

**An archaeological excavation  
at the 'Skyline 120' business park,  
Great Notley, near Braintree, Essex  
January-February 2006**

**report prepared by  
Ben Holloway**

**commissioned by  
Andrew Martin Associates  
on behalf of  
Countryside Properties**

CAT project code: 06/3a  
ECC project code: GNB06  
Braintree Museum accession code: BRNTM 2006.7  
NGR: TL 7366 2171 (centre)



**Colchester Archaeological Trust**  
12 Lexden Road,  
Colchester,  
Essex CO3 3NF

*tel.:* (01206) 541051  
*tel./fax:* (01206) 500124  
*email:* [archaeologists@catuk.org](mailto:archaeologists@catuk.org)

**CAT Report 367**  
April 2006

## Contents

1	Summary	1
2	Introduction	1
3	Archaeological background	1
4	Aim	2
5	Results	2
6	Finds	3
7	Discussion and interpretation	14
8	Acknowledgements	15
9	References	15
10	Glossary	17
11	Archive deposition	17
	Appendix 1: table of finds	19
	Figures	after p 20
	EHER summary sheet	

## List of figures

- Fig 1 Site location.
- Fig 2 Excavation site location in relation to the 2005 evaluation trenching.
- Fig 3 Phased excavation plan.
- Fig 4 Aerial photograph of excavation site, facing north (© Essex County Council).
- Fig 5 Sections of enclosure ditches: sheet 1.
- Fig 6 Sections of enclosure ditches: sheet 2.
- Fig 7 Sections of of later Roman field boundaries, medieval/post-medieval field boundaries and pits.
- Fig 8 Profiles of post-holes.
- Fig 9 Pottery from inner enclosure ditch.
- Fig 10 Pottery from inner enclosure ditch, outer enclosure ditch and field ditches.

## List of tables

- Table 1: Roman pottery fabric codes and fabric names used in this report (after *CAR 10*, with additions).
- Table 2: Late Iron Age and Roman pottery fabrics from inner enclosure ditch and pottery form type.
- Table 3: Late Iron Age and Roman pottery fabrics from outer enclosure ditch and pottery form type.
- Table 4: proportions of Late Iron Age and Roman pottery fabrics from the pits by weight.
- Table 5: proportions of Late Iron Age and Roman pottery fabrics from the field ditches by weight.
- Table 6: charred plant macrofossils.
- Table 7: bone fragmentation.
- Table 8: bone identification.

## 1 Summary

*An area of 0.68ha was soil-stripped and excavated at the 'Skyline 120' business park at Great Notley, near Braintree in Essex. The principal discovery was an enclosure, probably a farmstead, which was established in the Late Iron Age and enlarged by the addition of an outer ditch in the later 1st or early 2nd century AD.*

*The farmstead probably continued in use into the 2nd century AD, when its east side was cut by a ditch on a different alignment. This probably indicates that the settlement had been abandoned by that time, and the land given over to agricultural or pastoral farming. Subsequent subdivision of the landscape is suggested by a field-boundary ditch which must be at least post 2nd century AD (but probably later) cut at right-angles to the 2nd-century Roman field ditch.*

*Finds other than pottery were not plentiful, but the presence of loomweights, briquetage and structural clay suggest a domestic settlement based on an agricultural economy. Heavy plough damage probably accounts for the absence of any identifiable structures apart from a few pits and post-holes, the latter probably forming parts of fence lines.*

*Glacial features (cut by the Late Iron Age/Roman enclosure ditches) were also identified.*

## 2 Introduction

**2.1** This is the archive report on an archaeological excavation carried out by the Colchester Archaeological Trust (CAT) at the 'Skyline 120' business park at Great Notley near Braintree in Essex at NGR TL 7366 2171 (centre), on behalf of Countryside Properties (Fig 1). The excavation was carried out between the 11th January and the 3rd February 2006.

**2.2** An area measuring 0.68ha was stripped under archaeological supervision, using mechanical excavators equipped with toothless ditching buckets. The site was stripped of topsoil and subsoil to the natural horizon, and any archaeological features or layers observed were investigated and recorded before being removed.

**2.3** All fieldwork was done in accordance with a specification agreed with the Essex County Council (ECC) Historic Environment Management (HEM) team officer.

**2.4** This report mirrors standards and practices contained in the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation* (IFA 1999) and *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (IFA 2001). Other sources used are *Management of archaeological projects* (MAP 2), and *Research and archaeology: a framework for the Eastern Counties 1. Resource assessment* (EAA 3), *Research and archaeology: a framework for the Eastern Counties 2. Research agenda and strategy* (EAA 8), and *Standards for field archaeology in the East of England* (EAA 14).

## 3 Archaeological background

The 'Skyline 120' business park at Great Notley is located close to a series of known cropmarks that formed field boundaries (Essex Historic Environment Record or EHER no 14171) and possible ditched trackways (EHER nos 9993 and 6501). The development site is south of the line of a Roman road which leads from Colchester to Braughing in Hertfordshire. This road may be regarded with some confidence as a British track which was straightened and metalled by Roman engineers in the years following the invasion of AD 43. The road is known as Stane Street in records from AD 1181 (EHER no 6502).

A fieldwalking survey was carried out across the current development site and part of Notley Garden Village before development in 1994. The fieldwalking did not record any particular concentrations of finds (Brooks 1994). Further fieldwalking carried out in 1997 in another part of Great Notley Garden Village produced little additional evidence; however, three concentrations of burnt flint were found at NGR

TL 7410 0264, TL 7410 2066 and TL 7416 2072. These concentrations may indicate areas of prehistoric activity or possibly settlement (Garwood 1997).

In addition to the fieldwalking surveys, an archaeological watching brief and evaluation consisting of 1400m of trenching was carried out by CAT between June and September 2005. Archaeological features were scattered thinly across the evaluation site and almost exclusively took the form of linear ditches or gullies, with a few pit-like features. The north and west areas of the evaluation site were particularly lacking in archaeological material or features. Ditches in the south-western corner of the evaluation site, ditches containing Late Iron Age and early Roman pottery indicated the proximity of a Late Iron Age and early Roman settlement (CAT Report 337).

#### **4 Aim**

The aim of the excavation was to determine the location and preserve by record any surviving archaeological remains that would otherwise be damaged or removed by the on-going development work.

#### **5 Results**

Figure 2 shows the location of the excavation site. In total, an area of 0.68ha was stripped from the site to a depth of 0.6m to 0.7m, using two 360° machines. In the first phase, the topsoil horizon (Layer or L1) was removed to expose the clay subsoil horizon (L2), and in the second phase, subsoil (L2) was removed to expose the natural boulder clay (L3), into which the archaeological features had been cut and against which they could be clearly seen.

Archaeological features were apparent across the whole of the excavation site, but the focus was a rectilinear, double-ditched enclosure (Fig 3). This consisted of an inner enclosure (defined by a number of ditches, ie Feature or F1, F2, F20, F22, F40, F42), measuring 50m east-west by 65m north-south and enclosing an area of 0.32ha, beyond which an outer enclosure was defined by other ditches running almost exactly parallel to the inner enclosure on its east and north sides (F23, and F22 in 2005 evaluation trench T5), but not exactly on its west side. The outer enclosure measured 68m by at least 84m (the south edge being off the excavation site), and enclosed an area of at least 0.57ha.

The pottery recovered from the ditch fills of the inner enclosure suggest a Late Iron Age or early Roman (pre-conquest) date for its establishment, whereas pottery from the fills of the outer enclosure ditches is slightly later, suggesting a later 1st-century (ie post-conquest) or early 2nd-century date for that phase. There was insufficient information from the position of sherds in lower and upper ditch fills to be absolutely certain whether or not the phase one ditch was still open when the phase two ditch was dug, but the pottery evidence is in favour of the phase one ditch being more or less completely infilled at the time when the phase two ditches were dug. However, there is no reason to see this as a break in activity. It is more likely that the farmstead was simply enlarged on the same site by the digging of an outer enclosure ditch.

