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Summary

Between the 18th and 21st of April 2017 Oxford Archaeology East carried out an archaeological trial trench evaluation on land to the north of Green Lane, Reydon, Suffolk (centred TM 498 779).

A total of nine 30m trenches were excavated in an agricultural field. The evaluation revealed a series of primarily east-west aligned medieval ditches and a group of intercutting pits. The medieval archaeology was focused in the eastern half of the site, with a concentration of dated features in Trench 8. Pottery recovered from the intercutting pits and ditches suggests activity was centred upon the 13th and 14th century. The features identified on the site indicate use of the area for agriculture and possibly other peripheral activities on the fringes of medieval Green-edge settlement alongside Rissemere Lane East.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of work

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology East (OAE) was commissioned by Orbit Homes to undertake a trial trench evaluation at the site of a proposed for residential development comprising 23 dwellings, north of Green Lane, Reydon, Suffolk (Fig. 1).

1.1.2 The work was undertaken to inform the Planning Authority in advance of a submission of a Planning Application. A brief was issued by Rachael Abraham of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS/CT, dated 06/12/2016) and a Written Scheme of Investigation was produced by OAE detailing the Local Authority’s requirements for work necessary to inform the planning process (Blackbourn and Brudenell 2017). This document outlines how OA implemented the specified requirements.

1.2 Location, topography and geology

1.2.1 The site lies to north of Green Lane, on the northern edge of the village of Reydon, Suffolk (centred TM 498779, Fig. 1).

1.2.2 The area of proposed development consists of agricultural fields with existing houses to the east and on the opposite side of the road. The site is broadly flat at a height of 10m OD.

1.2.3 The geology of the area is mapped as Crag Group Sand overlain by the Lowestoft Formation comprising sands and gravels (BGS 2017).

1.3 Archaeological and historical background (Fig. 2)

Prehistoric and Roman

1.3.1 Neolithic flakes were recovered 500m to the north-west of the site (REY Misc), whilst approximately 300m to the north-east, a series of undated cropmarks have been recorded by aerial photography. These include a possible ring ditch, field boundaries, trackways and enclosures (REY 056).

1.3.2 To the north at Reydon Smear, a number of Roman finds have been recovered including building material, a scatter of pottery and evidence for a possible tile or brick kiln (REY 008). A single Roman coin has been recovered 400m to the south-east (REY 010) with a further coin recovered 250m north-west of the site (REY Misc).

Medieval

1.3.3 The site lies off the western edge of the former medieval green known as Reydon Common (REY 030). Medieval pottery has been recovered 500m north-west of the site (REY Misc), with further finds of pottery recovered during a watching brief at The Old School, 500m to the north-west (REY 055).

Post-medieval and modern

1.3.4 Two post-medieval pits were excavated 350m south-east of the site (REY 100), whilst the remains of a World War II barbed wire rectangular enclosure are partially visible from cropmarks 500m to the east (REY 040).
2 EVALUATION AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The project aims and objectives were as follows:

i. To determine or confirm the general nature of any remains present.

ii. To determine or confirm the approximate date or date range of any remains, by means of artefactual or other evidence.

iii. To set results in the local, regional, and national archaeological context – and, in particular, its wider cultural landscape and past environmental conditions.

iv. To provide sufficient information to construct an archaeological mitigation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables, and orders of cost.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 Nine trenches measuring 30 long by 2.0m wide were excavated to provide a 5% sample of the proposed 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 correctional data feed.

2.2.4 Trench footprints, 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 ditche 12 in Trench 8.
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 trenches that contained archaeological remains. The four trenches devoid of archaeology (Trenches 2, 3, 5 and 9) are not discussed further. However, 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 within the trenches was fairly uniform. The natural geology of brown yellow sand was overlain by a mid grey-brown silty sand subsoil (0.07m-0.24m thick), which in turn was overlain by a dark brown sandy silt topsoil (0.24-0.30m thick).

3.2.2 Ground conditions throughout the evaluation were generally good, and the trenches remained dry throughout. Archaeological features, where present, were more difficult to identify against the underlying natural geology at the western end of the investigation area than at the east.

3.3 General distribution of archaeological deposits

3.3.1 Archaeological features were present in Trenches 1, 4, 6, 7, and 8. Trenches 2 (Plate 1), 3 (Plate 2), 5 (Plate 3) and 9 (Plate 4) were all blank.

3.4 Trench 1

3.4.1 The trench was located at the far western end of the investigation area, on a north-east to south-west alignment with an average depth of 0.37m.

