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SUMMARY

In September 2006, Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) undertook an archaeological evaluation of land in Flookburgh, Cumbria (centred on SD 36605 75720) The work followed on from a desk-based assessment of the site by RSK ENSR, and was required to inform an application for a proposed residential development. The archaeological potential of the site was identified in a desk-based, which suggested that it had formed the southern end of a burgage plot. From at least 1825, and until sometime after 1957, the site was used an orchard.

The evaluation comprised the excavation of four trenches, which examined a total area of 47m². The trenches all revealed the same broad stratigraphy with the modern ground surface overlying an old soil horizon, which probably related to the orchard shown on the cartographic sources. This shallow and disturbed horizon overlay the natural subsoil. The single archaeological feature to be identified in the evaluation trenches comprised a twentieth-century soakaway drain, which was exposed in Trench 2. An assemblage of 100 artefacts, dominated by small fragments of pottery, was recovered from the evaluation. These all dated to the late post-medieval and modern periods, and are of little archaeological interest.

The results of the evaluation demonstrated that the proposed development will have a negligible archaeological impact on the site.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PROJECT

1.1.1 In September 2006, Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) was requested by K Blythe, of RSK ENSR, acting on behalf of AMS NW Development Ltd, to submit a project design for an archaeological evaluation of land at Church Walk, Flookburgh, Cumbria (centred on SD 36605 75720). The project design was devised to meet the requirements of a project brief (Appendix 1) prepared by the Cumbria County Historic Environment Service, and aimed to assess the presence, extent, character, date and significance of any buried archaeological remains that survived within the proposed development area.

1.1.2 The proposed development area (Planning Application 5/05/1321) lies at the southern end of a plot of land that extends from the south side of Main Street in Flookburgh, within the area demarcated as the medieval village. It was considered that the site had some potential to contained buried remains pertaining to medieval occupation, such as outbuildings, yards, pits, or features relating to craft-working activity.

1.2 TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

1.2.1 The village of Flookburgh lies in an area of gently undulating hills in the coastal zone north of Morecambe Bay, within the modern county of Cumbria. The ground level varies between 10 and 15m aOD (above ordnance datum). The study area is essentially open land, with several insubstantial sheds built around the northern and western perimeters.

1.2.2 The solid geology within the wider area consists of Westphalian red mudstones, siltstones and sandstones (Countryside Commission 1998). The Westphalian geological series are sedimentary rocks, formed under marine conditions between 314 to 308 million years ago. The overlying drift geology is relatively sparse and consists of more recent Flandrian glacial and post-glacial deposits, alluvial deposits of the associated river valleys and sandier deposits of the marshlands fringing Morecambe Bay to the south. The nearest rivers flow through Cark to the north, and the area around Flookburgh is characterised by several man-made drainage systems.

1.2.3 The soils are derived from the underlying geology, and Flookburgh mostly lies on the Denbeigh 1 series which are typical brown earths. To the south is the Downholland 3 Association, which typically comprise brown alluvial gley soils (Ordnance Survey 1983).
1.3 **HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND**

1.3.1 This outline summarises the pertinent findings from the information gathered for the 2006 desk-based assessment of the study area (RSK ENSR 2006).

1.3.2 **Palaeolithic and Mesolithic Periods (c10000 - 4000 BC):** the earliest known occupation in the region was in the natural shelter of the cliffs along the coast. In particular Kirkhead cave, to the south, has produced evidence of occupation during the Later Upper Palaeolithic period. Palaeolithic blades have also been recovered from Lindale Low to the north-east of Kirkhead (Salisbury 1992), which represent the most northerly recorded Palaeolithic sites in the country (Hodgkinson *et al* 2000). There is evidence of coastal exploitation in the Mesolithic period, with hunter-gatherer exploitation patterns, the creation of small-scale clearings, and the use of fire to provide grassland to attract game (*ibid*).

1.3.3 **Neolithic Period (c 4000 - 2500 BC):** the transition to the Neolithic is difficult to identify as only limited ceramic and lithic assemblages exists, with few monuments; this is thought to be due to a genuine lack of activity in the area, though later agricultural activity has removed a lot of evidence. The Neolithic is characterised mainly by polished stone axes, with several found at the southern end of the Cartmel area, including one example in Flookburgh, east of the present site (RSK ENSR 2006, Site 24). However, the axe finds from the area represent only a fraction of the total recovered for South Cumbria (only eight out of 67), and this may support the implication that this area was less used during this period.

1.3.4 **The Bronze Age (2500 - 700 BC):** the first palynological evidence for forest clearance occurs during the late Neolithic and early Bronze Age (*c*3000 BC), with the most significant forest clearance beginning in the Morecambe Bay area between 2300 and 1890 BC. This corresponds with the first appearance of Bronze Age Beaker burials; in 2001, a cremation cemetery, including 12 to 15 burials, with four collared urns and up to ten vessels in total, was uncovered approximately 2km to the east of Flookburgh (Wild 2003). Settlement evidence in the lowlands is limited, but there is considerable evidence of activity to the north of the study area (Quartermaine and Leech forthcoming).

1.3.5 **The Iron Age (700 BC - AD 43):** Iron Age sites and remains are notoriously difficult to identify, particularly in the North West. Little evidence has been recovered for human presence in the area, with finds restricted to areas such as Furness. This is mirrored by the lack of settlement evidence, with most upland settlement also being abandoned about this time (Hodgkinson *et al* 2001).

1.3.6 **Roman Period (AD 43 - 410):** there is almost no evidence of Roman activity within the region, with no confirmed roads or settlements. There are antiquarian references (Stockdale 1872) to a Roman road south of Flookburgh, but this remains untested archaeologically.

1.3.7 **Early Medieval Period (AD 410 - 1066):** Cartmel is first mentioned in AD 677, when it was granted to St Cuthbert by King Ecgfith of Northumberland...
(Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 254). The peninsula may have been a refuge for the surviving British population, as Ecgfirth refers to the Britons of the area. Whether this meant the local inhabitants as a whole or perhaps an enclave of monks is unclear (Crowe 1984, 65). The name Flookburgh may have origins from the Old English for a type of fish ‘floc’ (Mills 1976) or from the Old Norse name ‘Floki’ (Wyld 1911), whilst the ‘burh’ element is derived from Old English. The place-names suggest that there were overlapping occupations and cultures within the area.

