



# Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme, Field 3 Archaeological Evaluation Report

December 2020

**Client: VolkerSteven Ltd**

Issue No: 3 (FINAL)


OA Reference No: OXFASEV2

NGR: SP 5040 0473





Client Name: VolkerStevin Ltd  
Client Ref No.: C13191 – OFAS (Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme)  
Document Title: Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme, Field 3  
Document Type: Evaluation Report  
Report No.: 1  
Grid Reference: SP 5040 0473  
Planning Reference: Pre-determination  
Site Code: OXFAS20  
Invoice Code: OXFASEV2  
Receiving Body: Oxfordshire County Museum Services  
Accession No.: OXCMS: 2017.145  
OA Document File Location: \\10.0.10.86\Projects\o\Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme FAS\OXFAS 2020 Evaluation  
OA Graphics File Location: \\10.0.10.86\Projects\o\Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme FAS\010Geomatics  
Issue No: 3 (FINAL)  
Date: December 2020  
Prepared by: Adam Fellingham (Supervisor) and Ben M Ford (Senior Project Manager)  
Checked by: Ben M Ford (Senior Project Manager)  
Edited by: Andrew Simmonds (Senior Project Manager)  
Approved for Issue by: David Score (Head of Fieldwork)



**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.*

**OA South**

Janus House  
Osney Mead  
Oxford  
OX2 0ES

t. +44 (0)1865 263 800

**OA East**

15 Trafalgar Way  
Bar Hill  
Cambridge  
CB23 8SQ

t. +44 (0)1223 850 500

**OA North**

Mill 3  
Moor Lane Mills  
Moor Lane  
Lancaster  
LA1 1QD

t. +44 (0)1524 880 250

e. [info@oxfordarch.co.uk](mailto:info@oxfordarch.co.uk)

w. [oxfordarchaeology.com](http://oxfordarchaeology.com)

Oxford Archaeology is a registered Charity: No. 285627



Director and Chief Executive  
Gill Hey, BA PhD FSA MC1A  
Private Limited Company, No: 1618597  
Registered Charity, No: 285627  
Registered Office: Oxford Archaeology Ltd  
Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0ES

## Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme, Field 3

### *Archaeological Evaluation Report*

*Written by Adam Fellingham and Ben M Ford*

*With contributions from Edward Biddulph, Anni Byard,  
Michael Donnelly, Sharon Cook and Rebecca Nicholson,*

*with illustrations by*

*Matthew Bradley and Charles Rousseaux.*

### Contents

Summary.....	vii
Acknowledgements.....	ix
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Scope of work.....	1
1.2 Location, topography and geology .....	2
1.3 Archaeological and historical background .....	2
<b>2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Aims.....	13
2.2 Methodology .....	13
<b>3 RESULTS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 Introduction and presentation of results.....	15
3.2 General soils and ground conditions .....	15
3.3 General distribution of archaeological deposits .....	15
3.4 Field 3: Zone VII (Trenches 234–243) .....	16
3.5 Zone XI (Trenches 210–233) .....	18
3.6 Artefactual summary .....	22
3.7 Environmental sampling summary .....	22
<b>4 DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1 Reliability of field investigation.....	23
4.2 Evaluation objectives and results.....	23
4.3 Interpretation .....	23
4.4 Significance.....	27
4.5 Assessment of the proposed impacts and mitigation considerations.....	27

---

<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	<b>FINDS REPORTS .....</b>	<b>59</b>
B.1	Pottery by Edward Biddulph .....	59
B.2	Metal by Anni Byard .....	64
B.3	Glass by Anni Byard .....	65
B.4	Ceramic Building Material and Fired Clay by Ruth Shaffrey .....	66
B.5	Stone by Ruth Shaffrey .....	66
B.6	Flint by Michael Donnelly .....	67
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS.....</b>	<b>69</b>
C.1	Environmental Samples by Sharon Cook .....	69
C.2	Animal Bone by Rebecca Nicholson.....	81
C.3	Shell by Rebecca Nicholson .....	85
<b>APPENDIX D</b>	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>APPENDIX E</b>	<b>SITE SUMMARY DETAILS / OASIS REPORT FORM.....</b>	<b>89</b>

## List of Figures

- Fig. 1 Field 3: new evaluation area against wider project area showing the geoarchaeological zones on a background of surface topography from LiDAR data
- Fig. 2 Trench location plan
- Fig. 3 Detailed plan of ditched trackway (Trenches 221, 230-231 and 236-237)
- Fig. 4 Detailed plan of Trenches 224 and 226-228
- Fig. 5 Detailed plan of trackway and paleochannel (Trenches 239-243)
- Fig. 6 Sections from Trench 215
- Fig. 7 Sections from Trenches 224, 226 and 228
- Fig. 8 Sections from Trenches 232 and 233
- Fig. 9 Sections relating to the ditched trackway
- Fig. 10 Sections relating to the trackway and paleochannel
- Fig. 11 Depth below current ground level to the Significant Archaeological Horizon

## List of Plates

- Plate 1 Trench 215, showing pit 21509, Section 21501, looking east
- Plate 2 Trench 224, showing ditch 22411 (left) and pit 22409 (right), Section 22400, looking south-east
- Plate 3 Trench 226, showing ditch 22605 (left), ditch 22606 (center) and ditch 22611 (right), Section 22600, looking south-west
- Plate 4 Trench 227, showing ditch 22705 (left) and ditch 22703 (right), Section 22700, looking north
- Plate 5 Trench 228, showing pit 22803, Section 22800, looking west
- Plate 6 Trench 228, showing ditch 22811 (left), ditch 22815 (foreground) and ditch 22816 (right), Section 22801, looking south-east
- Plate 7 Trench 233, showing ditch 22304 (left) and ditch 22306 (right), Section 23300, looking east
- Plate 8 Trench 236, showing possible hollow-way 23605 (left) and trackway ditch 23616 (right), Section 23601, looking south
- Plate 9 Trench 241, general shot of paleochannel 24126, Section 24100, looking south
- Plate 10 Trench 243, general shot of trackway 24305 (foreground) and trackway 24304, looking north-west

## Summary

*The Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme (OFAS) is located to the west and south of Oxford, from just north of Botley Road to the south of Old Abingdon Road, and takes in areas to the east of Abingdon Road. The OFAS crosses two administrative districts: The Vale of the White Horse (Oxfordshire County Council) in the southern section, and the City of Oxford (Oxford City Council) in the northern section. It comprises the construction of a principal two-stage relief channel, designed to look and function as a natural living river, containing water all year round. Field 3 falls within the associated construction works proposed for the scheme and will be developed for a compound.*

*Following on from previous heritage asset focused work (Desk-based Assessment, bespoke and reactive geoarchaeological surveys, geophysical surveys, and an archaeological evaluation on Old Abingdon Road and along the proposed route of the scheme), Oxford Archaeology was commissioned by VolkerStevin Ltd on behalf of the Environment Agency to undertake an archaeological evaluation within Field 3, a possible location for a construction compound. The scope and design of the evaluation took an iterative approach with results from the previous studies. The fieldwork and report-writing took place between July and October 2020.*

*The results of the Field 3 evaluation build upon the results of previous work which had been divided into different Geoarchaeological Zones that relate to the different topographic characteristics of the area studied. This offered a framework for a coherent understanding of the full range of archaeological and geoarchaeological discoveries. Field 3 covered two of these Geoarchaeological Zones. Zone VII, in the north-east third of the area, is within the valley floor. This zone is characterised by relatively level ground and high elevations in the surface of the underlying Northmoor Gravel, which is covered by various thicknesses of alluvium associated with relict and existing watercourses and channels. Zone XI, in the south-west two-thirds of the area, is on the lower western valley slopes where ground levels start to rise above the floodplain and sediments are dominated by colluvial ploughwash. Within Field 3 these two Geoarchaeological Zones were divided by an existing Thames Water drainage culvert.*

*The archaeological results identified surviving archaeological deposits and features principally dating from the early-middle Iron Age, Roman and medieval periods, as well as numerous undated features. The evidence can be viewed as corroborating and developing the information and conclusions in relation to Geoarchaeological Zones VII (characterised by alluvial environments in the valley floor) and Zone XI (characterised by colluvial environments on the valley slopes) from the 2017 evaluation (OA 2018). The significant archaeological horizon at which archaeological features are first encountered was encountered at varying depths between 0.30m and 0.80m below the existing ground level.*

*Datable pre-Iron Age activity was limited to a handful of residual pieces of flintwork, many of which were either undiagnostic or broadly attributable to the Mesolithic/Neolithic. It is probable that some of the undated features date to the Bronze Age or earlier and reflect the pattern seen in the 2017 evaluation.*

*Evidence for Iron Age activity continues northwards along the valley slopes (Zone XI) and in the valley floor (Zone VII). The ditches probably relate to land divisions and agrarian uses of the wider landscape within which there is evidence for roundhouses belonging to dispersed settlement, perhaps farmsteads. The absence of late Iron Age evidence in this area is notable.*

*The work in Field 3 revealed further and more compelling evidence that there was a link between settlement activity on the slopes of the valley (Zone XI) to agricultural and/or pastoral activity along those same slopes and extending into the valley floor (Zone VII). A continuation of a probable NE–SW orientated routeway, evaluated in 2017, was revealed to extend up-slope beyond the cropmark features. Material culture such as pottery, animal bone and charred plant remains as were found in 2017 confirm settlement, agricultural and pastoral activity. The volume of this material combined with the Roman glass, a Harlow brooch, ceramic building material, and the rotary quern stone represent material classes not previously recovered. This strongly indicates that significant Roman settlement activity is present within or very near to this area of the site. This evidence for settlement, the routeway and enclosure (OA 2018) are set within a network of parallel and perpendicular boundary ditches probably representing contemporary field systems.*

*The geoarchaeological results identified an undated paleochannel in Zone VII. Overlying the upper deposits of the paleochannel were several trackways. Whilst no dating was recovered it is anticipated that these are continuations of surfaces seen in 2017 and date to the late Saxon–medieval periods. A single medieval ditch was also identified.*

## Acknowledgements

Oxford Archaeology would like to thank VolkerStevin Ltd for commissioning this project on behalf of the Environment Agency. Thanks are also extended to Richard Oram, who monitored the work on behalf of Oxfordshire County Council. Oxford Archaeology would also like to thank Catherine Charman (NEAS Archaeologist, Environment Agency) and the VolkerStevin team for their help and assistance throughout the duration of the project.

The project was managed for Oxford Archaeology by Ben Ford, MCIFA (Senior Project Manager). The fieldwork was directed by Adam Fellingham (Supervisor), who was supported by Tom Bruce, Jana Smirnova, Elizabeth Kennard, Ines Matos-Golver, Paul Murray, Ed Tolley and Thomasz Neyman. Survey was carried out by Jana Smirnova. Thanks are also extended to the teams of OA staff that cleaned and packaged the finds under the supervision of Leigh Allen, processed the environmental remains under the supervision of Rebecca Nicholson, and prepared the archive under the supervision of Nicola Scott.



## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Scope of work

- 1.1.1 The Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme (OFAS) proposal comprises a 5km long channel with associated other works located to the west and south of Oxford (from just north of Botley Road to the south of Old Abingdon Road, as well as taking in areas to the east of Abingdon Road). The OFAS crosses two administrative districts: the Vale of the White Horse (Oxfordshire County Council) in the southern section, and the City of Oxford (Oxford City Council) in the northern section. It comprises the construction of a principal two-stage relief channel, designed to look and function as a natural living river, containing water all year round. Associated elements of the OFAS include drainage ditches, flood bunds, culverts, and temporary works such as construction compounds.
- 1.1.2 Following on from a comprehensive and rigorous programme of desk-based studies and archaeological, geo-archaeological and geophysical field investigations within the original development limits of the OFAS, it is now necessary to undertake archaeological trenched evaluation in a new area, South Hinksey: Field 3 (henceforth Field 3). Field 3 is to be considered as a possible alternative location for a construction compound. It runs contiguous to the former red-line boundary on the scheme's western side between North and South Hinksey, immediately south of St Peter's College Sports Ground (Fig. 1).
- 1.1.3 Field 3 measures c 8.29 hectares (82,916m<sup>2</sup>) of previously undeveloped agricultural land and straddles the south-east-facing slopes of the Thames Valley edge (Zone XI), and the valley floor itself (Zone VII).
- 1.1.4 The Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record identifies cropmark features, and geophysical survey identified anomalies within Field 3 (Fig. 2). The trial trenching undertaken to the east and south of Field 3 during 2017 (OA 2018) revealed discrete archaeological features, worked flint clusters, and linear features (some of which coincided with previously identified cropmarks). The evaluation produced a limited amount of artefactual material, but this, combined with a suite of radiocarbon dates, indicated the remains dated from the prehistoric to the late Saxon periods, including residual early prehistoric flintwork within the colluvial deposits, evidence for Iron Age occupation, a Roman trackway and enclosure, and late Saxon rough stone causeways associated with relict channels. Many undated features of natural and archaeological origin were also recorded.
- 1.1.5 With the approval from Catherin Charman (NEAS Archaeologist, Environment Agency) in 2019, Jacobs consulted with Richard Oram, the Archaeological Advisor to the Vale of the White Horse District Council, to confirm the need for, and agree the scope of, the archaeological evaluation that would be required within Field 3.
- 1.1.6 A specific Field 3 WSI (OA 2020), acting as an addendum to the existing Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme WSI (Ch2M 2017), was produced and approved by Richard Oram before the works commenced. Oxford Archaeology was commissioned by VolkerStevin

Ltd on behalf of the Environment Agency to undertake the archaeological evaluation within Field 3

- 1.1.7 All the site work was undertaken in accordance with local and national planning policies, as well as CIFA guidelines, and OA procedures. All the site works were monitored to the satisfaction of Richard Oram prior to completion and backfilling. This report details the archaeological results of that work.

## **1.2 Location, topography and geology**

- 1.2.1 The proposed flood alleviation channel itself lies to the west and south of Oxford, with the northern limit of the scheme to the north of Botley Road and Botley Bridge and the southern edge of the scheme to the south of Old Abingdon Road, with a linear length of c 5km. There is an additional area south-east of Oxford, which lies between the current Thames channel and the A483, with a linear length of c 1km. An area of proposed land-raising is located west of the A34, on the hillslopes adjacent to Chiswell Valley.
- 1.2.2 The majority of the scheme is located in areas of low-lying floodplain meadow, dissected by several watercourses that bifurcate and carry flow from the main Thames channel north of Botley (Seacourt Stream, Hinksey Steam, Bulstake Stream and Hogacre Ditch). These are joined by small calcareous streams, draining down onto the floodplain from the slopes of Boar's Hill and Hinksey Hill to the west.
- 1.2.3 The bedrock geology underlying much of the scheme is Oxford Clay Formation and West Walton Formation Mudstone, with sediments deposited as mud, silt, sand and gravel. There are some areas of Kingston Formation Sandstone and Stanford Formation Limestone on the slopes of Hinksey Hill. In low-lying areas, the bedrock is overlain by a Quaternary sequence comprising the Northmoor (Floodplain) Sand and Gravel Formation and Alluvium (clay silt, sand and gravel). The higher areas adjacent to Chiswell Valley do not have any superficial deposits mapped by the British Geological Survey, although Head deposits (including colluvial ploughwash) are likely to be present.
- 1.2.4 Field 3 straddles Geoarchaeological Zones VII and XI, which were identified as a result of previous geoarchaeological investigations and archaeological trenching (OA 2017a and OA, 2018); their descriptions from the latter report are repeated below in Section 1.3.

## **1.3 Archaeological and historical background**

- 1.3.1 Comprehensive geoarchaeological, archaeological and historical backgrounds have already been produced for this project (OA 2016, 2017, 2017a, 2017b and 2018). It is not the intention to repeat them fully here, but the summary conclusion from the previous evaluation (OA 2018) and the discussions of the relevant Geoarchaeological Zones from the same report are reproduced in full below (ibid.).

### **Previous Archaeological Work (overall summary)**

- 1.3.2 Following on from previous heritage asset focused work (Desk-based Assessment, bespoke and reactive geoarchaeological surveys, geophysical surveys, and an archaeological evaluation on Old Abingdon Road), Oxford Archaeology was

commissioned by CH2M to undertake a trench-based archaeological and geoarchaeological evaluation along the route of the OFAS. The scope and design of the evaluation took an iterative approach with results from the previous studies. The fieldwork and report-writing took place between August 2017 and January 2018.

- 1.3.3 The results build upon previous work and have been organized into thirteen Geoarchaeological Zones (numbered I–XIII), which relate to the underlying topography of the area and offer a framework for a coherent understanding of the full range of archaeological and geoarchaeological discoveries.
- 1.3.4 Although there was a general paucity of artefactual evidence, and many features remain undated, an extensive and targeted programme of soil and sediment sampling from both archaeological features and geoarchaeological palaeochannels and alluvial sequences was undertaken and allowed for a comprehensive set of 28 radiocarbon dates to be obtained, giving an almost unbroken c 8,000-year chronology spanning the Mesolithic to the modern period.
- 1.3.5 Archaeological results included:
- Late Mesolithic–early Neolithic hunter-gatherer activity areas both in the valley floor and on the western slopes (where possible *in situ* stone tool preparation was identified);
  - an isolated middle Bronze Age human cremation, and flint tool findspots on the lower western valley slopes;
  - a late Bronze Age timber post alignment/structure perhaps contemporary with the start of late Bronze Age–early Iron Age roundhouse occupation on the lower western slopes associated with a hint of land division – perhaps agrarian/pastoral field systems;
  - Middle–late Iron Age roundhouse occupation on the lower western slopes (interdigitated with episodes of colluviation) and the suggestion of the development of rectilinear field systems extending into the valley floor;
  - a Roman trackway and square enclosure within the valley floor – perhaps developing earlier Iron Age land use and division;
  - Late Saxon–early medieval stone causeways;
  - Later medieval stone causeways across the floodplain, one associated with a documented principal route into Oxford from the west via North Hinksey village, and the other associated with South Hinksey village. These should be considered in context with the previous discovery of the medieval causeway and associated stone structures under Old Abingdon Road (and leading to the Grandpont). The suggested survival of channels associated with Botley Mill. Ridge and furrow to the east of Abingdon Road.
  - Post-medieval renewal and maintenance of the Old Abingdon Road routeway. The continued relevance of Botley Mill and its associated channels should also be considered.
- 1.3.6 The geoarchaeological results identified palaeochannels with organic silts and peat deposits from the Mesolithic through to the modern period, allowing for the broad temporal range of human activity listed above to be placed within the context of

contemporaneous evolving and shifting riverine environments and the wider valley landscape.

- 1.3.7 The low-lying riverine topography, the apparent consistent lowest level of the water table, and the nature of the clay alluvial blanket within the valley floor (up to c 1.5m thick in places) has created a waterlogged buried environment where preservation of organic remains below c 1.0m BGL is good, with excellent potential for the preservation of animal and plant ecofacts and plant remains of agricultural practices, as well as man-made objects and structures (both utilitarian and ritual) from the last 8,000 years.
- 1.3.8 Colluvial episodes during the later prehistoric period on the lower western slopes also present the potential for unusually well-preserved occupation evidence for the late Bronze Age–late Iron Age settlement identified in this area.

## **Zone VII**

### ***Geoarchaeological Summary***

- 1.3.9 Zone VII is located south of the current course of the Hinksey Stream and north-east of South Hinksey village. Ground levels average 55.00m to 55.50m OD. The fields in this area, mostly under pasture, are known historically as Great Common, Long Common and Little Common. This section of the route traverses an area of cropmarks identified from aerial photographs.
- 1.3.10 This Zone is characterised by relatively high elevations in the surface of the Northmoor Gravel at c 54.60m to 55.00m OD. The thickness of deposits overlying the gravel ranges from c 0.40m to 0.80m, increasing locally to c 1.20m, particularly in the northern part of the zone approaching the Hinksey Stream. Previous borehole work and geophysical survey indicated shallow channel-like features may traverse this zone and Borehole OA103 was drilled in 2016 to sample one of these features which is infilled with an organic silt clay to 1.20m BGL. A single radiocarbon date was processed from the base of this unit, which produced a recent date. The pollen also included rosebay willowherb which did not become widespread until after the Second World War. It was not clear therefore whether this channel is a recent feature or whether the samples were contaminated with recent material. The pollen data suggested an open, herb-rich grassy palaeoenvironment with evidence for areas of shallow, possibly stagnant water nearby. The occurrence of cereal-type pollen may represent pollen of a cultivated crop that was growing or possibly processed nearby. Pollen of weeds associated with disturbance and/or damp areas were also recorded.
- 1.3.11 Sampling from Trench 72 was intended to resample the sequence examined in Borehole OA103 at a different location. Northmoor Gravel was recorded at 54.27m OD (0.89m BGL). This was overlain by a peaty silt (7207), radiocarbon dated to the early Saxon period at cal AD 430–620 (Beta-481033, 1510±30 BP). The sequence was sealed by silt clay alluvium that was organic towards the base, with ground level at 55.16m OD. The radiocarbon date suggests that the peat-filled feature post-dates the cropmark enclosure and ditched trackway immediately to the southwest, which have been radiocarbon dated to the Roman period (see below). A further indirect date for the peat deposits in this zone derives from an *in situ* wooden stake driven into the peat

in Trench 64 which yielded a late Saxon–early medieval date of cal AD 890–1010 (Beta-481031, 1100±30 BP). This stake was found beneath a possible stone trackway surface or causeway (see below).

- 1.3.12 Waterlogged plant remains and insects from Trench 72 were well preserved in the organic sediments with a range of seeds of wetland and aquatic taxa: sedge, crowfoot, mint, water-plantain and marshwort, but seeds of open or rough ground are also present at lower frequency (nettle, grasses, docks). Molluscs were moderately preserved in the organic silt and the base of the alluvium. The assemblages were dominated by the aquatic species *Bithynia tentaculata*, along with *Valvata cristata* and *Planorbis planorbis*, but a range of other freshwater ditch and catholic species were also present, suggesting a slow flow regime.

### **Archaeological Summary**

#### **Mesolithic**

- 1.3.13 In Trench 61 one of the more significant assemblages of Mesolithic flint was retrieved from the samples from a burnt tree-hole (6111). However, two sherds of Iron Age pottery were also recovered from this context.

#### **Neolithic**

- 1.3.14 No archaeological features were present from this period in Zone VII.

#### **Bronze Age**

- 1.3.15 Only one feature was dated to the Bronze Age in Zone VII, a large pit in Trench 68. This pit contained small undiagnostic sherds of pottery that were loosely dated as prehistoric, but a radiocarbon date on uncharred hazelnut shell suggests they are middle to late Bronze Age at 1210–1010 cal BC (Beta-481032; 2910±30 BP).

#### **Iron Age**

- 1.3.16 The burnt treehole (6111), previously mentioned, was revealed at c 0.65m BGL on the southern edge of the palaeochannel belt running through Zone VI. The finds from this feature were almost entirely retrieved from the bulk samples and include two small, abraded pieces of Iron Age pottery.
- 1.3.17 Trench 67 contained a large pit (6702) similar in shape but wider and deeper than the one in Trench 68. The pottery in this pit was dated to the early Iron Age. Another Iron Age pit, again dated by pottery, was located in Trench 87 (8719). This pit was wide, but much shallower than the one in Trench 67.

#### **Roman**

- 1.3.18 Trenches 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81 and 83 were all located to target cropmark/earthwork features (linear and discrete), denoting a possible north-east to south-west trackway and adjacent enclosure (Figs. 10, 10i and 10ii).
- 1.3.19 These anomalies were targeted by Trenches 77 and 78. Two parallel ditches were revealed, the northernmost being excavated in Trench 77 (7700) (Fig. 35, Plate 33) and the southernmost in Trench 78, (7805) (Fig. 36, Plate 34). Unfortunately, neither slot produced any finds, but a radiocarbon date on waterlogged seeds and twigs from sample <519> from trackway ditch (7805) produced an early to middle Roman date of

cal AD 90–240 (Beta-481042, 1840±30 BP). It is noticeable that the ditches were both cut from just below the alluvial subsoil and the alluvial deposits they cut were not particularly thick.

