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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 6 February 2008</th>
<th>Distribution: James Donlon (MBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Application No:</td>
<td>Pre-planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Former Bartlemas Nursery School, off Cowley Road, Oxford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BRIEF FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT AND/OR FIELD EVALUATION
This brief is designed to provide a framework within which an archaeological body can develop a written scheme of investigation (WSI) to achieve the stated objectives. The main text of the Brief is generic, site specific information is confined to boxed sections. The developer's scheme should state detailed methods and standards to be applied to the study. The WSI should be submitted to the Planning Authority for written approval before work begins, and approval should be sought for any subsequent modification.

1 Introduction
1.1 Summary: This brief sets out the background and general conditions to enable the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be completed and submitted for the written approval of Oxford City Council as planning authority. The brief is valid for six months, and any specification which conforms with its requirements will be regarded as valid for a similar period.

1.2 The Site:
Location: Former Bartlemas Nursery School, off Cowley Road, Oxford
Approx area (hectares): 0.25 ha
Centred on grid ref: SP 524 056
Present condition of site: Disused primary school

1.3 Archaeological and historical background:
St Bartholomew’s hospital was established as a leprosarium in the 12th century, making it older if smaller than the charitable hospital of St John under what is now Magdalen College. The latter site confirms that hospitals of this period typically had a supply of clean water, often from a spring that was venerated as a holy well. We can see this also at Bartlemas in the remarkably straight alignment of the stream running obliquely across a slope, which has come to define the backs of many of the Southfield Road properties, issuing from a location referred to as a holy well, and continuing beyond the historic site skirting what is now the school.

The medieval charitable hospitals of Ospringe on the Dover road in Kent and St John the Baptist in Oxford illustrate water supplies carried underneath part of the hospital infirmary and in Ospringe the kitchen had prior use of the water. Both could apply to Bartlemas, implying that there could be the foundations and floors of one or more significant hospital buildings on the school side of the watercourse.

A desk-based archaeological assessment should concentrate on the historic landscape relating to the hospital within 200 m of the application site, plus the putative water supply.

1.4 Development and planning background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed development</th>
<th>planning authority has been consulted on a proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drawings</td>
<td>MBA 334.2/010F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any relevant planning</td>
<td>Pre-planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Planning Policies
Policy HE 2 of Oxford Local Plan 2001 - 2016 (adopted November 2005) requires that:

Where archaeological deposits that are potentially significant to the historic environment of
Oxford are known or suspected to exist anywhere in Oxford but particularly in the City
Centre Archaeological Area, planning applications should incorporate sufficient information
to define the character and extent of such deposits as far as reasonably practicable,
including where appropriate:
a. the results of an evaluation by fieldwork; and
b. an assessment of the effect of the proposals on the deposits and their setting.

If the existence and significance of deposits is confirmed, planning permission will only be
granted where the proposal includes:
c. provision to preserve the archaeological remains in situ, so far as reasonably
practicable, by sensitive layout and design (particularly foundations, drainage and
hard landscaping); and

d. provision for the investigation and recording of any archaeological remains that cannot
be preserved, including the publication of results, in accordance with a detailed
approved before the start of development.

The City Centre Archaeological Area is defined on the Proposals Map.

1.6 Requirement for assessment under above policy

| 1. Desk-based assessment | Yes |
| 2. Field collection survey | No |
| 3. Other survey | No |
| 4. Trenched evaluation | Yes |
| 5. Archaeological impact assessment | Yes |

2. Aim of the Assessment
2.1 The aim of the assessment is to identify/confirm any significant archaeological
remains on the site, including:
1. determine/confirm the character of any remains present, without compromising
any deposit which may merit investigation under full area excavation;
2. determine or estimate the date range of any remains from artefacts or otherwise;
3. investigate extent of any significant remains outside initial trenched sample;
4. Characterise (by minimally destructive techniques) any underlying archaeological
strata down to undisturbed geology;
5. determine the potential of the deposits for significant palaeo-ecological
information;
6. Specific objectives as follows:

6.1 To confirm that there is no structure or deposit of the medieval leper
hospital or its farm within the impact of the proposed development.

3. Assessment tasks
3.1 Task A1 (as required) - Desktop assessment

1. Review SMR/NAR etc As Appendix 1 Task 1.1 Yes
2. Review historic maps 1.2 Yes
3. Review local histories 1.3 Yes
4. Review other sources 1.4 See below

http://www.oxford.gov.uk/files/seals/docs/68967/Bartlema%20Conservation
%20Area%20Appraisal.pdf
M Satchell (unpublished) Evaluation report of the Hospital of St Bartholomew,
Oxford: Text of report to Listed Building Committee of OAHS (pdf attached)

3.1.5 Summarise significant results of any available geotechnical test pitting and other site
investigations, and provide commentary.
3.2 Task A2 (as required) - Geophysical survey
3.2.1 Archaeo-geophysical survey in accordance with Appendix 1, Task A2; covering area of areas specified by attached drawing.

3.3 Task A3 - Trenched evaluation
3.3.1 Evaluation trenches to be excavated in areas outlined on attached plan, subject to any revision arising from above (Tasks A1-A2).

3.4 Task A4 - Revised assessment of archaeological impact
The project should reassess the impact of the development on the cultural heritage, to a standard which could be used to inform a general environmental assessment of the development, and to identify an appropriate mitigation strategy.

4 Report, archives and dissemination of results
4.1 The report
A report shall be prepared covering the results of Tasks A1 - 4, to be delivered normally within two weeks of completion of Task A3 fieldwork. It shall include the following:
• Content as Appendix 1, Report, including a frontsheet as specified.
• Under Task A4 a statement of the impact of the development on significant archaeological deposits;
• At the discretion of the applicant, it may propose potential means of mitigating significant impacts.

4.2 Deposition of the archive (amended 8.03.2005)
• The full project archive and finds shall be deposited with an appropriate museum, subject to the owner's agreement and with due regard to proper standards of archival and artefact conservation. The museum should be approached for a reference number before any fieldwork commences.
• Normally the receiving museum will be the Oxfordshire County Museum Service (01865 300557 or 300972).
• However where a significant archive from the same or a related site already exists in a different museum, for instance the Ashmolean Museum, consideration should be given to amalgamating the archives.
• Also where a site is developed for the use of, or on land in the ownership of, the Ashmolean Museum, the new archive should be offered to that museum (Department of Antiquities, 01865 278020).
• It should be noted that Oxfordshire Department of Leisure and Arts makes a charge for depositing finds and archives.
A copy of the report shall be deposited on open access with the County Sites and Monuments Record within six months of completion of the fieldwork, and a further copy shall be deposited with the archive. Brief details of the results shall be sent to the National Archaeological Record in the format required by RCHME.

Significant academic results shall be published in a suitable form in an appropriate journal, newsletter or other medium to be agreed with the Oxford City Archaeological Advisory Service. Such publication to be undertaken within reasonable time, i.e. one year, unless the evaluation is followed by more extensive investigations, in which case within three years of completion of all fieldwork.

5 General requirements
5.1 **Hazards:** The developer or his agent shall provide sufficient information on below ground structures, services and any other potential hazards to enable the fieldwork to be completed in safety.

5.2 **Health and Safety:** The archaeological body must satisfy all requirements of current Health and Safety legislation.

5.3 **Human remains, Treasure Trove etc:** The archaeological body must satisfy all requirements of current legislation on the reporting of human remains, treasure trove, etc.

5.4 **Archaeological personnel:** The project, and specialist tasks within it, shall be carried out under the direction of appropriately qualified named personnel. Where not members of IFA, other evidence of qualifications and referees may be required.

5.5 **Notice of program:** Fourteen days notice of commencement of fieldwork to be given to Oxford City Council and Oxford City Planning Officer.

BD (Template revision 05a 8 March 2005, 17 May 2006)
Oxford City Council Brief 1: Archaeological Assessment: Appendix 1: Standard Task Methodologies

(NB with respect to Oxford City Council Brief 2: Mitigation. The task methodologies set out below relate to an Oxford City Council Brief 1, ie the assessment phase of a project. However Tasks A1 and A3 methodologies are also broadly applicable to the mitigation phase, ie Tasks M1 and M3. Further clarification from Oxford City Council as required.)

Task A1 (as required) - Desk based assessment scope
The following sources to be consulted as defined in site specific brief:
1. Oxon SMR; NAR; Rodwell Historic Towns in Oxon 1975; any article referred to specifically in brief
2. Historic maps: Agas (1578); Loggan (1675); Taylor (1750); Davis (1793); Hoggar (1850); OS (1875-on)
3. Salters' Survey of Oxford Vols 1 and 2; VCH Vols 4 and 5; Squires In West Oxford
4. RCHME Air Photographs; Scheduled Monument descriptions; RCHME Inventory of the Historical Monuments of Oxford; Listed Building Descriptions; topographical collections in Bodleian Library and Centre for Oxon Studies

Task A2 (as required) - Non-intrusive: Geophysical survey / fieldwalking methodology
1. General aim is to determine extent and layout of any remains by non intrusive methods in specified area or areas, thereby to provide an indication of areas which will benefit from clarification by trenching. General requirements as follows:
   • Survey grid to be accurately tied in to OS National Grid
   • Density of geophysical readings to conform with best industry standard
   • Geophysical report to include description of the equipment and methodology; results plotted to at least three formats at appropriate scales (normally 1:500 or 1:1000) related to OS Grid; interpretative plots; and commentary on interpretation.
   • Fieldwalking standards on application

Task A3 - Trenched Evaluation methodology
1. Position of trenches shall be accurately surveyed in and plotted on a current large scale OS plan (min. 1:1250) relative to the full extent of the site, and related to the National Grid and to existing physical features in or close to the site, especially permanent structures not likely to be disturbed in the foreseeable future;
2. Mechanical excavation to be carried out with a machine suited to the site and ground conditions, fitted with a toothless bucket of appropriate width to create a clean surface, and continuously supervised by an archaeologist. Upcast from mechanical trenching to be scanned for artefacts, to be recorded and retained;
3. Limit of mechanical excavation: Machine excavation only to top of significant archaeological features/deposits;
4. Hand excavation: Sufficient features to be excavated by hand to achieve the aims of the investigation, but avoiding compromising the integrity of any archaeological deposit which may be better excavated under conditions of full area excavation;
5. Individual trench plans will normally be drawn at 1:50 for uncomplicated areas, and 1:20 or 1:10 for complex features;
6. Overall stratification of each trench to be described with depths of overburden, any archaeological horizon and natural subsoil indicated; similarly where no archaeology is detected;
7. Sections of individual features and of general stratification shall normally be drawn at 1:20 but exceptionally may be recorded at 1:50 if simple or 1:10 if particular detail is required. All sections shall be tied in to Ordnance Datum, and their orientation and location related to detailed plans.
8. Archaeological layers and features to be numbered and described, including their stratigraphic interrelationships, using a single context recording system, and where necessary a trench matrix, according to best archaeological practice, and in accordance with IFA Standard and Guidance for Field Evaluations.
Oxford City Council Brief for Archaeological Fieldwork

9. *Human remains* shall be left in place and the Coroner informed. Where removal is necessary a licence shall be obtained from the Home Office.

10. *A photographic record* shall be made of the work, of individual trenches with significant archaeology and of significant individual contexts or groups of contexts.

11. *Palaeo-ecology:* A sampling strategy for ecofacts, soils and sediments shall be specified and agreed in advance, and the name of the appropriate specialist shall be specified.

12. *Artefact work:* All artefacts pertinent to the aims of archaeological evaluation shall be retained, including those from mechanical excavation. Recording, cleaning and conservation of finds to follow IFA Guidelines for Finds Work. Recording shall be carried out in a manner compatible with existing typological series for the City of Oxford; this is of particular importance in respect of pottery and ceramic tiles.

13. *Recording systems* to be used shall be specified by reference to the archaeological body’s Manual. A copy of the Manual to be supplied with the WSI if not previously submitted to Oxford City Council.

14. *Recording media and storage of finds* shall meet archival and conservation standards set by the Museums Association and the receiving museum. A copy of original records shall be made to be stored separately from the original archive for security purposes.

**Task A4 - Revised assessment of archaeological impact**

The report should reassess the provisional design impact of the development on archaeology in the context of the cultural heritage and current legislation as follows:

- EC requirements on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as adopted in England are presented in DETR Circular 02/99, which gives guidance on implementation. It classifies developments as Schedule 1 (EIA obligatory), or Schedule 2 (EIA required in the upper end, dependent on significance judged by sensitivity of the site, and size, type and special hazards of development).

- Many archaeological evaluations will be on sites which are not so classified; if in doubt however, the concluding statement of the archaeological assessment should be in a form which could be incorporated into an Environmental Statement.

**Report Format (assessment/field evaluation)**

Details of style and presentation at discretion of contractor, but must include following:

- Frontsheet setting out: site name; grid reference; assessment tasks undertaken; date and duration of project; site code; area of site; summary of results; location and reference of archive.

- Report to include: a summary of the project background and objectives; the site location; contractor’s methodology; description of results; interpretation of results in context of objectives; a summary of the content of the archive, including tabulation of finds; site plan based on OS grid, showing actual location of trenches, superimposed on any significant findings from Tasks A1 and A2; plans and sections of any trenches where significant archaeological deposits have been detected; a discussion of the results in the wider context; a reassessment of construction impact on significant deposits.
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1 Introduction

1.1 An area of gardens, playground and derelict school buildings formerly known as the Bartlemas Nursery School, off Cowley Road, Oxford are due to be redeveloped. Oxford Archaeology (OA) has been commissioned by James Donlon of Marcus Beale Architects Ltd (MBA) who are acting on behalf of Oriel College to undertake an archaeological evaluation of the impact areas to inform the planning application. Brian Durham, Archaeologist at Oxford City Council has prepared a Brief for the evaluation (dated 21st May 2008). This Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) details how OA will implement the requirements of that document. The first part of this document is site specific while the Appendices detail general OA standards and procedures.

1.2 The background information presented here is derived from the Desk Based Assessment (DBA) undertaken by OA and should be consulted for further detail where required (OA 2008).

