AUGER SURVEY AND WATCHING BRIEF AT SHAWBURY MOAT, SHAWBURY, SHROPSHIRE

Nick Daffern

Illustrations by Carolyn Hunt

24 March 2011

Historic Environment and Archaeology Service,
Worcestershire County Council,
Woodbury Building,
University of Worcester,
Henwick Grove,
Worcester WR2 6AJ

Project 3454
Report 1836

Contents

Auger survey and watching brief at Shawbury Moat, Shawbury, Shropshire

Nick Daffern

Part 1 Project summary

An archaeological auger survey and watching brief was undertaken at Shawbury Moat, Shawbury, Shropshire (NGR SJ 5605 2115) on behalf of English Heritage and the Environment Agency. The client intends to excavate a series of ponds to improve biodiversity of the monument and to increase local interest in the monument.

Significant quantities of disturbance and intrusive material were identified in both the auger survey and monitoring during the excavation of the ponds. This came in the form of natural bioturbation but more significantly through the cutting of drainage channels and the dumping of post-medieval and modern material. All artefactual material recovered was late 19th-20th century in date with the exception of two 16th-18th century roof tile fragments.

Despite this disturbance and intrusion, deposits which appeared to be undisturbed and in-situ were identified in the base of the sequence, particularly of note was the presence of a firm clay layer which is likely to represent the original clay lining of the moat.

No information regarding the dating and/or usage of the moat was retrieved during the works although environmental samples were retrieved that have the potential to assist in the understanding of the sites history through scientific dating and environmental assessment/analysis.

The author also undertook an extended search of documentary and literary sources in an attempt to provide a historical framework within which the site can be placed. This is certainly not exhaustive yet would provide a basis from which further research may proceed.

Part 2 Detailed report

1. Planning background

An archaeological auger survey and watching was undertaken at Shawbury Moat (NGR SJ 5605 2115), Shawbury, Shropshire (Fig 1), on behalf of English Heritage and the Environment Agency. The client intends to excavate a series of ponds to improve biodiversity of the monument and to increase local interest in the monument.

The proposed development site is considered to include a heritage asset with archaeological interest, the significance of which may be affected by the application (HER Number 01132).

The project conforms to relevant sections of the *Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief* (IfA 2008) and the *Manual of Service practice: fieldwork recording manual* (CAS 1995).

In addition, the sampling conforms to relevant sections of *Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation* (English Heritage 2002), *Geoarchaeology: Using earth sciences to understand the archaeological record* (English Heritage 2007) and *Environmental archaeology and archaeological evaluations* (AEA 1995).

The project also conforms to a project proposal (including detailed specification) which was produced (HEAS 2010).

2. Methods

2.1 Fieldwork methodology

2.1.1 Fieldwork strategy

Fieldwork was undertaken on 10 March 2011 and 16 March 2011. The site reference number and site code is HER NO 01132.

Seven auger holes were sunk using a Dutch auger on two transects along the northern and eastern arms of the moat prior to the excavation of the ponds to give an indication of the sequence and the depth of deposits (Figures 2). This method provided the opportunity to sample undisturbed deposits, something that would have been more difficult to ensure during the subsequent watching brief given the nature of the works.

The excavation of the ponds (Figure 3) was undertaken using a 360º tracked/wheeled excavator, employing a toothless bucket and under archaeological supervision. Deposits considered not to be significant were removed by the machine with all subsequent excavation occurring by hand. Clean surfaces were inspected and selected deposits were excavated to retrieve artefactual material and environmental samples, as well as to determine their nature. Deposits were recorded according to standard Service practice (CAS 1995).

2.1.2 Structural analysis

All fieldwork records were checked and cross-referenced. Analysis was effected through a combination of structural, artefactual and ecofactual evidence, allied to the information derived from other sources.

2.2 Artefact methodology

2.2.1 Artefact recovery policy

The artefact recovery policy conformed to standard Service practice (CAS 1995; appendix 2). This in principal determines that all finds, of whatever date, must be collected. However, in this case as no in-situ artefacts were recovered, only a sample of unstratified and later material was collected from the spoil during machining.

2.3 Environmental archaeology methodology

2.3.1 Sampling policy

The environmental sampling strategy conformed to standard Service practice (CAS 1995; appendix 4). All samples were taken in total, 7 of these samples 5 to 11 were discrete sediment samples from the auger survey. A 20 litre bulk sample, sample 1, was taken from context (705) and a large sample of wood, sample 2, was retrieved from the underlying deposit (706). Further smaller wood samples were retrieved from basal fills of pond 1 and 3, samples 3 and 4 respectively.

