

**Pre-determination  
archaeological evaluation at  
land to the west of Sydena, Lambs Lane,  
Lawshall, Suffolk, IP29 4PR**

**November 2020**



**by Mark Baister**

with contributions by Dr Matthew Loughton, Adam Wightman,  
Alec Wade, Laura Pooley and Lisa Gray

figures by Mark Baister and Sarah Carter

fieldwork by Mark Baister with Alec Wade  
and Robin Mathieson

**commissioned by Miles Steeden  
on behalf of Clare Addison**

NGR: TL 85212 54712 (centre)

Planning ref: pre-application

CAT project ref.: 2020/11d

Suffolk Parish Number: LWL 046

OASIS ref: colchest3-407906



**Colchester Archaeological Trust**

Roman Circus House,  
Roman Circus Walk,  
Colchester,  
Essex, CO2 7GZ

tel.: 01206 501785

email: [mb@catuk.org](mailto:mb@catuk.org)

**CAT Report 1621**  
December 2020

## Contents

1	Summary	1
2	Introduction	1
3	Archaeological and landscape background	2
4	Aims	3
5	Methodology	4
6	Results	4
7	Finds	6
	Ceramic and Pottery finds	6
	Faunal remains	9
	Worked flint	9
	Other finds	10
8	Environmental Assessment	10
9	Discussion	12
10	Acknowledgements	12
11	References	13
12	Abbreviations and glossary	14
13	Contents of archive	14
14	Archive deposition	14
	Appendix 1 Context list	16
	Appendix 2 Pottery list	17
	Appendix 3 CBM list	17

Figures after p17

CAT WSI

OASIS summary sheet

## List of photographs, tables and figures

Cover: Working shot of site, photograph taken facing south-west

Photograph 1	Ditch F1 cut through by ?pit F2 in T1. Photograph taken facing south-east.	4
Photograph 2	Long shot of Trench 2, with section excavated through L4 in foreground. Photograph taken facing north.	5
Photograph 3	Northern end of T2, showing section excavated through L5 and the metalled surface L7 beneath. Photograph taken facing north-west.	5
Photograph 4	Section at northern end of T2, showing subsoil L5 and redeposited natural L6 sealing metalled surface L7. Photograph taken facing west.	6

- Fig 1 Site location and trench layout in relation to the proposed development (dashed blue lines).
- Fig 2 Development site (in red) shown in relation to archaeological and historic sites recorded on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.
- Fig 3 Evaluation results.
- Fig 4 Detailed plan showing section excavated through metalled surface L7 and associated layers in T2.
- Fig 5 Feature, layer and representative sections.

## 1 Summary

*An archaeological evaluation consisting of two trial-trenches was carried out at land west of Sydena, Lawshall, Suffolk in advance of a planning application being submitted for the construction of two new dwellings and associated infrastructure. The site was located within a moated enclosure and the potential for archaeological deposits was high. Two features (a ditch and possible pit) and seven layers were recorded. The possible pit contained several sherds of medieval pottery but a largely complete glass onion bottle dated the backfilling of the feature to the mid 17th-18th centuries. The ditch was undated but may be associated with the surrounding moat and could have formed a division within it.*

*Three of the seven layers formed the general stratigraphy of the site (the topsoil, subsoil and natural clay), while the remainder were associated with or in close proximity to a metalled surface that sloped down to the north of the site. These layers contained finds of an 18th-19th century date, but the presence of earlier, residual, finds dating to the prehistoric, Roman and medieval periods suggests a continuity of occupation on, or in close proximity, to the site.*

## 2 Introduction (Fig 1)

This report presents the results of an archaeological evaluation at land west of Sydena, Lawshall, Suffolk which was carried out on the 25th November 2020. The work was commissioned by Miles Steeden on behalf of Clare Addison and was undertaken by Colchester Archaeological Trust in advance of the submission of a planning application proposing the construction of two new dwellings with associated infrastructure.

The Local Planning Authority (Babergh District Council) was advised by Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service (SCCAS) that this site lies in an area of high archaeological importance, and that, in order to establish the archaeological implications of any potential development, the applicant should commission a scheme of archaeological investigation prior to the submission of a planning application. This recommendation was given in accordance with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (MHCLG 2019).

All archaeological work was carried out in accordance with a *Brief for a Pre-determination Archaeological Evaluation* detailing the required archaeological work written by Matthew Baker (SCCAS 2020), and a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) prepared by CAT in response to the brief and agreed with SCCAS (CAT 2020).

In addition to the brief and WSI, all fieldwork and reporting was done in accordance with Historic England's *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE)* (Historic England 2015), and with *Standards for field archaeology in the East of England* (EAA 14 and 24). This report mirrors standards and practices contained in the Institute for Archaeologists' *Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation* (ClfA 2014a) and *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (ClfA 2014b), as well as the *SCCAS Requirements for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation* (SCCAS 2020).

### 3 Archaeological and landscape background (Fig 2)

The following archaeological background draws on information from the Suffolk Historic Environment Record ([archaeology.her@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:archaeology.her@suffolk.gov.uk)), SCC invoice number 9241823.

#### Geology

The Geology of Britain viewer (1:50,000 scale<sup>1</sup>) shows the bedrock geology of the site as being Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk formation, Newhaven Chalk Formation and Culver Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) – chalk, with superficial deposits of Lowestoft Formation (diamicton).

#### Historic landscape

The Lawshall area is defined as ancient rolling farmlands in the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment<sup>2</sup>. Within the Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map<sup>3</sup> it is defined as landscape sub-type 1.2 (pre-18th-century enclosure – rectilinear fields). The landscape immediately around the built up area is characterised as sub-type 1.4 (pre-18th century enclosure – irregular co-axial fields), and sub-type 3 post-1950 agricultural landscape (boundary loss from rectilinear fields).

#### Archaeology<sup>4</sup> (Fig 2)

(All measurements are taken from the centre point of the development site to the centre point of the archaeological site). The background is focused on results within approximately a 1km radius of the site.

##### *Prehistoric*

Within the search area around the development site, entries of Prehistoric date are rare. Undated cropmarks, recorded by aerial photography, are located 985m to the east of the site and include features interpreted as a 'D' shaped enclosure with a hut circle thought to be Iron Age in date (LWL 044). The only other entry of prehistoric date is a find spot of an Iron Age coin (LWL 021 697m S).

##### *Romano-British*

Romano-British finds within 1km of the development site comprise several find spots; a group of coins and brooches (LWL 021, 697m S), another group of coins alongside a bronze handle and a lion-head stud from a casket (LWL 019, 578m SW) and one more collection of coins with an associated brooch (LWL 020, 539m W).

##### *Anglo-Saxon*

There is little evidence of Anglo-Saxon activity within 1km of the development site. A possible buckle and incomplete bronze object recovered 578m SE of the site may date from this period, but could also be early medieval (LWL 019).

##### *Medieval*

Several moated enclosures within the vicinity have been placed in this period of activity, including Coopers Farm moat (LWL 003, 265m SE) and Moat Farm (LWL 027, 156m NW). The site itself is within one of these moated enclosures; West Farm LWL 001.

Although the three moated sites in question (including the one subject to this evaluation) have not been previously examined archaeologically, they have been placed into this period of activity due to their similarity to known medieval sites.

There are around 6,000 medieval moated sites known in England. They consist of wide ditches, often water-filled, that partly or completely enclose one or more parcels of land. These artificial islands would contain domestic or religious buildings. The peak period

<sup>1</sup> British Geological Survey – <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html?>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.suffolklandscape.org.uk/>

<sup>3</sup> The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map, version 3, 2012, Suffolk County Council

<sup>4</sup> This is based on records held at the Suffolk County Historic Environment Record (SCHER).

during which moated sites were built was between about 1250 and 1350. Collectively these sites form a significant class of monument and are important for the understanding of the distribution of wealth and status in the medieval countryside.

A historic green is located to the east (Herberts Green, LWL 026, 627m E). Although the green is undated it does appear on early historic mapping and is likely to date to the medieval or early post-medieval periods.

Medieval find spots within the search area include pottery found during excavation of a water pipeline (LWL 013, 433m S) and a copper-alloy knife and token found 697m S of the site (LWL 021).

#### *Post-medieval*

Buildings dating to the 16th century include Little West Farm (DSF16316, 272m S), Dales Farm (DSF16318, 588m SSE) and Hills Farmhouse (DSF1965, 868m NNE).

Sites dating to the 17th century include two windmills (LWL 018, 730m SE; LWL 041, 800m SE) and Elm House (DSF1240, 781m NNE).

A pair of 18th-century cottages survive some 790m ESE of the site (DSF 2177).

The site of a 19th-century windmill lies 733m NE of the site (LWL 022), and a partially surviving 19th-century farmstead lies 1km SW (Walgreaves Farm, HRT 050).

#### *Negative investigations*

A recent archaeological evaluation in a field to the east of the site uncovered several natural features, but nothing of archaeological significance (616m E, LWL 045, CAT Report 1616).

#### **Listed buildings<sup>5</sup>** (Fig 2)

Five listed buildings are recorded within the 1km search radius, all are HE Grade II listed. They date from the 16th-18th centuries.

## **4 Aims**

The aims of the evaluation were to:

- excavate and record any archaeological deposits that were identified within the evaluation trenches.
- identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit within the evaluation trenches, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation.
- evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.
- establish the potential for the survival of environmental evidence.
- provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of costs.

<sup>5</sup>

This is based on records held at the Suffolk County Historic Environment Record (SCHER).

## 5 Methodology

Two 15m long by 1.8m wide trial-trenches were laid out on the development site, positioned to target the proposed new dwellings. This equated to a total of 30m in length of linear trenches covering an area of 54 square metres (Fig 1).

The trenches were mechanically excavated under archaeological supervision. All archaeological horizons were excavated and recorded. A metal detector was used to check trenches, spoil heaps and excavated strata.

In addition, as detailed in the WSI, there is a low population of Great Crested Newts (GCN) in the moat surrounding the site. As these are a European Protected Species, the archaeological investigation was managed under an approved non-licence precautionary GCN method statement (attached to the WSI), and all site work was supervised by a GCN licensed monitoring ecologist.

## 6 Results (Figs 3-5)

Both the trenches were cut through a dark black modern topsoil (L1, c 350mm-370mm thick) and a medium/dark grey/brown clayey silt subsoil (L2, c 180mm-200mm thick) onto natural orange/brown chalky clay (L3, encountered at a depth of 400mm-540mm below current ground level).

