

# Early Iron Age and Medieval Remains on Land at Zone A Housing Beaulieu Chelmsford



## Archaeological Evaluation Report



February 2014

**Client: Countryside Zest  
(Beaulieu Park) LLP**

OA East Report No:1591  
OASIS No: oxfordar3-172155  
NGR: TL 7230 1014

**Early Iron Age and Medieval Remains on Land at Zone A Housing, Beaulieu,  
Chelmsford**

*Archaeological Evaluation*

*By Helen Stocks-Morgan BSc*

*With contributions by Carole Fletcher (BA AIfA), Rachel Fosberry HNC (Cert Ed) and  
Sarah Percival (BA, MA, MIFA)*

*Editor: Richard Mortimer (MfA)*

*Illustrators: Frances Chaloner and Severine Bezie*

*Report Date: February 2014*

**Report Number:** 1591  
**Site Name:** Beaulieu, Chelmsford, Essex, Zone A Housing  
**HER Event No:** SPBP 14  
**Date of Works:** February 2014  
**Client Name:** Countryside Zest (Beaulieu Park) LLP  
**Client Ref:** 15344  
**Planning Ref:** 09/01314/EIA  
**Grid Ref:** TL 7230 1014  
**Site Code:** SP BP 14  
**Finance Code:** XEX BEP 13  
**Receiving Body:** Chelmsford Museum / Stores

**Accession No:**

Prepared by: Helen Stocks-Morgan  
Position: Supervisor  
Date: 26/02/14

Checked by: Richard Mortimer  
Position: Senior Project manager  
Date: 26/02/14  
Signed: .....



**Disclaimer**

*This document has been prepared for the titled project or named part thereof and should not be relied upon or used for any other project without an independent check being carried out as to its suitability and prior written authority of Oxford Archaeology being obtained. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this document being used for a purpose other than the purposes for which it was commissioned. Any person/party using or relying on the document for such other purposes agrees and will by such use or reliance be taken to confirm their agreement to indemnify Oxford Archaeology for all loss or damage resulting therefrom. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for this document to any party other than the person/party by whom it was commissioned.*

**Oxford Archaeology East,**  
15 Trafalgar Way,  
Bar Hill,  
Cambridge,  
CB23 8SQ

t: 01223 850500  
f: 01223 850599  
e: oaeast@thehumanjourney.net  
w: <http://thehumanjourney.net/oaeast>

**Table of Contents**

**Table of Contents**

<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Location and scope of work.....	7
1.2 Geology and topography.....	7
1.3 Archaeological and historical background.....	7
1.4 Acknowledgements.....	11
<b>2 Aims and Methodology.....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 Aims.....	12
2.2 Methodology.....	12
<b>3 Results.....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	13
3.2 Field 23.....	13
3.3 Field 42.....	13
3.4 Finds Summary.....	16
3.5 Environmental Summary.....	16
<b>4 Discussion and Conclusions.....</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	17
4.2 Late Bronze Age / Early Iron Age Enclosure.....	17
4.3 Late Iron Age field system.....	17
4.4 Prehistoric settlement remains.....	17
4.5 Medieval remains.....	18
4.6 Significance.....	18
4.7 Recommendations.....	18
<b>Appendix A. Trench Descriptions and Context Inventory.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix B. Finds Reports.....</b>	<b>30</b>
B.1 Pottery.....	30
<b>Appendix C. Environmental Reports.....</b>	<b>33</b>
C.1 Mollusca.....	33
<b>Appendix D. Bibliography.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix E. OASIS Report Form.....</b>	<b>36</b>

### List of Figures

- Fig. 1 Site location map  
Fig. 2 Trench Location map  
Fig 3. Interpretative archaeological remains, showing previous archaeological work  
Fig 4 Selected sections

### List of Plates

- Plate 1 Ditch [9]  
Plate 2 Early Iron Age Enclosure [17]  
Plate 3 Ditch [21]

### List of Tables

- Table 1: Quantity and weight of pottery by Trench and Feature  
Table 2: Quantity and weight of baked clay by feature  
Table 3: Ceramic Building Material  
Table 4: Environmental Samples from Zone A (SPBP14)

## Summary

*An archaeological evaluation was carried out at Beaulieu, Chelmsford. The fieldwork took place between the 6/2/14 and the 18/2/14. A total of forty trenches were excavated across two separate fields, within the proposed development area.*

*The earliest occupation evidence on site appears to date to the Early Iron Age and comprises of surface finds and finds within the upper fills of an earlier ditched enclosure in the north-west of the development site. A rectilinear field system, on a north to south alignment, extends across the development area and is tentatively dated to the Late Iron Age.*

*A discrete concentration of Prehistoric activity is evident to the south-east of the site, represented by a two charcoal-rich pits.*

*Medieval activity is mainly concentrated to the north-west of the site, with features possibly suggesting to the presence of a farmstead. A further rectilinear field system, on a north-west to south-east alignment, was recorded to the south of the site.*



## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Location and scope of work

- 1.1.1 Between the 6th and 18th February 2014 Oxford Archaeology East carried out an archaeological evaluation at Beaulieu, Chelmsford: Phase 1 (TL 7230 1014) in advance of a construction of a new neighbourhood planned for North-East Chelmsford, known as Beaulieu. Chelmsford City Council has resolved to grant outline planning permission (ref: 09/01314/EIA) for a new neighbourhood at Beaulieu of up to 3,600 new homes and up to 62,300m<sup>2</sup> of mixed use development including new schools, leisure and community facilities, employment areas, new highways and associated ancillary development, including full details in respect of roundabout access from Essex Regiment Way and a priority junction from White Hart Lane.
- 1.1.2 An archaeological evaluation was conducted on land to the east of Essex Regiment Way and north of White Hart Lane, at Beaulieu, Chelmsford (see fig. 1 for location). The evaluation was undertaken in advance of Zone A residential housing.
- 1.1.3 This archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with the Archaeological Investigation and Mitigation Strategy (URS 2013) prepared for the Beaulieu scheme in consultation with Richard Havis of the Historic Environment Branch, ECC (Planning Application 09/01314/EIA), and supplemented by a Method Statement prepared by OA East.
- 1.1.4 The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, in accordance with the guidelines set out in *National Planning Policy Framework* (Department for Communities and Local Government March 2012). The results will enable decisions to be made by CCC, on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, with regard to the treatment of any archaeological remains found.
- 1.1.5 The site archive is currently held by OA East and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

### 1.2 Geology and topography

- 1.2.1 Beaulieu (the Site) is located approximately 4km to the north-east of Chelmsford, Essex (centred on TL 7230 1014; Figure 1). The Site encompasses an area of high ground surrounded on three sides by river valleys. To the west and south is the River Chelmer, and to the east is Boreham Brook. North of the Site the ground rises towards the village of Terling. From the southern part of the Site there are views south towards the Chelmer Valley and Danbury Hill.
- 1.2.2 The superficial geology consists of boulder clay of the Lowestoft Till formation underlain by London Clays. To the south of the area lay a mixture of head deposits and sand and gravels (British Geological Survey).

