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Summary

Trial trenching was carried out at the site of the former snooker club, Chalkstone way, Haverhill. The site was still an active demolition zone with large spoil heaps and concrete storage areas so trenches were located to best fit rather than fitting to the original trenching plan. A total of three trenches were excavated, two on a rough north to south alignment (Trenches 2 and 3) and one running east to west (Trench 1).

Trenches 2 and 3 revealed alluvial deposits and the river channel cut, with sparse prehistoric finds. Trench 1 was located at the southern side of the site and revealed a gravel terrace and a hollow with alluvial deposits and prehistoric finds.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted at the former Snooker Club, Chalkstone Way, Haverhill.

1.1.2 This archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Abby Antrobus of Suffolk County Council (SCC; Planning Application: DC/13/0166), supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East.

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 National Planning Policy Framework (Department for Communities and Local Government March 2012). The results will enable decisions to be made by SCC, 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 Suffolk Archaeological Service's stores in due course.

1.2 Geology and topography

The site lies on Alluvium relating to recent deposition from the adjacent watercourse (Stour Brook), overlying chalk bedrock. The stream is aligned NNW-SSE adjacent and north of the site, with the natural land surface sloping in that direction.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

This proposal lies in an area of archaeological interest recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, adjacent to known Roman and Medieval settlement remains (HER no. HVH 020). The area around the Stour Brook is known to be topographically favourable for early activity. Roman and Iron Age remains were recorded opposite, with an undated burial (HVH 008). Much of the following is taken from the Suffolk Historic Environment Records (SHER).

Prehistoric

1.3.1 The earliest evidence from the surrounding area is in the form of a Palaeolithic hand-axe of pointed form (HVH 013 – MSF6048) found around 200m to the northeast of the development area.

Iron Age and Roman

1.3.2 Iron age and Roman evidence makes up most of the known activity in the area with known features and finds from early iron age through to Roman. Such sites include HVH 019 – MSF13371 an evaluation, excavation and monitoring project which identified a small linear feature and a pit that contained Iron Age pottery and a further nine possible
features of uncertain date. Another an extensive trenches evaluation (HVH 056 – MSF23797) conducted in 2006 revealed a single Iron Age pit, two possible Early Roman features, nine undated ditches and three undated pits. Additionally, find spot HVH 008 – MSF6038 recorded Iron Age and Roman pottery as well as an undated inhumation.

1.3.3 Closer to the site Roman pottery sherds and ceramic building materials were found to the north of the Snooker club (HVH 020 – MSF13544).

Saxon and Medieval

1.3.4 As well as the Roman finds, find spot HVH 020 – MSF13545 recorded later pottery (four Thetford-type ware sherds including a rim and nine early-medieval coarseware sherds including three rims), showing some activity in this period just within the proposed development area.

1.3.5 The Medieval town of Haverhill, defined from historic maps and locations of listed buildings and Hodkinson's map of 1783, is some distance to the west of the development area. The closest recorded monuments relate to Hamlet Green, a satellite focus of this settlement (MSF29137, 29144, 29147)

Post-medieval and modern

1.3.6 A brickworks, kilns, rail link and extraction pits marked on OS maps were located to the west of the development area and is now built over.

1.3.7 An Early 19th century silk factory, used as an iron works in the 1880s and again since the early 20th century, was located west of the development area (HVH 074 – MSF24875).

1.3.8 The closest Listed structures are 18th to 19th century properties on Sturmer Road (e.g. 466425, 466427), along with a 19th century Railway bridge (466426).

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 The author would like to thank Lovell for commissioning the work, Gareth Rees for survey, Gillian Greer for illustrations and Anthony Haskins for finds reporting as well as Dr Paul Spoerry for managing the work and Abby Antrobus for monitoring the site.
2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

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

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The Brief required that a linear trenched evaluation is undertaken of the development area to enable the archaeological resource, both in quality and extent, to be accurately quantified.

2.2.2 Trial Trenching is required to identify the date, approximate form and purpose of any archaeological deposit, together with its likely extent, localised depth and quality of preservation. It will also evaluate the likely impact of past land uses and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits which will establish the potential for the survival of environmental evidence and provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological conservation strategy. Such a strategy would also deal with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and orders of cost.