3.4.2 A single east-west aligned ditch (20) was present at the southern end of the trench (Fig.3, Plate 5). The ditch was 0.95m wide and 0.24m deep (Fig.5 Section 6, Plate 6). It was filled by a dark reddish brown silty sand (21), which contained no finds.

3.5 Trench 4

3.5.1 Trench 4, in the middle of the investigation area, had a north-east to south-west alignment with an average depth of 0.37m.

3.5.2 The trench contained a single east-west aligned ditch terminus (18) which was present at the southern end of the trench (Fig.3, Plate 7). This was a continuation of ditch 14 in Trench 8. The ditch was 1.25m wide, extending 1.55m in from the eastern baulk and was 0.27m deep (Fig.5 Section 7, Plate 8). It was filled by a dark reddish brown silty sand (18), which produced no finds.

3.6 Trench 6

3.6.1 Situated along north-eastern side of the field, Trench 6 was aligned north-east to south-west, with an average depth of 0.37m.
3.6.2 At the eastern end of the trench was a broadly north-south aligned ditch (8), with a possible ditch terminus (22) in the middle, and a periglacial feature (24) at the western end (Fig.3, Plate 9).

3.6.3 Ditch 8 was 0.80m wide and was 0.20m deep (Fig.5 Section 3, Plate 10). It was filled by a dark reddish brown silty sand (9), which produced a fragment of post-medieval tile (28g).

3.6.4 The possible ditch terminus 22 was on a north-east to south-west alignment, extending 1.4m into the trench from the south-west. It was 1m wide and 0.3m deep (Fig.5 section 4). Its fill was a dark reddish brown sand (23) with no finds.

3.6.5 The periglacial feature 24 was on a roughly north-south alignment, 0.9m wide and 0.38m deep. It was filled with dark reddish brown sand (25) with no finds.

3.7 Trench 7

3.7.1 Located south of Trench 6, Trench 7 was aligned north-east to south-west with an average depth of 0.38m.

3.7.2 Two east-west aligned ditches located at the northern end of the trench: ditch 4 and ditch 6 (Fig.3, Plate 11).

3.7.3 Ditch 4 was 1.90m wide and 0.85m deep with a v-shaped profile (Fig.5 Section 1, Plate 12). It was filled by a dark reddish brown silty sand (5), which produced three sherds (18g) of 13-14th century pottery.

3.7.4 South of ditch 4 was a smaller ditch (6) which was 1.05m wide and 0.12m deep. Its fill was a dark reddish brown sand (7) with no finds. It continued as ditch 20 in Trench 1.

3.8 Trench 8

3.8.1 Trench 8 was located in the eastern edge of the investigation area. It was aligned north-east to south-west with an average depth of 0.44m.

3.8.2 The trench contained four ditches (10, 12, 14 and 16) and a cluster of pits (26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 37 and 38) at the southern end (Figs. 3-4, Plate 13).

3.8.3 The earliest ditch (10) had an east-west alignment, was 0.8m wide and 0.18m deep (Fig.5 Section 8, Plate 14). It was filled by a mid yellowish brown silty sand (11) which contained no finds.

3.8.4 Truncating ditch 10 on its northern edge was a curvilinear ditch (12), turning from the east to north-west. This ditch was 1.03m wide and 0.2m deep, its dark brown silty sand fill (13) contained six sherds (173g) of 14th century pottery. An environmental soil sample taken from the pit yielded only flecks of charcoal.

3.8.5 North of ditch 12 was another east-west aligned ditch (14). It was 1.6m wide and 0.37m deep (Fig.5 Section 9, Plate 15) and continued into, and terminated within, Trench 4 (Ditch 18). The ditch was filled by a dark reddish brown silty sand (15) which produced four sherds (38g) of 13-14th century pottery.

3.8.6 At the northern end of the trench was curvilinear ditch 16, aligned broadly north-east to south-west. The ditch was 1.1m wide and 0.34m deep (Fig.5 Section 10, Plate 16).
It was filled by a dark reddish brown silty sand (17) which contained a single sherd (11g) of 13-14th century pottery and a single fragment of residual Roman tile (57g).

3.8.7 South of ditch 10 was a small pit (26), partially exposed against the western balk of the trench. The pit was 1.05m wide and 0.24m in depth (Fig.5 Section 11, Plate 17), and was filled by a mid reddish brown silty sand (27) which yielded 11 sherds (91g) of 13-14th century pottery.

3.8.8 At the southern end of the trench were a series of large intercutting pits of medieval date which stretched across the width of trench. The east and west sections of the excavated slot displayed different sequences and are dealt with separately.

