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Summary

Between September and November 2012 Oxford Archaeology conducted an archaeological watching brief during the groundworks for the construction of the new Dickson Poon building at St Hugh's College Oxford (NGR: SP 50972 07718).

The earliest clear evidence recovered by the watching brief was a series of parallel shallow linear features belonging to ridge-and-furrow cultivation running north-south across the site. These underlay landscaping deposits probably associated with the earlier houses built upon the site from 1832 onwards.

A succession of rubbish pits dating to the 19th and early 20th centuries was observed. Two 19th century well shafts, one brick-lined, the second stone-lined, were also recorded. These may relate to the earlier houses, or may alternatively have been associated with the houses still fronting Canterbury Road, whose rear gardens have since been incorporated into the college grounds.

A number of rectangular features whose fill included corrugated iron and 20th century finds were recorded along the southern edge of the site. There are parallels to these features in the demolished air raid shelters found at other colleges (such as the one within the Provost's Garden at Queen's College), and it is likely that they date from the WWII use of the college as a military hospital.

No certain evidence for any features or deposits pre-dating the ridge and furrow was observed, although a single human bone was found in a 19th century layer. This is likely to be residual from an earlier burial, as no Christian cemetery is known in the vicinity, but this bone is at present undated. No residual finds of earlier date were however recovered. Although some truncation had presumably occurred due to the medieval cultivation, the complete absence of traces of any earlier features or finds (other than the human bone) makes it likely that any earlier occupation took place on, or in the immediate vicinity of, this site.

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope of work

1.1.1 Planning permission was granted for the construction of a new building and basement within the grounds of St Hugh's College Oxford. Due to the potential for disturbance of archaeological remains during the construction of the new building a condition was attached to the planning consent requiring that a programme of archaeological monitoring be undertaken during the period of groundworks (planning reference: 11/01794/FUL Condition 8).

1.1.2 Oxford Archaeology (hereafter OA), was commissioned by Gleeds Management Services on behalf of St Hugh's College to carry out the monitoring in the form of a watching brief during the intrusive works associated with the development. These works included services diversions and the basement excavation.

1.1.3 A brief was set by the Oxford City Archaeologist, David Radford, detailing the Local Authority's requirements for work necessary to discharge the planning condition (Radford 2012); OA subsequently produced a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) showing how it would meet these requirements (Oxford Archaeology 2012b).
1.1.4 All work was undertaken in accordance with local and national planning policies (National Planning Policy Framework) and particularly the planning conditions 10 and 11 as stated in the brief.

1.2 Location, geology and topography
1.2.1 The college is situated to the north of the historic core of Oxford and is part of the North Oxford Conservation Area. The site, centred on NGR SP 50972 07718), lies within the confines of St Hugh's College, which is located at the corner of St Margaret's Road to the north, and Banbury Road to the east (Fig. 1).

1.2.2 The site of the proposed work is an area of 310m² (Fig. 2), located to the west of The Lawn and north of the properties along Canterbury Road. The site was previously occupied by an area of lawn and tennis courts, within the landscaped grounds of the college.

1.2.3 The site is situated on drift geology on the Summertown-Radley gravel terrace, which is part of the Second Gravel Terrace of the Thames sequence. These have been described as reddish silts encountered at about 63m aOD (above Ordnance Datum), (Oxford Archaeological Unit 1998b). The gravels were laid down in the Pleistocene as part of the fluvial systems of the nearby Rivers Thames and Cherwell. The underlying solid geology is of the Oxford Clay formation (BGS website). The ground level at the site is flat and relatively consistent at 64.15m OD.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background
1.3.1 A Heritage Assessment for the site has been produced by Asset Heritage Consulting (2011) and provides a background to the Victorian development of the site, the evolution of St Hugh’s and the 19th and early 20th century gardens. An archaeological and historical background making use of this information is reproduced below.

1.3.2 The site lies within the North Oxford Conservation area, in the parish of St Giles, and is predominantly Victorian in character. A number of findspots are known around the area including a range of material from the Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods (PRNs 3258, 3591, 3594, 3864, 6048), and the Banbury and Banks Road is thought to follow the line of a minor Roman road.

1.3.3 During the Civil War when Oxford housed the Royalists and the Parliament, substantial defences were put in place and many buildings were utilised for associated purposes. The 1644 plan by De Gomme shows the site to lie to the north of the northern defences, within the immediate hinterland of activity (Lattey et al. 1936, 165).

1.3.4 An estate map of 1769 depicts the open fields of St Giles' parish which appear essentially unchanged in character from a 14th century survey of the parish. The 1769 documents show that the site was then part of a furlong owned by Mr Eaton. A field road is also shown curving NW-SE.

