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SUMMARY

In September 2006, Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out a field evaluation at Manor Farm, Moreton Road, Buckingham (NGR: SP 699 349) on behalf of Bellway Homes and Taylor Woodrow. The evaluation revealed a single Middle Bronze Age cremation burial (prior to c 1200 BC) and a possible associated area of burnt material. Medieval and post-medieval ditches and plough furrows were also revealed, concentrated at the north end of the site. A modern pig burial interred with recent glass was also revealed.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 In September 2006, Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out a field evaluation at Manor Farm, Moreton Road, Buckingham (NGR SP 699 349) (Fig. 1). The work was undertaken on behalf of Bellway Homes and Taylor Woodrow, as part of a pre-termination planning exercise.

1.1.2 A project brief was set by David Radford, Archaeological Officer for Buckinghamshire County Archaeological Service (BCAS 2006). OA prepared and obtained approval for a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (OA 2006), detailing how OA would meet the requirements of the brief.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 The evaluation was located within a 6 ha. field west of Moreton Road and south of Manor Farm (Fig. 1). The underlying geology is Jurassic Limestone with overlying Quaternary Boulder Clay BGS 219. The site is situated on a south-east facing slope ranging from c 115 m OD at the northern end of the site to c 104 m OD at the southern end. The topography of the surrounding landscape is gently undulating.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The archaeological background to the evaluation has been summarised from an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (DBA), Land at Moreton Lane, Buckingham (CgMs 2004). Subsequently, a geo-physical survey by Archaeological Survey was undertaken at the site (AS 2005).

Iron Age and Roman

1.3.2 Iron Age pottery from an ephemeral feature was recovered during the excavation of a pipe trench to the east of Maids Moreton. A Roman farmstead or small settlement has been recorded close to Castle Fields c 0.5 km south-west of the site. Following ploughing, 2nd to 4th century Roman coins, pottery and a large quantity of building material were noted immediately to the north-east and south-west of Castle Fields.
1.3.3 A Roman road aligned east-west is suggested to have run immediately to the south of the site. A second Roman road forms the northern boundary of the site, which is also the parish boundary. A Roman brooch and coin have been found within the built up area to the east of Moreton Road.

**Medieval and post-medieval**

1.3.4 The Manor at Maids Moreton was recorded in Domesday and is presumed to have Saxon origins. The earthwork of a windmill mound is located c. 300 m to the north of the site. An assemblage of sixteen silver coins was found immediately to the west of the site and possible house platforms close to the church are located to the east. The site would have been within the agricultural fields of Maids Moreton, characterised by ridge and furrow (seen on aerial photographs).

1.3.5 The dominance of the agricultural economy continued into the post-medieval period, and the All Souls College estate map of 1595 depicts the site as being within the open fields of Maids Moreton. The Maids Moreton Enclosure map (1803) depicts the site as being a large open field. The 1885 OS map shows the site comprising five fields with a spring located in the southern-most field. Manor Farm is first shown on the 1900 OS 6” scale map. A 1958 OS 1:10,560 map shows that Manor Farm had been extended and by 1983 Manor Farm had been demolished and replaced with the buildings that are there today.

2 **EVALUATION AIMS**

2.1.1 To establish the presence/absence of archaeological remains within the proposal area, particularly regarding the higher potential of locating late prehistoric and Roman deposits.

2.1.2 To determine the extent, condition, nature, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains present. To establish the ecofactual and environmental potential of archaeological deposits and features and to make available the results of the investigation.

3 **EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

3.1 **Scope of fieldwork, methods and recording**

3.1.1 The evaluation consisted of seventeen trenches, each measuring 30 m in length and 1.6 m in width. Trenches 6 and 13 were extended to the south by 2.5 m and 5 m respectively, after discussions with the County Archaeological Officer.

3.1.2 The trenches were excavated to provide a representative sample of the development area and were targeted on areas of archaeological potential highlighted by the geophysical survey.
3.1.3 The overburden was removed under close archaeological supervision by a JCB fitted with a toothless bucket. The trenches were cleaned by hand and the revealed features were sampled to determine their extent and nature, and to retrieve finds and environmental samples.

3.1.4 All trenches were planned at 1:50 and their sections drawn at scales of 1:20. All features were photographed using colour slide and black and white print film. Recording followed procedures detailed in the *OAU Fieldwork Manual* (ed. D Wilkinson, 1992).