### 1.3 Archaeological and historical background

#### Neolithic

- 1.3.1 Essex has some of the earliest surviving evidence of settlement, mainly concentrated to the north-east along the River Crouch at Lawford and Lemarsh (Hedges, 1984). Evidence for possible domestic settlement within the vicinity of Beaulieu was recorded



at Court Road, 1km to the north-west, in the form of several pits with Neolithic pottery within their fills (SMR 6142).

### **Bronze Age**

- 1.3.2 Settlement continued to be concentrated along the river valleys of the Chelmer and Crouch, however during the Bronze Age the landscape was enclosed by field systems for the first time, such as those found at Great Wakering (Kemble, 2001). These enclosed field systems would have continued in use through into the early Iron Age. It has been suggested that these Bronze Age field systems form the basis for the modern landscape in the Chelmer Valley (Drury & Rodwell, 1980).
- 1.3.3 Several crop-marks have been recorded by aerial photography to the south of Belstead Hall and interpreted as part of a Bronze Age settlement (SMR 16888), with further domestic dwellings excavated at Springfield Lyons, 2.5km to the south-west. Further occupation sites are attested to by the recovery of artefacts, such as at New Hall School, to the south-east and Pratt's Farm, to the north.

### **Iron Age**

- 1.3.4 The settlement pattern during the Iron Age would have been of nucleated settlements within a larger farming landscape. Evidence of this, within the vicinity of the development area, was seen to the south of Belstead Hall (SMR 17438). This comprised a large enclosure with associated pits and smaller ditches (Drury, 1978).
- 1.3.5 The Later Iron Age witnessed an expansion of settlement onto the heavier clay soils and the continued occupation of the estuaries. These estuarine sites are seen to become more complex in nature over time, with higher population density and sustained occupation, such as has been found at Little Waltham (Drury 1980).
- 1.3.6 By the end of the Iron Age sites such as Gosbecks oppida show that portions of the population were highly structured and of high status. These sites would have relied on farming communities scattered around the environs to supply agricultural commodities. (Crummy 1997).

### **Roman**

- 1.3.7 During the Roman period a small market town would have grown up around the Mansio, located 5km to the south-west at Moulsham Street. The area surrounding this would have formed an agricultural hinterland to supply produce to the town.
- 1.3.8 This agricultural landscape would have comprised of large farms and villa complexes, such as those at Great Holts Farm and Bulls Farm Lodge. Smaller domestic sites would also have formed part of the landscape. Evidence for these has been recorded during evaluation work at Greater Beaulieu. Evidence for pottery making, associated with domestic use was also recorded.

### **Anglo-Saxon**

- 1.3.9 In the immediate post-Roman period, the Roman town at Chelmsford was abandoned and much of the surrounding landscape reverted to rough pasture or woodland (Hunter, 2003). No known remains of Anglo-Saxon date are recorded within the application site although this is more likely to reflect the relatively poor archaeological visibility of Anglo-Saxon settlement sites rather than a lack of activity during the period.
- 1.3.10 Two records dating to the Anglo-Saxon period are held by the EHER; both of which are documentary records for Late Saxon manors, Belestedam (Belstead Hall) is recorded in the Domesday survey of AD 1086 (Reaney, 1035).

### Medieval

- 1.3.11 The medieval town of Chelmsford was founded at the end of the 12th century, by the Bishop of London, to the north of the earlier Roman settlement at Moulsham. Throughout the medieval period the site was located within the rural hinterland of Chelmsford in a landscape populated by scattered farmsteads and manors.
- 1.3.12 To the south-east lay the manor of New Hall on the site of the current New Hall School. It is first mentioned by name (as 'Nova Aula') in documents dating to AD1301 when the site formed part of the lands owned by the Canons of Waltham Abbey and was used as the summer residence of the Abbott. It was later transferred to the Regular Canons under Henry II (Burgess & Rance, 1988).
- 1.3.13 The first deer park surrounding New Hall was created during the medieval period with the manor at its centre (Tuckwell, 2006). Under Henry VII, New Hall was granted to Thomas Boteler, Earl of Ormond, who received a licence to crenellate (fortify) it in AD1481 (E41/420) and who, in all likelihood, rebuilt or remodelled the original medieval hall in the latest architectural style. The new structure came to the attention of Henry VIII who visited New Hall in 1510 and 1515, shortly before Ormond's death. Subsequently, the property passed to Thomas' daughter and thus into the Boleyn family through her husband Sir Thomas Boleyn, from whom Henry VIII acquired the hall in 1516, changing its name to the 'Palace of Beaulieu'. Shortly after 1518 he rebuilt the Ormond's medieval hall on a quadrangular plan with gatehouse in the south range, great hall in the east and chapel in the west ranges. Mary Tudor took residency at New Hall intermittently between 1532 and her ascendancy to the crown in 1553.
- 1.3.14 Evidence for a further moated manor is recorded at Belstead. This manor was occupied throughout the medieval period. By 1325 it was called Belestede, in 1354 it was recorded as Belestede Hall and by 1504 it was known as Belested Hall. The name is thought to derive from 'the site of the bell house' (P.H Reaney 1935).
- 1.3.15 Analysis of aerial photographs and geophysical survey identified a number of features which, when investigated by trial trench evaluation, were found to comprise a possible enclosure ditch or moat. A cobbled surface (possibly representing a house platform or yard surface), pit and several further ditches were recorded within the enclosure. Pottery recovered from the features suggests an occupation date of the 12-13th century (ECC FAU 2009). These remains have been interpreted as a medieval farmstead or manor, possibly the precursor to the later manorial site at Belstead Hall c.160m to the north-east of site 7.

### Post-Medieval

- 1.3.16 The development of New Hall and its deer park dominated the landscape of the application site and the surrounding area until the park contracted in size and the fields were enclosed for agriculture in the early 18th century. As the deer park was reduced in size the former medieval manors or lodges developed into farms, creating an essentially agricultural landscape.
- 1.3.17 Since the medieval period, New Hall had been set within the largest deer park in Essex; once totalling some 1,500 acres. The EHER records that the enclosed area actually comprised four separate parks surrounding New Hall and its gardens. Within the Great or Old Park located to the north of New Hall. The remaining parks were known as the Red Deer Park located to east of New Hall, the Dukes Park (located further east beyond the study area; EHER 47226) and the New or Little Park situated to the south and west of New Hall. The application site is located within this latter area.

## Previous Archaeological Investigations

### *Geophysical Surveys*

- 1.3.18 Geophysical magnetic susceptibility and detailed magnetometer surveys were carried out to evaluate the potential for important archaeological remains that may be buried within the Site. The magnetic susceptibility survey provided a rapid assessment of likely areas for previous settlement and industrial activity. The survey identified six areas of high potential, ten areas of medium potential and seven areas of low potential (Scott Wilson 2008). The magnetic susceptibility survey was followed by a detailed magnetometer survey of c.50% of the Beaulieu scheme. This survey provided a greater level of detail and identified individual features such as pits and ditches, field boundaries, buildings and structures, kilns or hearths and buried iron objects. The detailed magnetometer survey identified ten areas of high archaeological potential; six of medium potential and 19 of low potential (Scott Wilson 2008).

