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Summary

Oxford Archaeology (East) (formally CAMARC of Cambridgeshire County Council) conducted an archaeological investigation on land at the Cokenach Estate in the parish of Barkway, Hertfordshire. The investigations took place between 5th and 11th August 2008 and consisted of an open area “strip, map and record” followed by an excavation of the features present.

The investigations took place within the development area of proposed grain stores, spanning an area of approximately 4050m².

This investigation identified an undated segmented ditch, on a roughly north to south alignment. Running roughly perpendicular to this was a series of closely spaced, regular parallel ditches on an approximate north-west to south-east alignment. These ditches, for drainage, irrigation, lazy beds or planting trenches contained sherds of abraded Iron Age pottery in the excavated ditch fills. In other excavations, similar features have been interpreted as vineyards.

One of the aims of this investigation was to look for any surviving evidence of a deserted medieval settlement of Cokenach, however no evidence of any surviving features of that date were encountered. Little archaeological investigation has previously taken place within this part of Barkway, and this report hopes to add to the understanding and development of the area, particularly in the Iron Age/early Roman period.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological strip, map and record, followed by excavation was conducted on land to the east of Walk Wood on the Cokenach Estate just outside of the village of Barkway, Hertfordshire.

1.1.2 The work was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Andy Instone of the Hertfordshire's Historic Environment Unit (Planning Application 1/0467/08), supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East (formerly Cambridgeshire County Council's CAM ARC).

1.1.3 The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, in accordance with the guidelines set out in Planning and Policy Guidance 16 - Archaeology and Planning (Department of the Environment 1990). The results will enable decisions to be made by Hertfordshire's HEU, on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, with regard to the treatment of any archaeological remains found.

1.1.4 The site archive is currently held by OA East and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 The estate of Cokenach lies north-east of the village of Barkway, close to the north boundary of Hertfordshire, 5km south-east of Royston (Figure 1). The site was located to the east of the Cokenach Estate buildings, to the east of Walk Wood. The estate is bounded by agricultural land, with the north west boundary marked by the B1368 Barkway to Barley lane and Earls Wood lying adjacent to the south boundary. The geology of the area is predominantly boulder clay over chalk with limited clay-in-flints. The land falls gently towards the Quin valley to the south and is predominantly arable with generous amount of woodland.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

A historic building survey and subsequent watching brief was carried out within the stables and outbuildings of the estate in 2006 and 2007, and much of the historical background has been extracted from that report (Fletcher 2006 and 2007).

1.3.1 The area under investigation (Figure 1) lay within the grounds of the Grade II listed Cokenach House, part of the Cokenach estate for which there are five entries found at the Hertfordshire Historical and Environmental Record (HER).

1.3.2 The current house is believed to stand on the site of an earlier manor (HER 9279), formally a sheephold of Royston Priory. Documentary evidence shows that the manor was leased to Robert Chester in 1537 and sold to him, with the priory in 1540 by Henry VIII (Fletcher, 1994). A new house was then built at Cokenach, by Chester or his son, before 1574. These buildings survived until 1716 when the present house was built.
1.3.3 There is no visible evidence on the site of the medieval manor today. However the associated moat (HER 9280), which has been incorporated into the 18th century formal layout, can still be seen.

1.3.4 The possible site of a medieval settlement (HER 1005) has also been identified. However there is no clear evidence of a deserted medieval village or house platforms on the site. There is however good evidence from aerial photographs of large ditched fields and a ditch extending towards the Cambridge Road.

1.3.5 The remains of c.18th formal gardens and parkland (HER 7322), which surround the site, have also been recorded as of particular interest. The formal water layout of the gardens visible as an E-shaped canal may have derived from the remains of the medieval moat.

1.3.6 The outbuildings within the estate buildings complex (HER 10992) are recorded by the HER as being associated with the current house and date back to 1716.

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 The author would like to Savills for funding the work. Thanks also to David Brown for his assistance with the excavation. Andy Instone of Hertfordshire's Historic Environment Unit visited the site and monitored the work. The project was managed by James Drummond-Murray.
2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The objective of this investigation was to determine as far as reasonably possible the presence/absence, location, nature, extent, date, quality, condition and significance of any surviving archaeological deposits within the development area.