3.2 Finds and palaeo-environmental evidence

3.2.1 Finds were recovered by hand during the course of the excavation and bagged by context. Finds of special interest were given a unique small find number.

3.2.2 Environmental samples were taken for the recovery of charred plant remains and to assess the palaeo-environmental potential of the site and to help characterise the archaeological activity. 40 litre bulk samples were taken from suitable features following procedures set out in *Environmental Sampling Guidelines and Manual* (OA, 2000).

4 RESULTS: GENERAL

4.1 Soils and ground conditions

4.1.1 Soils consisted of a silty loam topsoil between 0.2 m and 0.56 m deep over a silty clay subsoil up to 0.26 m deep. The natural varied between trenches from tenacious silty clay to areas of sandy gravel, and to gravel rich sandy clay.

4.1.2 Ground conditions were generally favourable for the evaluation, with no waterlogging encountered. Trenches were located to avoid a NW-SE aligned sewer and overhead electricity cables. Modern field drainage activity across the site and concentrated around the location of Trench 14 may have disturbed potential archaeological deposits.

4.2 Distribution of archaeological deposits

4.2.1 Section 5 comprises a detailed description of the archaeological deposits within each trench, including individual context descriptions, with archaeological features described from earliest to latest. General context information is summarised in the inventory (Appendix 1).

4.2.2 The evaluation revealed a low density of archaeological features and deposits across the area evaluated. Activity was concentrated at the northern end of the site, with the only significant archaeological remains being represented by a Middle Bronze Age cremation and possible associated area of burnt natural within Trench 6.
4.2.3 Later activity was represented by NE-SW aligned furrows, ditches and gullies of apparent post-medieval date encountered in Trenches 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. There was no evidence for features or deposits dating to the intervening periods.

5 RESULTS

5.1 Trench descriptions

General

5.1.1 The topsoil and subsoil are not generally described within the individual trench descriptions. Generally topsoil was numbered as 100 in Trench 1, as 200 in trench 2 and so on. In Trench 1 subsoil was numbered as 101 in Trench 2, as 201 and so on. Where the subsoil sealed features this relationship will be made explicit. In all other cases it can be assumed that features cut the subsoil.

Trench 1

5.1.2 In Trench 1 (Fig. 2) the natural (100) was encountered at 109.67 m OD. It was cut by two roughly N-S aligned furrows, the fills of which were not excavated as they contained post-medieval ceramic building material (hereafter CBM), that was not retained.

Trenches 2 and 3

5.1.3 Trench 2 and 3 contained no archaeological features.

Trench 4

5.1.4 In Trench 4 (Fig. 2, Fig. 3), natural (405) was reached between 107.52 m OD and 106.43 m OD. It was cut by NE-SW aligned ditch (404) that measured 1 m wide and 0.15 deep. Post-medieval CBM was recovered from the single clay silt fill (403), suggesting a modern date for this feature (Fig. 5, section 400).

Trench 5

5.1.5 In Trench 5 (Fig 2) natural (510) was observed at 107.31 m OD. It was cut by modern N-S aligned field drains (502, 504) at the western end of the trench. Furrows 506 and 509 were aligned roughly N-S and located towards the centre and eastern end of the trench. These features were not excavated, as post-medieval CBM was noted within the fills, but not retained.

Trench 6

5.1.6 In Trench 6 (Fig. 2, Fig. 3) the natural (613) was encountered between 107.57 m OD and 107.12 m OD. At the western end of the trench it was cut by a cremation pit (602) measuring 0.4 m wide and 0.14 m deep (Fig. 5, section 601). This feature contained a single charcoal and burnt bone rich silty soil (603) from which Middle Bronze Age pottery was recovered. Fill 603 was sealed by subsoil 601.
5.1.7 At the eastern end of the trench was a burnt deposit (610) measuring 5.5 m long and 1.6 m wide. This deposit was also indicated by a strong response on the geophysical survey. A hand-dug slot (Fig. 5, section 602) was placed through this layer and this was subsequently extended by machine to be 1.7 m long and 0.5 m wide. This intervention revealed natural layers (611, 612, 613 and 614) underlying the upper natural clay (610). Of these natural deposits, 610 and 611 showed signs of extreme heating, resulting in distinctive red and yellow discoloration of the soil. No trace of the source of this heating was observed suggesting it has probably been lost due to truncation.