The inner enclosure had opposed entrances on its north and south sides, positioned slightly west of an imaginary line drawn north-south through the enclosure. Although there was a cluster of features close to the west edge of the north entrance (F56-F58), these cannot be interpreted with any certainty as parts of a gate structure because of the absence of corresponding features on the east side of the entrance, and also because associated pottery indicates that they are actually contemporary with the phase two ditches. F56-F58 each contained a dense lens of burnt material in their lower fills.

As well as the features close to the north entrance, there were other features within the enclosure. Three groupings of post-holes (probably fence lines) were identified: group 1 (F11, F12, F13, F14, F19) in the southern half of the enclosure, group 2 (F47, F48, F49) in the north half of the enclosure, and group 3 (F28, F29,

F30, F31, F32) in between the phase one and phase two ditches F23 and F22. Two of these post-holes had been packed with sandstone chippings and may represent a later entrance way. None of these features produced datable material, so it is uncertain whether they are phase one or phase two(or both).

A series of other ditches post-dating the phase two enclosure was identified on the eastern side of the excavation site. These consisted of two north-south aligned ditches (F24 and F70, which are probably parts of the same ditch) and an east-west aligned ditch (F21). Although little dating material was recovered from the ditches, they cut both the 1st- or early 2nd-century ditch F23 (and also the earlier phase one ditch F22), indicating that they are later Roman or post-Roman in origin. East-west ditch F21 also cut north-south ditch F24, indicating that F21 is of a later phase than F24/F70. The simplest explanation of these features, which are on a different alignment to the phase one and phase two enclosures, is that they are later field boundaries, and not associated with the main enclosure.

As well as the man-made features described above, other features of natural origin were identified, mainly in the centre and western half of the site. These features (F5-F10, F17-F18, F41, F46, F54-F55, F71-F76, F79-F90) consist of irregularly-aligned short segments of a straight-sided, deep ditch. These features produced a small amount of datable material, and charcoal was present in their upper-middle fills, but their sporadic distribution and irregular alignment make it certain that they are 'ice wedges' formed as a result of glaciation (Fig 4).

Also distributed across the excavation site were a number of pits and post-holes which appear to be natural in origin. They produced little or no datable material, and are likely to be tree bowls. They generally occur outside the area defined by the enclosure ditches.

## 6 Finds

The finds from the excavation consisted of pottery, lithics, burnt flints and animal bone, mainly recovered from the fills of the enclosure ditches (F1-F2, F20, F22-F23, F40, F42-F43). Small finds include two fragments of probable quern, fragments of daub loomweights, and a modern iron object. A small quantity of cremated bone was also recovered from domestic hearth waste deposit F77, and from the upper fill of the southern ditch of the inner enclosure. The complete finds list is given below as Appendix 1.

### 6.1 Pottery

*by Stephen Benfield*

#### Introduction

The excavation produced just under 11 kg (10,983 g) of Late Iron Age and Roman pottery from stratified contexts. The vast majority of this pottery (10,389 g) came from the two enclosure ditches.

Where possible, pottery fabrics were recorded using the Roman pottery fabric type series devised for *CAR 10* in which all of the fabrics are recorded as two letter codes. The *CAR 10* pottery fabrics are almost entirely concerned with pottery of Roman date from large assemblages recovered from Colchester. They do not include significant quantities of pottery of Late Iron Age date or of pottery of Late Iron Age tradition which is adapting to Roman pottery techniques ('Romanising'). To include Late Iron Age and Romanising pottery fabrics additional to the *CAR 10* fabric series (designated by three- or four-letter fabric codes), new codes have been used. These are grog-tempered wares (Fabric GTW) and Romanising coarse wares (Fabrics RCW, RCVW and ROW). The additional fabrics are described below and full fabric names for each of the lettered fabric codes are given in Table 1.

**Table 1: Roman pottery fabric codes and fabric names used in this report (after *CAR 10* with additions).**

Fabric code	Fabric name
BA	plain samian forms
SG	south Gaulish plain samian
DJ	coarse oxidised and related wares
DZ	fine oxidised wares
GTW	grog-tempered wares
GX	other coarse wares, principally locally-produced grey wares
HD	shell-tempered and calcite-gritted wares
HZ	large storage jars and other vessels in heavily-tempered grey wares
GT	Fabric HZ with grog temper
KX	black-burnished ware (BB2) types in pale grey ware
RCW	Romanising coarse ware
RCW	Romanising coarse vesicular ware
ROW	Romanising oxidised ware

The pottery vessel forms were recorded using the Camulodunum (Cam) Roman pottery form type series (Hawkes & Hull 1947; Hull 1958). Samian vessels were recorded using Dragendorff (Dr) form numbers.

The pottery fabrics and the vessel forms present in each site context were recorded or each put in a numbered find bag. The number of sherds was recorded for each fabric together with the weight and the estimated vessel equivalent (eve).

#### **Fabrics and descriptions additional to CAR 10 fabrics used in this report**

Fabric GTW (grog-tempered wares)

Generally thick sherds, with patchy red-brown to dark-brown surfaces. Fabric contains various quantities of crushed fired clay (grog) and is grey to brown.

Fabric RCW (Romanising coarse ware)

Sherd thickness is generally medium-thin. Surfaces are dark grey-brown. The fabric is grey-brown with red-brown margins and contains fragments of burnt organic matter and grog. The fabric sometimes has a tendency to laminate.

Fabric RCVW (Romanising coarse vesicular ware)

Sherd thickness is generally medium-thin. Surfaces are pale brown to light grey and often appear abraded. The fabric is pale grey-brown and contains fragments of burnt organic matter and grog.

Fabric ROW (Romanising oxidised ware)

Surfaces are reddish-brown. The fabric is reddish-brown or has a brown-grey core with reddish-brown margins. The fabric contains sand, occasional fragments of burnt organic matter and may contain grog.

#### **Pottery from the ditch of the inner enclosure**

Just under 5.3 kg (5,289 g) of pottery was recovered from the ditch of the inner enclosure (phase one). The primary interest of this pottery is its date or date range. Pottery recorded as grog-tempered wares (Fabric GTW) accounts for approximately 90% of both the sherds recovered and the overall weight of the pottery (Table XXB). Grog-tempered wares are current over the period of the Late Iron Age and into the early Roman period, c 75-50 BC to c AD 50. The second most common fabric is shell-tempered ware (Fabric HD) which accounts for about 8% of the sherds from the ditch and about 3% by weight; however, it is probable that this is the remains of a single pot. Shell-tempered ware is current with grog-tempered wares, although it continued to be produced in the Roman period. This fabric is known to be one produced in south-Essex (Going 1987, fabric 50, p 10), and it is possible that the shell-tempered vessel (Fig 9.3) is a regional import from there. Pottery fabrics which almost certainly post-date the Roman conquest do occur (Fabrics DJ & GX); however, these are only present in very small quantities (Table 2).

A closer dating bracket for the assemblage is difficult. There are no Gaulish imports from the site which appeared in Britain after c 25 BC. However, the absence

of these imported wares is probably not significant among a small assemblage from a rural site, and the platter or dish (Fig 9.1) certainly dates to after their introduction, and may be early Roman in date. Also, of the two Camulodunum (Cam) vessels forms recorded (Table 2), both are present among the large pottery assemblage from the Sheepen site in Colchester, dated c AD 5-60/61 (Niblett 1985, 3). While both these forms were current from the Late Iron Age into the Roman period, it can be noted that one (Cam 254) is primarily of Late Iron Age date (CAR 10, 476). While Figure 9.9, and possibly Figure 9.13, approximate to the Camulodunum bowl form Cam 218, the absence of clear parallels for most of the recognisable vessels among the pottery types from Camulodunum is, for a rural assemblage from toward the north-west of the county, not necessarily significant in terms of dating, and need not suggest that the majority, or any, of the pottery pre-dates the early 1st century AD.