Sample number	Context	Location	Depth (Below Ground Surface)	Material retrieved
1	(705)	Pond 2	0.80m	Bulk soil sample
2	(706)	Pond 2	0.60m	Wood
3	(706)	Pond 1	0.76m	Wood
4	(607)	Pond 3	Approx 1.55m	Wood
5	(102)	AH1	0.32m – 0.36m	Soil "grab" sample
6	(105)	AH1	0.59m	Soil "grab" sample
7	(304)	AH3	0.65m	Soil "grab" sample
8	(403)	AH4	0.90m – 1.00m	Soil "grab" sample
9	(503)	AH5	1.07m – 1.15m	Soil "grab" sample
10	(605)	AH6	1.00m – 1.10m	Soil "grab" sample
11	(606) and (607)	AH6	1.40m – 1.60m	Stratified soil sample, boundary of (606) and (607)

Table 1 Sample list

2.4 Statement of confidence in the methods and results

As regards the auger survey and watching brief and the monitoring and protection of the archaeological deposits, it can be stated that the methods adopted allow a high degree of confidence that the aims of the project have been achieved. Despite this, it should be noted that due to the inability to assess the artefacts and the environmental remains retrieved during this phase of work, there must be an element of uncertainty regarding some of the results, for instance the exact dating of the basal fills.

3. Topographical and archaeological context

The British Geological Survey Mid Wales and Marches 1:250,000 solid geology mapping shows that the underlying geology of Shawbury is the dune-bedded Bridgnorth Sandstone deposited during the Permian geologic period (299 – 251 million years ago).This solid geology is overlay by glacial outwash deposits ranging from coarse gravels to pebbly sands and clayey sands of average 2-3m thickness although they have been noted in thickness' in excess of 20m (Streetly and Shepley 2001, Smedley et al 2005), these drift deposits are well-developed at Shawbury as well as at Prees, Wem and north of Wellington. The Soil Survey of England and Wales (Sheet 3, 1983) assigns the soils at Shawbury to the 551d Newport 1

group describing them as glaciofluvial drift consisting of "deep, well drained sandy and coarse loamy soils, often over soft sandstone".

The site is located 30m to the west of the River Roden and 140m to the east of St Mary's Church (Figure 1) in the village and civil parish of Shawbury, Shropshire. The scheduled monument (reference number HER 01132) consists of a well-preserved, rectangular moated site with an internal platform/island which measures c32m by c40m. The internal platform is accessed via a well-preserved, original causewayed entrance in the middle of the western arm. The ditch is again well-preserved and is on average c2m in depth and between 13m and 17m in width narrowing to c10m in the north-west corner. Material from the excavation of the moat has been used in the creation of external banks, particularly prominent on the eastern arm, which are approximately 5m and 7m in width and up to 1.3m in height, and for the levelling of the central island to compensate for the natural slope towards the river.

No evidence has been identified for structures associated with the original construction upon the island although a modern brick foundation is present in the south-west corner of the island which is suggested to be an ornamental structure in the scheduled monument description. No archaeological works have previously been undertaken within the scheduled area to the knowledge of the author.

Little, if any archaeological investigations have been undertaken within the area and therefore evidence is limited. No definite records for prehistoric activity were identified in the 1km HER search surrounding the site although an undated, probably Iron Age/Roman, sub-rectangular enclosure identified from aerial photographs was recorded c800 metres to the north-east (HER no 02266).

Roman activity is similarly sparse with the projected line of the Wroxeter to Whitchurch Roman road running c200 metres to the west although as no excavations have been undertaken within Shawbury, this must remain unconfirmed. A single large ?Serstertius of Hadrian (HER no 70747), who was emperor between AD117 – AD138, has also been recovered from the area but its exact provenance and context is unclear.

The nearest dated medieval structure is the Church of St Mary the Virgin c100 metres to the west of the site, the nave and south aisle are 12th century in date and the chancel is 13th century with subsequent alterations and restorations.

Shawbury is first recorded as "*Sawesberie*" in 1086 in the Domesday Book lying within the Wrockwardine Hundred. Gelling and Cole (2000, 245-247) suggest that the place-name comes from combining the word "*sceaga*", meaning small wood, strip of wood or underwood forming the border of land, and the Anglo-Saxon word "*burh*", meaning fort or defended site. The presence of the latter indicates that there was some kind of defensive structure present within the environs of the town pre-conquest although the location and nature of this defensive structure is unknown. One very tentative possibility suggested by the author is that it is referring to the aforementioned Iron Age/Roman enclosure although this is purely hypothetical with no supporting evidence.

It is stated that the Edric and Algeat held the area as two manors yet by Domesday, it was in the holding of Gerard under Earl Roger (Thorn and Thorn 1986). No information is known about Algeat as it appears that Shawbury was his sole holding prior to the Conquest yet it is possible that the Edric mentioned is the powerful Anglo-Saxon land-owner commonly known as Edric the Wild or Eadric Silvaticus who held large areas of land throughout Shropshire.

