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Summary

An archaeological evaluation was carried out on land to the west of 94 Ramsey Road, Warboys, Cambridgeshire. The work took place as part of investigative fieldwork ahead of the construction of 19 affordable houses, new services and access road. The development site covers an area of approximately 5,450 square metres. Three archaeological trenches each 30 metres by 1.8 metres were positioned to achieve a representative sample of the site. The site area was centred on TL 2998 8063. The fieldwork took place between 09/02/15 and 11/02/15.

The trenches were located in the eastern half of the field in the footprints of the buildings and avoiding modern services near the entrance to the field.

The presence of two small fragments of Roman pottery (one found in a ditch in Trench 3) and one fragment of tile are likely to be the result of manuring. The ditch (in Trench 3) containing a single small sherd of Roman pottery is tentatively interpreted as a Roman cultivation ditch. A second, roughly parallel ditch approximately 16m to the east (in Trench 1) is possibly contemporary but was undated.

Medieval finds from the site include an iron strap end and five small sherds of pottery. Most of the pottery was found as residual in later features and may be the result of manuring. One feature, a large shallow pit in Trench 1, may be medieval in date, based on the presence of three medieval sherds of pottery.

The remaining three ditches are likely to be post-medieval in date. All are aligned approximately east to west. Two are approximately parallel and 14m apart, the third is not quite parallel and would converge if it continued the same alignment to the west of the site.

A single posthole contained one sherd of 18th or 19th century pottery.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work
1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted at land to the west of 94 Ramsey Road, Warboys (TL 2998 8063; see figure 1). These works took place as a condition of planning regulations for the development of a housing estate. The planned development covers an area of 5,450 square metres and will contain 19 affordable homes with new services and access. The evaluation trenches covered 162 square metres, focusing on the footprints of the proposed buildings. The work took place between the 9th and 11th of February 2015.

1.1.2 The site was located on the north-west edge of Warboys, in the district of Huntingdon and the parish of Warboys. The land for the development lies to the north of Ramsey Road, to the west of 94 Ramsey Road.

1.1.3 This archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a brief issued by Kasia Gdaniec of Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC; Gdaniec 2014; Planning Application 1400010FUL), supplemented by a project design prepared by OA East (Wiseman 2015).

1.1.4 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.

1.1.5 The site archive is currently held by OA East and will be deposited with CCC Deepstore in due course.

1.2 Geology and topography
1.2.1 Warboys is located 26km to the north-west of Cambridge, 21km south-east of Peterborough and 8.5km north-east of Huntingdon. The village lies on the edge of a slight plateau at about 30m above OD. The development area lies at about 22.5m above OD, in an area where the land slopes down from Warboys west towards Wistow. From the site the land rises to 29m above OD to Warboys wood to the north after which it drops rapidly into the Fen.

1.2.2 The development area lies on an area with a superficial Diamicton head deposit and mid Pleistocene glaciofluvial deposits. These overlie geological boundaries of Oxford Clay Formation, West Walton Formation and AmPTHill Clay Formation (BGS 1995; Gdaniec 2014). The former fen-edge lies 1.7km to the north (Wiseman 2015, 1).

1.3 Archaeological and historical background
1.3.1 The following information is based on Gilmour 2009.

1.3.2 Little archaeological work has taken place in the Warboys area, with the focus being towards the southern half of the village. There have, though, been a number of finds within the village, and there are numerous listed buildings. The known finds are discussed by period below.

1.3.3 Prehistoric and Roman
1.3.4 Only one prehistoric artefact has been reported from Warboys, despite various excavations uncovering prehistoric and Roman activity in the wider area. This object
was a bronze chape from an Iron Age scabbard (HER 03657), found about 700m south of the development area.

1.3.5 Saxon and medieval

1.3.6 The name Warboys is thought to derive from the combination of the old Scandinavian words for beacon and bush to give the name Wardenbuse (Ekwall 1960, 497 cited in Parry and Hall 2009, 1)

1.3.7 The first record of the parish of Warboys is from the gift of the land to the Abbey of St Benedict of Ramsey (located 6.6km to the north-west) by Archbishop Dunstan, and its confirmation by King Edgar in 974AD (Page et al 1932, 243). Warboys is later recorded in the Domesday Survey of 1086 by the name Wardebuse, as a large village with 48 householders amongst the lands of Ramsey Abbey (Wiseman 2015, 1). The site is located in an area that was dominated by the five Benedictine monasteries of Crowland, Ely, Peterborough, Ramsey and Thorney (Parry and Hall 2009, 1).

