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Summary

Between the 8th and 9th August 2016, Oxford Archaeology East conducted a trial trench evaluation at Little Paxton Primary School, Little Paxton, Cambridgeshire (TL 1888 6239) ahead of a planned extension to the school. Three trenches were excavated revealing a series of medieval features dating to the 12th-13th century. Pits, gullies and finds recovered from the southernmost trench suggest peripheral settlement activity, with a number of inter-cutting features yielding small quantities of pottery, animal bone, charcoal and charred cereals. To the north, a series of closely spaced, shallow parallel linear gullies were revealed, possibly representing cultivation beds. Part of a large pit was also uncovered, likely to be a sand and gravel quarry pit.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted by Oxford Archaeology East (OA East) at Little Paxton Primary School, Little Paxton, Cambridgeshire (TL 1888 6239) as part of a planning application (H/5001/16/CC) for a proposed extension to the school (Fig. 1).

1.1.2 The archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Andy Thomas of Cambridgeshire County Council History Environment Team (CCC HET; Thomas 2016), supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East (Wiseman 2016).

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 HET, 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 bedrock geology of the site is mudstone of the Oxford Clay Formation. This is overlain by sand and gravels of the River Terrace Deposits 1 and 2. (British Geological Survey online map viewer: http://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html). (accessed 3 April 2016)

1.2.2 The soils are typically argillic brown earths of the Efford 1 association (SSEW 1983)

1.2.3 The site lies on the floodplain of the River Ouse at 17m OD. The current channel of the river lies of the south and east of Little Paxton, approximately 150 metres from the school site.

1.2.4 The area for development is currently part of the school playing fields. A number of water drains and soakaways are known to be located in the area.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, with previous archaeological investigations in the school grounds having revealed evidence for prehistoric and medieval activity (CHER ECB2628).

1.3.2 The following background is based on information obtained from the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER), and summarised in the Written Scheme of Investigation (Wiseman 2016).

Palaeolithic and Mesolithic

1.3.3 There have been extensive finds of worked stone tools and associated discarded material along the river gravels around Little Paxton, dating from the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Ages.
1.3.4 Palaeolithic flakes, stone axes, and other tools were recovered from a number of pits 400–500m south-west of the site, along with remains of horse, bison, elephant and rhinoceros (CHER 00578, 00584, 00584a, 00587).

1.3.5 Mixed Mesolithic and Neolithic worked flints were found at Weston Brook, 1km north of the school site (CHER 08992).

**Neolithic and Bronze Age**

1.3.6 Various Neolithic flint scatters have been recorded near the site. These are located 750m to south-west (CHER 00577), 200m south-west (CHER 00584B), 600m north-east (CHER 08990) and 300-400m west (some with Neolithic pottery, CHER 00628b, 08989, 08991).

1.3.7 One Neolithic pit in the Little Paxton Gravel pits, 600m west of the site, produced a complete wooden axe handle and polished agate pebble (CHER 09792). Worked flints dating from the Neolithic to Late Bronze Age were also identified 800m to the east (CHER 08988), 900m to the north (CHER 08992A) and 600m to the west (CHER 08994) of the site.

1.3.8 Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age settlement activity was identified in an archaeological evaluation 700m north-west of the school (CHER 10710). This revealed plot boundaries, drainage ditches, structural remains, and evidence for flint tool-making and treatment of hides. A Neolithic ‘hut’ and a large flint scatter was also identified close by during roadworks in 1968 (CHER 00589).

1.3.9 Prehistoric pits, ditches and postholes, dated between the Early Bronze Age and Early Iron Age were identified in an evaluation 800m south-west of the site (MCB 19299). A Bronze Age ring ditch was located 600m north-west of the site (CHER 08987).

**Iron Age**

1.3.10 An evaluation at the school in 2007 identified two ditches and a posthole. They contained Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age pottery, along with medieval remains (MCB20343) (Muldowney 2007).

1.3.11 An Iron Age settlement was identified in the 1960s, 800m east of the school on the river gravels (CHER 00663a).

1.3.12 There are also substantial cropmarks on the river gravels, probably indicating Iron Age and Romano-British settlement of the area (CHER 00635, 04747 ECB3308). Some of these cropmarks are recorded across the school site.

**Roman**

1.3.13 A Romano-British settlement was excavated 750m east of the school in 1969, ahead of gravel quarrying (CHER 00633, 00633a). Cropmarks in the area showed a network of drainage ditches over 20ha. (CHER 00635, 00636). This appears to have been the centre of Roman activity around Little Paxton.