1.3.5 After the open land was enclosed in 1832 the site was occupied by various houses, including The Mount (demolished), The Lawn (now a Listed Building) and the Shrubbery (now the Principal's Lodgings) and a nursery garden.

1.3.6 St Hugh’s college itself was founded in 1886 and named after the 12th century Bishop of Lincoln (VCH 1954, 347). The college was initially to provide higher education for women in five gradually acquired private premises in Norham Road. The new college buildings on the site at the corner of Banbury Road and St Margaret's Road were opened in 1916. The buildings were designed by the firm of Buckland and Haywood of
Birmingham; the western Mary Gray Allen wing was added in 1928; and the new Moberly library in 1936 (VCH 1954, 348). During WWII the college was utilised as a military hospital.

1.3.7 The houses in Canterbury Road, which back onto the site, were all built to the designs of Frederick Codd between 1873 and 1876, Codd himself being the original occupant of No.9, which stands alongside the existing access to the college on this side (Asset Heritage Consulting 2011, 7). Most of these buildings are now used for student accommodation.

1.3.8 The gardens of the college are generally considered among the most attractive of any of Oxford's colleges and were originally planned and planted by Annie Rogers. The gardens incorporate several features, including a nut walk and 'wilderness', from the 19th century garden of The Mount (Asset Heritage Consulting 2011, 8).

1.3.9 The Principal's Lodgings and The Lawn both retain their own garden areas, as do Nos. 85 & 87 Banbury Road. The original rear gardens of the Victorian houses along Canterbury Road and Woodstock Road have been, for the most part, incorporated into the college's grounds. The least attractive parts of the grounds are undoubtedly the hard-surfaced tennis courts immediately to the west of The Lawn which take up some of the original garden space (Asset Heritage Consulting 2011, 8).

1.3.10 The 1998 evaluation, carried out in advance of new student accommodation being built, took place west of The Lawn and revealed the presence of a former medieval ploughsoil (OA 1998b). The follow-up 1999 watching brief uncovered evidence that there was remnants of ridge and furrow seen on a broadly N-S alignment.

Potential

1.3.11 The development site lies within an area of the Summertown-Radley gravel terrace that has demonstrated potential to preserve late Neolithic-Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman remains. The site has previously been partially evaluated by Oxford Archaeological Unit in 1998 (for a different building footprint) and then subject to a limited watching brief (also by Oxford Archaeological Unit) during compound construction work in 1999. These investigations noted the remains of medieval ridge and furrow of local interest but no other significant features. Nevertheless the general potential in this area is sufficient to warrant a watching brief during ground works for the revised development footprint.

1.3.12 Part of St Hugh's college was previously a Registered Park and Garden for its early 20th garden design, however subsequent alterations led to it being removed from the register. The remains of outbuildings associated with the garden of The Lawn, a 19th century listed building, may be located within the development footprint (plotted on the 1st edition and 1950s OS maps).

2 PROJECT AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The general aims of the project were to:

- determine the existence or absence of any archaeological remains;
- determine the approximate date or date range of the remains, by means of artefactual or other evidence;
- determine the approximate extent of the remains;
• determine the condition and state of preservation of the remains;
• determine the degree of complexity of the horizontal and/or vertical stratigraphy present;
• assess the associations and implications of any remains encountered with reference to the historic landscape;
• determine the implications of the remains encountered with reference to economy, status, utility and social activity;
• to determine the likely range, quality and quantity of the artefactual evidence present;
• determine the potential of the site to provide palaeo-environmental and/or economic evidence and the forms in which such evidence may be present.

2.1.2 The specific questions targeted by the watching brief were as follows:

Post-medieval

(i) To what extent was the agricultural land around Oxford subject to early private enclosure? Can a cartographic study of the district help to reconstruct the medieval and post medieval agricultural landscape, i.e. patterns and directions of ridge and furrow, early enclosure, drainage, and field systems for each township (OARARA 2012, Chapter 8, page 3)? Is the ridge and furrow pattern seen previously consistent over the whole site?

(ii) What pattern of suburban growth and redevelopment in the late post medieval period can be identified in the archaeological record (Oxford Archaeological Resource Assessments and Research Agendas (hereafter OARARA) 2012, Chapter 8, page 5)? Is there evidence for construction or change associated with the enclosing of the site in the period AD 1830-1850 and the establishment of the three villa-style houses?

(iii) The archaeology of post-medieval college gardens is an area that has been subject to only limited study. The documentary sources are reasonable for St Hugh’s, but are there any surviving archaeological remains and do they confirm or elaborate on known information and contribute to our understanding of the evolution of the colleges (OARARA 2012, Chapter 8, page 6)?

