Gainsborough Building Bath



Archaeological Evaluation Report



October 2006

Client: Bath Hotel and Spa Co. Ltd

Issue N^O: 1 OA Job N^O: 2947 NGR: ST7496 6460

Client Name:	Bath Hotel and Spa Company Ltd		
Client Ref No:			
Document Title:	The Proposed Gainsborough Thermal Spa Hotel, Beau Street, Bath. Archaeological Evaluation Report		
Document Type:	Evaluation report		
Issue Number:	1		
National Grid Reference: Planning Reference:	ST74966460		
OA Job Number: Site Code: Invoice Code: Receiving Museum: Museum Accession No;	2947 BAGAB05 (06) BAGABEV Roman Baths Museum, Bath BATRMxxxx.xx		
Prepared by: Position: Date:	Peter Davenport Project Manager 2nd October 2006		
Checked by: Position: Date:	Jon Hiller Senior Project Manager 3rd October 2006		
Approved by: Position: Date:	Nick Shepherd Head of Fieldwork 4th October 2006 Signed. RHAUS PP. N. SttePHER 410/06		
Documents Location	X:\Bath. Gainsborough Building\ Gainsborough Building		
Graphics File Location	Valuation report.doc \\Servergo\invoice codes a thru h\B_invoice		
Illustrated by	Julia Moxham		
Disclaimar			

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

© Oxford Archaeological Unit Ltd 2006 Janus House Osney Mead Oxford OX2 0ES t: (0044) 01865 263800 f: (0044) 01865 793496

e: info@oxfordarch.co.uk w: www.oxfordarch.co.uk

Oxford Archaeological Unit Limited is a Registered Charity No: 285627

The Proposed Gainsborough Thermal Spa Hotel, Beau Street, Bath

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION REPORT

CONTENTS

Summary	
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Location and scope of work	1
I.2 Geology and topography	2
1.3 Archaeological and historical background	2
1.4 Acknowledgements	3
2 Evaluation Aims	
2.1 General	4
2.2 Site specific	···· T
3 Evaluation Methodology	4
3.1 Scope of fieldwork	4
3.2 Fieldwork methods and recording	4
3.3 Finds	5
3.4 Palaco anvironmental avidence	
2.5 Drecentation of results	C
A Deputer Concret	S
4 Results: General	
4.1 Solis and ground conditions	5
4.2 Distribution of archaeological deposits	6
5 Results: Descriptions	6
5.1 Trench 1	6
5.2 Trench 2	7
5.3 Trench 3	7
5.4 Trench 4	8
5.5 Trench 5	9
5.6 Trench 6	. 10
5.7 Trench 7	. 10
5.8 Trench 8	.11
5.9 Trench 9	. 12
5.10 Artefacts and ecofacts	.12
6 Discussion and Interpretation	. 13
6.1 Reliability of field investigation	. 13
7 Discussion	.13
7.1 Trench 1	.13
7.2 Trench 2	.14
7.3 Trench 3	.14
7.4 Trench 4	14
7.5 Trench 5	15
7.6 Trench 6	15
7.7 Trench 7	16
7.8 Trench 8	16
7.9 Trench 9	16
7.10 Significance and Value.	16
8 Impact and Mitigation	17
8.1 Foundation design	17
\mathcal{O}	1. 1 . 19

8.2 Other level reductions		
8.3 Archaeological mitigation		
9 Conclusion		
Appendix 1 Archaeological Context Inventory		
Appendix 2 Pottery		
Appendix 3 Metalwork		
Appendix 4 Stone		
Appendix 5 Bibliography and references		
Appendix 6 Summary of Site Details III		

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Site location
Figure 2	Trench location and previously recorded archaeological remains
Figure 3	Trenches 1-4 sections
Figure 4	Trenches 5-6 sections
Figure 5	Trenches 7-8 or 9 sections
Figure 6	Plan of proposed piling and other potential impacts
Figure 7	Sample cross sections showing depths of archaeological deposits and
	proposed foundation design and potential impacts.
Figure 8	Areas where mitigation excavation may be required

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1	Trench 2 looking west, showing depth of post-1825 deposits.
Plate 2	Trench 3 looking south-west. The curve of the bow window wall is evident
	on the left. All the fill shown is post-1864.
Plate 3	Trench 4 looking east. Post 1864 backfill has been removed showing the
	Roman buttress in the top left corner.
Plate 4	Trench 5 looking south showing the probably 13th century hardened surface.
Plate 5	Trench 7 looking west. The post medieval footing is in front and the Roman
	or post-Roman surface behind.

SUMMARY

During June and July 2006 Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out a field evaluation at the Gainsborough Building, Beau Street, Bath (NGR ST74966460) [location] on behalf of Bath Hotel and Spa Co. Ltd. The work consisted of nine trenches, measuring between 0.8 m x 1.0 m and 1.25 m x 2.7 m. These were dug in the basement of a multi-period building, whose three main elements were erected in 1825, 1864 and the 1890s. It was originally built as the United Hospital for Bath (later Royal United Hospital – RUH), but in 1928 was sold and in 1932 opened as the Bath Technical College. It remained in academic use until 2005 when it was sold to the present owners for conversion to an hotel. The work in the 1860s had revealed significant and extensive Roman and possibly medieval layers under the western and southern part of the site, well recorded by James Irvine, a resident antiquary. Correspondence at the time suggested that the remains had been substantially preserved under the then new construction. The evaluation revealed these remains in some trenches, but in others, antiguarian excavation combined with foundation trenching had removed archaeological stratification. Trenches on the southern side of the site revealed that stratified archaeological deposits exist just below the basement floor level of the 1890s work and are of medieval origin. Under the 1825 block, along Beau Street, excavation to a depth of 1.33 m below the basement floor failed to find archaeological deposits at one point, and at another, they occurred at around 1.0 m below. In the Bath context, the remains are significant and important. Development proposals are being progressed with mitigation in situ as the appropriate response. Some limited mitigation excavation may be required, but designs are being developed to keep this to the absolute minimum necessary for the proposal.

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Location and scope of work
- 1.1.1 In June and July 2006 OA carried out a field evaluation at the Gainsborough Building, Beau Street Bath, formerly part of the Bath College of Further education and originally built as the (Royal) United Hospital (NGR ST74966460) on behalf of Bath Hotel and Spa Co. Ltd.
- 1.1.2 The work was in respect of a proposal for the development of the existing building for hotel use.
- 1.1.3 The work was carried out as part of the engineering investigation for foundation design so that only one set of intrusive investigations would be necessary. No brief was issued for the work by the local planning authority, but the proposals for the work were initiated by the owner in response to an understanding that such work would be required to facilitate planning consent. These were incorporated in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), prepared by Oxford Archaeology, and

approved verbally by the Archaeological officer for Bath and North East Somerset Council in conversation with the author.

1.1.4 The development site is situated in the centre of Bath adjacent to the Hot Bath Spring and is 0.1867 hectares in area (Fig. 1). It is bounded by Lower Borough Walls, Bilbury Lane, Beau Street and Hot Bath Street (Fig. 2).

