JOHN MOORE HERITAGE SERVICES

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT

WHITTINGTON WAY

BISHOP'S STORTFORD HERTFORDSHIRE

VOLUME 1: TEXT

SP 485 190

On behalf of

Hertfordshire County Council

MARCH 2008

REPORT FOR	Hertfordshire County Council CgMs Morley House 26 Holborn Viaduct London EC1A 2AT
FIELD WORK BY	Gwilym Williams
PREPARED BY	Gwilym Williams & Daniel Heale
ILLUSTRATIONS BY	Eoin Fitzsimons & Daniel Heale
FIELDWORK	2nd Janaury-11th February 2008
REPORT ISSUED	17th March 2008
ENQUIRES TO	John Moore Heritage Services Hill View Woodperry Road Beckley Oxfordshire OX3 9UZ Tel/Fax 01865 358300 Email: info@jmheritageservices.co.uk
Site Code	BSWW 08
JMHS Project No:	1834
Archive Location	Rhodes Museum Bishop's Stortford Accession number to be assigned at deposition

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

An evaluation was carried out by John Moore Heritage Services on behalf of CgMs on land south of Whittington Way, Bishop's Stortford. Trenching was targeted on the results of a geophysical survey.

The results of the trenching revealed a Bronze Age ring-ditch, which had been reused in the Romano-British period, a Bronze Age trackway apparently to a field-system or droveway for animal pens. Extensive remains of a Romano-British farmstead and associated agricultural activity, possibly a vineyard, were also recovered on the western side of the site. A Roman enclosure, which may have had its origins in the Bronze Age, was sampled on the northern side of the site. To the west of this enclosure were further remains of Roman enclosures, and possible structures. A number of cremations were also observed across the site, some of which could assuredly be dated to the Roman period while others were undated.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Site Location and Topography *(Figure 1)*

The site is located off Whittington Way, Bishop's Stortford, Hertfordshire south of the town and centred on grid reference TL 485 190. The site is c. 53 hectares in extent and is bounded by Whittington Way to the north, by Obrey Way to the north-west, by St James Way to the south and by London Road (A1184) to the east. The solid geology is shown by the Institute of Geological Sciences as Chalk (IGS, 1979). The drift geology, as shown on the 1:50,000 Geological Survey (Sheets 240: Epping and Sheet 222: Dunmow) is largely overlain by drift Boulder Clay. On the east side of the site a north-south Gravel Head deposit occurs, which is cut by a dry valley, filled with a similar Gravel Head deposit. Glacial Sands underlying the Boulder Clay are locally exposed to the north of the dry valley. The study site falls gently from north to south, lying between c. 80m and c. 60m above Ordnance Datum.

The archaeological remains were most densely located in the West Field, historically known as Spring Field, which was on Boulder Clay. The field dropped from north to south (sloping west to east) over a total distance of c.320; the fall over the northern c. 130m from north to south to the break of slope was from 79.6m OD to 75.4m on the west side and from 76m OD to 72.7m OD on the east side of the West Field. A west-east plateau, c. 80m wide, broke the overall slope between 75.4m OD in the west to 72.1m OD and 71.7m OD in the east. The slope then dropped to between 72.6m OD (west) to 69m OD (east) over c. 110m south of the plateau.

The topography and geology of the East Field were not entirely the same as the West Field. The field sloped from west to east and north to south with a sudden drop into a dry valley on the eastern side; the northwest corner was at 75m OD dropping to 69.9m OD to the east. The west side of the East Field sloped from 74.8m to 71.6m OD. A ring ditch was located on a knoll at 71.4m OD overlooking the dry valley; such a location on a false crest is typical for barrows.

The East Field fell to the south beyond the ring ditch; on the west side this fall was from below the easternmost extension of the farmstead, where the putative burnt

building was located (see below). The drop was marginal from 69.7m OD to 68.6m OD. On the east side of the Eastern Field the lowest point was 60.32m OD in the southeast corner, a drop of more than 10m from the ring ditch.

In the North Field the interface between Gravel Head-type deposits and Boulder Clay was just to the north of the footpath dividing the North Field from the East Field. Some colluviation was observed in Trench 64. The Gravel Head deposits extended as far west as Trench 26 in the North Field.

1.2 Planning Background

The south-western part of the study site falls within a wider area that is designated as an Area of Archaeological Significance, identified in East Hertfordshire District Council Local Plan Second Review, adopted in 2007. The 'Area of Archaeological Significance' was first designated in the 1990 East Hertfordshire Local Plan due to the discovery of Roman building remains during ploughing in the 1950s in a field now south of St James Way.

There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments on the study site or in the immediate vicinity, although the Iron Age Hillfort of *Wallbury*, a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM EX16) is situated c.500m to the southeast.

The Local Plan Second Review contains the following policies relating to Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other archaeological remains:

1.2.1 BH1 ARCHAEOLOGY & NEW DEVELOPMENT

(I) DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED WHERE THE COUNCIL CONSIDERS THAT IT WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE, WHETHER SCHEDULED OR UNSCHEDULED, AND THEIR SETTING.

(II) PERMISSION OR CONSENT MAY BE REFUSED WHERE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS DO NOT SATISFACTORILY PROTECT ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS OF MORE LOCAL IMPORTANCE, AND THEIR SETTING.

(III) WHERE APPROPRIATE, UNDER SECTION 106 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (OR AS SUBSEQUENTLY REVISED),THE DISTRICT COUNCIL WILL SEEK TO SECURE THE ENHANCEMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS AND THEIR SETTING.

1.2.2 BH2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS & ASSESSMENTS

WHERE APPLICATIONS ARE SUBMITTED ON SITESWHICH MAY HAVE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST, THE DISTRICT COUNCIL WILL EXPECT TO BE PROVIDED, BY THE APPLICANT, THE RESULTS OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION AND/OR ASSESSMENT PRIOR TO THE DETERMINATION OF AN APPLICATION. THE EVALUATION AND/OR ASSESSMENT SHOULD SEEK TO DEFINE:

A) THE NATURE AND CONDITION OF ANY ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS WITHIN THE APPLICATIONSITE; AND

B) THE LIKELY IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON SUCH FEATURES;
ON THE BASIS OF THE RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION AND/OR THE ASSESSMENT, THE COUNCIL WILL CONSIDER THE MOST APPROPRIATE MEANS OF MITIGATING THE IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT ON THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE PRESERVATION IN SITU OR, WHERE THIS IS NOT MERITED, THE

MEASURES NEEDED TO SECURE THE RECORDING OF ANY REMAINS PRIOR TO DEVELOPMENT.

1.2.3 BH3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONDITIONS & AGREEMENTS

WHERE DEVELOPMENT IS PERMITTED ON SITES CONTAINING ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS, ANY PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS AND/OR FORMAL AGREEMENTS REQUIRING APPROPRIATE EXCAVATION AND RECORDING IN ADVANCE OF DEVELOPMENT AND THE PUBLICATION OF THE RESULTS.

The Historic Environment Unit for Hertfordshire County Council advise that a pre-application evaluation of the proposed development site, comprising c. 5% or 97 trenches of 50m length, should be carried out to enable the Local Authority, East Hertfordshire District Council, in making an informed decision on the Application. This is in line with PPG16 and Local Plan Policies.

1.3 Archaeological and Historical Background

No find spots for archaeological remains earlier than the Late Bronze Age have been found within 500m of the study site. The desk-based assessment (Bourn 2007), from which this résumé is drawn, detailed the potential for encountering such remains. The aim of this background is to set the site in its immediate context; all references are to be found in the original Desk-Based Assessment.

1.3.1 Neolithic to Late Bronze Age

Within 1km of the study site there are no sites and finds of Neolithic or Early Bronze Age date. Certainly, archaeological investigations undertaken in 1994 in advance of the proposed St James Way did not identify any evidence of the period within the vicinity of the study site (HER 9277: Last & McDonald 1995). Similarly, Neolithic and Early Bronze Age activity was not identified during more recent excavations for a proposed agricultural roadway (No HER number, Essex CC Field Unit pers comm).

Late Bronze Age occupation is evidenced locally. An archaeological evaluation undertaken in 1994 on the alignment of St James Way revealed a large enclosure ditch c. 2.4m wide, a cobbled surface, and features containing animal bone and Late Bronze Age pottery (HER 9277: TL 4758 1910) c.150m west of the study site. A second trench, Trench J, revealed further prehistoric features suggesting that evidence of settlement/activity may extend towards the western boundary of the study site (HER 9277).

Six LBA rubbish pits were also recorded during archaeological investigations for the Thornbera Road Extension indicating a second LBA settlement site nearby (north of the study site) (HER 1090: TL 486 197). In addition, the HER records 3 finds of Late Bronze Age date including a looped and socketed axe (HER 2124: TL 476 187), a bronze socketed gouge on possible site of a 'ploughed out' round barrow (HER 2125: TL 4766 1846) and a bronze axe found in 1961 (HER 2126: TL 476 190).

1.3.2 Iron Age

The Iron Age is characterised in the region by settlement stability and the large-scale organisation of the landscape, developments that began in the Late Bronze Age. Settlement evidence is plentiful and diverse, ranging from individual farmsteads occupied by a single household, to hillforts holding much larger communities. *'Wallbury'* hillfort, a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM EX16), some 500m south-east of the study site may have played a part in the local settlement hierarchy.

Excavations along St James Way identified Iron Age settlement evidence, revealing two ring-gullies, the remains of round houses, within a complex of enclosure ditches. Early and Middle Iron Age pottery was recovered from the features (HER 9278: TL 4836 1876). In 1912, a quantity of Early Iron Age pottery (HER 2785: TL 490 196) was recovered during gravel extraction on Thorley Hill, north of the study site, suggesting a second occupation site. To the west of the development area a silver quarter stater of Cunoblin was found by a metal detectorist (HER 6540: TL 481 193).

1.3.3 Roman

In 1954, deep ploughing in a field beyond St James Way to the south of the study site revealed the remains of rectangular timber buildings with mortar floors. Artefacts associated with the features included pottery, coins, roof tile as well as worked and waste flint (HER 1526: TL 488 180). A sketch of the site places the site roughly 60m south of the proposed development site. More recent archaeological investigations on the site of a proposed agricultural roadway, within the study site (No HER: TL 480 194) identified evidence of a Roman rural settlement surrounded by a complex of enclosures and field boundaries.

Evidence of Roman occupation was also identified during a rescue excavation at Thorley Park (HER 4582: TL 4779 1962) and a Roman cremation was recorded during archaeological investigations for the Thornbera Road Extension (HER 1090: TL 486 197) c.500m north-east of the site. Within 500m of the study site a number of metal objects have been found by metal detectorists including a bronze fibula broach (HER 6537: TL 481 193) as well as a quantity of bronze and silver coins (HER 6539: TL 481 195).

1.3.4 Saxon

No Saxon remains are recorded in the vicinity of the development area. The proposed site lies over 2.5km south of the Saxon settlement at Bishop's Stortford and a short distance north-east of the Saxon manorial centre at Thorley.

1.3.5 Early Medieval – Medieval

Prior to the Conquest, William, Bishop of London, had bought the Manor of *Torlei* (Thorley) from the Saxon, Godith, to add to his lands at Stortford and Hadham. Then, between his death in 1075 and the Domesday Survey of 1086, both the Manor of Sawbridgeworth and Thorley were granted by the King to Geoffrey de Mandeville as a reward for his services at Hastings. The Domesday Survey of 1086 records *Torlei* manor having 4 hides (480 acres) with eight ploughed lands for arable farming, approximately 27 tenants, a knight, a priest and a mill.

Historical sources suggest that during tenancy of Geoffrey de Mandeville the first manor house was built on the site of present day Thorley Hall. The existing Thorley Hall (a Grade II Listed Building) is located 250m south-west of the study site, has late 13th and early 14th century origins (HER 4237: TL 4770 1884; LB II *).

During the 14th and 15th centuries the manor changed hands frequently and during this period Richard Whytyndone (1358–1423), better known as Dick Whittington, four times Mayor of London held the Manor. Whittington Way, immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of the site, reflects this association.

In 1420 the manor was sold to the Leventhorpes of Shingle Hall, Sawbridgeworth and in 1447 Henry VI granted John Leventhorpe permission to create a hunting park, for which he acquired a further 520 acres in the parishes of Sawbridgeworth and Thorley to accommodate it.

Cartographic research suggests that during the medieval period land within the proposed development area was in agricultural use and held by Thorley Hall, the seat of Thorley Manor. However, documentary evidence suggests the possibility that during the 15th century at least part of the study site fell within a hunting park.

1.3.6 Post-Medieval – Modern

Within the proposed development area, a single find of a post-medieval boot buckle was made by a metal detectorist (HER 6544: TL 481 195).

The earliest map showing the site at a useful scale is a map of 1672-3 showing the 'Lands of the Manor of Thorley Hall', showing a building to the south of Church Lane, which forms the western boundary of the study site. The site of a Tudor house was identified after ploughing revealed quantities of broken tiles, pottery and oyster shells in this area (HER 2778: TL 4800 1911). The remainder of the site is shown comprising 10 fields variously in arable and pasture use. The building may also be that seen on Bryants' map of 1820.

The 1825 Plan of Thorley Estate, Thorley Hall and Thorley Wash shows the majority of the site in arable and pastoral land use. By this date the earlier building off Church Lane had been demolished. The Tithe Map of 1840 shows a similar pattern of buildings off Church Lane to that on the 1820 Bryant's Map. The field pattern evident in the 1840's progressively ha sections of hedgerow removed over the period to 1980.

Cartographic evidence suggests that the Tudor house off Church Lane revealed during ploughing in the late 1980s (HER 2788: TL 4800 1911) had been demolished between 1951 and 1983.

In addition to the medieval Thorley Hall, a Grade II* Listed building, there are four other listed buildings and structures of post-medieval date associated with the Thorley Hall Estate. These include a nine bay timber framed barn (HER 11993: TL 4766 1891; LB II*) and a five bay timber framed barn (HER 11994: TL 4765 1883; LB II), 17th/18th century garden walls and garden shed (HER 12206: TL 4770 1887; LB II) and an 18th/19th century cast iron pump (HER 12207: TL 4770 1884; LB II). This group of listed buildings is separated from the study site by St James Way and a related overbridge and landscaping.

1.3.7 Magnetometric Survey

During 2007 Stratascan carried out an extensive magnetometry survey of the three fields. A number of anomalies of an archaeological origin were located, including a rectilinear enclosure, a circular ditch feature and a possible settlement site (Smalley, 2007: 3). The results of this geophysical survey informed the positioning of the trenches, both in terms of areas to investigate as exhibiting remains and as areas with no recorded remains. The features appeared to represent a late prehistoric and Romano British agricultural landscape.

1.3.8 Geotechnical Test-Pits

In September 2007, John Moore Heritage Services were asked to monitor geotechnical test-pits carried out on site. During this work twenty trial pits and three soakaways were excavated. Four of the trial-pits yielded finds from sealed contexts, with a further trial-pit evidencing undated activity.

Pottery and ceramic building material (CBM) from the late prehistoric through to post-medieval was recovered from a further thirteen trial-pits and soakaways. The results of the watching brief over the test-pitting indicated that there were sufficiently well preserved archaeological remains, despite there being little in the way of surface finds (Williams 2007).

The archaeological desk-based assessment (Bourn, 2007) established that a good potential for later prehistoric and Roman period remains was identified for the study site, with a lower potential for all other archaeological periods. This conclusion was based upon a survey of the Historic Environment Records held by Hertfordshire County Council.

Recent use of the study site for agriculture was believed to have had the potential to impact upon the archaeology, truncating or removing previously surviving archaeological deposits. Evidence from the magnetometry survey and the test-pit monitoring demonstrated the presence of preserved positive archaeological remains. The land had been tilled, rather than ploughed, with a consequent high degree of preservation, demonstrated by the presence of a number of positive features (see below).

2 AIMS OF THE INVESTIGATION

The aims of the investigation as laid out in the Written Scheme of Investigation were as follows:

- To determine or confirm the general nature of any remains present.
- To determine or confirm the approximate date or date range of any remains, by means of artefactual or other evidence.
- To determine or confirm the approximate extent of any remains.
- To determine the condition and state of preservation of any remains.
- To determine the degree of complexity of the horizontal and/or vertical stratigraphy present.
- To determine or confirm the likely range, quality and quantity of any artefactual evidence present.
- To determine the potential of the site to provide palaeoenvironmental and/or economic evidence and the forms in which such evidence may be present.

3 STRATEGY

3.1 Research Design

In response to a *Specification* designed and issued by CgMs Consulting, and agreed with the Historic Environment Unit (HEU) of Hertfordshire County Council, JMHS carried out the work, which was initially to comprise the excavation of ninety trenches across the site; a further seven trenches were excavated due to redesign of the layout of the proposed development (Fig. 2).