1.3.14 Roman cremation vessels were recovered in a field once called Barrow Close, 450m south of the school, on the River Ouse (CHER 00581). Pottery, animals bones and worked wood – possibly remains of a boat quay – were dredged from the river in 1952, 400m south-east of the school (CHER 00625).

1.3.15 A variety of Roman finds have been found scattered over the wider Paxton area. A Roman flask was found 200m south-west of the school (CHER 00592), with remains of a Roman shoe recovered 300m to the west (CHER 09792A). A pit with Roman rubbish
was excavated 800m to the north (CHER 00601), whilst field walking 900m west of the school found a light scattering of pottery (CHER 10710A).

**Saxon and Early Medieval**

1.3.16 Gravel quarrying in the 1960s identified ‘several thousand’ Late Saxon settlement features (CHER 00628) 300m east of the school. Another Late Saxon settlement was excavated on the south bank of the Ouse, 850m south-east of the school (CHER 00622). Finds included post-holes, ditches and beamslots.

1.3.17 Two Saxon inhumation burials (one with a seax) were found in the early 20th century on the Great Northern Road, 500m west of the school site (CHER 00582). Another inhumation was found 650m north-east of the school (CHER 00634). Several cremation urns, one containing two applied brooches, were found nearby (CHER 11288).

**Later Medieval**

1.3.18 St James’ Church (CHER 13010) is not mentioned in the Domesday Book, but the building contains 12th century stonework. It stands 400m north of the school. The First Edition Ordnance Survey map shows that this was the core of the early village (along High Street and Little Paxton Lane).

1.3.19 Areas of medieval ridge-and-furrow 700m north of the school (CHER 08007), and 550m north (CHER 08268) are visible in aerial photographs: both sites now form part of the village. Fieldwalking 800m west of the school identified a light scatter of medieval pottery – presumably remains of field manuring (CHER 10710b). Another light scatter was found 750m to the south-west (MCB16927).

**Post-medieval and modern**

1.3.20 The school is located on lands formerly part of Paxton Hall (CHER 00594). The current building (now Bethany House), 600m north of the school, contains Elizabethan and 18th century elements. The house was originally set in 20ha of gardens, and was approached from the south via an avenue. The estate comprised 690ha when sold in the early 19th century.

1.3.21 The 1887 Ordnance Survey map shows most of the area south of High Street and Little Paxton Road marked as part of Paxton Park. At the centre of the Park was the Paxton Park Hospital. The whole Paxton Park area has been developed for housing since the 1950s.

**1.4 Acknowledgements**

1.4.1 The Author would like to thank David Watson of Coulsons Building Group who commissioned the work and Lattenbury Services who provided the plant. The investigation was directed by the author, who was assisted in the excavation by Matt Brooks. Matt Brudenell managed the project for OA East. Thanks are also extended to Andy Thomas of Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment team who monitored the works.
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 One 16m long and two 13m long trenches were positioned within the proposed development area (Fig. 2)

2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a wheeled JCB-type excavator using a 1.6m wide toothless ditching bucket.

2.2.3 The site survey was carried out by Charlotte Walton using a Leica 2000 GPS.

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 Bucket sampling (of up to 90 litres) was undertaken on the top- and subsoils across all trenches to characterise their artefact content. Three environmental samples also were taken from a selection of dated features to investigate the potential for ecofact survival.

2.2.7 Conditions were dry, warm and sunny. The trenches were positioned on the grass playing fields. Soils were dry and compacted.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 The results are presented in numerical trench order running from south to north (Fig.3). The subsoil (2) was a mid greyish brown silty sand and the topsoil (1) a light greyish brown silty sand. The natural geology (3) was a mid greyish yellow gravelly sand.

3.2 Trench 1
3.2.1 Trench 1 was the southern most of the three trenches and was 13m long, aligned north-east to south-west at an average height of 15.35m OD (Plate 2).

3.2.2 The five features uncovered in Trench 1 were all located at the northern end of the trench (Fig. 3). The earliest comprised a wide sub-circular pit (10) and shallow east to west aligned ditch (18), both dated by single sherds of pottery to the 12th century. Pit 10 was at least 1.45m in diameter, and 0.5m deep. It was filled by a light grey sandy silt (11) which yielded a single sherd of 12th century pottery (4g). Ditch 18 was 1.15m wide and 0.18m deep. It had gently sloping sides and a broadly flat base, filled with mid grey sandy silt (19) (Fig. 4, Section 5). This also yielded a single sherd of 12th century pottery (1g) together with nine fragments of sheep/goat bone.

