

ARCHAEOLOGICAL
EVALUATION (STAGE 1.2) OF
LAND SOUTH OF TOP BARN
FARM, HOLT, WORCESTERSHIRE

Darren Miller and Erica Darch

Illustrated by Carolyn Hunt

11th June 2003

© Historic Environment and Archaeology Service, Worcestershire County
Council

Historic Environment and Archaeology Service,
Worcestershire County Council,
Woodbury,
University College Worcester,
Henwick Grove,
Worcester WR2 6AJ
WSM 32403 & 32411



Project 1965
Report 1165

Contents

Part 1 Project summary

1

Part 2 Detailed report

1.	Background	3
1.1	Planning background	3
1.2	Archaeological background (after Edwards 1997)	3
2.	Aims	4
3.	Methods	4
3.1	Fieldwalking	4
3.2	Metal-detecting	4
3.3	Topographical survey	4
3.4	Artefact analysis	4
3.5	Comparative analysis	5
3.6	The methods in retrospect.....	5
4.	Results	5
4.1	Neolithic or Early Bronze Age activity.....	5
4.2	Late Bronze Age/early Iron Age settlement.....	5
4.3	Late Iron Age settlement.....	5
4.4	Roman settlement	6
4.4.1	The Roman fieldwalking assemblage	6
4.4.2	Spatial patterning.....	7
4.5	Medieval agriculture	7
4.6	Post-medieval agriculture	8
4.7	Modern agriculture	8
5.	Discussion	9
6.	Archaeological potential	9
7.	Publication summary	10
8.	The archive	10
9.	Acknowledgements	11
10.	Personnel	11
11.	Bibliography	11

Archaeological evaluation of land south of Top Barn Farm, Holt, Worcestershire

Darren Miller and Erica Darch

Part 1 Project summary

This report is concerned with one stage of an ongoing evaluation of land to the south of Top Barn Farm, Worcestershire (NGR SO 8300 6135). The project has been commissioned from the Service by Entec UK, on behalf of Tarmac Western Ltd, who wish to explore the possibility of extending their existing quarry at Church Farm into two adjacent fields (the Evaluation Area). Both fields are known to contain archaeological remains (WCM 4507 and 4511), and the northern field (WCM 4507) is presently a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM HERE & WORCS 209).

The overall aim of the evaluation is to assess the character, survival, condition and vulnerability of archaeological deposits within the Evaluation Area (AS, 2001, 3). The aims of the present stage of the project were to apply two methods of archaeological prospection (fieldwalking and metal-detecting) and an element of topographical survey; and to analyse the results in relation to existing information. The evaluation was originally intended to cover the only the Evaluation Area as defined in the project proposal, but at the request of the Client, a small strip of land immediately to the east was included in the assessment.

The fieldwalking produced slight evidence for early prehistoric activity in the form of two worked flints, which may be comparable in date to a Neolithic arrowhead found during salvage recording in 1991. All three flints were isolated finds, and probably represent separate visits by individuals or small groups engaged in hunting or gathering.

No artefacts of Bronze Age or Iron Age date were recovered, although some of the cropmarks and geophysical anomalies identified in an earlier desk-based assessment and in Stage 1.1 of the evaluation may be attributed to the later Iron Age. In addition, nine pits of Iron Age date were identified during the 1991 salvage recording. There are therefore good grounds for inferring a late Iron Age element to the archaeology of the Evaluation Area, although it appears that settlement (or other activity) was of low intensity and thinly dispersed.

Clearer evidence of Roman settlement was recovered in the form of 160 sherds (642g) of Roman pottery, which was concentrated on the higher, flatter ground in the centre of the Evaluation Area, and appears to correspond with the highest concentrations of cropmarks and geophysical anomalies. These support the evidence from the 1991 salvage recording which recorded three ditches of Roman date. Taken together, the evidence suggests a farmstead of modest size and status based on one or more ditched enclosures, and set within a landscape of fields and tracks.

Later artefacts in the fieldwalking assemblage and the abraded condition of the Roman pottery indicated at least intermittent cultivation in the medieval and post-medieval periods, and more intensive modern cultivation.