1.3.8 Medieval Period (AD 1066 - 1540): in the early eleventh century most of present-day Cumbria was an area of dispute between the expanding English and Scottish Kingdoms. Malcolm III of Scotland invaded Cumbria in 1070, and was still in possession of much of the area at the time of the Domesday survey of 1086. The area saw the arrival of the Normans when William Rufus went north in 1092 to fortify land against the Scots and planted a castle and colony at Carlisle. In fact, there are suggestions that some of the accompanying Normans were encouraged to settle throughout Cumbria and place-name evidence indicates either adoption of Norman names or the establishment of new settlements. At the time of the Conquest, the lands of Cartmel, Walton and Newton were part of Earl Tostig’s lordship of Hougou (Millom) (Morris 1978), the lands remained crown property after 1066 but were granted to William Marshall, the Earl of Pembroke in 1186 by the then King Henry II. The Earl then granted the lands Cartmel Priory in 1190.

1.3.9 The late thirteenth to early fifteenth centuries was a period of economic depression in the area, caused by three major factors, both natural and manmade (Winchester 1987). The first was the Wars of Independence with Scotland, which from 1296 onwards caused devastation to much of the North. Even as far south as Cartmel raids in 1316 and 1322 resulted in severe damage and loss. The second was the outbreak of plagues and murrains among the human and animal population, and the third factor was the deteriorating climate which affected those marginal agricultural areas that had been colonised in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The coincidence of some of these factors caused the effects of each to be more severe than may ordinarily have been the case and economic recovery is not in evidence until the mid-fifteenth century.

1.3.10 Flookburgh is known to have been in existence by 1246, when it was recorded in the Assize Rolls. A grant from Edward I in 1278 allowed Flookburgh to hold a market, which suggests that it was perhaps a settlement foci in a landscape dotted with dispersed farms. Later, in 1412, Thomas de Lancaster was granted a charter to hold a weekly market and two annual fairs at Flookburgh. References to burgages are recorded first in 1508-9 indicates that Flookburgh had attained borough status. The location of Flookburgh on the main route to Furness and its proximity to the coast would have presented good opportunities.

1.3.11 The overall morphology of the village suggests that it may have been deliberately planned along two main roads set at right angles with a central market place, still fossilised in the present layout (Winchester 1987). The burgages were aligned north/south, either side of the main east/west road.
Burgages were linear plots of land, usually with a shop on the street front, dwellings and workshops behind them and the rear of the plot would have been fairly open and used for horticulture, allotments or other activities. These areas allowed small-scale production of food for domestic consumption (Dyer 2000, 116). The study area occupies the southern end of a burgage plot, which lay along the eastern side of Church Walk.

1.3.12 The economy of the area was based on fishing, particularly cockling, and agriculture, historically including wheat, barley, oats, with other activities including stock husbandry. There is little surviving evidence of activity dating exclusively to this period, partly because any structures are likely to have been rebuilt since, in more permanent material and medieval field systems overlain.

1.3.13 Post-medieval Period (AD 1540 - 1900): the early part of this period saw the rebuilding of many structures in the region in stone, as a result of economic prosperity, changing tastes and, in the case of Flookburgh, a fire which occurred through the village at about 1686 (Stockdale 1872). The burgages are again mentioned in 1609 when James I granted 65 burgages with accompanying tofts to a George Salter. The modern layout of the village still preserves the outlines of these linear burgage plots.

1.3.14 The study area is depicted as being an orchard on the first edition Ordnance Survey of 1851, but is also shown and recorded as being an orchard as early as 1825 on the township plan. At that time it was owned and occupied by a Captain Postlethwaite (RSK ENSR 2006). The map sequences show that the site remains an orchard up to sometime between 1957 and 1974, when it is no longer depicted as such on Ordnance Survey mapping.
2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 A project design (Appendix 2) was submitted by OA North in response to a request from K Blythe, of RSK ENSR, acting on behalf of AMS NW Development Ltd. The project design was adhered to, and the work was consistent with the relevant standards and procedures of the Institute of Field Archaeologists. The main aim of the investigation was to characterise the level of preservation and significance of any buried archaeological remains surviving in-situ. A programme of evaluation trenching examining a minimum of 5% of the total area to be affected by the proposed development within the study area was implemented to achieve this objective.

2.2 FIELDWORK

2.2.1 The site was investigated via four trenches, placed in the positions shown in Figure 1. The excavated trenches were to a combined total length of 33.35m, giving a total area of 47m².

2.2.2 Excavation of the uppermost levels of modern overburden/demolition material was undertaken by a 3-tonne machine fitted with a toothless ditching bucket to the top of the first significant archaeological level. Sondages were excavated in selected locations to confirm the natural sequence of deposits and to establish that no earlier remains had been covered by natural inundations. The work was supervised by a suitably experienced archaeologist. Spoil from the excavation was stored adjacent to the trench, and was backfilled upon completion of the archaeological works.

2.2.3 Thereafter, all remains were cleaned manually, using trowels to define their extent, nature, form and, where possible, date. All features of archaeological interest were investigated and recorded. Any investigation of intact archaeological deposits was exclusively manual. All excavation was undertaken with a view to avoiding damage to any archaeological features which appear worthy of preservation in-situ.

2.2.4 All information identified in the course of the site works was recorded stratigraphically, using a system adapted from that used by the Centre for Archaeology Service of English Heritage, with sufficient pictorial record (plans, sections and both black and white and colour photographs) to identify and illustrate individual features.

2.2.5 Results of the evaluation were recorded on pro-forma context sheets. The site archive included both a photographic record and accurate large-scale plans and sections at an appropriate scale (1:20). All artefacts and ecofacts were recorded using the same system, and were handled and stored according to standard practice (following current Institute of Field Archaeologists guidelines) in order to minimise deterioration.
2.2.6 A full and detailed photographic record of individual contexts was maintained and, similarly, general views from standard view points of the overall site at all stages of the evaluation were generated. Photography was undertaken using 35mm cameras on archivable black and white print film and colour transparency, and all frames will include a visible, graduated metric scale. Extensive use of digital photography was made throughout the course of the fieldwork for presentation purposes. Photographs records were maintained on special photographic pro-forma sheets.

