geology

The proposed development area (PDA) centred on TL 7651/7206, and is located on the eastern edge of the Breckland, on a mixture of farmland and cleared woodland approximately 1.5 km north of the village of Cavenham, and 750m south of the River Lark, (see Figure 1). The evaluation area sloped upwards gradually from 15.55m OD at Trench 1, to 17.82m at Trench 17 to 18.42m at Trench 26 and the underlying geology was glacio-fluvial drift of 2<sup>nd</sup> Terrace river gravels (BGS 2003).

#### 2.2 Archaeological Background

A recent Desk-Top Assessment (Rolfe 2006) examined the archaeological potential of the area in and around the PDA, and the relevant details are summarised below together with information from Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER).

Twelve sites dating from the Mesolithic through to the post-medieval period are recorded in the Suffolk HER within 1 km of the centre of the PDA. CAM 040, located directly to the west of the PDA, CAM 040 AREA C located 500m to the northwest and CAM 043, located 200m to the southeast of the PDA were multi-period evaluations and excavations carried out prior to previous expansions of Marston Pit. These investigations recovered worked flint blades and other lithic remains dating to the Mesolithic period; numerous worked flints dating from the later Neolithic period and evidence for Bronze Age settlement in the form of pits, hearths and post-hole structures.

Mesolithic and Neolithic flints were recovered 700m to the southeast of the PDA (CAM 023), where fieldwalking identified a spread measuring 130m x 180m. From this area, 65 flakes, 6 cores, 36 blades and a scraper dated to the Mesolithic, and a leaf-shaped arrow head dated to the Neolithic were recovered. Just to the south of this spread, (CAM 027) more fieldwalking recovered 72 flakes, 4 cores, 4 scrapers, 5 blades and 1 awl dating to the Neolithic period.

No Iron Age or Romano-British remains have been identified within the immediate area around the PDA, and the one Anglo-Saxon entry in the SMR for this area is at CAM 027, where a single sherd of Thetford-ware was recovered during the fieldwalking.

The post-medieval period is represented by four sites and includes CAM 042, located 250 northeast of the PDA, which was a temporary military base comprised of five ditched encampments and dated to 1779. Other sites include ILK 071; a civil war sconce with four angled bastions; a water mill (IKL 098), shown on the Hodskinson's map of 1783, and a World War II era pillbox (IKL 124). All of these sites are located between 600m and 800m to the northeast of the PDA

There are also two undated monuments close to the PDA and include the crop-mark of a 30m ring ditch located 750m to the east (CAM 010) and 'The Black Ditches', (CAM 001) which lie parallel to the eastern edge of the development area. This feature is likely to be either Iron Age or Post-Roman and related to the nearby Icknield Way (Rolfe 2006).

#### 2.3 Methodology

The area available to be evaluated through trial trenching consisted of Phases 1-3 (from a total of 7) with a combined area of approximately 38.74 ha. It comprised of open farmland and cleared woodland, with several agricultural buildings, and was evaluated by 27 trenches totalling 924m in length, giving approximately 5% coverage, (see Figure 2). Several changes to the initial Trench plan were necessary and included: Trenches 6, 11, 16 and 27 being shortened due to the presence of a conveyor belt; Trench 21 being moved and joined onto Trench 20 due to the presence of a trackway; and Trenches 23 and 25 being moved westwards as they were originally placed within an area of standing trees.

Topsoil and underlying deposits were removed under the supervision of an experienced archaeologist by a tracked 20-ton 360° machine using a 2.10m toothless ditching bucket. The removed overburden and all exposed features were scanned by metal detector for artefacts and a digital photographic record taken. Excavation of archaeological features was carried out using hand-tools; with one metre slots excavated in ditches; pits/postholes fully excavated, and bulk environmental samples taken where appropriate. All ambiguous natural features were also tested. The recording followed a CAU modified MoLAS system (Spence 1990) whereby feature numbers, F. were assigned to stratigraphic events and number [fill] or [cut] to individual contexts. The evaluation trenches were planned at 1:50 and individual sections drawn at 1:10.

All work was carried out in strict accordance with statutory Health and Safety legislation and with the recommendations of FAME (Allen & Holt 2010) and in accordance with a site specific risk assessment and the CAU Health and Safety Policy. The SCCAS assigned site code and event number is CAM 058.

#### 2.4 Archive

A total of 28 contexts from 12 features were excavated and recorded and artefacts including flint and burnt flint were recovered and catalogued. The documentary records and accompanying artefacts have been assembled into a catalogued archive in line with Appendix 6 of MAP2 (English Heritage 1991) and are currently being stored at the CAU offices.

