

Archaeological evaluation at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton Green, Suffolk, CO10 0QH

January 2019



by Dr Elliott Hicks

with contributions by Dr Matthew Loughton
figures by Chris Lister, Ben Holloway and Emma Holloway

fieldwork by Ben Holloway with Adam Tuffey, Bronagh Quinn and James Keeble

**commissioned by Sophie Gittins
on behalf of Granville Developments**

NGR: TL 913 409 (centre)
Planning ref: B/17/01105/FUL
CAT project ref.: 18/11j
Suffolk Parish Number: NEN 018
OASIS ref: colchest3-335287



Colchester Archaeological Trust

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

tel.: 01206 501785
email: eh2@catuk.org

CAT Report 1371
February 2019

Contents

1	Summary	1
2	Introduction	1
3	Archaeological and landscape background	1
4	Aims	2
5	Methodology	3
6	Results	3
7	Finds	4
8	Discussion	5
9	Acknowledgements	6
10	References	6
11	Abbreviations and glossary	6
12	Contents of archive	7
13	Archive deposition	7
	Appendix 1 Context List	9
	Figures	after p9
	WSI	
	OASIS summary sheet	

List of photographs, tables and figures

Cover: site shot

Photograph 1	T3 trench shot, looking southeast	4
Photograph 2	T7 trench shot, looking west northwest	4
Table 1	All metal-detected finds	5
Map 1	Extract from Suffolk LXXX.NW, rev.1902, pub.1905 showing the blacksmith's forge	5
Fig 1	Site location and trench layout in relation to proposed development	
Fig 2	Development site (red) in relation to nearby archaeological and historic sites as listed on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.	
Fig 3	Evaluation results	
Fig 4	Trench results	
Fig 5	Trench results	
Fig 6	Feature and representative sections	

1 Summary

An archaeological evaluation (eight trial-trenches) was carried out at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton, Suffolk in advance of the construction of six new dwellings and associated infrastructure. The evaluation uncovered a medieval pit dated to 11th-13th century, two post-medieval ditches/pits and a modern path. It is possible that the path and post-medieval features relate to activity at the blacksmith's forge shown on early 20th-century OS mapping of the area, while the medieval pit is representative of an earlier phase of activity at the site which was possibly associated with activity on the historic Newton Green. Several undated features – four ditches, ten pits and a pit/posthole – were also revealed during the excavations.

2 Introduction (Fig 1)

This report presents the results of an archaeological evaluation at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton, Suffolk which was carried out on 16th-17th January 2019. The work was commissioned by Sophie Gittins on behalf of Granville Developments, in advance of the construction of six new dwellings with associated infrastructure and was undertaken by Colchester Archaeological Trust (CAT).

The Local Planning Authority (Babergh District Council: Planning reference B/17/01105/FUL) 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 this application, the applicant should be required to commission a scheme of archaeological investigation in accordance with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (MHCLG 2018).

All archaeological work was carried out in accordance with a *Brief for a trenched archaeological evaluation at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton* detailing the required archaeological work written by Hannah Cutler (SCCAS 2018), and a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) prepared by CAT in response to the SCCAS brief and agreed with SCCAS (CAT 2018).

In addition to the brief and WSI, all fieldwork and reporting was done in accordance with English Heritage's *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE)* (English Heritage 2006), 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 evaluation* (ClfA 2017a) and *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (ClfA 2017b).

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), SCC invoice number 9193597 (a 2016 SHER search reused with the permission of Hannah Cutler, SCCAS Archaeological Officer).

Geology

The Geology of Britain viewer (1:50,000 scale¹) shows the bedrock geology of the site as London Clay Formation (clay, silt and sand) with superficial deposits of Lowestoft Formation (sand and gravel).

Historic landscape

Newton is defined as *rolling valley farmlands* in the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment.² Within the Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map³ it is defined

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

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

as Landscape sub-type 10.3, built up area – village (substantial groups of houses associated with a parish church). The landscape immediately around Newton is characterised as sub-type 1.1 (pre 18th century enclosure – random fields), sub-type 3.1/2 (post-1950 agricultural landscape – boundary loss from random fields/rectilinear fields) and sub-type 9.2 (post-medieval park and leisure – informal park (golf course)).