2 Location, Geology and Topography

2.1 The site is located next to the Cowley Road in Oxford. The southern boundary of the site rests on Cowley Road, the eastern boundary on the enclosure associated with the buildings of St Bartholomew’s Chapel, the northern boundary on the boundary with the Oriel College sports ground and the western boundary on the rear of properties that front on to Southfield Road. The site is occupied by the now derelict buildings of the former Bartlemas Nursery School. The ground slopes gently from the north to south at NGR SP 524 055.

2.2 The underlying geology of the site comprises the Oxford Clay of Upper Jurassic date. The ground rises to the north towards Headington Hill and the northern boundary of the St Bartholomew’s enclosure rests on the junction between the Upper Oxford Clay and the overlying Temple Cowley member which comprises fine grained sandstones and siltstones, also of Upper Jurassic date. Above this is the Beckley Sand Member. Both the Temple Cowley Member and Beckley Sand form part of the Corallian formation (BGS 1994).

2.3 This geological sequence is particularly relevant to tracing the whereabouts of any Holy Well/Spring which may be associated with Bartlemas, as the
junction between the relatively permeable sands and siltstones of the Temple Cowley and Beckley Members with the impermeable Upper Oxford Clay forms a natural spring line. This junction of geology passes approximately along the northern boundary of the Bartlemas enclosure c 300 m to the north of the Bartlemas School Site.

2.4 The area underlain by the Oxford Clay to the south and east of Bartlemas, was in historic times called Cowley Marsh.

3 Archaeological and Historical Background and Potential

3.1 See below for a summary background. For a detailed background including maps etc, and the references to OA numbers this text should be cross-referenced to the DBA (OA 2008).

3.2 No Prehistoric activity or findspots are recorded from within 500 m of Bartlemas Nursery School site and the potential for activity of this date being present on the site is, therefore, rated as being very low.

3.3 A Romano-British kiln site has been identified (OA 4) only c 500 m to the south-east of Bartlemas Nursery School and finds of Romano-British material were also made during investigations on the adjacent Oxford Brookes accommodation site (OA 2). Although these finds are believed to have been residual or re-deposited by manuring they still indicate that some Romano-British activity is present in the vicinity.

3.4 During the medieval and post-medieval periods the Bartlemas Nursery School site lay just outside the western boundary of the extra-parochial enclosure associated with the charitable hospital of St Bartholomew. The estimated area of this enclosure during the medieval period accords pretty well with the mapped area (13 acres 1 rood and 32 perches) that appears on historic maps from the 1802 Inclosure map onwards (OA 1997, 8). The old causeway road lay just to the south of Bartlemas Nursery School. This route was probably established by the medieval period and continued to be the main route eastward until Cowley Road became established during the 19th century.

3.5 It has been suggested that the water-course that defines the boundary between Bartlemas School and the St Bartholomew’s extra-parochial enclosure may have provided a water supply for the hospital. It is possible that this is the case, although another water feature has been identified from historic maps within the extra parochial enclosure. This second feature lies in close proximity to the surviving hospital chapel and is aligned on an area in which other medieval hospital buildings probably stood. This second feature may originally have been a boundary and/or fish-pond demarcating an internal division within the medieval hospital. It is possible that this feature may have been fed with water through a conduit taken off the watercourse that forms the boundary with the site of the former Nursery School. If this was the case then a conduit running between the watercourse on the boundary and this second water feature may have supplied water for the hospital.
3.6 Lying outside the extra-parochial enclosure, it is probable that the Bartlemas School site lay in a cultivated or waste area just within the north west boundary of the Parish of Cowley and that no hospital buildings extended over the watercourse that forms the boundary with Bartlemas. It is also highly probable that the site of the Holy Well of St Bartholomew lies somewhere on a natural springline within the northern half of the extra-parochial enclosure associated with St Bartholomew’s.

4 Aims of the Evaluation

4.1 To establish the presence/absence of archaeological remains within the proposal area.

4.2 To determine and confirm the character of any remains present, without compromising any deposits that may merit detailed investigation under full area excavation.

4.3 To determine or estimate the date range of any remains from artefacts or otherwise.

4.4 To investigate the extent of any significant remains outside initial trenched sample through agreement with the client and City Archaeologist.

4.5 To characterise any underlying archaeological strata down to undisturbed geology without significantly impacting upon significant younger (overlying) deposits where possible.

4.6 To determine the palaeo-environmental potential of archaeological deposits.

4.7 To make available the results of the investigation to inform the planning application and the potential for any further mitigation strategy.

Site specific informed aims

4.8 To confirm that there is no structure or deposit of the medieval leper hospital or its farm within the impact of the proposed development.

4.9 To investigate the degree of terracing and made ground within development area resulting from the construction of the former school.

5 Methodology

5.1 Six trenches, numbered 1 - 6 inclusive, have been positioned within the development area, avoiding extant former scholl buildings and live services, and targeted evenly on the area of impact of the proposed buildings and landscaping (as shown on MBA drawing No. 334.2/010F as supplied by James Donlon). Trenches orientated broadly E-W are aligned obliquely to the alignment of an historic stream running down the eastern side of the site.
5.2 Where hard standing is present, this will be broken out using a hydraulic breaker attached to a JCB-type machine excavator. A machine fitted with a toothless bucket will then excavate the six trenches. Machine excavation will proceed in spits no greater that 0.20m thick to the first significant archaeological horizon or natural geology (whichever is encountered first) under the supervision of an experienced archaeologist. These will consist of four trenches each 10 m by 1.8 m and a two trenches measuring 5 m by 1.8 m representing a 4% sample of the development area (see Fig. 1).

5.3 Hand excavation of any archaeological deposits encountered within all trenches will be undertaken following the removal of overburden and sufficient cleaning to determine the extent and character of these and to fulfil the aims outlined above (see Appendix 2).

5.4 OA will backfill all trenches after approval is given by the Oxford City Archaeologist. No specialist reinstatement has been requested although OA will backfill each trench with care with the excavated material. This will be lightly compacted by the machine.

5.5 A project Supervisor and one field technicians under the general supervision of a Project Manager (Ben Ford MIFA) will undertake the fieldwork. It is anticipated that the trenching will be completed within a week although the restrictions to access and necessary small machine size could result in the project taking up to two weeks. All OA’s fieldwork is carried out under the general direction of Nick Shepherd (Head of Fieldwork).

5.6 Any human remains that are encountered will initially be left in situ. If removal is necessary this will comply with the relevant Ministry of Justice procedures.

6 Report and archive preparation

6.1 A report of the findings will be produced as soon as possible or at the latest within four weeks of the completion of fieldwork. A draft copy of this report will be submitted to the College and their representative for comment and approval. Final copies of the report will be submitted to the Oxford City Archaeologist, Brian Durham, and the Sites and Monuments Record Office.

6.2 The content and style of the report will be as defined in Appendix 8.

6.3 The site archive will be created in accordance with the guidelines published in Guidelines for the preparation of Excavation Archives for long-term storage (UK Inst. for Conservation 1990) and standards in the Museum care of archaeological collections - see Appendix 8. The project archive will be deposited with the Oxfordshire County Museum Services.
6.4 A list of specialists used by OA is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Stafford OR Carl Champness (OA)</td>
<td>Geoarchaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Stafford (OA)</td>
<td>Molluscs assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Huckerby (OA)</td>
<td>Pollen assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Huckerby (OA)</td>
<td>Waterlogged Plant remains assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Smith (OA)</td>
<td>Charred Plant Remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Loe (OA)</td>
<td>Osteoarchaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena Strid (OA)</td>
<td>Animal bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Nicholson</td>
<td>Fish Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Fell (Oxford Institute of Archaeology)</td>
<td>Conservator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Campbell (External)</td>
<td>Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Hugo Lamdin-Whymark (External)</td>
<td>Lithic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(External)</td>
<td>Early Prehistoric pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Brown (OA)</td>
<td>Late Prehistoric pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Booth (OA)</td>
<td>Roman pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Blinkhorn/Duncan Brown (External)</td>
<td>Saxon/medieval/post-medieval pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Keyes (External)</td>
<td>Slag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Wilmot (External)</td>
<td>Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Higgins (External) OR John Cotter (OA)</td>
<td>Clay Pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Scott (OA)</td>
<td>Metalwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Miles (External)</td>
<td>Worked wood/Dendrochronology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafter radiocarbon lab</td>
<td>C14 dating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Health and Safety

7.1 All OA project fieldwork is undertaken in accordance with all relevant current Health and Safety Legislation. This includes in particular the following regulations (the list is not intended to be exhaustive):

- Health and Safety at Work Act 1974
- Construction (Design and management) Regulations 1994
- The management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1992
- Personal Protective Equipment at Work Regulations 1992
- Work Equipment Regulations 1992
- Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1992

7.2 OA has its own Health and Safety Policy which refers to the manual Health and Safety in Field Archaeology (SCAUM 1997), and these two documents constitute the Health and Safety arrangements of OA. The Director of OA is ultimately responsible under the terms of the Health and Safety Act (1974) for ensuring the safety of employees. He must know the broad requirements of relevant legislation; attend meetings of OA Health and Safety Committee; ensure that responsibility for health and safety is properly assigned and accepted at all levels. The Director and Chief Executive of OA is David Jennings.

7.3 The Safety Co-ordinator of OA: represents the director on matters of health and safety; keeps abreast of relevant legislation and approved practice, and disseminates this information to OA staff; advises staff as required on matters
of health and safety; maintains OA health and safety records; calls and chairs meetings of the OA Health and Safety Committee. The Safety Co-ordinator of OA is Dan Poore.

7.4 The Project Director is the person delegated to take overall charge of a particular project. She/he is responsible for health and safety matters on the projects that they manage, reporting to the Safety Co-ordinator in the first instance, and ultimately to OA’s Director. She/he must be satisfied that an adequate safety plan has been drawn up for the project, or for each phase of the project. The Project Director may also be the Project Manager in some cases (see below).

7.5 Individual Project Supervisors-Managers are the persons delegated to take charge of a particular phase or part of the overall project. They are responsible for ensuring that for each site that they are in charge of an adequate Risk Assessment and any amendments or additions to the Site Safety Plan have been drawn up prior to work starting on site, and they are immediately responsible for the Health and Safety of employees and sub-contractors under their supervision. They report directly to the Project Director and OA Safety Co-ordinator.

7.6 The OA Health and Safety Committee consists of the Director, Safety Co-ordinator, OA Manager and the Site Staff Representative. The Safety Co-ordinator normally calls meetings of the Committee when there is business for discussion, but may be called by other members of the committee.

7.7 OA’s independent Health and Safety Consultants are Safety Services Ltd, Stanton Harcourt, Oxon, who are consulted with regard to matters such as deep trenching, shoring and working in confined spaces.

7.8 Prior to the project a pro-forma OA Health and Safety Risk Assessment is produced by the project manager/supervisor and passed to the OA Safety Co-ordinator for approval. The Project Manager/supervisor ensures that the following information is available to the excavation team copy of the HSE poster ‘Health and Safety Law - What You should Know’, copy of the Safety Plan and Risk Assessment, Emergency Information Sheet giving details of nearest hospital etc, copy of the Notification of Project to HSE, location of an accident book.

8 General

8.1 OA 1998 appendices apply. Appendices 2, 8 and 11 are relevant (see below).
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OCC 2008, Oxford City Council, Brief for Archaeological Fieldwork. 1: Assessment Including Field Evaluation. (Brian Durham, OCC)
The following methods and terms will apply, where appropriate, to all OA fieldwork unless varied by undertakings specified in a detailed Written Scheme of Investigation.

2 MACHINE EXCAVATED TRENCHES

2.1 A visual inspection of the entire site will be undertaken. This will include the examination of any available exposures (e.g. recently cut field ditches and geological test pits).

2.2 An appropriate mechanical excavator will be used for machine excavated trenches. This will normally be a JCB 3CX Sitemaster or 360° tracked excavator with a 5' or 6' wide toothless bucket. For work with restricted access or working room a mini excavator such as a Kubota KH 90 will be used.

2.3 Allmachining will be undertaken under direct archaeological supervision.

2.4 All undifferentiated topsoil or overburden of recent origin will be removed down to the first significant archaeological horizon, in successive, level spits.

2.5 Following machine clearance, all faces of the trench that require examination or recording will be cleaned using appropriate hand tools.

2.6 Spoil heaps will be monitored in order to recover artefacts to assist in the analysis of the spatial distribution of artefacts. Modern artefacts will be noted but not retained.

2.7 All investigation of archaeological levels will be by hand, with cleaning, examination and recording both in plan and section.

2.8 Within significant archaeological levels a minimum number of features required to meet the aims will be hand excavated. Pits and postholes will be subject to a 50% sample excavation by volume. Linear features will be sectioned as appropriate. Features not suited to excavation within narrow trenches will not be sampled. No archaeological deposits will be entirely removed unless this is unavoidable. It is not necessarily the intention that all trial trenches will be fully excavated to natural stratigraphy, but the depth of archaeological deposits across the entire site will be assessed. The stratigraphy of all evaluation trenches will be recorded even where no archaeological deposits have been identified.

2.9 Any excavation, both by machine and by hand, will be undertaken with a view to avoiding damage to any archaeological features or deposits that appear to be worthy of preservation in situ.

2.10 Different environmental sampling strategies may be employed according to established research targets and the perceived importance of the strata under investigation. Bulk samples, a minimum of 10 litres, but up to 30 litres if possible for early prehistoric features will be taken for flotation for charred plant remains. Bulk samples will be taken from any waterlogged deposits present for macroscopic plant remains. Columns for pollen analysis will be taken if appropriate. Mollusc samples will be collected if present. Other bulk samples for small animal bones and other small artefacts may be taken from appropriate contexts.

2.11 Any finds of human remains will be left in-situ, covered and protected and the coroner informed. If removal is essential it will only take place under appropriate Home Office licence, section 25 of the Burial Act 1857 and local environmental health regulations, and if appropriate in compliance with the Disused Burial Grounds (Amendment) Act 1981.
2.12 All finds of gold and silver will be removed to a safe place and reported to the local Coroner according to the procedures relating to Treasure Act, 1996. Where removal cannot be effected on the same working day as the discovery, suitable security measures will be taken to protect the finds from theft.