5.1.8 Roughly NE-SW aligned furrows (604, 606 and 608) were spaced fairly evenly across the trench and had been indicated by negative responses on the geophysical survey. Of these features, fills (607) and (609) in 606 and 608 were removed by JCB. A hand-dug slot was placed through fill (605) of furrow 604. This feature measured 2.5 m wide and 0.12 m deep and post-medieval pottery and modern clay pipe was recovered, but not retained.

**Trench 7**

5.1.9 In Trench 7 (Fig. 2), natural (702) was reached at a depth of 106.36 m OD. It was cut by a tree throw (709) that measured 2 m in length and was 0.7 m wide. No finds were recovered from the single silty fill of this feature (710).

5.1.10 NE-SE aligned furrows 703 and 705 were located towards the western end of the trench. Fill (706) of 705 was excavated by machine, revealing post-medieval CBM that was not retained. Fill (704) of furrow 703 yielded modern clay pipe that was not retained. A 0.5 m wide hand dug slot was placed through fill (708) of linear feature 707. This revealed an *in situ* 19th-century ceramic field drain.

**Trench 8**

5.1.11 In Trench 8 (Fig. 2, Fig. 3 and Fig. 5, sections 800-803 incl.) the natural (803) was encountered at 105.23 m OD. It was cut by NE-SW aligned gully 808 that measured 0.22 m wide and 0.08 m deep. This feature terminated after 1.15 m with no dateable material recovered from the single clay fill (809).

5.1.12 Ditches 804 and 806 were located at the eastern end of the trench. Ditch 804 measured 0.4 m wide and 0.2 m deep. It contained a single clay fill (805) from which a post-medieval nail was recovered but not retained. The nearby parallel ditch (806) produced no finds from the single fill (807).

5.1.13 Irregular shaped feature 814 measured 0.75 m wide and 0.1 m deep. No finds were recovered from the single silty fill (815). This feature is likely to represent bioturbation or a tree throw hollow.

5.1.14 NE-SW aligned furrows 810, 812 and 816 were fairly evenly spaced across the Trench. Furrow 810 measured 2.85 m wide and 0.25 m deep. Post-medieval CBM
was recovered from fill (811). Machine excavation of furrow 812 also revealed post-medieval CBM within its fill (813). The CBM from both features was not retained. Furrow 816 was not excavated yet post-medieval CBM and clay pipe was noted on the surface of fill (817). A deep modern intrusion (likely to be a geo-technical pit) was revealed 18.2 m from the eastern end of the Trench.

**Trenches 9, 10 and 11**

5.1.15 Trench 9 (Fig. 2) contained no archaeological features but two modern service trenches. Trench 10 (Fig. 2) contained no archaeological features. Trench 11 (Fig 2) contained no archaeological features. A modern E-W aligned field drain was encountered 3.3 m from the northern end of the Trench.

**Trench 12**

5.1.16 In Trench 12 (Fig. 2), the natural (1202) was reached at 102.98 m OD. It was cut by pit 1207 that measured 2.8 m wide. This feature was not excavated as its fill (1208) contained 19th century bottles and pottery. E-W aligned ditch 1205 measured 1.5 m wide and was not excavated as fill (1206) contained a post-medieval clay pipe shaft (not retained). E-W aligned modern field drain 1203 was located 1.8 m from the northern end of the Trench.

**Trench 13**

5.1.17 In Trench 13 (Fig. 4, plan, Fig. 5 section 1301), the natural (1302) was encountered at 103.73 m OD. It was cut by a post-hole 1307 located 10.5 m from the eastern end of the Trench. No finds were recovered from single silty fill (1308). Post-hole 1303 measured 0.4 m wide and 0.35 m deep. The single silty fill (1304) contained limestone post-packing material and 19th century willow pattern pottery (not retained).

5.1.18 Shallow pit 1305 measured 0.65 m wide and 0.05 m deep. The articulated skeleton of a young pig (7-13 months) was recovered from the single silty fill (1306). Modern glass and pottery was also recovered from this fill, so the burial is clearly of recent date.

