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Summary

Between 28/01/15 and 30/01/15, Oxford Archaeology East (OA East) carried out an archaeological evaluation at land off Cox's Drove, Fulbourn, Cambridgeshire (TL 51694 56593). A total of 6 trenches were opened, covering 92 linear metres. Archaeological remains were uncovered in every trench. A possible roundhouse or hayrick, a number of postholes, pits and boundary ditches were excavated and recorded. A possible sunken feature building was also excavated. Furthermore a large solution hollow, containing residual Neolithic and Bronze Age worked flint along with Roman and Saxon pottery was located within the north-western corner of the site.

The amount of finds found on site were poor relative to the amount of archaeology recorded. A small assemblage of worked flint, Roman and Saxon pottery, fired clay and animal bone were recovered from the features. Environmental results, on the other hand, were good, with relatively large amounts of charred plant remains such as free threshing wheat being recovered from all samples.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted by OA East at land off Cox's Drove, Fulbourn, Cambridgeshire (TL 51694 56593). This evaluation was conducted prior to planning application, to help inform the Local Planning Authority of the potential impact the proposed development could have on any archaeological remains. The current development proposal consists of six residential houses with related ancillary works.

1.1.2 This archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Dan McConnell of Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC; Pre-planning), supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East (Cox 2015).

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 CCC, 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 village of Fulbourn lies about four miles east of the centre of Cambridge. The site itself is located on the northern edge of the historic village core, approximately 80m south of the Cambridge to Newmarket railway line and 500m north-west of St Vigor's church. The site is bounded by fields to the east and north and residential gardens are located to the west and south.

1.2.2 The underlying geology comprises of West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation with Totternhoe Stone Member chalk and Zag Chalk Formation to the east and south (BGS Geology of Britain Viewer; http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html, accessed 02/02/15). The site lies on relatively flat ground, with an average height of approximately 13mOD.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 Thorough background research was undertaken for a Desk-Based Assessment (Bush 2013). The background from this DBA is referenced below. Please refer to DBA figure for an HER map.

Pre-Iron Age

1.3.2 A small number of pre-Iron Age findspots are located near to site; a fieldwalking survey in fields off Station Road by the Fulbourn Village History Society in 2002 and 2003 (MCB 17650) recorded many worked flints including a Neolithic flint handaxe. A single Bronze Age findspot has been located on the south side of Fulbourn in a field off the Babraham Road. This consisted of a partial bronze socketed axe (MCB 16787).

Iron Age

1.3.3 Low levels of Iron Age activity have been recorded in Fulbourn. Extensive crop marks consisting of large north-west to south-east orientated enclosures and related features believed to date to the pre-Roman or Roman Iron Age have been identified adjacent to
the railway line on the western edge of the village, near Cadule Corner Farm (HER 06315 and 10240)

1.3.4 During 2005, excavations at The Chantry, 450m south-east of the site recorded a number of Iron Age features on a multi-period site (MCB 17229, Germany 2007) and during a fieldwalking survey further east in fields off Station Road, a number of Iron Age pottery sherds were recovered, along with Roman, Saxon, Medieval and post-medieval pottery (MCB 1650), although no specific concentrations were seen.

Roman

1.3.5 Evidence of Roman activity within the area is far more prolific and concentrated in two areas – to the south-west and the north-east of the village. In the mid 1880s, a number of Roman coins were found in association with bronze leaf shaped swords in a field on the north side of the Cambridge Road (HER 06237A). In the same field, a bronze object in the shape of a cockerel was also found during metal detecting (HER 11782).

1.3.6 Approximately 50m to the north-east of the site, Roman industrial activity in the form of lime processing and 30 Roman inhumations were found (MCB 7635) in the 19th century during the cutting of the railway sidings.

1.3.7 On the north-east side of the village, approximately 450m from site, extensive crop marks of rectilinear and circular enclosures and related features have been identified from aerial photographs (MCB 17881). These crop marks are currently undated, though likely to be Roman due to the high level of Roman finds spots within the field.

1.3.8 A small excavation was undertaken within this field during 1980 by Richard Wombwell, which found a range of features dating to the Roman period. These included wall foundations and evidence of iron working (HER 06287) along with Roman pottery, coins and glass.

1.3.9 Worsted Street (HER 07970) is located to the south-west of site and is the current parish boundary for Fulbourn. The Scheduled Monument (SM26) runs from Worts Causeway to Horseheath and was used to connect Cambridge to the Icknield Way, heading towards Great Chesterford (Malim et al.1997).

Saxon

1.3.10 Evidence for Saxon settlement is limited in Fulbourn. St Vigor's church (HER 06482), 500m to the south-east of site, has its origins in the Saxon period; in 1868 a stone cross was found under the floor of the nave (HER 06482a). The pattern of knots and an open six-cord plait on the cross are typical of Anglo-Saxon carved stone in East Anglia.