- 1.3.20 In addition, Trench 78 revealed a single pit (7807) corresponding to the discrete anomalies, but there were no corresponding features identified in Trench 77.
- 1.3.21 The trackway measured roughly 8.35m wide between the inside edges of the two ditches and in Trench 77 some heavily compacted areas of gravel indicated a possible metallated surface (although no wheel ruts were apparent). It was possible to trace the trackway for c 68m between Trenches 77 and 78, but it was not found in Trench 76 as the cropmarks indicated. The trackway also does not show up in Trench 75 which means that it may well thread the gap between Trenches 74 and 75. There is the possibility that features interpreted as natural at the south-east end of Trench 74 may actually be related to the trackway.
- 1.3.22 Roughly 30m to 35m south-east of the trackway was a square enclosure with an opening on the north-west side, facing the trackway. Trenches 77, 79, 80, 81 and 83 all targeted various parts of the enclosure ditch and found it to be cut from the same level as the trackway, suggesting the two are contemporary.
- 1.3.23 As with the trackway ditches, no finds were recovered from the enclosure ditch. No internal features were identified and curiously there were no organic deposits in the enclosure ditch either, as you might expect from an animal pen.
- 1.3.24 The orientation of the enclosure is not an exact fit to the cropmarks and as such it is difficult to ascertain precise internal dimensions, but it is roughly 52.50m from the internal edge in Trench 80 before it turns towards the north-east to the edge of Trench 77 where it is clearly turning towards the south-west.
- 1.3.25 As well as the cropmark ditches already described, there were other ditches that could be lined up between certain trenches in this zone. In Trench 98, ditches running parallel to the causeway head towards Trench 99, where a single ditch was recorded. It is not possible to say which of the two ditches in Trench 98 continues through to Trench 99. The intervention in Trench 99 contained a small piece of worked wood that was radiocarbon dated to the late Roman period at cal AD 240–390 (Beta-481029, 1730±30 BP).
- 1.3.26 The ditch in Trench 99 was recorded cutting from the top of the gravel and sealed by alluvium, whereas the two ditches in Trench 98 and the other datable Roman ditch were all cut from just below the subsoil. It is possible that this is a misjudgement regarding the cut level of the ditch in Trench 99 and that it also is cut from below the subsoil.

### **Saxon**

- 1.3.27 The Saxon period is generally quite poorly represented across the scheme and no archaeological feature produced any material culture of this period so it is important to note that one of the stone causeways in Zone VII, 6406 (see below), was pressed into an alluvial clay deposit (6403) that lay on top of a layer of peat (6404). Driven through the peat, but not through the clay above, was a worked stake (6408), which was radiocarbon dated to the late Saxon period at cal AD 890–1010 (Beta-481031,

1100±30 BP). Interestingly, samples taken from an organic palaeochannel fill in Trench 72, thought to be the same channel crossed by causeway {6406}, produced an early Saxon date of cal AD 430–620 (Beta-481033, 1510±30 BP).

### ***Medieval–modern***

1.3.28 No archaeological features were present from these periods in Zone VII.

### ***Undated***

1.3.29 Unfortunately, the vast majority of the features in this zone were undatable (due to a lack of artefacts). The causeway in Trench 64 {6406} ran NNE–SSW across a palaeochannel, measured 3.80m in width and was the better made and preserved of the two, though still not as well made as the routeway/causeway located in Trench 20. It lay at c 0.60m BGL and was sealed by alluvial clay. The causeway consisted of a single stone course, pressed into another thin alluvial clay (6403). This overlay the peat layer (6404) that had the Saxon wooden stake 6408 driven through it. Also in Trench 64 were two almost parallel cuts that appeared to be construction or robber cuts but upon excavating one (6409) they were found to be stone-filled land drains.

1.3.30 The causeway in Trench 98 {9811} ran roughly north-east to south-west and was also a single stone course pressed into alluvial clay but was situated in a wetter area and is thought to be more of an ad hoc route to bridge the gap between islands of drier gravel due to its poor construction. It lay at roughly 0.40m BGL, overlain by a thin alluvial deposit. The feature was only 1.60m wide and did not produce any dating evidence.

1.3.31 In Trench 101 a set of three north-east to south-west aligned, intercutting ditches (10100), (10101) and (10102) were identified which align very well with ditch 10214 in Trench 102. These ditches were all cut from the same horizon though none of them produced any dating evidence. These ditches run on roughly the same alignment as the stone causeway {9811} and the Roman ditch (9907).

1.3.32 In Trench 61 were two ditch termini (6112) and (6114) similar to Trench 46 in that they were almost touching. Both were overlain by alluvium and neither produced any dating material.

1.3.33 Numerous other ditches in this zone were identified but did not clearly align with any other identified linear features. Trench 62 contained NE–SW ditch 6204, which was overlain by alluvium and cut by a possible channel (6207). In Trench 66, NW–SE ditch 6603 was cut from 0.30m BGL, sealed by and cutting alluvial layers. At the south-eastern end of Trench 68 there were also the edges of two converging unexcavated linear features, ENE–WSW feature 6813 and NE–SW feature 6815. Three linear features were identified in Trench 69 all running NE–SW, (6913), (6915) and (6917), although feature 6917 was only seen in section. Ditch (7005) in Trench 70 was cut from the gravel level at roughly 0.50m BGL and ran NW–SE.

1.3.34 Trench 84 contained two parallel sets of intercutting NW–SE linear features, (8407) cut by (8409) and (8411) cutting (8413). These two sets of features both cut the lowest alluvial layer in the trench.

1.3.35 Parallel ditches were also identified in Trench 91, N–S aligned ditches 9105 and 9107, both of which were cut from the gravel horizon at about 0.25–0.30m BGL.

- 1.3.36 The E–W ditch in Trench 86 (8614) and the NNW–SSE ditch 8905 in Trench 89, along with the WNW–ESE ditch 9410 in Trench 94 and the NNE–SSW ditch 9705 in Trench 97 were all overlain by alluvium in their respective trenches, at a depth that varied between 0.40–0.85m BGL. Ditch 8614 contained numerous fragments of undatable fired clay. In some trenches there were deposits that appeared to contain burnt material, many of which were proved to be natural features with iron mineralisation being the cause of the burnt elements.
- 1.3.37 Some trenches encountered just the termini of ditches. In Trench 85, WNW–ESE terminus 8504 survived under 0.50m of alluvial overburden. The terminus in Trench 87 (8726) was similarly located stratigraphically but was oriented NE–SW. Terminus 10512 was aligned NW–SE and also cut from the gravel horizon but the alluvial sequence in this trench was deeper at roughly 0.80m thick.
- 1.3.38 The NW–SE aligned ditch 10404 in Trench 104 and NW–SE gully 10806 in Trench 108 were cut from between 0.50–0.60m BGL.
- 1.3.39 Pits of various sizes were identified across the zone but were far less frequent than the linear features. These features were located in Trenches 70 (7014), 86 (8608), 87 (8719), 94 (9406 and 9408) and 103 (10305).
- 1.3.40 Across the Zone very few postholes were found and they were almost entirely concentrated in Trench 87, which contained five clustered together (8709, 8711, 8713, 8715, 8717) and running across the trench in a NE–SW direction, roughly half way along the trench. Trench 88 contained a single posthole (8805), as did Trench 107 (10704), while in Trench 86 there was the possible posthole (8606).
- 1.3.41 Many of the trenches in this zone contained numerous possible archaeological features; these were tested by partial hand-excavation, that revealed undulating bases, amorphous shapes in plan, or obvious root holes, with no artefacts or evidence of human use, and therefore were interpreted to be natural in origin. However, many of these natural features were filled with deposits very similar to those that filled the archaeological features.

## **Zone XI**

### ***Geoarchaeological Summary***

- 1.3.42 Zone XI is located immediately north-west of South Hinksey village. Here ground levels rise from c 55.2m OD to c 60.5m OD, above the floodplain. The sediments in this zone are dominated by colluvial ploughwash, which invariably appears as a reddish-brown silt loam with variable amounts of poorly sorted limestone gravel. There was a noticeable lack of bedding within the colluvium, which may suggest it built up over a considerable time.
- 1.3.43 This zone is particularly significant due to the large number of archaeological features identified in multiple trenches, along with flint scatters. These features were invariably found stratified within the colluvial deposits. Consequently, excavation did not generally expose Pleistocene gravel and/or Head deposits. The colluvium is oxidized and has low potential for preservation of palaeoenvironmental remains apart from charred material associated with occupation. Molluscs were generally absent or only occasionally preserved in low numbers.

### **Archaeological Summary**

1.3.44 Overall a high concentration of archaeological features were identified in this zone although, similar to Zone VII, associated material culture was sparse.

#### **Mesolithic–early Neolithic**

1.3.45 Across the scheme, three 1.00m<sup>2</sup> sample areas (or test squares) were hand excavated in 0.05m spits for recovery of worked flint artefacts. Two of these sample areas were excavated in Trenches 142 and 144. The worked flint assemblages from each trench turned out to be of very different character, with the earlier of the two located in Trench 144.

1.3.46 In Trench 144 the flint was located within 0.10m of a layer of brownish orange colluvium (14403) at c 0.70m BGL. Two spits were excavated and fully sampled. The flint scatter dated to the late Mesolithic–early Neolithic period and was in fresh condition, which suggests that it resulted from a short episode of flint working either *in situ* or very nearby.

#### **Bronze Age**

1.3.47 The worked flint assemblage from Trench 142 was also located within a greyish reddish brown mottled layer of colluvium (14209) at c 0.60m BGL. The flint was subject to the same excavation method as Trench 144, which also resulted in two spits being fully excavated and sampled from a single test square.

1.3.48 The worked flint recovered from Trench 142 had a higher degree of edge damage typical of an *ex situ* assemblage and was of mixed character suggestive of a general prehistoric to Bronze Age date. Within the second spit of this test square a fragment of (early?) Bronze Age pottery was also recovered.

1.3.49 Trench 155 contained the only human remains recovered from the entire scheme in the form of cremation 15505, which was observed as cutting colluvium at 0.60m BGL. There was no urn associated with the cremation, but a sample of cremated bone produced a middle Bronze Age radiocarbon date of 1390–1130 cal BC (Beta-48075, 3020±30BP).

1.3.50 In Trench 146, NW–SE ditch 14607, a recut of ditch 14610, contained a single sherd of early Bronze Age pottery and is the only linear feature to be solely dated to the Bronze Age across the scheme. However, with the amount of residuality in other features it is quite possible that this is residual. This feature was cut from within the sequence of colluvium at c 0.70m BGL.

#### **Iron Age**

1.3.51 In Trench 142, pit (14212) contained numerous fragments of pottery which were mostly only attributable generally to the early prehistoric period, although one base sherd has been tentatively dated to the Iron Age. This pit was recorded at 0.80m BGL and was sealed by a possible palaeosol (14205) that contained Roman pottery.

1.3.52 In Trench 149, pit 14911 was dated from pottery to the middle–late Iron Age, although there were numerous residual and undatable sherds in the assemblage as well. Pit 16108 in Trench 161 was also dated to the late Iron Age, but it too had residual pottery

in the assemblage. These two pits were both found within the sequence of colluvium but were cut from very different depths. Pit 14911 was recorded at 0.50m and pit 16108 at 1.00m BGL.

- 1.3.53 Pit 16108 was immediately adjacent to ditch 16106, which contained middle–late Iron Age pottery and both features were sealed by colluvial layer 16109.
- 1.3.54 Clusters of postholes were recorded in Trenches 149 and 151. The arrangement of postholes in Trench 151 (15103, 15105, 15107 and 15109) strongly suggests that they form part of a circle for a roundhouse. Posthole 15109 contained pottery that was dated to the early prehistoric period, but a radiocarbon date from charred cereal returned a late Bronze Age to middle Iron Age date at 730–390 cal BC (Beta-481030, 2380±30BP). These postholes cut into reddish brown colluvium 15102 at a depth of 0.70m BGL.
- 1.3.55 In Trench 162 a sequence of three penannular gullies was identified (16206, 16208 and 16210). These gullies were not all cut from the same horizon: the earliest gully (16206) was sealed by colluvial layer 16204, whereas gullies 16208 and 16210 cut into the colluvium and are therefore later. The two later gullies survived at 0.60m and the earlier at 0.75m BGL.
- 1.3.56 Pottery was found in two of the three gullies (16206 and 16208) and has been dated to the middle to late Iron Age and early prehistoric period, respectively. Charred remains from the fill of gully 16206 were dated to the middle to late Iron Age at 360–60 cal BC (Beta-481689, 2150±30BP).
- 1.3.57 Some of the ditches in this zone have been noted to align across trenches. For instance, between Trenches 158 and 159 are NW–SE ditches that may well be continuations. In Trench 159 ditch 15909 and a set of intercutting ditches in Trench 158 (15803, 15805 and 15807) align very well. Whilst ditch 15803 produced middle–late Iron Age pottery, it sits in the middle of the sequence of three ditches, all of which are sealed by the same material horizon that seals ditch 15909. Consequently, discerning which of the three ditches might be running through is not possible. All of these ditches were cut from the same horizon at c 0.50m BGL. Ditch 15403 also lines up well with ditch 15909 and produced early prehistoric pottery, although it was recorded as cutting from just below the topsoil.

### ***Roman***

- 1.3.58 Trench 160 was placed to target one of the few geophysical anomalies within the scheme limit. This was found to be a sequence of three intercutting ditches (16008, 16011 and 16013), aligned roughly E–W and located right on top of the geophysics, which follows the line of the stream to the north remarkably well.
- 1.3.59 The earliest in the sequence, ditch 16013, was sealed by a layer of colluvium (16001), which the two later ditches were cutting. This ditch contained pottery that was dated to the Roman period (AD 43–410) and was cut from c 0.80m BGL.
- 1.3.60 In Trench 142 the Iron Age pit (14212) was sealed by a possible palaeosol (14205), which contained Roman pottery. This layer was then cut by NE–SW ditch 14206, which also contained pottery that dated to the Roman period. This Roman layer survived at c 0.70m BGL.

### ***Saxon***

1.3.61 No archaeological features were present from this period in Zone XI.

### ***Medieval–post-medieval***

1.3.62 As previously noted, the earliest of the ditches in Trench 160 was sealed by layer 16001, which was then cut by two later ditches (16008 and 16013). The latest ditch in the sequence (16008) contained pottery that dated from c 1650–1800. These ditches were cut from just below the topsoil.

### ***Modern***

1.3.63 No archaeological features were present from this period in Zone XI.

### ***Undated***

1.3.64 As highlighted above, several linear ditches in this zone could be lined up across trenches. In Trench 158, NW–SE ditch 15811 and ditch 15814 line up very well with ditch 15905 and ditch terminus 15907, although it is not possible to say which of the ditches in Trench 158 correspond with which in Trench 159. None of these ditches produced any dating material but all are cut from the same horizon and survive at 0.30–0.50m BGL.

1.3.65 The final NW–SE ditch in Trench 158, ditch 15809, lines up very well with ditch 15405, and unexcavated ditch 15911 lies just off the same line in the intermediary trench. None of these features contained any dating material, but the two excavated features were cut from the same horizon, between 0.50–0.60m BGL, and have very similar profiles.

1.3.66 It is interesting to note that none of the ditches in Trench 158 were identified in Trench 157 to the south-east.

1.3.67 The third linear in Trench 154, ditch 15407 was aligned NE–SW and slightly curving. This ditch may run through to Trench 152 and join with the slightly curving WNW–ESE ditch 15210. However, despite being cut from the same horizon at c 0.50–0.60m BGL, the two ditches are curving in slightly different directions which makes this a little tentative.

1.3.68 All of the remaining linear ditches in this this zone did not appear to be aligned with any other features. The NW–SE ditches 14508, 14510, 14603 and 14605, produced no dating evidence, and neither did the E–W aligned ditch 14702. Despite the close proximity of the trenches containing these ditches, the depths below ground level varied from 0.90m in Trench 145 to 0.75m in Trench 146 and 0.50m in Trench 147, which may suggest multiple horizons of activity or variable thicknesses of colluvial deposits.

1.3.69 Closely associated with the penannular gullies in Trench 162 was pit 16212 that was cut from the same horizon as the two later gullies but did not contain any dating material.

1.3.70 Most of the pits in this zone were devoid of any dating evidence, including pits 14506, 15204, 15207, 15212 15903 and 16103. As with the linear ditches, these pits were cut

from various depths below ground level: 0.90m in Trench 145, 0.50m in Trench 152, 0.45m in Trench 159 and 0.90m in Trench 161.

- 1.3.71 Unlike the postholes in Trench 151, the three postholes in Trench 149 (14903, 14905 and 14917) were undated and made no discernible pattern.
- 1.3.72 Some of the trenches in this zone contained possible features which were tested but found to be of natural origin.

## 2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The project took account of pertinent elements of the city and regional resource assessments and research agendas available on the web, such as The Solent-Thames Research Framework for the Historic Environment (Hey and Hind 2014) and the Oxford Archaeological Plan:

[http://thehumanjourney.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=553&Itemid=277](http://thehumanjourney.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=553&Itemid=277)

<http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decP/OxfordArchaeologicalPlan.htm>

<http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decP/OxfordArchaeologicalPlan.htm>

#### General aims and objectives:

2.1.2 The archaeological evaluation general aims were:

- To determine the nature and extent of any remains present within the trenches using sample excavation;
- To determine the date or date range of any remains, by means of artefactual or other evidence, such as scientific dating;
- To determine the nature and state of preservation of any ecofactual remains;
- To report on all archaeological remains and disseminate significant archaeological results via publication in a local Journal (Oxoniensia), or via a stand-alone monograph.

#### Specific aims and objectives

2.1.3 The specific aims and objectives of the project were:

- To ground-truth identified anomalies from previous geophysical and aerial surveys;
- To identify linears, features groups, artefact distributions etc that may run into the area from areas already evaluated nearby;
- To understand the site formation processes and how these relate to the archaeological remains;
- To fully report on the results and consider them in the light of the previous archaeological and geoarchaeological work undertaken for the OFAS.

### 2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The 34 trenches were laid out across Field 3 at the positions shown in the WSI by GPS, with trench numbering followed on from the main evaluation (OA 2018). The trenches were then excavated using two 360° tracked excavators equipped with toothless grading buckets, in maximum 0.2m-thick spits, under constant supervision by experienced archaeologists. The size of the trenches varied depending on location within the field due to service routes or environmental constraints and their excavated positions are shown on Figure 2.

- 2.2.2 All topsoil, subsoil, colluvial or alluvial deposits were removed in spits under the supervision of a trained archaeologist down to the first significant archaeological horizon, the natural gravel terrace or to a maximum depth of 1.0m below current ground level (bgl) depending on which was encountered first.
- 2.2.3 Where archaeological features and/or deposits were encountered a representative selection of these were hand excavated to establish their nature, extent, date, complexity, state of preservation and horizontal and vertical limits within the trench.
- 2.2.4 The stratigraphy of each trench was recorded, with at least one representative section of the sediment sequence recorded for each trench.
- 2.2.5 All archaeological features and deposits were planned and the sample that were excavated were recorded to standards in line with current best practice. The work included the recording of individual contexts in plan using GPS; section drawings of appropriate single contexts and features (at 1:20, 1:10 scales as deemed appropriate). A photographic record was made for each trench and excavated feature.
- 2.2.6 A single trench was excavated to a depth of 2.00m bgl by mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless bucket, in spits of 0.2m under the control of an experienced archaeologist for to enable geoarchaeological recording and sampling of deposits within a potential relict paleochannel. The focus of this was to target organic and alluvial sequences for ecofacts as well as to obtain material suitable for radiocarbon dating.
- 2.2.7 A range of 40L bulk samples were also collected from archaeological features, primarily for the recovery of charred plant remains, charcoal and for waterlogged plant remains and insects.
- 2.2.8 Recovered artefacts were recorded and bagged by individual context apart from small finds, which were given a unique number and their location recorded accurately in 3D.

## 3 RESULTS

### 3.1 Introduction and presentation of results

- 3.1.1 The ten Geoarchaeological Zones (I–X) defined during the 2016 survey (OA 2017a) and the three additional Zones (XI–XIII) defined during the main 2017 archaeological and geoarchaeological evaluation (OA 2018) have been used to present the results of the Field 3 evaluation. This consistent approach allows for a comparative presentation of the additional results with the main evaluation results. The definition of the Zones remains unaltered, although the boundaries for Zones VII and XI have been modified and extended into Field 3 (Fig. 2).
- 3.1.2 The results of the evaluation are presented below as summaries by geoarchaeological zone and period. They move broadly from north to south across Field 3, and include a geoarchaeological zone description, followed by an archaeological description by period – Paleolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman, medieval, post-medieval, modern and undated. Tables quantifying the total number of artefacts and environmental samples (collected and assessed) by zone are also presented below (see Sections 3.6 and 3.7).
- 3.1.3 Context numbers reflect the trench numbers unless stated e.g. ditch 22112 was a feature within Trench 221, while trackway 24304 was a surface within Trench 243.
- 3.1.4 A general description of each trench along with dimensions, depths, a brief descriptor, and artefactual material recovered for all features and deposits are presented in Appendix A. Finds data and spot dates are tabulated in Appendix B. Environmental data is tabulated in Appendix C.

### 3.2 General soils and ground conditions

- 3.2.1 The soil sequence in the trenches was relatively uniform. The natural geology of sands and gravels was overlain by either colluvial or alluvial deposits, the former on the valley slopes (Zone IX), the latter in the valley floor (Zone VII). At the interface of the two zones there would have been mixing of these types of deposits, the detailed differentiation of which would require some scientific analysis beyond the scope of this evaluation (as well as considering that much of this area was not accessible for trenching due to the exclusion zone around the buried Thames Water conduit). All these deposit types were overlain by subsoils, which in turn were overlain by topsoil.
- 3.2.2 Ground conditions throughout the evaluation were generally good, and the site remained dry throughout. Features (archaeological, geoarchaeological or otherwise) and structures, where present, were easy to identify against the colluvial, alluvial or underlying natural geology.

### 3.3 General distribution of archaeological deposits

- 3.3.1 There was a higher concentration of archaeological features, with some clustering, focused upon the lower elevations of Zone XI and to a lesser extent in Zone VII. The highest elevations of Zone XI revealed a much sparser distribution.

3.3.2 A comprehensive sample of features was hand-excavated, including ditches, spreads (including potential surfaces), postholes and pits as well as natural anomalies. In the vast majority of cases where artefactual material was recovered, features were dated to the Iron Age and Roman periods; some of these contexts included residual prehistoric worked flint. A single pit yielded only flint flakes and although undiagnostic they could indicate a broad prehistoric, if not pre-Iron Age date. A single ditch dated to the medieval period. Many of the hand-excavated interventions did not recover any datable material. A single paleochannel was excavated with mechanical assistance, and did not produce any artefacts.

### 3.4 Field 3: Zone VII (Trenches 234–243)

Figures 3, 5 and 9–10, Plates 8–10

#### *Geoarchaeological Summary*

- 3.4.1 Zone VII is in the valley floor, south of the current course of the Hinksey Stream and north-west of South Hinksey village. Existing ground levels here averaged between c 55.17m to 56.09m OD. The fields in this area, mostly under pasture, are known historically as Great Common, Long Common and Little Common. Field 3 includes cropmarks identified from aerial photographs (Fig. 2).
- 3.4.2 This area of Field 3 is characterized by relatively high elevations in the surface of the underlying Northmoor Gravel at c 54.60m to 54.95m OD, overlain by relatively thin units of alluvial material, and as such are almost identical to those recorded within this Zone VII during the previous phase of archaeological investigations.
- 3.4.3 The full stratigraphic sequence of a poorly defined paleochannel was revealed at the southern end of Trench 241. This was mechanically excavated to 2m below the ground (Fig. 10). Sample 24100 from the basal fill produced a small flot comprising fine modern roots with small flecks of possibly charred material <2mm. Three small fragments of indistinguishable nutshell/fruitstone were recovered but were too small to provide sufficient material for radiocarbon dating.

#### *Archaeological Summary*

- 3.4.4 Overall a relatively high concentration of archaeological features was identified in this zone although, similar to Zone XI, associated material culture was sparse.
- 3.4.5 No trenches needed to be moved or relocated in this zone.

#### *Palaeolithic–Iron Age*

- 3.4.6 No archaeological features were present from these periods in Zone VII.

#### *Roman*

- 3.4.7 Trenches 236 and 237 were located to target cropmark/earthwork anomalies, possibly a continuation of a north-east to south-west trackway, as recorded during the last phase of archaeological investigations during 2017 (Trenches 77 and 78).