After the conquest in 1066, Edric held his lands suggesting that he was not present at the Battle of Hastings yet according to John of Worcester he refused to surrender to William the Conqueror (this is contradicted by Orderic Vitalis who states that he did surrender), which resulted in his lands coming under attack from the Norman garrison at Hereford led by William fitz Scrob (Swenarton, 1981, Williams, 2000).

In 1067 he rose up against the Norman rule, aligning himself with the Welsh prince of Gwynedd and Powys, Bleddyn ap Cynfyn, and they proceeded to travel south, laying waste to Herefordshire and attacking the Norman forces at Hereford Castle reaching as far south as the River Lugg before retreating back into the Welsh Marches (Swenarton, 1981, Williams, 2000). The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles recorded that "The child Edric and the Britons were

unsettled this year, and fought with the castlemen at Hereford, and did them much harm" (Britannia).

After further nationwide rebellions, Edric once again rose up with his Welsh allies and unsuccessfully attacked Shrewsbury castle although they did burn the city as they retreated. This act resulted in the Battle of Stafford where Edric and his allies were defeated by the Norman army. In 1070, Edric made his peace with William and accompanied the king on his invasion of Scotland in 1072 (Swenarton, 1981, Williams, 2000).

The eventual fate of Edric is unclear, it is suggested that he may have risen up one final time during the Revolt of the Earls in 1075 and was captured and/or lost his lands but what is known is that the manor of Shawbury is no longer under his control at Domesday in 1086.

The Earl Roger who holds Shawbury at Domesday is Roger de Montgomerie, the 1st Earl of Shrewsbury and one of William the Conqueror's closest counsellors. William probably awarded the earldom and lands to Roger as, given the volatile nature of the region, the king would have required a trusted kinsmen to avoid any further uprisings. The Gerard who held the land on behalf of Roger is Gerard de Tournai who is named by Orderic Vitalis as one of the baron's who Roger brought over from France to maintain control within the area (Chibnall 1991, 284; Green 1997, 46).

After William the Conqueror's death in 1087, Roger de Montgomerie was one of the powerful barons who rose up against the newly crowned William II in the rebellion of 1088 although Roger soon abandoned the rebels after promises of land and money from the new King.

Upon Roger's death in 1094, his English lands passed to his son Hugh of Montgomery who became the 2nd Earl of Shrewsbury whilst his Norman lands passed to another of his sons, Robert of Bellême.

Hugh frequently fought the Welsh in the Marches before joining forces with Hugh d'Avranches, 1st Earl of Chester, in 1098 in an attempt to reclaim Anglesey from the Welsh. They were successful in defeating the Welsh but during the Norman victory "celebrations" which were apparently exceptionally violent (Lloyd 2004, 39-40); the Normans were surprised by a Norman fleet led by Magnus III of Norway. The Battle of Anglesey Sound which followed is recounted in the "Heimskrignla", a history of the Norwegian kings, written by the Icelandic historian Snorri Sturluson around 1230 in which Hugh is referred to as Hugo the Brave.

> Afterwards King Magnus sailed to Wales; and when he came to the sound of Anglesey there came against him an army from Wales, which was led by two earls -- Hugo the brave, and Hugo the Stout. They began immediately to give battle, and there was a severe conflict. King Magnus shot with the bow; but Hugo the Brave was all over in armour, so that nothing was bare about him excepting one eye. King Magnus let fly an arrow at him, as also did a Helgeland man who was beside the king. They both shot at once. The one shaft hit the nose-screen of the helmet, which was bent by it to one side, and the other arrow hit the earl's eye, and went through his head; and that was found to be the king's. Earl Hugo fell, and the Britons fled with the loss of many people (Laing 1844).

With the death of Hugh, his estates passed to his elder brother Robert of Bellême who became the 3rd earl of Shrewsbury.

Robert had previously been involved in the rebellion of 1088 and had had a tumultuous relationship with his fellow barons, frequently raiding and making war against his less powerful neighbours in Normandy leading him to became a lifelong enemy of the fourth son of William the Conqueror, the future Henry I.

In 1101, Robert of Bellême sided with the eldest son of William the Conqueror, Robert Curthose, and invaded England in an attempt to take the crown from Henry I. This ended in failure and in 1102 Robert of Bellême was banished from England and forfeited his titles and lands, including Shawbury, to the Crown.

According to the Battle Abbey Roll, Gerard de Tournai's daughter Sibil who was a great Shropshire heiress married Hamon Peverell (~1067 – 1136). He was a member of an influential Norman family, his half-brother, William Peverell, was possibly the illegitimate

son of William the Conqueror (Cleveland 1889) but it is not known whether Shawbury was amongst the land that she held at the time of the marriage or even whether the Battle Abbey Roll can be trusted as a reliable source.

The ownership of Shawbury is unclear after it was forfeited to the crown, Wrockwardine Hundred in which Shawbury lay is still in existence c1140 but by 1203, it has been amalgamated with another hundred, that of Hodnet to form the Bradford Hundred suggesting a shift in landownership and/or politics.

