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Summary

This report represents a statement on the excavation stage of the development by Croudace Limited (Royston) on land at Nos 16 & 20 Green Drift, Royston, Hertfordshire, TL 35305 41067. The excavation follows on from an evaluation carried out in June 2008 by Cam Arc (now OA East). The results of that evaluation were reported upon in an interim report (Fairburn June 2008).

The excavation produced archaeological features of three broad dates; prehistoric, Romano-British and post-medieval. A number of large tree throws of a prehistoric date were recorded; these were truncated by two parallel Romano-British ditches containing an assemblage of pottery and other finds consistent with manuring of fields at some distance from the associated settlement.

The excavation showed an apparent discontinuation of use of the land between the Roman and post-medieval periods.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation and excavation was conducted on land at 16 & 20 Green Drift, Royston, Hertfordshire. TL354 410.

1.1.2 The work was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Andy Instone of the Hertfordshire Historic Environment Unit (HHEU; Planning Application 1/02712/06), supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East (formerly Cambridgeshire County Council's CAM ARC).

1.1.3 The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, in accordance with the guidelines set out in Planning and Policy Guidance 16 - Archaeology and Planning (Department of the Environment 1990). The results will enable decisions to be made by the HHEU, on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, with regard to the treatment of any archaeological remains found.

1.1.4 The site archive is currently held by OA East and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 The site is situated approximately 800m from the centre of Royston which lies to the south east. The Roman Kneesworth Street is approximately 150m to the east. The site is bounded to the north by a road known as Green Drift which first appears on the 1887 ordnance survey map. In living memory Green Drift was still a dirt track which may suggest an earlier use as a drove way. The higher ground of Therfield Heath lies to the south west, while to the north the ground slopes very gently away into the valley of the River Cam (or Rhee).

1.2.2 The site lies on the band of Middle Chalk (Holywell Nodular Chalk – British Geological Survey Sheet 204) overlying the band of Melbourn Rock that outcrops to the north towards Bassingbourn. Although Middle Chalk is largely absent of flint in this region the higher band of Hollywell Nodular Chalk is very flinty.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The site lies within an extensive, wider historic landscape and is situated in an area of land encompassed by the Mile Ditches to the west, Ashwell Street to the north, Ermine Street to the east and the Icknield way to the south. Nationally important sites have been recorded within this landscape such as the Bronze Age cemetery on nearby Therfield Heath (NMR 30632). Royston lies at the junction of two important Roman roads; the north to south Ermine street and the east to west Icknield Way/Ashwell St. Until now no Roman period archaeology has been found in Royston itself, though remains have been found on Therfield Heath. Royston itself is principally a medieval settlement but came to prominence in the eighteenth century with both Charles I and James I having lodgings in the town. The subject site itself seems to have had little or no recorded use and was until the latter part of the nineteenth century an area of undeveloped fields with a track (now Green Drift) running along its northern boundary.
By 1898 a small building is shown in the north west corner of the site. By 1923 this building had doubled in size. The remainder of the site remained undeveloped until at least 1925 and by 1937 two residential properties had been constructed. These two houses were standing on the site immediately prior to development.

1.4 Acknowledgements
1.4.1 The Author would like to thank Emily Spencer of Croudace Limited who commissioned and funded the archaeological work. The site was excavated by James Fairbairn and Chris Montague. Steve Wadeson provided the pottery report and Rachel Fosberry studied the environmental remains. The project manager was Richard Mortimer.

The brief for archaeological works was written by Andy Instone of the HHEU, who visited the site and monitored both the evaluation and the excavation.

The author would also like to thank Sylvia Beamon and the Royston Museum for the visit of their Time Trackers Group and for the interest shown in the excavation.
2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

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

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The Evaluation Brief required that an approximate 5% sample excavation be carried out to determine the presence/absence of archaeological features. Following on from this an area excavation was opened sufficient to cover the extent of two linear ditches discovered at evaluation. The excavation was designed to determine their use, age and context within the wider landscape.

