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Summary

In June 2018 Oxford Archaeology East (OA East) carried out an archaeological evaluation at 56-58 Chesterton Road, Cambridge (TL 4539 5948). A single trench measuring 5.2m x 1.1m was opened revealing a single northwest-southeast aligned post-medieval wall, a pit also dating to the post medieval period and two natural layers. The archaeological investigation determined that prior to the current building on site, there was likely another building that fronted onto Chesterton Road in the post-medieval period (late 17th century onwards), and the features discovered in the evaluation relate to this. Beneath these features was a layer, possibly an alluvial deposit as a result of the nearby river Cam flooding.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of work

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology (OA) was commissioned by Henry Riley LLP to undertake a trial trench evaluation at the site of 56-58 Chesterton Road Cambridge (TL 4539 5948).

1.1.2 The proposed development is for the demolition of the current building on site, followed by the construction of a mixed use residential and retail development. Currently the building on site occupies roughly three quarters of the site with a car park making up the remaining quarter. The proposed development will likely consist of the same amount of building and hard standing, though in an altered format.

1.1.3 The work was undertaken in advance of a planning application. A brief was set by the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team (CHET) outlining the Local Authority’s requirements for work necessary to inform the planning process (Stewart 2018). A written scheme of investigation was produced by OA detailing the methods by which OA proposed to meet the requirements of the brief (Gilmour and Firth 2018).

1.2 Location, topography and geology

1.2.1 The site lies approximately 120m northeast of the 19th century Victoria Avenue Bridge (MCB16516) over the river Cam in West Chesterton (Fig.1).

1.2.2 The geology of the area is mapped as bedrock Gault Formation Mudstone, overlain by superficial River Terrace deposits of sands and gravels. (http://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html) (Accessed 19/06/2018)

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

The archaeological and historical background of the site is based on data from the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER) (Fig.2).

Roman

1.3.1 There is reference to a probable Roman drain found on Chesterton Road (HER 04547) and recorded in T.C. Lethbridge’s excavation archive, although the exact location is not recorded. Roman inhumations, thought to be part of the Roman cemetery at Jesus Lane (HER CB15727) were unearthed at 11 Park Street during renovation works (HER CB15513).

Saxon and Medieval

1.3.2 Quarrying at Swan’s gravel pit on Milton Road during the 19th or early 20th century to the north-west of the site found evidence for a possible Anglo-Saxon burial ground. However other investigations have only shown evidence for post-medieval quarrying (ECB4515, ECB2891).

1.3.3 An investigation at Victoria Avenue to the south-west of the site revealed evidence for medieval activity (ECB1326). Another investigation on Victoria Avenue revealed no
archaeological evidence for pre-modern activity (ECB2961). At the Ashley hotel, evidence of activity dating from the 14th-16th centuries was uncovered (ECB5318).

**Post-medieval and modern**

1.3.4 An evaluation at Trinity Boat House revealed 4m deep alluvium but no archaeological evidence was recovered other than a sherd of 16th or 17th century pottery (ECB4158). Excavations in 1982 uncovered an 18th century kiln for the production of clay tobacco pipe and tiles at Thompsons Lane (HER ECB473)

1.3.5 An investigation elsewhere on Chesterton Road revealed only late Victorian and modern evidence (ECB4309).
2 Evaluation Aims and Methodology

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The project aims and objectives were as follows:

i. 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

ii. provide sufficient coverage to establish the character, condition, date and purpose of any archaeological deposits

iii. provide sufficient coverage to evaluate the likely impact of past land uses, and the possible presence of masking deposits

iv. provide – in the event that archaeological remains are found – sufficient information to construct an archaeological mitigation strategy, dealing with preservation, the recording of archaeological deposits, working practices, timetables, and orders of cost.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The methodology follows that set out in the WSI (Gilmour and Firth 2018)

2.2.2 A total of one trench measuring 5.23m by 1.1m was excavated across the footprint of the building. Machining was monitored under the supervision of a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist.