#### 3. Results

The trenches showed relatively deep topsoil (averaging between 0.30m and 0.40m in depth) was present across the evaluated area. However; a moderate to high level of disturbance of the underlying geology was encountered, resulting primarily from intensive rabbit burrowing (particularly in the northern half of the PDA) and tree rooting. No non-ferrous artefacts were recovered from metal-detecting the machined overburden, although a small number of shot-gun cartridges and other modern objects were identified. Several worked flints, dated Late Neolithic-Early Bronze Age, were recovered from the topsoil (see Appendix 1), although these were quite widely dispersed and no concentrations/clusters were observed. A brief summary of each trench is given in Appendix 3.

A total of 12 archaeological features were identified within the 27 excavated trenches, (see Figures 3 and 4). These features included five individual small pits which were located across the PDA, together with a cluster of five further small pits within Trench 9. Two undated ditches were also present within the southern half of the PDA.

Small pit **F.102** was located towards the western end of Trench 4. It was 100% excavated and found to contain two Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age worked flints (see Appendix 1). The pit was infilled with a homogenous mid grey sandy silt with few inclusions, and a bulk environmental sample taken from it identified only low concentrations of fine charcoal (see Appendix 2). This pit was also cut by rabbit burrow **F.103**. Four other individual small pits identified and 100% excavated across the PDA included **F.100** in Trench 26, **F.110** in Trench 19, **F.111** in Trench 12 and **F.112** in Trench 11. All of these features, with the exception of **F.110** were infilled with a similar, homogenous mid grey sandy silt and contained no artefacts. **F.110** was infilled with dark grey sandy silt and a bulk environmental sample taken from it contained high quantities of well preserved small to large sized charcoal flecks and lumps. No artefacts were, however, recovered from this feature.

Within Trench 9, four small pits, **F.104-F.107**, (see Figure 6) were identified towards the eastern end, with a further pit, **F.108**, located within the central part (see Figure 4). A tree throw was also located adjacent to **F.107** and was tested for artefacts but none were recovered. All five pits were 100% excavated in order to maximise the chances of recovering any artefacts, however, only a single piece of burnt flint was recovered from **F.108**. All of these pits, with the exception of **F.105**, were infilled with homogenous mid grey sandy silt with very few inclusions. Pit **F.105**, however, was observed to contain frequent charcoal, and a bulk environmental sample taken from it confirmed the presence of a high quantity of well-preserved small to large sized charcoal flecks and lumps. Also recovered from this sample was a quantity of small burnt flint fragments (see Appendix 2).

Together with the small pits; two ditches were identified within the PDA. Feature **F.101** was a moderate sized, northwest-southeast orientated ditch seen in Trenches 24 and 26. It cut from within the topsoil level suggesting a post-medieval date, and measured up to 1.90m wide and 1.05m deep, (see Figure 5). A slot was excavated in both trenches revealing the ditch to be infilled with a homogenous pale to mid yellowish grey sandy silt containing very few inclusions and no artefacts. A bulk

environmental sample taken from the slot in Trench 24 contained only a small quantity of fine charcoal and evidence for a high level of bioturbation, (see Appendix 2). Feature **F.109** was a similar, moderate sized, northwest-southeast orientated ditch located in Trench 20. This feature also cut from within the topsoil level and was 1.80m wide, 0.80m deep and infilled with the same homogenous pale to mid yellowish grey sandy silt as seen in **F.101**. Ditch **F.109** was 100% excavated within the trench in order to maximise the chances of recovering any artefacts, but none were identified.

The only other features identified within the trenches were a series of modern water pipes and service cables which were present within Trenches 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 and are likely to be associated with the modern farm buildings currently standing within the southern half of the PDA.

#### 4. Discussion

The results from the evaluation suggest the significant Bronze Age settlement activity identified in previous excavations (CAM 040 and CAM 040 Area C), does not extend into the PDA in any concentration. The low number of recovered flints from the topsoil also suggests there are no spreads or clusters of earlier prehistoric material culture within that layer.

The general paucity of artefacts from the excavated pits suggests they do not represent significant settlement activity. A view supported by the poor bulk environmental sample results, although these could have been affected by local soil conditions. The identified pits, particularly the cluster present at the eastern end of Trench 9, are therefore likely to represent casual or low density usage of the landscape during prehistoric times. It is also plausible, due to the intensity of rabbit burrowing activity across the PDA, that some of the features identified as pits could in fact be natural features related to that activity, particularly considering the low number of recovered artefacts.