- 3.4.8 Both Trenches 236 and 237 exposed the full width of the feature. Two parallel ditches were revealed, with the northern most being excavated in Trench 236 (23616; Figs 3 and 9, Plate 8). Unfortunately, the slot did not produce any finds. However, during previous archaeological investigation the ditched trackway radiocarbon dating of waterlogged seeds and twigs from the trackway ditch produced an early to middle Roman date of cal AD 90–240 (Beta-481042, 1840±30 BP; OA 2018). It is noticeable that the ditches were both cut from just below the alluvial subsoil.
- 3.4.9 The cropmarks/earthworks suggested an alignment of discrete anomalies associated with the linears. In Trench 236, one of these was investigated, (23609) and proved to be a geological feature. This was also the case in Trench 237 where irregular features were located along the north-west side of the northern ditch.
- 3.4.10 The trackway measured between 8.35m and 8.56m wide between the inside edges of the two ditches in Trenches 236 and 237. Located between the ditches was a possible hollow-way which was shallow in depth and filled with alluvial clay. This was excavated in Trench 236 (23605) and did not continue into Zone XI.
- 3.4.11 It was possible to trace the trackway for c 97.50m between Trenches 237 and 221 (Zone VII), where this has not been previously identified from cropmark data. It should also be noted that the trackway was not found in either Trenches 214 or 215 and it is possible that the trackway may thread the gap between these two trenches.

### ***Medieval***

- 3.4.12 Overlying the upper alluvial deposits of the paleochannel were several limestone surfaces which are probably the remains of trackways consolidating routeways through softer ground. Whilst no dating was recovered it is anticipated that these date to the medieval period. These were located in Trenches 241 and 243 (24108, 24117, 24119, 24302, 24304 and 24305; Figs 5 and 10, Plates 9–10) and ran NNE–SSW across a paleochannel. The trackway sequence was investigated by hand excavation in Trench 243. Here an area of limestone measuring approximately 15m wide was encountered; the hand-excavated slot across this feature revealed that it was three separate trackways either constructed out of limestone crush or sub-rounded flint. All the causeways consisted of a single stone course, pressed into another alluvial deposit (24303) which in turn overlaid natural geology.
- 3.4.13 It is possible that one of these is the same as the causeway recorded by the previous phase of archaeological evaluation just north of the site, or it is possible that these three trackways are contemporary with each other and merge into one further to the north before it reaches the 2017 trenches.

### ***Modern***

- 3.4.14 Modern features consisted of a limestone soak-away (24124) and associated deposits (24104), as well as a pit (24116). These were all seen to be cut from below the topsoil in Trench 241.

### ***Undated***

- 3.4.15 The vast majority of features recorded in this zone were undatable due to a lack of artefacts. Numerous pits were recorded throughout this zone and varied in size and shape, but the majority had relatively shallow sides with concaved bases. They were all filled with either moderately firm mid-yellowish brown sandy silt or moderately soft mid-orangish brown silty clay.
- 3.4.16 Ditches of various sizes were identified across the zone but were far less frequent than the pits. These features were in Trenches 234 (23411, 23413, 23415), Trench 235 (23505), Trench 236 (23603), Trench 237 (23710), Trench 239 (23910) and Trench 241 (24111).
- 3.4.17 Across the zone a total of nine postholes were found in Trenches 235 (23517), 236, (23618), 238 (23804 and 23814), 239 (23904, 23921 and 23923) and 242 (24207 and 24220).
- 3.4.18 In this zone there were possible features, which were tested by partial hand-excavation, that revealed undulating bases, amorphous shapes in plan, or obvious root holes, with no artefacts or evidence of human use and therefore were interpreted as natural in origin. However, many of these natural features were filled with deposits very similar to those that filled the archaeological features.

## **3.5 Zone XI (Trenches 210–233)**

**Figures 3–4 and 6–9, Plates 1–7**

### ***Geoarchaeological Summary***

- 3.5.1 Zone XI is located immediately north-west of South Hinksey village. Here ground levels rise from c 55.51m OD to c 58.34m OD above the floodplain. The sediments in this zone are dominated by colluvial ploughwash, which invariably appears as a reddish-brown silt loam with variable amounts of poorly sorted limestone gravel. There was a noticeable lack of bedding within the colluvium which may suggest it built up over a considerable time.
- 3.5.2 This zone is particularly significant due to the large number of archaeological features identified during the previous phase of archaeological investigations in 2017, along with flint scatters. Both the 2017 and 2020 features that have been recorded within the colluvium are oxidized and have low potential for preservation of paleoenvironmental remains apart from charred material associated with occupation. Molluscs were generally absent or only occasionally preserved in low numbers.
- 3.5.3 Trenches 211–218 contained archaeological features either cutting or sealed by colluvial deposits. Whilst these were both similar in nature (i.e mid-brownish red or reddish-brown silty sand) it was clear that there was an upper and lower colluvial deposit present only within this area of site. This is most likely due to the surrounding higher ground to the south of the site on the other side of the A34. The upper colluvial deposit spreads further north within this zone and seals features dating from the Roman period, suggesting that the deposit is most likely post-Roman in date. The lower colluvial deposit recorded within these trenches is most likely pre-Roman in date as it

was cut by possible Roman pits in Trench 215. The lower colluvial deposit also sealed earlier undated features, including a pit containing undiagnostic flint flakes and another with nutshell and fruit stones.

### ***Archaeological Summary***

3.5.4 Overall a relatively high concentration of archaeological features was identified in this zone although, similar to Zone VII, associated material culture was densely populated around Trenches 224 to 228.

3.5.5 No trenches needed to be moved or relocated in this zone.

### ***Palaeolithic–Bronze Age***

3.5.6 Three flint flakes were recovered from the same context, fill 21511 from pit 21509, which was sealed within colluvial deposits. The flakes can only be dated to the broad prehistoric period, probably pre-Iron Age, but the pit fills also yielded hazelnut shell (as well as fruit stones), and a distinct lack of domesticated cereal grains which may strengthen the possibility of an earlier, perhaps Mesolithic–Neolithic date.

3.5.7 No other archaeological features could be dated to these periods in Zone XI.

### ***Iron Age***

3.5.8 Trenches 220, 222, 226 to 228 contained a total of nine features (ditches, pits and postholes) dating to either the early or middle Iron Age periods. A total of 73 sherds of pottery were collected from these features.

3.5.9 Four ditches and three pits dating from this period were recorded within the north-west area of Zone XI. They all varied in shape and size with relatively similar fills of either moderately firm mid-yellowish-brown sandy silt or moderately soft mid-orangish grey silty clay. The ditches potentially represent agricultural use of the wider landscape on the periphery of the settlement activity previously identified within Zone XI during the 2017 archaeological investigations.

3.5.10 The number of postholes that contained dating evidence from this period was low, a total of two. It is anticipated that a number of postholes that contained no dating material are most likely of a similar date due to their close proximity to dated features from the Iron Age period. It is also likely that the postholes recorded within Trench 214 are of a similar date, as they were sealed by the lower colluvial deposit (21403), which is cut by two pits in Trench 215 most likely dating from the Roman period.

### ***Roman***

3.5.11 Trenches 221, 230 and 231 were all either located or partly located over the projected line the north-east to south-west ditched trackway, as recorded during the last phase of investigations during 2017 (Trenches 77 and 78). Trenches 230 exposed the full width of the feature. Two parallel ditches were revealed, with the northern ditch being excavated (23004).

3.5.12 The northern ditch can be traced much further south than the cropmark/earthwork anomalies, to Trench 221 (22112). This slot produced four sherds of pottery dating to

the Roman period. The southern ditch was excavated within Trench 231 (23103); however, this part of the ditched trackway was unfortunately not traced any further south within the site. It is possible that the southern ditch continued into the south-eastern extent of Trench 221. It should also be noted that the trackway was not found in either Trenches 214 or 215 and it is possible that the trackway may pass through the gap between these two trenches.

- 3.5.13 As shown in the previous archaeological investigations and in Trenches 236 and 237 a series of discrete cropmark/earthwork anomalies associated with the ditched trackway did not reveal any convincing archaeological features that may relate.
- 3.5.14 Trenches 224 and 226–228 showed a substantial amount of archaeological activity that was either a spread of burnt material, boundary ditches and pits either overlying or cutting a pre-Roman buried soil (22602, 22716 and 22805). The finds recovered from features within the trenches comprised pottery, animal bone, small finds such as pieces of Roman blue glass (discussed in detail below in Appendix B.3) and a Harlow brooch (discussed in detail below in Appendix B.2). These finds, especially the glass and brooch, would suggest that Roman settlement activity is present within or near to this area of site as these finds recovered are indicative to domestic waste from settlement activity from this period.

### ***Medieval***

- 3.5.15 A single feature was recorded within the zone dating to the medieval period. This was a NE–SW ditch in Trench 233 (23306). This measured 3m wide and 0.32m deep with a single fill (23305) and contained pottery dating to the medieval period. The ditch is most likely associated with agricultural activity during this period.

### ***Post-medieval***

- 3.5.16 A single feature was recorded within the zone dating to the post-medieval period. This was an NNE–SSW ditch in Trench 210 (21003). This measured 2m wide and 1m deep containing seven fills (21004–21010). Fill 21004 contained pottery and glass dating from the 19th–20th century. The ditch is most likely associated with agricultural activity during this period as either a boundary or irrigation ditch.

### ***Modern***

- 3.5.17 No archaeological features other than geotechnical trial holes were present from this period in Zone XI.

### ***Undated***

- 3.5.18 The vast majority of features recorded in this zone were undatable due to a lack of artefacts.
- 3.5.19 Ditches of various sizes were identified across the zone but did not clearly align with any other identified features, except for ditches 23122, 23210 and 23304 in the north-east area of the zone. Whilst no dating was recovered from these features it is anticipated that they date from the Roman period, as for example, ditch 23304 is cut by a subsequent medieval ditch (23306). It is possible that these ditches from part of

a Roman rectilinear system around the ditched trackway and the square enclosure (OA 2018, Trenches 77, 79–81 and 83).

3.5.20 Numerous pits were recorded throughout this zone and varied in size and shape, but the majority were relatively shallow, with sloping sides and concaved bases. They were all filled with either moderately firm mid-yellowish brown sandy silt or moderately soft mid-orangish brown silty clay.

3.5.21 In this zone there were also anomalies that were sample excavated as possible archaeological features, but when tested by partial hand-excavation they revealed undulating bases, amorphous shapes in plan, or obvious root holes, with no artefacts or evidence of human use and therefore were interpreted as natural in origin. However, many of these natural features were filled with deposits very similar to those that filled the archaeological features.

### 3.6 Artefactual summary

3.6.1 The total number of artefacts recovered by hand during excavation and from soil samples have been collated by material type and zone and are presented in Table 1 below. Full specialist reports are presented by material type in Appendix B.

**Table 1: Quantification of artefactual material by zone**

Zone	VII	XI	Total
Prehistoric pottery	-	73	73
Late Iron Age/ Roman pottery	1	420	421
Medieval and later pottery	-	3	3
Undated	-	6	6
Flint	-	7	7
Animal bone	18	397	415
Glass	-	5	5
Metal	-	2	2

### 3.7 Environmental sampling summary

3.7.1 The total number of soil samples collected by zone and those assessed by material category of this phase of work are presented in Table 2. Full specialist reports are presented in Appendix C.

**Table 2: Sample summary**

Zone	Samples collected/ assessed	Samples Assessed	
	Bulk	WPR	CPR
VII	4	1	3
XI	16	6	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>

## 4 DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Reliability of field investigation

- 4.1.1 The trenches represent a c 4% sample of the available area of Field 3. This is nearly double the coverage from the main phase evaluation (OA 2018) and has proven to be substantially adequate to inform, understand, assess and draw wider conclusions on the potential archaeological and geoarchaeological features that lie within this area.
- 4.1.2 The scope of the evaluation, trench positions and their design were a result of a deliberate, iterative, staged and sequential approach to further understand the landscape and areas of archaeological and geoarchaeological potential crossed by the scheme.
- 4.1.3 Each trench was reviewed and the excavation strategy for the archaeological and geoarchaeological remains were discussed and agreed on site by experienced archaeologists, geoarchaeologists and where necessary with the Local Planning Archaeologist for Oxfordshire County Council.
- 4.1.4 OA's network of highly experienced in-house and external specialists have contributed to the post-fieldwork assessment. The project has been overseen by OA Project Managers from the Field and Geoarchaeology Departments, with significant experience of the archaeology of the Oxford region and the Thames floodplain. This level of experience within the team and rigour of approach, with checks and counterbalances, allows for a high level of reliability to be attached to the quality of the fieldwork and its results.

### 4.2 Evaluation objectives and results

- 4.2.1 All the aims and objectives of the evaluation work as set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation (OA 2020) have been comprehensively addressed by the thorough fieldwork programme and detailed post-fieldwork studies.
- 4.2.2 The decision to excavate the trenches to the first significant archaeological horizon, the Pleistocene gravels or to a maximum depth of 1m bgl has provided a broad and comprehensive data set that can be used to inform direct and indirect design and construction process impacts upon the heritage resources encountered (Fig. 11).
- 4.2.3 A full and comprehensive physical and digital archive has been compiled. Of note is the project's invaluable GIS model. Significant data on the deposit sequences, underlying gravel and surface topography were logged by OA.
- 4.2.4 All artefacts and ecofacts have been stabilized and stored appropriately. Samples that have not been assessed at this stage are available for future study, if and when required.

### 4.3 Interpretation

- 4.3.1 The wider scheme (including Field 3) crosses a landscape that has been shaped and exploited by human activity, along with natural processes for millennia. Much of the evidence is rural and agrarian in nature, which has left diffuse and ephemeral archaeological remains throughout the landscape with limited material cultural

assemblages. The evaluation work in Field 3 revealed a significant density of archaeological features associated with a concentration of material culture, which focused within the Iron Age and Roman periods. The results are significant, and the evaluation has revealed and added to information about human activity and change first noted in 2017 (OA 2018).

- 4.3.2 The results therefore build upon previous work and the geoarchaeological zones of VII and XI have been extended into the site to encompass this phase of works. These geoarchaeological zones, as defined by previous works, relate to the underlying topography of the scheme and offer a framework for a coherent understanding and initial model of the full range of archaeological and geoarchaeological discoveries of the project as a whole.
- 4.3.3 The site can be summarised into seven distinct characteristics based on the type of geoarchaeology and archaeology within Field 3. These areas are as follows:

#### *Colluvial deposits (Fig. 6, Plate 1)*

- 4.3.4 Zone XI, examined with trenches 210–233, was characterized by the presence of colluvial deposits below the subsoil and overlying the natural gravel. These deposits would have washed down from the valley slopes that rise to the south of Field 3 on the other side of the A34. Generally, two episodes or units were recognized, but in one trench up to four different colluvial deposits were present, and in others none. Colluvial deposition is a complex process; it can be localized or general, it can result from a short-lived event or a process that occurs over a long period of time. It is also extremely difficult to equate a colluvial unit within one trench to one in another trench, and therefore these will be discussed and their presence and relationship to archaeological features noted more generally.
- 4.3.5 The majority of features in Zone XI dated to the early–middle Iron Age or Roman period (see below) and these were only visible in plan when all the colluvial deposits were removed, i.e. the colluvium sealed the significant archaeological horizon. It should be noted that the fills of the features were often quite similar in colour and composition to the colluvial deposits.
- 4.3.6 An undated feature (21509) containing three undiagnostic flint flakes and some burnt stone was not recognized in plan but in section cut a lower colluvial unit in trench 215, so it is possible that significant archaeological horizons were present, but missed, within the colluvial sequences. However, in many trenches there were significant concentrations of features it is highly likely that the significant archaeological horizon was identified.
- 4.3.7 Where the only dated medieval feature (23306) was identified in Trench 233 it did not have any physical relationship with the colluvium present in other parts of the trench.
- 4.3.8 Therefore, broadly the evidence for Field 3 suggests that at least some of the colluvial events were post-Roman in date. It should be noted though that in 2017 further to the south in Zone XI the colluvium contained *ex situ* worked flints (late Mesolithic–early Neolithic), and in one case separated two phases of Iron Age settlement.

### ***Alluvial deposits***

- 4.3.9 Zone VII, examined with Trenches 234–243, was characterized by the presence of alluvial deposits, waterlain by inundation events/processes, short-lived and/or seasonal or long-lasting related to the River Thames and the multiple channels that characterise it in this part of the floodplain.
- 4.3.10 A paleochannel, filled with alluvial sedimentation, was observed in Trenches 240–242. Mechanically assisted excavation revealed a poorly defined base and an absence of organic rich deposits. The feature remains undated, as no material suitable for radiocarbon dating was recovered from the soil sample.
- 4.3.11 All the Iron Age and Roman archaeological features within these trenches were filled with sediments that were alluvial in nature and suggest periods of inundation. It is notable that these features were less indicative of settlement and more associated with land division and routeways, suggesting this area was not suitable for the type of settlement activity seen further upslope in those periods.
- 4.3.12 The possible stone trackways in Trenches 241 and 243 were clearly in part associated with the paleochannel and probably acted to consolidate the softer ground created by, and near, the infilled paleochannels. These surfaces, possibly late Saxon (see below), were in turn sealed below later deposits of alluvium.
- 4.3.13 These results corroborate conclusions from the 2017 evaluation that the process of alluvial deposition was occurring during the Iron Age and Roman periods as well as later in the medieval period.

### ***Iron Age activity***

- 4.3.14 Trenches 220, 222 and 226–228 contained a total of nine features (ditches, pits and postholes) dating to either the early or middle Iron Age periods. A total of 73 sherds of pottery were collected from these features. The ditches probably represent boundaries for fields associated with agricultural/pastoral practices that would have characterised this landscape.
- 4.3.15 Of the excavated postholes, only two contained dating evidence from this period, however due to their proximity the undated postholes can probably be considered to belong to the same periods. The postholes potentially indicate structures, possibly domestic roundhouses. Pits were also located close to the postholes and together these point towards a small perhaps unenclosed and dispersed settlement or farmstead similar to evidence further to the south in this Zone from the 2017 evaluation.
- 4.3.16 The absence of late Iron Age evidence in Field 3 is noticeable, and perhaps suggests in combination with the results from 2017 in Trench 162 that habitation was focused further to the south and associated with settlement enclosure later in the period.

### ***Roman domestic activity (Figs 4 and 7, Plates 2–6)***

- 4.3.17 Trenches 224 and 226–228 uncovered a substantial amount of archaeological activity that is most likely to be Roman in date. The artefacts recovered from features within Trenches 224 and 226–228 were pottery, small finds such as pieces of Roman glass, a

piece of rotary quern and a brooch. In addition, the ecofacts such as the animal bones and charred cultivated plant remains found within feature fills also contribute to the understanding of the activities and diet of that community. These finds indicate that Roman settlement activity is present within or near to this area of site as these finds recovered are indicative of domestic waste activity from this period.

#### ***Roman ditched trackway (Figs 3 and 9, Plate 8)***

- 4.3.18 Located across Trenches 221, 230, 231, 236 and 237 was the continuation of the Roman ditched trackway which was initially identified from aerial photographs, mapped as part of the National Mapping Programme (NMP) and sample excavated in 2017. This stage of the evaluation has shown that the ditched trackway extends much further to the south-west up the slope of the valley sides than previously known and mapped on the NMP.
- 4.3.19 Another interesting feature most likely associated with the ditched trackway was the potential hollowing from use located between the flanking ditches. This was investigated within Trench 236 and was subsequently sampled for waterlogged remains. This hollow was also present within Trenches 230 and 237.

#### ***Paleochannel and associated medieval trackways (Figs 5 and 10, Plates 9–10)***

- 4.3.20 Trenches 239–243 recorded alluvial deposits that are associated with a paleochannel. The full sequence of this channel was investigated with mechanical assistance within Trench 241 to a depth of 2m bgl. Overlying the upper deposits of the paleochannel in Trenches 241 and 243 were several stone spreads with the appearance of surfaces that may represent parts of more extensive routeways. These were sample hand-excavated within Trench 243. Here a spread of limestone measuring approximately 15m wide was encountered, the hand excavated slot across this surface revealed this comprised three separate trackways either constructed out of limestone pieces or sub-rounded flint river pebbles.
- 4.3.21 It is probable that these surfaces are associated with similar surfaces located close by to the north-east and recorded in Trench 64 (OA 2018). Therefore is likely that the Field 3 examples are of a similar late Saxon–medieval date.

#### ***Undated (Fig. 8, Plate 7)***

- 4.3.22 The features encountered within the site varied in form, including ditches, pits, postholes, structural surfaces and depositional spreads. The features were subject to sample hand excavation and the majority did not yield any datable artefacts.
- 4.3.23 Many possible archaeological features were tested by sample hand-excavation and revealed undulating bases, amorphous shapes in plan, or obvious root holes, with no artefacts or evidence of human use and therefore were interpreted as natural in origin. However, many of these natural features were filled with deposits very similar to those that filled the archaeological features.

## 4.4 Significance

- 4.4.1 The discovery of archaeological deposits and features that have not previously been recorded within the site is of high local and potentially regional significance and build upon evidence from the previous evaluation (OA 2018).
- 4.4.2 Datable pre-Iron Age activity was limited to a handful of residual pieces of flintwork (and many of these were either undiagnostic or broadly attributable to the Mesolithic–Neolithic period). It is probable that some of the undated features date to the Bronze Age or earlier and reflect the pattern seen in the 2017 evaluation.
- 4.4.3 The discovery of early to late Iron Age settlement activity recorded within Zone XI during the previous stages of archaeological work are of high local (and potentially regional) significance with this evaluation demonstrating that the evidence for Iron Age activity continues into Field 3. The ditches probably relate to land divisions and agrarian use of the wider landscape within which there is evidence for roundhouses belonging to dispersed settlement, perhaps farmsteads. The absence of late Iron Age evidence in this area is notable.
- 4.4.4 The Roman remains in Field 3 develop and maintain the high local (and potentially regional) significance attributed to them from the previous evaluation (OA 2018). In Field 3 a continuation of a probable NE–SW orientated routeway evaluated in 2017 was revealed to extend up-slope beyond the limit of the cropmark feature. The material culture, such as pottery, animal bone and charred plant remains as were found in 2017, confirm settlement, agricultural and pastoral activity. However, the volume of this material combined with the Roman glass, Harlow brooch, ceramic building material (tile), and the rotary quern stone recovered from Trenches 224 and 226–228, material classes not previously recovered (OA 2018), add further detail to a picture of activity within, and the status of that settlement. This strongly indicates that significant Roman settlement activity is present within or very near to this area of the site. This evidence for settlement, the routeway and enclosure are set within a network of parallel and perpendicular boundary ditches probably representing contemporary field systems. The work in Field 3 revealed further and more compelling evidence that there was a link between settlement activity on the slopes of the valley (Zone XI) to agricultural and/or pastoral activity along those same slopes and extending into the valley floor (Zone VII).
- 4.4.5 The remains of three possible trackways/causeways directly overlying the area of a paleochannel within Zone VII (Trenches 241 and 243) are likely to be continuations of similar features dated to the late Saxon–medieval periods and identified in Trench 64 (OA 2018). They have a high local significance and a medium regional significance in relation to understanding the wider landscape, environmental change and the connections between Oxford and its hinterland.
- 4.4.6 Archaeological remains dating from the post-medieval and modern periods are of low significance within Field 3.

## 4.5 Assessment of the proposed impacts and mitigation considerations

- 4.5.1 The evaluation revealed that significant archaeological deposits and features survive within Field 3. These remains were concentrated but not exclusive to the lower

- elevations of the slopes at the edge of the valley floor in Zone XI and focused upon the Iron Age and Roman periods, with some limited evidence for earlier and later activity.
- 4.5.2 Across Field 3 the first significant archaeological horizon was encountered at varying depths of between 0.30m and 0.80m below the existing ground level (Fig. 11). Evidence for stratification was also apparent both on the valley sides and floor; on the upper parts of the slopes, in Zone XI in Trench 215, episodes/processes of colluviation separated two significant archaeological horizons, and on the valley floor, Zone VII in Trench 241, there was also evidence for two significant archaeological horizons but here these were separated by the processes of alluviation.
- 4.5.3 The proposed impacts within Field 3 are associated with the construction and subsequent use of a construction compound, as well as the area's reinstatement afterwards. Impacts are twofold, and comprise;
1. Ground reduction (e.g. to accommodate the compound surface and any services required, and later reinstatement design), and
  2. Compression (general e.g. storage of materials, movement of plant and specifically rutting).
- 4.5.4 The construction design for the compound, and any temporary services it may need, has not yet been finalised. However, the Principal Contractor, VolkerStevin Ltd, have indicated that it will involve c 0.30m-deep ground reduction to remove the existing grass cover and topsoil with the compound surface built-up from that reduced level. The reinstatement design has not been finalised.
- 4.5.5 The proposed ground-reduction depth of 0.3m bgl will, in very limited areas adjacent to the north-eastern boundary, reveal the first significant archaeological horizon, as shown on Figure 11. This figure also shows that over the majority of the site a 0.2m-deep cover of existing ground would be left *in situ* over the significant archaeological horizon, which was encountered at depths of 0.5m bgl or lower.
- 4.5.6 The key to reducing potential impacts from the use of this area within the scheme are currently five-fold, and lie in;
1. The compound design,
  2. The construction process,
  3. The subsequent use of the compound,
  4. The reinstatement design,
  5. The reinstatement process.
- 4.5.7 The compound and reinstatement designs should consider direct ground removal and indirect compression upon the significant archaeological horizons.
- 4.5.8 During the compound's use the design must consider compression from long-term storage of materials, and areas where there will be heavy plant use. Subsidence from 'soft spots' in the existing ground and heavy use areas should be considered.
- 4.5.9 The design should build up rather than reduce the ground as much as possible, and consider the use of strengthening geo-textiles.