2.2.7 **Finds policy:** All finds were exposed, lifted, cleaned, bagged and boxed in accordance with the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation (UKIC) *First Aid For Finds*, 1998 (new edition). All identified finds and artefacts were retained from all material classes; these were hand collected from stratified deposits.

2.3 **ARCHIVE**

2.3.1 The deposition of a properly ordered and indexed project archive in an appropriate repository is considered an essential and integral element of all archaeological projects by the IFA in that organisation's code of conduct. As such a full archive of this project has been produced to a professional standard in accordance with current guidelines (English Heritage 1991). The project archive includes summary processing and analysis of all features and finds recovered during fieldwork, which will be catalogued by context. OA North practice is to deposit the original record archive of projects and a copy of the report with the appropriate County Record Office, and the material finds, subject to discussion with the legal owner, will be deposited with the nearest museum to meet the Museums and Galleries Commission Guidelines (MGC 1992). A copy of this report, together with an index to the archive, will be given to the Cumbria Historic Environment Record (the index to the archive and a copy of the report), and an archaeological fieldwork record form will be forwarded for deposition to the National Monuments Record.
3. EVALUATION RESULTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 The following chapter details the results obtained from the evaluation, and is presented in trench order. Full context descriptions can be found in Appendix 3.

3.2 TRENCH 1

3.2.1 The first trench (Plate 1) was oriented east/west, measured 10.05m by 1.4m, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.8m (13.93m aOD) (Figs 2 and 3). The trench was located within the eastern end of the shed structure, and was positioned to avoid roof supports and wall foundations.

3.2.2 The earliest deposit seen within this trench was the underlying geology 103. This consisted of a firm mid-orangey-brown silty-clay, with 5-10% small sub-rounded stone inclusions. This deposit was only exposed at the base of the sondage at the western end of the trench, but extended beyond the limit of excavations.

3.2.3 Above this layer was the natural subsoil (102). This comprised a mid-greyish-brown clayey-silt that contained less than 5% small-sized sub-angular stones. The boundary between these two deposits was extremely diffuse, graduated over a 0.1m vertical distance.

3.2.4 Overlying natural subsoil 102 was a 0.2m thick deposit, 101, of dark greyish-brown clayey-silt. This layer extended across the western and central parts of the site, and represented an old soil horizon, the darker colouring resulting from an organic component. The deposit was probably formed in-situ as a result of the organic matter combining with the uppermost surface of subsoil.

3.2.5 At the eastern end of the trench were two recent deposits, which, in stratigraphic terms, overlay soil horizon 101. Deposit 109 was a layer of corroded iron objects, overlain by a concrete layer related to the shed flooring (108). These two deposits extended up to 3.3m in length, and were only exposed in the northern half of the trench.

3.2.6 The modern surface (100) represented the top of the stratigraphic sequence, and consisted of hardcore, tarmac and debris, forming a layer that was 0.1m thick.

3.3 TRENCH 2

3.3.1 Trench 2 (Plate 2) was oriented north/south, measured 10.9m by 1.4m, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.05m (13.83m aOD). The trench was located south of, and perpendicular to, Trench 1 (Fig 2). The two trenches were joined, and the overall stratigraphy and deposits were the same.
3.3.2 The earliest deposit exposed within the trench was the underlying geology (103). This was the same as that identified in Trench 1, and consisted of a firm mid-orangey brown silty-clay, with 5-10% small sub-rounded stone inclusions. This deposit was only seen at the base of the sondage at the southern end of the trench and extended beyond the limit of excavations.

3.3.3 Above this layer was the natural subsoil (102). This comprised a mid-greyish-brown clayey-silt that contained less than 5% small-sized sub-angular stones. The boundary between these two deposits was extremely diffuse, graduated over a 0.1m vertical distance.

3.3.4 Overlying natural subsoil 102 was a 0.2m thick deposit, of dark greyish-brown clayey-silt (101), which was the same old soil horizon as seen in Trench 1.

3.3.5 Truncating the soil horizon 101 was a large feature 105, located along the western side of the trench towards the northern end (Fig 4). Feature 105 was straight-sided in plan, and extended west beyond the limit of excavation. It measured 4.3m in length and was over 0.7m wide. The feature was filled with deposit 104, which comprised 65% rubble, consisting of concrete fragments, unworked sandstone pieces, slate and bricks (Fig 9). The bricks were whole, machine-made and stamped with ‘Furness Brick Co. of Barrow’. The feature seemingly represented a soakaway drain, and dated to the mid- to late twentieth century.

3.3.6 Sealing the soakaway and all other deposits was the modern surface (100), consisting of hardcore, tarmac and debris up to 0.1m thick. The material was not appreciably different whether inside the shed or outside.

3.4 TRENCH 3

3.4.1 Trench 3 (Plate 3) was oriented east/west, measured 10.3m by 1.4m, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.8m (14.22ma OD). The trench was located west of, and perpendicular to, Trench 2 (Figs 2). The two trenches were joined and the overall stratigraphy and deposits were the same.

3.4.2 The earliest deposit encountered within this trench was the underlying geology (103). This consisted of a firm mid-orangey-brown silty-clay, with 5-10% small sub-rounded stone inclusions. This deposit was only exposed at the base of the sondage at the western end of the trench, but extended beyond the limit of excavations (Fig 10).

3.4.3 Above this layer was the natural subsoil (102). This comprised a mid-greyish-brown clayey-silt that contained less than 5% small-sized sub-angular stones. The boundary between these two deposits was extremely diffuse, graduated over a 0.1m vertical distance.

3.4.4 Overlying natural subsoil 102 was a 0.2m thick deposit (101) of dark greyish-brown clayey-silt. This layer was extensive and represented an old soil horizon, the darker colouring resulting from an organic component.
3.4.5 At the top of the stratigraphic sequence was the present surface, 100, consisting of hardcore, tarmac and debris, seen to be 0.1m thick. Within this layer was a narrow gauge water pipe 107, which was aligned north-west/south-east and crossed the width of the trench.

