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Summary

Between 27th and 28th February 2017, Oxford Archaeology East (OA East) conducted an archaeological evaluation on land to the rear of Clear Farm, South End, Bassingbourn-Cum-Kneesworth (centred TL 3333 4366). Two evaluation trenches were excavated, both 20m in length. The evaluation revealed a single medieval field boundary ditch, two possible hedge lines, and part of the foundations, floor and yard surface of a 19th century barn that burnt down on the site in 2004. A single sherd of medieval pottery dated to the mid 11th to mid 13th century was recovered from the field boundary ditch.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of work

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology (OA) was commissioned by Mr and Mrs Howard to undertake a trial trench evaluation on land to the rear of Clear Farm, South End, Bassingbourn-Cum-Kneesworth (TL 3333 4366, Fig. 1).

1.1.2 The work was undertaken as a condition of Planning Permission (planning ref. S/2363/16/FL), in accordance with a Brief issued by Gemma Stewart of the Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team (CCC HET: Stewart 2016), and an approved Written Scheme of Investigation produced by OA (Brudenell and Greef 2017). This document outlines how OA implemented the Local Planning Authority’s requirements in line with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation.

1.2 Location, topography and geology

1.2.1 The site lies the east of South End road in the village of Bassingbourn-Cum-Kneesworth, c. 280m south of the village centre. The plot is c. 0.12ha in area, and is situated to the east of the existing buildings at Clear Farm.

1.2.2 The area of proposed development was formally used as a yard area for parking vehicles and is covered with a layer of crushed hardcore. The site lies at c. 29m OD and is surrounded by agricultural land to the south, an area of rough pasture to the east, Clear Farm to the west, and residential gardens to the north.

1.2.3 The geology of the area is mapped as chalk of the West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation (British Geological Survey, online).

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The following is drawn from the Written Scheme of Investigation (Brudenell and Greef 2017) alongside data from the Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Record (CHER; Fig. 1).

Prehistoric

1.3.2 Evidence for prehistoric activity in the area includes a number of worked flint objects recovered from fields 600m to the south-west of the site during metal detecting (FCB20243), in the vicinity of a possibly prehistoric ring ditch (MCB19214). Archaeological investigations at Bassingbourn Village College (300m to the west of the development area) revealed a series of ditches on a NNE-SSW alignment arranged in two groups (ECB2321; ECB2553; ECB2701). The ditches, which appear to have formed a drove way for livestock, possibly date to the Middle Iron Age.

Romano-British

1.3.3 Within the historic core of Bassingbourn, evidence for Roman activity is limited to a find of a Roman statuette of Diana, 400m to the north-west of the development area (03123).
1.3.4 In the open fields 800m to the south of the development area a trackway identified as part of the Avenell Way, and ditches relating to Roman field systems and enclosures, have been identified as cropmarks (ECB3435; MCB19213; MCB21153; MCB21158).

**Saxon and medieval**

1.3.5 A Late Saxon origin has been suggested for Bassingbourn. Evidence for the early settlement has been found at Bassingbourn Village College, 300m west of the site, where a Saxon sunken feature building and a pit were revealed during excavation (MCB18142).

1.3.6 Medieval activity includes a small medieval moated site (01239), located 300m to the north-west to the site, that is now covered by modern housing. Saint Peter and Saint Paul’s Church (03191) is located 700m to the north of the development area. Most of the structure dates from the 14th century, although the church probably has an earlier origin. Medieval ridge and furrow has been identified from cropmarks immediately to the south of the site (MCB22227) and has also been recorded in the wider surrounding area.