1.3.8 No Saxon finds have been recorded in Warboys despite the 10th century record of the area.

1.3.9 Several medieval earthworks have been noted around the village. The church of St Mary Magdalene, located about 800m to the south-east of the site, had a 12th century foundation with 13th century and later additions (HER 03540).

1.3.10 To the east of the church is a large medieval fish-pond (HER 03586) that has slight earthworks to the south of it. These earthworks are thought to represent medieval cultivation strips (HER 10058). Medieval agricultural activity is also represented through the remains of ridge and furrow cultivation seen in fields bordering the present village: to the south-east of the site (HER 11638 and MCB20005), the south-south-east of the site (HER 10488) and to the east of the site (HER 11639). Medieval boundary ditches have been noted on the southern edge of Warboys (HER MCB20215), and a further ditch to the south-east (HER 11709).

1.3.11 Small scale medieval industrial activity has been suggested through metalworking residues from a ditch amongst a cluster of three pits and two postholes to the south-east of the development area (HER MCB18587).

1.3.12 Post-medieval

1.3.13 There are numerous listed buildings in Warboys, all except the church have a post-medieval date. To the north of the church is the 17th century manor house and stable block (HER 03541). To the south-east are the 19th century gardens and fishpond of the former rectory (HER 12225). Just to the south-west of the village is the site of the World War II bomber airfield of RAF Warboys (HER CB15154).

1.3.14 Previous archaeological work

1.3.15 Six previous evaluations and watching briefs are listed in the Cambridge Historic Environment Record (CHER), all within 400m of the church and former manor house on Ramsey Road, but at least 400m from the current development area. All of these recovered medieval and post-medieval material.

1.3.16 The first of these was off Pope's Lane in the south of village in 1991 (Begg and French 1992; HER ECB407). This revealed a probable field boundary ditch containing 15th century pottery and an extension of the medieval fish pond to the north of the site (HER 03586).
1.3.17 A second evaluation of land off Pope’s Lane took place in 1999 (Hatton and Wall 1999; HER ECB90), this time revealing a number of undated features that were thought to relate to water management. This evaluation also found remnants of a ridge and furrow system and three postholes. One of these postholes contained pottery that dated to the 13th to mid 15th centuries.

1.3.18 Work on the tower and south porch of the church was monitored in 2001 (Mackreth 2001; HER ECB608). This revealed a brick gutter by the north buttress and a floor 95mm below the current floor level by the east face of the tower, and recovered some displaced human bones.

1.3.19 Work at Red House Farm (Gilmour 2009; HER ECB3271), to the south-east of the development site, revealed medieval postholes, pits and a ditch. These contained industrial residues – probably a background spread from blacksmithing in the vicinity – domestic pottery, and a near complete sledge runner. These suggest that this site was on the fringes of the village with small scale craft activity alongside the main road running to the settlement focus around the church.

1.3.20 Work on land at 27 Station Road, Warboys in 2010 (McCall and Thompson 2010) revealed no archaeological remains.

1.3.21 An archaeological watching brief during work on the Wistow Rising Main at Warboys, to the south of the current site, in 2014 (Stocks-Morgan 2014; HER ECB4072) revealed a late medieval and post-medieval field boundaries. The positioning of these boundaries in relation to each other and the modern boundaries indicate a shifting system of fields and rectilinear enclosures around the churchyard, possibly as a result of changing land division in the 15th century, when the original enclosure around the church was integrated into the larger rectilinear field system that survives today.