3.5 TRENCH 4

3.5.1 Trench 4 (Plate 4) was oriented east/west, measured 2.1m by 1.4m, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.6m (14.32m aOD). The trench was located west of Trench 3 (Figs 2), and demonstrated similar stratigraphy to that recorded in Trenches 1-3.

3.5.2 The earliest deposit exposed was the natural subsoil (102), consisting of a mid-greyish-brown clayey-silt that contained less than 5% small-sized sub-angular stones. Overlying this was a 0.2m thick deposit, 101, of dark greyish-brown clayey-silt, representing an old soil horizon. Above this was the present surface (100), consisting of hardcore, tarmac and debris. It partially abutted a set of stones aligned east/west, which acted as a kerb to the shed immediately to the south of this trench.

3.6 FINDS

3.6.1 In total, 100 artefacts were recovered from the evaluation. This finds assemblage was dominated (79%) by fragments of pottery, with a date range that spanned to eighteenth to twentieth centuries. Other finds categories present included animal bone, clay tobacco pipe, iron, and ceramic building materials. The pottery was mainly consistent with types usually found in the North West, and included a high percentage of both glazed and unglazed red earthenwares and blackwares of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A significant proportion of Victorian pottery of the creamware, pearlware and transfer-printed types was also recovered.

3.6.2 Post-medieval pottery: Trench 1 yielded the bulk (46 sherds) of the pottery from the evaluation. The majority of the fragments were red earthenwares and similar types, notably four sherds of a yellow-glazed pancheon (101/1001). Of the nineteenth-century white earthenware types, four fragments of moulded creamware are interesting (101/1009), together with a fragment of trailed slipware of eighteenth- to nineteenth-century date (101/1007), a rim fragment of seventeenth- to eighteenth-century gritty mottled ware, and a rim fragment of Nottingham stoneware (101/1004). A small body sherd of a ‘feathered’ Staffordshire-type slipware of eighteenth century date (101/1014), was also recovered.

3.6.3 The pottery from Trench 2 has a proportionately much higher percentage of the white earthenware and pearlware types, including a possible Spode bowl or cup rim (101/1033), and fragments of a twentieth-century kitchen or bathroom tile. A large rim fragment of an eighteenth- or nineteenth-century blackware vessel (101/1031), and a sherd of an eighteenth-century brown-glazed red earthenware vessel (101/1039) were also recovered.
3.6.4 Trench 3 similarly yielded fragments of red earthenwares, blackwares, white earthenwares, pearlwares, and creamwares. Noteworthy in Trench 3, however, are two fragments of a nineteenth-century slipware vessel (101/1049), and a rim fragment of a blackware bowl or a probable eighteenth-century date were also recovered.

3.6.5 The pottery recovered from Trench 4 represented only three types of pottery; brown-glazed red earthenware (101/1067), white earthenware (101/1068), and blackware (101/1069).

3.6.6 Animal bone: Trenches 1, 3 and 4 produced 11 fragments of animal bone in total. Sheep/goat, pig, cow and chicken were all represented, some showing butchered chop marks, notably a large mammal (cow) rib (101/1021).

3.6.7 Clay tobacco pipe: Trenches 1, 2 and 3 yielded a combined total of six fragments of clay tobacco pipe, all of which were derived from layer (101). An eighteenth- to nineteenth-century date range may be ascribed to these fragments.

3.6.8 Ceramic building materials: the ceramic building material within the finds assemblage comprised a fragment of a nineteenth- to twentieth-century tile (101/1042), and a piece of undateable (but probably twentieth century) brick rubble (101/1041).

3.6.9 Iron: two iron objects were recovered in Trench 1. The first is a bent and heavily abraded nail of unknown purpose. The second is a plain, lacquered iron button, possibly from a coat.

3.6.10 Conclusion: the artefacts are of little archaeological interest, although the nature of the finds assemblage suggests that the study area has occasionally received domestic rubbish from nearby properties from the eighteenth century onwards.

3.7 Palaeoenvironmental Material

3.7.1 The potential for any analysis of the soils encountered during the evaluation was severely curtailed by the current state of the site. There was obvious contamination both chemically, from the machine oil and diesel, and physically from heavy site traffic and intrusive material across the uppermost surfaces permeating the lower deposits. These factors meant that the site had a low potential for soil micromorphology or phosphate analysis. As a result, it was determined that any samples from the site would have been unsuitable for palaeoenvironmental analysis.
4. INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INTERPRETATION

4.1.1 The evaluation revealed no significant archaeological deposits or features. Soil horizon 101 was probably formed *in situ* as a result of the organic matter combining with the uppermost surface of subsoil. This layer would therefore have been subject to root disturbance and trample over a period of years, which would be consistent with the site’s former use as an orchard.

4.1.2 A moderate amount of pottery was recovered from this layer including several sherds of eighteenth century wares. There was a slight decrease in the amount of pottery found towards the southern end of the study area, and with increased distance from the village centre.

4.2 DISCUSSION

4.2.1 Cartographic evidence has demonstrated that the study area had been used as an orchard during the early nineteenth century, and it is likely that it had been put to such use for a considerable period. Orchards and gardens in general were for small-scale production, which could either be consumed or sold. The common garden ‘crops’ were those such as cabbages, onions, legumes, herbs, apples, pears, and cherries (Muir 2004, 190). Once established, these types of plants are relatively hardy, easy to grow, require minimal time and maintenance and the harvesting seasons do not coincide with the main cereal harvests (Dyer 2000).

4.2.2 There is some evidence to show that orchards may not always have taken up the entire plot of land, but may have actually been trees planted around the perimeter of the plot, with the enclosed space used for other food producing plants (Dyer 2000, 118). It is possible that the study area could have held as many as a dozen mature trees.
5. IMPACT

5.1 IMPACT

5.1.1 The results of the evaluation demonstrated that the only archaeological deposit across the site was an old soil horizon (101). This yielded a small assemblage of finds, but had been subject to a degree of disturbance from services, the construction of the standing buildings, and the soakaway drain.