3.2.3 Truncating pit 10 on its north-east edge, and following the line of the pit was a curvilinear gully (12), varying in width between 0.42 and 0.64m. The gully had a steep sided U-shaped profile, with a maximum depth of 0.4m. It was filled by a mid brownish grey sandy silt (13), yielding a single sherd (17g) of 12th-13th century pottery (Fig. 4, Section 4 and Plate 1). An environmental soil sample from the gully yielded small amounts of charcoal, charred cereal grains and legumes.

3.2.4 A further wide, shallow sub-square pit (14) truncated both pit 10 and ditch 12. This pit measured 1.4m by 2.45m, and was 0.24m deep. The pit was filled with a mid yellowish grey sandy silt fill (15), and contained four sherds (58g) of 12th-13th century pottery (Fig. 4, Section 4). An environmental soil sample from the pit yielded similar small amounts of charcoal, charred cereal grains and legumes.

3.2.5 Finally, pit 14 was truncated on its eastern side by the terminus of gully 16. This was a shallow linear gully, aligned north-east to south-west, with gently sloping sides and a concave base. The gully measured 0.37m wide and 0.15m deep, and was filled with grey silty sand (Fig. 4, Section 4). No finds were recovered from the gully.

3.2.6 The whole trench was overlain by subsoil (2) between 0.27 and 0.43m thick. Above this the topsoil was between 0.2 and 0.22m thick. No artefacts were recovered from these horizons.

3.3 Trench 2
3.3.1 Trench 2 was located to the north of Trench 1. The trench measured 16m long on a north-west to south-east alignment, at an average height of 15.29m OD (Plate 3).

3.3.2 Two small, shallow parallel gullies were located in the south-eastern half of the trench, running on a roughly east-north-east to west-south-west alignment, situated 0.15m apart. The southern most of these (20) was 0.54m wide and 0.08m deep with a light greyish brown silty sand fill (21). This contained two sherds (45g) of 13th century pottery. The second gully (22) was 0.68m wide and 0.1m deep, with a fill (23) identical to gully 20 (Fig. 4, Section 7). It yielded three sherds (4g) of 13th century pottery and a pig incisor.
3.3.3 In the north-western half of the trench was a large pit (24) which extended beyond both sides of the trench. The pit was 6.5m wide and 0.4m deep. The section excavated displayed a moderately steep, stepped edge and a flat base (Fig. 4, Section 8). It was filled by a mid greyish brown silty sand (25) which contained nine sherds (45g) of 12th-13th century pottery. An environmental soil sample taken from the pit yielded small amounts of charcoal, charred cereal grains and legumes.

3.3.4 The whole trench was overlain by subsoil measuring between 0.2 and 0.26m thick. Above this was a topsoil measuring between 0.2 and 0.28m thick. No artefacts were recovered from these horizons.

3.4 Trench 3
3.4.1 Trench 3 was the northernmost of the three trenches. It was 13m long and aligned north-east to south-west at an average height of 15.14m OD.

3.4.2 At the southern end of the trench were a series of five parallel linear gullies running on an east to west alignment, spaced between 0.2m and 0.35m apart. Three of the gullies were excavated (Fig. 3 and Plate 4).

3.4.3 The northernmost gully (4) was 0.42m wide, with gently sloping sides and a concave base, measuring 0.07m deep. It was filled by a light greyish brown silty sand (5) (Fig. 4, Section 1).

3.4.4 The middle gully (6) was 0.52m wide and 0.08m deep, with a profile and fill (7) similar to that in gully 4. This contained one sherd (8g) of 11th-12th century pottery.

3.4.5 The most southern of the excavated gullies (8) was 0.48m wide and 0.07m in depth. The profile and fill fill (9) were again similar to gully 4.

3.4.6 The whole trench was overlain by subsoil measuring between 0.3 and 0.4m thick. Above this was a topsoil measuring 0.2m thick.

3.5 Finds Summary
3.5.1 A total of 22 sherds of pottery, weighing 0.182kg, was recovered. The majority of the sherds are relatively small but with occasional large, fresh fragments including rims, bases and a jug handle. The pottery is dated to the 12th to 13th centuries (Appendix B).

3.6 Environmental Summary
3.6.1 A total weight of 0.26kg of animal bone was recovered. The small size and poor condition of the assemblage means that minimal information can be derived from it, although sheep/goat bone and a pig incisor were identified (Appendix C.1).