Commonly some of the sherds from a find bag were found to be parts of pots and could be fitted together. This demonstrates that they were broken close by and they can be confidently associated with the enclosure. The vessels represented are mostly bowls or bowl/jars including large storage jars. There are also a few cooking pots, possibly beakers and one example of a dish or platter. The large storage jars are unlikely to have been routinely moved about and again associate the pottery with activity in the enclosure. There are no fine wares amongst the assemblage, and the pots are all vessels that would usually be expected in a rural domestic setting in the Late Iron Age.

**Table 2: proportions of Late Iron Age and Roman pottery fabrics from inner enclosure ditch and pottery form types.**

Fabric	sherds	% sherds	weight (g)	% weight (g)	pottery forms recorded (number recorded if more than one)
DJ	1	0.2	2	<0.1	
GTW	411	89.0	4,960	93.8	Cam 270B
GX	9	1.9	68	1.3	
HD	36	7.8	163	3.1	
HZ	2	0.4	38	0.7	Cam 254
RCW	3	0.6	58	1.1	
<b>totals</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>5289</b>	<b>100.1</b>	

#### **Pottery from the ditch of the outer enclosure**

A total of 5.1 kg (5,100 g) of pottery was recovered from the ditch of the outer enclosure. As with the inner enclosure, the main interest surrounding the pottery is its date or date range. Most of the pottery from the outer enclosure ditch can be dated to the early Roman period of the 1st-early 2nd century AD. As with the inner enclosure ditch, no imports or fine wares were recovered in the assemblage.

The pottery from the outer ditch is dominated not by grog-tempered ware, but by pottery recorded as Romanising coarse wares (Fabrics RCW & RCVW), which accounts for about 70% of all sherds and just under 60% by weight of pottery from the ditch (Table 3). Romanising wares are thought to have arisen in the early Roman period from the adaptation of Late Iron Age potting techniques to Roman ones, and at Chelmsford are most common in the earliest Roman ceramic phase (period 1) dated c AD 60-80 (Going 1987, p 9, Fabric 45 & p 106). Also Roman sandy wares form only a small part of the assemblage, and while Late Iron Age grog-tempered wares make up between about 10% to 15% by sherd count and weight (Table 3), they are possibly even less significant than this figure would suggest as some may be residual. The beaker form Cam 108 (Fig 10.21) is unquestionably a post-conquest introduction. Also jars of form Cam 266 and bowls of form Cam 218 in Romanising fabric are almost certainly post-conquest (Table 3). All three of these forms are dated 1st-early 2nd century.

The composition of the pottery vessel types is very similar to that from the inner enclosure and again no fine ware imports present. The range of pottery types recovered consists mainly of bowls and jars including large storage jars, with a cooking pot (Cam 259), a platter (a footring sherd from F43 find 52) and also a beaker. Another drinking vessel may be represented by sherds in fine oxidised ware (Fabric DZ). The recovery of significant proportions of two pots from the ditch, a Cam 266 jar and Cam 218 bowl (F43 find 52 & 61, Fig 10.25 and Fig 10.24) demonstrates the association of the pottery with use in the enclosure, and the range of vessels suggests rural domestic occupation as with the inner enclosure ditch. One pot, a jar or bowl base in Fabric RCW (F43 find 61), had a post-firing hole bored through it. This is probably one of a group of holes bored through the bottom of the pot and the vessel may have been used during the process of cheese-making (Malim 2005, p 199-201 & fig 93).

**Table 3: proportions of Late Iron Age and Roman pottery fabrics from outer enclosure ditch and pottery form types.**

Fabric	sherds	% sherds	weight (g)	% weight (g)	pottery forms recorded (number recorded if more than one)
DZ	14	2.7	33	0.6	
GTW	63	12.0	775	15.2	Cam 218, Cam 259
GX	22	4.2	153	3.0	
HZ(GT)	61	11.7	1,234	24.2	
RCW	249	47.6	1,911	37.5	Cam 108, Cam 218 (2)
RCVW	114	21.8	994	19.5	Cam 266 (3)
<b>totals</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>5,100</b>	<b>100</b>	

#### Pottery from the pits

A combined total of 539 g of pottery was recovered from seven pits (Table 4). Although only two pits contained any significant quantity of pottery (F45, 232 g & F85, 192 g), the range of pottery fabrics represented within each pit allows certain points to be made. The most striking aspect is that all of the pits, with the possible exception of F59, contained a proportion of pottery that is, or is probably, of Roman date. Also, with the possible exception of F59, in none of the pits was grog-tempered ware (Fabric GTW) the overwhelmingly dominant fabric type as it was among the pottery from the inner enclosure ditch. This suggests that the pits are mostly associated with the Roman phase of the site. Also, one of the pits (F45) produced the only example of an imported fine ware recovered from the site. This is a samian cup of form Dr 27g (Fabric BA(SG)) which is of post-conquest, 1st-century date.

**Table 4: proportions of Late Iron Age and Roman pottery fabrics from the pits by weight.**

Fabric	F45 (wt g)	F56 (wt g)	F59 (wt g)	F62 (wt g)	F63 (wt g)	F64 (wt g)	F85 (wt g)
BA(SG)	12						
GTW	60		9				37
GX	71	24			10		39
HZ	28						
HZ(GT)			11				
RCW	61			13	43	1	116
ROW	0					4	
<b>total</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>192</b>



### Pottery from the field ditches

A small quantity of pottery (63 g) was recovered from two field ditches (F24 & F67) (Table 5). Almost all of the pottery (55 g) came from the ditch F67 and consisted of fabrics of Late Iron Age and early Roman date consistent with the pottery recovered from other features on the site. The single sherd (Fabric KX) from the ditch F24 is, however, different. It is from a dish of form Cam 38A (Fig 10.26), a black-burnished ware form type, which appeared in the early 2nd century and was current until the early 3rd century (*CAR 10*, 469), and as such is the latest-dated Roman pottery identified from the site. Its earliest possible date just about coincides with the end of the date ranges of some of the other pottery forms from the outer enclosure ditch (Cam 108, Cam 218 and Cam 266), and as such this sherd could indicate that occupation of the site extended into the early part of the 2nd century.

**Table 5: proportions of Late Iron Age and Roman pottery fabrics from the field ditches by weight.**

Fabric	F24 (wt g)	F67 (wt g)
GTW		28
GX		11
HZ		4
KX	8	
RCW		7
ROW		5
<b>total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>55</b>

### Discussion

Most of the pottery came from the fill of two enclosure ditches. The pottery from the inner ditch is predominantly of Late Iron Age date, c 75-50 BC-c AD 50, while the pottery from the outer enclosure ditch is predominantly early Roman, ie 1st-early 2nd century AD. The latest-dated Roman pottery from the site (which came from the fill of a later ditch feature) is a single sherd which dates to after the early 2nd century. Overall, the pottery for both the Late Iron Age and the early Roman periods is similar in the range of pottery vessels represented. The most common pots are bowls and jars, including large storage jars. With these are one or two examples of vessel types representing food preparation and consumption, ie cooking pots, beakers and platters, although no flagons were identified among the pottery. One jar or bowl with holes bored through its base may represent cheese-making. The only imported pottery recovered from the site is a samian cup, although a shell-tempered vessel may be a regional import from the south of the county. Amphoras and mortaria, which would represent some degree of wealthy consumption or Roman-style food tastes and preparation, were not present among the pottery assemblage. Overall, the pottery suggests a rural settlement of little wealth or status occupied from a period in the Late Iron Age and continuing in use into the early Roman period of the 1st-early 2nd century AD with little change.

