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SUMMARY

In August 2007 Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out a field evaluation at Breakspear House, Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead, Herts. (NGR: TL 079 073) on behalf of Mills Whip Projects Ltd. Only two of the eight trenches contained archaeological features. A shallow linear gully was located in Trench 4 and a curvilinear gully was located in Trench 5, which has been dated to the post-medieval period. These features had undergone marked truncation from above and may be viewed as having been more substantial than indicated in their present condition.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 In August of 2007, OA carried out a field evaluation at Breakspear House, Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead, Herts. (NGR: TL 079 073) on behalf of Mills Whipp Projects Ltd., for Kier Group plc. A brief was set by Kate Batt of Hertfordshire County Council and a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (OA 2007) agreed with Mike Hutchinson for Mills Whipp Projects Ltd.. The development site lies on the eastern side of Hemel Hempstead and is bounded by Maylands Avenue to the west and St. Albans Road to the south and is 1.47 ha in area.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 The site is situated on a shallow dry valley that crosses the central area of the site roughly from east to west. A recent borehole survey of the subject site recorded natural orange and brown-grey coloured clay with flints, generally between 300 mm and 1 m below the present ground surface. However, on the embankment at the north-east area of the site (vicinity of Trench 2) it was between 1.6 m and 2.1 m below the existing ground surface.

1.2.2 During the works it was discovered that the areas of investigation to the north and south of the main buildings were heavily landscaped. The embankment to the south was revealed to have an overburden of up to 3.5 m of made ground. To the north this overburden was found to be up to 1.7 m in depth.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 A full description of the historical and archaeological background is presented in the ‘Archaeological Desktop Assessment’ (Mills Whipp, 2007a). The following section summarises the main influences on the historical land use within the study area (1 km radius from the application site) and briefly refers to the archaeological evidence.
Prehistoric

1.3.2 The exact nature of any prehistoric activity in the area of the application site cannot be determined with any certainty neither do finds distribution patterns suggest any focus for activity. However, where archaeological work has taken place within the wider study area prehistoric finds have been reported on a regular basis.

1.3.3 Prehistoric flints have been recovered from the area and the Scheduled Ancient Monument, the Highfield Tumulus, which lies 1.5 km north of the subject site. Evidence for Bronze Age activity is well represented on the eastern side of Hemel Hempstead in the Adeyfield area. At Wood Lane End an important “transitional site, yielding continuous occupation from the Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age” has been recorded (Hunns 2000). Excavations by Oxford Archaeology in 2006 (N. Shepherd pers comm) at Junction 8 of the M1, 1.5 km to the east of the site, revealed evidence for a Bronze Age settlement including pits, and possible cremation burials. Middle Iron Age evidence is very scarce within the study area.

Roman

1.3.4 The subject site lies within the hinterland of Verulamium just less than 5 km west of Watling Street, the major Roman route from Londinium to the north-west. The known existence of several major villa sites in the area indicates a prosperous agricultural area. It is likely that farming was the predominant land use within the vicinity of Hemel Hempstead where agricultural activities may have centred on small settlements and villas developed in the hinterland of Verulamium.

1.3.5 Within the study area a Romano-Celtic temple complex was recorded at Wood Lane End approximately 0.50 km north of the subject site. The site has been designated a Scheduled Ancient Monument (No. 82:16446) and lies within an ‘Area of Archaeological Significance’. Excavations by Oxford Archaeology (N. Shepherd pers comm) 1.5 km east of the site at Junction 8 of the M1 uncovered evidence for a rural settlement of late Iron Age and Roman date.

Saxon

1.3.6 No entries of Saxon or Danish date are entered in the SMR for the study area.

Medieval

1.3.7 During this period the subject site lay in a rural area approximately 2.5 km east of Hemel Hempstead. The site apparently lay within ‘Erles Wood’ (Chapman 1996). Wheat, oats and livestock are known to have been traded at the market and later wool (Hunns 2000). Medieval ridge and furrow features indicating ploughing have been recorded north of Wood Land End and the nearby Tudor farmhouse at Westwick Row might have medieval antecedents.
Post-Medieval

1.3.8 Early maps of the area, such as Kip in 1646, gave little indication of the site apart from the fact that it lay east of ‘Hemsted’ apparently in open ground. The earliest map which showed details of the site, Dury and Andrews 1766, indicated that the site lay across the boundary of two fields. The northernmost appeared to be ploughed ground whilst the southernmost was possible pasture.

