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SUMMARY

Between October 2009 and April 2010, Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out an archaeological watching brief on land to the rear of 12 and 12A Cornmarket, Thame, Oxfordshire (NGR: SP 706 058). The work was commissioned by Granger Estates Ltd in advance of the construction of five new mews cottages and associated facilities. The watching brief revealed evidence of a possible Bronze-Age barrow ditch, two possible burgage boundary ditches and nine post-medieval pits, including five intercutting cess pits.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of work

1.1.1 Between October 2009 and April 2010, Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out an archaeological watching brief on land to the rear on 12 and 12A Cornmarket, Thame, Oxfordshire (NGR: SP 706 058). The work was commissioned by Granger Estates Ltd in advance of the construction of 5 Mews Cottages and associated facilities.

1.1.2 Due to the possibility of below ground archaeological deposits being disturbed during the development a planning condition requiring an archaeological watching brief to be undertaken during the period of groundworks was attached to the planning permission (Planning Reference P08/E1037). This was in accordance with PPG16, PPS5 and the Districts Local Plan policies.

1.1.3 A brief was produced by Richard Oram, the County Planning Archaeologist, detailing the requirements for these conditions (OCAS, 2009) and OA prepared a Written Statement of Investigation (WSI) showing how it would meet these requirements (OA, 2009).

1.2 Location, geology and topography

1.2.1 The town of Thame is situated approximately 16 km east of Oxford (Fig. 1). The site is located on level ground in the centre of Thame, on the south side of the Cornmarket. The site is bounded to the north by buildings, to the east by a car park and to the west and south by rear yards. It is currently in use as the rear yard of a shop.

1.2.2 The underlying geology is River Terrace Gravels (British Geological Survey of England and Wales, sheet no. 237) and the site lies at 72 m above OD.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The archaeological and historical background to the watching brief was prepared for the WSI for the project and is summarised below.
1.3.2 Thame is an ancient market town on the Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire border. In the Anglo-Saxon period Thame was among the endowments of the bishopric of Dorchester with the earliest connection being the mention of the death of Oscytel, Bishop of Dorchester and later Archbishop of York, at Thame in 971, although by 1086 the bishopric had been transferred to Lincoln (VCH 1962, 160-178).

1.3.3 The original town of Old Thame lay at the west end of the High Street. Development eastwards and the creation of New Thame probably took place in the 12th century, and in the first quarter of the 13th century the centre of the High Street began to be built on (ibid).

1.3.4 The site is adjacent to a well-preserved burgage plot that is probably part of the 12th-century planned extension of Thame (PRN 14093)(SP 7062 0573). Further evidence of burgage plots on this side of the High Street has been recorded 133 m to the south-west of the site (PRN 14382)(SP7056 0570). This area south of the High Street was probably fully developed by the 15th century at the latest.

1.3.5 There has been a fairly large amount of recent truncation on the site with the construction of the range of buildings that are proposed to be developed including an existing cellar, but as the footprint of the proposed cottages is larger than the existing building there is the potential for the presence of medieval and early post-medieval urban backland features in the area (OCAS, 2009).

2 PROJECT AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 To identify and record the presence or absence, extent, condition, quality and date of archaeological remains in the areas affected by the development.

2.1.2 To preserve by record any archaeological features or deposits that may be disturbed or destroyed during the course of the groundworks.

2.1.3 To make available the results of the archaeological investigation.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The archaeological watching brief was conducted as a series of site visits, including periods of continuous attendance, during the excavation of any groundworks with the potential to affect any archaeological deposits. These included the excavation of the foundation trenches as well as service trenches.

2.2.2 The majority of these works were conducted using a small tracked excavator fitted with a 0.3 m wide toothless bucket. Excavation proceeded in spits until the required depth of excavation (typically between 1 m and 1.2 m) was achieved. The sides and base of the trench were closely examined for archaeological evidence and the spoil was examined for dating evidence.
2.2.3 A plan showing the extent of the excavations and the location of any archaeological features was maintained at a scale of 1:250 (Fig. 2) and any recorded sections were drawn at a scale of 1:20. All excavated features and recorded sections were photographed using colour digital photography and black and white print film. A general photographic record of the work was also made. Recording followed procedures detailed in the *OA Field Manual* (ed. D Wilkinson, 1992).

3 RESULTS

3.1 Description of deposits

3.1.1 The work was carried out in two main phases, the excavation of the building foundations and the later excavation of the service trenches.