1.3.11 A Saxo-Norman settlement was discovered during excavations at School Lane (MCB 17979), 600m to the south-east of site. Remains of timber structures, pits, boundary ditches and wells were recorded.

1.3.12 Further afield, The Fleam Dyke (HER 07889) is located to the south-east of Fulbourn and runs 4 miles from Fulbourn to Balsham. This scheduled monument (SM6) is a massive earthwork consisting of a 7m to 8m high bank and ditched barrier. It is thought to be a defensive structure built by the Anglo-Saxons to defend their core settlement. The earthwork may have pre-Saxon origins however.

Medieval

1.3.13 The predominant medieval remains near to site relate to manorial houses located in the village. The possible site of Colvilles Manor and chapel (HER 06245 is located off Stonebridge Lane in the south-east of the village. Excavations revealed several phases
of a clunch building. Few datable finds were recovered from the excavation, although a medieval silver penny and a 15th century book clap were found.

1.3.14 Medieval cropmarks consisting of a bank, enclosure and ridge and furrow (CB 14722) associated with Fulbourn Manor (HER 06324) are located a few hundred metres to the west, identified via aerial photography.

1.3.15 The multi-phase site at The Chantry, mentioned previously, contained a large amount of medieval remains. Pits and well containing 14th to 16th century pottery along with small scale smithing and a cobbled surface were found (MCB 17229)

1.3.16 Other medieval finds include a findspot of a crucifix, found in 1848 in a field off the Cambridge Road (HER 062321).

Post-Medieval

1.3.17 Post-medieval activity is seen across Fulbourn. Approximately 450m to the west of the subject site is located Poorwell Water (HER 11230). This was designated as the villages main water supply. It survives as a large depression with regular, straight sides and two mounds within.

1.3.18 To the north-east of site, on the edge of the village is the location of the former railway station (MCB 19921). Built in 1852 on Hay Street, later renamed Station Road, it was closed in 1967 and demolished after 1973.

1.4 Acknowledgements
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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 total of four trenches measuring 35m (a total of 140 linear metres) were to be excavated, equating to a 5% sample of site. Upon arrival at site, the configuration of trenching was found to be impossible to implement due to current structures on site. Instead, 6 trenches ranging in length from 9.5m to 20m were excavated, totalling 92m.

2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a wheeled 360 excavator using a 2m toothless ditching bucket.

2.2.3 The site survey was carried out using a Leica 1200 Smartnet GPRS.

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. Trench locations, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour and monochrome photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits.

2.2.6 Environmental samples were taken from any features or layers regarded as having potential for ecofactual remains.

2.2.7 Site conditions were generally dry, with the occasional rain and snow.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Results are presented in trench order below. Features are described in stratigraphic order where possible. Full trench descriptions and context inventory appear in Appendix A. Please see Figs 2 and 3 for site plans and Fig. 4 for trench locations in relation to the proposed housing.

3.2 Trenches 1-6

Trench 1 (Figs 3 & 5, Section 10)

3.2.1 Trench 1 was located in the western corner of the site, measuring 20m in length and aligned north-west to south-east. Solution hollow 50, hedge line 48, headland deposit 51 and posthole 46 were all located in the northern half of the trench.

3.2.2 Solution hollow 50 (Plates 1 & 2) was 8.46m across and 1.3m deep. The features shape in plan was unclear, but it had a steeply sloping northern edge, with a very gradually sloping southern edge. The lower fill (52) was a light grey sandy silt, 1.05m thick, with occasional flint and chalk inclusions. Worked flint and animal bone was recovered from the fill. Overlying this was fill 49; a dark brownish grey sandy silt with occasional small flint and chalk inclusions. Roman pottery, animal bone and worked flint were recovered from the fill. Environmental sample 6 was taken from fill 49 and sample 10 from fill 52. Sample 6 was found to contain well preserved barley grains along with oat and wheat. Charred cereal grains were also recovered from sample 10. This feature was overlain by headland deposit 51.

3.2.3 Hedge line 48 was located directly north of solution hollow 50. The feature was linear in plan, aligned north-east to south-west, with an irregular profile. The feature measured 0.66m wide and had a maximum depth of 0.3m. The fill (47) was a light greyish brown silty sand with occasional angular flint in a lens near the top of the fill. This feature was sealed by headland deposit 51.

3.2.4 Headland deposit 51 sealed solution hollow 50 and hedge line 48. This layer was at least 4.1m long and 0.42m thick. The layer was a mid brownish grey sandy silt with frequent flint inclusions. Early to Middle Saxon pottery, animal bone and worked flint were recovered from the fill. This layer was truncated by posthole 46.

3.2.5 Posthole 46 was circular in plan, 0.54m in diameter and 0.28m deep with steeply sloping sides and a concave base. The sole fill (45) was a mid brown silty sand with frequent charcoal and daub fragments, from which environmental sample 5 was taken. Animal bone was recovered from the fill. This feature was cut through headland deposit 51.

