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SUMMARY

In March 2007, Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) carried out an archaeological evaluation of land immediately adjacent to Radcliffe Tower, Greater Manchester (centred on SD 7957 0750), on behalf of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council Children’s Services. The remains of Radcliffe Tower are designated of national architectural or historical significance as a Grade I Listed Building and Scheduled Monument (SM 27585), and the archaeological evaluation was required to inform and support an application for Scheduled Monument Consent to remove a modern haulage road that crosses the designated area. The evaluation was intended to establish the presence, nature, depth, and extent of any archaeological remains buried beneath the haulage road, and was carried out under the terms of Class 7 Consent.

The evaluation comprised the excavation of three short trenches, which examined a combined total area of 40m$^2$. The position of the trenches was targeted on features depicted in documentary sources, and with reference to an archaeological investigation of the site carried out in 1979-80 (Tyson 1985). Trenches 1 and 3 each measured 5m in length, and Trench 2 was 15m in length. In broad terms, the same stratigraphic sequence was encountered in Trenches 1 and 2, comprising the uppermost surface of significant archaeological deposits overlain by a series of modern surfacing and associated make-up layers, on average 0.9m in depth. The earliest archaeological features exposed probably dated to the medieval period, and included a fine cobbled surface that was revealed at a depth of 1m below the modern ground surface in Trench 1, and a possible foundation for a timber crook and a hearth associated with the great hall connected to Radcliffe Tower at depths of 1.1m and 0.99m respectively in Trench 2. Features relating to the use of the site as a farm complex during the post-medieval period were also identified. Trench 3, placed along the haulage road to the south of Radcliffe Tower, was devoid of archaeological features, reflecting its position beyond the focus of archaeological activity.

The evaluation demonstrated that significant and well-preserved buried remains survive beneath the haulage road, highlighting the considerable archaeological potential of the site. Surviving in situ remains interpreted as representing elements of the medieval timber-framed great hall are of particular interest. These remains, however, lie at some depth below the modern ground surface and are sealed by a series of levelling layers. It is therefore likely that the proposed removal of the haulage road would have a negligible archaeological impact.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PROJECT

1.1.1 In May 2006, Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) was requested by Mr Tim Pope of King Sturge LLP, acting on behalf of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council Children’s Services, to submit a project design for an archaeological evaluation of land adjacent to Radcliffe Tower in Greater Manchester (SD 7957 0750). Radcliffe Tower was built in the early 15th century as part of a major remodelling of a manor house that existed on the site, and its remains are now designated as a Grade I Listed Building and a Scheduled Monument (SM 27585).

1.1.2 It has been proposed that a modern haulage road, which presently crosses the designated area immediately to the west of Radcliffe Tower, is removed as part of a scheme designed to enhance the site; despite the cultural heritage potential of the site, public access is restricted, largely due to issues associated with the use of land to the south for landfill. The archaeological evaluation was required to inform and support an application for Scheduled Monument Consent to implement the removal of the haulage road, and was carried out in accordance with the terms of Class 7 Consent. This report presents the results of this fieldwork in the form of a short document, followed by a statement of the archaeological potential of the site.

1.2 LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

1.2.1 The study area lies within the historic core of Radcliffe (SD 7957 0750), which is approximately 1km east of the modern town centre, and some 4km to the south of Bury, Greater Manchester (Fig 1). It is located on the northern bank of a loop of the river Irwell, which encompasses three sides of the historic settlement. In addition to the Tower, medieval Radcliffe also incorporated the church of St Mary and St Bartholomew, which lies a short distance to the east of the study area (Fig 2). The land to the south has been quarried for gravel and, more recently, was used as a landfill site.

1.2.2 Topographically, Radcliffe lies within the Manchester Pennine fringe, a transitional zone between the open moorlands of the Dark Peak and the Millstone Grit uplands of the Southern Pennines and the densely populated urban conurbation of Manchester (Countryside Commission 1998, 121). The area owes much of its landscape character to the pronounced landform with deeply incised steep valley sides and localised woodlands (op cit, 122). Radcliffe Tower is situated on the first terrace above a flood plain in a loop of the river Irwell, below its confluence with the river Roch, and lies at a height of 68m above Ordnance Datum (aOD).

1.2.3 The underlying drift geology of the area comprises alluvial sands and gravels overlying Carboniferous Coal Measures (British Geological Survey of England and Wales). The solid geology consists of weak sandstones and mudstones (Clinton and Higgs 1997).
1.3 **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

1.3.1 *Introduction:* a summary historical and archaeological background of Radcliffe has been compiled in order to place the results obtained from the archaeological evaluation into a wider context. This focuses on the medieval and post-medieval periods, although there is important archaeological evidence for activity in the area during earlier periods. In particular, a considerable assemblage of artefacts of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic date have been recovered from a prehistoric camp on the E’es, a level plain of mud flats situated to the north of the river Irwell and approximately 1.5km to the east of Radcliffe Tower (Spencer 1951, 197 *et seq*). In addition, excavations behind the cemetery in Radcliffe in 1951 uncovered a disk barrow, although no associated inhumations were identified (Sunderland 1995).

1.3.2 Firm archaeological evidence for Roman activity in Radcliffe is scant, although Margary (1957, 102) argued that a Roman road crossed the Irwell in Radcliffe at a point some ‘150 yards to the west of the ruined Radcliffe Tower’. This postulation has been supported by Sunderland (1995, 11), whilst Taylor (1904, 138-9) argued that ‘the Romans had a camp or small station’ on the line of the road at Radcliffe. The recovery of several sherds of Roman pottery from the E’es adds weight to this postulation (Spencer 1951, 197), although firm evidence is lacking.