3.8.9 On the eastern section of the excavated slot (Fig.5 Section 12, Plate 18) the earliest pit (29) survived to a width of 0.3m. The pit was located on the northern edge of the pit cluster, with a depth of 0.27m. The single fill of the pit comprised a mid reddish brown sand (36) which contained seven sherds (166g) of 13-14th century pottery.

3.8.10 Pit 29 was truncated by a larger pit (28) 3.3m wide and more than 0.9m deep. This contained a mid yellowish brown sand (32), 0.45m thick, containing 14 sherds (165g) of 13-14th century pottery. A thin, 0.12m thick, layer of light brownish grey sand (34) overlay this on the southern side.

3.8.11 Cutting pit 29 was a narrow steep sided pit (38), 0.7m wide and more than 0.35m deep. Its fill was a mid greyish brown sand (39), but yielded no finds.

3.8.12 Overlying all of these earlier features was a final large pit (37) which was 3.3m wide and 0.52m deep. Its fill (35) was a dark greyish brown sand which produced 52 sherds (473g) of 13-14th century pottery.

3.8.13 In the western section of the excavated, two pits were identified slot (Fig.5 Section 13, Plate 19). The earliest pit (30) was 1.2m wide and more than 0.9m deep. On its northern side was a slump of light brownish yellow sand (40), 0.35m thick. This was overlain by a mid greyish brown sand (41), 0.30m thick.

3.8.14 Truncating the top of pit 30 was a wide shallower pit (31), which was 2.6m wide and 0.35m deep. It contained two fills; a mid yellowish brown sand (42) at the very base, 0.15m thick, and a mid greyish brown sand (43), 0.2m thick, overlying it. No finds were recovered from 30 or 31.

3.9 Finds summary

3.9.1 A total of 98 sherds (1127g) of 13-14th century medieval pottery was recovered from the evaluation, all of which derived from features in Trench 7 and 8. Two fragment of post-medieval tile weighing 28g and a fragment of Roman tile weighing 57g were also recovered.

3.9.2 Environmental sampling of ditch 12 in Trench 8 produced small amount of non-diagnostic charcoal; further details are included in Appendix C.
4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Reliability of field investigation

4.1.1 The investigation produced broadly similar results across the whole area of the site. Archaeological features, distinguished by their reddish brown fills, were clearly visible within the evaluated trenches. The topsoil and subsoil layers were easily set apart from the natural horizon, characterised by their brown yellow sand. Both archaeological features and the natural deposits were free-draining, with no standing water hindering the archaeological work.

4.1.2 For the reasons stated above, the 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 preservation of any archaeological remains present within the proposed development area, as described in the Written Scheme of Investigation (Blackbourn and Brudenell 2017).

4.2.2 The trial trenching exposed features in Trenches 1, 4, 6, 7 and 8, and comprised a cluster of large intercutting medieval pits and a series of medieval and undated ditches, primarily aligned east to west. The medieval archaeology was focused in the eastern half of the site, with a concentration of dated features in Trench 8. Pottery recovered from intercutting pits and ditches in Trenches 7 and 8 suggests activity was centred upon the 13th and 14th century.

4.3 Interpretation

4.3.1 With the exception of ditch 20 in Trench 6, all archaeological features revealed by the trial trenching were focused in the eastern half of the site, with a notable concentration in Trench 8.

4.3.2 The features primarily comprised parallel linear ditches, most of which were aligned broadly east to west (ditches 4, 6, 10, 14, 18 and 20), with two on a north to south axis (ditches 8 and 24). These ditches appear to form a series of field or plot boundaries, with the east to west divisions running parallel to Green Lane to the south, and perpendicular to Rissemere Lane East, to the east.

4.3.3 The majority of the ditches were relatively slight and shallow, with surviving depths of less than 0.50m. The exception to this was ditch 4 in Trench 7 which measured 1.90m in width and 0.85m in depth, and may represent a more significant boundary. However, unlike the lines of ditches 6 and 20, or 14 and 18, which could be traced between Trenches 1 and 7 and Trenches 4 and 8 respectively, ditch 4 was only revealed in Trench 7. In general, finds from the ditches were scarce (which is not uncommon for agricultural field boundaries), but the pottery recovered from ditches 4 and 14 suggests a medieval date centred upon the 13-14th centuries.