2.1.2 The brief states that the site lies close to Area of Archaeological Significance no.68, as identified in the Local Plan. This notes that earthworks which may be the remains of a deserted medieval village lie at Cokenach. This investigation aimed to determine whether any evidence of a DMV survived in this location.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The aim was initially to carry out a “strip, map and record” program of investigation, after which consultation with Hertfordshire’s Historic Environment Unit would determine the next stage of investigation based upon the evidence found.

2.2.2 Once the area was stripped and planned, an on-site meeting was held with Andy Instone of the HEU. It was decided that the next stage of investigation through excavation should continue.

2.2.3 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a tracked 360° excavator using a toothless ditching bucket.

2.2.4 Spoil, exposed surfaces and features were scanned with a metal detector. All metal-detected and hand-collected finds were retained for inspection, other than those which were obviously modern.

2.2.5 All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using OA East's pro-forma sheets. Plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour and monochrome photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits, supplemented by digital photographs.

2.2.6 Environmental samples were taken where appropriate from a representative sample of features and the spoil heaps and trench surfaces were scanned visually for pottery and bone.

2.2.7 The site grid was set out at 10m intervals using a Leica GPS and located on the Ordnance Survey grid. The edge of the excavation was also surveyed in and incorporated with the drawn plans. Levels were taken on base plans and sections, also using the Leica GPS. All on-site survey was carried out by the author.

2.2.8 Site conditions were mostly good, although heavy rain over two days made conditions challenging at times. This did not affect the quality or the timing of the stripping or the excavation.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 Two distinct groups of features were found; a segmented ditch and a number of parallel ditches. These two groups will be described within the results section separately and considered together within the Discussion section.
3.1.2 For the purposes of this report, cut numbers will be displayed in bold text, all other contexts in normal text.

3.2 Segmented Ditch (Feature Group 1)
3.2.1 A narrow segmented ditch was recorded in two sections within the north-east corner of the excavation area (Figure 2).
3.2.2 This ditch measured approximately 34.5m in length and continued beyond the edges of the north-eastern corners of the excavation area.
3.2.3 This ditch was on a roughly north to south orientation and was slightly “wobbly” in plan.
3.2.4 A 2m wide gap divided this ditch which may represent an entranceway. Both terminals were excavated and were recorded as deliberately rounded ends as opposed to shallowing out.
3.2.5 The northern-most segment measured approximately 26m in length and was excavated in two slots (22 and a slot at the terminal, 04). The terminal slot was initially 1m in length, however it was extended to 4m in an attempt to find dating evidence. This ditch was on average 0.77m wide with gradual sloping edges and a concave base and 0.17m deep (Figure 3, Section 1).
3.2.6 The southern part of the segmented ditch measured approximately 8.5m in length and was excavated in a single slot at the terminal (06). This ditch was on average 0.42m wide, narrower than the segment to the north, with gradual sloping edges and a concave base and 0.20m deep. (Figure 3, Section 2).
3.2.7 No dating evidence was retrieved from any of the slots dug, nor from the surface of either ditch.
3.2.8 A 20litre sample (sample number 1) was taken from ditch slot 04. The results were poor and no artefactual or ecofactual evidence survived/was present.

3.3 “Cultivation Beds” (Feature Group 2)
3.3.1 A number of parallel ditches approximately 4.5m apart were recorded within the southern half of the excavation area (Figure 2). Given that they all shared the same dark grey brown silty fill, were all on the same alignment with regular spacing and were broadly similar in profile and dimension, they have been grouped together and will be discussed as a collective feature.
3.3.2 Together, these ditches have been interpreted as “lazy beds” for the cultivation of crop.
3.3.3 These ditches were laid out on a north-west to south-east alignment. All ditches continued beyond the western limit of the area, therefore no suggestion of average length can be made.
3.3.4 The ditches appear to have been laid out in two groups, possibly of six, with the ones located on the ends shorter or set back from the others.
3.3.5 A total of six investigative slots were dug through these ditches (10, 16, 20 and three terminals; 08, 12 and 14) were investigated in order to gain an understanding of date, function, dimension and character. On average these ditches measured between 0.80 and 1.0m in width with moderate sloping sides and a concave/flat base. They increased in depth from 0.12m at the terminal ends (Figure 3, Section 3) to 0.23m (Figure 3, Section 4).

