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Summary

Between 17th January and 24th February 2017, Oxford Archaeology East (OA East) conducted a metal detecting survey and monitoring of drill pits along the eastern section of the Anglian Water Tut Hill phase 1 pipeline scheme, Fornham St Martin, Suffolk (TL 8498 6620 – TL 8511 6636). In total, six drill pits were monitored and recorded on the floodplain of the River Lark.

No archaeological features or deposits were observed in the drill pits, and no artefacts were recovered from the metal detecting survey.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of work

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology (OA) was commissioned by Anglian Water to undertake a metal detector survey and monitor the drill pits along the Tut Hill phase 1 pipeline scheme between Mitchell Avenue and Barton Hill road, Fornham St Martin (TL 8498 6620 – TL 8511 6636, Figs.1-2).

1.1.2 This document has been prepared on behalf of Anglian Water in response to advice issued by Rachael Abraham of the Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service Conservation Team (SCCAS/CT), in compliance with the Anglian Water Code of Practice and an approved Written Scheme of Investigation produced by OA (Brudenell 2017).

1.2 Location, topography and geology

1.2.1 The pipeline route is located between Fornham All Saints in the west and Fornham St Martin in the east (Fig. 1). The western half of the route is located within the highway of Mildenhall Road (A1101) and Mitchell Avenue (TL 8420 6698 – TL 8498 6620), and did not require archaeological investigation. The eastern half of the scheme traverses fields at the base of the Lark Valley between 28-47m OD, east of Mitchell Avenue (Fig. 2). It crosses the River Lark and Thetford Road (B1106) on the eastern valley side, before turning south to join Barton Hill road at TL 8511 6636.

1.2.2 The eastern half of the scheme crosses alluvial deposits of the River Lark, together with Quaternary Head deposits and sands and gravels flanking the eastern side of the Lark Valley. The bedrock geology of the area comprises Cretaceous chalks of the Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation, Newhaven Chalk Formation and Culver Chalk Formation.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 Using data from the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (SHER), the following section provides a brief description of the main heritage assets within the vicinity of the eastern half of the scheme where archaeological investigation was required (chainage 50m-1275m; TL 8498 6620- TL 8511 6636).

Prehistoric

1.3.2 A prehistoric presence is attested by Neolithic and Early Bronze Age finds recorded at the western end of the investigation area (BSE 413). Finds include scrapers, blades, and flakes. The site is c. 2km south-east of a major prehistoric cropmark complex at Fordham All Saints, which includes a Neolithic Cursus (FAS 004; Scheduled Ancient Monument SF114).

Roman

1.3.3 To the east of the scheme, metal detecting and fieldwalking surveys in advance of the Fornham by-pass (FSM 007) and Sugar Beet Factory Lagoon (BRG Misc) located a scatter of Roman coins, suggestive of occupation.
Saxon

1.3.4 A possible Early Saxon cemetery is located c. 350m south-west of the western end of the area of investigation (BSE 059; BSE 373). A series of c. 25 burials were recorded in 1821 and 1956, although the exact details of the location area are unclear. Two Early Saxon brooches have also been recovered in the area; one a complete brooch found c. 400m north of the scheme (FSM 013), the other a fragment found during metal detecting in advance of the Fornham by-pass (FSM 007), c. 300m east of the eastern end of the scheme.

Medieval

1.3.5 Babwell Friary, a Franciscan Friary founded 1263 (dissolved 1538) is located immediately south of the western end of the investigation area (BSE 014; Scheduled Ancient Monument SF159). The northern half of the scheduled area includes fishponds and earthworks (and a World War II pill box BSE 399). The other half is area includes part of the church, cemetery and claustral wall. There are remains of the Friary wall along the bank which bounds the site on the north-east. The southern part of the site and its immediate surroundings have been subject to excavations and survey (BSE 014; BSE 154; BSE 119), and have revealed walls, footings, pits, ditches and burials. A medieval sculpture fragment of a head carved in fairly soft fine-grained limestone and possible structural remains were also found to the west (BSE 060).

