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Summary

An eight trench archaeological evaluation was carried out on 16-18th of February 2016 at Eriswell 2 Site Extension Scheme, A1065, Eriswell, Suffolk prior to the development by Anglian Water. The purpose of evaluation was to determine the survival and spread of WWII Prisoner of War Camp 85 Victoria located in the footprint of the proposed development.

The evaluation found that the majority of the camp has been demolished but foundation trenches and postholes survived throughout the development area. Truncated remains of a prehistoric field system were encountered, with two ditches recorded within Trench 7, and there is potential for further survival of prehistoric features elsewhere.
1 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 **Location and scope of work**

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted between 16th and 18th of February 2016 in Eriswell, Suffolk prior to a development of an Ion Exchange building by Anglian Water.

1.1.2 This archaeological evaluation (the site, TL 736 768, see Fig.1) was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Rachael Abraham of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS), supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East (Morgan, 2016).

1.1.3 The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed development 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 site lies on a bedrock of Holywell Nodular Chalk Formation and New Pit Chalk Formation which is overlain by alluvium clay, silt, sand and gravel (BGS).

1.3 **Archaeological and historical background**

1.3.1 The archaeological background is based on a Suffolk CC Historic Enviroment Record (HER) search (9181247)

1.3.2 Multi-period find scatters have been recorded from the area directly adjacent to the site (ERL 017). These finds range in date from the Bronze Age to Anglo-Saxon periods (MSF1552, MSF7865, MSF7866 and MSF7867). Finds ranging from Mesolithic to the Iron Age in date have been uncovered at Hurst Fen Neolithic settlement (SAM1006065, MSF163, MSF20321, MSF9486, MSF9487), 300m to the west. Approximately 500m to the south-west, a scatter of Mesolithic flakes have been found (MSF8924). A dense burnt flint patch has been observed 500m to the north-west (MSF11547) of the site. Bronze Age and Roman finds are known from the area to the south of the site (MSF7881, MSF7493, MSF7838). A group of barrows, two of which have been scheduled together (SAM1018345), are also known to the north of the development area (ERL001, ERL 028 and 034). There are earthworks of unknown date at Codson Hill (MSF19002) to the east of the site.

1.3.3 The site is located in the north-western part of a WWII Prisoner Of War (POW) camp (ERL 233). Camp 85 Victoria was a purpose-built camp of 'standard' issue, initially for Italian and later German prisoners between 1939 and 1948.

1.4 **Acknowledgements**

1.4.1 The author would like to thank Anglian Water who commissioned and funded the archaeological work. The project was managed by Matt Brudenell and Richard Mortimer. Thanks are also extended to Adele Lord who helped with the fieldwork. The project was monitored by Rachael Abraham of Suffolk County Council. The machining was undertaken by Anthill Plant Hire. Daria Tsybaeva undertook the site survey.
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 Eight trenches were excavated within the proposed development area and all archaeological remains were excavated where appropriate and possible. The trenches are located across the footprints of several buildings.
2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a tracked 360 excavator using a toothless ditching bucket.
2.2.3 The site survey was carried out using a Leica GPS fitted with Smartnet technology.
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, including those which were obviously modern.
2.2.5 Archaeological features and deposits were recorded using OA East's pro-forma sheets. Trench locations, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour and monochrome photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits.
2.2.6 No environmental sampling was undertaken as no suitable deposits were found.
2.2.7 The site conditions were dry and sunny.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 The trenches are presented below in numerical order (see Fig. 2 for trench locations).
3.1.2 The topsoil was a dark brownish grey silty sand (37), about 0.25m deep. The slightly lower western trenches also contained a think layer of subsoil, a mid orangey brown silty sand (38) with frequent small stones, which measured on average 0.15m deep. Both layers contained fragments of brick, tile and cement rubble throughout.
3.1.3 Finds were recovered from ditch 20 in trench 7 only.

