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SUMMARY

In July 2004, an archaeological field evaluation took place on land to the south of Gilsland, Northumberland (centred on NY 6364 6608), across the line of the Vallum and the putative line of the Stanegate. The northern edge of the proposed development area lies within the World Heritage Site and Scheduled Monument of Hadrian’s Wall, Vallum, section of the Stanegate Roman road and a Roman temporary camp between the B6318 road and the Poltress Burn in Wall miles 46 and 47 (SM 26071). The works were in response to a proposed planning application for the construction of a football field development on the site; English Heritage, in consultation with the Conservation Team of Northumberland County Council, required that a preliminary site inspection and an archaeological evaluation be undertaken to investigate the survival of archaeological remains within the study area. The results will inform decisions on approval of the planning application, as to mitigation of the archaeological remains either in situ or by record.

The site inspection demonstrated that no clearly visible evidence existed of the Vallum, the earthworks of which presumably have been ploughed out or destroyed in the past. A faint earthwork was discerned running along the inner north-west edge of the hill-slope; this earthwork appeared slightly terraced into the slope, and was broadly flat, sloping gently away to the north-west. The earthwork was identified as a probable ancient track, potentially the line of the Stanegate. The track was overlain at its southern end by a post-medieval track, which ran upslope towards Lawn Top farmhouse. To the south and south-west of this, faint evidence of ridge-and-furrow was seen along the top of the hill; this was regular and straight, and presumably relates to post-medieval steam ploughing. To the north-west of the farm, a series of earthworks, presumably either a hollow way or grubbed out field boundary, was identified.

The evaluation trenching comprised a total length of 42m divided into four trenches, targeting areas of impact and archaeological significance. These were situated towards the northern and eastern ends of the proposed development area, close to the location of the Vallum ditch and the putative line of the Stanegate. However, the evaluation was likely only to sample the south mound of the Vallum and possibly its ditch.

The results of the trenching were mixed. Two trenches, Trenches 1 and 3, showed no obvious archaeological evidence, revealing only the natural glacial geology. Trench 2, however, uncovered a large compact stone cobble surface across its length, which produced medieval pottery from within the stonework. This correlates with the ancient track identified during the survey running along the lower edge of the hill, which could be of medieval or earlier date. The track has been tentatively identified as a section of the Stanegate, presumably still extant during the medieval period, though further examination of the surface would be required to confirm this. Trench 4 uncovered a large bank of redeposited natural gravel approximately 5m across; this was sectioned and shown to lie on a spread of grey clayey silt, with turf-lines visible in section along its edge. This was tentatively identified as the south mound of the Vallum.

The results of the evaluation suggested that the majority of the proposed redevelopment area had been truncated by ploughing or else deliberately destroyed, but that there was still the likelihood of significant below-ground archaeological remains
being present, in the form of the Vallum and the ancient track, which may be a section of the Stanegate.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PROJECT

1.1.1 Planning permission is being sought by The Russell Foxcroft Recreational Trust for the development of a football pitch and changing facilities on land on the southern edge of Gilsland, Northumberland (NY 6364 6608). The northern end of the site (Fig 2) lies partially within the Hadrian’s Wall World Heritage Site and Scheduled Monument (SM 26071). Initial consultations with Tynedale District Council, English Heritage and the Conservation Team at Northumberland County Council raised no fundamental objections to the development, but the presence of considerable archaeological potential within the area required an archaeological evaluation to be undertaken in the first instance, to establish the presence or absence of archaeological remains in the development footprint. The results of the evaluation would then inform decisions to be taken regarding any application for planning permission for the development, and would suggest mitigation measures designed to preserve any archaeological remains in situ or by record. This process is in line with current government advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning (PPG16; DoE 1990).

1.1.2 English Heritage, in conjunction with Northumberland County Council, requested that Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) submit proposals for an evaluation of the development area. OA North provided a project design (Appendix 2) in accordance with a project brief (Appendix 1) produced by English Heritage. This project design was approved by the Hadrian’s Wall Archaeologist for English Heritage and OA North was subsequently commissioned to undertake the work in July 2004.

1.1.3 This document sets out the results of the preliminary site inspection and the archaeological evaluation in the form of a short report. It outlines the historical findings and observations made during the programme of work, followed by an assessment of the impact of the proposed development.
2. BACKGROUND

2.1 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1.1 The village of Gilsland stands on the border between Northumberland and Cumbria, on the watershed between two major river systems; the River Irthing flows past the village towards the west to enter the Eden, whilst the Tipalt Burn to the east enters the South Tyne (Countryside Commission 1998). The village lies within a narrow but distinctive lowland corridor, which separates the North Pennines from the Border forests (ibid.). Previously the village had been known as Rose Hill, after a prominent outcrop, which was levelled to make way for the railway station (LUAU 1999a). North of the village is the land known as the Bewcastle Waste (ibid), characterised by upland moorland, with mixed heather, rough grasslands, blanket bog and a network of small streams and mosses; the coniferous forest of Spadeadam lies within this area, and is used for military purposes (Countryside Commission 1998).

2.1.2 The site lies at approximately 155m aOD at the base of the valley, rising to 170m aOD at the top of the south-eastern slope. The underlying solid geology consists of sedimentary rocks of the Carboniferous age, a repetitive succession of limestones, sandstones and shales belonging to the Middle or Upper Limestone Groups (ibid). The drift geology consists of melt-out debris and fluvio-glacial deposits dating from the Devensian period, predominantly boulder clay or till (Countryside Commission 1998).

2.1.3 The development site (NY 6364 6608) is situated in a rectangular pasture field, orientated north-east/south-west, to the south of the hamlet of Crooks in the southern part of Gilsland (Fig 2). The topography of the site consists of a long area of level ground, approximately 25m across, and the base of a gentle glacial valley, broadly corresponding to the north-western boundary of the field. To the north-west, in the adjacent field, the land rises gently to form a low hill and the north-western side of the valley, just south of the known line of the Vallum. South-east of the level ground, the ground rises steeply, forming a steep slope along the central north-east/south-west axis of the field and the south-eastern side of the valley. The gradient of the slope eases towards the south-eastern field boundary, and levels off again to the south of Lawn Top farm.

2.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.2.1 The Stanegate System: by the turn of the first and second centuries AD, the Roman armies had formally withdrawn from Scotland to the Tyne-Solway isthmus, as a consequence of a series of crises which had required Domitian (AD 81-96) to regroup his forces in order to meet his needs on the European mainland. The withdrawal was seen as a reduction of commitments rather than a disaster, and the concept that the Roman empire actually possessed limits began to emerge (Breeze and Dobson 2000). Tacitus states in his Histories (AD 105): ‘Britain was totally conquered, then immediately let go’ (quoted in Breeze and Dobson 2000). The final withdrawal could have been under
Domitian (murdered in AD 96), Nerva (died in AD 98) or Trajan (AD 98-117) (Breeze and Dobson 2000).

2.2.2 The Tyne-Solway isthmus was the first possible strategic frontier line south of Scotland. A road between the Tyne and the Solway was already in existence by the Trajanic period, having seemingly been built under Quintus Petillius Cerialis, governor of Britain from AD 71 to 74, or one of his successors (Shotter 1997). The road, later named the Stanegate or ‘stony street’ in medieval times, linked two forts between Corbridge to the east and Carlisle to the west, both of which guarded major river crossings. Further extensions to this road are postulated to the east and west of these points, but are not proven. To the west, the Solway Firth was probably a significant enough barrier and required no further defences, though a road is postulated running west to the fort at Kirkbride. To the east, the River Tyne would also have been a significant obstruction to movement, though a road is postulated heading for the fort at Washing Well and on to South Shields. The Stanegate ran through a natural gap formed by the valleys of the Irthing and the Tyne, and at first existed as a strategic road rather than a frontier. The road was provided with forts at one-day marching intervals (around 13 miles), to protect troop movement and supply convoys, and to allow safe over-night accommodation. The main forts in the area of Gilsland were at Vindolanda to the east and Nether Denton to the west (Breeze and Dobson 2000).

2.2.3 Emperor Trajan was, like Domitian, a conqueror and ambitious for military glory, but had little interest in Britain. His military priorities were the conquest of Dacia and Parthia, and he may have wanted some form of stability in Britain in order to utilise his resources better elsewhere. He accepted the Stanegate as the furthest possible line of advance, and probably used some of the frontier devices he had already used elsewhere. These were in the form of watchtowers, small forts and fortlets manned by numeri (irregular units), with the road used as a frontier in lieu of a major river as a convenient boundary. It is suggested that, under Trajan, forts were built in the gaps between those already existing at Corbridge, Vindolanda, Nether Denton and Carlisle along the Stanegate, at half-day intervals (further small forts where built were local conditions justified them). These are thought to be (from east to west) at Newbrough, Haltwhistle Burn, Carvoran, Throp and Brampton Old Church. The provision of extra forts and fortlets allowed localised patrolling, observation of natives crossing the frontier and a close military presence to any point on the road. Throp, a small fort approximately 500m to the west of the development area, measured 61m by 59.4m. It was built as the base for a patrolling unit, and was not designed to hold more than a handful of troops (ibid). It is suggested that the fortlets served as control-posts for sectors of the Stanegate system (Birley 1961).