1.2 Geology and topography

- 1.2.1 The underlying geology consists of Holocene alluvium over Pleistocene river gravels and sands over Lias clay. At the Spa site, north of Beau Street, the two latter phases rarely amounted to more than 1.5 m together in thickness. The alluvium lies at c. 18 m to 17 m OD and slopes gently from north to south. It has probably been removed over much of the site by Roman building works. Present street level is at 22.15 m OD at Lower Borough Walls.
- 1.2.2 The site is in the centre of modern Bath and near the south east corner of the walled area of Roman and medieval Bath. Bath itself lies in the bottom of the Avon valley and the site is on the north side of the valley floor on a shallow, south-facing slope, rising slightly from the valley bottom itself. The site is currently occupied by the Gainsborough Building which is a multi-period building erected in three major campaigns in the 19th century, during which it grew to occupy the entire island site of the present proposed development.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

- 1.3.1 The archaeological background to the evaluation has been the subject of a two separate desk-based studies (Davenport 2003 and 2005), the results of which are summarised below. There are many known sites with archaeological remains in the close vicinity of the development site.
- 1.3.2 The area of proposed development lies within the central zone of the former Roman town of *Aquae Sulis*, close to the Hot Bath and Cross Bath springs and a short distance from the Roman baths and temple around the Kings Bath. Important and substantial Roman remains have been recorded immediately north and east of the site.
- 1.3.3 An inscribed block describing an unknown gift to a god or goddess "as the result of a dream" was discovered during the construction of the original block of the United Hospital in 1825 (Cunliffe 1969). Observations in 1864 during the construction of the Albert Wing and other extensions to the hospital showed the existence of important and well preserved remains of a second Roman bathing establishment, probably fed from the Hot Bath spring. Correspondence from the time suggests that the majority of the remains was incorporated in the footings and substructures of the new building (Irvine Papers).

- 1.3.4 The site is in the south-west quarter of the walled medieval city, adjacent to the city walls, and slight but suggestive evidence of medieval remains was recorded in 1864 at the rear (south) of the 1825 block. Medieval remains, in the form of rubbish pits, were found in the excavations north of the site in 1998-9 (Davenport, Jordan and Poole (forthcoming).
- 1.3.5 On the south-east corner of the site was the original site of St Catherine's hospital, founded in the early 15th century. On the north-east corner was the site of St James's Vicarage in the later medieval and earlier post-medieval centuries.
- 1.3.6 The earliest maps, from the very beginning of the 17th century, show the site as open ground with development on the north and east street frontages, the west frontage being considerably further westwards at that time. The northern part of the site was residential, with a substantial property, later Dr Bave's first house, and its garden extending over the rest of the site to the south. St Catherine's Hospital, and probably St James's Vicarage, continued to occupy the eastern frontage.
- 1.3.7 By the late 17th century the garden had been formalised into a rectangular bed or beds with a fenced path around and an entrance from Lower Borough Walls. Stables of the George Inn occupied the western end of the property, on the site of Hot Bath Street.
- 1.3.8 The Bave's house was rebuilt on the Lower Borough Walls frontage before 1723, and the northern side and St Catherine's Hospital was demolished when Bell Tree Lane was realigned as Beau Street and the new United Hospital block built in 1825.
- 1.3.9 The George Inn disappeared when Hot Bath Street was driven through it in 1805-6.
- 1.3.10 The Georgian houses that replaced it and the second Bave house were in turn replaced in 1864 by the Albert wing extension and the Residence for the Medical Officer of the United Hospital.
- 1.3.11 The central area of the site was finally infilled with new buildings in the 1890s.

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 OA would like to thank John Mann and Tim Coldwell of Mann-Williams Civil Engineers for their help with design proposals and the practicalities of excavation and access to the building. Richard Sermon, Archaeological Officer for B&NES who provided useful discussion on the WSI and made helpful comments on site and afterwards. The evaluation was carried out by Kim Watkins and Marek Lewcun (independent archaeological consultants) and managed by Peter Davenport of Oxford Archaeology.

2 EVALUATION AIMS

2.1 General

- 2.1.1 To establish the presence/absence of archaeological remains within the proposal area.
- 2.1.2 To determine the extent, condition, nature, quality and date of any archaeological remains present.
- 2.1.3 To establish the likely impact of proposed development on any archaeological remains present.
- 2.1.4 To determine the potential for preservation *in situ* of significant archaeological remains, should they be present.
- 2.1.5 To make available the results of the investigation.

2.2 Site specific

- 2.2.1 To establish the nature, significance and state of preservation of archaeological remains beneath the various parts of the existing buildings.
- 2.2.2 To establish the nature, depth and degree of preservation of the Roman remains under the Albert Wing.
- 2.2.3 To investigate the possibility of post-Roman remains surviving under the present building.
- 2.2.4 To evaluate the potential for the preservation of archaeological deposits under the proposals for conversion to a spa hotel.

3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Scope of fieldwork

- 3.1.1 The work was originally planned to consist of six trenches sited to suit engineering and archaeological requirements but three more were added as extra engineering questions were raised. These eventually varied in size from 0.8 m x 1.0 m and 1.25 m x 2.7 m (Fig. 2)
- 3.1.2 The trenches provided a broadly representative sample across the site, both spatially and as a sample of the different kinds of archaeological deposits expected: previously examined, truncated, more complete etc. They were also obviously concentrated in areas where new works and possible intrusion were expected.
- 3.1.3 The concrete floors and make-up were removed by contractors under archaeological supervision and recent soils were also excavated by contractors (by hand digging) again under archaeological supervision. The attending archaeologists took over the excavation when deposits predating the 19th century were suspected.

3.1.4 Trenches were excavated until significant archaeological layers were reached or recognised. Limited excavation into the layers took place where it was necessary to clarify or characterise the deposits. In some trenches removal of later intrusions such as the fills of antiquarian excavation or redundant foundations enabled the depth of the archaeological stratigraphy to be sampled. Otherwise, the upper surface of the exposed archaeological horizon in each of the trenches was cleaned and recorded archaeologically and excavation essentially stopped at this point.

3.2 Fieldwork methods and recording

- 3.2.1 The deposits revealed in the base of the trenches were cleaned by hand and the revealed features recorded. Finds were collected from the surface of the Roman deposits and in the usual way from excavated contexts.
- 3.2.2 All archaeological features were planned and where excavated their sections drawn at a scale of 1: 10 and in two cases, 1:20. The trenches were planned at 1: 20 and 1:50. All features were photographed using colour slide and black and white print film. Recording followed procedures laid down in the *OAU Fieldwork Manual* (ed. D Wilkinson, 1992).

3.3 Finds

3.3.1 Finds were recovered by hand during the course of the excavation and bagged by context. Finds of special interest were given a unique small find number.

3.4 **Palaeo-environmental evidence**

3.4.1 In the context of the excavation of small trenches, the soils could not be sufficiently characterised and dated to make such sampling appropriate.

3.5 **Presentation of results**

- 3.5.1 The archaeological results from each trench are described individually.
- 3.5.2 Section 5 contains a detailed description of all archaeological observations within each trench, and includes individual context descriptions. General archaeological information is summarised in the trench inventory table (Appendix 1).

4 **RESULTS: GENERAL**

4.1 Soils and ground conditions

4.1.1 The site is located on river alluvium and terrace gravels but these were not reached in the excavations. Most of the soils removed were very mixed 19th century dumps, but some silty loams of medieval date were removed in Trench 5.

4.1.2 Site conditions were generally dry, as the trenches were all indoors, but the ground remained damp throughout and, therefore, colour and texture definition were good and easily determined.