1.3.6 At the eastern end of the scheme, metal detecting and fieldwalking surveys in advance of the Fornham by-pass (FSM 007) and Sugar Beet Factory Lagoon (BRG Misc) located scatters of metalwork over a wide area. Finds included seal matrices, coins, jetons, tokens (including boy bishop issues), strap ends, buckles and finger rings suggestive of medieval activity and occupation.
2 PROJECT AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The general aim of the monitoring investigation was to preserve by record any archaeological evidence revealed within the drill pits. More specific aims were as follows:

- To establish the form, date and purpose of any archaeological deposits.
- To establish the impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.
- To recover artefacts to assist in the development of a type series within the region.

2.1.2 The aim of the metal detecting survey was to characterise the artefact content of the topsoil of the pipeline route east of the River Lark, and to establish the presence/absence of and date artefact scatters potentially indicative of sites.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 All below ground works were monitored by a qualified Archaeologist.

2.2.2 A metal detector survey using a Garrett ACE250 detector was carried out in a 1m transect either side of the pipeline route, over c. 1.1km. This was along the grass verge of fields north of Barton Hill road, and pasture along the floodplain of the River Lark between Thetford Road and Mildenhall Road.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction and presentation of results

3.1.1 The results of the drill pit monitoring and recording are presented below, with drill pit locations presented in Figure 2. Full details of each drill pit, including dimensions and depths of deposits can be found in Appendix A.

3.1.2 No finds other than modern shotgun cartridges and ring-pulls were found in the metal detecting survey. These were discarded on site and are not discussed further.

3.2 General soils and ground conditions

3.2.1 With the exception of Drill Pit 1 and 2, all the drill pits displayed the same sequence of deposits. These comprised natural geologies of pale yellowish-brown and grey alluvial silts, gravels and clays overlain by a thick reddish-brown alluvium derived subsoil up to 0.63 thick. This in turn was sealed by a dark reddish-brown topsoil up to 0.6m thick.

3.2.2 The soil sequence within Drill Pit 1 comprised a natural geology of yellowish-brown sands and gravel. This was overlain by 2.2m of blackish-brown made ground, which in turn was sealed by Tarmac forming the car park surface.

3.2.3 Drill Pit 2 had a similar sequence of deposits to Drill Pits 3-6, but had a layer of dark grey-brown organic silt at the base below the alluvium.

3.2.4 Ground conditions along the pipeline route were extremely poor. The ground was saturated with areas of surface water. The water table in the drill pits was high preventing direct access for detailed recording. The grass verges, pasture and saturated ground were not conducive to effective metal detecting.

3.3 General distribution of archaeological deposits

3.3.1 No archaeological artefacts or features were identified during the monitoring of the drill pits.

3.4 Drill Pit 1

3.4.1 Drill Pit 1 (Plate 1) was located in the Co-operative Food car park, off Mildenhall Road (centred TL 8499 6622). The pit measured 5m by 2m and was excavated to a depth of 2.5m.

3.4.2 The natural geology comprised yellowish-brown sands and gravel. This was overlain by up to 2.2m of blackish-brown modern made ground, which in turn was sealed by Tarmac forming the car park surface. No finds were recovered from the drill pit.

3.5 Drill Pit 2

3.5.1 Drill Pit 2 (Plate 2) was located to the east of the River Lark (centred TL 85032 66289). The pit measured 5m by 2m and was excavated to a depth of 1m.

3.5.2 The natural geology comprised pale yellowish-brown alluvial silts, overlain by a reddish-brown alluvium derived subsoil 0.30m thick. This in turn was sealed by a dark reddish-brown topsoil up to 0.2m thick. No finds were recovered from the drill pit.
3.6 Drill Pit 3

3.6.1 Drill Pit 3 was located to the west of the modern field drain separating fields between the River Lark and Thetford Road (centred TL 85077 66319). The pit measured 12m by 2m and was excavated to a depth of 0.8m.

3.6.2 The natural geology comprised an orange-brown alluvial silt, overlain by a reddish-brown alluvium derived subsoil 0.30m thick. This in turn was sealed by a dark reddish-brown topsoil up to 0.20m thick. No finds were recovered from the drill pit.

3.7 Drill Pit 4

3.7.1 Drill Pit 4 (Plate 3) was located to the west of Thetford Road (centred TL 85301 66499). The pit measured 4m by 2m and was excavated to a depth of 1.5m.