On the basis of this evidence, the Evaluation Area can be divided into areas of high, uncertain, and unknown archaeological potential. The central and northern parts of the Evaluation Area are considered to have a high potential, in view of the close associations between Roman pottery, cropmarks and geophysical anomalies, and the demonstrated presence of both Iron Age and Roman remains. The potential of the north-west corner of the Evaluation Area is uncertain, as it could not be fieldwalked, although cropmarks have been recorded there and it is likely that Roman pottery is also present. The potential of the east facing slopes of the Evaluation Area is also uncertain, as it is possible that remains might be sealed and to some extent protected by colluvium. Finally, the strip of land to the east of the Evaluation Area must be considered an unknown quantity, as it was not fieldwalked and has produced only one cropmark.

These designations, and the evidence on which they are based will inform future planning decisions and further fieldwork, if appropriate.

Part 2 Detailed report

1. Background

1.1 Planning background

This report is concerned with the results from Stage 1.2 of an ongoing archaeological evaluation of land to the south of Top Barn Farm, Worcestershire (NGR SO 8300 6135; Fig 1) which has been commissioned from the Service by Entec UK, on behalf of Tarmac Western Ltd (The Client). The Client wishes to explore the possibility of extending their existing quarry at Church Farm into two adjacent fields (the Evaluation Area). Both fields are known to contain archaeological remains (WCM 4507 and 4511), and the northern field (WCM 4507) is presently a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM HERE & WORCS 209).

1.2 Archaeological background (after Edwards 1997)

The Evaluation Area was designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument by the Department of the Environment in 1977 on the basis of cropmarks that indicated a focus of prehistoric and Roman activity. The existence of these and other cropmarks along the lower terrace of the Severn near Holt was first noted in the 1950s, and most of them were mapped in 1969-70. Many cropmarks have since been removed by quarrying, and the Evaluation Area now contains the largest surviving concentration in the area. However, the quarry companies supported several rescue excavations in the vicinity of the Evaluation Area between 1970 and 1975, and these produced important evidence on Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age funerary monuments, and Late Iron Age and Roman settlement and land-use.

The Evaluation Area itself was visited by the County Archaeologist in 1973, after a farmer reported seeing cropmarks at ground level in a root crop. The apparent dimensions of several enclosures were measured, although no surface finds were visible. In 1991, Scheduled Monument Consent was given for the construction of an access road along the boundary between the two fields, subject to archaeological salvage recording taking place before the groundworks. This work identified nine pits and one ditch of late Iron Age date, and three Roman ditches that appeared to correspond with recorded cropmarks (Edwards 1991). Several undated features were also found, and a Neolithic arrowhead was recovered from the ploughsoil.

The possibility of extending the existing quarry at Church Farm into the Evaluation Area was first considered in 1997 by the then owners Nash Rocks Ltd, who commissioned a desk-based assessment in order to address the implications of such a proposal. This assessment involved the collection and analysis of all information bearing upon the Evaluation Area and its environs (Edwards 1997). A detailed transcription of the cropmarks was also undertaken (Cox 1997) which was incorporated in the assessment and is reproduced below as Figure 4. No action was taken until after Nash Rocks Ltd became part of Tarmac Western Ltd, when a project design for a staged archaeological evaluation was commissioned from the Service (AS 2001).

Stage 1 of the evaluation comprised a geophysical survey, which was undertaken by Geophysical Surveys of Bradford (GSB 2002). Almost all of the Evaluation Area were sampled for anomalies using gradiometers in scanning mode, and three rectangular blocks totalling 2 hectares were surveyed in greater detail. The resultant interpretative plot of the main anomalies has been reproduced as Figure 5.

2. **Aims**

The overall aim of the project is to assess the character, survival, condition and vulnerability of archaeological deposits within the Evaluation Area (AS 2001, 3). The aims of stage 1.2 of the evaluation were necessarily more limited, but closely related to the wider objective. In summary, the aims were:

- to obtain further information on archaeological remains in the Evaluation Area by applying two methods of archaeological prospection (fieldwalking and metal-detecting) and an element of topographical survey;
- to analyse the results of this fieldwork in relation to existing evidence from the desk-based assessment (Edwards 1991) and Stage 1.1 geophysical survey;
- to inform future planning decisions and further fieldwork, if appropriate.