2.13 The OA welcomes monitoring visits by the local authorities' archaeological representatives. Timetables of the on-site work will be provided in order that visits can be made at appropriate times.

2.14 After recording, the trenches will be backfilled with excavated material, but will otherwise not be reinstated.

RECORDING

2.15 Contexts
- If less than ten trenches are to be recorded, a block of numbers, in a continuous sequence will be allocated to each trench.
- If more than ten trenches are to be recorded, a continuous unique numbering system will operate within each trench only.
- Written descriptions will be recorded on proforma sheets comprising factual data and interpretative elements.
- Where stratified deposits are encountered a Harris matrix will be compiled during the course of the excavation.

2.16 Plans
- These will normally drawn at 1:100, but on urban or deeply stratified sites a scale of 1:50 or 1:20 will be used. Detailed plans will be at an appropriate scale. Burials will be drawn at scale 1:10.
- The site grid will be accurately tied into the National Grid and located on the 1:2500 or 1:1250 map of the area.
- A register of plans will be kept.

2.17 Sections
- Long sections of trenches showing layers will be drawn at 1:50. Sections of features or short lengths of trenches will be drawn at 1:20.
- A register of sections will be kept.
- Generally all sections will be tied in to Ordnance Datum. The exception to this is where the proposal for the site is mineral extraction where depth in relation to the development proposals is irrelevant. In these cases only some significant sections will be tied in to OD.

2.18 Photography
- A full black and white and colour (35 mm transparency) photographic record, illustrating in both detail and general context the principal features and finds discovered will be maintained. The photographic record will also include working shots to illustrate more generally the nature of the archaeological work.
- Photographs will be recorded on OA Photographic Record Sheets.

2.19 All recording will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the OA Field Manual (ed. D Wilkinson 1992).

FINDS

2.20 All identified finds and artefacts will be retained, although certain classes of building material or post medieval pottery may sometimes be discarded after recording if an appropriate sample is retained. However, no finds will be discarded without the prior approval of the nominated representative of the local authority and the receiving Museum. All appropriate ironwork will be X-rayed.
2.21 The pottery and other relevant artefacts will be scanned to assess the date range of the assemblage.

2.22 All finds and samples will be treated in a proper manner and to standards agreed in advance with the approved recipient museum. These will be exposed, lifted, cleaned, conserved, marked, bagged and boxed in accordance with the guidelines set out in UKIC's "Conservation Guidelines No. 2".

2.23 The level of artefact analysis will be sufficient to establish date ranges of archaeological deposits, a general assessment of the types of pottery and other artefacts to assist in characterising the archaeology, and to establish the potential for all categories of artefacts should further archaeological work be necessary.

2.24 At the beginning of a project, the local relevant museum and the landowner will be contacted regarding the preparation and deposition of the archive and finds.

2.25 Environmental samples, if appropriate will be processed and scanned for potential date. This will usually be co-ordinated by Dr M Robinson of University Museum, Oxford using appropriate specialists.

8 EVALUATION REPORTS

8.1 Style and format of the report will be determined by OA, but will include as a minimum the following:

- A location plan of trenches and/or other fieldwork in relation to the proposed development.
- Plans and sections of features located at an appropriate scale.
- A section drawing showing depth of deposits including present ground level with Ordnance Datum, vertical and horizontal scale.
- A summary statement of the results.
- A table summarising per trench the features, classes and numbers of artefacts contained within, spot dating of significant finds and an interpretation.
- A reconsideration of the methodology used, and a confidence rating for the results.
- An interpretation of the archaeological findings both within the site and within their wider landscape/townscape setting.

8.2 Copies of the report will be supplied to the client and the Archaeological Officer monitoring the works. Copies of the report will also be supplied to the County Sites and Monuments Record on the understanding that it will become a public document after an appropriate period of time (normally six months).

8.3 If the evaluation works generate archaeological results of importance which merit wider publication, the client will be consulted about further arrangements.

ARCHIVES

8.4 The site archive, including finds and environmental material, will be ordered, catalogued, labelled and conserved and stored according to the UKIC Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage.

8.5 The site archive will be prepared to at least the minimum acceptable standard defined in Management of Archaeological Projects 2, English Heritage 1991.

8.6 The site archive will be microfilmed by the RCHME National Archaeological Record as a safeguard against the accidental loss and the long-term degeneration of paper records and photographs.

8.7 The site archive will be deposited with the relevant receiving Museum at the earliest opportunity unless further archaeological work on the site is expected within one year of completion of the
archive. The OA will advise the landowner that any artefacts resulting from the project work should be given to the relevant Museum.

11  GENERAL

11.1 The requirements of the Brief will be met in full where reasonably practicable.

11.2 Any significant variations to the proposed methodology will be agreed with the local authority's archaeological representative in advance.

11.3 The scope of work detailed in the main part of the Written Scheme of Investigation is aimed at meeting the aims of the project in a cost-effective manner. The Oxford Archaeological Unit attempts to foresee possible site-specific problems and resource these. However there may be unusual circumstances which have not been included in the costing and programme.

- Unavoidable delays due to extreme bad weather, vandalism, etc.
- Complex structures or objects, including those in waterlogged conditions, requiring specialist removal.
- Extensions to specified trenches or feature sample sizes requested by the archaeological curator.
- Trenches requiring shoring or stepping, ground contamination, unknown services, poor ground conditions requiring additional plant, specialist reinstatement of surfaces (i.e. tarmac, turf).

HEALTH AND SAFETY and INSURANCE

11.4 All work will be carried out to the requirements of Health and Safety at Work, etc. Act 1974, The Management of Health and Safety Regulations 1992, the SCAUM (Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers) H & S manual Health and Safety in Field Archaeology 1991, the OA Health and Safety Policy, and any main contractors requirements.

11.5 A copy of the OA's Health and Safety Policy is available on request. OA will require copies of the H & S policies of all other contractors and operators present on site in compliance with The Manual of H & S Regulations 1992.

11.6 The OA holds Employers Liability Insurance, Public Liability Insurance and Professional Indemnity Insurance. Details will be supplied on request.

11.7 The OA will not be liable to indemnify the client against any compensation or damages for or with respect to:

- Damage to crops being on the Area or Areas of Work (save in so far as possession has not been given to the Archaeological Contractor);
- The use or occupation of land (which has been provided by the Client) by the Project or for the purposes of completing the Project (including consequent loss of crops) or interference whether temporary or permanent with any right of way, light, air or water or other easement or quasi easement which are the unavoidable result of the Project in accordance with the Agreement;
- Any other damage which is the unavoidable result of the Project in accordance with the Agreement;
- Injuries or damage to persons or property resulting from any act or neglect or breach of statutory duty done or committed by the client or his agents, servants or their contractors (not being employed by the Oxford Archaeological Unit) or for or in respect of any claims demands proceedings damages costs charges and expenses in respect thereof or in relation thereto.

COPYRIGHT and CONFIDENTIALITY

11.8 Oxford Archaeological Unit will retain full copyright of any commissioned reports, tender documents or other project documents, under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 with
all rights reserved; excepting that it will provide an exclusive licence to the client in all matters
directly relating to the project as described in the Written Scheme of Investigation.

11.9 Oxford Archaeological Unit will assign copyright to the client upon written request but retains
the right to be identified as the author of all project documentation and reports as defined in the
Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (Chapter IV, s.79).

11.10 OA will advise the client of any such materials supplied in the course of projects that are not
OA's copyright.

11.11 OA undertakes to respect all requirements for confidentiality about the client's proposals
provided that these are clearly stated. It is expected that such conditions shall not unreasonably
impede the satisfactory performance of the services required. OA further undertake to keep
confidential any conclusions about the likely implications of such proposals for the historic
environment. It is expected that clients respect OA's general ethical obligations not to suppress
significant archaeological data for an unreasonable period.

OA STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

11.12 OA shall conform to the standards of professional conduct outlined in the Institute of Field
Archaeologists' Code of Conduct, the IFA Code of Approved Practice for the Regulation of
Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology, the IFA Standards and Guidance for Field
Evaluations, Desk Based Assessments, etc. and the British Archaeologists and Developers
Liaison Group Code of Practice.

11.13 OA is a member of the Institute of Environmental Assessment and the Council for British
Archaeology.

11.14 Project Directors normally will be recognised in an appropriate Area of Competence by the IFA.
For more extensive and complicated evaluation projects especially where they are part of large-
scale programmes of work in historic urban centres, the procedures outlined in English
Heritage's Management of Archaeological Projects 2nd Edition 1991 (MAP 2) will be followed
for immediate post-field archive preparation and initial assessment. Agreement to then be
reached, in collaboration with the local authority's archaeological representative, about what
aspects will need to be taken forward to provide a report in the required format containing the
information needed for planning purposes.
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Summary

Oxford Archaeology was commissioned Oriel College, Oxford to undertake an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment for the former Bartlemas Nursery Site in Oxford.

This report concludes that the Bartlemas Nursery School lies in an area in which there is some potential for Pre Medieval, and especially Romano-British, deposits and or features being present on the site During the Medieval and Post Medieval period the site lay just outside the extra parochial enclosure of St Bartholomew’s Hospital and is therefore likely to have lain in the open fields or waste on the boundary between the parishes of Cowley and Headington.

It is possible that the watercourse that forms the eastern boundary of the site with the St Bartholomew’s enclosure formed part of the water supply for St Bartholomew’s Hospital although it is unlikely that built structures associated with the hospital extended to the west of this boundary.

The exact location of a Holy Well associated with the water supply at St Barthomew’s remains uncertain although it is likely to have lain on a natural spring line in the northern part of the St Bartholomew’s enclosure.

A scheme of archaeological evaluation is suggested to inform on the requirement for any further archaeological mitigation of the Bartlemas Nursery School site. Any scheme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation should be agreed, well in advance of construction, with the curatorial body (Oxford City Archaeologist).
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology (OA) has been commissioned by Oriel College, Oxford to undertake an archaeological desk-based assessment of the former Bartlemas Nursery Site (Fig. 1). No detailed plans of the proposed groundworks with impact depths were available at the time of writing this report.

1.1.2 Two comprehensive desk based studies have already been undertaken for the site and/or its immediate environs. The first of these was a Desk Based Assessment, prepared by the Oxford Archaeological Unit (now Oxford Archaeology), for the Oriel College sports ground (OAU 1997). The second was the historical background and map regression, undertaken by Marcus Beale Architects, for the Bartlemas, Oxford Conservation Plan Assessment (MBA 2005).

1.1.3 This report does not seek to replace these reports but will summarise their findings where necessary. This report will mainly focus on establishing the potential for there being a medieval conduit that supplied water from a Holy Well/Spring to the former Medieval Leper Hospital of St Bartholomew's on or in close proximity to the Bartlemas School site.

2 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Summary

2.1.1 This assessment has taken into account relevant national and local legislation and policy, including:

- Planning: Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979
- Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999
- DoE Planning Policy Guidance Note 16, Archaeology and Planning 1990

2.2 Statutory Protection

2.2.1 A number of options for the statutory protection of archaeological or historic sites exist. 

*Planning: Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990*

2.2.2 Regulations by which historic buildings are accorded protection from changes brought about by development. This takes the form of listing, either as Grade I, Grade II* or Grade II. The Act also outlines protection of the historic character of areas through their designation as Conservation Areas. In general the regulations are administered by the local planning authority in consultation with English Heritage. 

*Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979*

2.2.3 The relevant sections of the Act allow for the protection of archaeological and historic monuments of national importance (other than buildings as defined above) through scheduling. Consent for works within scheduled areas and administration of the Act is
undertaken by the Department of Culture Media and Sport in consultation with English Heritage.

2.3 National Planning Guidance

2.3.1 The Town and County Planning system provides a framework for the protection of archaeological or historic remains threatened by development, principally through the application of the relevant Planning Policy Guidance Notes.

2.3.2 At a national level, Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16) was issued by the Department of the Environment in November 1990. Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment was issued by the Department of the Environment/Department of National Heritage in 1994.

*Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 (PPG 16)*

2.3.3 The importance of archaeology in the planning process is detailed in the Government's Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 (PPG 16) on Archaeology and Planning (DoE 1990). The underlying principle of this guidance is that archaeological resources represent a non-renewable resource and that the conservation of the archaeological resource should be the primary goal of archaeological resource management.

2.3.4 PPG 16 acknowledges the potentially fragile and finite or irreplaceable nature of archaeological remains (para. 6), and states that the desirability of preservation of archaeological remains and their setting is a material consideration within the planning process (para. 18). PPG 16 provides that there is a presumption in favour of the physical preservation of nationally important archaeological remains (para. 8), and that where preservation in situ is not justified it is reasonable for planning authorities to require the developer to make appropriate and satisfactory provision for excavation and recording of remains (para. 25).

2.3.5 Paragraph 19 of PPG 16 suggests that it is in developers’ own interests to include an initial assessment of whether the site is known or likely to contain archaeological remains as part of their research into the development potential of a site. Paragraph 22 adds:

> Local planning authorities can expect developers to provide the results of such assessments ... as part of their application for sites where there is good reason to believe there are remains of archaeological importance.

2.3.6 PPG 16 also notes that in spite of the best pre-planning application research, there may be occasions when the presence of archaeological remains only becomes apparent once development has commenced (para. 31).

*Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG 15)*

2.3.7 Planning Policy Guidance: Planning and the Historic Environment (PPG 15) states that 'It is fundamental to the Government's policies for environmental stewardship that there should be effective protection for all aspects of the historic environment' para. 1.1). In respect of Development Control, PPG15 says of local planning authorities (para. 2.11):

2.3.8 They should expect developers to assess the likely impact of their proposals on the site or structure in question, and to provide such written information or drawings as may be required to understand the significance of a site or structure before an application is determined.
2.4 Local planning Guidance

2.4.1 The City of Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 deposited February 2003 sets out the local policies in respect of archaeology. The most pertinent of these policies is:

Policy HE 2 Archaeology

2.4.2 Where archaeological deposits that are potentially significant to the historic environment of Oxford are known or suspected to exist anywhere in Oxford but in particular the City Centre Archaeological Area planning applications should incorporate sufficient information to define the character and extent of such deposits as far as reasonably practicable, including where appropriate:
- the results of an evaluation by fieldwork; and
- an assessment of the effect of the proposals on the deposits or their setting,

2.4.3 If the existence and significance of deposits is confirmed, planning permission will only be granted where the proposal includes:
- provision to preserve the archaeological remains in situ, so far as reasonably practicable, by sensitive layout and design (particularly foundations, drainage and hard landscaping); and
- provision for the investigation and recording of any archaeological remains that cannot be preserved, including the publication of results, in accordance with a detailed scheme approved before the start of development.