1.3.3 The period following the Roman military occupation saw the inhabitants of the region attempt to continue the Roman way of life. Remains that date to this period are rare, and much evidence is based on place names, topographical elements, such as curved churchyards, and surviving stonework, such as cross fragments and architectural detailing in buildings (Newman 1996). There is relatively little known about the area around Radcliffe during this period, as with many other places in the region. The name Radcliffe comes from the Old Norse for *rauðr* meaning red and *kleif* meaning cliff; ‘Red cliff’ almost certainly derived from outcrops of red sandstone visible along the river Irwell (Ekwall 1922).

1.3.4 Radcliffe is recorded in the Domesday Survey of 1086 as ‘Radeclive’, a manor held by Edward the Confessor prior to the Norman Conquest (Farrer and Brownbill 1908). It was part of the Salford Hundred, and was one of only four places in the Hundred to be mentioned (Morris 1978). After the Conquest, Radcliffe was given to Nicholas FitzGilbert de Talbois, who adopted the name of his new manor as his surname, thus becoming Nicholas de Radcliffe; it is thought that the de Radcliffe family has been associated with the town since the mid-12th century (Barton 1973, 225-7).

1.3.5 During the medieval period the settlement at Radcliffe probably constituted a small hamlet. The church of St Mary and St Bartholomew (SMR 9450.1.0 – GM10590) is listed as one of the earliest buildings in Radcliffe by Farrer and Brownbill (1908, 63): ‘The oldest details of the building are the piers supporting the chancel arch, which are of 13th-century date, but it is possible that the four angles of the nave may belong to an older church dating from the 12th century.’
1.3.6 Throughout the medieval period, the region was engaged in two main activities; agriculture and the production of woollen textiles. However, the 14th century was a period of extreme hardship, with a downturn in the climate and plagues amongst both the human and animal populations. As a result, many settlements throughout Britain experienced depopulation accompanied by abandoned dwellings, and in rural areas the ‘desertion’ of villages. The impact within Radcliffe is not known, but given its reliance economically on sheep for wool, it is likely that houses and areas of land would have fallen into disrepair and disuse (Kenyon 1991).

1.3.7 Earthwork depressions and crop marks to the east of Radcliffe Tower, towards Blackford Bridge (SMR No 2890.1.0), appear to represent buildings, including several crofts, ponds, and a track, which may cumulatively represent the remains of a medieval hamlet. A hollow way that is likely to preserve the line of a medieval road is also visible, and appears to be a south-westerly continuation of Roach Street (SMR No 2923.1). There is a crossing over the river Roch from Roach Street via the 17th-century Blackford Bridge, which is thought to represent the site of an earlier river crossing (SMR No 2993.1). Another important element of the historic landscape is the tithe barn, a 17th-century Grade II listed building, which lies to the north of the Tower on Tithe Barn Street (SMR 1601.0).

1.3.8 **Radcliffe Tower:** the origins of Radcliffe Tower can be traced to 1403, when James de Radcliffe received from the King a ‘licence to crenellate’ his manor house, as part of an ambitious rebuilding project (Arrowsmith nd, 2-3). Under the terms of the licence, James was permitted to erect a new great hall, two towers, and an outer enclosure wall. The finished complex only comprised a single stone tower (the present structure), together with a timber and plaster great hall, and a stone outer enclosure wall (Tindall 1981). The character and position of the manor house prior to these improvements is unclear, although it seems likely that it will have featured a timber-framed hall, and there is evidence to suggest that this originally stood on the site of the later buildings (Tyson 1985).

1.3.9 The Tower is built of sandstone blocks and although it is without a roof it survives to a substantial degree. The dimensions of the internal area of the building are 12.2m by 5.5m, and it survives to an overall height of 8.5m (Scheduled Monument Record 27585). The walls measure 1.5m at the base, but vary from 1.8m to 1.9m where there are surviving plinths around the building and reinforced segments for a staircase in the south-west corner. On the eastern side there are two window openings, a central fireplace, and a flue built into the wall. On the opposite western wall is a central doorway with a pointed arch and rolled moulding detail, and a second probable door way to the south at first floor level. In the northern and southern walls are larger windows with arched fireplaces below; these are replicated on the external faces of the north and south walls, perhaps for show (Arrowsmith nd, 9).

1.3.10 Stylistically, the Tower is of a type known as a ‘pele’ tower, a form of medieval fortification most commonly associated with the Border region between England and Scotland. The defensive design may have been in response to the economic depression and instability that characterised the
North of England during the 14th and early 15th centuries (Winchester 1987), but it is also likely to have been partially a reflection of the wealth and importance of the Radcliffe estate. Interestingly, in 1469, Edward IV granted Sir Thomas Pilkington a licence to ‘kernal and embattle’ his manor house at Bury, which similarly transformed his moated manor house to Bury Castle (Barton 1973).

1.3.11 There is some evidence to suggest that the Tower was originally three storeys high, and was recorded as such by Captain Roger Dewhurst, who visited the site in 1784 and sketched the building (BA ZZ/442/1). An engraving of the site, dated 1781 (MCL L1/60/2/111), similarly depicts the Tower to have been taller than the present structure. The engraving also features the contemporary two-storey timber-framed great hall abutting the western elevation of the Tower, and an L-shaped wing at the western end.

1.3.12 The great hall was described by the historian Thomas Whitaker in c 1800, who noted that it measured approximately 13.1m long, and varied from 7.9m to 8.5m wide (Whitaker 1876, 291). The fabric of the surviving western external face of the Tower still retains the outline of a gabled roof, which presumably represents the great hall; from the position of this outline, it may be inferred that the great hall was some 11.5m high (Arrowsmith nd, 15). Little is known about the west wing, although there is some evidence to suggest that it consisted of at least two adjoining buildings that had been constructed at different dates (op cit, l6).