Site procedures for the investigation and recording of potential archaeological deposits and features were defined in a *Written Scheme of Investigation* agreed with the HEU. The work was carried out in accordance with the standards specified by the Institute of Field Archaeologists (1994) and the principles of MAP2 (English Heritage 1991).

3.2 Methodology

Ninety-seven trenches were excavated. Ninety-one of these measured 50m by 2m; four of the trenches were shorter, three of which were laid out in the vicinity of overhead electric cables; two trenches were longer. Additionally one trench was opened up to define the fullest extent of the archaeology observed. Initially, the trenches were excavated by a JCB with a ditching bucket, but subsequently a 13-tonne 360° was employed. The site was monitored by Alison Tinniswood of HEU on three occasions.

The site comprises three fields divided by two hedgelines and a footpath (Fig. 2). The fields were identified during the evaluation as the West, East and North Fields; the fields currently in use are capitalised, whereas fields in lower case refer to fields dating from the Iron Age/Roman period, or earlier. Each field can be said to be topographically distinct; a description of the archaeology follows in the results.

The trenches were excavated to the top of the archaeology or the natural, whichever occurred first. The resultant surfaces were cleaned by hand, where necessary, prior to limited hand excavation of any identified archaeological features.

Standard John Moore Heritage Services techniques were employed throughout, involving the completion of a written record for each deposit encountered, with scale plans and sections drawings compiled where appropriate. A photographic record was produced and maintained.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Recording Methodology and Presentation of Results

All deposits and features were assigned individual context numbers. Context numbers in square brackets - [ ] - indicate features i.e. cuts of pits ditches etc that were investigated during the evaluation; while numbers in parentheses - ( ) - show feature fills or deposits of material, some of which were investigated, while others were characterised by analogy with previously excavated deposits. Trench numbers precede cut or fill numbers, so that (8/08) is fill 08 in Trench 8. All measurements are given in metres. A general description of the features and fills, or deposits, observed is given in the Appendix Context Description at the rear.

Due to the size of the evaluation, the field results are presented both chronologically and thematically. This will draw together a number of trenches which demonstrated similar results. This will be used to characterise the activities observed on site. The terms used below for the report are convenient although the actual interpretations remain still open to discussion depending on further work on the site.

4.2 Field Results

4.2.1 All Trenches *(Figure 2)*

All trenches evidenced a basic similar sequence of natural undisturbed ground, subsoil and topsoil.

The natural (Tr. no./03) consisted of yellow to brownish yellow silty clay with flint and chalk through it – this is the Boulder Clay which overlies the chalk bedrock. On the south and north sides of the site reddish brown gravelly deposits were observed – these are the Gravel Head deposits. In the northeast corner some sandy silt colluviation was observed. The Appendix at the rear details which natural was present in each trench. The natural was observed in all trenches.

The subsoil (Tr. no./02) was a grey brown loamy clay with small fragments (0.01-0.1m) of flint and chalk spread through it. The subsoil varied in thickness between 0.1m and 0.25m. The subsoil is an old ploughsoil.

In all the trenches ploughsoil (Tr. no./01) sealed the subsoil. The ploughsoil was a dark grey brown clay loam with flint and chalk, measuring between 0.15m and 0.25m thick; the usually undisturbed interface between the subsoil and the ploughsoil indicates that the land has been tilled, rather than ploughed.

4.2.2 The Bronze Age Remains

4.2.2.1 The Ditches in the South-East Corner *(Figure 3 & 4)*

In the south-east corner of the site a pair of parallel ditches may well indicate the existence of a track leading to the ring-ditch, or indeed to the farmstead. The geophysical survey revealed a pair of northwest/southeast aligned ditches – apparently showing a track – but which were subsequently shown as geological anomalies to the north (Smalley 2007), despite appearing to describe a crossroads. These features were observed in Trenches 87 and 82, including a single ditch at right angles in Trench 83, which may well be part of the putative crossroads. The difficulty in positively identifying the geophysical results and the discrepancies between the magnetometry survey and the evaluation may be in part explained by the very dirty gravel natural in parts of this area; it is conceivable that a period of weathering and larger open areas might make it easier to locate the archaeological features.

Trench 87 (Fig. 4) was located in the southeast corner of the site oriented northeast/southwest between 63.74m OD at the southwest end and 63.65m OD at the northeast end. Two ditches were excavated in Trench 87 with a gravelly spread (87/13) between them. The southern ditch [87/06] which c. 1.7m wide and c. 65m deep was filled with two orange brown sandy fills, the earlier deposit (87/07) contained pottery that was dated to the Bronze Age or later. The later deposit, (87/04) did not contain any dating material. (87/03) on the section drawing is excavated natural gravel.

To the northeast [87/09] was c. 2.2m wide and c. 1m deep and filled with three distinct deposits, which probably indicate recutting of the ditch given the steepness of the interface between (87/08) and (87/10). The earliest fill (87/08) completely filled the cut and was a mid brown silt containing pottery dated to the Bronze Age, with frequent small stone and moderate charcoal spread through the deposit; bone was also present in the fill. This deposit was cut by a U-shaped ditch [87/11] filled with a stiff mid brown clay (87/10), c. 0.7m thick; no pottery or inclusions were present in the section excavated. A possible, but unlikely, recut [87/12] through (87/10) was filled with mid grey brown sandy clay (87/05), which was very gravelly in the base of the deposit.

The gravelly spread (87/13) was c. 7m across; it comprised a more gravelly area than the gravel head deposits north and south of the ditches [87/06] and [87/09]. It is clear that from the limited view of the evaluation trench it is not easy to assert unequivocally that the gravelly area was a trackway; further investigation in the area of Trenches 82 and 83 would confirm the presence of a track.

Trench 82 (Fig. 4), located to the northwest of Trench 87, was oriented northeast/southwest; the top of the southwest end was at 67.20m OD; the northeast was at 66.88m OD. At the southwest end two parallel trenches, (82/04) and (82/05), were observed in line with those in Trench 87. They were not sampled, but it appears that the ditches [87/06] and [87/09] continue to the northeast and are present in Trench 82.

Trench 83 (Fig. 4) was located south of Trench 80 and east of Trench 82 on the east side of the site; oriented north/south, it dropped from 66.06m OD (north) to 64.57m OD (south). Three linear features, a gully (83/05) and two ditches (83/04) and (83/06) were observed in the trench. A small sherd of pottery, identified as Bronze Age was recovered from the surface of the east/west oriented ditch (83/04). The gully (83/05) was parallel with (83/04), but the second ditch (83/06), located to the south, was at right angles to the projection of the pair of ditches sampled in Trench 87, as well as the projection of those observed in Trench 82. Ditch and gully 983/05) and (83/04), one a possible recut for the other, must be the feature that was interpreted as of geological origin in the geophysical survey. Therefore a further track may run northeast from the northwest/southeast track.

No further evidence for the trackway was observed to the northwest; however, the ditch located to the north of the Roman farmstead, observed in Trenches 9 and 23 may well be part of such a trackway leading up to Bronze Age enclosures or a field-system. To the northeast, in Trench 83, a ditch dated from the Bronze Age may be associated with the principal trackway.

4.2.2.2 The Ring Gully and East Field *(Figures 3, 5 & 6)*

To the north of the trackway, the ring-ditch was located on the east side of the site overlooking the dry valley on the west side of Thorley Wash or Street. The ring-ditch, measuring c. 35m diameter, was sampled in Trenches 72 and 75, which both yielded a good amount of dating evidence. The tops of the trenches were located between 71.5m (Trench 72, west) and 71.2m (Trench 75, north) and 70.4m (Trench 72, middle) and 70.8m OD (Trench 75, middle), where the middle is downslope to the east. To the west, in Trench 73 the top of the trench in the middle was 70.5m OD, emphasising the knoll the barrow was located upon.

The V-shaped ring-ditch measured up to 1.1m wide and c. 0.7m deep [72/07]/[72/09]/[75/06]. It was filled with mid brown silty clay (72/06)/(75/05), which yielded pottery dating from the Bronze Age. On the north side it cut an earlier pit [72/10], which was only observed during the post-excavation analysis; no other features, such as postholes, were observed here. The centre of the ring ditch was not examined.

The ring-ditch [72/07]/[72/09]/[75/06] was recut during the Roman period by a narrower and shallower cut [72/12]/[72/13]/[75/07]. Small stone in a mid grey brown clay silt matrix (72/04), was visible in the base of the cut [72/12]/[72/13]/[75/07]. The fill (72/04) contained pottery spanning the Bronze Age to Roman, the latter material – probably post-AD43 – may be intrusive, but on balance was probably introduced as a result of recutting the ditch of the Bronze Age barrow. The deposit (72/04) yielded bone and flint in addition to the pottery. In Trench 75 the same deposit (75/04) only yielded pottery dating from the Bronze Age. The stone in the base of the recut ditch indicates that when the barrow was reused, soil with larger stones within it was imported to rebuild the barrow. It can be inferred that the recutting of the Bronze Age ditch accompanied a Roman inhumation, in addition to the earlier Bronze Age burial. The presence of Roman cremations elsewhere on site in addition to those undated ones points to potentially extensive use of the site for cremation burials.

The ring gully was shown as interrupted in the results from the geophysical survey (possibly being an incomplete ovoid); the evaluation was not able to confirm or reject this interpretation. Elsewhere on the site magnetometry has been demonstrated to be not always capable of recovering all the information, due to either interference or geological factors. Certainly the earlier pit was unexpectedly revealed.

The ring-ditch of the putative barrow on a knoll at 71.4m OD overlooks a dry valley above the London Road; barrows are typically located on such false crests. Overall, the topography and geology of the East Field were not entirely the same as the West Field. The field sloped from west to east and north to south with a sudden drop into a dry valley on the eastern side; the northwest corner (Trench 58) was at 75m OD dropping to 69.9m OD (Trench 69) to the east. The west side of the East Field sloped from 74.8m to 71.6m OD. To the west of the barrow in the East Field the trenches were frequently emptier than to the west. Nonetheless, five of the trenches demonstrated that the earlier prehistoric activity dating from the Bronze Age, which was only fragmentally revealed to the west, extended across from the western side of the farmstead to the ring-ditch.

The trenches which yielded datable material comprise Trenches 68, 69, 73, 77 and 83. These trenches lay in the East Field between the eastern edge of the vineyard (Trenches 53 and 56) and the ring-gully of the barrow (Trenches 72 and 75) to the east and north of Trenches 51, 48, 49, 81 and 87, comprising the eastern edge of the farmstead and the putative trackway.

The land fell from west to east between 74.4m OD (Trench 62, west) and 69.8m OD (Trench 69, north) at the north end to between 69.5m OD (Trench 77, south) and 64.6m OD (Trench 83, south) at the south end; the line that Trenches 68, 73 and 74 (the former two yielded dated material) fell from 72.3m OD (Trench 68) to 70.5m

(Trench 73) to 70m OD (Trench 74). The land behind the ring-ditch does not fall quite as dramatically as in the West Field, and although there are fewer archaeological remains, there is a certain amount of datable activity occurring.

Trench 68 (Fig. 5) which was to the west of the ring-gully and oriented east/west, revealed two postholes [68/08]/(68/04) and [68/09]/(68/05) c.1m apart. Bronze Age pottery was recovered from the fills of both; bone, in good condition, and flint were recovered from the fill of [68/08]. A further small posthole [68/07] lay to the east. In addition, Bronze Age pottery was collected from the subsoil, (68/02), which in itself is worth noting, as few finds were recovered from the topsoil or from the subsoil during the evaluation. This may be due to the trench following a substantial portion of the service trench shown on the magnetometry survey plan; this trench, which is associated with the 1930s roads, Highland Road and Hawthorn Rise to the east, appears to have been excavated and services laid in it as part of a projected pre-war development. It is therefore possible that remains have been disturbed in the vicinity of the east end of Trench 68. Additionally, Soakaway 2, from September 2007, was observed in the trench.

Trench 69 (Fig. 5), which was at c. 69.8m OD and oriented north/south, was located to the east of Trench 68. A single gully terminal was located about halfway along the trench, [69/07]/(69/04) along with two postholes, [69/08] and [69/09]. The gully terminal yielded Bronze Age pottery. The features' relationships with the ring-gully [72/07]/[72/09]/[75/06] to the south is not clear, nor with the remains observed in Trench 68.

To the west of Trench 68, lay Trench 63; oriented north/south, it dropped from 73.6m OD (north top of trench) to 72.7m OD (south top of trench). No remains were recovered from the trench, which appears to lie just outside of eastern edge of the proposed northeast vineyard. No evidence for the proposed Bronze Age field-system was recovered from here.

Trench 77 (Fig. 6) lay east of Trench 51; it was oriented northeast/southwest and dropped from 70m OD to 69.6m OD. An east/west oriented ditch was observed, but the pit or ditch terminal (77/06), on the west side of the trench at the south end yielded Bronze Age pottery. Although this trench was located outside of the farmstead area, there is a pit group c. 50m to the west; it is possible that isolated features would be too discreet to be picked up by the magnetometry survey.

In the central area of the East Field Trench 74 (Fig. 6) southwest of the ring-gully, which was oriented west/east and dropped from 74.7m OD to 69.4m OD, revealed three postholes, (74/04), (74/05) and (74/06). They were not sampled. Trench 79 (Fig. 6), located east of Trench 74, between 68.86m OD (west) and 68.43m OD (east) evidenced the terminal of a gully or ditch (79/05) and a posthole (79/04). Trench 71, between 66.26m OD (south) and 66.39m OD (north) contained no archaeological features; north of it, Trench 70 (Fig. 6), between 69.76m (west) and 66.61m OD (east) revealed three isolated postholes.

4.2.2.3 Bronze Age and later, North of the Farmstead *(Figurse 7-11)*

The trenches in the vicinity of the Roman farmstead also evidenced a quantity of Bronze Age activity. The geophysical survey recovered some of the Bronze Age features, but many were small gullies and some pits, which were not identified during

the magnetometry survey. The positively identified Bronze Age activity comprises some gullies on the west side of the site and the two ditches running northeast and northwest from the farmstead. It is possible that some of the other features identified during the geophysical survey are also Bronze Age, but many features failed to yield dating material. Additionally, several Roman features contain Bronze Age pottery which might be residual, although in some cases the Roman material is intrusive.

To the north of the plateau two field boundaries were identified by the geophysical survey; these were located during the evaluation forming three fields on the upper slope. Trenches 34, 32 and 33 on the east side and Trenches 9, 7, 3 and 96 on the west, with the possibility of this ditch extending as far as Trench 96. The geophysical survey located very little in the west and central Roman fields due north of the settlement, although agricultural activity was identified on the east side of the West Field; similar remains were also located south of the settlement area.

Trench 9 (Fig. 8) was located on the northwest side of the Roman farmstead, oriented northeast/southwest. Ditch [9/14], was located in the centre of the trench, which had been located initially through the geophysical survey. This northwest/southeast aligned ditch formed a boundary on the western part of the site. The ditch was filled with (9/04) and (9/15); the former, a dark red brown loamy clay, the latter was a mid brown grey silty clay with chalk and flint inclusions. Both fills were c. 0.2m thick. The ditch was c. 0.4m deep and approximately 4.5m wide. No evidence was observed for recutting. The pottery from the earlier deposit (9/15) was dated to the Bronze Age; bone was recovered from this deposit, also. Pottery from (9/04) was identified as being Bronze Age in date but there were also two sherds in the fill from a grog-tempered cordoned jar, which could be pre-AD43, suggesting a very Late Iron Age date; bone and flint were also recovered from the fill. The feature was also observed in Trenches 7, 3 and, possibly, 96 – (7/08), (3/09) and [96/24] – to the northwest.

Trench 23 (Fig. 8) was located to the east of Trench 9 and north of the farmstead; the trench was oriented north/south. The top of the topsoil was at 75.85m OD at the south end and 77.3m OD at the north end. The ditch (23/04) was only seen as a deposit at the very end of the trench; pottery dating from the Bronze Age was recovered from the surface of the feature and it was not sampled. North of this enclosure ditch were four narrow gullies, (23/05), (23/06), (23/17) and [23/16]/(23/15). The latter two may the same features as observed in Trench 31, (31/06) and (31/10), the other two gullies were also c. 0.4m wide gullies, although (23/06) seemed to be oriented more southwest/northeast than (23/05). These therefore may not be similar to the other gullies, and may be indicative of enclosures, rather than agricultural practice.

One pit [23/14]/(23/13) was sampled; the fill was orange brown silty clay; well-preserved bone was recovered. Additionally, three postholes [23/08]/(23/07), [23/08]/(23/07), and [23/08]/(23/07) were excavated. They could not be associated with any structure.