2.2.4 To guarantee an effective frontier control, more fortlets would have been needed, and watchtowers would have been essential (as for proved systems like the Gask Ridge or the Raetian border, which have a close spacing of watchtowers). Only five possible watchtowers are known in the area, at Pike Hill, Birdoswald and Walltown Crags (which became Turret 44b), on the later
line of Hadrian’s Wall, and at Mains Rigg and Barcombe, and little evidence exists of these. The frontier system gradually stabilised into permanence along this line, with forts rebuilt in stone, Corbridge in c AD 103, Vindolanda and Carlisle around AD 105 (Breeze and Dobson 2000).

2.2.5 The Stanegate system was not efficient enough to police the local tribes of the Brigantes, Selgovae, and Novantae effectively. It is suggested that there may also have been interaction between the Brigantes (within Roman Provincial territory) and the Selgovae (in lowland Scotland). British threats to the empire had become pressing at the beginning of Hadrian's reign; this is indicated by his biographer who mentions that ‘the Britons could not be kept under control’ (ibid).

2.2.6 Hadrian’s Wall and the Vallum: it was against this background that Hadrian succeeded Trajan in AD 117. His political aims were completely contrary to those of Trajan, who had been keen on conquering new lands. Hadrian was by contrast a consolidator, whose aim was to halt the expansion of the Roman Empire. He returned the territories of Mesopotamia, Syria and Parthia that had been conquered by his predecessor. In AD 121, he travelled the provinces to check the status of the army; he wished to have a well-trained and disciplined army in order to maintain order, and he developed elaborate frontier systems on all edges of the empire (ibid).

2.2.7 In AD 122, Hadrian visited Britain, installing a new governor, Aulus Platorius Nepos. It is thought that Hadrian’s Wall was started at this time under the governor’s direction, between AD 122 and AD 126 (Margary 1973; Collingwood Bruce 1978). There is no clear evidence when the Wall was finished, but it was certainly completed by the end of Hadrian's reign. The original plan for the Wall was to keep the forts of the Stanegate, with the Wall secured only by milecastles and turrets, running some miles north of the military road. Approximately 250m west of the development area, the well-preserved remains of the Poltross Burn Milecastle (MC 48) are visible (LUAU 1999a).

2.2.8 In c AD 124, there was a change in plan under the direction of Aulus Platorius Nepos. The decision was taken to attach the forts directly to the Wall; 12 new forts for whole auxiliary units, varying in size from 1.3ha to 3.7ha, were built. This was a great deal of additional work, causing changes in design to the finished Wall and milecastles and adding years to the construction process. The building of those forts can clearly be seen as a later decision as some of these replaced existing milecastles and turrets (such as at Housesteads). The decision was made to ensure better access to the areas north of the Wall for the military forces; those forts lying astride the Wall, such as Haltonchesters and Rudchester in the east, had three of four main gates north of Hadrian's Wall which provided unrestricted access to these areas. The forts were spaced at fairly regular c 12km intervals along the Wall to provide fighting forces in every sector of the frontier (Breeze and Dobson 2000).

2.2.9 Shortly after the construction of Hadrian's Wall was begun, a large earthwork was also constructed, which followed along almost the full length of the Wall
This earthwork, known as the Vallum, consisted of a continuous steep-sided trench, 3m deep and 6m wide with a 2.4m wide flat base (unlike the ditch fronting the Wall which seems to have had a normal Roman military V-shaped profile for much of its line). A 6m wide bank of upcast revetted with turf about 3m high was erected on either side of the ditch, which ran centrally between the two banks and was separated from them by a 3m wide space or berm. The overall dimensions of the entire construction was 36m (Collingwood Bruce 1978). The Vallum is thought to have been built at the same time or shortly after the decision to move the forts onto the Wall line. The line of the Vallum clearly extends around the south side of the Wall forts (such as at Birdoswald, 2km to the west of the development area), or avoids the forts completely, except at Carrawburgh where the Vallum was destroyed to allow the construction of the fort. The decision to excavate the Vallum perhaps indicates times of heightened tension in the Wall area; it is thought that the Vallum was intended to mark-out a kind of rearward boundary or "exclusion zone" behind the Wall, as it was not topped by either a palisade or a rampart walk (ibid). At the points where it passed the forts and milecastles on the Wall, the Vallum ditch was left uncut, and there was a corresponding gap in both banks, forming a causeway which carried the road issuing from the porta decumana (rear gate) of the fortification. Originally these causeways were associated with each milecastle, approximately 79 in all, but the decision was rapidly made to reduce these crossings to only 14. These crossings were usually right next to forts and thus increased their control of movement (ibid; Breeze and Dobson 2000).

2.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.3.1 Hadrian's Wall, the Vallum and the Stanegate have been subject to extensive archaeological interest in the Gilsland area since at least the nineteenth century, though the results of excavations have not always been fully published. Much of the Roman Wall which extends through Gilsland was probably removed to assist in the construction of the medieval Thirlwall Castle and only a short section of the Wall remains visible in the Vicarage garden, although there is a section to the west of Gilsland which is one of the best preserved sections in Cumbria (LUAU 1999a; Collingwood Bruce 1978).

2.3.2 Only limited information on the excavations is now available, from journals and other sources; very little excavation has been carried out on the Stanegate, for example, since the 1960s (Rachel Newman pers comm). More recently, the most extensive excavations undertaken in this area have been confined to Birdoswald fort, approximately 2km west of the site, which has seen excavation of the north-west corner of the fort (in 1987 to 1992, and 1997 to 1999), and sections excavated across the Vallum (in 1996, and more recently at Appletree in 1999) (see Wilmott 1997 for the early excavation seasons). Listed below are only those excavations directly relating to the development area. Most excavation regarding the construction of the Wall (for example, the excavations of Poltross Burn milecastle in the 1930s by FG Simpson (Simpson et al 1936)) have been omitted, as they fall outside the remit of this report, which is concerned mainly with the Stanegate and the Vallum.
2.3.3 The most extensive excavations relating to the development area were undertaken in 1910, on the Stanegate fort at Throp (Simpson 1913; Birley 1961; Collingwood Bruce 1978). It was found to be of very similar dimensions, form and date to the fort at Haltwhistle Burn, having entrances on the north-east and south-east sides, the latter leading to the Stanegate approximately 80m away. Little remained of internal structures, which were presumably of timber construction, only rough flagging, pitched stone and a series of hearths being recovered. Based on the little pottery evidence, the fort was thought to be of Hadrianic date or earlier, presumably fitting with the Stanegate construction and usage. The fort was reused briefly in the fourth century AD. (The fort has since been heavily truncated by ploughing, and little probably now remains).

2.3.4 The line of the Stanegate was also traced during the excavation season of 1910 (Simpson 1913). A crossing point was discovered over Poltross Burn east of Throp fort, and the road was traced for 75 feet (22.5m) east of the stream, running towards the field boundary immediately south-west of the development area, and south of the western field. Excavations near the Burn revealed that the outer edge of the road had been levelled up with clay, upon which a foundation of large stones was placed. The line was obliterated by ploughing in the field west of the development area, and within the development area itself (op cit, 383), although it was postulated around the hill in the field to the north-west of the development area, where a shallow terrace or embankment was visible running along the western edge of the hill. Trenching revealed some large stones, but little clear evidence of the road, though the postulated line was maintained due to the need for it to join known stretches east of the road to the east of the development area. The line postulated by Simpson is the line currently marked on the present-day Ordnance Survey (OS) maps.

2.3.5 West of Poltross Burn, the line was visible extending for around 200 feet (60m), as a well-preserved section of road, though all traces of kerbing had been removed. The road extends on to join the modern track passed Throp farm, which continues to Upper Denton and on to the Stanegate fort at Nether Denton (op cit, 384). More recently, descriptions of the line of the Stanegate between Carvoran and Carlisle indicate that the road can only be traced from Carvoran as far as an area to the south of Gap Farm, approximately 400m east of the development area, where it is lost; the road only reappears again on the east side of Upper Denton, approximately 1.5km west of the development area (Margary 1973, 447). This suggests the line of the Stanegate has since been lost to ploughing or is no longer visible.

2.3.6 An evaluation and geophysical survey was undertaken of a proposed housing development on the site of the former cattle-mart to the south of the Station Hotel, and north of Hadrian’s Wall (LUAU 1999a). Slight evidence was uncovered of the northern counterscarp of Hadrian’s Wall at the southern end of the site, but the cattle mart had obliterated most archaeological evidence in this area.