- 4.5.10 The construction and reinstatement processes must avoid over-tracking the stripped areas by plant, always working from a leading edge.
- 4.5.11 Any reinstatement that involves increases in the loads upon the ground from those that are currently on the site, e.g. landscaping of imported material to raise levels, will need to consider the effect of compression.
- 4.5.12 Any reinstatement landscaping should avoid final contouring that result in ground levels below those which currently exist at the site.

## APPENDIX A TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY

<b>Trench 210</b>							
General description						Orientation	E-W
Trench contained a post-medieval ditch cutting the natural. This was overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	25
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.56
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
21000	Layer			0.28	Topsoil		
21001	Layer			0.47	Subsoil/Colluvium		
21002	Layer				Natural		
21003	Cut		2	1	Ditch		
21004	Fill	21003	1.53	0.26	Primary Fill	Pottery Glass	Post-Medieval L19C- E20C
21005	Fill	21003	1.53	0.32	Secondary Fill		
21006	Fill	21003	1.55	0.3	Other Fill. Unexcavated		
21007	Fill	21003	1	0.1	Other Fill. Unexcavated		
21008	Fill	21003	1	0.32	Other Fill. Unexcavated		
21009	Fill	21003	1	0.38	Other Fill. Unexcavated		
21010	Fill	21003	0.5	0.24	Other Fill. Unexcavated		
<b>Trench 211</b>							
General description						Orientation	NNW-SSE
Trench contained a possible pit or geological feature cutting the natural. This was overlain by a colluvial layer which was in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.6
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
21100	Layer			0.2	Topsoil		
21101	Layer			0.2	Subsoil		
21102	Layer			0.2	Colluvial Layer		
21103	Fill	21104	0.94	0.1	Primary Fill		
21104	Cut		0.94	0.1	Pit		
21105	Layer				Natural		
<b>Trench 212</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE-SW
						Length (m)	50

Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of natural overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.9
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
21200	Layer			0.1	Topsoil		
21201	Layer			0.12	Subsoil		
21202	Layer			0.21	Colluvial Layer. Upper Colluvial		
21203	Layer			0.4	Colluvial Layer. Lower Colluvial		
21204	Layer				Natural		
21205	Cut		2.36	0.31	Ditch		
21206	Fill		2.36	0.31	Primary Fill		
21207	Cut		1.1	0.24	Ditch		
21208	Fill	21207	1.1	0.24	Primary Fill		
<b>Trench 213</b>							
General description						Orientation	WNW-ESE
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of natural overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.66
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
21300	Layer			0.2	Topsoil		
21301	Layer			0.06	Subsoil		
21302	Layer			0.17	Colluvial Layer. Upper Colluvial		
21303	Layer			0.15	Colluvial Layer. Lower Colluvial		
21304	Layer				Natural		
<b>Trench 214</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE-SW
Trench contained a series of post-holes and possible small pit cutting the natural. These were overlain by a series of colluvial deposits which was in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.6
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
21400	Layer			0.2	Topsoil		
21401	Layer			0.1	Subsoil		
21402	Layer			0.3	Colluvial Layer. Upper Colluvial		
21403	Layer			0.16	Colluvial Layer. Lower Colluvial		
21404	Layer				Natural		

21405	Cut		0.33	0.1	Posthole		
21406	Fill	21405	0.33	0.1	Primary Fill		
21407	Cut		0.08	0.22	Posthole		
21408	Fill	21407	0.08	0.22	Primary Fill		
21409	Cut		0.5	0.11	Pit		
21410	Fill	21409	0.5	0.11	Primary Fill		
21411	Cut		0.4	0.1	Posthole		
21412	Fill	21411	0.4	0.1	Primary Fill		
21413	Cut		0.3		Posthole. Unexcavated		
21414	Fill	21413	0.3		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21415	Cut		0.14		Posthole. Unexcavated		
21416	Fill	21415	0.14		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21417	Cut		0.5		Posthole. Unexcavated		
21418	Fill	21417	0.5		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21419	Cut		0.48		Posthole. Unexcavated		
21420	Fill	21419	0.48		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21421	Cut		0.34		Posthole. Unexcavated		
21422	Fill	21421	0.34		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21423	Cut		0.34		Pit. Unexcavated		
21424	Fill	21423	0.34		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21425	Cut		0.3		Pit. Unexcavated		
21426	Fill	21425	0.3		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21427	Cut		0.32		Pit. Unexcavated		
21428	Fill	21427	0.32		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21429	Cut		0.3		Posthole. Unexcavated		
21430	Fill	21429	0.3		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21431	Cut		0.23		Posthole. Unexcavated		
21432	Fill	21431	0.23		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21433	Cut		0.18		Posthole. Unexcavated		

21434	Fill	21433	0.18		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21435	Cut		0.36		Pit. Unexcavated		
21436	Fill	21435	0.36		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		

**Trench 215**

General description						Orientation	NNW-SSE
Trench contained a single pit cutting which was overlain by a series of colluvial deposits, one of which was cut by a pit and sealed by a final colluvial deposit. This was in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.85
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
21500	Layer			0.18	Topsoil		
21501	Layer			0.12	Subsoil		
21502	Layer			0.27	Upper Colluvial Layer		
21503	Layer			0.24	Lower Colluvial Layer		
21504	Layer				Natural		
21505	Cut		0.94	0.24	Pit		
21506	Fill	21505	0.74	0.06	Primary Fill		
21507	Fill	21505	0.94	0.1	Secondary Fill	Animal Bone, CPR	
21508	Fill	21505	0.94	0.06	Other Fill		
21509	Cut		1.58	0.28	Pit		
21510	Fill	21509	1.58	0.19	Primary Fill		
21511	Fill	21509	1	0.14	Secondary Fill	Flint, Burnt Stone	
21512	Layer			0.9	Colluvial Layer		

**Trench 216**

General description						Orientation	NE-SW
Trench contained a possible geological feature or pit and was overlain by a sequence of colluvial deposits. This was in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.45
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
21600	Layer			0.16	Topsoil		
21601	Layer			0.1	Subsoil		
21602	Layer			0.16	Upper Colluvial Layer		
21603	Layer			0.14	Lower Colluvial Layer		
21604	Layer				Natural		
21605	Layer				Natural		

21606	Cut		1.18	0.18	Natural Feature		
21607	Fill	21606	1.18	0.18	Primary Fill		
<b>Trench 217</b>							
General description						Orientation	NW-SE
Trench contained three ditches cutting the natural. These were overlain by a colluvial layer which was in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.52
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
21700	Layer			0.26	Topsoil		
21701	Layer			0.08	Subsoil		
21702	Layer			0.11	Colluvial Layer		
21703	Layer				Natural		
21704	Cut		0.25	0.25	Ring Gully		
21705	Fill	21704	0.25	0.25	Primary Fill		
21706	Cut		0.43	0.17	Ditch		
21707	Fill	21706	0.43	0.17	Primary Fill		
21708	Cut		1.3		Ditch. Unexcavated		
21709	Fill	21708	1.3		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
<b>Trench 218</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE-SW
Trench contained a large feature at the NE end. This was overlain by colluvial, which was in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.8
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
21800	Layer			0.23	Topsoil		
21801	Layer			0.21	Subsoil		
21802	Layer			0.17	Upper Colluvial Layer		
21803	Layer			0.21	Middle Colluvial Layer		
21804	Layer			0.25	Lower Colluvial Layer		
21805	Layer				Natural		
21806	Cut		11.5	0.56	Other Cut. Unexcavated large feature that also appears in Tr219. This was probed to get		

					profile of feature at 1m intervals.		
21807	Fill	21806	11.5	0.56	Primary Fill		
<b>Trench 219</b>							
General description						Orientation	NW-SE
Trench contained a continuation of the large feature recorded in Tr 218. This trench also contained a series of intercutting pits, a ditch and 2 pits. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.7
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Findings	Date
21900	Layer			0.21	Topsoil		
21901	Layer			0.35	Subsoil		
21902	Layer			0.26	Upper Colluvial Layer		
21903	Layer			0.18	Lower Colluvial Layer		
21904	Layer				Natural		
21905	Cut		1.83		Ditch. Unexcavated		
21906	Fill	21905	1.83		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21907	Cut		0.74	0.28	Pit		
21908	Fill	21907	0.74	0.12	Secondary Fill		
21909	Fill	21907	0.74	0.16	Primary Fill	Animal Bone, Burnt Stone	
21910	Cut		0.86	0.36	Pit		
21911	Fill	21910	0.86	0.36	Primary Fill		
21912	Cut		0.8	0.2	Ditch		
21913	Fill	21912	0.8	0.2	Primary Fill		
21914	Cut		1.18	0.34	Pit		
21915	Fill	21914	1.18	0.34	Primary Fill		
21916	Cut		0.48		Pit. Unexcavated		
21917	Fill	21916	0.48		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21918	Cut		5		Other Cut. Unexcavated		
21919	Fill	21918	5		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21920	Cut		0.5		Pit. Unexcavated		
21921	Fill	21920	0.5		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
21922	Cut		0.65		Natural Feature. Unexcavated		
21923	Fill	21922	0.65		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		

<b>Trench 220</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE-SW
Trench contained six ditches and four pits cutting either the natural or a buried soil. These were overlain by colluvial, which was in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.8
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Findings	Date
22000	Layer			0.18	Topsoil	Pottery Glass	Medieval 18C – 19C
22001	Layer			0.08	Subsoil		
22002	Layer			0.11	Uppermost Colluvial Layer		
22003	Layer			0.2	Colluvial Layer		
22004	Layer			0.3	Colluvial Layer		
22005	Layer			0.4	Colluvial Layer		
22006	Layer			0.3	Lowest Colluvial Layer		
22007	Layer				Natural		
22008	Cut		1.45	0.53	Pit		
22009	Fill	22008	0.57	0.05	Primary Fill		
22010	Fill	22008	0.69	0.2	Secondary Fill		
22011	Fill	22008	0.83	0.22	Tertiary Fill	Flint, Animal Bone	
22012	Fill	22008	0.18	0.22	Other Fill	Pottery	Early Iron Age
22013	Fill	22008	0.19	0.12	Other Fill		
22014	Cut		0.27	0.23	Posthole		
22015	Fill	22014	0.27	0.23	Primary Fill		
22016	Cut		0.9	0.18	Pit		
22017	Fill	22016	0.9	0.18	Primary Fill		
22018	Cut		0.97	0.12	Pit		
22019	Fill	22018	0.97	0.12	Primary Fill		
22020	Cut		0.6	0.17	Ditch		
22021	Fill	22020	0.6	0.17	Primary Fill		
22022	Cut		1.06	0.45	Ditch		
22023	Fill	22022	0.82	0.26	Primary Fill		
22024	Fill	22022	1.06	0.2	Secondary Fill		
22025	Cut		0.64		Pit. Unexcavated		
22026	Fill	22025	0.64		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22027	Cut		1.3		Tree Throw. Unexcavated		
22028	Fill	22027	1.3		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22029	Cut		0.43		Pit. Unexcavated		

22030	Fill	22029	0.43		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery	Late Iron Age-Early Roman
22031	Cut		0.9		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22032	Fill	22031	0.9		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22033	Cut		2		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22034	Fill	22033	2		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery  Animal Bone	AD 43- 410
22035	Cut		2		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22036	Fill	22035	2		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery	AD 43- 410
22037	Cut		2		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22038	Fill	22037	2		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		

**Trench 221**

General description						Orientation	NW-SE
Trench contained seven ditches, four pits and a post-hole. These were overlain by colluvial, which was in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.73
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
22100	Layer			0.18	Topsoil		
22101	Layer			0.12	Subsoil		
22102	Layer			0.23	Upper Colluvial Layer		
22103	Layer			0.2	Lower Colluvial Layer		
22104	Layer				Natural		
22105	Cut		0.8	0.2	Pit		
22106	Fill	22105	0.8	0.2	Primary Fill		
22107	Void						
22108	Fill	22112	1.72	0.16	Other Fill. Unexcavated	Pottery	AD 43- 410
22109	Fill	22112	1.48	0.16	Tertiary Fill		
22110	Fill	22112	0.86	0.2	Secondary Fill		
22111	Fill	22112	0.7	0.2	Primary Fill		
22112	Cut		1.72	0.5	Ditch. Trackway ditch	CPR	
22113	Fill	22114	1	0.42	Primary Fill		
22114	Cut		1	0.42	Ditch		

22115	Fill	22116	0.26	0.1	Primary Fill		
22116	Cut		0.26	0.1	Posthole		
22117	Fill	22118	0.52	0.22	Primary Fill		
22118	Cut		0.52	0.22	Ditch		
22119	Fill	22120	0.54	0.2	Primary Fill		
22120	Cut		0.54	0.2	Ditch		
22121	Fill	22122	0.78	0.4	Primary Fill		
22122	Cut		0.78	0.4	Ditch		
22123	Fill	22124	1.42		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22124	Cut		1.42		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22125	Fill	22126	0.76		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22126	Cut		0.76		Pit. Unexcavated		
22127	Fill	22128	0.79		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22128	Cut		0.79		Pit. Unexcavated		
22129	Fill	22130	1.32		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22130	Cut		1.32		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22131	Fill	22132	9.36		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22132	Cut		9.36		Ditch. Unexcavated		

**Trench 222**

General description						Orientation	NE-SW
Trench contained five ditches, a pit and a geological feature cutting the natural. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.7
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
22200	Layer			0.18	Topsoil		
22201	Layer			0.12	Subsoil		
22202	Layer			0.32	Colluvial Layer		
22203	Layer			0.23	Colluvial Layer		
22204	Layer			0.19	Colluvial Layer		
22205	Layer			0.2	Colluvial Layer		
22206	Layer				Natural		
22207	Cut		0.42	0.25	Ditch		
22208	Fill	22207	0.42	0.25	Primary Fill		
22209	Cut		1.28	0.26	Ditch		
22210	Fill	22209	1.28	0.26	Primary Fill		
22211	Cut		0.96	0.42	Pit		

22212	Fill	22211	0.13	0.12	Primary Fill		
22213	Fill	22211	0.96	0.4	Secondary Fill	Pottery	Early-Middle Iron Age
22214	Cut		0.95	0.17	Ditch		
22215	Fill	22214	0.2	0.11	Primary Fill		
22216	Fill	22214	0.79	0.14	Secondary Fill	Pottery	Early-Middle Iron Age
22217	Cut		1.33		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22218	Fill	22217	1.33		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery Glass Animal Bone	AD 43-410 Roman
22219	Cut		1.12		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22220	Fill	22219	1.12		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery	AD43-410
22221	Cut		0.72		Pit. Unexcavated		
22222	Fill	22221	0.72		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22223	Cut		0.97		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22224	Fill	22223	0.97		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery Animal Bone	AD 50-410
22225	Cut		0.45		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22226	Fill	22225	0.45		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22227	Cut		1.1		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22228	Fill	22227	1.1		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery	AD 43-410
22229	Layer		2.55		Buried soil. Unexcavated	Pottery	AD 100-300
<b>Trench 223</b>							
General description						Orientation	NW-SE
Trench contained a possible ditch or elongated pit, a ditch and three pits cutting the natural. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.4
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
22300	Layer			0.2	Topsoil		
22301	Layer			0.1	Subsoil		
22302	Layer			0.22	Colluvial Layer		

22303	Layer			0.21	Colluvial Layer		
22304	Layer				Natural		
22305	Cut		0.6	0.18	Ditch		
22306	Fill	22305	0.6	0.18	Primary Fill		
22307	Cut		2	0.25	Pit		
22308	Fill	22307	2	0.25	Primary Fill		
22309	Cut		0.65	0.16	Pit		
22310	Fill	22309	0.65	0.16	Primary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone	AD 43-410
22311	Cut		0.5	0.12	Ditch		
22312	Fill	22311	0.5	0.12	Primary Fill		
<b>Trench 224</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE-SW
Trench contained four ditches, seven pits and four post-holes. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.58
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
22400	Layer			0.3	Topsoil		
22401	Layer			0.26	Subsoil		
22402	Cut		1.1	0.6	Ditch		
22403	Fill	22402	0.7	0.2	Primary Fill		
22404	Fill	22402	0.62	0.2	Secondary Fill		
22405	Fill	22402	1.1	0.4	Tertiary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone	AD100-410
22406	Cut		0.82	0.24	Pit		
22407	Fill	22406	0.82	0.22	Primary Fill		
22408	Fill	22406	0.75	0.1	Secondary Fill	Pottery	AD 50-100
22409	Cut		2.74	0.5	Pit		
22410	Fill	22409	2.74	0.5	Primary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone	Early-Middle Iron Age, AD 43-410
22411	Cut		1.24	1	Ditch		
22412	Fill	22411	0.8	0.9	Primary Fill		
22413	Fill	22411	0.7	0.5	Secondary Fill	Pottery Glass	AD 43-410 Roman
22414	Fill	22411	1.24	0.66	Tertiary Fill	Pottery	AD 250-410

						Animal Bone	
22415	Cut		1.8		Ditch. Unexcavated		
22416	Fill	22415			Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22417	Fill	22415			Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22418	Cut		1.95		Pit. Unexcavated		
22419	Fill	22418	1.95		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22420	Cut		0.6		Pit. Unexcavated		
22421	Fill	22420	0.6		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery	AD 43-410
22422	Cut		0.7		Pit. Unexcavated		
22423	Fill	22422	0.7		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery	?AD 43-100
22424	Cut		0.8		Pit. Unexcavated		
22425	Fill	22424	0.8		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22426	Cut		1		Pit. Unexcavated		
22427	Fill	22426	1		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Animal Bone	
22428	Cut		0.5		Posthole. Unexcavated		
22429	Fill	22428	0.5		Other Fill. Unexcavated.	Pottery CBM - tile	AD 43-410
22430	Cut		0.36		Posthole. Unexcavated		
22431	Fill	22430	0.36		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22432	Cut		0.34		Posthole. Unexcavated		
22433	Fill	22432	0.34		Other Fill. Unexcavated.		
22434	Layer				Natural		
<b>Trench 225</b>							
General description						Orientation	NW/SE
Trench contained natural sands and gravels overlain by subsoil. A modern feature was seen cutting the subsoil. This was overlain by topsoil						Length (m)	10
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.52
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
22500	Layer			0.2	Topsoil		
22501	Layer			0.18	Subsoil		
22502	Layer			0.1	Colluvial Layer		

22503	Cut		0.8	0.48	Modern		
22504	Layer				Natural		
22505	Fill	22503	0.8	0.48	Other Fill. Unexcavated		
<b>Trench 226</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE/SW
Trench contained a possible pit, three inter-cutting ditches and seven post-holes. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	33
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.8
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Findings	Date
22600	Layer			0.25	Topsoil		
22601	Layer			0.3	Subsoil		
22602	Layer			0.25	Buried soil		
22603	Layer			0.1	Alluvial Layer		
22604	Layer				Alluvial Layer		
22605	Cut		1.06	0.4	Ditch		
22606	Cut		1.5	0.82	Ditch		
22607	Layer				Natural		
22608	Fill	22605	1.06	0.4	Secondary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone	AD 50-100
22609	Fill	22606	1.5	0.65	Secondary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone	AD 50-410
22610	Fill	22606	0.8	0.3	Other Fill. Unexcavated	Pottery	Early-Middle Iron Age
22611	Cut		1.35	0.8	Ditch		
22612	Fill	22611	1.1	0.3	Tertiary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone	Early Iron Age
22613	Fill	22611	1.6	0.32	Secondary Fill	Cu Alloy object	Undated
22614	Fill	22611	0.9	0.15	Primary Fill	Animal Bone	
22615	Cut		0.6	0.28	Pit		
22616	Fill	22615	0.6	0.28	Primary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone	Undated
22617	Cut		0.35	0.3	Posthole		
22618	Fill	22617	0.35	0.3	Primary Fill	Pottery	Early-Middle Iron Age
22619	Cut		0.35		Posthole		
22620	Fill	22619	0.35		Other Fill. Unexcavated		
22621	Cut		0.3		Posthole		

22622	Fill		0.3		Other Fill. Unexcavated		
22623	Cut		0.3		Posthole		
22624	Fill	22623	0.3		Other Fill. Unexcavated		
22625	Cut		0.3		Posthole		
22626	Fill	22625	0.3		Other Fill. Unexcavated		
22627	Cut		0.35		Posthole		
22628	Cut		1.5		Pit		
22629	Cut		4		Other Cut		
22630	Fill	22627	0.35		Other Fill. Unexcavated		
22631	Fill	22629	4		Other Fill. Unexcavated	Pottery	AD 43-410
22632	Fill	22628	1.5		Other Fill. Unexcavated		
22633	Fill	22611	0.9	0.2	Secondary Fill		
<b>Trench 227</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE-SW
Trench contained four ditches, three post-holes and a small pit cutting. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	45
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.6
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
22700	Layer			0.2	Topsoil		
22701	Layer			0.4	Subsoil/Colluvium		
22702	Fill	22703	0.7	0.22	Secondary Fill	Pottery  Animal Bone, CPR, Burnt Stone	Early-Middle Iron Age
22703	Cut		0.7	0.4	Ditch		
22704	Fill	22705	1.05	0.4	Primary Fill	Pottery,  Flint, Animal Bone, CPR, Burnt Stone	AD 100-200
22705	Cut		1.05	0.4	Ditch		
22706	Fill	22707	1.7		Secondary Fill	Pottery	Early-Middle Iron Age
22707	Cut		1.7		Ditch		
22710	Fill	22711	0.7	0.34	Secondary Fill	Pottery  Animal Bone	AD 50-100

22711	Cut		0.7	0.48	Ditch		
22712	Layer		8		Alluvial Layer		
22713	Layer				Natural		
22714	Fill	22711	0.46	0.16	Primary Fill		
22715	Fill	22703	0.5	0.25	Primary Fill		
22716	Layer			0.2	Buried soil		
<b>Trench 228</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE-SW
This contained seven ditches, five pits and eight post-holes. The features within the middle of the trench were overlain by a spread of burnt stone. This was overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.8
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
22800	Layer			0.25	Topsoil		
22801	Layer			0.25	Subsoil	Pottery	AD 100-410
22802	Layer			0.3	Colluvial Layer		
22803	Cut		0.86	0.34	Pit		
22804	Layer		11.2		Buried soil	Animal Bone, CPR + WPR, Burnt Stone	
22805	Layer		12.3	0.14	Other Layer	Pottery Animal Bone	AD 100-410
22806	Cut	22806	1.62		Pit. unexcavated		
22807	Cut	22807	2.01		Pit. unexcavated		
22808	Fill	22809	2.16		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22809	Cut		2.16		Ditch. unexcavated		
22810	Fill	22811	0.46	0.14	Secondary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone, Burnt Stone	Middle Iron Age
22811	Cut		0.46	0.17	Ditch		
22812	Layer				Natural		
22813	Fill	22814	0.65		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22814	Cut		0.65		Pit. unexcavated		
22815	Cut		0.73	0.64	Ditch		
22816	Cut		1.53	1.02	Ditch		
22817	Cut		0.16	0.2	Posthole		
22818	Fill	22817	0.16	0.2	Primary Fill	CPR, Burnt Stone	
22819	Cut		0.26	0.1	Posthole		
22820	Fill	22819	0.26	0.1	Primary Fill		