The two ditches, **F.101** and **F.109**, appear to be parallel and, due to their similarities, likely to date to the same period. They are located within an area formerly covered by a tree plantation, which appears on the First Edition Ordnance survey map dated from the 1880's. This suggests they predate the plantation and are therefore likely to be associated with post-medieval land enclosure, which occurred across Cavenham Heath in the late 1700's (Rolfe 2006). However, due to the lack of recovered artefacts, an earlier date cannot be ruled out at this stage.

Overall, the evaluation has indicated that there is a background prehistoric presence within the PDA probably related to casual or low level usage of the immediate landscape. Furthermore it has highlighted there is no evidence of Iron Age, Romano-British or medieval archaeology within the PDA, although the two possible postmedieval ditches suggest there is potential for later activity.

#### 5. Acknowledgements

The archaeological evaluation was commissioned by Andrew Josephs Associates on behalf of Allen Newport Ltd. Monitoring was undertaken on behalf of SCCAS/CT by Jess Tipper. David Gibson was CAU project manager. Bryan Crossan (CAU) undertook the surveying and Lizzie Middleton assisted the author on site

#### 6. Appendices

#### 5.1 Worked Flint – Lawrence Billington

A small assemblage of nine worked flints was recovered from the excavation, alongside three unworked burnt flints weighing 38.5g. The assemblage is quantified in Table 1. The worked flint assemblage is in good, very fresh condition and most pieces are made of a high quality fine grained dark grey flint. Where cortex survives it is invariably hard and somewhat abraded. Technologically the assemblage is made up entirely of hard hammer struck flake based material. The flakes are generally robust and relatively broad with plain, cortical or dihedral striking platforms, a few of which have seen preparation in the form of dorsal trimming. Whilst not strongly chronologically diagnostic this material is typical of Later Neolithic and Early Bronze Age flint-work, and there is no evidence for any flint-work predating this broad period. No formal retouched tool types are present although a single large secondary flake from **F.102** exhibits a small area of invasive retouch on one lateral edge and a broken flake (sf 1) shows clear signs of utilisation as a scraping tool.

feature	context	sf no.	secondary flake	tertiary flake	minimally worked core	retouched flake	totals	unworked burnt no.	unworked burnt weight
102	206					1	1		
108	218				1		1		
		1	1	1			2		
		2	1	1			2		
		3		1			1		
		4	1				1		
		5	1				1		
		6						3	38.5
		totals	4	3	1	1	9	3	38.5

 Table 1: Quantification of the flint assemblage

#### 6.2.1 Methodology

The 4 bulk soil samples taken on site were processed using an Ankara-type flotation machine. The flots were collected in  $300\mu$ m aperture meshes and the remaining heavy residues washed over a 1mm mesh. The flots and heavy residues were dried indoors prior to analysis. J.Hutton sorted the >4mm fractions of the heavy residues by eye; results have been added to Table 2. Dry flots were separated through a stack of sieves; fractions were sorted and macro remains identified under a low power binocular microscope (6x-40x magnification) by the author. All environmental remains are listed in Table 2.

#### 6.2.2 Results

The only archaeo-botanical remains recovered were charcoal. Features **F.101** and **F.102** contained low concentrations of fine charcoal (<4mm). Conversely, **F.105** and **F.110** had medium to high volumes of charcoal respectively, with numerous large, well preserved pieces which appear to have suffered little post-depositional attrition. Modern intrusive rootlets were common in all samples, especially in **F.101** where bioturbation has clearly disturbed archaeological deposits. Some burnt flint was recovered from the heavy residues, especially from **F.105**.

Sample number	1	4	2	3
Context	204	206	212	222
Feature	101	102	105	110
Feature description	Ditch		small pits	
Date	?	poten	tially preh	istoric
Sample volume - litres	14	12	9	8
Flot fraction examined -%	100%	100%	100%	100%
large charcoal, incl. from heavy residue (>4mm)			+++	++
med. charcoal (2-4mm)	+	-	+++	+++
small charcoal (<2mm)	++	++	+++	+++
vitrified vegetative tissue	+		+	
			200	
estimated charcoal volume - mililitres	<1 ml.	<1 ml.	ml.	5 ml.
>4mm Artefacts from the Heavy Residues				
Burnt flint		+	++	+