2.3.7 The opening of the Hadrian’s Wall Path National Trail in 2003 saw extensive watching briefs undertaken by OA North, in its former guise as LUAU, at Gilsland. Those of closest association were those to the south of the Station Hotel and 120m north of the development area (LUAU 1998), and at Poltross...
Burn milecastle (MC48), 250m to the west (LUAU 1999b). These watching briefs yielded little in the way of archaeological evidence, as the works only concerned the excavation of small holes for fences, kissing-gates and signposts.

2.3.8 The development area itself was evaluated by Paul Austen in 1999 on the line of the Stanegate as shown on the OS mapping (west-north-west of the current evaluation area), though no formal report or plan exists of these works (Mike Collins pers comm). The evaluation did not reveal any archaeological deposits and suggested that there was generally a low potential for the survival of archaeology. The possibility was raised that the site of the Stanegate alignment might therefore be further south than previously thought, along the base of the valley (where the current works have now concentrated).

2.4 **MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK**

2.4.1 The entire length of Hadrian's Wall and its immediate environs has been designated a World Heritage Site, and as such appreciation of the extent and importance of the archaeology is necessary for its curation and conservation. *The Hadrian's Wall Management Plan* (English Heritage 1996, updated 2001) for the first time sets out a framework whereby the World Heritage Site is to be managed and conserved. It is, however, acknowledged that the exact course of the Wall, and the quality or nature of its survival, is still unknown in a number of places.

2.4.2 The Management Plan delineates not only the extent of the area encompassed as a series of Scheduled Monuments, but also recommends an agreed setting (or buffer zone) around these monuments. At present these scheduled areas are protected by the 1979 Ancient Monument and Archaeological Areas Act; however, the zone constituting the setting is not. In neither area is there any restriction to established agricultural operations because of existing Class Consents. The Management Plan (*op cit*, 23) states that unscheduled archaeological sites have protection from development through the procedure set out in *Planning Policy Guidance Note 16* (PPG16). It is the very northern end of the proposed development area which is protected as part of the scheduled area, and the remainder of the site protected under PPG16.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 PROJECT DESIGN

3.1.1 A project design (Appendix 2) was submitted by OA North in response to a request from English Heritage for an archaeological evaluation and site inspection of the study area. It was designed in accordance with a project brief (Appendix 1) by English Heritage and Northumberland County Council. The project design was adhered to in full; all variations to the project design were made in consultation with English Heritage on site. All work was otherwise consistent with the relevant standards and procedures of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, and generally accepted best practice.

3.2 SITE INVESTIGATION

3.2.1 A rapid survey was undertaken of the surviving earthworks and other above-ground evidence within and immediately adjacent to the proposed development area. A site grid, located with respect to the OS National Grid was established (Appendix 2), and a close examination of the surface was systematically undertaken. The earthworks were recorded using total station recording equipment. The survey data was drawn up in the field and was superimposed into an industry standard CAD system (AutoCad Release 14) with digitised data from Ordnance Survey mapping at 1:2500, and is shown in Figure 4.

3.3 TRIAL TRENCHING

3.3.1 Initially, two 5m long trenches and two 10m long trenches were required by the client (Appendix 1), targeted to where the archaeological potential was perceived to be greatest and on areas of impact from the proposed development (Fig 3). Trench 1, approximately 10m in length, was positioned to examine the zone to the south-east of the development area likely to be affected by regrading. Trench 2, approximately 5m in length, was positioned to examine the zone to the east of the development area likely to be affected by the proposed sports pavilion. Trench 3, approximately 10m in length, was positioned to examine the zone to the east of the development area likely to be affected by the car park and drainage works. Trench 4, approximately 5m in length, was positioned to examine the zone to the north-east of the development area likely to be affected by the access route. All trenches had the potential to uncover evidence of the Stanegate, with the latter trench also having the potential to uncover evidence of the Vallum. Variations were made to Trenches 2 and 4, during the course of machining and with the approval of the English Heritage Hadrian’s Wall Archaeologist. Both trenches were extended, by 5m west-north-westwards and 7m southwards respectively, in order to clarify results obtained within the trenches during machining.

3.3.2 The final arrangement of the trenches is shown in Figure 3 and was accurately located by total station surveying; Trenches 1, 2 and 3 measured approximately 10m by 1.5m, and Trench 4 measured approximately 12m by 1.5m.
3.3.3 The trenches were excavated by a JCB 3CX mechanical excavator, employing a 1.5m wide toothless ditching bucket, working under full archaeological supervision. Mechanical excavation continued down to the level of the first potentially significant archaeological deposit, or to natural deposits, whichever was uppermost. All subsequent excavation was undertaken manually.

3.3.4 All the trenches were cleaned in their entirety, and displaced material (stored in appropriate spoil-heaps at the sides of the trenches) was scanned for the presence of archaeological artefacts and other potentially significant materials.

3.3.5 All finds recovered were bagged and recorded by context number; all significant finds were retained and have been processed and temporarily stored according to standard practice (following the Institute of Field Archaeologists guidelines).

3.3.6 Recording was by means of the standard OA North context recording system, where there were features and trench recording system where no features were recorded, with supporting registers and indices etc. A full photographic record in colour slide and monochrome formats was made, and scaled plan and section drawings were made of the trenches at appropriate scales where necessary.

3.3.7 On completion of the site works, the trenches were backfilled to the instructions of the client, but not otherwise reinstated.

3.4 ARCHIVE

3.4.1 A full professional archive has been compiled in accordance with the project design (Appendix 2) in a manner currently accepted as best practice.

3.4.2 The paper and digital archive will be deposited in the Northumberland Record Office in Morpeth, and a copy of this report, together with an index to the archive, will be sent to Northumberland County Council, for inclusion in their Sites and Monuments Record, and to English Heritage. The Society of Antiquaries Museum, Newcastle, will receive the material archive.
4. SURVEY RESULTS

4.1 SITE INVESTIGATION

4.1.1 The preliminary site investigation demonstrated that, despite some heavy ploughing in the area, archaeological evidence still existed in parts of the development area in the form of shallow earthworks. The effect of this ploughing is visible through the absence of any evidence of the Vallum ditch or the south mound in either the development area or the field to the north-west, as both should still be visible at the northern ends of both these fields. The earthworks have presumably been deliberately infilled and/or flattened prior to the use of the fields for arable purposes. The Vallum and its south mound are clearly visible to the east of the road, east of the development area, as fairly large earthworks running east for approximately 1km. Most evidence of the Vallum to the north-west of the development area has now been destroyed, with the first visible earthworks being approximately 600m north-west near Gilsland School (see Figure 2 for location). None of the earthworks listed below are visible on the First Edition Ordnance Survey (OS) map of 1863, which shows a similar picture for the development area to that shown on modern OS maps.

4.1.2 Ancient Track: the first earthwork to be noted was the line of an ancient track which ran approximately for 80m along the north-western base of the steep slope, which itself runs north-east/south-west across the centre of the development area (see Figure 4 and Plate 1). The track appears to be cut into the edge of the hill, forming a sharp break of slope at its base. The earthwork is visible as a broad flat area, approximately 3m to 4m across, with a slight camber down its centre line. On its north-western side, the track slopes off gently north-westwards for approximately 2m, where a fairly pronounced break of slope at the base indicates where the track ends on the base of the valley floor. The maximum height of this earthwork appears to be no more than 0.5m from the valley floor to the base of the hill. The track peters out at its northern end, approximately 30m from the north-eastern field boundary. The southern end of the track is overlain by a modern farm track which runs east-west (see below).

4.1.3 Farm Track: the line of a post-medieval or modern farm track is visible as a low mound running west to east from the north-western boundary of the development area for 10m, to the base of the steep slope (Fig 4). The bank is approximately 0.5m in height. At the base of the slope, the bank overlies the ancient track (see 4.1.2), and turns sharply east-north-east. The track runs obliquely up the slope in the direction of Lawn Top farmhouse (seen on Figure 2); approximately 2m to 3m wide, it cuts into the edge of the slope forming a slight terrace, approximately 0.5m high. The track peters out on the high ground near the farm, but cart tracks and ruts are still visible near to the farm on the line of the track.

4.1.4 Ridge and Furrow: a small group of cultivation furrows, at equal spacing of approximately 2m and very low and slight (no more than 0.3m high), are
visible along the gently sloping ground directly above the sharp hill-slope on the south and south-eastern edges of the development area (Fig 4). The furrows run from the south-east field boundary on a north-west to south-east alignment, and are partially obscured by heavy nettle growth in places. These do not appear to be of medieval date, lacking the aratral sinuous curves of ploughing by oxen. They are likely to be the result of steam ploughing relating to eighteenth and nineteenth century enclosure and land improvement activity on the higher ground and moorland south and south-east of the village.