4.2 Distribution of archaeological deposits

- 4.2.1 Roman deposits were revealed in Trenches 4, and 1, and medieval in Trenches 5, 7 and 8 (Figs. 2, 4 and 5 and Pls. 3, 4 and 5) Post-medieval deposits were uncovered in Trench 6 and Trench 9 failed to penetrate 19th or 20th century concrete. Trenches 2 and 3 were excavated wholly within post-1825 and 1864 contexts respectively (Pls. 1 and 3).
- 4.2.2 This indicates that the degree of survival and the depth, or even presence or absence, of archaeological deposits varies considerably over the site. Under the Albert Wing, the remains recorded by Irvine in some cases survive well (Trench 4, Pl. 3) and in others were clearly dug away by him or the builders (Trench 3, Pl. 2). Similarly, under the 1825 block, archaeological layers have in part been dug away to a considerable depth (Trench 2, Pl. 1) and survive at about one metre or so under the cellar floor in Trench 1 (Fig. 3).
- 4.2.3 Under the south side of the site, as predicted in the DBA (Davenport 2005), medieval deposits occur to within 0.50 or 0.6 m below the floor (Trenches 7 and 8) or even as little as 0.13m in Trench 5 (Fig. 4).
- 5 **RESULTS: DESCRIPTIONS**

Trenches 1-9

5.1 **Trench 1**

- 5.1.1 This trench was 1.1 m by 1 m, and located in the boiler room to the east of the main stairwell (see Figs. 2 and 3). The stratigraphic relationship between deposits in this trench was not very clear due to later disturbance.
- 5.1.2 This trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.3 m below floor level (floor 20.28m OD). The earliest deposit recorded within this trench appeared to be a medium dark grey clayey loam (117), containing scattered charcoal and grit. This may have been cut by the foundation trench for a Roman wall (113), or be a later deposit abutting the wall. A 0.4 m long section of wall (113) was visible in the northwestern corner of the trench, over 0.4 m wide, with a straight southern edge orientated east-west. A later possibly linear feature [116] had cut through layer (117), and was filled with a medium mottled grey loam with light brown patches (112), containing frequent Roman tesserae. In the south-eastern corner of the trench, context (112) was overlain by a very small area of a firm pale brown gritty deposit (115), at least 0.02 m thick, containing frequent small stones, this was only seen in

section and no dating evidence was retrieved. This was the highest surviving ancient archaeological layer and was at 19.48 m OD.

- 5.1.3 An undated cut or pit with irregular shaped edges [109] had cut through context (111). This was over 1.05 m wide and 0.25 m deep, and contained fill (110), a dark blackish grey loam with occasional small pieces of Bath stone.
- 5.1.4 A 19th century structure, probably a conduit or culvert (104), and associated foundation cut [105], overlay (110) and were on a north-south alignment on the western side of the trench (Fig. 3). The structure was built of Bath stone blocks on edge, some showing signs of burning.
- 5.1.5 Overlying this was a 19th century bedding layer of mortar and silt (103), up to 0.56 m deep, which underlay concrete floor (102). This had been cut by [108] running along the southern side of the trench, a linear cut for a brick lined duct or culvert (106), with fill (107) containing pieces of brown ceramic drain pipe. A further concrete floor layer (101) had been laid on top of this.
- 5.1.6 The only finds were 36 loose tesserae in layer 112 and a large sherd of a white glazed jar with "RUH" (*Royal* United Hospital, therefore post-dating 1868) printed on it in layer 103.

5.2 **Trench 2**

- 5.2.1 This trench was 1 m wide by 1.2 m long, and located in the room to the west of the main stairwell, adjacent to the southern wall (Figs. 2 and 3).
- 5.2.2 The trench was excavated to a depth of 1.33 m below floor level (floor at 20.26 m OD), and the earliest deposit recorded was a dark, blackish-brown soil with occasional stones and frequent charcoal (203). This was over 0.5 m thick and must be 19th century make-up as it abutted the 19th building footings. Overlying this was (202), a layer of compacted mortar and stone rubble make-up 0.2 m deep, overlain by a further make-up layer of loose stone rubble (210), 0.14 m deep. A concrete floor (200), 0.15 m thick, was then on top of this (PI. 1).
- 5.2.3 No finds were retained as all were later than 1825.

5.3 Trench 3

- 5.3.1 This trench was 1.4 m in length by 0.8 m wide and located adjacent to the apsidal wall at the southern end of a room in the central western part of the building (Figs. 2 and 3 and Pl. 2).
- 5.3.2 The trench was excavated to a depth of 1.15 m below floor level (floor at 19.61 m OD), where (305) a layer of moderately loose rubble mixed with lenses of topsoil and mortar and frequent charcoal was recorded. This also contained 19th century

ceramics and residual Romano-British pottery and tile. The layer abutted the 19th century footings and was therefore a make-up deposit.

- 5.3.3 Overlying this was a further make-up layer (304) with frequent 19th century masonry offcuts and Bath stone debris, 0.2 m deep. This was overlain by (303) a soft reddish layer of mortar and brick or tile dust, with topsoil lenses, 0.33m deep. A further layer of Bath stone masonry debris (302), 0.15 m thick, was above this, overlain by stone and brick rubble floor make-up (301). Then there were two layers of concrete flooring (300).
- 5.3.4 No finds were retained from this trench as all the layers were post-1864.

5.4 **Trench 4**

- 5.4.1 This trench was 1.4 m long by 1.1 m wide on a north-east, south-west alignment at the west end of the building (Fig. 2).
- 5.4.2 The trench was excavated to a depth of 0.64 m below floor level (floor 19.63 m OD), where the top of a Roman wall (408), was recorded in the north-eastern corner of the trench (Fig. 3 and Pl. 3). The longest side of the wall visible was on a north-south alignment, turning at right angles eastwards at the southern end. (This coincides with the butt end of a section of wall or buttress recorded by Irvine.).
- 5.4.3 A further sondage was excavated to a total depth of 1.04 m through the stratigraphy adjacent to the wall. Three courses of this wall were visible, constructed from neat rectangular limestone blocks ranging between 0.1 m and 0.18 m in height. The base or footings of the wall were not excavated, but a mottled gritty brownish grey clay layer (413), with frequent RB pottery including whole pot bases and occasional shaped structural pieces of stone, was abutting the wall at a depth of 1.04 m below floor level. This deposit was 0.11m deep and overlay an unexcavated gritty grey clay layer (414), with frequent charcoal, but similar in appearance. Overlying (413) there was a mottled sticky grey clay, (412), with frequent charcoal and iron panning deposits. It also contained small chunks of burnt wood and occasional oyster shell. This layer was 0.05 m thick, and overlain by a dark greyish brown compacted and quite peaty clay (409), with common charcoal inclusions and small sub-angular pieces of limestone. This layer was 0.1 m thick and contained occasional RB pottery and bone.
- 5.4.4 Context (409) appeared to have been cut by [410], a feature with a straight eastern edge on a north-west/south-east alignment. This cut had a moderately sloping, straight western side and flattish base. The fill (411) was a compacted mid greyish brown mottled clay with occasional charcoal, sub-angular limestone fragments, and *opus signinum* and tile flecks.
- 5.4.5 In the area around the wall there was an irregular shaped cut [405], 0.28 m deep, which contained a fill of loose soil, mortar and Bath stone debris (406). This

Oxford Archaeology BAGAB06

contained occasional pieces of slate, and residual RB pottery and CBM. This appeared to be the level of 19th century truncation and disturbance. A layer of hard white mottled mortar (407), 0.03 m deep, had been laid on top of this horizon, possibly as blinding to protect the underlying deposits. There was a layer of stony rubble (404) with frequent CBM and *opus signinum* fragments overlying this, 0.15m in depth. Above this was a further layer of loose rubble and mortar (403), with frequent residual RB material, 0.1 m deep. On top of this was (402), a layer of Bath stone masonry debris 0.1 m deep, overlain by rubble floor make-up (401), 0.18 m deep, and then concrete (400), 0.14 m thick.