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

2.2.4 The site survey was carried out by Gareth Rees using a Leica 1200.

2.2.5 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.

2.2.6 All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using OA East’s pro-forma sheets. Trench locations, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour and monochrome photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits.

2.2.7 The area was an active demolition site so trench locations were limited and those excavated were a “best fit” around the demolition areas.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 Below the results are presented by trench number.

3.2 Trench 1
3.2.1 Trench 1 was 50m long, 2.5m wide, 0.65m deep and located on the south of the site aligned east to west. The trench was excavated through 0.3m of demolition (1) and 0.1m of made ground (13) which was only present at the eastern end of the trench, to a mixed natural of degraded chalk, gravel and clay. Alluvial deposits (8),(9),(10),(11) and (14) were present in hollow (12) located at the east end of the trench.

3.2.2 Hollow (12) extended 20m from the east end of the trench and had an irregular cut and base undulating from 0.1m in depth to 0.5m in depth. Hollow (12) contained three layers excavated in two test pits (see below). The top alluvial fill (14) was excavated by machine to reveal a gravel layer (7) which was excavated within the test pits as (8) and (10).

3.2.3 Two 1m by 0.75m test pits were excavated through the alluvial layers within hollow (12) to the natural gravel. Three layers were recorded within each test pit (14), (8) and (9) in test pit 1 and (14), (10) and (11) in test pit 2.

3.2.4 Layer (14) was a mid brown plastic alluvial clay with no inclusions, 0.11m deep and extending 20m from the east end of the trench. This layer contained no finds.

3.2.5 Layer (8)=(10) was a mid red-brown firm silty clay deposit with frequent gravel inclusions. The layer was 0.1m in depth and extended the full 20m of the hollow and contained struck flint, pot and animal bone.

3.2.6 Layer (9)=(11) was a light yellow brown sandy silt deposit with occasional small flint inclusions. The layer was 0.26m in depth and extended the full 20m of the hollow and contained struck flint, pot and animal bone.

3.3 Trench 2
3.3.1 Trench 2 was 23m long, 2.1m wide, 1.4m deep and located on the north of the site running north to south. The trench was excavated through 0.36m of demolition (1) and 0.4-0.8m of alluvium (4) which increased in depth to the north.

3.3.2 Layer (4) extended across the entire trench from 0.4m in depth to the south, to over 0.8m in the north, with 8.2m of the northern end of the trench still showing the layer at the finished excavation level of 1.2m. Layer (4) was a dark greyish brown plastic silty clay with occasional small flint inclusions. The layer contained one piece of struck flint.

3.4 Trench 3
3.4.1 Trench 3 was 22m long, 2.1m wide and 1.2m deep and was located on the north of the site running north to south. The trench was excavated through 0.36m of demolition (1), 0.2m of made ground (2) and 0.64m of alluvium (3) which increased in depth to the north.

3.4.2 Layer (3) extended across the entire trench from 0.46m in depth to the south to over 0.64m in the north with 19m of the northern end of the trench still showing the layer at the finished excavation level of 1.2m. Layer (3) was a dark greyish brown plastic silty clay with occasional small flint inclusions. The layer contained struck flint.
3.5 Finds Summary

3.5.1 Although no cut features were present the alluvial layers seen within all trenches contained struck flint, bone and pottery.

The majority of the finds were associated with alluvial deposits within hollow (12) in Trench 1 which contained neolithic, Bronze Age and some possible Iron Age struck flint as well as two fragments of prehistoric pottery.

3.5.2 The finds assemblage within the hollow points towards an aggregation of material being mixed by alluvial movement due to the material being from multiple prehistoric periods. A table of all finds is shown below.

Table 1: Finds Quantification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Weight in kg</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>Burnt Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>Burnt Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Artefact</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>Blades x6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>Core x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Artefact</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Artefact</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>Blades x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>Cores x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Burnt Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>Prehistoric pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>Burnt Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.831</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Discussion and Conclusions

4.1 Trench 1
4.1.1 Trench 1 produced the majority of finds, from hollow (12). The hollow contained the same alluvial material as in trenches 1 and 2 but with a higher finds concentration suggesting flooding bringing material into the hollow as it filled. The mix of prehistoric finds also suggests a gradual process of sedimentation within the hollow, as three distinct layers can be seen (14), (10) and (11) with a mix of finds coming from each layer.