4.3.4 Pottery of this date was also recovered from curvilinear ditches 12 and 16 in the northern half of Trench 8, and the series of pits in the southern half of the trench.
Sharing similar dimensions and fill characteristics, ditches 12 and 16 probably form two sides of the same boundary or enclosure. However, the axis of these ditches is at odds with the dominant east to west alignment of the other boundaries at the site. In fact, ditch 16 cut the east to west aligned ditch 10, hinting that the boundary/enclosure may be later than the wider system of field or plot divisions.

4.3.5 The large cluster of pits at the southern end of Trench 8 appear to be broadly contemporary with the other features at the site, again yielding pottery dating to the 13-14th century. The purpose of the pitting is unclear, though some may be quarry pits for the extraction of sands and gravel. Whatever their exact function, the overall density and range of features in Trench 8 signals a concentration of activity in the eastern part of the site. Given the number of finds is relatively low, this activity is probably just beyond the core of settlement, which is most likely located slightly further to the east, along the Green-edge by Rissemere Lane East. Indeed, the remains uncovered at the eastern end of the site may be best interpreted as a back-yard, or rear of plot features associated with Green-edge settlement further east.

4.4 Significance

4.4.1 The features identified on the site indicate use of the area for agriculture and possibly other peripheral activities on the edge of medieval Green-side settlement.

4.4.2 Progress in dating the origins of Greens and Green-side settlement has been highlighted at a topic requiring further work in the Eastern England Regional Research Framework (Medlycott 2011, 70). The site here offers the potential to examine this topic and explore further the origins and development of Green-side activity in Reydon.

4.4.3 The site also has the potential to add to understandings of rural medieval pottery industries in Suffolk (Medlycott 2011, 71). Although the evaluation assemblage is small, it forms a significant addition to the growing corpus of rural medieval pottery from the county.

4.4.4 The environmental potential of the site is poor, with no animal bone surviving, and the environmental sample containing only occasional charcoal.
## APPENDIX A  Trench Descriptions and Context Inventory

### Trench 1

**General description**

Trench contained a single small ditch. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty sand.

<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>0.25</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orientation**

N-S

**Length (m)**

30

**Width (m)**

2

**Avg. depth (m)**

0.37

### Trench 2

**General description**

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

<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>0.29</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>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orientation**

E-W

**Length (m)**

30

**Width (m)**

2

**Avg. depth (m)**

0.48

### Trench 3

**General description**

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

<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>0.22</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orientation**

E-W

**Length (m)**

30

**Width (m)**

2

**Avg. depth (m)**

0.35

### Trench 4

**General description**

Trench contained a ditch terminus. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty sand.

<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>0.24</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Ditch Terminus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orientation**

N-S

**Length (m)**

30

**Width (m)**

2

**Avg. depth (m)**

0.37
### Trench 5

**General description**

Trench contained a small modern pit. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty sand.

<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>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 6

**General description**

Trench contained a single ditch, one possible ditch terminus and a probably natural linear. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty sand.

<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>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Ditch Terminus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Natural Feature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Natural Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 7

**General description**

Trench contained two east-west ditches. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty sand.

<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>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trench 8

**General description**

Trench contained four ditches, and a series of large intercutting pits. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty sand.

<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>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>14th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Pit Fill</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Pit 28 Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Pit 28 Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Pit 37 Fill</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Pit 29 Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Pit 38 Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Pit 30 Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Pit 30 Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Pit 31 Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Pit 31 Fill</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>13-14th cent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 9

**General description**

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

<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>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B    FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Medieval Pottery

By Sue Anderson

Introduction

B.1.1 Medieval pottery (98 sherds, 1127g) was collected from eight contexts during the evaluation (Table 2). A high proportion of the pottery is abraded.

Methodology

B.1.2 Quantification was carried out using sherd count, weight and estimated vessel equivalent (eve). The minimum number of vessels (MNV) within each context was also recorded, but cross-fitting was not attempted unless particularly distinctive vessels were observed in more than one context. A full quantification by fabric, context and feature is available in archive. All fabric codes were assigned from the author’s post-Roman fabric series for Suffolk. Methods follow MPRG recommendations (MPRG 2001) and form terminology following MPRG classifications (1998). The results were input directly onto an MS Access database which forms the archive catalogue.