2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision and using a toothless ditching bucket. A wheeled JCB-type excavator was employed at evaluation stage and a tracked 360 machine at excavation..

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

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

2.2.5 A total of 130 litres from 10 relevant contexts were sampled to investigate possible survival of micro- and macro-botanical remains. These were processed by OA East's environmental department and studied by Rachel Fosberry. The samples were all found to be either completely sterile or to contain nothing but fine charcoal.

2.2.6 Conditions on site were reasonable. Access to certain areas of the site was restricted due to the mature trees and shrubs. Weather conditions during the excavation were dry and overcast.
3 Results

3.1 Introduction
The results from the excavation and the earlier evaluation stages have been combined for presentation here. Three phases of archaeological activity were recorded. These Phases were Prehistoric, Romano-British and Post Medieval.

3.1.1 Top Soil and Sub Soil
Topsoil (027) was recorded across the whole site area and was represented a turfed area consistent with a suburban garden. It had an average depth of 0.20m.

The subsoil (028), or more accurately a lower topsoil, was a light chalky grey/brown silty loam with frequent chalk inclusions and (unworked) flint pieces. The subsoil extended to a maximum depth of 0.30m.

These soils directly overlay the band of middle chalk. The topsoil depth was greater at the Northern end of the evaluation area, perhaps due to slippage on the downward slope of the site, or to garden landscaping.

3.2 Prehistoric
Prehistoric tree throws were found on three areas of the excavation. They were excavated and recorded as features 041, 061 and 063.

3.2.1 Tree Throw 041
This was ovate in plan, 1.00m x 1.10m, with sloping sides and an irregular base. It had an average depth of 0.50m. The feature had two fills (039) and (040). The primary fill (040) consisted of a compact dark grey/brown silty clay with granulated and angular chalk inclusions. This feature was half sectioned. No finds were recovered within this fill. An environmental sample (4) totalling 20L was taken but was found to be devoid of any micro- or macro-botanical remains. The upper fill 039 consisted of a mid brown silty clay with occasional chalk nodules. No finds were recovered from this fill.

3.2.2 Tree Throw 061
This was ovate in plan, 2.10m x 0.90m, with steep sides, an irregular uneven base, and an average depth of 0.45m. The feature contained a single fill (060) consisting of a very compact mid grey silt with frequent small chalk inclusions. No finds were recovered from this fill. An environmental sample (7) totalling 20L was taken but was found to be devoid of any micro- or macro-botanical remains.

3.2.3 Tree Throw 063
This was ovate in plan, 2.50m x 2.60m, with very steep sides, an irregular uneven base and a depth of 0.50m at its deepest point. The feature contained a single fill of compact mid to light grey silty clay with occasional chalk pieces and very rare charcoal flecks. No finds were recovered from this fill.

All three of these features had similar characteristics. When excavated the fills broke into clumps which in turn separated into layers suggesting a gradual siting of these features, rather than a deliberate or fast backfill. This in turn suggests that these trees
were not felled deliberately as part of a land clearance scheme but more likely fell as part of the natural process.

3.3 Roman

3.3.1 Two small parallel linear ditches were found in the evaluation process 024 and 026 and warranted further investigation in the excavation stage. Area excavation uncovered the full length of the ditches, which ran to the north-northwest from terminals at the south, continuing beneath the probable medieval Green Drift. The ditches were parallel and 4.40m apart.

3.3.2 Ditch 024

Ditch 024 ran NNW from its terminal and measured 11.5m in length before entering the northern edge of excavation. A total of five sections were excavated through the ditch at approximately one metre intervals. A single section (024) was dug during the evaluation phase, with a further four sections (053, 055, 057 and 059) during the excavation. All sections were of similar depths between 0.40m and 0.52m. The ditch was uniform in width only varying from 0.56m at its terminal to 0.50m at its truncation point at the edge of excavation. The fills in these sections were all of a moderately loose mid to light grey silty chalk material. All sections showed visible root disturbance from the modern garden trees and shrubbery. No finds were present within any of the fills. An environmental sample (8) totalling 20L was taken from terminal context 059 (fill 058). A further 20L sample was taken from context 024 Fill (023). No artefacts nor micro/ macro flora or fauna were recovered from these samples except fine charcoal.

