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Summary

On the 26th and 27th May 2009 OA East undertook the machine excavation of 15mtrs of evaluation trenching in advance of the building of a proposed extension to the existing Holme Primary school. The evaluation trenches revealed evidence of a modern bank in Trench 1 probably associated with the formation of the existing school playground and backfill of a possible quarry pit in Trench 2.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted at Holme Primary School, Cambridgeshire, TL1901 8795.

1.1.2 This archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Kasia Gdniec of Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC; Planning Application Project number 10522), 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 CCC, 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 lies close to the historic core of the village, east of the Parish church of St Giles (TL 1901 8795). The site lies on Oxford Clay.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 Little work has been undertaken in Holme. The only project of note was an evaluation and subsequent watching brief carried out by ULAS that revealed Iron Age and Roman ditches and medieval fishponds (ECB 1334 & 203 - Chapman and Clay 1999). This lay on Station Road to the south of the current site.

Stray HER finds include:
HER 01305: Neolithic Axe
HER 07880: Iron Age and Roman pottery
HER 01300: Roman artefact scatter

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 The author would like to thank the clients Capita acting for CCC. The project was managed by James Drummond Murray. James Fairbairn carried out the evaluation. The illustrations were produced by Lucy Offord. James Drummond Murray edited the report. The brief for the archaeological work was written by Kasia Gdaniec.
2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The objective of this archaeological evaluation 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 Brief required that 15mtrs of evaluation trenching be opened, 10mtrs within the proposed development area, and 5mts to the north east of the development area, in relocation of an access road.

2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a wheeled JCB-type excavator using a toothless ditching bucket.

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 20L of bulk soil samples were collected from Trench 2

The samples were processed by water flotation for the recovery charred plant remains, dating evidence and any other artefactual evidence that might be present. For full methodology see Appendix C1

2.2.6 Site conditions were overcast with occasional rain. Due to access restrictions a mini digger was used to excavate the evaluation trenches. Trench 1 encountered a disused electricity cable at its eastern end.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 Trench 1 was located over a bank adjacent to the school playground and mostly within the proposed development area. It was 8.50m long and 1.25m wide with a maximum depth of 1.10m.

3.1.2 Trench 2 was located on the grass playing field to the north east of trench 1. It was 6.50m long and 1.50m wide with a maximum depth of 1.55m.

3.2 Trench 1
3.2.1 Trench 1 was located over a modern bank and was almost entirely made up of a topsoil and subsoil mixture (101) with a maximum depth of 1.10m. This consisted of a mid brown silty clay which most probably had been brought from elsewhere in or dragged back from the existing playing field to form a raised platform for the school playground. Two abraded sherds of pottery was recovered from (101). The pottery dated from the 16th to the 18th century.

3.3 Trench 2
3.3.1 Trench 2 was situated on the school playing field to the north east of trench 1. A sondage was dug at the north western end of trench 2 in an effort to reveal the depth of the natural geology. This sondage revealed a possible ditch or pit 110 located at its base. Due to the narrow width and relative depth of the trench at this point it was considered too dangerous to excavate this feature. Visual inspection revealed the fill (106) to consist of a mid grey silty clay, no finds were seen on the surface of this feature. Feature 110 was sealed by (112) which consisted of a dark brown silty clay redeposited material which had a maximum depth of 0.64m. This redeposited material contained pottery dating from the 16th to 17th century. A pit like feature 108 was also found at the south eastern end of Trench 2 it had a maximum depth of 0.28 m and a gently sloping side. The fill (107) consisted of a grey brown silty clay material that contained 12 sherds of semi abraded pottery dating from the 16th century. Contexts 110 and 108 were sealed by another redeposited layer (104) this had a maximum depth of 0.79m and was very similar in colour and consistency to layer (112) and could perhaps be two parts of the same. Layer (104) contained 18 sherds of abraded pottery dating to the 18th century. Within this layer a small piece of window glass, a piece of glazed floor tile thought to be of a medieval date, a piece of cobalt blue glass probably from a poison bottle and a black glass marble again dating to the 18th century were also recovered, (see appendix B). At the base of (104) was a dark band of dumped burnt material, this layer (105) showed no evidence of burning in tu and was probably deposited when this area was backfilled. A dark silty turf line 111 with a maximum depth of 0.14m sealed the area of the evaluation trench.