3. **Methods**

3.1 **Fieldwalking**

Both fields were sampled by transect fieldwalking, which took place over four days in early April 2003. In each field a baseline was set out parallel to the straightest field boundary. Transects were set out at right angles to the baseline every 20m along its length, and each transect was divided into 20m intervals. The transects were then walked at a uniformly slow pace by experienced fieldwalkers, who collected material from an area some 2-3m either side of each transect. By this means, approximately 10% of the total surface area available for fieldwalking was covered. Each field was given a Sites and Monuments Record number, and each collection unit was identified by this number, and the appropriate alpha/numeric reference (A1, A2, A3 etc).

3.2 **Metal-detecting**

The metal-detecting took place over two days alongside the fieldwalking. Both fields were scanned by a trained operator using a professional instrument in a range of discriminatory modes. The few finds recovered were located using a hand-held Global Positioning System.

3.3 **Topographical survey**

An element of topographical survey was undertaken alongside the fieldwalking. This involved taking levels along three transects, and planning the direction and degree of natural slopes. After the fieldwork, this information was supplemented by contour data taken from 1:10,000 maps, and used to produce a 1:2500 map of contours at 1m intervals across the Evaluation Area (Fig 2).

3.4 **Artefact analysis**

Analysis of the assemblage began with a basic sort by artefact type and material, followed by allocation of dates and pottery fabric types, the latter with reference to the fabric series maintained by the Service (Hurst and Rees 1992). An attempt to measure the level of abrasion was made by grading pottery and tile as unabraded, lightly abraded, abraded and highly abraded. All of this information was entered into a Microsoft Access database and then interrogated by running a number of queries. This allowed distribution plots to be produced for each category of material by weight (in ranges corresponding to the quartiles of each set of values), which were used as the basis for further analysis.

3.5 **Comparative analysis**

The post-fieldwork analysis involved detailed comparison of the datasets produced by the fieldwalking, metal-detecting and topographical survey, together with a re-assessment of the evidence from the desk-based assessment and geophysical survey.

3.6 **The methods in retrospect**

In general, the range of methods applied in Stage 1.2 of the evaluation is considered to have produced high-quality evidence that is capable of bearing the interpretations put upon it, and will provide a sound basis for Stage 1.3.

Unfortunately, the presence of polytunnels in the north-west corner of the Evaluation Area prevented some 2.5 hectares from being fieldwalked and metal-detected, and the aerial photographic evidence for the northern part of the area of is also incomplete. However, legitimate inferences can still be made in relation to this part of the Evaluation Area, such that the relative lack of information is not considered to present a major problem. Fewer inferences can be made regarding the additional strip of land to the east of the Evaluation Area, which was not fieldwalked, and has produced only one cropmark.

4. **Results**

This section is intended as an integrated summary of the results of the various methods described above. However, as reports have already been completed following the aerial photograph assessment (Cox 1997), desk-based assessment (Edwards 1997) and geophysical survey (GSB 2002), more emphasis will be placed on the new evidence from the fieldwalking, metal-detecting and topographical survey.

4.1 **Neolithic or Early Bronze Age activity**

The fieldwalking produced slight evidence for early prehistoric activity in the form of two worked flint flakes. These are likely to be broadly contemporary with the Neolithic arrowhead found during salvage recording (Edwards 1991, 3 and fig 6). All three flints were isolated finds, and probably represent separate visits by individuals or small groups engaged in hunting or gathering. It is therefore unlikely that they represent buried remains of this period. Moreover, none of the cropmarks or geophysical anomalies immediately suggest an early prehistoric date.

4.2 **Late Bronze Age/early Iron Age settlement**

No evidence of late Bronze Age or early Iron Age settlement has been identified so far, or at least no cropmarks, geophysical anomalies or artefacts can be attributed with confidence to either period. However, evidence of late Bronze Age and early Iron Age activity has been recorded at several sites in the vicinity (Edwards 1997, 36-7), and the possibility of remains of these periods being present cannot be entirely ruled out.