**Table 2:** Plant Macro-Remains and other Finds from the Bulk Soil Samples

*Key: '-' 1 or 2 items, '+' <10 items, '++' 10-50 items, '+++' >50 items. Intrusive rootlets present in all samples.* 

#### 5.3 Trench and Feature Tables

Trench 1						
General Description	Orientation	N-S				
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.39				
Tranch 1 contained no anabaselesisel factures on densaits	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.18				
Trench T contained no archaeological features of deposits.	Width (m)	2.10				
	Length (m)	14.20				

Trench 2						
General Description	Orientation	E-W				
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.40				
Trench 2 contained no archaeological features or deposits.	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.18				
	Width (m)	2.10				
	Length (m)	48.50				

Trench 3						
General Description Orientation N-S						
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.42				
Trench 3 contained no archaeological features or deposits. Two	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.12				
worked flints were recovered from the topsoil.	Width (m)	2.10				
	Length (m)	48.20				

Trench 4									
General I	General Description Drientation E-W								
								Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.28
Tren	Trench 4 contained a single small pit which was cut by an animal burrow.Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)0.1Width (m)2.1								0.17
									2.10
								Length (m)	30.30
Feature No.	Feature Type	Shape	Context No.	Cut/ Fill	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Artefacts	Archaeological Period
102	Small Pit	-	206	F	-	-	-	FL	Prohistoric?
102	Small Pit	Oval	207	С	0.85	0.50	0.18	-	T tenistorie :
103	Burrow	-	208	F	-	-	-	None	Modern
103	Burrow	Linear	209	С	>6.50	0.48	0.20	-	Widdelli

Trench 5							
General Description	Orientation	N-S					
Trench 5 contained no archaeological features or deposits. A	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.40					
ngle worked flint was recovered from the topsoil. Two natural	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.20					
features were tested which turned out to be a root bowl and rabbit	Width (m)	2.10					
burrow.	Length (m)	50.00					

Trench 6						
General Description	Orientation	NW-SE				
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.50				
Tranch 6 contained no archaeological features or deposits	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.15				
Tenen o contained no archaeological features of deposits.	Width (m)	2.10				
	Length (m)	12.70				

Trench 7						
General Description	Orientation	E-W				
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.47				
Tranch 7 contained no archaeological features or deposits	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.23				
Trench 7 contained no archaeological features of deposits.	Width (m)	2.10				
	Length (m)	49.50				

Trench 8						
General Description Orientation N-S						
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.35				
Trench 8 contained no archaeological features or deposits. A	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.30				
single worked flint was recovered from the topsoil.	Width (m)	2.10				
	Length (m)	48.60				

Trench 9											
General I	Description	Orientation	E-W								
			Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.32							
Trench 9 the trench	contained a	a group of small pit w	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.13							
	single w	orked flint	core was re	ecovered	from the to	psoil.		Width (m)	2.10		
								Length (m)	28.20		
Feature No.	Feature Type	Shape	Context No.	Cut/ Fill	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Artefacts	Archaeological Period		
104	Small Pit	-	210	F	-	-	-	None	Unknown		
104	Small Pit	Oval	211	С	1.00	0.80	0.16	-	Ulikilowii		
105	Small Pit	-	212	F	-	-	-	None	Unknown		
105	Small Pit	Circular	213	С	N/A	0.45	0.17	-	Ulikilowii		
106	Small Pit	-	214	F	-	-	-	None	Unknown		
106	Small Pit	Oval	215	С	0.6	0.45	0.40	-	Ulikilowii		
107	Pit	-	216	F	-	-	-	None	University		
107	Pit	Oval	217	С	N/A	0.40	0.11	-	UIIKIIOWII		
108	Small Pit	-	218	F	-	-	-	BF	Drahistoria?		
108	Small Pit	Circular	219	С	N/A	0.60	0.16	-	r teinstorie ?		

Trench 10		
General Description	Orientation	N-S
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.32
Trench 10 contained no archaeological features or deposits. A	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.17
natural feature was tested which turned out to be a rabbit burrow.	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	49.50

Trench 11													
General I	Description			Orientation	NE-SW								
			Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.37									
	Trench 11 contained a single small pit.		Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.14									
					Width (m)	2.10							
								Length (m)	12.80				
Feature No.	Feature Type	Shape	Context No.	Cut/ Fill	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Artefacts	Archaeological Period				
112	Small Pit	-	227	F	-	-	-	None	None Unknown				
112	Small Pit	Circular	228	С	N/A	0.40	0.20	-					