3.7.2 The natural geology comprised yellowish-brown alluvial silt, overlain by a reddish-brown alluvium derived subsoil 0.30m thick. This in turn was sealed by a dark reddish-brown topsoil up to 0.30m thick. No finds were recovered from the drill pit.

3.8 Drill Pit 5

3.8.1 Drill Pit 5 was located to the west of Thetford Road (centred TL 85342 66553). The pit measured 8m by 2m and was excavated to a depth of 0.8m.

3.8.2 The natural geology comprised yellowish-brown and grey alluvial silt with gravels, overlain by a reddish-brown alluvium derived subsoil 0.30m thick. This in turn was sealed by a dark reddish-brown topsoil up to 0.6m thick. No finds were recovered from the drill pit.

3.9 Drill Pit 6

3.9.1 Drill pit six (Plate 4) was located to the east of Thetford Road (B1106, centred TL 85370 66572). The pit measured 5m by 2m and was excavated to a depth of 1m.

3.9.2 The natural geology comprised a redish-brown alluvial silt with gravels, overlain by a reddish-brown alluvium derived subsoil 0.30m thick. This in turn was sealed by a dark brown topsoil 0.60m thick. No finds were recovered from the drill pit.

3.10 Finds summary

3.10.1 No archaeological finds were recovered during the excavation of the drill pits or through metal detecting along the pipeline route.
4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Interpretation

4.1.1 No archaeological finds or deposits were observed during the works. With the exception of the built up ground recorded in Drill Pit 1, the soil sequence is typical of a pastoral floodplain with alluvial derived subsoil and topsoil.

4.1.2 Whilst ground conditions prevented direct access to the drill pits, and were not conducive to effective metal detecting, there was no indication that the floodplain area had been utilised for occupation.

4.2 Significance

4.2.1 No significant archaeological material was uncovered during the works.
# APPENDIX A  
## DRILL PIT DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY

### Drill pit 1

**General description**

Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of tarmac and made ground overlying natural geology of sand and gravels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Made ground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drill pit 2

**General description**

Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty clay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Natural alluvial clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Natural organic rich clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drill pit 3

**General description**

Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty clay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Natural alluvial clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drill pit 4

**General description**

Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty clay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Natural alluvial clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drill pit 5

**General description**

Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty clay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Natural alluvial clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Drill pit 6

**General description**
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty clay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Natural alluvial clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX C  OASIS REPORT FORM

### Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OASIS Number</th>
<th>Oxfordar3-273009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Tut Hill Phase 1 Pipeline Scheme, Fornham All Saints, Suffolk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Start of Fieldwork:** 17/01/2017  
- **End of Fieldwork:** 24/02/2017  
- **Previous Work:** No  
- **Future Work:** No  

### Project Reference Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>FSM 030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER Number</td>
<td>ESF25318 &amp; ESF25319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Techniques used (tick all that apply)

- Aerial Photography - interpretation
- Aerial Photography - new
- Annotated Sketch
- Augering
- Dendrochronological Survey
- Documentary Search
- Environmental Sampling
- Fieldwalking
- Geophysical Survey
- Geophysical Survey - new
- Gravity-core
- Laser Scanning
- Measured Survey
- Metal Detectors
- Photographic Survey
- Photogrammetric Survey
- Rectified Photography
- Remote Operated Vehicle Survey
- Sample Trenches
- Survey/Recording of Fabric/Structure
- Targeted Trenches
- Test Pits
- Topographic Survey
- Vibro-core
- Visual Inspection (Initial Site Visit)

### Monument Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Choose an item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Object Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Choose an item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Project Location

- **County:** Suffolk  
- **District:** Fornham St. Martin  
- **Parish:** St. Edmundsbury  
- **HER office:** Suffolk  
- **Size of Study Area:**  
- **National Grid Ref:** TL 8498 6620 – TL 8511 6636  
- **Address (including Postcode):** Thetford Rd, Bury Saint Edmunds IP31 1SX

### Project Originators

- **Organisation:** Oxford Archaeology East  
- **Project Brief Originator:** Rachel Abrahams  
- **Project Design Originator:** Matt Brudenell  
- **Project Manager:** Matt Brudenell
### Project Archives

<table>
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<th>Physical Archive (Finds)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OA East</td>
<td>XSFTHF17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Archive</td>
<td>Suffolk County Stores</td>
<td>FSM 030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physical Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present?</th>
<th>Digital files associated with Finds</th>
<th>Paperwork associated with Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Bones</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Remains</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratigraphic</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Bone</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Stone/Lithic</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Digital Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present?</th>
<th>Paper Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aerial Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matrices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photos (negatives/prints/slides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Further Comments
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1. **General background**

This Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) conforms to the principles identified in English Heritage’s guidance documents *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE)*, specifically the MoRPHE Project Manager’s Guide (2015) and Project Planning Note 3: Archaeological Excavation.

