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Summary

Between the 23rd and the 31st of January 2018 Oxford Archaeology East undertook an archaeological evaluation on land north of Mill Hill Garage, Wimblington Road, March (TL 4152 9398). Three trenches were excavated, which exposed a series of linear features, including a probable prehistoric ditch, two modern drainage ditches containing intact field drain pipes and several undated ditches, some of which are also likely to represent relatively recent drainage ditches.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of work

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology (OA) was commissioned by Brand Associates (on behalf of Whiting and Partners LLP) to undertake a trial trench evaluation at the site of Land North of Mill Hill Garage, Wimblington Road, March.

1.1.2 The work was undertaken as a condition of Planning Permission (planning ref. F/YR15/0961/F) in accordance to a brief commissioned by Gemma Stewart of the Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team (CCC HET; Stewart 2017). A written scheme of investigation was produced by OA detailing the methods by which OA proposed to meet the requirements of the brief (Macaulay 2017).

1.2 Location, topography and geology

1.2.1 The site lies to north of Mill Hill Garage, Wimblington Road, March

1.2.2 The area of proposed development consists of 0.46 hectares of undeveloped farmland that has been ploughed historically, before being acquired and left fallow. Topographically, the site lies on the of the fen island of March, at an elevation of c3.4m OD.

1.2.3 The geology of the area is mapped as Ampthill Clay overlain by superficial sands and gravels. The site lies on the southern edge of the gravel island of March, below the 5m contour (British Geological Survey 2014, (British Geological Survey online map viewer. http://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html)).

1.2.4 The soils on the site range from loamy to clayey soils (http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/).

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The following section provides a brief period summary of known heritage assets close to the site. This information is drawn from the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER), based on a 1km area around the site, and the location of relevant records are plotted on Fig. 1.

Previous Archaeological Investigations

1.3.2 Whilst there have not been any archaeological investigations within the area of the Site itself, there have been a number of significant archaeological investigations (evaluations and excavations) in the vicinity, c1km+ to the north. These include a number of archaeological interventions at the Neale-Wade Community College (ECB 3283 & 3360), which recorded ditches of Bronze Age, Iron Age and Medieval date. Archaeological evaluations at Jobs Lane to the west (ECB 3013) recorded Bronze Age pits, lithics and Roman ditches. Also on Jobs Lane, and backing
onto Wimblington Road, is a very significant multi-phased Roman settlement (ECB 1005, 1474, 1475, 3422 & 4279). Further north from the Site, Roman field systems were recorded off Upwell (Eastwood Cemetery) Road (MCB19340). Recent archaeological investigations of Barkers Lane, March has indicated that an enclosure previously known from cropmarks (CHER 11645) is of Middle Bronze Age date.

1.3.3 The most significant archaeological remains are a putative Roman villa complex which lies 800m to the north of the site (ECB1474, 3422) and to the southwest of this (i.e. closer to the site) lie a series of rectilinear enclosures (MCB23322). A chance find of a Roman Brooch and Roman pottery was recorded south of the site and roundabout off March Road, Wimblington (MCB 16741).

Prehistoric and Roman

1.3.4 The Cambridge HER identifies a number of Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman settlements sites in the vicinity. These remains (e.g. MCB 22642, 15352, 19571, 20107) have been recorded by the archaeological investigations detailed above. Indeed, almost all of the nearby archaeological finds have been generated by recent development-led archaeological investigations.

Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval

1.3.5 The site lies over 1km south of St Wendreda’s Church (06013, MCB 16846), known to date from at least the 14th century but with earlier 12th century remains.

1.3.6 The March Sconce, a Civil War Sconce (Fort) and a Scheduled Monument (of National Importance DCB241) lies 1500m north of the site.
2 EVALUATION AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 This evaluation aimed to establish the presence or absence of archaeological remains on the site, characterise where they are found (location, depth and extent), and establish the quality of preservation of any archaeology and environmental remains.

2.2 Research frameworks

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


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


2.3 Methodology

2.3.1 Three trenches were excavated, with a total length of 95m, providing a c. 4% coverage of the 0.46 ha development area.

2.3.2 Mechanical excavation was carried out by a tracked JCB excavator using a toothless ditching bucket under constant archaeological supervision.

2.3.3 Spoil, exposed surfaces and features were scanned with a metal detector. A bucket-sampling exercise was also undertaken whereby 90 litres of spoil from each soil horizon at the trench ends was hand sorted to characterise the artefact content.

2.3.4 All archaeological features were recorded using OA East’s pro-forma sheets. Trench locations, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour digital photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits.

2.3.5 Site conditions were overcast for the majority of the duration with the occasional heavy shower. This, along with the high water table, resulted in two of the three trenches (1 and 2) being flooded.