Trench 35 (Fig. 8), oriented northeast/southwest located between 75.2m OD (west) and 74.8m (east) lay across the line of a possible Bronze Age trackway. The feature (35/06) corresponds to the northern gully, which forms a junction with the northeast aligned boundary ditch in Trench 34, and extends west into Trenches 23 and 9. The feature (35/05) is very wide and may incorporate an area of pitting as well as a linear feature. No evidence for a positive feature between the two northern features was

visible. These ditches broadly correspond with the features recorded during the magnetometry survey; namely the two narrower gullies to the north of the northern enclosure ditch of the settlement, which yielded Roman pottery, located at the south end of the trench. Neither of these features produced any dating material, although they align with the gully observed in the south end of Trench 23 and in Trench 9, (9/09), which produced Bronze Age pottery.

Trench 7 (Fig. 8), oriented east/west across the western ditch recorded by the geophysical survey, exposed the two ditches (7/08), the larger, and [7/13]/(7/07), the smaller, at c. 45°. Two terminals, (7/10) and (7/11) were observed, as well as four postholes [7/12]/(7/04), (7/05), (7/06) and (7/09).

Trench 34 (Fig. 9) was to the north of Trench 35; the trench was oriented east/west. The top of the topsoil was at 76.47m OD at the west end and 75.51m OD at the east end. At the east end of the trench an area of the northeast/southwest boundary ditch [34/11] was revealed. This measured 7.5m across in plan and was filled with grey-green-brown silty clay, bone was recovered from the fill (34/08), as well as pottery dating from the Bronze Age. At present there is no reason to believe that the pottery from the ditch is residual, although only a small quantity of pottery was recovered from it. The ditch itself was only c. 0.4m deep.

To the west of the ditch, were four north/south aligned agricultural gullies at the west end of the trench. The gullies (34/05), (34/06), (34/07) and (34/08) were all c. 1.1m wide and spaced apart between 1m and 1.5m. None were sampled, although all four were of similar fill-type. No further gullies were observed in neighbouring trenches making it difficult to determine how such isolated features relate to the rest of the area. There is little or no similarity in orientation with those in Trench 31 to the northeast.

On the west side of the farmstead area in Trench 8 (Fig. 9) one of two parallel north by northeast south by southwest linear features observed in the trench was Bronze Age. The northern gully [8/13] was sampled and yielded pottery identified as Bronze Age in date. The gully was 0.6m wide and 0.2m deep filled with yellowish grey brown clay (8/10); the finds from this context were recorded as (8/14).

The feature (8/08) and (8/09) was mid brownish grey and was cut by the southern section of the enclosure ditch [8/15]. This gully may well be an enclosure gully, although without better view in plan it is not possible to be certain. It was undated.

South of the enclosure ditch was a large posthole or small pit [8/06], filled with (8/04) and (8/05); bone and flint as well as pottery dating from the Bronze Age were recovered from fill (8/04) of the feature, which measured 0.7m by 0.9m and was 0.3m deep. The bone was well-preserved.

To the north of the Bronze Age features in Trench 8, a single southwest oriented gully terminal in Trench 6 (Fig. 19), (6/04), yielded Bronze Age pottery.

Trench 29 (Fig. 9) is located at the top of the West Field parallel with the south ditch of the rectangular enclosure, on a northeast/southwest alignment. The top of the topsoil was at 76.68m OD at the northeast end, and 77.77m OD at the southwest end. Two features were observed; a linear feature [29/12]/(29/04) was located at the east

end; a further gully (29/08) and a terminal (29/06) were located to the west. The gully [29/12] is in line with the northeast/southwest ditch shown on the magnetometry survey; however when it was investigated in Trench 34 it was c. 5m wide. A large quantity of Bronze Age pottery was recovered from the surface of (29/04) the fill of gully [29/12] during machining. The yellowy brown fill (29/04) was cut by the enclosure ditch [29/10]. The other gully (29/08) to the west may correspond to the linear feature on the geophysical survey; the gully terminal (29/06) cannot be determined at present but may relate to the proposed Bronze Age field-system or later Roman enclosures. The stakehole (29/07) was not sampled.

Trench 30 (Fig. 10) lies to the north of Trench 31 and was oriented east/west. The top of the topsoil was at 77.84m OD at the southwest end and 77.13m OD at the northeast end. While features such as (30/05), (30/07), (30/10), (30/11) may well be part of the network of agricultural gullies, there are also narrower linear features (30/04) and (30/06) which were less clear-cut to interpret; although the latter may well be a modern land drain. Postholes (30/08) and (30/09) were observed, but not sampled.

Trench 31 (Fig. 10) lies to the northwest of Trench 32 and was oriented northeast/ southwest. The top of the topsoil was at 76.41m OD at the southwest end and 76.31m at the northeast end. The trench revealed four gullies c. 1m wide (31/05)/[31/18], (31/09) – which is cut by (31/12) – and (31/17); one c. 0.7m wide (31/13) and five between 0.4m and 0.5m wide: (31/04), (31/06), (31/10), (31/11) and (31/15)/[31/22]. In addition four postholes – (31/07)/[31/19], (31/08)/[31/20], (31/14) (31/16) – were observed, two of which were sampled.

The gullies observed in the trench probably form parts of small enclosures for animals such as paddocks or corrals. In some cases, features such as (31/13) might feasibly continue as far as Trench 32, (32/05). Clearly the gullies (31/05)/[31/18] and (31/09)/(31/12) are parallel and on a similar northwest/southeast alignment which could indicate evidence of enclosures in the immediate area. To the west of the trench, there is little evidence for further enclosure gullies or ditches. The narrower gullies (31/04), (31/06), (31/10), (31/11) and (31/15)/[31/22] are aligned east/west; (31/06) and (31/10) may extend as far as Trench 24 (23/15)/[23/16] and (23/17). The various linear features appear to be on several alignments suggesting several phases of activity. It is possible that some have an agricultural function but (31/17) could be the corner of a small enclosure. None of the postholes could be associated in such a manner as to propose a function for them, although in the context of small enclosures for animals they may well represent temporary structures or fencelines, which extend beyond the edges of the trench. Only further work can clarify their relationship with one another.

Trench 24 (Fig. 10) was located north of Trench 23 and west of Trench 31; the trench was oriented northwest/southeast. The top of the topsoil was at 76.66m OD at the south end and 78.04m OD at the north end. Stakeholes (24/04), (24/05), (24/06), (24/09) and (24/10) and postholes [24/11] and [24/12] were observed. The stakeholes may have been for temporary erections with a double and a triple stake arrangement. Some flint and Roman tile was recovered from the surface of (24/07).

North of Trench 24 the magnetometry survey revealed the west side of a possible small banjo enclosure, which would be associated with a middle Iron Age or later date; no evidence for any such date has been recovered from the site. Nonetheless,

this would accord with an area of agricultural or pastoral activity, comprising several phases of different enclosures for different activities. It is not uncommon for them to be associated with later Roman activity (Perry, 1972), which might suggest a degree of continuity of landuse.

Trench 25 (Fig. 10) was located north of Trench 24 and northwest of Trench 30; the trench measured c. 30m long and was oriented northwest/southeast. The top of the topsoil was at 78.11m OD at the south end and 78.18m OD at the north end. Two parallel gullies [25/11]/(25/09) and [25/12]/(25/05) were observed at the north end of the trench. These were sampled and shown to be 0.5m wide and c. 0.2m deep. North of these two gullies was a small pit [25/08]/(25/04), c. 0.6m diameter, which was sampled – no finds were recovered. The gully (25/10) cannot be associated with any other feature, although it is feasible that it is the same gully as (30/07).

Trench 4 (Fig. 11) was located west of Trench 25 and north of Trench 5; the trench was oriented east/west. The top of the topsoil was at 79.34m OD at the west end, and 78.87m OD at the east end. At the west end of the trench the area of pitting (4/04), which had been recorded by the magnetometry survey, was observed, but in order to preserve its integrity, it was agreed with HEU not to sample the feature. To the west a ditch (4/05) was observed. One sherd of undiagnostic fired clay was recovered from the orange brown clay fill. To the east of this, the pit [4/08]/(4/06) was excavated. No finds were recovered from the dark brown, almost black fill. A small posthole or stakehole (4/07) was also present.

Trench 5 (Fig. 11) was located west of Trench 24 and north of Trench 7; the trench was oriented southeast/northwest. The top of the topsoil was at 78.23m OD at the east end, and 78.88m OD at the west end. Five postholes (5/04), (5/05), (5/06), (5/07) and [5/10] were observed, but cannot be associated with any form of structure. As noted above in Trench 4, the linear feature [5/11], rather than curving, may indeed be the same gully as (04/05). The gully (7/07) does not seem to be present as far north as Trench 5.

4.2.2.4 Summary North of the Farmstead

The central field was not as well defined in terms of the activity being carried out as the other areas of the West Field. The apparent emptiness shown by the magnetometry was a not inaccurate reflection of the paucity of archaeological remains – clearly, both the geophysical and the evaluation show there to be a quantity of remains; however, these are not as dense nor as easily interpreted as elsewhere on the site.

A number of enclosure ditches were recorded such as that in Trenches 4 and 5, that in Trench 7 and that in Trenches 9, 7 and 3 on the west side of the central area; as well as the enclosure ditches in Trenches 34 and 32, and the gully, which appears to function as the terminal to the northeast aligned ditch, located at the east end of Trench 29. The dating-evidence from these trenches points to a Bronze Age date, although frequently little pottery was recovered from the features, and it is not entirely clear how much of this material might be residual. Only Trenches 9, 34 and 29 yielded Bronze Age pottery. The ditches may well be associated with the trackway, although it is not clear, as yet, what the layout indicates. While the narrow ditch to the north of the farmstead boundary ditch – (23/04) and (9/09) – and the two ditches north of the farmstead are conceivably part of a Bronze Age landscape how these

relate to the ring-ditch to the east or to the rectangular enclosure to the northeast, which contains Bronze age pottery in its lower fill, is not clear.

In this area north of the farmstead, the presence of a number of small enclosures, as well as a possible banjo enclosure – recovered by the magneometry survey – indicates that the area is not wholly empty. Whether it is due to the geological conditions that so little was revealed, or the comparative shallow depth of the features is not certain. Nonetheless, it is possible that the Bronze Age activity is succeeded by a poorly represented middle Iron Age phase, in the form of the possible banjo enclosure, identified from the magnetometry survey, which itself may continue into the Roman period. Perry (1972) has shown that in Hampshire there can be a correlation between such enclosures and later Roman villae.

Whether the later Roman vineyard extends over the east side of the West Field is entirely plausible, but it is clear that the picture is more complex than a single phase of agricultural activity. The Bronze Age and post-Bronze age activity across the site incorporates a range of potential enclosures. Further examples include the features in Trenches 62, 56, 55 and 53 (see below). It does not, however, clarify why there is an open area between 100m and 150m wide, north of the farmstead and west of the banjo enclosure with only little evidence of agricultural activity. Both the evaluation and the geophysical survey point to some use of the area, although it is equally possible that the trenching quite simply missed the archaeology.

4.2.3 Iron Age and Roman Remains

4.2.3.1 The Farmstead *(Figures 12-17)*

Trenches 8, 9, 10, 22, 21, 35, 39, 40, 41, 45, 51, 48, 49 & 81

The remains investigated in the central plateau area in Trenches 8, 9, 10, 21, 22, 35, 39, 40, 41 and 45, as well as the southern end of Trench 23 and the northeast end of Trench 13, and Trenches 48, 49 and 51 in the East Field can be characterised as evidence for settlement comprising enclosures and structures. These include enclosure ditches, internal division ditches, ring gullies, an area of burning, which may be associated with the destruction of a building (Trench 51), as well as at least one area of intensive pitting. Postholes were also identified, although it was not possible during the evaluation to postulate structures. Activity related to the farmstead is also observed as the field boundaries in Trenches 3, 7, 34 and 32.

The settlement shape, from the geophysical survey, indicates a bipartite or possibly tripartite structure: this may indicate different properties or domestic enclosures; equally it may indicate areas of different economic function within a single farmstead. On the west side is an elongated and reversed D-shaped area of small enclosures; to the east of this is a more open area, again with some enclosures though not apparently so large; to the east of this area and divided from it by a large north/south aligned pit group is an area with some light enclosures and remains of two structures, one of which was burnt. The pit-group in Trench 39 was identified as modern disturbance by the geophysical survey; a large quantity of pits, dating from the Roman period, was apparent during machining. As dating material was recovered from the surface, it was agreed with HEU not to compromise the potential of the pit group by sampling it.

Certainly, the burnt area and putative associated ring ditch, as well as the sampled house gully, lay on the eastern side of the farmstead area possibly indicating a domestic sphere of activity. The putative house gully was sampled at the north end of

Trench 45; immediately to the south of this building and opposite the burnt area in the north of Trench 51 the geophysical survey indicated the arc of a negative feature. This may well be the western edge of a further house gully, which the hedgeline and ditch dividing the West and East Fields has partially truncated. Beneath the hedgeline in this area the soil was markedly darker.

The burnt area in the East Field (Tr. 51) may then be an associated destruction layer; it is significant that the c. 0.1m thick deposit of charcoal rich material, which appears to have sealed a subsoil or buried occupation horizon, was not recovered during the geophysical survey. Below the burnt layer and cutting the occupation horizon were a number of stakeholes; no interpretation could be made within the constraints of the evaluation. Pottery from the geotechnical test-pits from September 2007 indicated a 2nd century date. Further dating was recovered during the evaluation.

The enclosure ditches were sampled. An area of enclosures was sampled in the western part of the farmstead. The central area was not extensively trenched, but a number of gullies, and an area of pitting, were observed. The pitting in Trench 39, which may well be grain or other storage pits reused as rubbish pits, had been discovered by the geophysical survey (Trench 39), however, the gullies in Trench 40 had not been picked up by the geophysical survey. These gullies may be associated with production or, possibly, settlement; significant quantities of oyster shell were recovered from the surface of the features.

4.2.3.1.1 Trench 8 *(Fig. 13)*

Trench 8 was located on the western side of the putative settlement. The trench was oriented north-south and measured 50m long. From north to south the ploughsoil soil was between 76.76m OD and 75.41m OD.

The earliest feature in the trench was a Bronze Age north by northeast south by southwest gully [8/13]; to the south (8/08) and (8/09) was cut by the southern section of the Roman enclosure ditch [8/15]. South of the enclosure ditch was a pit [8/06], dating from the Bronze Age. The enclosure ditch [8/15] was recorded during the geophysical survey. It was filled with (8/11) in the north section and (8/07), which yielded well-preserved bone, in the south section; no finds were recovered from either, although a Roman date is most likely, given the dating from Trench 9 (see below). The ditch itself measured between c. 2m and c. 3m wide and was c. 0.75m deep; the cut was rounded with sides at c. 60°. An environmental sample taken for analysis of the snail remains revealed that the species present were typical of both open habitats, and also of more shaded habitats.

Within the enclosure was a positive archaeological feature identified from the geophysical survey, which the trench did not uncover. By analogy with other areas, particularly Trench 22 (see below), this may well be a hard-standing, or similar surface, located just to the east of the trench edge. To the north of the enclosure was an east/west oriented linear feature (8/12), which was not sampled but which was characterised as an agricultural gully and which may be associated with the east west gully in Trench 91 (see below).

4.2.3.1.2 Trench 9 *(Fig. 13)*

Trench 9 was located east of Trench 8, and north of Trenches 10 and 22. It was placed over the northern enclosure boundary. The trench was oriented east by

northeast west by southwest. The top of the west end the trench was at 76.51m OD, the base was at 76.09m OD; the east end rose to between 76.85m OD and 76.45m OD.

Ditch [9/14], as described above, was located on the geophysical survey in the centre of the trench. This ditch formed a field boundary between the western part of the vineyard and the central field, due north of the farmstead. The ditch was filled with (9/04) and (9/15). Pottery from (9/04) was identified as being Bronze Age in date but there were also two sherds in the fill from a grog-tempered cordoned jar, which could be pre-AD43, suggesting a very Late Iron Age date; bone and flint were also recovered from the fill. The pottery from (9/15) was Bronze Age; bone was recovered from this deposit, also.

A small pit [9/17] was cut by the ditch [9/14] on the east side. This was only recorded in section, and may well be a terminus for a gully or similar feature. The east side of ditch [9/14] was not easily recognised as such was not planned. The fill (9/16) of the pit was mid brown grey silty clay, measuring 0.5m (SW/NE) and c. 0.1m deep. The fill yielded pottery dating from the Bronze Age.

East of these two ditches was a northwest/southeast aligned linear feature (9/09), which may be the narrow, northwest/southeast aligned linear feature observed to the north of the enclosure ditch on the plan of the magnetometry survey; the fill of this gully was mid greyish brown clay, yielding Bronze Age pottery, flint and bone, in a good state of preservation. The cut (9/10) was not sampled; it represents either a terminus or small pit.