1.3.9 In archaeological terms only limited post-medieval material has been found. The brick foundations to the Tudor farmhouse at Westwick Row were uncovered during drainage works in the 1990s. Associated farm buildings of 17th century or earlier date, dated from the bricks, are listed within the SMR referred to as ‘The Bothy’ and two barns.

1.3.10 To the east of the town the clay beds gave rise to a thriving brick making industry in the 19th century. At Mayland’s Wood approximately 0.75 km north of the subject site a brick kiln is shown on the tithe map of 1840 and a brickfield and kiln are also noted at Bennets End 0.5 km south of the subject site. It may have operated as part of a much larger brickfield that lay 300 m to the south-west beyond the study area.

2 EVALUATION AIMS

General aims

2.1.1 In general the purpose of an archaeological investigation is to determine and understand the nature, function, and character of an archaeological site in its cultural and environmental setting.

2.1.2 The aim of the archaeological operation is to ensure that any remains in the investigation areas are identified and to mitigate the impact of the development on any such remains by making a record of and seeking to understand them.

2.1.3 To identify, investigate and record any archaeological remains to the extent possible by the methods put forward in the WSI.

2.1.4 To determine (so far as possible) the stratigraphic sequence and dating of the deposits or features identified.

2.1.5 To disseminate the results through deposition of an ordered archive at the local museum, the deposition of a detailed report at the Sites and Monuments Record, and publication at a level of detail appropriate to the significance of the results.

Specific aims

2.1.6 The Desk Based Assessment indicated deposits which may warrant specific attention:

• The presence of prehistoric finds and features in the vicinity of the application site, especially of Bronze Age date;
• The presence of a managed Roman landscape which included villas, settlements and a Romano-Celtic temple complex north of the site and east in the vicinity of the M1 junction 8;
• The presence of transitional sites of Bronze Age to Iron Age date and multi-period sites (Brown and Glazebrook 2000).

2.1.7 In undertaking the archaeological evaluation OA adhered to the research strategy for the eastern counties set out within Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 2. Research agenda and strategy.

3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 The trial trenches were located to investigate a c 5% sample by area of the application site. Eight trenches numbered sequentially 1 through 8 and measuring 30 m by 2 m were required. They were excavated to the top of significant archaeological deposits or, where not present, the natural geology.

3.1.2 The methodology set out in the WSI was adhered to on site. No significant variations were necessary during the course of the works.

3.2 Presentation of results

3.2.1 A general description of the works and its findings is detailed below. This will be followed by a detailed description of the trenches and archaeological features.

4 RESULTS: GENERAL

4.1 Soils and ground conditions

4.1.1 The topsoil was a light brown silty loam with a high organic content. The topsoil overlay either redeposited natural, made ground deposits or natural subsoil. The redeposited natural was a tenacious orange clay with abundant flint and appears to date to the development of the site in 1969. The made ground deposits consisted of silty clay with frequent flint inclusions. These deposits also appear to date to the development of the site in 1969 and may be redeposited subsoil deposits. Buried topsoil horizons were noted on a number of occasions and were brown to dark brown silty loam that occasionally contained a higher clay content. The natural subsoil was a compact orange clay with abundant flint inclusions. Some variation in colour was observed, as were variations in sand and gravel inclusions.

4.1.2 The ground conditions on site were very stable. No ground water was observed at any location on site. Landscaping of the site resulted in the embankments to the northern and southern areas, comprising a large volume of overburden in the form of redeposited material. These deposits maintained their stability for the duration of the works.
4.2 Distribution of archaeological deposits

4.2.1 Trenches 1-4 and 7-8 inclusive revealed no archaeological deposits. Trenches 5 and 6 did reveal archaeological deposits, described below.

4.2.2 Trench 5 was located to the west of the main building and ran from the south-western corner of the building northwards (see Fig. 2). Towards the southern end of Trench 5 a severely truncated curvilinear feature (504/506) was identified at a depth of 0.61 m below ground level. The feature was oriented along the south-north axis of the trench. The gully measured 6.4 m long by 0.43 m width (maximum) by 0.07 m deep and contained a single fill (505/507). Two interventions were excavated to assess depth and to locate finds for dating. Two small abraded fragments of pottery were recovered from the base and two ceramic fragments were recovered from a slightly higher location within the fill.