The next definitive indication of ownership of the area comes in 1253 when Giles de Erdington, son of Thomas de Erdington, "had license from Henry III in the thirty-seventh year of his reign to make a saltory or deer-leap in his park.' The site is still called Shawbury Park." (Shirley 1867). This park was approximately 1.2 km to the south west of the moated site, the name Shawbury Park is still used today to refer to a farm /residential complex and Shawbury Park Wood further to the south.

In the 13th Century the Erdington family held a grant of Free Warrant in Shawbury. Henry de Erdington (son of Giles) leased his mill at Shawbury to Robert de Stanton. Later this mill forms part of a gift to the church of St. Mary to sustain a chaplain (Adrian Brown, pers comm)

> **1**. Henry de Erdintone
> **2**. God and St. Mary of Shawbury of land for a chaplain at Shawbury
> **1** grants to **2** for the sustentation of one chaplain to celebrate divine office in the church of St. Mary of Shawbury in free pure and perpetual ---- for the health of my soul, those of my ancestors and heirs, that messuage which Robert the miller nicknamed 'Cergan' holds from **1** in the town of Shawbury. Together with one virgate of land in fields of Shawbury, namely 16 acres. 7 acres of land in fields towards Morton Toret above 'Crokeforlang' and 9 acres between the land of Cherleton, the Abbot of Lilleshall, and Cressewallebroke with the field springs of water which the said plain contains.
>
> Witnesses John of Ercall, knight, John son of Aer, Robert Corbet of Morton Toret, knights, Adam vicar of Shawbury, Reyner of Acton and others.
>
> Endorsed 'a gyfte of landes by Sir Henry Erdington to the chappell of Shawbury viz a messuage meadowe and a yard land contayninge xvı acres in every field (in total) and without date for a chantry priest in Shawbury Church (Adrian Brown, pers comm)

Mills formed an important part of the local life and economy. There is evidence that there were at least two mills in Shawbury plus one at "Edgeboulton ", one at Moreton Mill and one or possibly two in Wytheford (Adrian Brown, pers comm)

At an unknown date, Giles de Erdington's great-great-granddaughter Margaret de Erdington (c1352 – c1395) married Roger Corbet (c1330 – c1396) with Shawbury presumably passing over to the Corbet family as part of that marriage. The Corbet family were another family who had come from Normandy during the invasion and in an interesting twist of fate it was Roger de Montgomerie, the 1st Earl of Shrewsbury, who had brought the Corbet's to England as they were another family considered to be brave and loyal (Chibnall 1990, 263).

During the Civil War, Sir Vincent Corbet sided with the King, with his residence at Morton Corbet part of the Royalists defence of Shrewsbury becoming the scene of multiple engagements between Royalist and Parliamentary forces (English Heritage).

Shawbury itself appeared to be largely unaffected although a garrison of men were stationed next to the church. The church records of 1647 document that £1 was paid for "Repayring the clocke being spoyled by ye garrison" and 10 shillings were paid for "Fillinge uppe the trenche that the garrison had caste uppe about the Churche" (Adrian Brown, pers comm)

Shawbury was still in the hands of the Corbet family in 1696 when William Lloyd, the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, writes to Richard Corbet who is noted as living at Shawbury Park (British History Online). Around 1800, the Corbet family left their residences at Shawbury Park and Morton Corbet Castle and moved to their recently enlarged and renovated country house at nearby Acton Reynald Hall.

The moat and the surrounding field are today owned by the Diocese of Lichfield and are leased to Shawbury parish Council.

4. Results

4.1 Structural analysis

The location of the augerholes and the excavated ponds are shown in Figures 2 and 3. The results of the structural analysis are presented in Appendix 1.

4.1.1 Phase 1: ?Medieval/undated deposits

The firm, reddish brown clay encountered during both the auger survey and the watching brief was the lowest deposit encountered is likely to represent the lining of the moat and is therefore potentially medieval in date. The clay appears to have been deliberately deposited/modified as a lining for the moat as no sedimentary structures were identified within the clay during the auger survey although it may be the case that the upper surface of the natural alluvial clay has been puddled for use as the moat lining whilst the underlying natural clay remained unaffected. This latter notion would have saved on the need to transport clay from another location thus making the excavation and lining of the moat more efficient.

Overlying this in augerholes AH1, AH2, AH3 and AH7 was a layer of light grey coarse silty sand which was also identified during the excavation of ponds 1, 2 and 4 and 4. This layer also appeared to be an undisturbed, in-situ layer representing the earliest phases of sedimentation of the moat. This contained rare-occasional wood and plant macrofossil fragments which appeared to be in-situ and non-intrusive and therefore a sample <1> was taken for assessment from the context (705) in pond 1.

