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Summary

Between the 2nd and the 4th of June 2015, Oxford Archaeology East conducted an archaeological trenching evaluation at Land South of Westry Hall, Wisbech Road, March which revealed a single undated linear ditch in one trench and a number of postholes suggestive of a structure in another. Two of the trenches contained no archaeological features. The trench containing the postholes was extended to reveal a sub-circular roundhouse comprising eleven surviving postholes. Small quantities of pottery from the postholes date the building to the Early Iron Age, making this a relatively rare discovery in Cambridgeshire.
1 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 **Location and scope of work**

1.1.1 A trial trenched archaeological evaluation was conducted by Oxford Archaeology East (OA East) at Land South of Westry Hall, 351 Wisbech Road, on the north-west edge of March (TL 404 9849; Fig. 1). The work was undertaken in advance of a proposed residential development entailing the erection of two three-storey dwellings and two two-storey dwellings, all with detached garages. The site is approximately 0.63ha in area and is currently open pasture.

1.1.2 The evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Gemma Stewart of Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team (CCC HET; Planning Application F/TR13/0834/O), supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East (Brudenell 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 site is located at the north-western end of the town of March, which occupies a former fen island. The superficial geology comprises Quaternary sands and gravels of the March Gravels Member, which overlie Amphill Clay of the Jurassic period (British Geological Survey 1980). The land, which is currently pasture, is relatively flat at between c.3m-4m OD.

1.3 **Archaeological and historical background**

1.3.1 March is located upon an area of high ground and has been extensively settled and exploited from the prehistoric period onwards, evidenced by numerous findspots and archaeological investigations in the area. *Early Neolithic to Bronze Age (c. 4000BC-800BC)*

1.3.2 Waste flints and scrapers dating from the Early Neolithic to the Bronze Age have been found at Cherryholt Farm (HER 05007) and a Neolithic stone axe of the “woodhenge” type has also been found close by (HER 05904). Other evidence includes an Early Neolithic pit and a number of linear features revealed during excavations at Gaul Road (MCB19567) to the south of the current site.

1.3.3 Bronze Age activity has been recorded at various locations including at Whitemoor Sidings (ECB2014), at Hundred Road (ECB3027; including a post-built structure), at Neale Wade Community College (Pickstone 2010), at the March Northern County Offices (O’Brien 2003) and adjacent to the A141 (Jones 2007). Both settlement and funerary evidence has been identified, the latter including cropmarks of a barrow (HER 04895) to the south of Earls Fen Farm.
Iron Age to Roman (c.800 BC - 410AD)

1.3.4 An Iron Age trackway and possible stock enclosures have been identified at Estover Road near the Fen Causeway (HER 07936a), an Iceni coin hoard (100 BC to 42 AD) was discovered at Field Baulk Farm (MCB16060) and an Iron Age bowl was found within the town in 1938 (HER 05922). Close to the River Nene a possible Iron Age pit was found during an evaluation at Elwyn Road (ECB285, Casa Hatton 2001) and another pit of either Bronze Age or Iron Age date was found at land west of Dartford Road (ECB2511, Hogan et al 2007). Just outside the town's historic core, investigations at land west of No. 47 Wimblington Road (ECB3422) revealed a ditch which produced Late Iron Age and Romano-British pottery.

1.3.5 There are extensive Roman remains (over 70 sites) in and around March that range from stray finds to settlement sites. The main Roman communication route across the island was the Fen Causeway, a Roman road running between Denver, Norfolk and Peterborough. A number of excavations have been carried out along the route of the road, which passes to the south of the current site, including an evaluation at Calvary Park (Weston and Williams 2005).

1.3.6 Other remains include Roman farmsteads, field systems, ditches and evidence of salt production; the latter at Longhill Road to the north-east of the current site (Atkins 2003).

Anglo-Saxon and medieval

1.3.7 Anglo-Saxon occupation in the area probably comprised scattered farms and occasional hamlets associated with the manor of Doddington. Evidence for settlement has been found around Tydd St Giles (Andrews 1995) to the north-west and Walpole Bank to the north-east. By the time of the Norman Conquest occupation appears to have been focused around Knights End and the Church of St Wendreda, where the medieval settlement subsequently developed.