3.3.6 Pottery was retrieved from four of the slots as well as from the surface of one ditch (18 which was not excavated) and was all broadly contemporary and considered to be Iron Age in date.

3.3.7 Two environmental samples (sample numbers 2 and 3) were taken from two of the ditches in the hope of understanding what may have been grown in these beds. The results however were artefactually and ecofactually sterile.

3.4 Finds Summary

3.4.1 A total of ten sherds of Iron Age pottery were recovered during the excavation.

3.4.2 The assemblage is heavily abraded. Not closely datable, small fragments such as these indicate high levels of post-depositional disturbance (such as ploughing and/or middening) and suggests that this pottery was not found within its primary site of deposition.

3.4.3 All ten sherds were recovered from cultivation beds.

3.5 Environmental Summary

3.5.1 Two samples were taken, from each of the feature groups in order to gain a greater understanding of date, function and type of crop being grown. The results were very poor with both samples producing no evidence of ecofacts or artefacts.
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Discussion

Feature Group 1

4.1.1 The segmented ditch, Feature Group 1, may represent the remains of an enclosure or a segmented boundary.

4.1.2 Although undated, its perpendicular alignment to Feature Group 2 indicates that they may be contemporary. Comparable examples found on previous excavation discussed in the next section strongly supports the suggestion that these two feature groups are in fact associated.

Feature Group 2

4.1.3 Feature Group 1 represents cultivation/associated drainage containing abraded sherds of Iron Age pottery. The ditches, then, may have acted as drainage in a similar manner to similar features excavated at Godmanchester (Green, 1978) where they have been interpreted as Lazy Beds; a system of cultivation based on ridges of soil upcast from spade dug parallel ditches, possibly a precursor to the medieval ridge and furrow cultivation. Green suggests that Lazy Beds would have been a way of bringing heavy land under cultivation, or were perhaps used where space was limited. At Cokenach it seems very unlikely that space was a problem, there is no evidence at present to suggest that land was limited in any way. The possibility that the land had previously been uncultivated and was too heavy to work with a plough is perhaps more plausible, but if this were the case there would surely be much more widespread evidence of this type of cultivation. It may be that this method of cultivation was used for specialised crop growing, and excavations in Colchester have identified similar features which have been suggested were for growing asparagus or vines.

4.1.4 Excavations at Wollaston in Northamptonshire have provided strong evidence for growing vines in very similar features, the evidence for grapes coming from pollen from the trenches (Brown et al. 2001). At both Wollaston and Colchester it has been suggested that the crops were grown in the ditches or bedding trenches, rather than on the ridges between. Other features of a similar nature have been identified by David Neal at Stanwick in Northamptonshire where they were given a similar interpretation. Only one fact separates all these examples from those found at Cokenach, which is that the Cokenach ditches seem to be earlier, they appear to be Iron Age and not Roman. However, given the level of abrasion of the pottery, it may be argued that they are not a representative date of the features themselves and rather have come from an earlier phase of occupation on, or close to, the area of excavation (see Appendix C).

4.1.5 Excavations in Cambridgeshire at Milton (Connor, 1998), Fen Drayton (Mortimer, 1995) Caldecote (Kenney, 2007) and St Neots (Hinman et al. forthcoming) have revealed very similar features, all of which have been interpreted as cultivation beds.

4.1.6 The environmental results from the Milton excavation in 1998 suggested that the ditches were dug for drainage. The only pottery retrieved from the ditch fills were small abraded sherds of possibly middle Iron Age date. Like the excavation at Cokenach, the ditches led towards a perpendicular ditch.

4.1.7 At Caldecote, 14 parallel ditches running west-northwest to east-southeast each at least 34m long and with a spacing of 5–6.4m were recorded. These ditches terminated to the west within one metre of a perpendicular bounding ditch, again very much like those found at
Cokenach. This group of features is reminiscent of the pattern found at Wollaston in Northamptonshire, which has been identified as a Roman vineyard. The example at Caldecote is physically almost identical in size, spacing and arrangement to that at Wollaston and has thus been provisionally given the same interpretation. Study of the material suggests that the possible vineyard was laid out c. AD 125 and had become derelict by c. AD 250.