*Excavation of the building foundations*

3.1.2 These took the form of a rectangular block of terraced buildings abutting up to the rear of the buildings fronting the Cornmarket. The trenches were excavated to a width of 0.75 m and a depth of 1.2 m.

3.1.3 The underlying solid geology, consisting of a fine orange-yellow gravel (100) was encountered at a depth of between 0.4 m and 0.6 m below ground level. Within the southern half of the building plot this was cut by a two wide ditches running from south-west to north-east across the site (Fig. 2) (Fig. 3, Sections 102 and 103 respectively). It is possible that these two sections are part of a the same continuous ditch.

3.1.4 Within section 102 the ditch had steeply sloping sides and a flat base and measured 2 m wide and 0.9 m deep (114). The eastern edge of the cut was filled by a 0.12 m deep layer of mixed silts and gravel (115), a probable lens of slumped natural gravel. This was overlain by a 0.18 m deep layer of grey-brown sily sand (116), the primary silting layer, sealed by a later silting deposit of grey-brown sandy silt (117), which also contained pyre residuals.

3.1.5 Filling the eastern side of the ditch was a layer of orange brown silty sand (118), possibly evidence of deliberate backfilling. Overlying this deposit and filling the western side of the ditch was a very dark grey silt (119) which also contained evidence of burning. Filling the remainder of the ditch was a orange-brown silty sand (120).

3.1.6 In section 103 the full profile of the ditch (121) was not observed, but it was estimated to be approximately 2.6 m wide and 1.2 m deep. The western side of the ditch cut was filled by an orange-brown silty sand (122), possibly slumped natural. Overlying this on the western side of the ditch was a second 0.3 m deep layer of possible slumped natural, an orange-brown silty sand (123).
3.1.7 A deposit of grey-brown silty sand (124) was observed sealing the eastern edge of the ditch. Overlying deposits (123) and (124) was a 0.12 m deep lens of dark grey silty sand (125).

3.1.8 Sealing these deposits was a 0.4 m deep layer of orange-brown silty sand (126), a probable silting deposit. Overlying this was a 0.3 m deep layer of orange-brown sand which runs across the ditch (127), the probable result of deliberate backfilling of the ditch. The remainder of the ditch was filled by a grey-brown silty sand (128), a probable levelling layer.

3.1.9 Within the northern half of the foundation trenching a sequence of intercutting pits was observed. Within the area of Section 100 the natural 100 was cut by a 1.1 m diameter and 0.7 m deep circular pit (102). This was filled by a greenish grey-brown silty sand with cess staining (103). Truncating the eastern edge of this feature was a second circular pit measuring 1.2 m in diameter and 0.7 m deep (104). Filling this was a similar greenish grey-brown silty sand with cess staining (105).

3.1.10 A 0.95 m diameter by 0.7 m deep pit (106) was observed cutting the natural at the eastern edge of the building foundations. This was also filled with a greenish grey-brown sandy silt (107). Clipping the eastern edge of pit 106 was a circular pit, 0.7 m deep and approximately 1 m in diameter (108). This was filled by a cess stained grey-brown silty sand (109). Truncating the eastern edge of Pit 108 and also appearing within Section 101 was a 1.7 m diameter by 0.7 m deep circular pit (110). The base of this feature was filled by a 0.4 m deep layer of dark green silty sand (111). Filling the remainder of the pit was a grey-brown silty sand (112), which also produced fragments of brick, tile and animal bone.

3.1.11 These two sequences of pits were sealed below a 0.3 m deep layer of grey-brown silty sand (113), a possible buried soil horizon. Sealing 113 and the two ditch sections was a layer of post-medieval made ground (101), up to 0.5 m in depth.

**Excavation of the Service Trenching**

3.1.12 Subsequent to the construction of the new houses a 40 m length of 0.75 m wide service trenching was excavated along the eastern boundary of the development site (Fig. 2).

3.1.13 The natural gravel (100) was encountered at a depth of between 0.3 m and 0.6 m below the current ground level. At the northern end of the trench this was cut by an east-west aligned “V” shaped ditch (129), 2 m wide and in excess of 1 m deep (Section 105). The ditch was filled by a brown silt sand (130) which contained fragments of abraded limestone (construction debris ?).