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 OA East would like to thank Andrew Schofield for funding the work. The site was managed by Dr Matthew Brudenell and surveyed by David Brown. The fieldwork was carried out by Steve Graham and Paddy Lambert. The Brief was written by Gemma Stewart of CCC HET, who also monitored the work. Thanks are also extended to the various specialists who contributed to the report, the illustrator and the editor.
2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims
2.1.1 The evaluation sought 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 proposed development area.

2.2 Methodology
2.2.1 The Brief required the excavation of 105m of linear trenching in the area of the site proposed for residential development.
2.2.2 In total, four trenches were excavated (Trenches 1-4), three of which were 25m long, and one 30m long. All had a uniform width of 1.60m.
2.2.3 Following a request from the client, Trench 1 was relocated 1.50m further to the east to accommodate changes in the development proposal. During the course of excavating Trench 1 it became apparent that the remains of a large post-built structure were present at the north-eastern end of the trench. In consultation with both the client and CCC HET, an additional area (10m by 8.5m) was opened by machine at the north eastern end of the trench in order to fully-expose the structure.
2.2.4 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a wheeled JCB-type excavator using a toothless ditching bucket.
2.2.5 The site survey was carried out using a Leica GSO8 with Smartnet live data feed.
2.2.6 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.
2.2.7 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.
2.2.8 Environmental samples were taken from the base of the ditch located in Trench 4 and from the postholes forming the structure in Trench 1.
2.2.9 Site conditions were good, being dry and bright throughout the evaluation with occasional overcast spells.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 Of the four trenches excavated (Fig 2), two contained no archaeological features (Trenches 2 and 3), one contained a single linear ditch (Trench 4) and one contained a circular structure comprising of a series of postholes (Trench 1). The subsoil comprised a mid brown sandy silt, while the topsoil was a brown loam. The trenches are described below in numerical order, supplemented by further trench/context information in Appendix A and finds and environmental reports in Appendices B and C.

3.2 Trench 1
3.2.1 Trench 1 was located in the north-east corner of the evaluated area. It measured 25m long and was orientated north-east to south-west. Six postholes were identified at the north-east end of the trench forming a curvilinear alignment, suggesting that they belonged to circular structure.

3.2.2 In consultation with the client and CCC HET, the decision was made to extend the north-eastern end of the trench southwards to uncover the plan of the possible structure. A rectangular area measuring 10m by 8.5m was subsequently stripped revealing a further five postholes forming a post-built roundhouse.

Post-built structure
3.2.3 Combined, the structure consisted of 11 postholes forming a sub-circular ring, with an apparent break or opening along the south-eastern side (Fig. 2; Plate 1). The diameter of the structure was 8.5m east to west and at least 7m north to south. There was no evidence of any internal features within the ring of postholes. All postholes were 100% excavated.

3.2.4 The postholes were all sub-circular in plan and measured between 0.2m (122) and 0.55m (117) wide and between 0.05m (107) and 0.3m (120) deep (Figs 3 and 5; Plates 1 and 2 and see App. A). The main fills generally comprised a light brown or orange brown clay sand or silt with occasional concentrations of small, often tightly-packed flints and stones. The latter appear to have been the remnants of packing material around the remains of postpipes; these were distinguishable by their different-coloured fills that generally comprised mid brown clay sand. Many of the postpipes (notably within 101, 105 and 111) were very well defined, and had distinctive tapering profiles (see Fig. 5 for sections and Plate 2).

3.2.5 Three of the postholes contained sherds of Early Iron Age pottery (all from the postpipe fills); these were within 103 (three sherds), 105 (one sherd) and 111 (18 sherds). Other finds were scarce, comprising tiny fragments of unidentifiable animal bone (one burnt piece and a fragment of tooth) from the postpipes of 105 and 111. Environmental samples taken from the postholes contained few macrofossils other than occasional charcoal flecks.

3.3 Trench 2
3.3.1 Trench 2 measured 25m long and was aligned north-east to south-west to the south of Trench 1 (Fig. 2). A mixed natural of clay sand and terrace gravels was exposed, sealed by a 0.15m-thick subsoil (201) and a 0.40m-thick topsoil (200).
3.4 Trench 3
3.4.1 Trench 3, located in the north-east part of the site, was 35m long and orientated north-east to south-west (Fig. 2). A mixed natural of clay sand and terrace gravels was exposed, overlain by subsoil (301) that was on average 0.22m thick and topsoil (300) that was on average 0.23m thick.