5.4.6 No finds were retained as no layers earlier than 1864 were removed.

5.5 **Trench 5**

- 5.5.1 Trench 5 was located in the central part of the building (Fig 2), and was initially 1.2 m wide by 1.4 m long. The trench was then extended 1.3 m northwards in order to remove the footings of a 19th century wall, and reveal the deeper stratigraphy (Fig. 5 and Pl. 4).
- 5.5.2 The removal of footings revealed dark loamy soil deposits to a depth of 1.3 m below floor level (floor at 20.04 m OD; Fig. 5). The lowest recorded deposit (510) was a slightly gritty dark earth, over 0.2 m thick, with occasional RB tile, and was not excavated. Above this there was a thin horizon of yellowish clayey material, (509), 0.08 m thick, with occasional gravel. Overlying that was an undated thick layer of soft dark loamy soil (508), with common sub-angular limestone inclusions, 0.18 m deep. Above this was a dark brown soil (507) which was not excavated, but which appeared to be equivalent to three separate contexts recorded on the south side of the 19th century wall (506) that bisected the trench. The lowest of these was (505), a dark earth layer over 0.2 m thick, overlain by a rough stony surface of small uneven pebbles and stones (504, Fig. 5 and Pl. 4). A thin compacted clayey loam layer (503) on top of this surface contained medieval pottery (Pl. 4). Above this was further dark brown loamy soil (502), with frequent medieval pottery, a coin (SF 1) and residual RB pottery and tile. The layer was 0.24 m deep.
- 5.5.3 A 19th century wall footing (506) of rubble and poured concrete had been cut through this deposit, and was directly overlain by the floor bedding (501), and concrete floor (500).
- 5.5.4 The pottery from 502 and 503 dated from the 12th and the 13th centuries. The coin or token (SF1) from 502 is undated, but these tokens often date to the 16th century.

5.6 **Trench 6**

- 5.6.1 This trench was initially 1.6 m long by 0.6 m wide, and was then extended 0.4 m eastwards, and widened at the eastern end to 1 m wide. The trench was located on the eastern side of the building, beneath the former chapel (Figs 2 and 4).
- 5.6.2 The trench was excavated to a depth of 1 m below current floor level (floor 20.34m OD), where a stone feature (608), comprising loosely packed sub-angular limestone pieces, and some larger slabs was recorded. This was not fully excavated but was more than 0.22 m in depth. This was overlain by dark, greenish-brown loamy soil (607) with frequent medieval pottery, also containing pieces of slate, brick and 18th century ceramics. This context was the same as (606), in the western half of the trench, which was not excavated.
- 5.6.3 At a distance of 0.9 m from the western side of the trench, the dark soil (606) was truncated by a cut (605) for a red brick kerb or wall (604), on a north-south alignment, with an abutting concrete surface (603) to the east, 0.08 m thick. This was overlain by a further layer of dark brown, loamy soil with mortar inclusions and late medieval pottery (602). A brick and rubble floor make-up (601) overlay this, with the concrete floor (600) above.
- 5.6.4 602, and 606 produced 12th to13th century pottery and one sherd that may be 10th 11th century, but these were underlain by 607 which produced significant quantities of 18th century wares as well as medieval sherds.

5.7 **Trench 7**

- 5.7.1 This trench was 1.4 m long by 1.2 m wide, and located close to the southern side of the building (Figs 2 and 4).
- 5.7.2 The trench was excavated to an average depth 0.64 m below floor level (floor 20.06 m OD), with a small sondage through deposits to a depth of 0.9 m (Fig. 5). At a depth of 0.64 m, the top of a firm, brownish-yellow clay (708) was recorded in the south-western corner of the trench. The top of this layer was uneven and compacted like a trodden surface, with occasional RB pottery and a worked stone trough fragment (Pl. 5). This layer contained frequent flecks of charcoal, CBM and *opus signinum*, and was over 0.23 m in depth, but was not fully excavated. Pottery tentatively suggests a Roman date.
- 5.7.3 On the southern side of the trench this deposit had been cut by a vertically sided feature [706], with a straight southern edge on a roughly east west alignment. The upper fill (707) was a soft, dark brown, compacted soil with frequent charcoal flecks, and occasional bone, pot (of medieval date but with one residual RB sherd), and one piece of slag. This deposit was excavated to a depth of 0.22 m but the base was not found.

Oxford Archaeology BAGAB06

- 5.7.4 Fill (707) was cut by a footings trench [711] for an 18th century wall (709), which ran on a north north-west/south south-east alignment along the eastern side of the trench. The footings of wall (709) were constructed from fairly crudely cut and uneven blocks of limestone, and were abutted by (710) the fill of the footings trench, a mid brown clayey loam with mortar inclusions, 16th or 17th century ceramics and occasional oyster shell.
- 5.7.5 A layer of dark brown, loamy soil, (705), with occasional medieval and RB pottery overlay the truncated wall. Layer (704), a hard white mortar 0.01 m thick with large black inclusions then overlaid this. Then there was a make-up layer, (703), of soil with frequent grey mortar 0.6 m deep. This was overlain by a further make-up layer of cinders and rubble, (702), 0.25m deep, and then a loose rubble make-up of large Bath stone blocks 0.17 m deep (701). The overlying concrete floor (700) was 0.15 m thick.

5.8 **Trench 8**

- 5.8.1 This trench was in the adjoining room to the east of Trench 7, also on the southern side of the building (Fig. 2), and was 2 m long by 1.6 m wide.
- 5.8.2 The trench was excavated to an average depth of 0.55 m below floor level (floor 20.07m OD), where the top of a dark, greenish-brown clayey soil (809) was recorded, containing frequent medieval pottery (Fig. 5). A small sondage was further excavated in the north-eastern corner of the trench by excavating a 19th century footings trench, to 1.18 m below floor level. This showed that (809) was 0.27 m deep, and overlay a mottled greyish brown gritty clay (811), of probable medieval date, over 0.55 m deep, with common residual RB pottery. The base of this context was not found.
- 5.8.3 The dark soil (809) had been cut by two footings trenches, [805] for truncated wall (802) on a roughly east-west alignment, and [807] for wall (804), part of the existing building. Wall (802) appeared to abut wall (804), and be of the same date, as both walls were abutted by the same layer of pale yellow soft mortar (803). The fills of both footings trenches [805] and [807], (806) and (808) respectively, were the same loose brown soil with mortar inclusions, occasional slate and residual medieval pottery.
- 5.8.4 A 19th century pipe trench containing a brown ceramic pipe had been cut through wall (804). Several layers of 19th century floor make-up were then abutting the truncated wall (802). The lowest layer being (810) a dark brown soil with mortar and cinder inclusions, 0.13 m deep. This was overlain by (801) a Bath stone rubble and brick layer, and the 0.16 m thick concrete floor (800).
- 5.8.5 The footing trench fill 806 produced residual Roman pottery,

5.9 Trench 9

5.9.1 This trench was in an area of vaults on the eastern side of the building alongside Bilbury Lane (Fig. 2). The trench was 1 m by 1 m and revealed various layers of solid concrete, and stone to a depth of 0.6m.

5.10 Artefacts and ecofacts

General

5.10.1 Summaries of the artefact and ecofact reports can be found below. Full reports and references can be found in Appendices 1-15.

Pottery

- 5.10.2 The pottery from pre-19th century stratified deposits is predominantly medieval, and typically of the 12th to the 13th centuries. This is the most common date range found for two reasons. Most medieval finds in Bath come from the bases of medieval rubbish pits which often survive later truncation where superficial layers are lost, and such pits were most commonly dug in the 11th to 13th centuries. Later medieval layers, being higher and with many fewer pits, seem to have suffered more from truncation by later activity.
- 5.10.3 However, the medieval pottery from Trench 5 is in stratified superficial deposits, which is relatively rare in Bath. That from Trench 7 is from a cut feature and other medieval pottery is residual in later contexts, for example in Trench 6.
- 5.10.4 Roman pottery is residual in most layers, but may be in situ in layer 708 in Trench 7.

Coin

5.10.5 One Cu alloy coin or more probably token came from Trench 5 in the same layer as much of the medieval pottery (502). It is undated but these tokens often date to the 16th century.

Animal Bone

5.10.6 Thirteen pieces of animal bone with an average weight of under 18 grams were collected from five Roman or medieval contexts, but the small number and size greatly reduced the value of studying them. They have simply been placed in the archive. They are presumably food debris.