### *Trial trench Evaluation (2008)*

- 1.3.19 A limited programme of targeted trial trench evaluation was undertaken between June and August 2008. The purpose of the trial trenching was to confirm the presence/absence and significance of archaeological remains at eight sites identified by an assessment of the combined results of the desk-based studies and non-intrusive surveys (Scott Wilson 2007).
- 1.3.20 The trial trenching confirmed the presence of archaeological remains dating from the late prehistoric to post-medieval periods. This included a Late Iron Age and Early Romano-British settlement (Site 8); an Iron Age ditch (Site 5); medieval rural settlement possibly indicative of a precursor to Belstead Hall (Site 7); a possible medieval/early post-medieval warrener's lodge associated with the former deer park (Site 10); early post-medieval moated enclosure (Site 11); Tudor fishpond and associated earthwork dam (Site 2); a brick making site comprising two scove or clamp kilns of possible Tudor date (Site 3) and evidence for associated quarrying activity (Site 4).

### *Beaulieu Minerals trial trench evaluation*

- 1.3.21 A trial trench evaluation was undertaken in September/October 2011 to inform and support the planning application for the Beaulieu Minerals Extraction scheme. The evaluation identified a concentration of archaeological remains to the north-west of New Hall School. These remains appear to represent a rural settlement and possible metalworking activity dating from the Late Bronze Age through to the end of the Roman period. Metal detecting of the plough soil revealed several Early Roman coins and fragments of Early Roman brooches within the main area of activity.

### *Beaulieu 1<sup>st</sup> Mitigation evaluation and excavations 2013*

- 1.3.22 Recent archaeological trial trench evaluation of the proposed Essex Regiment Way roundabout, White Hart Lane junction and connecting access road identified four locations of significant archaeological remains (Stocks-Morgan, 2013).
- 1.3.23 Site 5, located within the footprint of the proposed Essex regiments Way roundabout, identified part of a Middle Iron Age settlement comprised a single round-house, surviving only as the remains of an eaves-drip gully. Several small pits and postholes were identified outside the roundhouse and were likely to be associated with domestic activity contemporary with the building. This settlement was surrounded by a large oval enclosure.
- 1.3.24 In Area A1 a single east to west aligned field boundary ditch of possibly Late Iron Age date attests to a wider agricultural landscape of field systems. A second, probably

medieval, ditch was encountered on a north-west to south-east alignment (Stocks-Morgan, 2013a).

- 1.3.25 Site 11 and Zone D1 identified evidence of two High Medieval house platforms and their surrounding enclosures. Thought to be part of a shrunken medieval village (Stocks-Morgan, 2013b).

## **1.4 Acknowledgements**

- 1.4.1 The author would like thank Iain Williamson of URS and Countryside Zest (Beaulieu Park) LLP who respectively commissioned and funded the archaeological work. The project was managed by Richard Mortimer and the illustrators were Frances Chaloner and Severine Bezie. Thanks are also extended to Matt Brooks, Nick Cox, Adele Lord and Diogo Silva who helped with the fieldwork. The project was monitored by Richard Havis and Alison Bennett of Essex County Council. The machining was undertaken by Harry Buchanen of Danbury Plant Hire.

## 2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The objective of this evaluation was to determine as far as reasonably possible the presence/absence, location, nature, extent, date, quality, condition and significance of any surviving archaeological deposits within the development area.

### 2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 Forty trenches were excavated within the proposed development area and all archaeological remains were excavated where appropriate and possible.

2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a tracked 15 ton machine using a toothless ditching bucket.

2.2.3 The site survey was carried out by Pat Moan using a Leica GPS fitted with *Smartnet* technology.

2.2.4 Spoil, exposed surfaces and features were scanned with a metal detector. All metal-detected and hand-collected finds were retained for inspection, other than those which were obviously modern.

2.2.5 All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using OA East's *pro-forma* sheets. Trench locations, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour and monochrome photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits.

2.2.6 A total of two bulk samples were taken, from deposits considered most appropriate for environmental sampling, while also considering feature type and period

2.2.7 The site conditions encountered included severe waterlogging in the majority of the trenches. This was caused by a high water combined with heavy rain during the evaluation. This severely limited the hand excavation of some archaeological features.

### 3 RESULTS

#### 3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The trenches are presented below by field and then in numerical order (see Fig. 2 for trench locations).

#### 3.2 *Field 23*

3.2.1 All the trenches excavated were 30m in length and 2m wide. The natural geology was an orange gravel unless otherwise stated. A subsoil layer (2), approximately 0.22m thick was recorded underlying a topsoil deposit (1) measuring approximately 0.3m thick (see appendix A for Trench inventory).

##### **Trenches 42a, 42b and 43**

3.2.2 No archaeological features were recorded in these trenches.

#### 3.3 *Field 42*

3.3.1 All the trenches excavated were 30m in length and 2m wide, exposing a natural greyish orange clay natural unless otherwise stated. A subsoil layer (2), approximately 0.22m thick was recorded underlying a topsoil deposit (1) measuring approximately 0.3m thick (see appendix A for Trench inventory).

##### **Trench 15**

3.3.2 The trench was located at the base of a south-west facing slope and was 8m in length. A layer of greyish brown silty clay (34) was encountered underlying the subsoil. It measured 0.5m thick and contained a single sherd of Iron Age pottery. This layer is possibly the result of soil washing down-slope (colluvium).

##### **Trench 44**

3.3.3 The natural geology exposed was an orange gravel. No archaeological features were recorded in this trench.

##### **Trenches 45 – 46**

3.3.4 No archaeological features were recorded in these trenches.

##### **Trench 47**

3.3.5 The natural geology exposed was an orange gravel. No archaeological features were recorded in this trench.

##### **Trench 48**

3.3.6 At the eastern end of the trench were two pits. Against the northern baulk was a small sub-circular pit (**29**), 0.6m in diameter and 0.2m deep. This pit had concave sides and a concave base (see fig. 4 for section). It contained a dark greyish brown silty clay fill with frequent charcoal inclusions (28). A thin lens 0.02m thick, in the surrounding natural had a slightly reddish tinge, possibly caused by in-situ burning.

3.3.7 Immediately to the south was a second sub-circular pit (**35**). The pit had gentle sides and a concave base, measuring 0.3m in diameter and 0.05m deep. This pit was filled by a dark reddish brown silty clay, with frequent charcoal inclusions (30).

### **Trench 49**

- 3.3.8 Towards the southern end of the trench an east to west ditch (**27**) was recorded. It had concave sides and a flattish base, measuring 0.7m wide and 0.12m deep (see fig. 4 for section). It was filled by a light greyish brown silty clay (26).

### **Trench 50**

- 3.3.9 No archaeology was recorded in this trench.

### **Trench 51**

- 3.3.10 No archaeology was recorded in this trench.

### **Trench 52**

- 3.3.11 A north-south aligned ditch (**37**) was recorded in the centre of the trench. This ditch was left unexcavated due to waterlogging within the trench, however its visible width was 1.2m and its upper fill comprised a mid greyish brown silty clay (36).