The Assemblage

B.1.3 Table 1 shows the quantities of medieval pottery by fabric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Date range</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt/g</th>
<th>Eve</th>
<th>MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early medieval ware</td>
<td>EMW</td>
<td>11th–12th c.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval coarseware</td>
<td>MCW</td>
<td>12th–14th c.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waveney Valley coarseware</td>
<td>WVCW</td>
<td>12th–14th c.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollesley-type coarseware</td>
<td>HOLL</td>
<td>13th–14th c.?</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollesley-type coarseware (clay pellets)</td>
<td>HOLLcp</td>
<td>13th–14th c.?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollesley Glazed Ware</td>
<td>HOLG</td>
<td>L.13th–E.14th c.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprovenanced glazed</td>
<td>UPG</td>
<td>L.12th–14th c.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Post-Roman pottery quantities.

B.1.4 Four sherds of two handmade early medieval ware vessels were found. These were in fine to medium sandy fabrics typical of north Suffolk and Norfolk. All were body and base fragments, but were probably from cooking pots/jars.

B.1.5 Medieval coarsewares in this assemblage were general in fine to medium sandy fabrics, occasionally micaceous, but generally with sparse locally-occurring inclusions such as chalk, ferrous particles and flint/rounded quartz. Identifiable fabrics were all Hollesley-type and Waveney Valley-type coarsewares. This included a sub-group of Hollesley-type ware which is in the same abundant fine/medium sandy fabric but with common large self-coloured clay pellets evident on the surfaces and in section. This fabric has been noted elsewhere in the county, but particularly at Cedars Field moated site (Anderson 2004). Identifiable forms in this group comprised two bowls, nine jars.
and five jugs (two rims, three handles). All rims in this group were developed forms, generally squared beads, of 13th/14th and 14th-century date.

B.1.6 Glazed wares were not common, forming 8.5% of the high medieval group by sherd count and 9.3% by MNV. This is within the normal range for a rural site in the county, however. The majority of glazed sherds in this group were Hollesley-type wares and included a jug handle. One small unprovenanced body sherd was a fairly soft, fine pink fabric with white slip and copper green glaze, possibly Scarborough Ware or a Low Countries product.

**Pottery by context**

B.1.7 Table 2 shows the distribution of pottery by feature and fabric. The majority of pottery was recovered from features in Trench 8 and most of these were probably of 13th/14th-century date with little earlier material present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr.</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>EMW</th>
<th>MCW</th>
<th>WVCW</th>
<th>HOLL</th>
<th>HOLLcp</th>
<th>HOLG</th>
<th>UPG</th>
<th>Spotdate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Pottery quantification (sherd count) by trench, feature and period.

**Discussion**

B.1.8 Although this is a relatively small assemblage of medieval pottery, the concentration of largely 13th/14th-century pottery in one area of the site suggests occupation of this period in the vicinity. The assemblage is typical of the period, although fewer bowls are present than might be expected for a rural site.

B.1.9 Little medieval pottery has been recovered from the parish previously and this is therefore an important addition to the growing rural medieval pottery corpus. Like other small settlements along the Suffolk coast where pottery of this date has been found it tends to be Hollesley-type ware. However, sites to the north-east of the county also seem to have been supplied by potters located along the Waveney Valley – no production sites of this period have yet been identified there, but the development of forms into the Waveney Valley type of late medieval and transitional wares suggests that there was probably a precursor to this industry in the high medieval period. The wares are similar to but generally finer and slightly more micaceous than Hollesley-type wares. They also tend to be darker grey, although a similar range of colours to that seen in Hollesley ware is also present.
### B.2 Ceramic Building Material (CBM)

*By Sue Anderson*

#### B.2.1 Two fragments (85g) of CBM were collected from two contexts (Table 3). Ditch fill (9) in Trench 6 contained an abraded fragment of a red-firing medium sandy post-medieval plain roof tile (RTP). Ditch fill (17) in Trench 8 contained one abraded piece of Roman tile (RBT). Curving finger marks on the surface, together with a thickness of 20mm, suggest that this was a piece of flanged tegula. It was in a fine sandy orange fabric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>Abr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>fs</td>
<td>RBT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>cfm, prob flanged tegula</td>
<td>Rom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key – fabrics: fs – fine sandy; ms – medium sandy; cfm – curving finger marks.*

Table 3. Pottery quantification (sherd count) by trench, feature and period.
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 medieval ditch 12 in order to assess the quality of preservation of plant remains and their potential to provide useful data as part of further archaeological investigations.

Methodology

C.1.2 The total volume (18L) 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 samples was collected in a 0.3mm nylon mesh and the residue was washed through 10mm, 5mm, 2mm and a 0.5mm sieve. The dried flot was scanned using a binocular microscope at magnifications up to x 60.