### Trench 1 (T1): 15m long by 1.8m wide



**Photograph 1** Ditch F1 cut through by ?pit F2 in T1.  
Photograph taken facing south-east.

In the northern-half of this trench was ditch F1, cut through by probable pit F2 (Photograph 1). Ditch F1 was aligned east-west and measured 2200mm in width and 310mm in depth. Probable pit F2 was 1090mm wide and 550mm deep. As F2 lay entirely within the boundaries of F1, it was not visible in plan and was only observed subsequently in section after the majority of the slot had been excavated. As a result all finds recovered during the excavation of the section have been assigned to F2, although there is the possibility that some belonged to F1 (see finds below).

### Trench 2 (T2): 15m long by 1.8m wide

A thin build-up layer of loose stone and chalk was present in the southern half of this trench (L4). A slot was excavated through it at the southern end of the trench where it was at its thickest and it was found to impact into the natural L3 by 160mm (Photograph 2). L4 was also visible in the section of the trench, at around 50mm thick,

up until the start of L5 in the northern half of the trench.



**Photograph 2** Long shot of Trench 2, with section excavated through L4 in foreground. Photograph taken facing north.

L5 was a medium grey/brown clayey silt subsoil, similar to the subsoil L2, but slightly lighter and with a much higher concentration of charcoal and CBM flecks. Upon completion of the machining it covered the northern 6.5m of the trench. A section was dug through L5 (Fig 4, Photograph 3) and it was found to be up to 150mm thick and to directly seal L7, a compacted metallised surface consisting of packed stones with occasional fragments of chalk and very abraded CBM. L7 sloped down to the north, being 380mm below current ground level at its southern end and 700mm at its northern (Fig 5).



**Photograph 3** Northern end of T2, showing section excavated through L5 and the metallised surface L7 beneath. Photograph taken facing north-west.

At the northern end of the trench another layer, of redeposited light yellow chalky clay (L6), formed an interface between layers L5 and L7 (Photograph 4), and sloped down to the south, following the incline of the metallised surface (Fig 5).



**Photograph 4** Section at northern end of T2, showing subsoil L5 and redeposited natural L6 sealing metallised surface L7. Photograph taken facing west.

Two small sections were dug through L7, at its southern and northern ends (Fig 4) and it was found to vary in thickness between 150-180mm. Directly beneath the surface was natural clay (L3), and no features were observed beneath it.

## 7 Finds

### Ceramic and Pottery finds

by Dr. Matthew Loughton

The excavation uncovered 33 sherds of pottery and ceramic building material (henceforth CBM) with a weight of just over 3.7 kg (Table 1). There were rim sherds from 0.30 vessels (rim EVE) (Table 1). Small quantities of pottery and CBM were recovered from two features and three layers (Table 2).

Ceramic material	nr	Weight (g)	MSW (g)	EVE
Pottery	24	321	13	0.30
CBM	9	3,439	382	-
<b>All</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>3,760</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0.30</b>

**Table 1** Details on the main types of ceramics and pottery

Cxt	Description	nr	weight/gr	MSW/gr
F2	?Pit	15	100	7
L4	Build-up layer	6	221	37
L5	Subsoil above metallised surface	3	2,516	839
L6	Redeposited Natural	5	883	177
L7	Metallised Surface	4	40	10
<b>Total</b>		<b>33</b>	<b>3,760</b>	<b>114</b>

**Table 2** Quantities of pottery and CBM from specific features and contexts

### Roman Pottery

The Roman pottery was classified according to the fabric groups outlined in CAR 10



(Symonds & Wade 1999) and vessel types via the Colchester (*Camulodunum*), henceforth Cam, type series (Hawkes & Hull 1947; Hull 1958; CAR 10, Bidwell & Croom 1999, 468-487). The pottery was recorded by sherd count, the number of rims, handles and bases, and weight, for each fabric group. The number of vessels was determined by rim EVE (estimated vessel equivalent).

Two abraded sherds of Roman pottery with a weight of 30 gr were recovered while cleaning over the metallated surface L7. There was a Cam 305B bowl (EVE: 0.06) in fabric GB (BB2 black-burnished ware, category 2) dating from AD 275 to the end of the Roman period and a possible Cam 218 bowl (EVE: 0.06) in fabric GX (other coarse, principally locally-produced grey wares) dating from the Claudian period to the early 2nd century AD.

### Post-Roman Pottery

The post-Roman pottery was recorded according to the fabric groups from CAR 7 (Cotter 2000) and the Suffolk post-Roman Pottery type series while the number of vessels was determined by rim EVE (estimated vessel equivalent). There were 22 sherds of post-Roman pottery with a weight of 291 gr and 0.18 vessels which was recovered from one feature and three layers (Table 3).

The ?pit F2 contained a small assemblage of early Medieval pottery with sherds of Early Medieval sandy wares (F13/Suffolk MCWG Medieval coarseware gritty/MCWM Medieval coarseware micaceous) and Medieval sandy greywares (F20/Suffolk LMR Late Medieval reduced ware).

Post-medieval red earthenware (F40/Suffolk PMRE Post-medieval redwares Essex type/PMRW Post-medieval redwares-unglazed or partly glazed) pottery was recovered from the build-up layer (L4), the redeposited natural (L6) and from cleaning over the metallated surface (L7). The only sherd of note was a brining trough or oval casserole (EVE: 0.06) which came from L6 (redeposited natural). Similar vessels dating to the 18th and 19th centuries have been reported from Colchester (Cotter 2000, 214-215 fig. 147 no. 172).

A small sherd (7 gr) of late slipped kitchenware (F51A/INDS), dating to the 19th-20th century, came from cleaning over the metallated surface (L7), although is probably intrusive in this context, given the other associated finds.

Finally, the redeposited natural (L6) contained a late Medieval-Post medieval wide bowl or dish (EVE: 0.12) perhaps of Ely Glazed ware (?) (ELGY). This is in a hard overfired wheelmade fabric, with a very black core with fine quartz, mica, some rare white inclusions. The surfaces are oxidised and slightly orange in colour while there are traces of a green glaze mostly on the rim and interior of the vessel.

Cxt	Description	nr	weight/gr	MSW/gr	EVE
F2	?Pit	15	100	7	0.00
L4	Build-up layer	2	23	12	0.00
L6	Redeposited Natural	3	158	53	0.18
L7	Metallated Surface	2	10	5	0.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0.18</b>

**Table 3** Quantities of Post Roman pottery from specific contexts

### Ceramic building material (CBM)

There were nine sherds of CBM with a weight of 3.4 kg which were recovered from three layers (Table 4). This material mostly consists of unfrogged brick fragments which

came from the build-up layer L4 (nr 1/16 gr), L5 (nr 3/2,516 gr), and the redeposited natural L6 (1/707 gr). There were also two sherds of Medieval-Post Medieval peg-tile (61 gr) and one sherd of unidentified Roman CBM (121 gr) which all came from the build-up layer L4.

Cxt	Description	nr	weight/gr	MSW/gr
L4	Build-up layer	4	198	50
L5	Subsoil above metalled surface	3	2,516	839
L6	Redeposited Natural	2	725	363
<b>Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>3,439</b>	<b>383</b>

**Table 4** Quantities of CBM by context

### Conclusion

Table 5 summarises the dating evidence for the features and contexts which produced dateable ceramic finds. Most of the features and layers contain finds of from the Post-Medieval and Modern periods although the ?pit F2 produced an assemblage of later Medieval pottery.

Cxt	Feature type	Roman	Post-Roman	CBM	Overall date Approx.
F2	?Pit	-	F20/LMR? MCWG MCWM	-	12th-14th century
L4	Build-up layer	-	F20/LMR? F40/PMRW	PT BR RBT	16th-19th century
L5	Subsoil above metalled surface	-	-	BR UNFROGGED	18th-19th century
L6	Redeposited Natural	-	F40/PMRE (OVAL CASSEROLE/BRINING TROUGH?) F40/PMRW ELYG? (BOWL/DISH)	BR UNFROGGED	16th-19th century
L7	Metalled Surface	GB (CAM 305B) GX (CAM 218?)	F51A/INDS F40/PMRE	-	18th-19th century

**Table 5** Approximate dates for the individual contexts based on ceramic finds

## Faunal remains

by Alec Wade

The evaluation produced ten pieces of animal bone (total weight 159g) from four contexts of a post-medieval date. The bone was in generally poor condition with moderate to severe erosion of surface detail and some discolouration suggesting the pieces were residual within their various contexts (particularly those fragments recovered from L6 and the cleaning of L7).

Three species were identified – cow (one piece), pig (three pieces) and sheep or goat (three pieces).

Although these pieces represent unremarkable domestic waste, no clear butchery marks (or signs of working) were identified on the material. However, the poor condition of the bone would make this determination difficult in the case of fine cut marks and obscure any signs of superficial dog gnawing.

Context	Find no	No. of pieces	Weight (g)	Species	Comments
F2 (T1) (post-medieval pit)	5	1	48	Pig (Sus domesticus)	Tibia fragment with an unfused distal metaphysis (less than 2 years old).
L4 (T2) (post-medieval build-up layer)	1	1	28	Cow (Bos taurus)	Upper molar.
		1	2	Pig (Sus domesticus)	Fragment of a boar's canine.
L6 (T2) (post-medieval re-deposited chalky clay layer)	3	1	8	Pig (Sus domesticus)	Radius diaphysis fragment in extremely poor condition – may have been dog gnawed.
		1	4	-	Unidentified fragment.
L7 (T2) (post-medieval metal surface)	2	1	14	Cow (Bos taurus)	Mandible fragment (coronoid process).
		3	54	Sheep or goat (Ovis aries / Capra hircus)	Tibia fragment (1) with a fused distal epiphysis (older than 1.66 years in age), a humerus diaphysis fragment (1) and a distal femur fragment (1) with an unfused metaphysis (less than 3.5 years old).
		1	1	-	Unidentified fragment.
<b>Totals</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>		

**Table 6** Faunal remains by context

## Worked flint

by Adam Wightman

A single secondary flake was recovered from cleaning over the metal surface L7. It is broken at the proximal end, but areas of abrupt retouch survive on both lateral edges and the distal end. Retouch to the distal end and the left lateral edge may have been undertaken to create a point that could be used for piercer materials such as hides. The piece does not retain any technological or typological characteristics which allow it to be closely dated, although it is most likely to date from the Mesolithic-Early Bronze Age (and as a result is undoubtedly residual in this context).