1.3.13 Archaeological evidence has demonstrated that the outer enclosure wall, built as part of the ‘licence to crenellate’, probably replaced an earlier boundary ditch that was approximately 7m wide and 1.5m deep (Tyson 1980). This was backfilled during the construction work of the early 15th century and replaced by a rubble wall on a parallel alignment, which had a foundation measuring some 1.44m wide. The wall was placed approximately 3m beyond the earlier ditch, and was associated with an outer ditch, which was approximately 7m wide and 1m deep (Tyson 1985).
The site continued to be occupied by the descendants of James de Radcliffe until 1517, when the manor was passed to a distant relative, Lord FitzWalter. In 1529, he was made the Earl of Sussex, and it would seem unlikely that he would have paid regular visits to the Radcliffe estate thereafter (Arrowsmith nd, 17). In 1561, the manor was sold to the Assheton family of Middleton Hall, who leased the manor house of Radcliffe and its lands to local tenant farmers. This arrangement continued under the ownership of the Earls of Wilton, who acquired the Radcliffe estate in the second half of the 18th century through the marriage of Eleanor Assheton to Sir Thomas Egerton of Heaton, Lord Grey de Wilton (Farrer and Brownbill 1908). The site is shown on a map of Radcliffe, dated to 1767 (GMRO E7/18/5/2), which depicts the Tower, its adjoining buildings, and a square-shaped boundary (Section 4.1.2 below).

The great hall was still extant in the early 19th century, when it was described by an eyewitness: ‘the ancient hall is of wood, with mossy oak uprights and beams’ (Baines 1836, 14). At this date, the main hall was used as a barn, and the western end of the west wing was occupied as a dwelling. These elements of the site, however, were demolished during the early 1830s, leaving the remains of the Tower as an isolated structure. It was reduced in height, the upper part was used as a hay loft, and the arched fireplaces in the east and south walls dismantled to provide access into the building for carts or animals; these apertures have since been blocked up. The Tower continued to be used as a farm outbuilding until the 1950s (Arrowsmith nd, 18), after which date it was consolidated and designated a Scheduled Monument.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

In 1979-80, the Bury Archaeological Group carried out an important archaeological investigation of land immediately to the west of Radcliffe Tower, within the area designated as part of the Scheduled Monument. This work was undertaken to assess the impact of a proposal to construct the haulage road to the landfill site situated to the south. In total, seven trenches were excavated (Trenches A-G; Fig 2), and four main phases of archaeological activity were identified. The earliest remains were of a medieval date, and comprised a rubble foundation and an associated ditch or large pit (Tyson 1985). The ditch, exposed in Trench C (Fig 2), was 7m wide and 1.5m deep, and aligned east/west.

The second phase of activity was considered to represent the documented rebuilding of the manor house in c 1403, incorporating the construction of the stone-built enclosure wall and associated ditch, and an enlarged courtyard. The enclosure wall was placed parallel and to the north of the original ditch, and was 1.44m wide. Another ditch, some 7m wide and 1m deep and seemingly associated with the enclosure wall, was revealed further to the north.

Phase 3, dated broadly to 1500-1730, was represented by the construction of the timber-framed west wing, the evidence for which was provided by low sandstone foundation walls at right angles to the Tower. The ditch associated
with the enclosure wall was considered to have been infilled during this period, an action which may have been associated with the construction of an enlarged courtyard.

1.4.4 The final phase, 1730-1840, encompassed the remodelling of the timber-framed buildings for the use by tenant farmers, and their eventual demolition. Evidence for the construction of later buildings, presumably associated with the use of the site as a farm complex, was also identified.

1.4.5 The excavations produced only a small assemblage of artefacts, although this included five sherds of medieval pottery. Other groups of artefacts recovered from the trenches included fragments of slipware pottery of a 17th-century date, and sherds of tin-glazed earthenware and imported stoneware vessels. Other finds included fragments of clay tobacco pipes, glass, lead, iron, and copper. Three flint objects, considered to be of prehistoric origin, were also recovered, providing a reminder of the proximity of the Tower to the Palaeolithic/Mesolithic camp on the E’es (Section 1.3.1 above).
2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 The archaeological fieldwork comprised the excavation of three evaluation trenches, which were placed across the present haulage road, in accordance with the project design (Appendix 1); the trenches were not extended into any other parts of the Scheduled Monument. The trenches had a total combined length of 25m, and were placed in the positions shown in Figure 2. Trench 1 was targeted on the projected line of a ditch exposed during the excavations of 1979-80 (Tyson 1985, 41), Trench 2 was placed adjacent to the entrance to Radcliffe Tower and across the postulated site of the great hall, and Trench 3 was intended to establish the presence or absence of archaeological features to the south of the tower, particularly an apparent wall depicted on a map of 1767 (Section 4.1.2 below).

2.2 FIELDWORK

2.2.1 Excavation of the uppermost levels of modern surfacing was undertaken by a machine fitted with a toothless ditching bucket to the top of the first significant archaeological level; this work was supervised by a suitably experienced archaeologist. Thereafter, all deposits were cleaned manually to define their extent and nature, although all significant archaeological deposits were left in situ and unexcavated. Spoil from the excavation was stored adjacent to the trench, and was backfilled in a stratigraphic manner upon completion of the archaeological works. The base of each trench was covered with a geo-textile membrane prior to backfilling.

2.2.2 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.

2.2.3 Results of the evaluation were recorded on pro-forma sheets. 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, as well as colour transparency, and all frames included a visible, graduated metric scale. Extensive use of digital photography was also made throughout the course of the fieldwork for presentation purposes.