3.1.14 Located six metres to the south was a 1.5 m wide by 0.4 m deep flat bottomed ditch (131) (Section 106). This ran slightly obliquely across the trench and was aligned approximately north-west to south-east. It was filled by a reddish brown sandy silt which also contained abraded stone fragments (132).
3.1.15 Roughly in the centre of the trench the edges of four circular pits were exposed, Pits 133 and 135 (Section 107), Pit 141 (Section 108) and Pit 138 (Fig. 2) which appeared in plan only. Pit 133 had steeply sloping sides and a flat base and was calculated to be approximately 1.8 m in diameter with 0.3 m depth surviving. It was filled by a dark grey-brown sand-silt (132). Pit 135 measured roughly 2.5 m in diameter and also had only 0.3 m depth surviving. The base of the pit was filled by a 0.12 m deep layer of very dark grey silt containing charcoal flecking (136). The upper part of the pit was filled by a grey-brown sandy silt containing charcoal, animal bones and fragments of roof tile (137).

3.1.16 Pit 138 was visible only in the base of the trench and was not recorded in section. It measured approximately 0.7 m in diameter and was filled by a very dark grey silt containing charcoal and mortar (139). The service trench clipped the edge of a very large circular feature with steeply sloping sides and a flat base (141), roughly in the centre of the site. This had a calculated diameter of 9 m and a surviving depth of 0.32 m. Filling the feature was a grey-brown clay silt (140) which produced fragments of butchered bone, a large quantity of clay roof tile fragments and shards of pottery.

3.1.17 Sealing the fill of Pit 141 and overlying the natural gravel (100) within the southern part of the trench was a 0.3 m deep layer of pale brown clay silt (142). This contained quantities of lime mortar, fragments of hand moulded brick, floor (quarry) tiles and red clay roof tiles, suggesting that it may be a demolition or construction layer.

3.1.18 At the southern end of the trench a 0.15 m deep layer of dark brown clay silt loam was observed (143) overlying layer 142 (Section 109).

3.1.19 Overlying this layer and sealing the other features elsewhere within the site was an overall layer of grey-brown clay silt up to 0.5 m in depth (101). This deposit contained numerous fragments of modern bricks, pottery and bottle glass and probably represents the modern topsoil.

3.2 Finds

3.2.1 Fragments of building materials (brick, roof and floor tiles) together with animal bone and some fragments of pottery were recovered during the course of the watching brief. The majority of the dating evidence collected has been identified as being deposited during the post-medieval period (16th- to 20th-centuries) and probably relates to the construction and habitation of the buildings currently fronting the Cornmarket. Flint flakes and fragments of pottery were collected from ditch deposits recorded within the foundation trenching. These have been provisionally dated as Bronze Age, c2000 BC-700BC.

3.3 Palaeo-environmental remains

3.3.1 Samples of burnt (pyre) material were collected from the lower fills of the two curvilinear ditch cuts observed during the foundation excavations (Contexts 117 and
Environmental samples: wood charcoal and charred plant remains from 12-12a Cornmarket, Thame
By Dana Challinor, MA (Oxon), MSc

Introduction and Methodology

3.3.2 Two samples of probable Bronze Age date were submitted for examination, following processing at Oxford Archaeology. The samples came from two possible cremation deposits in a ditch. Sample 100 was 80L in volume and was taken from a deposit possibly representing pyre debris, from context 117 within ditch 114. Sample 101 was 20L in volume, from context 119 within the same ditch. Forty litres from sample 100 was processed by water flotation using a siraf-style tank and meshes of 0.25mm (flot) and 0.5mm (residue); the remaining 40L was wet-sieved to 2mm for the recovery of bones and artefacts only. The entirety of sample 101 was processed by water flotation.

3.3.3 All residues were sorted and the finds, which included flint, burnt bone and pottery, were passed to the finds department.

3.3.4 The flots were scanned under a binocular microscope at up to x45 magnification. Charcoal caught on a 2mm sieve was considered identifiable and an estimate of quantity made. Twenty fragments were randomly extracted, fractured if necessary and examined in transverse section. The identification of diffuse porous species was subsequently checked at high magnification (up to x400). The flots were also scanned for the presence of any other plant remains and an estimate of abundance made.

