Framingham Earl To Bixley Mains Replacement, Norfolk

Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief Report

May 2016

Client: Anglian Water

OA East Report No: 1884
OASIS No: oxfordar3-240146
NGR: TG 2646 0127
Framingham Earl To Bixley Mains Replacement, Norfolk

Archaeological Evaluation and Watching Brief

By Lukas Barnes, Ashley Pooley and Stephen Morgan

With contributions by James Fairburn

Editor: Rachel Clarke BA MCIfA

Illustrator: Séverine Bézie BA MA

Report Date: May 2016
Report Number: 1884
Site Name: Framlingham Earl to Bixley Mains Replacement
HER Event No: ENF138615
Date of Works: January and February 2016
Client Name: Anglian Water
Client Ref: WAT-06197-02-EN - Framlingham Earl/Bixley Mains Renewal
Planning Ref: n/a
Grid Ref: TG 26433 01261 and TG 24133 03869
Site Code: ENF138615
Finance Code: XNFFRA15
Receiving Body: Norfolk Museums
Accession No:
Prepared by: Lukas Barnes, Ashley Pooley and Stephen Morgan
Position: Assistant Supervisor
Date: 18/05/16
Checked by: Richard Mortimer
Position: Senior project Manager
Date: 20/05/16
Signed: 

Disclaimer
This document has been prepared for the titled project or named part thereof and should not be relied upon or used for any other project without an independent check being carried out as to its suitability and prior written authority of Oxford Archaeology being obtained. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this document being used for a purpose other than the purposes for which it was commissioned. Any person/party using or relying on the document for such other purposes agrees and will by such use or reliance be taken to confirm their agreement to indemnify Oxford Archaeology for all loss or damage resulting therefrom. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for this document to any party other than the person/party by whom it was commissioned.

Oxford Archaeology East,
15 Trafalgar Way,
Bar Hill,
Cambridge,
CB23 8SQ

t: 01223 850500
f: 01223 850599
e: oaeast@thehumanjourney.net
w: http://thehumanjourney.net/oaeast

© Oxford Archaeology East 2016
Oxford Archaeology Limited is a Registered Charity No: 285627
# Table of Contents

**Introduction**

1. **Location and scope of work**
2. **Geology and topography**
3. **Archaeological and historical background**
4. **Acknowledgements**

**Aims and Methodology**

1. **Aims**
2. **Methodology**

**Results**

1. **Introduction**
2. **Evaluation**
3. **Watching Brief**
4. **Finds Summary**

**Conclusions**

1. **Conclusions**
2. **Significance**
3. **Recommendations**

Appendix A. Trench Descriptions and Context Inventory

Appendix B. Finds Reports

1. **Coins**

Appendix C. Bibliography

Appendix D. OASIS Report Form
List of Figures
Fig. 1  Site location map
Fig. 2  Location of Trenches 1-5
Fig. 3  Drill pit locations showing outline of SAM area

List of Plates
Plate 1  Trench 1, from the east
Plate 2  Trench 2, from the west
Plate 3  Trench 3, from the west
Plate 4  Trench 4, from the west
Plate 5  Trench 5, from the west
Plate 6  Drill Pit 2, from north-west
Summary

The replacement of a mains water pipe to the west of Poringland, Norfolk and to the east of the major Roman town at Caistor St Edmund (Fig. 1) necessitated work taking place within a scheduled area. Consequently an evaluation was carried out by OA East, comprising the excavation and recording of five trial trenches to the north of Shotesham Road, Poringland (TG 26433 01261) and a watching brief on three drill pits to the north of Caistor Lane, Caistor St Edmund (TG 24133 03869).

No archaeological features or deposits were encountered within the evaluation trenches.

The watching brief on the drill pits revealed no archaeological features, however, two Roman coins were recovered.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted at Poringland, Norfolk (Fig. 2) and a watching brief at Caistor St Edmund, Norfolk (Fig. 3).

1.1.2 This archaeological evaluation and watching brief was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by James Albone, Planning Archaeologist at Norfolk County Council, supplemented by a Specification prepared by Oxford Archaeology East (Mortimer 2016).

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 NCC, on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, with regard to the treatment of any archaeological remains found.

1.1.4 This report pertains to the evaluation trenches and watching brief undertaken by Oxford Archaeology between the 6th January and 11th February 2016.

1.1.5 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 evaluation area was situated on a south facing slope at approximately 48m OD. The geology of the evaluation area consisted of Newhaven Chalk Formation overlain by Lowestoft Formation sand and gravel bedrock.

1.2.2 The area examined in the watching brief was confined to a pipe trench running on a west-east orientation parallel and to the north of Caistor Lane, Caistor St Edmund. The ground rises from approximately 14m OD to the west to 24m OD to the east. The geology of the watching brief area consists of Newhaven Chalk Formation overlain by clay silt and sand Head deposits.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The site of the medieval St. Michaels Church lies approximately 200m to the south-west of the evaluation area.