3 SOURCES CONSULTED AND METHODOLOGY

3.1.1 The primary repository of archaeological data for this area is the Oxfordshire Sites and Monuments Record/Historic Environment Record (SMR/HER). This was visited in order to update the information contained in previous studies (OAU 1997, Lowe 1998, JMHS 2001 and TVAS 2002) undertaken for the site and its environs.

3.1.2 Designated sites, including the listed buildings at St Bartholomew’s are mapped on figure 2 of this report. Archaeological sites and findspots have been given an OA number and have been mapped on Figure 3 of this report. Figure 4 of this report maps features identified from historic mapping and figure 5 maps extant and historical water features within the St Bartholomew’s enclosure and relates them to the local geology.

3.1.3 Figures 6 - 9 comprise historic maps (mainly O/S) detailing the history of the site and the St Bartholomew’s enclosure since 1840.

3.1.4 A full list of published and unpublished sources consulted is given in Appendix 1.

4 LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

4.1.1 The site is located next to the Cowley Road in Oxford. The southern boundary of the site rests on Cowley Road, the eastern boundary on the enclosure associated with the buildings of St Bartholomew’s Chapel, the northern boundary on the boundary with the Oriel College sports ground and the western boundary on the rear of properties that front on to Southfield Road. The site is occupied by the buildings of the former Bartlemas Nursery School.

4.1.2 The underlying geology of the site comprises the Oxford Clay of Upper Jurassic date. The ground rises to the north towards Headington Hill and the northern boundary of the St Bartholomew’s enclosure rests on the junction between the Upper Oxford Clay and the overlying Temple Cowley member which comprises fine grained sandstones and siltstones, also of Upper Jurassic date. Above this is the Beckley Sand Member. Both
the Temple Cowley Member and Beckley Sand form part of the Corallian formation (BGS 1994).

4.1.3 This geological sequence is particularly relevant to tracing the whereabouts of any Holy Well/Spring which may be associated with Bartlemas, as the junction between the relatively permeable sands and siltstones of the Temple Cowley and Beckley Members with the impermeable Upper Oxford Clay forms a natural spring line (See Fig. 5). This junction of geology passes approximately along the northern boundary of the Bartlemas enclosure c 300 m to the north of the Bartlemas School Site.

4.1.4 The area underlain by the Oxford Clay to the south and east of Bartlemas, was in historic times called Cowley Marsh.

5 WALK OVER SURVEY

5.1.1 A walkover was conducted on February 28th 2008 to trace the line of a ditch that has been suggested to be a conduit to supply water to the St Bartholomew’s Hospital site. Historically this ditch has formed the western boundary of the enclosure associated with Bartlemas.

5.1.2 The ditch could be viewed along parts of its course and in places was still water filled. Part of the ditch lies under the Oriel sports pavilion and Oxford Brookes accommodation before exiting to become the eastern boundary of the former Bartlemas School site. The ditch apparently peter out in the grounds of Bartlemas Farm.

5.1.3 In the northern section of the boundary, some encroachment by the gardens of properties fronting Southfield Road means that in places the line of the ditch lies within these gardens (no access was made to these gardens) and has been mainly filled in, although sections were still occasionally visible. The boundary was followed to the north west corner of the Bartlemas enclosure. There was no indication of the presence of either the ditch or a spring/well at this point.

6 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

6.1 Designated Sites

6.1.1 The Bartlemas Nursery School lies within the Bartlemas Conservation Area (Fig. 2). This Conservation area extends from the southern end of the Oriel College sports pitches to the Cowley Road and also includes the allotments and the nursery school site. In addition, St Bartholomew’s Chapel, Bartlemas House and Bartlemas Farmhouse are all Listed Buildings.

6.2 Previous Archaeological investigations

6.2.1 Three desk based studies and three archaeological field investigations have already been undertaken for the site and/or its immediate environs. These comprise:

- **OA 1** An investigation undertaken during the digging of a modern pond between the Chapel and Bartlemas House suggested that a later Medieval boundary may have existed between the Chapel and Bartlemas House (Durham 1990).

- **OA 2** A Desk Based Assessment, prepared by the Oxford Archaeological Unit (now Oxford Archaeology), for the site immediately to the north of Bartlemas School, which is now occupied by Oxford Brookes University accommodation (OAU 1997). A second desk study was undertaken for the same site in 1998 (Lowe, 1998). An
archaeological evaluation of the site was undertaken in 2001 (TVAS 2002). The evaluation recorded a possible section of walling within the former St Bartholomew’s enclosure and also recovered a number of sherds of abraded Romano-British, Late Saxon and Medieval pottery (ibid).

- **OA 3** An archaeological Watching Brief was undertaken to the rear of St John’s Vicarage (JMHS 2001). No archaeology was recorded within this site although the presence of limestone rubble and gravel suggested that the historical road which passed St Bartholomew’s possibly lay just to the north (JMHS 2001, 7).

6.2.2 In addition, some archaeological recording was undertaken during the construction at Oxford Boys School (OA 4) c 500 m to the south-east of the site; here a large spread of Romano-British finds was interpreted as being evidence for a kiln site being present (Atkinson, 1948, 67). Archaeological investigations were also undertaken on the site of the new East Oxford Health Centre (OA 5) c 500 m to the north-west but this recorded no archaeology. There is also a report of Medieval pottery (OA 6) having been recovered from the allotments within the St Bartholomew’s enclosure (OAU 1997).

6.3 **Pre-Medieval Settlement**

6.3.1 The upper Thames Valley in which Oxford lies is rich in Prehistoric sites. The majority of these known sites are, however, concentrated on the Thames Gravel Terraces. Increasingly, however, settlement is now being recognised to have also become established on the higher ground such as that formed by the Corallian formation, at the foot of which the Bartlemas School site lies.

6.3.2 It has been conjectured that a Prehistoric droveway/long distance route may have followed the line of the original London Road, along Cheney Lane and Old Road towards Shotover. As yet, however, no proof for this has been identified (OA1999, 5).

6.3.3 Evidence for Later Neolithic and Bronze age settlement activity has been recognised at Manor Ground in Headington c 1.5 km to the north of the Bartlemas site. The Manor Ground Site also provided evidence of Mesolithic/Early Neolithic exploitation of the area and for proximity to Iron Age settlement (JMHS 2003, 24). In addition, some evidence for Iron Age activity has been noted from investigations at the Churchill Hospital c 1 km to the north of Bartlemas (Young 1975).

6.3.4 Roman activity in the east Oxford area is clearly represented by the identification of an extensive pottery industry with associated settlement in an arc around the north east and eastern limits of Oxford from Barton and Old Headington to Cowley and Blackbird Lees. This industry is related to the presence of a major Roman Road from Silchester, via Dorchester to Alcester (Margary 1973). It has also been conjectured that the old route that follows the line of Barracks Lane could be Roman in origin (JMHS 2001). This was, based on its straight alignment, proximity to the Romano-British kiln site identified at Oxford Boys school (OA 4) and junction with the Roman Dorchester to Alcester Road near the Cowley car plant.

6.3.5 The closest pottery manufactory site to Bartlemas was recognised c 500 m to the south east of the Bartlemas site at Oxford Boys School (OA 4). Other Kiln sites are known to be present in Temple Cowley c 1 km to the west of the site and Churchill Hospital c 1 km to the north (Young 1975). Roman activity is also suggested to exist in close proximity to the Bartlemas site by the finds of Roman pottery made during the investigations on the site of the Brookes university accommodation (OA 2).

6.3.6 Evidence for early Saxon activity is suggested by the finds of probably early Post Roman loom weights or pot boilers from the Headington reservoirs c 1 km to the north of the site. A single sherd of Late Saxon pottery was recovered during the investigations.
on the site of the Brookes University accommodation (OA 2) and finds of Late Saxon pottery have also been recorded from St Clements c 1 Km to the west.

6.4 Medieval and Post Medieval

6.4.1 St Bartholomew’s lies in an area that used to be just within the south east edge of the Parish of Headington with neighbouring Cowley. Cowley is first mentioned in a charter of 1004 and is also recorded in the Domesday Book of 1086. The main settled area of Cowley probably lay c 1.5 km to the south east near Church Cowley and Temple Cowley (OAU 1997, 4). Headington is also mentioned in a charter of 1004 but the nucleus of settlement in this case lay c 2 km to the north of Bartlemas in Old Headington (OA 2006, 13).

6.4.2 St Bartholomew’s Chapel and hospital was founded to care for lepers in 1126. Like the majority of such hospitals built, the foundation was outside the centre of a populous area to provide a quiet retreat for the sick and place it in isolation to prevent contagion. St Bartholomew’s was established within an enclosure of 6 acres taken from a cultivated area known as “The Strowell” in the Manor of Headington (OAU 1997, 6). By 1397, this original enclosed area appears to have been increased to approximately 13 acres, 1 rood and 33 perches (OAU 1997, 7). This area was effectively removed from any existing parishes (ie: extra-parochial) and survived to be recorded as such by Peshall in 1773 (Peshall 1773, 278) and subsequently clearly shown to be extra-parochial on the Headington enclosure map of 1802, the Cowley tithe map of 1853 and the 1st edition O/S 25" map of 1879 (Fig. 7). Bartlemas Nursery school lies just outside the western boundary of this enclosure and, therefore, within the historic parish of Cowley.

6.4.3 In 1328 the hospital was granted to Oriel College and the present stone chapel building dates from shortly after this grant (OAU 1997, 3). By 1342 the hospital appears to have ceased caring for lepers but was being used by Oriel College either to care for sick and infirm college members (ibid) and/or as a source of revenue due to its new status (confirmed by a Royal license of 1336) as a pilgrimage site associated with St Bartholomew (Wood 1661-66, 514-517). By this date St Bartholomew’s appears to have become associated with a number of relics including the comb of Edward the Confessor (said to be efficacious against headaches), a piece of skin of St Bartholomew and fragments of the crosses of SS Andrew and St Phillip (Rannie, 1900, 24).

6.4.4 In 1536 an agreement was made between Oriel College and the City of Oxford by which St Bartholomew’s remained in the ownership of Oriel College but also effectively became a City almshouse (VCH 1967, 473).

6.4.5 St Bartholomew’s was extensively damaged during the Civil War. Parliamentarian troops badly damaged the chapel (which was used as a stable) and stripped the lead from its roof. In addition the almshouses were burnt down and the farmhouses extensively damaged. It is also recorded that before the Civil War, the Hospital had stood within an extensive elm grove but that this was cut down (presumably by the Royalists) so that it could not act as shelter for rebel troops (OAU 1997, 8).

6.4.6 In 1649, Oriel college built a new almshouse (now Bartlemas House) and re-roofed the chapel. The role of St Bartholomew’s appears, however, to have changed by the mid 18th century as in 1773 the hospital was in lease to a surgeon, Sam Glass, who did not have to supply the almshomes but instead distributed 9d weekly to those resident in Oxford (OAU 1997, 3).

6.4.7 During the19th century there were a series of disputes between the City and Oriel College concerning the charity at St Bartholomew’s and by 1900 the situation was
regularised with the site being placed in stewardship of the municipal charity trustees. By 1900 the northern half of the St Bartholomew’s enclosure was in use as playing fields for Oriel College and the hospital buildings rented. In the early 1980’s Bartlemas Farmhouse, Bartlemas House and Bartlemas Cottage were sold to various private owners (OAU 1997, 3).

6.4.8 As noted above (sec. 6.4.2), the Bartlemas Nursery school Site lies just outside the western boundary of the historic enclosure associated with St Bartholomew’s. This area was only acquired by Oriel College in 1926, the area on which the nursery school stands being open ground at this date. The nursery school was built by 1956. In 2000, the area of former tennis courts, immediately to the north of Bartlemas School, was developed as accommodation for Oxford Brookes University.

6.5 The Hospital Buildings and Water Supply

6.5.1 The exact nature and location of all the medieval buildings and structures associated with the hospital of St Bartholomew’s remains uncertain although investigations at St Bartholomew’s have identified a number of features and finds. Amongst these have been:

- an archaeological investigation undertaken between the Chapel and Bartlemas House (OA 1), which recorded a possible boundary feature associated with 15th century pottery (Durham 1990)

- the investigations on the Oxford Brookes University site (OA 2) which may have identified a section of robbed out walling as well as recovering a number of sherds of Medieval pottery. (TVAS 2002). The walling fragment was in the section of the site that lay inside the St Bartholomew’s enclosure.

- finds of Medieval pottery made from within the area of the allotments (OA 6).

6.5.2 The only certain surviving medieval structure is the Chapel which dates to c 1336 and this may itself replace an earlier Chapel. It is probable, however, that the remaining hospital buildings lay near this chapel and within the extra-parochial enclosure granted to the hospital.

6.5.3 Some estimation of what hospital buildings did exist at St Bartholomew’s during the Medieval period has been made based on available documentary sources (OAU 1997). This study indicated that St Bartholomew’s probably comprised the chapel with an attached series of individual cells for lepers, at least one warden’s house (if not two), and a farmhouse with ancillary buildings including a dovecote (OAU 1997, 7).

6.5.4 Studies of other charitable hospitals suggest that they were built to a fairly standard plan and that the hospital buildings may have been enclosed within a precinct wall. (Rigold 1964 and Gilchrist 1992, 104). In addition, it is probable that there was provision for fresh water being supplied to the hospital and in at least three excavated examples (two in Kent (Rigold 1964)) and at the hospital of St John the Baptist in Oxford (on the site now occupied by Magdalen College) (Durham et al, 1991), this water supply was carried under the hospital buildings.