3.2 Trench 1
3.2.1 This trench was not excavated as it was inaccessible at the time of excavation.

3.3 Trench 2
3.3.1 No archaeology was recorded at this trench.

3.4 Trench 3
3.4.1 At the eastern end of the trench was a posthole (1) which was sub-circular in plan and measured 0.37m in diameter. It had steep sides and a flat base, 0.22m deep, and was filled by a mid orangey brown silty sand (2).
3.4.2 Immediately to the west was a north-west to south-east aligned ditch which measured 0.5m wide. The ditch had steep sides and was excavated to the depth of 0.4m when a metal pipe (5) was encountered. The ditch contained a dark greyish brown silty sand.
3.4.3 At the western end of the trench were two parallel ditches (8 and 6) aligned north to south, measuring 0.85m and 0.8m respectively (see Plate 2). The ditches were dated to the modern period and not excavated. They contained similar fills (9 and 7 respectively) of mid whitish grey crushed chalk and sand and fragments of ceramic building material (CBM). The ditches were cut into a thin layer of subsoil (38).

3.5 Trench 4
3.5.1 Two postholes (10 and 12) were located respectively at the northern end and in the centre of the trench. The postholes were circular in plan, both measuring 0.4m in diameter. They contained dark greyish black silty sand and fragments of modern CBM and cement. The postholes were not excavated.

3.6 Trench 5
3.6.1 No archaeology was recorded at this trench.

3.7 Trench 6
3.7.1 At the western end of the trench were two intercutting postholes (14 and 16), sub-circular in plan. Posthole 14 had steep stepped sides and a flat base, measuring 0.5m in diameter and 0.33m deep. Posthole 16 was steep-sided with a flat base, measuring 0.25m in diameter and 0.19m deep. Both postholes contained a dark orangey brown silty sand with fragments of clinker (15 and 17 respectively). Posthole 14 possibly truncated posthole 16.
3.7.2 Posthole 18 was circular in plan and measured 0.4m in diameter (see Plate 4). It contained a dark brownish grey silty sand (19) with fragments of modern sharpened wooden stakes in it. The posthole was not excavated.
3.8  Trench 7
3.8.1  A slightly curving north-east to south-west aligned ditch (22/25) was located in the middle of the trench. The ditch had gradually sloping sides and a concave base, measuring over 0.7m wide and 0.24m deep, at the northern end but was gently sloping with a flat base, measuring only 0.4m in width and 0.07m in depth, further south. It contained a light greyish brown sand (23 and 26 respectively).
3.8.2  At the southern end of the trench was a layer (24), measuring about 0.12m thick (see Plate 3). It consisted of crushed chalk and was located over natural of sand and chalk and was only covered by topsoil (37). It may represent the remains of a surface.
3.8.3  Slightly further south was a possible ditch (20) aligned north-north-west to south-south-east (see Plate 1). It had gradually sloping sides and a flat base, measuring over 0.8m wide and 0.2m deep. It contained a light greyish brown sand (21) and four sherds of prehistoric pottery.

3.9  Trench 8
3.9.1  In the middle of the trench was a circular posthole (33), measuring 0.4m in diameter. It was filled with a mid brownish grey sand (34) and contained two modern iron nails. It was not excavated.
3.9.2  At the western end was an east-south-east to west-north-west aligned gully (35), which measured 0.25m wide (see Plate 5). It contained a light greyish brown silty sand (36) with fragments of CBM, cement and asbestos. This feature was not excavated.

3.10  Trench 9
3.10.1  At the western end of the trench were two parallel ditches (27 and 29), aligned north to south and measuring 1.25m and 2.2m wide respectively. The ditches contained a mid greyish brown sand (28 and 30 respectively) with frequent fragments of CBM, cement and iron. The features were not excavated.
3.10.2  In the middle of the trench was a terminus of ditch 31, which measured 1.3m long and 0.75m wide. It contained a light greyish brown sand (32) and a protruding ceramic pipe. It was not excavated.

3.11  Finds Summary
3.11.1  The presence of modern finds such as fragments of CBM, cement, clinker and nails were recorded but not retained.
3.11.2  A few small sherds of Early Iron Age pottery were found in ditch 20.

3.12  Environmental Summary
3.12.1  No environmental sampling took place.
4 Discussion and Conclusions

4.1 Prehistoric ditches
4.1.1 Truncated ditches 22/25 and 20 may well be part of the same prehistoric field system, showing similarity in both fills and profiles. Ditch 25 was more severely truncated. The date of the field system is unclear but it would potentially be middle Bronze Age.