3.4 Finds Summary
3.4.1 The finds evidence suggests that the majority of the finds recovered were of a post medieval date and the nine sherds of medieval pottery were residual elements within later contexts. The two pieces of floor tile recovered may possibly have come from a house (on or) nearby the site.
3.5 Environmental Summary

3.5.1 The environmental evidence from the sample taken from pit 108 in Trench 2 suggests that contents of the sample, which included small amounts of charcoal, some cereal grain and weed seeds, was most probably derived from low-density domestic waste deposited in the pit. A small amount of hammer scale was also recovered from the residue although no slag was found in Trench 2 during the evaluation (see appendix C).
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

3.5.1 Of the two evaluation trenches dug at Holme Primary school only trench number 2 showed signs of archaeology. A ditch like feature was discovered in the base of the sondage unfortunately this was at a depth considered too deep for excavation. Feature which contained pottery dating to the 16th century may also pre-date the backfill or redeposited material above. The excavation area in Trench 2 is sealed by a backfilled or redeposited material to a depth of at least 1.0m This suggests either quarrying or the ground level has been raised. It is not uncommon for topsoil and subsoil to be moved over distance when landscaping school grounds. Waste soils the Royston road cemetery excavations (Heritage Network, 1986-1984) were used for landscaping purposes in other schools and colleges across Hertfordshire.

3.6 Significance
3.6.1 Although the evaluation adds little to what is known to the area around Holme Primary school it does suggest some evidence for some medieval archaeology underlying post medieval disturbance.

3.7 Recommendations
3.7.1 Recommendations for any future work based upon this report will be made by the County Archaeology Office.
APPENDIX A. TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY

### Trench 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>NW-SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench1 was devoid of any archaeological features, it consisted of of a dark brown silty clay topsoil and subsoil mixture overlying an orangey yellow sand gravel natural</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>8.50m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>context no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>NW-SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench2 Contained two archaeological feature 110 and 108 sealed by redeposited material</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>context no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Pottery

By Carole Fletcher BA AIFA

Finds Summary

The evaluation at Holme Primary School, Holme, Cambridgeshire produced a small pottery assemblage of 33 sherds, weighing 0.626kg including unstratified material, from two trenches.

The majority of the finds are post medieval, although nine sherds of medieval pottery were recovered as a residual element within later contexts. Alongside the post medieval pottery were recovered fragments of vessel and window glass, the vessel fragment is blue glass possibly from a poison bottle. The window glass appears to be from a square pane of unknown date. In addition a large natural black glass marble was recovered from context 104.

Two fragments of tile were also recovered the smaller is undiagnostic, the larger fragment retains traces of glaze and is part of a medieval floor tile.
The Finds

4 Introduction

4.1.1 The evaluation at Holme Primary School, Holme, Cambridgeshire produced a small pottery assemblage of 33 sherds, weighing 0.626kg, including unstratified material, from four contexts.

4.1.2 The condition of the overall assemblage is moderately abraded and the average sherd from individual contexts is moderate at approximately 19g.

4.1.3 Ceramic fabric abbreviations used in the text are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric Type</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bichrome</td>
<td>BICR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne D ware</td>
<td>BOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brill-Borstal ware</td>
<td>BRILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglian redware</td>
<td>EAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Stoneware</td>
<td>ENGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyveden-Stanion ware</td>
<td>LYST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post medieval black glazed ware</td>
<td>PMBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post medieval redware</td>
<td>PMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottersbury</td>
<td>POTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly ware</td>
<td>SHW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire white salt-glazed stoneware</td>
<td>SWSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin glazed earthenware</td>
<td>TGW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional redware</td>
<td>TRAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerwald stoneware</td>
<td>WEST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.4

5 Methodology

5.1.1 The basic guidance in the Management of Archaeological Projects (MAP2) has been adhered to (English Heritage 1991). In addition the Medieval Pottery Research Group (MPRG) documents Guidance for the processing and publication of medieval pottery from excavations (Blake and Davey, 1983), A guide to the classification of medieval ceramic forms (MPRG, 1998) and Minimum Standards for the Processing, Recording, Analysis and Publication of Post-Roman Ceramics (MPRG, 2001) act as a standard.

5.1.2 Dating was carried out using OA East's in-house system based on that previously used at the Museum of London. Fabric classification has been carried out for all previously described types. All sherds have been counted, classified and weighed. All the pottery has been spot dated on a context-by-context basis.

5.1.3 The pottery and archive are curated by OA East until formal deposition.

6 Assemblage

6.1.1 In Trench 1 context 101 produced two sherds of PMR, no other material was recovered.
6.1.2 Trench 2 produced a broader range of fabrics including nine sherds of medieval pottery. Context 104 which contained mainly 18th century fabrics including SWSG and three small sherds from an imported WEST drinking vessel, also contained a single base sherd from a medieval BRILL jug.

