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Summary

In October 2009 Oxford Archaeology East undertook a desk-based assessment to examine the available historical and archaeological resources relating to a 25ha plot of land at the Weatheralls, Soham, Cambridgeshire (centred at TL 5970 7365). The work was commissioned by Cambridgeshire County Council before a planning application had been submitted. The aim of the assessment was to define the archaeological potential of the site in advance of potential redevelopment. The desk-based assessment will be used to determine whether an archaeological evaluation of the area is required.

The site lies to the east of the historic medieval centre of the town of Soham.

Interpretation identified that prehistoric activity could be present in any part of the proposed development site but is likely to be on only a small scale. There is the possibility of a higher density of prehistoric remains in the the south western field where the ring ditch was formerly identified from aerial photographs and again to the northwest, close to a previous evaluation that identified a prehistoric ditch.

A lack of previous evidence (except for one coin) for Roman remains tends to reduce their likelihood. Saxon remains would probably be confined to the western, higher third of the site as peat growth recommenced during this period, but there is currently no evidence for this.

Evidence of medieval agriculture and quarrying may well be present. Any medieval settlement remains would probably be confined to the western, higher third of the site and with the village being further to the west, this area was no doubt peripheral.

Nonetheless the presence of outlier settlement close by in the post-medieval period tends to suggest that similar remains cannot be ruled out, with the genesis for this being perhaps in earlier centuries. A structure is shown on the tithe map in the eastern field and in addition there will be remains from a 20th century farm in the south westernmost field.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Planning Background
1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology East has been commissioned by Cambridgeshire County Council to produce a desk-based study for a plot of land to the east of Soham known as the Weatheralls. The aim of this assessment is to determine the nature and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed development area in accordance with the guidelines set out in Planning and Policy Guidance 16 – Archaeology and Planning (Department of the Environment 1990). The work was carried out to in compliance with a Brief produced by Kasia Gdaniec of CAPCA (August 28th 2009) and in line with OA East's Specification for the work (Spoerry, 2nd October 2009). In both cases the elements of work commissioned by CCC satisfy only part of the requirements of these documents.

1.1.2 This document comprises mainly desk-based research but also includes a description of the results of a visit to the proposed development site. On completion a copy of this report will be held at the Cambridgeshire HER, Cambridgeshire County Council.

1.2 Location, Geology and Topography
1.2.1 The site lies predominantly on 2nd terrace river gravels at a height of c.5m OD with some of the underlying Gault Clay likely to be present at the western side of the plot (British Geological Survey 1981). The site is located to the east of the town of Soham and covers three separate fields between the existing residential development and allotments, and the A142 Soham ring-road. The land slopes gently toward the drainage ditch between the eastern and south western fields (plate 1). The north western field slopes from north and northwest to the east. The eastern field slopes away from the A142 with its highest point being in its eastern corner. These fields which cover an area of 25ha are currently in use as agricultural land. The most easterly field is surrounded on all sides by drainage ditches and is crossed by four public rights-of-way. The Soham Lode runs east to west about 200m to the south of the site. The Weatheralls form the most westerly part of Soham Fen with the land sloping away to the east (Hall 1996, fig. 38). It is therefore likely that peat will be present over a large area of the the site, particularly where the land is lowest to the east. The Fenland Survey parish essay for Soham shows this land as all lying well above the edge of prehistoric to Roman period fenland (Hall 1996, 72-81), but the medieval fen edge traverses the site on the 3.5m contour with the land to the west being higher and comparatively dry. To the east the remaining two thirds of the fields in the study area lie on what is know as 'skirtland', the zone steadily being enlarged and exposed from under eroding peat deposits.

1.3 Acknowledgements
1.3.1 The author would like to thank Stephen Conrad of Cambridgeshire County Council for commissioning the work and funding the report. Paul Spoerry managed the project and edited the report. Sarah Poppy of the Cambridgeshire HER office provided information on nearby sites, find spots and listed buildings. The staff of the Cambridgeshire archives were also very helpful when providing historic maps of the area. Andy Corrigan produced the illustrations.
2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL SOURCES

2.1 Historical Sources

2.1.1 There is very little historical evidence making direct mention of the Weatheralls. The name Weatherall appears to be a 19th century corruption of Netherall which was the name of a manor, possibly on Paddock Street from the 13th century, although no remains exist today (Wareham and Wright 2002). By 1503 the closes adjoining Paddock Street had been renamed 'Netherall Closes' (see figure 4) and it may have been from this area that the land known as the Weatheralls today took its name.

2.1.2 The name Netherall probably derived from a lower farm or hall or may refer to the status of the manor (http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/english/ins/kepn). Like Netherall, the name Soham is derived from Old English; Soegan Hamm or 'swampy' settlement referring to its position on a peninsula in Soham Mere (Reaney 1943, 196). The westernmost part of the Weatheralls was acquired by the council for allotments in the 1920s which now border the south western boundary of the proposed development area (Wareham and Wright 2002).

2.2 The Historic Environment Record (HER)

2.2.1 A search was carried out for entries in the HER within 700m of the proposed development area. General background and find spots are discussed here. Archaeological investigations are discussed below (section 2.6)

Prehistoric

2.2.2 The fen-edge around Soham and the Snail Valley has a long history of human activity. Sites and find spots in the immediate vicinity include Mesolithic and Neolithic remains recorded to the northwest of Broad Hill, where a large quantity of worked flints, including axes, knives and scrapers, were recovered (Hall 1996). Prehistoric finds within the search area tended to be located outside of the current settlement to the east. Four Mesolithic tranchet axes were recorded in the 1970s 700m to the southwest of the site (HER07087). No finds from earlier periods were found in the vicinity. Tools dating to the Neolithic period have been found at three spots in Soham. These are stone and flint axes, including one from the centre of the proposed development area (HER07087, 02097, 11019). Evidence for a continuation of activity within the boundaries of the site comes from a flint scatter and a bronze razor both dating to the Bronze Age (HER 11019A, 07101) whilst a fieldwalking survey on the site of the reservoir to the north also located Bronze Age lithics (Hall 1998; CB14568). A ring ditch seen from aerial photographs may represent the location of a barrow within the boundaries of the proposed development area (HER07102), although in the aerial photographic re-assessment that forms part of this report it has been re-classified as a 'mound' of probable natural origin (Appendix A). An Iron Age spearhead has also been recorded from this area.