The enclosure ditch on the north side of the farmstead was located and recorded as [9/18], filled with (9/06). The ditch was c. 2.5m wide and can be associated with [8/15] to the west. The deposit (35/04) is probably part of the same enclosure ditch-system. This feature, [9/18], was not fully excavated due to a fast rising water-table, but was demonstrated to be at least 0.7m deep. Pottery recovered from the fill, firm mid greyish brown clay was identified as Late Iron Age/early Roman, represented by sherds of grog-tempered storage jar-type vessels, indicating a domestic context for the assemblage. At the west end of the trench an east/west gully (9/13) was observed, but not sampled.

4.2.3.1.3 Trench 10 *(Fig.13)*

Trench 10 was south of Trench 9 and west of Trench 22; it was located across an internal enclosure on the southern half of the farmstead. The trench was oriented east by northeast/west by southwest, parallel to Trench 9. The top of the west of the trench was at 75.25m OD, the base was at 74.92m OD; the east end rose to between 75.40m OD and 75.06m OD.

The internal dividing gully, visible on the geophysical survey was sampled – (10/08) filled the gully [10/12], yielding Roman, late 1st cent Romano-British grey wares which comprised jars and other vessel forms as well as more coarse wares; well-preserved bone was also recovered. The fill was mid greyish brown clay with chalk flecking, similar to (10/05) at the east end of the trench. The edge only of this feature was revealed – though not sampled – and it is not clear from the geophysical plan that this was recorded during the magnetometry survey.

The other features in the trench were not sampled though dating was recovered from the linear feature (10/04) and the small pit or terminus (10/06). The north/south aligned gully (10/04), filled with dark grey brown silty clay containing flint (5%), chalk (2%) and charcoal (1%) yielded a mix of pottery (grey wares and more groggy wares) dating from the post-Conquest/early Roman period. The feature (10/06), to the east of (10/04), which was characterised by pale greyish brown silty clay with chalk (5%), and flint and charcoal (both c. 1%) yielded scrappy bits of Roman pottery from the later 1st century, as well as some slag. The deposit (10/07) immediately to the east of (10/06) yielded well-preserved bone.

To the west of (10/04) a pair of stakeholes was observed – (10/09) and (10/10) – but little can be said as any further remains would be beyond the edges of excavation. Bone was recovered from the surface of (10/09).

At the southwest end of the trench part of the north by northeast/south by southwest enclosure ditch (10/11) was recovered. This was a similar fill to the fill (10/05), which is adjacent to another main enclosure ditch at north end of the trench. Too little was revealed to examine either feature in any great detail, however it is clear that there is a greater density of archaeological remains than immediately apparent from the magnetometry survey.

4.2.3.1.4 Trench 22 *(Fig. 14)*

To the east of Trench 10 was Trench 22, which was aligned north by northwest/south by southeast. It was laid out across a major internal enclosure within the farmstead. This enclosure ditch (22/10) separates the western side of the farmstead from a central area. The trench was almost at right angles to Trench 10. The top of the northwest of the trench was at 75.64m OD, the south end dropped to between 74.51m OD; the trench was c. 0.45m deep.

The density of archaeology at the northern end of the trench means that it is not fruitful to attempt to associate the various cuts recovered during the evaluation with those observed from the geophysical survey. It is moreover clear that without opening up the trench, it would not be certain which of the cuts observed were the pitting and which the ditches and gullies. The magnetometry revealed an area of pitting and an area of positive archaeological feature with linear negative features either side of it.

The evaluation revealed an area of hardstanding (22/19), comprising a 0.08m thick deposit of gravel and yellow clay, more than 0.8m wide and more than 2m long, extending beyond the edges of the trench. Bone, in a state of good preservation, was recovered from the hardstanding.

To the north the hardstanding (22/19) was cut by [22/17], an east/west aligned ditch; this relatively shallow ditch measured c. 1.6m wide and c. 0.6m deep, and was filled with two fills (22/20) and (22/21). The upper fill (22/20), a pale grey brown silty clay, yielded Romano-British greyware, flint and bone; the lower fill (22/21), a mid brown grey silty clay failed to reveal any dating evidence.

The ditch [22/17] was truncated to the north by a land-drain, removing the relationship between it and the feature [22/16] to the north. The cut [22/16] was excavated and shown to cut an earlier feature to the north [22/18]. The grey brown

clay fill (22/04) was only seen at the edge of the trench and not fully investigated. It extended beyond the edges of excavation but was observed to be at least 0.08m thick.

The cut [22/16] contained two fills both of which yielded pottery which can be dated to the post-Conquest period. The primary fill (22/23), mid brown clay, was not bottomed; the upper fill (22/22), 0.4m thick, was similar with more chalk through it; both fills contained well-preserved bone. It is possible that this feature is in fact a pit forming part of the pit group observed on the magnetometry survey plan.

South of the hardstanding (22/19) were a pair of ditches [22/12] and [22/14]. The earlier ditch [22/12] was filled mid bluish grey clay (22/15), c. 0.1m thick and (22/07), 0.5m thick; pottery recovered from the ditch – including a complete narrow-mouthed fineware pot, as well as a possible Verulamium region fine ware handle from a jug – point to a date after the late 1st century AD. An environmental sample taken from this deposit evidenced wheat as well as the presence of snails typical of open habitats. Bone and oyster shell were also represented in the finds.

Ditch [22/12] was cut by a bigger deeper ditch [22/14], which failed to provide any dating. The primary fill (22/13) – a blackish dark grey clay silt – possibly points to an anaerobic atmosphere; certainly the water-table rose quickly within the section excavated through the ditch. This layer was sealed by (22/08), dark greyish brown clay. It is probable that the narrow red linear feature south of the blue positive archaeological feature shown on the magnetometry survey is one of these two ditches.

4.2.3.1.5 Trench 21 *(Fig. 14)*

Trench 21 was located southeast of Trench 22, was oriented north-south and measured 50m long. The top of the topsoil was at 74.58m at the north end, 73.83m in the middle and 73.23m at the south end. The top of the natural was at 74.21m at the north end, 73.53m in the middle and 72.91m at the south end. The geophysical survey identified a single negative linear feature aligned northwest/southeast approximately half-way along the trench. The trench was therefore laid out across the apparent internal enclosure gully [21/13] within the central yard area of the farmstead. The gully which bisects the central yard area on the southern side of the farmstead was revealed in addition to a number of other smaller gullies.

Gully [21/13] was observed at c. 20m from the north end of the trench; although pottery was recovered from the fill (21/09) – a mid greyish brown clay – which dates from the Bronze Age, the presence of post-Conquest material, raises the possibility of residuality; the presence of Roman grey ware in (40/08), which is the terminal of this feature, does however, seem to point to a certain amount of residual material on the site. It is always possible that the Roman pottery may well be intrusive, only further work can clarify the issue. Nonetheless, within the trench further features of unequivocally Roman date were sampled.

A pit (21/10) was located on the east side at the north end of the trench, within the central enclosure of the tripartite farmstead. This dark grey clay filled feature contained Roman pottery of various fabrics, bone and shell; to the north, the irregular feature [21/12] filled by (21/11) – mid greyish brown clay – also yielded Roman pottery and bone. It is perhaps notable that significant areas of pitting were recorded to the east during the magnetometry survey, and were also identified at the east end of Trench 39.

South of the gully [21/13] an east/west oriented agricultural gully (21/08), a curvilinear ditch [21/14], a sub-rectangular feature (21/06) and two further gullies (21/05) and (21/04) were also observed. These were not sampled. The presence of the probable agricultural gullies (21/08) and (21/04) raises the question of the relationship between the farmstead and the agricultural activities observed on the site (see below).

4.2.3.1.7 Trench 35 *(Fig. 14)*

Trench 35 was located north of Trench 21 and northeast of Trench 22; it was located across the main enclosure ditch – previously observed in Trenches 22 and 13 – on the northern side of the farmstead and two gullies separated by a bank or similar positive feature. The trench was oriented northeast/southwest. The top of the west of the trench was at 82.59m OD; the east end dropped to 81.85m OD.

Three linear features were identified during the evaluation: [35/07]/(35/04) – which evidenced Roman pottery, flint and shell – (35/05) and (35/06). These correspond with the features recorded during the magnetometry survey; namely the northern enclosure ditch of the settlement, which continued to yield Roman pottery at the south end of the trench; as well as the two narrower gullies to the north. The feature (35/05) is very wide, and within the constraints of the evaluation trench may comprise pitting, or a pit group in addition to the linear feature picked up by the magnetometry survey. No evidence for a positive feature was observed between the two northern features.

4.2.3.1.7 Trench 39 *(Fig. 15)*

Trench 39 was located southeast of Trench 35 and east of Trench 21. The trench was oriented northwest/southeast, and was located south of the main enclosure ditch and across an area of disturbed ground. The top of the northwest of the trench was at 74.32m OD; the southeast end dropped to 72.53m OD.

At the southeast end of the trench an area of disturbed ground was exposed, and shown to comprise an extensive area of pitting (39/04). Identified as modern disturbance by the geophysical survey, the pit group is Roman and was not sampled – pottery and other finds, bone and metal, were taken from the surface, but given the complexity of such features it was agreed with the HEU that in the context of an evaluation it was preferable to preserve such remains *in situ*. The pit group represents grain or other storage pits reused as rubbish pits.

To the north of the pit-group was an enclosure gully (39/13), which was not excavated. To the north of this were two terminals or pits (39/12) and (39/14), which were located c. 7m apart. The latter yielded Roman pottery characterised by a 'late rilled sherd' in addition to more typical grey ware. To the north (39/07) is c. 8.5m from (39/06); the fills of the four features are dissimilar, and may be indicative of ditches or gullies to small enclosures for animals or other farm activities.

A 4m-wide ditch [39/17]/(39/05) was located at the west end of the trench. Sampling of the feature yielded pottery dating probably from the 2nd century, which appears to be of reasonably high status; bone and oyster shell are also present in the finds assemblage. The ditch is oriented northeast/southwest, approximately at a right angle to the main enclosure ditch, to the north. This may indicate a later subdivision of the central yard area parallel with the cut (22/10) to the west.

The small pit or posthole [39/15]/(39/06) was truncated by a land drain; it yielded some Terra Nigra pottery from the 1st century. A second posthole [39/16]/(39/10) was excavated to the northeast. Two stakeholes (39/08) and (39/09) were observed to the west; (39/09) was located east of the ditch [39/17], and (39/08) to the west.

This trench revealed a high number of features indicating several stages of reorganisation of the central area of the farmstead, and can be compared with Trenches 21 and 40. The eastern side of the trench revealed that the area of disturbance was a large pit group, which forms a boundary with the adjacent area to the east, where potentially domestic activity was carried out.

4.2.3.1.8 Trench 40 *(Fig. 15)*

Trench 40 was located south of Trench 39 and east of Trench 21. The trench was oriented northeast/southwest, at right angles to Trench 39. It was located southeast of the area of disturbed ground, and across the southeast corner of the central enclosure of the farmstead. The top of the northeast of the trench was at 73.08m OD; the southwest end dropped to between 72.86m OD.

At the southwest end of Trench 40 the gully (40/04) which formed the southeastern corner of the central enclosure was observed. This feature was not sampled.

To the north [40/16] was sampled and recorded. The fill (40/08) was brownish grey clay, approximately 0.8m deep and 1.3m wide. The south side of the cut was at c. 60°, the north side almost vertical. Pottery, bone, shell and metal were present in the fill, including a stamped Samian base, as well as a range of other Roman and coarse wares. The gully [40/15] is the east end of the internal division also seen in Trench 21, [21/13].

Further features, all apparently gullies (40/10), (40/11) and [40/15] were observed at the north end of the trench. It appeared possible that (40/11), for example, was more than likely part of building; the fill was dark reddish brown, but filled with a high quantity of oyster shell, in addition to Roman pottery and bone. The other gully (40/10) located on the east side of the trench contained Roman grey ware and post-AD43 grog-tempered pottery.

At the north end of the trench [40/15] was also sampled, which was filled by (40/13), dark brown clay, c. 0.45m deep and approximately 1.1m wide. The pottery possibly dates from the 2nd century, indicating that there may well have been a modification of the internal enclosures of the central area at this time, as also seen in Trench 39, (39/05). Bone was also recovered from the fill.

Further features comprise the gullies (40/14) and (40/06) as well as the pits or gully terminals (40/05) and (40/07); the feature (40/09) appeared to represent a tree-throw.

4.2.3.1.9 Trench 41 *(Fig. 15)*

Trench 41 was located east of Trench 40 and southeast of Trench 39. The trench was oriented northwest/southeast. It was targeted an area of gullies and ditches in the southeast corner of the farmstead. This trench, Trenches 45 and 51 comprise the eastern part of the tripartite settlement. The top of the northwest of the trench was at 72.53m OD; the southeast end dropped to 70.36m OD.

Trench 41 had one east/west aligned agricultural ditch (41/07) and a further two possible ones laying on a north-south axis and which varied in fill colour. The gully (41/04) at the west end was light orangey brown in colour, while (41/10) at the east end was mid greyish brown. This may be indicative of a chronological difference as this differing in fills of the vineyard is notable across the site. Neither feature was dated.

The south enclosure ditch (41/11) was only observed as a small area at the extreme southeast end of the trench; no dating was recovered. Nonetheless, both north/south ditches [41/14], filled by (41/12), and [41/13], filled by (41/09) – the junction of which was to the west – yielded pottery with a late 1st century AD date, at the earliest, possibly extending into the 2nd century AD, and included bone, within the fill; in addition, shell and metal were recovered from (41/09). The east/west ditch (41/08) merely produced Roman grey ware.

The gully (41/06) at the west end of the trench appears to be part of the enclosure recovered during the magnetometry.

4.2.3.1.10 Trench 45 *(Fig. 15)*

Trench 45 was located north of Trench 41. It was placed to recover evidence for the agricultural activity. However, due to its location it proved necessary to break the trench as an overhead cable lay across the line of the trench; c. 10m at the north-eastern end was excavated followed by a c. 10m gap and then c. 30m were excavated to the southwest. The trench was oriented northeast/ southwest. The top of the west of the trench was at 71.81m OD; the east end rose to 72.09m OD.

Although a number of linear features crossed the trench, these do not accord with the results from magnetometry survey. In the southern portion of the trench, the linear features revealed by trenching were oriented east/west; the gully visible on the magnetometry is represented by (45/06) a 7m wide feature, which yielded well-preserved bone. Several gullies are present to the north – (45/07), (45/08), (45/09) and (45/10) – as well as a single to the south – (45/05).

In the northern part of the trench the area of discolouration, (45/12), which was 'dirty' Boulder Clay, yielded pottery dating from the Bronze Age. Cutting this area to the north were two gullies. The earlier [45/23] seemed to be re-cut by [45/18]; neither yielded any dating. The curve of the gullies, which were between 0.4m - [45/23] – and 0.5m – [45/18] – deep, may well be indicative of a structure. The fill (45/17) showed a marked quantity of burnt material on the northern side of the cut; the fill (45/15) which was the same yielded pottery dating from the Bronze Age: well-preserved bone was recovered from both contexts. This feature was not revealed by the magnetometry survey. Other features include the northwest/southeast gully (45/04); the narrow gully, (45/21) cut into the Bronze Age area of discolouration (45/12); and the posthole [45/20]/(45/19) north of the ring-gully [45/18] and [45/23]. The latter posthole may be a structural element of a building and associated with either of the ring-gullies.

4.2.3.1.11 Trench 51 *(Fig. 16)*

Trench 51 was located east of Trench 45. The trench was oriented north by northwest/south by southeast. It was placed to investigate further the results from

Test Pit 18 in September 2007 as well as a linear anomaly. The top of the north of the trench was at 71.16m OD; the south end dropped to 69.92m OD.

Two ditches and an area of burning were observed during the machining. The southernmost ditch (51/07) was also observed in Trenches 48, 49 and 81. To the north of this large ditch was a gully (51/06). Neither of these features was sampled, and efforts were focused on the enclosure ditch [51/09] and the burnt area.

The ditch [51/09] was c. 1.5m wide and 0.8m deep, and filled with two fills, the upper (51/05) contained a rim of Bronze Age pottery; no pottery was recovered from the lower fill (51/08). The evaluation trench was enlarged to an open area 7m by 7.5m (NS/EW) near the northern end. This was carried out to better understand the c. 0.1m thick area of sooty deposit observed during geotechnical work in September 2007, and which yielded a significant quantity of 2nd century pottery. The burning extended to the west, visible in the wall of the ditch under the hedgeline and toward Trench 45. It is not possible to assert with surety whether the burning observed in (45/17) is in any way associated with that from Trench 51. The chronological gap in the pottery is too great.