3.3.3 Ditch 026

Ditch 026 ran NNW from its terminal and measured 12.5m in length before entering the northern edge of excavation. A total of five sections were excavated at approximately one metre intervals. A single section (026) was dug during the evaluation with four during the excavation phase (043, 045, 047 and terminal 049). The ditch was very similar to ditch 024 with most sections being of a similar width, depth and profile containing a single fill, a relatively loose mid to light grey silty chalk. The exceptions were sections 047 and 049 which contained a sequence of two fills.

Section 047 Fills (046) and (051)

This section showed vertical sides slightly tapering towards the flat base and measured 0.56m in width and 0.45m in depth. The lower fill (046) consisted of a loose light brown silty clay with frequent granulated sub angular chalk inclusions. The upper fill (051) consisted of a loose mid to light brown silty/clay with frequent subangular chalk inclusions.

Section 049 Fills (048) and (050)

The terminal section showed vertical sides, slightly tapering towards a flat base, and measured 0.46m wide x 0.47m deep. The context contained two fills; the lower fill (050) was a moderately loose mid/grey brown silty clay chalk mix with moderate angular and sub angular small chalk pieces. A small amount of oyster shell was recovered from this fill. The upper fill (048) was a loose light brown silty clay material with frequent angular
and sub angular granulated chalk inclusions. The fill contained seven sherds of Romano-British pottery. An environmental sample (6) totalling 20L was taken. No artefacts nor micro / macro flora or fauna were recovered with the exception of fine charcoal.

3.3.4 Summary of Ditches

The two parallel ditches recorded were aligned with the Roman Road (Kneesworth St) 150m to the east and appeared to be continuing to the north-northwest beneath the medieval Green Drift. They were of near-identical form, were 4.40m apart and there was some evidence for a heavily truncated bank lying between them (see fig. 3). The narrow ditches, supplemented by a broad bank topped by hedges, would have made a quite substantial field boundary. While there were no finds of any kind within ditch 024 a variety of Romano-British finds materials (see below) were recovered from ditch 026. A Roman attribution for these features appears likely, making them the first in situ Roman archaeology recorded within the town, with the exception of the Roman Road.

3.3.5 Medieval and Post Medieval

No real evidence of medieval occupation or use of the site was found during the evaluation or excavation stage of the project. Post-medieval and modern features were recorded at the evaluation stage in most of the trenches:

3.3.6 A single sherd of medieval glazed ware, along with two small sherds of post-medieval red ware, were found within the fill of a small pit 002 (Trench 1). The heavily abraded nature of the medieval pottery suggests it represented residual material, rather than the post-medieval finds being intrusive.

3.3.7 A modern fence line, or one side of a timber structure, was recorded in Trenches 2 and 3. Post holes 010, 012 and 014 in Trench 2 have a probable relationship with similar post holes 018 and 020 in Trench 3. All of these post holes had similar dimensions, with average measurements of 0.36m diameter x 0.08m deep.

3.3.8 A second fence line was recorded in Trench 5, post holes 034, 036, and 038. Again these three features had similar dimensions, with diameters of 0.20m and depths of 0.05m. This fence line ran parallel with Green Drift and probably represents a boundary or enclosure fence. It could also relate to a building that was erected in the northwest corner of the site, appearing on the 1898 map.

3.3.9 A modern east-west drainage pipe was recorded in Trench 4.

3.3.10 A modern test pit, probably relating to the construction of the swimming pool in the garden of number 20 Green Drift, was found in Trench 3.

3.3.11 A square modern pit 004 was excavated in Trench 1. This probably had a direct relationship with construction of the modern dwelling situated slightly to the north.