3.5 Trench 4
3.5.1 Trench 4, aligned north-west to south-east, measured 25m long and contained a single linear ditch (402) orientated east to west and located towards the centre of the trench (Fig. 4; Plates 3 and 4). The ditch was 1.62m wide and 0.42m deep with an irregular profile (Fig. 5). It contained two fills: a 0.20m-thick light brown grey sandy clay (404) overlain by a 0.24m-thick light orange grey sandy clay (403); neither of which contained finds.

3.5.2 This ditch was not identified in any of the other trenches, suggesting that it either terminated or turned north or south at some point to the west of Trench 4 and before Trench 3. The ditch was sealed by subsoil (401) that was on average 0.20m thick, above which was a 0.18m-thick topsoil (400).

3.6 Finds Summary
3.6.1 Apart from a few scraps of animal bone (see below), the main find recovered from the structure was pottery. The latter comprises 22 sherds (125g), all of which is datable to the Early Iron Age (see App. B).

3.7 Environmental Summary
3.7.1 A very small amount of bone (2g) came from two of the postpipe fills. The bone from postpipe 104 in posthole 105 was unidentifiable and burnt, whilst the other postpipe (110; in posthole 111) contained very small unidentifiable pieces and a single tooth from a sheep (Chris Faine pers. comm.).

3.7.2 Twelve bulk samples were taken, one from ditch 402 and the remainder from the postholes forming the structure, which were 100% sampled. Of these, seven samples were selected and found to contain sparse amounts of charcoal and no plant remains. Following processing of all the samples, additional sherds of pottery and fragments of animal bone were recovered and incorporated with the hand-collected assemblage.
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1.1 Of the two features uncovered in the evaluation area, the most significant is the roughly circular post-built structure located in Trench 1. Pottery recovered from three of the postholes indicates an Early Iron Age date for the structure, which makes this a relatively rare discovery in Cambridgeshire.

4.1.2 Positioned on the highest point of the field (3.74m OD), the 8.5m-diameter structure comprises a single ring of slightly irregularly-spaced and sized postholes. The shape and size of this structure appears to be fairly typical for roundhouses of Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age date in the region (Evans and Knight 1998). At Colne Fen in Earith for example, of the six roundhouse structures which were identified, the three most convincing examples possessed broadly similar dimensions (6.75m, 7.25m and 9m; Evans et al 2013) to the roundhouse at the current site. At Barleycroft Paddocks the diameters of the roundhouses were, however, slightly smaller at 6m, 6.4m and 7.5m (Evans and Knight 1997).

4.1.3 Five of the postholes (105, 111, 114, 122 and 125) were more substantial than the others, being in excess of 0.20m deep with clearly defined postpipes; the shallower depth of the other postholes may have been due to subsequent truncation. Four of the deeper postholes were spaced broadly equidistant to each other whilst the fifth (125) was somewhat isolated on the south-western edge of the structure. This might indicate that the five deeper postholes contained the main load-bearing posts of the structure.

4.1.4 The somewhat irregular spacing of the postholes is similar to that found in a roundhouse excavated at Eye Quarry (Patten 2009), where the clustering together of postholes was interpreted as possibly representing repair or replacement of posts.

4.1.5 The large gap of 8m between the two southernmost postholes (122 and 125) may have included the location of a south-east facing entrance, although it is probable that any postholes that may have been present here have since been removed by later truncation. A south-east facing entrance would be consistent with other examples of roundhouse structures from this period within the Cambridgeshire fens, including at Colne Fen, Earith (Evans et al 2013) and Barleycroft Paddocks (Evans and Knight 1997).

4.1.6 With the exception of the undated ditch located to the north-east of the roundhouse in Trench 4 (see below), no other features were revealed in any of the trenches that might have been associated with the roundhouse. It is possible that the roundhouse was an isolated structure, although it should be noted that roundhouses of this period are often found in small groups or in association with features such as ditches, wells or three/four post structures. It is feasible, therefore, that other contemporary features may be located in the vicinity, for example along the northern and southern perimeters of the excavation area which are not being developed due to their proximity to power lines and a protected tree line.