4.3 **Late Iron Age settlement**

Most of the cropmarks and geophysical anomalies are of forms that would be consistent with a late Iron Age date (Figs 4 and 5), while salvage recording has demonstrated the presence of features of this period (Edwards 1991, 4-5). No Iron Age artefacts were recovered by fieldwalking, although such material rarely survives in continuously cultivated ploughsoils. There are therefore reasonable grounds for inferring a late Iron Age element to the archaeology of the Evaluation Area. However, the cropmarks and geophysical anomalies would also be consistent with a Roman date, and the amount of Roman pottery recovered by

fieldwalking makes this identification more likely. Nevertheless, it can be suggested that the various pit groups detected by aerial photography and geophysical survey are more likely to be of late Iron Age than Roman date, by analogy with the nine pits excavated during salvage recording (Edwards 1991, 5). If this were the case, then the pits might settlement of domestic or agrarian character, thinly dispersed across the Evaluation Area.

4.4 Roman settlement

As mentioned above, many of the cropmarks and geophysical anomalies could be of Roman date, and this suggestion is supported by the modest, but not insignificant sample of Roman pottery recovered by fieldwalking (Fig 3), and also by the three Roman ditches identified during salvage recording (Edwards 1991, 5-6). The Roman fieldwalking assemblage is described in some detail below, followed by some comments on its distribution in relation to the cropmarks, geophysical anomalies and topography.

4.4.1 The Roman fieldwalking assemblage

Field 1 (WSM 32403)

Almost all the Roman material from this field was pottery. The pottery fabrics recovered are listed in Table 1. Only one sherd of identifiable form was recovered, a type 56rim from interval L7 that can be dated to the 3rd century (Webster, 1976). There were also 16 pieces (197g) of probable Roman tile, 1 piece (4g) of possible Roman or medieval tile and 53g of fired clay, 5g of which may also be Roman or medieval. In addition, a small lead weight (24g) recovered by metal-detecting may be of Roman date.

Fabric type	Fabric number	Total	Weight (g)
Severn Valley ware	12	104	471
Organic tempered Severn Valley ware	12.2	1	3
Miscellaneous Roman wares	98	38	59

Table 1: Roman pottery from Field 1 (WSM32403)

Field 2 (WSM32411)

Seventeen sherds (109g) of Roman pot and one piece of possible Roman or medieval tile were recovered from this field (See Table 2 for the pottery fabrics). Only one sherd of identifiable form was recovered, a type 6 rim dating to the 2nd or 3rd century. (Webster, 1976)

Fabric type	Fabric number	Total	Weight (g)
Severn Valley Ware	12	15	78
Oxfordshire White Mortaria	33	1	29
Miscellaneous Roman wares	98	1	2

Table 2: Roman pottery from Field 2 (WSM32411)

The Roman material from both fields was mostly abraded to highly abraded with only four sherds from Field 1 and three from Field 2 being classed as slightly abraded. No sherds were unabraded.

4.4.2 **Spatial patterning**

The distribution of the Roman fieldwalking assemblage, considered alongside that of the cropmarks and geophysical anomalies allow some inferences to be made regarding the character and extent of Roman settlement, and the potential survival of buried remains.

To begin with Field 1, there appears to be a correlation between the highest distributions of Roman pottery, cropmarks, and geophysical anomalies, and between all of these indicators and the higher ground above the 34m contour (Figs 2-5). Taken together, this evidence strongly suggests a Roman settlement of domestic/agrarian character, and relatively low status, based on one or more enclosures occupying the higher, flatter ground in the centre of the Evaluation Area. However, it is important to note that the relative scarcity of finds and features below the 34m contour may be more apparent than real, because of the likelihood that at least some soil has been washed downslope by a combination of ploughing and rainfall. It is therefore possible that the settlement represented on the higher ground may have extended onto the lower slopes, where a greater depth of soil may have protected buried features from plough-damage, at least to some extent. It should also be noted that the relative abundance of pottery on the higher, flatter ground may be indicative of variable levels of plough disturbance of sub-surface features and associated material as much as the presence of buried remains.