Oxford Archaeology BAGAB06

6 DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

6.1 Reliability of field investigation

- 6.1.1 The evaluation took the form of the excavation of nine hand-dug trenches. Finds were abundant enough to judge intuitively the likelihood of residuality. Layers thought likely on finds and stratigraphic grounds to be medieval were very likely to be so in the absence of later pottery or artefacts, abundant in later layers.
- 6.1.2 Intrusion of later material into earlier deposits was a strong theoretical possibility given the history of this site. However, this was rarely found and where deposits were adjudged to be of later date, for example in Trenches 2 and 3, stratigraphical relationships to structures of known date confirmed the interpretation. Limited excavation into the pre-19th century contexts took place with the consent of the B&NES Archaeological Officer. This was in order to aid the characterisation of the deposits encountered, and the interpretation of subsequent activity within the area.

7 **DISCUSSION**

7.1 Trench 1

- 7.1.1 A Romano-British wall was recorded in this trench, the top of which was 1.08 m below floor level (Fig. 3). There was a lot of later disturbance in this area so relationships between deposits were not clear. There appeared however to be a later linear cut feature with frequent *tesserae* from a Roman mosaic floor contained in the fill.
- 7.1.2 Some truncation of the Roman horizons had occurred in this area during the postmedieval period and there were no medieval deposits present. The latest phase included several structures associated with the 19th century building, including stone and brick ducts cutting through the area. One white glazed earthenware jar had "RUH" printed under the glaze, presumably part of the institutional stock of the Royal United Hospital.
- 7.1.3 The Roman wall ran east-west, parallel to the series of walls Irvine had recorded south of this trench under the later chapel and Medical Officer's Residence (Fig. 2). These seemed to belong to the building with the preserved mosaic. This wall may be part of the same building and the *tesserae* suggest the destruction of a mosaic nearby, perhaps another in the same range of buildings.
- 7.1.4 It seems unlikely, from the comparative levels at the Spa excavation across the road and from Irvine's work under the Albert wing, that a mosaic would survive *in situ* at this level.

7.2 Trench 2

- 7.2.1 In this area the 19th century make-up layers abutting the footings of the existing building wall continued to a depth of over 1.33 m. No earlier deposits were recorded, and the area appears to have been dug away during or before the construction of the 1825 block (Fig. 3 and Pl. 1).
- 7.2.2 It is hard to imagine this being done for no good reason in the era of hand digging (a hand forged spade blade and socket with broken wooden shaft was found in the back fill). It may be that cellars of the earlier buildings here were filled in after construction was completed. That the deep excavation was not common to the whole 1825 building is shown by the survival of Roman remains in Trench 1 nearby to the east.

7.3 Trench 3

- 7.3.1 In this area, as with Trench 2, the 19th century make-up layers abutted the footings of the existing building and their base was not reached at 1.15 m below floor level (Fig. 3 and Pl. 2).
- 7.3.2 The explanation here appears to be that excavation for the footings of the wall were extended to investigate archaeological remains, probably at Irvine's request. Irvine's plans show an earlier Roman wall running below the later Roman bath building and it may be that it was pursued in excavation. It is clear from Irvine's records that more of the site must have been dug than was strictly necessary merely for the new foundations.

7.4 Trench 4

- 7.4.1 This trench revealed part of an RB stub wall, or buttress, the top of which was 0.65 m below floor level (Fig. 3 and Pl. 3). This wall was abutted by over 0.37 m in depth of later Roman stratigraphy, sampled to a depth of 1.05 m below floor level, the bottom of which was not found. There was also a straight-edged cut, of unknown purpose through the RB deposits, which appeared to be of Later Roman or post-Roman date? (see finds). In the area around the wall an irregular cut had been excavated through these deposits in the 19th century. This appeared to be an exploration dug by Irvine in the 1860s when he planned part of the Roman bath house building, including this butt end of wall.
- 7.4.2 At this time a layer of hard grey mortar appears to have been laid over the Roman / post-Roman deposits to protect them, prior to laying floor make-up layers for the new Albert Wing on top. The lowest 19th century floor make-up layers contained large amounts of RB building debris, and *opus signinum* floor fragments, probably indicating that Irvine or the builders had excavated through these deposits and then dumped them back on top as make-up.

Oxford Archaeology BAGAB06

7.4.3 This trench confirms that the archaeological remains that Irvine recorded in the 1860s will survive under the floors of the Albert wing, where not removed or damaged by later alterations. It also showed that the remains are slightly east of the position shown on Fig. 2, which was arrived at by "best fitting" the 19th century plans to the modern survey.

7.5 **Trench 5**

- 7.5.1 In this area the top of stratified archaeological deposits were recorded at 0.14 m below current floor level, to a depth of over 1.3 m (Fig. 5 and Pl. 4). The dark loamy soils recorded between 1.3 m below floor level and 0.8 m are probably a "dark earth" horizon, dating from the post-Roman to early medieval periods.
- 7.5.2 This was overlain by successive layers of similar dark loamy soils of medieval date, and a rough stone surface was laid down at some point in the 12/13th century. The medieval soil horizon had been truncated by a 19th century wall footing, and the later floor.
- 7.5.3 Such a depth of post-Roman material may reflect later infilling of a terrace of Roman construction. The bath house itself must be terraced into the ground surface judging from the natural levels recorded north of Beau Street in the Spa excavation.
- 7.5.4 The area was a garden or backyard and largely undisturbed from the early 17th century. What it was used for in the earlier middle ages remains uncertain. Irvine's records, which are partial in this area, suggest these deposits mask Roman buildings at some depth.

7.6 **Trench 6**

- 7.6.1 In this area a feature (that appeared to be a stone soakaway of probable 18th century date), was recorded at a depth of 0.75 m below floor level, the base of which was not excavated (Fig. 4). A large quantity of re-deposited medieval garden soil had then been dumped on top during construction. This had then been truncated during the 19th or 20th century by drainage features, and a concrete surface in the eastern half of the trench. This may have been a path on a north-south alignment with a kerb or wall running along the western edge. This surface had later been covered by a layer of re-deposited late medieval garden soil, and the present floor levels.
- 7.6.2 These drainage features clearly reflect the later use of the area and the concrete edging and drain belong either to the 1890s construction (when the chapel was erected) or the alterations belonging to the conversion to a college after 1932.
- 7.6.3 The medieval pottery, although residual, is typical and presumably reflects medieval deposits nearby

7.7 **Trench 7**

- 7.7.1 In this area the top of either a late Roman or, more probably, post-Roman horizon was recorded at a depth of 0.67 m below current floor level (Fig. 4). This consisted of a firm clay deposit, over 0.23 m deep, which had possibly been laid as make-up or a surface, and contained small fragments of Roman building materials, possibly from a collapsed or demolished building and exclusively Roman pottery. This had been cut by a vertical-sided feature containing 12th century pottery and probably of early medieval date, but unknown purpose, perhaps a robber trench. The next phase of surviving activity was the construction of a post-medieval building, its north-south wall recorded cutting the medieval deposits. This post-dated pottery of 16th to 17th century date. Finally during the 19th century a layer of mortar was laid over the truncated wall and earlier deposits, and several layers of floor make up put on top, including what appeared to be demolition rubble from the post-medieval building.
- 7.7.2 The "Roman or post-Roman horizon" is broadly part of the sequence seen in Trenches 5 and 8. The post-medieval footings may well be part of the foundations of the second Bave's house, erected around 1720.

7.8 **Trench 8**

7.8.1 In this area the top of medieval deposits was recorded at 0.55 m below current floor level (Fig. 5). The stratigraphic deposits continued to a depth of over 0.56m below this, and appeared to be medieval, very like those seen in Trench 5, but contained much Roman pottery. There had been considerable dissection by later walls and a 19th century pipe trench. The fills of these later disturbances contained residual medieval pottery.