4.1.8 Investigations at St Neots, Cambridgeshire from 2005-08 enabled an entire field comprising two of these “lazy bed” systems to be revealed and fully investigated. Despite intensive excavation, little dating evidence was retrieved from either of the lazy bed systems. However a road, field lay out and settlement including roundhouses all respect the layout of the lazy bed fields and are considered contemporary, dating to the late Pre-Roman Iron Age (c 50BC-AD42). The northern-most system comprised sixteen lazy beds, orientated north-north-west to south-south-east, 100m to the east of a road and approximately 25m to the north-east of the second system. A perpendicular ditch was recorded at the southern end of the lazy beds. The second system comprised twenty lazy beds spanning an area 80m wide and up to 90m long, orientated north-north-west to south-south-east directly to the east of the road. The lazy beds were all parallel and regularly spaced out with a gap of approximately 3.5m between each one. Pottery was scarce, although an early Roman date has been suggested.

4.1.9 Like the sites mentioned above, the lazy beds were located on a slope, with the ditches running down-hill. The slope of the land on the site was obvious and the lazy beds began on the highest part of the excavation area and sloped downhill towards the current western field boundary. There is every reason to suggest that more of these lazy beds may be present further up-slope towards the east, beyond the edge of the site.

4.1.10 The location of the site is also an important factor to consider, in particular the proximity of the site to other known Roman activity and influence. The site lies approximately 5 miles east of the current A10, the route of Ermine Street, a known Roman Road and 7 miles east of the Icknield Way. Given the proximity of these well used roads it is possible that early Roman activity in the area may have had an influence on local cultivation practices and methods.

4.1.11 A HER search of the Cokenach Estate revealed no known Roman activity within the bounds of the site, however a search of the ADS (Archaeological Data Service) website indicates a Roman presence within the locality. The records are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADS Number</th>
<th>Summary of Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHNMR-1301967</td>
<td>Land at Crossways, Barley: Abraded Roman pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHNMR-638604</td>
<td>Barley: Roman cremation and inhumation excavated 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHNMR-1315305</td>
<td>Reed: DBA identified a Roman Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMR_NATINV-368123</td>
<td>Barley: 2 Roman cemeteries excavated 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMR_NATINV-368102</td>
<td>Barkway: Roman coin hoard found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMR_NATINV-368078</td>
<td>Barkway Rookey Wood: Romano-Celtic &amp; silver hoard (now in BM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Conclusions

4.2.1 Interpretations for these “Lazy Bed” features vary, but all suggest some kind of intensive agriculture, and all the sites would seem to be late Iron Age or early Roman in date. The ditch system at Cokenach is almost certainly for some kind of crop growing. The pottery assemblage from the ditches is exclusively Iron Age in date. However, the pottery is so abraded, there is argument to suggest that the assemblage date is not totally representative. The exact date of the site is therefore still open to interpretation, however, it is likely to be late Iron Age/Early Roman. Although undated, the segmented ditch (Feature Group 1) which runs parallel to the lazy beds fits into the same pattern discussed in most of the other comparable sites and is likely to represent a boundary to the area.

4.2.2 Unfortunately the environmental results did not yield any ecofacts or artefacts to aid our understanding of date of function.

4.2.3 There was no evidence within the investigation area of the deserted medieval settlement of Cokenach, however the discovery of the features on this site provide new evidence for late Iron Age/early Roman activity within this part of the county. Any further work should look to understanding the wider setting for this area of cultivation such as the proximity of settlement and communication links which may provide a date by association.

4.3 Significance

4.3.1 This investigation at Cokenach shown that there is no surviving evidence of a deserted medieval settlement in this location. The absence of any material or artefacts from this date within the topsoil or subsoil would indicate it is not closely located to the excavation area.

4.3.2 This investigation did however reveal evidence of late Iron Age/early Roman crop cultivation. Any further work should look to understanding the wider setting for this area of cultivation such as the proximity of settlement and communication links which may provide a date by association.
APPENDIX A. HEALTH AND SAFETY STATEMENT

A.1.1 OA East will ensure that all work is carried out in accordance with relevant Health and Safety Policies, to standards defined in The Health and Safety at Work, etc. Act, 1974 and The Management of Health and Safety Regulations, 1992, and in accordance with the manual Health and Safety in Fieldwork Archaeology (SCAUM 1997).