Trench 2 (Fig. 3)

3.2.6 Trench 2 was located directly south of Trench 1, measured 12.85m in length and aligned north-east to south-west, with the north-eastern end of the trench turning to run east north-east to west south-west, to avoid damaging the trackway running into the site. The trench contained two postholes (10 & 12) along with a group of intercutting ditches and a gully (3, 6 & 8). At least one further ditch was located in the group, but not excavated.

3.2.7 Ditch 3 (Fig. 5, Section 1, Plate 3) was aligned north-north-west to south-south-east and was linear in plan. The feature measured 1m wide and 0.7m deep, with a U-shaped
The basal fill (4) was a light grey clayey silt, 0.3m thick, with occasional fired clay, flint and charcoal inclusions. Environmental sample 1 was taken from this fill, from which a moderate assemblage of charred wheat, oats and barley were recovered. This fill was overlain by 5, a dark brownish grey silty clay, 0.38m thick, with rare flint inclusions. This feature was truncated by later ditch 6, on the same alignment.

3.2.8 Ditch 6 (Fig. 5, Section 1, Plate 3) was linear in plan, aligned north north-west to south east and measured 1m wide and 0.51m deep with a wide U-shaped profile. The fill (7) was a mid brownish grey silty clay with rare flint inclusions. This feature truncated earlier ditch 3 and was truncated by later gully 8.

3.2.9 Gully 8 (Fig. 5, Section 1, Plate 3) was linear in plan, aligned north north-west to south east and measured 0.6m wide and 0.21m deep with a wide U-shaped profile. The sole fill (9) was a mid yellowish grey silty clay with rare chalk inclusions.

3.2.10 Directly to the south-west of gully 8 was posthole 10 (Plate 3). This feature was sub-circular in plan, 0.4m in diameter and 0.21m deep, with a U-shaped profile. The sole fill (11) was a mid yellowish brown clayey silt with rare chalk inclusions.

3.2.11 Approximately 1.2m to the south of posthole 10 was another posthole; 12. This feature was sub-circular in plan and 0.41m in diameter. The fill (13) was a dark brownish grey clayey silt with occasional chalk inclusions. This feature was not excavated.

Trench 3 (Fig. 3, Plate 4)

3.2.12 Trench 3 was located 6m to the east of Trench 1 and aligned east north-east to west south-west. The trench contained two ditches (27 & 30), a ring ditch (39), and two pits (33 & 43), as well as three periglacial features. A modern pit truncated ditches 30 and 39, meaning their relationship was unknown. All features were located in the western half of the trench.

3.2.13 Pit 43 (Fig. 5, Section 9, Plate 5) was sub-circular in plan, 0.9m in diameter and 0.3m deep with a wide U-shaped profile. The sole fill (44) was a mid yellowish brown clayey silt with moderate chalk inclusions, particularly near the base. This pits eastern edge was truncated away by later pit 33.

3.2.14 Pit 33 (Fig. 5, Section 9, Plate 5) was sub-circular in plan, 0.9m in diameter and 0.7m deep with near vertical sides and a flat base. The basal backfill (34) was a dark brownish grey clayey silt, 0.15m thick, with rare chalk inclusions, from which sample 8 was taken, which contained occasional charred grained and a single cleaver seed. This was overlain by backfill 35: a light greyish yellow silt, 0.1m thick, with very common (>90%) chalk inclusions. Above this lay a dark brownish grey clayey silt (36), 0.13m thick, with moderate chalk inclusions. Animal bone and fired clay were recovered from the fill. This was overlain in turn by 37; a light greyish yellow silt, 0.12m thick, with regular chalk inclusions. The uppermost fill (38) was a mid brownish grey clayey silt, 0.22m thick, with occasional flint and chalk inclusions, from which fired clay was recovered. This pits eastern edge was truncated away by ring ditch 39.

3.2.15 Ring ditch 39 (Fig. 5, Sections 8 & 9, Plates 5 & 6) was curvilinear in plan, 0.8m wide and 0.5m deep with a U-shaped profile. It was aligned north-west to south-east before curving to run north-east to south-west, where it truncated earlier pit 33. The ring ditch had a projected internal diameter of 5.5m. The basal fill (40) was a light brownish yellow silt, 0.1m thick, with very common chalk inclusions (~65%). Above this was secondary silt; a dark bluish grey clayey silt, 0.21m thick, with rare chalk and charcoal inclusions, from which sample 9 was taken. This sample contained abundant charred wheat. Charred beans were also present. The uppermost fill (42) was a mid
greyish brown clayey silt, 0.26m thick with rare chalk and flint inclusions. Fired clay was recovered from this fill. This ditch was truncated at its western end by a modern pit.

3.2.16 Feature 27 (Fig. 5, Section 7, Plate 7) was at least 0.4m wide, over 1m in length and 0.42m deep with a square profile. The feature was presumed to be linear in plan with an east-north-east to west-south-west alignment. This feature was heavily truncated by feature 30 on the same alignment. The only fill (28) was a mid yellowish grey clayey silt, 0.42m thick, with regular chalk inclusions. Animal bone was recovered from the fill. This feature could be a beamslot related to the function of feature 30.