4.2 PoW Camp 85 Victoria
4.2.1 Parallel ditches, 27 and 29, 6 and 8, are likely to be foundation trenches for buildings constructed for the POW camp, later backfilled with construction rubble when the camp came into disuse. The metal and ceramic pipes encountered near both sets of foundations were probably associated with the camp’s water supply and waste. Postholes 33, 18, 16, 14, 12 and 10 encountered along the northern edge of the site probably formed part of a camp fence. A small linear gully 35 a the north-eastern end of development was likely a beam slot for a less substantial structure associated with the camp.

4.2.2 The foundations of other camp buildings can be seen further south in the field, outside the development area (see Plate 6). To the east of the development are two standing huts, remains of the POW camp, now used for storage (see Plates 7-8). The huts are standard issue of Ministry of War Production made out of pre-cast reinforced concrete frames. Each hut measured 60 feet long broken into 10 bays with alternating windows and open plan design inside. To the west of the development is a large concrete surface that was also part of the camp (see Plate 9).

4.3 Significance
4.3.1 Prehistoric features were found in Trench 7, and there is therefore a possibly that other features of this date will survive in the development area.

4.3.2 No standing remains related to the camp were present within the development area. The camp was probably demolished for reconstruction or reclamation of agricultural land after 1948 (Thomas, 2003). However, the foundations of the camp are still preserved beneath the topsoil. Camp Victoria is one of only two known PoW camps of 'standard' issue in Suffolk, both demolished (Thomas, 2003). Despite their recent history, PoW camps in Britain are poorly recorded and understood. Camp Victoria is therefore significant at both local and regional level and its remains help to contribute towards a local “sense of place”.

4.4 Recommendations
4.4.1 Recommendations for any future work based upon this report will be made by the Suffolk CC.
### APPENDIX A. TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY

#### Trench 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>N-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not excavated</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trench 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>E-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of chalk and sand.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>14.5</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>37</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trench 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>E-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench contained three ditches and one posthole. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of chalk.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>20</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>cut</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trench 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>N-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench contained two postholes. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of chalk and sand.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contexts</td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>N-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of chalk and sand.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>E-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench contained three postholes. Consists of topsoil overlying a natural of chalk and sand.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>finds</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>N-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench contained two ditches. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying a natural of chalk and sand.</td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></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>20</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>pot</td>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 8

**General description**

Trench contained one posthole and one gully. Consists of topsoil overlying a natural of sand.

**Orientation** E-W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13.5</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>33</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>nails</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td></td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gully</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 9

**General description**

Trench contained three ditches. Consists of topsoil overlying a natural of chalk and sand.

**Orientation** E-W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15</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>27</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>CBM, iron</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Prehistoric Pottery

By Matt Brudenell

B.1.1 Four plain body sherds of prehistoric pottery (11g) were recovered from ditch 20. The sherds derive from the same vessel and are tempered with finely crushed burnt flint and quartz sand. The character of the fabrics is typical of Early Iron Age ceramics from Suffolk and parts of Eastern England (Brudenell 2012), and can be dated c. 800-350 BC.
## APPENDIX C. HER SEARCH RESULTS

### Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Sites and Monuments Record