### Illustrated pottery from the ditch of the inner enclosure

Fig 9.1 [F20 find 59] platter or dish with bead rim, two non-joining sherds in grey-brown fabric, with sparse fine dark grog, and dark grey-brown surface (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.2 [F20 find 59] cooking pot with internal bead rim, probably form Cam 254, two non-joining sherds in coarse fabric with common voids from dissolved or burnt out inclusions or temper, brown to red-brown fabric and very dark brown exterior surface (Fabric HZ)

Fig 9.3 [F40 find 26] cooking pot with faint bead and internally thickened rim, three non joining rim sherds with other non-joining sherds and fragments probably from the body of this vessel, very dark-brown fabric with abundant shell fragments, patchy brown to very dark-brown surfaces (Fabric HD)

Fig 9.4 [F20 find 59] bowl, single sherd, dark grey-brown fabric with dark grog and red-brown margins, very dark brown burnished surface (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.5 [F2 find 57] jar or bowl with cordon on shoulder below rim, four joining sherds, dark brown sandy fabric with dark and sparse red-brown grog, fabric margins lighter red-brown, dark-brown surface (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.6 [F40 find 60] beaker, single sherd, grey fabric with common fine dark grog and thin red-brown margins, dark-brown to very dark-brown surfaces (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.7 [F20 find 34] jar or bowl rim with internal groove behind top of rim, single sherd, grey fabric with dark grog, surfaces red-brown to dark-brown (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.8 [F22 find 11] jar or bowl, single sherd, sandy dark grey-brown fabric with black burnt organic fragments and sparse fine dark grog, surfaces dark grey-brown (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.9 [F20 find 59] carinated bowl with three cordons, three joining sherds, grey fabric, containing dark grog, with red margins and patchy red-brown to dark brown surfaces (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.10 [F20 find 43] bowl with groove around girth of body just above carination, six joining sherds, sandy fabric with grey core with red-brown margins, contains fine dark grog and sparse black burnt organic fragments, surfaces brown to dark-brown (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.11 [F20 find 59] jar or bowl base with small footring at edge, grey-brown fabric with red-brown margins, contains sparse black burnt organic fragments and fine dark grog, surfaces patchy dark-brown to red-brown (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.12 [F20 find 4] base with footring from a jar or bowl, dark-brown fabric with fine red-brown and dark grog, very dark brown surface (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.13 [F22 find 11] bowl with rippled shoulder, single sherd, sandy fabric, brown to red-brown, with sparse dark grog and sparse black burnt organic fragments, surfaces abraded, surface colour is red-brown to dark-brown (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.14 [F42 find 58] large bowl (exact measurement of vessel diameter difficult) with bulge below neck, eight sherds most of which join, brown to red-brown fabric with dark grog and patchy red-brown to dark brown surfaces (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.15 [F20 find 59] large storage jar, two joining sherds, dark-brown to red-brown surfaces, red-brown fabric with red-brown grog, rare dark grog and occasional dark burnt organic fragments (Fabric GTW)

Fig 9.16 [F20 find 59] large storage jar form Cam 270B, two joining sherds, rather soft red-brown fabric with red-brown grog the same colour as the fabric and very dark brown surface (Fabric GTW)

Fig 10.17 [F20 find 43] large storage jar, sherds from rim and neck, fabric grey-brown with thin red-brown margins, heavily tempered with red-brown and dark grog, surfaces dark brown (Fabric GTW)

Fig 10.18 [F20 find 4] large storage jar with cordon below neck, five joining sherds, red-brown fabric with coarse red-brown grog, surfaces patchy red-brown with dark-brown rim (Fabric GTW)

### **Illustrated pottery from the ditch of the outer enclosure**

Fig 10.19 [F43 find 61] jar, single sherd, fabric brown with burnt black organic fragments and some dark grog, and red-brown margins, surface very dark brown (Fabric RCW)

Fig 10.20 [F43 find 61] bowl or jar, single sherd, grey fabric with dark grog and red-brown margin below external surface, surface very dark brown (Fabric GTW)

Fig 10.21 [F43 find 61] beaker decorated with comb stabbing, form Cam 108, body sherd, dark grey fabric with black burnt organic fragments and thin red-brown margin below external surface, surface dark grey-brown (Fabric RCW)

Fig 10.22 [F43 find 46] large narrow neck jar, five joining sherds, grey fabric with dark grog and sparse black burnt organic fragments, surfaces brown (Fabric GTW)

Fig 10.23 [F43 find 52] cooking pot with bead rim, single sherd, coarse fabric with dark and red-brown grog, surface very dark brown (Fabric HZ(GT))

Fig 10.24 [F43 find 46] jar form Cam 218, rim and shoulder, with many similar sherds from body and base probably all from one pot, although much of pot missing, grey fabric and surfaces with sparse inclusions of black burnt organic fragments, abraded (Fabric RCW)

Fig 10.25 [F43 find 52] jar form Cam 266, joining rim and shoulder sherds, also many similar non joining body sherds assumed to be part of the same vessel so that much of the pot is present, grey fabric with common fragments of black burnt organic matter, dark brown to dark grey-brown surfaces, abraded (Fabric RCVW)

#### **Illustrated pottery from the field ditch F24**

Fig 10.26 [ F24 find 24] dish form Cam 38A, plain, abraded sherd in gritty dark grey sandy fabric, surface very dark grey, abraded (Fabric KX).

## **6.2 Small finds**

*by Nina Crummy*

The assemblage is small and most items date from the Late Iron Age or early Roman periods, but one is post-medieval or modern. The objects consist of small fragments of triangular loom weights, structural clay, and briquetage, a fragment of a saddle quern which appears to have been recycled as building stone, two further pieces of stone, and a fragment of iron.

Triangular loomweights are typical of Iron Age sites and here almost certainly date to the Late Iron Age or early Roman occupation of the site. Weights of this type continued in use for some decades after the Roman invasion of AD 43, before technological and economic change brought about the decline of the use of the warp-weighted loom and the establishment of a supply of factory-made cloth.

Only one very small fragment of structural clay was recovered, distinguished from the loomweights by a void left by a piece of planed timber and by the use of chaff tempering instead of grit or small pebbles. As it has been fired, it presumably derives from an oven or kiln that incorporated timber into the framework, probably for the straight-sided lower walls or at the sides of the entrance.

The only piece of salt briquetage is extremely small, but adds to the increasing body of evidence for the transport of salt containers as well as their contents inland from the coastal manufacturing sites (Rodwell 1979; Rigby & Foster 1986, 188; Barford 1990, 79-80; Sealey 1995). Perhaps briquetage troughs were simply the best method of transporting traded salt or even fish preserved in salt, a possible side product of the coastal red hills, perhaps they provide evidence for salt production as a seasonal occupation, or perhaps, as has been suggested with reference to briquetage from Kelvedon, raw salt-cakes were acquired at the coast to be refined inland (Hawkes & Hull 1947, 347; Fawn *et al* 1990, 33; Rodwell 1979, 159-60, 172; Eddy 1982, 26).

A fragment of sandstone from a Roman field ditch has the typical dished wear of a saddle quern, probably originally made from a glacial erratic, but it also has two worked edges, suggesting that its final use involved adaptation as building stone, which has always been in short supply in the region. Two quartzite blocks were probably used for paving, and one is also scored on both faces and may have been used as a sharpening stone; again both may have come from larger glacial erratics.

The latest object is a fragment of iron from a medieval or post-medieval pit. The low level of corrosion on this object suggests a late post-medieval date.

#### **Fired clay**

SF 5a. (4) F20 section 1. Late Iron Age/early Roman enclosure ditch. Ten fragments from one or more fired clay triangular loomweights; only two pieces fit together. The fabric is hard, with some fine grits and voids left by small pebbles, and shows the lines of torsion formed during manufacture. It has fired externally to a dull buff-orange, and internally is reduced to grey-black. One fragment is from a blunt apex and is marked by a broad saddle. Another with no external surfaces surviving retains a small part of a perforation. Total weight 291 g.

Saddles have been recorded on weights ranging in date from the Early to the Late Iron Age on sites such as Gussage All Saints, Dorset, Winnall Down, Hampshire, and Maxey, Cambridgeshire, and West Stow, Suffolk (Wainwright 1979, fig 76, 4020; Bates & Winham 1985, fig 70, 4, 8; Crowther 1985, 174-9; West 1990, fig 51, 144c). In Essex they have been noted at North Shoebury, Ardale, Slough House Farm, Orsett 'Cock', Ardleigh, and Stanway (Wymer & Brown 1995, fig 84, 8; Major 1988, fig 81, 4; Major 1998a, 162; Major 1998b, 106, fig 69, 1, 4; Major 1999, 158; Crummy forthcoming).