**Trench 14**

5.1.19 In Trench 14 (Fig. 2), natural (1402) was reached at a depth of 101.93 m. It was cut by modern NE-SW aligned field drains 1403, 1405, 1407 and 1409. Two deposits (1411 and 1412) located at the eastern end of the trench contained 20th century material likely to be contemporary with the digging of the field drains.

**Trench 15 and 17**

5.1.20 Trenches 15 and 17 (Fig. 2) contained no archaeological features.
Trench 16

5.1.21 In Trench 16, (Fig. 2), the natural (1602) was reached at a depth of 100.48 m OD. It was cut by modern features 1603 and 1605. Fill (1604) of 1603 contained 20th century refuse and fill (1606) in 1605 contained modern field drain fragments.

5.2 Finds

Prehistoric Pottery: Cremation vessel, by Lisa Brown (OA)

5.2.1 The prehistoric pottery assemblage comprises 40 sherds belonging to a single vessel from context 603. Eight sherds were hand recovered, the remainder extracted from an environmental sample. In association with human bone recovered from this context, it can be stated confidently that the vessel is a cremation pot.

5.2.2 The fabric of the vessel reflects the geology of the site, Jurassic Limestone underlying Quaternary Boulder Clay. The fabric is a very lightly sanded shelly clay, fired to light greyish-brown colour and containing sparse reddish argillaceous inclusions 2 mm and smaller, which are probably all grog. Some traces of burnt out organic matter are also apparent. The shell is completely leached but traces of fossil shell, including platey fragments and ooliths, are visible in hand specimen and detail of the shell species at 10x magnification. The shell is a naturally occurring inclusion in faces of Jurassic clays in the region and the vessel is likely to be locally made.

5.2.3 Although all but two sherds are un-diagnostic body sherds, one fragment (13 mm thick) is probably from a flat base. The maximum thickness of the wall is 10 mm but the sherds are too fragmentary for circumference measurement. The base shape and the horizontal ridge decoration present on a second sherd, along with the coarseness of the fabric, combine to suggest that the vessel is a bucket urn or similar contemporary vessel of the Middle Bronze Age (more properly described as the late early Bronze Age). The presence of grog indicates a date prior to c 1200 BC.

5.2.4 Catalogue of sherds: From Context 603 <100> 31 sherds (63 g) un-diagnostic body sherds; 1 sherd (12 g) possibly basal sherd (13 mm maximum measurable thickness); and from the same context and recovered by hand: 7 sherds (30 g) un-diagnostic body sherds and 1 sherd (5 g) decorated with a broad ridge created by pulling up wet clay (rather than application).

Post-medieval pottery

5.2.5 The post-medieval pottery assemblage comprises: Context 403: 1 sherd (6 g), ?Midlands Yellow Ware of 17th-18th century date; Context 811, 1 sherd (3 g). Midlands, Staffordshire or Slipware - probably 18th century and Context 1306, 1 sherd (1 g) of 19th century English bone china.
The cremated human bone by Nicholas Marquez-Grant (OA)

5.2.6 Preliminary examination of the single cremation deposit was undertaken by employing standard osteological methods (Brickley and McKinley 2004). This was undertaken to assess the potential of the remains to yield osteological information (for example, age, sex and non-metric variation) and information on pyre technology and funerary ritual.

5.2.7 The remains of at least one individual were present and comprised fragments of skull, vertebrae, ribs, shoulder girdle, upper and lower limbs and some hand phalanges. The majority of these remains were buff-white in colour and the largest fragment, probably that of a femur, measured 53 mm. Overall, large bone fragments (larger than 10 mm) were frequent in the sample.

5.2.8 The remains indicate that the individual had probably attained adulthood when they died. Sex could not be estimated owing to the fact that relevant elements were missing or were too poorly preserved. Possible evidence for non-specific inflammation was observed on the lower limb bones requires confirmation through microscopic analysis. Non-specific inflammation is linked to many causes that broadly relate to minor trauma and infection. This pathology is a relatively common finding in archaeological remains, particularly when it involves the leg bones (Roberts and Manchester 1995). There was no evidence for any cranial or post-cranial non-metric traits.

5.2.9 The deposit described here was associated with fragments of pottery of Middle Bronze Age date. Whether the pottery represents a grave good or the urn that once contained the cremated remains, awaits more detailed analysis. Detailed analysis of soil residues is also required to explore evidence for other associated artefacts and organic remains.