**18/02/2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Summary Description</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERL 001</td>
<td>Dale Hole Round Barrow MSF7832</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument - Tumulus located E of A1065 at edge of field.</td>
<td>ERISWELL, FOREST HEATH, SUFFOLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 007</td>
<td>Roman artefact scatter of pottery and metalwork, including coin and finger ring. MSF7838</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>TL 7304 7627 : 1934 excavations found pottery, including samian (F38), and bronze etc (S1)(R1).</td>
<td>Centred TL 7305 7625 (100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 010</td>
<td>'The Pimples' MSF7857</td>
<td>Neo</td>
<td>Axe, greenstone, partly polished 'probably Borrowdale volcanic ash' (S1)(R1).</td>
<td>Centred TL 7311 7731 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 017</td>
<td>Findspot of a Bronze-Age bronze penannular ring. BA MSF1552</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bronze penannular ring of a type called 'ring money', 2cm in diameter, was found in a field with a metal detector.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7286 7677 (285m by 603m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 017</td>
<td>Findspot of a handmade Iron-Age pottery sherd. (IA) MSF7865</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Pottery sherd, probably late IA, handmade sandy.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7295 7681 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 017</td>
<td>S of Dalehole Plantation (Rom) MSF7866</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Large pottery scatter on field ploughed since 1985.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7286 7677 (285m by 599m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 017</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon artefact scatter of coins. (Sax) MSF7867</td>
<td>Sax</td>
<td>? Sceatta, not seen, said to have been found by a treasure hunter (metal detected).</td>
<td>Centred TL 7295 7685 (100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 018</td>
<td>Dalehole Plantation MSF7868</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Pottery etc.-anchor</td>
<td>Centred TL 7285 7715 (100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 028</td>
<td>Site of a barrow of unknown date. MSF7880</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Barrow - site of.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7306 7691 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 029</td>
<td>Bronze-Age artefact scatter of pottery found within an area of a larger Roman scatter. MSF7881</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bronze Age pottery found (S1), within area of larger Rom scatter, ERL 007.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7297 7624 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 034</td>
<td>Possible round barrow of unknown date. MSF7887</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument - Possible barrow, flattened by ploughing.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7310 7721 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 041</td>
<td>Roman artefact scatter, including a bronze figurine head of Atys. MSF7897</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Bronze figurine head of Atys (sold).</td>
<td>Centred TL 7285 7695 (100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 051</td>
<td>Codson Hill MSF1598</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>A Rom bronze brooch (S1).</td>
<td>Centred TL 7295 7705 (100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Summary Description</td>
<td>NGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 053</td>
<td>Findspot of a Bronze-Age bronze awl. MSF7493</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bronze awl, two and five-sixteenths inches long.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7638 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 056</td>
<td>Iron-Age artefact scatter of pottery and coins,</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>`2 gold staters - Iceni double crescents' (Mack 397-9?) and a few Iceni silver and</td>
<td>Centred TL 7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including 2 gold staters-Iceni double crescents</td>
<td></td>
<td>two cast potin coins (said by finder to be 'Thurrock' type).</td>
<td>7745 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and a few Iceni silver and 2 cast potin coins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(IA) MSF9484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 056</td>
<td>Findspot of an Anglo-Saxon Offa penny. (Sax)</td>
<td>Sax</td>
<td><code>Offa (AD 757-796) penny of unrecorded type found in area of IA coins</code> (S1).</td>
<td>Centred TL 7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF9485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7745 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 056</td>
<td>Large Roman artefact scatter of pottery and</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Late Rom scatter of metalwork &amp; pottery located some years earlier `on either side</td>
<td>Centred TL 7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metalwork, including a coin. (Rom)</td>
<td></td>
<td>of drove` (S1).</td>
<td>7745 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF9791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 113</td>
<td>Codson Hill</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Sub-square (square with rounded corners) enclosure, circa 280m long sides</td>
<td>TL 7367 7661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF19002</td>
<td></td>
<td>enclosing circa 8.5 hectares.</td>
<td>(point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 233</td>
<td>Prisoner of War Camp 85 &quot;Victoria Camp&quot;</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>The site of a Second World War prisoner of war camp at Codson Hill called Victoria</td>
<td>Centred TL 7307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF27408</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7672 (429m by 331m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 240</td>
<td>OUTLINE RECORD: Eriswell 2 Site Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TL 7310 7660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheme, A1065 (EVAL) OAE MSF4456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 014</td>
<td>Hurst Fen Neolithic Site (Neo) MSF163</td>
<td>Neo</td>
<td>Scheduled site of partially excavated extensive Neo settlement &amp; typesite for</td>
<td>Centred TL 7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mildenhall Ware.</td>
<td>7687 (409m by 446m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 014</td>
<td>Hurst Fen (IA) MSF20321</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>78 Sherds of early Iron Age or Neolithic pottery. Scheduled</td>
<td>TL 7250 7680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 014</td>
<td>Hurst Fen Neolithic site (Mes) MSF9486</td>
<td>Mes</td>
<td>Mesolithic finds from Hurst Fen Neo site.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7685 (100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 014</td>
<td>Hurst Fen Neolithic site (BA) MSF9487</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bronze Age finds from Hurst Fen Neolithic site.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7687 (408m by 451m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 106</td>
<td>Prehistoric artefact scatter of flakes. MSF8924</td>
<td>Preh</td>
<td><code>Honey coloured flakes found</code> (S1)(R1).</td>
<td>Centred TL 7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7635 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 237</td>
<td>The Trout Pond MSF9207</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Possible moat or pond.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7682 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 282</td>
<td>Dense burnt flint patch of unknown date. MSF11547</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Dense burnt flint patch, not visible on surface but revealed when large hole</td>
<td>Centred TL 7242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>excavated by farmer, in 1970s (?).</td>
<td>7708 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Summary Description</td>
<td>NGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 482</td>
<td>Defined area of (repeated?) illegal metal detector activity reported by Forest Enterprise. MSF15494</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Defined area of (repeated?) illegal metal detector activity reported by Forest Enterprise.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7210 7673 (10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 485</td>
<td>Mildenhall Warren (PMed) MSF16090</td>
<td>PMe</td>
<td>Single (clearly double in places) earthwork bank surrounding most of Mildenhall Warren, running for approximately 4.5km (minimum).</td>
<td>Centred TL 7236 7524 (3120m by 2469m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 485</td>
<td>Mildenhall Warren (Med) MSF16091</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Earthwork bank/s surrounding most of Mildenhall Warren (see MNL 553), running for approximately four and a half kms minimum.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7297 7583 (100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 489</td>
<td>Hurstfen Drove MSF16692</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Small rectangular cropmark to the southwest of MNL 014.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7205 7655 (100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 553</td>
<td>Mildenhall Warren; Mildenhall Woods MSF22219</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Mildenhall rabbit Warren, established by 1247-8?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL 701</td>
<td>Bombay (1880s); Mildenhall Woods MSF27491</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Somewhat sinuous large bank earthwork forming very large (circa 700m N-S) irregularly curving enclosure (3 sides only survive) boundary on north, west and south of 'Bombay', with entrances in centre west and possibly the south-west.</td>
<td>Centred TL 7189 7643 (786m by 760m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNL Misc</td>
<td>Bush Heath (Med) MSF17845</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Nov/Dec 1997: Metal detector find of unidentified long cross penny (S1).</td>
<td>Centred TL 7265 7575 (100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX E. WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