## Other finds

by Laura Pooley

Seven fragments of mid 17th- to 18th-century glass onion bottle came from ?pit F2, along with two fragments of oyster shell from made surface L4 and an iron nail from metalled surface L7. All of the finds are described below in Table 7.

Context	Finds no.	Description
L4	1	<b>Shell:</b> Two fragments of oyster shell, 10.4g. Discarded.
L7	2	<b>Iron nail:</b> Incomplete with tip missing, square-sectioned shank, head damaged (probably flat and round), 8.5g.
F2	5	<b>Glass:</b> Seven fragments of dark olive green onion bottle, including one large fragment consisting of the neck, collar and rim (collars were rings of glass applied to the neck of the bottle, just below the rim, so that the corks could be tied down), 165.8g. Mid 17th to 18th century.

**Table 7** Other finds listed by context

## 8 Environmental assessment

by Lisa Gray MSc MA ACIfA Archaeobotanist

### Introduction

Three samples were presented for assessment. The aims of this assessment are to determine the significance and potential of the plant macro-remains in the samples, consider their use in providing information about diet, craft, medicine, crop-husbandry, feature function and environment.

Sample	Feature no.	Feature type	Provisional date	Sample volume (L.)
1	F1	Ditch	undated	40
2	F2	Pit	Post-medieval	20
3	F6	Redeposited natural clay layer	Post-medieval	40

**Table 1** Samples presented for evaluation

### Sampling and processing methods

Samples were taken and processed by Colchester Archaeological Trust. All samples were processed using a Siraf-type flotation device. Flot was collected in a 300-micron mesh sieve then dried.

Once with the author the flots were scanned under a low powered stereo-microscope with a magnification range of 10 to 40x. The whole flots were examined. The abundance, diversity and state of preservation of eco- and artefacts in each sample were recorded.

Identifications were made using uncharred reference material (author's own and the Northern European Seed Reference Collection at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London) and reference manuals (such as Beijerinck 1947; Cappers *et al.* 2006; Charles 1984; Jacomet 2006). Nomenclature for plants is taken from Stace (Stace 2010). Latin names are given once and the common names used thereafter.

At this stage, to allow comparison between samples, numbers have also been estimated but where only a very low number of items are present, they have been counted. Identifiable charred wood >4mm in diameter has been separate from charred wood flecks. Fragments this size are easier to break to reveal the cross-sections and

diagnostic features necessary for identification and are less likely to be blown or unintentionally moved around the site (Asouti 2006, 31; Smart & Hoffman, 1988, 178-179). Charred wood flecks <4mm diameter have been quantified but not recommended for further analysis unless twigs or roundwood fragments larger than 2mmØ were present.

## **Results (no table due to low productivity of samples)**

### **Quality and type of preservation**

The plant remains in these samples were preserved by charring. Charring occurs when plant material is heated under reducing conditions where oxygen is largely excluded leaving a carbon skeleton resistant to decay (Boardman & Jones 1990, 2; Campbell *et al.* 2011, 17). The soil type is Soilscape 9, a 'Lime-rich loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage' (Cranfield University 2020). This type of soil can provide preservation conditions suitable for the survival of charred and mineralised plant remains, bones, mollusca, ostracods, foraminifera, parasite eggs and phytoliths (Campbell *et al.* 2011, 5-6). There was no evidence of waterlogging in these samples and the mollusca appeared to be terrestrial.

### **Bioturbation and contamination**

Evidence of possible bioturbation and aeration in the soil was present in the form of modern rootlet fragments in each sample. Samples <1> and <2> contained low numbers of the subterranean snail *Ceciliodes acicula* (Müller). This snail burrows well below the ground surface (Kerney & Cameron 1979, 149).

### **The charred plant remains**

A fragment of charcoal of identifiable size was found in sample <3>. Two bread/club rivet wheat grains (*Triticum aestivum/durum/turgidum*) were found in sample <1> and one bread/club/rivet wheat was found in sample <2>. These grains are typical cereal types for the medieval midlands regions (Carruthers & Hunter-Dowse 2019, 124). Unfortunately, no chaff was present so it was not possible to identify which type of free-threshing wheat was present.

### **Potential, significance and recommendations**

The overall density of charred plant remains per litre of sampled soil is quite low, meaning that they may be the remains of activities taking place in the vicinity of the sampled feature rather than evidence of feature use. They may be residual or intrusive therefore no further work is recommended on these samples. The presence of charred plant remains in these samples means that samples taken during any future archaeological investigations may contain charred or mineralised plant macro remains.

## 9 Discussion

The finds uncovered during this evaluation suggest a level of occupation on, or in close proximity to, the moated site. Most notably, the assemblage of 12th-14th century pottery from F2 falls neatly into the date range 1250-1350, the peak period of the creation of medieval moated enclosures. The intact stem and body fragments of glass onion bottle recovered from the same feature, however, serve to date F2 as being backfilled in the mid 17th-18th century.

Other earlier finds, including the rim of a late-medieval bowl from L6, are also residual in their contexts, based on the recovery of later, post-medieval, ceramic evidence (see Finds above).

Additionally, although the two Roman sherds of pottery, the fragment of Roman CBM and the worked flint are all unquestionably residual in the contexts within which they were found, they do serve to suggest a continuity of occupation in the proximity of the site.

Although no features or layers could be conclusively dated to the medieval period, superficially it appears that ditch F1 in T1 must be associated in some fashion with the surrounding moat. It failed to appear in T2 and so presumably either stops, or turns, and forms a subdivision of some sort within the moated enclosure.

The layers L4, L5 and L6 uncovered in T2 all contained dating evidence (excluding residual finds) that suggested they were laid down sometime in the 18th-19th centuries. Similar dating evidence was recovered while cleaning the metallised surface L7, although it should be noted that these finds may have originated from the layers L5 and L6 above (additionally, when two sections were excavated into L7 no finds were recovered from within its make-up).

Given the metallised surface L7 slopes markedly to the north, it presumably represents the outer limits of a deliberately excavated depression in the north-east corner of the moated enclosure. One explanation for this would be for the collection and retention of water, possibly associated with the keeping of animals. In discussions with the current owner of the site it was suggested that the associated property of West Farm once owned several flocks of sheep, some of which were kept overnight within the moated enclosure (*pers comm*).

In summary, then, although several finds were recovered dating to the medieval period (and the presumed date of the moated enclosure), all the contexts uncovered during this evaluation appear to date to the mid 17th-19th centuries. This does not, of course, preclude contexts of an earlier, medieval, date being present within the enclosure. Further archaeological investigation on the site would be needed to determine the level of occupation within the enclosure. Any further work would also help to ascertain the complete form of the contexts uncovered during this evaluation, most notably the alignment of the ditch F1 and the extent of the metallised surface L7.

## 10 Acknowledgements

CAT is grateful to Miles Steeden for commissioning and Clare Addison for funding the project. The project was managed by Chris Lister, fieldwork was carried out by Mark Baister with Alec Wade and Robin Mathieson. Figures are by Mark Baister and Sarah Carter. The project was monitored by Matthew Baker for Suffolk County Council Archaeological Services.

## 11 References

Note: all CAT reports, except for DBAs, are available online in .pdf format at

<http://cat.essex.ac.uk>

- |   |       |  |
|---|-------|--|
| Asouti, E.  | 2006  | <i>'Factors affecting the formation of an archaeological wood charcoal assemblage'</i> , retrieved on 13th February 2015 from World Wide Web:<br><a href="http://pcwww.liv.ac.uk/~easouti/methodology_application.htm">http://pcwww.liv.ac.uk/~easouti/methodology_application.htm</a> |
| Beijerinck, W.                                    | 1947  | <i>Zadenatlas der Nederlandsche Flora</i>  |
| Bidwell, P.                                       | 1999  | <i>A survey of pottery production and supply at Colchester</i> in Symonds, R. and Wade, S. (eds.), CAR <b>10: Roman pottery from excavations in Colchester 1971-86</b> , 488-499   |
| Bidwell, P. & Croom, A.                           | 1999  | <i>The Camulodunum/Colchester type series</i> in Symonds, R. and Wade, S. (eds.), CAR <b>10: Roman pottery from excavations in Colchester 1971-86</b> , 468-487  |
| Boardman, S. & Jones, G.                          | 1990  | <i>'Experiments on the Effect of Charring on Cereal plant Components'</i> , in <i>Journal of Archaeological Science</i> <b>17</b> , 1-11   |
| Brown, N & Glazenbrook, J                         | 2000  | <i>Research and Archaeology: a frame work for the Eastern Counties 2 Research agenda and strategy</i> , East Anglian Archaeological, occasional papers 8 (EAA <b>8</b> )   |
| Campbell, G., Moffett, L. & Straker, V.           | 2011  | <i>Environmental Archaeology. A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods, from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation</i> (second edition)  |
| Cappers, R. J. T., Bekker, R. M. & Jans, J. E. A. | 2006  | <i>Digital Zadenatlas Van Nederlands – Digital Seeds Atlas of the Netherlands</i>  |
| Carruthers, W. & Hunter-Dowse, K.                 | 2019  | <i>A Review of Macroscopic Plant Remains from the Midland Counties</i>   |
| CAT   | 2020  | <i>Health &amp; Safety Policy</i>  |
| Charles, M.                                       | 1984  | <i>'Introductory remarks on the cereals'</i> in <i>Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture</i> <b>1</b> , 17-31   |
| ClfA  | 2014a | <i>Standard and Guidance for an archaeological evaluation</i>  |
| ClfA  | 2014b | <i>Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials</i>  |
| ClfA  | 2019  | <i>Code of Conduct</i>   |
| Cotter, J.P.                                      | 2000  | <i>CAR 7: Post-Roman pottery from excavations in Colchester 1971-85</i>  |
| Cranfield University                              | 2020  | <i>'Soilscapes'</i> retrieved from the World Wide Web on 13th of December 2020: Soilscapes soil types viewer - National Soil Resources Institute. Cranfield University ( <a href="http://landis.org.uk">landis.org.uk</a> )  |
| Gurney, D   | 2003  | <i>Standards for field archaeology in the East of England</i> . East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14 (EAA <b>14</b> )   |
| Hawkes, C.F.C. & Hull, M.R.                       | 1947  | <i>Camulodunum. First Report on the Excavation at Colchester 1930-1939</i>   |
| Historic England                                  | 2015  | <i>Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE)</i>  |
| Historic England                                  | 2019  | <i>Animal bones and archaeology: recovery to archive</i> by Baker, P. & Worley, F  |
| Howe, M.D., Perrin, J.R. & Mackreth, D.F.         | 1980  | <i>Roman pottery from the Nene Valley: a guide</i>   |
| Hull, M.R.  | 1958  | <i>Roman Colchester</i>  |
| Jacomet, S.                                       | 2006  | <i>Identification of cereal remains from archaeological sites</i> second edition   |
| Medlycott, M                                      | 2011  | <i>Research and archaeology revisited: A revised framework for the East of England</i> . East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 24 (EAA <b>24</b> )  |
| MHCLG   | 2019  | <i>National Planning Policy Framework</i>  |
| SCC   | 2008  | <i>The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map, version 3</i>  |
| SCCAS   | 2019a | <i>Requirements for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation</i>   |
| SCCAS   | 2019b | <i>Archaeological Archives in Suffolk: Guidelines for Preparation and Deposition</i>   |
| SCCAS   | 2020  | <i>Brief for a Pre-determination Archaeological Evaluation at Land to the West of Sydena, Lambs Lane, Lawshall</i> by M Baker  |