Results

C.1.3 Preservation of plant remains is poor with only occasional charcoal fragments, some of which appear to have been subjected to high temperature and/or repeated burning and may be the result of later manuring of cultivated fields.
APPENDIX D    BIBLIOGRAPHY


## APPENDIX E  OASIS REPORT FORM

### Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OASIS Number</th>
<th>oxfordar3-279001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Land north of Green Lane, Reydon, Suffolk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start of Fieldwork</th>
<th>18-04-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of Fieldwork</td>
<td>21-04-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Reference Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>REY 105</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER Number</td>
<td>ESF25471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Directive from planning authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place in Planning Process</td>
<td>Pre-application</td>
</tr>
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</table>

### Techniques used (tick all that apply)
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- ☐ Aerial Photography - new
- ☐ Annotated Sketch
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- ☐ Fieldwalking
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- ☐ Grab-sampling
- ☐ Gravity-core
- ☐ Laser Scanning
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- ☐ 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ditch</th>
<th>Medieval (1066 to 1540)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Medieval (1066 to 1540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>Medieval (1066 to 1540)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Waveney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Reydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER office</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Study Area</td>
<td>4600 sq.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Ref</td>
<td>TM 498 779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address (including Postcode)</td>
<td>Green Lane, Reydon, Southwold, Suffolk, IP18 6PF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Originators

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>OA East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Brief Originator</td>
<td>Rachael Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Contents</td>
<td>Present?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Bones</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratigraphic Survey</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Bone</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Stone/Lithic</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Media</th>
<th></th>
<th>Paper Media</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Aerial Photos</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Context Sheets</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images (Digital photos)</td>
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<td>Diary</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrations (Figures/Plates)</td>
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<td>Drawing</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Image</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreadsheets</td>
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<td>Map</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
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<td>Matrices</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Reality</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research/Notes</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photos (negatives/prints/slides)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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), and conforms to Suffolk County Council's *Requirement for Archaeological Evaluation* document (2011).

1.1. **Circumstances of the project**

Oxford Archaeology East (OA East) have been commissioned by Orbit Homes to undertake a trial trench evaluation on land proposed for residential development comprising 23 dwellings, north of Green Lane, Reydon, Suffolk.

This Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been prepared in response to a Brief for a Trenched Archaeological Evaluation issued by Rachael Abraham of the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS/CT), dated 6/12/16.

The decision on the need for any further work/mitigation will be made by SCCAS/CT following the results of the evaluation. The scope of any further work (if required) will be specified in a separate SCCAS/CT brief, and require the submission and approval of a separate WSI.

1.2. **Location, geology and topography**

The site is located to the north of Green Lane, Reydon, Suffolk centred on TM 498779. The plot currently sits on agricultural land that is broadly flat at 10m OD. The plot is bounded by a hedged boundary to the east and Green Lane to the south, agricultural land is present to the north and west.

The geology on site comprises the Crag Group – Sand overlain by the Lowestoft Formation comprising sands and gravels ([http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html](http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html))

2. **Archaeological background**

The following section provides a brief summary of the archaeological background for the area surrounding the site, drawing on information held by the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (SHER).

2.1. **Prehistoric and Roman.**

Neolithic flakes were recovered 500m north-west of the site (REY Misc; MSF 9046). A single struck flint was also recovered 500m to the east (REY Misc;
A Bronze Age axe hammer made of quartzite and measuring 9 inches long was recovered 900m west of the site (REY 017).

A series of Bronze Age finds and features have been identified 1.25km north-west of the site including a possible ring ditch (REY 006), three Bronze Age mounds (REY 015) and a scatter of beaker sherds and struck flints (REY 016).

Approximately 300m north-east of the site lie a series of undated cropmarks that appear to represent a ring ditch, field boundaries, trackways and possible enclosures (REY 056).

At Reydon Smear a number of Roman finds were recovered including building material, a scatter of pottery and evidence for a possible tile or brick kiln (REY 008). A single Roman coin has been recovered 400m to the south-east (REY 010) with a further coin recovered 250m north-west of the site depicting Hadrian (REY Misc; MSF 9136).

2.2. Medieval

The site lies on the edge of the former medieval green known as Reydon Common (REY 030), where there is potential for medieval green-edge settlement. Medieval pottery has been recovered 500m north-west of the site (REY Misc; MSF 9045), with further finds of pottery recovered during a watching brief at The Old School, 500m to the north-west (REY 055). However, no features were observed here, and the pottery was recovered from the subsoil.

The Vicarage, formerly the Church of St Maragaret is located 700m north-west (REY 011) and was recorded in the Domesday book.