E.1 Specification for Archaeological Evaluation

By Stephen Morgan

Introduction
Site Name: Eriswell 2 Site Extension Scheme, A1065, Eriswell
Site Code: ERL240
Project Code: XSFES16
County (Grid Ref): Suffolk (TL 736 768)

Project No.: Trial Trench Evaluation
OASIS No.: oxforda3-242305
HER Event No.: ESF23496
Planning App. No.: N/A
Client: Anglian Water
Date: 9/2/2016 update 11/2/16
Author: Stephen Morgan

General Background

Circumstances of the Project
E.1.1 This development will involve the construction of an ion exchange building within the footprint of a known WWII POW camp and in an area of high potential for earlier archaeological periods.

The Geology of the Site
E.1.2 The site lies on a bedrock of chalk which is overlain by alluvium clay, silt, sand and gravel.

The Proposed Development
E.1.3 The proposed development is for an ion exchange building covering a total of c. 5500 sqm.

Archaeological Background
E.1.4 Multi-period find scatters have been recorded from the area directly adjacent to the site (ERL 017). These finds range in date from the Bronze Age to Anglo-Saxon periods (MSF1552, MSF7865, MSF7866 and MSF7867). Finds ranging from Mesolithic to the Iron Age in date have been uncovered at Hurst Fen (MSF163, MSF20321, MSF9486, MSF9487), 300m to the west. Approximately 500m to the south-west, a scatter of Mesolithic flakes have been found (MSF8924). A dense burnt flint patch has been observed 500m to the north-west (MSF11547) of the site. Roman finds are known from the area to the south of the site (MSF7828). A group of barrows are also known to the north of the development area (ERL 028 and 034).

E.1.5 There are earthworks of unknown date at Codson Hill (MSF19002) to the east of the site.
E.1.6 The site is located in the north-western part of a WWII POW camp (ERL 233). The
trenches are located across the footprints of several of these buildings.

**Objectives**

E.1.7 The evaluation will seek to establish the character, date, state of preservation and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed development area.

E.1.8 In the event that archaeological remains are present the evaluation will seek to consider appropriate methodologies and suitable resourcing levels for excavation.