Archaeology⁴ (Fig 2)

(All measurements are taken from the centre point of the development site to the centre point of the archaeological site).

Roman: A length of Roman road (Margary 322) runs across the Newton Green Golf Course (NEN 002, 430m W).

Medieval: The medieval Church of All Saints (NEN 001) lies 725m NE. An archaeological evaluation 240m SE (NEN 015) revealed a medieval ditch (11th-12th century) aligned NE/SW across the southeastern end of the site (three modern pits and a modern tree-throw were also recorded) (CAT Report 1052).

Medieval/post-medieval: Evaluation at Whisper Woods revealed one small post-medieval ditch and a small group of unstratified medieval pottery sherds (NEN 008, 555m SE). Fieldwalking assessment in 1992 for the extension to the Newton Green Golf Course (NEN Misc, 200m W) revealed medieval and post-medieval pottery and ceramic building material, probably from manuring.

Post-medieval: The site of a possible post-medieval mill is suggested by field names 'Great Mill Field' and 'Little Mill Field' (COG Misc, 760m WSW). Historically, settlement within the parish, as depicted on Hodgkinson's map of Suffolk of 1783, clustered along the northern edge of Newton Green around the parish church/Newton Hall complex and along Sudbury Road. What is now the golf course to the south of Sudbury Road was a green until at least the late 18th century. Hodgkinson's map appears to show the development site as vacant ground.

Modern: A small type 22 Second World War pillbox (NEN 009) lies 1km SE.

Undated: Hawk Hill (NEN 004, 1.1km ESE) was an oval shaped mound defined and named as 'mound' on OS 1st edition facsimile map (based on 1838 edition). Four undated linear features were also identified during monitoring work for a pipeline replacement (NEN 012, 430m NE)

Listed buildings⁵ (Fig 2)

There are 21 listed buildings within 1km of the development site. They are all Grade II listed and date from the 16th to the 18th century. Also Grade II listed are one 19th-century wall and one 20th-century WWI war memorial. The nearest is located 130m SE.

4 Aims

The aims of the evaluation were to:

- excavate and record any archaeological deposits that were identified within the development site;
- identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit within the application area, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation;

³ The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map, version 3, 2008, Suffolk County Council

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

⁵ This is based on records held at the Suffolk County Historic Environment Record (SCHER).

- 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.

5 Methodology

Eight trial-trenches were laid out across the development site. The trenches were all 30m long by 1.8m wide except T2, which was 10m long and 1.8m wide (totalling 396m²).

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

6 Results (Appendix 1, Figs 3-6)

The trenches were excavated through modern topsoil (L1, c 0.18-0.44m thick, soft, dry medium/dark grey/brown silty-clayey-loam with 1% gravel) and subsoil (L2, c 0.07-0.25m thick, firm, moist medium/dark grey/brown sand clayey-silt) onto natural (L3, firm, dry medium orange/brown clayey-silt with >50% gravel, encountered at a depth of 0.42-0.73m below current ground level).

There were no archaeological remains in T2.

Trench 1 (T1): 30m long by 1.8m wide

Undatable ditch F14 was aligned E-W and was 1.21m wide and 0.31m deep.

Undatable pit F17 extended beyond the limit of excavation (LOE) and so its full dimensions could not be ascertained, but its exposed extent was 0.34m wide and 0.12m deep.

Trench 3 (T3): 30m long by 1.8m wide

Post-medieval (1750 or later) ditch or pit F9 was aligned WNW-ESE and was 1.78m wide and 0.49m deep. This feature was cut by modern path F11, which extended through the trench on an E-W alignment, and was composed of compacted gravel and modern detritus, including clinkers, sherds of china, peg-tile and iron objects.

Trench 4 (T4): 30m long by 1.8m wide

Four undatable pits, F13, F15, F18 and F19, were uncovered. They were 0.49m-0.87m wide and 0.09-0.15m deep.

Trench 5 (T5): 30m long by 1.8m wide

Post-medieval ditch or pit F16 was aligned WNW-ESE and was 1.67m wide and 0.23m deep.

Two undatable pits, F10 and F12, both extended beyond the LOE but the exposed extent of each was 0.79, wide and 0.28m deep, and 0.68m wide and 0.28m deep, respectively.

Modern path F11 passed through the trench on an WNW-ESE alignment.