3.2.17 Feature 30 (Fig. 5, Section 7, Plate 7) was linear in plan, aligned east-north-east to west-south-west and measured at least 0.8m wide and 0.4m deep with a square profile. Basal fill 29 was a light yellowish-brown clayey silt with rare chalk inclusions, 0.06m thick. Slumping fill 31 was a dark brownish grey clayey silt, 0.4m thick with rare charcoal and chalk inclusions, from which environmental sample 7 was taken; containing abundant abraded wheat grain and a single rye grain. Romano-British pottery and worked flint was recovered from the fill. This was overlain by fill 32; a mid greyish brown sandy silt, 0.35m thick, with occasional chalk inclusions. Roman pottery was also recovered from the fill. This feature truncated ditch 27, presumed to be on the same alignment and was truncated by a modern pit where the feature would have met ring ditch 39, thus destroying the relationship between them.

Trench 4 (Fig. 2)

3.2.18 Trench 4 was located to the east of Trenches 1-3 and west-north-west of Trenches 5 & 6. The trench contained a single ditch and three periglacial features.

3.2.19 Ditch 1 was located at the northern end of the trench. The feature was aligned east-north-east to west-south-west and was at least 1.27m wide and 0.15m deep with a wide U-shaped profile. The single fill (2) was a mid brown sandy silt with occasional flint and chalk inclusions. Animal bone was recovered from the fill.

Trench 5 (Fig. 3, Plate 8)

3.2.20 Trench 5 was located in the south eastern part of site and aligned north-north-east to south-south-west and ran perpendicular to Trench 6, directly to the south. The trench contained three ditches, two of which were unexcavated

3.2.21 Ditch 14 was linear in plan and aligned north-east to south-west. The feature measured 0.45m wide and 0.16m deep with a wide, flat based U-shaped profile. This ditch is thought to be the same as ditch 21, in Trench 6. The sole fill (15) was a mid brown sandy silt with occasional flint and chalk inclusions.

Trench 6 (Fig. 3)

3.2.22 Trench 6 was located directly south of Trench 5, in the south eastern part of site and aligned east to west. A total of four ditches (16, 18, 21 and one unexcavated) and three postholes (23, 25 and one unexcavated) were within the trench.

3.2.23 Ditch 16 (Fig. 5, Section 4), in the eastern half of the trench, was linear in plan and aligned north to south. The feature measured 0.8m wide and 0.4m deep. The sole fill (17) was a light brownish grey clayey silt with regular chalk inclusions. This ditch was truncated by ditch 18.

3.2.24 Ditch 18 (Fig. 5, Section 4) was linear in plan, 2.3m wide, 0.72m deep and aligned north to south. The ditch had moderately steep sides and a concave base. The lower fill (19) was a light grey clayey silt with moderate charcoal inclusions. Above this lay a dark greyish brown silty clay (20) that was 0.3m thick, from which a single sherd of early to
middle Saxon pottery was recovered. Environmental sample 2 was taken from this fill, which contained charred wheat with occasional barley grains, along with a single cleaver and cornflower seed. The sample is also rich in silicates suggesting hearth waste.

3.2.25 Ditch 21, located in the western part of the trench, was aligned north-east to south-west and linear in plan. The feature had a wide U-shaped profile and measured 0.65m wide and 0.15m deep. The sole fill (22) was a mid yellowish brown clayey silt with moderate charcoal inclusions. Environmental sample 3 was taken from this fill and found to contain occasional charred cereal grains, one of which was identifiable as spelt. This feature is thought to be the same as ditch 14 in Trench 5.

3.2.26 Posthole 23, directly west of ditch 16, was sub-circular in plan, 0.46m in diameter and 0.18m thick, with a shallow U-shaped profile. The sole fill (24) was a mid grey clayey silt with rare charcoal inclusions. Environmental sample 4 was taken from this fill and contained sparse charred wheat grains.

3.2.27 Posthole 25 (located between ditch 16 and posthole 23) was sub-circular in plan, 0.44m in diameter and 0.15m deep with a shallow U-shaped profile. The sole fill (26) was a mid grey clayey silt with rare charcoal inclusions.

3.3 Finds and Environmental Summary

3.3.1 A total of 13 sherds of pottery, weighing 106g was recovered from the features on site. Of this assemblage, half was of Early to middle Saxon in date. The rest of the assemblage consisted of six abraded sherds of Roman pottery and a single piece of prehistoric pottery. A total of 1.7kg of animal bone and 12 worked flints were also recovered from features on site. The feature most prolific for finds was solution hollow 50, where the majority of pottery, animal bone and worked flints were recovered.

3.3.2 Of the ten environmental samples taken from site, all were found to contain relatively abundant charred plant remains, including barley and free threshing wheat (Appendix C).
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1.1 The archaeology uncovered during the evaluation at land off Cox's Drove offers a tantalising glimpse into past land use on the site. The small and varied finds assemblage recovered from the site means dating the features on site is uncertain, but as discussed below, Roman and Saxon phases of activity have been identified.