6.1.3 Context 107 produced the majority of the medieval pottery recovered during the evaluation, this includes two sherds of SHW dating from the mid 12th to mid 14th centuries and five sherds from one or more 13th century LYST jugs. In addition a single sherd of late medieval POTT was identified unfortunately no vessel type could be established.

6.1.4 The context also contained early post medieval fabrics and has been dated to the 16th century with the medieval pottery being a residual element in the assemblage.

6.1.5 Context 112 produced only a single shared from a BOND, bowl. BOND was produced in Lincolnshire in the 16th and early 17th century and is widely found on sites in Cambridgeshire.

6.1.6 The assemblage is a mixture of medieval wares from the surrounding counties, locally produced post medieval wares such as the PMBL or PMR, possibly from Ely and later pottery from the industrial Midlands such as the SWSG.

7 STATEMENT OF RESEARCH POTENTIAL AND FURTHER WORK

7.1.1 An assemblage of this size provides only basic dating information for a site. The medieval pottery is moderately abraded and is residual and represents medieval activity close to the area of excavation. The assemblage as a whole represents 16th, 17th and 18th century rubbish disposal which has in turn disturbed earlier medieval deposits.

7.1.2 No further work should be undertaken on this assemblage

**POTTERY DATING TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Sherd Count</th>
<th>Sherd Weight (kg)</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>16th-18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>Drinking Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>BRILL</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGS</td>
<td>Drinking Vessel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGS</td>
<td>Drinking Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PMBL</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWSG</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TGW</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>Drinking Vessel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>BICR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>16th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LYST</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LYST</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8 Ceramic Building Material

8.1.1 Two fragments of ceramic building material were recovered during the evaluation, both are abraded. The fragment from context 104 is part of a glazed medieval floor tile. The dating of this tile is uncertain although the presence of residual 13th to mid 14th century pottery in this context and context 107, suggest a similar date range for the tile. Glazed medieval floor tiles are not a common find on rural excavations where there is no obvious medieval manor or ecclesiastical building nearby. This may indicate that the tile has been brought to the site from elsewhere and relates only to the 18th century deposition of material on the site.

CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Floor tile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Undiagnostic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Glass

9.1.1 Fragments of vessel and window glass were recovered from context 1104. The vessel fragment is Cobalt blue glass used in the late 18th and 19th centuries for medicine and poison bottles. The window glass appears to be from a square pane of unknown date.

9.1.2 In addition a large black glass marble of unknown date was recovered. The description black glass is misleading as the true colour of the marble is a dark dull green. The term black glass is used most commonly when describing the colour of early bottles. The marble has no visible pontil mark and is approximately 3cm in diameter, which is too large to be the stopper of a mineral water bottle. The marble is possibly late 18th century.

GLASS TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Marble : black glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vessel: blue glass (Cobalt blue)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Window</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

By Rachel Fosberry AIFA

9.2 Introduction and Methods

9.2.1 A single sample was taken from a redeposited fill of a pit and it was submitted for an initial appraisal.

9.2.2 Ten litres of the sample was processed by tank flotation for the recovery of charred plant remains, dating evidence and any other artefactual evidence that might be present. The flot was collected in a 0.3mm nylon mesh and the residue was washed through a 0.5mm sieve. Both flot and residue were allowed to air dry. The dried residue was passed through 5mm and 2mm sieves and a magnet was dragged through each resulting fraction prior to sorting for artefacts. Any artefacts present were noted and reintegrated with the hand-excavated finds. The flot was examined under a binocular microscope at x16 magnification and the presence of any plant remains or other artefacts are noted on Table 1.

9.2.3 For the purpose of this initial assessment, items such as seeds, cereal grains and small animal bones have been scanned and recorded qualitatively according to the following categories:

# = 1-10, ## = 11-50, ### = 51+ specimens

9.2.4 Items that cannot be easily quantified such as charcoal, magnetic residues and fragmented bone have been scored for abundance:

+ = rare, ++ = moderate, +++ = abundant

9.3 Results

9.3.1 The results are recorded on Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Cut No.</th>
<th>Flot Contents</th>
<th>Residue Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Occasional grain,</td>
<td>Bone, pottery, fired clay,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3.2 Preservation is by charring and is generally moderate.