2.2.3 The trial trench was excavated by a mechanical excavator to the depth of geological horizons/the upper interface of any archaeological features or deposits. A toothless ditching bucket was used to excavate the trenches. Overburden was excavated in spits of no more than 0.1m thickness.

2.2.4 Spoil was stored alongside the trench, with the topsoil and subsoil separated to allow for sequential backfilling. The trench was not backfilled until permission had been obtained from the CHET.

2.2.5 The tops of archaeological deposits were first cleaned by machine, and then by hand. All excavation of features was done by hand.

2.2.6 Metal detecting was carried out after the tarmac had been removed and throughout the excavation.

2.2.7 Surveying was done using a survey-grade differential GPS (Leica CS10/GS08) fitted with “smartnet” technology with an accuracy of 5mm horizontal and 10mm vertical.

2.2.8 Where appropriate, feature sections were drawn at 1:20 or 1:10 scale and trench plans at 1:50 scale. All drawings included the following information: site name, site code, scale, plan or section number, context or feature numbers, orientation, date and the name of the archaeologist who prepared the drawings.

2.2.9 The photographic record comprises of high resolution digital photographs.

2.2.10 Registers of all contexts, trenches, drawings and photographs was kept.
2.2.11 All archaeological features and deposits were issued unique context numbers and documented on context sheets.

2.2.12 No deposits were encountered that were deemed appropriate for environmental sampling.
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 archaeology present in the single trench. The full details of the trench with dimensions and depths of all deposits can be found in Appendix A. Metal detecting did not locate any finds.

3.2 General soils and ground conditions

3.2.1 The natural geology of sandy gravel was overlain by a sandy silt deposit, which in turn was overlain by garden soil, all sealed under a concrete surface.

3.2.2 Ground conditions throughout the evaluation were generally good, and the trench remained dry throughout. Archaeological features, where present, were easy to identify against the underlying natural geology.

3.3 Bucket Sampling

3.3.1 Ninety litre bucket samples were taken from the various overlying deposits within the trench and hand sorted for the retrieval of artefacts, although this yielded no finds of archaeological importance.

3.4 Trench 1

3.4.1 Trench 1 (Fig.3, Plate 1) contained the remains of a single wall (3), a single pit (1) and two natural layers (4 and 5), sealed under modern concrete surface (6).

3.4.2 Buried soil (4) (Plate 2) directly overlay the natural across the entire extent of the trench and had a thickness of 0.34m, it was a mid reddish brown, clay silt, with frequent small sub-rounded stone inclusions. The deposit was devoid of any finds.

3.4.3 Pit 1 cut into layer (4), and was a sub-circular feature with moderate sloping sides, breaking into a concave base, measuring 0.5m diameter and 0.19m in depth. The feature was filled by a single deposit (2), a dark grey, sandy silt with occasional small sub-angular stone inclusions. Three fragments of CBM (0.378kg) were recovered from the fill, analysed on site and not retained.

3.4.4 Wall 3 (Plate 3) was built upon layer (4), and was a brick wall on a northwest-southeast alignment, measuring 0.21m in width, 0.28m in height and 1.87m of the walls length was observed in the confines of the trench. The wall was made of bricks measuring on average 110mm x 70mm x 230mm, laid in two regular the courses, the lower course had a header bond while the upper had a stretcher bond, the wall had northeast and southwest facings and was bonded with a mid yellowish brown sandy lime mortar that had small stone inclusions. The wall was laid on rubble foundations.

3.4.5 Layer (5) overlay pit 1 and abutted against wall 3, and was visible across the whole extent of the trench measuring 0.35m in thickness. The deposit was a dark brownish grey, silty clay, with occasional charcoal flecks and small gravel inclusions. The deposit contained no finds.
3.5  Finds summary

3.5.1  The only finds encountered were the three fragments of CBM from pit 1 (0.378kg), these were identified on site as being yellow/white Burwell type brick fragments with evidence of green plastering, dating to the late 17th or 18th century (Ted Levermore pers comm).