6.5.5 It is also possible that the water supply to St Bartholomew’s was associated with a Holy Well known variously as St Bartholomew’s Well, Strowell or Hickwell (Rattue, 1991, 173). This well was first recorded by Wood in his survey of the Antiquities of Oxford (Wood 1661-66, 514-517) although it may have originally been associated with the cult of St Bartholomew that was licensed at the hospital of St Bartholomew in 1336 (ibid). Although the cult of St Bartholomew was suppressed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I,
Wood recorded that garlanding of the well and a perambulation continued to occur on May Day and Holy Thursday at the time that he was writing (ibid).

6.5.6 There is also a record (Rannie, 1900, 24) that it became a custom amongst the Scholars and Choir of New College, Oxford to process to St Bartholomew's on the mornings of Ascension Day and May Day where they said prayers and sang Hymns. "They then sought a well hard by, known as Strowell or Stockwell, around which, after a recitation of the Epistle and other religious observances, they relapsed into mere woodland merriment of a semi-pagan kind..." (ibid)

6.6 The Location of the Holy Well

6.6.1 The location of the Holy Well that may be associated with St Bartholomew's Hospital is unknown. None of the early maps of the St Bartholomew's (Fig 6) site or its immediate surroundings or the 19th century Ordnance Survey mapping (Fig 7) record the presence of a Holy Well.

6.6.2 The description given by Rannie (Rannie 1900) in section 6.5.5 above strongly suggests that the well actually lay within the St Bartholomew's enclosure as it is recorded as being hard by and called Strowell or Stockwell. Strowell being recorded as having belonged to the parcel of land given to St Bartholomew's by Henry II (see sec 6.4.2 above (OAU 1997, 7)). Furthermore, in the geological background (sec 4.1.3 above) it was noted that the northern section of the St Bartholomew's enclosure lies over the junction of the impermeable Oxford Clay with the overlying (and more permeable) sandstone of the Temple Cowley member and, therefore, on a natural springline (See fig. 5).

6.6.3 A small stream has historically formed the western boundary of the enclosure in which St Bartholomew's lies and it was this small stream (containing for much of its length by a relatively recent open culvert) that was traced during the walkover (see Sec 5 above). No well or spring was noted during this walkover, although the stream appears to rise in the area of changing geology in the north of the St Bartholomew's enclosure as noted above. Exactly where this little stream actually rises remains uncertain due to the encroachment and possible infilling by the gardens of properties fronting Southfield Road. This stream can be traced to continue along the western edge of the historic enclosure associated with St Bartholomew's and, therefore also forms the eastern edge of the Bartlemes nursery school site. As this water course lies on the western edge of the historic enclosure associated with St Bartholomew's it seems unlikely that any hospital buildings would have actually straddled the watercourse and, therefore, extended onto the nursery school site.

6.6.4 It should also be noted that the small watercourse that forms the western boundary of the St Bartholomew's enclosure is not the only potential source of water for the Medieval hospital site. A curving water feature is clearly shown on the 1840 map of St Bartholomew's (Fig. 6) and also clearly indicated on O/S mapping up to 1921 (Figs 7 and 8). Even after 1921, this feature partially survives to be shown as a drain on the 1:2500 O/S mapping of 1956 (Fig 8), linking to a drain which follows the eastern boundary of the St Bartholomew's enclosure (see Fig. 5).
7 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL AND PREVIOUS IMPACTS ON THE SITE

7.1 Archaeological Potential

7.1.1 No Prehistoric activity or findspots are recorded from within 500 m of Bartlemas Nursery School site and the potential for activity of this date being present on the site is, therefore, rated as being very low.

7.1.2 A Romano-British kiln site has been identified (OA 4) only c 500 m to the south east of Bartlemas Nursery School and finds of Romano-British material were also made during investigations on the adjacent Oxford Brookes accommodation site (OA 2). Although these finds are believed to have been residual or re-deposited by manuring they still indicate that some Romano-British activity is present in the vicinity.

7.1.3 During the Medieval and Post Medieval periods the Bartlemas Nursery School site lay just outside the western boundary of the extra-parochial enclosure associated with the charitable hospital of St Bartholomew. The estimated area of this enclosure during the Medieval period accords pretty well with the mapped area (13 acres 1 rood and 32 perches) that appears on historic maps from the 1802 Inclosure map onwards (OAU 1997, 8). The old causeway road (See fig. 4) lay just to the south of Bartlemas Nursery School. This route was probably established by the Medieval period and continued to be the main route eastward until Cowley Road became established during the 19th century.

7.1.4 It has been suggested that the water course that defines the boundary between Bartlemas School and the St Bartholomew's extra-parochial enclosure may have provided a water supply for the hospital. It is possible that this is the case, although another water feature has been identified from historic maps within the extra parochial enclosure. This second feature lies in close proximity to the surviving hospital chapel and is aligned on an area in which other medieval hospital buildings probably stood. This second feature may originally have been a boundary and/or fish-pond demarcating an internal division within the Medieval hospital. It is possible that this feature may have been fed with water through a conduit taken off the watercourse that forms the boundary with the Nursery School Site. If this was the case then a conduit running between the watercourse on the boundary and this second water feature may have supplied water for the hospital.

7.1.5 Lying outside the extra-parochial enclosure, it is probable that the Bartlemas School site lay in a cultivated or waste area just within the north west boundary of the Parish of Cowley and that no hospital buildings extended over the watercourse that forms the boundary with Bartlemas. It is also highly probable that the site of the Holy Well of St Bartholomew lies somewhere on a natural springline within the northern half of the extra-parochial enclosure associated with St Bartholomew's.

7.2 Past Impacts

7.2.1 The building of the Bartlemas Nursery School will have impacted on any potential archaeology that may be present within the site. It is probable that any archaeology that may be present will be severely truncated within the footprint of the nursery school building and may also have been impacted to a lesser extent during the creation of associated hardstanding around the school buildings.
8 PROPOSED EVALUATION OF SITE

8.1.1 Without fieldwork the presence, state of survival, importance and effects on, the buried unknown archaeological resource cannot be accurately quantified. A scheme of Evaluation trenches within the footprint of the proposed new residential development is therefore suggested. This will inform on the presence and quality of any potential archaeology in this area to inform a decision on whether any further mitigation is required.

8.1.2 Any scheme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation should be agreed, well in advance of construction, with the curatorial body (Oxford City Archaeologist).

9 CONCLUSIONS

9.1.1 This report concludes that the Bartlemas Nursery School lies in an area in which there is some potential for Pre Medieval, and especially Romano-British, deposits and or features being present on the site. During the Medieval and Post Medieval period the site lay just outside the extra parochial enclosure of St Bartholomew’s Hospital and is therefore likely to have lain in the open fields or waste on the boundary between the parishes of Cowley and Headington.

9.1.2 It is possible that the watercourse that forms the eastern boundary of the site with the St Bartholomew’s enclosure formed part of the water supply for St Bartholomew’s Hospital although it is unlikely that built structures associated with the hospital extended to the west of this boundary.

9.1.3 The exact location of a Holy Well associated with the water supply at St Bartholomew’s remains uncertain although it is likely to have lain on a natural spring line in the northern part of the St Bartholomew’s enclosure.

9.1.4 A scheme of archaeological evaluation is suggested to inform on the requirement for any further archaeological mitigation of the Bartlemas Nursery School site. Any scheme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation should be agreed, well in advance of construction, with the curatorial body (Oxford City Archaeologist).
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Gazetteer

OA 1  Investigation undertaken during excavation of a modern pond recorded a possible late medieval internal boundary within the Bartlemas site. (Durham 1990)

OA 2  Investigations undertaken prior to the building of the Oxford Brookes University accommodation immediately to the north of Bartlemas Nursery School recorded a possible section of walling within the Bartlemas enclosure but no other significant features although finds of Romano British pottery suggested activity of this date in the vicinity. (OAU 1997, Lowe 1998, TVAS 2002)

OA 3  A Watching Brief undertaken to the rear of St John’s Vicarage recorded no archaeology but suggested that the original Causeway road lay just to the north of the investigated area. (JMHS 2001).

OA 4  Investigations undertaken during work at the Oxford Boys School recorded numerous finds of Romano-British pottery suggesting that a kiln site was present (Atkinson 1948).

OA 5  Investigations undertaken at the new East Oxford Health Centre recorded no archaeology (OA 2005).

OA 6  Report of medieval pottery being found on the allotments within the Bartlemas enclosure.
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#### Risk Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name:</th>
<th>Former Bartlemas Nursery School, Oxford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Ben Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Code:</td>
<td>OXFBSN 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by:</td>
<td>D. Wilkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoice Code:</td>
<td>OXBFSN 08 SEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>28.05.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDM Status:</td>
<td>Site does not fall under CDM Regulations at this time. OA will be the only contractor on site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job Summary:** Please give sufficient detail, so that the risk assessment can be checked. Minimum = type of project / number of trenches or size of area / urban or rural / number of people and duration.

Machine-assisted excavation of 4 x 10m trenches and 2 x 5m trenches located around former school buildings belonging to the former Bartlemas Nursery School (now disused). Breaking up of hardstanding surfaces will be required. To be completed in 1 week by 2 people.

**Basis for this Risk Assessment (e.g. is it the first RA for this site or a follow on, or review? Will it undertaken in line with a CDM Construction Phase Health and Safety Plan? etc.):**

First RA for this site

**First Aid**

The regulations require that your risk assessment considers the appropriate level of 1st Aid cover necessary for each site. You must consider the size of the team, the nature of the hazards present (e.g. plant on site, working in deep excavations), the remoteness from the emergency services and whether the site is shared with other contractors engaged in hazardous activities. If you feel that a first aider is required for your site please advise Nick Shepherd (Head of Fieldwork). If you are unclear about 1st Aid provision please ask Dan Poore (Health and Safety Advisor) for advice.