Roman

2.2.3 There are six find spots dating to the Roman period within the vicinity of the site. Five of these are located within residential areas of the town with only one being located on the lower ground to the east in East Fen Common. A coin (not closely dated) was found on the south western boundary of the site (HER07097) with Roman pottery and human remains found to the northwest (07100). Field walking on land to the rear of 52
Station Road recovered some Roman pottery (MCB18105) whilst human remains were uncovered to the south at White Hart Lane (MCB17746).

*Saxon and Medieval*

2.2.4 Finds from the Saxon period have tended to centre around St. Andrew's Church and may relate to the Saxon cemetery thought to lie under the current churchyard (Fox 1923; HER07123a; 071234; 11386). A long brooch fragment from the Early Saxon period was reportedly found to the northeast of the current site. These finds may mark the genesis of the town which is thought to date to the Early Saxon period.

2.2.5 Twelfth century documentary sources refer to the foundation in the 7th century AD of a monastery by St Felix, first bishop of the East Angles, who was buried in Soham. The monastery was destroyed during the Danish invasions of East Anglia (late 9th century) along with many other religious foundations in the area, never to be re-established (Salzman 1948). As yet there has been no definite archaeological evidence for Middle Saxon activity in Soham, though a single sherd of Ipswich ware was recovered during excavations at St Andrew's House (Atkins 2004a).

2.2.6 The manor of Soham was given to Ely Abbey shortly after the re-foundation of the latter in the 10th century (Conybeare 1897). The exact location of the monastery is unknown, although it is possible that the Parish church of St Andrew's (late 12th century) was founded on the site of its Saxon predecessor. The sub circular pattern of roads around the centre of the village may suggest a religious precinct (Oosthuizen 2000).

2.2.7 The expansion of Soham in both size and wealth appears to have continued into the early medieval period. Remains from the Infant's School (Taylor and Waite 1991) and from High Street/Clay Street illustrate this growth that is attested by the construction of St Andrew's Church in the late 12th century (Hatton & Last 1997). St. Andrew's Church lies 460m to the southwest of the proposed development site. A coin, dated only to the medieval period, has been found at the southwest of the proposed site.

*Post-Medieval*

2.2.8 A collection of post-medieval material was reportedly found within the current site (07097B). This includes a variety of material including weights, bells, thimbles and coins which if in-situ may represent some form of mercantile activity. Other significant post-medieval remains have come from evaluations in the centre of the town at St. Andrew's House, the High Street and Brook Dam Lane (MCB15832, MCB17349,CB15264).

*Listed Buildings*

2.2.9 Standing buildings dating to the 16th and 17th centuries are listed 300m to the west of the proposed development site. The closest examples of these are on Paddock Street, High Street and Pratt Street. Other listed buildings dating from the 16th to the 19th centuries exist through out the historic town centre; however none of these are likely to have implications for the site in question. It was during the 16th and 17th centuries that the closes occupying the land currently known as the Weatheralls were first named Netherhall perhaps indicating that this land was being more intensively used.

2.3 Cartographic Evidence

2.3.1 The earliest cartographic record of the site was made in 1656. This map of Soham and Fordham Manors (archive no.107/P10(v); figure 4) shows the division of land within
these parishes at this time. The land now known as the Weatheralls is shown on this map divided into three distinct areas. The land to the west forms part of Netherall Closes to the south and Calfe Fen Closes to the north. These closes were divided into nine plots. The names of the occupiers were marked in these plots. Most were linear strip fields on an northeast to southwest orientation; an agricultural use is most likely at this time. The lane now known as Kents Lane appears as Calfe Fen Close on this map.

2.3.2 The eastern section of the site is recorded as lying in Calfe Fen Common. There is no other information provided except that a small area of land to the south was called ‘the Frithes’. There is no eastern boundary shown to this area. This land may have been used for pastoral rather than agricultural activity. No buildings are shown within the proposed development area.

2.3.3 An outlying group of cottages lying along a sinuous lane or enclosure are shown immediately northwest of the subject fields in an area adjacent to Calfe Fen Common. These cottages lie on an outcrop of the higher land of the ‘island’. The line of the medieval fen edge as shown on figure 8 clearly shows how these properties ‘hug’ the dry land, and occupation here continues on subsequent maps and is later called Burgess Corner.

2.3.4 The 1840 tithe map shows the entire site of the Wetheralls divided between two plots (figure 5). The boundaries on this map are the same as those that exist today. The area previously recorded as Netherall and Calfe Fen Closes fell in plot 1795 whilst the eastern part of the site fell into plot 546. Both plots were owned by John Dohede Snr who appears to have had extensive holdings in Soham at this time. These plots were both let to Hatfield who used them as pasture. Whilst plot 546 which had previously been in Calfe Fen Common became known as the Wetheralls, plot 1795 had taken the name of Home Pasture. A feature shown in the western part of plot 546 may represent the location of a temporary structure, although its representation on the map is unclear.

2.3.5 The 1st edition 25” Ordnance survey map from 1885 shows the land in the current proposed development area with the same field boundaries to the northeast, northwest and southeast as are present today (figure 6). The south western boundary is now altered slightly from 1885 due to the establishment of the allotments between Brewhouse Lane and Weatherall Close in the 1920s. These can be seen on the 3rd edition 25” Ordnance survey map from 1926 (figure 7). At this time the land to the southwest of the development plot was still arable. No buildings are shown in the proposed development area on either map.

2.4 Aerial Photographs

2.4.1 An assessment of aerial photographs was carried out by Air Photo Services in order to identify and accurately map archaeological, recent and natural features. The full report is given in appendix A, the following is a summary.

2.4.2 No definite archaeological features were identified other than slight suggestions of parallel ridges on the dry land area that may remain from medieval cultivation (figure 8).

2.4.3 The fields in the eastern half of the Development Area were used as pasture in the 1940s and into the 50s with one (the field that includes the quarry) remaining as grass for much longer (it was first photographed in arable use in 1982). Before conversion to arable, these fields held small ponds – as can be seen elsewhere in the wider area – and a network of streams, that may have been seasonal, flowing to the east.