**Post-medieval and modern**

1.3.7 A number of late medieval and early post-medieval buildings are still standing in the core of the village along the street frontage to the west and north of the development area. Notable buildings near to the site include The United Reformed Church (Built 1790, DCB5013), the New United Reformed Church (Built in the 19th century, DCB6781), Barns, Coach House, Bakehouse and Maltings (Built c. 1500, DCB5342), South End House (built in the 17th century, DCB5416) and the Tanyers (built 1809, DCB6133). Of greater significance is the Dovecote at Clear Farm (10400; DCB466), located 40m to the west of the site, and built c. 1750. This is the sole survivor of the original Clear Farm buildings burned down by discontented farm labourers in 1849 (Selby 2016). The current building immediately west of the site were erected shortly afterwards in a courtyard arrangement, including a barn on the eastern wing, partly within the development area, which burned down in 2004. The remaining buildings have been converted into residential properties.
2 EVALUATION AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The project aims and objectives were as follows:

i. Provide sufficient coverage and exposure to enable excavation to establish the approximate form, date and purpose of any archaeological deposits, together with extent, localised depth and quality of preservation.

ii. Provide sufficient coverage and exposure to evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking deposits.

iii. Provide sufficient coverage and exposure to provide information to construct an appropriate archaeological conservation/mitigation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables and order of cost.

iv. Set results in the local, regional, and national archaeological context.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 Two 20m long by 1.8m wide trenches were excavated, providing a c. 6% sample of the 0.12ha development area.

2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a tracked 360° hydraulic excavator using a toothless ditching bucket.

2.2.3 The site survey was carried out using a Leica GSO8 with Smartnet live data feed.

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 photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits.

2.2.6 An environmental sample was taken from ditch 12 in Trench 2, which was very organic in appearance.

2.2.7 Site conditions were good. The sky was overcast throughout the evaluation, with some occasional sunny spells.
3 Results

3.1 Introduction and presentation of results

3.1.1 The results of the evaluation are presented below, and include a stratigraphic description of the features and deposits. Features within trenches are discussed in order of their location from north to south or from west to east. Full details of each trench, including dimensions and depths of all deposits can be found in Appendix A. Finds and environmental reports are presented in Appendix B and C.

3.2 General soils and ground conditions

3.2.1 The soil sequence across the trenches was fairly uniform. The natural geology of silty chalk was overlain by a mid greyish brown clayey silt subsoil (0.36-0.40m in thickness), which in turn was overlain by crushed concrete hardcore (0.16-0.28m thick). There was no surviving topsoil at the site.

3.2.2 Ground conditions throughout the evaluation were generally good, and the trenches remained dry throughout. Archaeological features, where present, were easy to identify against the underlying natural geology.

3.3 General distribution of archaeological deposits

3.3.1 Both trenches (Fig. 2) revealed a small number of archaeological features and deposits.

3.4 Trench 1

3.4.1 Trench 1 (Plate 1) was located in the centre of the development area and was aligned north-west to south-east. The trench exposed two archaeological features. Pit/feature 20 was located in the middle of the trench. It was amorphous in plan and displayed gently sloping sides and an irregular base. This feature was 0.70m long, 0.40m wide and 0.05m deep. It was filled by a single deposit of dark greyish brown clayey silt (21), from which no finds were recovered.

3.4.2 Hedge line 17 was located towards the southern end of Trench 1. This feature had gently sloping sides, an irregular base and measured 0.90m in width and 0.15m in depth. It was filled by two deposits. The basal fill (19) consisted of dark greyish brown clayey silt and was between 0.06m and 0.15m thick. The upper fill (18) was dark blueish grey clayey silt and was 0.07m thick. No finds were recovered from the fills.

3.5 Trench 2

3.5.1 Trench 2 (Plate 2) was located to the south-east of Trench 1, and was orientated south-west to north-east. This trench revealed a number of features including a wall foundation, the remains of an associated chalk/clunch floor and surface, a post-hole, two ditches and a modern pit.

3.5.2 Foundation trench 5 (Fig. 3 section 1, Plate 3) was exposed in the western end of Trench 2. The wall trench was aligned north-west to south-east and measured 0.58m in width and 0.66m in depth. The cut had vertical sides and a flat base. The basal footing of the wall (6) consisted of rammed chalk/clunch 0.32m thick. Above which,
three surviving courses of a brick wall were set on a tile base (7). The wall was built of bricks measuring 0.24m by 0.11m by 0.06m, and was bonded by a lime mortar. Bricks were set in even courses. The wall trench cut the subsoil (3).

