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Summary

On the 14th of April 2016, OA East conducted an archaeological evaluation at Bidwell's Stores, Green Barn, Maris Lane, Trumpington, to provide information with regard to a planning application for the construction of an office building and storage facility following the demolition of the 'Green Barn'. The site is located in an area of high archaeological potential. A single trench was excavated and revealed a pit and make-up for a surface, both were 20th century in date. There was no indication of any remains pre-dating the 20th century.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted at Green Barn, Maris Lane, Trumpington.

1.1.2 This archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Gemma Stewart of Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC; Planning Application 15/2092/FUL), supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East.

1.1.3 The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, in accordance with the guidelines set out in National Planning Policy Framework (Department for Communities and Local Government March 2012). The results will enable decisions to be made by CCC, on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, with regard to the treatment of any archaeological remains found.

1.1.4 The site archive is currently held by OA East and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 The site lies on West Melbury Marly Chalk formation geology at approximately 16m aOD (http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html).

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 Recent large scale excavations in Trumpington have produced much information on Trumpington’s archaeology. The Trumpington Meadows excavation by the Cambridge Archaeological Unit (CAU - Patten 2012) lay c. 400m to the south-west of the site, revealing Neolithic monuments, extensive Iron Age activity, an Early to Middle Saxon settlement and cemetery and Late Saxon enclosures. The Clay Farm excavation (Philips and Mortimer forthcoming) around 1km to the east exposed 20ha of the Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman landscape. Nearby at the Waitrose car park, evidence of Saxon and Medieval activity was revealed (Hatton and Hinman 2000). Anstey Hall Farm, Trumpington was subject to a watching brief (Moan 2013) and evaluation (Ladd 2013), the latter producing prehistoric and Roman artefacts and Middle Saxon to Medieval settlement features and structures.

1.3.2 The principal piece of work undertaken in the immediate vicinity has been the excavations at Anstey Hall Farm c. 200m due west of the subject site (Ladd forthcoming). A summary of the results of that excavation are presented below and also includes other recent excavations within the area.

1.3.3 Excavations at Anstey Hall, Trumpington Meadows and the Waitrose site have all produced residual Roman material in the form of pottery, ceramic building materials and a quern stone. These indicate Roman activity in the area, probably deriving from farmsteads with associated field systems along the river Cam to the west and the Hobson's Brook/Clay Farm area to the east. In addition Roman remains were found at Anstey Hall - described as a cemetery (Fox 1923, 111-2) - and at the Park and Ride site (CHER 09716).

1.3.4 There is what appears to be a dispersed, open Early-Middle Saxon settlement site in the area south of Trumpington Church and down into Trumpington Meadows. This
settlement included a small but high status later 7th century cemetery group, excavated by the CAU at Trumpington Meadows. Subsequent reorganisation in the Middle Saxon period (late 7th/8th century) saw the enclosure of the site with narrow strips probably focused to the north of the site along the Grantchester Road and with a possible track way aligned west to east through the centre. A deep palisade trench in the north of the site, only metres from the 13th century village church, suggest a manorial or ecclesiastical centre just beyond the limit of excavation.

1.3.5 Reorganisation continued in the Late Saxon period with divisions being consolidated into larger areas with larger ditches and a possible stockade structure. The putative track way line was recut as a ditch which separated the settlement to the north from the regular enclosures laid out to the south in Trumpington Meadows. A large, multi-seater cess pit dating to this period may be evidence for the short-term stationing of troops, farmworkers or building workers within the settlement.

1.3.6 In 991, Ealdroman Beorhtnoth gave a manor at Trumpington to the monks of Ely (Baggs 1982). As in the Middle Saxon period, the Late Saxon focus of settlement was probably just to the north of the site, adjacent to the village church. It may have been the centre of a manor, one of the four major land holdings recorded in Domesday at Trumpington (Connor 2016).

1.3.7 During the 12th century, the enclosures and divisions appear to have been given over to fields. In the east of the site, a boundary originating in the Middle Saxon period, perhaps paralleling the Roman Road from Royston to Cambridge appears to have persisted, becoming a cobbled track leading to the church by the 12th century. Adjacent to this track were Medieval cess pits (possibly associated with construction of the church), a large quarry pit and a malting oven.

1.3.8 The tithe map of Trumpington shows the major Late Saxon boundary and the track to the church became fossilized as land boundaries while the majority of the area to the south had been incorporated into an open field (ibid).

1.3.9 The original Church of St Nicholas was established by 1200, probably owned by the de Caillys, and had a Chapel to St Mary from 1300 (Baggs 1982). Later (by prefixing St Mary and through scribal error) it became the Church of St Mary and St Michael (Ladd Forthcoming).

1.3.10 The buildings of Anstey Hall Farm (18th-19th century) and Anstey Hall itself (17th century at its core) are both listed (CHER 01145, MCB19342). The associated gardens (CHER 12270) were laid out to the south of the original house, although the area west of the Hall leading to the Farm (Trenches 6 and 7 in evaluation) was evidently landscaped as part of the gardens (Ladd 2016 Forthcoming).

1.3.11 In 1941 the Hall was requisitioned by the government, as was the Farm in 1950 for the Plant Breeding Research Institute which used much of the farmland to the south (Baggs 1982).