4.1.7 The sparsity of domestic material culture, other than the few sherds of pottery recovered from the postpipes, might indicate that this was not a domestic structure and/or was relatively short-lived. Interpretation of the Fengette (Bronze Age) roundhouses, which also produced few finds was that these structures were not for human habitation but were the remains of stock pens or barns (Pryor 1980). A similar interpretation may be proposed for the March roundhouse and may explain the lack of associated features or occupation evidence. However other excavated sites from this
period have produced evidence of long standing ditch systems and wells but with few associated finds (Evans 2013). A further example of this is a roundhouse that was excavated at Stonald Field, Whittlesey which also failed to produce any artefactual material from any of its postholes (Patten 2004).

4.1.8 This evidence contrasts with that from the later Iron Age, when roundhouses were clearly maintained or rebuilt and there was considerable associated artefact deposition. One explanation for this contrast might relate to a social/cultural change from the Early Iron Age to the Late Iron Age in terms of inheritance patterns and land holding (Evans 2013). Whereas settlement was seemingly much more fluid and temporary in the earlier Iron Age, it became more 'fixed' and permanent later on in the Iron Age as land increasingly represented a form of 'wealth' in its own right.

4.1.9 The undated ditch (402) located in Trench 4 does not appear to correspond with any of the boundaries or field ditches shown on historic maps of the area, including the Thomas Yeakenell map of 1819 and the late 19th century and later Ordnance Survey maps. This indicates that the existing field boundaries in the local area were well established and fixed by the 18th or early 19th century. Based on this evidence, and the fact that it was sealed beneath the subsoil, it is probable that the ditch pre-dated the later post-medieval period, but it is not possible to firmly assign it to any particular period.

4.2 Significance

4.2.1 Early Iron Age roundhouses are relatively rare in Cambridgeshire and so this example makes a valuable contribution to the study of settlement and associated structures of this period.

4.3 Recommendations

4.3.1 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>NE-SW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench contains circular structure consisting of 11 postholes, sealed over by soil (100) and subsoil (101) overlying a natural of clayey sand and terrace gravels.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>25.0</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>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 102</td>
<td>Pot, Flint</td>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 105</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 109</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Fill of 111</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 117</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 117</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 127</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Posthole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 127</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fill of 103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td>NE-SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of soil (200) and subsoil (201) overlying a natural of clayey sand and terrace gravels.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>context no</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of soil (300) and subsoil (301) overlying a natural of clay sand and terrace gravels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>context no</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench contains single linear feature 402 cutting into a natural of clay sand and terrace gravels sealed over by soil (400) and subsoil (401).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>context no</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Pottery

By Matt Brudenell.

Introduction

B.1.1 A total of 22 sherds (125g) of Early Iron Age pottery were recovered from the site, displaying a low mean sherd weight (MSW) of 5.7g. The pottery derived from the postpipe fillings (102, 104 and 110) of three postholes associated with the post-built roundhouse in the extension of Trench 1 (Table 1). The material can be assigned to the Decorated ware phase of the Post Deverel-Rimbury (PDR) ceramic tradition, and dates to the Early Iron Age (c. 800-350 BC). The ceramics are in a stable condition, but sherd sizes are small and the pottery is corky and fragile, with inclusions largely leached from the sherd surfaces. This report provides a quantified description of the assemblage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>No./Wt. (g) sherds</th>
<th>Fabrics (no./wt(g) sherds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>S1 (3/31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>S1 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>18/91</td>
<td>S1(15/84); F1(2/6); F2 (1/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22/125</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Pottery quantification by context

Fabrics:

Flint

F1: Moderate finely crushed burnt flint (mainly 0.25-1mm) in a slightly sandy clay matrix. 2 sherd, 6g

F2: Sparse finely crushed burnt flint (mainly 0.25-1mm). 1 sherd, 1g

Shell

S1: Moderate to common medium to coarse shell (1-3mm), often leached at the surface leaving plate-like voids/ a corky appearance.