2.3.6 Due to the significant amount of water present across the site, and specifically due to flooding in trenches 1 and 2, a sump was dug using a tracked JCB excavator to the west of trench 2 to enable water to be pumped out of the trench and archaeological features to be investigated.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction and presentation of results

3.1.1 The results of the evaluation are presented below, and include a stratigraphic description of the trenches which contained archaeological remains. The full details of all trenches with dimensions and depths of all deposits are presented in Appendix A. Finds and environmental reports are included in Appendices B and C.

3.1.2 Context numbers reflect the trench numbers unless otherwise stated, e.g. pit 102 is a feature within Trench 1, while ditch 304 is a feature within Trench 3.

3.2 General soils and ground conditions

3.2.1 The soil sequence between all trenches was fairly uniform. The natural geology of sandy gravel was overlain by a mid grey brown clayey silt subsoil, which in turn was overlain by topsoil.

3.2.2 Ground conditions throughout the evaluation were extremely wet and trenches 1 and 2 flooded towards their western ends. Archaeological features, where present, were clearly visible with the dark and mid brown fill against the bright yellow orange of the gravel terrace on which the development site is located.

3.3 General distribution of archaeological deposits (Fig. 2)

3.3.1 Archaeological features were identified in all trenches and are described below.

3.4 Trench 1

3.4.1 Trench 1 (Plate 1) was 45m long and was located in the centre of the proposed development area, on an east to west alignment. This trench revealed two linear features, both sealed by a subsoil deposit (101).

3.4.2 Ditch 103 (Fig. 3, Section 5), was located at the eastern end of the trench, on a northeast to southwest alignment. It was found to be 0.87m wide and up to 0.33m deep, with steeply sloping sides and a concave base. This feature contained a single deposit of dark grey brown sandy clay with occasional small angular stones was excavated (104), no finds were recovered.

3.4.3 Ditch 105 (Plate 4) was located 8.8m from the western end of the trench, on a north to south alignment. It was 2.2m wide, up to 0.38m deep and had gently sloping sides and a concave base. A single deposit (106) of dark grey sandy clay with moderate small stones was excavated and several fragments of faunal bone were recovered, as well as a single piece of fired clay.
3.5 Trench 2

3.5.1 Trench 2 (plate 2) was 30m long and was located in the centre of the proposed development area, on a northwest to southeast alignment. This trench revealed one linear feature on a N-S alignment.

3.5.2 Ditch 203, is located 4.35m from the western edge of the trench on a N-S alignment and almost certainly represents the continuation of ditch 105, exposed in Trench 1 to the north. Ditch 203 was 2.1m wide and 0.27m deep, with gently sloping sides with a concave base. It contained a very dark grey sandy clay fill (204) which produced a single fragment of roe deer antler and two sherds of prehistoric pottery (19g), probably of Iron Age date (App. B).

3.6 Trench 3

3.6.1 Trench 3 (Plate 3) was 30m long and was located in the eastern part of the proposed development area, on a northeast to southwest alignment. This trench revealed four distinct linear features, all of which were sealed by subsoil (302).

3.6.2 Ditch/field drain 304 was located at the southwestern end of the trench. The ditch was aligned east to west, perpendicular to the nearby road. It measured 0.42m wide and 0.19m deep with steeply sloping sides and a concave base. It contained a single fill of mid grey brown sandy clay (305). An intact ceramic field drain pipe was found in the base of this feature.

3.6.3 Ditch 307 was located to the northeast of ditch 304, on an east to west alignment. It measured 0.64m wide and 0.26m deep, with moderately steep sides and a concave base (Fig. 3, Section 2). It contained a single deposit of mid grey brown sandy silt (308), which contained rare small rounded stones. A single small flake of worked flint was recovered from an environmental sample taken from this fill.

3.6.4 Ditch/field drain 309 was located towards the middle of the trench on an east to west alignment (Fig. 3, Section 3). It measured 1.18m wide and was excavated to a depth of 0.45m at which point an intact ceramic field drain pipe (311) was uncovered and further excavation was not possible without removing it. This feature contained a single deposit of dark brown grey sand silt (310).

3.6.5 Ditch 312 was located at the northeast end of the trench, on a north to south alignment. It was found to be 1.76m wide and 0.34m in depth. It contained a single mid grey brown deposit (313) of sandy silt, which contained frequent small angular and sub-angular stones and gravel.
3.7 Finds and environmental summary

3.7.1 The majority of the finds recovered came from Trenches 1 and 2, from the two sections excavated across what is very probably a single ditch running between the two trenches (105 and 203). Ditch 105 produced seven fragments (319g) of animal bone and a single fragment of fired clay (10g), whilst ditch 203 produced a single fragment of roe deer antler and two sherds of prehistoric pottery (19g).