2.2.4 The precise location of the evaluation trenches was surveyed by EDM tacheometry using a Leica TR407 total station linked to a pen computer data logger. This process generated scaled plans within AutoCAD software, which have then subject to manual survey enhancement. All information was tied in to Ordnance Datum and relevant topographic features.
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 English Heritage guidelines (*The Management of Archaeological Projects, 2nd edition, 1991*) and the *Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long Term Storage* (UKIC 1990). The project archive includes summary processing and analysis of all features and finds recovered during fieldwork, which will be catalogued by context.

2.3.2 The paper and finds archive for the archaeological work undertaken at the site will be deposited with the nearest museum which meets Museums’ and Galleries’ Commission criteria for the long term storage of archaeological material (MGC 1992). This archive will be provided in the English Heritage Centre for Archaeology format, both as a printed document and on computer disks as ASCII files (as appropriate).

2.3.3 A synthesis (in the form of the index to the archive and a copy of the publication report) will be deposited with the Greater Manchester Sites and Monuments Record. A copy of the index to the archive will also be available for deposition in the National Archaeological Record in London and the National Monuments Record, Swindon.
3. EVALUATION RESULTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 The following section details the results obtained from the evaluation, and is presented in trench order; summary context descriptions can be found in Appendix 2. The trenches were intended to establish the presence/absence, nature, depth, and extent of any buried archaeological remains to inform an application for Scheduled Monument Consent. Archaeological remains of interest were encountered in situ within Trench 1 and Trench 2, at an average depth of 1m below the modern ground surface (Figs 3 and 4), whilst Trench 3 was devoid of any significant deposits.

3.2 TRENCH 1

3.2.1 Trench 1 was located at the northern end of the haulage road (Plate 1), and was targeted on the projected alignment of a ditch exposed during the archaeological investigations carried out in 1979-80. The trench was oriented north/south, and was excavated to a length of 5.08m and a maximum depth of 1.07m.

3.2.2 The earliest deposit identified within the trench was a mid-brown silty-clay layer (120). This layer had an even fine texture, and contained numerous darker brown compact sandy-lenses, consistent with natural iron pan formation. Layer 120 corresponded to 142 in Trench 2 to the south, and seemingly represented the natural drift geology.

3.2.3 The natural geology was overlain by a fine cobbled surface (119), which extended along the length of the trench on the western side but had been truncated to the north-east (Plate 2). The surface was formed of densely packed rounded pebbles/cobbles, mostly 0.05m diameter, but with some ranging up to 0.12m diameter. The surface had been subject to a degree of compaction and wear, although there was no clear indication for it having ever been repaired or modified. Surface 119 was overlain by a thin layer of grey silty-clay (118) which appeared to be material trampled onto the surface, representing occupation of the site. The dating of this putative occupation was hampered by an absence of finds from surface 119 and layer 118, although it would seem likely that they were of late medieval/early post-medieval origin.
3.2.4 Within the western part of the trench, layer 118 was overlain by a thin deposit of mid-brown silty-clay (117), similar in texture and consistency to layer 120, and may have represented the re-deposition of this natural deposit. The fine texture of the layer suggested that it had accrued gradually, rather than having been dumped as a single episode. Layer 117 did not extend across the eastern part of surface 119, where it was partially overlain by a thin pale grey deposit (128). Layer 128 contained fragments of mortar and stone, suggesting that it may have derived from the collapse or demolition of a building. No finds were recovered from any of these layers.

3.2.5 Layers 117 and 128 were sealed by a sequence of contemporary layers that had seemingly been deposited as levelling for a substantial surface, representing a remodelling of the site. The levelling layers (116, 115, 127, 124, and 114) contained compacted brick rubble, clinker, and fragments of stone. These layers were sealed in the north-eastern corner of the trench by a spread of medium-sized rounded cobbles (123), averaging 0.06m x 0.10m in size, and exposed at a depth of 0.48m below the modern ground surface. These cobbles had been deliberately laid, probably representing the vestiges of a formerly more extensive surface, which was perhaps associated with the use of the site as a farm complex.

3.2.6 Whilst cobbled surface 123 did not extend across the entire trench, its associated levelling layers were cut by two features, representing more recent activity. Feature 126 was a sizeable intervention, over 0.8m deep, with very regular and straight sides. It was filled with a mixed deposit (125), which included numerous small fragments of stone and brick. The second feature comprised a curvi-linear cut (122) with straight sides and a flat base, which contained an iron water pipe. This service trench was aligned approximately north/south, and was 0.27m wide and 0.6m deep. Both features were sealed by a short sequence of foundation levelling (113 and 112) for a modern tarmac road surface (111). The levelling layers were separated by a sheet of terram, presumably laid to protect the underlying archaeological deposits, and dating the road surface to the late 20th century. The uppermost layer comprised another tarmac surface (110), which formed the surface of the modern haulage road.

3.3 Trench 2

3.3.1 Trench 2 was placed to the south of Trench 1, directly opposite the doorway into Radcliffe Tower, and crossing the footprint of the former timber-framed great hall (Fig 2). The trench was oriented north/south, measured 15m by 1.6m, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 2.05m (65.44 aOD). Significant archaeological remains were exposed at a depth of 0.99m below the modern ground surface, and have been interpreted as the remains of the great hall.

3.3.2 The earliest deposit identified was a mid-brown silty-clay layer (142), which occurred intermittently throughout the length of the trench (Fig 4). The material was of an even fine texture with what appeared to be darker brown compact sandy lenses, consistent with possible iron pan formation and flecks
of manganese. The layer was similar to 120 in Trench 1, and almost certainly represented the natural geology. The surface of this layer was exposed at a depth of 1.13m below the modern ground level.

