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Summary

On the 2nd of July, Oxford Archaeology East excavated three small trenches in the Green Lane Industrial estate. Although the Trenches did not encounter any archaeological finds, features or deposits they demonstrated that subsoil and natural geological deposits had not been truncated in two of the locations.

The subsoil in the third trench had been totally removed and the natural geology here was truncated.
1 Introduction

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted at Green Lane Industrial estate, Gamlingay.

1.1.2 This archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Specification prepared by OA East (Macaulay 2012).

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 guidelines set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012). The results will enable decisions to be made by Cambridgeshire's Heritage Environment Team (CHET) 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 development lies within the village of Gamlingay, in Cambridgeshire and is centred on TL 2339 5242. The area under investigation lies on a slight hill to the west of the village centre and during construction of the industrial estate it is evident that some areas have been affected by terracing. The site currently has a height range of 54.6m OD to the north, sloping down to 51.8m OD to the south.

1.2.2 The underlying geology is Lower Green Sand (British Geological Survey 1976).

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 Although little archaeology has been recorded within the western half of Gamlingay, a number of flint implements have been found within 1km of the proposed development including Mesolithic flint tools (CHER 02336), a Bronze Age arrowhead and flint blade (CHER 02395). The latter where c.50m away from the proposed development.

1.3.2 Additionally a prehistoric enclosure has been identified 1km to the east of the development area (CHER 11980). Flint tools have also been recorded from 800m southeast and southwest of the development (CHER 00105 and 02393).

1.3.3 The Cambridge Historic Environment Record also records an Early-Middle Saxon settlement and cemetery (CHER 11980A). Recorded medieval archaeology within the area of the development includes Merton Manor Farm (CHER 01139), a 12th century chapel (CHER 00253) and late medieval almshouse (CHER 02313).

1.3.4 Previous small-scale test pitting and trial trenching to the western side of the proposed development area has not recorded any archaeological features or deposits. However, it has demonstrated the survival of the upper level of the underlying geology in some parts of the site (Collins 2010).

1.3.5 Gamlingay is a very large parish of over 1,300 hectares and is recorded in Domesday as Gamelinge which means 'the low-lying land of the people of Gamela'. The village
developed from four distinct hamlets – Dutter End, Green End, Dennis Green and Newton-on-heath, which still existed in the 13th century.

1.4 Acknowledgements
1.4.1 The author would like to thank Josh Williams of Mott MacDonald for commissioning the work; Nick Wright and Jan Anderson of Green End Trading who funded the evaluation, and Lattenbury Services who provided the machinery. The author would also like to thank excavator Nick Cox for his hard work.
2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The objective of this 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 three small test pits/trenches were excavated.

2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a 17.5 tonne 360 mechanical 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 Site conditions were generally dry and overcast with occasional showers. Trenches were backfilled in the order of removal but, as requested, reinstatement was not undertaken.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 The trenches were located around the eastern side of the Industrial estate. No archaeological features or deposits were recorded in any of the three trenches. Trench A was cut through heavily re-enforced concrete whilst trenches B and C were cut through turf.

3.2 Trench A
3.2.1 Trench A (Plate 1) was 2.5m by 2.5m in length and width the trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.8m.
3.2.2 The trench was excavated down to mid reddish-brown natural sands. The sands were sealed by a subsoil (4) of mid orangey-brown silty-sand, 0.2m deep, which in turn was sealed by a buried topsoil layer (5) of mid greyish-brown silt, 0.32m deep. 5 was cut by a modern concrete-capped pipe, which restricted access to half of the trench. The pipe and the buried soil were sealed by a layer of heavily re-enforced concrete (6) with a maximum depth of 0.20m and finally a layer of tarmac (7) c. 0.16m deep.

3.3 Trench B
3.3.1 Trench B (Plate 2) was excavated alongside the allotment gardens on the south of the proposed development area. The trench was 3.40m long and 2.20m wide. The trench was excavated down to an undisturbed natural geological deposit of mid brownish-yellow sand, 0.10m deep. This was sealed by a heavily bio-turbated deposit of mid yellowish-brown silty sand (8), 0.15m deep. This was sealed by a final layer of a mix of mid purple-grey clinker and tarmac (9), with a maximum depth of 0.35m.

3.4 Trench C
3.4.1 Trench C (Plate 3) was 5.5m long by 2.2m wide. The trench was excavated down to undisturbed reddish-brown natural sands. The sands were sealed by a preserved subsoil (1) of mid orangey-brown silt, 0.22m deep. The subsoil and natural were cut by three modern features, which were not excavated. The features contained a mix of degraded rubber, glazed ceramics, glass bottles and car parts.
3.4.2 The three features were sealed by a bioturbated dark greyish brown silty topsoil deposit (2) 0.48m deep which in turn was sealed by a layer of light greyish sand and concrete rubble (3) with a maximum depth of 0.38m.
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Trench A
4.1.1 Trench A contained a single modern capped pipe. The surviving subsoil and topsoil would however, suggest that any archaeological features or deposits within the area of Trench A may be preserved.

4.2 Trench B
4.2.1 Trench B was excavated straight to the natural geology. It is therefore likely that the area around the trench bordering the allotments has been heavily truncated. The upper deposits within trench B may represent metalling for the trackway along the side of the allotments.

4.3 Trench C
4.3.1 Trench C had well-preserved topsoil and subsoil deposits. Although heavily disturbed by modern cut features it is possible that archaeological features or deposits within this area may survive.

4.4 Significance
4.4.1 Test pits A and B have surviving subsoil deposits with little or no truncation beyond that of intrusive modern features. This may indicate that any archaeological deposits present along the Eastern side of the proposed development area could survive. As seen in the Cambridge Archaeological Unit evaluation (Collins 2010) the development area is heavily truncated to the south (Test Pit C).

4.5 Recommendations
4.5.1 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 A

**General description**

Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of tarmac, concrete, soil and subsoil overlying a natural of sand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Buried soil/Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Re-enforced concrete</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Trench B

**General description**

Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists tarmac, clinker and disturbed natural overlying a natural of sand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Disturbed Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Modern build-up</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Trench C

**General description**

Trench Devoid of archaeology. Consists of modern build-up, topsoil and subsoil overlying natural sands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-S</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Modern levelling/build-up</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1: Site location showing development area (red) and evaluation trenches (dashed)