Found within the clay and sealed beneath the light grey silty sand was what appeared to be a trunk of a fallen tree (Plate 3 and 4) although due to its size (c4.80m in length by c0.40m width) and being within the clay a true indication of its dimensions and form could not be gained. There were no definite indications of working upon the wood although this does not exclude their presence on the unexposed surfaces. A sample <2> of the wood was taken for identification and dating purposes.

Another smaller fragment of wood was encountered to the west in the base of Pond 1, similarly sealed within the clay and on the same east-west alignment. It is unclear whether the two pieces of wood are one and the same but a sample <3> was taken for identification to allow comparison of species to possibly help confirm whether the two are from the same source.

A final sample <4> of wood was retrieved from the base of pond 3 in the upper surface of the clay lining (607).

4.1.2 Phase 2: modern deposits

The majority of the deposits listed encountered during the works are thought to be modern or at least subjected to frequent and sometimes severe disturbance and intrusion in post-medieval or modern times.

Bioturbation and rooting were one of the most common forms of disturbance that was witnessed and can be assigned to the large veteran trees that sit upon the banks/earthworks of the moat and the yellow irises (*Iris pseudacorus*) which occupy the wettest locations within the moat.

There also appears to have been extensive disturbance through the cutting of drainage courses through the site as witnessed by the recovery of late 19-20th century drainage pipe (Angus Crawford, pers comm) in all of the ponds that were excavated with the exception of pond 2. This is supported by the observations of Watson (1981) in the monument description:

> The narrowing of the ditch at the NW angle is probably the result of modern house drains having been cut through it here. Also at this NW corner a probable leat runs into the moat. Surrounding the moat on its downslope E half is a well preserved

outer retaining bank c2m wide and up to 2m high at its E end where it is more substantial. This bank has been partially cut back at the NE corner due to a modern drain being cut through it here

One segment of the fence that once encircled the site was encountered approximately 0.10 – 0.15m below ground surface during the machining of pond 2 illustrating the extent and of the very recent intrusive disturbance of deposits.

Another source of disturbance, mixing and contamination of deposits is that of people walking across the wettest locations of the moat, this was neatly evidenced by the recovery of an Adidas trainer from approximately 0.35m below ground surface and multiple items of modern litter such as cans, bottles and crisp packets.

4.2 Artefact analysis

Due to budgetary restrictions and the limited assemblage of finds recovered, a comprehensive assessment of artefacts has not been undertaken at this stage.

The finds were processed and rapidly examined by finds archaeologists who stated that the majority of the artefacts were of late 19th – 20th century date with brick, drainage pipe, tile and CBM the most abundant material. A single fragment of decorated Edwardian floor tile was also recovered (Angus Crawford pers comm).

The exception to this were two fragments of 16th – 18th century coal-fired roof tile. This was of a flanged and curved type with a very similar appearance to Midlands Purple pottery fabric (Laura Griffin pers comm)

5. Synthesis

5.1 ?Medieval

As no artefactual material was retrieved from within the clay lining/basal fills of the moat it is not currently possible to assign a date for the excavation of the feature. Despite this, the presence of the clay lining and undisturbed basal deposits identified during the monitoring give a strong indication that medieval deposits relating to the excavation have been preserved within the monument.

No masonry was encountered during the works suggesting that, if there was a structure on the platform, it was of wooden construction as even extensive robbing of a site would still produce an element of tumble or the dumping of damaged/useless masonry fragments into the moat. It may be suggested that the monitored works merely missed any of these dumps although this would seem unlikely given the scale and spatial distribution of monitoring.

The date of the moat's excavation and the occupation of the platform is not currently known but based upon the general trend in the West Midlands at sites such as High Ercall Hall, Salop, Hawksley Manor, Birmingham and Lower Brockhampton Hall, Herefordshire, it is likely that the site dates to between the early 13th century and the mid 14th century.

The development of Shawbury Park as a residence is likely to have been the cause of the moated sites abandonment. The dating for this development is unclear as the deer park was certainly in existence by 1253 but whether there was an associated residence is unknown but by 1696, Shawbury Park is clearly used as the seat of the Corbet family within the area.

If Shawbury Park developed rapidly as a residence then Shawbury Moat may have only had a relatively short lifespan i.e. less than 100 hundred years and that is dependent upon a residence being built upon its island at all. At the opposite end of the scale, if Shawbury Park did not have a residence until later, then Shawbury Moat could potentially have functioned for over 300 years but due to the latter truncation and disturbance in the moat, the evidence for this later activity has been lost. It is likely that only geophysical and/or archaeological evaluation of the central platform would help to resolve this issue

5.2 Post-medieval/Modern

It would appear that all occupation and usage of the site has ceased by the post-medieval/modern era and the area is abandoned to become scrub grassland/ understory woodland, being occasionally disturbed through developments further to the west with the expansion of the village.