4.1.5 **Grubbed-out Field Boundary and/or Hollow Way:** towards the eastern side of the field, and running along the top of the steep hill, is a series of earthworks either relating to a hollow way or a grubbed out field boundary (Fig 4). The earthworks extend westwards out of the north-east boundary of the development area, but may originally have followed the sinuous curve to the east which runs eastwards to Lawn Top farmhouse. The western end of the earthworks is lost in the gorse bushes, prevalent in the centre of the development area, but does not appear to extend westwards beyond them. The earthworks consist of a ‘ditch’ or ‘hollow way’ approximately 1m deep cutting into the slope, approximately 2.5m across, with a bank on the north-west side. Some remnants of fencing were observed within the ditch but these could have come from replacement of the north-eastern boundary (which appears to have happened recently). The earthworks could relate to an early post-medieval hollow way up to the farmhouse at Lawn Top, perhaps predating the later track (see above 4.1.3). They could equally be the remnants of the north-western boundary of a strip-field, probably of early post-medieval date, mirrored on the south-eastern side by the current boundary of the development area, which has a similar curve to it. These earthworks probably relate to the first encroachments by the village onto the wastelands to the south and south-west.

4.1.6 **Significance:** the evidence would suggest that the area has been significantly levelled, either by ploughing in recent years or to increase availability of land. This is visible from the remnants of plough-furrows discovered during the site investigation and the destruction of the Vallum ditch and south mound to the north of the development area. Earthworks are still visible within the field, albeit only on a very slight scale. The only earthworks of any significant date are those associated with the ancient track, which is further discussed below, and any remaining earthworks are of post-medieval or modern date.
5. EVALUATION RESULTS

5.1 TRENCH 1

5.1.1 Trench 1 was 9.7m long by 1.5m wide, orientated approximately north-south (Fig 3; Plate 2). It was positioned at the western corner of the development area, immediately north-west of Lawn Top farmhouse and west of the bungalow of Broom Garth. The maximum depth of the trench was 0.58m.

5.1.2 The machining removed 0.58m of dark orangey-brown to greyish-brown friable clayey-silt topsoil, containing rare sub-rounded pebbles no greater than 100mm. The depth of the topsoil varied across the trench, being deepest at its centre and shallowing off at the north and south ends of the trench to 0.35m. The removal of the topsoil exposed the natural drift geology, which varied slightly across the trench base. In the northern half of the trench, the natural material was a soft mottled orange, cream and pink silty-clay, containing very occasional pebbles; the southern half was much stonier, containing moderate to frequent sub-rounded pebbles no greater than 200mm in a soft pinkish-brown silty-clay matrix. A rapid investigation showed the southern stony layer to be running beneath the clayey layer to the north. A land drain was visible bisecting the stony material and running in a north-west/south-east alignment.

5.1.3 No evidence of any cut archaeological features was found in the base of Trench 1, and no archaeological artefacts were found during excavation.

5.2 TRENCH 2

5.2.1 Trench 2 was originally 5m long by 1.5m wide, orientated west-north-west/east-south-east (Fig 3; Plates 3, 4 and 5). Following discovery of archaeological remains, discussions with the Hadrian’s Wall Archaeologist (Mike Collins pers comm) led to the trench being extended by 5m on its west-north-western end to clarify the origins of the deposits exposed. The revised length was 10m by 1.5m. It was machine-excavated to the south-west of Trench 3, and to the south of Trench 4, at the base of the steep hill-slope. The maximum depth of the trench was 0.86m (Fig 5).

5.2.2 The machining removed the topsoil, 16, a dark greyish-brown friable clayey silt and turf containing occasional sub-angular and sub-rounded stone no greater than 30mm, to a depth of 0.26m. This overlay a colluvial deposit, 17, a mid brownish-orange friable clayey-silt containing occasional rounded and sub-rounded stones no greater than 30mm, to a depth of 0.55m. This deposit was at its deepest at the west-north-western end of the trench, being only 0.25m deep at its east-south-eastern end.

5.2.3 At the base of the trench, an extensive layer of well-compacted stone, 19, in a pale creamy-grey soft silty-sand matrix, 20, was uncovered (Fig 5; Plates 4 and 5). The stones in this layer varied from 20mm to 350mm in size at the east-south-eastern end, becoming smaller, around 20mm to 150mm, at its west-north-western end. Two sherds of medieval pottery were recovered from the stone’s matrix. The stone layer extended for the full length of the trench,
though it was partially truncated at the west-north-western end of the trench by the machining. Between colluvial deposit 17 and stone layer 19, an interface layer, 18, was revealed, comprising frequent small sub-rounded and sub-angular stone no greater than 30mm, with less frequent larger stones, no greater than 100mm, in a mixed mid orange and grey loose gritty silty-sand matrix. This was possibly a disturbed upper metalled surface, as identified in section. It extended from the east-south-eastern end of the trench for approximately 5m to the centre of the trench. The natural drift geology, 21, a pale pinkish-brown mottled with yellowish-brown firm clayey-silt, containing rare sub-rounded stone no greater than 50mm, was only visible at the base of the truncation (Fig 5).

5.2.4 No evidence of any cut archaeological features was found in the base of Trench 2, though the stone layer represents a significant archaeological deposit, probably a disturbed road surface, which is tentatively dated to the medieval period or earlier by the recovery of two sherds of thirteenth to fourteenth century pottery (See Section 6). The full depth and extent of this deposit is unclear at present, since it was left unexcavated by the evaluation.

5.3 TRENCH 3

5.3.1 Trench 3 was 10m long by 1.5m wide, orientated north-west/south-east. It was machine-excavated west of the eastern side of the development area, adjacent to the powerline stanchion and west of the point at which the road turns a corner (Fig 3; Plate 3). The maximum depth of the trench was 0.85m.

5.3.2 The machining removed 0.25m of mid to dark brownish-grey friable silty sand topsoil, containing rare sub-rounded pebbles no greater than 100mm. The removal of the topsoil exposed a colluvial deposit, a mid orangey-brown friable silty-sand containing occasional rounded and sub-rounded stones no greater than 30mm in size. The deposit was machined to a maximum depth of 0.55m. Removal of this deposit exposed the natural drift geology, a light orangey-brown silty-sand, fairly compacted, containing moderate small to medium sub-rounded and sub-angular stones no greater than 30mm. A sondage was excavated at the south-western end of the trench to 0.4m to assess the natural geology, which was found to be fairly consistent. A land drain was visible bisecting this material and running in a north-west/south-east alignment at the north-eastern end of the trench. At the north-eastern end of the trench, several dressed stones were visible in the section; these were apparently in a cut, and had been inserted as backfill for support of the stanchion for the powerline.

5.3.3 No evidence of any cut archaeological features was found in the base of Trench 3, and no archaeological artefacts were found during excavation.

5.4 TRENCH 4

5.4.1 Trench 4 was originally 5m long by 1.5m wide, orientated north-north-east/south-south-west (Fig 3; Plates 3, 6, 7, 8, 9). Following discussions with the Hadrian’s Wall Archaeologist (Mike Collins pers comm), it was extended by 7m on its southern end to clarify the archaeological deposits originally
exposed. The revised length was therefore 12m by 1.5m. It was machine-excavated on the eastern side of the north-west boundary of the development area. The maximum depth of the trench was 1.2m (Figs 6 and 7).

5.4.2 The machining removed 0.22m of topsoil, 01, a dark greyish-brown soft sandy-silt containing moderate to regular sub-rounded and sub-angular pebbles no greater than 50mm in size. Evidence of a modern track was visible within this deposit running along the edge of the north-western field boundary, in the form of dumps of modern material (brick, mortar, glass etc). This overlay 0.48m of colluvial deposit, 02, a mid to dark orange-brown friable clayey-silt containing moderate sub-rounded pebbles no greater than 40mm. This deposit was at its deepest at the two ends of the trench, becoming very shallow across the mid-point (Fig 7).

5.4.3 Following removal of the colluvium, the line of a large bank of redeposited natural gravel, approximately 5.5m in width, was identified running east-west across the trench (Plate 7). A 0.6m wide sondage was excavated through the bank (Fig 6; Plate 6) and its overlying and underlying deposits. The bank comprised the layering of a series of deliberate dumps: at its base, layer 05 was excavated to 0.42m in depth, proving to be a light to medium greyish-orange clayey-sand containing moderate small to medium rounded and sub-rounded stones. This formed a uniform lower bank deposit. This in turn was overlain by layer 12 to a depth of 0.12m, a light to mid brownish-orange sandy-silt containing more frequent small rounded stones. This formed the central bank deposit. This in turn was overlain by layer 04 to a depth of 0.3m, a mid pinkish-orange firm and gritty clayey-sand containing very frequent small pebbles no greater than 15mm in size, with occasional larger sub-rounded stones no greater than 40mm. This formed the upper bank deposit. The total depth of the bank appeared to be around 0.8m and had evidently been truncated by ploughing (Fig 7).