Medieval activity was identified 1.4km west of the site with not only the recovery of metalworking debris and pottery (REY 027) but also gravel workings comprising three wells, one of which had a brick lining and their fills yielding pottery, animal bone and nails (REY 018).

2.3. Post-medieval and modern

Two post-medieval pits were excavated 350m south-east of the site (REY 100), although this date is tentative. Post-medieval pottery has also been recovered 1.25km north-west of the site (REY 003).

Evidence for World War II defences in this part of Suffolk are vast. A barbed wire rectangular enclosure is partially visible 500m to the east (REY 040). A World War II anti tank ditch is located 700m west of the site and can be seen on aerial photographs (REY 034). Slit trenches of the same date have also been identified in the village (approximately 600m south) and vary between 7m and 25m in length (REY 039).
3. Aims and objectives

3.1. Aims of the evaluation

The evaluation will seek to establish the character, date, state of preservation, and extent of any archaeological remains within the development area. The scheme of works is designed to do the following:

- 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.
- Provide sufficient coverage and exposure to evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking deposits.
- 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.
- Set results in the local, regional, and national archaeological context.

3.2. Research frameworks

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

- Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern counties: 1. Resource Assessment (Glazebrook 1997, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 3);

4. Methods

The archaeological evaluation 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 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists’:
- Code of Conduct
- Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations

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 manual (publication forthcoming). Further guidance is provided to all excavators in the form of the OA *Fieldwork Crib Sheets – a companion guide to the Fieldwork Manual*. These have been issued ahead of formal publication of the revised Fieldwork Manual.

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 has been commissioned for this project. The result will be integrated into the evaluation report, as required by the paragraph 6.5 of the brief.

4.2. **Trial Trenching**

A 5% sample of the development area will be excavated with a total of nine 30m long, 1.8m wide trenches due to be opened in the positions indicated on the plans attached to this WSI.

The trenches will set out by a Lecia survey-grade GPS fitted with "smartnet" technology with an accuracy of 5mm horizontal and 10mm vertical. Before trenching the footprint of each trench will be scanned by a qualified and experienced operator using a CAT and Genny that has a valid calibration certificate. The footprint of the trenches will also be metal detected prior to machining (see Section 4.8). During machine stripping, the location of trenches may be altered if there are site obstructions, services, or modern disturbance. If so, the location of affected trenches will be re-surveyed.

All trenches will be excavated by a mechanical excavator to the depth of geological horizons, or to the upper interface of archaeological features or deposits, whichever is encountered first. Overburden will be excavated in spits not greater than 100mm thick and metal detected during the process. A toothless ditching bucket with a bucket size of 1.8m will be used to excavate the trenches.

Topsoil, subsoil, and archaeological deposits will be kept separate during excavation, to allow for sequential backfilling of excavations. The trench will not be backfilled without the approval of SCCAS/CT.

All machine excavation will take place under constant supervision of a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist. The top of the first archaeological deposit will be cleared by machine, but will then be cleaned off by hand. Exposed surfaces will be cleaned by trowel and hoe as necessary, in order to clarify located features and deposits. Any archaeological deposits present will then be excavated by context to the level of the geological horizon where safe to do so. All trench spoil and archaeological features will be scanned visually and with a metal detector to...
4.3. **Excavation of archaeological features and deposits**

Excavation of all archaeological deposits will be done by hand unless otherwise agreed by SCCAS/CT. Significant archaeological features (e.g. solid or bonded structural remains, building slots or post-holes) will be preserved intact, even if fills are sampled.

Exposed surfaces will be cleaned by trowel and hoe as necessary in order to clarify features and deposits. Unless otherwise agreed by the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, all features will be investigated and recorded to provide an accurate evaluation of archaeological potential, whilst at the same time minimising disturbance to archaeological structures, features and deposits.

There will be sufficient excavation to give clear evidence for the period, depth, and nature of any archaeological deposit. Investigation slots through all linear features will be at least 1m in width. Discrete features will be half-sectioned or excavated in quadrants where they are large or found to be deep. In necessary, an auger will be used to gain information from deep deposits below 1m in depth.

The depth, nature and potential artefact content of colluvial or other masking deposits will also be investigated and recorded across the site. Buried soils will be tested pitted with 1m test pits.

Any natural subsoil surface revealed will be hand cleaned and examined for archaeological deposits and artefacts.

4.4. **Recording of archaeological features and deposits**

Records will comprise survey, drawn, written and photographic data. A register of all trenches, features, photographs, survey levels, small finds, and human remains will be kept.