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 The author would like to thank Adrian Tindall of Archaeological Risk Management for commissioning the work on behalf of Cocksedge Building Contractors Ltd. The fieldwork was carried out by Mary Andrews and Robin Webb who also undertook the survey. Machine excavation was carried out by Lattenbury Services. The site was managed by Aileen Connor, and monitored by Kasia Gdaniec of Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team.
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 Three trenches were excavated to provide a representative sample of the development area. Each of these trenches was 30m long and 1.8m wide (see figure 2). The trenches were positioned and aligned to fit within the footprints of the proposed new buildings.

2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a tracked JCB-type excavator using a toothless ditching bucket to the depth of geological horizons, or to the interface of archaeological features. Archaeological features were then excavated by hand.

2.2.3 The site survey was carried out using a Leica 1200 GPS fitted with *Smartnet* technology.

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 Seven bulk samples were taken from a range of deposits to assess the potential survival of environmental remains.

2.2.7 During the excavation the weather remained dry, although the ground had retained high levels of moisture making it sticky underfoot. The water table was high at time of excavating and water lay in most features as well as in the north-west half of trench 1 (see plate 1) and north end of trench 2.
3 Results

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The results for each of the trenches are presented below in numerical order, with general descriptions of the trenches given in Appendix A. Descriptions of features are given spatially as they were located along the trenches.

3.1.2 The field had previously been used as a paddock for horses. The site is bounded by ditches on its north-western and southern sides. Archaeological features were present in all three trenches (see figure 2), with a uniform topsoil (1) and subsoil (2) across the site. The topsoil (1) was a friable dark greyish brown silt of between 0.19m and 0.28m thickness. The subsoil (2) was a soft mid greenish brown clay-silt of between 0.16m and 0.4m. Subsoil sealed a (0.2m thick) layer of colluvium (hillwash) in the north-east area of the site (Trenches 1 and 2). The natural geology consisted of a mixture of predominantly orange clay-silt with patches of blue clay, and was encountered at a depth of between 0.4m and 0.82m below the modern ground level.

3.2 Trench 1

3.2.1 This 30m by 1.8m trench was located on a slight slope running from 22.2mOD at the south-west end to 22.4mOD at the north-east end. The north-east 14m contained a colluvium deposit (25) that was a soft mid reddish brown clay-silt that had a depth of 0.2m. Topsoil, subsoil and colluvium were removed by machine.

3.2.2 To the west of this deposit was an undated ditch (4) aligned north-west to south-east with gentle sides and a flat base. It was filled by a plastic mid greenish brown clay-silt (3) that contained one fragment of bone. It was approximately parallel with and 16m to the east of ditch 14 (Trench 3).

3.2.3 Four and a half metres to the west of this ditch was a circular posthole (6) with steep sides. This posthole was filled by a friable mid greyish brown clay-silt (5) that contained one sherd of pottery dating to the late 18th-mid 19th century.

3.2.4 A further 1.25m to the west of the posthole was a tree root (7) of irregular shape that was filled by a firm mid brown silt-clay (8) and contained modern glass.

3.2.5 The south-west end of the trench contained a broad, shallow pit (24) with steep sides and a flat base. This was filled by a soft mid greenish brown silt-clay (23) that contained two tiny fragments of 12th-15th century pottery and a fragment of Roman pottery, it is likely that these are residual.

3.2.6 An east to west aligned service trench (22) cut pit 24, a residual fragment of 12th-15th century pottery was found in this feature.

3.3 Trench 2

3.3.1 This 30m by 1.8m trench was located on a slight slope running from 22.5mOD at the north end to 23.1mOD at the south end. The trench was positioned to test a cropmark identified on Google Earth (https://earth.google.com).

3.3.2 The north end of the trench contained the colluvium deposit (26) that extended 4.25m into the trench and had a depth of 0.2m. This was the same deposit as found at the east end of trench 1, and shows the north corner of the site having a build-up of hillwash from the surrounding slopes. This was removed by machine.

3.3.3 Eight metres to the south of the colluvium deposit was a ditch (11) running north-east to south-west with steep sides and a flat base. This ditch was filled by a firm light greyish
brown clay (12) that contained 16\textsuperscript{th}-18\textsuperscript{th} century pottery. This ditch was in approximately the same location and alignment as the northernmost of the linear cropmarks noted on Google Earth.