This WSI also incorporates the requirements of the EAA *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England* (Gurney 2003).

1.1. **Circumstances of the project**

Oxford Archaeology East (OA East) have been commissioned by Anglian Water to undertake a programme of archaeological monitoring and metal detecting survey along sections of the Tut Hill Phase 1, Fornham All Saints pipeline scheme, Suffolk.

This document has been prepared on behalf of Anglian Water in response to advice issued by Rachael Abraham of the Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service Conservation Team (SCCAS/CT), and in compliance with the Anglian Water Code of Practice.

Archaeological works will comprise:

1. Monitoring drill pits at chainage 1225m, 1175m, 800m and 775m
2. Monitoring open-cut sections within the car park at chainage 1225-1275m
3. Metal detecting survey of the full length of the pipeline route to the east of the River Lark, chainage 50m-1150m.

1.2. **Location, geology and topography**

The pipeline route is located between Fornham All Saints in the west and Fornham St Martin in the east. The western half of the route is located within the highway of Mildenhall Road (A1101) and Mitchell Avenue (TL 8420 6698-8498 6620) and does not require archaeological investigate. The eastern half of the scheme traverses fields at the base of the Lark Valley between, 28-47m OD, east of Mitchell Avenue. It crosses the River Lark and Thetford Road (B1106) on the eastern valley side, before turning south to join Barton Road at TL 8511 6636.

The eastern half of the scheme crosses alluvial deposits of the River Lark, together with Quaternary Head deposits and sands and gravels flaking the eastern side of the Lark Valley. The bedrock geology of the area comprises Cretaceous chalks of the Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation, Newhaven Chalk Formation And Culver Chalk Formation.
2. Archaeological background

Using data from the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (SHER), the following section provides a brief description of the main heritage assets within the vicinity of the eastern half of the scheme where archaeological investigation in required (chainage 50m-1275m; TL 8498 6620- TL 8511 6636).

2.1. Prehistoric

A prehistoric presence is attested by finds of Neolithic or Early Bronze Age finds recorded at the western end of the investigation area (BSE 413). Finds include sparerbs, blades, and flakes.

2.2. Roman

To the east of the scheme, metal detecting and fieldwalking surveys in advance of the Fornham by-pass (FSM 007) and Sugar Beat Factory Lagoon (BRG Misc) located scatter of Roman coins, suggestive of occupation.

2.3. Saxon

A possible Early Saxon cemetery is located c. 350m south-west of the western end of the area of investigation (BSE 059; BSE 373). A series of c. 25 burials were recorded in 1821 and 1956, although the exact details of the location area unclear.

Two Early Saxon brooches have also been recovered in the area; one a complete brooch found c. 400m north of the scheme (FSM 013), the other a fragment found during metal detecting in advance of the Fornham by-pass (FSM 007), c. 300m east of the eastern end of the scheme.

2.4. Medieval

Babwell Friary, a Franciscan Friary founded 1263 (dissolved 1538) is located immediately south of the western end of the investigation area (BSE 014; Scheduled Ancient Monument SF159). The northern half of the scheduled area includes fishponds and earthworks (and a World War II pill box BSE 399). The other half is area includes part of the church, cemetery and claustral wall. There are remains of the Friary wall along the bank which bounds the site on the north-east. The southern part of the site and its immediate surrounding have bee subject to excavations and survey (BSE 014; BSE 154; BSE 119), and have revealed walls, footings, pits ditches and burials. A medieval sculpture fragment of a head carved in fairly soft fine-grained limestone and possible structural remains were also found to the west (BSE 060).