SF 6. (56) F85. Late Iron Age/early Roman pit. Four small fragments of fired clay, tempered with small pieces of chalk. Probably from a loomweight. Total weight 20 g.

(27) F45. Late Iron Age/early Roman pit. Small fragment of fired clay with hard gritty fabric fired to orange internally and brown externally. Weight 17 g. Probably part of a loomweight, but the surface is rougher than usual.

(27) F45. Late Iron Age/early Roman pit. Tiny fragment of salt briquetage, in typically pinky-brown fabric, with voids from vegetable tempering. Weight 1 g.

SF 5b. (4) F20 section 1. Late Iron Age/early Roman enclosure ditch. Small fragment of fired clay with smooth internal surface from contact with a piece of planed timber 18 mm wide and a minimum of 5 mm thick. The fabric is hard and fired orange, with a single piece of chaff from vegetable tempering visible. Maximum dimensions 39 by 30 mm, maximum surviving thickness 12 mm. Weight 11 g. Possibly from the opening to an oven or kiln with a timber and wattle frame.

### Stone objects

SF 1. (25) F24. Roman field ditch. Fragment of sandstone with one straight and one slightly curved worked edge. One surface is quite rough, the other smooth and dished. Probably part of an Iron Age, or earlier, saddle quern trimmed for use as building stone. Maximum dimensions 85 by 89 mm, 45 mm thick.

SF 2. (19). Unstratified. Roughly lozenge-shaped quartzite block, probably cut for use as a paving stone, though only one edge is worked to a fully smooth finish. Both surfaces are smooth, but one is more weathered or worn than the other. Both are lightly and randomly scored, and may have seen secondary use for sharpening iron bladed tools. Maximum dimensions 170 by 123 mm, 45 mm thick.

SF 4. (52) F43. Late Iron Age/early Roman enclosure ditch. Quartzite block with one surface worked flat and smooth, the others are rough and the base is partly rounded. Two contiguous edges are straight and fairly smooth, and are set at an obtuse angle to each other. Probably intended for use as paving. Maximum dimensions 141 by 98 mm, 67 mm thick.

### Iron object

SF 3. (32) F59. Medieval or post-medieval pit. Fragment of sheet iron, 55 by 40 mm, 6 mm thick. The degree and colour of the corrosion suggests a late post-medieval or modern date.

### Lithics

In total, three lithics were recovered from the excavation, from pit feature F77, inner enclosure ditch F2 Sx 2 and from natural 'ice wedge' feature F41 Sx 2. These consist of a secondary flake, a tertiary flake with some evidence of re-touch along its edges, and a broken scraper. The lithics appear to be either damaged or wasters. The scraper is broken at its distal end, which would account for it being discarded. The secondary flake has a hinge fracture, indicating that it broke away abruptly from the core when they were struck. This would explain why, like the scraper, it was discarded. The tertiary flake, also has evidence of hinge fracture although there is evidence of some minor re-touching along the flakes leading edge indicating that the lithic was used rather than immediately discarded. Lithics recovered from the Great Notley site occur in both natural and roman contexts. This would appear to indicate that the material was in the case of the Roman contexts residual in the plough soil and the flakes were deposited as the features silted. The scraper was recovered from a natural context, this would indicate that the lithic was also residual in the ground eventually working its way into the fill as the feature silted.

### **Burnt flint/stone**

In total, 259 g of burnt flint fragments and stone was recovered from the excavation. The material was deposited in two contexts, a pit (F45) and the western inner enclosure ditch (F20). Material of this type is usually associated with hearths. The finds locations are consistent with disposal of hearth material (in domestic rubbish pits or ditches), this may indicate the presence of nearby settlement.

## **6.3 Environmental analysis**

*by Val Fryer*

### **An assessment of the charred plant macrofossils and other remains from the 'Skyline 120' business park, Great Notley, near Braintree in Essex (GNBP 06)**

#### **Introduction and method statement**

Excavations at the business park, undertaken by CAT in February 2006, revealed pits and deposits of probable Late Iron Age to early Roman date. Samples for the extraction of the plant macrofossil assemblages were taken from fills within seven pits, and from a discrete deposit within feature F77.

The samples were processed by manual water flotation/washover, and the flots were collected in a 500-micron mesh sieve. The dried flots were scanned under a binocular microscope at magnifications up to x 16, and the plant macrofossils and other remains noted are listed on Table 6. Nomenclature within the table follows Stace (1997). All plant remains were charred. The non-floating residues were collected in a 1mm-mesh sieve and sorted when dry. All artefacts/ecofacts were returned to the Colchester Archaeological Trust for analysis.

#### **Results**

##### *Plant macrofossils*

With the exception of charcoal fragments, plant macrofossils were generally extremely rare. Preservation was moderately good, although most grains were puffed and distorted, possibly as a result of combustion at high temperatures. However, sample 7 did contain large quantities of wheat chaff, including a particularly high density of spelt wheat (*Triticum spelta*) glume bases. Oat (*Avena* sp.) and wheat grains were also noted, the latter mostly being of an elongated 'drop-form' shape typical of spelt. In addition, a small number of seeds of common cereal crop contaminants, including brome (*Bromus* sp.), fat hen (*Chenopodium album*), small legumes (Fabaceae) and small grasses (Poaceae), was also recorded. A single large sedge (*Carex* sp.) fruit was noted within sample 3 from the fill of pit F56.

Charcoal fragments were abundant throughout, and other plant macrofossils included pieces of charred root/stem and indeterminate buds and inflorescence fragments.

##### *Other materials*

Small fragments of black porous and tarry material were noted within all but sample 3, all probably being derived from the combustion of organic remains at very high temperatures. Other remains included fragments of bone, burnt or fired clay, burnt stone and pottery.

#### **Conclusions and recommendations for further work**

Although charcoal fragments were present within all the pit assemblages, little else was recovered to indicate what function the pits may have fulfilled. However, the assemblages from F26, F53 and F56 (samples 1, 2 and 3) were sufficiently large to suggest that they may have been discrete deposits of fuel waste, which were placed within an available open feature. The few other remains recorded from the pit fills were almost certainly accidental inclusions, possibly in the form of wind-blown detritus.

Sample 7, from feature F77, is unique amongst the current samples, as it contains a high density of probable cereal-processing waste. Wheat chaff is abundant, along with a small number of grains and some common segetal weed seeds. F77 also contained a large number of fragments of burnt animal bone, and it would appear most likely that the assemblage is derived from hearth waste. Cereal chaff was

commonly used as kindling or fuel for a range of domestic and light industrial purposes, and it may even have been traded as fuel during the Roman period (Van der Veen 1999).

Although sample 7 does contain sufficient material for quantification, the analysis of a single sample in isolation is unlikely to add significant data to the overall interpretation of the site and its component features. The regional/national significance of the assemblage is also minimal as numerous contemporary parallels are recorded. Therefore, no further analysis is required, although it is recommended that a written summary of this assessment is included within any publication of data from the site.