3.3.4 A further 5.5m to the south was a second ditch (10) with a slightly concave base and sides that were gentle to the north and steep to the south. This ditch was filled by a plastic mid greenish brown silt-clay (9) and contained two iron nails (small find 1) a small fragment of Roman tile, possibly a tegula, and post-medieval red brick. This ditch corresponded with the southern of two linear cropmarks noted on Googel Earth.

3.4 Trench 3

3.4.1 Trench 3 was located on a slope running from 22.7mOD at the west end to 23.4mOD at the east end. It was 30m long and 1.8m wide.

3.4.2 The eastern 20m of the trench contained a ditch (16,17, 19) that ran east to west along the trench. This ditch had gentle sides and a concave base and was cut by a clay field drain. The ditch was filled by a plastic mid greenish brown silt-clay (15) that contained 16\textsuperscript{th}-18\textsuperscript{th} century glass and pottery along with post-medieval ceramic building material.

3.4.3 Three and a half metres to the west of this ditch was a second ditch (14) (see plates 2 and 3) aligned north-north-west to south-south-east with steep sides and a flat base. This ditch contained a soft light greenish brown silt-clay (13) and contained one small fragment of abraded Roman pottery, probably residual. The ditch was parallel with ditch 4 (Trench 1).

3.5 Finds Summary

3.5.1 The archaeological works at the site produced a pottery assemblage of 11 sherds, weighing 0.095 kg. The assemblage spans from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} to the late 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries. The condition of the overall assemblage is abraded and the mean sherd weight is low at approximately 0.009 kg. The works also produced a single shard of bottle glass dating from the 17\textsuperscript{th}-18\textsuperscript{th} century at the earliest, weighing 0.013kg, and five fragments of ceramic building material weighing 0.050kg. The ceramic building material included three pieces of post-medieval brick, two undiagnostic fragments and one abraded piece of Roman tile.

3.5.2 The archaeological works also produced two undiagnostic wrought iron nails, a medieval/post-medieval wrought iron square section nail, and a medieval iron strap end.

3.6 Environmental Summary

3.6.1 Two fragments of animal bone were recovered during the archaeological works – one partial cattle rib and one unidentifiable fragment.

3.6.2 Seven bulk samples of between 10 and 30 litres were taken during the archaeological works, all of which were devoid of plant remains. One small fragment of vitrified charcoal/coal was recovered from the samples.
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1.1 The presence of a few small abraded fragments of pottery and tile of all periods suggests that the site was located within a farming landscape from the Roman period to the present day. It is possible that the two north-south aligned ditches were cut during the Roman period but there is insufficient evidence to be certain of their date since only one sherd of pottery was found. They are likely to represent former field boundaries or possibly delineate a track or perhaps relate more directly to cultivation.

4.1.2 Medieval finds from the site include an iron strap end and five small sherds of pottery. Most of the pottery was found as residual in later features and is probably the result of manuring. One feature, a large shallow pit in Trench 1, may be medieval in date, based on the presence of three medieval sherds of pottery, but the date is inconclusive and its function uncertain.

4.1.3 The majority of the features within the development area were post-medieval. These consisted of one isolated posthole in the centre of the site that may represent the location of a post for tethering a horse, given the sites recent use as a paddock. The remaining three ditches all followed an approximately east to west alignment, It is possible that they represent shifting field boundaries similar to those noted around the church (Stocks-Morgan 2014).

4.1.4 The assemblage of pottery that was recovered from the archaeological works is domestic in nature, and except for two sherds of pottery was small and abraded. This suggests that the material has been reworked, probably result of ploughing.