Modern

(iv) Can we further map and characterise the development of housing and social status amongst communities affected by the 19th century reforms of the university. More specifically, into what setting was St Hugh’s College established and what impact did it have (OARARA 2012, Chapter 9, page 3)?

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The watching brief was undertaken in two phases. Prior to the construction of the building and the excavation of the basement it was necessary to divert existing services, principally the data transfer cables and water main, around the footprint of the new building. Following this preliminary work the topsoil and part of the underlying deposits were stripped and a piling mat was laid over the area of the new basement in order to enable sheet piles to be driven down to support the sides prior to the excavation of the basement.
2.2.2 Subsequent to the piles being driven the reduction in ground level within the basement area was achieved in two steps. During the first step any deposits of worked or mixed soil were removed down to the level of the terrace gravel exposing any features cut into the surface of the gravel. During the second step the gravel was reduced down to the finished level.

2.2.3 The watching brief was conducted as a series of site visits during the topsoil strip and the exposure of the terrace gravel.

2.2.4 All these excavations were accomplished using a tracked excavator fitted with a toothless bucket. Where the presence of services made this impractical, hand tools were used.

2.2.5 All spoil generated by both the machine and hand excavations was examined for the presence of archaeological artefacts.

2.2.6 All features and deposits were issued with unique context numbers, and context recording was in accordance with established OA practices. Bulk finds were collected by context. Black-and-white negative photographs and a digital photographic record was taken of all excavations, general settings and archaeological sections.

2.2.7 A site plan showing the location of any excavations and any recorded sections was maintained (see Fig. 3). Section drawings of features and sample sections were drawn at a scale of 1:20.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Description of deposits

3.1.1 Each phase of the work will be described separately followed by an overall discussion and conclusion.

Diversion of services

3.1.2 Prior to the start of construction it was necessary divert some of the existing services to avoid the footprint of the new building. This work entailed the excavation of approximately 75m length of 1.8m wide trenching and a 35m length of 1m wide trench (Fig. 2). The depth of both trenches was 1m.

3.1.3 The first trench ran parallel to Canterbury Road, behind the back gardens of the houses before turning north following the line of the access road before then heading north-east, running around the footprint of the basement excavation (Fig. 2).

3.1.4 The underlying terrace gravel (6) was exposed throughout the length of the excavation (Fig. 4, Sections 1 to 4). Where the trench ran parallel to Canterbury Road this was seen to be overlain by a layer of dark reddish brown silty clay measuring up to 0.28m in depth (layer 5) (Fig. 4, Section 1). This layer, which represents the Holocene soil that developed over the gravel in prehistory, had been truncated by a pair of wide shallow features 0.36m deep and spaced 4.6m apart, centre to centre [4], the remains of medieval ridge-and-furrow cultivation. The troughs and ridges ran approximately north-south across the trench. Running in a roughly 0.35m deep parallel band over both the troughs and ridges was a layer of yellowish grey-brown clayey loam (3). Occasional charcoal flecking was visible within this deposit but no dating evidence was recovered.

3.1.5 Overlying 3 was a layer of grey-brown silty clay loam (2) measuring between 0.15m and 0.25m in depth. This context also contained charcoal flecking but also produced fragments of pottery dating to the mid 19th century together with animal bone and a
single fragment of human bone. Above this was a 0.26m deep layer of dark grey-brown clayey loam (1), the present day topsoil and turf.

3.1.6 At the northern end of the trench a backfilled feature was observed cutting the terrace gravel [11] (Section 3). This was in excess of 2m in width and greater than 0.5m deep. The base of the cut was filled with a greyish brown clayey silt with gravel inclusions (10). The remainder of the cut was filled with a orange-yellow coarse sand and gravel (9). Elsewhere layer 6 could be seen to be overlain by a 0.25m deep layer of pale greyish yellow coarse sand mixed with gravel (13) (Fig. 4, Section 4).

3.1.7 Where the trench followed the access road the terrace gravel, the backfill of [11] and layer (13) was overlaid by a 0.45m deep layer of modern made ground composed of compacted crushed limestone (8) (Fig. 4, Sections 2, 3 and 4). This formed the base upon which the tarmac road surface (7) and the area of hardstanding (12) was laid.

3.1.8 The second trench ran from an access chamber on the southern edge of the site across the tennis courts before turning westwards to join up with an existing duct north of the basement footprint (Fig. 2).