At the eastern end of the scheme metal detecting and fieldwalking surveys in advance of the Fornham by-pass (FSM 007) and Sugar Beat Factory Lagoon (BRG Misc) located scatters of metalwork over a wide area. Finds included seal matrices, coins, jetons, tokens (including boy bishop issues), strap ends, buckles and finger rings suggestive of medieval activity and occupation.
3. **Aims and objectives**

3.1. **Aims of the project**

The general aim of monitoring investigation is to preserve by record any archaeological evidence revealed within the areas of open cut ground works and drill pits. When archaeology is encountered, the investigation will have the following aims:

- Establish the form, date and purpose of any archaeological deposits.
- Establish the impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking colluvial/alluvial deposits.
- Recover artefacts to assist in the development of a type series within the region.

The aim of the metal detecting survey is to characterise the artefact content of the topsoil of the pipeline route east of the River Lark, and to establish the presence/absence and date artefact scatters potentially indicative of sites.

3.2. **Research frameworks**

This investigation takes place place within, and will contribute to the goals of Regional Research Frameworks relevant to this area:


4. **Methods**

The archaeological investigations will be conducted in accordance with current best archaeological practice and the appropriate national and regional standards and guidelines.

All work will be conducted in accordance with the Institute for Archaeologists’:

- Code of Conduct
- Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Watching Briefs

Additional guidelines, specific to the region, which we also adhere to are:

- *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England* (East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 14)

Fieldwork will also be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the OA Field Manual (ed. D Wilkinson 1992), and the revised OA fieldwork
4.1. Background research

The relevant results of a background study are briefly summarised in Section 2 above. The results of this study will be fully incorporated into the final evaluation report and supplemented by further documentary research where appropriate. An HER search will be commissioned for this project. The result will be integrated into the evaluation report.

4.2. Metal detecting survey: Investigation and Recording methodology

The full length of the pipeline route to the east of the River Lark (i.e. chainage 50m-1150m) will be scanned by a metal detector prior to any ground works.

The survey will be conducted by staff experienced in the use of metal detectors. Metal detectors will not be set to discriminate against iron. All metal objects found will be retained, except for objects of late 20th century date (e.g. aluminium ring pulls, shotgun cartridges). The location of all metal objects retained will be recorded using a GPS device. Once recorded, objects will be bagged and labelled.

4.3. Treasure Act

If finds are made that might constitute ‘Treasure’ under the definition of the Treasure Act (1996), they will, if possible, be excavated and removed to a safe place. Should it not be possible to remove the finds on the day they are found, suitable security will be arranged.

Finds constituting Treasure will be immediately reported to the Suffolk Finds Liaison Officer (FLO) who will then inform the coroner within 14 days.

4.4. Monitoring: Investigation and Recording methodology

Ground works associated with the open-cut section of the scheme and drill pits will be monitored by a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist, followed by the investigation and recording of any archaeological features and deposits revealed where safe to do so.

Spoil arising from the ground penetrating works will be scanned visually and with a metal detector to aid recovery of artefacts.

The depth, nature and potential artefact content of colluvial or other masking deposits will also investigated and recorded.

4.5. Recording of archaeological deposits and features

Records will comprise survey, drawn, written and photographic data. The drawn record will comprise sketched and measured plans (scale normally 1:50 or 1:20) and sections as appropriate. The location of the ground works and any archaeological features observed will be tied in to the OS grid. The
written record will comprise trench and context descriptions on OA East pro-
forma “watching brief” recording sheets.

All site drawings will include the following information: site name, site code, 
scale, plan or section number, orientation, date and the name or initials of 
the archaeologist who prepared the drawing.

The photographic record will comprise high resolution digital photographs 
and/or black and white and colour film photographs.

Photographs will include both general site shots and photographs of specific 
features. Every feature will be photographed at least once. Photographs will 
include a scale, north arrow, site code, and feature number (where relevant), 
unless they are to be used in publications. The photograph register will 
record these details, and photograph numbers will be listed on 
corresponding context sheets.

4.6. Human remains

If human remains are encountered, the client and the SCCAS/CT will be 
immediately informed.

Excavation may be required where the remains are under imminent threat, 
or if information on date and preservation is required. Human remains will be 
evacuated in accordance with all appropriate Environmental Health 
regulations, and will only occur after a Ministry of Justice exhumation licence 
has been obtained.

4.7. Post-excavation processing

Processing will take place in tandem with monitoring, and advice will be 
sought from relevant specialists on key artefact types.