9.3.3 The single sample from context 107 contains charred plant remains in the form of cereal grains, legumes, weed seeds and charcoal. The cereal grains are probably those of wheat (*Triticum* sp.). The legumes were identified as field bean (*Vicia faba*) and were present as whole beans and as individuals cotyledons. The weeds include grass seeds (*Poaceae* sp.) and stems and brome (*Bromus* sp.) seeds. Small uncharred seeds of duckweed (*Lemna* sp.) are also present.

9.3.4 Small bones of rodents were noted in the flot and a single fish vertebra was retrieved from the residue. A tiny fragment of fish scale was also noted. Fragments of animal bone were present in the residue.

9.3.5 Small fragments of pottery and fired clay were noted in the residue.

9.3.6 The residue also contained fragments of mussel (*Mytilus* sp.)

9.3.7 The sample contained several flakes of hammer scale and a single iron pin.

### Table x. Results

| charred grass stem, *Bromus* sp., *Poaceae* sp., *Vicia faba*, *Lemna* sp., small bone, fish scale | mussel shell, fish bone, hammerscale |

9.4 Discussion

9.4.1 The single sample examined from this evaluation produced a low abundance of charred material in the form of charcoal fragments with some cereal grains, legumes and a few weed seeds. These plant remains, along with other dietary remains namely animal bone, fishbone and mussels, are probably derived from low-density deposits of domestic refuse.

9.4.2 Duckweed seeds are indicative of slow-flowing or standing water. No other plant remains indicated that this feature was waterlogged although it may have de-watered or the seeds may have been redeposited along with the rest of the deposit.

9.4.3 Flake hammerscale is indicative of blacksmithing activity taking place in the near vicinity. No slag was recovered from the evaluation of this site.

9.5 Statement of Research Potential

9.5.1 The plant remains recovered from this site are dominated by crop plants, both cereals and legumes, along with other dietary refuse in the form of mussel shells. This assemblage has limited research potential.

9.6 Further Work and Methods Statement

9.6.1 The low densities of plant remains from this sample are not considered to merit full analysis at this stage.

9.6.2 If further excavation is planned, sampling for both plant remains and metal working should be undertaken as investigation is likely to provide an insight into to utilisation of local plant resources and economic evidence from this period.
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### Project Reference Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>HOMHOM09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER No.</td>
<td>ECB 3185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning App. No.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related HER/OASIS No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of Project/Techniques Used

**Prompt**: Planning condition

**Development Type**: Public Building

**Please select all techniques used:**

- [ ] Aerial Photography - interpretation
- [ ] Aerial Photography - new
- [ ] Annotated Sketch
- [ ] Augering
- [ ] Dendrochronological Survey
- [ ] Documentary Search
- [ ] Environmental Sampling
- [x] Fieldwalking
- [ ] Geophysical Survey
- [ ] Monument Period
- [ ] Object Period
- [ ] Monument Period
- [ ] Object Period
- [ ] Pits
- [ ] Graves
- [ ] Select period...

### 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>Pits</td>
<td>Post Medieval 1540 to 1901</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Medieval 1066 to 1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>Post Medieval 1540 to 1901</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Post Medieval 1540 to 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select period...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Location

- **County**: Cambridshire
- **District**: Peterborough
- **Parish**: Holme
- **HER**: Cambridge
- **Study Area**: 20.40m
- **Site Address (including postcode if possible)**: Holme Primary school, Church Street, Holme, Peterborough, PE7 3PB
- **National Grid Reference**: TL 1901 8795
## 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>Kasia Gdaniec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design Originator</td>
<td>James Drummond-Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>James Drummond-Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>James Fairbairn</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>CCC store, Landbeach</td>
<td>OA East</td>
<td>CCC Stores Landbeach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMHOM09</td>
<td>HOMHOM09</td>
<td>HOMHOM09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Archive Contents/Media

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

---
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Drawing Conventions

Plans

Limit of Excavation
Deposit - Conjectured
Natural Features
Sondages/Machine Strip
Intrusion/Truncation
Illustrated Section S.14
Archaeological Deposit
Excavated Slot
Modern Deposit
Cut Number IT18

Sections

Limit of Excavation
Cut
Cut-Conjectured
Deposit Horizon
Deposit Horizon - Conjectured
Intrusion/Truncation
Top Surface/Top of Natural
Break in Section/
Limit of Section Drawing
Cut Number IT18
Deposit Number
117
Ordnance Datum 18.45m OD
Inclusions

Convention Key
Figure 1: Location of trenches with the development area outlined (red)
Figure 2: Trench locations (1:200)
Figure 3: Trench plans and sections (1:75)