The deposit (51/04) was spread over the opened area. The date is broadly Roman, and like TP(18/2) also contained burnt clay; bone and metal were recovered from the deposit. The test-pit in the autumn yielded a 2nd century date, which concurs with (51/30) a posthole north of the burnt area, which yielded samian of a type uncommon before the 2nd century. A spread (51/31) of grey brown silty clay at the north end of the extension, which was not excavated, yielded Roman greywares. Two further, unexcavated, postholes – (51/33) and (51/34) – as well as a gully or possible beamslot (51/32), containing flint, were also observed here.

Beneath the burnt spread (51/04) the deposit was numbered (51/10); a number of stakeholes were observed cutting the natural (51/03). These were located due south of the dated features (51/30) and (51/31) and the postholes, (51/33) and (51/34); the stakeholes (51/14), (51/15), (51/16), (51/17), (51/18), (51/19), (51/20) and(51/21) were located in a sondage dug through the burnt layer, none however can be said to form a structure. However, to the east of this group of stakeholes a north/south oriented beamslot [51/22] was sampled. This measured c. 1m long, 0.15m wide and 0.15m deep. No finds were recovered to date it, although it was sealed by the burning. To the east a further group of stakeholes was observed (51/11), (51/12) and (51/13); (51/12) was seen to be cutting through the layers of burning (51/04) and (51/10).

To the west of the trench in the West Field, a semi-circular anomaly was recorded. It is possible that this represents the west side of a building, with which the burning is associated. The only partial presence of the ring gully on the magnetometry survey may be due to the proximity of the hedge and ditch. Certainly below the burnt deposit (51/04) there were what appeared to be a number of stakeholes – (51/11), (51/12), (51/13), (51/14), (51/15), (51/16), (51/17), (51/18), (51/19), (51/20) and (51/21) – and a possible beam slot [51/22].

4.2.3.1.12 Trenches 48, 49 & 81 *(Figs 16 & 17)*

Trenches 48, (Fig. 16) 49 (Fig. 17) and 81 (Fig. 17) were located to the southeast of Trench 51. The trenches were oriented northeast/southwest at 70.10m OD (north) and

69.38m OD (south); north/south at 69.47m OD (north) and 68.23m OD (south); and northeast/southwest at 68.41m OD (north) and 68.71m OD (south) respectively. A pair of ditches extended east from Trench 51, as (51/07) toward Trench 48, 49 and 81; these were located on the break of slope. The ditch [48/09] measured 1.8m wide and 0.6m deep while [48/10] was 1.5m wide and 0.7m deep; pottery recovered from the fill was Bronze Age. In Trench 49 the ditches were 4m apart; [49/08]/(49/09) measured 1.1m wide and 0.6m deep and which yielded Late Iron Age pottery, while [49/12]/(49/13) was 1.2m wide and 0.4m deep. The ditch [49/08] was recut by a smaller gully [49/10]/(49/11), measuring 0.5m wide and 0.3m deep. Trench 81 revealed two parallel ditches, although only the southern one (81/04) is in line with those investigated in Trenches 48 and 49. The ditch (81/05) was c. 0.5m to the north.

4.2.3.1.13 Summary of the Farmstead

The farmstead area can be divided into three parts. On the west side is a complex of small interconnected enclosures, surrounded by an apparently Roman large enclosure ditch. The relationship between this Roman enclosure and the earlier Bronze Age ditches (oriented northeast/southwest and northwest/southeast) which link the Roman occupation on the west side and the rectangular enclosure on the east side is not self-evident.

The western ditch, which runs northwest to the Roman occupation in the North Field, does contain some Roman pottery in the top fill. This may indicate either the pottery to be intrusive, or that the ditch was still a visible earthwork and maintained somewhat as a boundary. No Roman pottery was recovered from the eastern ditch, so it is not certain that this was still visible.

The enclosures on the western side of the farmstead are separated from the possible buildings on the east side – where at least one structure appears to have burnt down – by an area with pitting and further enclosures, the ditches of which are not so large, suggesting a possible difference in activities carried on across the various parts of the farmstead. The presence of well-preserved bone and, particularly, oyster shell in many of the deposits from this part of the site points to the domestic nature of the occupation associated with the activity from the 2nd century. Its precise relationship with the earlier pottery phases is not entirely clear within the limitations of an evaluation.

What is nonetheless clear is that there is a mix of features, some of which could be structural, others of which are likely to be related to small enclosures for animal rearing/containment or other farm activities, such as stockpiling. There were a small number of features which may have been Bronze Age within the farmstead area, but it is equally probable that the earlier pottery recovered from some features can only have been residual. Certainly the density of features points to an area of activity which was not static; rather new enclosures superseded earlier, with pitting perhaps having replaced enclosures in the central area between Trenches 39, 40 and 21.

Finally, the limited view of the features within the context of an evaluation makes it impossible to ascertain always their precise relationships with each other. It is clear that the pottery recovered from the enclosure ditch is Roman but that there is pottery, from the gullies both within and immediately surrounding the enclosure, which is apparently much earlier. At this stage it is not possible to quantify how much residual material is present within the farmstead.

While the burning layer of the putative house on the east side is 2nd century (in Trench 51), while the possible house to the north of it, in Trench 45, again seems to be much earlier. It should be noted here Stewart Bryant's (1997:14) remarks on the difficulties of dating late prehistoric pottery in parts of Hertfordshire, which will be dealt with in more detail in the conclusions below. A final point to consider in respect of the Roman pottery from the farmstead, is that, overall, it is comparatively high status, and if representative of the site as a whole not typical of similar rural sites (Isobel Thompson, pers. comm.).

Extending from south of the burnt structure (51/04) are a pair of ditches, which were visible in Trenches 48, 49 and 81. It is not certain that the ditches are part of an entrance to the farmstead, they could equally form part either of the Bronze Age field-system or trackway described above. Nonetheless, the ditches from the farmstead seem to be heading south of Trench 82, where the trackway ditches were observed during the evaluation.

4.2.3.2 The Vineyards *(Figures18-28)*

Possible evidence for viticulture was evidenced to the south of the settlement area as well as to the north in the west, central and east Roman fields. While the term vineyard, vine trenches etc. is used, the features may have had other agricultural/horticultural purposes. Trenches 91, 92 and particularly, 93 and 94 to the northwest revealed extensive evidence of possible vine trenches, although Trenches 6 and 7 yielded traces of the agricultural gullies. Trenches 13, 14, 15, 16 and 20 yielded extremely good results south of the settlement area; Trenches 18, 19 and 42 produced some evidence of the vine trenches. Trenches 33, 36 and 54 yielded evidence on the east side of the West Field. Trenches 53 and 55 in the East Field also revealed traces of the vine trenches. In the central field north of the settlement, where Trenches 4, 5, 7, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 32 and 34 were opened; 23, 25, 30, 31, 32 and 34 showed evidence of potential vineyard activity.

The ditches were identified by the geophysical survey as agricultural features of unknown origin. Nonetheless the evaluation recovered well-preserved linear features in the approximate position of those indicated on the geophysical survey. These comprised areas of agricultural trenches, measuring c. 0.7m wide, c. 0.3m deep and possibly up to 100m long. These agricultural trenches have been provisionally identified as trenches for vines, by analogy with other sites such as Wollaston in the Nene Valley (Brown et al, 2001); moreover, c. 1.5km to the northwest Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust recovered evidence for similar agricultural activity (Last, McDonald & Humphrey, 2001), although the spacing recovered was more regular.

These ditches form a cohesive pattern of contiguous linear agricultural ditches, which may be interpreted as agricultural in use. A variety of solutions have been proposed such as lazy-beds, market garden-beds and a vineyard. The features excavated at Whittington Way appear to resemble strongly features excavated at Wollaston – although none of the posthole arrangements observed there were exposed at Whittington Way – with the result that a vineyard is only a working hypothesis for their function.

4.2.3.2.1 Northwest Vineyard *(Figures 18-20)*
Trenches 3, 6, 91, 92, 93 & 94

The area to the northwest side of the site was characterised by a particularly large number of agricultural ditches. Trenches 6, 91, 92, 93, and 94 were all situated on the northwest side of the West Field; all were 50m long and 2m wide. Neither the north end of Trench 91, nor Trenches 92, 93 and 94 had been subject to geophysical survey.

The evaluation trenches revealed extensive evidence for agricultural activity ditches in Trenches 91, 92, 93 and 94. The agricultural ditches were characterised by their fill (mid orangey brown colour), composition (clay/silty clay) and form (c. 0.6m wide, and up to 100m long) as found elsewhere on the site. These agricultural ditches were primarily on a north/south axis although occasionally were aligned on a more northwest/southeast axis, with at least one example of an east/west aligned 'headland'. In agreement with HEU, the features were not excavated on the northwest side as previously they had been extensively sampled across the site.

Trench 91 (Fig. 19) was oriented southeast-northwest; the top of the northwest end of the trench was at 77.28m OD; the top of the southeast end was at 76.37m OD. The trench contained four lengths of agricultural ditch and a terminus: three of the ditches were not present on the magnetometry survey, although, the north/south aligned ditch (91/10) in the southeast corner may well have been identified. The two ditches located at the southeastern end of the trench may have formed a junction to an enclosure with (91/09) as part of a field-system, and may be the same agricultural ditch as recorded in Trench 8 (8/12). The fill for these agricultural ditches was mid orangey brown silty clay. No finds were recovered from the features.

To the northwest (91/05) may be a similar north/south or northeast/southwest oriented ditch at right angles to (91/06); the ditch (91/06) may well extend to Trench 6, where it extended perhaps as either (6/07) or (6/09). If this is so, there are possibly a number of smaller undated enclosures west of the farmstead, which seem to lie between the postulated vineyard to the north in Trenches 93, 94 and the north end of 92 and to the south in Trenches 11, 13, 14 ,15, 16 and 20. None of the putative enclosure gullies could be associated with one another. The feature (91/08) is a pit and (91/07) is a tree throw pit.

Trench 92 (Fig. 20) also contained four possible agricultural ditches on a northeast/ southwest axis (92/10), (92/09), (92/08) and (92/05) as well as one east/west (92/12) and the terminal of a north/south ditch (92/13). The ditch (92/08) appears to line up with (91/05) – both having a similar fill; the ditch (92/05) and (91/07) may also be the same feature. The relationship between the larger ditch (92/09) and the gully (92/08) was not established. Three postholes were also observed (92/11), (92/07) and (92/06)in the trench; none were investigated. The irregular pit (92/04), cut by the gully (92/05) was not investigated.

Three agricultural ditches were visible in Trench 6 (Fig. 19), one of which was a ditch terminus [6/13]/(6/07); this agricultural ditch was sectioned and recorded to determine its function and depth. No finds were recovered. The gully terminal (6/04) yielded pottery dating from the Bronze Age. The postholes (6/08) and [6/06]/(6/05) were located east of [6/13]; only [6/06] was sampled. No finds were recovered. The features (6/10) and 6/11) are modern land drains. The gully (6/09) is oriented northeast/southwest, but was not sampled.

Trenches 93 and 94 (Fig. 20) had a high concentration of agricultural ditches; eight trenches were recorded in Trench 93 and five within Trench 94; the trenches were located between 78.88m OD (Trench 93 northwest) and 78.59m OD (Trench 93 southeast), and 78.77m OD (Trench 94 northeast) and 77.57m OD (Trench 94 southwest). All the features in Trench 94 were oriented east-west, three of which line up in plan and can be associated with ditches in Trench 93: ditch (93/05) is the same as (94/04), ditch (93/11) is the same as (94/06) and (93/13) is the same as (94/07), the second yielding pottery dated as broadly Roman. Just to the south of (93/05)/(94/04), a gully (93/07), which doesn't appear to continue into Trench 94 also produced pottery dated as broadly Roman. Almost at right angles to (93/05)/(94/04) are, to the north, (93/04) and, to the south, (93/09). South of (93/13)/(94/07) is a further north/south ditch (93/08).

4.2.3.2.2 South Vineyard *(Figures 21-25)*

Trenches 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 42, 43 and 44

The southern end of site was primarily used for agriculture, as can be viewed by the high amount of agricultural ditches present. Results from the magnetometry survey show a high number of linear ditches on a north-south axis in this area. Trenches 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 43, and 44 all have agricultural ditches visible within them although those features in Trench 42 do not appear to be on the same alignment; Trench 17 was empty. The majority of these ditches are on a north-south axis, except the ditches in Trenches 12 and 19, which were on an east-west axis, and Trench 42, which were on a northwest/southeast alignment. The fill of these ditches can be characterised by a mid greyish brown colour and clay composition

Trench 11 (Fig. 22), at a height between 74.36m OD (west) and 74.64m OD (east), had three well-defined agricultural ditches and another two possible agricultural ditches. The three definite agricultural ditches were located at the west end of the trench and were on a north-south axis; (11/12), (11/14) and (11/16) were parallel and spaced at c. 5m apart. A relationship between (11/16) and [11/17] was not established during the evaluation. The possible agricultural ditch [11/17] was, however, cut by a larger, later Roman ditch [11/19]/(11/13), which yielded bone and flint. The ditch [11/17] is parallel with [11/06] to the east. [11/06] and [11/07] (at right angles to each other) are narrower and were less well dug than [11/18] and [11/13]. (11/05), the fill of [11/07] contained animal bone. Pottery from (11/04), the fill of [11/06] has given a possible Late Iron Age to 1st century AD date range. This is earlier than might be expected for the vine trenches, and either the pottery is residual or the ditch is part of a separate enclosure perhaps with [11/07]. At the east end of the trench, cut by the gully [11/07] were two north/south gullies [11/11] and [11/09]. No finds were recovered from them

Trench 12 (Fig. 22) had only one ditch in the south of the trench, which was on an east-west axis. Excavation revealed that it was similar to the agricultural ditches, measuring c. 0.15m deep and c 0.32m in wide; the fill was firm mid orangey brown clay. It cannot however be easily associated with any of the putative vineyard features. A cremation was recovered from this trench, which is detailed below.

Trench 13 (Fig. 22) was located south of the farmstead between 74.27m OD (west) and 74.17m OD (east), and evidenced seven putative agricultural ditches, as well as the southeast return of the enclosure ditch of the settlement, also observed in Trenches

22 and 35 to the north. The ditches, which are unequivocally agricultural in function, are oriented north by northeast/south by southwest. It should be noted that all the agricultural ditches in this trench were mid reddish brown clay. The results of the geophysical survey failed to show any linear features present in this trench although they were identified further south and continue into Trenches 14 and 15. The agricultural features (13/06), (13/07), (13/08), [13/11]/(13/09), [13/13]/(13/10) observed measured between c. 0.60m and 1m wide. These correspond with projections from Trenches 14 to the south. At the east end of the trench, [13/12]/(13/05), is the southeast corner of the farmstead enclosure ditch, which yielded bone and flint from the fill. The linear to the south of (13/04) contained some bone, but was undated and may be part of the agricultural ditch system with this feature continuing southwards through Trenches 20 and 15.

Trench 14 (Fig. 22) was located due south of Trench 13 and oriented west by northwest/east by southeast and measured 50m long. The top of the topsoil was at 73.97m at the west end, 73.59m in the middle and 73.22m at the east end. The geophysical survey identified a series of six positive linear anomalies aligned north by northeast/south by southwest; the evaluation trench identified five agricultural features (14/06), (14/07), (14/08) (14/09) and (14/10), which corresponded approximately to those from the geophysical survey and can be associated with those from Trenches 14 and 16. A further possible linear [14/11] filled with (14/04), mid greyish brown clay, was investigated. A possible pit (14/05) was also observed. The agricultural features (14/06), (14/07), (14/08) (14/09) and (14/10) were filled with mid greyish brown clay fills which characterised this feature type. This material also filled the possible pit (14/05). No finds were recovered from the features.

Trench 15 (Fig. 23) lay to the south of Trench 14 and was oriented northwest-southeast and measured 50m long. The top of the topsoil was at 70.60m at the west end and 69.36m at the east end. The geophysical survey identified two positive linear anomalies aligned north by northeast/south by southwest; the evaluation trench identified four agricultural features (15/05), (15/08) (15/09) and (15/10) and a further ditch (15/07)/[15/12]. All of the fills were mid greyish brown clay, the same colour and composition as found in Trenches 13, 14, and 16, indicating that these are the same agricultural ditches. All ditches, except for [15/12] were on a north by northeast/south by southwest axis. The exception must have another function.

Feature [15/12]/(15/07) may be the same as (14/07); however, the narrower c. 0.5m gullies, (15/09) and (15/10), do not appear to line up with any feature in Trench 14; (15/08) may be present to the south as (16/08). The broader c. 1m wide gully (15/05) does not appear to correspond with any broad gully to the north. A possible pit (15/10) with a dark greyish brown clay was also observed along with another pit (15/04). Feature (15/06 was interpreted as a tree throw pit.