Results

3.3.5 Both flots contained abundant charcoal, with particularly good preservation and fragment size in context 117. Both charcoal assemblages were mixed in character with several species identified, the results of which are presented in Table 1. Five taxa were positively identified: *Alnus/Corylus* (alder/hazel), several fragments were confirmed as *Corylus avellana* (hazel), *Fraxinus excelsior* (ash), *Maloideae* (hawthorn, apple, pear, service etc), *Prunus spinosa* (blackthorn) and *Quercus* sp. (oak). A couple of oak heartwood fragments were noted in 117 and there were quite a few roundwood fragments in both.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Context number 117</th>
<th>Context number 119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quercus sp.</strong></td>
<td>oak</td>
<td>++h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alnus/Corylus</strong></td>
<td>alder/hazel</td>
<td>++r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prunus spinosa</strong></td>
<td>blackthorn</td>
<td>+r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maloideae</strong></td>
<td>hawthorn group</td>
<td>++r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraxinus excelsior</strong></td>
<td>ash</td>
<td>+r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>++h</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+=up to 5, ++=5-25, +++=up to 100; ++++=>1000; h=heartwood, r=roundwood

Table 1: Results of the charcoal analysis

3.3.6 The flots also produced some cereal grains (c 20). These were badly degraded and had lost most of their testas, but were consistent with Triticum sp. (wheat), probably T. spelta/dicoccum (spelt/emmer). In the absence of the more diagnostic chaff or better preservation, it was not possible to verify the identification. A partial grain of Hordeum sp. (barley) and a single fragment of Corylus avellana (hazel) nutshell were also recovered from context 117. No chaff or small weed seeds were noted, although only a sub-sample of the fine fractions were scanned.

Discussion

3.3.7 The charcoal is not typical of the classic Bronze Age cremation assemblages, which tend to be dominated by a single taxon. Mixed assemblages are sometimes attributed to the gender/age of the deceased. In this case, the possibility that the cremated bone may have derived from animal rather than human remains means that the deposit could represent spent fuelwood from cooking. The hazelnut shell could have entered the context with the wood, but it is also possibly the remains of foodstuffs. Indeed, the presence of cereal grains, without the smaller-sized plant remains associated with crop processing, is indicative of food remains, though it could equally represent ritual feasting rather than domestic cooking. In any case, all of the charcoal taxa identified are native and consistent with the types of wood readily available and generally utilised for fuel in the Bronze Age.

4 Discussion and Conclusions

4.1.1 The activity observed can be broadly divided into two clusters, those originating before the foundation of the Saxon settlement of Thame and those relating to the post-medieval period, most likely the establishment of the present street frontage.

4.1.2 The two ditch sections (114) and (121) are surmised to be continuations of the same feature. This conclusion has been drawn from similarities between the fills and projections of their alignments. These projections suggest that they formed part of a circular ring ditch with an internal diameter c12 m, a width of between 2.1 m and 2.6 m and a depth in excess of 1.2 m. It is possible that this may represent the enclosing ditch of a round barrow.
4.1.3 Examination of the fills show that the ditch was open for a period allowing silting deposits (115, 116, 117, 122, 123, 124 and 125) to accumulate. The presence of burnt material within some of these deposits may indicate burning activities either within the barrow or nearby, possibly from cremation pyres or as indicated by the palaeoenvironmental report more likely to be the result of domestic cooking or ritual feasting. They may also indicate possible erosion of an associated barrow mound from within the centre of the ring ditch.

4.1.4 Later deposits appear to indicate a deliberate backfilling of the ditch. The direction of deposition (indicating from which side of the ditch they were deposited) suggests that the majority of the material was deposited from the western (internal) side of the ditch and may indicate a levelling or possibly slighting of the associated barrow mound. This activity most likely occurred during the creation of New Thame from the 12th-century onwards, when the present street alignment was established and the network of burgage plots associated with the street frontage laid out.

4.1.5 Ditches 129 and 131 roughly follow the alignment of the current street frontage and may represent two phases of internal ditches within the burgage plot, although no dating evidence was recovered to establish their relationship.

4.1.6 Pits 133, 135 and 138 appear to be small rubbish pits, probably post-medieval in date and are associated with occupation of the buildings fronting Cornmarket. The sequence of intercutting cess pits (102, 104, 106, 108 and 110) observed may indicate a long period of continuous habitation by the same tenant or family.

4.1.7 A study of Figure 2 suggests that the intercutting cess pits and Pit 138 are in line. This may indicate that they respect a possible plot boundary. The location of this boundary relatively close to the buildings fronting Cornmarket may indicate that the burgage plot associated with the street frontage has been sub-divided.

4.1.8 Pit 141 is a substantial feature and may represent a rubbish or cess pit shared between frontages. The material recovered from within its fill suggests a late medieval or early post-medieval date. It is possible that the labour involved with such a substantial feature may have been meant it was intended to be emptied periodically rather than sealed and a fresh one dug. If this is the case then the dating evidence relates to its time of disuse rather than its excavation.