3.3.12 Three uneven, shallow features (028, 030 and 032) were excavated in Trench 4. They were consistent with tree root disturbance and contained no finds.

3.3.13 Finds Summary

Finds were rare across the site, both in the excavated sections and within the overlying soils. The small Romano-British pottery assemblage was recovered exclusively from ditch 026 and consisted of local domestic coarse wares. Only three other sherds of
pottery (0.057kg) were recovered from the site, all from the fill of pit 002. These consisted of two sherds of post-medieval red ware dating to the 19th century and a single residual sherd of medieval pottery from the 12th to 14th centuries.

3.3.14 Two small oyster shells were recovered from context 49 and a single Roman nail was found in the fill of context 43 (both in ditch 026).

3.3.15 All excavated areas and spoil heaps were scanned using a metal detector as in accordance with the excavation brief. Other than obvious modern metal objects no finds of any note were recovered.

3.4 Environmental Summary
All environmental samples were processed using standard OA East procedures. All 130L of samples taken during evaluation and excavation phases were found to be artefactually and eco-factually sterile, with the exception of fine charcoal.
4 Discussion and Conclusions

4.1 Discussion

4.1.1 The main focus of the excavation phase was the two parallel ditches found in the evaluation phase. The object of the excavation phase was to ascertain there age, use, function and how they may fit into the wider historic landscape. The ditches were regular, apparently single phase, and formed a relatively broad hedge bank, with an internal area 4.40m wide. It can be said with some certainty that the ditches are of Roman date containing almost exclusively 2nd to 3rd century Sandy Coarse Wares (see Appendix B1). Most of the pottery recovered was heavily abraded suggesting that a nearby, as yet undiscovered, Romano-British settlement existed.

4.1.2 The eastern ditch 024 was devoid of pottery, or any other finds material, while western ditch 026 contained a small assemblage of pottery, oyster shell, iron nails etc. With Ermine St only 150m to the east of the site it may be assumed that the settlement this material came from was located between these ditches and the road, with the fields outside the settlement, to the west having been manured. In keeping with Romano-British agricultural practises midden rubbish from the settlement would have been spread on to the nearby agricultural land. It is likely that a bank would of existed between the two ditches and may have been topped by a hedgerow giving a fairly substantial division between agricultural and possible domestic land use.

4.1.3 Immediately south of the site are the lower slopes of Therfield Heath which from prehistoric to modern times would have been better used as 'upland' grazing than as plough land. With the prevalence of prehistoric funerary sites located on its slopes it may even have been reserved for solely ritual purposes. For whatever reason, the ditches end at the point in the landscape where the steeper upland slope meets the more gradual plain that runs down into the valley of the River Cam/Rhee to the north.

4.1.4 The full length of these ditches is not known but they run under Green Drift northwards and may represent part of a much larger agricultural landscape lying between the lower slopes of Therfield Heath and the marshy land abutting the river to the north. This flatland extends both west towards Baldock and east to the valley of the Cam/Granta, the route of the Icknield Way and Ashwell Street. This middle land is fertile agricultural land which has been farmed from the prehistoric to the present and is still separated, to the west of Ermine St, into narrow north-south field blocks that run between heath and valley (see Figs 4 & 5). These field blocks, and the Roman ditches recorded at Green Drift, not only run parallel to Ermine St to the east but to the Mile Ditches a kilometre and a half to the west. The Mile Ditches are a series of major Iron Age boundaries that cut across the land between the heath the tributaries of the Cam /Rhee. (Hesse, M. Field systems in southwest Cambridgeshire:Abington Pigotts, Litlington and the Mile Ditches. PCAS 89,2000, 49-58.)