Each context will be individually documented on context sheets, and hand drawn in section and plan. Written descriptions will be recorded on pro-forma sheets comprising factual data and interpretative elements.

Where stratified deposits are encountered, a Harris Matrix will be compiled during the course of the excavation.

Trench plans will normally be drawn at 1:50, but on deeply-stratified sites a scale of 1:20 will be used. Detailed plans of individual features or groups will be at an appropriate scale (1:10 or 1:20). Levels will be taken at tops and bottoms of trenches using the GPS and on archaeological deposits and significant artefacts, and will be displayed on all drawn plans and sections. Long sections showing layers will be drawn at 1:50. Sections of features or short lengths of trenches will be drawn at 1:10.

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.

4.5. **Finds recovery**

At the start of work, a finds supervisor will be appointed to oversee the collection, processing, cataloguing, and specialist advice on all artefacts collected.

Finds will be exposed, lifted, cleaned, conserve, marked, bagged, and boxed in line with the standards in:

- United Kingdom Institute for Conservators (2012) *Conservation Guidelines No. 2*
- Watkinson & Neal (1988) *First Aid for Finds*
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014) *Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials*

Artefacts will be collected by hand and metal detector. Excavation areas and spoil will be scanned visually and with a metal detector to aid recovery of artefacts. All finds will be bagged and labelled according to the individual deposit from which they were recovered, ready for later cleaning and analysis. 'Special/small finds' may be located more accurately by GPS if appropriate.

All artefacts recovered from excavated features will be retained for post-excavation processing and assessment, except:

- those which are obviously modern in date
- where very large volumes are recovered (typically ceramic building material)
- where directed to discard on site by the SCCAS/CT.

Where artefacts are discarded on site, a sufficient number will be retained to characterise the date and function of the feature they were excavated from. A record will be kept of the quantity and nature of discarded artefacts.

4.6. **Environmental sampling**

Environmental sampling will follow the guidelines set out in:

- Association for Environmental Archaeology (1995) *Environmental archaeology and archaeological evaluations. Recommendations concerning the environmental archaeology component of archaeological*


Bulk samples (40 litres or 100% of context whichever is greater) will be taken from a range of site features and deposits to target the recovery of plant remains (charcoal and macrobotanicals) fish, bird, small mammal and amphibian bone and small artefacts. Bulk samples will be processed using tank flotation. Waterlogged samples will be wet sieved and stored in cool or wet conditions as appropriate.

Where practical, waterlogged wood specimens will be recorded in detail on site, in situ. When removed, they will be cleaned and photographed, and stored in wet cool conditions for assessment by a suitably qualified specialist (see Appendix 1)

The project team will consult Historic England’s Scientific Advisor on environmental sampling and dating where necessary.

4.7. 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 excavated in accordance with all appropriate Environmental Health regulations, and will only occur after a Ministry of Justice exhumation licence has been obtained.

4.8. Metal detecting and the Treasure Act

Metal detector searches will take place at all stages of the excavation by an experienced metal detector user (Simon Birnie). The trench footprint will be detected prior to machining, and the during the machining process (see Section 4.2). Trench spoil (topsoil and subsoil) and all archaeological features and deposits will also be detected.

Metal detectors will not be set to discriminate against iron.

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.
4.9. **Post-excavation processing**

Processing will take place in tandem with excavation, and advice will be sought from relevant specialists on key artefact types. The Project Manager and fieldwork project officer will be given feedback to enable them to develop excavation strategies during fieldwork.

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

4.10. **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. **Evaluation Report**

The evaluation 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
- site and trench location plans, and plans of each area excavated showing the archaeological features found
- sections of excavated features
- interpretation of the archaeological features found
- specialist reports on artefacts and environmental finds
- relevant photographs of features
- a predictive model of surviving archaeological remains, where affected by development proposals, and assessment of their importance
- Appendices including the aerial photograph assessment and geophysical survey
- 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 Written Brief
- 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

Trial trenching will take approximately 4 days (including backfilling). This
does not allow for delays caused by bad weather.

Post-excavation processing and assessment tasks will commence shortly after the evaluation commences, to inform the strategy, and 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)
1x Site Assistant (as required)
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 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>Donnelly, 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/environmental</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;</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SPECIALISM</td>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, Kath</td>
<td>Archaeobotany (charred, waterlogged and mineralised plant remains)</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</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>NAME</td>
<td>SPECIALISM</td>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis, Steve</td>
<td>Iron Age pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Jane</td>
<td>Medieval Pottery in the Lincolnshire area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zant, John</td>
<td>Coins</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.
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