5.1.2 The archaeological significance of the study area would appear to be low, and it seems likely that the proposed development will have a negligible archaeological impact.
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APPENDIX 1: PROJECT BRIEF

BRIEF FOR AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

AT LAND ADJACENT TO 1 CHURCH VILLAS, CHURCH WALK, FLOOKBURGH

CUMBRIA

Issued by the

County Historic Environment Service

Environment Unit, Economy, Culture and Environment

COUNTY COUNCIL

Date of Brief: 14 July 2006

This Design Brief is only valid for 1 year after the above date. After this period the County Historic Environment Service should be contacted. Any specification resulting from this Brief will only be considered for the same period.
1. SITE DESCRIPTION AND SUMMARY

Site: Land adjacent to 1 Church Villas, Church Walk, Flookburgh

Grid Reference: SD 36605 75720

Planning Application No.: 5/05/1321

Area: 800 square metres

Detailed proposals and tenders are invited from appropriately resourced, qualified and experienced archaeological contractors to undertake the archaeological project outlined by this Brief and to produce a report on that work. The work should be under the direct management of either an Associate or Member of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, or equivalent. Any response to this Brief should follow IFA Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations, 1994. No fieldwork may commence until approval of a specification has been issued by the County Historic Environment Service.

2. PLANNING BACKGROUND

2.1 Cumbria County Council’s Historic Environment Service (CCCHES) has been consulted by South Lakeland District Council regarding a planning application for 3 dwellings on land adjacent to 1 Church Villas, Church Walk, Flookburgh.

2.2 The scheme affects an area considered to have a high archaeological potential and so a condition has been placed on planning consent requiring a scheme of archaeological work to be undertaken at the site. The first phase of this work will be an archaeological evaluation to assess the nature and potential of the site. This Brief deals solely with this phase.

2.3 This advice is given in accordance with guidance given in Planning Policy Guidance note 16 (Archaeology and Planning) and with policy C19 of the South Lakeland Local Plan.

3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 Flookburgh is first mentioned in documents dating to 1246 and the site is located in an area which was occupied, during the medieval period, by backplots of burgages fronting on to Main Street. This area is designated by the Cumbria Extensive Urban Survey as of high importance.

4. SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

4.1 Objectives

4.1.1 The evaluation should aim to determine the location, extent, date, character, condition, significance and quality of any surviving archaeological remains liable to be threatened by the proposed development. An adequate representative sample of all areas where archaeological remains are potentially threatened should be studied.

4.2 Work Required

4.2.1 A desk-based assessment of the existing resource, to be undertaken before any work commences on site. This should include an assessment of primary and secondary maps and documents relating to the site, to set the evaluation results in their geographical, topographical, archaeological and historical context. Records held by the County Historic Environment Record and County Records Office in Kendal should be consulted.

4.2.2 The excavation of a series of linear trial trenches and/or test-pits to adequately sample the threatened available area, and the investigation and recording of deposits and features of
archaeological interest identified within those trenches. All features must be investigated and recorded unless otherwise agreed with the County Historic Environment Service. Initial topsoil and demonstrably modern overburden can be removed by machine, but subsequent cleaning and investigation must be by hand. A minimum sample of 5% of the total site area should be investigated.

4.2.3 The evaluation should provide a predictive model of surviving archaeological remains detailing zones of relative importance against known development proposals. An impact assessment should also be provided, wherever possible.

4.2.4 The following analyses should form part of the evaluation, as appropriate. If any of these areas of analysis are not considered viable or appropriate, their exclusion should be justified in the subsequent report.

- A suitably qualified specialist should assess the environmental potential of the site through the examination of suitable deposits, including: (1) soil pollen analysis and the retrieval of charred plant macrofossils and land molluscs from former dry-land palaeosols and cut features, and; (2) the retrieval of plant macrofossils, insect, molluscs and pollen from waterlogged deposits.
- Advice is to be sought from a suitably qualified specialist in faunal remains on the potential of sites for producing bones of fish and small mammals. If there is potential, a sieving programme should be undertaken. Faunal remains, collected by hand and sieved, are to be assessed and analysed, if appropriate.
- The advice from a suitably qualified soil scientist should be sought on whether a soil micromorphological study or any other analytical techniques will enhance understanding site formation processes of the site, including the amount of truncation to buried deposits and the preservation of deposits within negative features. If so, analysis should be undertaken.

5. SPECIFICATION

5.1 Before the project commences a project proposal must be submitted to, and approved by, the County Historic Environment Service.

5.2 Proposals to meet this Brief should take the form of a detailed specification prepared in accordance with the recommendations of The Management of Archaeological Projects, 2nd ed. 1991, and must include:

- A description of the excavation sampling strategy and recording system to be used
- A description of the finds and environmental sampling strategies to be used
- A description of the post excavation and reporting work that will be undertaken
- Details of key project staff, including the names of the project manager, site supervisor, finds and environmental specialists and any other specialist subcontractors to be employed
- Details of on site staffing, expressed in terms of person days
- A projected timetable for all site work and post excavation work

5.3 The specification should identify the proposed locations of trial trenches. Final trench locations will however be determined following the desk-based assessment and must be agreed with the County Historic Environment Service.

5.4 Any significant variations to the proposal must be agreed by the County Historic Environment Service in advance.

6. REPORTING AND PUBLICATION
6.1 The archaeological work should result in a report, this should include as a minimum:

- A site location plan, related to the national grid
- A front cover/frontispiece which includes the planning application number and the national grid reference of the site
- The dates on which the fieldwork was undertaken
- A concise, non-technical summary of the results
- An explanation of any agreed variations to the brief, including justification for any analyses not undertaken (see 4.2.5)
- A description of the methodology employed, work undertaken and the results obtained
- Plans and sections at an appropriate scale showing the location and position of deposits and finds located
- A list of, and dates for, any finds recovered and a description and interpretation of the deposits identified
- A description of any environmental or other specialist work undertaken and the results obtained

6.2 Three copies of the report should be deposited with the County Historic Environment Record within two months of completion of fieldwork. This will be on the understanding that the report will be made available as a public document through the County Historic Environment Record.