4.1.2 Two foci of activity can be seen in the evaluation; to the west and the east, with the central area being relatively quiet. At least two phases of activity can be seen to the east, possibly relating to the Roman settlement known to be located nearby (MCB17881), with the area falling into disuse in the post-Roman era. A total of three phases of activity are evident in the western part of site, where one or two phases of agricultural or edge of settlement activity are followed by a phase of possible Saxon occupation.

4.2 Prehistoric

4.2.1 The single sherd of prehistoric pottery from solution hollow 50 (Figs 3 & 5, Section 1, Plates 1 & 2) and the small assemblage of abraded worked flint recovered from across the site indicate that there is prehistoric activity in the area. It can be assumed that the undated features on site are not prehistoric, as their form and evidence from surrounding known sites would indicate that is unlikely. The finds recovered are more likely to be evidence of a 'background noise' of prehistoric activity in the area, which have then been deposited into later features by natural processes.

4.3 Roman

4.3.1 The ditches located in the eastern trenches on site have been tentatively dated to the Roman period, though lack of finds makes dating uncertain. This area appears to have two phases of activity, with the area being in disuse in the post-Roman era. Heavily abraded Roman pottery was recovered from the upper fill of ditch 18 (20), which was much darker and more humic than the lower fill of the ditch, and it is possible this fill is the surviving Saxon soil horizon.

4.3.2 The function of the other ditches found on site is unclear. They are likely boundary ditches, though the fact that the ditches (3, 6 and 8) in Trench 2 (Figs 3 & 5, Plate 3) are not seen in Trench 1 suggests they turn or terminate within the 10m between trenches. This would indicate they may be part of an enclosure, similar to those seen to the east as cropmarks in aerial photographs (MCB17881), and so could also be Roman in date.

4.3.3 The undated curvilinear ditch (39; Fig. 3, Plates 5 & 6) in Trench 3 would appear to be a roundhouse or hayrick, though without more being uncovered it is difficult to tell. The fired clay recovered from the feature supports the interpretation of the ditch being part of a structure, with wattle impressions being seen on one fragment. Furthermore, the lack of a relationship between this feature and the possible Saxon SFB 30, due to modern truncation, is frustrating, as that would have possibly helped with dating. There is a chance the relationship would survive outside of the trench.

4.4 Saxon

4.4.1 The feature interpreted as a solution hollow (50: Figs 3 & 5, Section 1, Plates 1 & 2) had a wide array of finds, with around half of the sites finds assemblage by weight being recovered from its fills. The range of dates for these finds might suggest a
solution hollow, with residual finds eroding in with the surrounding soils. The Saxon pottery recovered from the fills is far less abraded than the Roman pottery, suggesting the feature formed during this period. There is a possibility that the feature is a dew pond or some similar feature, though the fills and varied finds assemblage would suggest a natural formation. Other functions for the feature, such as a watering hole, seem unlikely since the topography of site and depth of the feature would mean the water table was not reached.

4.4.2 Sealing the solution hollow was headland deposit 51 (Fig. 5, Section 1). It is possible this layer is surviving due to being protected from plough damage by the thick subsoil cover in the area, and sitting within the depression of the solution hollow. Unabraded early-middle Saxon pottery was recovered from this fill.

4.4.3 This headland deposit was truncated by a later posthole (46). Fired clay was recovered from the posthole, indicating the posthole may relate to a Saxon or later structure.

4.4.4 Abraded Roman pottery was also recovered feature 30, which also truncated feature 27 (Fig. 3, Plates 4 & 7), also containing abraded Roman pottery. This feature is possibly a boundary, though because the feature was not fully uncovered in the trench its form and function is uncertain. From the quite square/trapezoidal profile seen in section (Fig. 5, Section 7, Plate 7), there is a question of whether the feature could in fact be a sunken feature building (SFB), with 27 forming a beamslot. If the feature is an SFB, it would explain why the feature is not seen in Trenches 1 or 4.

4.4.5 The evidence for definite Saxon activity on site is limited to the pottery recovered from the upper fills of the solution hollow, however the unabraded nature of these sherds would suggest nearby activity. Similarly, the posthole in Trench 1 would indicate Saxon settlement on the site.

4.4.6 Free threshing wheat and a lack of rye being recovered from the environmental samples is consistent with Saxon activity.

4.5 Significance

4.5.1 Overall, the archaeology discovered on site was relatively unexpected, with Saxon remains being rare within the locale. As the remains could help further our understanding of the previous land use along with the villages history, the site is considered to be locally significant.