If you do not need a First Aider, you will need as a minimum an 'Appointed Person', whose responsibility is to take charge when someone is injured or fall ill, and who calls an ambulance if necessary. The appointed person also looks after and re-stocks the 1st Aid box.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. HAZARD</th>
<th>2. RISK-</th>
<th>3. RISK RATING</th>
<th>4. Applies to this project? Yes/No</th>
<th>5. CONTROLS</th>
<th>6. ACTION BY</th>
<th>7. RESIDUAL RISK RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of the site and its hazards.</td>
<td>Personal injury.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>All staff to receive and sign for an induction based on this risk assessment and the WSI.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director (i.e. Project Officer or Supervisor)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of the site and its hazards.</td>
<td>Personal injury.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Weekly Health and Safety briefings, including a toolbox talk, will be delivered by the Project Manager or their nominated representative (normally the Project Officer or Supervisor) and attended by all site staff. A record of attendance will be maintained using the form provided in the H and S pack.</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle movement</td>
<td>Personal injury.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Authorized, assessed drivers only to drive OA vehicles (owned or hired). Banksman must be present for all reversing of vans, minibuses or any vehicle with restricted rear view. PPE: Hi-vis vests</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle security</td>
<td>Unauthorised use of vehicles/ vandalism</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Contractor to immobilise plant. Park in designated areas. Tools to be kept in locked OA vehicle.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director / Driver</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARD</td>
<td>RISK</td>
<td>RISK RATING</td>
<td>APPLIES TO THIS PROJECT</td>
<td>CONTROLS</td>
<td>ACTION BY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving to and from site</td>
<td>Road traffic accident</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>All drivers, either of OA or of hired vehicles, must be qualified and competent to drive. Each driver must have their licence checked by Duncan Waltham (DW), OA Head of Logistics. Each driver must have their driving ability assessed, either by DW or as part of a MIDAS test undertaken by Bryan Matthews. Each driver must have a copy of the driver's Code of Conduct, which details their rights and responsibilities as a driver. On long journeys it is particularly important that drivers take breaks; or that driving is shared by more than one driver. The Project Manager is responsible for the safety of the site team once they have left the office (either Oxford or Lancaster), although this does not affect the legal responsibilities that drivers assume each time they drive for OA - see 'Drivers Risk Assessment'.</td>
<td>Duncan Waltham/Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving on site</td>
<td>Injury to staff and members of the public</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>All vehicle movements around sites should be subject to a 10 mph speed limit, and should take account of footpaths and access routes. Reversing of vans and all vehicles with restricted rear view must only be undertaken with the assistance of a bankman. Wheels should be checked for excess mud before driving on the public highway.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director/Directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment in general</td>
<td>Personal injury, property damage</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No OA staff to use equipment not owned or hired by OA.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. RESIDURAL RISK RATING
(High Medium Low Insignificant)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. HAZARD</th>
<th>2. RISK</th>
<th>3. RISK RATING (High Medium Low)</th>
<th>4. Applies to this project? Yes/No</th>
<th>5. CONTROLS</th>
<th>6. ACTION BY?</th>
<th>7. RESIDUAL RISK RATING (High Medium Low Insignificant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damaged/defective equipment</td>
<td>Personal injury, property damage</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Daily inspection of equipment; Replace defective equipment where necessary, and ensure that Logistics Dept. are aware that defective equipment has been returned.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slips, trips and falls</td>
<td>Personal injury</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>All access and egress routes to be clearly defined and kept as dry and free from mud as practicable (regular inspections must be undertaken to ensure this). Tools and other equipment to be kept tidy and away from defined access routes. Only manageable loads to be carried. Edge protection to be installed as necessary.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical excavator</td>
<td>Personal injury</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Authorised and competent driver. Driver's ability/attitude regarding safe working should be monitored, and action taken if necessary. Competent OA signaler to be used for plant work on site. Banksman to be used for plant movements around site and Induction, Tool box talks. Monitor. PPE: hard hat, hi-vis vest, safety boots. DRIVER'S CITB TICKET NEEDS TO BE CHECKED BEFORE WORK COMMENCES</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in deep excavations</td>
<td>Trench collapse, falling objects, falling into trench. Personal injury.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Deep excavations can be considered as any excavation which creates the potential for a significant fall or collapse of material. This can apply to excavations as shallow as 0.5 m deep. An assessment of the stability of soils for all excavations &gt;500 mm deep MUST be made. If in doubt, do not enter, or step/batter/shore. Edge protection, to prevent falls, must also be installed. Deep excavations will require a Method Statement to accompany a detailed Risk Assessment (to be added below)</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. HAZARD</td>
<td>2. RISK</td>
<td>3. RISK-RATING (High Medium Low)</td>
<td>4. Applies to this project? Yes/No</td>
<td>5. CONTROLS</td>
<td>6. ACTION BY?</td>
<td>7. RESIDUAL RISK RATING (High Medium Low Insignificant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Services</td>
<td>Risk of Electrocution, gas leaks or flooding.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Undertake Services check through statutory bodies/clients drawings wherever possible. Competent person (defined by the HSE as someone who has received, as a minimum, training from a qualified operative) to check for unknown underground services prior to machining using a Cable Avoidance Tool (&quot;Cat and Jenny&quot;). Hand excavate in areas of suspected live services to locate and isolate from interference from mechanical excavation. Notify statutory bodies/clients if suspected live services are found. ALWAYS ASSUME THAT ALL SERVICES ARE LIVE.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead cables</td>
<td>Risk of electrocution</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>unsure - check upon initial days work</td>
<td>Undertake Services check through statutory bodies/clients drawings wherever possible. Visual inspection of entire site prior to any work starting. If overhead cables present, specific risk assessment to be undertaken and entered in section below: as a minimum, goalposts to be erected for all plant movements under cables, boom restricters to be considered, all personnel to be briefed, especially with regard to use of surveying staff and erection of any towers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. HAZARD</td>
<td>2. RISK</td>
<td>3. RISK RATING (High Medium Low)</td>
<td>4. Applies to this project? Yes/No</td>
<td>5. CONTROLS</td>
<td>6. ACTION BY?</td>
<td>7. RESIDUAL RISK RATING (High Medium Low Insignificant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Cold/wet weather; hypothermia/ice</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Re-arrange fieldwork if practicable. Staff will be issued with suitable clothing and suitable footwear. Additional breaks to be taken in the event of very hot weather. Work on site to be suspended in the event of prolonged heavy rain, or when site becomes too slippery to be safely worked. Weather forecasts should be monitored and precautions taken in the event of predictions of dangerous weather e.g. high winds - shelter in a cabin or vehicle; electrical storms - shelter in a vehicle.</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot weather; heatstroke/dehydration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrocution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil contamination/zoonotic hazards</td>
<td>Ingestion/contact with contaminated soils or bacteria within soils</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes - no report available</td>
<td>Where no contamination is known treat as suspected anyway. Good hygiene regime. Wash face and hands (hot water and soap) before each break and at end of day. No smoking or eating on site except in designated areas. Should evidence of contamination be found (either by odour or appearance) excavation to cease and suitable advice to be sought. Relevant departments should be notified of the risk (logistics, environmental, finds, archives depts). All material (e.g. finds, records and equipment) returning from contaminated sites should be as clean as possible in order to minimise the risk of contaminants being brought back to the office or stores.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director / Project Manager</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>Personal injury, or injury to livestock</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Prior to starting on site the Project Manager should establish that no fields are to have excavations undertaken within them where there is a risk that livestock will be present. Cattle in particular can be very inquisitive and injuries to personnel are not uncommon. Electric fencing is available from logistics if areas need to be isolated from</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. HAZARD</td>
<td>2. RISK</td>
<td>3. RISK RATING (High/Medium/Low)</td>
<td>4. Applies to this project? Yes/No</td>
<td>5. CONTROLS</td>
<td>6. ACTION BY</td>
<td>7. RESIDUAL RISK RATING (High/Medium/Low/Insignificant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leptospirosis (Weil’s Disease), Tetanus</td>
<td>Contraction of serious disease</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes (near water course and disused buildings)</td>
<td>livestock; livestock can also be injured by falling into open trenches.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Hearing damage; tinnitus</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>yes (breaker to be used)</td>
<td>Hearing protection in the form of ear plugs, or preferably ear defenders compatible with hard hats, must be available for sites where noise is likely to be a hazard. As a general rule of thumb, if you are having to raise your voice to make yourself heard by someone less than 2 m away, the noise level is likely to be higher than 80 decibels. At this level it is advisable although not compulsory to wear ear defenders or ear plugs. This advice must be passed on to all staff by the person responsible for monitoring sound levels (usually the Supervisor or Project Officer). If you have to shout to be heard, the level is likely to be in excess of 85dB. At this level the wearing of ear defenders or plugs is mandatory, and must be enforced by the Supervisor or Project Officer. Hearing protection zones must be established on sites where noise is a problem, and appropriate PPE worn within them. In most cases this zone will be the area around the source of noise.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARD</td>
<td>RISK</td>
<td>RISK RATING</td>
<td>Applies to this project? Yes/No</td>
<td>CONTROLS</td>
<td>ACTION BY</td>
<td>RESIDUAL RISK RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp objects</td>
<td>Injury or disease</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Great care to be taken when clearing areas, moving rubbish etc. Where there is the potential for presence of needles/any materials associated with drug use. If found, to be left in place, area cordoned off and advice sought from Local Authority Environmental Health Officer (EHO). As a last resort, needle may be moved by person wearing gloves and using a shovel. Place in a bucket and cover with a layer of soil. Report to EHO.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director/all staff</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas bottle</td>
<td>Fire/explosion</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>If using a gas bottle for the preparation of hot drinks, the bottle itself MUST be safely positioned outside the mess hut, to ensure adequate ventilation in the event of a gas leak. If the gas ring is positioned within the mess hut, it must be placed on a fire mat, in a safe position away from walls and any overhanging materials. In transit the bottle must be securely fixed within the vehicle. The bottle, ring and connecting pipe should be regularly checked for leaks. The ring and regulator should be removed from the bottle prior to the gas bottle being moved, and especially when placed in vehicle. The regulator in the crew bus should always be disconnected from the bottle before the vehicle is driven anywhere, as the motion of the vehicle will cause the bottle to leak.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. HAZARD</td>
<td>2. RISK</td>
<td>3. RISK RATING (High Medium Low)</td>
<td>4. Applies to this project? Yes/No</td>
<td>5. CONTROLS</td>
<td>6. ACTION BY?</td>
<td>7. RESIDUAL RISK RATING (High Medium Low Insignificant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexploded ordnance</td>
<td>Explosion</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>All new sites will be evaluated for the risk of there being unexploded ordnance present. Consideration should be given to a sites past use, preferably at desk-based assessment stage but certainly prior to mobilisation to site. The site specific risk assessment will identify sites located in areas where ordnance was produced; or sites which may have been a target for wartime bombing raids. Where sites is identified as having the risk of unexploded ordnance the risk assessment will define a specific procedure for dealing with 'suspicious objects'. This procedure will be brought to the attention of everyone on site by means of induction and prominently displayed information sheets.</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual handling</td>
<td>Risk of strain injuries from incorrect or excessive manual handling</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Induction. **Assess manual handling risks for each task. Consider alternative mechanical methods for tasks. No slinging of loads for machines by OA staff.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Director</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Stress, personal injury</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No harassment or bullying of any type (be it physical, verbal, sexual, racial etc) will be tolerated on any OA project. Should any member of staff encounter harassment or feel threatened by the actions of another (within or external to OA), they must report it to the Site PO/Supervisor who in turn will report it to the appropriate authority and make a record of the harassment and any actions taken. If harassment persists, OA staff will remove themselves from the site.</td>
<td>Project Manager/Fieldwork Director/OA Staff</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARD</td>
<td>RISK</td>
<td>RISK RATING (High Medium Low)</td>
<td>CONTROLS</td>
<td>ACTION BY?</td>
<td>RESIDUAL RISK RATING (High Medium Low Insignificant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following empty rows are for the assessment of additional risks during the course of the work. WHEN ARRIVING AT THE SITE FOR THE FIRST TIME, IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT A FURTHER ASSESSMENT OF THE RISKS IS UNDERTAKEN, AND THE FINDINGS/REQUIRED ACTIONS ARE RECORDED BELOW TO FORM PART OF THE INDUCTION, BEFORE WORK COMMENCES. Some risks will only become apparent once you are on site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAZARD</th>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>RISK RATING (High Medium Low)</th>
<th>CONTROLS, and DATE RISK IDENTIFIED</th>
<th>ACTION BY?</th>
<th>RESIDUAL RISK RATING (High Medium Low Insignificant)</th>
<th>TOOLBOX TALK GIVEN?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Headings
- **Site information**
  - Line 1: [OA South] County[Oxon] Parish:[Oxford]
  - Site[Former Bartlemas Nursey School] Site code[OXFBNS 08]
  - Line 2: Excavators name[B Ford]
  - Line 3:

### Classification of Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index to archive</th>
<th>Tick if present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Final Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Publication Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Diary/Daybook/Fieldnotes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: General Summaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Primary Context Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Synthesised Context Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Survey Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Catalogue of Drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Primary Drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Synthesised Drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Finds Data – Text: Primary Finds Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Finds Data – Text: Synthesised Finds Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Finds Data – Text: Specialist Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Finds Data – Text: Box/Bag List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Catalogue of Photos/Slides/Videos/X--rays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Environmental/Ecofact Data: Primary Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Environmental/Ecofact Data: Synthesised Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Environmental/Ecofact Data: Specialist Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Documentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Press and Publicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In June, Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out an archaeological evaluation at the former Bartlemas Nursery School, off Cowley Road, Oxford (SP 524 055). The work was commissioned by Marcus Beale Architects Ltd (MBA) on behalf of Oriel College, and was intended to inform a planning application for the proposed redevelopment of the site. The evaluation revealed natural geology comprising Upper Oxford Clay, which was overlain by a colluvial soil which may represent a buried ploughsoil. Two north-south aligned linear features produced post-medieval artefactual evidence, and are likely to represent a precursor to the system of ceramic field drains on the same alignment, which was also evident in a number of the trenches. Evidence for 20th century landscaping of the natural topography of the site, associated with the construction of the existing school buildings in the 1950s, was also observed. The evidence recovered probably reflects the agricultural use of the site prior to the construction of the school, possibly on marginal land on the periphery of Cowley Marsh, as indicated on a number of cartographic sources. No evidence for features or deposits pre-dating the 18th century was revealed within the trenches.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.53</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.59</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SITE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench orientation</th>
<th>Grid reference</th>
<th>Field No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Average depth to top of natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Nos?</td>
<td>Section Nos?</td>
<td>Were finds recovered?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a trench contains only a small number of contexts, and requires only one or two plans and sections, list plans and sections on this sheet. If the trench contains large numbers of contexts use a conventional context check list and plan and section list sheets as necessary.

**Context check list / Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present topsoil/ploughsoil</td>
<td>All trenches excavated to top of mid-pale grey/brown clay with concentrations of orange sand and gravel (30:20) and variances of colour within the clay (some blue grey concentrations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were some, largely irregular, patches of dark mid brown silty clay similar to the underlying colluvial deposit which are likely to represent bioturbation (two of these were excavated in Trench 5 and proved to be quite ephemeral with diffuse edges and fairly sterile fills).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field drains (ceramic pipe at base) were present in Trenches 1, 2, and 5 and were predominantly aligned with the natural slope from N to S (one E-W aligned in TR5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief description of archaeology/comments**

Two other linear features were present (in the W end of TR5 and in the E. end of TR1). One of these was excavated (TR1, cut 1071) and produced early pottery, CEM and clay pipe stems. It is possible that these represent a precursor to the drainage system represented by the ceramic field drains, particularly given the similarity in alignment (these were also aligned NNE).

Upper Oxford clay with sandy patches originating from the overlying Temple Cowley and Beckley Sand members to the north (cf. DEA).

The drainage systems predate the agricultural use of the land prior to the construction of the school in the 1950s.|

**Recorder** RB

**Date** 4/6/08
Oxford Archaeology

EVALUATION TRENCH RECORD SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench orientation</th>
<th>Grid reference</th>
<th>Field No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Average depth to top of natural</th>
<th>Was archaeology present?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Nos?</td>
<td>Section Nos?</td>
<td>Were finds recovered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a trench contains only a small number of contexts, and requires only one or two plans and sections, list plans and sections on this sheet. If the trench contains large numbers of contexts use a conventional context check list and plan and section list sheets as necessary.

Context check list / Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present topsoil/ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→coat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and suggest that this was fairly marginal land on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>periphery of Cowley Marsh (St. Bartholomew's farm, OS 1st Ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cowley Field, 1840 estate map).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The natural slope has been terraced prior to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction of the school so that the ?suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deposit creating the natural was not present in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. end of trench 3 or in Trench 4. It had also been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>truncated over the majority of Trench B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Natural (describe)

Brief description of archaeology/comments

Recorder: RB
Date:
EVALUATION TRENCH RECORD SHEET

SITE: OXFBNS08
Trench orientation: E-W
Grid reference: —
Field No.: —

Length: 10m  Width: 2m  Average depth to top of natural: 0.75m
Was archaeology present?: No

Plan Nos?: 101  Section Nos?: 101, 102  Were finds recovered?: Yes.

If a trench contains only a small number of contexts, and requires only one or two plans and sections, list plans and sections on this sheet. If the trench contains large numbers of contexts use a conventional context check list and plan and section list sheets as necessary.

Context check list / Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Present on reference sheet. Tonsue, Mid Yellow Burn Clay (Natural) over peddles throughout. orange gravel. Tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>See context sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Terry - current grand surface. Compiled entire excavated area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>See context sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Natural (describe)

Brief description of archaeology/comments

Trench contained one probably archaeological linear rubbish
Note: Still at its eastern end.
**CONTEXT RECORD**

**SITE** OXF-87508

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site sub-div</td>
<td>Overlain by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure No.</td>
<td>Abutted by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan No.</td>
<td>Cut by: [107]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section No.</td>
<td>Same as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101, 102</td>
<td>Part of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Ordinates</td>
<td>Consists of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overlies: (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Butts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide No.</td>
<td>Cuts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg No.</td>
<td>Fill of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix location</td>
<td>Relationships uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION (See check lists):**

1. Teracious 2. Dying Mid Grey Brown
5. ≤ 0.4m Thick (Thickest on South side of trench) 6. Visible in sections for entire trench. 10m EW x 2m N-S, tapers to thinnest in east of trench.


**INTERPRETATION/DISCUSSION**

Possibly colluvial clay deposit.