Trench 12											
General Description Orientation E-W											
			Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.32							
		Trench 12		Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.14						
								Width (m)	2.10		
								Length (m)	47.50		
Feature No.	Feature Type	Shape	Context No.	Cut/ Fill	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Artefacts	Archaeological Period		
111	Small Pit	-	224	F	-	-	-	None			
111	Small Pit	-	225	F	-	-	-	None	Unknown		
111	Small Pit	Oval	226	С	>0.50	0.45	0.20	-			

Trench 13		
General Description	Orientation	N-S
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.32
Trench 13 contained no archaeological features or deposits.	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.17
	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	50.00

Trench 14		
General Description	Orientation	E-W
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.36
Trench 14 contained a modern water pipe and no archaeological features or deposits. A single piece of burnt flint was recovered from the topsoil.	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.22
	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	26.50

Trench 15		
General Description	Orientation	N-S
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.35
Trench 15 contained the continuation of the modern water pipe observed in Trench 15. No archaeological features or deposits were present and two natural	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.14
features were tested which turned out to be a rabbit burrow and root bowl.	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	49.00

Trench 16		
General Description	Orientation	E-W
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.47
Trench 16 contained no archaeological features or deposits.	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.19
	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	13.00

Trench 17		
General Description	Orientation	E-W
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.40
Trench 17 contained a telephone cable and no archaeological features or deposits.	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.16
	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	24.30

Trench 18		
General Description	Orientation	N-S
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.40
Trench 18 contained a continuation of the telephone cable seen in Trench 17 and two treethrows which were both tested for artefacts but were found to be sterile.	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.20
No other archaeological features or deposits were present.	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	50.00

Trench 19												
General l	Description			Orientation	E-W							
			Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.40								
	Trench 19 contained a single small pit.				Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.13						
								Width (m)	2.10			
								Length (m)	31.00			
Feature No.	Feature Type	Shape	Context No.	Cut/ Fill	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Artefacts	Archaeological Period			
110	Small Pit	-	222	F	-	-	-	None	Unknown			
110	Small Pit	Oval	223	С	0.75	0.53	0.16	-	Unknown			

Trench 20												
General l	Description	Orientation	N-S									
		Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.45									
Trench 2	0 contained and a t	ter pipe	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.15								
		,						Width (m)	2.10			
								Length (m)	46.00			
Feature No.	Feature Type	Shape/Orien tation	Context No.	Cut/ Fill	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Artefacts	Archaeolo gical Period			
109	Ditch	-	220	F	-	-	-	None				
109	Ditch	Linear, E-W	221	С	Unknow n	1.80	0.80	-	Unknown			

Trench 21		
General Description	Orientation	E-W
Trench 21 contained no archaeological features or deposits.	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.45
	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.11
	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	12.70

Trench 22		
General Description	Orientation	E-W
	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.38
Trench 22 contained no archaeological features or deposits.	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.09
	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	19.00

Trench 23		
General Description	Orientation	N-S
Trench 23 contained no archaeological features or deposits.	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.37
	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.03
	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	53.00

Trench 24	4								
General I	General Description Drientation E-W						E-W		
Avg. Top Depth (r						Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.45		
	Trench 24 contained a moderate sized, undated ditch. <b>Avg. Subsoil</b> <b>Depth (m)</b> 0.20					0.20			
	<b>Width (m)</b> 2.10					2.10			
							Length (m)	28.00	
Feature No.	Feature Type	Shape/Orien tation	Context No.	Cut/ Fill	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Artefacts	Archaeologi cal Period
101	Ditch	-	204	F	-	-	-	None	
101	Ditch	Linear, NW- SE	205	С	Unknow n	1.40	0.45	-	Unknown

Trench 25		
General Description	Orientation	NE-SW
Trench 25 contained no archaeological features or deposits.	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.40
	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.20
	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	21.00

Trench 2	6								
General I	Description							Orientation	N-S
Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)							0.49		
Trench 2	Trench 26 contained a continuation of the undated ditch seen in Trench 24 and a small undated nit 0.17						0.17		
			1					Width (m)	2.10
					Length (m)	47.50			
Feature No.	Feature Type	Shape/Orien tation	Context No.	Cut/ Fill	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Artefacts	Archaeologi cal Period
100	Small Pit	-	200	F	-	-	-	None	University
100	Small Pit	Oval	201	С	0.50	0.45	0.11	-	Ulknown
101	Ditch	-	202	F	-	-	-	None	
101	Ditch	Linear, NW- SE	203	С	Unknow n	1.90	1.05	-	Unknown