### **Trenches 53 - 55**

- 3.3.12 No archaeology was recorded in these trenches.

### **Trench 56**

- 3.3.13 In the centre of the trench was a ditch (**39**), aligned north to south. The ditch had steep sides and a concave base, measuring 1.4m wide and 0.3m deep. It was filled by a dark greyish brown silty clay (38).

### **Trench 57**

- 3.3.14 Towards the northern end of the trench lay a sub-circular pit (**23**). The pit had concave sides and a concave base, measuring 0.6m in wide and 0.15m deep. This pit contained a mid yellowish grey silty clay with frequent charcoal flecks (22).
- 3.3.15 To the south lay a ditch (**25**), aligned north-west to south-east. This ditch had steep sides and a concave base and was 0.65m wide and 0.5m deep. It was filled by a mid greyish brown silty clay (24).

### **Trench 58**

- 3.3.16 No archaeology was recorded in this trench.

### **Trench 59**

- 3.3.17 To the north of the trench lay a ditch (**21**), aligned north-east to south-west. The ditch had steep sides and a flat base and terminated to the south-west. It measured 1m wide and 0.23m deep and had a mid yellowish brown silty clay fill (20) (see plate 3).

### **Trench 60 - 62**

- 3.3.18 No archaeology was recorded in these trenches.

### **Trench 63**

- 3.3.19 In the centre of the trench was a north-south aligned ditch (**17**). A slot was excavated on the western side of the ditch which revealed it had stepped sides. Further excavation was halted due to severe waterlogging. The full width of the ditch was 3.75m and its excavated depth was 0.6m (see fig. 4 for section). This was filled by a dark orangey grey silty clay (19), 0.35m thick. Which was then overlain by a dark greyish brown silty clay (18), 0.22m thick, which contained 23 sherds of Early Iron Age pottery (see plate 2).

#### **Trench 64**

- 3.3.20 A north to south aligned ditch (**41**) was recorded in the centre of the trench. This ditch was left unexcavated due to waterlogging within the trench, however its visible width was 1.2m and its upper fill comprised a mid to dark greyish brown silty clay (**40**).

#### **Trench 65**

- 3.3.21 To the western end of the trench lay a linear feature (**7**), aligned north north-west to south south-east. This ditch had an irregular profile, measuring 1.32m wide and 0.12m deep. It was filled by a mid reddish brown silty clay (**8**). This feature is thought not to be archaeological in origin.
- 3.3.22 To the east of this was a ditch (**9**), aligned north-west to south-east. It had steep sides and a concave base, 0.7m wide and 9.38m deep (see fig. 4 for section). It was filled by a mid yellowish brown silty clay (**10**) which contained fragments of baked clay and an oyster shell (see plate 1).

#### **Trench 66**

- 3.3.23 At the northern limit of the trench a cobbled surface (**13**) was revealed, consisting of large rounded flints laid directly onto the clay natural. The exposed surface measured 0.9m east to west and 1.4m north to south, extending beyond the limit of excavation.
- 3.3.24 This surface was bounded to the west by a north north-east to south south-west ditch (**14**). The ditch had steep sides and a concave base, measuring 1.1m wide and 0.35m deep with a dark greyish brown silty clay fill (**11**).
- 3.3.25 Immediately south of the cobbled surface was a small sub-circular pit (**15**), measuring 0.6m in diameter. It contained a dark greyish brown fill (**12**) with frequent charcoal flecks.

#### **Trench 67**

- 3.3.26 An east-west aligned ditch (**43**) was recorded at the northern end of the trench. This ditch was left unexcavated due to waterlogging within the trench, however its visible width was 4.1m and its upper fill comprised a dark greyish brown silty clay (**42**).

#### **Trench 68**

- 3.3.27 In the centre of the trench lay a north-south aligned ditch (**45**). It measured 1.2m wide and had a mid to dark greyish brown silty clay fill (**44**). To the east of this ditch lay a parallel ditch (**47**) which was 0.8m wide with a similar mid to dark greyish brown silty clay fill (**46**). These ditches were left unexcavated during the evaluation due to waterlogging within the trench.

#### **Trench 69**

- 3.3.28 The trench was located on a south-west facing slope of a depression in the field. A pond (**5**) was located in the southern half of the trench, which was consisted of a large spread of dark greyish brown silty clay (**6**). A slot was excavated at the edge of the deposit, revealing it had steep sides and was at least 0.5m deep. A sherd of Roman pottery was retrieved from this deposit.

#### **Trench 70**

- 3.3.29 No archaeology was recorded in this trench.



### **Trench 71**

3.3.30 No archaeology was recorded in this trench.

### **Trench 72**

3.3.31 In the centre of the trench lay an east to west aligned ditch (**49**) was recorded at the northern end of the trench. This ditch was left unexcavated due to waterlogging within the trench, however its visible width was 5.5m and its upper fill comprised a dark greyish brown silty clay (48).

### **Trench 73**

3.3.32 In the centre of the trench was a modern square pit (**51**) seen cutting through the topsoil and subsoil. It was 2.5m long and contained a dark greyish brown silty clay (50) with dumps of bricks.

### **Trench 74**

3.3.33 No archaeology was recorded in this trench.

### **Trench 75**

3.3.34 No archaeology was recorded in this trench.

### **Trench 76**

3.3.35 In the centre of the trench lay a small sub-circular pit (**53**). This pit was left unexcavated due to waterlogging within the trench, however its visible diameter was 1.4m and its upper fill comprised a dark greyish brown silty clay (52).

### **Trench 77**

3.3.36 To the north of the trench lay a ditch (**4**), aligned east to west. The ditch had steep sides and a flat base. It measured 1.1m wide and 0.3m deep and had a mid greyish brown silty clay fill (3).

### **Trench 78**

3.3.37 At the eastern end of the trench lay a north-east to south-west ditch (**55**), which was 0.8m wide and 0.2m deep. This ditch had steep sides and a concave base. It contained a dark greyish brown silty clay fill (54).

### **Trench 79**

3.3.38 No archaeology was recorded in this trench.

## **3.4 Finds Summary**

3.4.1 An assemblage of thirty-four sherds of pottery was recovered from feature fills and the topsoil. All bar two sherds date to the Early Iron Age, with one 'Iron Age' and one Roman.

3.4.2 Twenty-three sherds of of undiagnostic baked clay and three tile fragments was retrieved during the evaluation.

## **3.5 Environmental Summary**

3.5.1 Two samples were taken from two pits, thought to have potential for environmental remains. Both samples contained charcoal, but no carbonised plant remains. One oyster shell was recovered from the evaluation.

## 4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

### 4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 The site was severely affected by flooding throughout the evaluation, caused by a high water table and heavy rainfall. The area to the north-west of the site was the most severely affected. This flooding meant that several features could not be excavated, however their locations, sizes in plan and descriptions were recorded. The main effect of this waterlogging on the evaluation was that the dating of these features can only be tentative at best, therefore previous archaeological work within the immediate vicinity, and broader knowledge of archaeology within the region, have been used to attribute probable or possible dates to features. The features are clearly significant.
- 4.1.2 The discussion concentrates on features that are dated and can be grouped. It is presented as an overall chronological format to help set the findings into context within their wider landscape setting (see fig. 3 for archaeological phasing).