Schmid, E.	1972	<i>Atlas of animal bones</i>
Smart, T. L. & Hoffman, E. S.	1988	' <i>Environmental interpretation of archaeological charcoal</i> ' in Hastorf, C. A. & Popper, V. S. <i>Current Palaeobotany</i>
Stace, C.	2010	<i>New Flora of the British Isles</i> 3rd Edition

## 12 Abbreviations and glossary

Anglo-Saxon	period from c 500 – 1066
CAT	Colchester Archaeological Trust
CBM	<b>C</b> eramic <b>B</b> uilding <b>M</b> aterial such as brick and tile
ClfA	Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
context	a layer or feature on an archaeological site
feature (F)	an identifiable thing like a pit, a wall, a drain
layer (L)	distinct or distinguishable deposit (layer) of material
medieval	period from AD 1066 to c AD 1500
modern	period from c AD 1800 to the present
natural	geological deposit undisturbed by human activity
NGR	National Grid Reference
OASIS	<b>O</b> nline <b>A</b> ccess to the Index of Archaeological Investigation <b>S</b> , <a href="http://oasis.ac.uk/pages/wiki/Main">http://oasis.ac.uk/pages/wiki/Main</a>
post-medieval	from c AD 1500 to c 1800
Roman	the period from AD 43 to c AD 410
SCC	Suffolk County Council
SCCAS	Suffolk County Council Archaeological Services
SCHER	Suffolk County Historic Environment Record
section	(abbreviation sx or Sx) vertical slice through feature/s or layer/s
WSI	<b>W</b> ritten <b>S</b> cheme of Investigation

## 13 Contents of archive

**Finds:** one museum box of retained finds

### **Paper and digital record**

One A4 document wallet containing:

The report (CAT Report 1621)

SCCAS evaluation brief

Original site record (trench record sheet, sections)

Site digital photographic log

### **Digital record**

The report (CAT Report 1621)

SCCAS evaluation brief, CAT written scheme of investigation

Site digital photographs, thumbnails and log

Graphic files

Survey data

## 14 Archive deposition

The paper archive and finds are currently held by CAT at Roman Circus House, Roman Circus Walk, Colchester, Essex, but will be permanently deposited with SCCAS under Parish Number LWL 046.



© Colchester Archaeological Trust 2020

**Distribution list:**

Miles Steeden  
Matthew Baker, SCCAS  
Suffolk County Historic Environment Record



**Colchester Archaeological Trust**

Roman Circus House,  
Roman Circus Walk,  
Colchester,  
Essex, CO2 7GZ

tel.: 01206 501785

email: [mb@catuk.org](mailto:mb@catuk.org)

## Appendix 1 Context list



Context Number	Trench	Finds Number	Feature / layer type	Description	Date
L1	All	-	Topsoil	soft moist medium/dark grey/brown/black loamy silt	Modern
L2	All	-	Subsoil	friable dry/moist medium grey/brown silty clay with occasional stone inclusions	Modern/post-medieval
L3	All	-	Natural	firm dry/moist light/medium yellow/orange clay with rare stone inclusions	Post-glacial
L4	T2	1	Build-up layer	firm/hard dry/moist light grey clayey silt with common stone inclusions of	18th-19th century
L5	T2	4	Subsoil covering metallated surface L7	friable medium grey/brown silty clay with charcoal flecks, daub flecks and rare stone inclusions	18th-19th century
L6	T2	3	Re-deposited natural clay	friable/firm moist yellow clay	18th-19th century
L7	T2	2	Metallated surface	Metallated surface consisting of packed stones, mostly medium and large sized rounded stones with occasional fragments of chalk and very abraded CBM.	18th-19th century
F1	T1	-	Ditch	firm moist medium grey/brown clayey silt with occasional chalk inclusions	Undated
F2	T1	5	?pit	firm moist medium/dark grey/brown clayey silt with occasional chalk inclusions	Mid 17th-18th century

## Appendix 2 Pottery list

Cxt	Feature type	Find no.		MSW	Discard	Rim	Handle	Base	Dec.	Stamp	Graf Pre-F	Graf Post-F	Wind	Soot	Pitting	Burn	Overfired	Residue	Gritted	Abraded	Modif.	Mark	Repair hole	Hole	Disc	Polishing	Fabric Grp	Typology	EVE	Diam.	Comments	Date
		NR	GR.																													
F002	?PIT	5	2	4	2																					F20LMR?					c.1150-1375/1400	
F002	?PIT	5	1	4	4									X												F20LMR?					c.1150-1375/1400	
F002	?PIT	5	2	26	14																					MCWG					LATE 11TH-13TH CENTURY	
F002	?PIT	5	8	35	4																					MCWM					12TH-14TH CENTURY	
F002	?PIT	5	1	20	20																					F20LMR?					c.1150-1375/1400	
F002	?PIT	5	1	9	0	0	0	1						X												F20LMR?					c.1150-1375/1400	
L004	MADE SURFACE	1	1	10	10																					F40PMRW					16TH-18TH CENTURY	
L004	MADE SURFACE	1	1	13	13	0	0	1																		F20LMR?					c.1150-1375/1400	
L006	REDEPOSITED NATURAL	3	1	73	73	1	0	0																		F40PMRE	OVAL CASSEROLE/BRINING TROUGH?	0.06	320	GESTINGHORPE? ORANGE/GOLD GLAZE	18TH-19TH CENTURY	
L006	REDEPOSITED NATURAL	3	1	48	48	0	0	1																		F40PMRW					16TH-18TH CENTURY	
L006	REDEPOSITED NATURAL	3	1	37	37	1	0	0									X									ELYG?	DISH/BOWL	0.12	260	GREEN GLAZE, BLACK CORE	LATE MEDIEVAL-POST MEDIEVAL	
L007	METALLED SURFACE	2	1	7	7																					F51A/WDS					LATE 18TH-20TH CENTURY	
L007	METALLED SURFACE	2	1	3	3																					F40PMRE					16TH-18TH CENTURY	
L007	METALLED SURFACE	2	1	10	10	1	0	0												X						GB	CAM 305B	0.06	210	BURNISHING LOST	AD 275-END ROMAN	
L007	METALLED SURFACE	2	1	20	20	1	0	0																		GX	CAM 218?	0.06	240		AD 44-120	

## Appendix 3 CBM list


Cxt	Feature type	Find no.		MSW	Typology	Sub-type	FL CORN	MINI	FL H.	FL W.	FL TH.	LCA	LCA L.	UCA	UCA L.	Stamp	Sign.	Tally	Graf PF	Animal	Shoe	Scored	Comb.	Roller	Circ. Vt.	Rect. Vt.	Bl. vt.	PH R	PH SQ	2 Phs	Blind	L	BR	TH	Mortar	Burnt	Overfired	Abraded	Modif.	Date		
		NR	GR.																																							
F001	DITCH	4	1	814	814	BR	UNFROGGED		0																																16TH-19TH CENTURY	
F001	DITCH	4	1	343	343	BR	UNFROGGED		0																																	16TH-19TH CENTURY
F001	DITCH	4	1	1359	1359	BR	UNFROGGED		0																																16TH-19TH CENTURY	
L004	MADE SURFACE	1	2	61	31	PT			0																																MEDIEVAL-POST MEDIEVAL	
L004	MADE SURFACE	1	1	16	16	BR			0																															MEDIEVAL-POST MEDIEVAL		
L004	MADE SURFACE	1	1	121	121	RBT			0																															ROMAN		
L006	REDEPOSITED NATURAL	3	1	707	707	BR	UNFROGGED		0																																16TH-19TH CENTURY	
L006	REDEPOSITED NATURAL	3	1	18	18	BR			0																															16TH-20TH CENTURY		




© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number 100039294.

Fig 1 Site location and trench layout in relation to the proposed development (dashed blue lines).

Fig 2 Development site (in red) shown in relation to archaeological and historic sites recorded on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.





Imagery ©2020 CNES/Airbus, Getmapping PLC, Infoterra Ltd & Bluesky, Landsat/Copernicus, Maxar Technologies, Map data © 2020  
HER data © Suffolk Historic Environment Record



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number 100039294.

Fig 3 Evaluation results.





© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number 100039294.

Fig 4 Detailed plan showing section excavated through metallised surface L7 and associated layers in T2.




Fig 5 Feature, layer and representative sections.



**Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)  
for a pre-determination archaeological  
evaluation at  
land to the west of Sydena, Lambs Lane,  
Lawshall, Suffolk, IP29 4PR**

**NGR:** TL 85212 54712 (centre)

**Planning references:** pre-application

**District:** Babergh

**Parish:** Lawshall

**Commissioned by:** Miles Steeden

**Client:** Clare Addison

**Curating museum:** Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

**Suffolk parish number:** LWL 046


**CAT project code:** 2020/11d

**OASIS reference no.:** colchest3-407906

**Site manager:** Chris Lister

**SCCAS Monitor:** Matthew Baker

**This WSI written:** 27/11/2020



COLCHESTER ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST,  
Roman Circus House,  
Roman Circus Walk,  
Colchester,  
Essex, CO2 7GZ

*tel:* 01206 501785

*email:* [mb@catuk.org](mailto:mb@catuk.org)

## Site location and description

The development site is located on the southern side of Hartest Lane, within a moated enclosure at Lawshall, Suffolk, IP29 4PR (Fig 1). The site is centered at National Grid Reference (NGR) TL 85212 54712. The site is a small 0.15 hectare plot surrounded by a moat, with multiple substantial trees on its boundary.