3.7.2 A single small struck flint flake was recovered from an environmental sample taken from ditch 307, Trench 3.

3.7.3 Environmental samples were taken from features 103, 105, 203, 307 and 312 but none contained well-preserved or abundant charred plant remains.
4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Reliability of field investigation

4.1.1 The extremely wet ground conditions and site flooding impacted on the investigation. Despite this, archaeological features, distinguished by their mid to dark grey and brown colours, were clearly visible against the yellowy orange of the natural gravels and sands and pumping of excess water allowed all features to be investigated and the results of the evaluation are believed to have a good level of reliability.

4.2 Evaluation objectives and results

4.2.1 The aim of the evaluation was to establish the character, date and state of preservation of any archaeological remains within the proposed area of development as described in the Written Scheme of Investigation (Macaulay 2017).

4.2.2 The trenches revealed a small number of linear features. Two of these (304, 309) contained intact field drains and clearly represent relatively recent drainage features. Two sections of the ditches excavated in trenches 1 and 2 (105 and 203) appear to relate to a single feature which produced a small quantity of animal bone and prehistoric pottery. Three further ditches, 103 312 and 307 did not produce any dating evidence.

4.3 Interpretation

4.3.1 Ditches 105 and 203 appear to relate to a single broadly north to south aligned ditch crossing the western part of the site. Combined, these features produced a small assemblage of animal bone alongside 2 sherds of prehistoric pottery, tentatively dated to the Iron Age, and it seems likely that this feature forms part of a prehistoric enclosure or boundary. Ditch 312, some 70m to the east in Trench 3, shares a similar alignment and morphology with ditch 105/203 and, whilst undated, may be associated with this phase of activity.

4.3.2 Ditches/drains 304 and 309 both run perpendicular to the B1101 on an east-west alignment, both contained intact field drain pipes and can be dated to the post-medieval/modern period.

4.3.3 Ditch 103 and ditch 307 were on a different alignment to both the putative prehistoric features and the recent field drains. Ditch 103 was aligned northeast to southwest whilst 307 was broadly perpendicular to 103 on a northwest to southeast alignment. Both features share similar wide and shallow profiles with moderately steep sides and concave bases, and their fills were also similar. It is possible that these represent post-medieval/modern drainage channels, potentially converging and draining into a pit/pond to the north of the development area shown on early Ordnance Survey maps, although this remains speculative.
4.4 **Significance**

4.4.1 The most significant result of the evaluation was the identification of a probable prehistoric ditch in the western part of the evaluated area (105/203). Of the other features identified, two are demonstrably post-mediival/modern field drains and the other, undated, ditches may be of similar date and function.
## Trench Descriptions and Context Inventory

### Trench 1

**General description**
Trench 1 contained two ditches, one on a north-south alignment and one on a north-east to south-west alignment. These features were sealed by topsoil and subsoil, and overlie the natural geology of yellowy orange gravels with sandy lenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Cut of ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Fill of ditch</td>
<td>Bone, Fired Clay</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Cut of ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Fill of ditch</td>
<td>Bone, Fired Clay</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 2

**General description**
Trench 2 contained one ditch on a north to south alignment, sealed by topsoil and subsoil and overlying natural geology of yellowy orange gravel with sandy lenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Cut of ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Fill of ditch</td>
<td>Bone, Pottery</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trench 3

**General description**

Trench 3 contained four ditches, two with field drains in situ on an east to west alignment. Stratigraphically these features were sealed by topsoil and subsoil, which overlies natural geology of yellowy orange gravel with sandy lenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Cut of Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Fill of Ditch</td>
<td>Post medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Post medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Cut of ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Fill of ditch</td>
<td>Worked flint</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Cut of ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Fill of ditch</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Cut of ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Fill of ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Pottery

B.1.1 Two sherds of shell-tempered hand-made prehistoric pottery (19g) were recovered from an environmental sample (5) taken from deposit 204, fill of ditch 203. Although the pottery is not strongly diagnostic it is likely to be of Iron Age date (M. Brudenell pers comm).

B.2 Fired Clay

By Ted Levermore

B.2.1 A single fragment of amorphous fired clay (10g) was collected from context 106. It is made in an orange sandy fabric with common fine quartz and rounded voids and rare coarse sub-angular flint and sub-rounded calcareous pellets. One side is darkened to a dull brown suggesting a remnant surface, however there are no remaining diagnostic or structural traits.

B.3 Flint

B.3.1 A single flint chip was recovered from the residue of sample <1>, taken from context 308, fill of ditch 307, the flint is not chronologically diagnostic (L. Billington pers comm).