3.3.3 A deposit of mid-reddish-pink clay (141) overlay the natural geology within the central part of the trench (Plate 5), at a depth of 0.99m below the modern ground surface. This 0.04m thick deposit was slightly mounded and measured 1.6m by 0.7m, and continued eastwards beyond the limit of the excavated trench. The darker colour and slightly brittle texture of the clay implied that it had been subjected to high temperatures, which was reinforced by a distinct discolouration of layer 142 in the vicinity of 141. These factors suggested feature 141 to have been the remains of a hearth, whilst its position implied that it had been inside the great hall.

3.3.4 A square-shaped feature (151), exposed at a depth of 1.07m in the southern part of the trench, had been cut into the natural geology. It measured 1.6m long by over 0.8m wide, with a depth in excess of 0.1m, and contained several sandstone blocks (146), the largest of which measured 0.8m x 0.2m (Plate 6). These were all roughly hewn, but nevertheless of a regular shape, and had clearly been carefully positioned. The material (145) in-between the individual stones contained fragments of thin slabs of angular sandstone and mortar flecking, representing packing. The position of feature 151 corresponded broadly with scars on the surviving fabric of the Tower, raising the possibility that it represented a foundation pad for a structural timber of the great hall.

3.3.5 A culvert (137) of stone and brick construction was exposed at the northern end of Trench 2, at a depth of 0.99m (Plate 7). This 0.8m wide structure was aligned north-west/south-east, and had been cut into the natural geology (142). It was composed of up to four courses of small, roughly hewn stone blocks along the western side, with mould-thrown bricks forming the eastern side (Plate 8), although it is possible that the brick component represented a later repair. The flat capping of the culvert comprised sandstone slabs, creating an internal channel that was approximately 0.3m deep and 0.2m wide. The culvert contained a 0.05m thick mid-brown deposit (149).

3.3.6 The culvert was cut by a linear feature (150) which was aligned north-east/south-west and measured over 12m long, 1.4m wide, and in excess of 0.3m
deep (Plate 3). It was filled with a mid-brown sandy gravel material (144), which overlay a mixed silty-clay (143) with gravel inclusions. A small sherd of post-medieval pottery, which has been dated to the late 18th or 19th century was recovered from layer 144. Deposit 143 contained flecks of reddish clay, which may have been derived from hearth 141. Feature 150 could was not excavated in its entirety, and its intended function remains unclear, although it was almost certainly post-medieval in date.

3.3.7 Another linear feature (140) truncated much of the eastern side of feature 150. Excavation revealed feature 140 to be a foundation trench for a ceramic land drain (Plate 5). This was similarly aligned north-east/south-west and measured over 11m long, 0.38m wide, and over 0.4m deep. The segmented components of the land drain were unglazed, and a small sherd of blue and white transfer-printed ware vessel of a probable 19th-century date was recovered from the backfill (139). The drain was presumably inserted after the timber-framed hall had been demolished, and was used to aid drainage of the land while in use for agricultural purposes.

3.3.8 A deposit of compacted rubble, hardcore, and tarmac (135) sealed drain 140 (Plate 4). It contained numerous brick fragments, stones, and clinker, and was overlain by a thin layer of hardcore (148), although this was only identified in the central part of the trench, and presumably represented the levelling of a hollow in the ground surface. Above that was an extensive layer of brick rubble (134), which was equivalent to 114 in Trench 1, and varied in depth, with the extreme northern and southern visible ends being up to 0.45m thick. Fragments of brick formed the main component of this layer, and these varied from mould-thrown to modern machine-made variants, with frogs and stamped ‘Accrington’. This layer possibly represented the demolition of structures during the 20th century.

3.3.9 Overlying brick rubble 134, but again confined to the central part of the trench, was a thin layer of tarmac (133), which must have been a partial surface at some point. This was sealed by two layers of hardcore, identical to those seen in Trench 1 (with 132 equating to 113; and 131 equating to 112), and then at the top of the sequence two layers of tarmac forming the current surface (with 130 equating to 111; and 129 equating to 110).

3.4 TRENCH 3

3.4.1 Trench 3 was placed to the south of Trench 2 (Fig 2), and was intended to investigate a boundary wall depicted on a plan of 1767 (Section 4.2.1 below). The trench was oriented north/south, measured 5m by 1.6m, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.16m (65.92m aOD). No archaeological features were identified within the trench, and no artefacts were recovered.

3.4.2 The earliest deposit encountered within this trench was a mixed mid-brown silty-sand (107), which contained a small proportion of rounded stones (Fig 8). This layer was similar to the natural geology exposed in Trenches 1 and 2 (layers 120 and 142 respectively), but was much more mixed and appeared to have been disturbed; it was identified only in the southern half of the trench.
Directly above this layer was a mottled, dark blackish-brown deposit (106), which became thicker towards the northern end of the trench. It contained a large proportion of clinker, which had presumably been imported to the site as a levelling material. It was overlain by a compacted but uneven layer of brick rubble, gravel, and lenses of sand (105), which was similarly likely to have been intended as levelling (Plate 10).

Layer 105 was cut by a linear trench (109), which contained a rubber water pipe, indicating this to have been a modern intervention. The cut was aligned approximately north-west/south-east, and measured 0.4m wide and over 0.5m deep. The trench was backfilled with rubble 108, which was sealed by another make-up layer (104). This contained a large proportion of small brick fragments and stone chippings. Above this was a layer of grey gravel, 103, and a thin layer (102) of compacted brick rubble (which could be equivalent to 114 in Trench 1 and 134 in Trench 2).

Towards the top of the sequence was a layer of pinkish-grey hardcore (101), which was directly equivalent to 112 in Trench 1, and 131 in Trench 2; this material was deposited in c 1980. The uppermost deposits were the two layers of tarmac, numbered as 100 for ease of recording in this trench, but directly equivalent to 110 and 111 in Trench 1, and 129 and 130 in Trench 2. These formed the present road surface.