Trench 16 (Fig. 23) lay to the south of Trench 15, and three of the agricultural features continue into this trench. As noted above, they are of the same fill and on the same axis as the ditches in Trenches 13, 14 and 15. Trench 16 was oriented northwest-southeast and measured 50m long. The top of the topsoil was at 69.87m at the west end and 68.15m at the east end. The geophysical survey identified a single positive linear anomaly aligned north by northeast/south by southwest; the evaluation trench identified three agricultural features (16/05), (16/06) and (16/07); none of which corresponded exactly to those from the geophysical survey, although they were on a

similar alignment to the agricultural features in Trenches 14 and 15. Feature (16/07) may be the same as (15/08); however, neither the narrow gully (16/06) nor the broader gully (16/05), do not appear to line up with any gullies to the north. The small pit [16/08] was filled with dark grey brown clay (1604); only bone was recovered from the feature.

Six ditches continue through a number of trenches. Ditch (13/04) is the same as (20/06) and probably (15/11), ditch (13/06) is the same as (14/10) and (15/08). Ditch (13/07) continues into Trench 14 (14/09). Two of the agricultural ditches are present in Trenches 13, 14 and 16, (13/10) [14/11] (16/05) and [13/11] (14/06) (16/06). Only one agricultural ditch was visible in all 4 trenches (13/08) (14/08) (15/05) and (16/07).

Trench 17 (Fig. 23) was located south of Trench 20 and oriented northeast-southwest and measured 50m long. The top of the topsoil was at 67.82m at the southwest end, 68.98m in the middle and 69.77m at the northeast end. The geophysical survey identified a single strong discrete positive anomaly, possibly associated with a metal object; use of a metal detector failed to locate the putative object. The evaluation trench identified an irregular feature (17/04), filled with orange brown silty clay. It was not investigated.

Trench 18 (Fig. 23), which was located east of Trench 17, was oriented northwest/southeast. The top of the topsoil was at 71.96m OD at the northwest end and 70.14m OD at the southeast end. There were five agricultural ditches aligned north/south but there was a noticeable range of different fills; light yellowish brown clay (18/04) (18/05), dark greyish brown clay (18/06), and the usual mid greyish brown clay (18/07) (18/08). It was not possible to ascertain whether this range of difference is significant or not. There were no results from the geophysical survey for this trench, but five features were recorded. The four linear features, (18/05), (18/06), (18/07) and (18/08) are parallel both to one another and to the four agricultural linear features to the east, shown on the geophysical survey. Moreover, Trench 44 also revealed traces of further ditches parallel with these in Trench 18. As they had been characterised as agricultural ditches, possibly for viticulture, they were not sampled.

Trench 19 (Fig. 24) was located south of Trench 17; oriented northeast/southwest it was at right angles to Trench 18. The top of the topsoil was at 71.33m OD at the southwest end and 72.48m OD at the northeast end. There were four linear features on an east-west axis, at right angles to the ditches in Trench 18, and at right angles to the linear anomalies picked up during the magnetometry survey. None of these were excavated but they had light orangey brown clay as a fill. No finds were recovered from any of the features.

Trench 20 (Fig. 24) lies to the east of Trench 14 and was oriented northeast-southwest measuring 50m long. The top of the topsoil was at 72.70m at the southwest end, 73.20m in the middle and 73.84m at the northeast end. The geophysical survey did not identify any potential archaeology within the trench. The evaluation trench identified two linear features (20/04)/[20/08] and (20/06)/[20/07], on a south-north axis – as well as a possible pit (20/05); all the features were filled with orange brown silty clay. No finds were recovered from the linear agricultural feature [20/08].

Trench 42 (Fig. 24) was originally oriented northeast/southwest, but during machining the west end peg for Trench 44 was used as a sight, with the result that the trench was

reoriented north by northeast/south by southwest and c. 66m long, instead of 50m. The top of the topsoil was at 70.19m OD at the southwest end and 71.22m OD at the northeast end. The trench contained four agricultural ditches, all on varying alignments. [42/10] and (42/07) continued on a northwest-southeast alignment and contained mid brownish silty clay. (42/06) lay on an east-west axis and was filled with mid greyish brown silty clay, whilst [42/15] lay north to south and was filled with dark orangey brown silty clay. Two stakeholes (42/11) and (42/13) were investigated; no finds were recovered. A possible gully (42/09) or other linear feature was observed at the south end of the trench and a terminus or pit (42/05) was observed north of the east/west linear (42/06).

Trench 44 (Fig. 25) was originally oriented northwest/southeast, but during machining for Trench 42 the west end peg for Trench 44 was used as a sight, with the result that that trench was reoriented. Consequently, the north end peg for Trench 42 was used for the west end of Trench 44, reducing it in length, but yielding valuable results. The trench was oriented east/west and measured 34m long. The topsoil was at 71.73m OD at the west end, and 70.76m OD at the east end. Within the trench the agricultural ditch [44/07] measured 31m long, 0.6m wide and 0.3m deep. The fill (44/04) yielded Roman pottery. Two north/south ditches (44/05) and (44/06) extended from the south side of [44/07]. These also measured c. 0.6m wide, and were c. 5.5m apart. These perpendicular ditches extended beyond the edge of the trench. These are similar to examples excavated both from Thorley (Last, McDonald & Humphrey,) and from Wollaston (Brown et al, 2001).

Trench 43 (Fig. 25) was located south of Trench 44, and oriented northeast/southwest. The top of the topsoil was at 69.29m OD at the southwest end, and 69.76m OD at the northeast end. There were four agricultural ditches, three aligned north/south; two of which were probably those observed in Trench 44. The ditch (43/04) was mid brownish grey silty clay and is possibly the same ditch as (44/05) on a north-south alignment. Ditch [43/12] is on the same alignment as (44/06). The northernmost north-south aligned agricultural ditch (43/11) extends north to the east of Trench 44. An east/west oriented ditch (43/08) may well be a drainage ditch associated with the vineyard. The pit or ditch terminus (43/07) and gully (43/10) have similar fills to (43/08) and the other linear features, which appear to be a part of the network of agricultural ditches for the vineyard, although they may equally be part of either the Bronze Age field-system or a different Roman agricultural regime.

4.2.3.2.3 Northeast Vineyard *(Figures 26-28)*
Trenches 38, 36, 37, 54, 57, 32 and 33

Trench 38 (Fig. 27) lies to the north of the farmstead northwest of Trench 45. The trench was oriented northwest/southeast. The top of the topsoil was at 74.28m OD at the northwest end and 72.89m OD at the southeast end. The terminals of two agricultural gullies (38/06) and (38/08), as well as three postholes (38/04), (38/05) and (38/07) were observed. The agricultural features may well line up those observed in Trench 37 to the northeast. Within the context of 2m-wide evaluation trenches it is not possible to fully assess the significance of the presence of the postholes, in respect of the agricultural gullies. Certainly, those postholes observed at Wollaston were within the gullies, rather than outside of them (Brown et al, 2001).

Trench 36 (Fig. 27) lies to the west of Trench 38 and was oriented northeast/ southwest. The top of the topsoil was at 74.54m OD at the southwest end, and

74.86m OD at the northeast end. Three northwest/southeast linear anomalies were recorded by the magnetometry survey. The archaeological evaluation recovered these three and a further one to the south, yielding a total of four parallel gullies, (36/06), (36/07), (36/08) and (36/09). No finds were recovered from any of the features. The four gullies appear to be at right angles to those observed between Trenches 38 and 37. If this is so, then it is indicative of a different phase of the vineyard or other agricultural practice. Only further work can clarify the nature of this relationship.

Trench 37 (Fig. 27) lies to the north of Trench 38 and northeast of Trench 36. It was oriented northwest/southeast parallel with Trench 38. The top of the topsoil was at 72.77m OD at the northwest end, and 71.25m OD at the southeast end. Trench 37 had six agricultural gullies which were parallel with one another, some of which can be projected into adjacent trenches. At the northwest end of the trench, the gully (37/04) appears to be an extension of the gully observed in Trenches 32 and 33 – (32/13) and (33/11).

Similarly, (37/10), (33/04) and (38/06); (37/14) and (38/08), and (37/05) and (33/07) may all be examples of gullies which extend from the one trench to others. Within the narrow constraints of 2m wide trenches, minor changes in fill and apparent differing alignments can mislead interpretation. Nonetheless, it is clear that these gullies do form a laid-out trench network for agricultural activity. Additionally (37/11) and (37/12) are parallel with the above gullies, and also parallel with gullies in Trenches 54 and, possibly, 57. It is interesting that the features found are not on the same alignment as those revealed in the magnetometry survey.

Trench 54 (Fig. 27) lies to the east of Trenches 38 and 37, oriented north/south. The top of the topsoil was at 72.71m OD at the south end, and 74.05m OD at the north end. Two gullies were observed in Trench 54 – [54/09] and (54/10). Although [54/09] evidenced a terminal, it was heavily truncated by a modern land-drain and so was not sampled. These are parallel with gullies in Trenches 33, 37 and 38 although [54/09] does appear to change direction within the trench. The trench also exposed three other features (54/04), (54/05) and (54/08), located on the edge of the trench. These could represent either small pits or gully terminals; too little was revealed to be certain which they are.

Trench 57 (Fig. 28) lies to the north of Trench 54 and was oriented north/south. The top of the topsoil was at 75.62m OD at the north end, and 74.13m OD at the south end. The agricultural gully [57/19] contained a mix of residual Bronze Age flint-gritted ware, and Roman and one post-AD43 rim from the brown clay fill (57/11). The agricultural gully sampled here appears to be similar to [54/09] and [54/10] to the south and may form part of the network of congruent linear features composing the proposed vineyard. Certainly Trench 54 to the south evidences similar features as does Trench 33 to the west. The gully [57/19] may well continue into Trench 33. The east/west feature (57/13)/(57/14) is part of the rectangular enclosure described below. South of and parallel with the ditch of the rectangular enclosure were two further ditches: [57/18] was sampled, but the orange brown clay fill (57/07) failed to yield any dating; the southernmost ditch (57/04) was not sampled. It did, however, cut a square-ended feature (57/05), which was also without any dating material. Other features within the trench include the cremation pits [57/16] and [57/17] detailed below, as well as the pit (57/06) and stakehole (57/08).

Trench 32 (Fig. 28) was oriented east-west and measured 50m long. It was located south of Trench 33 and west of Trench 57. The top of the topsoil was at75.44m OD at the east end, and 76.17m OD at the west end. The geophysical survey identified a single north by northeast/southwest ditch and a gully; the evaluation trench located the ditch (32/07), as well as a possible ditch at right angles, (32/05); the agricultural feature (32/13), recorded by the magnetometry was located at the east end of the trench. Further linear features were also observed which were characterised as agricultural features; these were (32/09) and (32/10). Possible pits were also observed: (32/04), (32/08), (32/11) and (32/12).

The agricultural gullies (32/13) and (32/10) could be associated with (33/11) and (33/13) respectively (see Trench 32). The gully (32/09) did not appear to be present in any other trench.

Trench 33 (Fig. 28) lies to the north of Trench 32 and was oriented northwest/ southeast. The top of the topsoil was at c. 75.6m OD at the southwest end and 76.43m OD at the northeast end. The trench revealed a number of agricultural gullies, many of which can be shown to extend into other trenches. These comprise, from the evaluation, (33/13) and (32/10); (33/11), (32/13) and (37/04); (33/07) and (37/05); and (33/04), (37/14) and (38/08). The gullies (33/06) and (33/05) did not appear to be visible elsewhere, but as is noted below the degree of exactitude in the context of an evaluation is not absolute.

Two postholes or small pits were also observed (33/09) and (33/10), but were not sampled, nor did they yield any dating material. A curved linear feature [33/14]/(33/12) was sampled; no pottery was recovered, although bone was present; it was not felt appropriate to risk its stratigraphic relationship with the agricultural gully (33/11).

4.2.3.2.3.1 Summary of the northeast vineyard

It is not easy associating the linear features seen in plan during the evaluation with those recorded by the magnetometry. The magnetometry survey recorded a number of agricultural features running north/south on the east side of the West Field; that is the Roman east field. Four of the linear anomalies measured c. 150m in length, others measured less, c. 100m. The features revealed by the evaluation exceed the number of features recorded by the geophysical survey, which is not altogether unsurprising.

Furthermore, the various alignments of the features exposed during the evaluation were not always reconcilable with those seen during the magnetometry. Sometimes, for example in Trench 36, the correspondence is markedly good; in other cases the gullies seem to be on very different unrecorded alignments. Clearly, given the paucity of good dating material from the features, the chronological scale of the putative vineyard remains unclear, as does the number of phases, which may potentially number up to three – two observed in the evaluation and that shown on the geophysical survey. This can only be resolved by examining those areas where the gullies evidence the potential for stratigraphic relations.

4.2.3.3 The Rectangular Enclosure and Occupation in the North West Corner

4.2.3.3.1 The Rectangular Enclosure *(Figures 29-33)*

Located at the north of the site was a square-sided, rectangular enclosure straddling all three Fields, which was oriented south-east/northwest, measuring c. 84m by 72m. This enclosure was located in the northeast corner of the West Field, the central part of the North Field and appears to have continued into the East Field. No structures were apparent within the feature according to the magnetometry survey.

Trench 29 (Fig. 31) was laid out immediately south of the rectangular enclosure on a northeast/southwest alignment. The top of the topsoil was at 76.68m OD at the northeast end, and 77.77m OD at the southwest end.

Following excavation of the trench, which yielded two possible agricultural features and some postholes, it was decided to extend the trench to the north to examine the ditch of the enclosure. In order to understand the relationship between the enclosure and the putative agricultural gullies, the feature [29/12]/(29/04), located at the east end of the trench, was chosen to be the line along which the trench was extended to the northeast.

A large quantity of Bronze Age pottery was recovered from the surface of (29/04) the fill of gully [29/12] during machining. The yellowy brown fill was cut by the enclosure ditch [29/10], which failed to yield any dating evidence, although pottery recovered from the upper fill (59/08) of this feature, in Trench 59 (Fig. 32) to the east, was possibly Roman; that from the lower fill (59/09) was Bronze Age. The pottery from the ditch [34/11] to the south of the rectangular enclosure, and which seems to be part of the same complex was also identified as Bronze Age. To the east of Trench 59, Trench 57 (Fig. 32) was aligned north/south and clipped the rectangular enclosure, recorded as (57/13) and (57/14), at the very north end of the trench (Fig. 18). In Trench 60, (Fig. 32) the enclosure ditch (60/08) was also observed, although not sampled; it was not observed in Trench 28 (Fig. 31), although this may well be due to the natural, a dirty gravel deposit, not being sufficiently weathered. The ditch [59/10] was more than 0.8m deep; adverse weather conditions and a rising water-table prevented the complete excavation of the section through the feature. Sufficient was sampled to ascertain that the ditch was filled with at least two fills – upper fill (59/08) mid grey brown silty clay, c. 0.6m thick and (59/09) dark grey brown clay, more than 0.2m thick. The former fill (59/08) contained bone and flint in addition to pottery. By way of contrast, [29/10] was 0.4m deep; (29/09) was 0.3m thick and (29/11) 0.1m thick; the fills were comparable with those in Trench 59. The ditch [59/10] had a posthole [59/12] cut into the north side of the ditch-cut. Cut into the final backfilling of the trench was an undated posthole [59/14].

It appeared during the evaluation that a further ditch (59/06) and a gully (59/04) were present to the north of [59/10] and although little else was visible in the trenches in the North Field this may be due to insufficient weathering. The ditches were on broadly similar alignments to [59/10] and may indicate further enclosures to the north, which were not recovered during the magnetometry survey. The feature (59/07) appeared to be a posthole, the feature (59/05) was an irregular pit, or natural feature. In Trench 60 a number of linear features were observed. In addition to the north ditch (60/08) of the enclosure, a north/south gully at right angles to (59/04) was observed.

During the magnetometry survey, the North Field was characterised, in addition to the enclosure, by an east/west aligned ditch and bank. This was identified in Trenches 1, 2, 27 and 28. It was not observed in Trench 26. The underlying natural, a dirty gravel deposit in Trenches 26, 27, 28 and 60, was not easily conducive – within the limited constraints of a 50m by 2m trench – to the identification of features. It is probable that a period of weathering would reveal further activity, if it were indeed present.

The north side of the rectangular enclosure was observed in Trench 60 (Fig. 32) as (60/08); to the south of this was a narrow linear feature (60/07), which yielded Roman tile, as well as a broader linear feature [60/09] and bank (60/10) feature which were investigated, these may be the same ditch and bank feature as seen to the west in Trenches 2, 27 and 28. The ditch was 2m wide and c 4m deep; to the north the putative bank (60/10) was 2.2m wide and 0.2m thick. To the south of the ditch [60/09] and bank (60/10), the terminal of a gully (60/05) was observed as well as the edge of a pit (60/04), which also yielded Roman tile.