4.1.5 In conclusion it is likely that the site has been used for agriculture, possibly both arable and pasture at different times since at least the Roman period.
## 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 drain or service trench, a circular posthole, a tree throw containing post-medieval glass, a ditch, and a hollow containing medieval pottery. Topsoil and subsoil overlay orange silty clay and colluvium at the north-east end of the trench..</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>30</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>0.21</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 4</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Cut of linear ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Fill of posthole 6</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Cut of circular posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Cut of tree throw</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Fill of tree throw 7</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Fill of drain/service trench 22</td>
<td>Iron nail SF3, pot</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Cut of drain/service trench</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Fill of pit/hollow 24</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>Medieval?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Cut of pit/hollow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Medieval?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Colluvium. Same as 26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>NNW-SSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench contained two post-medieval ditches. Topsoil and subsoil overlay orange silty clay with blue clay patches.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>30</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>0.27</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 10</td>
<td>Iron nails SF1, CBM</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Cut of linear ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Cut of linear ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 11</td>
<td>Pot, CBM, bone</td>
<td>Post-medieval</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>0.24</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 14</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Cut of linear ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>&gt;1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 16. Same as 18 and 20</td>
<td>Iron strap</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>end SF2,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pot, CBM,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>&gt;1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Cut of linear ditch. Same as 17 and 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>&gt;0.85</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Cut of linear ditch. Same as 16 and 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>&gt;0.85</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 17. Same as 15 and 20</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Cut of linear ditch. Same as 16 and 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 19. Same as 15 and 18</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Metalwork

By Chris Faine

Metal Small Finds Catalogue

B.1.1 SF 1 (Context 9): Two rectangular section wrought iron nails. Length: 50.9/86mm.

B.1.2 SF 2 (Context 15): Iron strap end. Made from a single sheet folded widthways. One side shows the remains of a possible lead alloy glaze. No rivet hole remains and there is an iron spacer between the plates. Medieval (1250-1400 AD)

B.1.3 SF 3 (Context 21): Wrought iron square section nail. Domed head. Width: 9.3mm Length: 34.2mm. Date: Medieval/Post-medieval
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B.2 Glass

by Carole Fletcher

B.2.1 The excavation produced a single shard of bottle glass, weighing 0.013kg, from ditch 16. The condition of the glass is poor, indicating some age and, although not closely datable, the bottle is likely to be at its earliest late 17th-18th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>Neck shard from a clear, pale green bottle. The surface of the glass is covered with a relatively stable gold iridescent layer, below this the glass is pitted.</td>
<td>?Late 17th-18th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B1: Glass

B.3 Pottery

by Carole Fletcher with Roman Pottery identified by Stephen Macaulay

Introduction

B.3.1 Archaeological works produced a pottery assemblage of 11 sherds, weighing 0.095 kg. The assemblage spans the 2nd to the late 18th century. The condition of the overall assemblage is abraded and the mean sherd weight is low at approximately 0.009 kg.

Methodology

B.3.2 The Medieval Pottery Research Group (MPRG) A guide to the classification of medieval ceramic forms (MPRG, 1998) and Minimum Standards for the Processing, Recording, Analysis and Publication of Post-Roman Ceramics (MPRG, 2001) act as a standard for the post-Roman pottery.

B.3.3 Recording was carried out using OA East’s in-house system based on that previously used at the Museum of London. Fabric classification has been carried out for all previously described Roman, medieval and post-medieval types. All sherds have been counted, classified and weighed on a context-by-context basis. The assemblage is
recorded in the summary catalogue. The pottery and archive are curated by Oxford Archaeology East until formal deposition.

B.3.4 Posthole 6 produced a single abraded sherd from black-glazed refined red earthenware vessel with white internal slip, dating to the late 18th-mid 19th century. Ditches 11 and 16 produce sherds of Post-medieval Redware, ditch 16 also contained the base sherd from a Nottinghamshire/Derbyshire stoneware bowl, dating to the 18th century.

B.3.5 Ditch 14, produced a rim sherd from a Roman Sandy oxidised Greyware jar dating to the 2nd-4th century, the sherd is moderately abraded and does suggest Roman activity in the vicinity of the site. However, this and the other Roman pottery recovered appears to be spread most likely through manuring scatters.

B.3.6 The assemblage is domestic in nature, indicating low levels of pottery deposition across the site resulting from Roman and later manuring scatters. All sherds except for a single Roman sandy oxidised grey ware jar rim and the 18th-19th century sherds are abraded, indicating significant reworking of the material, most likely through ploughing.