4.6 Recommendations

4.6.1 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

**General description**
Trench contained a solution hollow, hedge line and a post hole. Consisted of a chalk natural overlain by subsoil (0.3m thick) and topsoil (0.42m thick).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>NW-SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg. depth (m)</strong></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Width (m)</strong></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length (m)</strong></td>
<td>20</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>45</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Hedge line</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Hedge line</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Solution hollow</td>
<td>Pottery, Flint, Fired Clay</td>
<td>E/M Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Solution hollow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Headland</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>E/M Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Solution hollow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 2

**General description**
Trench contained 2 intercutting ditches, a gully, two postholes and a tree throw. Consisted of chalk natural overlain by subsoil (0.4m thick) and topsoil (0.38m thick).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>NE-SW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg. depth (m)</strong></td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Width (m)</strong></td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length (m)</strong></td>
<td>12.85</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>3</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Fired Clay</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trench 3

#### General description

Trench contained two ditches, two pits, a ring ditch and two geological features. Consisted of a chalk natural overlain by subsoil (0.62m thick) and topsoil (0.18m thick).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20</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>27</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.4+</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Ditch?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Ditch?</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>?Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Ditch/?SFB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.8+</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>?Ditch/?SFB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>?Ditch/?SFB</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>?Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>?Ditch/?SFB</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>?Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Animal Bone &amp; Fired Clay</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Fired Clay</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Fired Clay</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Fired Clay</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 4

#### General description

Trench contained a ditch and three periglacial features. Consisted of a chalk natural overlain by subsoil (0.25m thick) and topsoil (0.2m thick). Hardcore was overlying the subsoil in the southern quarter of trench (0.35m thick).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20</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>Cut</td>
<td>1.27+</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Animal Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trench 5

**General description**
Trench contained a gully, two ditches (unexcavated) and two periglacial features. Consisted of chalk natural overlain by subsoil (0.4m) and topsoil (0.2m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 6

**General description**
Trench contained four ditches (1 unexcavated) and three postholes (1 unexcavated). Consisted of chalk natural overlain by subsoil (0.21m thick) and topsoil (0.25m thick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Pottery

By Paul Blinkhorn

B.1.1 The pottery assemblage comprised 13 sherds with a total weight of 106g. It comprised a mixture of Prehistoric, Romano-British and early/middle Anglo-Saxon pottery, as follows:

**PHT:** Prehistoric. Hand-built. Sparse to moderate sub-angular iron ore, red grog and shell up to 2mm, most 1mm or less. Rare angular white flint up to 2mm. 1 sherd, 13g

**RBG:** Romano-British. Large sandy grey wares. 6 sherds, 51g.

**EMS1:** Sandstone. Moderate to dense calcareous-cemented sandstone up to 2mm, many free quartz grains up to 1mm. 5 sherds, 37g.

**EMS2:** Sparse Sandy. Few visible inclusions, sparse sub-rounded quartz 0.2mm or less. 1 sherd, 5g.

B.1.2 The pottery occurrence by number and weight of sherds per context by fabric type is shown in Table 1. Each date should be regarded as a *terminus post quem*. The assemblage is largely in fairly good condition, the obvious residual material aside, although the sherds of Romano-British pottery from contexts 20 and 31 are both somewhat abraded, and could easily be residual. They are certainly at least the product of secondary deposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Ctxt</th>
<th>PHT No</th>
<th>PHT Wt</th>
<th>RBG No</th>
<th>RBG Wt</th>
<th>EMS1 No</th>
<th>EMS1 Wt</th>
<th>EMS2 No</th>
<th>EMS2 Wt</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E/MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E/MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Pottery occurrence by number and weight (in g) of sherds per context by fabric type*

B.1.3 The sherd of prehistoric pottery is of uncertain date, and could be as early as the Bronze Age. Certainly, pottery of that date with fabrics based around flint, grog and shell are known from previous excavations at Fulbourn (Barclay 1999). The Anglo-Saxon pottery is undecorated, and can only be dated broadly to within the early-middle Anglo-Saxon period, although given the site’s location in the ‘Primary Zone’ of Ipswich Ware distribution (Blinkhorn 2012), it is unlikely to be middle Saxon, and is most likely of 5th – 7th century date. The fabrics are very typical of sites in the region, (e.g. Blinkhorn 1999).
B.2 Fired clay

*With Carole Fletcher*

B.2.1 A small assemblage of 17 fired clay fragments were recovered from four contexts, weighing 145g (see Table 2). The condition of the overall assemblage is heavily abraded. All fragments are of a pinkish red sandy clay fabric with common chalk inclusions (15%). A single fragment survives with a wattle impression; all other fragments having no diagnostic features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Fired Clay quantification*

**Statement of Potential and Further Work**

B.2.2 Further work will be required on this assemblage should excavation be undertaken. The assemblage should be examined by a suitable specialist.

B.3 Worked Stone

*With Carole Fletcher*

B.3.1 A total of nine fragments of lava quern were recovered from context 49 (solution hollow 50, Trench 1) weighing 22g. These fragments are all less than 2cm in size and highly weathered, with no surviving diagnostic features.