4.1.9 Layer 142 represents a construction or demolition layer. Its location south of the proposed boundary discussed above may indicate building construction within the southern half of the plot, although no structural evidence to support this inference was observed. The soil horizons 113 and 143 are probable layers of worked (garden) soil and may relate to cultivation of these areas of the plot.

4.1.10 Layer 101 is an occupation and construction layer probably relating to the erection and activities of the current standing buildings fronting the Cornmarket. Its
composition suggests that it has been disturbed either by building work or activities such as cultivation a number of times.
### APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1  ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>&gt; 0.6 m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural terrace gravel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Occupation layer</td>
<td>Brick, tile,</td>
<td>C19th/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pottery, glass</td>
<td>C20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>Cess Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>Fill of Cess Pit 102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>1.2 m</td>
<td>Cess Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>1.2 m</td>
<td>Fill of Cess Pit 104</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>0.95 m</td>
<td>Cess Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>0.95 m</td>
<td>Fill of Cess Pit 106</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>Cess Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>Fill of Cess Pit 108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>1.7 m</td>
<td>Cess Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.4 m</td>
<td>1.3 m</td>
<td>Primary fill of Cess Pit 110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>1.7 m</td>
<td>Backfilling of Pit 110</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>C18th/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>Cultivated soil horizon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>0.9 m</td>
<td>1.8 m</td>
<td>Possible Round Barrow Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>0.65 m</td>
<td>Erosion/slumping depsoit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.18 m</td>
<td>0.9 m</td>
<td>Silting deposit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.1 m</td>
<td>1.2 m</td>
<td>Silting deposit</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.6 m</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>Deliberate backfilling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C12th ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.6 m</td>
<td>1.2 m</td>
<td>Deliberate backfilling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C12th ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.4 m</td>
<td>1.2 m</td>
<td>Deliberate backfilling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C12th ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>1.2 m</td>
<td>2.2 m</td>
<td>Possible Round Barrow Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
<td>&gt; 0.4 m</td>
<td>Erosion/slumping depsoit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>Erosion/slumping depsoit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.14 m</td>
<td>0.4 m</td>
<td>Silting deposit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.12 m</td>
<td>0.6 m</td>
<td>Silting deposit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.38 m</td>
<td>1.4 m</td>
<td>Deliberate backfilling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C12th ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.2 m</td>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>Deliberate backfilling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C12th ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Comments</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>128</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>1.8 m</td>
<td>Deliberate backfilling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C12th ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>1.9 m</td>
<td>Probable burgage plot boundary ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>1.9 m</td>
<td>Probable deliberate backfilling of ditch 129</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>0.45 m</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>Probable burgage plot boundary ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.45 m</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>Probable deliberate backfilling of ditch 131</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>1.1 m</td>
<td>Circular rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>1.1 m</td>
<td>Fill of Pit 133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>0.4 m</td>
<td>2.3 m</td>
<td>Circular rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.12 m</td>
<td>2.3 m</td>
<td>Lower fill of Pit 135</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>2.3 m</td>
<td>Upper fill of Pit 135</td>
<td>Bone, brick, tile</td>
<td>C16th/ C17th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>Circular rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>Fill of Pit 138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>&gt; 3 m</td>
<td>Fill of Pit 141</td>
<td>Bone, brick, pottery</td>
<td>C16th/ C17th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>&gt; 3 m</td>
<td>Very large circular cess/rubbish pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C16th/ C17th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>&gt; 8 m</td>
<td>Mixed layer of demolition/construction material and soil</td>
<td>Brick, tile</td>
<td>C16th/ C17th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.15 m</td>
<td>&gt; 5 m</td>
<td>Buried soil horizon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C18th/ C19th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3 SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS
Site name: 12-12a Cornmarket, Thame, Oxfordshire
Site code: THCORN 09
Grid reference: SP 706 058
Type of watching brief: Machine and hand excavation of building foundations and service trenching.
Date and duration of project: October 2009 to April 2010, 5 months
Area of site: 0.25 hectares
Summary of results: The watching brief revealed evidence of a possible Bronze or Iron Age Round Barrow ditch, two possible burgage plot boundary ditches and nine post-medieval pits, including five intercutting Cess Pits.
Location of archive: The archive is currently held at OA, Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford, OX2 0ES, and will be deposited with Oxfordshire County Museums Service under the following accession number OXCMS: 2010.6.
Figure 2: Site plan
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Figure 3: Sections