#### Key to table

x = 1-10 specimens    xx = 10-100 specimens    xxx = 100+ specimens  
b = burnt            ss = sub-sample            Dep. = deposit

**Table 6: charred plant macrofossils.**

Sample no	1	2	3	4
<b>Context no</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Feature no</b>	<b>F26</b>	<b>F53</b>	<b>F56</b>	<b>F57</b>
<b>Feature type</b>	<b>pit</b>	<b>pit</b>	<b>pit</b>	<b>pit</b>
<b>Cereals</b>				
<i>Avena sp. (grains)</i>				
(awn fragments)			x	
<i>Triticum sp. (grains)</i>				
(glume bases)				
(spikelet bases)				
(rachis internodes)				
<i>T. dicoccum</i> Schubl. (glume bases)				
<i>T. spelta</i> L. (glume bases)				x
Cereal indet. (grains)				x
(sprout fragments)				
<b>Herbs</b>				
<i>Bromus sp.</i>				
<i>Chenopodium album</i> L.				
Fabaceae indet.				
Small Poaceae indet.				
<i>Vicia/Lathyrus sp.</i>			x	
<b>Wetland plants</b>				
<i>Carex sp.</i>			x	
<b>Other plant macrofossils</b>				
Charcoal <2mm	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
Charcoal >2mm	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
Charred root/stem			x	x
Indet. buds				
Indet. inflorescence fragments				x
Indet. seeds				
Mineralised root channels			x	x
<b>Other materials</b>				
Black porous 'cokey' material	x			x
Black tarry material		x		
Bone			x	
Burnt/fired clay	x		x	
Burnt stone	x		x	
?Pottery	x		x	
Small coal fragments				
<b>Sample volume (litres)</b>	<b>20ss</b>	<b>20ss</b>	<b>20ss</b>	<b>20ss</b>
<b>Volume of flot (litres)</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.1</b>
<b>% flot sorted</b>	<b>12.50%</b>	<b>12.50%</b>	<b>12.50%</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 6.4 Cremated bone by Francesca Boghi

### Introduction

Cremated human skeletal remains from two features were received for analysis. The material derives from an excavation carried out by CAT at the business park site at Great Notley near Braintree in Essex. The two features, F77 and F2, were both dated to the Late Iron Age/early Roman period and were interpreted respectively as a domestic hearth waste deposit and the fill of an inner enclosure ditch.

### Methodology

The analysis of the cremated bone followed the guidelines drafted by McKinley (2004).

### Results

A total of 29g of cremated bone from two features was present in this sample. The bone in both contexts appears fully oxidised, as indicated by the predominantly white colour and by the extensive fissuring, cracking and warping of the bone fragments. The buff/white colour of the bone with small amounts of blue/grey areas indicates that a temperature in excess of 600° was reached during the cremation process. The bone in both context comprised a large proportion of fragments over 10mm (Table 7).

**Table 7: bone fragmentation.**

feature	residue	2mm	5mm	10mm	max fragment size (mm)	total (g)
F2	0g	0g	2g	7g	33	9
F77	0g	0g	2g	18g	53	20

In F77, 14 g of bone (70%) were identified as animal bone (cattle; Julie Curl pers comm). The rest of the assemblage (6 g) could not be positively identified as either human or animal, due to the small quantity and heavy fragmented nature of the fragments, although it may be interpreted as probably animal as it had the typical texture of animal bone. In F2, 2 g of bone (22%) were identified as animal bone (sheep or cattle; Julie Curl pers comm), whilst the rest of the fragments was animal in texture but could not be identified (Table 8).

**Table 8: bone identification.**

feature	human	%	animal	%	unidentified	%	total (g)
F2	0g	0	2	22.2	7g	77.7	9
F77	0g	0	14	70.0	6g	30.0	20

### Summary and conclusion

Cremated animal and unidentified bone were recovered from the site. The bone cremated remains could represent evidence for cremated burials at or near this site. The remains in F2, a ditch fill, could represent the disturbance of an earlier burial deposit (possibly a burial pit containing pyre debris). The remains in F77, contained in a charcoal-rich matrix from a feature with scorched edges, could represent the evidence for a *pyre/bustum* burial. However, as none of the bone fragments in either feature could be positively identified as human, it is not possible to prove the burial nature of these deposits. As the full oxidisation of animal bone can also be obtained through deliberate or accidental burning, it is, therefore, equally possible that the bone in these contexts could also represent burnt domestic refuse or residues of domestic cooking.

## 7 Discussion and interpretation

This excavation shows that a relatively small number of features and finds can actually be both interesting and important. The site was dominated by a Late Iron Age and early Roman rectangular enclosure (see site plan Fig 3 and aerial photograph Fig 4).

The enclosure is actually of two phases, but two phases of a continuous period of occupation rather than two distinct episodes.

Phase one consists of a Late Iron Age enclosure formed by an inner ditch (F1, F2, F20, F22, F40, F42). Two opposed entrance ways were identified, in the north and south sides of the enclosure. Pottery from the fill of the inner ditch is almost exclusively pre-conquest, suggesting that the phase one enclosure was created before AD 43. The pottery and other finds are consistent with domestic activity, and the querns and loomweights suggest a combination of arable and pastoral farming.

Although there was limited evidence of internal structures, two clusters of undated post-holes (groups 1 and 2) and fragments of fired clay indicate the possibility of buildings. Also, the alignment of the posts suggests fence lines within the enclosure, possibly stock pens. The types of materials associated with phase one are all indicative of Late Iron Age domestic activity, such as loomweights, large quantities of storage jars, domestic pottery and hearth waste containing burnt faunal remains, all of which was dumped into the enclosure ditches.

The pottery assemblage gives an insight into the status of the settlement. The material consists of locally-produced pottery with examples of Camulodunum forms also found at the Sheepen site in Colchester, as well as grog- and shell-tempered wares from southern Essex. No imported fine wares were identified in the phase one material, although this is not necessarily an important feature in an assemblage from a rural site (it may indicate relatively low status).

The phase two occupation is marked by the construction of the outer ditch in the later 1st century AD or possibly as late as the early 2nd century AD. This appears to indicate a reorganisation of the settlement in the years following the Roman conquest, although there is no indication of a break in the continuity of occupation. The area occupied by the enclosure was expanded from 0.31ha to 0.57ha by the digging of the outer (phase two) ditches F23 and F43. The northern and southern ditches were not identified in the current excavation, but the northern ditch of the phase two enclosure was seen in the 2005 evaluation (as F22 in evaluation trench 5: CAT Report 337). The pottery from the outer (phase two) enclosure ditch dates to the 1st to early 2nd century AD. As with phase one, the assemblage consists of domestic material. Evidence of internal structure was limited to a concentration of post-holes (group 3; F28-F32). Two of these post-holes had been packed using sandstone, although, as in phase one, the alignment of the post-holes suggests fences rather than buildings. Further evidence of structural material consisted of fragments of sandstone and quartzite. The sandstone was a fragment of saddle quern which had been trimmed to be used as building stone, whereas the quartzite had been shaped to be used as paving. In addition to the post-holes, there was a cluster of pits (F45, F56, F57, F58), the material from which can be dated to phase 2. The pitting was centred around the north entrance of the (backfilled?) phase one enclosure. The pits contained large amounts of burnt material with evidence of scorching around the edges, indicating *in situ* burning. Pottery from these features is domestic in nature and is likely to represent the disposal of waste rather than any ritual deposit. Burnt faunal material identified in pit feature F77 is indicative of hearth waste rather than the originally suspected cremation deposit and is further indication of the domestic nature of the deposits and the close proximity of settlement. This feature also contains large amounts of cereal, possibly brewing waste. The pottery assemblage from the phase two enclosure consists of predominantly locally-produced material dated to the 1st or early 2nd century AD. It contained no imported fine wares, indicating that the site remained relatively low status in the early Roman period. The pottery also indicates that the site appears to have gone out of use and been abandoned in the 2nd century.

Later Roman activity is represented by field-boundary ditches F24, F67 and F70 (phase three). The majority of the pottery from these ditch fills was of early Roman date, consistent with that associated with phase two. However, a sherd from F24 is



dated to the early 2nd-early 3rd century. As ditch F24 cuts the outer (phase two) enclosure ditch F23, this may be the date by which the enclosure had been abandoned, and at which the land began to be reorganised into parcels of agricultural land. Three parcels of such land can be identified (Fig 3), and gaps between ditches F24 and F70 and between F70 and F67 may indicate entranceways into the newly-created fields.