2.4.4 After conversion to arable, the backfilled streams were sometimes visible as darker bands in the soil and on some photographs small light-toned patches were also
recorded. These have been named as ‘mounds’ in the key to figure 8 but are not
thought to be of archaeological origin. It is more likely that they are surface indications
of clayey deposits that are being uncovered by modern cultivation.

2.4.5 An isolated building – probably a barn – was in the south-west field of the Development
Area and reached by a track running from Soham village (through what is now housing
expansion). The barn appears to have been in use to at least 1975, when it had an
area for turning on its west side, but had been demolished by 1982. Photographs taken
in 1946 were of very poor quality so the earliest clearer view of this barn was in 1956.
Those photographs suggest that, at that date, the site them may have been a small
farm as there seems to be a second building to the east and possibly a small enclosed
area. These features are described in some detail because they may be apparent in
either the geophysical survey or located during other field investigation.

2.4.6 An area has been mapped as ‘hand-dug quarry’ on the north side of the Development
Area. This is visible as a shallow depression on some photographs and may have
been partly backfilled when the land was converted to arable use.

2.5 Earthworks
2.5.1 There are no known earthworks within the proposed development area, although some
probable natural features were identified in the aerial photographic survey that include
‘mounds’. To the north west of the site, to the south of Qua Fen Common, a series of
earthworks appears to represent ponds and drainage ditches presumably dating to the
medieval and post-medieval period (plate 2). There are indications from the
photographs studied during the aerial photographic survey that this activity may have
previously continued into the current site.

2.6 Archaeological Excavations and Surveys

Evaluation at Weatherall’s Close, TL 59546 73772 (Hickling 2005)

2.6.1 Three trenches were excavated on land adjacent to the northwest of the current site
measuring a total of 160m. These uncovered a northwest to southeast orientated
furrow and a small ditch measuring 0.5m wide and 0.13m deep. This ditch contained a
single Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age sherd. These trenches were 0.55-0.7m deep
and were all flooded by a high water table.

Evaluation at Brehouse Lane, TL 59664 73382 (Bradley-Lovekin 2007)

2.6.2 This site lay 46m to the west of the current site. It comprised two 20m trenches. These
contained modern disturbance and a single probable archaeological feature. This was
a pit 0.75m wide and 0.33m deep that contained no finds. These trenches contained
0.65m of overburden.

Evaluation at Ten Bell Lane, TL 59388 73631 (Atkins 2004b)

2.6.3 Located 85m to the west, this evaluation consisted of two trenches totalling 45.7m in
length. Evidence for late Medieval sand quarrying was located in Trench 1 whilst two
undated ditches were uncovered in Trench 2. Several waste flint flakes as well as
residual Roman and prehistoric pottery attest to activity in this area. The ditches were
orientated northeast to southwest and were 1.48m and 0.95m wide and 0.25m and
0.17m deep respectively. Overburden in these trenches was c.0.7m thick.
Assessment (evaluation) at Pratt Street, TL 59388 73573 (Taylor and Waite 1991)

2.6.4 The evaluation at Pratt Street in 1991 consisted of 6 trenches totalling 54m in length. This was located 138m to the west of the current site. A single ditch 0.5m deep possibly dating to the Early Saxon period was uncovered. Three north-south orientated ditches containing Saxo-Norman pottery were also located. A further three medieval ditches dating to the 10th to 13th centuries were also uncovered. This represents the densest known archaeology near the proposed development site. Overburden was c.0.75m thick.

Evaluation at 9-13 Pratt Street, TL 59259 73459 (Hatton and Last 1997)

2.6.5 Located 269m to the south west of the current site this evaluation consisted of three trenches totalling 55m in length. Several ditches orientated northwest to southeast were uncovered as well as a large pit. These features were dated to the Late Saxon period. Modern and post-medieval features were also uncovered. Overburden varied from 0.95m to 1.4m and water logging hindered excavation. This site was located at 9m OD which perhaps accounts for the density of features and depth of over burden compared with sites further to the east.

Evaluation at Paddock Street, TL 59597 73105 (Rees 2009)

2.6.6 An evaluation 270m to the south of the current site revealed evidence for activity dating from the late Roman to post-medieval periods. A ditch 0.9m wide and 1.2m deep orientated east west dated to the Roman period. All other features were dated to the 12th to 14th centuries including a series of ditches, an enclosure and a possible retting pit. No direct evidence of domestic occupation was uncovered.

Other Archaeological Interventions

2.6.7 Apart from the evaluation at Paddock Street, one other intervention in the vicinity at the Old Parish Hall revealed evidence of Roman activity (Thatcher 2008). Evaluations at Station Road and Market Street uncovered evidence for Late Saxon and Saxo-Norman activity in the form of inhumations and beam slot structures (Lopez Catalan 2008; Cooper 2004a; Heawood 1997)

2.6.8 Medieval activity was uncovered at the old Parish Hall, Brook Dam Lane, Lion Mills and the Market Street (Thatcher 2008; Matthews 2007; Cooper 2004a; Cooper 2004b). This took the form of pits and ditches some of which may have represented property boundaries.

2.6.9 Excavations at St. Andrews House (538m to SW) and Cloverfield Drive (545m to NW) uncovered sites with evidence for multi-period occupation (Casa Hatton 2000; Atkins 2004a; Mortimer in prep.). These revealed evidence for occupation from the Bronze Age and Roman periods although the majority of features dated to the Early and High medieval periods.

2.7 Site Visit and Current Field Conditions

2.7.1 A site visit was conducted by the author on 6th October 2009. This was carried out to determine field conditions, access and egress and to establish whether the topography could suggest or elucidate archaeological interpretation.

2.7.2 The fields have all been under arable cultivation in recent decades, and were for the most part in the process of being ploughed and harrowed when visited, with only part of
the eastern field which had been in set aside being at that time unused. Information from County Farms indicates that winter wheat was sown across most of the site later in October, but it is not clear without a further visit whether this is true of all of the eastern field.

2.7.3 There is a marked (for Fenland) difference in height between the western edges of the site and the central area between the western fields adjacent to the central drainage ditch. The north eastern corner of the eastern field also drops away.