Methodology

4.3.2 All the pottery was fully recorded following the recommendations laid out by the Prehistoric Ceramic Research Group (2009). All sherds were counted, weighed (to the nearest whole gramme) and assigned to fabric (sherd broken in excavation were refitted and counted as single entities). Sherd type was recorded, along with evidence for surface treatment, decoration, and the presence of soot and/or residue. Rim forms have been described using a codified system recorded in the catalogue, and are assigned vessel numbers. Forms have been classified using a series devised by the author (Brudenell 2011; 2012), and the class scheme created by John Barrett (1980). All pottery has been subject to sherd size analysis. Sherds less than 4cm in diameter have been classified as ‘small’ (18 sherds); sherds measuring 4-8cm are classified as ‘medium’ (4 sherds), and sherds over 8cm in diameter ‘large’ (no examples). Sherds weighing less than one gramme were recorded as crumbs. These were weighed and recorded on the pottery data sheet (3g in total), but are not described further in this report.
Assemblage characteristics

4.3.3 Plain sherd s in shell-tempered fabrics dominates the assemblage, and accounts for 94% of the pottery by weight. These are likely to have derived from local Jurassic clays and are typical of Early and Middle Iron Age assemblages from the Cambridgeshire Fens, where shell replaced flint as the dominant inclusion at the start of the Early Iron Age. However, the use of flint continued in the first half of the first millennium BC, and is evinced by the presence of three small shreds in this assemblage (7g); one being a burnished fineeware sherd (1g in fabric F2).

4.3.4 Although no partial vessel profiles were reconstructed from the group, two key diagnostic sherds were recovered: a single fingertip decorated shoulder sherd from context 102 (16g) and a single rim sherd decorated with fingertip impressions on the rim-exterior from context 104 (3g) – both in fabric S1. While this type and location of decoration is also found on Late Bronze Age pottery, it is far more common in the Early Iron Age, and when coupled with the character of the fabrics, is strongly suggestive of an Early Iron Age date for the pottery group and the building as a whole.

Discussion

4.3.5 Based on the character of the fabrics, their relative frequency, and the presence of two diagnostic features sherds (a decorated rim and shoulder), the pottery from the roundhouse can be assigned to the Early Iron Age and belongs to the Decorated ware phase of the PDR ceramic tradition. This is dated c. 800-350 BC (Brudenell 2012) and has features in common with material published from Holme Fen, Earth (Brudenell 2013). As the pottery was recovered from the postpipes of the roundhouse is it reasonable to assume that it was broadly contemporary with the abandonment of the building, suggesting the structure is likely to have been of Early Iron Age origin.

Recommendations

4.3.6 The pottery has been fully recorded, and no further quantification is required. There are no partial or complete vessel profiles worthy of illustration or publication, and therefore no further work is recommended on this small assemblage.

APPENDIX C. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

C.1 Environmental samples

By Rachel Fosberry

C.1.1 Twelve bulk samples were taken from features in order to assess the quality of preservation of plant remains and their potential to provide useful data as part of further archaeological investigations. Features sampled include an undated ditch (402) and several postholes from a possible Early Iron Age roundhouse.

C.1.2 For this initial assessment, seven samples were selected and one bucket (approximately 10 litres) of each 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 0.25mm 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Cut No.</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>no of buckets</th>
<th>Volume processed (L)</th>
<th>Charcoal &lt;2mm</th>
<th>Flot comments</th>
<th>Large animal bones</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no preservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>post hole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>sparse charcoal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>post hole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>sparse charcoal</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>post hole</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>sparse charcoal</td>
<td>##</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>post hole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no preservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>post hole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no preservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>post hole</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no preservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Environmental samples from MARWIR15

Discussion

C.1.3 All of the samples are devoid of plant remains other than modern rootlets and sparse charcoal fragments, suggesting that either the structure was not a place of human occupation or that plant remains have not been preserved. Additional sherds of pottery were recovered from postholes 103 and 111 and degraded animal bone from postholes 105 and 111.
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Figure 5: Selected sections
Plate 1: Early Iron Age post-built structure in Trench 1, from the north-east

Plate 2: Posthole 125, from the north-east
Plate 3: Trench 4, from the south-east
Plate 4: Ditch 402 in Trench 4, from the north-east