The enclosure was probably the site of a farmstead, and the finds indicate that both pastoral and arable farming were taking place nearby. In recent years, a number of Late Iron Age or early Roman sites have been excavated in Essex which may afford parallels to the Great Notley enclosure. Perhaps the closest parallel is the site at Abbotstone field, Stanway, where in period 2, phase 2 (late 1st century AD to early 2nd century AD), two square ditched enclosures were created. As with Great Notley, no structural remains were recorded in either enclosure, although finds would suggest that people were living and working on the site, farming, and producing textiles and metalwork (CAT Report 312). Another parallel in terms of its date and rectangular shape would be the Late Iron Age ACS enclosure at Stansted Airport (Havis & Brooks 2004, 528). This contained the remains of twelve circular structures grouped around a central ritual structure, all within a ditched enclosure of roughly the same size as Great Notley phase two. Perhaps the Stansted example shows how much structural evidence can survive if a site is not as heavily plough-damaged as the site at Great Notley appears to have been.

Evidence of post-Roman activity on the site is very limited (phase four). It consists of two features, a post-medieval pit F59 at the northern edge of the site, and an undated ditch feature F21 running along the southern edge. The pit F59 was agricultural in nature and contained some evidence of burning, as well as a fragment of post-medieval iron sheet likely to be from agricultural machinery. The ditch F21 cannot be closely dated, due to a lack of finds. However, it does cut several earlier features, which indicates that it belongs to a further reorganisation of the old field systems, possibly in the medieval or later period (Fig 3).

The farmstead excavated at the 'Skyline 120' business park represents the continuity of a rural settlement of comparatively low status from the Late Iron Age to the early Roman period, and its eventual abandonment in the early 2nd century. Subsequently, the land was reorganised into parcels of agricultural land, the boundary ditches of which cut across the site of the earlier enclosure. The site remained as either agricultural or pastoral land into the post-medieval and modern periods.

## 8 Acknowledgements

The Colchester Archaeological Trust would like to thank Countryside Properties for commissioning and funding the work via Andrew Martin Associates. The project was monitored by Vanessa Clarke, Essex County Council Historic Environment Management team officer. The site work was supervised by Ben Holloway, assisted by Chris Lister, and carried out by Catriona Bell, Lawrence Driver, Nicky Garland, Mariusz Gorniak, Brian Hurrell and Emma Sanford.

## 9 References

- |                           |      |  |
|---------------------------|------|--|
| Barford, P M              | 1990 | 'Briquetage finds from inland sites', in Fawn <i>et al</i> 1990, 79-80   |
| Bates, P J, & Winham, R P | 1985 | 'Loomweights', in <i>The prehistoric settlement at Winnall Down, Winchester</i> , by P J Fasham, Hampshire Field Club Monograph, 2                         |
| Brooks, H                 | 1994 | A fieldwalking survey of Great Notley Garden Village: business park, Howard Brooks Archaeological Services unpublished report                              |
| CAR 7                     | 2000 | <i>Colchester Archaeological Report 7: Post-Roman pottery from excavations in Colchester, 1971-85</i> , by J Cotter  |
| CAR 10                    | 1999 | <i>Colchester Archaeological Report 10: Roman pottery from excavations in Colchester, 1971-86</i> , by R P Symonds and S Wade, ed by P Bidwell and A Croom |

CAT Report 312		Excavations at Abbotstone field, Bell House Pit, Tarmac Colchester Quarry, Warren Lane, Colchester, Essex, unpublished CAT archive report, by Laura Pooley, 2005
CAT Report 337		An archaeological watching brief and evaluation at great Notley business park, near Braintree, Essex, unpublished CAT archive report, by Kate Orr, 2005
Crowther, D R	1985	'The other finds', in <i>Archaeology and environment in the Lower Welland Valley 1</i> , by F Pryor & C French, East Anglian Archaeology, <b>27</b> , 163-95
Crummy, N	forth-coming	'Loomweights', in <i>Stanway: excavations at Colchester Quarry (Stanway Hall Farm), Colchester, Essex, 1987-2003</i> , by Crummy <i>et al</i>
EAA 3	1997	<i>Research and archaeology: a framework for the Eastern Counties 1. Resource assessment</i> , East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers, <b>3</b> , ed by J Glazebrook
EAA 8	2000	<i>Research and archaeology: a framework for the Eastern Counties 2. Research agenda and strategy</i> , East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers, <b>8</b> , ed by N Brown & J Glazebrook
EAA 14	2003	<i>Standards for field archaeology in the East of England</i> , East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers, <b>14</b> , ed by D Gurney
Eddy, M	1982	<i>Kelvedon: the origins and development of a Roman small town</i>
Fawn, A J, Evans, K A, McMaster, I, & Davies, G M R Going, C	1990    1987	<i>The Red Hills of Essex</i>    <i>The mansio and other sites in the south-eastern sector of Caesaromagus: the Roman pottery</i> , CBA, Research Report, <b>62</b>
Havis, R, & Brooks, H	2004	<i>Excavations at Stansted Airport 1986-91</i> , East Anglian Archaeology, <b>107</b>
Hawkes, C F C, & Hull, M R	1947	<i>Camulodunum</i> , RRCSAL, <b>14</b>
Hull, M R	1958	<i>Roman Colchester</i> , RRCSAL, <b>20</b>
IFA	1999	<i>Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation</i>
IFA	2001	<i>Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials</i>
Major, H	1988	'Baked and fired clay objects', in <i>Archaeology and environment in South Essex: rescue archaeology along the Grays by-pass, 1979/80</i> , by T J Wilkinson, East Anglian Archaeology, <b>42</b> , 94-7
Major, H	1998a	'Objects of baked clay', in <i>Archaeology and the landscape in the Lower Blackwater Valley</i> , by S Wallis & M Waughman, East Anglian Archaeology, <b>82</b> , 160-63
Major, H	1998b	'Fired clay', in <i>Excavations at the Orsett 'Cock' enclosure, Essex, 1976</i> , by G A Carter, East Anglian Archaeology, <b>86</b> , 106-110
Major, H	1999	'Fired clay', in <i>The archaeology of Ardleigh, Essex: excavations 1955-80</i> , by N R Brown, East Anglian Archaeology, <b>90</b> , 157
MAP 2	1991	<i>Management of archaeological projects</i> , 2nd edition (English Heritage)
McKinley, J I	2004	'Compiling a skeletal inventory: cremated human bone', in <i>Guidelines to the standards for recording of human remains</i> , ed by M Brickley and J McKinley, Reading: British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology/Institute of Field Archaeologists, 9-13
Malim, T	2005	<i>Stonea and the Roman fens</i>
Niblett, R	1985	<i>Sheepen, an early Roman industrial site at Camulodunum</i> , CBA, Research Report, <b>57</b>
Rigby, V, & Foster, J	1986	'Building materials', in <i>Baldock, the excavation of a Roman and pre-Roman settlement, 1968-72</i> , by I M Stead & V Rigby, Britannia Monograph, British series, <b>7</b> , 183-8

Rodwell, W	1979	'Iron Age and Roman salt-winning on the Essex coast', in <i>Invasion and response</i> , ed by B C Burnham and H B Johnson, BAR, <b>73</b> , 133-75
Sealey, P R	1995	'New light on the salt industry and Red Hills of prehistoric and Roman Essex', in <i>Essex Archaeol Hist</i> , <b>26</b> , 65-81
Stace, C	1997	<i>New flora of the British Isles</i> , second edition, Cambridge University Press
Van der Veen, M	1999	'The economic value of chaff and straw in arid and temperate zones', in <i>Vegetation History and Archaeobotany</i> , <b>8</b> , 211-24
Wainwright, G J	1979	<i>Gussage All Saints: an Iron Age settlement in Dorset</i> , DoE Archaeological Report, <b>10</b>
West, S	1990	<i>West Stow: the prehistoric and Romano-British occupation</i> , East Anglian Archaeology, <b>48</b>
Wymer, J J, & Brown, N	1995	<i>North Shoebury: settlement and economy in south-east Essex</i> , East Anglian Archaeology, <b>75</b>

## 10 Glossary

CBM	ceramic building material
context	either a feature, layer or a complex of layers/features
feature	an identifiable thing like a pit, a wall, a drain, a floor; can contain 'contexts'
HEM	historic environment management officer
IFA	Institute of Field Archaeologists
Iron Age	the period from c 700 BC to AD 43
layer	distinct or distinguishable deposit of soil
medieval	period from AD 1066 to Henry VIII
modern	period from the 19th century onwards to the present
natural	geological deposit undisturbed by human activity
NGR	National Grid Reference
post-medieval	after Henry VIII to around the late 18th century
prehistoric	prehistoric the period before written record, ie till AD 43 in Britain
roman	the period AD 43 to AD 410
U/S	unstratified material recovered from spoilheap

## 11 Archive deposition

The paper and digital archive is held by the Colchester Archaeological Trust at 12 Lexden Road, Colchester, Essex CO3 3NF, but it will be permanently deposited with Braintree Museum under accession code BRNTM 2006.7.