B.3.2 A single fragment of gritstone, weighing 30g, was also recovered from context 49 (solution hollow 50, Trench 1). This fragment measured 4cm in diameter and was heavily abraded. No outer edge survived, so discerning the diameter of the quern was not possible.
B.4 Worked Flint

By Anthony Haskins

Introduction and methodology

B.4.1 A small assemblage of twelve flints were rapidly assessed for typological and chronological indicators. This report covers this basic assessment.

B.4.2 For the purposes of this report individual artefacts were scanned and then assigned to a category within a simple lithic classification system (Table 3). Unmodified flakes were assigned to an arbitrary size scale in order to identify the range of debitage present within the assemblage. Edge retouched and utilised pieces were also characterised. Beyond this no detailed metrical or technological recording was undertaken during the preliminary analysis. The results of this report are therefore based on a rapid assessment of the assemblage and could change if further work is undertaken.

Quantification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amorphous core</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Flake</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Flake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Blade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Blade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Flint Quantification

B.4.3 The majority of the flints (58%) were recovered from the solution hollow fill 49, a single flake was also recovered from the solution hollow fill 52. The remainder of the material was spread across a mix of pit, ditch and posthole fills.

Results

B.4.4 The flint recovered is generally in an abraded state with some recortification present and is generally a light whitish-blue to blueish-white colour with a chalky cortex where present. The single recovered core is formed on a dark brownish-black semi translucent flint again with a thick white chalky cortex.

B.4.5 The core had a single surviving platform that shows little sign of structured working and had the remnants of several failed removals. The poor quality of the core and unstructured working would suggest a later prehistoric date.

B.4.6 The range of debitage present is a mix of flakes and blades. The two recovered blades are more likely to be of Neolithic date and are more heavily recortificated than the rest of the assemblage suggesting that they are earlier. The remainder of the debitage is a mix of undiagnostic secondary and tertiary flakes – several of which were broken. The size and poor quality of the knapping would, however, suggest a later prehistoric date.

B.4.7 One of the secondary flakes from watering hole fill 49 may have semi-abrupt retouch down the left lateral edge forming a potential side scraper. If this is true retouch it removes the recortificated surface and suggests re-use of an earlier flake, however, it is just as likely to be modern damage caused in excavation as there is little sign of the edge having ever been utilised.
Conclusion

B.4.8 This is a small mixed date assemblage of residual flints from a range of features across the site. The earliest material is likely to be Neolithic whilst the later material is from the later prehistoric period, most likely Bronze Age.
APPENDIX C. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

C.1 Faunal remains

By Chris Faine

Introduction

C.1.1 In total, 1.7kg of animal bone was recovered from features during the evaluation. All data was initially recorded using a specially written MS Access database. Bones were recorded using a version of the criteria described in Davis (1992). Initially all elements were assessed in terms of siding (where appropriate), completeness, tooth wear stages (also where applicable) and epiphyseal fusion. Completeness was assessed in terms of percentage and zones present (after Dobney & Reilly, 1988).

Results

C.1.2 The assemblage consisted of 28 fragments, of which 7 were identifiable to species. Contexts 2, 28, 34, 36, 42, 45 & 51 contained no identifiable fragments. Context 4 (Ditch 3, Trench 2) contained a partial sheep skull with cuts marks apparent on the occipital, along with horse and sheep mandibles from animals aged 3-4 & 4-5 years old at death respectively. Context 20 (Ditch 18, Trench 6) contained a partial adult dog mandible. A partial cattle mandible and metatarsal were recovered from context 49 (Solution hollow 50, Trench 1) and a partial inominate from context 51 (Trench 1).
C.2 Environmental samples

By Rachel Fosberry

Introduction

C.2.1 Ten bulk samples were taken from features within the evaluation trenches in order to assess the quality of preservation of plant remains and their potential to provide useful data as part of further archaeological investigations.

C.2.2 Features sampled include ditches, post holes and pits that are thought to date to the Saxon period with some residual Roman material.

Methodology

C.2.3 The total volume (up to 10 litres) of each bulk sample was processed by water flotation (using a modified Siraff three-tank system) for the recovery of charred plant remains, dating evidence and any other artefactual evidence that might be present. The floating component (flot) of the samples was collected in a 0.3mm nylon mesh and the residue was washed through 10mm, 5mm, 2mm and a 0.5mm sieve. Both flot and residues were allowed to air dry. A magnet was dragged through each residue fraction prior to sorting for artefacts. Any artefacts present were noted and reintegrated with the hand-excavated finds. The dried flots were subsequently sorted using a binocular microscope at magnifications up to x 60 and an abbreviated list of the recorded remains are presented in Table 4. Identification of plant remains is with reference to the Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands and the authors' own reference collection. Nomenclature is according to Zohary and Hopf (2000) for cereals and Stace (1997) for other plants. Carbonized seeds and grains, by the process of burning and burial, become blackened and often distort and fragment leading to difficulty in identification. Plant remains have been identified to species where possible. The identification of cereals has been based on the characteristic morphology of the grains and chaff as described by Jacomet (2006).