3.6.2 Three bulk samples were taken from gully 12 and pit 14 in trench 1, and pit 24 in trench 2. These all contained carbonised plant and charcoal, including small amounts of cereal grain and legumes (Appendix C.2).
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1.1 The evaluation revealed a series of medieval features across all three trenches, dated by pottery to the 12th to 13th century. The features comprised a series of pits, gullies and ditches, several of which inter-cut in Trench 1, indicating repeated episodes of activity in this zone. Indeed, the character of the pits and gullies in Trench 1 is suggestive of settlement related activity, with pottery, animal bone and charred cereal remains entering their fills. The quantity of finds, however, is relatively small, which may imply that this area is located on the periphery of settlement.

4.1.2 By contrast, the series of closely spaced, shallow parallel linear gullies in Trenches 2 and 3 (4, 6, 8, 20 and 22) are likely to be associated with cultivation, although their exact purpose is unclear. The pottery indicates that they are broadly contemporary with features in Trench 1, and may represent cultivation beds backing onto the edge of a property.

4.1.3 Finally, the large pit (24) in the north-west end of Trench 2 is possibly a gravel extraction pit, having stepped sides and flat base which cuts down into the gravelly sand geology. Small scale quarrying is often found in medieval contexts, particularly on the edges of settlement plots and fields.

4.2 Significance

4.2.1 The evidence shows that there is no continuation into the investigation area of the prehistoric features found to the north-east in the 2007 evaluation (Muldowney 2007) or identified as cropmarks in the surrounding area (Fig. 2).

4.2.2 The features from the current evaluation, however, point to varying medieval activities, all dating to the 12th and 13th centuries. This area is away from the historic core of Little Paxton, but indicates outlying settlement, probably relating to a nearby farm.

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 contained a medieval ditch and a group of inter-cutting medieval features. Consists of soil and subsoil overlying a natural of gravelly sand.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Pit fill</td>
<td>pottery</td>
<td>12th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12th-13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Gully fill</td>
<td>pottery</td>
<td>12th-13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12th-13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Pit fill</td>
<td>pottery</td>
<td>12th-13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Gully fill</td>
<td>shell</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Ditch fill</td>
<td>Pottery, a. bone</td>
<td>12th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>NW-SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench contained a single large medieval quarry pit and several small cultivation gullies. Consists of soil and subsoil overlying a natural of gravelly sand.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Gully Fill</td>
<td>pottery</td>
<td>13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Gully Fill</td>
<td>pottery</td>
<td>13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Quarry pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12th-13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context no</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>Depth (m)</td>
<td>comment</td>
<td>finds</td>
<td>date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Gully fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11th-12th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Gully fill</td>
<td>pottery</td>
<td>11th-12th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Gully fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS**

**B.1 Pottery**

*By Richard Mortimer MCIfA*

**Introduction and methodology**

B.1.1 A total of 22 sherds of pottery, weighing 0.182kg, was recovered from 3 trenches. The majority of the sherds are relatively small but with occasional large, fresh sherds including rims, bases and a jug handle. The average sherd weight is slightly over 8 grams.

**Methodology**

B.1.2 Rapid recording was carried out using OA East’s in-house system based on that previously used at the Museum of London. All sherds have been counted, classified and weighed on a context-by-context basis. The pottery and archive are curated by Oxford Archaeology East until formal deposition.

**Assemblage**

B.1.3 The largest number of sherds came from context 25, the fill of a large pit (24), which contained a total of 9 sherds, comprising 6 sherds of sandy red wares, and single sherds of sandy greyware, shelly ware and fine shelly ware.

B.1.4 Context 15, the fill of a shallow pit (14) contained 4 sherds in total including one sherd of St Neots ware and two sherds of Developed St Neots ware, as well as one heavily
burnt unidentifiable sherd. The Developed St Neots ware included the rim of a fine bowl and the rim of a jar.

B.1.5 Three sherds were recovered from context 23 (the fill of small gully 22). These included single sherds each of Brill ware, and sandy and fine red wares. The Brill ware was part of a jug, possibly the same vessel found in context 21.

B.1.6 Context 21 (also the fill of a small gully, 20) contained two Brill ware sherds. One of these was part of a green-glazed jug handle.

B.1.7 Other contexts produced single sherds only. Context 7, the fill of another shallow gully (6) contained a Hunts Fen sandy ware T-shaped rim sherd. Context 11 (fill of pit 10) produced an abraded sherd of sandy greyware. Ditch fill 13 contained a Developed St Neots ware base sherd. Context 19 (the fill of ditch 18) contained a single Stamford ware sherd.