## Proposed work

The proposed development comprises the erection of two new dwellings and associated infrastructure.

## Archaeological background

The following archaeological background draws on information from the Suffolk Historic Environment Record ([archaeology.her@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:archaeology.her@suffolk.gov.uk)), SCC invoice number 9241823.

### Geology

The Geology of Britain viewer (1:50,000 scale<sup>1</sup>) shows the bedrock geology of the site as being Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk formation, Newhaven Chalk Formation and Culver Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) – chalk, with superficial deposits of Lowestoft Formation (diamicton).

### Historic landscape

The Lawshall area is defined as ancient rolling farmlands in the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment<sup>2</sup>. Within the Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map<sup>3</sup> it is defined as landscape sub-type 1.2, pre-18th-century enclosure – rectilinear fields. The landscape immediately around the built up area is characterised as sub-type 1.4 (pre-18th century enclosure – irregular co-axial fields), and sub-type 3 post-1950 agricultural landscape (boundary loss from rectilinear fields).

### Archaeology<sup>4</sup> (Fig 2)

(All measurements are taken from the centre point of the development site to the centre point of the archaeological site). The background is focused on results within approximately a 1.6km radius to the east of the site.

#### *Prehistoric*

Within the search area around the development site, entries of Prehistoric date are rare. Undated cropmarks, recorded by aerial photography, are located 985m to the east of the site and include features interpreted as a 'D' shaped enclosure with a hut circle thought to be Iron Age in date (LWL 044). The only other entry of prehistoric date is a find spot of an Iron Age coin (LWL 021 697m S).

#### *Romano-British*

Romano-British finds within 1km of the development site comprise several find spots; a group of coins and brooches (LWL 021, 697m S), another group of coins alongside a bronze handle and a lion-head stud from a casket (LWL 019, 578m SW) and one more collection of coins with an associated brooch (LWL 020, 539m W).

#### *Anglo-Saxon*

There is little evidence of Anglo-Saxon activity within 1km of the development site. A possible buckle and incomplete bronze object recovered 578m SE of the site may date from this period, but could also be early medieval (LWL 019).

---

<sup>1</sup> British Geological Survey – <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html?>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.suffolklandscape.org.uk/>

<sup>3</sup> The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map, version 3, 2012, Suffolk County Council

<sup>4</sup> This is based on records held at the Suffolk County Historic Environment Record (SCHER).

### *Medieval*

Several moated enclosures within the vicinity have been placed in this period of activity, including Coopers Farm moat (LWL 003, 265m SE) and Moat Farm (LWL 027, 156m NW). The site itself is within one of these moated enclosures; West Farm LWL 001.

Although the three moated sites in question (including the one subject to this evaluation) have not been previously examined archaeologically, they have been placed into this period of activity due to their similarity to known medieval sites.

There are around 6,000 medieval moated sites known in England. They consist of wide ditches, often water-filled, that partly or completely enclose one or more parcels of land. These artificial islands would contain domestic or religious buildings. The peak period during which moated sites were built was between about 1250 and 1350. Collectively these sites form a significant class of monument and are important for the understanding of the distribution of wealth and status in the medieval countryside.

A historic green is located to the east (Herberts Green LWL 026, 627m E). Although the green is undated it does appear on early historic mapping and is likely to date to the medieval or early post-medieval periods.

Medieval find spots within the search area include pottery found during excavation of a water pipeline (LWL 013, 433m S) and a copper-alloy knife and token found 697m S of the site (LWL 021).

### *Post-medieval*

Buildings dating to the 16th century include Little West Farm (DSF16316, 272m S), Dales Farm (DSF16318, 588m SSE) and Hills Farmhouse (DSF1965, 868m NNE).

Sites dating to the 17th century include two windmills (LWL 018, 730m SE; LWL 041, 800m SE) and Elm House (DSF1240, 781m NNE).

A pair of 18th-century cottages survive some 790m ESE of the site (DSF 2177).

The site of a 19th-century windmill lies 733m NE of the site (LWL 022), and a partially surviving 19th-century farmstead lies 1km SW (Walgreaves Farm, HRT 050).

### *Negative investigations*

A recent archaeological evaluation in a field to the east of the site uncovered several natural features, but nothing of archaeological significance (616m E, LWL 045, CAT Report 1616).

### **Listed buildings<sup>5</sup>** (Fig 2)

Five listed buildings are recorded within the 1km search radius, all are HE Grade II listed. They date from the 16th-18th centuries.

## **Planning background**

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Services (SCCAS) has recommended that an archaeological evaluation of the site be carried out prior to the submission of a planning application, as it lies within a moated enclosure and in an area highlighted by the Suffolk HER as having a high potential for archaeological deposits. This recommended archaeological condition is based on the guidance given in the National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2019).

---

<sup>5</sup>

This is based on records held at the Suffolk County Historic Environment Record (SCHER).

## Requirement for work

The required archaeological work is for trenched archaeological evaluation. Details are given in the Project Brief (*Brief for a Pre-determination Archaeological Evaluation at Land to the West of Sydena, Lambs Lane, Lawshall*) written by M Baker of SCCAS (2020).

As per the brief, 5% of the development site will be sampled (30m of linear trenching at 1.8m wide, covering an area of 75m<sup>2</sup>). Two 15m long trenches are suggested, located across the footprint of the proposed dwellings (Fig 1).

Localised extensions to trenches may be required by the SCCAS after the site monitoring visit. This will only be used if unclear archaeological remains or geomorphological features present difficulties of interpretation, or to assist with the formulation of a mitigation strategy.

As noted by the brief (SCCAS 2020), there is a low population of Great Crested Newts (GCN) in the moat surrounding the site. As these are a European Protected Species, the archaeological investigation will be managed under an approved non-licence precautionary GCN method statement (attached to this WSI), and all site work will be supervised by a GCN licensed monitoring ecologist.

If any GCN is found, all work will stop immediately and advice will be sought regarding the need for a European Protected Species mitigation licence from Natural England to complete the archaeological investigation.

The trial-trenching is required to:

- identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation.
- evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.
- establish the potential for the survival of environmental evidence
- provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of costs.

All work will take place within and contribute to the goals of the Regional research frameworks (Gurney 2003, Medlycott 2011).

Decision on the suitability of the site for development and the need for any further archaeological investigation (eg excavation) will be made by SCCAS, in a subsequent brief, based on the results presented in the report for this evaluation. Any further investigation will be the subject of a further WSI by CAT, submitted to SCCAS for scrutiny and formally approved by the LPA.

This document represents a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the archaeological evaluation ONLY; this document alone will NOT result in the discharge of any archaeological conditions.

## Staffing

The number of field staff for this project is estimated as follows: one supervisor plus two archaeologists for one day.

In charge of day-to-day site work: Mark Baister

## General methodology

All work carried out by CAT will be in accordance with:

- professional standards of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, including its *Code of Conduct* (CIfA 2014a-c)
- Standards and Frameworks published by East Anglian Archaeology (Gurney 2003, Medlycott 2011)
- relevant Health & Safety guidelines and requirements (CAT 2020), including a Risk Assessment which will be carried out before the evaluation begins.

- the Project Brief issued by SCCAS (2020)
- The outline specification within *Requirements for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation* (SCCAS 2020) to be used alongside the Project Brief.

CAT is covered by Aviva Insurance Ltd, 006288/04/20, which includes Professional Indemnity £1,000,000, Employer's Liability £10,000,000 and Public Liability £5,000,000.

Professional CAT field archaeologists will undertake all specified archaeological work, for which they will be suitably experienced and qualified.

Notification of the supervisor/project manager's name and the start date for the project will be provided to SCCAS ten days before start of work.

Unless it is the responsibility of other site contractors, CAT will study mains service locations and avoid damage to these.

Prior to the commencement of the site a HER parish code will be sought from the HER team. The HER parish code will be used to identify the finds bags and boxes, and the project archive when it is deposited at the curating museum.

At the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/> will be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators forms. At the end of the project all parts of the OASIS online form will be completed for submission to SCCAS. This will include an uploaded .PDF version of the entire report.

## Evaluation methodology

Where appropriate, modern overburden and any topsoil stripping/levelling will be performed using a mechanical excavator equipped with a toothless ditching bucket under the supervision and to the satisfaction of a professional archaeologist. If no archaeologically significant deposits are exposed, machine excavation will continue until natural subsoil is reached. Machine assistance may also be required for very large/deep features and a contingency has been made within the budget if required, but all features will be hand excavated unless specifically agreed with SCCAS.

Where necessary, areas will be cleaned by hand to ensure the visibility of archaeological deposits.

If archaeological features or deposits are uncovered, time will be allowed for these to be excavated, planned and recorded. **All** features will be excavated and recorded unless otherwise agreed with SCCAS.

There will be sufficient excavation to give clear evidence for the period, depth and nature of any archaeological deposit. For linear features 1m wide sections will be excavated across their width to a total of 10% of the overall length. Discrete features, such as pits, will have 50% of their fills excavated, although certain features may be fully excavated. Complex archaeological structures such as walls, kilns, ovens or burials will be carefully cleaned, planned and fully recorded, but where possible left *in situ*. Only if it can be demonstrated that the complex structure/feature is likely to be destroyed by groundworks, and only then after discussion with the SCCAS, will it be removed.

Trenches will first be stepped where appropriate to allow for safe excavation of deep features. After discussion with SCCAS the use of a hand held auger (or a power auger where appropriate) will be used where necessary to gain information from very deep deposits/features if depth cannot be established through hand excavation.

Any complex/unexpected deposits will be discussed with SCCAS to agree a strategy.

Fast hand-excavation techniques involving (for instance) picks, forks and mattocks will not be used on complex stratigraphy.

The depth and nature of colluvial or other masking deposits will be established. Therefore, a sondage will be excavated in each trench to test the stratigraphy of the site. This will occur in every trench unless it can be demonstrated that a feature excavated within a particular trench has clearly penetrated into natural.