4.1.5 The site of the Romano-British settlement or farmstead that produced the 'manure' found within ditch 026 is not known but may be situated somewhere between ditch 024 and the Roman Kneesworth Street some 150m to the east. From the limited amount of pottery and other waste recovered it might be assumed that the settlement or farmstead would have been of a relatively small size – also, any settlement of any size within this area might have been expected to known by now. The lack of high status pottery, and the homogeneity of the assemblage may suggest that the farmstead or settlement was relatively poor and perhaps short-lived. It may have been a client farm for a villa in the locality. The paucity of any post Roman finds and the lack of any
obvious subsoil cover on the site suggests that in the post Roman periods these lower slopes of Therfield Heath remained as rough pasture land.

4.2 Significance

4.2.1 Other than the Roman origins of Kneesworth street and remains up on Therfield heath no other Roman remains have been recorded in Royston, making the discovery of these in situ Romano-British ditches significantly both within the local and wider historical landscape. The results of the excavation also suggest that these ditches were laid out within an existing and possibly much earlier prehistoric field system, in relation to the Mile Ditches to the west. A small settlement or farmstead must also be waiting to be discovered in the locality giving further insight into the Roman history of Royston.
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APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Pottery

By William S. Wadeson

1 INTRODUCTION
1.1.1 A total of seventeen sherds, weighing 0.189kg, of Romano-British and Post Roman pottery were recovered during the evaluation and subsequent excavations at 16-20 Green Drift, Royston, Hertfordshire (XHT RGD 08).
1.1.2 The majority of the assemblage is heavily abraded with an average sherd weight of 11g. Small fragment sizes such as these indicate high levels of post-depositional disturbance (such as ploughing or middening) and suggest that this pottery was not found within its primary site of deposition.

2 METHODOLOGY
2.1.1 The assemblage was examined in accordance with the guidelines set down by the Study Group for Roman Pottery (Webster 1976; Darling 2004; Willis 2004). The total assemblage was studied and a preliminary catalogue was prepared. The sherds were examined using a magnifying lens (x10 magnification) and were divided into fabric groups defined on the basis of inclusion types present. The fabric codes are descriptive and abbreviated by the main letters of the title (Sandy grey ware = SGW) vessel form was also recorded. The sherds were counted and weighed to the nearest whole gram and decoration and abrasion were also noted.
2.1.2 The site archive is currently held by CAM ARC and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

3 QUANTIFICATION
3.1.1 See Appendix A below.

4 THE ASSEMBLAGE

4.1 Romano-British Pottery

4.1.1 The assemblage contained fourteen sherds, weighing 0.132kg of Romano-British pottery. Recovered from a single ditch, the majority of these, twelve sherds (0.123kg) are typical of locally produced sandy grey wares. These include a fragment from a local imitation of a poppy headed beaker dated to the 2nd to 3rd century and a single sherd from a storage jar manufactured at Horningsea between the 2nd and 3rd centuries.
4.1.2 The remaining two sherds, (0.009kg) are small heavily abraded fragments of sandy coarse ware the smallest of which is part of an indent beaker. Both sherds can be dated from the mid 2nd century to the late 3rd century.
4.2 Post Roman Pottery

Only three other shreds of pottery (0.057kg) were recovered during excavation all from the fill of pit 002. This included two shreds of post medieval red ware dating to the 19th century and a single residual sherd of medieval pottery from the 12th to 14th centuries.

5 PROVENANCE

5.1.1 All Romano-British fabrics are locally produced but their production centres are unknown. Only the single sherd of Horningsea can be located with certainty to a specific area of production.

6 DISCUSSION

6.1.1 This is a small predominantly Romano-British assemblage comprised mainly of undiagnostic coarse wares and is typical of a mid to late Roman domestic assemblage in this area. The small number of sherds recovered during excavation is common on many sites, suggesting there is an as yet unlocated Romano-British settlement or farmstead nearby.

6.1.2 Due to the small nature of the sherds dating has been difficult, however where dates are more certain the bulk of the assemblage can be dated to the 2nd to 3rd centuries.