This is supported by the artefactual assemblage which was entirely post-medieval/modern in date, the presence of which can be related to the cutting of drainage channels through the monument and the dumping of waste material during the expansion and development of the village.

In the scheduled monument description, reference is made to "brick foundations of a possible ornamental structure" in the south-west corner of the platform. Research by the local Shawbury Moat Project Group suggests that this structure is in fact the fallen wall of a pig-sty dating from the early 20th century. The brief observation that the author made of the structure tends to support that this observation and suggests that the feature is utilitarian in function rather than ornamental although an intrusive investigation would be required to conclusively resolve the matter.

6. Recommendations

The recommendations above are those of the Service and may vary from those of any archaeological curator or advisor to the planning authority.

Plant macrofossils

It is recommended that the sole bulk soil sample <1> is processed using standard flotation techniques for the recovery of plant macrofossil remains with subsequent assessment and identification of the material gathered to assess the presence and preservation and to provide information regarding the vegetation and conditions within the environment. Non-aquatic plant macrofossils would also provide material for radiocarbon dating if a scheme were undertaken.

Wood assessment

Identification of the wood retrieved both by hand during the watching brief and that retrieved from the bulk sample is recommended. It would provide not only an indication of the tree species that are flanking the moat and/or the woodland resources that were being utilised upon the site but provide material for radiocarbon and dendrochronological dating.

Pollen

Assessment for the preservation of pollen, fungal spores and parasite ova is recommended upon three samples retrieved during the auger survey.

Sample <11> contains 0.20m of stratified deposits representing the boundary between the clay lining and the overlying basal organics whilst sample <10> may potentially represent later, post-abandonment deposits from the same sequence retrieved from augerhole 6.

Consideration should also be given for assessment of sample <6> as this too is likely to represent an early phase of the site although as it is from a silty sand layer, preservation may be poor due to mechanical damage and therefore the priority should be given to the aforementioned samples from augerhole 6 which have the highest potential for survival.

Scientific dating

The recovery of multiple wood samples from the lower stratified deposits and plant macrofossils from the bulk sample could potentially allow a scheme of dating, either dendrochronological or radiocarbon, to assist in dating the origins of the monument. It would be recommended that only a limited scheme i.e. one or two dates, is undertaken in the first instance to ensure that intrusive material has not contaminated the lower deposits.

If material is shown to be of a suitable date, then consideration should be made for the dendrochronological dating of the wood sample retrieved from the fallen tree. As this tree trunk is within the clay lining of the moat, it may provide an accurate date for the deposition

of the clay lining of the moat and therefore a lower bracket date for the occupation and use of the site.

7. Publication summary

The Service has a professional obligation to publish the results of archaeological projects within a reasonable period of time. To this end, the Service intends to use this summary as the basis for publication through local or regional journals. The client is requested to consider the content of this section as being acceptable for such publication.

An archaeological auger survey and watching brief was undertaken at Shawbury Moat, Shawbury, Shropshire (NGR SJ 5605 2115) on behalf of English Heritage and the Environment Agency. The client intends to excavate a series of ponds to improve biodiversity of the monument and to increase local interest in the monument.

Significant quantities of disturbance and intrusive material were identified in both the auger survey and monitoring during the excavation of the ponds. This came in the form of natural bioturbation but more significantly through the cutting of drainage channels and the dumping of post-medieval and modern material. All artefactual material recovered was late 19th-20th century in date with the exception of two 16th-18th century roof tile fragments.

Despite this disturbance and intrusion, deposits which appeared to be undisturbed and in-situ were identified in the base of the sequence, particularly of note was the presence of a firm clay layer which is likely to represent the original clay lining of the moat.

No information regarding the dating and/or usage of the moat was retrieved during the works although environmental samples were retrieved that have the potential to assist in the understanding of the sites history through scientific dating and environmental assessment/analysis.

The author also undertook an extended search of documentary and literary sources in an attempt to provide a historical framework within which the site can be placed. This is certainly not exhaustive yet would provide a basis from which further research may proceed.

8. Acknowledgements

The Service would like to thank the following for their kind assistance in the successful conclusion of this project, Jenny Marriot, Lisa Moffett and Bill Klemperer of English Heritage and Simon Cuming and his team from the Environment Agency. Thanks also go to the Shawbury Moat Project Group for the on-site discussion regarding the moat and pig sty and the information that Adrian Brown provided regarding the history of the parish.

9. Personnel

The fieldwork and report preparation was led by Nick Daffern. The project manager responsible for the quality of the project was Simon Woodiwiss. Fieldwork was undertaken by Nick Daffern and Emily Beales, finds analysis by Laura Griffin and Angus Crawford, and illustration by Carolyn Hunt.

