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Summary

On 17th and 18th March 2016 Oxford Archaeology East opened five small evaluation trenches around St Leonard’s Hospital, Newton Road, Sudbury (TL 8777 4138). Although truncation outside the immediate footprint of the hospital buildings was less severe than expected, the presence of modern services restricted the area available to excavate. No archaeological features were present.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work
1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted at St Leonard’s Hospital, Newton Road, to the east of the centre of Sudbury (Fig. 1; TL 8777 4138).
1.1.2 This archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Dr Abby Antrobus of Suffolk County Council (SCC; Planning Application B/14/00585/FUL), supplemented by a Written Scheme of Investigation by Sarah Jago of CgMs.
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 National Planning Policy Framework (Department for Communities and Local Government, March 2012). The results will enable decisions to be made by SCC, 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 proposed development area (PDA) covers 0.48ha c.500m to the north of the River Stour east of the centre of Sudbury town at an elevation between 39 and 45m OD (Fig. 1). Its northern limits are on a moderate slope close to the hill crest while its southern portion is relatively flat, potentially from landscaping during construction of the hospital in the 19th century.
1.2.2 The site geology is recorded as Lowestoft Formation Sand and Gravel and Diamicton (BGS 2016). Trenches revealed clayey silts/sands across much of the site with sands and gravels to the south, on the lower ground.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background
1.3.1 A desk-based assessment (Craven 2012) listed the HER entries within 500m, concluding there was a low to moderate potential for prehistoric to medieval archaeology, although there were no records within the immediate locality of the site.

1.4 Acknowledgements
1.4.1 Evaluation and recording was undertaken by Ted Levermore and supervised by Stuart Ladd. Stephen Macaulay managed the project. The work was commissioned by William Bedford of CgMs on behalf of PJ Livesey. Abby Antrobus of Suffolk CC monitored the project, although no site visit during the works was required.
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 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with an 8-tonne rubber-tracked JCB-type excavator using a toothless ditching bucket and mechanical breaker.

2.2.2 All trenches were CAT-scanned prior to excavation. This identified a number of probably live electrical services across the north of the site, connecting hospital buildings to Burroughs Piece Road. Consequently, Trenches 1 and 3 were moved slightly from the trench plan supplied in the WSI and covered a slightly reduced area.

2.2.3 Spoil, exposed surfaces and features were scanned with a metal detector. Only obviously modern metal and non-metal finds were recovered and these were not retained.

2.2.4 All archaeological features and deposits were to be 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 Site conditions were dry throughout, varying between hot and sunny and cold and cloudy.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 Trench descriptions are provided in order of trench number. Deposits are described from earliest to latest. No archaeological features were present. Soils were present in Trenches 2, 4 and 5.

3.1.2 Trenches 1 and 3 were located in the north of the site in and around a tarmac-surfaced car park. Trench 2 was positioned on a grass-covered area east of the car park. Trench 4 lay to the south of the hospital buildings in a tarmac-surfaced car park. Trench 5 lay further south on an area of grass. These locations are shown on Figure 2.

3.2 Trench 1

8.3m x 2.6m

3.2.1 Due to probable live electrical services, this trench was positioned slightly to the south of the original plan, perpendicular to Burroughs Piece Road.

3.2.2 Natural geology of fine clayey sand was encountered at a depth of up to 0.4m. A number of irregular glacial features filled by very firm mid-brown clayey silt were visible (Plate 1), apparently oriented down the natural slope. These were excavated by hand to confirm their nature and were typically 0.2m deep although this varied.

3.2.3 The area may have been truncated as there were no soils present. Two layers (0.2m thick) of modern block paving lay immediately upon the natural sand across the trench. A further 0.2m of tarmac made up the surface.

3.2.4 No archaeological features were found.

3.3 Trench 2

7.1m x 2.2-3.1m

3.3.1 In order to work around the concrete barriers securing the northern site access, Trench 2 was positioned diagonally across a grassy area in the northeast of the site, between a concrete surface, the tarmac-surfaced car park and a concrete shed.