B.3.7 Pottery Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Basic Form</th>
<th>Sherd Count</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
<th>Pottery Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Refined Red Earthenware</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Late 18th-mid 19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Post-medieval Redware</td>
<td>Bowl body sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>Mid 16th-18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Roman Sandy Oxidised Greyware</td>
<td>Jar rim sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>2nd-4th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire/ Derbyshire Stoneware Redware</td>
<td>Bowl base sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-medieval Redware</td>
<td>Bowl body sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Mid 16th-18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Huntingdonshire Fen Sandy Ware / Huntingdon Late Medieval Calcareous ware</td>
<td>Body sherd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Late 12th-mid 15th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Medieval Ely-type ware</td>
<td>Body sherd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>Mid 12nd-mid 14th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huntingdonshire Fen Sandy Ware / Huntingdon Late Medieval Calcareous ware</td>
<td>Body sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Late 12th-mid 15th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman Oxidised ware</td>
<td>Body sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>2nd-4th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>0.094</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B2: Pottery
B.4 Ceramic Building Material

by Carole Fletcher

B.4.1 Five fragments of ceramic building material (0.050 kg) were recovered from the archaeological works. Three are pieces of post-medieval brick, two are undiagnostic fragments and from ditch 10 is an abraded piece of Roman tile, possibly a Tegula.

B.4.2 The ceramic building material is abraded and the low levels of material recovered are not enough to indicate buildings of any period within the area of archaeological works. The material represents a low level rubbish scatter, most likely as the result of manuring.

B.4.3 Ceramic Building Material Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>Fragment of Roman tile (Tegula). Swirled pink, cream and red clay with occasional ?calcereous inclusions. Part of sanded surface survives.</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Fragment of hard fired sandy red brick with what appear to be flint inclusions</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>Fragment of hard fired sandy red brick</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Undiagnostic fragment</td>
<td>Not closely datable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>Fragment of hard fired sandy red brick,</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Undiagnostic fragment</td>
<td>Not closely datable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B3: Ceramic Building Material
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APPENDIX C. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

C.1 Faunal remains

By Chris Faine

C.1.1 Two fragments of animal bone were recovered from 2 contexts. Context 3 contained a partial cattle rib, with an unidentifiable fragment being recovered from context 12.
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C.2 Environmental samples

By Rachel Fosberry

Introduction

C.2.1 Seven bulk samples were collected in order to assess the quality of preservation of plant remains and their potential to provide useful data as part of further archaeological investigations.

C.2.2 The samples were taken from ditch deposits that dated from the ?Roman and post-medieval periods and from undated features.

Methodology

C.2.3 One bucket (up to 10) litres of each bulk sample was processed by water flotation (using a modified Siraff three-tank system) for the recovery of charred plant remains, dating evidence and any other artefactual evidence that might be present. The floating component (flot) of the samples was collected in a 0.3mm 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.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Cut No.</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Sample Size (L)</th>
<th>Charcoal &lt;2mm</th>
<th>Large animal bones</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hollow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table C1: Environmental samples from WARRAM15*
C.2.4 All of the samples were devoid of plant remains other than modern rootlets and sparse charcoal fragments. Sample 2, fill 5 of undated posthole 6 contains a small fragment of vitrified charcoal/coal suggesting a later date for this deposit. Sample 6, fill 20 of post-medieval ditch 19 contains a small fragment of animal bone and Sample 7, fill 23 of hollow 24 contains an unidentifiable pottery fragment.

C.2.5 Occasional flakes of hammerscale are present in Samples 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Discussion

C.2.6 The samples from the site are unproductive. Many of the features sampled have been interpreted as field ditches and the lack of preserved remains indicates that these ditches were not used for the disposal of refuse and neither were they deep enough to have contained water to preserve plant remains. Pottery and a small fragment of animal bone was recovered from two deposits and are likely to be the result of spreading of midden waste/manure on the fields as fertiliser. The small quantities recovered are not indicative of deliberate deposition and preclude any further interpretation of the site.
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Figure 1: Site location showing archaeological trenches (black) in development area (red)
Plate 1: Photo of Trench 1, with the north-east half under water. Photo taken from the south-west

Plate 2: Photo of Trench 2. Photo taken from the north-west
Plate 3: Photo of Trench 3, showing ditch 14 in the foreground. Photo taken from the west

Plate 4: Photo of ditch 14. Photo taken from the north-west