Trench 6 (T6): 30m long by 1.8m wide

Two undatable ditches were uncovered. F1 was aligned WNW-ESE and was 1.67m wide and 0.15m deep; F2 was aligned NW-SE and was 0.9m wide and 0.31m deep.

Trench 7 (T7): 30m long by 1.8m wide

Medieval (c 11th- to 13th-century) pit F5 was 0.77m wide and 0.18m deep. Two further pits, F4 and F6, which both extended beyond the LOE and were 1.1m wide and 0.19m deep and 1.01m wide and 0.27m deep respectively, yielded no datable material.

Treethrow F3 was also recorded.

Trench 8 (T8): 30m long by 1.8m wide

Undatable pit F8 was 0.8m wide and 0.44m deep.



Photograph 1 T3 trench shot – looking southeast



Photograph 2 T7 trench shot – looking west northwest

7 Finds

7.1 Ceramic and Pottery finds

by Dr Matthew Loughton

There were only two sherds of pottery:

F5 (3): a small (4 g) reduced wheel-made sherd with sand and rare flint temper. Difficult to date but possibly early medieval sandy ware (fabric 13) which dates from c 1000/1050 until 1225 (CAR 7, 39-40).

F9 (4): one base, with a weight of 7 g, in fabric F48E (yellow ware) which dates from c AD 1750 onwards (*ibid*, 253).

7.2 Lava quern

by Laura Pooley

Fifteen small fragments (76.9g) of lava quernstone came from F1 (1). Some of the fragments join and show fresh breaks (probably as a result of the current evaluation) while the older surfaces are quite abraded. Such small fragments cannot be closely-dated but lava quernstones were first imported into Britain in the Roman period, then again in the later Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods (CAR 2, 75).

7.3 Metal-detected finds

by Laura Pooley


Twenty objects were metal-detected from topsoil L1 in evaluation trenches T3-T7 and are recorded in Table 1 below. Dating to the post-medieval/modern period, they appear to be mostly agricultural in origin and will be discarded once this report has been approved by SCCAS.

Trench	Object type	Description
T3	Tube	Copper-alloy tube made from a rolled sheet, now filled with mud, possibly a sheath for a hand-tool or similar (92g)
	Fragments	Three unidentified lumps of iron (240g)
	Bolts	Two large iron bolts, probably from agricultural machinery (226g)
T4	Nails	One iron nail (38g)
	Shears/pliers	Almost complete but heavily rusted iron garden pruning shears or pliers (430g)
T5	Bolt	Large iron bolt, probably from agricultural machinery (226g)
	Bracket	Copper-alloy bracket, probably an internal fitting from a house/barn (286g)
	Re-bar	Length of iron re-bar (512g)
T6	Strip	Rectangular iron strip (82g)
	Nails	Two iron nails (88g)
	Nail/bolt	Iron nail or bolt (96g)
T7	Nails	Two small iron nails (20g)
	Fragment	Unidentified fragment of iron (14g)
T7	Nail	Small iron nail (6g)
	Fragment	Unidentified fragment of iron (10g)

Table 1 All metal-detected finds

8 Discussion

Archaeological evaluation at this site led to the uncovering of a number of archaeological features. The modern trackway, given its composition (clinkers and iron objects, as well as other refuse material) was likely associated with the blacksmith's forge shown occupying this site in OS mapping of the area compiled in the early 20th century (see Map 1 below). The post-medieval ditch, which may in fact be two elongated pits, may also be linked to activity at the forge. A further pit of medieval date (c 11th-13th century) is indicative of human occupation or activity here during this earlier period too.



Map 1 Extract from Suffolk LXXX.NW, rev. 1902, pub.1905 showing the blacksmith's forge.

The majority of the features uncovered, however (four ditches, ten pits, and a pit/posthole), yielded no artefactual evidence, and therefore it is not possible to determine their date or purpose with any certainty. The pits north of path F11 seem to be more clustered together than those situated to the south of it, and this may indicate that they, like the path, were associated in some way with the forge. The absence of material recovered from these features, however, suggests this is unlikely. Another possibility is that these features are the product of an earlier phase of activity at this site, perhaps contemporary with medieval pit F5 and possibly related to activity on the historic Newton Green, although perhaps during earlier periods.