3.1.9 At the northern end of the trench a continuation of the terrace gravel (6) could be observed (Fig. 5, Section 6). Above the gravel, and also exposed within the base of Section 5 was a continuation of the dark reddish brown silty clay (5) measuring over 0.25m in depth. Within the east-west aligned arm of the trench layer (5) was cut by the base of a probable furrow [21], similar in alignment and width to cut [4]. Filling 21 was a greyish brown silty loam containing charcoal flecking and measuring between 0.3m and 0.5m in depth (20). A similar deposit, a reddish grey-brown silty loam with charcoal flecking (17) was observed above layer (5) within Section 5.

3.1.10 Overlying 17 and 20 were 0.15m deep deposits of mid brown silty loam with gravel inclusions (16 and 19) respectively. Their similarity suggests that they are probably both continuations of the same context.

3.1.11 Layer 16 was cut by a circular feature approximately 8m in diameter with steeply sloping sides [15] (Section 5). The base of the feature was not exposed and in section it was in excess of 0.7m deep. Filling the cut was a single deposit of dark grey-brown silty loam containing lenses of gravel, reddish brown clay and fragments of brick and stone (14).

3.1.12 Where the trench passed through the old tennis courts layers 14 and 16 were sealed below a layer of finely crushed stone forming a hardcore base for the tarmac tennis court surface. Outside the tennis court and within the college grounds layer 19 was covered by a 0.17m deep layer of grey-brown silty loam (18), the present day topsoil and turf.

The ground reduction within the basement footprint

3.1.13 During the first phase of work within the basement footprint, the topsoil and portions of the underlying deposits were stripped in order to allow the construction of a piling mat.

3.1.14 During this operation approximately 0.4m – 0.6m depth of material was removed. This material included the layers of present day topsoil (1, 16 and 18) and the upper part of layers (2, 16 and 19), the tarmac tennis court surface and its underlying crushed stone hardcore base.

3.1.15 Following the stripping a levelling layer of crushed brick, concrete and mortar (22) could be observed below the southeast corner and southern edge of the tennis court (Fig. 5, Section 7). Within the eastern half of the site the top courses of two lined wells
were exposed when the upper courses of their lining collapsed (Fig. 3, Wells 24 and 27; Plates 1 and 3)

3.1.16 The upper courses of the brick-lined well [24] were exposed within the eastern section of the reduced dig (Fig. 6, Section 10 and Plate 2).

3.1.17 Stratigraphy similar to that observed within Section 5 was observed. Cut into the top of layer was a circular shaft approximately 2.7m in diameter [25]. The full depth of the shaft could not be seen due to silting but measured in excess of 2.7m deep. Constructed inside the shaft was a brick lining using plain hand-moulded bricks measuring 0.228m x 0.112m x 0.068m. The lining was unusual in that the courses within the brickwork were vertically aligned (Plate 2). The bricks within the lining butted together with no evidence of mortar. Topping the brick shaft was a hemi-spherical well cap constructed using stepped horizontal courses of brick bonded with lime mortar. A large slab of limestone had been used to cover the top which had cracked and started to slump in. There was evidence for the well being later used as a soak-a-way with a salt-glazed pipe being inserted through the brick capping.

3.1.18 The well cap had been covered by a orange-brown sandy silt (26). This was overlaid by soil horizon 16.

3.1.19 A second well constructed out of stone and also with a hemi-spherical well cap [27] was exposed approximately 12m further south-west (Fig. 3, Fig. 7 Section 11 and Plate 3).

3.1.20 A circular shaft approximately 1.9m in diameter [28] had been dug through the ploughsoil horizon (20). The full depth of the shaft was unknown but was in excess of 2m. Built within the shaft was a stone lining [27]. This used a variety of stone sizes ranging from 0.35m x 0.18m x 0.2m dressed blocks down to 0.15m x 0.15m x 0.12m as quarried stones. Possible evidence of a lime wash was visible on some of the stones, perhaps suggesting that they had been reused. The well cap was formed of five courses of arched stones capped with hand-moulded bricks. No mortar was used in its construction.

3.1.21 The stone lining and cap was covered by a reddish grey sandy silt (29) which produced brick fragments.

3.1.22 Also exposed during this phase of stripping were three rectangular features along the southern edge of the site: [35], [37] and [39] (Fig. 3 and Fig. 6, Section 9). The features were all of similar dimensions measuring 4m in length, 2.4m in width and 1m deep with vertical sides and a flat base. They had all been cut through the surface of layer 20.

3.1.23 All the features had been backfilled with a similar dark grey-brown silty clay loam (layers 34, 36 and 38), which produced fragments of corroded corrugated iron and 5-gallon drums together with fragments of decomposing wood, brick and bottle glass. Overlying the fills was the topsoil, horizon 16.