4.2.3 Trench 6 was located to the east of the main building in the centre of the present car park area (see Fig. 2). A shallow ephemeral linear feature was observed at a depth of 0.56 m below current ground level. The cut for the gully (604) was 1.90 m long by 0.40 m wide by 0.10 m deep. The gully had a single fill (605) which contained no artefacts.

5 RESULTS: DESCRIPTIONS

5.1 Description of deposits

Trench 1

5.1.1 Trench 1 was oriented E-W and measured 30 m in length and 2 m in width. Below the topsoil (100) and redeposited natural (101) was a layer of made ground (102) consisting of dark brown silty clay with flint inclusions which overlay the natural clay (103). The natural clay was encountered at a depth of between 1.25 m and 1.59 m below current ground level.

Trench 2

5.1.2 Trench 2 was oriented N-S and measured 30 m in length and 2 m in width. As in Trench 1, below the topsoil and redeposited clay was a layer of buried topsoil (202) which directly overlay the natural clay (203). An isolated deposit of mixed building rubble (204) was observed which replaced the buried topsoil within the southernmost 7 m of the trench. The natural clay was encountered at a depth of between 0.71 m and 0.89 m below current ground level.

Trench 3

5.1.3 Trench 3 had to be relocated slightly to the north of its planned position due to the presence of services. This resulted in a slight adjustment to the dimensions stated in
the WSI whilst the orientation of E-W was maintained. The trench measured 24 m in length and 2 m in width. The modern topsoil (300) directly overlay the natural clay (301), which was encountered at a depth of between 0.30 m and 0.32 m below current ground level.

**Trench 4**

5.1.4 Trench 4 was oriented N-S and measured 30 m in length and 2 m in width. Four deposits were revealed in this trench. The uppermost was the tarmac surface of the current car park (400) that overlay a deposit of hardcore (401). Below the hardcore was a deposit of made ground (402) that sat directly on the natural clay (403), which was encountered at a depth of between 0.33 m and 0.48 m below current ground level.

**Trench 5**

5.1.5 Trench 5 was oriented N-S and measured 30 m in length and 2 m in width. The uppermost deposit (500) was the tarmac forming the current surface of the car park that overlay a deposit of hardcore (501). A buried soil horizon (502) was located below the hardcore that lay above the natural clay (503). At a depth of 0.55 m a shallow, curvilinear gully (504/506) was revealed which was cut into the natural and contained a single fill deposit (505/507) (see Fig. 3). Immediately to the west of this gully a patchy feature was encountered which appeared archaeological but upon excavation was found to be the result of root action. The natural clay was encountered at a depth of between 0.49 m and 0.56 m below current ground level.

**Trench 6**

5.1.6 Trench 6 was oriented E-W and measured 30 m in length and 2 m in width. The uppermost deposit (600) was the tarmac forming the current surface of the car park that overlay a layer of hardcore (601). A thin light brown silty soil layer (602) was located below the hardcore and directly overlay the natural (603). Two service trenches ran across the width of the trench and a very shallow gully (604) was located towards the eastern end of the trench at a depth of 0.78 m. The ephemeral linear gully, oriented SW-NE was located towards the eastern end of the trench. The gully was revealed to a length of 1.9 m and was 0.40 m wide with a maximum depth of 0.10 m. No artefacts were observed within the fill. Natural clay was encountered at a depth of between 0.50 m and 0.79 m below current ground level.

**Trench 7**

5.1.7 Trench 7 required shortening to allow for access and was reduced from 30 m to 17.5 m but retained the intended width of 2 m and its E-W orientation. The trench was very deep and all recording was done by lowering tapes and no one was permitted access into the excavated trench. A total of six deposits were observed. The topsoil (700) and redeposited natural clay (701) overlay a substantial deposit of made ground consisting of a brown clay with flint inclusions (702) which in turn overlay a darker deposit of made ground (703). Under the made ground was a soil horizon of clay
loam (705) that directly overlay the natural clay (704). Some post-medieval pottery was recovered from the excavated spoil. These finds were given a context number (706) as a finds reference number. The natural clay was encountered at a depth of between 2.88 m and 3.4 m below current ground level.