### 4.2 Prehistoric enclosure and Early Iron Age settlement

- 4.2.1 The first phase of archaeology on site dates at least to the Early Iron Age, but more probably earlier, with the construction of a large ditched enclosure (**17,49**) in the north-western part of the development area. The eastern boundary (**17**) of this enclosure was excavated in Trench 63 and twenty-three sherds of Early Iron Age pottery were recovered from its upper fill (**18**). The presence of Early Iron Age pottery in the upper fill of what is a very large enclosure ditch would suggest that the enclosure was constructed considerably earlier; it could well represent a Middle Bronze Age enclosure.
- 4.2.2 Alongside the assemblage from the enclosure ditch, eight sherds of Early Iron Age pottery were recovered from topsoil in trench 64 suggesting a more extensive occupation spread at this period. Undated settlement features - charcoal-rich pits, a cobbled surface and a pond - were also recorded within this same area (see below), any or all of which could be contemporary with the Early Iron Age activity.

### 4.3 Possible Late Iron Age field system

- 4.3.1 A rectilinear field system on a north-south alignment was recorded in both the north-western and south-eastern areas of the site (**27,41**).
- 4.3.2 No dating evidence was recovered from these ditches during the evaluation, mainly due to the general paucity of pottery within early field systems, but perhaps also to the low number of excavated slots during this phase of evaluation. A date in the Late Iron Age might tentatively be attributed to this field system based on the retrieval of Late Iron Age pottery during the previous evaluation carried out by OA East in 2013, which encountered ditches on the similar alignment and profile to the south (Stocks-Morgan, 2013a).

### 4.4 Probable Medieval field system

- 4.4.1 A second co-axial field system was recorded at the centre of the site, on a north-west to south-east alignment (**25,55**). No clearly datable material was recovered from these ditches, however previous archaeological work immediately to the south has recovered High Medieval pottery from ditches on the same alignment (*ibid.*). The retrieval of an oyster shell from one of the ditch fills, while not conclusively dating the field system to the medieval period, would suggest either a Romano-British or Medieval/post-Medieval date.

- 4.4.2 While no dated Medieval settlement remains were recorded in the evaluation, and no Medieval pottery was recovered, it is likely that some of the undated settlement remains (see below) will relate to the Medieval remains recorded in Trench 25 of the initial 2008 evaluation (Pocock 2008). This trench was located within the large enclosure ditch, between Trenches 68 and 69.

#### 4.5 Undated settlement remains

- 4.5.1 To the north-west of the site a number of settlement-related features were recorded, chief among these a possible cobbled surface (13), at the northern end of trench 66. A gravelled surface dated to the medieval period, was recorded to the west of here during the initial evaluation phase (*ibid.*)
- 4.5.2 A large spread of dark grey clay was recorded at the southern end of trench 69. Given the trench's placement over a depression in the field it is suggested that this formed part of a large pond (5). A single sherd of Roman pottery and an undiagnostic roof tile fragment were recovered from the upper fill, however a pond this large would act as a catchment for debris for centuries, so any finds from the uppermost layers are unlikely to date the feature closely.
- 4.5.3 During the initial evaluation (*ibid.*) two large ditches were recorded immediately south of this pond feature and could possibly be related to it.
- 4.5.4 A small concentration of features were present at the south-east of the site, in trench 48. These comprise two small pits (29,35), one of which with a charcoal-rich fill and evidence for in-situ burning. These pits are currently undated, but their general morphology suggests a prehistoric date.
- 4.5.5 A similar pit was encountered during previous evaluation work (in trench 24, Stocks-Morgan 2013a) which suggests that settlement activity and the utilisation of the landscape is more widespread than this evaluation has highlighted.

#### 4.6 Significance

- 4.6.1 The only clearly dated archaeological remains present on site date to the Early Iron Age and possibly Medieval/post-Medieval periods. Most other features, both ditches and settlement-related features, remain undated, but this very lack of datable finds might suggest at least some of these are of prehistoric date. Others will relate to the Medieval activity already recorded in the area. These remains occur throughout the development area but with two distinct concentrations, to the north-west on the higher ground and to the south-east.
- 4.6.2 A large north-south and west-east enclosure ditch lies beneath the Early Iron Age settlement spread, and may therefore date to the Bronze Age. Enclosure ditches on this scale have been excavated across East Anglia and, where well-dated, have been shown to be of Middle Bronze Age date.

#### 4.7 Recommendations

- 4.7.1 Recommendations for any future work based upon this report will be made by the County Archaeology Office.

## APPENDIX A. TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY

Trench 15						
<b>General description</b>				<b>Orientation</b>	NE-SW	
Trench contained a colluvium layer. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.				<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	1	
				<b>Width (m)</b>	2	
				<b>Length (m)</b>	8	
Contexts						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
34	layer	-	0.5	Colluvium	pottery	Prehistoric
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.2	Subsoil	-	-
Trench 42a						
<b>General description</b>				<b>Orientation</b>	E-W	
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of orange gravel.				<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.55	
				<b>Width (m)</b>	2	
				<b>Length (m)</b>	30	
Contexts						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.25	Subsoil	-	-
Trench 42b						
<b>General description</b>				<b>Orientation</b>	E-W	
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of orange gravel.				<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.55	
				<b>Width (m)</b>	2	
				<b>Length (m)</b>	30	
Contexts						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.2	Subsoil	-	-
Trench 43						
<b>General description</b>				<b>Orientation</b>	N-S	
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of orange gravel.				<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.55	
				<b>Width (m)</b>	2	
				<b>Length (m)</b>	30	
Contexts						
context	type	Width	Depth	comment	finds	date

no		(m)	(m)			
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.24	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 44</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of orange gravel.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.38
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
1	Layer	-	0.29	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.09	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 45</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.48
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
1	Layer	-	0.27	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.19	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 46</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.5
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.21	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 47</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of orange gravel.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.56
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context	type	Width	Depth	comment	finds	date

no		(m)	(m)			
1	Layer	-	0.28	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.30	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 48</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench contained two pits. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.48
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
28	Fill	0.6	0.2	Pit	-	-
29	Cut	0.6	0.2	Pit	-	-
30	Fill	0.3	0.05	Pit	-	-
35	Cut	0.3	0.05	Pit	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.39	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.21	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 49</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.46
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
26	Fill	0.7	0.12	Ditch	-	-
27	Cut	0.7	0.12	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.28	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.17	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 50</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.46
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
1	Layer	-	0.27	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.20	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 51</b>						

<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.45
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.24	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 52</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.52
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
36	Fill	0.8	-	Ditch	-	-
37	Cut	0.8	-	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.26	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.22	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 53</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.45
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
1	Layer	-	0.25	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.23	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 54</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.55
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
1	Layer	-	0.31	Topsoil	-	-