22821	Cut		1.01	0.53	Ditch		
22822	Fill	22806	1.45		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22823	Cut		0.08		Posthole. unexcavated		
22824	Fill	22823	0.08		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22825	Cut		0.12		Posthole. unexcavated		
22826	Fill	22825	0.12		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22827	Cut		0.16		Posthole. unexcavated		
22828	Fill	22827	0.16		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22829	Cut		0.09		Posthole. unexcavated		
22830	Fill	22829	0.09		Other Fill. unexcavated	Flint	
22831	Cut		0.09		Posthole. unexcavated		
22832	Fill	22831	0.09		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22833	Cut		0.1		Posthole. unexcavated		
22834	Fill	22833	0.1		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22835	Cut		0.18		Posthole. unexcavated		
22836	Fill	22835	0.18		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22837	Cut		0.32		Pit. unexcavated		
22838	Fill	22837	0.32		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22839	Fill	22811	0.46	0.11	Primary Fill		
22840	Fill	22815	0.48	0.12	Primary Fill		
22841	Fill	22815	0.6	0.12	Secondary Fill		
22842	Fill	22815	0.73	0.3	Tertiary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone, Burnt Stone	AD 43- 410
22843	Fill	22816	0.68	0.08	Primary Fill		
22844	Fill	22816	0.5	0.12	Secondary Fill	Pottery Animal Bone, CPR + WPR	AD 43- 410
22845	Fill	22816	0.64	0.14	Tertiary Fill		
22846	Fill	22816	0.6	0.43	Other Fill	Pottery	AD 200- 240

						Glass, Burnt Stone, Animal Bone, CPR + WPR	Roman
22847	Fill	22816	1.53	0.68	Other Fill	Pottery,  Rotary Quern, CBM – tile, Burnt Stone, Flint, Animal Bone, CPR	AD 100- 200 Roman
22848	Fill	22821	1.01	0.53	Primary Fill	Pottery  Cu Alloy Brooch Animal Bone	AD 43- 100 AD43-100
22849	Fill	22803	0.33	0.11	Primary Fill		
22850	Fill	22803	0.66	0.14	Primary Fill		
22851	Fill	22803	0.95	0.21	Deliberate Backfill	Pottery,  Animal Bone, CPR + WPR	Early- Middle Iron Age
22852	Fill	22807	2.01		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22853	Layer			0.1	Colluvial Layer		
22854	Layer		4.2	0.3	Colluvial Layer		
22855	Fill	22816	0.34	0.12	Primary Fill		
<b>Trench 229</b>							
General description						Orientation	NW-SE
Trench contained four ditches, three post-holes and two pits cutting the natural. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.69
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Findings	Date
22900	Layer			0.24	Topsoil		
22901	Layer			0.3	Subsoil		
22902	Layer			0.15	Buried soil/ colluvial?		
22903	Fill	22904	1.62	0.44	Tertiary Fill		
22904	Cut		1.76	0.84	Ditch		
22905	Fill	22906	0.56	0.24	Primary Fill		
22906	Cut		0.56	0.24	Ditch		
22907	Fill	22908	0.8	0.24	Primary Fill		
22908	Cut		0.8	0.24	Pit		

22909	Fill	22910	1.78		Other Fill. Unexcavated	Pottery	Late Iron Age-Early Roman
22910	Cut		1.78		Ditch. unexcavated		
22911	Fill	22912	11.4		Other Fill. Unexcavated	Pottery, Animal Bone	AD 43- 410
22912	Cut		11.4		Ditch		
22913	Layer				Natural		
22914	Fill	22904	1	0.26	Primary Fill	WPR (peaty)	
22915	Fill	22916	0.74	0.08	Primary Fill		
22916	Cut		0.74	0.08	Ditch		
22917	Fill	22918	0.9	0.32	Secondary Fill		
22918	Cut		0.9	0.4	Pit		
22919	Fill	22920	0.25		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22920	Cut		0.25		Posthole. unexcavated		
22921	Fill		0.3		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22922	Cut		0.3		Posthole. unexcavated		
22923	Fill	22924	1.52		Other Fill. unexcavated		
22924	Cut		1.52		Pit. unexcavated		
22925	Fill	22904	1.4	0.54	Secondary Fill		
22926	Fill	22918	0.84	0.08	Primary Fill		
<b>Trench 230</b>							
General description						Orientation	NW-SE
Trench contained part of the ditched trackway and part of a possible hollow-way cutting a buried soil. This was overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	21
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.5
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
23000	Layer			0.4	Topsoil		
23001	Layer			0.25	Subsoil		
23002	Layer			0.1	Buried soil/Colluvium?		
23003	Fill	23004	1.76	0.2	Primary Fill		
23004	Cut		1.76	0.2	Ditch		
23005	Fill	23006	3.44		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23006	Cut		3.44		Ditch. unexcavated		
23007	Layer				Natural		

<b>Trench 231</b>							
General description						Orientation	ENE-WSW
Trench contained seven ditches, (one of which is most likely part of the ditched trackway recorded within Trenches 221, 230, 236-237), five pits and a buried soil. There were overlain by topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.55
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
23100	Layer			0.25	Topsoil		
23101	Layer			0.3	Buried soil		
23102	Fill		1.9	0.06	Primary Fill		
23103	Cut		1.9	0.06	Ditch		
23104	Fill	23105	0.8	0.12	Primary Fill		
23105	Cut		0.8	0.12	Pit		
23106	Fill	23107	1.06	1.06	Primary Fill	Animal Bone	
23107	Cut		1.06	1.06	Pit		
23108	Fill	23109	1.80	0.18	Primary Fill		
23109	Cut		1.8	0.18	Ditch		
23110	Fill	23111	1.2	0.18	Primary Fill		
23111	Cut		1.2	0.18	Ditch		
23112	Fill	23113	2.5	0.2	Primary Fill	Pottery	AD 43-410
23113	Cut		2.5	0.2	Other Cut		
23114	Fill	23115	1.37	0.17	Primary Fill	Animal Bone	
23115	Cut		1.37	0.17	Ditch		
23116	Fill	23117	1.6	0.2	Primary Fill		
23117	Cut		1.6	0.2	Pit		
23118	Fill	23119	2.05		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23119	Cut		1.63		Ditch. unexcavated		
23120	Layer				Natural		
23121	Fill	23122	1.7		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23122	Cut		1.7		Ditch. unexcavated		
23123	Fill	23124	0.8	0.24	Primary Fill		
23124	Cut		0.8	0.24	Pit		
23125	Fill	23126	1.12		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23126	Cut		1.12		Pit. unexcavated		
<b>Trench 232</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE-SW
Trench contained three ditches and a tree throw. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	35
						Width (m)	2.2

						Avg. depth (m)	0.6
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
23200	Layer			0.2	Topsoil		
23201	Layer			0.2	Subsoil		
23202	Layer			0.2	Buried soil		
23203	Fill	23204	1.44		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23204	Cut		1.44		Pit. unexcavated		
23205	Fill	23206	1.52	0.18	Primary Fill		
23206	Cut		1.52	0.18	Ditch		
23207	Fill	23208	0.48	0.16	Primary Fill		
23208	Cut		0.48	0.16	Ditch		
23209	Fill	23210	0.44	0.62	Tertiary Fill		
23210	Cut		0.44	0.62	Ditch		
23211	Layer				Natural		
23212	Fill	23210		0.34	Secondary Fill		
23213	Fill	23210		0.18	Primary Fill	CPR + WPR (peaty)	
<b>Trench 233</b>							
General description						Orientation	NNW-SSE
Trench contained six ditches, two pits and an irregular feature cutting the natural or a buried soil. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.55
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
23300	Layer			0.25	Topsoil		
23301	Layer			0.25	Subsoil		
23302	Layer				Colluvial Layer		
23303	Fill	23304	2	0.2	Tertiary Fill	WPR + insects + snails	
23304	Cut		2.2	0.6	Ditch		
23305	Fill	23306	2.8	0.32	Primary Fill	Pottery, Animal Bone	Medieval
23306	Cut		2.8	0.32	Ditch		
23307	Layer			0.1	Buried soil		
23308	Fill	23309	0.8		Other Fill. unexcavated	Pottery	AD 43-410
23309	Cut		0.8		Ditch. unexcavated		
23310	Fill	23311	0.8	0.25	Secondary Fill	Animal Bone	
23311	Cut		0.8	0.4	Pit		
23312	Fill	23313	1.4		Other Fill. unexcavated		

23313	Cut		1.4		Ditch. unexcavated		
23314	Fill	23315	2.8		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23315	Cut		2.8		Ditch. unexcavated		
23316	Fill	23317	2.2		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23317	Cut		2.2		Pit. unexcavated		
23318	Fill	23319	2.81		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23319	Cut		2.81		Ditch. unexcavated		
23320	Layer				Natural		
23321	Fill	23304	1.5	0.15	Primary Fill		
23322	Fill	23304	2	0.3	Secondary Fill		
23323	Fill	23311	0.9	0.4	Primary Fill		

**Trench 234**

General description						Orientation	N-S
Trench contained three ditches and two pits. These were overlain by alluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.7
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
23400	Layer			0.2	Topsoil		
23401	Layer			0.1	Subsoil		
23402	Layer			0.06	Alluvial Layer		
23403	Layer			0.18	Alluvial Layer		
23404	Layer			0.09	Alluvial Layer		
23405	Layer			0.16	Alluvial Layer		
23406	Layer			0.06	Alluvial Layer. possible colluvium		
23407	Layer				Natural		
23408	Fill	23409	0.56	0.14	Primary Fill		
23409	Cut		0.56	0.14	Ditch		
23410	Fill		0.88	0.43	Primary Fill		
23411	Cut		0.88	0.43	Ditch		
23412	Fill	23413	1.05	0.35	Primary Fill		
23413	Cut		1.05	0.35	Ditch		
23414	Fill	23415	1.45		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23415	Cut		1.45		Ditch. unexcavated		
23416	Cut		1	0.15	Pit		

23417	Fill	23416	1	0.15	Primary Fill		
<b>Trench 235</b>							
General description						Orientation	NE/SW
Trench contained two ditch terminus, four pits and two post-holes cutting the natural. These were overlain by alluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.5
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
23500	Layer			0.2	Topsoil		
23501	Layer			0.1	Alluvial Layer		
23502	Layer			0.13	Alluvial Layer		
23503	Layer			0.17	Alluvial Layer		
23504	Fill	23505	0.5	0.18	Secondary Fill		
23505	Cut		0.5	0.24	Ditch		
23506	Fill	23505	0.8		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23507	Cut		0.8		Pit. unexcavated		
23508	Fill	23509	1.2		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23509	Cut		1.2		Pit. unexcavated		
23510	Fill	23511	0.92	0.12	Primary Fill		
23511	Cut		0.92	0.12	Pit		
23512	Fill	23513	0.9	0.2	Primary Fill		
23513	Cut		0.9	0.2	Pit		
23514	Fill	23515	1.43		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23515	Cut		1.43		Pit. unexcavated		
23516	Fill	23517	0.5	0.1	Primary Fill		
23517	Cut		0.5	0.1	Posthole		
23518	Fill	23519	0.95		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23519	Cut		0.95		Pit. unexcavated		
23520	Fill	23505	0.4	0.06	Primary Fill		
23521	Layer				Natural		
<b>Trench 236</b>							
General description						Orientation	NW-SE
Trench contained two ditches forming part of the trackway as defined by previous evaluations and NMP data, a possible hollow-way in the center. This trench also contained a geological feature, a post-hole and five possible pits. These were overlain by alluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.42
Context No.	Type	Fill Of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
23600	Layer			0.25	Topsoil		

23601	Layer			0.15	Subsoil		
23602	Fill	23603	2.78		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23603	Cut		2.78		Ditched Trackway. unexcavated		
23604	Fill	23605	4.6	0.15	Primary Fill	WPR	
23605	Cut		4.6	0.15	Possible hollow- way		
23606	Fill	23607	1.92		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23607	Cut		1.92		Ditched trackway. unexcavated		
23608	Fill	23609	0.46	0.15	Primary Fill		
23609	Cut		0.46	0.15	Natural Feature		
23610	Fill	23611	1.8		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23611	Cut		1.8		Pit. unexcavated		
23612	Fill	23613	1.1		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23613	Cut		1.1		Pit. unexcavated		
23614	Layer				Natural		
23615	Layer				Buried soil. unexcavated		
23616	Cut		3.2	0.6	Ditch		
23617	Fill	23616	1.7	0.3	Tertiary Fill		
23618	Cut		0.89	0.49	Posthole		
23619	Fill	23618	0.89	0.49	Primary Fill		
23620	Cut		2	0.38	Pit		
23621	Fill	23620	2	0.38	Primary Fill		
23622	Cut		0.6		Pit. unexcavated		
23623	Fill	23622	0.6		Other Fill. unexcavated		
23624	Fill	23616	2.1	0.3	Secondary Fill		
23625	Fill	23616	2.1	0.3	Primary Fill		

**Trench 237**

<b>General description</b>						<b>Orientation</b>	NE/SW, NW/SE
Trench contained two ditches forming part of the trackway as defined by previous evaluations and NMP data, a possible hollow-way in the centre. This trench also contained geological features cutting the natural. These were overlain by alluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						<b>Length (m)</b>	30
						<b>Width (m)</b>	2.20
						<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.50
<b>Context No.</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Fill of</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Finds</b>	<b>Date</b>
23700	Layer		-	0.10	Topsoil	-	-

23701	Layer		-	0.20	Subsoil	-	-
23702	Layer		-	0.30	Alluvium	-	-
23703	Fill	23704	2.05	-	Secondary Fill	-	-
23704	Cut		2.05	-	Ditched trackway unexcavated		
23705	Fill	23706	3.00	-	Secondary Fill		
23706	Cut		3.00	-	Possible hollow-way unexcavated		
23707	Fill	23708	1.80	-	Secondary Fill		
23708	Cut		1.80	-	Ditched trackway unexcavated		
23709	Fill	23710	1.50	0.14	Primary Fill		
23710	Cut		1.50	0.14	Ditch cut		
23711	Fill	23712	0.46	0.11	Secondary Fill		
23712	Cut		2.20	0.44	Tree-throw cut		
23713	Fill	23714	1.00	0.19	Primary Fill		
23714	Cut		1.00	0.19	Pit cut		
23715	Layer		-	-	Natural		
23716	Fill	23712	0.37	0.31	Primary Fill		
23717	Fill	23718	0.33	0.25	Primary Fill		
23718	Cut		0.33	0.25	Pit cut		

<b>Trench 238</b>							
<b>General description</b>						<b>Orientation</b>	<b>N-S</b>
Trench contained four pits and two post-holes cutting the natural. These were overlain by alluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						<b>Length (m)</b>	40
						<b>Width (m)</b>	2.2
						<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.4
<b>Context No.</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Fill of</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Finds</b>	<b>Date</b>
23800	Layer			0.10	Topsoil	-	-
23801	Layer			0.20	Subsoil	-	-
23802	Layer			0.10	Alluvium	-	-
23803	Fill	23804	0.42	0.06	Primary fill	-	-
23804	Cut		0.42	0.06	Posthole		
23805	Fill	23806	1.21	0.37	Primary fill		
23806	Cut		1.21	0.37	Pit		
23807	Fill	23808			Other Fill. Unexcavated		
23708	Cut				Pit		
23809	Fill	23810			Other Fill. Unexcavated		
23810	Cut				Pit		
23811	Fill	23812	0.78	0.21	Primary fill		
23812	Cut		0.78	0.21	Pit		
23813	Fill	23814	0.56	0.10	Primary fill		
23814	Cut		0.56	0.10	Posthole		

23815	Layer				Natural		
-------	-------	--	--	--	---------	--	--

<b>Trench 239</b>							
<b>General description</b>						<b>Orientation</b>	<b>E-W</b>
Trench contained a ditch, three pits, for post-holes and a geological feature cutting the natural. These were overlain by alluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						<b>Length (m)</b>	40
						<b>Width (m)</b>	2.2
						<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.6
<b>Context No.</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Fill of</b>	<b>Width (m)</b>	<b>Depth (m)</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Finds</b>	<b>Date</b>
23900	Layer			0.20	Topsoil	-	-
23901	Layer			0.25	Alluvium	-	-
23902	Layer			0.15	Colluvium?	-	-
23903	Fill	23904	0.52	0.12	Primary fill	-	-
23904	Cut		0.52	0.12	Posthole		
23905	Fill	23905	0.65		Other Unexcavated Fill.		
23906	Cut		0.65		Pit Unexcavated		
23907	Fill	23908	0.83	0.19	Primary fill		
23908	Cut		0.83	0.19	Tree-throw		
23909	Fill	23910	1.10		Other Unexcavated Fill.		
23910	Cut		1.10		Ditch (unexcavated)		
23911	Fill	23912	0.64	0.27	Primary fill	Animal Bone	
23912	Cut		0.64	0.27	Pit		
23913	Layer				Natural		
23914	Cut		0.66	0.39	Pit		
23915	Fill	23914	0.33	0.39	Secondary fill		
23916	Fill	23914	0.70	0.20	Primary fill		
23917	Fill	23918	0.95	0.27	Secondary fill		
23918	Cut		1.06	0.50	Pit		
23919	Fill	23918	1.06	0.50	Primary fill		
23920	Fill	23921	0.30		Other Unexcavated Fill.		
23921	Cut		0.30		Posthole (unexcavated)		
23922	Fill	23923	0.30		Other Unexcavated Fill.		
23923	Cut		0.30		Posthole (unexcavated)		

<b>Trench 240</b>							
<b>General description</b>						<b>Orientation</b>	<b>N-S</b>
Trench contained a single pit cutting the natural and a shallow part of a paleochannel. These were overlain by alluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						<b>Length (m)</b>	50
						<b>Width (m)</b>	2.2
						<b>Avg. depth (m)</b>	0.9

Context No.	Type	Fill of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Findings	Date
24000	Layer			0.25	Topsoil	-	-
24001	Layer			0.14	Subsoil	-	-
24002	Layer			0.15	Alluvium	-	-
24003	Layer			0.12	Alluvium	-	-
24004	Fill			0.34	Alluvial fill	Animal Bone	
24005	Fill			0.05	Alluvial fill		
24006	Cut		13.50	0.39	Palaeochannel		
24007	Layer				Natural		
24008	Cut		0.56	0.30	Pit		
24009	Fill	24008	0.56	0.30	Primary fill		

Trench 241							
General description						Orientation	N-S
Trench contained a paleo-channel and 2 trackways and a possible trackway. The trench also contained colluvial layers over lying the two trackways. This was in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	1.4
Context No.	Type	Fill of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Findings	Date
24100	Layer			0.22	Topsoil	-	-
24101	Layer			0.18	Subsoil		
24102	Layer			0.60	Colluvium	Pottery	AD 43-410
24103	Layer			0.33	Colluvium		
24104	Layer			0.08	Made ground		
24105	Layer			0.17	Colluvium		
24106	Layer			0.04	Alluvium		
24107	Layer			0.23	Alluvium		
24108	Structure			0.18	Trackway		
24109	Layer			0.18	Alluvium		
24110	Layer				Natural		
24111	Cut		1.00		Ditch unexcavated		
24112	Fill	24111	1.00		Other Unexcavated Fill.	Animal Bone	
24113	Cut		1.70		Trackway/Ditch unexcavated		
24114	Fill	24113			Other Unexcavated Fill.		
24115	Structure		5.40	0.18	Trackway		
24116	Cut		0.80	0.70	Modern feature		
24117	Structure		5.10		Trackway unexcavated		
24118	Fill	24117	5.10		Other Unexcavated Fill.	-	-

24119	Structure		3.10		Trackway unexcavated	-	-
24120	Fill	24119			Other Fill. Unexcavated	-	-
24121	Modern		4.50		Trackway/Modern feature unexcavated		
24122	Fill	24121	4.50		Other Fill. Unexcavated		
24123	Layer			0.20	Alluvium		
24124	Cut		1.30	0.70	Modern feature		
24125	Fill	24126	5.50	0.14	Secondary Fill		
24126	Cut		5.50	0.36	Paleochannel		
24127	Fill	24126	5.50	0.36	Primary fill	CPR + nut/fruit stone	

**Trench 242**

General description						Orientation	NE-SW
Trench contained seven pits, two possible post-holes and three geological features and part of a paleochannel. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.95
Context No.	Type	Fill of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
24200	Layer			0.20	Topsoil	-	-
24201	Layer			0.30	Subsoil	-	-
24202	Layer			0.30	Colluvium	-	-
24203	Fill	24232		0.24	Alluvial Fill		
24204	Layer			0.06	Alluvium		
24205	Cut		0.45	0.12	Pit		
24206	Fill	24205	0.45	0.12	Primary Fill	Oyster shell, Animal Bone, CPR	
24207	Cut		0.46	0.10	Posthole		
24208	Fill	24207	0.46	0.10	Primary Fill		
24209	Cut		0.53	0.19	Ditch		
24210	Fill	24209	0.53	0.19	Primary Fill		
24211	Cut		0.80	0.20	Geological/Ditch		
24212	Fill	24211	0.8	0.20	Primary Fill		
24213	Cut		2.10		Tree Throw Unexcavated		
24214	Fill	24213			Other Fill. Unexcavated		
24215	Fill	24232		0.15	Secondary Fill		
24216	Cut		1.90		Pit Unexcavated		

24217	Fill	24216	1.90		Other Unexcavated	Fill.		
24218	Cut		1.30		Pit Unexcavated			
24219	Fill	24218	1.30		Other Unexcavated	Fill.		
24220	Cut		0.29		Posthole Unexcavated			
24221	Fill	24220	0.29		Other Unexcavated	Fill.		
24222	Cut		0.54		Pit Unexcavated			
24223	Fill	24222	0.54		Other Unexcavated	Fill.		
24224	Cut		1.36		Pit			
24225	Fill	24224	1.36		Other Unexcavated	Fill.		
24226	Cut		0.68		Pit Unexcavated			
24227	Fill	24226	0.68		Other Unexcavated	Fill.		
24228	Cut		1.70		Pit Unexcavated			
24229	Fill	24228	1.70		Other Unexcavated	Fill.		
24230	Fill	24213			Other Unexcavated	Fill.		
24231	Layer				Natural			
24232	Cut		16.91	0.39	Paleochannel			

**Trench 243**

General description						Orientation	NW-SE
Trench contained part of a paleochannel, which was overlain by three trackways. These were overlain by colluvial layers, which were in turn overlain by subsoil and topsoil.						Length (m)	50
						Width (m)	2.2
						Avg. depth (m)	0.9
Context No.	Type	Fill of	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Description	Finds	Date
24300	Layer			0.28	Topsoil	-	-
24301	Layer			0.26	Alluvium	-	-
24302	Layer		12.00	0.12	Surface	-	-
24303	Layer			0.30	Alluvium	-	-
24304	Structure		2.00	0.10	Surface	-	-
24305	Structure		4.40	0.60	Surface	-	-
24306	Layer				Natural	-	-
24307	Layer			0.30	Alluvium	-	-
24308	Layer			0.05	Alluvium	-	-



## APPENDIX B FINDS REPORTS

### B.1 Pottery by Edward Biddulph

#### *Introduction*

B.1.1 A total of 503 sherds of pottery, weighing 5449g, were recovered from the evaluation. The assemblage was scanned to identify diagnostic forms and fabrics, provide spot-dates and generally characterise the material. Pottery fabrics were assigned codes from OA's standard recording guidelines (Booth nd) and correlated where possible with the National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (NRFRC; Tomber and Dore 1998). Forms identified by rim were given codes from OA's system, supplemented by the typology of the Oxford Roman pottery industry (Young 1977) and well-established samian types (cf. Webster 1996).