A.1.2 Risk assessments prepared for the OA East office will be adhered to.

A.1.3 OA East has Public Liability Insurance. Separate professional insurance is covered by a Public Liability Policy.

A.1.4 Full details of the relevant Health and Safety Policies and the unit’s insurance cover can be provided on request.
## APPENDIX B. CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context no</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Cut of Ditch terminus</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Cut of Ditch terminus</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 08 p</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Cut of Cultivation bed</td>
<td>IA/RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Cut of Cultivation bed</td>
<td>IA/RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Terminus of cultivation bed</td>
<td>IA/RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 14 p</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Terminus of cultivation bed</td>
<td>IA/RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 16 p</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Cut of cultivation bed</td>
<td>IA/RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Un exc.</td>
<td>Un exc.</td>
<td>Fill of 18 p</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Un exc.</td>
<td>Un exc.</td>
<td>Cut of cultivation bed</td>
<td>IA/RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Cut of cultivation bed</td>
<td>IA/RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Cut of ditch (= to 04)</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=pottery
APPENDIX C. POTTERY BY WILLIAM S. WADESON

C.1 Introduction
C.1.1 A total of ten sherds, weighing 0.039kg of Iron Age pottery were recovered during the excavation at Land East of Walk Wood, (The Cokenach Estate), Barkway, Hertfordshire (XHT WWC 08)

C.1.2 The assemblage is heavily abraded with an average sherd weight of 4g. Not closely datable, small fragments such as these indicate high levels of post-depositional disturbance (such as ploughing and/or middening) and suggests that this pottery was not found within its primary site of deposition.

C.1.3 All ten sherds were recovered from cultivation beds.

C.2 Methodology
C.2.1 The total assemblage was studied and a preliminary catalogue was prepared. The sherds were examined using a magnifying lens (x10 magnification) and were divided into fabric groups defined on the basis of inclusion types present. The fabric codes are descriptive and abbreviated by the main letters of the title (Flint and Quartz tempered ware = F&QTW) vessel form was also recorded. The sherds were counted and weighed to the nearest whole gram and decoration and abrasion were also noted.

C.2.2 The site archive is currently held by OA East and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

C.3 The Assemblage: Iron Age Pottery
C.3.1 Excavations produced a total of ten sherds of Iron Age pottery comprising of mainly small degraded, undiagnostic fragments of flint and quartz sand tempered wares (F&QTW). A single sherd of quartz sand tempered ware (QTW) was recovered from fill 13 while a further three small fragmentary sherds of shell (fossil) tempered ware (STW) were retrieved from fill 07.

C.4 Provenance
C.4.1 All Iron Age fabrics are locally produced but their production centres are unknown.

C.5 Discussion
C.5.1 This is a small assemblage Iron Age pottery comprised of undiagnostic coarse wares and not closely datable. These small, extremely abraded fragments are common on many sites and represent an earlier phase of occupation on, or close to, the area of excavation.

C.6 Further Work
C.6.1 Due to the small size of the assemblage no further analysis is required.
C.7 Quantification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Dsc.</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Weight (Kg)</th>
<th>Spot Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>STW (Fossil)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>Heavily Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F&amp;QTW</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>QTW</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>Heavily Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F&amp;QTW</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>Heavily Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F&amp;QTW</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.039</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Pottery Quantification in context order.

U = Undiagnostic body Sherd
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Summary of fieldwork results: This investigation identified an undated segmented ditch, on a roughly north to south alignment. Running roughly perpendicular to this was a series of closely spaced, regular parallel ditches on an approximate north-west to south-east alignment. These ditches, for drainage, irrigation, lazy beds or planting trenches contained sherds of abraded Iron Age pottery in the excavated ditch fills. In other excavations, similar features have been interpreted as vineyards.
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Figure 1: Location of excavation and development area highlighted (red)
Figure 2: Excavation Plan
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Figure 3: Sections 1 - 4
Plate 1: Segmented Ditch, facing north
Plate 2: Cultivation Beds, facing south west

Plate 3: Section through Cultivation Bed (10)