10. Bibliography

Association for Environmental Archaeology, 1995 *Environmental archaeology and archaeological evaluations. Recommendations concerning the environmental component of archaeological evaluations in England*, Working Papers of the Association for Environmental Archaeology, **2**

Britannia *Anglo Saxon Chronicle – 1067-69*, http://www.britannia.com/history/docs/1067-69.html, accessed 21 March 2011

British History Online The manuscripts of Sir Walter O. Corbet in, *The Manuscripts of Shrewsbury and Coventry Corporations [etc]: Fourth report, Appendix: Part X*, 1899, 66-77, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=67082, accessed: 22 March 2011

CAS, 1995 (as amended) *Manual of Service practice: fieldwork recording manual*, County Archaeological Service, Hereford and Worcester County Council, report, **399**

Chibnall, M (ed) 1990 *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis: Volume II - books III and IV*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Chibnall, M 1991 Anglo-Norman Studies XIII: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1990, Woodbridge: Boydell Press

Cleveland, C L W 1889 The Battle Abbey roll, with some account of the Norman lineages, Cornell University Library, http://www.archive.org/details/battleabbeyrollw03battuoft, accessed 22 March 2011

DCLG 2010 *Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the historic environment,* Department for Communities and Local Government

DCLG/DCMS/EH 2010 *PPS5 Planning for the historic environment: historic environment planning practice guide.* Department for Communities and Local Government/Department for Culture, Media and Sport/English Heritage

English Heritage *Moreton Corbet Castle - History and Research*, http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/daysout/properties/moreton-corbet-castle/history-and-research/, accessed 23 March 2011

English Heritage 2002 *Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation*, Swindon: English Heritage Publishing

English Heritage 2007 *Geoarchaeology: Using earth sciences to understand the archaeological record*, Swindon: English Heritage Publishing

Green, J 1997 *The aristocracy of Norman England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

HEAS 2010 *Proposal for an auger survey and archaeological watching brief at Shawbury moat, Shawbury, Shropshire*, Historic Environment and Archaeology Service, Worcestershire County Council, unpublished document dated 25 June 2010, **P3454**

IfA 2008 *Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief,* Institute for Archaeologists

Laing, S 1844 Snorre Sturluson: Heimskringla. The Chronicle of the Kings of Norway, http://lind.no/nor/index.asp?lang=&emne=asatru&vis=s_e_magnus_berrfott, accessed 22 March 2011

Lloyd, J E 2004 *A History of Wales; From the Norman Invasion to the Edwardian Conquest*, New York: Barnes and Noble Publishing

Shirley, E P 1867 *Some account of English deer parks, with notes on the management of deer*, Cornell University Library, http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924052776345, accessed 22 March 2011

Smedley, P L, Neumann, I, and Brown, S 2005 *Baseline Report Series 20: The Permo-Triassic Sandstone Aquifer of Shropshire*, British Geological Survey Commissioned Report No. CR/05/061N

Soil Survey of England and Wales 1983 Midland and Western England, sheet 3, scale 1:250,000 + *Legend for the 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales (A brief explanation of the constituent soil associations)*

Streetly, M. and Shepley, M G 2001 *Scoping study – groundwater model of the Shropshire Permo-Triassic Sandstone aquifer system*, Environment Agency Report

Swenarton, M 1981 *Eadric Silvaticus and the English Resistance*, Historical Research, 54: 102–105

Thorn, F and Thorn, C (eds) 1986 *Domesday Book - Vol 25: Shropshire*, Chichester: Phillimore

Watson, M D 1981 *Field observation by Shropshire County Council, Site visit form - dated 06/02/1981*, unpublished report, Shropshire County Council

Williams, A 2000 *The English and the Norman Conquest*, Ipswich: Boydell Press

Figures

Plates

Plate 1 Excavation of pond 1 illustrating presence of modern drainage pipe

Plate 2 Post-excavation of pond 1 facing north, also illustrates the depth of the moat and the central island and eastern arm of the moat

Plate 3Fallen tree trunk (?) in base of pond 2, facing north

Plate 4 Fallen tree trunk (?) in the base of pond 2, facing west. Pond 1 is in background as is the source of the spring which feeds the moat

Appendix 1 Augerhole descriptions

Augerhole 1

Position – 0.00m, start of south – north transect

Maximum depth: 1.18m

Main deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface (b.g.s) – top and bottom of deposits
101	Fill	Soft, pliable dark blackish brown organic silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.00m – 0.12m
102	Fill	Soft, pliable, mid greyish brown clayey silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.12m – 0.40m
103	Fill	Sort, pliable, light brownish grey silt with rare with modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.40m – 0.52m
104	Fill	Friable, mid greyish brown silty, coarse sand	0.52m – 0.58m
105	Fill	Friable, light grey coarse silty sand	0.58m – 0.69m
106	Layer/lining	Firm, mid-light reddish brown clay	0.69m – 1.18m