B.1.2 Each context-group was quantified by sherd count and weight (grammes), and any rims present were additionally quantified by vessel count (MV), based on rims, and estimated vessel equivalent (EVE), which measures the percentage of rim circumference that survives (thus, 0.3 equals 30%). The total was 5.27 EVEs from 39 vessels identified by rim. Pottery data by context is provided in Table 1

B.1.1 The following early/middle Iron Age fabrics were noted:

- AF2 Sand/flint, fine (0.07 EVE)
- AF3 Sand/flint, fine/coarse
- A2 Sand, fine (0.17 EVE)
- A3 Sand, fine/coarse (0.15 EVE)
- FV2 Flint/organic, fine
- F2, Flint, fine
- F4 Flint, coarse
- S2 Shell, fine
- S3 Shell, fine/coarse (0.12 EVE)
- S4 Shell, coarse (0.1 EVE)

B.1.2 The following late Iron Age/Roman-period fabrics were noted (NRFRC codes in brackets):

- B11 Dorset black-burnished ware (DOR BB 1) (0.04 EVE)
- E30 Coarse sand-tempered fabric
- E40 Shell-tempered fabric
- E50 Limestone-tempered fabric (0.04 EVE)
- E60 Flint-tempered fabric
- E80 Grog-tempered ware (SOB GT) (0.13 EVE)
- E830 Grog-and-flint-tempered fabric (0.35 EVE)
- M22 Oxford white ware mortarium (OXF WH)
- O10 Fine oxidised ware (0.14 EVE)
- O11 Oxford fine oxidised ware
- O21 Oxford sandy oxidised ware (0.1 EVE)
- O80 Coarse tempered oxidised ware
- Q21 Oxford white-slipped oxidised ware (OXF WS)
- R10 Fine reduced ware
- R11 Oxford fine reduced ware (OXF FR) (0.08 EVE)
- R20 Sandy reduced ware (1.09 EVE)
- R21 Oxford sandy reduced ware

- R30 Unsourced medium sandy reduced ware (1.39 EVE)
- R50 Dark surfaced ware (0.09 EVE)
- R90 Coarse tempered reduced ware
- S32 Les Martres-de-Veyre samian ware (LMV SA) (0.1 EVE)
- W10 Fine white ware (0.05 EVE)
- W12 Oxford fine white ware (OXF WH)
- W20 Sandy white ware
- W22 Oxford sandy white ware (0.87 EVE)

B.1.3 The post-Roman pottery was not identified in detail but were assigned one of two general codes: Z20 (medieval) and Z30 (post-medieval).

B.1.4 The following forms were identified by rim:

- BA Small flagon (0.55 EVE)
- C Jar (0.9 EVE)
- CC Narrow-mouthed jar (0.47 EVE)
- CD Medium-mouthed jar (0.4 EVE)
- CH Bead-rimmed jar (0.35 EVE)
- CI Everted rim jar (0.11 EVE)
- CS Slack shouldered jar (0.25 EVE)
- D Jar or bowl (0.62 EVE)
- E Beaker (0.05 EVE)
- EC Bag-shaped beaker
- HA Carinated bowl (0.45 EVE)
- HB Straight-sided bowl (0.04 EVE)
- HC Curving-sided bowl (0.21 EVE)
- HD Necked bowl (0.62 EVE)
- J Dish (0.09 EVE)
- JA Straight-sided dish (0.15 EVE)

### Description

Context	Sherds	Weight (g)	MV	EVE	Description	Spot-date
21004	1	6	0	0	Z30 glazed body sherd	Post-medieval
22000	1	10	0	0	Z20 glazed sherd	Medieval
22012	3	5	1	0.07	AF2 (C, slightly everted, simple rim, EVE 0.07)	EIA
22030	1	13	0	0	Body sherd, fabric E80	LIA/ER
22034	24	192	1	0.09	R50 (C, EVE 0.09). Other sherds: R20, R30	AD 43-410
22036	1	6	0	0	Body sherd, fabric R11	AD 43-410
22108	4	47	1	0.47	R20 (CC, Young R15, EVE 0.47)	AD 43-410
22213	2	5	0	0	Body sherds, fabric A2	EIA-MIA
22216	9	8	0	0	Body sherds, fabric FV2	EIA-MIA
22218	13	114	0	0	R30 body sherds probably from single vessel, a carinated bowl or jar (eg Young R26)	AD 43-200
22220	2	7	1	0.05	R30 (D, EVE 0.05)	AD 43-410

Context	Sherds	Weight (g)	MV	EVE	Description	Spot-date
22224	1	3	0	0	Body sherd, fabric W22	AD 50-410
22228	2	17	0	0	Body sherds E80/O80, W22	AD 43-410
22229	1	7	1	0.05	O11 (JA, Young O41, EVE 0.05)	AD 100-300
22310	2	7	0	0	Body sherds, fabrics R11, R30	AD 43-410
22405	9	98	0	0	Body and base sherds: R10, R30, R50, W12	AD 100-410
22408	3	33	1	0.05	W22 (D, EVE 0.05). Other sherds E40	AD 50-100
22410	4	39	1	0.1	W22 (D, EVE 0.1). Other sherds R20, R30	AD 50-410
22410	12	37	0	0	Body and base sherds from single vessel, fabric A3	EIA-MIA
22413	3	55	0	0	Body sherds E30 (internal residue), E60, R90	AD 43-410
22414	48	547	3	0.27	B11 (HB with dropped flange, EVE 0.04); R30 (D, EVE 0.16); R30 (D, EVE 0.07). Other sherds: R20	AD 250-410
22421	3	4	0	0	Body sherds, fabric R30	AD 43-410
22423	1	83	0	0	Grog-tempered storage jar body sherd R90	?AD 43-100
22429	1	16	0	0	Base sherd from jar or beaker, R30	AD 43-410
22608	20	148	1	0.07	E80 (C, EVE 0.07). Other sherds: E30, O10, R30, W20, S4	AD 50-100
22609	6	42	1	0.1	A3 (CS, EVE 0.1). Other sherds: O11, S3	AD 50-410
22610	2	24	0	0	Body sherds, fabrics AF3, F4	EIA-MIA
22612	5	70	1	0.05	S3 (C, everted rim, EVE 0.05). Other sherds: A2	EIA
22616	6	4	0	0	Crumbs. Undatable	Undated
22618	1	27	0	0	Body sherd S3 (shoulder sherd from ?CS jar)	EIA-MIA
22631	1	12	0	0	Body sherd, fabric R30	AD 43-410
22702	4	42	0	0	Body sherds, fabrics AF3, A2	EIA-MIA
22702	6	17	0	0	Sample 22700: fabrics S3, A3	
22704	68	739	5	0.96	O21 (CD, Young O10, EVE 0.11); R20 (CD, burnt under rim, EVE 0.20); R30 (HA, Young R41, EVE 0.45); W22 (CD, Young W33, EVE 0.1); S4 (C, thickened jar rim, EVE 0.1). Other sherds: O11 (?EC), W22	AD 100-200
22704	23	78	0	0	Sample 22701: body sherds R20, S2	-
22706	5	48	1	0.1	A2 with burnished surfaces (CS, EVE 0.1). Other sherds: F2	EIA-MIA
22710	27	420	2	0.43	E830 (CH, burnt deposit under rim, 0.35 EVE); R11 (HC, ?Young R41, EVE 0.08). Other sherds: E40, R20	AD 50-100
22801	6	146	1	0.04	E50 (CI, EVE 0.04). Other body sherds E30, M22, O80, R30	AD 100-410

Context	Sherds	Weight (g)	MV	EVE	Description	Spot-date
22805	18	264	2	0.19	R20 (C, EVE 0.12); W22 (D, EVE 0.07). Other sherds: O20, R30, R90, S4	AD 100-410
22810	3	12	0	0	Body sherds A2 (?pedestal base), S3	MIA
22842	8	104	0	0	Body and base sherds, fabrics S4, O10	AD 43-410
22844	1	11	0	0	Body sherd, fabric AF3	
22844	5	65	1	0.05	Sample 22804: W10 (E, EVE 0.05). Other sherds: R20 (internal burnt residue)	AD 43-410
22846	26	660	4	0.86	O11 (HC, Young O39, EVE 0.13); O11 (base of cup or small bowl with internal potter's stamp); R30 (C, EVE 0.11); W22 (BA, Young W6, EVE 0.55); A2 (CI, EVE 0.07). Other sherds: Q21 (flagon neck), R20, R21, R30 (jar body sherd, acute lattice), R90	AD 200-240
22846	10	162	2	0.25	Sample 22802: S32 (JA, Drag. 18/31, EVE 0.1); R30 (C, EVE 0.15). Other sherds: R20 (body sherds from same vessel with internal burnt deposit)	-
22847	57	686	3	0.67	O10 (D, EVE 0.05); R20 (HD, Young R38, EVE 0.22); R30 (HD, Young R38, EVE 0.4). Other sherds: R90, W22, S4	AD 100-200
22847	19	115	3	0.21	Sample 22801: O10 (J – flanged dish, EVE 0.09); A3 (CS, EVE 0.05); S3 (D, angled everted rim, 0.07)	-
22848	8	45	1	0.06	E80 (C, EVE 0.06). Other sherds R11, R30, R30, R50	AD 43-100
22851	1	2	0	0	Sample 22800: fabric S4	EIA-MIA
22909	2	25	0	0	Body sherds, fabrics E40, E80	LIA/ER
22911	10	73	0	0	Body sherds, fabrics O20, R20, R50	AD 43-410
23112	1	16	1	0.08	R20 (C, EVE 0.08)	AD 43-410
23305	1	7	0	0	Z20 glazed white ware	Medieval
23308	1	15	0	0	Body sherd, fabric R20	AD 43-410
24102	1	11	0	0	Body sherd, possibly neck/shoulder sherd of flagon, O20	AD 43-410
Totals	503	5449	39	5.27		

**Table: Description and quantification of the pottery by context**

B.1.5 The earliest pottery groups, from trenches 220, 222, 226, 227 and 228, dated to the early to middle Iron Age, and amounted to 9% of the assemblage by sherd count. Fabrics containing sand and shell were dominant, with smaller quantities of flint-tempered fabrics also present. Forms included jars with everted rims or slack-profiled shoulders, some rims having possible fingertip decoration. Some vessels (eg in context 22012) appeared to be more characteristic of the early Iron Age, while a pedestal base in context 22810 better fits the middle Iron Age.

B.1.6 Two groups, from trenches 220 and 229, were assigned to the late Iron Age/early Roman period. The groups contained pottery of late Iron Age tradition (E wares),

chiefly grog-tempered pottery (E80). No forms were identified. It is possible that the groups were deposited after AD 43, along with groups – recovered from trenches 224, 226, 227 and 228 – dated to the early Roman period (c AD 43-100). These contained E wares alongside pottery of certain post-conquest date. Identified forms included a bead-rimmed jar (CH) in fabric E830 and a curving-sided bowl (HC) with flanged rim. Overall, pottery from groups dated to the late Iron Age/early Roman period and early Roman period took a 12% share of the assemblage by sherd count.

- B.1.7 Three groups, recovered from trenches 227 and 228, were dated to the middle Roman period (c 100/120-250) and accounted for 40% of the assemblage by sherd count. The pottery was recovered from just two features, ditches 22703 and 22816. Pottery diagnostic of the period includes a reduced ware curving-sided bowl with bead or flanged rim (Young 1977, type R41), a ring-necked flagon (Young 1977, type W6) in a sandy white ware, a dish (Drag. 18/31) in samian ware from Les Martres-de-Veyre (S32), and a flanged dish in fine oxidised ware. Of interest is a base from context 22846 (ditch 22816) of a cup or bowl in fabric O11 with an illiterate potter's name stamp on the internal surface. The vessel is possibly a copy of samian form Drag. 33 (Young 1977, type O43), which Young (1977, 196) dates to the mid/late 3rd century. However, occurrences of the type may be earlier, as the type was produced at Nuneham Courtenay (c 5km to the south-east of the site) from the 2nd century onwards (Booth 1993, 157).
- B.1.8 A single group of pottery was dated to the late Roman period (c AD 250-410), although this alone accounted for 10% of the assemblage by sherd count. The group, from context 22414, a fill of ditch 22411 in trench 224, contained a bowl with dropped flange rim in black-burnished ware (B11), dating deposition after AD 250.
- B.1.9 A large proportion of the assemblage (25% by sherd count), from trenches 220-224, 226, 228, 229, 231, 233 and 241, was from context groups that contained broadly dated or undiagnostic pottery and could only be assigned ceramic dates that spanned two or more periods (eg early to mid-Roman, mid- to late Roman or very broadly Roman). However, excluding groups dating very broadly to the Roman period, four of the five groups date after AD 100, while one dates to the 1st or 2nd century.
- B.1.10 Three sherds of post-Roman pottery were recovered from Trenches 210, 220 and 233.

### *Discussion*

- B.1.11 Generally, the assemblage was in poor to moderate condition. The mean sherd weight (MSW; weight divided by sherd count) is 10.8g, while the range of MSW values per context is 0.67g to 83g. Excluding pottery from samples, the MSW only marginally increases to 11.4g. The mean rim percentage (EVE divided by MV) of 0.13 EVE or 13% (0.14 EVE, excluding pottery from samples) points again to a poorly preserved assemblage. These values are characteristic of an assemblage that is well fragmented, though with the occasional larger piece.
- B.1.12 Most of the groups were recovered from trenches in the north and north-western part of the site, with the largest amounts coming from trenches concentration of 227 and 228. The condition and distribution of the assemblage suggest that the pottery was

deposited reasonably close to areas of use and initial discard, though much of the pottery may have undergone several episodes of disturbance and redeposition.

B.1.13 As expected, the Oxford industry dominated pottery supply during the Roman period. Other sources included Dorset, whose potters supplied black-burnished ware, and Les Martres-de-Veyre in Central Gaul, which supplied some of the samian ware.

B.1.14 The assemblage from the current evaluation has a different chronologically emphasis to that of the previous phase of fieldwork, from which pottery of mainly middle-late and late Iron Age date was recovered, largely from Zones XI and XII. While pottery of that date is attested in the current assemblage, most of the pottery is of Roman date, and indeed has a strong middle to late Roman component, pointing to spatial differences between periods and movement in the focus of settlement over time.

***Recommendations regarding the conservation, discard and retention of material***

B.1.15 The pottery reported on here has the potential to inform future research through re-analysis and thus it is recommended that all the pottery is retained. This follows the advice set out in the ‘Standard for Pottery Studies in Archaeology’ (PCRG, SGRP, MPRG 2016).

**B.2 Metal by Anni Byard**

***Introduction***

B.2.1 The evaluation yielded the remains of two objects weighing a total of 11.4g, recovered from two contexts. Only one of these objects, a brooch, was identifiable. The brooch dates from the first century AD and was recovered from the fill of ditch 22821. The second object consisted several small, abraded fragments of unidentifiable form and date, recovered from the fill of ditch 22606.

Context	SF no.	Material	Weight (g)	Dimensions (mm)	Description	Date
22613	22600	Copper alloy	1.4	n/a	Four thin sheet fragments, one has slight bend.	Uncertain
22848	22801	Copper alloy	10	46.6 L 19.2 W	Near-complete Colchester derivative ‘Harlow’ brooch, white metal coated.	AD 43-100

***Discussion***

B.2.1 Late Iron Age / early Roman brooches are often found in ditches on settlement sites and at temple complexes. The brooch has a white-metal coating, which is probably tin rather than silver (this would have to be tested to confirm) and is therefore unusual;

of the c500 'Harlow' type brooches listed on the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) database, only five have such a coating. Mackreth (2011, 50) suggested Harlow brooches were 'commonly' worn by peoples of the Trinovantes and Catuvellauni tribes (North Thames region) although caution is required when using material culture as evidence of ethnicity (e.g. Oosthizen 2019). Indeed, the PAS shows concentrations of Harlow brooches in Norfolk (Iceni territory) with a small concentration between Swindon and Wantage. Bayley *et al* (2001) note a distinctive variant of the Harlow brooch as emanating from the Cirencester region; this brooch conforms to that variant type (Mackreth type CD Ha. 3a1) and can be dated from c AD 43-100.

### Recommendations

B.2.2 The metalwork should be retained to enable comparative study between regional and local typologies and site profiles. The brooch should be cleaned and conserved. Should further work take place on the site it is recommended that the brooch be illustrated or photographed and included in any resulting report or publication.

## B.3 Glass by Anni Byard

### Introduction

B.3.1 Five sherds of glass were recovered during the evaluation. A fragment of a probable 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> century wine bottle was recovered from the topsoil of trench 222, while part of the upper neck and rim of a brown spirit or pharmaceutical bottle was recovered from the fill of ditch 21004. The three remaining sherds of glass were retrieved from features across three trenches and are detailed in the table below:

Context	SF no.	Count	Weight	Type	Sherd type	Colour	Function	Comments	Date
21004		1	9.1	Bottle	Neck / finish	Brown	Spirit / medicine	Internal thread	L19C-E20C
22000		1	21.6	Bottle	Base	Dk olive green	Wine	Weathered fragment	18C-19C
22218		1	0.2	Vessel	Rim	Lt green	Uncertain	Tiny sherd of a vessel rim, possibly a bowl or glass/cup	Roman
22413	22400	1	2.1	Bottle	Base	Pale aqua / blue	Flask / bottle	Base sherd from a probable square glass bottle	Roman
22846	22800	1	9	Flask	Finish / spout	Pale aqua / blue	Bath flask?	Flask top	Roman

## ***Discussion***

B.3.2 The tiny rim sherd from trench 222 is hard to classify but is of probable Roman date and is likely to be from a delicate vessel such as a drinking glass or bowl. The small probable square bottle sherd from trench 224 is not closely datable on its own, but of the examples found in Britain most date from the first to third century AD. The possible flask spout from trench 228 is likely from a similar vessel and of similar date. These small flasks can be globular or square in form and would have had a stopper to prevent the liquid within escaping. Elaborate globular examples are often called bath or oil flasks (aryballos), with some found in association with other toilet implements such as strigils. Roman glass is not commonly found as much of it was collected and recycled. The presence of fine glass vessels does suggest a building or settlement of status in the vicinity.

## ***Recommendations***

B.3.3 The Roman glass should be conserved and retained. Should further work take place on the site, it is recommended that the Roman glass be illustrated or photographed and included in any resulting report or publication. The modern shards from contexts 21004 and 22000 have been recorded and no further work is required. These pieces should be discarded.

## **B.4 Ceramic Building Material and Fired Clay by Ruth Shaffrey**

### ***Introduction***

B.4.1 In total 35 pieces of ceramic building material (CBM) and fired clay were retained and submitted for analysis. These were examined with a x10 magnification hand lens, assigned to a functional category and the fabric recorded. Full details of these can be found in a Microsoft excel spreadsheet in the project archive.

B.4.2 CBM was recovered from two contexts: 22429 (1 fragment, 269g) and 22847 (2 fragments, 82g). Both are pieces of flat tile.

B.4.3 The 32 fragments of fired clay are all small amorphous pieces of indeterminate form, mostly of a silty red fabric with ferruginous inclusions.

B.4.4 None of the CBM or fired clay fragments are dateable.

B.4.5 The fired clay can be discarded. The CBM should be retained for potential for further study.

## **B.5 Stone by Ruth Shaffrey**

B.5.1 A total of 48 pieces of stone was retained and submitted for analysis. These were examined with a x10 magnification hand lens for signs of use.

B.5.2 A single stone object was recovered from context 22847 (SF22802). This is an edge fragment of upper rotary quern stone measuring 55mm thick and weighing 387g. It is made

from Old Red Sandstone from the Forest of Dean/Wye Valley area and is almost certainly Roman in date.

B.5.3 A total of 44 pieces of stone are burnt, either heat cracked/shattered quartzite, or oxidised limestone. These were recovered from contexts 21511 (2), 21909 (13), 22702 (2), 22704 (6), 22804 (6), 22810 (4), 22818 (5), 22842 (1), 22846 (1) and 22847 (4). Three fragments of stone are unworked and show no signs of use.

B.5.4 The burnt and unworked stone can be discarded. The rotary quern fragment should be retained so that it can be available for further study.

## B.6 Flint by Michael Donnelly

### *Introduction*

B.6.1 Additional evaluation following on from the original Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme (OA, 2018) and brought to light a small assemblage of just seven pieces. These were generally well- made and including a blade and blade tools typically of Mesolithic or Neolithic activity. The flint was in good condition despite heavy cortication and it was unlikely to have been heavily reworked. The scale of the assemblage suggests limited activity at the edges of the river during early prehistory. The lack of activity may well reflect the potentially dangerous environment being largely avoided by these mobile groups.

CATEGORY TYPE	Number
Flake	3
Blade	1
Core fragment	1
Knife other	1
Piercer	1
Total	7
Burnt unworked	na
No. burnt (%)	0%
No. broken (%)	57.14%
No. cores/related debitage (%)	14.29%
No. retouched (%)	28.57%

### *Methodology*

B.6.2 The artefacts were catalogued according to OA South's standard system of broad artefact/debitage type (Anderson-Whymark 2013; Bradley 1999), general condition noted, and dating was attempted where possible. The assemblage was catalogued directly onto an Open Office spreadsheet. During the assessment additional information on condition (rolled, abraded, fresh and degree of cortication), and state of the artefact (burnt, broken, or visibly utilised) was also recorded. Retouched pieces were classified according to standard morphological descriptions (e.g. Bamford 1985, 72-77; Healy 1988, 48-9; Bradley 1999). Technological attribute analysis was initially undertaken and included the recording of butt and termination type (Inizan et al.

1999), flake type (Harding 1990), hammer mode (Onhuma and Bergman 1982), and the presence of platform edge abrasion.

### *Discussion*

- B.6.3 This small assemblage was fresh but heavily corticated, something that is often seen in material from in and around Oxford. The flints included three blade forms, one of which had been formed into a piercer while another was a backed or other form of knife with heavy irregular invasive retouch on its right side and blunting/backing along its left edge. The piercer was fashioned on a blade or flake (the piece was broken so its exact form is unclear) exhibiting multiple flaking directions in its dorsal negative scars indicative of axe or adze working.
- B.6.4 All three blade forms could belong to a single industry dated to the Neolithic period but given the disparate nature of the assemblage they could easily belong to multiple occupations or visits to the site over many thousands of years with a Mesolithic or even late Upper Palaeolithic date being possible for some.
- B.6.5 Several flakes were also present, but these were undiagnostic. All three were recovered from the same context, fill 21511 from undated pit 21509 that was sealed within colluvial horizons. The flints may be contemporary with the pit but were undiagnostic.
- B.6.6 Finally, one probable core fragment was recovered but this possible may also represent a broken flake adze or axe. If there were the case, then the piece would also be early in date but would be undiagnostic if it was simply a core fragment.
- B.6.7 Overall, the assemblage represents very limited flint use on site probably by mobile groups using the river's edge for hunting and gatherings task or as a suitable routeway for travel between more permanently established sites.

## APPENDIX C ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

### C.1 Environmental Samples by Sharon Cook

#### *Introduction*

- C.1.1 Twenty samples were taken during the evaluation of Field 3 for the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme in 2020. The samples were taken from a range of archaeological features and deposits across the area of investigation, primarily to assess the preservation and abundance of charred plant remains and charcoal and their potential to provide useful data as part of further archaeological investigations.
- C.1.2 The samples were additionally selected to maximise the recovery of material suitable for radiocarbon dating in cases where artefacts were not recovered or were unsuitable for phasing the features.

#### *Methodology*

- C.1.3 The total volume (up to 40 litres) of all bulk samples not identified in the field as potentially waterlogged, was processed by water flotation (using a modified Siraf system) for the recovery of plant remains and any bones or artefacts that might be present. For samples which were identified as potentially waterlogged, a bucket of material (c10l) was retained to ensure the processing of specialist samples for insects and waterlogged materials was possible if required.
- C.1.4 Flots were collected in a 0.25mm nylon mesh and the residues were washed through a 10mm, 4mm, 2mm and a 0.5mm sieve. Both flots and residues were air dried in a heated room. A magnet was dragged through each residue fraction after to sorting for artefacts to check for hammer scale and any bones or artefacts were noted and reintegrated with the hand-excavated finds.
- C.1.5 Dried flots were scanned under a low-power binocular microscope at magnifications between x10 to x20. The sizes of assemblages varied considerably between samples and so for samples with small numbers of charred plant remains within the samples, the numbers within the tables are full number of items (cereal grain, cereal chaff, weed/ wild plants and other charred plant remains), however for richer assemblages this was not possible within the time available for an evaluation and these have been recorded on a semi-quantitative: \* = < 5 items, \*\* = 5 - 25 items, \*\*\* = 25 - 50 items, \*\*\*\* = 50-100 items, \*\*\*\*\* = >100 items.
- C.1.6 Charcoal was also assessed on the same semi-quantitative scale in terms of fragments >2mm and fragments <2mm. Any fragments less than 2mm are unsuitable for species identification. Further identification of charcoal has not been attempted for this assessment.
- C.1.7 Identifications of seeds and cereal chaff were made with reference to published guides (e.g. Jacomet 2006 and Cappers *et al.* 2012) and the comparative seed collection held at OAS but should again be considered preliminary. Nomenclature for the plant taxa follows Stace 2010.