6.3 Should further archaeological work result from the evaluation, the results of the evaluation will need to be made available for inclusion in a summary report to a suitable regional or national archaeological publication.

6.4 Recommendations concerning any subsequent mitigation strategies and/or further archaeological work following the results of the field evaluation should not be included in the report. Such recommendations are welcomed by the County Historic Environment Service, and may be outlined in a separate communication.

6.5 Cumbria HER is taking part in the pilot study for the Online Access to Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) project. The online OASIS form at http://ads.abds.ac.uk/project/oasis must therefore also be completed as part of the project. Information on projects undertaken in Cumbria will be made available through the above website, unless otherwise agreed.

7. THE ARCHIVE

7.1 An archive must be prepared in accordance with the recommendations of The Management of Archaeological Projects, 2nd ed. 1991, and arrangements made for its deposit with an appropriate repository. A copy shall also be offered to the National Monuments Record.

7.2 The landowner should be encouraged to transfer the ownership of finds to a local or relevant specialist museum. The museum’s requirements for the transfer and storage of finds should be discussed before the project commences.

7.3 The County Historic Environment Service must be notified of the arrangements made.

8. PROJECT MONITORING
8.1 One weeks notice must be given to the County Historic Environment Service prior to the commencement of fieldwork.

8.2 Fieldwork will be monitored by the Assistant Archaeologist on behalf of the local planning authority.

9. FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

9.1 It is the archaeological contractor’s responsibility to establish safe working practices in terms of current health and safety legislation, to ensure site access and to obtain notification of hazards (eg. services, contaminated ground, etc.). The County Historic Environment Service bears no responsibility for the inclusion or exclusion of such information within this Brief or subsequent specification.

9.2 All aspects of the evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the Institute of Field Archaeologist’s Code of Conduct and the IFA’s Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations.

9.3 Human remains must be left in situ, covered and protected when discovered. No further investigation should normally be permitted beyond that necessary to establish the date and character of the burial, and the County Historic Environment Service and the local Coroner must be informed immediately. If removal is essential, it can only take place under appropriate Department for Constitutional Affairs and environmental health regulations.

9.4 The involvement of the County Historic Environment Service should be acknowledged in any report or publication generated by this project.
APPENDIX 2: PROJECT DESIGN

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF PROJECT

1.1.1 In September 2006, Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) was requested by K Blythe, of RSK ENSR, acting on behalf of AMS NW Development Ltd, to submit a costed project design for an archaeological evaluation of land at Church Walk, Flookburgh, Cumbria (centred on SD 36605 75720). The project design has been devised to meet a project brief prepared by the Cumbria County Historic Environment Service, and aims to assess the presence, extent, character, date and significance of any buried archaeological remains that may survive within the proposed development area.

1.1.2 The proposed development area (Planning Application 5/05/1321) is thought to lie at the southern end of a burgage plot extending from the south side of Main Street in Flookburgh, and thus within the area demarcated as the medieval village. It is therefore considered that the site has some potential to contain buried remains pertaining to medieval occupation, such as outbuildings, yards, pits, or features relating to craft-working activity.

1.2 OXFORD ARCHAEOLOGY

1.2.1 Oxford Archaeology has over 30 years of experience in professional archaeology, and can provide a professional and cost effective service. We are the largest employer of archaeologists in the country (we currently have more than 200 members of staff) and can thus deploy considerable resources with extensive experience to deal with any archaeological obligations you or your clients may have. We have offices in Lancaster and Oxford, trading as Oxford Archaeology North (OA North), and Oxford Archaeology (OA) respectively, enabling us to provide a truly nationwide service. Watching briefs, evaluations and excavations have taken place within the planning process, to fulfil the requirements of clients and planning authorities, to very rigorous timetables.

1.2.2 OA North has the professional expertise and resources to undertake the project detailed below to a high level of quality and efficiency. OA North is an Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) registered organisation, registration number 17, and all its members of staff operate subject to the IFA Code of Conduct.

2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 ACADEMIC AIMS

2.1.1 The main research aim of the investigation will be to characterise the level of preservation and significance of any buried archaeological remains surviving in situ within the study area. To this end, the following programme has been designed, in accordance with a project brief prepared by the Cumbria County Historic Environment Service. The results will provide information as to whether further investigation is required prior to the development taking place. The required stages to achieve these ends are as follows:

- to implement a programme of evaluation trenching examining a minimum of 5% of the total area to be affected by the proposed development;
- to produce a written report that will assess the significance of the data generated by the above fieldwork programme within a local and regional context;
to facilitate the implementation of a strategy that will take account of the archaeological resource of the site in the final design proposals, and satisfy the requirements of the curatorial archaeologist.

3  METHOD STATEMENT

3.1.1 The following work programme is submitted in line with the aims and objectives summarised above.

3.2  FIELDWORK

3.2.1 The programme of evaluation trenching will establish the presence or absence of any previously unknown archaeological deposits and, if established, will then test their date, nature, depth and quality of preservation. In this way, it will adequately sample the threatened available area.

3.2.2 The site will be investigated initially via four trenches, placed in the positions specified by RSK ENSR (Figure 1). The trenches will have a combined total length of 40m, and all will have a minimum width of 1.6m, although may be stepped out for Health and Safety reasons if deep stratigraphy is encountered.

3.2.3 Excavation of the uppermost levels of modern overburden/demolition material will be undertaken by a machine fitted with a toothless ditching bucket to the top of the first significant archaeological level. The work will be supervised by a suitably experienced archaeologist. Spoil from the excavation will be stored adjacent to the trench, and will be backfilled upon completion of the archaeological works.

3.2.4 Machine excavation will then be used to define carefully the extent of any surviving foundations, floors, and other remains. Thereafter, all remains will be cleaned manually, using either hoes, shovel scraping, and/or trowels depending on the subsoil conditions, to define their extent, nature, form and, where possible, date. All features of archaeological interest will be investigated and recorded. Any investigation of intact archaeological deposits will be exclusively manual. Selected pits and postholes will normally only be half-sectioned, linear features will be subject to no more than a 10% sample, and extensive layers will, where possible, be sampled by partial rather than complete removal. It is hoped that in terms of the vertical stratigraphy, maximum information retrieval will be achieved through the examination of sections of cut features. All excavation will be undertaken with a view to avoiding damage to any archaeological features which appear worthy of preservation in situ.