Also in Field 1, there is apparently a negative correlation between the highest concentrations of Roman pottery and the two main enclosures. In particular, the largest amounts of Roman pottery per interval were found along the east side of the larger enclosure, whereas only several sherds were recovered from its interior. The correlation is not secure, and the quantities of Roman pottery are relatively small, but it is nonetheless possible that the pattern represents rubbish deposition or manuring of cultivated plots immediately outside the settled area.

The quantity of finds and features in Field 2 is significantly less than in Field 1 (WSM 32403), and within the field itself, almost all indicators are thinly distributed or poorly represented. It therefore seems likely that this area lay on the periphery of the Roman settlement, although as noted above, several pit groups may be associated with late Iron Age activity.

4.5 **Medieval agriculture**

The fieldwalking provided slight evidence for medieval agriculture in the form of several diagnostic sherds that were most probably ploughed into the ploughsoil as a rubbish component of farmyard manure.

The medieval material from Field 1(WSM 32403) consisted of 5 sherds (37g) of oxidised glazed Malvernian ware (fabric 69) and 4 sherds (14g) of an unknown medieval pot type (fabric 99). A large amount of fired clay, tile and brick was also recovered from the field, and much of it could be medieval, none could be securely dated to this period, and it is best considered as post-medieval or modern. The only possible medieval material from Field 2 (WSM 32411) was tile, which could also be of post-medieval or modern date.

Taken together, the pottery and other potentially medieval artefacts suggest that both fields were cultivated to some extent in the medieval period, or at least between the 14th and 17th centuries, which is the maximum date range of oxidised Malvernian ware (V Bryant, pers comm). Medieval agriculture is also suggested by the forms of field boundaries recorded on the Holt Tithe Map of 1839 (Edwards 1998, fig 6). In particular, the curve of two boundaries (both long since removed) suggests that they were formed by large plough-teams of medieval type. The amount of ploughing suggested by this evidence will undoubtedly have affected earlier buried remains to a greater or lesser extent, almost certainly by truncating the upper fills of features on the higher ground, but perhaps also by contributing to colluviation, and the masking of features on the lower slopes. However, the names of the fields in the Evaluation Area (recorded on the 1839 Tithe map) suggest that they formed part of a park in the medieval

or early post-medieval period, which would imply that cultivation was delayed or interrupted for some time (Edwards 1997, fig 6).

4.6 Post-medieval agriculture

Post-medieval (17th to 19th century) agriculture was represented by much higher frequencies of tile, pottery and other artefacts (Fig 6). These indicate that both fields continued to be cultivated in the post-medieval period, with Field 1 receiving by far the greatest investment in terms of manure. The impact of ploughing on buried remains during this period is likely to have been considerable.

Field 1 (WSM 32403)

The largest group of material recovered from this field was 13th to 18th century flat roof tile (2.40kg). The high level of abrasion made it very difficult to date the tile to one period. The total weight of tile dating from the medieval to modern period (including 13th to 18th century roof tile, but not floor tile) was 5.55kg. Some of the material classified as fired clay may include fragments of tile and brick that were too abraded to be properly identified.

Thirty-nine sherds (450g) of post-medieval or post-medieval pottery were recovered from this field (see Table 4 for fabric types).

Also recovered was vessel glass and iron which may have been post-medieval.

Fabric	Number	Total	Weight (g)
Miscellaneous post-medieval wares	100	2	4
Post-medieval red ware	78	19	192
Red sandy ware	78.1	1	29
Stoneware	81	13	188
Westerwald Stoneware	81.2	1	19
Nottingham stoneware	81.3	1	1
Porcelain	83	1	7
Post-medieval buff ware	91	1	10

Table 4: Post-medieval pottery from Field 1 (WSM32403)

Field 2 (WSM 32411)

Twenty sherds (232g) of pottery dating from the post-medieval or post-medieval period were recovered from this field (Table 5). Also recovered were tile, glass, iron and fired clay which could date to the post-medieval period.