9 Acknowledgements

CAT is grateful to Sophie Gittins and Granville Developments for commissioning and funding the project. The project was managed by C Lister, fieldwork was carried out by B Holloway with A Tuffey, B Quinn and J Keeble. Figures are by C Lister and E Holloway. The project was monitored by Hannah Cutler for Suffolk County Council Archaeological Services.

10 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)
CAR 7	2000	<i>Colchester Archaeological Report 7: Post-Roman pottery from excavations in Colchester, 1971-85</i> , by J Cotter
CAT	2014	<i>Health & Safety Policy</i>
CAT	2016	<i>Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for an archaeological evaluation at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton, Suffolk, CO10 0QH</i>
CAT Report 1052	2016	<i>Archaeological evaluation on land opposite Saracens Head, Sudbury Road, Newton, Suffolk, CO10 0QJ: December 2016</i>
CIfA	2008a	<i>Standard and Guidance for an archaeological evaluation</i>
CIfA	2008b	<i>Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials</i>
DCLG	2012	<i>National Planning Policy Framework</i>
Gurney, D	2003	<i>Standards for field archaeology in the East of England</i> . East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14 (EAA 14).
English Heritage	2006	<i>Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE)</i>
Margary, I D	1967	<i>Roman roads in Britain</i> (2nd ed)
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)
SCC	2008	<i>The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map, version 3</i>
SCCAS	2010	<i>Archive Guidelines</i>
SCCAS	2012	<i>Requirements for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation</i> (version 1.3)
SCCAS/CT	2016	<i>Brief for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation at Land opposite Saracens Head, Sudbury road, Newton</i> . Rachael Abraham, October 2016

11 Abbreviations and glossary

Anglo-Saxon	period from c 500 – 1066
CAT	Colchester Archaeological Trust
CIfA	Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
clinker	the stony residue from burnt coal or from a furnace
context	specific location of finds on an archaeological site

feature (F)	an identifiable thing like a pit, a wall, a drain, can contain 'contexts'
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	Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations, http://oasis.ac.uk/pages/wiki/Main
peg-tile	rectangular thin tile with peg-hole(s) used mainly for roofing, first appeared c AD1200 and continued in use to present day, but commonly post-medieval to modern
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
ws	written scheme of investigation

12 Contents of archive

Finds: part of a box

Paper and digital record

One A4 document wallet containing:

The report (CAT Report 1371)

SCCAS evaluation brief, CAT written scheme of investigation

Original site record (feature and layer sheets, trench record sheet, finds record)

Site digital photographic log

13 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 NEN 018.

Distribution list:

Sophie Gittins
Granville Developments
Hannah Cutler, SCCAS
Suffolk County Historic Environment Record



Colchester Archaeological Trust

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

tel.: 01206 501785

email: eh2@catuk.org

checked by: Philip Crummy
date: 07.02.2019

Appendix 1 Context list

Context Number	Trench number	Finds Number	Feature / layer type	Description	Date
L1	All	-	Topsoil	Soft, dry medium/dark grey/brown silty-clayey-loam with 1% gravel	Undatable
L2	All	-	Subsoil	Firm, moist medium/dark grey/brown sand clayey-silt	Undatable
L3	All	-	Natural	Firm, dry medium orange/brown clayey-silt with >50% gravel	Post-glacial
F1	T6	1, 2	Ditch	Soft/friable, dry/moist medium grey/brown silty-clay	Undatable
F2	T6	-	Ditch	Soft/friable, dry/moist medium orange/brown clayey-silt	Undatable
F3	T7	-	Treethrow	Friable/firm, dry/moist medium grey/brown silty-clay	Undatable
F4	T7	-	Pit	Friable/firm, dry/moist medium grey/brown silty-clay with >7% stones	Undatable
F5	T7	3	Pit	Soft/friable, dry/moist medium grey/brown silty-clay with 8% stones	Medieval (?11th century)
F6	T7	-	Pit	Soft/friable, dry/moist medium grey/brown silty-clay with 4% stones	Undatable
F7	T8	-	Pit/posthole	Friable, dry medium grey/brown silty-clay with 4% stones	Undatable
F8	T8	-	Pit	Soft/friable, dry medium grey/brown silty-clay with <1% stones	Undatable
F9	T3	4	Ditch	Friable/firm, dry/moist medium grey/brown clayey-silt with 2% 5stones	Post-medieval
F10	T5	-	Pit	Firm, moist medium grey/brown silt	Undatable
F11	T3, T5	-	Path	Hard, moist dark brown/black compacted gravel, clinkers, china peg-tile and iron objects	Modern
F12	T5	-	Pit	Firm, moist medium grey/brown silt	Undatable
F13	T4	-	Pit	Firm, moist medium grey/brown silt	Undatable
F14	T1	-	Ditch	Friable/firm, dry/moist medium grey/brown clayey-silt	Undatable
F15	T4	-	Pit	Firm/moist, medium grey/brown sandy-silt	Undatable
F16	T3, T5	-	Ditch	Friable/firm, dry/moist medium grey/brown silty-clay	Undatable
F17	T1	-	Pit	Soft/friable, dry/moist medium grey/brown clayey-silt	Undatable
F18	T4	-	Pit	Firm, moist light grey/brown sandy-silt	Undatable
F19	T4	-	Pit	Firm, moist medium grey/brown silt	Undatable