Any finds requiring specialist treatment and conservation will be sent for 
appropriate treatment.

4.8. Changes to the method statement

If changes need to be made to the methods outlined above – either before or 
during works on site – the SCCAS/CT will be informed and asked to consider 
changes before they are made. Changes will be agreed in writing before 
work on site commences, or else at the earliest available opportunity.

5. Reporting and Archiving

5.1. Report

The project report will provide an objective account of the archaeological 
investigation and its findings. It will contain a comprehensive, illustrated 
assessment of the local and regional context in which the archaeological 
evidence rests, and highlight any relevant research issues within regional 
and national research frameworks.

The report will include:
• a title page detailing site address, site code and accession number, NGR, author/originating body, client’s name and address
• full list of contents
• a non-technical summary of the findings
• a description of the geology and topography of the area
• a description of the methodologies used
• a description of the findings and metal detecting plot
• site plans, and plans showing the archaeological features found
• sections of excavated features
• discussion and interpretation of the archaeological features and find found
• specialist reports on artefacts
• relevant photographs of features
• the OASIS reference and summary form.

5.2. Draft and final reports

A draft digital copy of the report will be supplied to SCCAS/CT for comment. Following approval of the draft report, a copy will be sent to the client for submission to the Local Planning Authority, and a hard copy will supplied to the SCCAS/CT for deposition with the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.

A copy of the approved report will be uploaded to the OASIS database.

Where positive results are drawn from the evaluation, a summary statement will be provided to the SCCAS/CT suitable for inclusion in the Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History annual round up.

6. Archiving

A single site archive will be produced. The site archive will conform to the requirements of MoRPHE and the Archaeological Archives in Suffolk, Guidelines for preparation and deposition (Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service 2014).

The preparation of the archive will also follow the guidelines contained in Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long Term Storage (United Kingdom Institute for Conservation, 1990), Standards in the Museum care of Archaeological Collections (Museums and Galleries Commission 1992), and Archaeological Archives: A guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation (Brown 2007).

6.1. Archive contents

The archive will be quantified, ordered, and indexed. It will include:
• artefacts
• ecofacts
• project documentation – including plans, section drawings, context sheets and registers
• photographs (digital photographs will be stored on CD-ROM, and colour printouts made of key features)
• a printed copy of the WSI
• a printed copy of the final report
• a printed copy of the OASIS form.

It is Oxford Archaeology Ltd’s policy, in line with accepted practice, to keep site archives (paper and artefactual) together wherever possible.

A digital security copy of all documentary parts of the archive will also be made and retained by Oxford Archaeology.

6.2. Transfer of ownership

OA East will seek to transfer title of ownership of the complete project archive to Suffolk County Council or another registered local depository at the appropriate time. Until then, all artefactual and paper archive material relating to the project will be held in storage by OA East.

7. Timetable

The fieldwork will take between 2-5 days depending on the construction programme.

Post-excavation processing and assessment tasks will commence shortly after the fieldwork commences, to minimise time required to prepare the report after the fieldwork is completed.

Post-excavation tasks and report writing is anticipated to take 4 weeks following the end of fieldwork, unless there are exceptional discoveries requiring more lengthy analysis.

8. Staffing and support

8.1. Fieldwork

The fieldwork team will be made up of the following staff:
1 x Project Manager (supervisory only, not based on site)
1 x Project Officer/Supervisor (full-time)
1 x Finds Assistant (part-time, as required)
1 x Environmental Assistant (part-time, as required)

The Project Manager will be Matt Brudenell

All Site Assistants will be drawn from a pool of qualified and experienced staff. Oxford Archaeology East will not employ volunteer, amateur, or student staff, whether paid or unpaid, except as an addition to the team stated above.

8.2. Post-excavation processing

Pottery will be assessed by Sarah Percival or Matt Brudenell (prehistoric), Alice Lyons (Roman) and Dr Paul Spoerry (Saxon and medieval).

Environmental analysis will be carried out by OA East staff, in consultation
with the OA Environmental Department in Oxford. The results will be reported to the Historic England Scientific Advisor. Environmental analysis will be undertaken by Rachel Fosberry (charred plant macrofossils, plant macrofossils), Liz Stafford (land molluscs), and Denise Druce and Mairead Rutherford (pollen analysis).