### 3.5 Finds

3.5.1 In total, six fragments of artefacts were recovered from a total of three contexts in Trench 2 (135, 139, and 144). The assemblage comprised exclusively ceramic vessel fragments, all of which may be dated to the later post-medieval period, with other classes of material being absent. All finds were treated in accordance with standard OA North practice.

3.5.2 In general terms, the material was in poor condition, and all fragments were clearly abraded and rolled. The pottery comprised fragments of kitchen and tablewares, although all sherds were too small to furnish details of their form. The assemblage is of very limited archaeological significance and can add little to the interpretation of the site.

### 3.6 Palaeo-environmental Sampling

3.6.1 The excavated trenches provided no opportunity for the implementation of any meaningful palaeo-environmental sampling strategy; the excavated deposits had clearly sustained truncation and contamination from the intrusive material of modern origin, and there were no deposits considered suitable for the survival of biological material. These factors meant that the deposits exposed within the excavated trenches had a low potential for soil micromorphology or phosphate analysis.
4. INTERPRETATION

4.1 INTERPRETATION

4.1.1 The evaluation was necessarily limited in its scope, intended primarily to ascertain the presence or absence of any buried archaeological remains beneath the modern haulage road, and assess the impact of removing the road from the Scheduled Area. Nevertheless, significant in situ archaeological remains were encountered and a sequence of deposits was identified, to which broad phasing may be attributed. The presence of these remains highlight the considerable potential of the site, and its importance as a cultural heritage asset.

4.1.2 Phase 1: the earliest remains encountered in Trench 1 comprised metalled surface 119 and potential occupation deposit 118. Whilst it was not excavated, surface 119 had seemingly been laid directly onto the natural geology, thereby representing a primary phase of activity on the site. The character of the surface suggested that it had been external to any buildings, whilst its position corresponds with an enclosed area, perhaps a courtyard, depicted on the map of Radcliffe Tower of 1767.

4.1.3 It seems likely that the hearth and foundation pad exposed in Trench 2 similarly represented an early phase of activity on the site. These were both located within the projected footprint of the great hall, and had almost certainly been associated with this structure. Whilst the absence of any artefacts from these deposits hampered absolute dating, it is considered likely that they represented the occupation of the site during the later medieval period (after 1403), although the possibility that they had been associated with the earlier manor house cannot be discounted. These remains are of particular interest as their presence suggests that the size and form of the timber-framed great hall could potentially be elucidated from buried remains across the site.

4.1.4 Layers 117 and 128 (Trench 1) may have represented a subsequent period of reduced activity, and whilst it is tempting to associate this with Lord FitzWalter’s ownership of the site in the 16th century, firm evidence is lacking.
4.1.5 **Phase 2:** the deposition of the sequence of levelling deposits and associated cobbled surface 123 in Trench 1 probably represented a period of remodelling, and a separate phase in the evolution of the site. The absence of any artefacts from these deposits again hampered absolute dating, although it seems likely that they were laid during the occupation of the site by tenant farmers. Culvert 137, exposed in Trench 2, is also likely to have been constructed during this period, although the possibility that these features all originated following the demolition of the great hall in the early 1830s cannot be discounted.

4.1.6 The level of the modern haulage road slopes gently downwards to the south, falling from 67.57m aOD at the north end of Trench 1 to 67.42m aOD at the southern end of Trench 2, and to 67.08m aOD at the southern end of Trench 3. It is likely that this trend reflects the topography of the medieval landscape, and whilst the absence of any archaeological remains in Trench 3 may have resulted from their destruction during the construction of the haulage road in the 1980s, it seems more likely that this actually reflected a position to the south of the focus of activity during the medieval and post-medieval periods.

4.1.7 The paucity of artefacts recovered from the excavated trenches was notable, although this mirrored the small finds assemblage produced from the archaeological investigation carried out in 1979-80 (Tyson 1985). The absence of post-medieval artefacts from the lowest deposits exposed in Trenches 1 and 2, however, imply that these remains had not been disturbed by subsequent activity.
5. IMPACT

5.1 IMPACT

5.1.1 The results of the evaluation demonstrated that features of considerable archaeological significance survive beneath the modern haulage road within the central and northern part of its route across the Scheduled Area at depths of between 0.9m and 1.1m. These features are sealed by numerous levelling layers and associated surfacing, some of which may date to the later post-medieval period. In particular, the vestiges of a cobbled surface (I23), exposed at a depth of 0.48m below the modern ground surface in Trench 1, may represent the site’s use as a farm complex.

5.1.2 In general terms, the archaeological impact of any development is assessed in terms of the sensitivity or importance of the site to the magnitude of change or potential scale of impact during any future redevelopment scheme. The magnitude, or scale of an impact is often difficult to define, but may be termed as substantial, moderate, slight, or negligible, as shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Impact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>Significant change in environmental factors; Complete destruction of the site or feature; Change to the site or feature resulting in a fundamental change in ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its cultural heritage or archaeological value/historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Significant change in environmental factors; Change to the site or feature resulting in an appreciable change in ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its cultural heritage or archaeological value/historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Change to the site or feature resulting in a small change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its cultural heritage or archaeological value/historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible change or no material changes to the site or feature. No real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its cultural heritage or archaeological value/historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Criteria used to determine Scale of Impact

5.1.3 Whilst the area beneath the haulage road demonstrably contains significant archaeological remains, these lie at some depth below the modern ground surface. It is there not envisaged that the remains will be disturbed by the proposed removal of the haulage road, an action that will enhance the setting of the Scheduled Monument. Hence, the proposed removal of the road will have a negligible impact on the sub-surface archaeological resource.
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APPENDIX 1: PROJECT DESIGN