2.7.4 There is gated access to the fields from both the A142 and from Kents Lane, the latter down an unmade track. There is also access from Bushel Lane and East Fen Common. Field boundaries are in many areas non-existent and there is little to prevent access by foot from adjacent streets and housing estates, except where drains are visible (which survive as marked on OS maps). Overhead power cables traverse the site along the boundary between the western fields and across the eastern field in a north easterly direction. Footpaths in common usage follow the cables and also traverse the eastern field and in places less established footpaths cross the western fields towards the housing estates.
3 DEPOSIT MAPPING

3.1 General
3.1.1 In this section, following mapping of the distribution of all known finds, ancient monuments and events, attempts are made to predict the existence of further remains within the study area. These predictions should not be used to produce ‘constraint maps’.

3.2 Prehistoric
3.2.1 Isolated Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age finds have been found within the proposed development area. The possible ring ditch identified from cropmarks in the south western field (HER 07102) may indicate the location of a barrow or eaves drip gully for a round house, although its current re-classification as a natural mound derived from former streams and ponds would remove its archaeological significance. Early Iron Age pottery on an adjacent site to the north at Wetheralls Close does, however, indicate that activity of this period existed close by and it may have extended into the northwest field of the current site. The history of arable agriculture on the site in recent decades has precipitated further erosion of the peat here on a shallow dip slope where it was at its thinnest and this means that there is potential for formerly obscured remains to have already been revealed across the eastern two thirds of the land under study. Also, if peat is still present there is a chance that prehistoric material will be preserved beneath it.

3.2.2 In summary prehistoric activity could be present in any part of the proposed development site but is likely to be on only a small scale. There is a possibility of a higher density of prehistoric remains in the the south western field where the ring ditch was formerly identified from aerial photographs and again to the northwest, close to the evaluation at Weatherall’s Close that identified a prehistoric ditch (Hickling 2005).

3.3 Roman
3.3.1 Evidence for Roman activity is rare in Soham. Residual material at Ten Bell Lane and a ditch a Paddock Street demonstrate that there was some occupation in this period although no focus has been identified. A coin found on the site may indicate some level of Roman activity in the east of the site where the land rises slightly.

3.3.2 In summary Roman period remains, like those of the prehistoric periods, might be present across the whole of this landscape including the lower areas, but the clear lack of previous evidence (except for one coin) for such remains here tends to reduce their likelihood. Even evidence for field systems seems unlikely as there is so little evidence for these from aerial photographs across a large zone to the east of here.

3.4 Saxon
3.4.1 Although Soham was an important Saxon centre there is little evidence of activity of any kind having spread this far east and the presence of such remains here must be deemed unlikely. Nonetheless early to middle Saxon settlement landscapes were less nucleated than those of more recent centuries and small outlier and specialist activity and economic sites are a feature of the landscape. It is possible that the landscape here, particularly above the 3.5m contour, would have proved attractive for occupation and use in this period.
3.4.2 In summary Saxon remains would probably be confined to the western, higher third of the site as peat growth recommenced during this period, but there is currently no evidence for this.

3.5 Medieval
3.5.1 Evidence of previous agricultural regimes will probably be present on the site. The boundaries seen on the 1656 map, and associated furrows, are the features from this period that are most likely to be present and this system probably has its origins in the medieval period. Quarrying for sand and gravel, such as that seen at Ten Bells Lane, may also be present. This is most likely to be located to the east of the site on the 'island' soils where the British Geological Survey records terrace gravels (1981). The aerial photographic survey identified early modern quarrying in the central northern part of the site and this sits adjacent to former ponds shown on the 19th century maps that may well indicate earlier phases of extraction here also. Medieval occupation would probably have been found closer to the existing town, rather than in this peripheral location, but the presence of the group of cottages immediately to the north at Burgess Corner, is rather anomalous and is a reminder that there may well have been more fluidity to earlier settlement patterns.

3.5.2 In summary evidence of medieval agriculture and quarrying may well be present here. Any medieval settlement remains would probably be confined to the western, higher third of the site and with the village being further to the west this area was no doubt peripheral. Nonetheless the presence of outlier settlement in the post-medieval period in several locations on the eastern edge of the higher ground (above the 3.5m contour) tends to suggest that such remains here cannot be ruled out, with the genesis for this being perhaps in earlier centuries. Cottages immediately to the north at Burgess Corner are the closest example of this.

3.6 Post-Medieval
3.6.1 Post-medieval remains relating to the agricultural use of the land (ridge and furrow, field boundaries and drainage works) could be present on any part of the site. The quarry mentioned in the section above was clearly enlarged during the 20th century. A possible structure seen on the 1840 tithe map may be present in the northwestern part of the eastern field. Remains from a short-lived mid-20th century farm may also be present in the southernmost field. This was not mapped on the 1926 Ordnance Survey map, but was present in photographs from 1946, and was demolished between 1975 and 1982.

3.6.2 In summary as with the medieval remains, there is potential for outlier structures and settlement of post-medieval date, with a structure shown on the tithe map in the eastern field to be considered alongside possible activity along the edge of high ground in the west. In addition there will be remains from a 20th century farm in the south westernmost field.
4 Degree of Survival

4.1 Assessment of Survival

4.1.1 This section broadly assesses the degree of survival of archaeological remains in the areas defined by deposit mapping. The assessment takes the form of a predictive model based on probability and not certainty. It is intended as a guide only.

4.1.2 The degree of preservation of potential buried remains within the study area is likely to have been affected by ploughing. In general terms such impact would have intensified following wholesale drainage of the fens in the 17th century, with areas such as this on the shallow edge of peat deposits, experiencing peat loss early on. Before that medieval and post-medieval agriculture may also have had an effect on earlier deposits. The formation of skirtland here, as identified in the Fenland Survey volumes (e.g figure 3 in Hall 1996) is clear evidence of former peatland soil erosion and in this zone formerly obscured pre-medieval remains might have been exposed, damaged and lost early on following fen drainage. Those fields on the west of this site that were retained as pasture would, however, have been protected from the effects of dessication and erosion until their ploughing and individual drainage in the later 20th century, as discussed by Palmer (Appendix A). This recent ploughing and the digging of field drains may have partially truncated archaeological features.