Fabric	Number	Total	Weight (g)
Post-medieval red ware	78	12	166
Stoneware	81	1	22
Porcelain	83	1	19
Creamware	84	4	19
Post-medieval buff wares	91	2	6

Table 5: Post-medieval pottery from Field 2 (WSM32411)

4.7 Modern agriculture

Modern (19th and 20th century) agriculture was also well-represented by manuring scatters, which appear to be more evenly distributed between the two fields. In addition, the geophysical survey identified linear anomalies which are considered to relate to modern ploughing (Figs 6 and 7). As discussed in the earlier desk-based assessment (Edwards 1997,

36-37), and in the proposal (AS 2001, 23-25), the impact of modern ploughing on earlier buried remains is likely to have been considerable, although its effects may not have been entirely destructive.

Field 1 (WSM32403)

Eighty-two sherds (332g) of modern pottery were recovered from this field (see Table 6 for the pottery fabrics). Other modern material included iron objects, plastic, vessel and window glass, land drain and brick. The tile recovered consisted of 683g of flat roof tile, 541g of floor tile and a further 322g of tile which may have been post-medieval or modern.

Fabric	Number	Total	Weight
Miscellaneous modern	101	1	4
Modern Stone China	85	81	328

Table 6: Modern pottery from Field 1 (WSM 32403)

Field 2 (WSM32411)

Twenty sherds (48g) of modern pottery (all Fabric 85) were recovered from this field, along with 3 sherds (37g) of post-medieval or modern pottery, 14g of modern vessel glass and 20g of post-medieval or modern vessel glass.

The modern material was overall less abraded than the earlier material, probably due to the hardness of the material and shorter length of time it had spent in the soil.

5. Discussion

In summary, the evidence available at the present stage of the evaluation suggests an occasional Neolithic presence, extensive but thinly-spread late Iron Age settlement, and more concentrated Roman settlement on the higher ground in the centre of the Evaluation Area (but perhaps extending onto the lower slopes). The later artefacts in the fieldwalking assemblage and the condition of earlier material indicate at least intermittent cultivation of both fields in the later medieval or early post-medieval period, and more intensive cultivation from the 17th century onwards.

At present, little more can be said about the extent and character of Iron Age settlement, while the evidence for medieval and later farming requires no further comment. However, the various indicators for Roman settlement allow some hypotheses to be entertained. Taken together, the evidence suggests a farmstead set within a landscape of fields and tracks. Because of the palimpsest of cropmarks and geophysical anomalies and the undiagnostic nature of most of the pottery, it is impossible at present to determine the size of the farmstead at any one time, or to establish the overall date-range of occupation. However, it seems likely that the two most prominent enclosures were contemporary (and perhaps functionally distinct) and that they constituted most of the farmstead at one stage of its development (Fig 5; Edwards 1997, fig 9, C and D). It also seems that the farmstead was less long-lived or intensely occupied than the density of cropmarks might suggest, as the artefact assemblage was relatively small. Finally, despite the small size of the assemblage, it may be significant the only dateable pottery sherds were of 2nd and/or 3rd century date. It is unlikely that all the cropmarks can be placed within this narrow time-frame, although it is possible that the settlement may have been most intensively occupied around this time.

6. Archaeological potential

A full assessment of the significance of all archaeological remains in the Evaluation Area will be undertaken once the evaluation is complete. However, at this interim point for the purposes of this report, the Evaluation Area can be divided into areas of high, uncertain, and unknown

archaeological potential (Fig 8). The central and northern parts of the Evaluation Area are considered to be an area of high potential, because of the close associations between Roman pottery, cropmarks and geophysical anomalies, and the demonstrated presence of Iron Age and Roman remains. This assessment must be qualified in view of the considerable amount of plough truncation that can be inferred, although it is still likely that deeper cut features survive to some extent beneath the active ploughsoil.

The potential of the north-west corner of the Evaluation Area is uncertain, as it could not be fieldwalked, although cropmarks have been recorded there and it is likely that Roman pottery is also present. The potential of the east facing slopes of the Evaluation Area is also uncertain, as it is possible that remains might be sealed and to some extent protected by colluvium. Finally, the strip of land to the east of the Evaluation Area must be considered an unknown quantity, as it was not fieldwalked and has produced only one cropmark.

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.