Trench 27		
General Description	Orientation	NE-SW
Trench 27 contained no archaeological features or deposits.	Avg. Topsoil Depth (m)	0.55
	Avg. Subsoil Depth (m)	0.14
	Width (m)	2.10
	Length (m)	13.00

#### 7. References

Allen, J.L. and A. Holt. 2010. Health and Safety in Field Archaeology. FAME

British Geological Survey (BGS), 2003. Bury St. Edmunds. Sheet 188

Gibson, D. 2013. A Specification for Archaeological Evaluation. Permitted Mineral Development, Cavenham, Suffolk. CAU

Rolfe, J. 2006. An Assessment of the Potential for Impact on Archaeological Deposits as a Result of the Proposed Quarry Extension at Marston Pit, Cavenham. Suffolk C.C. Archaeological Service.

Spence, C. 1990. Archaeological Site Manual. MoLAS, London



Figure 1. Location Plan.



Figure 2. Trench Plan.



Figure 3. Trench Plan.



Figure 4. Trench Plan.





Figure 5. Photograph and Section of Trench 26, Feature F.101.





Figure 6. Photograph and Section of Trench 9, Features F.104, F.106, F.107 and F.108.

## OASIS DATA COLLECTION FORM: England

List of Projects | Manage Projects | Search Projects | New project | Change your details | HER coverage | Change country | Log out

#### **Printable version**

#### OASIS ID: cambridg3-148716

Project details	
Project name	Marston Pit, Cavenham, Suffolk An Archaeological Evaluation Assessment
Short description of the project	An archaeological trenched evaluation was undertaken by Cambridge Archaeological Unit (CAU) on open farmland and former woodland, to the north of Cavenham, Suffolk in advance of the proposed expansion of Marston Pit sand and gravel quarry. The evaluation identified several small, possibly prehistoric, pits together with two moderate sized, undated ditches.
Project dates	Start: 18-03-2013 End: 22-03-2013
Previous/future work	No / Not known
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	Local Authority Designated Archaeological Area
Current Land use	Cultivated Land 4 - Character Undetermined
Current Land use	Woodland 5 - Undetermined
Monument type	PITS Late Prehistoric
Monument type	DITCHES Uncertain
Significant Finds	FLINT Late Prehistoric
Methods & techniques	"Sample Trenches"
Development type	Mineral extraction (e.g. sand, gravel, stone, coal, ore, etc.)
Prompt	Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPS
Position in the planning process	After full determination (eg. As a condition)

#### **Project location**

Country	England
Site location	SUFFOLK FOREST HEATH CAVENHAM Marston Pit, Cavenham, Suffolk

#### OASIS FORM - Print view

Postcode	IP28 6SE
Study area	4.43 Hectares
Site coordinates	TL 7652 7206 52 0 52 19 03 N 000 35 24 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 16.00m Max: 18.00m

#### **Project creators**

Name of Organisation Cambridge Archaeological Unit

Project brief originator Local Authority Archaeologist and/or Planning Authority/advisory body

Project design originator	David Gibson
Project director/ manager	David Gibson
Project supervisor	Matthew Collins
Type of sponsor/ funding body	Landowner
Name of sponsor/ funding body	Allen Newport Ltd.

#### **Project archives**

Physical Archive recipient	Cambridge Archaeological Unit
Physical Archive ID	CAM 058
Physical Contents	"Worked stone/lithics"
Digital Archive recipient	Cambridge Archaeological Unit
Digital Archive ID	CAM 058
Digital Contents	"none"
Digital Media available	"GIS","Images raster / digital photography","Survey"
Paper Archive recipient	Cambridge Archaeological Unit
Paper Archive ID	CAM 058
Paper Contents	"Survey"
Paper Media available	"Context sheet","Map","Photograph","Plan","Report","Section","Survey ","Unpublished Text"

#### Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	Marston Pit, Cavenham, Suffolk An Archaeological Evaluation Assessment
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Collins, M.

#### OASIS FORM - Print view

Other bibliographic details	1161
Date	2013
Issuer or publisher	CAU
Place of issue or publication	CAU
Description	A4 Booklet. Pdf Document
Entered by	Matthew Collins (mc459@cam.ac.uk)
Entered on	23 April 2013

## **OASIS**:

Please e-mail English Heritage for OASIS help and advice

© ADS 1996-2012 Created by Jo Gilham and Jen Mitcham, email Last modified Wednesday 9 May 2012 Cite only: http://www.oasis.ac.uk/form/print.cfm for this page