© Colchester Archaeological Trust 2006

### Distribution list:

Kate Ritchie, Andrew Martin Associates  
David Zimber, Countryside Properties  
Vanessa Clarke, Essex County Council Historic Environment Management team officer  
Essex Historic Environment Record, Essex County Council



**Colchester Archaeological Trust**

12 Lexden Road,  
Colchester,  
Essex CO3 3NF

tel.: (01206) 541051  
tel./fax: (01206) 500124  
email: [archaeologists@catuk.org](mailto:archaeologists@catuk.org)


Checked by: Philip Crummy  
Date: 28.04.06

Adams c:/reports06/greatnotley/report367.doc

## Appendix 1: table of finds

Find no	Context	Section no	Description	Weight (g)
1	U/S	-	pot	86
2	F1	Sx 1	pot	12
2	F1	Sx 1	Lithic	6
2	F1	Sx 1	animal bone	40
3	VOID	VOID	VOID	-
4	F20	Sx 1	lithic	1
4	F20	Sx 1	animal bone	4
4	F20	surface find	pot	1,091
5	F2	Sx 2	pot	39
5	F2	Sx 2	lithic	9
6	F2	Sx 2	cremated bone	10
7	F22	Sx 2	pot	236
8	F4		pot	2
9	VOID	VOID	VOID	-
10	VOID	VOID	VOID	-
11	F22	Sx 2	pot	504
12	F31		sandstone fragments	3,000
13	F23	Sx 1	pot	127
14	F23	Sx 3	pot	117
14	F23	Sx 3	animal bone	4
15	-	-	environmental sample	-
16	F22	Sx 1	animal bone	53
16	F22	Sx 1	CBM	31
17	F23	Sx 2	animal bone	0.3
17	F23	Sx 2	pot	44
18	F23	Sx 4	animal bone	11
18	F23	Sx 4	pot	247
19	U/S	-	pot	147
20	F23	Sx 4	animal bone	3
20	F23	Sx 4	pot	62
21	F23	Sx 5	pot	57
21	F23	Sx 5	animal bone	6
22	-	-	environmental sample (see sample register)	-
23	F40	Sx 1	pot	161
24	F24	Sx 3	pot	9
25	-	-	small find (see small finds list)	-
26	F40	Sx 2	stone	386
26	F40	Sx 2	pot	217
26	F40	Sx 2	animal bone	22
26	F40	Sx 2	lithic	190
27	F45		pot	247
27	F45		animal bone	25
27	F45		burnt flint	250
28	F42	Sx 1	pot	184
28	F42	Sx 1	animal bone	187
29	F41	Sx 2	lithic	16
30	F40		pot	1
31	F59		animal bone	62
31	F59		pot	22
32	-	-	small find (see small finds list)	-
33	-	-	environmental sample (see sample register)	-
34	F20	Sx 2	pot	140
35	F42	Sx 2	pot	27
35	F42	Sx 2	lithic	17
36	F56		pot	22
37	-	-	environmental sample (see sample register)	-
38	-	-	environmental sample (see sample register)	-
39	F58		CBM	49
40	F62		pot	14
41	-	-	environmental sample (see sample register)	-

42	F42	Sx 2	animal bone	7
42	F42	Sx 2	lithic	7
42	F42	Sx 2	pot	3
43	F20	Sx 3	animal bone	99
43	F20	Sx 3	lithic	9
43	F20	Sx 3	pot	449
44	F63		pot	69
45	-	-	environmental sample (see sample register)	-
46	F43	Sx 1	animal bone	38
46	F43	Sx 1	pot	900
47	F64		pot	5
48	F67		pot	151
49	F77		cremated bone (human/animal)	20
50	F77		lithic	9
51	-	-	environmental sample (see sample register)	-
52	F43	Sx 2	pot	957
52	F43	Sx 2	pot	1,019
53	-	-	environmental sample (see sample register)	-
54	-	-	environmental sample (see sample register)	-
55	L5		pot	99
56	F85		lithic	4
56	F85		pot	205
56	F85		animal bone	61
57	F2		pot	44
57	F2		animal bone	46
58	F42	surface find	pot	767
59	F20		animal bone	80
59	F20		sandstone	172
59	F20		pot	1,597
60	F40		pot	71
61	F43		pot	987
62	F43		pot	1,119



andrew  
martin  
associates



Fig 1 Site location.




Fig 2 Excavation site location in relation to 2005 evaluation trenching.






Fig 3 Phased excavation plan.



Fig 4 Aerial photograph of excavation, facing north (© Essex County Council).




Fig 5 Sections of enclosure ditches: sheet 1.




Fig 6 Sections of enclosure ditches: sheet 2.




Fig 7 Sections of later Roman field boundaries, medieval/post-medieval field boundaries and pits.




Fig 8 Profiles of post-holes.




Fig 9 Pottery from inner enclosure ditch.




Fig 10 Pottery from inner enclosure ditch, outer enclosure ditch and field ditches.



**Essex Historic Environment Record/  
Essex Archaeology and History**

**Summary sheet**

<b>Site address:</b> 'Skyline 120' business park, Great Notley, near Braintree, Essex	
<b>Parish:</b> Black Notley	<b>District:</b> Braintree
<b>NGR:</b> TL 7366 2171 (centre)	<b>Site code:</b> GNBP06
<b>Type of work:</b> Excavation	<b>Site director/group:</b> Colchester Archaeological Trust
<b>Date of work:</b> January-February 2006	<b>Size of area investigated:</b> 0.68 hectares
<b>Location of finds/curating museum:</b> Braintree museum (accession code BRNTM 2006.7)	<b>Funding source:</b> Developer
<b>Further seasons anticipated?</b> No	<b>Related EHER nos:</b> 14171, 9993, 6501, 6502, 17766
<b>Final report:</b> CAT Report 367 and summary in EAH	
<b>Periods represented:</b> Late Iron Age, early Roman, post-Roman	
<p><b>Summary of fieldwork results:</b>  <i>An area of 0.68ha was soil-stripped and excavated at the Skyline 120 business park at Great Notley, near Braintree in Essex. The principal discovery was an enclosure, probably a farmstead, which was established in the Late Iron Age and enlarged by the addition of an outer ditch in the later 1st or early 2nd century AD.</i>  <i>The farmstead probably continued in use into the 2nd century AD, when its east side was cut by a ditch on a different alignment. This probably indicates that the settlement had been abandoned by that time, and the land given over to agricultural or pastoral farming. Subsequent subdivision of the landscape is suggested by a field-boundary ditch which must be at least post 2nd century AD (but probably later) cut at right-angles to the 2nd-century Roman field ditch.</i>  <i>Finds other than pottery were not plentiful, but the presence of loomweights, briquetage and structural clay suggest a domestic settlement based on an agricultural economy. Heavy plough damage probably accounts for the absence of any identifiable structures apart from a few pits and post-holes, the latter probably forming parts of fence lines.</i>  <i>Glacial features (cut by the Late Iron Age/Roman enclosure ditches) were also identified.</i></p>	
<b>Previous summaries/reports:</b> CAT Report 337	
<b>Author of summary:</b> Ben Holloway	<b>Date of summary:</b> April 2006