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



Fig 2 Development site in relation to nearby archaeological and historic sites as listed on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (listed buildings shown as orange circles)

Imagery ©2018 Google, Map data ©2018 Google
Data ©Suffolk Historic Environment Record






Fig 3 Evaluation results.




Fig 4 Trench Results.




Fig 5 Trench results.




Fig 6 Feature and representative sections.

Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for an archaeological evaluation at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton, Suffolk, CO10 0QH

NGR: TL 913 409 (centre)

Planning references: B/17/01105/FUL
(and additional area to rear currently pre-application)

Commissioned by: Sophie Gittins

Client: Granville Developments

Curating museum: Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

Suffolk parish number: NEN 018


CAT project code: 18/11j

OASIS reference no.: colchest3-335287

Site manager: Chris Lister

SCCAS Monitor: Hannah Cutler

This WSI written: 30.11.2016



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

tel: 01206 501785

email: lp@catuk.org

Site location and description

The development site (0.78ha) is located at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton, 2.5 miles east of Sudbury, Suffolk (Fig 1). Site centre is NGR TL 913 409.

Proposed work

The development comprises the erection of six new dwellings with associated infrastructure.

Archaeological background

The following archaeological background draws on information from the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (archaeology.her@suffolk.gov.uk), SCC invoice number 9193597 (a 2016 SHER search reused with the permission of Hannah Cutler, SCCAS Archaeological Officer).

Geology

The Geology of Britain viewer (1:50,000 scale¹) shows the bedrock geology of the site as London Clay Formation (clay, silt and sand) with superficial deposits of Lowestoft Formation (sand and gravel).

Historic landscape

Newton is defined as *rolling valley farmlands* in the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment². Within the Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map³ it is defined as Landscape sub-type 10.3, built up area – village (substantial groups of houses associated with a parish church). The landscape immediately around Newton is characterised as sub-type 1.1 (pre 18th century enclosure – random fields), sub-type 3.1/2 (post-1950 agricultural landscape – boundary loss from random fields/rectilinear fields) and sub-type 9.2 (post-medieval park and leisure – informal park (golf course)).

Archaeology⁴ (Fig 2)

(All measurements are taken from the centre point of the development site to the centre point of the archaeological site).

Roman: A length of Roman road (Margary 322) runs across the Newton Green Golf Course (NEN 002, 430m W).

Medieval: The medieval Church of All Saints (NEN 001) lies 725m NE. An archaeological evaluation 240m SE (NEN 015) revealed a medieval ditch (11th-12th century) aligned NE/SE across the southeastern end of the site (three modern pits and a modern tree-throw were also recorded) (CAT Report 1052).

Medieval/post-medieval: Evaluation at Whisper Woods revealed one small post-medieval ditch and a small group of unstratified medieval pottery sherds (NEN 008, 555m SE). Fieldwalking assessment in 1992 for the extension to the Newton Green Golf Course (NEN Misc, 200m W) revealed medieval and post-medieval pottery and ceramic building material, probably from manuring.