B.3.2 It is unlikely that this fragment has originated within this context due to the high amount of rooting present and the size of the piece makes it likely to be intrusive into this feature.
APPENDIX C  ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

C.1  Environmental Remains

By Rachel Fosberry

Introduction

C.1.1  Five bulk samples were taken from features within the evaluated area in order to assess the quality of preservation of plant remains and their potential to provide useful data as part of further archaeological investigations. Samples were taken from features encountered within Trenches 1 - 3 from undated ditch deposits.

Methodology

C.1.2  The total volume (up to 18L) of each of the samples was processed by tank flotation using modified Siraff-type equipment for the recovery of preserved plant remains, dating evidence and any other artefactual evidence that might be present. The floating component (flot) of the samples was collected in a 0.3mm nylon mesh and the residue was washed through 10mm, 5mm, 2mm and a 0.5mm sieve.

C.1.3  The dried flots were scanned using a binocular microscope at magnifications up to x 60 and an abbreviated list of the recorded remains are presented in Table 4. Identification of plant remains is with reference to the Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands (Cappers et al. 2006) and the authors' own reference collection. Nomenclature is according to Stace (1997)

Quantification

C.1.4  For the purpose of this initial assessment, items such as pottery and bone have been scanned and recorded qualitatively according to the following categories: # = 1-5 specimens

Results

C.1.5  The flots are comprised of untransformed rootlets and occasional seeds of goosefoot (Chenopodium sp.), dead-nettle (Lamium sp.) and poppy (Papaver sp.). The deposits were not considered to be waterlogged indicating that these remains must be modern contaminants.
Table 1: Environmental samples from ECB 5307

Discussion

C.1.6 The environmental samples from this site do not indicate that there is potential for the recovery of preserved plant remains. However, if further excavation is planned for this area, it is recommended that environmental sampling is carried out in accordance with Historic England guidelines (2011).

C.2 Faunal Remains

By Zoe Ui Choileain

Introduction

C.2.1 A small assemblage of animal bone was recovered from two ditch slots (105 and 203). Eight fragments of countable bone weighing 333g were recorded.

Methodology

C.2.2 Identification of the assemblage was undertaken with the aid of Schmid (1972) and the OAE reference collection. Preservation condition was evaluated using the 0-5 scale devised by Brickley and McKinley (2004 14-15).

Results

C.2.3 Both cattle and roe deer were present within the assemblage alongside a few bones from small mammals. Full results are presented in Table 2, below.
Discussion

C.2.4 The cattle bone most likely represents one individual. Tooth wear indicates an age of 50 weeks (Grant, 1982; 92) which is the most common time for animals to be butchered for consumption. The roe antler is attached to a fragment of skull. This indicates hunting rather than the gathering of shed antler.

Retention, Dispersal and Display

C.2.5 There is no further information to be gathered from this assemblage and unless further excavations are to take place the material is recommended for dispersal.
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**End of Fieldwork**
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**Project Reference Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>MARMIL18</td>
<td>F/YR15/0961/F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HER Number**
ECB 5307

**Prompt**
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Rural commercial

**Place in Planning Process**
After full determination (eg. As a condition)

**Techniques used (tick all that apply)**
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- ☐ Aerial Photography - new
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- ☐ Vibro-core
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<table>
<thead>
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<tr>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
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<tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fired Clay</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal bone</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Flint</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pottery</td>
<td>Late Prehistoric (- 4000 to 43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Cambridgeshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Fenland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER office</td>
<td>Cambridge County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>0.46ha</td>
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<tr>
<td>National Grid Ref</td>
<td>TL 4152 9398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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land at north of Mill Hill Garage, Wimblington Road, March PE15 0YB
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## Organisation
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- Project Brief Originator: Cambridge Historic Environment Team
- Project Design Originator: Stephen Macaulay
- Project Manager: Stephen Macaulay
- Project Supervisor: James Fairbairn

## Project Archives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Archive (Finds)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Archive (Finds)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Archive</td>
<td>OAE</td>
<td>MARMIL18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Archive</td>
<td>Cambridge County Council Stores</td>
<td>ECB5307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Physical Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Contents</th>
<th>Present?</th>
<th>Digital files associated with Finds</th>
<th>Paperwork associated with Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Bones</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Remains</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>
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<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Digital Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Media</th>
<th>Paper Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Aerial Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Context Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images (Digital photos)</td>
<td>Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrations (Figures/Plates)</td>
<td>Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Image</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreadsheets</td>
<td>Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Matrices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Reality</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photos (negatives/prints/slides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further Comments
Figure 1: Site location showing archaeological trenches (black) in development area (red), overlain with HER entries mentioned in the text.
Figure 2: Trench plan showing all features
Figure 3: Selected sections. Scale 1:10
Plate 1: Trench 1, view from east

Plate 2: Trench 2, view from south east

Plate 3: Trench 3, view from north east
Plate 4: Ditch 105, view from north

Plate 5: Ditch 203, view from south

Plate 6: Ditch 304, view from north