Discussion

B.1.8 The bulk of the assemblage, and the contexts that it comes from, are securely dated to the 12th to 13th centuries, with a little material such as the single St Neots ware sherd and the Huntingdon Fen Sandy ware dating a little earlier. Many of the sherds are in relatively good, fresh condition and while they may not represent direct disposal neither are they the result of manuring. The assemblage probably represents secondary deposition within or at the edge of an occupied area.

B.1.9 As would be expected in this part of Cambridgeshire the bulk of material was coming from industries in the west of the County (St Neots, Huntingdon) and from Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire.

Pottery Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Sherd count</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Context date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hunts Fen Sandy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Small T-shaped rim</td>
<td>11th/12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sandy greyware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>abraded</td>
<td>c.12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dev St Neots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>12th/13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>St Neots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12th/13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev St Neots</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1 fine bowl rim, 1 large jar rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Unknown, heavily burnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Stam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Brill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>p/o jug handle near rim, green glaze</td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Brill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poss. p/o vessel in 21</td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy red ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>abraded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine red ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Med sandy red</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>12th/13th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

C.1 Faunal Remains

By Zoe Ui Choileain BA MA BABAO

Introduction

C.1.1 A total weight of 0.26kg of animal bone was recovered from the evaluation.

Methodology

C.1.2 All identifiable elements were recorded using a version of the criteria described in Davis (1992). Identification of the assemblage was undertaken with the aid of Schmid (1972) and France (2009) plus use of the OAE reference collection. Taphonomic information such as butchery, carnivore/rodent gnawing and burning was recorded. Moreover, preservation condition was evaluated using the 0-5 scale devised by Brickley and McKinley (2004).

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Number of frags</th>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Collection method</th>
<th>Erosion</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Long bone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Incisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>pig</td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Faunal remains catalogue

Results according to collection method (i.e. hand-collection or flotation). Erosion grades (simplified version of Brickley & McKinley 2004, 14-15): 0 (surface morphology clearly visible, fresh appearance), 1 (light and patchy surface erosion), 2 (more extensive surface erosion than grade 1), 3 (most of bone surface affected by some degree of erosion, 4 (all of bone surface affected by erosive action), 5 (heavy erosion across whole surface, completely masking normal surface morphology).

C.1.3 Two species were identified in this assemblage. Context (19) contained fragments of sheep mandible with M1 and M2 teeth present. Context (23) was identifiable as a pig incisor. All the bone present was adult.
C.1.4 The overall surface condition of the bone was determined to be consistent with Brickley
and Mckinley's Grade one (2004 14-15) where only light and patchy surface erosion is
present.

Discussion and conclusion

C.1.1 This is a small assemblage and in its present state there is little information that can be
provided about diet or industrial practices. No further work is necessary.

C.2 Environmental samples

By Rachel Fosberry ACIfA

Introduction

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

Methodology

C.2.2 The total volume (approximately 20 litres) of each bulk sample was processed by water
floation (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 3. Identification of plant remains is with reference to the Digital
Seed Atlas of the Netherlands (Cappers et al. 2006) 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.2.3 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:

# = 1-5, ## = 6-25, ### = 26-100, #### = 100+ specimens

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

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

C.2.4 All of the samples contain small amounts of charred cereal grains, legumes and charcoal. The plant remains were not well preserved and it is likely that the damage had occurred prior to burial. There was also a considerable amount of rooting within all of the samples which may have caused movement of material within contexts.

C.2.5 Free-threshing wheat (Triticum aestivum sensu-lato) grains predominate with occasional grains of barley (Hordeum vulgare) and occasional legumes, probably peas (Pisum sativum) or small beans (Fabaceae).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context No.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature No.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature type</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>Pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample vol (L)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cereals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum vulgare L. caryopsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triticum sp. caryopsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cereal indet. caryopsis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other food plants:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legumes 2-4mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other plant macrofossils:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal volume (ml)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal &lt;2mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal &gt;2mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of flot (mls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Environmental samples

Discussion

C.2.6 The environmental samples taken at Little Paxton Primary School have produced evidence of carbonised plant remains in trenches 2 and 3. The contents of all three samples is remarkably similar suggesting a background scatter of burnt food.

C.2.7 There is good potential for the recovery of plant remains from this site and any further excavations in the area should include environmental sampling.
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