3.2.5 All information identified in the course of the site works will be recorded stratigraphically, using a system adapted from that used by the Centre for Archaeology Service of English Heritage, with sufficient pictorial record (plans, sections and both black and white and colour photographs) to identify and illustrate individual features.

3.2.6 Results of the evaluation will be recorded on pro-forma context sheets. The site archive will include both a photographic record and accurate large-scale plans and sections at an appropriate scale (1:50 and 1:20). All artefacts and ecofacts will be recorded using the same system, and will be handled and stored according to standard practice (following current Institute of Field Archaeologists guidelines) in order to minimise deterioration.

3.2.7 A full and detailed photographic record of individual contexts will be maintained and similarly general views from standard view points of the overall site at all stages of the evaluation will be generated. Photography will be undertaken using 35mm cameras on archivable black and white print film as well as colour transparency, and all frames will include a visible, graduated metric scale. Extensive use of digital photography will also be
undertaken throughout the course of the fieldwork for presentation purposes. Photographs
records will be maintained on special photographic pro-forma sheets.

3.2.8 **Finds policy:** all finds will be exposed, lifted, cleaned, conserved, marked, bagged and boxed
in accordance with the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation (UKIC) *First Aid For
Finds*, 1998 (new edition). It may be necessary to undertake a selective sieving strategy,
should any deposit (including the topsoil or modern overburden) contain significant artefacts.
All identified finds and artefacts will be retained, although certain classes of building material
can sometimes be discarded after recording if an appropriate sample is retained on advice
from the recipient museum’s archive curator.

3.2.9 **Environmental Sampling:** environmental samples (bulk samples of 30 litres volume, to be
sub-sampled at a later stage) will be collected from stratified undisturbed deposits and will
particularly target negative features (gullies, pits and ditches). An assessment of the
environmental potential of the site will be undertaken through the examination of suitable
deposits by the in-house palaeoecological specialist, who will examine the potential for
further analysis. The assessment would include soil pollen analysis and the retrieval of
charred plant macrofossils and land molluscs from former dry-land palaeosols and cut
features. In addition, the samples would be assessed for plant macrofossils, insect, molluscs
and pollen from waterlogged deposits. The costs for the palaeoecological assessment are
defined as a contingency and will only be called into effect if good deposits are identified and
will be subject to the agreement of Cumbria County Historic Environment Service and the
client.

3.2.10 Advice will also be sought as to whether a soil micromorphological study or any other
analytical techniques will enhance the understanding of the site formation processes,
including the amount of truncation to buried deposits and the preservation of deposits within
negative features. Should this be required the costs for analysis have been provided as a
contingency.

3.2.11 **Faunal remains:** if there is found to be the potential for discovery of bones of fish and small
mammals, a sieving programme will be carried out. These will be assessed as appropriate by
OA North’s specialist in faunal remains and, subject to the results, there may be a requirement
for more detailed analysis. A contingency has been included for the assessment of potential
for analysis of such faunal remains.

3.2.12 **Treasure:** any gold and silver artefacts recovered during the course of the evaluation will be
removed to a safe place and reported to the local Coroner according to the procedures relating
to the Treasure Act, 1996. Where removal cannot take place on the same working day as
discovery, suitable security will be employed to protect the finds from theft.

3.2.13 **Human Remains:** any human remains uncovered will be left in situ, covered and protected.
No further investigation will continue beyond that required to establish the date and character
of the burial. Cumbria County Historic Environment Service and the local Coroner will be
informed immediately. If removal is essential, the exhumation of any funerary remains will
require the provision of a Home Office license, under section 25 of the Burial Act of 1857. An
application will be made by OA North for the study area on discovery of any such remains
and the removal will be carried out with due care and sensitivity under the environmental
health regulations.

3.2.14 **Reinstatement:** it is understood that there will be no requirement for reinstatement of the
ground beyond backfilling. The ground will be backfilled, and the ground will be roughly
graded with the machine.
3.3 **ARCHIVE PREPARATION AND REPORT PRODUCTION**

3.3.1 *Archive*: the results of all archaeological work carried out will form the basis for a full archive to professional standards, in accordance with current English Heritage guidelines (*Management of Archaeological Projects*, 2nd edition, 1991). The project archive represents the collation and indexing of all the data and material gathered during the course of the project. It will include summary processing and analysis of all features, finds, or palaeoenvironmental data recovered during fieldwork, which will be catalogued by context.

3.3.2 The deposition of a properly ordered and indexed project archive in an appropriate repository is considered an essential and integral element of all archaeological projects by the IFA in that organisation's code of conduct. OA North conforms to best practice in the preparation of project archives for long-term storage. This archive will be provided in the English Heritage Centre for Archaeology format and a synthesis will be submitted to the Cumbria HER (the index to the archive and a copy of the report). OA North practice is to deposit the original record archive of projects with the appropriate County Record Office.

3.3.3 The deposition and disposal of any artefacts recovered in the evaluation will be agreed with the legal owner and an appropriate recipient museum. Cumbria County Historic Environment Service will be notified of the arrangements made.

3.3.4 Except for items subject to the Treasure Act, all artefacts found during the course of the project will be donated to the receiving museum.

3.3.5 *Report*: one bound and one unbound copy of a written synthetic report will be submitted to the client, and a further three copies submitted to the Cumbria HER within eight weeks of completion. The report will include:

- a site location plan related to the national grid
- a front cover to include the planning application number and the NGR
- the dates on which the fieldwork was undertaken
- a concise, non-technical summary of the results
- an explanation to any agreed variations to the brief, including any justification for any analyses not undertaken
- a description of the methodology employed, work undertaken and results obtained
- plans and sections at an appropriate scale showing the location and position of deposits and finds located
- a list of and dates for any finds recovered and a description and interpretation of the deposits identified
- a description of any environmental or other specialist work undertaken and the results obtained
- An assessment of the likely impact of the proposed development on areas of known and predicted archaeology
- a copy of this project design, and indications of any agreed departure from that design
- the report will also include a complete bibliography of sources from which data has been derived.
3.3.6 The evaluation will provide a predictive model of surviving archaeological remains detailing zones of relative importance against known development proposals. In this way, an impact assessment will also be provided.