5.2.10 The potential of the remains to yield osteological information is high. Preliminary analysis has established that they represent an adult of unknown sex. More detailed analysis is recommended to explore a more precise age estimate, sex attribution and the possible pathological changes observed on the lower limb bones.

5.2.11 The buff-white colour of most of the remains suggests that full oxidation of the organic matrix was achieved during the cremation process. In this respect, it was, therefore, a successful cremation. The lack of very small fragments in the deposit indicates that a selection process that favoured the collection of larger pieces of bone over smaller ones for deposition may have taken place. Whether this was accidental or deliberate is unclear at present. However, for the present analysis, the smallest sieve fractions were not systematically examined and may well yield a significant quantity of smaller bone fragments.

5.2.12 These results would benefit from further analysis should the occasion arise.
**The animal bone by Fay Worley (OA)**

5.2.13 At total of 161 fragments (338 g) of well-preserved animal bone were recovered from context (1306). Refitting recently broken fragments reduced this count to 138 fragments. No evidence of butchery, gnawing, burning or pathology was noted on the assemblage. The animal bone was recovered from a pit and is probably modern in date.

5.2.14 All bone fragments belonged to a single articulated burial of a young piglet. The majority of the skeleton was identified, comprising the right parietal, occipital and temporal regions of the skull, a fragment of the right mandible, the right scapula and humerus, a fragment of ulna, the pelvis, both femora, tibiae, fibulae, astragali and calcanea, five further carpals or tarsals, two metapodial fragments, six unfused long bone diaphysis and epiphysis fragments, 34 fragments from a minimum of 13 ribs, 52 fragments from a minimum of 10 vertebrae and 22 unidentified fragments. No elements from the right forelimb, skull or feet were recovered.

5.2.15 The bone assemblage allowed estimation of age-at-death. The only tooth recovered was an un-erupted mandibular second molar. The presence of this tooth indicated that the piglet was less than 7-13 months old at death. Long bone epiphyseal fusion indicated that the pig was less than a year old at death, possibly less than 3-6 months old-at-death based on the presence of un-fused vertebrae (following Silver 1969).

**The Flint by Rebecca Devaney (OA)**

5.2.16 A total of 159 fragments (119 g) of burnt un-worked flint was recovered. The fragments are very small, on average weighing less than 1 g each. The material was recovered from a single context (603), a Middle Bronze Age cremation fill. The natural geology comprises stony clay till with flint and chalk pebbles and deposits of sand and gravels and so the burnt unworked flint is likely to represent natural material that became incorporated in the cremation pyre, and not a specific funerary deposit.

6 **ENVIRONMENTAL REMAINS**

*Environmental and Economic Assessment by Seren Griffiths (OA)*

6.1.1 A 20 litre bulk sample was taken from a pit fill interpreted as containing a probable cremation (sample 100, context 603) and a 10 litre sample (sample 101, context 610) was taken from the burnt clay natural possibly associated with the cremation of the bones (Appendix 1). The samples were taken for the recovery of charred plant remains, molluscs and small bones and artefacts. Samples were processed by flotation using a modified Siraf-type machine, the flot being collected onto a 250 micron mesh. The remaining material was then wet sieved through a column for the recovery of small bones and artefacts. The residue was washed onto 500 micron mesh and retained. The flots and residues were air-dried and the flots scanned under a binocular microscope. The residues were sorted for bones and artefacts down to 2mm and the
remaining material retained. Initially assessment was undertaken at Oxford Archaeology by Seren Griffiths.

**Plant Remains**

6.1.2 Both samples produced small flots - 95 ml from sample 100 (context 603) and 30ml from sample 101 (context 610). Both flots contained elements of modern plant matter. Sample 100 (context 603) contained common items of wood charcoal of around 2mm (the minimum size considered potentially identifiable to species level) and frequent items of charred weed seeds (probable sedge plants - *Carex* sp.). Items of vitrified charcoal were also present in the flot. Sample 101 (context 610) contained frequent items of modern plant matter, including modern cereal straw, which probably blew into the sample during collection. A fragmentary item of charred cereal grain was present in sample 101 (context 610). Molluscs were present in both samples, and probable burnt mollusc shells were identified in sample 100 (context 603). Further identification of these shells therefore might provide some limited indication of the contemporary environment at the time of cremation.