**FINDS (tick):** None [✓] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

**△ Small Finds**

**◇ Samples**

**△ Building Materials**

**RECORDER:** JT

**DATE:** 03.06.08.

**INITIALS**
CONTEXT RECORD

SITE: TRENCH OXFEND 08

ADDITIONAL SHEETS:

Trench
Site sub-div
Structure No.
Plan No.
Section No.
Co-Ordinates
Level
Slide No.
Neg No.
Matrix location

OVERLAIN BY:
ABUTTED BY:
CUT BY:
FILLED BY:
SAME AS:
PART OF:
CONSISTS OF:
OVERLIES:
BUTTS:
CUTS:
FILL OF:
RELATIONSHIPS UNCERTAIN

Description (See check lists):

3. Silty Clay 4. 5% S.A. stone < 8mm
5. <0.25m thick

6. Visible in all sections. >10m E-W x >2m N-S.
7. Very rooted with large tree roots.
8. Machine crocet, damp ground.

Interpretation/Discussion

Possibly a previous ground surface?

Finds (tick): None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ]
CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

△ Small Finds
◇ Samples
△ Building Materials

Reconder: JT
Date: 03-06-08
Initials: [ ]
## Context Record

**Site:** OXFBN5 08

### Additional Sheets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description (See Check Lists):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Slightly tenacious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mid Grey Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Silty Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 5% so. Stone = 10mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. &lt; 0.15m in east, tapering away by western end of trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 4.5m E-W x 2m N-S (continuing N/E/S beyond trench limits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. - 8. Machine, overcut, Damp ground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation/Discussion:**

Possibly a horizon level: applied as landscape during/after
construction or quarrying on this site.

**Finds:** (tick): None [x] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ]

CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

**Small Finds**

**Samples**

**Building Materials**

**Check Lists:**

**Type:**

- Deposit:

- Cut:
  1. shape 2. plan 3. base/sides/top profile 4. dimension & depth 5. sketch 6. truncation 6. fill nos 7. other comments

- Masonry:
  1. materials 2. size of bricks etc 3. finish of stones 4. coursing/bond 5. form 6. faces 7. bond 8. dimensions as found 9. other comments

**Context No.:** 104

**Matrix Location:** Relationships uncertain

**Stratigraphic Matrix:**

- 105

this context is 104

- 103

**Recorder:** JT

**Date:** 03-06-08

**Initials:**
## Context Record

### Additional Sheets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site sub-div</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section No.</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Ordinates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Butts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide No.</td>
<td>Cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg No.</td>
<td>Fill of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix location</td>
<td>Relationships uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description (See check lists):

1. Loose & Mid Grey - Pink
2. Hardcore, ≤ 35mm
3. < 0.15m thick at western end of trench
4. Runs ≥ 2m N-S × ? m E-W
5. Machine exc, Overcut, Damp ground.

### Interpretation/Discussion

Hardcore levelling deposit, prob. contemp. with orchard & nursery.

### Stratigraphic Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Finds (tick):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Small Finds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Context Record

**SITE:** OXF NS508

**Context No.:** 107

**Additional Sheets:**

**Type:** Direct

**Check Lists:**

**DEPOSIT:**

**Cut:**
1. shape in plan 2. base/sides/top profile 3. dimension and depth 4. sketch 5. truncation & fill 6. other comments

**Masonry:**
1. materials 2. size of bricks etc 3. finish of stones 4. coursing/bond 5. form 6. faces 7. bond 8. dimensions as found 9. other comments

### Description (See check lists):

1. **Linear**
2. 
3. c.0.4m wide x >2m long (n/next)
4. 
5. 
6. 【108】
7. 

### Interpretation/Discussion

North - South ditch.

---

**Finds (tick):** None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

△ Small Finds

△ Samples

△ Building Materials

**Recorder:** JT

**Date:** 23/06/08

**Initials:**
SITE OXF8NS08

ADDITIONAL SHEETS:

Trench
Context Type: Deposit / Cut / Structure

Site sub-div
Overlay by:

Structure No.
Abutted by:

Plan No.
Cut by:

Section No.
Filled by:

Same as:

Part of:

Co-Ordinates
Consists of:

Overlies:

Level
Butts:

Slide No.
Cuts:

Neg No.
Fill of:

107

Matrix location
Relationships uncertain

Description (See check lists):

1. 

2. Light Gray Brown

3. Silty Clay

4. 

5. 

6. 2m N-S x 0.4m wide E-W

7. 

8. Machine overcast

Interpretation/Discussion

Dirt fill

Finds (tick): None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

△ Small Finds

◇ Samples

△ Building Materials

Context No. 108

TYPE Direct Fill

Check Lists:

DEPOSIT:
1. compaction 2. colour
3. composition 4. inclusion
5. thickness 6. extent
7. comments 8. method & conditions

CUT:
1. shape in plan
2. base/sides/top profile
3. dimension and depth
4. sketch 5. truncation 6. fill nos 7. other comments

MASONRY:
1. materials 2. size of bricks etc
3. finish of stones 4. coursing/bond 5. form 6. faces
7. bond 8. dimensions as found
9. other comments

STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX

[Diagram showing stratigraphic relationships with numbers 103 and 108]

this context is 103

Recorder JT

Date 03-06-08

Initials
SITE
OX-FNS 08

EVALUATION TRENCH RECORD SHEET

Trench No. 2

Trench orientation N-S
Grid reference —
Field No. —

Length 5m Width 2m
Average depth to top of natural 0.75m
Was archaeology present? No

Plan Nos? 201
Section Nos? 201, 202
Were finds recovered? No

If a trench contains only a small number of contexts, and requires only one or two plans and sections, list plans and sections on this sheet. If the trench contains large numbers of contexts use a conventional context check list and plan and section list sheets as necessary.

Context check list / Descriptions

Context No. Description
201 Light grey-brown clay soil. South of trench
202 Reinforced concrete. See context sheet.
203 See context sheet
204 See context sheet
205 See context sheet
206 Gritty field drain 0.15m wide x > m deep. Run on m S-N to TR by 210
207 Field drain 0.15m wide x m deep. Run on m S-N to TR by 210. Not bottomed.
208 See context sheet
209 See context sheet
210 See context sheet
211 See context sheet
212 Reinforced concrete with 8mm reinforcement visible across entire trench. 0.25m thick
213 Tarred layer c.20mm thick across entire trench

Brief description of archaeology/comments

Trench contained a sewage pipe running E-W at its northern end. This pipe is cut by N-S grid. It is cut, possibly for a field drain. No archaeology present.

Recorder JT
Date 02-06-08
### CONTEXT RECORD

**SITE:** OX-PENS98  
**Context No.:** 201

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ADDITIONAL SHEETS:</strong></th>
<th><strong>TYPE:</strong> Natural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trench:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Context Type:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site sub-div:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overlain by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure No.:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Abutted by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan No.:</strong> 201</td>
<td><strong>Cut by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section No.:</strong> 202</td>
<td><strong>Filled by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Ordinates:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consists of:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overlies:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slide No.:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neg No.:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matrix location:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relationships uncertain</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description (See check lists):**

1. Terrace  
2. Light Brown-Grey  
3. Clay  
4. Occ. chalk frags.  
5.  
6. 4 m N/S w/exc x 2 m E-W w/exc  
7.  
8. Modern, overcast.

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

```
  ____________  
  |           | 201  
  | __________ |  
  | 202        |  
  |____________|
```

**Interpretation/Discussion:**

Oxfordshire Clay Natural.

**Finds (tick):** None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

- Small Finds
- Samples
- Building Materials

**Recorder:** JT  
**Date:** 02-06-08  
**Initials:**
**CONTEXT RECORD**

**SITE:** OXF5N508  
**TYPE:** Nature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Context Type: Deposit</th>
<th>Cut/Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site sub-div</td>
<td>Overlain by:</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure No.</td>
<td>Abutted by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan No.</td>
<td>Cut by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section No.</td>
<td>Same as:</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Ordinates</td>
<td>Consists of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlies:</td>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Butts:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide No.</td>
<td>Cuts:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg No.</td>
<td>Fill of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix location</td>
<td>Relationships uncertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description (See check lists):**

2. Clay 4. 50% gravel < 20mm
   5. 0.10m thick

3. Small segment of probably natural orange gravel or clay.
4. Pot of Temple Carey Sands?

5. Only a little in SE corner of trench. 0.2m E-W x 0.3m N-S

6. 8. Overcast, mechanical

**Finds (tick):** None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

- Small Finds
- Samples
- Building Materials

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>204</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Check Lists:**

**DEPOSIT:**

**CUT:**

**MASONRY:**

**Interpretation/Discussion**

- Small segment of probably natural orange gravel or clay.
- Pot of Temple Carey Sands?
Description (See check lists):

1 - 4 = as 202
5) > 0.2m thick
6) Area 1.4m E-W in exc
   x 175cm N-S in exc, lying towards north of trench.
7)...
8) Overcast, Machine exc.

Interpretation/Discussion

Orange sandy gravel - clay, Natrud. Po part of Temple
Centering sand deposit?

Finds (tick): None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ]
CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]
SITE: Oxford Archaeology

CONTEX RECORD

SITE: OXF BNS 08

Trench: Context Type: Deposit/Structure

Site sub-div: Overlain by: 205

Structure No.: Abutted by:

Plan No.: Cut by: 200

Filled by:

Section No.: Same as: 202

Part of:

Co-Ordinates: Consists of: Overlies: 203

Level: Butts:

Slide No.: Cuts:

Neg No.: Fill of:

Matrix location: Relationships uncertain

DESCRIPTION:

1. Teracian, thin 2. Milt granit grey
3. Silty Clay
4) Red Small stone frags & 3mm.
5. < 0.23m thick
6. 3m N-S in ex, 2 m E-W in ex, irregular outline.
7.
8. Machine, present

INTERPRETATION/DISCUSSION

Possible made ground/terracing depl. or might be colluvium.

Finds (tick): None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ]
CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

△ Small Finds

Recorder: JT

Date: 02-06-08

Initials:
**Site**: OXF8NS08  
**Trench**  
**Context Type**: Deposit / Cut / Structure  
**Check Lists**:  
- Deposits:  
- Cut:  
- Masonry:  

**Context No.**: 205  
**Additional Sheets**:  
**Matrix Location**: Relationships uncertain  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description (See check lists):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5' length 6' wide x 2m depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Runs 4.6m along N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Machine, on cast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this context is 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation/Discussion**:  
Possible made ground deposit  

**Finds** (tick):  
- None [ ]  
- Pot [ ]  
- Bone [ ]  
- Flint [ ]  
- Stone [ ]  
- Burnt stone [ ]  
- Glass [ ]  
- Metal [ ]  
- CBM [ ]  
- Wood [ ]  
- Leather [ ]  

**Small Finds**  
**Samples**  
**Building Materials**

**Recorder**: JT  
**Date**: 02-06-08  
**Initials**
**CONTEXT RECORD**

**SITE** OXN598

**ADDITIONAL SHEETS:**

**Trench**
- Context Type: Deposit / Cut / Structure

**Site sub-div**
- Overlain by:

**Structure No.**
- Abutted by:

**Plan No.**
- Cut by: 210
- Filled by:

**Section No.**
- 201 + 202
- Same as: (103) (21)
- Part of:

**Co-Ordinates**
- Consists of:
- Overlies: (209)

**Level**
- Butts:

**Slide No.**
- Cuts:

**Neg No.**
- Fill of:

**Matrix location**
- Relationships uncertain

**Description (See check lists):**

1. Soft greyish brown 2. Dark Black Clay
2. Silty Clay 3. Varying including
   - Some peg f.e. Staining +
   - Matting ≤ 20
4. Subangular stone ≤ 25mm, acc CBM
5. Thickest in east at south, ≤ 0.28m thick. Runs 4.4m N-S in ex
   - Lanes up on west side ≥ 0.10m, ≥ 2m E-W in ex.

**Interpretation/Discussion**

Made grand deposit.

**Finds (tick):**
- Pot
- Bone
- Flint
- Stone
- Burnt stone
- Glass
- Metal
- CBM
- Wood
- Leather

**Triangles:**
- Small Finds
- Samples
- Building Materials

**Recorder:** JT
**Date:** 02-05-01
**Initials:**
### Context Record

**SITE:** OXF8NS08

**Additional Sheets:**

- **Context Type:** Deposit / Cut / Structure
- **Check Lists:**
  - 1. compaction 2. colour
  - 3. composition 4. inclusion
  - 5. thickness 6. extent
  - 7. comments 8. method & condition

**Trench:**
- Overlain by: **208**

**Site Sub-div:**
- Abutted by: ___________

**Structure No.:**
- Cut by: ___________
- Filled by: ___________

**Plan No.:**
- Consists of: ___________
- Overlies: **205**

**Section No.:**
- Same as: ___________
- Part of: ___________

**Co-ordinates:**
- Consists of: ___________
- Overlies: **205**

**Level:**
- Butts: ___________

**Slide No.:**
- Cuts: ___________

**Neg No.:**
- Fill of: ___________

**Matrix Location:**
- Relationships uncertain

**Description (See check lists):**

- **Tenacious Slightly Silty Clay**
- **Md Brown Grey**
- **5) < 0.4mm thick at northern end**
- **6) fairly loose, only in eastern section of trench, 2.1m N-S**
- **8) Machine damp ground, overcast, smell of rotting carrion**

**Interpretation/Discussion:**

- Clay deposit with dirty feel. Possibly part of charcoal?

**Finds (tick):**
- None [ ]
- Pot [ ]
- Bone [ ]
- Flint [ ]
- Stone [ ]
- Burnt stone [ ]
- Glass [ ]
- Metal [ ]
- CBM [ ]
- Wood [ ]
- Leather [ ]

**Small Finds**

**Samples**

**Building Materials**

**Recorder:** JT

**Date:** 02/08

**Initials:**
**CONTEXT RECORD**

**SITE CODE:** EBN508

**Trench:** 2

**Context Type:** Deposit / Cut / Structure

**Site sub-div:**

**Structure No.:**

**Plan No.:** 201

**Filled by:** (211)

**Section No.:** 201

**Co-Ordinates:**

**Level:**

**Slide No.:** Cuts: (208)

**Neg No.:** Fill of:

**Matrix location:** Relationships uncertain

**Interpretation/Discussion:**

Service trench cut running E-W at northern limit of house. Not fully exc. in plan or depth.