3.1.24 Following the initial phase of stripping a layer of geo-textile (“Terram”) followed by a 0.5m deep layer of crushed demolition material (“Type 1”) was laid over the area forming a working platform for the pile driving machine. This drove in interlocking sheet steel piles along the perimeter of the basement excavation in order to support the sides of the excavation.

3.1.25 After completion of the piling the piling mat was removed and the underlying material was removed in spits down to the level of the terrace gravel (approximately 0.4m to 0.6m depth of material). During this operation a number of features were exposed following the removal of the remainder of the buried soil horizon (layers 2 and 19). Further traces of the ridge-and-furrow cultivation recorded during the earlier works were
observed running roughly north-south across the site (Fig. 3 and Fig. 5, Section 7). The base of the ridge and furrow [21] could be seen cutting into the surface of layer 5 for approximately 0.25 m with the ridges spaced between 4.3m and 4.6m apart. Filling the furrows was a continuation of the dark reddish brown sandy silt clay (20).

3.1.26 These traces could only be discerned within the eastern half of the site. Within the western half the ground below the landscaping layers had been heavily disturbed. It was unclear when this activity took place.

3.1.27 Also recorded during this phase of operations were seven roughly circular features. These were concentrated into two distinct groupings, one on the northern edge of the site and the other on the south-west of the site (Fig. 3).

3.1.28 In the south-west corner of the site two circular features [31] and [32] were cut into layer 20. These features measured 2.2m and 2.5m in diameter, and were excavated to a depth of 1.4m and 1.5m respectively. Both the pits had steeply sloping/vertical sides and a rounded, bowl-shaped base.

3.1.29 Filling the pits was a dark grey-brown silty clay loam containing charcoal flecking and gravel inclusions (numbered respectively 30 and 33). Both of the fills produced fragments of pottery and glass. Assessment of these finds suggested that pit [31] had been backfilled in the first half of the 19th century while pit [33] was backfilled in the late 19th century or early 20th century.

3.1.30 Along the northern edge of the stripped area a cluster of five circular pits was observed cutting layer 20 (Fig. 3).

3.1.31 The two isolated pits [41] and [43] both measured approximately 2m in diameter and displayed similar steeply sloping sides and a rounded base. Pit [41] had been dug to a depth of 1.2m, while pit [43] had been dug to a depth of 1.4m.

3.1.32 Both these features had been filled with a dark grey-brown silty loam mixed with ashes, charcoal and broken pottery (numbered 40 and 42 respectively), suggestive of general domestic refuse dating to the latter half of the 19th century.

3.1.33 West of the two isolated pits were three intercutting pits, all of which cut layer 20. The earliest pit (46) measured 2.5m in diameter and had been excavated to a depth of 1.4m and displayed a similar profile to the pits previously described.

3.1.34 It had been filled with a dark grey-brown silty loam (47). This contained a mixture of domestic refuse including ashes and charcoal, broken pottery and glass and fragments of brick and tile (47). Analysis of the material recovered from the fill suggests a deposition date between AD1820 and AD1900.

3.1.35 The two later pits (45) and (48) were both approximately 2m in diameter and between 1.2m and 1.3m deep. Both had similar profiles and were filled with a dark grey-brown sandy silt loam, numbered (44) and (49) respectively. The fills contained domestic detritus such as broken pottery and glass together with quantities of ash and charcoal. Examination of the finds recovered from fill 49 suggests a date between AD1850 and AD1900 for the dumping.

3.1.36 Following the removal of the ridge-and-furrow cultivation soils the surviving strips of the Holocene soil layer (5), and lenses of orange-brown sandy clay (23) found beneath it in the surface of the terrace gravel, were closely examined for possible truncated features predating the ridge and furrow. No evidence for any such features was observed.

3.1.37 It was hoped that the bases of Wells 24 and 27 would be exposed during the subsequent reduction of ground level within the footprint of the basement. Well 24 was
however outside the footprint of the basement excavation and was backfilled and capped. Well 27 was initially left undisturbed at the edge of an access ramp during the removal of the bulk of the basement, and was unfortunately removed following a changeover of site contractor without OA being informed, and so was not observed.

3.2 Finds

3.2.1 Post-medieval material dating from the 19th and early 20th centuries was recovered from the majority of the deposits. These artefacts included transfer printed creamware, stoneware and glazed earthenware, clay pipe and glass bottles. Assessment of the dating material during the post-extraction phase gave a range of dates from AD1820 up to AD1914 (See appendices C and D).

3.2.2 No dating evidence from earlier than the 19th century was recovered.

3.3 Environmental remains

3.3.1 Because of the relatively late date of the deposits encountered it was not thought appropriate to carry out environmental analysis of the 19th and 20th century pits, so no palaeo-environmental samples were taken.