**Discussion**

6.1.3 The samples taken from this evaluation contained a limited range of palaeoenvironmental and palaeoeconomic indicators. In general, preservation of charred material was fair, and mollusc shells clearly survive in these soils. The bone recovered from the samples was almost all cremated, however given the nature of the sampled contexts this is not surprising and un-burnt bone was recovered by hand collection.

6.1.4 Given the very limited number of sampled contexts, further work on the charred remains and molluscs is not recommended. However, if this site is taken to excavation the charcoal and seeds recovered from the cremation should be included in any assessment. While the snails from both samples might inform on the contemporary landscape surrounding the cremation site, the populations are insufficient on their own to warrant further work.

7 **DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION**

7.1 **Reliability of field investigation**

7.1.1 The results of the evaluation appeared to be generally reliable. The field was pasture and no obstructions to opening the trenches were encountered.

7.1.2 Post-medieval ploughing represented by ridge and furrow and modern field drainage techniques may have impacted upon earlier archaeological features.

7.2 **Geophysical survey results**
7.2.1 A number of the trenches were located over anomalies identified in the geophysical survey, carried out prior to the evaluation. The strong response recorded at the eastern end of Trench 6 corresponded with the extensive area of burnt natural soil recorded within the trench.

7.2.2 Ridge and furrow was clearly represented in the geophysical survey and a number of furrows were recorded in the trenches to the north and the east of the site. None of the other potential features or deposits suggested by the geophysical survey were encountered during the evaluation.

7.3 **Overall interpretation**

7.3.1 The archaeological features and deposits revealed within the seventeen trenches suggests limited activity within the Middle Bronze Age - with a greater density of agricultural activity in the medieval and post-medieval periods. None of the deposits encountered suggested any activity within the intervening periods.

7.3.2 The Middle Bronze Age cremation burial located at the western end of Trench 6 indicates potentially significant evidence of funerary activity within this period. The heavily burnt area of natural soil at the eastern end of this trench contained no dateable material, but it is possible that it is in some way associated with the cremation activity.

7.3.3 The burning might represent the site of an associated pyre, the remaining structure of which could be outside the trench, or have been lost due to plough truncation.

7.3.4 Both of these features occupy the top of a natural rise, perhaps suggesting deliberate placement upon a prominent landscape feature. The spring indicated on the 1885 OS map, located towards the southern end of the site may suggest land to the south of this natural rise was wet in the prehistoric period. This may account for the lack of activity to the south during this period.

7.3.5 Despite the proximity of the site to known Romano-British activity, no features or finds of this period were recovered during the evaluation. Medieval and post-medieval activity comprised furrows concentrated to the north of the site.

7.3.6 This was highlighted by previous aerial photography and these features relate to ridge and furrow attached to the medieval Manor of Maids Moreton. A number of modern features located across the site relate to 19th and 20th century field drainage. A clearly modern pig burial was revealed within Trench 13, but not analysed in detail.
APPENDIX I  ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Ctxt No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Thick. (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Ditch fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>404</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land drain fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>504</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>505</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land drain fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>507</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>508</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>509</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Pit fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Furrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Furrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Furrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Ditch fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Tree throw hollow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Tree throw hollow fill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Ditch fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Ditch fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Gully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Gully fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Thickness (m)</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Tree throw hollow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Tree throw hollow fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Furrow fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pit fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Posthole fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Pit fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Posthole fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Depth (m)</td>
<td>Thickness (m)</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1408</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field drain fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Modern disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pit fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Modern ploughsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3 SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS

Site name: Manor Farm, Moreton Road, Buckingham, Bucks
Site code: BULAMF 06
Grid reference: SP 699 349
Type of evaluation: 17 x 30 m trenches
Date and duration of project: 11th-15th September 2006
Area of site: 6 ha.

Summary of results: The evaluation revealed a single Middle Bronze Age cremation and a possible associated area of burnt soil. Medieval or post-medieval ridge and furrow was concentrated at the northern end of the site. The southern part of the site contained only post-medieval and modern features.

Location of archive: The archive is currently held at OA, Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford, OX2 0ES, and will be deposited with Buckinghamshire County Museum in due course, under the following accession number: AYBCM 2006.201
Figure 1: Site location
Figure 5: Sections