A representative section will be drawn of each trench, to include ground level, the depth of machining within the trench and the depth of any sondages.

The use of a hand held auger (or a power auger where appropriate) will be used where necessary to gain information from very deep deposits/features.

A metal detector will be used to scan all trenches both before and during excavation. This will be carried out by trained CAT staff under the supervision of project manager/supervisors Adam Wightman, Mark Baister or Ben Holloway who have over 5 years experience of metal detecting on archaeological sites. Experienced metal detectorist Geoff Lunn will be available for advice and support throughout the project. Geoff has 4 years experience and has worked with CAT to recover finds from recent excavations at the Mercury Theatre and Essex County Hospital sites in Colchester, and who has also worked with the Colchester Archaeological Group, Suffolk Archaeology, Access Cambridge Archaeology, The Citizen Project (MOLA) and others. If considered necessary, Geoff will be employed by CAT for to assist with the metal detecting. All finds will have their location recorded via GPS or with the Total Station. All spoil heaps will also be scanned and finds recovered.

Individual records of excavated contexts, layers, features or deposits will be entered on pro-forma record sheets. Registers will be compiled of finds, small finds and soil samples.

All features and layers or other significant deposits will be planned, and their profiles or sections recorded. The normal scale will be site plans at 1:20 and sections at 1:10, unless circumstances indicate that other scales would be appropriate.

The photographic record will consist of general site shots, and shots of all archaeological features and deposits. A photographic scale (including north arrow) shall be included in the case of detailed photographs. Standard "record" shots of contexts will be taken on a digital camera. A photographic register will accompany the photographic record. This will detail as a minimum feature number, location, and direction of shot.

Trenches will not be backfilled until they have been signed off by the SCCAS.

### **Site surveying**

The evaluation trenches and any features will be surveyed by Total Station or GPS, unless the particulars of the features indicate that manual planning techniques should be employed. Normal scale for archaeological site plans and sections is 1:20 and 1:10 respectively, unless circumstances indicate that other scales would be more appropriate.

The site grid will be tied into the National Grid. Corners of excavation areas will be located by NGR coordinates.

### **Environmental sampling policy**

The number and range of samples collected will be adequate to determine the potential of the site, with particular focus on palaeoenvironmental remains including both biological remains (e.g. plants, small vertebrates) and small sized artefacts (e.g. smithing debris), and to provide information for sampling strategies on any future excavation. Samples will be collected for potential micromorphological and other pedological sedimentological analysis. Environmental bulk samples will be 40 litres in size (assuming context is large enough)

Sampling strategies will address questions of:

- the range of preservation types (charred, mineral-replaced, waterlogged), and their quality

- concentrations of macro-remains
- and differences in remains from undated and dated features
- variation between different feature types and areas of site

CAT has an arrangement with Val Fryer/Lisa Gray whereby any potentially rich environmental layers or features will be appropriately sampled as a matter of course. Trained CAT staff will process the samples (unless complex or otherwise needing specialist processing) and the flots will be sent to VF/LG for reporting.

Should any complex, or otherwise outstanding deposits be encountered, VF/LG will be asked onto site to advise. Waterlogged 'organic' features will always be sampled. In all cases, the advice of VF/LG and/or the Historic England Regional Advisor in Archaeological Science (East of England) on sampling strategies for complex or waterlogged deposits will be followed, including the taking of monolith samples.

### **Human remains**

CAT follows the policy of leaving human remains *in situ* except in those cases where damage or desecration are to be expected, or in the event that analysis of the remains is shown to be a requirement of satisfactory evaluation of the site.

If circumstances indicated it were prudent or necessary to remove remains from the site during the monitoring, the following criteria would be applied; if it is clear from their position, context, depth, or other factors that the remains are ancient, then normal procedure is to apply to the Department of Justice for a licence to remove them. In that case, conditions laid down by the license will be followed. If it seems that the remains are not ancient, then the coroner, the client, and SCCAS will be informed, and any advice and/or instruction from the coroner will be followed.

Following HE guidance (HE 2018) all archaeological human remains excavated during the course of the evaluation will either be analysed and reported by CAT project osteologist Megan Seehra or will be sent to external specialist Julie Curl.

### **Photographic record**

The photographic record will consist of general site shots, and shots of all archaeological features and deposits and follow HE guidelines (HE 2015a). A photographic scale (including north arrow) shall be included in the case of detailed photographs. Standard "record" shots of contexts will be taken on a digital camera. A photographic register will accompany the photographic record. This will detail as a minimum feature number, location, and direction of shot.

Basic site record shots will be taken using the site recording tablet at a resolution of 2592 x 1944 (5 megapixels).

Photographs of significant archaeological features and deposits will be taken using a Nikon D3500 DSLR camera with a 24.2 megapixel DX-format sensor.

### **Post-excavation assessment**

If a post-excavation assessment is required by SCCAS, it will be normally be submitted within 2 months of the end of fieldwork, or as quickly as is reasonably practicable and at a time agreed with SCCAS.

Where archaeological results do not warrant a post-excavation assessment, preparation of the normal site report will begin.

## Finds

All significant finds will be retained.

All finds, where appropriate, will be washed and marked with site code and context number.

Most of our finds reports are written internally by CAT Staff under the supervision and direction of Philip Crummy (Director) and Howard Brooks (Deputy Director). This includes specialist subjects such as:

- ceramic finds (pottery and ceramic building material): Dr Matthew Loughton
- animal bones: Alec Wade (or Adam Wightman, small groups only)
- small finds, metalwork, coins, etc: Laura Pooley
- non-ceramic bulk finds: Laura Pooley
- flints: Adam Wightman
- environmental processing: Bronagh Quinn
- project osteologist (human remains): Meghan Seehra

or to outside specialists:

- animal and human bone: Julie Curl (Sylvanus)
- environmental assessment and analysis: Val Fryer / Lisa Gray
- radiocarbon dating: SUERC Radiocarbon Dating Laboratory, Glasgow
- conservation/x-ray: Laura Ratcliffe (LR Conservation) / Norfolk Museums Service, Conservation and Design Services

Other specialists whose opinion can be sought on large or complex groups include:

- flint: Hazel Martingell / Tom Lawrence
- prehistoric pottery: Stephen Benfield / Nigel Brown / Paul Sealey
- Roman pottery: Stephen Benfield / Paul Sealey / Jo Mills / Val Rigby / Gwladys Monteil
- Roman brick/tile: Ernest Black / Ian Betts (MOLA)
- Roman glass: Hilary Cool
- small finds: Nina Crummy

other: EH Regional Adviser in Archaeological Science (East of England).

All finds of potential treasure will be removed to a safe place, and reported immediately to the Suffolk FLO (Finds Liaison Office) who will inform the coroner within 14 days, in accordance with the rules of the Treasure Act 1996. The definition of treasure is given in pages 3-5 of the Code of Practice of the above act. This refers primarily to gold or silver objects.

Requirements for conservation and storage of finds will be agreed with SCCAS and carried out as per their guidelines (SCCAS 2019b).

## Results

Notification will be given to SCCAS when the fieldwork has been completed.

An appropriate archive will be prepared to minimum acceptable standards outlined in *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment* (HE 2015b).

The draft final report will be submitted within 6 months of the end of fieldwork for approval by SCCAS.

The approved final report will normally be submitted to SCCAS as both a PDF and a hard copy.

The report will contain:

- The aims and methods adopted in the course of the archaeological project.
- Location plan of the area in relation to the proposed development.
- Section/s drawings showing depth of deposits from present ground level with Ordnance Datum, vertical and horizontal scale.
- Archaeological methodology and detailed results including a suitable conclusion and discussion and results referring to Regional Research Frameworks (EAA8, EAA14 & EAA24).
- All specialist reports or assessments.
- A concise non-technical summary of the project results.



- Appendices to include a copy of the completed OASIS summary sheet and the approved WSI.

Results will be published, to at least a summary level, in the PSIAH (Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History) annual round up should archaeological remains be encountered in the evaluation. An allowance will be made for this in the project costs for the report.

Final reports are also published on the CAT website and on the OASIS website.

## **Archive deposition**

The archive will be deposited with the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service as per their archive guidelines (SCCAS 2019).

If the client does not agree to transfer ownership to SCCAS they will be required to nominate another suitable repository approved by SCCAS or provide funding for additional recording and analysis of the finds archive (such as, but not limited to, additional photography or illustration of objects). In the rare event that artefacts of significant monetary value are discovered, separate ownership arrangements may be negotiated, provided they are not subject to Treasure Act legislation.

If the finds are to remain with the landowner or an approved third party, a full copy of the archive will be housed with the SCCAS.

The archive will be deposited with the SCCAS within 3 months of the completion of the final publication report, with a summary of the contents of the archive supplied to SCCAS. Prior to deposition CAT's data management plan (based on the official guidelines from the Digital Curation Centre [DCC 2013]) will ensure the integrity of the digital archive.

## **Monitoring**

SCCAS officers are responsible for monitoring all archaeological work within Suffolk and will need to inspect site works at an appropriate time during the fieldwork and will review the progress of excavation reports and/or archive preparation.

Notification of the start of work will be given to SCCAS ten days in advance of its commencement and a monitoring visit will be booked with SCCAS at this time.

Any variations in this WSI will be agreed with SCCAS prior to them being carried out.

SCCAS will be notified when the fieldwork is complete.

The involvement of SCCAS shall be acknowledged in any report or publication generated by this project.

### ***SCCAS remote monitoring requirements during the Covid-19 pandemic***

Currently SCCAS are undertaking monitoring visits.

However, if government/local government advice changes due to a spike in cases/localised lockdown, etc. SCCAS may have to start remotely monitoring sites again.


In this case, the following remote monitoring requirements have been laid-out by SCCAS:

- All features present in the trenches, including presumed natural and geological features are to be investigated as per the WSI

In addition, the following must be sent to the SCCAS to enable them to decide if the fieldwork can be signed-off and trenches backfilled.

- GPS trench plans showing what is present in each trench – with context numbers included,

- Written text stating what finds were found (if any) in each context, with provisional date,
- Text stating which features environmental samples have been taken from,
- Photographs of 1) each trench, from each end of the trench; 2) trench sections (bulk); and 3) features (all photographs will be taken at appropriate times of day and not in bad lighting conditions and once trenches, sections, features have been cleaned)
- A diagram showing the direction each photograph was taken from, with photograph number. For example,



Provision will be made in the timetable of works for the SCCAS to review the remote monitoring documents and for any queries to be resolved.