5.4.4 On each side of the bank, turflines, in the form of thin bands (averaging 0.06m) of dark brown to black humic and less humic loose and friable silty-sand (07 and 13), were visible running up to and lipping onto the bank (Plates 8 and 9). These had gradually been buried by layers of stone tumble which had tipped off the bank and sealed them, particularly on the north side; the tumble comprised light to medium orange, orangey-brown and grey sandy-silt to clayey-silt, containing frequent small to medium sub-rounded and sub-angular stones, and varied in depth from 0.07m to 0.13m (layers 08, 10 and 11). Deposits of mixed and mottled dark blackish-grey humic material, orange and bluish-grey silty-clay and lenses of whitish-grey clayey-silt, with rare stone inclusions, were visible overlying the deposits of tumble on both sides to a maximum depth of 0.24m and were possibly the result of disturbance by animal trampling (03 and 14). A further deposit of tumble, 09, comprising a mid greyish-brown sandy-silt containing frequent small to medium sub-rounded and sub-angular stone inclusions to a depth of 0.17m, visible on the north side of the bank, may have been the result of ploughing clipping the top of the bank. The colluvial deposits sealed the bank and its adjacent deposits, levelling off the ground (Fig 7).

5.4.5 Beneath the bank, a uniform layer of light bluish-grey compact fairly stoneless silty-clay, 06, was visible extending for the length of the trench, possibly
deliberately deposited as a construction base for the bank, although it clearly extended considerably beyond the area of the bank. This overlay the natural drift geology, 15, a compact pale to mid pinkish to yellowish-brown boulder clay.

5.4.6 No evidence of any cut archaeological features was found in the base of Trench 4, although the bank and associated deposits represent a significant archaeological feature, and are likely to be remnants of the south mound of the Vallum, dated to the Hadrianic period, due to their position on a line with extant remnants of the south mound to the east. The bank was represented by deposits measuring c 6m wide with the accompanying berm of c 3m wide. This correlates with the known Vallum dimensions in this area, suggesting that the ditch lies immediately to the north of the trench.
6. FINDS

6.1 THE FINDS

6.1.1 Only two small conjoining fragments of pottery were recovered during the excavation. The fabric represented was soft and relatively gritty, oxidised to a bright orange, and although much-abraded, both fragments bore the remnants of a pale olive green glaze. The fabric is easily recognisable as medieval, probably of thirteenth- to fourteenth-century-date.

6.1.2 The presence of what is effectively a single sherd of medieval pottery cannot be taken as an indicator of activity in the close vicinity. The size and abraded nature of the fragments suggests that their soil matrix has been disturbed on a number of occasions, and they could have travelled some distance as a result of agricultural activity.
7. DISCUSSION

7.1 SURFACE EVIDENCE

7.1.1 The preliminary site investigation demonstrated that archaeological evidence still existed in parts of the development area in the form of shallow earthworks. The evidence suggests that, while the area had been significantly levelled by ploughing in recent years, as visible from the remnants of plough-furrows discovered during the site investigation and the apparent destruction of the Vallum to the north of the development area, earthworks are still visible within the field, albeit only on a very slight scale. The only earthworks of any significant date were the ancient track, the remaining earthworks being of apparent post-medieval or modern date.

7.1.2 The origin of the ancient track is problematic. The northern end of the track may originally have continued northwards to join the main road near the position of the modern field gate; the roads which run through Gilsland village are fairly sinuous, suggesting early origins, and these roads appear to end at the corner immediately north of the development area. The continuation of the roads as visible at present, to the east and south-east of the development area, are very straight, and were laid out during the enclosure of the former moorland and waste to the south-east of the village, presumably during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A suggestion may be that the early road from Gilsland may originally have joined this ancient track, forming a cart road along the base of the valley south-westwards, perhaps dating to the medieval period or earlier (the overlying of this track by a later post-medieval track uncovered during the survey itself suggests an earlier date). The track would have hugged the edge of the hill to avoid the boggy ground at the base of the valley. A track still exists running south-westwards from the proposed development area along the south-eastern side of Poltross Burn (Fig 2).

7.1.3 An alternative possibility is that the earthwork in fact relates to the Stanegate itself. The course of the Stanegate, as surveyed by FG Simpson (1913), runs from a crossing over the Poltross Burn in a north-easterly direction towards the hill to the west of the proposed development area, where it was lost to ploughing. The supposed line, as suggested by Simpson, has the road running around the western edge of the hill and running eastwards to join known sections of the road to the east of the main road, east of the site, as shown on present day OS mapping. A suggestion may be that the road in fact turns eastwards after the river crossing, following the line of the valley rather than running over the hill. A short section of the existing track along the south-easter side of the Poltross Burn has an east-west kink just east of the Stanegate river crossing point, possibly indicating a fossilised line of the original road; the southern field boundary of the field to the west of the site also has a distinct curve. The road would have followed this line, then turned north-eastwards along the north-western edge of the valley, to the position of the current earthwork.
7.1.4 The continuation of the road northwards is difficult to trace, however, and there are two possible alignments. If this road joined the roads into Gilsland, as previously suggested, it would have to cross over to the north of the line of Hadrian’s Wall, which would not fit with current theories regarding the relationship of the road and Wall. A more likely possibility is that it turned sharply eastwards at its north-eastern end, and runs along to the south of the Vallum to the fort at Carvoran near Greenhead (Fig 2).

7.1.5 The likelihood of this earthwork representing an ancient track, potentially the Stanegate, appears to be supported by the results from Trench 2, which found a compact stone layer across the base of the trench, on the line of this earthwork.

7.1.6 The hollow-way or grubbed out field boundary, the ridge and furrow, and the farm track are all typologically of post-medieval or modern date, and relate to farming activity in the environs of Lawn Top farmhouse. These earthworks should therefore be considered as of lesser significance, and the current level of record undertaken during this survey is adequate for this stage of the development. The regrading works for the development will entirely remove these features from the landscape.

7.2 **SUB-SURFACE EVIDENCE**

7.2.1 The evaluation trenching comprised a total length of 42m, concentrated towards the northern and eastern ends of the proposed development area, close to the known position of the Vallum ditch and the putative line of the Stanegate. The results of the trenching were mixed. Two trenches, Trenches 1 and 3, showed no obvious archaeological evidence, revealing only the natural glacial geology.

7.2.2 Trench 2, however, uncovered a large compact stone cobble surface across its length. This has been tentatively identified as the Stanegate, and correlates with the ancient track identified during the site investigation. The possibility exists that the track could have medieval origins; some weight is lent to the claims for these origins by the recovery of a little medieval pottery, albeit abraded, directly from the surface of the road. However, the length of use of the Stanegate as a track is uncertain, and it is fairly likely that it would have been extant for some time after the ending of the Roman Empire, perhaps well into the medieval period. Indeed, parts have been encompassed within the modern road system. The name ‘Stanegate’ is known to have medieval origins, which would support this possibility.

7.2.3 During previous works by Simpson in 1910 (Simpson 1913), and by Paul Austen in 1999 (Mike Collins pers comm), the line of the Stanegate as shown on current OS mapping was evaluated at length, though the positions of both Simpson’s and Austen’s trenches are not securely located. Simpson states that this potential line was trenched and revealed some large stones, but little clear evidence of the road, though he does note the presence of a terraced area around the western side of the hill, which he presumed to be the road (Simpson 1913); this terrace was not seen during the present works, and may now have
been ploughed out. Austen’s trenches revealed nothing but natural glacial deposits (Mike Collins pers comm).

7.2.4 Observations of the Stanegate at Brampton Old Church in 1935 revealed a surface 17 feet 6 inches (5.25m) across, leading from the east gate of the fort (Simpson et al 1936). Excavations in 1935 at Buckjumping near High Crosby revealed a metalled surface 21 feet (6.3m) wide marked by 3 foot (0.9m) wide ditches on both sides, which produced a second century AD mortarium rim and Samian pottery (op cit). These confirmed previous observations from 1896, which described excavations of ‘a roadway of small cobbles and river gravel, at least 12 ft wide’ (3.6m) (Haverfield 1896; Simpson et al 1936, 185). Excavations were also carried out in Watchclose Plantation to confirm excavations in 1896 (Haverfield 1896) which found the Stanegate, described thus: ‘the agger visible on the surface was about 27 feet [8.10m] wide, and the thicker part of the road (cobbles and river-gravel) 24 feet [7.2m] wide, but the stones had spread out to a width of 45 feet [13.5m]’ (Simpson et al 1936, 186).