2	Layer	-	0.26	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 55</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.5
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.2	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 56</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.55
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
38	Fill	1.4	0.3	Ditch	-	-
39	Cut	1.4	0.3	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.26	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 57</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench contained one ditch and one pit. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.48
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
22	Fill	0.6	0.15	Pit	-	-
23	Cut	0.6	0.15	Pit	-	-
24	Fill	0.65	0.5	Ditch	-	-
25	Cut	0.65	0.5	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.32	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.15	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 58</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.36



overlying a natural of boulder clay.		<b>Width (m)</b>	2			
		<b>Length (m)</b>	30			
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
1	Layer	-	0.25	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.14	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 59</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.56
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
20	Fill	1	0.23	Ditch	-	-
21	Cut	1	0.23	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.2	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 60</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.46
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.16	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 61</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.36
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
1	Layer	-	0.24	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.16	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 62</b>						

General description					Orientation	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					Avg. depth (m)	0.42
					Width (m)	2
					Length (m)	30
Contexts						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
1	Layer	-	0.30	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.16	Subsoil	-	-
Trench 63						
General description					Orientation	E-W
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					Avg. depth (m)	0.44
					Width (m)	2
					Length (m)	30
Contexts						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
17	Cut	>1.9	> 0.6	Ditch	-	Early Iron Age
18	Fill	> 1.9	0.4	Ditch	Pottery and Baked Clay	Early Iron Age
19	Fill	> 0.5	> 0.2	Ditch	-	Early Iron Age
1	Layer	-	0.24	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.26	Subsoil	-	-
Trench 64						
General description					Orientation	NW-SE
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					Avg. depth (m)	0.38
					Width (m)	2
					Length (m)	30
Contexts						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
40	Fill	1.2	-	Ditch	-	-
41	Cut	1.2	-	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.24	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.14	Subsoil	-	-
Trench 65						
General description					Orientation	E-W
Trench contained two ditches. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					Avg. depth (m)	0.46
					Width (m)	2

					Length (m)	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
7	Cut	1.32	0.12	Ditch	-	
8	Fill	1.32	0.12	Ditch	Baked clay	
9	Cut	0.7	0.38	Ditch	-	
10	Fill	0.7	0.38	Ditch	Baked clay	
1	Layer	-	0.31	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.18	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 66</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench contained one ditch, one pit and a cobbled surface. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.45
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
11	Fill	2	0.68	Pit	-	-
12	Fill	0.6	-	Ditch	-	-
13	Layer	0.9	-	Cobbled surface	-	-
14	Cut	0.6	-	Pit	-	-
15	Cut	2	0.68	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.18	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 67</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.44
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
42	Fill	4.1	-	Ditch	-	-
43	Cut	4.1	-	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.24	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.18	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 68</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench contained two ditches. Consists of topsoil and subsoil					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.38

overlying a natural of boulder clay.	<b>Width (m)</b>	2
	<b>Length (m)</b>	30

**Contexts**

context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
44	Fill	1.2	-	Ditch	-	-
45	Cut	1.2	-	Ditch	-	-
46	Fill	0.8	-	Ditch	-	-
47	Cut	0.8	-	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.25	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.18	Subsoil	-	-

**Trench 69**

<b>General description</b>	<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench contained a pond. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.	<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.46
	<b>Width (m)</b>	2
	<b>Length (m)</b>	30

**Contexts**

context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
5	Cut	13	>0.4	Pond	-	-
6	Fill	13	>0.4	Pond	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.1	Subsoil	-	-

**Trench 70**

<b>General description</b>	<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.	<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.46
	<b>Width (m)</b>	2
	<b>Length (m)</b>	30

**Contexts**

context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.2	Subsoil	-	-

**Trench 71**

<b>General description</b>	<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.	<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.52
	<b>Width (m)</b>	2
	<b>Length (m)</b>	30

**Contexts**

context	type	Width	Depth	comment	finds	date
---------	------	-------	-------	---------	-------	------

no		(m)	(m)			
1	Layer	-	0.28	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.28	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 72</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	NW-SE
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.46
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
48	Fill	5.5	-	Ditch	-	-
49	Cut	5.5	-	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.16	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 73</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	N-S
Trench contained one pit. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.48
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
50	Fill	2.5	-	Pit	-	Modern
51	Cut	2.5	-	Pit	-	Modern
1	Layer	-	0.28	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.26	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 74</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.5
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
context no	type	Width (m)	Depth (m)	comment	finds	date
1	Layer	-	0.28	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.22	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 75</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	E-W
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.5

overlying a natural of boulder clay.		<b>Width (m)</b>	2			
		<b>Length (m)</b>	30			
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
1	Layer	-	0.32	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.18	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 76</b>						
<b>General description</b>		<b>Orientation</b>		N-S		
Trench contained one pit. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.		<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>		0.42		
		<b>Width (m)</b>		2		
		<b>Length (m)</b>		30		
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
52	Fill	0.45	-	Pit	-	-
53	Cut	0.45	-	Pit	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.22	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.2	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 77</b>						
<b>General description</b>		<b>Orientation</b>		N-S		
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.		<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>		0.34		
		<b>Width (m)</b>		2		
		<b>Length (m)</b>		30		
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
3	Fill	1.1	0.3	Ditch	-	-
4	Cut	1.1	0.3	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.12	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 78</b>						
<b>General description</b>		<b>Orientation</b>		E-W		
Trench contained one ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.		<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>		0.48		
		<b>Width (m)</b>		2		
		<b>Length (m)</b>		30		
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
54	Fill	0.8	0.2	Ditch	-	-

55	Cut	0.8	0.2	Ditch	-	-
1	Layer	-	0.3	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.2	Subsoil	-	-
<b>Trench 79</b>						
<b>General description</b>					<b>Orientation</b>	NE-SW
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of boulder clay.					<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.45
					<b>Width (m)</b>	2
					<b>Length (m)</b>	30
<b>Contexts</b>						
<b>context no</b>	<b>type</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>comment</b>	<b>finds</b>	<b>date</b>
1	Layer	-	0.26	Topsoil	-	-
2	Layer	-	0.16	Subsoil	-	-

## APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

### B.1 Pottery

*By Sarah Percival*

#### Introduction

B.1.1 A total of 34 sherds weighing 184g were collected from two excavated features, ditch 17, Trench 63 and pond 5 Trench 69. Small numbers of sherds were also found in subsoil and colluvium in Trenches 15 and 63 (Table 1). The pottery is fragmentary and in moderate to poor condition. The average sherd weight is 5g.

Trench	Context	Feature	Feature Type	Spotdate	Quantity	Weight (g)
15	34		Colluvium	Iron Age	1	1
63	2		Subsoil	Early Iron Age	1	1
	18	17	Ditch	Early Iron Age	23	131
64	1		Topsoil	Early Iron Age	8	47
69	6	5	Pond	Roman NCD	1	4
Total					34	184

Table 1: Quantity and weight of pottery by Trench and Feature

#### Methodology

B.1.2 The total assemblage was studied and a full catalogue was prepared. The sherds were examined using a binocular microscope (x10 magnification) and were divided into fabric groups defined on the basis of inclusion types. Fabric codes were prefixed by a letter code representing the main inclusion present (F representing flint, G grog and Q

quartz). Vessel form was recorded; R representing rim sherds, B base sherds, D decorated sherds and U undecorated body sherds. The sherds were counted and weighed to the nearest whole gram. Decoration and abrasion were also noted. The pottery and archive are curated by OAE.