RADCLIFFE TOWER,
RADCLIFFE,
GREATER MANCHESTER

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION PROJECT DESIGN

Proposals

The following project design is offered in response to a request from Mr Tim Pope of King Sturge LLP, acting on behalf of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council Children’s Services, for an archaeological evaluation to inform Scheduled Monument consent in advance of the proposed development of land centred on the former East Lancashire Paper Mill at Radcliffe, Greater Manchester.
1 BACKGROUND

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF PROJECT

1.1.1 In March 2004, Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) was requested by Libero Architects, acting on behalf of P&F Properties Ltd, to undertake a desk-based assessment of the former East Lancashire Paper Mill (ELPM) and its environs in Radcliffe, Greater Manchester (centred on SD 7915 0735). Detailed consideration in the assessment was given to the former ELPM site and Radcliffe Tower, although general contextual consideration was afforded to other sites identified within a 1km radius of the former paper mill. Following on from the desk-based assessment (OA North 2004), a programme of archaeological evaluation was initiated on some of the sites identified to have archaeological potential, to establish the presence, nature and extent of buried remains; further evaluation within the proposed development area will be undertaken as soon as is logistically possible. The evaluation trenching completed to date was targeted upon the projected course of a Roman road alignment, and a former bleach works (OA North 2005).

1.1.2 The desk-based assessment and resultant evaluation trenching was carried out to inform a planning application, and an associated Environmental Statement. The results focused upon the potential survival of archaeological remains within the former ELPM site and the effects upon any such remains arising from the proposed high density mixed-use development, and the effect of, particularly, the recreation-related development upon the Radcliffe Tower (centred on SD 7957 0750).

1.1.3 The latter element includes a proposal to remove a haulage road that passes immediately to the west of Radcliffe Tower, to allow for the creation of school playing fields. The remains of Radcliffe Tower are designated of national architectural or historical significance as a Scheduled Monument (SM 27585), and the haulage road crosses the designated area. The removal of this road will undoubtedly enhance the environmental setting of the Monument, which is currently difficult for the public to access.

1.1.4 In order for development work to proceed in the area of Radcliffe Tower, Scheduled Monument consent needs to be obtained. As part of this process, an archaeological evaluation has been recommended, which will be undertaken under the terms of Class 7 Consent. The results obtained from this programme of works will be used to inform an application for Scheduled Monument consent to remove the haulage road.

1.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1.2.1 The original date of the Radcliffe Tower is uncertain. It is mentioned in 1358 through Richard Radcliffe of Radcliffe Tower, and was rebuilt in 1403 when James de Radcliffe received the King’s permission to embark upon an ambitious rebuilding of his existing manor house (Barton 1973, 226). The timber hall is believed to have been situated immediately to the west of the tower, and both buildings are thought to have been abandoned during the 17th century; they had been converted to a farm building by 1700. Excavations of the site in 1979-80 showed that the hall and tower were contained within a ditched enclosure on the north side, which was later reinforced by a rubble wall to form a courtyard.

1.3 OXFORD ARCHAEOLOGY

1.3.1 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. OA is an Institute of Field Archaeologists Registered Organisation (No 17), and is thus bound by the IFA's Code of Conduct and required to apply the IFA's quality standards.

1.3.2 OA North recently undertook a desk-based assessment of the former East Lancashire Paper Mill site as an initial stage of the archaeological work associated with the present development (OA North 2004). Following on from the results of the desk-based study, OA North is currently engaged in a programme of archaeological evaluation and watching brief in advance of, and associated with, the proposed development.

2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 ACADEMIC AIMS

2.1.1 The main research aim of the investigation will be to ascertain the presence or absence of archaeological remains underneath the present haulage road in order to inform an application for Scheduled Monument consent.

2.2 OBJECTIVES

2.2.1 The objectives of the project may be summarised as follows:

- to determine the presence or absence of archaeological remains beneath the present haulage road;
- to determine the character and extent of any archaeological remains;
- to establish the depth of any buried archaeological remains;
- to facilitate the implementation of a strategy that will take account of the archaeological resource of the site in the final design proposals.

3 METHOD STATEMENT

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

3.2 FIELDWORK

3.2.1 It is proposed that the archaeological fieldwork comprises the excavation of three evaluation trenches across the present haulage road: The trenches will have a total combined length of 25m, and will be confined to the area of the present haulage road; the trenches will not be extended into other parts of the Scheduled Monument as this will not be disturbed during the proposed removal of the haulage road.

3.2.1 The trenches will be placed in the positions shown in Figure 1, pending any on-site restrictions such as modern service trenches. The first trench will measure 5m in length, and will be aligned approximately north/south along the haulage road at the northern end of the site, across the projected line of the ditch encountered during the excavations of 1979-80.
(Tyson 1985, 41). The second trench will measure 15m in length, and will also be aligned approximately north/south across the haulage road adjacent to the entrance to Radcliffe Tower, across the postulated site of the timber hall. The third trench be placed across the road to establish the presence or absence of archaeological features to the south of the tower, and will be excavated for a length of 5m. All trenches will be excavated to a maximum width of 2m.

3.2.2 Methods: 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. Thereafter, all deposits will be cleaned manually to define their extent, nature, form and, where possible, date. Spoil from the excavation will be stored adjacent to the trench, and will be backfilled upon completion of the archaeological works.

3.2.3 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.

3.2.4 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.

3.2.5 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.

3.2.6 The precise location of the evaluation trenches will be surveyed by EDM tacheometry using a total station linked to a pen computer data logger. This process will generate scaled plans within AutoCAD software, which will then be subject to manual survey enhancement. All information will be tied in to Ordnance Datum.