7.2.5 The Stanegate was further revealed 5 miles west at Boothby, during drainage works in 1974; two trenches were then excavated (Richardson 1978). The first trench revealed a 4m wide and 1m high clay and cobbles agger topped with a sparse layer of small cobbles and gravel. The agger was flanked by two 3m wide ditches, and consolidated with large stones set in puddled clay. The second trench revealed a road surface of hard-packed gravel resting on irregular layers of large stones, sandy-clay, and closely set flat stones, approximately 3m wide and 1m high. The south ditch showed similar dimensions to those seen in the first trench (Richardson 1978, 206).

7.2.6 It is clear that the excavated remains of the road from various excavations has varied greatly from excavation to excavation. The dimensions of the surface uncovered during excavations in 1896, 1910, 1935 and 1974 point to a road surface of predominantly of gravel and cobble construction and bedded in clay or sand, averaging between 3m and 6.3m in width and up to 1m in height, often flanked by stone gutters or roadside ditches, and frequently kerbed with large stones (Haverfield 1896, Simpson 1910; Simpson et al 1936; Richardson 1978). No evidence of roadside ditches as recovered during the excavations of Trench 2, but the stone surface was only cleaned for evaluation and no further investigation was undertaken at the request of the Hadrian’s Wall Archaeologist and as specified in the project brief (Mike Collins pers comm). Excavations at Watchclose in 1896 (Haverfield 1896) and again in 1936 (Simpson et al 1936), revealed the profile of a road which had been extensively disturbed by forestry works. The dimensions of the road were given, but it was pointed out that the stone had been disturbed and spread across a large area, to 13.5m in width. The stonework in Trench 2 may be of a similar nature and origin; the road may have been extensively disturbed by ploughing, removing the upper metalled surfaces and spreading the stone core across a wider area than previously occupied by the road. If this is the case, ditches or roadside drains may still exist, but have been buried by the spread stone. Clarification of this will only be possible through further excavation of this surface.

7.2.7 The large bank of redeposited natural gravel uncovered in Trench 4, approximately 5m across, is almost certainly the south mound of the Vallum.
The mound is clearly aligned with the visible remains of the south mound on the eastern side of the road to the east of the development area, and little other explanation can be put forward for its presence, other than the possibility that it represents some other form of Roman activity in the area, such as a camp adjoining the Vallum on its southern side. The bank shows a clear depositional sequence, which indicates that it was a standing monument, with grass growing up to it and over it, built on a firm base of grey silty-clay, potentially deliberately laid as a construction base. The bank crumbled slightly after construction, as evidenced by tips of stone off its surface, and was also subject to disturbance by animals later in its life. The bank was entirely buried by colluvial and/or relic plough-soils, which brought up the ground to the present day levels. The evidence of plough damage may be indicated by the clipping of the bank which resulted in a dump of stone on its north side.

7.2.8 Accounts of the construction of the Vallum indicate that the mounds on the north and south sides of the ditch were 6m wide and about 3m high and were separated from the ditch by a 3m wide berm (Collingwood Bruce 1978). This would fit with the dimensions of the mound, with the bank uncovered in the trench being of similar dimensions. No evidence was visible of turf revetting, as stated by Collingwood Bruce (1978); however, this may have been destroyed as the bank was gradually buried and went out of use. The bank has obviously been truncated by ploughing, as visible from the section that cut across it (Fig 7). This would mean the ditch is likely to lie immediately to the north of the trench and therefore at the northern tip of the development area.
8. IMPACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 IMPACT

8.1.1 The evaluation has established that the majority of the site has been extensively disturbed by ploughing, although major archaeological deposits still exist in the proposed development area. These are in the form of remnants of a stone surface, potentially an ancient track, which has been tentatively identified as the Stanegate, and a large intact section of the south mound of the Vallum.

8.1.2 The evaluation undertaken was designed specifically to look for these archaeological elements within the remit specified by the project brief, with trenches centred on the major areas of impact from the development, in the form of the pavilion, car parks, drainage, and regrading works. At present, the possibility of further archaeological evidence being uncovered within the development area cannot be precluded, particularly along the line of the putative Stanegate, and the south mound of the Vallum and possibly also its ditch in northern corner of the site.

8.1.3 The proposed development site covers a significant area along the south side of the Vallum, and a further field on the north-western side, which is an area of high ground between the putative Stanegate and the line of the Vallum. The topography of the site at present is unsuitable for its proposed usage as a football field, and will certainly require levelling to some extent, which will impinge on known and potentially unknown archaeological remains.

8.1.4 All excavation for the footings of the pavilion and ancillary buildings, the car park, and all drainage works, will have a destructive effect on any underlying archaeological deposits. In addition, Hadrian's Wall is a World Heritage Site and the location of a football field development within the immediate proximity to the line of the Wall will have a direct impact upon the visual setting of that monument.

8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.2.1 It is recommended that further excavation be undertaken in the position of all ground-intrusive activity relating to the construction of the footings of the pavilion and ancillary buildings, the car park, and all drainage works; this would broadly correspond to the entirety of the north corner of the development area. It is further recommended that an evaluation be undertaken of the areas to be regraded for the construction of the football pitch itself, in order to ascertain the presence or absence of archaeological remains within this zone; particular attention should be paid to the potential line of the Stanegate as identified during the site investigation survey. Further mitigation excavation may subsequently be required should significant archaeological deposits be uncovered during the evaluation prior to development.
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APPENDIX 1: PROJECT BRIEF

SPECIFICATION FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION AT LAND SOUTH OF GILSLAND VILLAGE, TYNEDALE, NORTHUMBERLAND

Introduction

Planning permission is being sought for the development of a football pitch and changing facilities on land on the southern edge of Gilsland, Northumberland. The site lies partially within the Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site and Scheduled Ancient Monument. However, the proximity of Hadrian's Wall, the fact that the Roman Stanegate road is thought to pass through this area, as well as the presence of Roman remains in the area, means that there is considerable potential for archaeological remains to be disturbed by the planned landscaping and drainage works. Following consultations with the Conservation Team of Northumberland County Council and English Heritage, an archaeological evaluation of the football pitch site has been recommended before any decision could be taken on any application for planning permission. Depending on the results of this evaluation, it may be necessary to explore the best ways of designing this development so as to best preserve the archaeological remains in situ and/or devise a scheme of mitigation works to be the subject of an archaeological condition. Scheduled Monument Consent has been applied for for the works within the monument, which will be undertaken under Class 7 consent, to inform this application.

Site Location

The development site is situated on open land south of Gilsland at NY 6356 6607 centred (Figure 1). The majority of the site is roughly level, while the southern part slopes towards the north. The site is currently used for grazing.

Background

A group, fronted by Mr Paul Barker, has proposed the creation of a football pitch and changing facilities to the south of the village of Gilsland. Initial consultations with Tynedale District Council, English Heritage and the Conservation Team of Northumberland County Council showed that there was no fundamental objection to the scheme, but that the considerable archaeological potential of the area meant that an archaeological evaluation should be carried out on the site, to establish the presence and importance of any archaeological remains likely to be affected by the football pitch. This would then allow an informed decision to be taken on any application for planning permission for the pitch, and would also suggest mitigation measures designed to preserve any archaeological remains in situ or by record. This process is in line with current government advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning (PPG16).

In light of this, a programme of evaluation excavation took place on the site in 1999 conducted by Paul Austen. No formal report on this evaluation work was produced, but it consisted of a series of trenches which did not reveal the presence of any archaeological deposits. This work suggested that to the south of the scheduled area had a generally low potential for survival of archaeology. However, it also raised the possibility that because the trenches did not locate the Stanegate Roman road this might lie further south of its line as marked on the OS map. This possibility meant that one potential route of the Stanegate lay immediately to the south of the development site as then designated.

Subsequently to this, the plans for the football pitch were amended, which involved a change in the orientation of the pitch, entailing further regard to land in the south eastern part of the site, as well as car parking and drainage works. In light of these changes, both
Northumberland County Council and English Heritage felt that further evaluation excavation was necessary to provide information about the impact of the amended proposal. Such evaluation works, funded by English heritage, are the works covered by this specification. This work will examine the area of regarding, which also has the potential to contain the line of the Stanegate, as well as the car park and drainage, which take in another area where Stanegate remains are a possibility as well as remains from the vallum.

**Requirement for Work**

The purpose of the evaluation is to establish the presence or otherwise of archaeological remains from the Stanegate Roman road and other remains to the south of Hadrian’s Wall. This will then allow an assessment of their importance to be made, indicating the weight that should be given to their preservation.