CAT understands that if SCCAS cannot gain sufficient information remotely, they will not be able to sign off fieldwork which may lead to delays in the completion of projects.

### **Education and outreach**

The CAT website ([www.thecolchesterarchaeologist.co.uk](http://www.thecolchesterarchaeologist.co.uk)) is updated regularly with information on current sites. Copies of our reports (grey literature) can be viewed on the website and downloaded for free. Staff regularly give lectures to groups, societies and schools (a fee may apply). CAT also works in partnership with Colchester Archaeological Group (providing a venue for their lectures and library) and the local Young Archaeologists Club.

CAT archaeologists can be booked for lectures and information on fees can be obtained by contacting the office on 01206 501785.

## References

Note: all CAT reports, except for DBAs, are available online in PDF format at <http://cat.essex.ac.uk>

- |                               |       |  |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| Brown, N and Glazenbrook, J   | 2000  | <i>Research and Archaeology: a frame work for the Eastern Counties 2 Research agenda and strategy</i> , East Anglian Archaeological, occasional papers 8 (EAA 8) |
| CAT                           | 2020  | <i>Health &amp; Safety Policy</i>  |
| CIfA                          | 2014a | <i>Standard and Guidance for an archaeological evaluation</i> . Updated Oct 2020   |
| CIfA                          | 2014b | <i>Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials</i> . Updated Oct 2020                         |
| CIfA                          | 2014c | <i>Code of Conduct</i> . Revised Oct 2019  |
| Digital Curation Centre (DCC) | 2013  | <i>Checklist for Data Management Plan v. 4.0</i>   |
| Gurney, D                     | 2003  | <i>Standards for field archaeology in the East of England</i> . East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14 (EAA 14).  |
| Historic England (HE)         | 2015a | <i>Digital Image capture and File Storage: Guidelines for best practice</i> . By S Cole & P Backhouse  |
| Historic England (HE)         | 2015b | <i>Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE)</i>  |
| Historic England (HE)         | 2018  | <i>The Role of the Human Osteologist in an Archaeological Fieldwork Project</i> . By S Mays, M Brickley and J Sidell   |
| Medlycott, M                  | 2011  | <i>Research and archaeology revisited: A revised framework for the East of England</i> . East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 24 (EAA 24)                  |
| MHCLG                         | 2019  | National Planning Policy Framework. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.   |
| SCC                           | 2012  | <i>The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map</i> , version 3   |
| SCCAS                         | 2019  | <i>Archaeological Archives in Suffolk: Guidelines for Preparation and Deposition</i>   |
| SCCAS                         | 2020  | <i>Requirements for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation</i> . Updated Oct 2020  |
| SCCAS                         | 2020  | <i>Brief for a Pre-determination Archaeological Evaluation at Land to the West of Sydena, Lambs Lane, Lawshall</i> by Matthew Baker                              |



M Baister



Colchester Archaeological Trust,  
Roman Circus House,  
Roman Circus Walk,  
Colchester,  
Essex, CO2 7GZ

tel: 01206 501785


email: [mb@catuk.org](mailto:mb@catuk.org)



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number 100039294.

Fig 1 Site location and trench layout in relation to the proposed development (dashed blue lines).

Fig 2 Development site (in red) shown in relation to archaeological and historic sites recorded on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.



Imagery ©2020 CNES/Airbus, Getmapping PLC, Infoterra Ltd & Bluesky, Landsat/Copernicus, Maxar Technologies, Map data © 2020  
HER data © Suffolk Historic Environment Record

# Adonis Ecology

## Non-licensed Method Statement to Conduct Archaeological Excavations at Moat House, Lawshall to Assist a Planning Application

Project Ref: 1396

Prepared on behalf of:

**@ The Drawing Board**

The Stables  
Hall Street  
Long Melford  
Suffolk  
CO10 9JT

**By:**



**Adonis Ecology Ltd.**

Unit 11 Lavenham Studios  
Brent Eleigh Road  
Lavenham, Sudbury  
Suffolk, CO10 9PE  
Tel: 01787 249 160

E-mail: [askus@adoniseology.co.uk](mailto:askus@adoniseology.co.uk)  
[www.adoniseology.co.uk](http://www.adoniseology.co.uk)

Registered in England and Wales No: 6208092  
Registered Office: Crane Court, 302 London Road, Ipswich, IP2 0AJ.

## Quality Assurance



Copyright © Adonis Ecology Ltd.

The findings outlined within this report and the data we have provided are to our knowledge true, and express our bona fide professional opinions. This report has been prepared and provided in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) Code of Professional Conduct and the British Standard BS 42020:2013 which provides a code of practice for biodiversity in planning and development (BSI, 2013).

As far as the author and report checker are aware, the only differences that occur in this report from the recommended layouts are:

- to enable greater clarity and reduce repetition;
- where there are inconsistencies in the guideline documents; and
- to retain a proportionate approach in accordance with BS 42020:2013.

No method of assessment can completely remove the possibility of obtaining partially imprecise or incomplete information. Therefore, we cannot guarantee that this assessment completely defines the degree or extent of the occurrence of various species or habitats on the site, or the effectiveness of recommended actions as described in the report. In addition, as the ecological situation of a site is dynamic, this assessment pertains only to the conditions noted during the site visit. Therefore, to achieve the objectives of assessment as stated in this report, the conclusions are based on the information that was available during the time of the assessment and within the limits prescribed by our client in the agreement.

	Name	Signature
Report prepared by:	Stewart Wesley BSc (Hons) MCIEEM	
Report checked by:	Katrina Wells BSc (Hons) MSc GradCIEEM	

## CONTENTS

<b>0</b>	<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Background .....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>MITIGATION STRATEGY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Overview .....	5
2.2	Relevant Legislation.....	5
2.3	Mitigation Strategy .....	6
<b>3</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>9</b>



## 0 SUMMARY

- 0.1 Adonis Ecology Ltd. was commissioned by @ The Drawing Board to produce a non-licensed Method Statement to undertake archaeological excavations on the site known as Moat House, Hartest Lane, Lawshall, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, IP29 4PR, grid reference (at centre of site) TL 852 547.
- 0.2 A great crested newt *Triturus cristatus* population estimate survey of the moat surrounding the site, and all other ponds within 250m of the site was conducted by Adonis Ecology Ltd. in May/June 2020. The surveys revealed a 'small' population of great crested newts in the moat surrounding the site, and a 'medium' population in the wider surroundings (Adonis Ecology, 2020). The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) for the site also considered there to be potential for foraging/dispersing badgers *Meles meles*, hedgehogs *Erinaceus europaeus* and common toads *Bufo bufo* to occur on the site (Adonis Ecology, 2019).
- 0.3 It was understood that an archaeological investigation is required by Suffolk County Council to further progress the planning application. It was considered that if these works were undertaken without precautions, there would be a significant risk of impact to great crested newts which could occur in the terrestrial habitats on site. Sue Hooton, Principal Ecological Consultant at Place Services who was consulted on the application, has confirmed in principal that these works could proceed on site, so long as a non-licensed method statement is included in the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the works.
- 0.4 This Method Statement covers the areas that can be impacted, the working methodology and the weather conditions to be adhered to during the works, and to be included in the WSI for the works.
- 0.5 With the measures of this Method Statement completed as outlined, it was considered the pre-determination archaeological works could be completed with negligible risk of impact to great crested newts.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Adonis Ecology Ltd. was commissioned by @ The Drawing Board to produce a non-licensed Method Statement to undertake archaeological excavations on the site known as Moat House, Hartest Lane, Lawshall, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, IP29 4PR, grid reference (at centre of site) TL 852 547.
- 1.1.2 A great crested newt *Triturus cristatus* population estimate survey of the moat surrounding the site, and all other ponds within 250m of the site was conducted by Adonis Ecology Ltd. in May/June 2020. The surveys revealed a 'small' population of great crested newts in the moat surrounding the site, and a 'medium' population in the wider surroundings (Adonis Ecology, 2020). The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) for the site also considered there to be potential for foraging/dispersing badgers *Meles meles*, hedgehogs *Erinaceus europaeus* and common toads *Bufo bufo* to occur on the site (Adonis Ecology, 2019).
- 1.1.3 It was understood that an archaeological investigation is required by Suffolk County Council to further progress the planning application. It was considered that if these works were undertaken without precautions, there would be a significant risk of impact to great crested newts which could occur in the terrestrial habitats on site. Sue Hooton, Principal Ecological Consultant at Place Services who was consulted on the application has confirmed in principal that these works could proceed on site, so long as suitable mitigation measures are included in a non-licensed method statement, and that this is included in the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the works to be completed.

### *Aim and Objectives*

- 1.1.4 The aim of this method statement is to provide a specific methodology to be followed during the archaeological works to reduce any risk of impact to great crested newts (and any other protected and Section 41 animals) that may occur on site to negligible.
- 1.1.5 To achieve this aim, the report has the following objectives:
- to describe actions to be taken during the archaeological excavations to reduce the risk of impact to protected and Section 41 species to negligible;
  - to describe ongoing precautions to be carried out during the development works to ensure any impact to protected and Section 41 species remains negligible during the works.

## 2 MITIGATION STRATEGY

### 2.1 Overview

2.1.1 Without mitigation, the required archaeological excavations would result in the temporary loss of a small amount of low-quality, potential shelter habitat for great crested newts which occurs on the site. The site consisted largely of tall ruderal habitat, with no rabbit *Oryctolagus cuniculus* holes, log, stone or other habitat piles, nor any other significant features considered highly suitable for sheltering great crested newts, but was considered to provide some low value terrestrial and shelter habitat for great crested newts. The site lies within a moat which was shown to support a 'small' population of breeding great crested newts (Adonis Ecology, 2020).

2.1.2 A rapid risk assessment (Natural England, 2020) showed that if greater than 100m<sup>2</sup> of land was impacted during the works, an offence would be 'likely' and a Natural England European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) would be necessary to allow the works to proceed lawfully. However, as planning consent is usually required to obtain an EPSL, this would prevent the works being undertaken pre-determination. However, so long as less than 100m<sup>2</sup> of land is impacted by the works, and with correct impact avoidance measures implemented during the works, it was considered the works could proceed with negligible risk of impact to great crested newts, and without the need to obtain an EPSL for the site.