3.3.7 Recommendations concerning any subsequent mitigation strategies and/or further archaeological work following the results of the field evaluation will not be included, although this may be outlined to Cumbria County Historic Environment Service in a separate communication.

3.3.8 This report will be in the same basic format as this project design; a copy of the report can be provided on CD, if required.

3.3.9 The Arts and Humanities Data Service (AHDS) online database project Online Access to index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) will be completed as part of the archiving phase of the project.

3.3.10 Confidentiality: the final report is designed as a document for the specific use of the Client, and should be treated as such; it is not suitable for publication as an academic report, or otherwise, without amendment or revision. Any requirement to revise or reorder the material for submission or presentation to third parties beyond the project brief and project design, or for any other explicit purpose, can be fulfilled, but will require separate discussion and funding.

3.4 OTHER MATTERS

3.4.1 Health and Safety: OA North provides a Health and Safety Statement for all projects and maintains a Unit Safety policy; further details are presented in Appendix 1. All site procedures are in accordance with the guidance set out in the Health and Safety Manual compiled by the Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers (1997). A written risk assessment will be undertaken in advance of project commencement and copies will be made available on request to all interested parties. OA North uses a CAT-Scan device prior to any excavation to test for services as a matter of course, and will pay particular attention to the service information supplied by the Client. All OA North staff will be equipped with hard hats, safety boots, and high-visibility jackets.

3.4.2 Contingencies: the costings attached towards the rear of this document has not allowed for either the installation of secure fencing, nor the use of a mechanical breaker to remove hard-standing surface. It is anticipated that the site will be securely fenced from the public prior to the commencement of any archaeological works. OA North can supply and erect appropriate fencing if required, although this will be subject to additional costing.

3.4.3 Insurance: the insurance in respect of claims for personal injury to or the death of any person under a contract of service with the unit and arising out of an in the course of such person's employment shall comply with the employers' liability (Compulsory Insurance) Act 1969 and any statutory orders made there under. For all other claims to cover the liability of OA North, in respect of personal injury or damage to property by negligence of OA North or any of its employees, there applies the insurance cover of £2m for any one occurrence or series of occurrences arising out of one event.

3.4.4 Monitoring: it is recommended that a representative of Cumbria County Historic Environment Service and other interested parties are invited to view the archaeological evaluation during the course of the fieldwork.
4 WORK TIMETABLE

4.1 A one week period should be allowed to excavate, record and backfill the evaluation trenches.

4.2 A report will be submitted within six weeks of the completion of the fieldwork.

5 STAFFING PROPOSALS

5.1.1 The project will be under the overall charge of Ian Miller BA (OA North Project Manager) to whom all correspondence should be addressed.

5.1.2 The will be undertaken by Vix Hughes BSc (OA North Project Officer). Vix has considerable experience of archaeological evaluations and excavations, and has directed numerous such projects throughout the North West. Vix will be assisted by at least one technician, although extra staff can be called upon if required.

5.1.3 Assessment of the finds from the evaluation will be undertaken by OA North's in-house finds specialist Sean McPhillips BA (OA North Project Officer). Sean acts as OA North's in-house finds specialist, and has an extensive knowledge of all finds of all periods from archaeological sites in northern England.

5.1.4 Assessment of any palaeoenvironmental samples will be undertaken by, or under the auspices of, Elizabeth Huckerby MSc (OA North Project Officer). Elizabeth has extensive knowledge of the palaeoecology of the North West through her work on the English Heritage-funded North West Wetlands Survey.
### APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY CONTEXT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Number</th>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Current surface - tarmac, hardcore, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Layer - dark greyish brown, clayey silt; old soil horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Layer - mid greyish brown clayey silt; natural subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Layer - mid orangey brown, silty clay; natural drift geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill - dark black silt, 65% bricks, sandstone, slate, concrete, fill of 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cut - regular, soakaway, 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer - patch of 101 not removed by machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cut - for water pipe service, 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - concrete, inside shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - corroding iron, inside shed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 4: SUMMARY FINDS LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Cxt</th>
<th>OR no</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yellow-glazed pancheon</td>
<td>18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blackware</td>
<td>18th-19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plant pot</td>
<td>19th-20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nottingham-type stoneware</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pearlware plate</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mottled ware</td>
<td>17th-18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trailed slipware</td>
<td>18th-19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Red earthenware</td>
<td>18th-19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moulded creamware</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transfer-printed pearlware</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transfer-printed ware</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transfer-printed white earthenware</td>
<td>20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transfer-printed white earthenware</td>
<td>1930-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staffordshire type slipware</td>
<td>18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brown-glazed earthenware</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sheep goat metatarsal</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sheep/goat mandibular molar</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sheep/pig pelvis; butchered</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chicken femur</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large mammal rib; butchered</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sheep/goat mandibular molar</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sheep/goat longbone shaft</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Clay tobacco pipe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pipe stems</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lacquered button</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blackware rim</td>
<td>18th-19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?Spode bowl/cup rim</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brown-glazed earthenware</td>
<td>18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Building material</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Building material</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tile</td>
<td>20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Slipware</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brown-glazed red earthenware</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>White earthenware</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blackware</td>
<td>18th-19th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: Plan and North-facing Section of Trench 4
Figure 7: Section of sondage in Trench 2. St 104/105 in Trench 2 and of sondage in Trench 3.
Plate 1: General view of the site, looking east
Plate 2: Trench 1, looking north-east
Plate 3: Trench 2, looking north
Plate 4: Trench 2 close up of soakaway fill 104, looking west
Plate 5: Trench 3, showing water pipe 107, looking east
Plate 6: Trench 4, looking south-east