## Results

Sample no.	Context no.	Trench	Feature no.	Feature/Depo sit	Date	Sample vol.	Retained	Finds	Notes
21500	21507	215	21505	Secondary fill of Pit		20			7.5YR 4/4 Brown sandy silt loam.
21900	21908	219	21907	Secondary fill of Pit		40			10YR 4/4 Dark yellowish-brown sandy silt loam.
21901	21909	219	21907	Basal fill of Pit		40			10YR 5/4 Yellowish brown/ 10YR 5/2 greyish brown sandy clay loam.
22100	22109	221	22112	Fill of Ditch	AD 43- 410	30	10		10YR 5/4 Yellowish brown clay loam.
22101	22110	221	22112	Secondary fill of Ditch	AD 43- 410	25	7		10YR 5/2 Greyish brown silty clay.
22700	22702	227	22703	Secondary fill of Ditch	EIA-MIA	12		Animal Bone, Pottery	10YR 3/3 Dark brown sandy silt loam.
22701	22704	227	22705	Basal fill of Ditch	AD 100- 200	40		Animal Bone, Pottery	10YR 3/1 Very dark grey silt loam.
22800	22851	228	22803	Backfill of Pit	EIA-MIA	16		Animal Bone, Pottery, Fired Clay	10YR 4/4 Dark yellowish-brown sandy silt loam.
22801	22847	228	22816	Fill of Ditch	AD 100- 200	40		Animal Bone, Pottery, Fired Clay, Slag	7.5YR 2.5/2 Very dark brown sandy silt loam.
22802	22846	228	22816	Fill of Ditch	AD 200- 240	9	9	Pottery, Fired Clay, Slag	10YR 3/1 Very dark grey silty clay loam.
22803	22818	228	22817	Fill of Posthole	EIA-MIA	2			10YR 3/2 Very dark greyish brown silty clay loam.
22804	22844	228	22816	Secondary fill of Ditch Terminus	AD 43- 410	8	7	Animal Bone, Pottery	10YR 2/2 Very dark brown silt loam.

Sample no.	Context no.	Trench	Feature no.	Feature/Depo sit	Date	Sample vol.	Retained	Findings	Notes
22805	22804	228		Layer		40		Animal Bone, Slag	10YR 4/4 Brown silt loam.
22900	22914	229	22904	Basal fill of Ditch	Roman?	25	7		10YR 5/2 Greyish brown silty clay.
23200	23213	232	23210	Basal fill of Ditch		3			10YR 3/2 Very dark greyish brown clay loam.
23300	23321	233	23304	Basal fill of Ditch		27	9		10YR 4/4 Dark yellowish brown/10YR 5/1 Grey silty clay loam.
23600	23604	236	23605	Fill of possible hollow-way	Roman?	12			10YR 4/2 Dark greyish brown sandy clay loam.
23601	23625	236	23616	Basal fill of Ditch	Roman?	32			10YR 4/1 Dark grey silt loam.
24100	24127	241	24126	Basal fill of Paleochannel		27	8		10YR 5/2 Greyish brown silty clay loam with orange mottling.
24200	24206	242	24205	Basal fill of Pit		12		Shell	2.5Y 5/3 Light olive brown sandy clay.

**Table: Sample descriptions.**

### **Trench 215**

- C.1.8 A single 20 litre bulk sample (21500) from the secondary fill (21507) of pit 21505, which is currently undated, produced a 30ml flot comprising uncharred fine roots with small quantities of charcoal the majority of which is <2mm in size. Two charred fruit stones (*Prunus cf domestica/spinosa*) and further *Prunus sp.*, fragments are present, but the former are incomplete.
- C.1.9 Hazelnut shell and several small fragments which could not be further identified at this time were also recorded. The nutshell and fruit stone are suitable for radiocarbon dating however confirmation of the identification of the *Prunus* stones is recommended as some species can be difficult to differentiate and were introduced relatively late.
- C.1.10 A small quantity of terrestrial molluscs (<10) are present together with occasional *Ceciliodes acicula* which are a burrowing snail and probably relatively modern. There

are also a small number of uncharred seeds which do not appear to be of ancient origin.

<b>Sample No</b>		<b>21500</b>
<b>Context No</b>		<b>21507</b>
<b>Cut No</b>		21505
<b>Trench No</b>		215
<b>Feature Type</b>		Secondary fill of Pit
<b>Period</b>		
<b>Sample Vol (L)</b>		20
<b>Flot Volume (ml)</b>		30
<b>Charcoal</b>		
	>10mm	
	10-4mm	*
	4-2mm	*
<b>Legumes, fruits &amp; nuts</b>		
<i>Corylus avellana</i> L.	hazelnut shell	2f
cf <i>Corylus avellana</i>	probable hazelnut shell	4f
<i>Prunus</i> cf <i>domestica/spinosa</i>	wild plum/blackthorne	2 + 7f
<i>Prunus</i> sp.	cherry	23f
Indeterminate	fruitstone/nutshell fragments.	50+

**Table: The Charred Plant Remains in Trench 215**

### **Trench 219**

C.1.11 Two samples were taken from an undated pit within trench 219. Both samples produced small flots primarily comprising fine uncharred roots with occasional charcoal. The charcoal for both samples of small size with minor external mineral staining and encrustation and includes knotty fragments and rare small twigs. Rare traces of waterlogging were noted however no other plant remains are present within these samples.

### **Trench 221**

C.1.12 The two samples from Roman ditch 22112 in trench 221 produced small flots which contain fine roots with a slightly waterlogged appearance. A single elder (*Sambucus* sp.) seed in sample 22100 and an uncharred prickly sowthistle (*Sonchus asper*) in sample 22101 have a modern appearance.

C.1.13 Both samples contained small quantities of charred material which is likely to be the result of secondary deposition.

### **Trench 227**

C.1.14 The two ditches within trench 227 have been dated to the Iron Age (ditch 22703) and the early Roman period (ditch 22705). Both flots contain moderate quantities of uncharred fine roots. Both flots contain charred cereal grain as well as crop processing

waste in the form of glume bases from spelt wheat (*Triticum spelta*) with the sample from ditch 22705 containing the richer assemblage.

C.1.15 Charred wild plants are primarily of those species which prefer waste and arable ground such as docks (*Rumex* sp.), knotweeds (Polygonaceae) and grasses (Poaceae). The assemblage is typical of an Iron Age or Roman date.

C.1.16 The uncharred seeds do not appear to be waterlogged and are probably modern.

Sample No		22700	22701
Context No		22702	22704
Cut No		22703	22705
Trench No		227	227
Feature Type		Secondary fill of Ditch	Basal fill of Ditch
Period		EIA-MIA	AD 100-200
Sample Vol (L)		12	40
Flot Volume (ml)		75	40
Charcoal			
	>10mm		
	10-4mm	**	***
	4-2mm	****	****
<b>Cereal grain</b>			
<i>Triticum</i> sp.	wheat		3
cf. <i>Triticum</i> sp.	cf. wheat	2	3
cf. <i>Hordeum</i> sp.	cf. barley	3	1
<i>Avena/Bromus</i>	oat/brome		1
Cerealia	indet. cereal	3	10f
<b>Chaff</b>			
<i>Triticum spelta</i>	spelt spikelet fork		1
<i>Triticum spelta</i>	spelt glume base	1	20
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt glume base		6
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt glume base fragment	1	60
<i>Avena</i> sp.	oat awns		*
<b>Legumes, fruits &amp; nuts</b>			
<i>Vicia/Lathyrus</i> sp.	vetch/vetchling/tare, etc 4-2mm		4
<b>Wild species</b>			
<i>Medicago/Trifolium/Melilotus</i>	medick/clover/melilots		5
<i>Malva</i> sp.	mallows	1	
Polygonaceae	knotweed family	1	
<i>Persicaria</i> sp.	knotweeds		1

<b>Sample No</b>		<b>22700</b>	<b>22701</b>
<b>Context No</b>		<b>22702</b>	<b>22704</b>
<b>Cut No</b>		22703	22705
<b>Trench No</b>		227	227
<b>Feature Type</b>		Secondary fill of Ditch	Basal fill of Ditch
<b>Period</b>		EIA-MIA	AD 100-200
<b>Sample Vol (L)</b>		12	40
<b>Flot Volume (ml)</b>		75	40
<i>Rumex</i> spp.	docks	1	2
<i>Galium aparine</i> L.	cleavers		1
cf large Asteraceae	probable daisy family		2
<i>Eleocharis</i> sp.	spike-rushes	1	1
Poaceae	grass seed (large)	1	
Poaceae	grass seed (small)	2	2
<b>Other</b>			
Indet.	seed/fruit	2f	2

**Table: The Charred Plant Remains in Trench 227**

### **Trench 228**

- C.1.17 Six samples were taken from trench 228 to the south of trench 227. The samples from these two trenches evidence settlement activity in the vicinity as both contain charred plant material in the form of crop waste commonly associated with 'in settlement' processing activity.
- C.1.18 Of the six samples sample 22800 (pit 22803), 22803 (posthole 22817) and sample 22805 (layer 22804) contain charcoal but very little other charred material. By contrast the remaining samples from the fills of ditch 22816, which is dated to the Roman period, contain cereal grains and chaff together with charred wild plant seeds, probably from weeds accidentally harvested with the cereals.
- C.1.19 The pattern for waterlogged plant remains is similar with the exception that sample 22801 (22816) contains no waterlogged seeds. This may indicate that this fill is above the level of flooding and therefore anaerobic preservation could not occur.

Sample No		2280 0	22801	22802	228 03	22804	228 05
Context No		2285 1	22847	22846	228 18	22844	228 04
Cut No		2280 3	22816	22816	228 17	22816	
Trench No		228	228	228	228	228	228
Feature Type		Backfill of Pit	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Posthole	Secondary fill of Ditch	Terminus Layer
Period		EIA-MIA	AD 100-200	AD 200-240		AD 43-410	
Sample Vol (L)		16	40	9	2	8	40
Flot Volume (ml)		150	100	50	20	150	110
Charcoal							
	>10mm	*					
	10-4mm	***	***	***	**	****	*
	4-2mm	**** *	*****	*****	*** *	*****	*** *
Cereal grain							
<i>Triticum</i> sp.	wheat		36	9		8	1
cf. <i>Triticum</i> sp.	cf. wheat	1	23	7		3	
<i>Hordeum</i> sp.	barley		2				
<i>Avena/Bromus</i>	oat/brome		1				
Cerealia	indet. cereal	4f	58	9		8	3f
Chaff							
<i>Triticum spelta</i>	spelt spikelet fork		1	2		3	
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	spikelet fork					3f	
<i>Triticum spelta</i>	spelt glume base		20	9		29	
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt glume base		20	12		15	1
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt glume base fragment		106	17		11	1
<i>Triticum/Hordeum</i>	rachis internode		1			4f	
<i>Triticum/Hordeum</i>	rachis frag		1f	2f		3f	
<i>Triticum</i> sp.	coleoptile			1		1	
<i>Avena</i> sp.	oat awns		**			*	
Cerealia	det embryo		1				

Sample No		22800	22801	22802	22803	22804	22805
Context No		22851	22847	22846	22818	22844	22804
Cut No		22803	22816	22816	22817	22816	
Trench No		228	228	228	228	228	228
Feature Type		Backfill of Pit	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Posthole	Secondary fill of Ditch	Terminus Layer
Period		EIA-MIA	AD 100-200	AD 200-240		AD 43-410	
Sample Vol (L)		16	40	9	2	8	40
Flot Volume (ml)		150	100	50	20	150	110
Legumes, fruits & nuts							
<i>Vicia/Lathyrus sp.</i>	vetch/vetchling /tare, etc >4mm					1	
<i>Vicia/Lathyrus sp.</i>	vetch/vetchling /tare, etc 4-2mm		10 + 11 (1/2) + 8f	7 + 5(1/2) + 7f		6	1f
<i>Vicia/Lathyrus sp.</i>	vetch/vetchling /tare, etc <2mm		4 + 7(1/2) + 5f	4		1(1/2)	
<i>Corylus avellana L.</i>	hazelnut shell		11				
<b>Wild species</b>							
<i>Medicago/Trifolium/Melilotus</i>	medick/clover/melilots		52	10		12	
<i>Medicago/Trifolium/Lotus</i>	medick/clover /birds-foot-trefoil		29	7		13	
<i>Malva sp.</i>	mallows			1			
<i>Rumex spp.</i>	docks		8	4		11	
<i>Chenopodium sp.</i>	goosefoots		9				
<i>Montia fontana L.</i>	blinks			1		1	
<i>Galium aparine L.</i>	cleavers		1	1		1f	
<i>Plantago lanceolata L.</i>	ribwort plaintain		2				
Lamiaceae	dead nettle family					1	
cf large Asteraceae	probable daisy family		5				
<i>Tripleurospermum sp.</i>	mayweeds		2				

Sample No		22800	22801	22802	22803	22804	22805
Context No		22851	22847	22846	22818	22844	22804
Cut No		22803	22816	22816	22817	22816	
Trench No		228	228	228	228	228	228
Feature Type		Backfill of Pit	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Posthole	Secondary fill of Ditch	Terminus Layer
Period		EIA-MIA	AD 100-200	AD 200-240		AD 43-410	
Sample Vol (L)		16	40	9	2	8	40
Flot Volume (ml)		150	100	50	20	150	110
Valerianella dentata (L.) Pollich	narrow fruited cornsalad			1		1	
Juncus sp.	rushes		9	1			
Eleocharis sp.	spike-rushes		15	2		1	
Carex spp.	sedges		7	1			
Poaceae	grass seed (large)		7	1		2f	
Poaceae	grass seed (medium)		1	2		4	
Poaceae	grass seed (small)		5	1		1	
<b>Other</b>							
Indet.	seed/fruit		5f	4f		1	

**Table: The Charred Plant Remains in Trench 228**

Sample No		2280 0	2280 1	22802	2280 3	2280 4	2280 5
Context No		2285 1	2284 7	22846	2281 8	2284 4	2280 4
Cut No		2280 3	2281 6	22816	2281 7	2281 6	
Trench No		228	228	228	228	228	228
Feature Type		Backfill of Pit	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Posthole	Secondary fill of Ditch	Layer
Period		EIA- MIA	AD 100- 200	AD 200- 240		AD 43- 410	
Sample Vol (L)		16	40	9	2	8	40
Flot Volume (ml)		150	100	50	20	150	110
WPR Present							
<i>Fumaria officinalis</i> L.	common fumitory			**		***	
<i>Ranunculus bulbosus/acris</i>	meadow/bulbous buttercup					**	
<i>Ranunculus</i> sub gen <i>batrachium</i>	crowfoot					***	
<i>Medicago/Trifolium/Lotus</i>	medick/clover/birds-foot-trefoil						*
<i>Rubus</i> sp.	brambles			**		***	
<i>Urtica dioica</i> L.	common nettle			***** *		**** *	
<i>Urtica uriens</i> L.	small nettle			**		**	
<i>Fallopia</i> sp.	knotweeds			**			
<i>Rumex</i> sp.	docks					****	
<i>Stellaria media</i> (L.) Vill.	common chickweed					****	
<i>Chenopodium</i> sp.	goosefoots			***		****	*
<i>Chenopodium/Atriplex</i>	goosefoots/oraches					***	
<i>Hyoscyamus niger</i> L.	henbane					*	
<i>Solanum nigrum</i> L.	black nightshade					**	
Lamiaceae	dead-nettle family	*				**	
<i>Leonurus cardiaca</i> L.	motherwort					**	
<i>Lamium</i> sp.	dead-nettles			**		**	
<i>Galeopsis</i> sp.	hemp-nettles	*				**	
<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	elder	*		***		**	

Sample No		2280 0	2280 1	22802	2280 3	2280 4	2280 5
Context No		2285 1	2284 7	22846	2281 8	2284 4	2280 4
Cut No		2280 3	2281 6	22816	2281 7	2281 6	
Trench No		228	228	228	228	228	228
Feature Type		Backfill of Pit	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Ditch	Fill of Posthole	Secondary fill of Ditch	Layer
Period		EIA- MIA	AD 100- 200	AD 200- 240		AD 43- 410	
Sample Vol (L)		16	40	9	2	8	40
Flot Volume (ml)		150	100	50	20	150	110
WPR Present							
<i>Valerianella dentata</i> (L.) Pollich	narrow fruited cornsalad					**	
<i>Aethusa cynapium</i> L.	fool's parsley					***	
<i>Lemna</i> sp.	duckweed			*			
<i>Eleocharis palustris</i>	common spike- rush			**		***	
<i>Carex</i> sp.	sedges	*				****	*

**Table X: The Waterlogged Plant Remains in Trench 228**
**Trench 229**

C.1.20 The sample from the basal fill of ditch 22904 in trench 229 contains no identifiable charred material although small flecks <1mm are present. The sample is rich in fibrous waterlogged material which consists of roots and stem material and contains uncharred seeds from plants including nettles (*Urtica dioica*), water crowfoot (*Ranunculus* subgen *Batrachium*), sedge (*Carex* sp.) and chenopod (*Chenopodium* sp.), indicative of damp and disturbed/waste ground. Rare duckweed seeds (*Lemna* sp.) indicate that the base of the ditch is likely to have been water filled for some time.

**Trench 232**

C.1.21 Sample 23200 from the basal fill 23213 of ditch 23210 is a heavily waterlogged peaty deposit which comprises a large volume of fibrous waterlogged material which consists of roots and stem material, and small black flecks which may be charred plant material but could also be the result of staining due to waterlogging. Occasional fragments of wood and some possible charcoal are generally small.

C.1.22 Due to the large volume of the flot only 50ml was scanned, this contains a similar waterlogged assemblage to sample 22900.

### **Trench 233**

C.1.23 The flot from ditch 23304, which is undated, contains only fibrous waterlogged material which consists of roots and stem material, and small black flecks which may be charred. Rare insect fragments are small and unidentifiable. A small number (<5) of snails are also present.

### **Trench 236**

C.1.24 Two samples were taken from trench 236. The first sample 23600 was from the fill (23604) of a possible hollow-way and contains only a small number of uncharred roots.

C.1.25 The second sample (23601) from the basal fill 23625 of ditch 23616 contains a small quantity of nettles (*Urtica dioica*) and water crowfoot (*Ranunculus* subgenus *Batrachium*) together with goosefoot (*Chenopodium* sp.) fragments. The remainder of the flot volume comprises uncharred fine roots which have a modern appearance.

### **Trench 241**

C.1.26 A single sample from the basal fill of a paleochannel produced a small flot comprising fine modern roots with small flecks of possibly charred material <2mm. Three small fragments of indistinguishable nutshell/fruitstone are present but are too small to provide sufficient material for radiocarbon dating.

### **Trench 242**

C.1.27 The final sample is 24200 from the basal fill of pit 24205. This flot contains a large quantity of uncharred modern looking roots with a good quantity of charcoal which is generally small-sized. The charcoal has a slight mineral staining which indicates some degree of waterlogging however no other plant remains are present within the flot.

## *Discussion*

C.1.28 Charred plant remains were sparse in most deposits apart from those features in trenches 227 and 228 which contain grain and crop related debris in mixed condition. Cereal grains are frequently badly clinkered and fragmented but glume base fragments in many samples are in good condition and of a large size.

C.1.29 Charcoal is present within many samples; however, the distribution appears to be largely from features and deposits on the higher ground with the samples from lower areas containing little charred material. The exception to this is the previously mentioned area around trenches 227 and 228 which is on lower ground to the North of the site.

C.1.30 As the charcoal appears to be mineral stained and waterlogged plant remains are present it would seem likely that the ditches were dug for drainage. Ditch 22705 and ditch 22816 are of a similar date and contain similar assemblages, although their point of origin is unclear, it is possible that the charred material has been washed to its current position from elsewhere on the higher ground.

C.1.31 Uncharred seeds of unclear origin are present in small quantities across the site. These are mainly from species such as elder (*Sambucus* sp.) and goosefoots (*Chenopodium* sp.) which are common within assemblages and frequently difficult to assess due to

their robust condition. Slight traces of waterlogging are present in many of the samples, but most contained only small quantities of fibrous material (roots and stems) with few or no seeds.

- C.1.32 Waterlogged remains are present in quantity in samples from trenches 228, 229, 232 and 236 with the majority of these samples containing common nettle (*Urtica dioica*), water crowfoot (*Ranunculus* subgenus *Batrachium*), sedge (*Carex* sp.) and goosefoots (*Chenopodium* sp.) all of which are indicators of damp and/or waste ground.
- C.1.33 Molluscs are present within many of the sample flots with freshwater snails as well as terrestrial snails represented. Samples 22100, 22101, 22700, 22701, 22800, 22802 and 22805 all contain assemblages with potential for further assessment.
- C.1.34 Insect remains in all samples are rare and probably modern.

## C.2 Animal Bone by Rebecca Nicholson

### Introduction

- C.2.1 A total of 415 bone fragments weighing 2.921kg was recovered from the evaluation. Bones were recorded to assessment level, by context, using a pro-forma Access database and with the use of a modern comparative bone collection, with readily identifiable elements identified to species or family (Table 1). Large mammal indicates animals of cattle, horse or red deer size, medium mammal indicates animals of pig, sheep/goat, roe deer, dog and cat size. Where tooth row aging has been applied, this follows Grant (1982) and measurements follow von-den-Driesch (1976).

### The assemblage


- C.2.2 Bone condition is variable depending on trench and was scored on a subjective scale of 1 (very good) to 5 (extremely poor) (Fig 1). In general, bones from contexts dated as Iron Age or Roman are in fair condition (condition 2-3) while a higher proportion of those from undated contexts are highly eroded and chalky (condition 5), which may indicate that some of these features are earlier in date. A small number of bones are burnt, including small fragments of deer antler (probably roe) from undated pit fill 21507. Evidence of gnawing is minimal and butchery marks confined to a small number of large mammal bones with clear chop marks, probably related to the extraction of marrow or division of joints.
- C.2.3 The assemblage contains bones from cattle, sheep/goat, pig, horse, ?roe deer, bank or field vole and indeterminate bird. Measurements taken on two loose upper M3 teeth (left and right side, almost certainly a pair) from undated pit fill 23106 indicates a large animal, of a size consistent with very large domestic pig (*Sus domesticus*) or wild boar (*Sus scrofa* L. 1758) (Albarella and Payne 2005; Albarella *et al.* 2009). With tooth lengths of 36.9mm and 36.7mm and widths of 21.2mm and 21.8mm, these specimens fall at the cut off point established for separating modern West Palearctic wild and domestic pigs (Evin *et al.* 2014).