**Methods**

**Background Research**

E.1.9 A suitable level of documentary research will be undertaken in order to determine the expected archaeological character of the site. Existing information from historical sources and previous archaeological finds and investigations in the vicinity will be collated. The likely archaeological potential of the site will then be assessed with regard to current regional and national research issues and preservation criteria. A full HER search has been carried out.

E.1.10 The results of the background study will not be formally presented separately, but will be incorporated into the final evaluation report.

**Aerial Photographs**

E.1.11 Aerial photography is not required at this site. However, an aerial photograph from Google Earth has been provided.

**Geophysical Survey**

E.1.12 Geophysical survey is not required at this site.

**Trial Trenching**

E.1.13 Trial trenches will be excavated by machine to the depth of geological horizons, or to the upper interface of archaeological features or deposits, whichever is encountered first. The trial trenches will cover 5% of the site by area. These will comprise one x 10m, six x 15mm and 2 x 20m trenches, all 2m wide and with a total length of 140m.

E.1.14 A plan of the proposed trenching strategy is appended here for approval before trenching begins.

E.1.15 Exposed surfaces will be cleaned by trowel and hoe as necessary in order to clarify located features and deposits. Trench spoil will be scanned visually and with a metal detector to aid recovery of artefacts.

E.1.16 Trial trenching will be carried out in accordance with Suffolk County Council’s Requirements for Trenched Archaeological Evaluation 2011.

**Recording and Sampling**

E.1.17 Records will comprise survey, drawn, written and photographic data. The drawn record will comprise an initial plan (scale 1:50 or 1:100) for each trench. Thereafter, single context and/or excavated feature plans will be produced for all exposed and excavated features. Trenches and features will be tied in to the OS grid. Sections will be drawn at 1:10 or 1:20 as appropriate. The written record will comprise context descriptions on OA
East pro-forma context sheets. The photographic record will comprise monochrome of trenches and excavated features, and colour slides supplemented by colour and digital photographs.

E.1.18 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.

E.1.19 Bulk samples will be taken by the excavator and in consultation with the English Heritage Regional Scientific Advisor and the projects environmental specialist where practicable, to test for the presence and potential of micro- and macro-botanical environmental indicators. These samples will be 40l in volume or full context (whichever is smaller). The result of any analysis will be incorporated in the evaluation report.

**Human Remains**

E.1.20 If Human remains are encountered, the relevant authority and the client will be informed. No further excavation will take place until removal becomes necessary, this will only be carried out in accordance with all appropriate Environmental Health regulations and will only occur after a Ministry of Justice licence has been obtained. Excavation may be required where the remains are under imminent threat or dating/preservation information is required for costing purposes. Due to the wide range of variables costs of excavation, removal and analysis of human remains are **not included** in any statement of costs accompanying or associated with this specification.

**Report, Archive and Oasis record**

E.1.21 A report on the results of the evaluation will be completed within one week of the completion of fieldwork. A draft report will be submitted for comment and approval before a final hard and digital copy are issued.

E.1.22 An Oasis number has been obtained and the report will be submitted on completion of evaluation.

E.1.23 All artefactual material recovered will be held in storage by OA East and ownership of all such archaeological finds will be given over to relevant authority to facilitate future study and ensure proper preservation of all artefacts. In the unlikely event that artefacts of significant monetary value are discovered, and if they are not subject to Treasure Act legislation separate ownership arrangements may be negotiated. It is Oxford Archaeology Ltd’s policy, in line with accepted practice, to keep site archives (paper and artefactual) together wherever possible. All archives will comply in format with MAP 2 recommendations. The archive will be deposited with Suffolk CC.

**Timetable**

E.1.24 Documentary study will take place before fieldwork begins. Following this it is estimated that the fieldwork will take approximately 3 days to complete. These figures do not allow for delays caused by bad weather. Working days are based on a 5-day working week, Monday to Friday.

E.1.25 Post-excavation tasks and report writing will take a maximum of 4 weeks following the end of fieldwork, unless there are exceptional discoveries requiring more lengthy analysis. A summary statement of results, however, can be produced more quickly as required.

E.1.26 SCCAS will advise on need for further work if necessary which would be subject to
separate brief and WSI.