4.2 Trenches 2 and 3
4.2.1 Trenches 2 and 3 were both excavated to reveal the same alluvial material to a depth of at least 1.2m, becoming deeper to the north. This has been interpreted as an earlier cut to the Stour Brook, located to the north and running next the site. In both trenches the alluvial material produced struck flint from the neolithic period through to the Iron Age.

4.3 Significance
4.3.1 Previous work in the area has shown that there has been prehistoric activity and the Brook has been a focal point from the neolithic to the Iron Age. This work has shown that flint has been utilised in the area (probably from a local source) and that Brook would have been much wider, with deposits associating with flooding events.

4.4 Recommendations
4.4.1 Recommendations for any future work based upon this report will be made by the County Archaeology Office.
# Appendix A. Trench Descriptions and Context Inventory

## Trench 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench contained hollow (12) with 3 layers under modern demolition and made ground. Hollow excavated in two 1m test pits and assigned separate context numbers</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21st cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Gravel layer</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Alluvial silt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Gravel layer</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Alluvial silt</td>
<td>Flint, pot</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Cut of hollow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Made ground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21st cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Alluvial clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Trench 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial material and possible river channel cut seen at north end.</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21st cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Alluvial clay</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Trench 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial material and possible river channel cut seen at north end.</td>
<td>N-S</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21st cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Made ground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21st cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Alluvial clay</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Flint

By Anthony Haskins MSc BSc PIFA

Introduction and methodology

B.1.1 A total of 68 lithics were submitted for assessment. This report covers a rapid assessment of chronological and typological indicators.

Methodology

B.1.2 The flint was rapidly assessed based on a simple classification system. No measurements were taken and heavily burnt pieces were not assessed.

Quantification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT NO.</th>
<th>SUB TYPE</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Single platform</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Platform at Right Angles</td>
<td>B-F Blade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposed Platform</td>
<td>B-F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flakes (&gt;50mm)</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flakes (&gt;25mm &lt;50mm)</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flakes (&gt;10mm &lt;25mm)</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blades</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chunks/angular shatter (&lt;50mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burnt flint (all types)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Flint Quantification

Results

B.1.3 The raw material is a mix of colour ranging from a dark blackish-brown through to light blue-greys and greenish brown flints. The cortex where present is a thin cream or off white colour and was largely rounded suggesting the material was collected from secondary sources. Various levels of patination and recortification is present on the material.

B.1.4 All the recovered material has abraded and damaged edges suggesting it is residual in nature. The alluvial deposit this material was found in would suggest that it has been washed down stream at various points.

B.1.5 The core chronology recovered is largely blade or narrow flake based in particular;ar the platform at right angles and single platform cores. This would suggest at least some of the material is of Early Neolithic date. These cores have more indications of patination and recortification than some of the other material.
B.1.6 The range of debitage present represents a mix of large short unstructured squat flakes through to blades produced from structured working. The material shows indications of hard and soft hammer percussion.

B.1.7 Conclusions

B.1.8 This is a mixed date assemblage of material ranging in date from the Early Neolithic through to the Bronze or Iron Age. It is clearly residual material that was produced further away and reached it's current location through natural means.

B.2 Prehistoric Pottery

By Sarah Percival

B.2.1 A total of three sherds weighing 23g were recovered from two contexts. All are body sheds containing common moderate to coarse flint pieces up to 5mm. The sherds are in poor condition with abraded surfaces and signs of over-firing or perhaps post breakage burning. The sherds are not closely datable but are most likely to be of Earlier Neolithic or Late Bronze Age/ Early Iron Age date.

B.3 Animal Bone

By Chris Faine

B.3.1 Six fragments of animal bone were recovered from the evaluation. The total weight of bone recovered was 0.052kg with a single identifiable fragment being recovered from context 7 in the form of a partial adult sheep tibia. No identifiable remains were recovered from context 3.
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