4 Discussion and Conclusions

4.1.1 The relatively shallow depth at which the natural terrace gravel was found throughout the development area showed that the site had not been subject to gravel extraction, in contrast to other sites within the immediate vicinity such as St Antony's College 300m to the south (OA 2012a).

4.1.2 The lenses of sandy clay material (23) in the surface of the Pleistocene gravel (6) are probably late glacial or early post-glacial in origin, while layer (5) represents the Holocene supernatural that is found overlaying the gravel terraces in Oxfordshire. It's survival on the site demonstrates that truncation has not been particularly severe.

4.1.3 Evidence of extensive ridge-and-furrow cultivation was observed both during the service diversions and during the basement excavations (cuts [4] and [21]). This was seen to run roughly north-south across the site parallel to the Banbury Road (B4165). It is probable that these workings are those noted both the 14th century survey of the parish and an estate map of 1769 depicting the open fields of St Giles' parish mentioned in the historical background. Although a thick deposit of cultivated soil was recorded filling the furrows and forming the ridges (layers 3 and 20), no dating material was recovered.

4.1.4 The features observed cutting the ploughsoil, rubbish pits [31], [32], [41], [43], [45], [46] and [48], and the two wells [24] and [27], have been dated either by artefactual evidence or by construction techniques to dates ranging between the mid 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th century.

4.1.5 The artefacts recovered from the rubbish pits appears to indicate that they originated from domestic households rather than from the college. There is nothing remarkable about the relatively small sample of material recovered, which is typical of ordinary middle-class households of this period.

4.1.6 The rubbish pits were concentrated into two separate clusters which may suggest they were associated with at least two households. Further historical research such as early street plans might show to what extent the rear gardens of the houses fronting
Canterbury Road extended into what is now the college grounds, and thus with which property these pits may have been associated.

4.1.7 The wells exposed during the course of the watching brief both displayed integral well-caps, which would indicate that they were constructed as such rather than being adapted from open-topped wells.

4.1.8 The bricks used within the construction of well [24] are typical of those produced between the latter part of the 18th and the middle of the 19th centuries, which may indicate that this well was built soon after the enclosure of the site in AD1832. It may also suggest that it is associated with one of the earlier houses. Its large diameter may also indicate that it was intended for use by a large household.

4.1.9 The stone-built well [27] displayed a similar hemispherical well cap, suggesting that it too was intended for use with a lift pump. A quantity of dressed and whitewashed stone was visible within its construction, however none of it was diagnostic. Its construction date is therefore uncertain, but is tentatively ascribed to the 19th century.

4.1.10 No evidence of any structures associated with the wells was observed.

4.1.11 The three rectangular features ([35], [37] and [39]) observed cutting layer (3) on the southern edge of the site are similar in both size and fill and it is probable that they are contemporary. The fragments of corroded corrugated iron and decaying wood observed within their fills suggest that they originally contained a corrugated iron structure. A similar rectangular feature recorded during an evaluation in the Provost's garden at Queens College was dug to contain an air-raid shelter (OA, 1998a)

4.1.12 Deposits of probable worked soil (layers 2, 16 and 19) sealed all the post-medieval features. The composition of the deposits are similar and it is probable that they represent the same phase of activity.

4.1.13 Layer 2 included finds dating from the mid-18th to the late 19th century. Since however it post-dated features of late 19th or early 20th century date, these finds are all residual.

4.1.14 The composition of the contexts suggest that they represent worked soils, most likely landscaping or gardening deposits formed either when the college gardens were laid out or during later reworking.

4.1.15 A single fragment of abraded human bone was recovered from layer 2. No evidence of an inhumation was observed during the course of the watching brief and the origin of the bone is unknown. It may have been displaced by the later ploughing or may have been brought in with deposits of soil during the landscaping of the college grounds.

4.1.16 Layers 1 and 18 represent a later phase of landscaping, possibly laid down during the last phase of building work within the site.

4.1.17 The absence of truncated features below the plough ridges or of residual finds from within the ploughsoil may indicate that early activity on the site was minimal.

4.1.18 No evidence for any of the earlier demolished buildings on the site such as foundations was observed. Spreads of demolition material (22) were observed below the tennis courts, and the size of the bricks from this deposit suggests that they originated from a mid-19th century building.