The rectangular enclosure was sampled and proved to be earlier than previously believed – the pottery was identified as Bronze Age in date, subject to the caveats expressed by Bryant (1997:14). This enclosure is then to be associated with the ring-ditch to the east. Although the presence of Roman pottery in the top of [59/10] may well indicate that it was still visible as an earthwork and whether it was redug or whether the Roman pottery is intrusive is as yet unclear. One cremation and a possibly associated burning pit were located south of the enclosure in Trench 57 (Fig. 32). These are detailed below, but it is perhaps of significance that the enclosure, many of the cremations and the ring-ditch are located here at the north end of the site overlooking the dry valley of Thorley Wash and the brook at the south end of the site. If this is the case then further cremations are to be anticipated on this western plateau overlooking the Stort Valley.

Trench 2 (Fig. 32) which was oriented northeast/southwest at c. 79.95m OD revealed the east/west ditch (2/04) recovered by the magnetometry survey, although the bank was not observed, and a second east/west gully to the south (2/05). To the east, Trench 26 (Fig. 29), oriented north by northwest/south by southeast at between 79.8m OD (north) 80m OD (south), failed to reveal any traces of archaeological remains in the dirty gravel natural. It is possible that an extended period of weathering may permit the ditch to become visible. Trench 27 (Fig. 31) oriented northeast/southwest at between 78.4m OD (north) and 78.6m OD (south) revealed the ditch (27/04), which extended into Trench 28 (Fig. 31), was oriented northwest/southeast at between 78m OD (north) and 76.9m OD (south), as (28/04). To the north of the ditch (28/04) was a gully terminal or pit (28/05) and a stakehole (28/06); neither were sampled

Trench 61 (Fig. 33), oriented northwest/southeast was located between 75.4m OD (north) and 74.5m OD (south). Three linear features (61/05), (61/06) and (61/07) were located north of the modern disturbance (61/04). The east/west ditches were not investigated; the ditch (61/07) may well be an extension of the ditch to the west of the rectangular enclosure.

Trench 58 (Fig. 33) to the northwest of Trench 56, oriented northeast/southwest and located between 74.99m OD at the northeast end, and 74.76m OD at the southwest end, yielded good evidence for archaeological features corresponding with the magnetometry survey. The gully (58/06) at the southern end of the trench may well

extend into Trench 54, (Fig. 27), as (54/07), although equally it may be part of an enclosure respecting those to the northeast. To the northeast, the ditch [58/07] appears to be part of the agricultural activity identified by the magnetometry survey as a number of small rectilinear enclosures and (58/04) seems to be a large irregular pit.

Trench 62 (Fig. 33) was located at the north of the East Field, to the east of Trench 58. The trench was oriented east/west and the topsoil at the west end was at 74.43m OD, and at the east end at 73.34 OD. At the west end of the trench the ditches (62/04) and (62/06) appear to correspond with the agricultural enclosure features shown on the magnetometry survey. The features (62/09) and (62/10) at the east end may well be a part of an enclosure comprising right angled agricultural ditches as in Trench 58. Two pits, (62/05) and (62/07) – the latter cutting a small gully (62/08) – were also observed, though not sampled.

4.2.3.3.2 Occupation in North West Corner *(Figs.29, 34-35)*

At the west end of the North Field a second square enclosure was seen in Trenches 95 and 97. The bank and ditch observed on the magnetometry survey and in Trenches 1, 2, 27 and 28, connected the rectangular enclosure with further settlement activity on the northwest side of the site. A large number of ditches and spreads of activity were observed.

Trenches 1, 95, 96 and 97 yielded extensive evidence of enclosures and gullies. A limited amount of sampling of features within the trenches was carried out. However, for example, Trench 97 yielded sufficient quantities of dateable material from the surface of features which were evidently complex, that invasive sampling was agreed with the HEU to be potentially of more damage than to leave the features for future investigation. In addition to significant quantities of remains, Trench 1 also evidenced a cremation. Dating was only recovered from Trenches 3 and 97.

4.2.3.3.2.1 Trench 3 *(Fig. 34)*

Trench 3 was located in the northwest corner of the West Field to the northeast of the western vineyard area. The trench was oriented northeast/southwest to sample the western boundary ditch also observed in Trenches 9 and 7. The top of the topsoil was at 79.62m OD at the northeast end, and 78.84m OD at the southwest end.

At the south end of the trench the boundary ditch (3/09), present elsewhere as (7/08) and [9/14], was observed; this may also be the ditch sampled to the north in Trench 96 as [96/23] or [96/24]. South of this ditch was a possible agricultural gully (3/10), which may extend west to Trench 93 as (93/05) or (93/07). North of the boundary ditch (3/09) were further features, (3/05), (3/06) and (3/07) which were characterised by orange brown clay fills, which is frequently associated with the earlier activity on site. The ditch to the south of this group of features [93/11] was sampled, and (93/12) stony grey brown clay yielded pottery from the Roman period.

North of this trench would appear – from both the little visible from the magnetometry survey as well as the evaluation – to be the location of a second farmstead or settlement. Although Trench 2 yielded few remains, Trenches 1, 95, 96 and 97 exposed a number of ditches, gullies, pits and spreads.

4.2.3.3.2.2 Trench 1 *(Fig. 34)*

Trench 1 was located north of Trench 3 and east of Trench 97. The trench was oriented northwest/southeast. The top of the topsoil was at 80.72m OD at the northwest end, and 80.04m OD at the southeast end.

The density of features in Trench 1 is extremely high. The magnetometry survey revealed the presence of the bank and ditch in Trench 1, but nothing else; to the west of the trench and the extreme west of the geophysical survey are a pair of gullies and a ditch. Trench 1 however revealed six approximately east/west aligned linear features (both ditches and gullies) and three north/south, in addition to a possible north/south feature at the very north end of the trench. The east/west oriented gullies [1/07] and [1/04] were sampled. Gully [1/04] yielded bone from (1/06), and [1/07] was dated to the Bronze Age (1/08), although this may be residual. Small pit (1/09) also was present.

It is not possible to assert unequivocally that (1/11) is the ditch associated with the bank and ditch, but it is well positioned to be such. One, if not more of the gullies (1/12), (1/13) or (1/14) are likely to associated with the gully shown on the geophysical survey plan; equally, the ditch (1/16) may well be the ditch seen in Trenches 4 and 5 to the south; it is also possible that gully [1/07] lines up with (97/18).

4.2.3.3.2.3 Trench 95 *(Fig. 34)*

Trench 95 was located on the west side of the proposed development area. The trench was oriented northwest/southeast. The top of the topsoil at the northern was at 79.94m OD, and 79.80m OD at the southern end.

The north/south ditch [95/17] was sampled; it was filled by (95/16) comprising dark grey brown silty clay. Daub and bone was recovered from the fill. This ditch recut an earlier feature [95/15], filled with (95/04), a similar material, though somewhat paler in hue, which was Roman. This feature is believed to be the north/south axis of a square enclosure, the east/west axis of which comprises (95/08) and the Roman dated ditch [97/23]. In addition to the larger ditches, there were five further small ditches or gullies; four, (97/95/06), (95/09), (95/11) and (95/12) oriented northeast/southwest, and one oriented north/south (95/10); a pit (95/13) and three postholes (95/05), (95/07) and (95/14) were also observed.

4.2.3.3.2.4 Trench 96 *(Fig. 34)*

Trench 96 was located northeast of Trench 95 and west of Trench 97; the trench was oriented northeast/southwest. The top of the topsoil was at 80.72m OD at the east end, and 80.20m OD at the west end.

The group of postholes and possible pits or terminals comprising (96/04), (96/05), (96/06), (96/07), (96/08), (96/10), (96/11), (96/22), (96/12) and (96/21) was not sampled with the agreement of the HEU as the apparent complexity of activity would have been compromised, rendering potential structures less comprehendible were sampling to have been undertaken in the restricted confines of the evaluation. This grouping of features – not all necessarily contemporaneous – was located between at least two, and possibly four potential agricultural ditches, (96/09), (96/13), (96/15) and (96/17), which may be indicative of several phases of small enclosures at this end

of the site. It was not possible to ascertain any stratigraphic relationships between the features, as any were beyond the edges of the trenches.

The ditches [96/24] and [96/23] were sampled; Roman pottery was recovered from the fills (96/16) and (96/20) of both cuts, respectively. The complete form of [96/24] was not recovered as it was cut by the later ditch [96/23] at approximately 45°, enabling the minimum width to be ascertained, and due to a rising water-table, it did not prove possible to bottom either feature. The ditch [96/24], may well be part of the same western boundary ditch observed in Trenches 3, 7 and 9 – (3/09), (7/08) and [9/14] – to the south; the later pottery from within it may however indicate a later date. The ditch [96/23] does not appear to be a recut of [96/24], as it is apparently on a differing alignment; however, only further investigation can clarify their relationship.

4.2.3.3.2.5 Trench 97 *(Fig. 97)*

To the east of Trench 97 and west of Trench 1, Trench 97 – oriented northeast/southwest between 80.22m OD (southwest) and 80.86m OD (northeast) – contained approximately twenty-two features. At the southern end of the trench, most of the features appeared to be east/west oriented ditches. At the north end of the trench the density of archaeological remains was such that it was agreed with the HEU that investigation of such a clearly sensitive area would be prejudicial to understanding exactly what activities were being undertaken here. Nonetheless, a reasonable amount of dating material was gathered from the tops of the features, enabling a picture to be apprehensible.

The group of features (97/04), (97/23), (97/05), (97/06), (97/07), (97/08), (97/09) and [97/25] – two of which yielded dating material – comprised pits or ditch terminals and some linear features. The features (97/04) and [97/25]/(97/10) were not dateable, although pottery was recovered from both, as well as bone. Other features such as the large east/west linear (97/11), and the possible north/south return (97/20) to the ditch [95/17] yielded an early Roman date, with a mixture of flint-, sand-, shell- and grog-tempered wares; a samian rim was also collected. Well preserved bone was recovered from these two latter deposits.

The narrow gullies (97/16) and (97/18) also yielded Roman pottery, although of an indeterminate date. Bone, in good condition, was recovered from both these deposits, in addition to slag from (97/16).

4.2.3.3.2.6 Summary of the rectangular enclosure and northwest occupation

The occupation observed in the North Field comprises a northwest/southeast aligned rectangular enclosure [59/10]/(57/13)/(57/14)/[29/10]/(60/08) with a ditch c. 2.2m wide and between 0.4m and 0.8m in depth dating from after the Bronze Age. Some features were identified within the enclosure but no stratigraphic relationship was demonstrated between the enclosure and the features inside it; the only stratigraphic relationship established was between the ditch of the rectangular enclosure and a possible agricultural gully or enclosure ditch; this showed that the enclosure ditch was apparently later than the northeast aligned Bronze Age ditch; it is clear however that there is a good possibility that the ditch was recut during the Roman period as Roman pottery was recovered from the south side of the rectangular enclosure.

To the west in Trenches 1, 95, 96 and 97 several ditches as well as pits and a cremation were observed. Dating material was only recovered from Trench 97; this was all Roman. At least one square-sided enclosure [95/15]/[95/17]/(95/08)/[97/23] was observed in the northwest corner of the site. These enclosures as well as the spreads of deposit and postholes point strongly to either an extension of the farmstead on the plateau, or perhaps another group of buildings, perhaps associated with the estate of a villa in the vicinity. Such a potential candidate exists to the south of St James' Way (Bourn, 2007:10).

4.2.3.4 Cremations *(Figs.32, 34 & 36)*

Cremations were located across the site; three cremations were located in the West Field: one was located in Trench 12 (Fig. 36), one further confirmed and one possible were located in Trench 57 (Fig. 32); a single cremation was located in the North Field in Trench 1 (Fig. 34) and two were located in the East Field in Trenches 55 (Fig. 36) and 73 (Fig. 36).

The cremation [12/06]/(12/07) from Trench 12 (Fig. 36) had a significant quantity of pottery associated with it; this appears to be late Iron Age or Roman, the pottery may pre-date the Conquest, but this is not certain; a small quantity of bone was also retained from the cremation. The cremation pit measured c. 0.3m diameter; it was locate at a height of 72.65m OD. Similarly the other cremation (73/04) which yielded dating material was broadly in the same time-frame Late Iron Age/early RB. The cremation (73/04) (Fig. 31) was larger than that in Trench 12, measuring c. 0.6m diameter. It was not sampled, the pottery was recovered from the surface of the feature. It was at 71.65m OD.

The cremations from the other trenches were notable for the pits being similar in size to that in Trench 73, and larger than in Trench 12: (1/09) (Fig. 25), (55/04) (Fig. 30) and both measured a diameter of c. 0.6m; indeed, [57/17]/(57/10) (Fig. 18) and [57/16]/(57/09)/(57/15) measured c. 1m diameter. The former two were located at 80.70m OD and 72/01m OD, while [57/17] was at 74.81m OD. The probable cremation [57/17] was sampled, yielding sp. Pomoideae (hawthorn, apple, etc.) charcoal; bone was however observed from the pit; flint was, moreover, recovered from the pit-fill (57/10). The pit [57/16] had a red layer (57/09), which may well be evidence of a burning pit, rather than the inhumed cremation, which yielded flint and shell.

In summation, the dated cremations are late Iron Age or Roman, which is an entirely appropriate date-range for such remains in the region (Bryant, 1997:27; Niblett, n.d.:23). The other cremations are undated, but may well be of a similar date range.

4.2.3.5 Undated Trenches *(Figs. 2, 37 & 38)*

Trench 52 (Fig. 37) was located north of Trench 51, oriented east/west at between 71.6m OD (west) and 71.1m OD (east). At the west end the ditch (52/04) was probably the same as seen on the geophysical survey oriented northwest/southeast. A land drain truncated (52/05), a narrow north/south gully. The feature (52/06) was either an irregular pit or linear. The posthole [52/10](52/07) was sampled but failed to yield any dating material. The stakehole to the southeast (52/08) was not sampled. The feature (52/09) was a gully terminal.

Trench 53 (Fig. 37) was located on the western side of the East Field. The trench was oriented north by northeast/south by southwest. The top of the topsoil was as 73.50m OD at the north end and 72.33m OD at the south. Three ditches most likely enclosure ditches, part of a putative Bronze Age field-system, although as they are undated they may well be Roman, were observed in the trench; the enclosure gullies were not sampled. Two were aligned northeast/southwest – (53/04) and (53/06) – and a single example – (53/07) – was aligned at right angles southeast/northwest. No finds were recovered from any of the features. The narrow linear feature (53/04) does not appear to respect the alignment of any of the other features, although is also undated. It is possible it is associated with (55/05), a narrow gully in the adjacent trench to the west. The feature (53/05) was an irregular pit or tree-throw.

Trench 56 (Fig. 37), which was located north of Trenches 53 and 55, and oriented west by northwest/south by southeast; the topsoil at the west end was at 74.33m OD and at 73.09m OD at the east end. The features observed in the trench were barely convincing; the possible terminal (56/05) may be part of an undated ditch, but too little was observed to be certain. The feature (56/04) may be an irregular pit or of natural origin.

Trench 76 (Fig. 37) was oriented north/south on the east side of the site at between 66.62m OD (north) and 65.88m OD (south). Two east/west ditches (76/04) and (76/05) were observed. Neither were investigated.

Trenches 46, 47, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90 at the south end of the East Field did not reveal any significant deposits; Trench 46 (Fig. 38) evidenced a single north/south gully (46/04); Trench 88 had a pair of land drains; it is clear that the possibility of further remains being present cannot be discounted, nonetheless, the quantity of remains observe elsewhere is not matched in this part of the proposed development site. To the north, Trench 50 failed to reveal anything except a modern land drain; east of this Trench 78 was also empty. Trench 85 (Fig. 38) revealed three postholes while an irregular feature was partly within Trench 86 (Fig. 38). Trenches 89 and 90 were blank.

In the North Field, Trenches 64, 65, 66, and 67 failed to reveal any significant archaeology; Trench 64 revealed the modern linear feature shown on the geophysical survey. The extensive disturbance visible on the magnetometry was not observed in either Trenches 64 or 66.

4.3 Reliability of results and methodologies

The evaluation was carried out under mixed conditions. Rain was a particular factor through January, although after this the weather eased off but many of the trenches had already been opened. The geology was noted in places – notably to the very north and south of the site – to be variegated, with the result that the presence or absence of features can not be said without qualification to define the full extent of the archaeological record.

