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Summary

An Evaluation was carried out at Hinchingbrooke school, Grid ref TL 2261 7166. The evaluation had intended to consist of four test pits, however excavation of a single test pit and on site factors, showed the proposed development area is likely to have been the site of a backfilled swimming pool with sufficient modern overburden to cover any possible archaeological deposits.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted at Hinchingbrooke School, at grid reference TL 2261 7166.

1.1.2 This archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Dan McConnell of Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC; Planning Application No. 1000771FUL), supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East.

1.1.3 The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, in accordance with the guidelines set out in Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (Department for Communities and Local Government 2010). The results will enable decisions to be made by CCC, on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, with regard to the treatment of any archaeological remains found.

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

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 The site is located within the grounds of Hinchingbrooke school, at grid reference TL 2261 7166, the development area is on very uneven ground, with the height ranging from 20.93m AOD to 21.83m AOD.

1.2.2 The site lies on Second Terrace Deposits, with the River Ouse approximately 1km to the south.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The site lies to the south-west of an area of substantial archaeological activity, which has been subjected to excavations by the Archaeological Field Unit (now CAM ARC) of Cambridgeshire County Council between 1997 and 2007. These investigations are known collectively as the Bob’s Wood excavations (ECB219) and were undertaken in 2000 and 2003 (Hinman, M. 2000). Additional investigations undertaken within the remit of the Bob’s Wood Project include excavations at Hinchingbrooke Parkway, (Fletcher 2004) and Christie Drive (Howe, 2007). These projects confirmed the presence of significant archaeological remains dating to the later prehistoric and early Roman eras in the area.

1.3.2 Furthermore, the site is situated within the bounds of the park associated with Hinchingbrooke House which dates to the 16th century but is constructed on the site of Hinchingbrooke Priory (CHER 02707). The development area thus lies within an area of high archaeological potential.

1.3.3 A burial of Roman date is known to the south (ECB 02586).

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 The author would like thank Cambridgeshire County Council who commissioned and funded the archaeological work. The project was managed by James Drummond-
Murray and the illustrator was Andy Corrigan, with Jonathan House as the on-site staff. The project was monitored by Dan McConnell.

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 The Brief required that all archaeological deposits should be investigated, and recorded.
2.2.2 Excavation of the test pit was carried out by an archaeologist using hand excavation tools.
2.2.3 The site survey was carried out by Taleyna Fletcher using a Leica GPS which is located on the ordnance survey grid.
2.2.4 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.
2.2.5 No environmental samples were taken from the site, as no appropriate features were identified during the investigations.
2.2.6 The site conditions were dry and sunny, the site conditions did not inhibit the archaeological work.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 One test pit was excavated, the results are presented and described below.

3.2 Test Pits
3.2.1 Only test pit 3 was excavated, a total of four test pits had been planned, however a combination of on site observations, conversations with the staff, and the results of test pit 3, the further test pits were abandoned.
3.2.2 Test pit 3 was excavated to a depth of 0.5m, through very compacted modern building materials, including bricks, breeze blocks, as well as plastics and scrap metal.
3.2.3 Communication with the on site school staff suggested that the site may have been the former location of the house swimming pool, and that the area had in recent years been a significant depression in the ground which had been backfilled and made up over the last decades. (School Caretaker pers. comm.).

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Discussion
4.1.1 It is possible archaeological deposits may survive on the site, however if they are present it is likely there is sufficient coverage from modern deposits. Study of the cartographic evidence (see fig. 1) shows a possible swimming pool structure, however no maps have been seen with the feature labelled.

4.2 Significance
4.2.1 As the proposed development is likely to have a low impact on the ground, it is highly unlikely that deposits other than modern will be impacted.

4.3 Recommendations
4.3.1 Recommendations for any future work based upon this report will be made by the County Archaeology Office.
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