4.1.19 Although landscaping deposits were recorded within the college grounds these had been disturbed, making it impossible to determine if any garden features had survived.
## APPENDIX A. ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.26m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Topsoil and turf</td>
<td>Pottery, brick</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.15m – 0.26m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Buried soil horizon, original topsoil ?</td>
<td>Pottery, bone, brick</td>
<td>C19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Up to 0.35m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Earlier ploughsoil filling furrows (see [4])</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.36m</td>
<td>4.6m</td>
<td>&gt; 20m</td>
<td>Cuts for ridge-and-furrow cultivation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.28m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Holocene `supernatural’ over terrace gravel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>&gt; 1.5m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural terrace gravel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>0.1m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern road surface</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.42m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Crushed stone hardcore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.5m</td>
<td>&gt; 2m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Upper layer of fill within Pit 11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5m</td>
<td>&gt; 2m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Primary fill of pit 11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5m</td>
<td>&gt; 2m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Truncated pit, small scale gravel extraction ?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.15m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern made ground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern made ground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>&gt; 0.7m</td>
<td>&gt; 8m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Backfill of pit 15</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>C19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>&gt; 0.7m</td>
<td>&gt; 8m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Truncated pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.12m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Truncated layer of original topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Up to 0.28m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ploughsoil horizon, same as layer (3) ?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.15m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Present day topsoil and turf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.17m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Buried soil horizon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.36m</td>
<td>0.18m – 0.25m</td>
<td>&gt; 0.25m</td>
<td>&gt; 0.3m</td>
<td>1.4m</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughsoil filling furrow [21], same as (3) and (17)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut of ridge-and-furrow cultivation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C18th/ early C19th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardcore base below tennis court</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C18th/ early C19th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lens of natural sandy clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C18th/ early C19th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick-lined well with hemi-spherical well cap</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Pottery, glass, slate, brick, iron</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut for well shaft</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backfilling of well shaft</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backfilling of rubbish pit 31</td>
<td>Pottery, glass, slate, brick, iron</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backfill of rubbish pit 32</td>
<td>Pottery, glass, slate, brick, iron</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th/ C20th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backfill of pit 35</td>
<td>Pottery, glass, brick, corrugated iron</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th/ C20th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable cut for air</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.8m</td>
<td>2.4m</td>
<td>4m</td>
<td>Backfill of pit 37</td>
<td>Pottery, glass, brick, corrugated iron</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.8m</td>
<td>2.4m</td>
<td>4m</td>
<td>Probable cut for air raid shelter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1m</td>
<td>2.4m</td>
<td>4m</td>
<td>Backfill of pit 35</td>
<td>Pottery, glass, brick, corrugated iron</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1m</td>
<td>&gt; 2m</td>
<td>4m</td>
<td>Probable cut for air raid shelter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
<td>1.9m</td>
<td>1.9m</td>
<td>Backfill of rubbish pit 41</td>
<td>Pottery, brick</td>
<td>C19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
<td>1.9m</td>
<td>1.9m</td>
<td>Probable rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.4m</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>Backfill of rubbish pit 43</td>
<td>Pottery, glass brick</td>
<td>C19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.4m</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>Probable rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>2.1m</td>
<td>2.1m</td>
<td>Backfill of rubbish pit 45</td>
<td>Pottery, glass, brick</td>
<td>C19th/ early C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.3m</td>
<td>2.1m</td>
<td>2.1m</td>
<td>Probable rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th/ early C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.4m</td>
<td>2.5m</td>
<td>2.5m</td>
<td>Probable rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th/ early C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.4m</td>
<td>2.5m</td>
<td>2.5m</td>
<td>Backfill of rubbish pit 46</td>
<td>Pottery, glass, slate, brick</td>
<td>C19th/ early C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>Probable rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C19th/ early C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>Backfill of rubbish pit 48</td>
<td>Pottery, glass, brick</td>
<td>C19th/ early C20th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C. ASSESSMENT OF THE POTTERY AND CLAY PIPE

by John Cotter

Introduction and methodology

C.1.1 A total of 10 sherds of pottery weighing 1416g. was recovered from five contexts. All the pottery was examined and spot-dated during the present assessment stage. For each context the total pottery sherd count and weight were recorded on an Excel spreadsheet, followed by the context spot-date which is the date-bracket during which the latest pottery types in the context are estimated to have been produced or were in general circulation.

C.1.2 Comments on the presence of datable types were also recorded, usually with mention of vessel form (jugs, bowls etc.) and any other attributes worthy of note (eg. decoration etc.). Post-medieval fabric codes employed here are those of the Museum of London which are widely applicable in the south of England.

Date and nature of the assemblage

C.1.3 Although small, the assemblage is in good condition and includes a few complete vessels. Ordinary domestic pottery types are represented. The pottery is described in detail in the spreadsheet and summarised below.