Context	Sample number	Phase	Quantity	Weight (g)	Notes
21507	0	Undated	4	4	4 small frags of burnt antler
21507	0	Undated	11	3	burnt mammal fragments
21909	0	Undated	1	9	Cattle 2 <sup>nd</sup> phalange
22011	0	Undated	3	43	Large mammal distal mandible frag. Very eroded and white – possibly calcined. Also frags of limb bone shaft.
22034	0	Roman	1	1	Mammal fragment
22108	0	Roman	2	50	Cattle femur caput
22110	0	Roman	21	44	Large mammal mandible frags. Fresh breaks. No teeth
22218	0	Roman	13	15	Mammal fragments
22224	0	Roman	9	51	Large mammal limb bone shaft fragments
22310	0	Roman	1	8	Medium mammal tibia shaft fragment
22405	0	Roman	1	2	Medium mammal shaft frag
22410	0	Roman	11	338	Ginger coloured bone, fragmented but little surface erosion. Incl almost complete but fragmented right cattle mandible with P3 in-situ and M3 loose, both in wear. Cattle metacarpal, fresh break, fused proximal and distal Bd=50.1mm; SD=26.4mm; GL=223mm
22414	0	Roman	2	10	Medium mammal fragments
22427	0	Roman	1	13	Large mammal shaft frag, burnt
22608	0	Roman	26	130	Sheep/goat cranium and metapodial (slightly gnawed). Cattle tooth fragment
22609	0	Roman	19	120	Cattle phalange and scapula fragment plus large and medium mammal limb bone. Probable sheep/goat radius shaft and cattle scapula fragment are gnawed (carnivore)
22612	0	EIA	10	108	Cattle left radius shaft, gnawed (dog) a proximal end. Fresh breaks
22614	0	Undated	3	36	sheep/goat mandible with Dp4, M1, M2 in wear, M3 in crypt (MWS24 = animal 1-2 yrs). Hole in ramus circular but no cut marks, probably natural. Sheep/goat calcaneus is fused and gnawed.
22616	0	Undated	3	8	Medium mammal rib and shaft frags
22702	0	EIA-MIA	9	139	Medium mammal (probably sheep/goat) long bone shaft frags, large mammal pelvis fragment
22702	22700	EIA-MIA	10	42	Sheep/goat scapula, mandible ascending ramus frag, loose M1/M2 in wear. Indet bird bone shaft frag

Context	Sample number	Phase	Quantity	Weight (g)	Notes
22702	22700	EIA-MIA	11	4	Bank/field vole skull frag. Indet bird fragment. Medium mammal 2 <sup>nd</sup> phalange
22704	0	E-Mid Roman	13	187	Horse mandibular P2, worn. Sheep/goat distal tibia. Cattle premolar loose and unworn.
22704	0	E-Mid Roman	11	215	Cattle tibia shaft; chopped through. ?gnawed proximal shaft. Bird rib. Sheep/goat M1/M2 in wear.
22704	22701	E-Mid Roman	25	12	1 burnt frag
22704	22701	E-Mid Roman	17	30	Shaft frags, mostly sheep/goat sized
22710	0	E Roman	4	4	Mammal bone fragments
22804	0	Undated	2	59	Chalky, white frags, extremely eroded, large mammal
22804	22805	Undated	6	0	Medium mammal fragments
22805	0	Roman	19	68	Part of sheep/goat mandible with P4 in wear, also loose s/g M1/M2
22810	0	MIA	3	7	Medium mammal cranial frags
22842	0	Roman	3	28	Large mammal cuneiform
22844	22804	Roman	2	84	Cattle horn core, incomplete
22844	0	Roman	2	34	Unfused cattle phalange
22844	22804	Roman	2	2	Mammal bone fragments
22846	0	Mid Roman	6	157	Cut mark on medium mammal rib frag. Cattle distal tibia has chop mark, removing part of cortex, close to the break- filleting? Probably marrow-cracked. Slight lipping at edge of articular surface
22846	0	Mid Roman	1	6	Medium mammal metapodial shaft frag split longitudinally
22847	0	E-Mid Roman	10	105	Cattle vertebra, unfused; large mammal rib. 1 calcined frag medium mammal shaft; sheep/goat calcaneum, fused
22847	0	E-Mid Roman	17	66	Large mammal vertebra plus frags
22847	22801	E-Mid Roman	2	1	1 burnt mammal frag and 1 amphibian bone
22847	22801	E-M Roman	9	12	Carpal/tarsal bone of medium mammal. Fragments.
22847	0	E-Mid Roman	17	94	Mammal bone fragments, 1 burnt. 1 sheep/goat M1/M2
22848	0	E Roman	3	34	Large and medium mammal fragments
22851	22800	EIA-MIA	2	2	Mammal frags
22851	22851	EIA-MIA	2	5	Mammal shaft frags

Context	Sample number	Phase	Quantity	Weight (g)	Notes
22911	0	Roman	1	7	Mammal shaft frag
23106	0	Undated	41	167	Pig - 4 loose teeth, all very worn- ?wild boar. Incl R&L upper M3, M1, P4. M3 =36.9x21.2mm, 36.7x21.8mm. L mammal tibia shaft with unusual transparent coating in places. All eroded/chalky
23114	0	Undated	1	10	Horse tooth (M1/M2, slight wear)
23305	0	Medieval	2	15	Large mammal fragments
23310	0	Undated	2	129	Cattle humerus shaft; gnawed edge (carnivore). Fresh break - 2 conjoining frags
23911	0	Undated	3	64	Chalky. Horse right scapula glenoid cavity
24004	0	Undated	1	113	cattle proximal radius shaft, left. Very eroded edges, ?waterworn
24112	0	Undated	3	5	Medium mammal fragments
24206	24200	Undated	1	8	Loose cattle unerupted M3 frag
24206	0	Undated	10	13	Loose cattle molar frags, little wear and indet frags

**Table: Number and weight of bone fragments, by context**



Graph: Levels of preservation by number of fragments and phase (1=very good; 5=extremely poor)

***Recommendations for retention/dispersal***

C.2.4 The bone has been recorded to assessment level only and full recording should be considered if the area is subsequently excavated and additional bone recovered. As a

minimum, from this evaluation the bone from contexts likely to be prehistoric should be retained in the archive.

### **C.3 Shell by Rebecca Nicholson**

#### ***Introduction***

C.3.1 A single piece of shell weighing 36g was recovered from the residue of sample 24200, from primary fill 24206 of pit 24205. The shell fragment is fossil, heavily eroded and pitted and probably of the oyster *Gryphaea*. It is likely to derive from the underlying geology.

#### ***Recommendations regarding the conservation, discard and retention of material***

C.3.2 The shell has no further archaeological value and retention in the archive is not required.

## APPENDIX D      BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albarella, U and Payne, S, 2005 Neolithic pigs from Durrington Walls, Wiltshire, England: a biometrical database, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 32 (2005) 589–599,

Albarella, U, Dobney, K, and Rowley-Conwy, P, 2009 Size and shape of the Eurasian wild boar (*Sus scrofa*), with a view to the reconstruction of its Holocene history, *Environmental Archaeology* 14 (2), pp 103-136

Anderson-Whymark, H, 2015, the flint, in Allen, T, Barclay, A, Cromarty, A, M, Anderson-Whymark, H, Parker, A, Robinson, M, and Jones, G, *Opening the wood, making the Land; The Archaeology of a Middle Thames Landscape, Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age, Vol 1*, Oxford: Oxford Archaeological Unit. Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph **38**

Bamford, H., 1985 *Briar Hill: excavation 1974-1978*, Northampton: Northampton Development Corporation. Archaeological monograph **3**

Bayley, J, Mackreth, D F, Wallis, H 2001, Evidence for Romano-British brooch production at Old Buckenham, Norfolk. In *Britannia* Vol. 32 pp. 93-118.

Booth, P, 1993 The pottery, in A Romano-British kiln site at Lower Farm, Nuneham Courtenay, and other sites on the Didcot to Oxford and Wootton to Abingdon Water Mains, Oxfordshire (P Booth, A Boyle and G D Keevill), *Oxoniensia* **58**, 134–206

Booth, P, nd Oxford Archaeology Roman pottery recording system: an introduction, unpublished, updated November 2019

Bradley, P, 1999 The worked flint. In A. Barclay and C. Halpin. Eds. *Excavations at Barrow Hills, Radley, Oxfordshire*, Oxford: Oxford Archaeological Unit. Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph **11**: 211-227.

CH2M, 2017, Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme, Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation.

Cappers, R T J, Bekker, R M and Jans, J E A, 2012, *Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands* Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing and Groningen University Library. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition.

Dewey, H, and Bromehead, C E N, 1915 *The geology of the country around Windsor and Chertsey*, London, H.M. Stationery Office.

Evin, A, Cucchi, T, Escarguel, G, , Owen, J, Larson, G, Strand Vidarsdottire, U, and Dobney, K Using traditional biometrical data to distinguish West Palearctic wild boar and domestic pigs in the archaeological record: New methods and standards, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 43, 1–8

Grant, A, 1982 The use of toothwear as a guide to the age of domestic ungulates, in *Ageing and sexing animal bones from archaeological sites* (eds B Wilson, C Grigson and S Payne), BAR Brit. Ser. 109, 91-108, Oxford

Harding, P, 1990 The worked flint, in *The Stonehenge environs project*, (ed J C Richards) London, English Heritage

Healy, F, 1988 The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Spong Hil, North Elmham, Part VI: Occupation during the seventh to second Millennia BC, East Anglian Archaeological reports 38

Inizan, M.-L, Reduron-Ballinger, M, Roche, H and Tixier, J, 1999 *Technology and terminology of knapped stone*, Cercle de Recherches et d'Etudes Préhistoriques, CNRS, Nanterre

Jacobs, 2019 (19 Sept), Memo. Field 3 - Archaeological Consultation Feedback. Oxford FAS. Internal memo

Jacomet, S, 2006, *Identification of Cereal Remains from Archaeological Sites*, (2nd edition, trans. by James Greig), Basel, Archaeobotany Laboratory, IPAS, Basel University

Mackreth, D.F, 2011, *Brooches in Late Iron Age and Roman Britain*. Oxford, Oxbow.

Onhuma, K and Bergman, C A, 1982 Experimental studies in the determination of flake mode, *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology, London* **19**, 161-171

Oosthuizen, S, 2019, *The emergence of the English*. Leeds, Arc Humanities Press.

Oxford Archaeology (OA), 2010, Solent-Thames Research Frameworks project.  
[http://thehumanjourney.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=553&Itemid=277](http://thehumanjourney.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=553&Itemid=277)

OA, 2016, Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme. Phase 2. Archaeological Watching Brief Report. (client report)

OA, 2017 (June). Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme Phase 2. Heritage Desk based Assessment (client report)

OA, 2017a (June). Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme Geoarchaeological Assessment Report (client report)

OA, 2017b (June). Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme: Old Abingdon Road, Oxford. Archaeological Evaluation Report (client report)

OA, 2018, Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme: Old Abingdon Road, Oxford. Archaeological Evaluation Report (client report)

PCRG, SGRP, MPRG, 2016 *A standard for pottery studies in archaeology*, Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group, Study Group for Roman Pottery, and the Medieval Pottery Research Group

Saville, A., 1980, On the measurement of struck flakes and flake tools, *Lithics* **1**, 16-20.

Stace, C. 2010. (third edition). *New Flora of the British Isles*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomber, R, and Dore, J, 1998 *The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection: a handbook*, MoLAS Monograph **2**, London

von den Driesch, A, 1976 *A Guide to the Measurement of Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites*. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University

Webster, P, 1996 *Roman samian pottery in Britain*, York

Young, C J, 1977 *The Roman pottery industry of the Oxford region*, BAR Brit. Ser. **43**, Oxford

## APPENDIX E SITE SUMMARY DETAILS / OASIS REPORT FORM

<b>Site name:</b>	Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme, Field 3
<b>Site code:</b>	OXFAS20
<b>Grid Reference</b>	SP 5040 0473
<b>Type:</b>	Evaluation
<b>Date and duration:</b>	July 2020 (3 Weeks)
<b>Area of Site</b>	8.25 hectares
<b>Location of archive:</b>	The archive is currently held at OA, Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0ES, and will be deposited with Oxfordshire County Museum Services in due course, under the following accession number: OXCMS:2017.145

**Summary of Results:** *The Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme (OFAS) is located to the west and south of Oxford, from just north of Botley Road to the south of Old Abingdon Road, and takes in areas to the east of Abingdon Road. The OFAS crosses two administrative districts: the Vale of the White Horse (Oxfordshire County Council) in the southern section, and the City of Oxford (Oxford City Council) in the northern section. It comprises the construction of a principal two-stage relief channel, designed to look and function as a natural living river, containing water all year round. Field 3 falls within the associated construction works proposed for the scheme and will be developed for a compound.*

*Following on from previous heritage asset focused work (Desk-based Assessment, bespoke and reactive geoarchaeological surveys, geophysical surveys, and an archaeological evaluation on Old Abingdon Road and along the proposed route of the scheme), Oxford Archaeology was commissioned by VolkerStevin Ltd on behalf of the Environment Agency to undertake an archaeological evaluation within Field 3, a possible location for a construction compound. The scope and design of the evaluation took an iterative approach with results from the previous studies. The fieldwork and report-writing took place between July and October 2020.*

*The results of the Field 3 evaluation build upon the results of previous work which had been divided into different Geoarchaeological Zones that relate to the different topographic characteristics of the area studied. This offered a framework for a coherent understanding of the full range of archaeological and geoarchaeological discoveries. Field 3 covered two of these Geoarchaeological Zones. Zone VII, in the north-east third of the area, is within the valley floor. This zone is characterised by relatively level ground and high elevations in the surface of the underlying Northmoor Gravel, which is covered by various*

*thicknesses of alluvium associated with relict and existing watercourses and channels. Zone XI, in the south-west two-thirds of the area, is on the lower western valley slopes where ground levels start to rise above the floodplain and sediments are dominated by colluvial ploughwash. Within Field 3 these two Geoarchaeological Zones were divided by an existing Thames Water drainage culvert.*

*The archaeological results identified surviving archaeological deposits and features principally dating from the early-middle Iron Age, Roman and medieval periods, as well as numerous undated features. The evidence can be viewed as corroborating and developing the information and conclusions in relation to Geoarchaeological Zones VII (characterized by alluvial environments in the valley floor) and Zone XI (characterized by colluvial environments on the valley slopes) from the 2017 evaluation (OA 2018). The significant archaeological horizon at which archaeological features are first encountered was encountered at varying depths between 0.30m and 0.80m below the existing ground level.*

*Datable pre-Iron Age activity was limited to a handful of residual pieces of flintwork, many of which were either undiagnostic or broadly attributable to the Mesolithic/Neolithic. It is probable that some of the undated features date to the Bronze Age or earlier and reflect the pattern seen in the 2017 evaluation.*

*Evidence for Iron Age activity continues northwards along the valley slopes (Zone XI) and in the valley floor (Zone VII). The ditches probably relate to land divisions and agrarian uses of the wider landscape within which there is evidence for roundhouses belonging to dispersed settlement, perhaps farmsteads. The absence of late Iron Age evidence in this area is notable.*

*The work in Field 3 revealed further and more compelling evidence that there was a link between settlement activity on the slopes of the valley (Zone XI) to agricultural and/or pastoral activity along those same slopes and extending into the valley floor (Zone VII). A continuation of a probable NE–SW orientated routeway, evaluated in 2017, was revealed to extend up-slope beyond the cropmark features. Material culture such as pottery, animal bone and charred plant remains as were found in 2017 confirm settlement, agricultural and pastoral activity. The volume of this material combined with the Roman glass, a Harlow brooch, ceramic building material, and the rotary quern stone represent material classes not previously recovered. This strongly indicates*

*that significant Roman settlement activity is present within or very near to this area of the site. This evidence for settlement, the routeway and enclosure (OA 2018) are set within a network of parallel and perpendicular boundary ditches probably representing contemporary field systems.*

*The geoarchaeological results identified an undated paleochannel in Zone VII. Overlying the upper deposits of the paleochannel were several trackways. Whilst no dating was recovered it is anticipated that these are continuations of surfaces seen in 2017 and date to the late Saxon–medieval periods. A single medieval ditch was also identified.*

**Project Details**

OASIS Number			
Project Name			
Start of Fieldwork		End of Fieldwork	
Previous Work		Future Work	

**Project Reference Codes**

Site Code		Planning App. No.	
HER Number		Related Numbers	
Prompt			
Development Type			
Place in Planning Process	Choose an item.		

**Techniques used (tick all that apply)**

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <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 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 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	Period	Object	Period
	Choose an item.		Choose an item.
	Choose an item.		Choose an item.
	Choose an item.		Choose an item.

Insert more lines as appropriate.

### Project Location

County		Address (including Postcode)
District		
Parish		
HER office		
Size of Study Area		
National Grid Ref		

### Project Originators

Organisation	
Project Brief Originator	
Project Design Originator	
Project Manager	
Project Supervisor	

### Project Archives

	Location	ID
Physical Archive (Finds)		
Digital Archive		
Paper Archive		

Physical Contents	Present?	Digital files associated with Finds	Paperwork associated with Finds
Animal Bones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ceramics	<input 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 Remains	<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

Database	<input type="checkbox"/>
GIS	<input type="checkbox"/>
Geophysics	<input type="checkbox"/>
Images (Digital photos)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Illustrations (Figures/Plates)	<input type="checkbox"/>



### Paper Media

Aerial Photos	<input type="checkbox"/>
Context Sheets	<input type="checkbox"/>
Correspondence	<input type="checkbox"/>
Diary	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drawing	<input type="checkbox"/>

Moving Image	<input type="checkbox"/>	Manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spreadsheets	<input type="checkbox"/>	Map	<input type="checkbox"/>
Survey	<input type="checkbox"/>	Matrices	<input type="checkbox"/>
Text	<input type="checkbox"/>	Microfiche	<input type="checkbox"/>
Virtual Reality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Miscellaneous	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Research/Notes	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Photos (negatives/prints/slides)	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Report	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Sections	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Survey	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Further Comments**

X:\v\Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme FAS\010\Geomatics\03 GIS Projects - DRM\_v2\Figures\CXFAS\_Report\_Figure\_1\_Location\_2020-10-16.mxd\*matt.bradley\*16/10/2020



**Legend**

- Scheme boundary (Jan 2018)
- District boundary
- Non-assessed geotechnical zone
- Field 3: New evaluation area

**Elevation in m (OD)**

High : 149.141

Low : 53.3673


0 1:12,500 @ A3 500 m

**Geotechnical Zones and trench numbers**

Zone I A, B and C: North of Botley Road (Trenches 1 - 7)
Zone II: Site of Botley Mill (Trenches 8 - 11)
Zone IV: The Hinksey Stream in the Great Meadow (Trenches 12 - 17)
Zone V A, B and C: Bulstake Stream (Trenches 18 - 37, 39, 40, 43 - 46, 48 - 50, 53, 54 and 196)
Zone VI: The Long Meadow (Trenches 38, 41, 42, 47, 51, 52, 55 - 58 and 60)
Zone VII: South Hinksey (Trenches 59, 61 - 81 and 83 - 108)
Zone VIII: The Devil's Backbone (Trenches 109 - 130)
Zone IX: North of the Old Abingdon Road (Trenches 131-141)
Zone XI: Lower Slopes of Hinksey Hill Trenches 142 - 163
Zone XII: Upper Slopes of Hinksey Hill Trenches 177 - 195
Zone XIII: Thames Channel (Eastwick Farm) Trenches 197 - 204

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017. OS Mastermap provided by client. © Environment Agency copyright and/or database right 2017

Figure 1: Field 3: new evaluation area against wider project area showing the geotechnical zones on a background of surface topography from LIDAR data




X:\a\Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme FAS\010\Geomatics\03 GIS Projects - DRM\_v2\Figures\CXFAS\_Report\_Figure 2\_Trench location plan\_2020-08-14.mxd\matt.bradley\16/10/2020

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="border: 1px solid orange; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Scheme boundary (Jan 2018)</li> <li><span style="border: 2px solid orange; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Field 3: New evaluation area</li> <li><span style="border-bottom: 2px solid blue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Proposed evaluation trenches</li> <li><span style="border-bottom: 1px solid grey; display: inline-block; width: 15px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Previous evaluation trench</li> <li><span style="border: 2px solid magenta; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Geoarchaeological zone</li> <li><span style="border-bottom: 2px solid blue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Channels identified from LIDAR</li> <li><span style="border-bottom: 1px dashed grey; display: inline-block; width: 15px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> High conductivity identified from EM survey</li> <li><span style="border-bottom: 1px solid red; display: inline-block; width: 15px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Gradiometer features</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evaluation Data</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Archaeological feature</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: grey; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Structure</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: blue; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Paleochannel</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: brown; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Gravel surface</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: orange; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Silty gravel</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: green; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Possible feature / geological anomaly</li> </ul>	<p><b>Illustrative interpretations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Causeway</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Channel</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border-bottom: 1px dashed black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Ditch</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border-bottom: 1px dotted black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Extrapolated post linear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Wood</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Borehole</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; margin-right: 5px; background-color: yellow;"></span> Previous borehole</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px dashed black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Extrapolated post circle</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Causeway</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Updated constraints</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Badger Set exclusion zone</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Gas Pipe exclusion zone</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Thames Water Culvert exclusion zone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: yellow; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Early Iron Age</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: orange; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Early - middle Roman</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: green; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Medieval</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: red; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Roman?</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: yellow; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Middle - late Iron Age</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: orange; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Roman</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: red; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Post-medieval - Modern</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Not phased</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--	---

0 1:2,500 @ A3 100 m

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017. OS Mastermap provided by client.

Figure 2: Trench location plan



X:\a\Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme FAS\010\Geomatics\03 GIS Projects - DRM\_v2\Figures\CXFAS\_Report\_Figure\_3\_Trench location plan\_2020-10-14.mxd\benjamin.brown\*29/10/2020

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="border: 1px solid red; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Scheme boundary (Jan 2018)</li> <li><span style="border: 2px solid orange; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Field 3: New evaluation area</li> <li><span style="border: 1px solid blue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Proposed evaluation trenches</li> <li><span style="border: 1px solid grey; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Previous evaluation trench</li> <li><span style="border: 1px solid pink; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Geoarchaeological zone</li> <li><span style="border: 1px solid blue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Channels identified from LiDAR</li> <li><span style="border: 1px dashed blue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> High conductivity identified from EM survey</li> <li><span style="border: 1px dashed red; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Gradiometer features</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evaluation Data</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Archaeological feature</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: grey; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Structure</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: blue; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Paleochannel</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: brown; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Gravel surface</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: orange; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Silty gravel</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: green; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Possible feature / geological anomaly</li> </ul>	<p><b>Illustrative Interpretations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Causeway</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border-bottom: 1px dashed black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Channel</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border-bottom: 1px dotted black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Ditch</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border-bottom: 1px dashed red; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Extrapolated post linear</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border-bottom: 1px dotted black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Extrapolated post circle</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Causeway</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Updated constraints</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Badger Set exclusion zone</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Gas Pipe exclusion zone</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; border: 1px solid blue; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Thames Water Culvert exclusion zone</li> </ul>	<p><b>Legend</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: yellow; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Early Iron Age</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: orange; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Middle - late Iron Age</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: yellow; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Early - middle Roman</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: orange; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Roman</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: green; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Medieval</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Not phased</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--


0 1:700 @ A3 50 m

Figure 3: Detailed plan of ditched trackway (Trenches 221, 230-31 and 236-237)

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017. OS Mastermap provided by client.



X:\a\Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme FAS\010\Geomatics\03 GIS Projects - DRM\_v2\Figures\CXFAS\_Report\_Figure 5\_Trench location plan\_2020-10-16.mxd matt.bradley 16/10/2020



Scheme boundary (Jan 2018)	<b>Evaluation Data</b>	Borehole	Causeway
Field 3: New evaluation area	Archaeological feature	Previous borehole	Updated constraints
Proposed evaluation trenches	Structure	<b>Illustrative interpretations</b>	Badger Set exclusion zone
Previous evaluation trench	Paleochannel	Causeway	Gas Pipe exclusion zone
Geoarchaeological zone	Gravel surface	Channel	Thames Water Culvert exclusion zone
Channels identified from LiDAR	Silty gravel	Ditch	
High conductivity identified from EM survey	Possible feature / geological anomaly	Extrapolated post linear	
G gradiometer features	Wood	Extrapolated post circle	
NMP cropmarks			

Roman?	Not phased
--------	------------

0 1:400 @ A3 25 m

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017. OS Mastermap provided by client.

Figure 5 Detailed plan of trackway and paleochannel (Trenches 239-243)




Figure 6: Sections from Trench 215




Figure 7: Sections from Trenches 224, 226 and 228




Figure 8: Sections from Trenches 232 and 233




Figure 9: Sections relating to the ditched trackway









Figure 10: Sections relating to the trackway and paleochannel



X:\a\Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme FAS\010\Geomatics\03 GIS Projects - DRM\_v2\Figures\OXFAS\_Report\_Figure 11\_2020-10-16.mxd\* matt.bradley\*16/10/2020

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017. OS Mastermap provided by client.

Figure 11: Depth below current ground level to Significant Archaeological Horizon



Plate 1: Trench 215, showing pit 21509, Section 21501, looking east



Plate 2: Trench 224, showing ditch 22411 (left) and pit 22409 (right), Section 22400, looking south-east



Plate 3: Trench 226, showing ditch 22605 (left), ditch 22606 (centre) and ditch 22611 (right), Section 22600, looking south-west



Plate 4: Trench 227, showing ditch 22705 (left) and ditch 22703 (right), Section 22700, looking north



Plate 5: Trench 228, showing pit 22803, Section 22800, looking west



Plate 6: Trench 228, showing ditch 22811 (left), ditch 22815 (foreground) and ditch 22816 (right), Section 22801, looking south-east



Plate 7: Trench 233, showing ditch 22304 (left) and ditch 22306 (right), Section 23300, looking east



Plate 8: Trench 236, showing possible hollow-way 23605 (left) and trackway ditch 23616 (right), Section 23601, looking south



Plate 9: Trench 241, general shot of paleochannel 24126, Section 24100, looking south



Plate 10: Trench 243, general shot of trackway 24305 (foreground) and trackway 24304, looking north-west





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

Janus House  
Osney Mead  
Oxford OX20ES

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 1QD

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 MCIfA  
*Oxford Archaeology Ltd is a  
Private Limited Company, N<sup>o</sup>: 1618597  
and a Registered Charity, N<sup>o</sup>: 285627*