7.9 Trench 9

- 7.9.1 This did not reveal much as the concrete was proved to be at least 0.6m deep in this area, and further excavation was not practicable.
- 7.9.2 The floor slab level here was the lowest of any of the basement slabs (c.19.55 m OD), but archaeological levels should still exist underneath it. Archaeological deposits one to 1.5 m thick occurred at this level in Bellott's Hospital basement on the other side of Bilbury Lane (Davenport, Jordan and Poole, forthcoming).

7.10 Significance and Value

- 7.10.1 The suite of archaeological deposits are clearly extensive and well preserved. They also vary considerably in character.
- 7.10.2 The Roman buildings recorded on site in 1864 and especially investigated and fully planned under the Albert wing, clearly represent a bathing establishment which, by

its proximity to the Hot and Cross Bath springs, must have been a thermal bathing establishment. This makes it only the second known in Britain, after the main and internationally famous Roman Baths in the centre of town only a short distance off.

- 7.10.3 The buildings in the other parts of the site are less well known and understood, being only partly exposed in foundation trenches dug for Victorian buildings, and not in open areas. The exception to this was the mosaic and hypocaust uncovered and preserved *in situ* under the Medical Officer's Residence in the south-east corner of the site.
- 7.10.4 While badly damaged by its collapse into the heating ducts below, the mosaic survived completely enough to be reconstructed on paper and preserved under the floors of the Victorian buildings. It suggests a high status building, possibly ancillary to the thermal baths.
- 7.10.5 By definition, the exposure of these remains in the 1860s means that the overlying deposits here have been removed. However, significant later archaeological layers have been demonstrated to exist in Trenches 5, 7 and 8 in the south and central parts of the site, areas not disturbed by more than foundation trench digging in the 1860s and 1890s.
- 7.10.6 Well-preserved or informative remains connected to the use of the springs in Roman times will be of national importance. The medieval layers are certainly of local or regional significance for the history of medieval Bath, an important regional centre in the middle ages.
- 7.10.7 Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (DOE 1990 para. 8) says that there is a presumption in favour of physical preservation for nationally important archaeological remains (whether scheduled or not). This approach is reflected in Structure Plan Policy 19 and in the Local Plan Policies C27, 28 and 29.
- 7.10.8 Recognising this, the developers have spent much effort in designing foundations for the new build proposals which are intended to allow for preservation *in situ* of almost all such remains and a very high proportion of the remainder. These and their impact on buried remains are described below.

8 IMPACT AND MITIGATION

8.1 Foundation design

8.1.1 The new build along the southern side of the site requires the insertion of new foundations in the form of concrete piles (Fig. 6 and 7). To reduce impact to a very low level, it is intended to insert these through the current masonry footings which form the north and south walls of the existing range (Fig. 6). On the assumption that no archaeological deposits remain under the base of the footings, this will have no effect on the archaeological layers and structures. Investigations are planned to confirm the depth of the footings and the lack of archaeological deposits under them.

- 8.1.2 The piles will be linked by a structural slab 450 mm thick (with no local thickening) whose underside will be at about the level of the existing deposits known from Trenches 7 and 8, thus leaving these preserved *in situ* under the new build, or requiring the mitigation excavation of a very few centimetres of their upper surfaces (Fig. 7). Further design refinements will be attempted to reduce this impact to the absolute minimum possible. The removal of the southern part of the single storey section of the Albert Wing will allow the continuation of this system right up to the existing four storey remainder of the wing.
- 8.1.3 There originally was an issue with three piles at the west end of the new block where there is not believed to be any existing foundation to pile through. These three piles would have presented a potentially damaging impact to the Roman remains beneath, that were preserved *in situ* in the 1860 work. However, further design work has removed the need for these three piles.
- 8.1.4 The single storey new build east of the chapel will be taken up on a new basement construction on a concrete raft well above the present basement floor level, itself at least 200 mm above any archaeological levels. There will be no impact here.

8.2 **Other level reductions**

- 8.2.1 It is intended to lower the floor of the basement under the chapel to provide adequate headroom for the insertion of a mezzanine floor.
- 8.2.2 Trench 6 indicated that there were no deposits earlier than the 17th or 18th century here, although the disused drain and soakaway that seem to be the interpretation of the remains found here appear to have disturbed medieval deposits. In general, however, it appears that there is about one metre of material of no archaeological significance below the present floor which is at 20.34m OD. It is therefore evident that the floor can be lowered by up to 500 or 600 mm with no impact on even the post- medieval levels, assuming the trench is representative and that a slab of about 300 mm is adequate.
- 8.2.3 Two baths are to be built in the existing building, requiring excavation below the basement floors (Figs. 6 and 8).
- 8.2.4 One of these will be a circular bath in the apse-ended room where Trench 3 was excavated (Figs. 6 and 8). The results from that trench showed that at least 1.15 m below the basement floor was devoid of deposits later than 1864 in that part of the room (the result of antiquarian excavation). It is likely that the trench is typical of this end of the room and that a bath could be inserted to this depth (or possibly even more) without causing damage to archaeological deposits.
- 8.2.5 The other is a much larger rectangular bath in the south-eastern rooms of the 1825 block (Figs. 6 and 8). Trench 2 was dug in the easternmost of these two rooms and showed that in that part of the room there were no deposits pre-dating 1825 above 1.33 m below the floor. In the light of results from here and from Trench 1, it is now

intended to excavate a further trench to test the north-western corner of the proposed bath site to confirm this lack of archaeological strata (Fig. 8). In any case, the archaeological level of any Roman remains, based on Trench 1, is likely to be about 1 m or slightly less, and excavation to this depth could very likely be accommodated without damaging the buried remains.

- 8.2.6 In the area around Trench 5, where the main pool is planned, it is intended to excavate a further trench to confirm the extent and depth of archaeological deposits to improve the level of information prior to the final design of the pool (Fig. 8).
- 8.2.7 Lifts are required to be inserted in the building at several points (Figs. 6 and 8). While research will be carried out into minimising the need for pits below the basement level, it is very likely that lifts of the kind required for the new hotel will require pits at the base of the shafts, up to 1.5 metres deep. The largest of these by far is on the site of Trench 1 and is 5 m x 2 m.
- 8.2.8 Whereas it might be possible to re-site lifts, it is not all clear that there is anywhere within the 1825 block, for example, where the impact would be significantly lessened by so doing. Given the necessity for lifts and the inability to position them without some impact on the archaeological levels, the only mitigation available will be preservation by record, or mitigation excavation.
- 8.2.9 Should mitigation excavation be acceptable, it would be done to a high research standard, aiming to answer specific questions about the archaeological resource and helping characterise and provide a better understanding of that much greater part of the archaeological resource preserved under the new development and improve its long term management.
- 8.2.10 Such an approach is explicitly recognised in the World Heritage Management Plan (issue 33, p52) where having acknowledged that "It is difficult to manage and conserve what is not properly understood", it is stated: "Whilst there should always be a presumption to preserve archaeological remains *in situ*, there may be occasions where specialist research-led archaeological investigations will be required to enhance our knowledge of the history of Bath and the nature of archaeological deposits and structures".
- 8.2.11 Two lifts are also required in the new build on Lower Borough Walls. Similar considerations apply here (Figs. 6 and 8).
- 8.2.12 The third potential impact on buried remains is new drainage. This will be reduced by the use, wherever possible, of existing service runs. The drainage from the central spa pool in the new atrium area is intended to utilise numerous small bore pipes which will require much less depth of disturbance. Given the shallow nature of the deposits shown in Trench 5, all service runs, which will need to be agreed in advance, will be monitored archaeologically, both to avoid over-digging and to record any remains uncovered.