7 FURTHER WORK

7.1.1 Due to the small size of the assemblage no further analysis is required.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Decoration</th>
<th>Spot Date</th>
<th>Context Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Modern Red Ware</td>
<td>UR</td>
<td>Planting pot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Medieval Glazed Ware</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1200 - 1400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>SGW</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MC1-C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>SGW</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MC1-C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>Sandy Coarse Ware</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MC2-LC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C1-C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>SGW</td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>Poppy headed beaker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Barbotine dots</td>
<td>C2-C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>Horningsea</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Storage jar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Linear combing</td>
<td>C2-C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>Sandy Coarse Ware (Fine)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MC2-LC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc. Horningsea type ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C1-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>SGW</td>
<td>UR</td>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>C2-C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: C=Century, E=Early, M=Mid, L=Late.  
R=Rim, U=Undecorated body sherd, D=Decorated body sherd, B=Base.
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- **Project Name**: e.g. Evaluation and Excavation at 16 & 20 Green Drift, Royston, Herts.
- **Project Dates (fieldwork)**
  - Start: 15-06-2008
  - Finish: 30-06-2008
- **Previous Work (by OA East)**
  - No
  - Future Work: No

**Project Reference Codes**

- **Site Code**: XHT RGD 08
- **Planning App. No.**: 1/02712/06
- **HER No.**: n/a
- **Related HER/OASIS No.**: 

**Type of Project/Techniques Used**

- **Prompt**: Planning condition

**Please select all techniques used:**

- Field Observation (periodic visits)
- Part Excavation
- Salvage Record
- Full Excavation (100%)
- Part Survey
- Systematic Field Walking
- Full Survey
- Recorded Observation
- Systematic Metal Detector Survey
- Geophysical Survey
- Remote Operated Vehicle Survey
- Test Pit Survey
- Open-Area Excavation
- Salvage Excavation
- Watching Brief

**Monument Types/Significant Finds & Their Periods**

List feature types using the NMR Monument Type Thesaurus and significant finds using the MDA Object type Thesaurus together with their respective periods. If no features/finds were found, please state “none”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditches</td>
<td>Roman 43 to 410</td>
<td>ceramic</td>
<td>Roman 43 to 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

- **County**: Hertfordshire
- **District**: Royston
- **Parish**: 
- **HER**: 
- **Study Area**: 2700 sq m
- **Site Address (including postcode if possible)**:
  - 16 - 20 Green Drift, Royston, Hertfordshire SG8 5DA
- **National Grid Reference**: TL 35305 41067
### Project Originators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>OA EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Brief Originator</td>
<td>Andy Instone, HCC Historic Environment Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design Originator</td>
<td>Richard Mortimer (Oxford Archaeology East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Richard Mortimer (Oxford Archaeology East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>James Fairbairn (Oxford Archaeology East)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Archives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physical Archive</th>
<th>Digital Archive</th>
<th>Paper Archive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location ...Royston Museum</td>
<td>Location ...OA East</td>
<td>Location ...Royston Museum</td>
<td>Location ...Royston Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession ID ...XHT</td>
<td>Accession ID ...XHT RGD 08</td>
<td>Accession ID ...XHT RGD 08</td>
<td>Accession ID ...XHT RGD 08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Archive Contents/Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physical Contents</th>
<th>Digital Contents</th>
<th>Paper Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Bones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Bones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratigraphic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Stone/Lithic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Digital Media

- Database
- GIS
- Geophysics
- Images
- Illustrations
- Moving Image
- Spreadsheets
- Survey
- Text
- Virtual Reality

### Paper Media

- Aerial Photos
- Context Sheet
- Correspondence
- Diary
- Drawing
- Manuscript
- Map
- Matrices
- Microfilm
- Misc.
- Research/Notes
- Photos
- Plans
- Report
- Sections
- Survey
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Figure 1: Overall site location
Figure 2: Evaluation trenches
Figure 3: Excavation area with associated sections
Figure 4: Historic map, C.1891
Figure 5: Modern map, c. 2002-3
Plate 1: Ditches 024 and 026 looking north

Plate 2: Ditch 026 butt end