**Staffing and Support**

E.1.27 The following staff will form the project team:

1 x Project Manager (supervisory only, not based on site)
1 x Project Officer/Supervisor (full time)
1 x Site Assistant (part time, as required)
1 x Finds Assistant (part time, as required)
1 x Illustrator for post-excavation work (part time)

E.1.28 The Project Manager and Project Officer/Supervisor will be core staff of OA East. Names, qualifications and experience of key project personnel will be communicated to the relevant authority before the commencement of fieldwork. All Site Assistants will be drawn from a pool of qualified and experienced staff. The Contractor will not employ volunteer amateur or student staff, whether paid or unpaid, to fulfil any of the above tasks except as an addition to the stated team.

E.1.29 Specialists will be employed for consultation and analysis as necessary. It is anticipated that the site at Eriswells may produce multi-period remains and there will be sampling of environmental remains. Sarah Percival/Matt Brudenell will assess any Prehistoric pottery, Alice Lyons/Steve Macaulay will be asked to comment on any Roman pottery and Dr Paul Spoerry will be asked to assess any Saxon/medieval pottery. Jane Phimester of OA South will be asked to comment on WWII remains. Environmental analysis will be carried out by OA East staff in consultation with Val Fryer and the results will be conveyed to the English Heritage Regional Scientific Advisor. Faunal remains will be examined by Ian Baxter/Chris Faine. Conservation will be undertaken by Colchester Museums. In the event that these 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.

**Further Considerations**

**Insurance**

E.1.30 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.

**Services, Public Rights of Way, Tree Preservation Orders etc.**

E.1.31 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.
Site Security

E.1.32 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.

Access

E.1.33 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 mobile office and portable toilet on or near to the site. 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.

Site Preparation

E.1.34 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. Unless previously agreed in writing, the costs of any preparatory work required, including tree felling and removal, scrub or undergrowth clearance, removal of concrete or hard standing, 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.

Backfilling/Reinstatement

E.1.35 Backfilling/reinstatement of trenches is not included in the cost unless otherwise agreed with the client.

Monitoring

E.1.36 The relevant planning authority will be informed appropriately of dates and arrangements to allow for adequate monitoring of the works.

Health and Safety, Risk Assessments

E.1.37 A risk assessment covering all activities carried out during the lifetime of the project is attached at Appendix 2. This draws on OA East’s activity-specific risk assessment literature and conforms with CDM requirements.

E.1.38 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.

Invoicing

E.1.39 Unless otherwise agreed in writing, an invoice for 50% of the agreed costs of the project will be presented on the project's initiation. This will normally be payable before further works take place. The remaining balance of the fees for the project will be invoiced to the client on completion of the project and presentation of the final report.

E.1.40 It is expected that payment will be received within 30 days of invoicing. If payment is not made within this time interest will be charged at base rate. After a period of three months Oxford Archaeology Ltd employs a debt collection company to recover unpaid invoices and any costs incurred during this process will be passed on to the client.
## APPENDIX 1: CONSULTANT SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Specialism</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Barry</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Freelance</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>Brown, Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Lisa</td>
<td>Prehistoric Pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brundell, Matt</td>
<td>Bronze Age &amp; Iron Age pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane, Jon</td>
<td>illustration &amp; reconstruction</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crummy, Nina</td>
<td>Small Find Assemblages</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodwell, Natasha</td>
<td>Human Bone</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Jerry</td>
<td>Roman pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faine, Chris</td>
<td>Animal bone</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, Carole</td>
<td>Medieval pot</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Charlie</td>
<td>Soil micromorphology &amp; pollen</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryer, Val</td>
<td>Molluscs/environmental</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, Alice</td>
<td>Late Iron Age/Roman pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, Mark</td>
<td>Neolithic pottery</td>
<td>Freelance</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>Palmer, Rog</td>
<td>Aerial photographs</td>
<td>Air Photo Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percival, Sarah</td>
<td>Prehistoric pottery, querns</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popescu, Adrian</td>
<td>Roman coins</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Kelly</td>
<td>Prehistoric &amp; RB small finds</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Mark</td>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>University of Oxford</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, Wendy</td>
<td>Plant remains</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoerry, Paul</td>
<td>Medieval pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Radiocarbon dating is normally undertaken for CAM ARC by Waikate University, New Zealand and by the Oxford University Accelerator Laboratory.