3.3.2 Natural clayey silts were encountered at a depth of 0.65-0.8m. A thin linear streak of darker silt, angled down the natural slope (i.e. to the southwest) proved to be a variation in the natural.

3.3.3 Subsoil (0.3m thick) survived, with 0.4-0.5m of topsoil and turf overlying it. The topsoil thickness varied, probably due to dumping of material during the period when the hospital was in use. Only modern brick/tile and asphalt were found within the topsoil.

3.3.4 No archaeological features were found.

3.4 Trench 3

6m x 2.6m

3.4.1 It was not possible to position Trench 3 aligned east-west across the car park in the north of the site, as per the original trench plan, due to the probable presence of buried services. Instead a small trench was excavated 5m east of Trench 1.

3.4.2 Natural clayey sand with similar irregular glacial features to Trench 1 were found at a depth of c.0.3m. No soil was present. Two layers of block paving and a layer of tarmac lay directly upon the natural sand.
3.4.3 No archaeological features were found.

3.5 Trench 4

9.6 x 2.2m

3.5.1 This trench was broken out of tarmac within a car park on the south side of the hospital, aligned north-south, parallel with the western boundary.

3.5.2 Depth varied from 0.4m at the northern end to 0.6m at the southern end as the tarmac surface had been levelled relative to the natural geology of clayey silt and flint gravel.

3.5.3 A heavily compressed band of soil survived to a thickness of up to 0.35m across the southern half of the trench. At the northern end of the trench this was truncated to 0.2m thick.

3.5.4 Overlying the soil was a layer 0.21-0.25m thick comprising imported sands and gravels. This was a make up for the tarmac surface which was 0.1m thick.

3.5.5 No archaeological features were found.

3.6 Trench 5

10.8m x 1.8m

3.6.1 This trench was positioned on a grassy area between the car park and the site's southern boundary.

3.6.2 Natural sands and gravels were encountered at a depth of 0.75m, although this was slightly over cut by the machine to a total depth of 0.9m.

3.6.3 Overlying the gravel was a layer of clayey sand perhaps 0.15m thick with no clear lower horizon to the gravels. This may represent some colluvium or a continuation of the natural deposits seen in the other trenches at higher elevations.

3.6.4 Subsoil survived with a thickness of 0.3-0.35m. Topsoil and turf 0.25-0.3m thick overlay the subsoil.

3.6.5 No archaeological features were found.

3.7 Finds Summary

3.7.1 Only modern artefacts were found. These were not retained.

3.8 Environmental Summary

3.8.1 No environmental samples were taken.
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Discussion

4.1.1 It was thought that modern development and landscaping may have truncated any archaeological features on site. The evaluation showed that although landscaping had taken place on the site, this is unlikely to have reduced levels significantly within the areas investigated.

4.1.2 Soil had evidently been stripped from Trenches 1 and 3 prior to laying of the block paved surface, but the surface slope and the levels within Trench 2 (which was on grass with surviving soils) suggests little underlying natural sand was removed.

4.1.3 Trench 4 showed a small amount of truncation due to levelling for the southern car park. A steep bank to the north between the car park and the hospital buildings was evidently built up ground. At Trench 5, a good covering of subsoil and topsoil preserved the natural gravels.

4.1.4 Despite the apparently limited truncation within the evaluation trenches, no archaeological features (or finds) were discovered. The site's distance from Sudbury's medieval core and any water sources and its underlying moderate natural slope may explain this.

4.1.5 The trenches in the north of the site were positioned between detected services and standing buildings. The below-ground impact of these is probably greater than that seen in the trenches.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Recommendations for any future work based upon this report will be made by the Consultant (CgMS) and the Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service.
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Figure 1: Site location, showing archaeological trenches (black) in development area (red)
Figure 2: Trench layout
Plate 1: Trench 1, view north-northeast

Plate 2: Trench 2, view northeast
Plate 3: Trench 3, view north-northeast

Plate 4: Trench 4, view north-northeast
Plate 5: Trench 5, view east