3.5.2  A complete brick (measuring 110mm x 70mm x 230mm, and weighing 2.720kg) was taken from wall 3 and identified on site as being a frogged brick, which were in use from the late 17th century onwards with the brick analysed likely dating to the 18th century (Ted Levermore pers comm).

3.5.3  Neither the CBM fragments or the brick were retained.
4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Reliability of field investigation

4.1.1 Archaeological features distinguished by their mid to dark grey and brown colours, were clearly visible within the evaluated area. Archaeological features and the buried soil layers were clearly distinct from the yellowish brown of the sand and gravel natural.

4.1.2 The absence of rain and good ground conditions ensured that standing water did not hinder the archaeological investigation.

4.1.3 For the above reasons, the results of this archaeological evaluation are believed to be reliable.

4.2 Evaluation objectives and results

4.2.1 The aims of this evaluation were: to establish the presence or absence of archaeological remains on the site and characterise where they are found, and to establish the character, date, condition and purpose of any archaeological deposits.

4.2.2 To evaluate the likely impact of past land uses and the possible presence of masking deposits.

4.3 Interpretation

4.3.1 Overlying the natural was layer (4), this was likely a naturally deposited layer, possibly an alluvial deposit formed as a result of the nearby river Cam flooding. This layer was devoid of any finds or other dating evidence.

4.3.2 Pit 1 and wall 3 were stratigraphically next in sequence above layer (4). Wall 3, has an alignment perpendicular to Chesterton road and is possibly the remains of a garden wall associated with a building that used to front onto Chesterton Road before being demolished and the current building on site was erected. The wall is certainly post-medieval in date, as the brick analysed on site from wall 3 is frogged, and frogged bricks were not introduced until the late 17th century, and it is possible the wall dates to much later than this; potentially as late as the 19th century.

4.3.3 Pit 1 yielded CBM that also dates from the late 17th century onwards, and may be contemporary with wall 3, possibly relating to the construction of wall 3, or structures nearby that wall 3 would have been associated with.

4.3.4 The features in Trench 1 were covered by deposit (5), likely a garden soil that was allowed to build up on the site over time, before finally being sealed over by the current modern surface (6) that serves as the car park to the current building on site.
APPENDIX A  TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench 1</th>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>N-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trench devoid of archaeology. Consists of topsoil and subsoil overlying natural geology of silty sand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. depth (m)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>1</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Fill of pit 1</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Buried Soil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Buried Soil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Concrete Surface</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX C  OASIS REPORT FORM

### Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OASIS Number</th>
<th>56-58 Chesterton Road, Cambridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Start of Fieldwork**: 18/06/2018  
**End of Fieldwork**: 19/06/2018  
**Previous Work**: No  
**Future Work**: Unknown

### Project Reference Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>ECB5442</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning App. No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER Number</td>
<td>ECB5442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Numbers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Techniques used (tick all that apply)

- ☐ 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
- ☐ Survey/Recording of Fabric/Structure
- ☒ Targeted Trenches
- ☐ Test Pits
- ☐ Topographic Survey
- ☐ Vibro-core
- ☐ Visual Inspection (Initial Site Visit)

### Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wall</th>
<th>Post Medieval (1540 to 1901)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Post Medieval (1540 to 1901)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Cambridgeshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER office</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Study Area</td>
<td>0.02ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Ref</td>
<td>TL 4539 5948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Address (including Postcode)

56-58 Chesterton Road  
Cambridge  
Cambridgeshire  
CB4 1AA

### Project Originators

| Organisation | Oxford Archaeology East |
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<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>
<td>Environmental</td>
<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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aerial Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>Context Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images (Digital photos)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrations (Figures/Plates)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Image</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreadsheets</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matrices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Reality</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photos (negatives/prints/slides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sections</td>
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