The work should consist of a series of machine excavated trenches, each the width of a ditching bucket, in the positions marked on the enclosed plan (figure 2). Trench 1 will measure 1.5m by 10m and is designed to examine the area of the south east part of the site that will be affected by regarding. This area has the potential for remains relating to the Stanegate Roman road (see above). Trench 2 will measure 1.5m by 5m and is designed to evaluate the area of the proposed sports pavilion. Trench 3 will measure 1.5m by 10 and is designed to examine the area to be impacted on by the car park and drainage; this area has the potential to contain remains relating to the Stanegate Roman road and the vallum. Trench 4 will measure 1.5m by 5m and is designed to examine the area of the access route; it also has the potential to contain remains from the Stanegate and the vallum.

The archaeologist is asked to provide:
- A costing to undertake all four trenches
- A costing for trenches 1, 2 and 3 only

The plant for machine excavation is to be provided by a local farmer. The presence of this machine is to be arranged through Mr Barry Mason, MWE Architects (0191 2602299).

The work must conform to the following specification:

1. **General**

   1.1 All work should be carried out in compliance with the codes of practice of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) and should follow the IFA Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations, Excavations or Watching Briefs, as appropriate.

   1.2 All staff must be suitably qualified and experienced for their project roles.

   1.3 All staff must familiarise themselves with the results of any previous archaeological work on or near the site prior to the start of work. All staff must be aware of the work required under the specification, and should understand the aims of the project.

2. **Fieldwork**

   2.1 The entire site should be inspected before the commencement of machine excavation. This should include the examination of any available exposures (ditches, geotechnical test pits etc.).
2.2 Trench positions should be accurately surveyed prior to excavation and related to the National Grid.

2.3 Topsoil and unstratified modern material may be removed mechanically under strict archaeological supervision. If mechanically excavated an appropriate machine must be used with an appropriate bucket, preferably a wide toothless ditching blade. Choice should be influenced by prevailing site conditions and the machine must be able to carry out a clean job.

2.4 All machine work must be carried out under the direct supervision of a professional archaeologist.

2.5 All topsoil or recent overburden must be removed down to the first significant archaeological horizon in successive level splits. The continued use of machinery beyond this point should only take place when specifically agreed with the planning archaeologist.

2.6 On completion of machine excavation, all faces of the trench that require examination or recording will be cleaned using appropriate hand tools.

2.7 All investigation of archaeological horizons will be by hand, with cleaning, inspection and recording both in plan and section.

2.8 Manual excavation will examine all sensitive deposits, and will enable an assessment of the nature, date and survival of deposits. The deposits will be investigated sufficiently to establish their character, but the full depth of the deposits to natural will not necessarily be established across the full trench. All trenches will be excavated in a stratigraphical manner, whether by machine or by hand. All features exposed will be sample excavated. This would typically involve the excavation of 50% of discrete features and 25% of linear features, where uniform fill is present. For linear features where non uniform fill is present, a greater percentage may be excavated if appropriate, and this should be discussed with the Conservation Team of Northumberland County Council. No feature should be wholly excavated as the intention is simply to evaluate the archaeological resource at this stage. Similarly, structures and features worthy of preservation should not be unduly excavated.

2.9 All excavation, both by machine and by hand, must be undertaken with a view to avoiding damage to any archaeological features or deposits which appear to be worthy of preservation in situ.

2.10 Human remains should be left in situ, covered and protected. The coroners' office should be informed. If removal is essential work must comply with relevant Home Office regulations.

2.11 Deposits should be assessed for their potential for providing environmental and dating evidence. Where it can be anticipated that deposits with potential for environmental evidence will be encountered, a sampling strategy should be submitted to the County Archaeologist for approval. For carbonised remains, bulk samples of a minimum of 10 litres (up to 30 litres for early prehistoric features) should be collected. Bulk samples of 10-30 litres should be taken from waterlogged deposits for analysis of macroscopic plant remains.

2.12 In some circumstances a programme of evaluation may, in answering the questions
posed, also raise others of an unexpected nature. Every attempt should be made to deal with the problem by agreed modification of the specification while fieldwork is in progress. A contingency arrangement should be provided which allow for extra machining, trial trenching or geophysics to answer particular problems which arise during fieldwork. Failure to do this may necessitate further evaluation work being recommended to the local authority and a delay in the decision making process.

3. Recording

3.1 A full and proper record (written, graphic and photographic as appropriate) should be made for all work, using pro forma record sheets and text descriptions appropriate to the work. Written descriptions should comprise both factual data and interpretative elements. Accurate scale plans and section drawings should be drawn at 1:50, 1:20 and 1:10 scales as appropriate. Sections should normally be accurately related to Ordnance Datum.

3.2 The stratigraphy of all trenches should be recorded even where no archaeological deposits have been identified.

3.3 Where stratified deposits are encountered, a ‘Harris’ matrix should be compiled.

3.4 The site grid should be accurately tied into the National Grid and located on a 1:2500 or 1:250 map of the area. All deposits and the base of all trenches must be adequately levelled.

3.5 A photographic record of all contexts should be taken in colour transparency and black and white print and should include a clearly visible, graduated metric scale. A register of all photographs should be kept.

4. Storage

4.1 During and after the excavation and watching brief, all objects must be stored in the appropriate materials and storage conditions to ensure minimal deterioration and loss of information (this should include controlled storage, correct packaging, regular monitoring of conditions, immediate selection for conservation of vulnerable material).

4.2 All storage must have appropriate security provision.

5. Finds Processing

5.1 All finds processing, conservation work and storage of finds must be carried out in compliance with the IFA Guidelines for Finds Work and those set by UKIC.

5.2 Artefact collection and discard policies must be fit for the defined purpose.

5.3 Finds should be scanned to assess the date range of the assemblage with particular reference to pottery. Artifacts should be used to establish the potential for all categories of finds should further archaeological work be necessary.

5.4 All bulk finds which are not discarded must be washed and, with the exception of animal bone, marked. Marking and labelling must be indelible and irremovable by abrasion. Bulk finds must be appropriately bagged and boxed and recorded. This
process must be carried out no later than two months after the end of excavation.

5.5 All small finds must be recorded as individual items. All small finds must be appropriately packaged. Vulnerable objects must be specially packaged, and textiles, painted glass and coins stored in appropriate specialist systems. This process must be carried out within two days of the small find being excavated.

5.6 Assessment and analysis of artifacts and environmental samples must be carried out by an approved named specialist.

5.6 The deposition and disposal of artifacts must be agreed with the legal owner and recipient museum prior to the work taking place. Where the landowner decides to retain artifacts adequate provision must be made for recording them.

5.7 All retained artifacts and ecofacts must be cleaned and packaged in accordance with the requirements of the recipient museum.

6. Site Archive

6.1 The site archive should be prepared to the standard specified in Management of Archaeological Projects, appendix 3 (HBMIC 1991) and in accordance with the Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long Term Storage (UKIC 1980). This should include the indexing, ordering, quantification and checking for consistency of all original context records, object records, bulk find records, sample records, skeleton records (if recovered), photographic records, drawing records, photographs, drawings, level books, site note-books, spot-dating records and conservation records. Ensuring that all artifacts and ecofacts recovered and retained from the site are packed and stored in the appropriate materials and conditions and that all their associated records are complete. This should be completed by the end of the fieldwork. A summary account of the context record should be included and written by the supervising archaeologist.

6.2 The archive should be submitted to the County SMR within 6 months of the end of fieldwork. The location of artifacts must be stated in the archive.

7. Report

7.1 The report should be bound, with each page and paragraph numbered.

7.2 The report should include as a minimum the following:

i. A location plan of the site

ii. A location plan of the trenches and/or other type of fieldwork strategy employed.

iii. Plans and sections of features and/or extent of archaeology located.

iv. A summary statement of the results.

v. A table summarising per trench the deposits, features, classes and numbers of artifacts encountered and spot dating of significant finds.
8. Monitoring

8.1 Reasonable access to the site for the purposes of monitoring the archaeological scheme will be afforded to the County Archaeologist and the English Heritage Hadrian's Wall Archaeologist, or their nominees, at all times.
9. Further Information

9.1 Guidance on the archaeological action recommended and any further information can be obtained from:

County Archaeologist
Environment Directorate
Northumberland County Council
County Hall
Morpeth
Northumberland

Tel 01670 534058/534057

Or:

Hadrian's Wall Archaeologist
English Heritage
Abbeygate House
Market Street
Hexham
NE46 3LX

01434 605088
LAND SOUTH OF GILSLAND VILLAGE
TYNE DALE
NORTHUMBERLAND

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

Proposals
The following design is offered in response to a request from English Heritage for an archaeological evaluation in advance of a proposed football field development on land to the south of Gilsland village, Northumberland.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 English Heritage has requested that Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) submit proposals for an evaluation on land to the south of Gilsland village, Northumberland, in advance of a proposed football field development at the site.