Geophysical prospection is normally undertaken by Cranfield University, Geoquest, and Geophysical Surveys, Bradford.
## APPENDIX F. OASIS REPORT FORM

All fields are required unless they are not applicable.

### Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OASIS Number</th>
<th>Ersiwell 2 Site Extension Scheme, A1065, Eriswell, Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Ersiwell 2 Site Extension Scheme, A1065, Eriswell, Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Dates (fieldwork)</td>
<td>Start: 16-02-2016, Finish: 18-02-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Work (by OA East)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Reference Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>Planning App. No.</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER No.</td>
<td>ERL240</td>
<td>Related HER/OASIS No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of Project/Techniques Used

**Prompt**: Planning condition

**Development Type**: Service Infrastructure

### Please select all techniques used:

- [ ] Aerial Photography - interpretation
- [ ] Aerial Photography - new
- [ ] Annotated Sketch
- [ ] Augering
- [ ] Dendrochronological Survey
- [ ] Documentary Search
- [ ] Environmental Sampling
- [ ] Fieldwalking
- [ ] Geophysical Survey
- [ ] Grab-Sampling
- [ ] Gravity-Core
- [ ] Laser Scanning
- [ ] Measured Survey
- [ ] Metal Detectors
- [ ] Phosphate Survey
- [ ] Photogrammetric Survey
- [ ] Photographic Survey
- [ ] Rectified Photography
- [ ] Remote Operated Vehicle Survey
- [ ] Sample Trenches
- [X] Targeted Trenches
- [ ] Test Pits
- [ ] Topographic Survey
- [ ] Vibro-core
- [ ] Visual Inspection (Initial Site Visit)

### Monument Types/Significant Finds & Their Periods

List feature types using the NMR Monument Type Thesaurus and significant finds using the MDA Object type Thesaurus together with their respective periods. If no features/finds were found, please state “none”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Modern 1901 to Present</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>Medieval 1066 to 1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>Modern 1901 to Present</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Iron Age -800 to 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select period...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Eriswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>ERL240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>0.7ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address (including postcode if possible)</td>
<td>Ersiwell 2 Site Extension Scheme, A1065, Eriswell,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Reference</td>
<td>TL 736 768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Originators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>OA EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Brief Originator</td>
<td>Rachael Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design Originator</td>
<td>Stephen Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Richard Mortimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Daria Tsybaeva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Archives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Archive</th>
<th>Digital Archive</th>
<th>Paper Archive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk CC</td>
<td>OAE</td>
<td>Suffolk CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL240</td>
<td>ERL240</td>
<td>ERL240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Archive Contents/Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal Bones</th>
<th>Physical Contents</th>
<th>Digital Contents</th>
<th>Paper Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Bones</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratigraphic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Bone</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Stone/Lithic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Digital Media

- ☑ Database
- ☑ GIs
- ☑ Geophysics
- ☑ Images
- ☑ Illustrations
- ☑ Moving Image
- ☑ Spreadsheets
- ☑ Survey
- ☑ Text
- ☑ Virtual Reality

### Paper Media

- ☑ Aerial Photos
- ☑ Context Sheet
- ☑ Correspondence
- ☑ Diary
- ☑ Drawing
- ☑ Manuscript
- ☑ Map
- ☑ Matrices
- ☑ Microfilm
- ☑ Misc.
- ☑ Research/Notes
- ☑ Photos
- ☑ Plans
- ☑ Report
- ☑ Sections
- ☑ Survey

### Notes:

---
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Figure 1: Site location
Figure 2: Trench plan.

Key:
- Limit of excavation
- Drawn section
- Break of slope
- Cut number
- Modern feature
- Prehistoric feature
Plate 1: Ditch 20, looking south.

Plate 2: Foundation trench 6, looking north.
Plate 3: Surface layer 24, looking east.

Plate 4: Posthole 18, looking east.
Plate 5: Trench 8, looking east.

Plate 6: Foundations of a house from POW camp Victoria, looking south.
Plate 7: Standing remains of a house from POW camp, looking south.

Plate 8: Standing remains of houses from POW camp, looking north-west.
Plate 9: Concrete surface, looking south.
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