### Later Prehistoric Pottery

- B.1.3 The prehistoric assemblage comprised 33 sherds weighing 180g. These included a small abraded sherd in sandy fabric Q1 from colluvium 34, Trench 15. This small body sherd maybe of Iron Age date but is not closely datable.
- B.1.4 A small assemblage of 23 flint-tempered sherds weighing 131g were collected from the upper fill of ditch 17, Trench 63. These included a rim from a small jar with short upright neck and rounded lower body, and an abraded, stepped base. The sherds have wet-hand wiped or closed surfaces and several have been burnt sometime between original discard and eventual deposition in the ditch fill. A further small flint-tempered body sherd of similar date was found in the subsoil of the same trench.

### Roman Pottery

- B.1.5 An unsourced, micaceous, sandy oxidised body sherd weighing 4g was found in context 6, pond 5, Trench 69. The small, abraded sherd is not closely datable within the Roman period.

### Discussion

- B.1.6 The extensive use of flint-tempered fabrics and absence of decoration within the Later prehistoric assemblage suggests that it is of Later Bronze Age or Earlier Iron Age date c.1000-800BC. The jar rim found in context 18 is typical of first millennium BC forms in East Anglia (Brudenell 2012, fig.4.1). In Essex possible contemporary Mature Plainware assemblages have been found at Lofts Farm, Broomfield, North Shoebury and Mucking (Brudenell 2012, table 5.2). The small size of the assemblage prohibits exact dating and therefore it is important that any pottery produced by further work at the site is accompanied by a radiocarbon date on a suitable short life sample.

## B.2 Baked Clay

*By Sarah Percival*

### Assemblage

- B.2.1 A total of 23 pieces of baked clay weighing 100g was recovered from five excavated contexts. The majority of the assemblage is made of a soft poorly-mixed fabric with common small to medium chalk inclusions up 3mm long (Contexts 2, 8 and 10). The remainder of the pieces are made of fine, silty fabric with sparse flint with the exception of one piece from context 18, ditch 17 which is heavily flint-tempered and may be a degraded pottery sherd. Two pieces have flat surfaces and may be hearth lining or similar. The remainder of the assemblage is undiagnostic.

Trench	Context	Feature	Feature Type	Quantity	Weight (g)
63	2		Subsoil	2	2
	18	17	Ditch	1	2
64	1		Topsoil	9	57
65	8	7	Ditch	10	31



	10	9	Ditch	1	8
Total				23	100

Table 2: Quantity and weight of baked clay by feature

### B.3 Ceramic Building Material

*By Carole Fletcher*

#### **Assemblage**

- B.3.1 The excavation generated a small assemblage of ceramic building material (0.057kg) recovered from a single context. Three fragments from a single roof tile were recovered from context 6. The tile has a sanded base, the fabric is quartz tempered with occasional mica and rare coarse flint and pebble fragments. The tile is of indeterminate date.

Context	Form	No. Fragments	Weight (g)	Date
6	Tile	3	0.057	Not closely datable

Table 3: Ceramic Building Material

## APPENDIX C. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

### C.1 Mollusca

*By Carole Fletcher*

C.1.1 A total of 0.012kg of shell fragments of Oyster (*Ostrea edulis*) were collected from context 10. The shell does not appear to have been deliberately broken or crushed.

### C.2 Environment Samples

*By Rachel Fosberry*

#### Introduction

C.2.1 Two bulk samples were taken during recent excavations Zone A at Beaulieu Park. Both samples were taken from undated pits that contained visual evidence of burning.

#### Methodology

C.2.2 The total volume (10 and 13 litres) of each of the samples was processed by tank flotation using modified Siraff-type equipment. The floating component (flot) of the samples was collected in a 0.3mm nylon mesh and the residue was washed through 10mm, 5mm, 2mm and a 0.5mm sieve. A magnet was dragged through each residue fraction prior to sorting for artefacts. Any artefacts present were noted and reintegrated with the hand-excavated finds.

#### Results

Sample No	Context	Cut	Feature Type	(l)	(ml)	<2mm	2mm
1	22	23	Pit	10	1	-	-
2	20	29	Pit	13	20	+++	+++

Table 4: Environmental Samples from Zone A (SPBP14)

C.2.3 Sample 1, fill 22 of pit **23** is devoid of preserved plant remains or artefacts. Sample 2, fill 20 of pit **29** contains a significant quantity of wood charcoal including fragments measuring up to 4cm x 2cm.

#### Discussion

C.2.4 Charcoal is evidence of the burning of wood and has the potential for species identification and for radiocarbon dating. The lack of any other plant remains or artefacts precludes further interpretation of the features sampled.

## APPENDIX D. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brudenell, M., 2012 *Pots, practice and society: an investigation of pattern and variability in the post-Deverel Rimbury ceramic tradition of East Anglia*. Unpublished PhD thesis, York University
- Burgess, & Rance (eds) 1988 *Boreham – History, Tales and Memories of an Essex Village*. (Boreham Histories Project Group)
- Crummy, P., 1997 *City of Victory: the story of Colchester - Britain's first Roman town* (Colchester: Colchester Archaeological Trust)
- Davis, S. J. M. 1992 A rapid method for recording information about mammal bones from archaeological sites. Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 19/92.
- Dobney, K & Reilly, K. 1988 *A method for recording archaeological animal bones: the use of diagnostic zones*. *Circaea* 5(2): 79-96
- Drury, P.J., 1978 *Excavations at Little Waltham, 1970-71*, CBA Res. Rep. 26, London
- Drury, P. J., 1980 'The early and middle phases of the Iron Age in Essex', in Buckley, B. G., (eds), *The Archaeology of Essex to AD 1500*, CBA Research Report 34
- Drury, P. J. & Rodwell, W., 1986 'Settlement in the Later Iron Age and Roman periods', in Buckley, B. G., (eds), *The Archaeology of Essex to AD 1500*. CBA Research Report 34
- Hedges, 1984 'The Neolithic in Essex', in Buckley, B. G., (eds), *The Archaeology of Essex to AD 1500*. CBA Research Report 34
- House, J., 2010 *Prehistoric and Roman Remains at Beaulieu Park, Chelmsford*. Oxford Arch. East Report No, 1309 (unpublished)
- Hunter, J., 2003 *Field systems in Essex*. (Essex Society for Archaeology and History, Colchester)
- Kemble, J., 2001 *Prehistoric and Roman Essex* (Shroud: Tempus)
- Mortimer, R., 2013 *Method Statement for Trial Trenching*. Oxford Arch. East Tender Ref No, 13149 (unpublished)
- Pocock, M. 2008 Archaeological Evaluation at Greater Beaulieu Park, Chelmsford, Essex. Essex County Council Archaeological Field Unit Report No 1905 (unpublished)
- Reaney, P.H., 1933 *Place names of Essex*. (Cambridge)
- Stocks-Morgan, H. 2013 *Iron Age and Medieval Remains on land at Phase 1, Beaulieu, Chelmsford*. Oxford Arch. East Report No, 1473 (unpublished)
- Stocks-Morgan, H. 2013a *Iron Age Remains at Site 5 and Area A1, Phase 1, Beaulieu, Chelmsford*. Oxford Arch. East Report No, 1541 (unpublished)
- Stocks-Morgan, H. 2013b *Medieval Remains at Beaulieu (zone D) Chelmsford*. Oxford Arch. East Report No, 1544 (unpublished)
- Tuckwell, T., 2006 *New Hall and its School* (Kings Lynn)
- Tyler, S. & Major, H. 2005 The Early Anglo-Saxon Cemetery and Later Saxon Settlement at Springfield Lyons, Essex. Essex. East Anglian Archaeology Report No. 111