Augerhole 2

Position – 10.00m north of augerhole 1

Maximum depth: 1.20m

Main deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface (b.g.s) – top and bottom of deposits
201	Fill	Soft, pliable dark blackish brown organic silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.00m – 0.06m
202	Fill	Soft, pliable, mid greyish brown clayey silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.06m – 0.57m
203	Fill	Firm, mid reddish brown clay	0.57m – 0.65m
204	Fill	Friable, mid reddish brown clayey coarse sand	0.65m – 0.70m
205	Fill	Firm, mid reddish brown clay	0.70m – 0.85m
206	Fill	Friable, mid reddish brown clayey coarse sand with rare rounded – sub rounded pebbles/gravel	0.85m – 0.91m
207	Layer/lining	Firm, mid reddish brown clay	0.91m – 1.08m

Augerhole 3

Position – 20.00m north of augerhole 1

Maximum depth: 1.38m

Main deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface (b.g.s) – top and bottom of deposits
301	Fill	Soft, pliable dark blackish brown organic silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.00m – 0.06m
302	Fill	Soft, pliable, mid greyish brown clayey silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments(frequency decreases with depth)	0.06m – 0.56m
303	Fill	Pliable, dark greyish/blackish brown clayey silt with occasional root and plant macrofossil fragments (probably modern/intrusive?)	0.56m – 0.65m
304	Fill	Firm, light grey coarse sandy clay	0.65m – 0.78m
305	Fill	Friable, light grey coarse sand	0.78m – 0.82m
306	Layer/lining	Firm, mid reddish brown clay	0.82m – 1.38m

Augerhole 4

Position – 30.00m north of augerhole 1

Maximum depth: 1.72m

Main deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface (b.g.s) – top and bottom of deposits
401	Fill	Soft, pliable dark blackish brown organic silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.00m – 0.05m
402	Fill	Soft, pliable, mid greyish brown silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments, becomes clayey silt with depth	0.05m – 0.50m
VOID			0.50m – 0.80m
403	Fill	Pliable, light brownish grey clayey silt with occasional root and plant macrofossil fragments (probably modern/intrusive?) Unclear/diffuse boundary to:	0.80m – 1.05m
404	Fill	Pliable, light brownish grey coarse sandy silt. Deposit showed signs of disturbance/mixing	1.05m – 1.32m
405	Layer/lining	Firm, mid reddish brown clay	1.32m – 1.72m

Augerhole 5

Position – 40.40m north of augerhole 1

Maximum depth: 1.90m

Main deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface (b.g.s) – top and bottom of deposits
501	Fill	Friable, light bluish grey slightly silty coarse sand	0.00m – 0.33m
502	Fill	Pliable, light brownish, occasionally sandy, grey clayey silt with occasional root and plant macrofossil fragments (probably modern/intrusive?)	0.33m – 1.05m
503	Fill	Pliable, mid brown clayey silt with frequent wood fragments	1.05m – 1.20m
VOID			1.20m – 1.70m
504	Layer/lining	Firm, mid-light reddish brown clay. Contains degraded sandstone fragments, probably reworked solid geology	1.70m – 1.90m

Augerhole 6

Position – 60.60m north of augerhole 1, start of east –west transect

Maximum depth: 1.76m

Main deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface (b.g.s) – top and bottom of deposits
601	Fill	Soft, pliable dark blackish brown organic silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.00m – 0.08m
602	Fill	Soft, pliable, mid greyish brown silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.08m – 0.32m
603	Fill	Soft, pliable, mid-dark brown silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.32m – 0.44m
604	Fill	Soft, pliable, light - mid brown silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.44m – 0.68m
605	Fill	Pliable, light brownish grey clayey silt with occasional plant macrofossils and occasional fine sand lenses. Unclear/diffuse boundary to:	0.68m – 1.17m
606	Fill	Pliable – firm light brownish grey silty clay with occasional plant macrofossils and occasional fine sand lenses.	1.17m – 1.47m
607	Layer/lining	Firm, mid-light reddish brown clay	1.47m – 1.76m

Augerhole 7

Position – 20.00m west of augerhole 6

Maximum depth: 1.05m

Main deposit description

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface (b.g.s) – top and bottom of deposits

Context	Classification	Description	Depth below ground surface (b.g.s) – top and bottom of deposits
701	Fill	Soft, pliable dark blackish brown organic silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.00m – 0.22m
702	Fill	Pliable, dark brown silt with frequent modern root and plant macrofossil fragments	0.22m – 0.40m
VOID			0.40m – 0.46m
703	Fill	Friable, light – mid brownish/bluish grey coarse sand	0.46m – 0.52m
704	Fill	Pliable, mid greyish brown clayey silt with rare plant macrofossils	0.52m – 0.74m
705	Fill	Friable, light grey mid-coarse sand with occasional wood fragments and plant macrofossils	0.74m – 0.84m
706	Layer/lining	Firm, mid- light reddish brown clay	0.84m – 1.05m