Quantification

C.2.4 For the purpose of this initial assessment, items such as seeds, cereal grains and legumes have been scanned and recorded qualitatively according to the following categories

# = 1-10, ## = 11-50, ### = 51+ specimens #### = 100+ specimens

Items that cannot be easily quantified such as charcoal have been scored for abundance

+ = rare, ++ = moderate, +++ = abundant

Results

C.2.5 Preservation is by carbonisation with all of the samples containing charred cereal grains. The results are discussed by trench:

Trench 1

C.2.6 Samples were taken from two of the three fills of solution hollow 50. Sample 10 from lower fill 52 contains occasional charred cereal grains whereas Sample 6, fill 49 contains charred barley (Hordeum vulgare) grains that are well preserved with some grains still enclosed in their outer sheath. Oat (Avena sp.) and wheat (Triticum sp.)
grains are also present. There may have been some mixing of material between fills 49 and 52.

C.2.7 Sample 5, fill 45 of post hole 46 contains occasional charred grains of barley and wheat.

_Trench 2_

C.2.8 Sample 1, fill 4 was taken from ditch 3 contains a moderate assemblage of charred wheat, oats and barley grains with occasional poorly preserved legume fragments of large pea/small bean (Fabaceae).

_Trench 3_

C.2.9 Sample 8, fill 34 of pit 33 contains occasional charred grains and a single cleaver (Galium aparine) seed.

C.2.10 Sample 9 from secondary silting fill 41 of curvilinear ditch 39 contains abundant charred cereal grains with wheat grains predominating although many of the grains are abraded and poorly preserved. Several of the grains are of a compact morphology suggesting they are the bread wheat variety (T. aestivum compactum).

C.2.11 Sample 7 was taken from slumping fill 31 from a possible Sunken Feature Building (SFB) 30. This sample also contains abundant charred grain that has a similar composition to sample 9 in that it is predominantly comprised of abraded charred wheat grains although a single grain from this sample has been identified as rye (Secale cereale). Charred beans are also present.

_Trench 6_

C.2.12 Sample 2, secondary fill 20 of ditch 18 is also comprised of poorly-preserved charred wheat with occasional barley grains. Single charred seeds of cleaver and cornflower (Centaurea sp.) are also present and the sample is rich in silicates suggesting hearth waste.

C.2.13 Sample 3 (fill 22 of ditch 21) contains occasional charred cereal grains. One of the wheat grains has the characteristic morphology of spelt (T. spelta), a hulled wheat variety commonly cultivated in the Roman period.

C.2.14 Sample 4, fill 24 of post hole 23 contains sparse charred wheat grains.
Table 4: Environmental samples from Cox's Drove

**Discussion**

C.2.15 The environmental samples from Land off Cox's Drove are dominated by charred cereal grains which occur in abundance in some deposits and appear to be scattered across the site. The cereal varieties of free-threshing wheat and barley are commonly encountered in archaeological deposits dating from the Late Iron Age onwards. During the Iron Age and Roman period spelt wheat was usually more popular than free-threshing wheat and it is possible that some of the wheat grains recovered from this site may be of this variety although none of the distinctive glume bases are present. Rye does occur in the Roman period in this region but is more commonly cultivated in the Saxon period which correlates with the pottery finds of this date.

C.2.16 The quantities of charred grain are quite significant as they represent only a small proportion of what must have been burnt. Carbonisation only occurs in certain areas of a fire, usually at the base of a hearth and grains survive the process favourably over other cereal components such as straw (Boardman and Jones 1990). Chaff elements and weed seeds are rare, indicating that the grain has been sieved and fully processed. The largest assemblages of charred grain from this site occur in ditch fills often described as 'slumping' or 'sifting' deposits which may suggest a catastrophic burning event of a structure like a granary or may be indicative of the disposal of waste from large-scale bread making. It does seem likely that some domestic or industrial activity involving large quantities of prime grain have taken place in this area.

C.2.17 The samples from the evaluation demonstrate that the site has the potential to provide key evidence (particularly in the form of carbonised grains) for the processing and production of food in the Saxon period, a research theme that is identified as of regional significance (Medlycott 2011, 58).
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Figure 1: Site location showing archaeological trenches (black) in development area (red)
Figure 2: Trench plan
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Figure 3: Plan of Trenches 1 – 3 and Trenches 5 & 6
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Figure 4: Plan of Trenches in relation to proposed development
Figure 5: Sections 1, 4 & 7-10
Plate 1: Solution hollow 50, Trench 1, looking west

Plate 2: Solution hollow 50, Trench 1, looking south-west
Plate 3: Ditches 3, 6, 8 and posthole 10, Trench 2, looking south-west

Plate 4: Trench 3, looking east north-east
Plate 5: Pits 33 & 43 truncated by ring ditch 39, Trench 3, looking north north-west

Plate 6: Ring ditch 39, Trench 3, looking south-west
Plate 7: Ditch 27 and ditch or SFB 30, Trench 3, looking north-east

Plate 8: Trench 5, looking north north-east