2.1.3 The following mitigation strategy is designed to confirm:

- how works will be conducted to ensure less than 100m<sup>2</sup> of land is impacted during the works;
- how extant populations of great crested newts (and other protected and Section 41 species) will be maintained at a favourable conservation status, and
- there will be no breach of relevant legislation.

### 2.2 Relevant Legislation

#### *Great Crested Newts*

2.2.1 Great crested newts are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), as well as the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended by the Countryside Rights of Way Act 2000. Offences likely to be relevant to development are to:

- damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place;
- intentionally or deliberately capture or kill;
- intentionally injure;
- deliberately disturb, or intentionally or recklessly disturb in a place of shelter or protection;

- intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to a place used for shelter or protection.

#### *Badgers*

2.2.2 Badgers are not considered rare but are protected, along with their setts, under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992, and Schedule 6 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981 as amended) for animal welfare reasons. The following are offences under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992:

- wilfully kill, injure, take or attempt to kill, injure, possess or take a badger;
- cruelly ill-treat a badger;
- dig for a badger;
- disturb a badger while it is occupying a sett, or cause a dog to enter a sett;
- interfere with a badger sett by e.g. damaging, destroying or obstructing a sett or any part of it.

2.2.3 The Protection of Badgers Act 1992 defines a badger sett as “any structure or place which displays signs indicating current use by a badger” (OPSI, 2007).

2.2.4 More recent guidance (Natural England, 2009) states that badgers are relatively tolerant of moderate levels of disturbance, however, any activity that is likely to cause interference (such as damaging a sett tunnel or chamber or obstructing access to a sett entrance) would require a licence.

#### *Section 41 Species*

2.2.5 A number of species including hedgehogs *Erinaceus europaeus* and common toads *Bufo bufo* are NERC Act 2006 Section 41 species. The local conservation of any Section 41 species is a material consideration for any planning application.

### **2.3 Mitigation Strategy**

#### *Area of Clearance*

2.3.1 It was understood that two 15m x 1.8m trenches will be required for the archaeological excavations on site. Whilst this in itself would result in less than 100m<sup>2</sup> of land being impacted, it was considered that the additional land that would be impacted by tracking a small digger into the excavation areas, and from storage of spoil from the excavations, would result in greater than 100m<sup>2</sup> of land being impacted by the works.

2.3.2 To ensure no more than 100m<sup>2</sup> of land is impacted, a specific area to be tracked over to reach the working areas will be determined at the start of the works. A hand search of the area will be undertaken by an ecologist to

confirm there are no great crested newts within the area. If required to make this check easier, the vegetation may be strimmed to a height of approximately 10cm in height. The ecologist would confirm this on the day of works. Assuming the area is confirmed to be clear of great crested newts, a temporary track surface will be installed over the area. This will both reduce the loss of habitats (as the surface vegetation will only be squashed, not removed) and will define the route for vehicles to use during works. In the unlikely event the ecologist finds a great crested newt, or considers that it cannot be confirmed great crested newts will not be harmed during the placement of the temporary track, an alternative route will be determined, with this area to be hand searched and confirmed to be clear of great crested newts before the works commence.

- 2.3.3 In addition, spoil from the excavation will be taken off site, to be stored on adjacent arable land. Vehicles used to move the soil will only track over the temporary surface provided on site. The ecologist will also confirm that the area to be used for spoil storage on the adjacent arable land has no potential to support sheltering great crested newts so as to prevent any additional impact to land considered suitable for sheltering great crested newts.
- 2.3.4 Overall, with the measures undertaken as described, the works will result in less than 100m<sup>2</sup> of land being temporarily lost, and the works can proceed without the need for a European Protected Species Licence.

*Working Methodology*

- 2.3.5 Prior to works commencing on site, an ecologist will undertake a toolbox talk to describe the risk to great crested newts from the works to all site workers, inform them of the working methods and to explain what to look out for during the works.
- 2.3.6 The ecologist, who must hold or be covered by a Natural England class licence for great crested newts, will then undertake a thorough hand search of the two areas to be excavated (following vegetation cut as above if required), searching for any features suitable for great crested newts to shelter, and checking for great crested newts. Where necessary, any significant cracks or holes will be checked using an endoscope to confirm the absence of great crested newts. During the most recent site visit in June 2020, there were no rabbit *Oryctolagus cuniculus* holes, piles of wood/stone or other materials, and no other significant shelter features on the site. However, if any are present, areas chosen for excavation should avoid these areas. If the ecologist considers there to be any significant risk of great crested newts occurring in the excavation area, either because there is a high value shelter feature present, or because any potential low value shelter feature cannot be checked thoroughly for great crested newts, the area proposed for excavation should be altered to avoid the feature, with any new area to be hand searched as well.
- 2.3.7 If the ecologist is satisfied that there is no potential for great crested newts to occur within the areas to be excavated, then works will proceed on the same day, without further input from the ecologist. If there is considered to be any

very low likelihood of great crested newts being in areas to be excavated (and the areas can be moved no further to avoid these features), again on the same day, the ecologist will oversee the excavation of the top 20cm of soil. Given the works will be undertaken outside of the great crested newt active season (taken to be March to mid-October), this will only be undertaken when night time temperatures have been over 5°C for at least two nights prior to the works being undertaken. In the highly unlikely event a great crested newt is found during these works, the works will cease immediately and subsequently, only areas confirmed by the ecologist to be clear of great crested newts will be excavated.

#### *Precautions During Works*

- 2.3.8 To prevent any risk of harm to great crested newts (or other animals including badgers, hedgehogs and common toads) during the works, trenches being left open overnight will either be fully covered, or have wooden planks placed in them at no more than a 45° angle, at intervals no greater than 5m, so that any wildlife that falls in can climb out safely. Alternatively, each end of the trench could be sloped at no more than a 45° angle to allow animals to climb out.

#### *Post Works*

- 2.3.9 On completion of the works, the excavations must be filled in, using the soil that was previously removed to fill the holes. The soil at the end should be level with the top of the trench (not piled higher than the trench), and should be moderately compacted so as not to create a potential high-quality refuge feature on the site (which a large pile of loose soil could provide).

### **3 CONCLUSION**

- 3.1 With the works completed as described in this Method Statement, it was considered the required archaeological excavation works could be completed lawfully, and with negligible risk of impact to great crested newts.

## 4 REFERENCES

Adonis Ecology (2019). *Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of Moat House, Lawshall, to Support a Planning Application*. Adonis Ecology, Lavenham.

Adonis Ecology (2020). *Great Crested Newt Survey Report for Proposed New Dwellings on Land at Moat House, Lawshall to Support a Planning Application*. Adonis Ecology, Lavenham.

Natural England (2009). *Interpretation of 'Disturbance' in relation to badgers occupying a sett*. Natural England, Peterborough.

Natural England (2020). *Form WML-A14-2 (Version April 2020)*. Natural England, Peterborough.

OPSI (2007). *Protection of Badgers Act 1992*. Office of Public Sector Information, HMSO, London.

# 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: colchest3-407906**

### Project details

Project name	A pre-determination archaeological evaluation at land to the west of Sydena, Lambs Lane, Lawshall, Suffolk, IP29 4PR
Short description of the project	An archaeological evaluation consisting of two trial-trenches was carried out at land west of Sydena, Lawshall, Suffolk in advance of a planning application being submitted for the construction of two new dwellings and associated infrastructure. The site was located within a moated enclosure and the potential for archaeological deposits was high. Two features (a ditch and possible pit) and seven layers were recorded. The possible pit contained several sherds of medieval pottery but a largely complete glass onion bottle dated the backfilling of the feature to the mid 17th-18th centuries. The ditch was undated but may be associated with the surrounding moat and could have formed a division within it. Three of the seven layers formed the general stratigraphy of the site (the topsoil, subsoil and natural clay), while the remainder were associated with or in close proximity to a metalled surface that sloped down to the north of the site. These layers contained finds of an 18th-19th century date, but the presence of earlier, residual, finds dating to the prehistoric, Roman and medieval periods suggests a continuity of occupation on, or in close proximity, to the site.
Project dates	Start: 25-11-2020 End: 22-12-2020
Previous/future work	No / Not known
Any associated project reference codes	2020/11d - Contracting Unit No.
Any associated project reference codes	LWL 046 - HER event no.
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Current Land use	Vacant Land 2 - Vacant land not previously developed
Monument type	PIT Post Medieval
Monument type	METALLED SURFACE Post Medieval
Significant Finds	POTTERY Medieval
Significant Finds	POTTERY Post Medieval
Methods & techniques	""Environmental Sampling"", ""Measured Survey"", ""Metal Detectors"", ""Photographic Survey"", ""Sample Trenches""
Development type	Rural residential
Prompt	National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF
Position in the planning process	Pre-application

### Project location

Country	England
Site location	SUFFOLK BABERGH LAWSHALL land to the west of Sydena, Lambs Lane
Postcode	IP29 4PR
Study area	54 Square metres
Site coordinates	TL 85212 54712 52.1590921152 0.708018562656 52 09 32 N 000 42 28 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 102.44m Max: 102.77m

### Project creators

Name of Organisation	Colchester Archaeological Trust
Project brief originator	Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service



Project design originator	Mark Baister
Project director/manager	Chris Lister
Project supervisor	Mark Baister
Type of sponsor/funding body	Developer

#### Project archives

Physical Archive Exists?	No
Digital Archive recipient	Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service
Digital Archive ID	LWL 046
Digital Contents	"Survey"
Digital Media available	"Survey", "Text"
Paper Archive recipient	Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service
Paper Archive ID	LWL 046
Paper Contents	"Survey"
Paper Media available	"Miscellaneous Material", "Photograph", "Plan", "Report", "Section", "Survey "

#### Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	Pre-determination archaeological evaluation at land to the west of Sydena, Lambs Lane, Lawshall, Suffolk, IP29 4PR November 2020
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Baister, M
Other bibliographic details	CAT Report 1621
Date	2020
Issuer or publisher	Colchester Archaeological Trust
Place of issue or publication	Colchester
Description	A4 bound report with clear plastic front and opaque black cardboard back.
URL	<a href="http://cat.essex.ac.uk/summaries/CAT-1621.html">http://cat.essex.ac.uk/summaries/CAT-1621.html</a>
Entered by	Mark Baister (mb@catuk.org)
Entered on	22 December 2020



Please e-mail [Historic England](mailto:Historic England) 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

[Cookies](#) [Privacy Policy](#)