3.5.3 A post-hole (8; Plate 3) was located directly underneath wall trench 5. The post-hole was sub-square in plan and measured 0.35m long, 0.33m wide and 0.24m deep. It had vertical sides and a flat base. This feature was filled by a single deposit (9) of mid brownish grey silty clay. No finds were recovered from the post-hole.

3.5.4 Abutting wall trench 5 on its western side was a compacted chalk surface (2). It was 0.16m thick, and was exposed for a distance of 1.5m between wall 5 and the western end of the trench (Plate 3). Abutting the wall trench on its eastern side was another compacted chalk surface (22/23). This was 0.16-0.28m thick, and was recorded for a distance of 5.22m east along the trench section. Both surfaces were covered by the top layer of hardcore (1) but overlaid the subsoil (3); surface 22/23 was cut by pit 15.

3.5.5 Ditch/hedge line 10 (Fig. 3 section 3) was located directly to the north-east of wall trench 5. This ditch, which was aligned on a north-west to south-east axis, had irregular edges in plan and measured 0.90m wide and 0.15m deep. It had steep sides and an irregular base and was filled by a single deposit (11) of dark greyish brown silty clay. The feature was sealed by the subsoil (3).

3.5.6 Ditch 12 (Fig. 3 section 4; Plate 4) was located to the east of ditch 10. It was also aligned north-west to south-east, and measured 1.14m wide and 0.30m deep with steep sides and a flat base. This ditch was filled by two deposits. The basal fill (13) consisted of dark blueish grey silty clay. An environmental sample taken from the fill yielded charred free-threshing wheat and sparse charcoal (Appendix C). The upper fill (14) was mid greyish brown silty clay. This fill produced a single fragment of medieval pottery (10g) dating to the mid 11th to mid 13th century (see Appendix B). The ditch was sealed by the subsoil (3).

3.5.7 Pit or pond 15 (Fig. 3 section 6) was located towards the middle of the trench, but was not fully exposed. It was 7m long and 0.40m deep, and cut the subsoil (3). The pit was filled by a single deposit (16) of dark blueish grey silty clay, and contained fragments of crushed brick and concrete.

3.6 Finds summary

3.6.1 A single piece of mid 11th to mid 13th century pottery was recovered from the site. In addition, brick and tile samples were taken from the fill (7) in wall 5. An environmental sample was taken from the basal deposit (13) of ditch 12. This yielded charred free-threshing wheat and sparse charcoal.
4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Reliability of field investigation

4.1.1 Archaeological features, distinguished by their mid brown and grey colours, were clearly visible within the evaluated trenches. The hardcore and subsoil layers were easily set apart from the geology, characterised by its light whitish yellow colour. Both archaeological features and the natural deposits were free-draining, with no standing water hindering the archaeological work.

4.1.2 For reasons stated above results of the completed evaluation are considered to have a good level of reliability.

4.2 Evaluation objectives and results

4.2.1 The aim of this investigation was to establish the character, date and state of preservations of any archaeological remains present within the proposed development area, as described in the Written Scheme of Investigation (Brudenell and Greef 2017).

4.2.2 The trial trenching of the site exposed a small selection of archaeological features, comprising ditches, pits, a post-hole, wall trench and surface deposits. Despite the topsoil having been removed from the site, and replaced by hardcore, the underlying subsoil remained intact ensuring the features were reasonably well preserved. The only area of complete truncation was in the centre of Trench 2, where modern pit 5 penetrated the natural.

4.3 Interpretation

4.3.1 The earliest dated feature in the evaluation was ditch 12, which yielded a single sherd of mid 11th to mid 13th century medieval pottery from its secondary fill. The ditch was orientated north-west to south-east, perpendicular to the line of an extant drainage ditch along the northern boundary of the site. Ditch 12 was sealed by the subsoil, and was flanked by feature 10 on a broadly similar alignment immediately east. The shared orientation suggests the two features may have been contemporary; the slightly amorphous plan and profile of 10 may indicate that the feature was a hedge-line rather than a ditch. Together, these features are likely to have formed part of a former field division.