**Trench 8**

5.1.8 Trench 8 also required modification from the dimensions outlined in the WSI. For reasons of access the length was reduced from 30 m to 23.5 m whilst following the intended N-S orientation. The topsoil (800) and redeposited natural orange clay (801) overlay a layer of made ground formed of a dark greyish brown clay silt (802) which sat directly above the natural (803). The natural clay was encountered at a depth of between 1.26 m and 2.40 m below ground level. The southern end of the trench was stepped to allow safe access for staff.

5.2 **Finds**

*Assessment of the pottery from Hemel Hempstead*

*by John Cotter*

**Introduction and methodology**

5.2.1 A total of 4 sherds of pottery weighing 101 g. were recovered. This is all of late medieval and/or post-medieval date. All the pottery was examined and spot-dated during the present assessment stage. For each context the total pottery sherd count and weight were recorded on an Excel spreadsheet, followed by the context spot-date which is the date-bracket during which the latest pottery types in the context are estimated to have been produced or were in general circulation. Comments on the presence of datable types were also recorded, usually with mention of vessel form (jugs, bowls etc.) and any other attributes worthy of note (eg. decoration etc.).

**Date and nature of the assemblage**

5.2.2 Overall the pottery assemblage is in a poor condition consisting, for the most part, of fairly small worn sherds. Ordinary domestic pottery types are represented. These comprise two sherds of late medieval-type unglazed orange sandy ware dating perhaps to the late 15th or 16th century. These include a complete detached bunghole from a cistern - a type of large brewing jar. Two small sherds of post-medieval glazed red earthenware, probably dating to the 17th-18th century are also present. All these wares could be locally sourced. No further work on this assemblage is necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Pottery Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of the ceramic building material (CBM) from Hemel Hempstead
by John Cotter

Introduction and methodology

5.2.3 A total of 15 pieces of ceramic building material (CBM) weighing 217 g. were recovered. This is mainly of post-medieval date. All the CBM was examined and spot-dated during the present assessment stage in a similar way to the pottery (see above) and the data recorded on an Excel spreadsheet. As usual, the dating of broken fragments of ceramic building material is an imprecise art and spot-dates derived from them are necessarily broad and should therefore be regarded with caution.

Date and nature of the assemblage

5.2.4 The CBM assemblage is in a poor, worn and fragmentary condition. Most of the assemblage comprises unglazed flat roof tiles in orange sandy fabrics and a few pieces in lighter fabrics with marl streaking. These are all probably of fairly local production. Most appear to be of broad post-medieval date (16th to 19th century) but a few coarser pieces might be of medieval or late medieval date, but this is far from certain. Two small scraps of post-medieval red brick were also identified. No further work on this assemblage is necessary.

Table 2: CBM Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Spot-date</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>16-19C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Edge frag. Flat roof tile. Fine orange brown fabric. 13mm thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>17-19C?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Joining sherds. Flat roof tile. Red post-med sandy fabric. 11mm thick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>17-19C?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Frags 2x flat roof tiles. 1 edge frag 10mm thick in dense red post-med fabric. 2 others (poss same tile) worn and in light orange marl-streaked fabric, also 10mm thick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>16-17C?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Flat roof tile frags. Both poss late med/early post med? 1 edge frag in orange red fabric w sandy surfaces, fairly crudely formed with trace of circular nail hole, 15mm thick. Other is smaller worn flake in dense smooth marl-streaked fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Spot-date</td>
<td>Sherds</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>med/post-med?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2x small worn scraps prob from roof tiles. Reddish fabrics, 1 poss marl-streaked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>16-19C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17-18C date poss most likely? 2x worn scraps reddish-brown brick. 1x worn scrap prob roof tile in dense smooth orange fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>med/post-med</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Worn frags roof tile. 1 poss late med/early post-med? In dense smooth orange fabric with sharp grey core, 12mm thick. Other scrap incl sandy tile surface, orange smooth, undatable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 15 217

6 DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

6.1 Reliability of field investigation

6.1.1 The only area to have been demonstrably truncated was the area around Trenches 4 and 5 to the west of the existing building, and to a lesser extent Trench 6 to the east of the building. In Trench 5 a curvilinear gully was preserved below the tarmac, sand and hardcore that comprised the car park area. In Trench 6 a small stretch of possible gully was revealed.

6.1.2 Conditions on site were conducive with the site works. The site remained dry for the duration of the works, which meant that excavation was not problematic and that features were unlikely to be masked or hidden as a result of human or machine activity on site.