Faunal remains will be examined by Lena Strid (Oxford Archaeology South) or Ian Smith (Oxford Archaeology North).

Conservation will be undertaken by Colchester Museums.

In the event that OA's in-house specialists are unable to undertake the work within the time constraints of the project, or if other remains are found, specialists from the list at Appendix 1 will be approached to carry out analysis.

9. Other matters

9.1. Insurance

OA East is covered by Public and Employer’s Liability Insurance. The underwriting company is Allianz Cornhill Insurance plc, policy number SZ/14939479/06. Details of the policy can be seen at the OA East office.

9.2. Services, Public Rights of Way, Tree Preservation Orders etc.

The client will inform the project manager of any live or disused cables, gas pipes, water pipes or other services that may be affected by the proposed excavations before the commencement of fieldwork. Hidden cables/services should be clearly identified and marked where necessary.

The client will likewise inform the project manager of any public rights of way or permissive paths on or near the land which might affect or be affected by the work.

The client will also inform the project manager of any trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders within the subject site or on its boundaries.

9.3. Site security

Unless previously agreed with the Project Manager in writing, this specification and any associated statement of costs is based on the assumption that the site will be sufficiently secure for archaeological work to commence. All security requirements, including fencing, padlocks for gates etc. are the responsibility of the client.

9.4. Access

The client will secure access to the site for archaeological personnel and plant, and obtain the necessary permissions from owners and tenants to place a portable toilet on or near to the site if required. Any costs incurred to secure access, or incurred as a result of withholding of access will not be OA East’s responsibility. The costs of any delays as a result of withheld access will be passed on to the client in addition to the project costs already
specified.

9.5. **Site preparation**

The client is responsible for clearing the site and preparing it so as to allow archaeological work to take place without further preparatory works, and any cost statement accompanying or associated with this specification is offered on this basis.

Any other preparatory work, including tree felling and removal, scrub or undergrowth clearance, demolition of buildings or sheds, or removal of excessive overburden, refuse or dumped material, will be charged to the client, in addition to any costs for archaeological evaluation already agreed.

9.6. **Site offices and welfare**

All site facilities – including welfare facilities, tool stores, mess huts, and site offices – will be positioned to minimise disruption to other site users, and to minimise impact on the environment (including buried archaeology).

9.7. **Backfilling/Reinstatement**

Backfilling but not reinstatement of trenches is included in the cost unless otherwise agreed with the client.

9.8. **Monitoring**

The relevant planning authority will be informed appropriately of dates and arrangements to allow for adequate monitoring of the works. Monitoring will be conducted by representatives from the SCCAS/CT, and meetings may be attended by the OA East project manager and client to discuss findings and progress.

9.9. **Health and Safety, Risk Assessments**

A risk assessment covering all activities to be carried out during the lifetime of the project will be prepared before work commences. This will draw on OA East’s activity-specific risk assessment literature and conforms with CDM requirements.