C.1.4 Most of the sherds are mass-produced products of the Staffordshire and Midlands potteries of the late 18th and 19th centuries - mainly the latter. These include a late example of a Creamware soup tureen (c 1770-1830), perhaps dating from the 1830s? All the remaining pieces are probably ‘Victorian’ or in some cases possibly as late as the early 20th century. These include plain (REFW) or transfer-printed (TPW) Staffordshire-type white earthenwares (c 1825+) including small plain jars or pots for meat paste etc., and decorated plates or dishes. There are also two vessels in modern English stoneware including a brown-glazed blacking bottle and a discoid lid from a storage jar. In short the assemblage consists of a mix of ‘Victorian’ tablewares and kitchenwares. No further work is recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Spot-date</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>c1830-1860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 vessels. Dish/plate frags in blue transfer-printed whiteware (TPW). 1 with 'Flow Blue' decoration, 1 probably early C19th sub-Pearlware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>c1820-1850</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2x blue TPW vessels including plate rim with dog rose-style decoration. 1x cup base with landscape. 1x profile late Creamware (CREA) squat soup tureen with vestige of lug handle &amp; with 3 horizontal bands of brown paint externally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>c1875-1925?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>2 complete vessels. Small cylindrical meat paste pot in plain white earthenware (REFW) with impressed weight mark under - poss '2 OZ'. 1x complete modern Bristol-glazed light grey stoneware jar lid - discoid with lid seating (diam 104mm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Archaeological Watching Brief Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>c1820-1900+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>c1850-1900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>1416</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Clay Pipe by John Cotter**

C.1.5 A single slightly worn piece of clay pipe weighing 6g. was recovered from context (30). This comprises a broken bowl profile of spurred type and probably dates to the early-to-mid 19th century. A blundered maker’s mark occurs on both sides of the spur and although the ‘surname’ initial could be read as a ‘P’ no match for this can be found in the extant lists of Oxford pipemakers. No further work is recommended.
APPENDIX D. THE GLASS ASSEMBLAGE

By Ian R Scott

D.1.1 The glass comprised 2 complete bottles and two sherds of vessel glass, which were recovered from 3 contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1) sherd from the base of a squat free blown wine bottle of early to mid 18th-century date. Green metal. (2) body sherd from a 19th-century soda or mineral water bottle. Probably from an egg-shaped bottle, also known as a torpedo bottle. Part of an embossed inscription survives: ‘. . . PROP . . .’ possibly ‘Property of . . .’. Probably dates from the mid- to late-19th century. Green tinted metal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Complete wide-necked bottle or jar. Moulded in a 3-piece mould with an applied tooled finish or rim. Green metal. The bottle is embossed on base: ‘C &amp; B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E. THE BONE ASSEMBLAGE

E.1.1 Fragments of bone were only recovered from a single context, the probable buried soil horizon, 2, observed during the service trench excavations.

E.1.2 The majority of the fragments were of animal origin, but a single fragment of human bone was also recovered. No evidence of an inhumation was observed during the course of the watching brief and it is probable that the fragment had been transported from elsewhere by the ploughing or the landscaping activity noted elsewhere on the site.

The Animal Bone identified by Lena Strid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 large mammal rib fragment, 1 pig lateral metapodial unfused, 27g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Human Bone, identified by Louise Loe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 fragment radius, 11g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F. SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS

Site name: Dickson Poon Building, St Hugh’s College, Oxford
Site code: OXCHIN 12
Grid reference: Centred at NGR 50972 07718
Type: Watching Brief
Date and duration of project: September to December 2012
Area of site: 310m²

Summary of results: N-S ridge-and-furrow cultivation was observed, though no dating for this was obtained. The cultivation soil was cut by a group of 19th and early 20th century pits and two wells, one brick-built, the other stone-lined and capped. The pits and wells are of 19th and early 20th century date, and may be associated with the houses that were constructed after AD 1832, when the site was enclosed. No earlier archaeological features or finds were recovered, except for a single human radius fragment found in the buried topsoil, which may have derived from an earlier burial elsewhere.

Location of archive: The archive will be deposited with the Oxfordshire County Museums Service under the accession No. OXCMS.2012.72
Figure 1: Site location
Figure 2: Outline of new building showing the location of groundworks monitored by Archaeological Watching Brief
Figure 3: Plan of archaeological features observed within the basement footprint and location of the drawn sections.
Figure 4: Sections 1-4
Figure 5: Sections 5-7
Figure 6: Sections 8-10 including well 24
Figure 7: Plan and section of well 27
Plate 1: Well 24 when first broken into

Plate 2: Well 24 showing interior brick lining