4.3.2 The two features in Trench 1 (17 and 20) were also sealed by the subsoil, but were shallow and slightly amorphous. Aligned perpendicular to ditch 12 in Trench 2, feature 17 is also thought to be the remains of a hedge line, sharing similar characteristics to feature 10. The function of feature 20 is more ambiguous, but it could be the remains of a pit (undated).

4.3.3 With the exception of modern pit or pond 5, which cut the subsoil, the other remaining features and deposits recorded in Trench 2 were probably all associated with the former 19th-century barn that recently stood on the site. Wall trench 5 and post-hole 8 presumably formed part of the foundation and wall-line of the eastern wall of the barn. This structure was a largely timber-framed, timber-clad barn, c. 30m long by c.
10m wide, constructed as part of a courtyard arrangement of farm buildings at Clear Farm in the mid-19th century (Selby 2016; a date matching that given to the brick recovered from wall trench 5). The other buildings in the courtyard are still extant, but the eastern barn burnt down in 2004.

4.3.4 Surface 2, recorded at the western end of the trench, was internal to the barn and is likely to represent a rammed chalk/clunch floor. Surface 22/23 was external, and probably formed part of a yard area.

4.4 Significance

4.4.1 The site lies on the outskirts of the historic village of Bassingbourn, on land previously occupied by farm buildings. The evaluation revealed a field boundary and hedge line, of probable medieval in date, and the remains associated with the 19th century barn that burnt down in 2004.

4.4.2 Few finds were recovered from the site, and the environmental potential is considered to be low, with no animal bone recovered and only scant charred remains from the sample processed. Given the low significance of these finds it is not recommended that they are retained and deposited as part of the project archive.
## APPENDIX A  
**TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY**

### Trench 1

**General description**

Trench contained a pit and a gully. It consists of layer of hardcore and subsoil overlaying natural geology of clayey chalk.

<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>0.28</td>
<td>Hardcore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Cut of hedge line 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Fill of hedge line 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Fill of hedge line 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Cut of pit/feature 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Fill of pit/feature 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 2

**General description**

Trench contained a wall, a post-hole, couple of ditches and a modern pit. Consists of layer of hardcore overlying three surfaces and subsoil covering natural geology of clayey chalk.

<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>0.12</td>
<td>Hardcore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Chalk surface</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Foundation cut of wall trench 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Fill of wall trench 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Fill of wall trench 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Cut of post-hole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Fill of post-hole 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Cut of ditch/hedge line 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Fill of ditch/hedge line 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Cut of ditch 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mid 11th-mid 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Fill of ditch 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mid 11th-mid 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Fill of ditch <strong>12</strong></td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>mid 11th-mid 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Cut of pit <strong>15</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Fill of pit <strong>15</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Chalk Surface (northern bulk)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Chalk surface (southern bulk)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Pottery

By Carole Fletcher

Assemblage

B.1.1 A single moderately abraded sherd of pottery was recovered from ditch 12 (Table 1). The sherd is a rim from a Developed St Neots rounded bowl with externally beaded and internally thickened rim. The rim sherd dates from the mid 11th-mid 13th century, however, a single sherd is not reliable dating for the entire feature. In isolation, the sherd is of little significance, although it does indicate early medieval activity in the vicinity of the area evaluated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>No. of Sherds</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
<th>Pottery Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>1050–1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Pottery catalogue

B.2 Ceramic Building Material

By Ted Levermore

Introduction

B.2.1 A small sample of ceramic building material (CBM) was collected from wall trench 5 in the form of a post-medieval/early modern brick and a post-medieval/early modern tile.