4.1.3 The potential for the survival of organic remains in waterlogged conditions is moderate given the height of the water table at the surrounding sites. It is possible that any deeper features encountered could contain waterlogged deposits in their lower fills.

4.2 Rating

4.2.1 Based on the distribution of known finds and their degree of survival in the study area, as defined in the previous sections, rating can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Survival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>moderate/high</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Summary

4.3.1 In all periods there is more likelihood of remains, particularly of settlement, being located towards the western part of the site on the higher ground.

4.3.2 Later prehistoric remains may be present in the western and central part of the site and these have been probably both revealed and part-truncated by progressive soil loss.

4.3.3 The remainder of the land is most likely to retain truncated evidence for medieval and post-medieval agriculture.

4.3.4 The deepest surviving features may retain discrete waterlogged fills.
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1.1 The objective of this study was to assess the archaeological potential of the area known as the Weatheralls, Soham, by drawing together all known documentary, cartographic and archaeological evidence from the surrounding area.

5.1.2 The site has a low to moderate level of archaeological potential. Archaeological work previously carried out has revealed predominantly medieval remains, mostly relating to agriculture. The site sits on good farming land on terrace gravels and nevertheless offers a good location for early settlement, but little has actually been confirmed here.

5.1.3 Some evidence for prehistoric activity was revealed and this may extend across parts of the western, higher ground. There is a possibility of Roman use on the site, but previous work in the area has shown there is a low potential for such remains.

5.1.4 Medieval and post-medieval features are more likely and would probably consist of features related to agriculture; ridge and furrow, field boundaries and potential agricultural structures.
APPENDIX A. AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT

A.1 Summary
A.1.1 This assessment of aerial photographs examined an area of some 100 hectares surrounding a smaller Development Area (centred TL599737) in order to identify and accurately map archaeological, recent and natural features.
A.1.2 No definite archaeological features were identified but there were suggestions of ridges that may remain from medieval cultivation.
A.1.3 Natural features include former streams and ponds and some ‘mounds’ have also been mapped that are likely to be natural, possibly clay brought to the surface by modern cultivation.
A.1.4 Recent features include removed field boundaries, an isolated barn (or possibly a former small farm) and its access track, an area of hand-dug quarrying and recent field drains.
A.1.5 Original photo interpretation and mapping was at 1:2500 level.

A.2 Introduction
A.2.1 This assessment of aerial photographs was commissioned to examine a Study Area of some 100 hectares surrounding a Development Area of 40 hectares (centred TL599737) in order to identify and accurately map archaeological, recent and natural features and thus provide a guide for field evaluation. The level of interpretation and mapping was to be at 1:2500.

A.3 Archaeological and Natural Features From Aerial Photographs
A.3.1 In suitable cultivated soils, sub-surface features – including archaeological ditches, banks, pits, walls or foundations – may be recorded from the air in different ways in different seasons. In spring and summer these may show through their effect on crops growing above them. Such indications tend to be at their most visible in ripening cereal crops, in June or July in this part of Britain, although their appearance cannot accurately be predicted and their absence cannot be taken to imply evidence of archaeological absence. In winter months, when the soil is bare or crop cover is thin (when viewed from above), features may show by virtue of their different soils. Upstanding remains, which may survive in unploughed grassland, are also best recorded in winter months when vegetation is sparse and the low angle of the sun helps pick out slight differences of height and slope.
A.3.2 Pasture fields, as are common in this Assessment Area especially on the early aerial photographs, are not among those generally recognised as ‘suitable’ to indicate the presence of levelled sub-surface features unless photographs have been taken towards the end of very dry summers. Such dry summers occurred in Britain in 1949, 1959, 1975, 1976, 1984, 1989 and 1990 (Bewley 1994, 25) and more recently in 1995, 1996 and 2006. This does not imply that every grass field will reveal its buried remains on these dates but it does provide a list of years in which photographs taken from mid July to mid-September may prove informative.
A.3.3 These effects on crop growth and soil are not confined only to archaeological features as any disturbance of soil and bedrock can produce its own range of shadow, crop and soil differences. Among these may be some features of unknown origin that cannot be classified without specialist knowledge or input from field investigation.
A.4 Photo Interpretation and Mapping

Photographs examined

A.4.1 The most immediately informative aerial photographs of archaeological subjects tend to be those resulting from observer-directed flights. This activity is usually undertaken by an experienced archaeological observer who will fly at seasons and times of day when optimum results are expected. Oblique photographs, taken using a hand-held camera, are the usual products of such investigation. Although oblique photographs are able to provide a very detailed view, they are biased in providing a record that is mainly of features noticed by the observer, understood, and thought to be of archaeological relevance. To be able to map accurately from these photographs it is necessary that they have been taken from a sufficient height to include surrounding control information.

A.4.2 Vertical photographs cover the whole of Britain and can provide scenes on a series of dates between (usually) 1946-7 and the present. Many of these vertical surveys were not flown at times of year that are best to record the archaeological features sought for this Assessment and may have been taken at inappropriate dates to record crop and soil responses that may be seen above sub-surface features. Vertical photographs are taken by a camera fixed inside an aircraft and with its exposures timed to take a series of overlapping views that can be examined stereoscopically. They are often of relatively small scale and their interpretation requires higher perceptive powers and a more cautious approach than that necessary for examination of obliques. Use of these small-scale images can also lead to errors of location and size when they are rectified or rescaled to match a larger map scale.

A.4.3 Cover searches were obtained from the Cambridge University Collection of Aerial Photographs (CUCAP) and the National Monuments Record: Air Photographs (NMRAP), Swindon. The relevant photographs all came from routine vertical surveys as all of the those resulting from observer-directed aerial survey concentrated on the upstanding remains south of the Study Area. Images current on Google Earth and Flash Earth at the time of this work (October 2009) were also examined.

A.4.4 Photographs consulted are listed in the Appendix to this report.

Base maps

A.4.5 Digital data derived from original survey at 1:2500 or larger scale were provided by the client.

Study Area

A.4.6 Photographs were examined in detail for the Study Area indicated in the figure.