The magnetometry survey was not wholly reliable for the presence of archaeological features. Many more additional ditches and gullies were recovered than were shown during the survey; this may be a consequence of the density of information within the raw data preventing a clear interpretation of the additional features. Nonetheless, the

evaluation largely confirmed the presence of indicated remains and added to the picture of the farmstead.

The evaluation was able to determine and confirm the general nature of the remains present to be agricultural in the vicinity of settlements; it also established the date range for the remains to be prehistoric to Roman; the evaluation confirmed the approximate extent of the remains within the area of the proposed development site; determined the good condition and state of preservation of the remains to be good to very good; established that the degree of complexity of the horizontal and vertical stratigraphy present was high; confirmed that the range, quality and quantity of the artefactual evidence present was of sufficient significance to warrant further investigation in the event of the site being subject to development; and determined that the site had the localised potential to provide palaeoenvironmental and/or economic evidence in the form of bulk sampling, palynological sampling, and primarily faunal analysis.

5 FINDS

5.1 **The Pottery** by Isobel Thompson

Pottery overview

03/12 Scraps, including a grog rilled sherd (1st century AD) and one fine f/g
04/05 One sherd undiagnostic fired clay
06/04 Bronze Age: coarse and fine f/g
08/04 Bronze Age: coarse f/g
08/14 Bronze Age: 2 f/g scraps
09/04 Bronze Age: f/g; but also two sherds from a grog-tempered cordoned jar, which could be pre-43
09/06 Late Iron Age/early Roman: grog-tempered storage jar sherds
09/09 Bronze Age: f/g scraps
09/15 Bronze Age: f/g
09/16 Bronze Age: f/g
10/04 Roman grey ware, several late grog sherds (post-43), one f/g sherd
10/06 Roman: two later 1st century scraps
10/08 Roman: late 1st cent RB grey ware everted rim jars etc; large parts of a rilled jar in late brittle grog; 1 sherd f/g
11/04 1st century AD; one sherd indeterminate grog
11/06 Late Iron Age?: grog scraps, not certainly pre-43 but might be
12/07 Late Iron Age (not certainly pre-43, but might be): includes sherds from a base in imitation TR, grog with matt red surfaces, and this might be a butt beaker; certainly an import copy; many grog scraps; also a bag of what appears to be cremated bone
13/02 Roman: grey ware rim
13/05 Roman: grey ware rim, and sherd of a late grog cordoned jar
21/09 Bronze Age: f/g, including a decorated piece; and a post-43 rilled jar scrap
21/10 Roman: grey ware; white slip on red, probably a jug; fired clay lump
21/11 Roman: grey rim, red scraps
22/07 Roman: 1 complete little pot, narrow-mouthed cup, Roman fine sandy fabric; white (?VRF) jug handle; RB grey ware sherd; also a thin everted rim jar, late grog rilled jar and other late 1st century pieces; and bone
22/20 Roman: RB greyware etc, plus one f/g scrap
22/22 Roman: RB grey ware, late grog, chalky lump
22/23 Roman: post-43 slightly sandy rilled jar, etc
24/07 Roman: ?tile, worn
29/04 Bronze Age: coarse f/g
34/08 Bronze Age: f/g
35/04 Roman scrap
39/04 Roman: tile, grey ware, colour-coat; one sherd f/g
39/05 Roman: TS; Roman grey ware pedestal base; colour-coat; flanged bowl; beaker. 2nd cent?

39/06 Roman: one piece of a 1st century TN (copy) plate, post-conquest form. This type is Claudian and later
39/11 Roman: grey ware and other scraps; one stone; one late rilled sherd
40/08 TS wide bowl base (?Dr 18/31) with stamp, OF someone; and other Roman; and coarse f/g scrap
40/10 Roman: RB grey ware, post-43 grog
40/11 Roman: one sandy sherd
40/13 Roman: grey ware, ?2nd century
41/08 Roman: grey ware rim
41/09 Roman: TS bowl; TN plate copy rim frags; Roman grey ware etc; some f/g. The Samian bowl appears to be a Drag 35 cup, Flavian or later
41/12 Roman: RB grey ware; jug sherds; f/g scraps
41/13 Roman: sherds from a ring-neck flagon with small handle, red with white slip; and grey scraps
44/04 One Roman sherd, one f/g
45/12 Bronze Age: three f/g scraps
45/15 Bronze Age: f/g scrap
47/10 Bronze Age 2 sherds f/g & one indeterminate scrap; the second bag just has a stone in it
51/04 Roman: scraps, and one f/g or fired clay lump
51/05 Bronze Age: f/g rim
51/30 Roman: TS cup, one sherd; ?Drag 33, uncommon until 2nd century
51/31 Roman: grey ware etc; also 1 f/g scrap
57/11 Bronze Age/Roman: 3 f/g sherds and one post-43 rim, and scraps
59/08 ?Roman: 1 sherd
59/09 Bronze Age: f/g
68/02 Bronze Age: f/g
68/04 Bronze Age: f/g including a finely gritted rim sherd
68/05 Bronze Age: large coarse f/g sherd, broken up
69/04 Bronze Age: f/g
72/04 Bronze Age: large hard sherds f/g including a base sherd; also one small grog sherd, probably post-43
72/06 Bronze Age: f/g
73/04 Late Iron Age/early RB: 2 grog scraps
75/04 Bronze Age: f/g
75/05 Bronze Age: f/g
77/06 Bronze Age: 1 f/g sherd
83/04 Bronze Age: 1 f/g scrap
87/07 Bronze Age: f/g scrap
87/08 Bronze Age: three f/g scraps
93/07 Roman: 1 scrap
93/13 Roman: 1 scrap
97/04 Scraps of f/g and grog
97/10 Rim in finely sandy fabric, with decoration; unknown, not late Iron Age or Roman
97/11 Roman: early RB scraps, grog storage-jar sherds; one f/g sherd
97/16 Roman: grey, sandy etc, grog scraps
97/18 Roman: grey ware sherd
97/20 Roman: shelly jar; TS rim; late grog; sandy; lump with chalk grains, indeterminate; ?pot
97/23 Roman: post-43 grog
u/s sherds of one jar, no form, probably grog but could be early

Key points:

- Two main periods are represented. The flint-gritted is more substantial than is usual on Hertfordshire sites, where it is very common but usually residual and much broken-up and crumbling. The firing temperature of some of this appears higher than usual. Also, one piece is decorated. I am assuming that this material is Bronze Age.
- The remainder is almost entirely later 1st - 2nd century. I thought at first that there was nothing pre-conquest, but there are one or two contexts with what may be pre-conquest sherds. These are few, however, and not very diagnostic.
- The Roman includes some comparatively high-status pieces, including

Samian. The stamp needs identification.

5.1.2 Addendum to the pottery by David Gilbert & Gwilym Williams
Pottery from contexts (1/08) and (48/08) were spot-dated to the Bronze Age; from (49/09) to the Late Iron Age(?); and from contexts (51/04), (95/04), (96/16) and (96/20) to the Roman period.

5.2 The Environmental Remains by Mark Robinson
Four flots from a late Iron Age to Roman settlement on Boulder Clay at Whittington Way, Bishop's Stortford, Herts (BSWW08) were scanned under a binocular microscope for biological remains. The following items are present:

08/07 Snails: *Vallonia excentrica*, *V. costata*, *Discus rotundatus*, *Trichia hispida* gp., *Cepaea* sp.

22/07 Carbonised seeds: Gramineae indet. (grass) , *Triticum* sp. (wheat) 1.
Snails: *Vallonia* sp., *Cepaea* sp.

51/04 Carbonised seeds: *Triticum spelta* (spelt wheat) 2, *T. dicoccum* or *spelta* (emmer or spelt) 1, cereal indet. 1, *Anthemis cotula* (stinking mayweed) 1, weed indet. 1.

57/15 Charcoal: Pomoideae (hawthorn, apple etc).

The small assemblages of carbonised plant remains are appropriate for a site of Iron Age or Roman date, with the use of spelt wheat. The weed stinking mayweed is characteristic of heavy calcareous soils such as Boulder Clay. The snails include both species of open habitats such as *Vallonia excentrica* and *V. costata* and species of shaded habitats such as *Discus rotundatus*.

The remains from the flots are unexceptional and have no potential for further analysis.

6 DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

The geophysical survey shows a rectangular enclosure to the north. In the centre of the site is a farmstead, dating from the Roman period. Between the farmstead and the rectangular enclosure is an interrupted ditch on the east side, matched by an opposing ditch to the west. The ditches are at an angle of between 45° and 60°to one another; one is oriented northeast/southwest, the other northwest/southeast; they do not appear to meet, although are linked at their south end by the Roman northern enclosure ditch of the farmstead. Bronze Age pottery has been recovered from both the east and west ditches, although Roman pottery has also been recovered from the eastern ditch. To the southeast is a trackway, dated to the Bronze Age, and to the east a barrow, also dated to the Bronze Age, but which seems to have been re-used during the Roman period. In addition to which a possible banjo enclosure is evidenced between the two ditches north of the farmstead. In the northeast corner some geophysical survey was carried out and the evaluation confirmed the quantity of remains.

The site faces south on a slope which drops from c. 80m OD to c. 60m OD. The barrow was located in a typical location on the east side of the slope overlooking the Stort Valley on a false crest. The farmstead is located to the west of the barrow between approximately 75m OD and 71m OD. To the north of the farmstead are a

number of gullies and ditches which seem to indicate a number of enclosures from differing phases, though in the large these are probably late prehistoric. To the east of the eastern ditch the geophysical survey located linear features of an agricultural origin; further examples of these were found to the south of the farmstead and to the northwest. These features date from the Roman period. The landscape here has been used and maintained over a reasonably extended period of time, as illustrated by the presence of agricultural features dating from the Bronze Age through to the Roman period.

Although the rectangular enclosure could not be accurately dated – it contained pottery from the Bronze Age through to the Roman period, it was shown to be a significant feature, in places up to c. 0.8m deep and 2.5m wide. What was carried out within the enclosure is not clear, though a number of undated features were observed. To the west, and linked to the rectangular enclosure by a bank and ditch, was further Roman occupation. This comprised ditches, pits, postholes and at least one cremation.

Cremation is introduced into the region from the later 2nd/early 1st centuries BC (Bryant, 2000:27). The pottery from the cremations recovered during the evaluation points to a post-Conquest date, which concurs with the occupation evidence. Sites such as Barton Court Farm, Oxon (Miles, 1986) indicate that it is not uncommon for inhumations and particularly cremations to be present on Romano-British villa sites. However the other cremations may not be of this period.

The ring-ditch of the barrow was located on the east side of the site, overlooking both the Stort Valley and the road to London, it was subsequently redug during the Roman period for a secondary inhumation. The Stort connects the region with London, both as a market to sell produce such as the wine but also as a source of the high-status wares which characterise the site. Moreover, Stane Street runs east/west through Bishop's Stortford connecting Chelmsford – the tribal capital of the Trinovantes – with Verulamium – the Roman tribal capital of the Catuvellauni.

The chronological relationship with the two phases of putative vineyard and the settlement is of potentially great significance. Previous work at Wollaston indicates a date-range of 2nd to early 4th (Brown et al. 2001) – the pottery from Whittington Way tails off in the 2nd century and moreover, no direct stratigraphic relationship was established between the vineyard and the settlement. Further work on the potential traces of vineyard in the central area of the farmstead would clarify whether they post-date the settlement or are contemporary with it. By the 3rd century it appears to be understood that viticulture was regularly carried out in Britain, when the emperor Probus (276-282) issued an edict permitting "Gauls, Spaniards and Britons to cultivate vineyards and make wines" (Brown et al. 2001:745).

The possible agricultural activity revealed across the site seems to comprise at least two phases. None of the agricultural ditches were excavated in excess of 0.75m of length. This was enough to characterise them as putative gullies for vines; although this is the most reasonable hypothesis, it remains all the same possible that they functioned as gullies for other climbing plants, or perhaps even as lazy beds. Extensive and comparative hand-excavation supplemented by palynological sampling can only clarify the issue and confirm or refute the hypothesis. It is indeed not impossible that the different orientations reflect different crops. Certainly the

apparent predating of the rectangular enclosure by some of the gullies does not appear immediately consistent with a 3rd century date for wide-scale introduction of viticulture. Moreover, it is clear that two phases at least are indicated by the geophysical survey.

The site is located on Boulder Clay overlying Chalk on the eastern side of the county; near the historic boundary of the Trinovantes and Catauvllani, both of which adopted *Romanitas* swiftly notwithstanding uprisings, over the course of the 1st century. Other examples of vineyards include Stanton Law, Bucks; Wilby Way Wellingborough, Northants; Waddesdon, Bucks; and Fen Drayton, Cambs. all of which are within or immediately bordering the historic allies of the empire, although by the 3rd century, civil disturbance was less significant a factor than general economic stagnation (Wacher, 1978:116-118). Undoubtedly there are many more unrecognised; perhaps even to the west and north, although geological and climatalogical factors are not inconsiderable.

An on-going issue is the dating of later-prehistoric sites. "For the later Iron Age of Hertfordshire and Essex, a finer degree of dating (to between 50 and 100 years) is possible for most sites from 100 BC" (Bryant 2000:14, citing Sealey 1996). The pottery is characterized by "forms and fabrics (which) tend to be long-lived and in some parts of the region persist well into the later Iron Age" (Bryant, 1997:23); this is further complicated by an ongoing tradition of hand-made pottery, in some cases after the introduction and adoption of wheel-made and indeed imported wares (Bryant, 1997:26). The prehistoric pottery from the site is characterized by such flint-gritted wares, which are so comparatively difficult to date. Activity extended from the Bronze Age into the middle Iron Age and Roman periods and with the forthcoming publication of the Thorley and Dunmow Road sites (Last, J McDonald, T & Humphrey, R 2001) to provide a comparative data-set much significant work on the pottery traditions of late prehistoric East Hertfordshire and West Essex could be undertaken.

On the northwest side of the site, the exposed enclosures, as well as the spreads of archaeological deposit and postholes point strongly to either an extension of the farmstead on the plateau, or perhaps another group of buildings, perhaps associated with the estate of a villa in the vicinity. This might indicate a number of small settlements – or individual farms – in close proximity in the neighbourhood, subject to the economic regime of a local villa. Such a potential candidate exists to the south of St James' Way (Bourn, 2007:10). The site at Whittington Way revealed a sequence which combines agricultural, domestic and burial data. The potential for further work on the economy of buildings perhaps belonging to a villa estate is high as the preservation of bone was extremely good, the pottery comprises an apparent quantity of comparatively high-status wares, and the archaeological features comprise many negative features such as enclosures as well as possible positive archaeological remains, including areas of hardstanding and at least one probable burnt house.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albion Archaeology 2006 Waddesdon Church of England Primary and Secondary School, School Lane, Waddesdon : Archaeological Watching Brief

Bourn, R 2007 Desk –Based Assessment for Land off Whittington Way CgMs,

Branigan K & Niblett, R n.d. The Roman Chilterns Chess Valley Archaeological and Historical Society, Chesham

Brown, AG & Meadows, I 2000 Roman vineyards in Britain: finds from the Nene Valley and new research Antiquity: **74** 491-2

Brown, A G, Meadows, I, Turner, S D & Mattingly, D J 2001 Roman vineyards in Britain: stratigraphic and palynological data from Wollaston in the Nene Valley, England Antiquity: **75** 745-57

Brown, N, & Glazebrook, J, 2000 Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 2. research agenda and strategy East Anglian Archaeology Occ. Paper No 8 Scole Archaeological Committee

Bryant, S 1997 Iron Age in Glazebrook pp 23-34

Bryant, S 2000 The Iron Age in Brown & Glazebrook pp14-18

English Heritage 1991 *Management of Archaeological Projects*

Glazebrook, J 1997 Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 1. resource assessment East Anglian Archaeology Occ. Paper No 3 Scole Archaeological Committee

Institute of Field Archaeologists. 1994 *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations*

Last, J McDonald, T & Humphrey, R 2001 Two Prehistoric & Roman Sites in East Hertfordshire: Thorley & Dunmow Road, Bishop's Stortford Vol 2 Figures & Plans Draft Report Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust

Miles, D (ed) 1986 Archaeology at Barton Court Farm Abingdon Oxon. CBA

Niblett, R n.d. in Branigan K & Niblett J The Roman Chilterns

Perry, BT 1972, *"Excavations at Bramdean, Hampshire, 1965 and 1966, and a discussion of similar sites in southern England".* Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club, 29, 41-78

Smalley, RAJ, 2007 Geopyhsical Survey Report. Whittington Way, Bishop's Storford. Unpublished client report. Stratscan

Wacher, J 1978 Roman Britain JM Dent & Sons London

Williams, G 2007 Land off Whittington Way, Bishop's Stortford Unpublished Client Report John Moore Heritage Services