Methodology

B.2.2 The assemblage was quantified by context, fabric and form and counted and weighed to the nearest whole gram (Table 2). Fabrics were examined using a x20 hand lens and were described by main inclusions present. Width, length and thickness were recorded where possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tile with mortar</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Late post-med to early modern. 19th Century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brick with mortar</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late post-med to early modern. 19th Century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Ceramic building material catalogue

Assemblage and Discussion

B.2.3 The brick (225x110x60mm; 9x4x2.5 inches) is in a reddish-orange sandy clay fabric with common fine to very coarse (2 – 15mm) inclusions of crushed CBM fragments and fine to coarse sub-rounded voids. It is machine formed with a shallow and simple frog in one
bed face, this indicates an early modern date. All faces, except one stretcher, are coated with a thin lime and gravel mortar indicative of use in a wall. It is in two refitting pieces.

B.2.4 The tile (170mm wide; 170mm remaining length; 20mm to 30mm thick) is probably an edging tile, where this fragment was part of a much longer tile used as a border to a path, wall or in the garden. It has a lozenge-wedge shaped profile, each end is bevelled and 20mm wide and the top third of the tile is rounded (max 30mm wide). This would lend the tile to being hammered into the ground with the wider bevelled end left exposed. The tile, however, is covered in the same gritty lime mortar as the brick described, having come from the wall, so it is likely this brick may have been used for a decorative coarse, as a sill, as spacing or for coping. It is in a dark reddish-orange silty clay fabric with occasional coarse rounded flint pebble inclusions and covered with a fine moulding sand. It is probably machine made with the bevelling and the return from the widest point cut away after the forming process. This is evidenced by the smoothing and removal of the moulding sand from the bevelled faces.

B.2.5 These fragments are probably from the early to middle part of the 19th century. The brick may have seen one use in the wall and the tile was probably reused judging by the mortar-covered broken faces. The fact it is has been broken into a square suggests it has been repurposed. This building material is clearly structural and dates the feature to the middle of the 19th century at the earliest.
APPENDIX C  ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

C.1 Environmental Samples

By Rachel Fosberry

Introduction

C.1.1 A single bulk sample was taken from fill 13 of probable medieval ditch 12 located within Trench 2 of the evaluated area in order to assess the quality of preservation of plant remains and their potential to provide useful data as part of any further archaeological investigations.

Methodology

C.1.2 The total volume (14 litres) of the samples was processed by tank flotation using modified Siraff-type equipment for the recovery of preserved plant remains, dating evidence and any other artefactual evidence that might be present. The floating component (flot) of the sample was collected in a 0.3mm nylon mesh and the residue was washed through 10mm, 5mm, 2mm and a 0.5mm sieve.

C.1.3 The dried flot was scanned using a binocular microscope at magnifications up to x 60. Identification of plant remains is with reference to the Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands (Cappers et al. 2006) and the authors' own reference collection. Nomenclature is according to Zohary and Hopf (2000) for cereals and Stace (1997) for other plants. Plant remains have been identified to species where possible. The identification of cereals has been based on the characteristic morphology of the grains and chaff as described by Jacomet (2006).

Quantification

C.1.4 For the purpose of this initial assessment, items such as seeds and cereal grains have been scanned and recorded qualitatively according to the following categories:

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

C.1.5 Items that cannot be easily quantified such as charcoal has been scored for abundance

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

Results

C.1.6 Preservation of plant remains is by carbonisation and is restricted to occasional charred free-threshing wheat (Triticum cf. aestivum) grains and sparse charcoal fragments. There are numerous molluscs and modern rootlets within the sample and it is not possible to ascertain if the charred grains are contemporary with the deposit or later intrusions.
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Figure 1: Site location showing archaeological trenches (black) in development area (red) with CHER data
Figure 2: Map of the evaluation trenches showing all features
Figure 3: Selected sections
Plate 1: Trench 1, view from the north

Plate 2: Ditches 10 and 12, Trench 2, view from the east
Plate 3: Wall 5, Trench 2, view from the south

Plate 4: Ditch 12, Trench 2, view from the north