6.1.3 The only artefacts recovered from a secure context within an archaeological feature were those found in the excavation in Trench 5. Two pieces of pottery recovered from gully (505) were recovered from the basal level of the fill and as such are from a relatively secure context. Nonetheless, the truncation noted above may cast some doubt on the reliability of other artefacts recovered from elsewhere on site.

6.2 Overall interpretation

Summary of results

6.2.1 A total of eight evaluation trenches were excavated to locate any archaeological deposits. All trenches were excavated to the depth of the natural or until archaeological deposits were located. With the exceptions of Trenches 5 and 6 all evaluation trenches were devoid of archaeological deposits.

6.2.2 Within Trench 5 a curvilinear gully was located. Although heavily truncated, a shallow cut was extant in the natural. The gully extended for 6.4 m with an approximately N-S orientation. A possible terminus of the gully was observed (firm
interpretation is difficult due to the level of truncation present) at its northern extreme with the gully then continuing into the section at its southern end. A single fill was observed to a depth of 0.07 m. Fragments of ceramic material were recovered from the fill of the gully. Two fragments were recovered from the basal level of the cut with other fragments being recovered from slightly higher levels in the fill.

6.2.3 Trench 6 contained a single archaeological feature. An ephemeral linear gully, oriented SW-NE was located towards the eastern end of the trench. The gully was revealed to a length of 1.9 m and was 0.40 m wide with a maximum depth of 0.10 m.

Significance

6.2.4 The heavily truncated linear gully located in Trench 6 is of unknown significance. No material was recovered to assist in dating the feature. The shallow nature of the gully and the restricted dimensions exposed have made interpretation of the form or function of the feature problematic.

6.2.5 The curvilinear gully located within Trench 5, while clearly observable, was nonetheless also heavily truncated. Pottery fragments indicate a post medieval date for the feature. As in Trench 6 the level of truncation has made interpretation of this feature difficult.

6.2.6 As has been discussed above, the truncation present in the site has severely hampered attempts to provide reliable interpretation. While this truncation was only observed with certainty around Trenches 4, 5 and 6, it can be inferred that this may continue to be an issue throughout the site given the level of modern activity noted elsewhere on site. It is therefore impossible to ascribe any meaningful level of significance to the features discovered.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1  ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Ctxt No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Thick. (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>No./ wt</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redeposited natural CBM</td>
<td>1/49</td>
<td>16-19C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Made ground pot, CBM</td>
<td>1/80,</td>
<td>16-19C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redeposited natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buried topsoil pot, CBM</td>
<td>1/5,</td>
<td>17-19C?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubble layer pot, CBM</td>
<td>1/13,</td>
<td>16-17C?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardcore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Made ground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench No</td>
<td>Ctxt No</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>Thick. (m)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>No./wt</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardcore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buried topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Cut of curvilinear gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Fill of gully cut</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>med-post med?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Cut of gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Fill of gully cut</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>16-19C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gully (505/507)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16-19C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench No</th>
<th>Ctxt No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Thick. (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>No./wt</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardcore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buried topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Cut of linear gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Fill of gully</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench No</th>
<th>Ctxt No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Thick. (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>No./wt</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redeposited natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>Made ground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Made ground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buried topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>un-stratified finds</td>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>med/post</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench</td>
<td>Ctx No</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>Thickness (m)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>No./wt</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reference number</td>
<td></td>
<td>-med</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Modern topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>Redeposited natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Made ground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3 SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS

Site name: Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead
Site code: HEHEMA07
Grid reference: TL 079 073
Type of evaluation: Trial trench evaluation
Date and duration of project: 28/08/07 - 04/09/07

Area of site:

Summary of results: All trenches devoid of archaeology except trenches 5 and 6. Trench 5 contained a shallow curvilinear gully with associated pottery. Trench 6 contained a short shallow linear gully with no associated artefacts.

Location of archive: The archive is currently held at OA, Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford, OX2 0ES, and will be deposited with the Hertfordshire County Museums Service in due course, under the following accession number: TBC
Figure 1: Site location
Figure 2: Trench location plan
Figure 3: Plan and sections of Trench 5
Figure 4: Plan and sections of Trench 6
Figure 5: Trenches 1 and 2
Figure 6: Trenches 3 and 4
Figure 7: Trench 5 and Trench 6