---

URS                      2013      *Beaulieu Park, Chelmsford, Essex: Archaeological Investigation and Mitigation Strategy. (Unpublished Archaeological Design)*

Maps consulted

British Geological Survey, 1993      Sheet 241, England and Wales 1:50,000

Websites consulted

<a href="http://www.old-maps.co.uk/maps.html">http://www.old-maps.co.uk/maps.html</a> . 22/06/11	1897	1:2500	Essex	Viewed
---	------	--------	-------	--------

## APPENDIX E. OASIS REPORT FORM

All fields are required unless they are not applicable.

### Project Details

OASIS Number	oxfordar3-172155		
Project Name	Beaulieu, Chelmsford, Essex, Zone A Housing		
Project Dates (fieldwork) Start	06-02-2014	Finish	18-02-2014
Previous Work (by OA East)	Yes	Future Work	No

### Project Reference Codes

Site Code	SPBP 14	Planning App. No.	09/01314/EIA
HER No.	sp bp 14	Related HER/OASIS No.	oxfordar3-152484,

### Type of Project/Techniques Used

Prompt	Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG15
Development Type	Housing Estate

### Please select all techniques used:

<input type="checkbox"/> Aerial Photography - interpretation	<input type="checkbox"/> Grab-Sampling	<input type="checkbox"/> Remote Operated Vehicle Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> Aerial Photography - new	<input type="checkbox"/> Gravity-Core	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sample Trenches
<input type="checkbox"/> Annotated Sketch	<input type="checkbox"/> Laser Scanning	<input type="checkbox"/> Survey/Recording Of Fabric/Structure
<input type="checkbox"/> Augering	<input type="checkbox"/> Measured Survey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Targeted Trenches
<input type="checkbox"/> Dendrochronological Survey	<input type="checkbox"/> Metal Detectors	<input type="checkbox"/> Test Pits
<input type="checkbox"/> Documentary Search	<input type="checkbox"/> Phosphate Survey	<input type="checkbox"/> Topographic Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Sampling	<input type="checkbox"/> Photogrammetric Survey	<input type="checkbox"/> Vibro-core
<input type="checkbox"/> Fieldwalking	<input type="checkbox"/> Photographic Survey	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Inspection (Initial Site Visit)
<input type="checkbox"/> Geophysical Survey	<input type="checkbox"/> Rectified Photography	

### Monument Types/Significant Finds & Their Periods

List feature types using the [NMR Monument Type Thesaurus](#) and significant finds using the [MDA Object type Thesaurus](#) together with their respective periods. If no features/finds were found, please state "none".

Monument	Period	Object	Period
ditch	Iron Age -800 to 43	pottery	Bronze Age -2.5k to -700
ditch	Medieval 1066 to 1540	pottery	Iron Age -800 to 43
ditch	Bronze Age -2.5k to -700	pottery	Early Medieval 410 to 1066

### Project Location

County	<input type="text" value="essex"/>	Site Address (including postcode if possible)
District	<input type="text" value="Chelmsford"/>	<input type="text" value="land of White Hart Lane,&lt;br/&gt;CHelmsford&lt;br/&gt;CM2 6TD"/>
Parish	<input type="text" value="Springfield"/>	
HER	<input type="text" value="SP BP 14"/>	
Study Area	<input type="text"/>	National Grid Reference <input type="text" value="TL 7230 1014"/>

### Project Originators

Organisation	<input type="text" value="OA EAST"/>
Project Brief Originator	<input type="text" value="Richard Havis (ECC HER)"/>
Project Design Originator	<input type="text" value="Iain Williamson (URS)"/>
Project Manager	<input type="text" value="Richard Mortimer (OA East)"/>
Supervisor	<input type="text" value="Helen Stocks-Morgan (OA East)"/>

### Project Archives

Physical Archive	Digital Archive	Paper Archive
<input type="text" value="OA East"/>	<input type="text" value="OA East"/>	<input type="text" value="OA East"/>
<input type="text" value="SP BP 14"/>	<input type="text" value="SPBP 14"/>	<input type="text" value="SPBP 14"/>

### Archive Contents/Media

	Physical Contents	Digital Contents	Paper Contents
Animal Bones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ceramics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Glass	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Human Bones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Industrial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leather	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Metal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Stratigraphic		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Survey		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Textiles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wood	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Worked Bone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Worked Stone/Lithic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
None	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Digital Media	Paper Media
<input type="checkbox"/> Database	<input type="checkbox"/> Aerial Photos
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GIS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context Sheet
<input type="checkbox"/> Geophysics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correspondence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Images	<input type="checkbox"/> Diary
<input type="checkbox"/> Illustrations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drawing
<input type="checkbox"/> Moving Image	<input type="checkbox"/> Manuscript
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spreadsheets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Map
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Survey	<input type="checkbox"/> Matrices
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Text	<input type="checkbox"/> Microfilm
<input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Reality	<input type="checkbox"/> Misc.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Research/Notes
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Photos
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Report
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sections
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Survey

**Notes:**



**Head Office/Registered Office/  
OA South**

Janus House  
Osney Mead  
Oxford OX2 0ES

t: +44 (0) 1865 263 800  
f: +44 (0) 1865 793 496  
e: [info@oxfordarchaeology.com](mailto:info@oxfordarchaeology.com)  
w: <http://oxfordarchaeology.com>

**OA North**

Mill 3  
Moor Lane  
Lancaster LA1 1GF

t: +44 (0) 1524 541 000  
f: +44 (0) 1524 848 606  
e: [oanorth@oxfordarchaeology.com](mailto: oanorth@oxfordarchaeology.com)  
w: <http://oxfordarchaeology.com>

**OA East**

15 Trafalgar Way  
Bar Hill  
Cambridgeshire  
CB23 8SQ

t: +44 (0) 1223 850500  
e: [oaeast@oxfordarchaeology.com](mailto: oaeast@oxfordarchaeology.com)  
w: <http://oxfordarchaeology.com>



**Director:** Gill Hey, BA PhD FSA MIFA  
*Oxford Archaeology Ltd is a  
Private Limited Company, N<sup>o</sup>: 1618597  
and a Registered Charity, N<sup>o</sup>: 285627*