3.2.7 Finds: the recovery of finds will be in accordance with best practice (following current Institute of Field Archaeologists guidelines) and subject to expert advice in order to minimise deterioration. OA has close contact with Ancient Monuments Laboratory staff at the University of Durham and, in addition, employs in-house artefact specialists, with considerable expertise in the investigation, excavation, and finds management of sites of all periods and types, who are readily available for consultation. Finds storage during fieldwork and any site archive preparation will follow professional guidelines (UKIC). Emergency access to conservation facilities is maintained by OA North with the Department of Archaeology, the University of Durham.

3.2.8 Human remains: it is not anticipated that human remains may be encountered during the evaluation. However, should such remains be encountered, these will be left in-situ, covered and protected. Should their removal prove to be essential, the recovery and exhumation of any funerary remains will require the provision of a Home Office licence, 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.

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). In general terms, the sampling
strategy will be aimed at recovering palaeo-botanical, palaeo-zoological and pedological evidence, although the precise scope of the programme will be agreed with the Client prior to commencement of the fieldwork. All samples will be processed at OA North’s offices in Lancaster, and will be subject to a rapid preliminary analysis by the in-house palaeo-environmentalist in order to allow an assessment of their potential.

3.3 **ARCHIVE PREPARATION AND REPORT PRODUCTION**

3.3.1 **Archive:** the results of the fieldwork will form the basis of a full archive to professional standards, in accordance with current English Heritage guidelines (The Management of Archaeological Projects, 2nd edition, 1991) and the Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long Term Storage (UKIC 1990). The project archive represents the collation and indexing of all the data and material gathered during the course of the project. 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.

3.3.2 The paper and finds archive for the archaeological work undertaken at the site will be deposited with the nearest museum which meets Museums’ and Galleries’ Commission criteria for the long term storage of archaeological material (MGC 1992). This archive will be provided in the English Heritage Centre for Archaeology format, both as a printed document and on computer disks as ASCii files (as appropriate).

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

3.3.4 A synthesis (in the form of the index to the archive and a copy of the publication report) will be deposited with the Greater Manchester Sites and Monuments Record. A copy of the index to the archive will also be available for deposition in the National Archaeological Record in London.

3.3.5 **Report:** four copies of a bound and collated final report will be submitted to the Client and English Heritage within four weeks of the completion of the fieldwork. At the Client’s discretion, further copies will be sent to the Assistant County Archaeologist, the Greater Manchester Sites and Monuments Record, and the Bury Conservation Officer. The final report will include a copy of this project design, and indications of any agreed departure from that design. It will include an historical and archaeological background to the study area, an outline methodology of the investigation, and present, summarise, assess, and interpret the results of the programme of archaeological works detailed above. In addition, recommendations for any further mitigation works and details of the final deposition of the project archive will also be made.

3.3.6 **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. 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. It is assumed that the Client will provide any available information regarding services within the study area, if available. All OA North staff will be equipped with hard hats, safety boots, and high-visibility jackets.

3.4.2 OA North will arrange for herras-type fencing to be erected around the evaluation trenches public prior to the commencement of any archaeological works.

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:** English Heritage will be informed of the commencement of the evaluation programme, and of any significant discoveries encountered. It is recommended that the Assistant County Archaeologist and the Bury Conservation Officer are invited to view the archaeological evaluation during the course of the fieldwork. Any such meeting can be arranged by OA North.

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 a maximum of four weeks of the completion of the fieldwork; the report can be submitted within a shorter time-scale if required.

4.3 OA North can execute projects at very short notice once an agreement has been signed with the Client.

5 **STAFFING PROPOSALS**

5.1 The project will be under the overall charge of **Ian Miller BA** (OA North Senior Project Manager), who will be responsible for all elements of the day to day management of the archaeological investigation, and to whom all correspondence should be addressed.

5.2 The evaluation in the field will be carried out either by an OA North Project Officer experienced in this type of project, who will be assisted by two technicians. All OA North Project Officers are experienced field archaeologists capable of carrying out projects of all sizes. Present timetabling constraints preclude detailing at this stage exactly who will be undertaking this element of the project.

5.3 Assessment of any finds from the excavation will be undertaken by OA North’s in-house finds specialist **Christine Howard-Davis BA** (OA North Finds Manager). Christine has extensive knowledge of all finds of all periods from archaeological sites in northern England, and is a recognised expert in the analysis of glasswork.

5.4 Assessment of any palaeoenvironmental samples which may be taken will be undertaken by **Elizabeth Huckerby MSc MIFA** (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 2: SUMMARY CONTEXT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer - tarmac surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer - hardcore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer - brick rubble layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer - gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fill - water pipe trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cut - water pipe trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - tarmac surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - tarmac surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 / 113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - hardcore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - hardcore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - brick rubble layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - black mixed makeup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - black mixed makeup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer – mid-brown silty-clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - trample / occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - fine cobble surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer – mid-brown silty-clay, possible subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fill - water pipe trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cut - water pipe trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - course cobble surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - brick rubble layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fill - uncertain feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cut - uncertain feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - brick rubble layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer - mortar rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer - tarmac surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer - tarmac surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer - hardcore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer - hardcore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer - tarmac surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer - brick rubble layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer - black mixed stony rubble makeup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill - backfill of culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structure - culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cut - for culvert 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill - land drain trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cut - land drain trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer - possible clay hearth base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer – mid-brown silty-clay, possible subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill - uncertain feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill - uncertain feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill - of foundation 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structure - sandstone foundation in 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clinker material impressed into 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer - hardcore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill - within culvert 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cut - uncertain linear feature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3: 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>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Three small fragments of a manganese-speckled ware bowl or cup, comprising two body sherds and the base of a strap handle. One small body fragment of a dark-glazed earthenware vessel.</td>
<td>18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>One base sherd of an under-glaze transfer-printed ware bowl or saucer</td>
<td>18th-19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>One small fragment of an under-glaze transfer-printed ware vessel.</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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