**Finds (tick):** None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

**Recorder:** JT

**Date:** 02-06-08

**Initials:**
SITE: OxFBN508
Context Type: Deposit / Cut / Structure

Additionals Sheets:

Context No. 211

Check Lists:

Type: Service Fill

DEPOSIT:

CUT:
1. shape in plan 2. base/sides/top profile 3. dimension and depth 4. sketch 5. truncation 6. fill nos 7. other comments

MASONRY:
1. materials 2. size of bricks etc 3. finish of stones 4. coursing/bond 5. form 6. faces 7. bond 8. dimensions as found 9. other comments

Description (See check list):

1. Terrace 8ft 2. Mica Yellow Brown
3. Silty clay 4. < 10% mixed 70mm diam x 310mm long ceramic pipe > 150mm dia
5. > 70m deep 6. > 0.65m in ex x 2m long in ex

8. Machine, damp grass, uncvert

Interpretation/Discussion

Background of service trench including ceramic pipe.

Field drain segment suggests that 206 is yield drain cut.

Finds (tick):

- None
- Pot
- Bone
- Flint
- Stone
- Burnt stone
- Glass
- Metal
- CMB
- Wood
- Leather

- Small Finds
- Samples
- Building Materials

Recorder: JT
Date: 02-05-08
Initials:
SITE
0X055068

EVALUATION TRENCH RECORD SHEET

Trench orientation E-W
Grid reference
Length 8.5m Width 2.6m
Average depth to top of natural: 0.35m
Was archaeology present? No
Plan Nos? 600
Section Nos? Sketch only
Were finds recovered? No

If a trench contains only a small number of contexts, and requires only one or two plans and sections, list plans and sections on this sheet. If the trench contains large numbers of contexts use a conventional context check list and plan and section list sheets as necessary.

Context check list / Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Present topsoil/ploughsoil 0.2m thick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Colluvial S/soil 0.08m thick - truncated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>hardcore and s/crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Natural - upper Oxford Clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief description of archaeology/comments

Northern ¼ of trench excavated through concrete and hardcore directly overlying natural; southern ¼ of trench, natural overlain by thin deposit of mid brown clay silt?colluvium (similar to that seen in trenches 1+2) which was subsequently overlain by topsoil. The natural + colluvium have been truncated during the construction of the nursery (see sketch over).
**SITE**  
OXF8NS08

**EVALUATION TRENCH RECORD SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench orientation</th>
<th>Grid reference</th>
<th>Field No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Average depth to top of natural</th>
<th>Was archaeology present?</th>
<th>Were finds recovered?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5m</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>0.3m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan Nos? 600  
Section Nos? SKETCH ONLY

If a trench contains only a small number of contexts, and requires only one or two plans and sections, list plans and sections on this sheet. If the trench contains large numbers of contexts use a conventional context check list and plan and section list sheets as necessary.

**Context check list / Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Present topsoil/ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>HARDCore + CLAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>NATURAL - upper OXFORD CLAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>1960's CONSTRUCTION TRENCH / ROOT DISTURBED NAT?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief description of archaeology/comments

Majority of trench excavated through topsoil and root disturbed clay. Construction trench directly overlying truncated natural clay. Western end of trench through gravel, hardcore/service trench backfill and concrete slab.
Trench 5 was L-shaped, with a 0.4m wide cut van NS at FRs, NW extend.

Line extended due to flooding but cut continues at 504, and run seen to contain 2 minimal pottery, closest to E-W extent of T.5 was a rough clay cutting pit, probably a natural feature and containing no finds. To the west of this item one irregular cut, 6.5m long also probably resulted from natural processes and containing bone fragments. The area was decorated by a N-S filled drain.

The south of the trench showed teracing 4.5m from northern limit and run crossed by a drainage pipe 2.8m from southern extent of trench.
Sketch
Trench Plan
Not to Scale

- Ext of 503 + 504, Southern limit of terrace
- Ext of 503 + 504

Field drain

S. 501

Extr of 503 + 504

5.25 m 5.501

10 m

2 m

1 m

9 m

2.8 m 2.8 m

2 m
The earliest feature in Trench 5 is an irregular cut [506] filled by [507] containing an ochre bone. Probably natural. This is cut by a circular but irregular cut, [508] which is fairly sterile and very similar to the overlying colluvium [504].

[504] covers the whole E-W axis of the trench, cut in west by N-S post Median drain [510] and in the east by a field drain. [504] extends 4.7m N-S (from north of trench) and is terminated by terracing related to arable use.

Overlying buried soil [503] also runs 10m E-W and 4.7m N-S, where it adjoins one terracing by terracing related to the construction of the nursery. A drain crosses the trench E-W 2.8m from its southern limit. [502] continues east of trench 5 and is probably redeposited clay natural from terracing process. All are lain by topsoil, current ground surface, [501].
Description (See check lists):

1. Softer terracotta 2. Mid Brown, (3 Silt Clays) hard

3. Silty clay

4. Ochre orange and < 5% mixed stone, sub-rounded, sub angular + rond < 30mm (more)

5. < 0.2m thick in east, thinner + more irregular to west

6. Visible in all sections of trench, 9m N-S x 10m E-W

7.

Interpretation/Discussion

Deposit consisting of clay, re-deposited clay, probably from terracing of area in preparation for construction of nursery.

---

Finds (tick): None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

- Small Finds
- Samples
- Building Materials

Recorder JT

Date 04-06-08

Initials
SITE OKFNS08

Trench
Overlain by: 502
Abutted by: 502

Structure No.

Plan No.

Section No. 501, 502

Co-Ordinates

Overlies: 504

Level
Butts: 502

Cut by:
FILLED BY:

Co-Ordinates

Overlies: 504

MASONRY:
1. materials 2. size of bricks etc
3. finish of stones 4. courting / bond 5. form 6. faces
7. bond 8. dimensions as found
9. other comments

Description (See check lists):
1. SOFT 2. Dark Brown Clay
3. Very Silty Clay
4. C 5%. SR/BIA stone < 15 mm
5. Fairly consistently 0.25m
6. Runs 10m E-W and for 7m N-S in north-west trench to southern
   truncation of nursing construction landscaping.

Finds (tick): None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ]
CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

Probable buried plough soil / former topsoil. Some very large roots
present. Areas under logs, established trees.

STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX

this context is 503

1. compaction 2. colour
3. composition 4. inclusion
5. thickness 6. extent
7. comments 8. method & conditions

CUT:
1. shape & plan
2. base / sides / top profile
3. dimension & depth
4. sketch & truncation 6. fill
7. other comments

INTERPRETATION / DISCUSSION

Context Type: Deposit / Cut / Structure
Check Lists:

DEPOSIT:

Context No. 503

TYPE: Buried Soil

Recorder JT

Date 04-06-08

Initials

Small Finds

Samples

Building Materials
**CONTEXT RECORD**

**SITE** OXF 8N S08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Context Type: Deposit / Cut / Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site sub-div</td>
<td>Overlain by: (S03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure No.</td>
<td>Abutted by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan No.</td>
<td>Cut by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section No.</td>
<td>Same as: (S09)? Possibly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Ordinates</td>
<td>Part of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consists of:</td>
<td>Overlies: (S09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Butts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide No.</td>
<td>Cuts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg No.</td>
<td>Fill of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix location</td>
<td>Relationships uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description (See check lists):**

1. S gritty L light brown grey
2. Silty Clay
3. < S: Small stone <5mm + flecks of chalk
4. < 0.2m in north, tapers to 0.15m in south
5. Visible accross trench's E-W axis, cut for 0.7m NS at north, fill tied by landscaping

**Interpretation/Discussion**

Collural deposit? Truncated at south by landscaping related to construction of - among school.

**Finds (tick):** None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

- Small Finds
- Samples
- Building Materials

**Context No.:** 504

**TYPE:** Collurium

**Check Lists:**


- CUT: 1. shape in plan 2. base/sides/top profile 3. dimension and depth 4. sketch 5. truncation 6. fill nos 7. other comments

- MASONRY: 1. materials 2. size of bricks etc 3. finish of stones 4. coursing/bond 5. form 6. faces 7. bond 8. dimensions as found 9. other comments

**STRAITIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

```
  503          504
  ______      ______
 this context is      509
  ______      ______
```

**Recorder:** JT

**Date:** 04/10/03

**Initials:**
**Context Record**

**Site:** OXFBN508

**Context No.:** 506

**Trench Context Type:** Deposit / Cut / Structure

**SITE:**

- **Site sub-div:**
- **Structure No.:**
- **Plan No.:** 501
- **Section No.:** 501
- **Co-Ordinates:**
- **Level:**
- **Slide No.:**
- **Neg No.:**
- **Matrix location:** Relationships uncertain

**Check Lists:**

**DEPOSIT:**
1. compactness
2. color
3. composition
4. inclusion
5. thickness & extent
6. comments & method & conditions

**CLAY:**
1. shape in plan
2. base/sides/top profile
3. dimension & depth
4. sketch
5. evaluation of fill
6. notes (other information)

**MASSS:**
1. materials 1-2: size of bricks etc.
3. fine of stones 4:
7. edge 5-6. faces
8. dimensions as found
9. other comments

**Description (See check lists):**

1. Incomplete. 2. Flattish box, mod. side (South) c 75-75°, sharp top + curve
6. b.s. 3. <5m E-W x 1m N-S inex.

- **Context:**
- **Finds:** (tick): None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

```
  507
   506
     505
```

**Interpretation/Discussion**

Possible root disturbance - regular edges, irregular outline.

Contained frags of bone.

**Finds** (tick):

- Small Finds
- Samples
- Building Materials

**Recoder:** JT

**Date:** 04-06-08

**Initials:**
### Context Record

#### Site
- **OXF-N6508**

#### Additional Sheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Site sub-div</th>
<th>Structure No.</th>
<th>Plan No.</th>
<th>Section No.</th>
<th>Co-Ordinates</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Slide No.</th>
<th>Neg No.</th>
<th>Matrix location</th>
<th>STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Description (See check lists):

1. Firm 2 mid brown grey 3. Clay
2. 2% chalk, occ bone shre.
3. ≤ 0.2m thick
4. Sign fill >1m N-S X 5m E-W
5. Indistinct Limits 600.

#### Interpretation/Discussion

Fill of irregular cut & unknown purpose. Possibly root disturbance?

#### Finds
- **None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]**

#### Additional Sheets
- **Finds (tick): None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]**

#### Details
- **Small Finds**
- **Samples**
- **Building Materials**

---

**Recorder JT**

**Date 24-06-08**

**Initials**
**CONTEXT RECORD**

**SITE OXFNB508**

**ADDITIONAL SHEETS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Context Type: Deposit / Cut / Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site sub-div</td>
<td>Overlain by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure No.</td>
<td>Abutted by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan No.</td>
<td>Cut by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section No.</td>
<td>Same as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Ordinates</td>
<td>Consists of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Butts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide No.</td>
<td>Cuts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg No.</td>
<td>Fill of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix location</td>
<td>Relationships uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE: CUT**

**TYPE: CUT**

**Check Lists:**

**DEPOSIT:**

**CUT:**
1. shape in plan 2. base/sides/top profile 3. dimension and depth 4. sketch 5. truncation 6. fill nos 7. other comments

**MASONRY:**
1. materials 2. size of bricks etc 3. finish of surface 4. coursing/bond 5. form 6. faces 7. bond 8. dimensions as found 9. other comments

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this context is 508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation/Discussion**

*Possibly a natural depression or tunnel, might result from root disturbance*

**Finds (tick):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Pot</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Flint</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Burnt stone</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>CBM</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Leather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Small Finds**

**Samples**

**Building Materials**

**Recorder:**

**Date:** 04-06-08

**Initials:**
**CONTEXT RECORD**

**SITE OXFBN508**

**ADDITIONAL SHEETS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description (See check lists):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Soft Light Brown Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Silty Clay 4.5 &lt; 5mm Small Stone &lt;5mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 0.13m Flack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 1.3m N-S (c. 02) x 1.3m E-W Single fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mattlock, gravel, arcaeat, gravel &amp; turf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

```
      504
     /   
   509  
    /   
  508  
```

This context is 509

**INTERPRETATION/DISCUSSION**

Fill very similar to underlying colluvium (504). Possibly S/A (504)

**Finds (tick):** None [ ] Pot [ ] Bone [ ] Flint [ ] Stone [ ] Burnt stone [ ] Glass [ ] Metal [ ] CBM [ ] Wood [ ] Leather [ ]

- Small Finds
- Samples
- Building Materials

**Context No.** 509

**TYPE Deposits**

Check Lists:

- Deposit:
  1. Compaction 2. Colour
  3. Composition 4. Inclusion
  5. Thickness 6. Extent
  7. Comments 8. Method & conditions

- Cut:
  1. Shape in plan
  2. Baseline top profile
  3. Dimensions & depth
  4. Sketch: truncation 6. Fill nos 7. Other comments

- Masonry:
  1. Materials 2. Size of bricks etc
  8. Bonding 9. Dimensions as found
  9. Other comments

**Matrix Location**

Relationships uncertain
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of material</th>
<th>Tick if present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index to archive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Final Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Publication Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Diary/Daybook/Fieldnotes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: General Summaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Primary Context Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Synthesised Context Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Survey Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Catalogue of Drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Primary Drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Site Data – Text: Synthesised Drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Finds Data – Text: Primary Finds Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Finds Data – Text: Synthesised Finds Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Finds Data – Text: Specialist Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Finds Data – Text: Box/Bag List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Catalogue of Photos/Slides/Videos/X--rays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Environmental/Ecofact Data: Primary Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Environmental/Ecofact Data: Synthesised Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Environmental/Ecofact Data: Specialist Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Documentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Press and Publicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan number</td>
<td>Context(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>TRENCH 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>TRENCH 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>OVERLAY TO QA CAD DRAWING OF PROPOSED BK LOCATIONS SHOWING ACTUAL TRENCH LOCATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section number</td>
<td>Context(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>S-FACING SECT. EAST END OF TR.1 inc [107]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>N-FACING SECT. WEST END OF TR.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>BASE OF [107]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>CUT [210] (WEST FACING) TR.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>WEST FACING SECT. TR.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
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