Photo interpretation and mapping

A.4.7 All photographs were examined by eye and under slight (2x) magnification, viewing them as stereoscopic pairs when possible. Digital copies of the most informative were transformed to match the digital data using the specialist program AirPhoto (Scollar 2002). Where it proved advantageous, digital photographs were enhanced using the default setting in AirPhoto before being examined on screen.

A.4.8 Images in Google Earth were initially viewed and selected from within AirPhoto which automatically geo-references saved files (Scollar and Palmer 2008). These were then imported into AutoCAD, where they were interpreted and overdrawn.
A.4.9 Transformed files were set as background layers in AutoCAD Map, where features were overdrawn, making reference to the original prints, using standard conventions. Layers from this final drawing have been used to prepare the figure in this report and have been supplied to the client in digital form.

Accuracy

A.4.10 AirPhoto computes values for mismatches of control points on the photograph and map. In all transformations prepared for this assessment the mean mismatches were less than ±1.50m. These mismatches can be less than the survey accuracy of the base maps themselves and users should be aware of the published figures for the accuracy of large scale maps and thus the need to relate these mismatches to the Expected Accuracy of the Ordnance Survey maps from which control information was taken.

A.5 Commentary

Soils

A.5.1 The Development Area has two main soil deposits that equate broadly with the medieval dry land (on the west) and the medieval fen (to the east). The Soil Survey of England and Wales (SSEW 1983a) shows the dry land soil to be river terrace and chalky drift (soil association 512f: Milton) which it describes as: Deep permeable calcareous fine loamy soils variably affected by groundwater…(SSEW 1983b, 8). This soil covers approximately the western quarter of the Area. East of this is river terrace drift (soil association 872b: Clayhithe) described as: Deep humose fine loamy over sandy and fine loamy over clayey soils…. Some peat soils. Groundwater controlled by ditches and pumps (SSEW 1983b, 20). These different environments could not be distinguished on the aerial photographs examined. The Soil Survey notes that the Milton soil association can show complex soil patterns locally which implies that these will be visible as differences in crop growth. In that case, it is likely that buried archaeological features, especially ditches and pits, may be visible in a similar manner.

A.5.2 David Hall gives a more detailed description of the geology and Flandrian deposits (Hall 1996, 72) and also has mapped the fen edge at two different periods (ibid, figures 37-38). Hall’s estimated medieval fen edge has been drawn on the figure in this report and echoes the soil division mapped by the Soil Survey.

Archaeological features

A.5.3 No definite archaeological features were identified other than slight suggestions of parallel ridges on the dry land area that may remain from medieval cultivation.

A.5.4 Hall (1996, figure 37) shows the whole of the Study Area to be dry land in prehistoric and Roman times, but he did not field walk the Development Area as part of the Fenland survey (ibid, Figure 36). The closest finds from his work, and from the examination of aerial photographs carried out at that time, are some 500m east of the A142.

A.5.5 Within the Study Area, the more-detailed examination of aerial photographs undertaken for this assessment also found no suggestions of sub-surface features on photographs that were showing the presence of backfilled field boundaries, streams, ponds and field drains.
**Non-archaeological features**

A.5.6 The fields in the eastern half of the Development Area were used as pasture in the 1940s and into the 50s with one (the field that includes the quarry) remaining as grass for much longer (it was first photographed in arable use in 1982). Before conversion to arable, these fields held small ponds – as can be seen elsewhere in the wider area – and a network of streams, that may have been seasonal, flowing to the east.

A.5.7 After conversion to arable, the backfilled streams were sometimes visible as darker bands in the soil and on some photographs small light-toned patches were also recorded. These have been named as ‘mounds’ in the key to the figure but are not thought to be of archaeological origin. It is more likely that they are surface indications of clayey deposits that are being uncovered by modern cultivation.

A.5.8 An isolated building – probably a barn – was in the south-west field of the Development Area and reached by a track running from Soham village (through what is now housing expansion). The barn appears to have been in use to at least 1975, when it had an area for turning on its west side, but had been demolished by 1982. Photographs taken in 1946 were of very poor quality so the earliest clearer view of this barn was in 1956. Those photographs suggest that, at that date, the site them may have been a small farm as there seems to be a second building to the east and possibly a small enclosed area. These features are described in some detail because they may be apparent in either the geophysical survey or located during other field investigation.

A.5.9 An area has been mapped as ‘hand-dug quarry’ on the north side of the Development Area. This is visible as a shallow depression on some photographs and may have been partly backfilled when the land was converted to arable use.

A.5.10 Former field boundaries and more recent field drains have been mapped as they may affect the integrity of any sub-surface archaeological deposits.

**Land use**

A.5.11 Some land use has been mentioned above. In general terms, the land use has followed the soil types with the most of the ‘dry land’ fields being arable from the first photographs in 1946, and the lower and wetter fields being used for pasture. Conversion to arable was at different dates, perhaps dependent on field drainage but all, except for the one mentioned above, were in arable use by 1968 with drains in the southern fields first being visible on aerial photographs in 1982. Possibly the new A142 bypass, constructed between 1974 and 1982 had a detrimental effect on natural drainage as it cut across the former stream courses.

A.5.12 Land surrounding the Development Area has been mostly pasture in the north and south and pasture converted to arable (in the 1960s) on the east. West of the Area, the field that is blank on the map has always been allotments, and the field south of that was in arable use until it was built over. That building began in or before 1956 with the Health Centre added by 1995.
A.6 Aerial Photographs Examined

*Source: Cambridge University Collection of Aerial Photographs (searched 9th October 2009)*