8.3 Archaeological mitigation

- 8.3.1 Where archaeological levels are intended to be preserved *in situ* and new foundation structures laid over them, methods will be used to make sure that they are not damaged in this process. It is likely that excavation to formation level in these areas will be done under archaeological control. This is intended to prevent accidental damage through, for example, over-digging, and to make sure that any remains and deposits exposed, but not removed, during reduction works are properly and fully recorded.
- 8.3.2 As part of the process of installing the foundations at the junction of the southern new build with the Albert wing, it may be appropriate to carefully uncover the Roman remains here to ensure the optimum placement of foundation structures. There would be the research potential during this process to record and position the structures to modern standards and confirm the degree of survival. The latter would also enhance the quality of future management of the buried remains.
- 8.3.3 Assuming the argument for lift pits is accepted, these would be excavated to a high archaeological standard to a specification agreed with the B&NES Archaeological Officer.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1.1 Given the major nature of the conversion works and the new build, the impact on archaeological deposits, though real, is extremely limited. Damage to or destruction of important archaeological remains will be kept to a minimum by careful foundation design and monitored execution of that design.
- 9.1.2 Certain elements of the design are essential to the successful operation of the proposed hotel and where these cannot be constructed without damage to the archaeological resource, mitigation excavation to a high standard to provide appropriate preservation by record will be put in place.
- 9.1.3 When the hotel is completed, there will be public access during normal daytime operating hours, to enable members of the public to view the principal public rooms of the hotel which contain the majority of architectural details. Provision will be made to explain the archaeology of the site and the history of the building in an accessible location. More extensive access will be provided (in guided groups) as part of the Heritage Open Days programme.

-

.

.

Ŀ

1

APPENDIX 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

101 concrete floor 0m 0.12m	
101 concrete floor 0m 0.12m	
02 concrete floor 0.12m 0.12m	
103 floor make-up 0.24m 0.1-0.52m	19th
04 structure 0.48m 0.55m	19th
105 linear cut 0.82m 19th ter	rrace for 104
106 brick structure 0.12m 19	th /20th duct
07 backfill	19th/20th
08 linear cut	19th/ 20th
09 cut	unclear
10 fill of 109	unclear date
11 Dark grey loam 0.8m min 0.19m Post RB? Occu	upation layer
12 mottled grey loam 1.1m min 0.2m RB layer with rol	man tesserae fill of 116
13 RB Wall 1.08m min 0.24m	RB wall EW
14 Silt /stony layer 0.98m 0.08m bedding for 10	4 19th /2.0th
15 pale brown sand and 1m min 0.01m bedding for grit	or RB floor?
16 linear cut L.Im min 0.2m RB ? fil	led with 112
17 dark grev clavev loam 1.2m min 0.14m Pro	e-early RB?
h 2	o outry reb :
00 concrete floor 0m 0 lm	19th/20th
01 stone rubble laver 0 lm 0 15m floor m	ake-un 19th
02 mortar and stone 0.25m 0.2m floor m rubble	nake-up 19th
03 dark brown loam 0.45m min 0.8m floor m	ake-up 19th
n 3	and up 15th
00 concrete floor 0m 0.2m floo	or 19th /20th
01 stone/ brick rubble 0.2m 0.11m floor m	ake-up 19th
02 Bath stone masonry 0.31m 0.05-0.1m masonry t debris	norizon 19th
03 mortar and brick/stone 0.36m 0.3m m dust	ake-up 19th
04 Bath stone masonry 0.66m 0.2m m debris and mortar	ake-up 19th
05 loose rubble, mixed 0.86m min 0.35m m with mortar and topsoil	ake-up 19th
14	
00 concrete floor 0m 0.15m floo	or 19th /20th
01 loose stone rubble 0.15m 0.18m floor m	ake-up 19th
02 Bath stone debris and 0.33m 0.14m m offcuts	ake-up 19th
03 loose mortar and 0.44m 0.14m make-up with rede rubble with RB CBM and op. sig.	eposited RB 19th
04 loose rubble layer with freq RB CBM and op. sig. 0.52m 0.14m make-up with rede	eposited RB 19th
05 Irregular cut 0.7m 0.3m 19th century exm	loratory cut
06 loose soil and mortar 0.7m 0.3m fill	of 405 19th
07 hard white mortar 0.68m 0.01m mortar blinding	aver 19th

Context	Description	Depth	Thickness	Comments
408	RB wall E-W butt end	0.65m	min 0.4m	RB wall on Irvine plan
409	Dark greyish brown	0.7m	0.1m	Late / Post RB layer
410	Straight edged cut	0.7m	0.22m	Late / Post RB cut?
411	Mid greyish brown clay	0.7m	0.22m	fill of 410
412	Sticky grey clay with FE panning	0.8m	0.04m	RB layer
413	Gritty brownish grey clay	0.93m	0.12m	RB occupation layer
414	Gritty grey clay	1.05m		RB layer
French 5				
500	concrete floor	Om	0.11m	19th /20th floor
501	rubble	0.11m	0.04m	floor bedding 19th /20th
502	Dark brown soft loam	0.15m	0.25m	Medieval soil
503	compacted dark brown loam	0.4m	0.02m	Medieval soil
504	Rough stony surface of small stones	0.4m	0.03m	Medieval surface
505	Dark brown soft loam	0.42m	min 0.2m	Medieval soil
506	Wall E-W 19th century	0.15m		19th century wall footing
507	Dark brown soft loam	0.16m	0.68m	Medieval soil same as 502 / 505
508	Dark brown soil	0.84m	0.18m	Med / Dark earth ?
509	Yellowish clay lens with gravel	1.02m	?0.08m	Occupation horizon post RB?
510	Dark soil layer	1.1m	0.2m	Dark earth /Post RB?
French 6				
600	Concrete floor	0m	0.24m	19th /20th floor
601	brick and stone rubble	0.24m	0.1 m	floor make-up 19th
602	Dark brown loam with mortar inclusions	0.3m	0.12m	redeposited late med soil
603	Concrete surface	0.42m	0.08m	19th road / path ?
604	truncated red brick structure	0.4m	0.1 m	19th kerb /wall
605	linear flat based cut	0.41m	0.08m	cut for 603 and 604 19th
606	Dark greenish brown clayey loam	0.4m		Redeposited med soil
607	Dark greenish brown clayey loam	0.5m	0.28m	Same as 606
608	Loose stone structure	0.78m	0.21m	17th /18th soakaway
Trench 7				
700	concrete	0m	0.15m	concrete floor 19th / 20th
701	Rubble with Bath stone blocks	0.15m	0.15-0.2m	floor make-up 19th
702	Cinders and rubble	0.32m	0.25m	floor make-up 19th
703	Soil and mortar layer	0.55m	0.04-0.1m	floor make-up 19th
704	White mortar layer	0.61m	0.01m	mortar blinding 19th
705	Dark brown loamy soil	0.62m	0.03-0.05m	19th levelling
706	Vertical sided cut	0.69m	min 0.24m	Early med ? Cut
707	Dark brown compacted loam	0.69m	min 0.24m	Fill of 706
708	Firm brownish yellow clay layer	0.69m	min 0.24m	RB surface ?
709	Wall footings 18th	0.61m	min 0.3m	18th wall

