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SUMMARY

Archaeological monitoring of pipeline work along the course of Peterborough South Trunk Main was undertaken by the Archaeology Field Unit, Cambridgeshire County Council. No archaeology was encountered during this monitoring although the Sites and Monuments Record records the presence of a Romano-British farmstead close to the easement.

The scheduled ancient monument 116, a Roman signal station was unaffected by this work, however the Romano-British farmstead partially excavated by the Fenland Archaeological Trust in 1989 was disturbed by an access road. This work occurred prior to our archaeological involvement, therefore no record of type of archaeology or level of deposit disruption exists.

1 INTRODUCTION

Monitoring of soil stripping for the Peterborough South Trunk Main at Haddon was undertaken by the Archaeological Field Unit, Cambridgeshire County Council on behalf of Anglian Water Services Ltd. Particular attention was paid to the area north of Haddon and to the north and east of Hill Farm and Haddon Lodge (TL135/944), where the pipeline route passes closest to scheduled ancient monument 116. This monument is believed to be a Roman signal station (Sites and Monuments Record no. 01335) overlooking Ermine Street, though it has been variously described as a prehistoric round barrow and windmill mound. To the south of Haddon Lodge the route passes close to the a Romano-British farmstead (SMR no.09748) excavated by the Fenland
Archaeological Trust in 1989 (French 1992). It is apparent from the Sites and Monument Record and recent excavations in the area that there was the high potential for the recovery of Roman archaeology.

2  **TOPOLOGY AND GEOLOGY**

The route of the pipeline extends down from the north-south aligned ridge at 50m OD running down to 20m OD along the western side of the A1. The geology of the area has been variously described as Boulder Clay on the 1877 Geological Survey map (CUL MAP. 35.0.31) and Jurassic and Cretaceous clays by the Soil Survey of England and Wales. This indicates variable geology, with slowly permeable heavy clay soils.

3  **METHODOLOGY**

Archaeological fieldwork was undertaken during March and April 1994. Work entailed the monitoring of topsoil stripping and pipelaying within an easement of 25m wide by contractors for Anglian Water Services Ltd. Due to the heavy soil types tracked bulldozers were used to strip the topsoil prior to trenching. This method was extremely restrictive offering very low level visibility to the archaeologist. Unsurprisingly no archaeology was encountered during monitoring of soil stripping, finds collected from the easement prior to and during stripping confirmed the absence of extensive or intensive Roman activities. The only finds recovered consisted of tile, brick and post-medieval pottery in close proximity to quarry pits located to the east of Haddon Lodge and adjacent to the A1 (TL 138943).
No archaeology was encountered within the easement, though the easement ran very close to both the signal station and the Roman farmstead near Haddon Lodge. Prior to the archaeological involvement a road of rubble and brick construction was built along the southern side of the A605, passing through the Roman farmstead. This work undoubtedly did significant damage to the archaeological remains and the full extent of Roman activities in the area remained unrecorded.

CONCLUSION

Topsoil stripping and pipelaying monitoring revealed no evidence for archaeology in the area beyond the Roman signal station and farmstead already recorded on the Sites and Monuments Record for Cambridgeshire. The methodology required for the brief for this particular project must be considered inadequate; the method of soil stripping only hindered archaeological involvement, whilst the contractor had undertaken significant ground works prior to the involvement of this Office. Given the known quality of the Romano-British farmstead and presuming knowledge of the access road it is believed that in this case an archaeological evaluation would have been justified in line with work undertaken on Anglian Water Service schemes in the Ely area.
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