A.6.1 Oblique Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO_ID</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>NGRE</th>
<th>NGRN</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GG 10-12</td>
<td>Soham area</td>
<td>55940</td>
<td>273200</td>
<td>30 Jun 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OX 1-2</td>
<td>Soham, looking NW</td>
<td>559300</td>
<td>273300</td>
<td>11 Aug 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OX 3-7</td>
<td>Dispersed settlement, Soham Common</td>
<td>560200</td>
<td>273300</td>
<td>11 Aug 1954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.6.2 Vertical Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO_ID</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>NGRE</th>
<th>NGRN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC8D222</td>
<td>14 May 1968</td>
<td>Mildenhall Fen to Cambridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>560954</td>
<td>273408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8R137</td>
<td>25 May 1970</td>
<td>Greenhills to Soham</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>560648</td>
<td>272738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8R138</td>
<td>25 May 1970</td>
<td>Greenhills to Soham</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>560238</td>
<td>272821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8R139</td>
<td>25 May 1970</td>
<td>Greenhills to Soham</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>559827</td>
<td>272904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8EA221</td>
<td>23 Mar 1982</td>
<td>Fenland Survey</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>560962</td>
<td>273408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8EA222</td>
<td>23 Mar 1982</td>
<td>Fenland Survey</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>560423</td>
<td>272703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8EA262</td>
<td>23 Mar 1982</td>
<td>Fenland Survey</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>559179</td>
<td>274227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8HW096</td>
<td>10 Jul 1985</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>559602</td>
<td>274370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8HW097</td>
<td>10 Jul 1985</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>560616</td>
<td>274388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8HW105</td>
<td>10 Jul 1985</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>560764</td>
<td>273338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8HW106</td>
<td>10 Jul 1985</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>559816</td>
<td>273199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8IL180</td>
<td>25 Apr 1986</td>
<td>Soham, Wet Horse Fen</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>560610</td>
<td>272719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8IL181</td>
<td>25 Apr 1986</td>
<td>Soham, Wet Horse Fen</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>560914</td>
<td>272956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8knBP039</td>
<td>30 Aug 1988</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>560270</td>
<td>273253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8knBP040</td>
<td>30 Aug 1988</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>559594</td>
<td>273238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8knBP084</td>
<td>30 Aug 1988</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>560697</td>
<td>273518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8knBP085</td>
<td>30 Aug 1988</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>560060</td>
<td>273510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8knBP086</td>
<td>30 Aug 1988</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>559220</td>
<td>273525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Source: National Monuments Record Centre: Air Photographs (cover search 43890)**

A.6.3 Specialist Collection. All from CUCAP. Vertical Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sortie number</th>
<th>Library number</th>
<th>Camera position</th>
<th>Frame number</th>
<th>Centre NGR</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sortie quality</th>
<th>Scale 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAF/106G/UK/1</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>TL 605 742</td>
<td>07 JUN 1946</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>9800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/106G/UK/1</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>2322</td>
<td>TL 599 743</td>
<td>07 JUN 1946</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>9800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/106G/UK/1</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>4321</td>
<td>TL 604 727</td>
<td>07 JUN 1946</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>9800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/106G/UK/1</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>4322</td>
<td>TL 598 726</td>
<td>07 JUN 1946</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>9800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/58/1971</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>TL 599 734</td>
<td>27 MAR 1956</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/58/1971</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>TL 598 738</td>
<td>27 MAR 1956</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/82/1428</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>F21</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>TL 591 728</td>
<td>23 MAY 1956</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/82/1428</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>F21</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>TL 591 735</td>
<td>23 MAY 1956</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/82/1428</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>F21</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>TL 591 741</td>
<td>23 MAY 1956</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/82/1428</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>TL 610 729</td>
<td>23 MAY 1956</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/82/1428</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>TL 610 735</td>
<td>23 MAY 1956</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/82/1428</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>TL 610 742</td>
<td>23 MAY 1956</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/82/1428</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>TL 598 726</td>
<td>07 JUN 1946</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>9800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/543/1/899</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>TL 599 736</td>
<td>05 MAY 1960</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>10002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/543/1/899</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>TL 595 741</td>
<td>05 MAY 1960</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>10002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/58/1968</td>
<td>3901</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>TL 591 741</td>
<td>23 MAR 1956</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/58/1968</td>
<td>3901</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>TL 591 736</td>
<td>23 MAR 1956</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL/68061</td>
<td>5155</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>TL 589 730</td>
<td>12 AUG 1968</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL/68061</td>
<td>5155</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>TL 589 730</td>
<td>12 AUG 1968</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL/68061</td>
<td>5155</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>TL 589 745</td>
<td>12 AUG 1968</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL/68061</td>
<td>5155</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>TL 589 745</td>
<td>12 AUG 1968</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL/69056</td>
<td>5418</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>TL 591 730</td>
<td>09 JUN 1969</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL/69056</td>
<td>5418</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>TL 601 730</td>
<td>09 JUN 1969</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL/69056</td>
<td>5418</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>TL 609 746</td>
<td>09 JUN 1969</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/7174</td>
<td>10109</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>TL 603 734</td>
<td>04 MAY 1971</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/7174</td>
<td>10109</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>TL 603 741</td>
<td>04 MAY 1971</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/7174</td>
<td>10109</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>TL 593 740</td>
<td>04 MAY 1971</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/68133</td>
<td>11705</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>TL 594 737</td>
<td>31 MAY 1968</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/68133</td>
<td>11705</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>TL 593 744</td>
<td>31 MAY 1968</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/74095</td>
<td>12038</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>TL 602 737</td>
<td>30 MAY 1974</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/74095</td>
<td>12038</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>TL 594 736</td>
<td>30 MAY 1974</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/86084</td>
<td>12827</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>TL 595 745</td>
<td>13 JUN 1986</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/86084</td>
<td>12827</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>TL 601 745</td>
<td>13 JUN 1986</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/82114</td>
<td>12956</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TL 595 739</td>
<td>13 MAY 1982</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/82114</td>
<td>12956</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TL 601 731</td>
<td>13 MAY 1982</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/95655</td>
<td>14962</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>TL 592 743</td>
<td>30 JUL 1995</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/95655</td>
<td>14962</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>TL 598 743</td>
<td>30 JUL 1995</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/95655</td>
<td>14962</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>TL 599 730</td>
<td>30 JUL 1995</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/95655</td>
<td>14962</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>TL 593 730</td>
<td>30 JUL 1995</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/58/2678</td>
<td>15373</td>
<td>F21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>TL 603 726</td>
<td>21 JAN 1959</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>10600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/58/2678</td>
<td>15373</td>
<td>F21</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>TL 596 725</td>
<td>21 JAN 1959</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>10600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/58/2678</td>
<td>15373</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>TL 603 745</td>
<td>21 JAN 1959</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>10600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF/58/2678</td>
<td>15373</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>TL 595 744</td>
<td>21 JAN 1959</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>10600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Vertical aerial photograph 11 May 2007
- Vertical aerial photograph undated 2007
- Vertical aerial photograph undated 2003
- Vertical aerial photograph undated 1999
- Satellite: Digital Globe 14 April 2003
- Satellite: Digital Globe 27 March 2003

Most informative photographs

- RC8-EA 262
- RC8-HW 106
- RAF/58/1971/F22: 374
- RAF/543/T899/F22: 71
- RAF/58/2678/F22: 97
- MAL/68061: 116
- OS/74095: 105
- Google Earth 11 May 2007

A.7 Terms and Conditions

A.7.1 Air Photo Services have produced this assessment for their clients, Oxford East, subject to the following conditions:

A.7.2 Air Photo Services will be answerable only for those transcriptions, plans, documentary records and written reports that it submits to the clients, and not for the accuracy of any edited or re-drawn versions of that material that may subsequently be produced by the clients or any other of their agents.