All aspects of the project, both in the field and in the office will be conducted according to OA East’s Health and Safety Policy, Oxford Archaeology Ltd's Health and Safety Policy, and Health and Safety in Field Archaeology (J.L. Allen and A. St John-Holt, 1997). A copy of OA East’s Health and Safety Policy can be supplied on request.
## APPENDIX 1: CONSULTANT SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SPECIALISM</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Leigh</td>
<td>Worked bone, CBM, medieval metalwork</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Martin</td>
<td>Medieval coins</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Sue</td>
<td>HSR, pottery and CBM</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayliss, Alex</td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biddulph, Edward</td>
<td>Roman pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Barry</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinkhorn, Paul</td>
<td>Iron Age, Anglo-Saxon and medieval pottery</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardman, Sheila</td>
<td>Plant macrofossils, charcoal</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonsall, Sandra</td>
<td>Plant macrofossils; pollen preparations</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth, Paul</td>
<td>Roman pottery and coins</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreham, Steve</td>
<td>Pollen and soils/ geology</td>
<td>Cambridge University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Lisa</td>
<td>Prehistoric pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane, Jon</td>
<td>illustration &amp; reconstruction artist</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champness, Carl</td>
<td>Snails, geoarchaeology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotter, John</td>
<td>Medieval/post-Medieval finds, pottery, CBM</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crummy, Nina</td>
<td>Small Find Assemblages</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowgill, Jane</td>
<td>Slag/metalworking residues</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrah, Richard</td>
<td>Wood technology</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Anthony</td>
<td>Worked Flint</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donelly, Mike</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan, Roger</td>
<td>Slags, metallurgy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druce, Denise</td>
<td>Pollen, charred plants, charcoal/wood identification, sediment coring and interpretation</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drury, Paul</td>
<td>CBM (specialised)</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Jerry</td>
<td>Roman pottery</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faine, Chris</td>
<td>Animal bone</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, Carole</td>
<td>Medieval pot, glass, small finds</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosberry, Rachel</td>
<td>Charred plant remains</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryer, Val</td>
<td>Molluscs/environment</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale, Rowena</td>
<td>Charcoal ID</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake, Helen</td>
<td>Small finds</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleed-Owen, Chris</td>
<td>Herpetologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffin, Richenda</td>
<td>Post-Roman pottery, building materials, painted wall plaster</td>
<td>Suffolk CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton-Dyer, Sheila</td>
<td>Fish and small animal bones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard-Davis, Chris</td>
<td>Small finds, Mesolithic flint, RB coarse pottery, leather, wooden objects and wood technology; Archaeobotany (charred, waterlogged and</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, Kath</td>
<td>Archaeobotany (charred, waterlogged and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SPECIALISM</td>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Jenny</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>ASUD, Durham University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, David</td>
<td>Window glass &amp; lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker, Alison</td>
<td>Fishbone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loe, Louise</td>
<td>Osteologist</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, Alice</td>
<td>Late Iron Age/Roman pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaulay, Stephen</td>
<td>Roman pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters, Pete</td>
<td>geophysics</td>
<td>Cranfield University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton, Paul</td>
<td>Phosphates/garden history</td>
<td>Peterborough Regional College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mould, Quita</td>
<td>Ironwork, leather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson, Rebecca</td>
<td>Fish and small mammal and bird bones, shell</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Rog</td>
<td>Aerial photographs</td>
<td>Air Photo Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percival, Sarah</td>
<td>Prehistoric pottery, quern stones</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole, Cynthia</td>
<td>Multi-period finds, CBM, fired clay</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popescu, Adrian</td>
<td>Roman coins</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rackham, James</td>
<td>Faunal and plant remains, can arrange pollen analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddler, Ian</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon bone objects &amp; related artefact types</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Mark</td>
<td>Insects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland, Steve</td>
<td>Faunal and human bone</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford, Mairead</td>
<td>Pollen, non-pollen palynomorphs, dinoflagellate cysts, diatoms</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuels, Mark</td>
<td>Architectural stonework</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaife, Rob</td>
<td>Pollen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Ian</td>
<td>Roman, Medieval, post-medieval finds, metalwork, glass</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealey, Paul</td>
<td>Iron Age pottery</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shafrey, Ruth</td>
<td>Worked stone, cbm</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Ian</td>
<td>Animal Bone</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoerry, Paul</td>
<td>Medieval pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford, Liz</td>
<td>Snails</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strid, Lena</td>
<td>Animal bone</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyers, Ian</td>
<td>Dendrochronology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ui Choileain, Zoe</td>
<td>Human bone</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickers, Kim</td>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>Sheffield University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadeson, Stephen</td>
<td>Samian, Roman glass</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Helen</td>
<td>Medieval Pottery in the Essex area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way, Twigs</td>
<td>Medieval landscape and garden history</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb, Helen</td>
<td>Osteologist</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis, Steve</td>
<td>Iron Age pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Radiocarbon dating is normally undertaken for Oxford Archaeology East by SUERC and by the Oxford University Accelerator Laboratory.
Geophysical prospection is normally undertaken by Cranfield University, Geoquest, and Geophysical Surveys, Bradford.
Figure 1: Site location showing route of pipeline (red)
Figure 2: Drill pit location plan along the Tut Hill phase 1 pipeline route (mapping supplied by the client)
Plate 1: Drill pit 1, facing west

Plate 2: Drill pit 2, facing west
Plate 3: Drill pit 4, facing north-east

Plate 4: Drill pit 6, facing north