Fieldwork forming part of an ongoing evaluation was undertaken on land 500m south of Top Barn Farm, Worcestershire (NGR SO 8300 6135). The project was commissioned by Entec UK, on behalf of Tarmac Western Ltd, who wish to explore the possibility of extending their existing quarry at Church Farm into two adjacent fields (the Evaluation Area). Both fields are known to contain archaeological remains (WCM 4507 and 4511), and the northern field (WCM 4507) is presently a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM HERE & WORCS 209). The aim of this stage of the evaluation was to apply two methods of archaeological prospection (fieldwalking and metal-detecting) and an element of topographical survey; and to analyse the results in relation to existing information.

The fieldwalking produced slight evidence for early prehistoric activity in the form of two worked flints, which may be comparable in date to a Neolithic arrowhead found during salvage recording in 1991. All three flints were isolated finds, and probably represent separate visits by individuals or small groups engaged in hunting or gathering. No artefacts of Bronze Age or Iron Age date were recovered, although some of the cropmarks and geophysical anomalies previously identified in the Evaluation Area may be attributed to the later Iron Age. In addition, nine pits of Iron Age date were identified during the 1991 salvage recording. There are therefore good grounds for inferring a significant late Iron Age element to the archaeology of the Evaluation Area, although it appears that settlement (or other activity) was of low intensity and thinly dispersed.

Clearer evidence of Roman settlement was recovered in the form of 160 sherds (642g) of Roman pottery, which were concentrated on the higher, flatter ground in the centre of the Evaluation Area, and appear to correspond with the highest concentrations of cropmarks and geophysical anomalies. Taken together, the evidence suggests a farmstead of modest size and status based on one or more ditched enclosures, and set within a landscape of fields and tracks. Later artefacts in the fieldwalking assemblage and the abraded condition of the Roman pottery indicated at least intermittent cultivation in the medieval and post-medieval periods, and more intensive modern cultivation.

8. **The archive**

The archive consists of:

- 4 Fieldwork progress records AS2

-
- 2 Photographic records AS3
 - 2 Colour slides films
 - 2 Monochrome films
 - 2 Scale drawings
 - 1 Box of finds
 - 1 Computer disk

The project archive is intended to be placed at:

Worcestershire County Museum
Hartlebury Castle
Hartlebury
Near Kidderminster
Worcestershire DY11 7XZ
Tel Hartlebury (01299) 250416

9. **Acknowledgements**

The Service would like to thank Ben Yates and Colin Hume of Tarmac Western Limited and their archaeological consultant, Simon Atkinson of Entec UK for their assistance with this project.

10. **Personnel**

The fieldwork and report writing were led by Darren Miller. The project manager responsible for the quality of the project was Robin Jackson. Fieldwork was undertaken by Andrew Brown, Darren Miller, Maggie Noake and Sheena Payne; metal-detecting by Dean Crawford; finds analysis by Erica Darch, and illustrations by Carolyn Hunt.

11. **Bibliography**

AS 2001 Proposal for a staged archaeological evaluation south of Top Barn Farm, Holt, Worcestershire (SAM HERE & WORCS 209; WSM 4507 & 4511), Archaeological Service, Worcestershire County Council, document dated 6th August 2001

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

Cox, C 1997 Aerial photographic Assessment Report, in Edwards 1997, 50-56 & figs 8 & 9

Edwards, R 1991, *Salvage Recording at Church Farm Quarry, Holt*, County Archaeological Service, Hereford and Worcester County Council, report, **75**

Edwards, R 1997 *Desk-based assessment of enclosures south of Top Barn Farm, Holt*, Hereford and Worcester, County Archaeological Service, Hereford and Worcester County Council, report, **605**

GSB Prospection, 2002 *Ball Mill Quarry, Worcestershire*, GSB report, **2002/18**

Hurst, J D, and Rees, H, 1992 Pottery fabrics; a multi-period series for the County of Hereford and Worcester, in Woodiwiss, S G (ed), *Iron Age and Roman salt production and the medieval town of Droitwich*, CBA Res Rep, **81**

IFA, 1999 *Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation*, Institute of Field Archaeologists

Webster, P V, 1976, Severn Valley Ware: A Preliminary Study, *Trans. Bristol and Gloucester Archaeological Soc.*, **94**, 18–46