1.3.2 The route of the pipeline in the watching brief area lies approximately 700m to the north-east of the Roman civitas capital of the Iceni, Venta Icenorum (SAM 1013873). Consequently, the immediate area of the pipeline is within a scheduled area (SAM 1003954) and is likely to contain remains of Roman settlement.

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 These works were commissioned by Anglian Water. The evaluation was carried out by Ashley Pooley and Lukas Barnes and the watching brief by Simon Birnie. The coins were examined by James Fairbairn. The project was managed by Richard Mortimer.
2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims
2.1.1 The objective of this evaluation and watching brief was to determine as far as reasonably possible the presence/absence, location, nature, extent, date, quality, condition and significance of any surviving archaeological deposits within the development area.

2.2 Methodology
2.2.1 The evaluation consisted of five 50m-long trenches excavated on 5th and 6th January 2016 along a 350m length of the proposed mains pipeline route to the north of Shotesham Road, Poringland (TG 26433 01261).

2.2.2 All of the evaluation trenches were excavated by a tracked 8-tonne mechanical excavator, using a toothless ditching bucket, under constant archaeological supervision.

2.2.3 The watching brief examined three drill pits along this route where interventions were required to replace valves and the mains pipe. In these areas disturbance was limited to not more than 3.00m by 1.50m, with an archaeologist from OA East in constant attendance. The interventions were conducted by a tracked mini-digger using a toothless bucket.

2.2.4 Spoil, exposed surfaces and features were scanned with a metal detector. All metal-detected and hand-collected finds were retained for inspection, other than those which were obviously modern.

2.2.5 All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using OA East's pro-forma sheets. Trench locations, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour and monochrome photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 The results from the evaluation and watching brief are presented separately below.

3.2 Evaluation
3.2.1 Five trenches were excavated along the north side of Shotesham Road. No archaeological features were identified in any of the five trenches excavated. In addition, no artefacts were recovered during excavation of these trenches or noted while walking across the field. The absence of significant archaeological features or finds within any of the trenches excavated was unexpected, given the frequency of prehistoric and Roman finds in the area recorded in the Norfolk Historic Environment Record.

3.2.2 Details of each evaluation trench are given in Appendix A and a plan of the trench locations is shown in Fig 2.

3.3 Watching Brief
3.3.1 Drill pit locations are shown on Fig 3.

3.3.2 Drill Pit 1 was machine excavated approximately 3m from the eastern limit of the SAM and was 3m long, 1.5m wide and 1.2m deep. The deposits found within this drill pit consisted of pipe trench backfill. No archaeology was observed.

3.3.3 Drill Pit 2 was machine excavated and measured approximately 3m long, 1.5m wide and 0.75m deep. Only pipe trench backfill was found in this Drill Pit and no archaeology was observed. Two Roman coins where found in the spoil whilst metal detecting.

3.3.4 Drill Pit 3 was 3m long and 1.5m wide. Only pipe trench backfill was found in this Drill Pit and no archaeology was observed.

3.4 Finds Summary
3.4.1 Two copper 1st century Roman coins were recovered during metal detection of the spoil of Drill Pit 2.
4 CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Conclusions
4.1.1 The absence of significant archaeological features or finds within any of the trenches excavated suggests a lack of archaeological activity in the immediate area. The recovery of Roman coins from the Drill Pits is consistent with them being in an area of intensive Roman settlement.

4.2 Significance
4.2.1 The results of the evaluation suggest that the site is of very low archaeological significance.

4.3 Recommendations
4.3.1 Recommendations for any future work based upon this report will be made by Planning Archaeologist at Norfolk County Council.
## Appendix A. Trench Descriptions and Context Inventory

### Trench 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.32m</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20m</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 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.45m</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12m</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 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.32m</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20m</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 4

**General description**
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of soil and subsoil overlying a natural of sandy gravel overlying chalk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>E-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.64m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.80m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>30m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.40m</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.23m</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 5

**General description**
Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of soil and subsoil overlying a natural of sandy gravel overlying chalk and iron panning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>E-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.61m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.80m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>30m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context no</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.47m</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.14m</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 Coins

*By James Fairburn*

**B.1.1**  SF1: Domitian AE As. 87 AD. IMP CAES DOMIT AVG GERM COS XIII CENS PER P P, laureate head right / FORTVNAE AVGVSTI S-C, Fortuna standing left holding a cornucopia and a ship's rudder.

**B.1.2**  SF2: Heavily corroded AS coin. Probably imperial issue Domitian. 28mm. Bust facing right. Reverse has Senatus Consulto or SC. Almost all bronze coins issued before the late 3rd century AD bore the legend.
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Figure 1: Site location showing area of archaeological monitoring (black) and route of pipeline (red)
Figure 2: Location of trenches 1-5
Figure 3: Location of Drill Pits
Plate 1: Trench 1, from the east

Plate 2: Trench 2, from the west
Plate 3: Trench 3, from the west

Plate 4: Trench 4, from the west
Plate 5: Trench 5, from the west

Plate 6: Drill Pit 2