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 OA East would like to thank Bidwells LLP for funding the work. The site was managed by Richard Mortimer. The fieldwork was carried out by Steve Graham. The brief was written by Gemma Stewart of CCC HET who also monitored the work. Thanks are also extended to the illustrator and editor.
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.

2.1.2 The evaluation was called to provide information in relation to a planning condition for proposed development work entailing the demolition of existing ancillary storage buildings (known as the Green Barn) and their replacement with a new office building and the conversion of a single storey barn adjacent to it.

2.2  Methodology

2.2.1 The development area was approximately 200 square metres. The archaeological potential of the site was assessed by means of a 10% archaeological trial trench evaluation. The initial breaking and lifting of the concrete slab overlying the site area took place under a watching brief as part of the archaeological works. This was followed by a continuous single 13.5m x 1.6m trench positioned along the centre/west of the site in a north-east to south-west orientation. This constituted a change to the original trench design due to the presence of services across the area. The trench was excavated to the top of the first archaeological deposit or to the underlying natural substrata, whichever was encountered first.

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

2.2.3 The site was located to Ordnance Survey by means of triangulation from standing buildings adjacent to the site.

2.2.4 Spoil, exposed surfaces and features were scanned with a metal detector. No metal-detected finds were retained as all 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 No environmental sampling was undertaken during the course of the evaluation.

2.2.7 Site conditions were good being dry and bright throughout the evaluation with the occasional overcast spell.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The excavated trench (Figure 3, Plates 1 and 2) contained a single pit and modern surface both located at the south-west end of the trench. The natural marly chalk within the trench was overlaid by imported soils containing modern brick, mortar and other debris. The trench is described below and supplemented by trench/context information in Appendix A.

3.2 Trench 1

3.2.1 The trench was a single continuous trench located in the middle of the proposed development area with a north-east to south-west orientation (Figure 2). The trench was 13.5m in length and 1.60m wide. A modern concrete drain 1.5m wide ran across the centre of the trench from north-west to south-east.

3.2.2 Natural undisturbed geology was reached at between 0.50m and 0.75m below the top of the trench. The deposit sequence to the north and south of the central drain were different in character. The deposits to the north of the drain are described first in sequence form earliest to latest, followed by the sequence to the south, again from earliest to latest.

3.2.3 The earliest layer to the north of the drain was context 2 (Figure 3, Section 1), a grey-brown clay sand (0.30m thick). Above this was a compact mid red-brown silt sand (3) 0.20m thick. This was overlaid by a band of dark grey coke fragments and ash (1) sealed in turn by a grey brown sand silt (4) 0.20m thick.

3.2.4 On the south side of the drain the earliest layer (5) was 0.2m thick and extended across the width of the trench but was only 1.8m long as it was truncated at its southern end by a pit (10) and stopped at a modern drain to the north. It comprised a mixture of Cambridge White bricks (used from the late 18th century onwards), London Brick Company red bricks (1900+) and clunch nodules.

3.2.5 Pit 10 at the south end of the trench, truncated layer 5. This pit (Figure 3, Sections 1 and 2, Plates 3 and 4) was 2.80m long and 0.84m deep. The pit continued under both sides of the evaluation trench. The pit was filled with three layers; a light red-brown silt sand 0.13m deep (15), over which was a dark red silt clay 0.40m deep (11) that contained fragments of red brick, some of which were stamped “L.B.C” for the London Brick Company (founded 1900), along with pieces of modern machined iron components and washers. And finally a layer (0.34m thick) of white clay (12), presumably deliberately laid to cap the top of the pit.

3.2.6 Overlying layer 12 (at its north end) and layer 5 was a dark red clay sand (6), a 0.30m thick layer of compact grey brown sand silt (14) overlay 12 at its south end. This was in turn overlaid with a band of compact (ballast) sand (13) 0.12m thick. Above this was a dark grey silt clay silt clay (7) that extended as far as the drain and was 0.20m thick. This was overlain by a compact band of yellow mortar (8) 0.10m thick and above this was a dark grey mix of mortar and sand (9) 0.20m thick.

3.2.7 The entire area of the evaluation was capped by a horizontal band of concrete (16) 0.16m thick which was removed prior to the evaluation.
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1.1 Although the site was located within an area of archaeological potential there was no evidence for any activity within the proposed development area prior to the 20th century.

4.1.2 The only features within the trench were a pit (10) and adjacent layer (5) both of which contained London Red Brick dating from 1900 onwards with no other earlier material present. As such these features will both date to the 20th century. Whilst it is possible that earlier features may have originally been located in the south-west end of the trench, the extent and depth of the modern pit would make their survival highly unlikely.

4.2 Significance

4.2.1 The absence of any archaeological finds or features prior to the 20th century within the trial trench strongly suggests that there is no pre-modern archaeological activity within the proposed development area.

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                  | Orientation | NE-SW | Avg. depth (m) | 0.80 | Width (m) | 1.50 | Length (m) | 13.5 |

General description

Trench contains single pit (10) with modern brick within its fills. This is overlaid by levelling layers of imported soil and was capped by concrete surface.

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>0.20</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Modern Surface</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Modern Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Fill of 10</td>
<td>Brick, Scrap metal</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Levelling Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Fill of 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Concrete Surface</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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