11

1

d,

18

4

Context	Description	Depth	Thickness	Comments
710	Loose mid brown clayey loam, with mortar	0.67m	min 0.24m	Fill of footings trench 18th
711	-Linear cut, 18th century footings trench	0.67m,	min 0.24m	Footings trench 18th c
Trench 8				
800	concrete floor	0m	0.16m	concrete floor 19th /20th
801	Rubble with Bath stone blocks	0.16m	0.15m	floor make-up 19th
802	Truncated wall E-W	0.34m	min 0.31m	Wall 18th /19th
803	Soft pale yellow mortar	0.6m	0.05m	mortar abutting walls 802 and 804
804	Existing wall of room NS	0m		NS wall of room
805	Linear cut E-W	0.65m	min 0.5m	Foundation cut for wall 802 18th /19th
806	Loose soil fill with mortar and slate	0.65m	min 0.5m	Fill of footings trench 805
807	Linear cut NS	0.6m	min 0.55m	Foundation cut for wall 804
808	same as 806	0.6m	min 0.55m	fill of footings trench807
809	Dark greenish-brown clayey loam	0.6m	0.25m	Medieval soil / pit fill
810	Mortar and topsoil	0.4m	0.13m	floor make-up 19th
811	Mottled greyish brown gritty clay	0.6m	min 0.55m	med soil /dark earth
Trench 9				
901	concrete floor	0m		19th / 20th
902	concrete floor			19th/20th
903	gritty make-up			19th / 20th
904	concrete			19th / 20th
905	stone rubble			19th /20th

Context	Description	Date
103	1 sherd of a white glazed jar with RUH printed under the glaze	1864-1928
502	47 sherds. Glazed tripod pitchers and jugs in Bath Fabric A and some possible Ham Green ware	12th to early 13th century
503	Glazed jug bases and cooking pot rim. Also possible Ham Green ware	12th to early 13th century
602	Thick wheel thrown body sherd with int. and ext. yellow glaze. Local tripod pitcher? or Winchester ware	10-11th or 12th century
606	Glazed jug sherd	late 12th -13th century
607	10 sherds inc. Staffs slip ware porringer and N. Devon gravel tempered ware	18th century
607	Costrel rim and coarsewares	13th-14th century
702	2 sherds tripod pitcher rim, slight int. rouletting	late 11th – 12th century
702	1 amphorae base sherd	Roman
707	14 sherds of coarseware inc. poss. Ham Green rim	12th century
707	1 large rim of jar, poss. BB1	Roman
708	1 sherd BB1, I of oxidised scrap	Roman
710	2 sherds of early post med. redware. One with internal dark green glaze, one jug rim.	16th-17th century
710	2 sherds of medieval pottery	medieval
806	4 sherds Bath Fabric A glazed tripod pitcher	12th – early 13th century
806	1 sherd BB1	Roman
809	4 sherds of local grey ware, one of Gallic amphora and 1 of BB1	Roman

APPENDIX 2 POTTERY

By John Cotter and Dan Stansbie

APPENDIX 3 METALWORK

By Ian Scott

Three pieces of metalwork were recovered. These comprised one piece of iron - a nail head fragment (ctx 708) - and two pieces of copper alloy. These comprise a small irregular fragment, and small coin or token (both ctx 502).

- 1 Small nail fragment including head. Fe. Ctx 708 sf 03.
- 2 Small irregular fragment cu alloy fragment, possibly waste. Ctx 502 sf 02.
- 3 Small token or coin only 12 x 13 mm across. One face appears blank, the other is occupied by a slightly asymmetrical cross. Its date and purpose are uncertain, but probably a token rather than a coin. Ctx 502 sf 01.

APPENDIX 4 STONE

By Peter Davenport

9.1.4 One piece of oolitic limestone was collected from context 708. It was at first thought to be the broken off corner of a stone box or trough, very roughly finished, especially on the outside. The exterior sides are rough and were never very finely finished, but the present effect is due to weathering. The interior and front face, allowing for

weathering, are reasonably well-finished. It measured 0.21 m x 0.16 m x 0.13 m and the surviving internal depth of the trough was 0.07 m. The edges of the trough were 0.05 m thick and, internally, thickened towards the base. It is impossible to say how big it originally was.

9.1.5 Closer inspection showed that the intact corner had an angle somewhat less than 90°, which is unlike any other trough or box known from other Bath sites in Roman contexts. The possibility exists that it is the apex of the gable-like upper part of a framed bas-relief or inscription. It had obviously been broken up and used for rubble. If it is part of an inscription or relief, it probably came from one of the shrines around the hot springs.

APPENDIX 5 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

Booth, P, nd	Oxford Archaeology Roman pottery recording system, Oxford Archaeology, unpublished (revised January 2006)		
Cunliffe, B. W. 1969	Roman Bath Society of Antiquaries Monograph (London)		
Davenport, P. 2003	The City Of Bath College. An Archaeological and Historical Desktop Assessment. Unpublished Planning Document B&NES SMR		
Davenport, P. 2005	The Gainsborough Building, Beau Street, Bath: An Archaeological Desktop Assessment. Unpublished Planning Document B&NES SMR		
McCarthy, M. R. and Brooks, C. M. 1988	Medieval Pottery in Britain AD900-1600 Leicester University Press		
OAU, 1992	Field Manual (ed. Wilkinson D)		
Tomber, R, and Dore, J. 1998	<i>The national Roman fabric reference collection: a handbook</i> , MoLAS Monogr 2		
Vince, A. G. unpub.	The Medieval Ceramic Industry of the Severn Valley Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Southampton, 1984		
Young, C. J. 1977	Oxfordshire Roman pottery, BAR Brit. Ser. 43, Oxford		

SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS **APPENDIX 6**

Site name: Bath, Gainsborough Building

Site code: BAGAB06

Grid reference: NGR ST74966460

Type of evaluation: 9 hand excavated trenches

Date and duration of project: June 2006 to July 2006 (three weeks)

Area of site: 0.186 ha

Summary of results: The trenches revealed a variety of levels of preservation of archaeological deposits across the site. In places the construction of the present building had removed all older deposits down to over a metre from basement floor level and in others Roman and medieval remains appeared well-preserved.

Location of archive: The archive is currently held at OA, Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford, OX2 0ES, and will be deposited with the Roman Baths Museum, Bath in due course, under the following accession number: BATRM06.xxx (tbc).



Scale 1:25,000

Reproduced from the Explorer1:25,000 scale by permission of the Ordnance Survey on behalf of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 1998. All rights reserved. Licence No. AL 100005569

Figure 1: Site location



]

]

-rl

-

- 11

d

.1







U

) 🗿 🗌 Servergo:/oaupubs1_e thru h*BATH05*BAGABEV*Bath, Gainborough Building*jm*06.09.06

1





Servergo:/ounpubs1_a thru h*BATH05*BAGABEV*Bath, Gainborough Building*jm*06.09.06

1









West-East section through basement of the Gainsborough Building, Bath



Figure 7: Sample cross sections showing archaeological deposits and proposed foundation design and potential impacts



Figure 8: Proposed piling plan and areas where further evaluation and excavation may be required



Plate 1. Trench 2 looking west, showing depth of post-1825 deposits



Plate 2. Trench 3 looking south-west. The curve of the bow window wall is evident on the left. All the fill shown is post-1864.



Plate 3. Trench 4 looking east. Post 1864 backfill has been removed showing the Roman buttress in the top left corner.



Plate 5. Trench 7 looking west. The post-medieval footing is in front and the Roman or post-Roman surface behind



Plate 4. Trench 5 looking south showing the probably 13th century hardened surface.



Oxford Archaeology

Janus House Osney Mead Oxford OX2 0ES

t: (0044) 01865 263800 f: (0044) 01865 793496 e: info@oxfordarch.co.uk w:www.oxfordarch.co.uk



Oxford Archaeology North

Storey Institute Meeting House Lane Lancaster LA1 1TF

t: (0044) 01524 541000 f: (0044) 01524 848606 e: lancinfo@oxfordarch.co.uk w:www.oxfordarch.co.uk



Director: David Jennings, BA MIFA FSA

Oxford Archaeological Unit is a Private Limited Company, N^o: 1618597 and a Registered Charity, N^o: 285627

Registered Office: Oxford Archaeological Unit

Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0ES