Post-medieval: The site of a possible post-medieval mill is suggested by field names 'Great Mill Field' and 'Little Mill Field' (COG Misc, 760m WSW). Historically settlement within the parish, as depicted on Hodgkinson's map of Suffolk of 1783, clustered along the northern edge of Newton Green around the parish church/Newton Hall complex and along Sudbury Road. What is now the golf course to the south of Sudbury Road was the green until at least the late 18th century. Hodgkinson's map appears to show the development site as vacant ground.

Modern: A small type 22 pillbox from WW2 (NEN 009) lies 1km SE.

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

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

³ The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map, version 3, 2008, Suffolk County Council

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

Undated: Hawk Hill (NEN 004, 1.1km ESE) was an oval shaped mound defined and named as 'mound' on OS 1st edition facsimile map (based on 1838 edition). Four undated linear features were also identified during monitoring work for a pipeline replacement (NEN 012, 430m NE)

Listed buildings⁵ (Fig 2)

There are 21 listed buildings within 1km of the development site. They are all Grade II listed and date from the 16th to the 18th century. Also Grade II listed are one 19th century wall and one 20th century WWI war memorial. The nearest is located 130m SE.

Planning background

As the site lies within an area highlighted by the Suffolk HER as having a high potential for archaeological deposits, it was recommended by the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) that a trenched archaeological evaluation take place to enable the archaeological resource, both in quality and extent, to be accurately quantified.

Requirement for work

The required archaeological work is for trenched archaeological evaluation. Details are given in the Project Brief (*Brief for a trenched archaeological evaluation at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton*) written by SCCAS (2018).

As per the brief, 5% of the development site will be sampled (220m of linear trenching at 1.8m wide). Seven 30m long trenches and one 10m long trench will be positioned across the development site in, where possible, a systematic grid array (see Fig 1).

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

Staffing

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

In charge of day-to-day site work: Ben Holloway

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 2008a, b, c)

⁵ This is based on records held at the Suffolk County Historic Environment Record (SCHER).

- Standards and Frameworks published by East Anglian Archaeology (Gurney 2003, Medlycott 2011)
- relevant Health & Safety guidelines and requirements (CAT 2018)
- the Project Brief issued by SCCAS (2018)
- The outline specification within *Requirements for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation* (SCCAS 2017a) to be used alongside the Project Brief.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Trained CAT staff will use a metal detector to scan all trenches both before and during excavation. The location of small finds will be recorded using the total station or by GPS. 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 trench and any features will be surveyed by Total Station, 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* unless there is a clear indication that the remains are in danger of being compromised as a result of their exposure, or unless directed to do so by SCCAS. 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.

All archaeological human remains excavated during the course of the evaluation will be sent to specialist Julie Curl for analysis and reporting.

Photographic record

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.

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:

prehistoric and Roman pottery: Matthew Loughton
post-Roman pottery: Howard Brooks
animal bones (small groups): Alec Wade / Adam Wightman
small finds, metalwork, coins, etc: Laura Pooley
flints: Adam Wightman
environmental processing: Robin Mathieson

or to outside specialists:

animal bones (large groups) and human remains: Julie Curl (*Sylvanus*)
environmental assessment and analysis: Val Fryer / Lisa Gray
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:

prehistoric and Roman pottery: Stephen Benfield
Roman brick/tile: Ernest Black
Roman glass: Hilary Cool
Prehistoric pottery: Paul Sealey
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 2017).

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* (English Heritage 2006).

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 2017).

If the finds are to remain with the landowner, 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.

Monitoring

SCCAS will be responsible for monitoring progress and standards throughout the project, and will be kept regularly informed during fieldwork, post-excavation and publication stages.

Notification of the start of work will be given SCCAS one week in advance of its commencement.

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.

Education and outreach

The CAT website (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. A magazine (*The Colchester Archaeologist Vol 28* out now) summarises all our sites and staff regularly give lectures to groups, societies and schools (a fee may apply). CAT also works alongside the 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