A.7.3 That transcriptions, documentation, and textual reports presented within this assessment report shall be explicitly identified as the work of Air Photo Services.

A.7.4 Air Photo Services has consulted only those aerial photographs specified. It cannot guarantee that further aerial photographs of archaeological significance do not exist in collections that were not examined.

A.7.5 Due to the nature of aerial photographic evidence, Air Photo Services cannot guarantee that there may not be further archaeological features found during ground survey which are not visible on aerial photographs or that apparently ‘blank’ areas will not contain masked archaeological evidence.

A.7.6 We suggest that if a period of 6 months or more elapses between compilation of this report and field evaluation new searches are made in appropriate photo libraries. Examination of any newly acquired photographs is recommended.
A.7.7 That the original working documents (being interpretation overlays, control information, and digital data files) will remain the property of Air Photo Services and be securely retained by it for a period of three years from the completion date of this assessment after which only the digital files may be retained.

A.7.8 It is requested that a copy of this report be lodged with the relevant Sites and Monuments Record within six months of the completion of the archaeological evaluation.

A.7.9 Copyright of this report and the illustrations within and relevant to it is held by Air Photo Services © 2009 who reserve the right to use or publish any material resulting from this assessment.
APPENDIX B. HER ENTRIES WITHIN 500M OF THE SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Record Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04843</td>
<td>Roman iron long brooch</td>
<td>Find spot</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07097</td>
<td>Roman coins</td>
<td>Find spot</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07097A</td>
<td>Medieval coins</td>
<td>Find spot</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07097B</td>
<td>Post-medieval metalwork</td>
<td>Find spot</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07099</td>
<td>Saxo-Norman ditched enclosures</td>
<td>Monument (evaluation)</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07100</td>
<td>Roman pottery and human remains</td>
<td>Find spot</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07101</td>
<td>Beaker flints</td>
<td>Find spot</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07102</td>
<td>Ring ditch</td>
<td>Monument (cropmark)</td>
<td>Prehistoric?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11019</td>
<td>Neolithic Axe</td>
<td>Find spot</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11019A</td>
<td>LBA-EIA razor</td>
<td>Find spot</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11019B</td>
<td>Early Saxon brooch</td>
<td>Find spot</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11169</td>
<td>Possible paleochannels</td>
<td>Monument (cropmark)</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECB Number</th>
<th>MCB Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECB442</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fieldwalking along Soham Bypass, Investigations along Ely to Isleham pipeline</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Multi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB532</td>
<td></td>
<td>Investigations along Ely to Isleham pipeline</td>
<td>1993-4</td>
<td>Multi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB1494</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation at Pratt Street</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Prehistoric and medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB1809</td>
<td>MCB16279</td>
<td>Evaluation at Ten Bell Lane</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB2089</td>
<td>MCB16872</td>
<td>Evaluation at Weatheralls Close,</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Prehistoric and medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB2284</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP Assessment, Ely to Isleham pipeline</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Multi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB2555</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation at Brewhouse Lane</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D. OASIS REPORT FORM
All fields are required unless they are not applicable.

**Project Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OASIS Number</th>
<th>Oxford3-65389</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Land at Wetheralls Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Dates (fieldwork) Start</td>
<td>05-10-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Dates (fieldwork) Finish</td>
<td>06-10-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Work (by OA East)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Work</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Reference Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>SOH TWE 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning App. No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related HER/OASIS No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of Project/Techniques Used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Not Recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please select all techniques used:

DBA

- [X] Aerial Photography - interpretation
- [X] Documentary Search
- [ ] Aerial Photography - new
- [ ] Visual Inspection (Site Visit)

**Monument Types & Period**
List feature types using the NMR Monument Type Thesaurus together with their respective periods. If no features were found, please state “none”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Cambridgeshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire HER office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address (including postcode if possible)</td>
<td>The Wetheralls Soham CB7 5BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>25ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Reference</td>
<td>TL 5970 7365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Originators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>OA EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Brief Originator</td>
<td>CAPCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design Originator</td>
<td>Paul Spoerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Paul Spoerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Gareth Rees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Archives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Archive</th>
<th>Digital Archive</th>
<th>Paper Archive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OA East</td>
<td>CCC stores, Landbeach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SOH TWE 09</td>
<td>SOH TWE 09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Archive Contents/Media

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

### Notes:
Figure 1: Location of the development area (outlined red)
Figure 2: Map showing development area (outlined in red) and the locations of nearby HER entries.
Figure 3: Terrain model showing proposed development area (outlined in red) and HER entries (blue outlines/triangles and purple dots).
Figure 4: Soham and Fordham Manors, 1656. Cambridgeshire Archives Services, 107/P10(v)
Figure 5: Tithe Map, 1840. Cambridgeshire Archive Services, P142/27/2
Figure 6: 1:25" first edition Ordnance Survey map, 1885
Figure 7: 1:25" third edition Ordnance Survey map, 1926
Conventional Key

- Extent of Aerial Photography Assessment
- Pond/Stream
- Development Area
- Possible Ridge and Furrow
- Fen Edge
- Field Boundary
- Quary
- Field Drain
- Building/Track
- Mound

Figure 8: Map showing development area (outlined in red) and the locations of nearby HER entries
Plate 1: Topography seen from NE corner of eastern field facing south west

Plate 2: Earthworks to the north of the site