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|--|
| 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 | 2014 | <i>Health & Safety Policy</i> |
| CAT Report 1052 | 2016 | <i>Archaeological evaluation on land opposite Saracens Head, Sudbury Road, Newton, Suffolk, CO10 0QJ: December 2016</i> |
| CifA | 2008a | <i>Standard and Guidance for an archaeological evaluation</i> |
| CifA | 2008b | <i>Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials</i> |
| DCLG | 2012 | <i>National Planning Policy Framework</i> |
| Gurney, D | 2003 | <i>Standards for field archaeology in the East of England</i> . East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 14 (EAA 14). |
| English Heritage | 2006 | <i>Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE)</i> |
| Margary, I D | 1967 | <i>Roman roads in Britain</i> (2nd ed) |
| 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) |
| SCC | 2008 | <i>The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map, version 3</i> |
| SCCAS | 2010 | <i>Archive Guidelines</i> |
| SCCAS | 2012 | <i>Requirements for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation</i> (version 1.3) |
| SCCAS/CT | 2016 | <i>Brief for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation at Land opposite Saracens Head, Sudbury road, Newton</i> . Rachael Abraham, October 2016 |

L Pooley



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

tel: 01206 501785
email: lp@catuk.org




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



Fig 2 Development site in relation to nearby archaeological and historic sites as listed on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (listed buildings shown as orange circles)

Imagery ©2018 Google, Map data ©2018 Google
Data ©Suffolk Historic Environment Record



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: colchest3-335287

Project details

Project name	Archaeological evaluation at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton, Suffolk, CO10 0QH
Short description of the project	An archaeological evaluation (eight trial-trenches) was carried out at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton, Suffolk in advance of the construction of six new dwellings and associated infrastructure. The evaluation uncovered a medieval pit dated to 11th-13th century, two post-medieval ditches/pits and a modern path. It is possible that the path and post-medieval features relate to activity at the blacksmith's forge shown on early 20th-century OS mapping of the area, while the medieval pit is representative of an earlier phase of activity at the site which was possibly associated with activity on the historic Newton Green. Several undated features - four ditches, ten pits and a pit/posthole - were also revealed during the excavations.
Project dates	Start: 16-01-2019 End: 17-01-2019
Previous/future work	No / Not known
Any associated project reference codes	18/11j - Contracting Unit No.
Any associated project reference codes	B/17/01105/FUL - Planning Application No.
Any associated project reference codes	NEN 018 - HER event no.
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Current Land use	Residential 1 - General Residential
Monument type	DITCH Uncertain
Monument type	TREETHROW Uncertain
Monument type	PIT Uncertain
Monument type	PIT Medieval
Monument type	PIT/POSTHOLE Uncertain
Monument type	DITCH Post Medieval
Monument type	PATH Post Medieval

Monument type	PATH Modern
Significant Finds	POTTERY Medieval
Significant Finds	POTTERY Post Medieval
Significant Finds	QUERN STONE Uncertain
Significant Finds	IRON OBJECT Post Medieval
Significant Finds	IRON OBJECT Modern
Methods & techniques	""Sample Trenches""
Development type	Rural residential
Prompt	Planning condition
Position in the planning process	After full determination (eg. As a condition)

Project location

Country	England
Site location	SUFFOLK BABERGH NEWTON Red House Farm, Sudbury Road
Postcode	CO10 0QH
Study area	0.79 Hectares
Site coordinates	TL 913 409 52.032963983181 0.789166694642 52 01 58 N 000 47 21 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 62.83m Max: 64.11m

Project creators

Name of Organisation	Colchester Archaeological Trust
Project brief originator	HEM Team Officer, SCC
Project design originator	Laura Pooley
Project director/manager	Chris Lister
Project supervisor	Ben Holloway
Type of sponsor/funding body	Developer

Project archives

Physical Archive recipient	Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service
Physical Archive ID	NEN 018
Physical Contents	"Ceramics","Metal","other"
Digital Archive recipient	Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service
Digital Archive ID	NEN 018
Digital Media available	"Images raster / digital photography","Survey"

Paper Archive recipient	Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service
Paper Archive ID	NEN 018
Paper Media available	"Context sheet","Drawing","Photograph","Report"

Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	Archaeological evaluation at Red House Farm, Sudbury Road, Newton Green, Suffolk, CO10 0QU: January 2019
Author(s)/Editor (s)	Hicks, E.
Other bibliographic details	CAT Report 1371
Date	2019
Issuer or publisher	Colchester Archaeological Trust
Place of issue or publication	Colchester
Description	A4 loose-leaf ring-bound
URL	http://cat.essex.ac.uk
Entered by	Dr Elliott Hicks (eh2@catuk.org)
Entered on	8 February 2019

OASIS:

Please e-mail [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?id=342140> for this page

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