1.2 BACKGROUND

1.2.1 Hadrian's Wall passes to the north of the development site, with the well preserved remains of the Poltross Burn Milecastle (MC 48) situated north-west of the study area. This milecastle is thought, because of style characteristics (standard B) and its similarity to MC 47, to have been constructed by Legio XX Valeria Victrix. It contains two small buildings on either side of a central area, each of which were sub-divided into four partitions (Breeze and Dobson 1987). Excavation demonstrated that it continued in use into the fourth century AD.

1.2.2 The vallum extends immediately north of the development area, and survives as an extant earthwork in the fields to the east of Crooks and beyond the C300 minor road. Immediately south of the vallum is the suggested line of the earlier Stanegate road; however, the line of Stanegate is not reliably known within this area.

1.2.3 Previous Interventions: an evaluation was undertaken by Paul Austen in 1999, in the area to the south of the vallum, which did not reveal evidence for any significant archaeological remains, and specifically did not reveal the line of Stanegate. This has raised the possibility that the line of Stanegate was to the south of the line shown on the OS mapping. LUAU (now OA North) undertook an evaluation at Gilsland market on the site of the wall and counterscarp bank (LUAU 1999). This demonstrated that any archaeological features had been lost as a result of the construction of the market.

1.2.4 In May 1998, LUAU (now OA North) undertook a watching brief (LUAU 1998) at Gilsland, during construction of a stile on the Hadrian's Wall Path National Trail, on behalf of the Countryside Commission, across the wall to the north of the site. It revealed a 0.1m deep layer of reddish brown gravelly sandy loam, above a buried organic soil layer (0.23m deep) over a gravelly sandy loam which was similar to that on the surface. It is thought likely that the ground surface was buried during works associated with the livestock mart (LUAU 1998).

1.3 OXFORD ARCHAEOLOGY NORTH

1.3.1 Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) has considerable experience of the archaeological survey and evaluation of sites and monuments of all periods, having undertaken a great number of small and large projects during the past 20 years. Projects have been undertaken to fulfil the different requirements of various clients and planning authorities, and to very rigorous timetables. OA North has considerable experience of the recording of historic buildings together with the evaluation and excavation of sites of all periods, having undertaken a great number of small and large scale projects during the past 20 years. Fieldwork has taken place within the planning process and construction programmes, to fulfil the requirements of clients and planning authorities, to very rigorous timetables.

1.3.2 OA North has undertaken extensive evaluation work on the line of the Hadriamic Frontier, having undertaken an archaeological investigation on the site of the former Auction Mart (LUAU 1999). In addition OA North has the consultancy for the Hadrian’s Wall National Trail, and has provided advice on the alignment of the route through the area of Gilsland; and in addition undertook a watching brief on the site of a stile to the north of the site. OA North has considerable experience and knowledge of the archaeology of the wall and that within the vicinity of Gilsland in particular.
1.3.3 OA North has the professional expertise and resources to undertake the project detailed below to a high level of quality and efficiency. OA North is an Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) registered organisation, registration number 17, and all its members of staff operate subject to the IFA Code of Conduct.

2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 The following programme has been designed, in accordance with a brief by Northumberland County Council and English Heritage to provide an evaluation. The required stages to achieve these ends are as follows:

2.2 EVALUATION TRENCHING

2.2.1 To implement a programme of trial trenching, which will excavate three or four trenches.

2.3 REPORT

2.3.1 A written report will assess the significance of the data generated by this programme within a local and regional context. It will present the evaluation and would make an assessment of the archaeological potential of the area, and would make recommendations for further work.

3. METHOD STATEMENT

3.1 EVALUATION TRENCHING

3.1.1 The programme of trenching will establish the presence or absence of any previously unsuspected archaeological deposits and, if established, will then test their date, nature, depth and quality of preservation. In particular it is intended to investigate evidence for the Stanegate road, and potentially also elements of the vallum, which for the most part is believed to be outside the study area.

3.1.2 Site Investigation: it is proposed to undertake a site investigation survey of the site, which will rapidly examine the extent of the development area and will assess the potential for surface survival of archaeological remains. Features identified by this investigation will be subject to sketch surveyed and located on digitised Ordnance Survey mapping (1:2,500).

3.1.3 A site grid, located with respect to the OS National Grid will be established, which will serve as the control for the location of the trenches.

3.1.4 Trial Trenching: the evaluation is required to excavate up to four trenches, the size and location of which are defined in the project brief. Trench 1 will be 1.5m x 10m and is the southernmost of the four trenches. Trench 2 will be 1.5m x 5m and is intended to evaluate the site of the proposed sports pavilion. Trench 3 will 1.5m x 10 and is on the site to be affected by a proposed car park and Trench 4 will be 1.5m x 5m and is intended to examine the area of the proposed access route to the football field.

3.1.5 The trenches will be excavated by a combination of mechanised and manual techniques; the topsoil will be removed by mechanical excavator, fitted with a 1.7m wide toothless ditching bucket, and archaeological deposits beneath will be first manually cleaned and then any features identified will be manually excavated. The machine excavation will not intrude into any potential archaeological stratigraphy and all machine excavation will be undertaken under careful archaeological supervision. All mechanical excavation will be undertaken in shallow spits down to the upper level of the first significant archaeological horizon. Following mechanical excavation the floor of the trench will be cleaned by hoe and manual excavation techniques will be used to evaluate any sensitive deposits, and will enable an assessment of the nature, date, survival and depth of deposits and features. The trenches will not be
excavated deeper than 1.25m to accommodate health and safety constraints; any requirements to excavate below this depth will involve recosting.

3.1.6 All features will be sample excavated and would entail the excavation of 50% of discrete features and 25% of linear features. Following manual excavation the floor and the sides of the trenches that require examination will be cleaned by hoe and trowel. All trenches will be excavated in a stratigraphical manner, whether by machine or by hand.

3.1.7 Trenches will be located by use of GPS equipment which is accurate to +/- 0.25m, altitude information will be established with respect to Ordnance Survey Datum. Archaeological features within the trenches will be planned by manual techniques.

3.1.8 Environmental Sampling: environmental samples (bulk samples of 30 litres volume, to be sub-sampled at a later stage) will be collected from stratified undisturbed deposits and will particularly target negative features (gullies, pits and ditches). Subject to the results of the excavation, and discussions with the County Archaeologist, an assessment of any environmental samples will be undertaken by the in-house palaeoecological specialist, who will examine the potential for further analysis. The assessment would examine the potential for macrofossil, arthropod, palynological and general biological analysis. The costs for the palaeoecological assessment would be a variation to the defined costs and will only be called into effect if good waterlogged deposits are identified and will be subject to the agreement of the County Archaeologist and the client.

3.1.9 Samples will also be collected for technological, pedological and chronological analysis as appropriate. If necessary, access to conservation advice and facilities can be made available. OA North maintains close relationships with Ancient Monuments Laboratory staff at the Universities of Durham and York and, in addition, employs artefact and palaeozoological specialists with considerable expertise in the investigation, excavation and finds management of sites of all periods and types, who are readily available for consultation.

3.1.10 Finds: finds recovery and sampling programmes will be in accordance with best practice (current IFA guidelines) and subject to expert advice. All material will be collected and identified by stratigraphic unit. Hand collection by stratigraphic unit will be the principal method of collection, but targeted on-site sieving will serve as a check on recovery levels. The location of findspots for objects deemed to be of potential significance to the understanding, interpretation and dating of individual features, or of the site as a whole, will be recorded in 3-D. All finds will be treated in accordance with OA North standard practice, which is cognisant of IFA and UKIC Guidelines. In general this will mean that (where appropriate or safe to do so) finds are washed, dried, marked, bagged and packed in stable conditions; no attempt at conservation will be made unless special circumstances require prompt action. In such case guidance will be sought from Ancient Monuments Laboratory (AML) conservator Jennifer Jones at Durham University. Finds storage during fieldwork and any site archive preparation will follow professional guidelines (UKIC).

3.1.11 Recording: all information identified in the course of the site works will be recorded stratigraphically, with sufficient pictorial record (plans, sections and both black and white and colour photographs) to identify and illustrate individual features. Primary records will be available for inspection at all times.

3.1.12 Results of the field investigation will be recorded using a paper system, adapted from that used by Centre for Archaeology of English Heritage. The archive will include both a photographic record and accurate large scale plans and sections at an appropriate scale (1:50, 1:20, and 1:10). Levels will be tied into the Ordnance Datum and the trenches will be located with respect to the National Grid. All artefacts and ecofacts will be recorded using the same system, and will be handled and stored according to standard practice (following current Institute of Field Archaeologists guidelines) in order to minimise deterioration. Where stratified deposits are encountered a ‘Harris’ matrix will be compiled.
3.2 **REPORT**

3.2.1 **Archive:** the results of the fieldwork will form the basis of a full archive to professional standards, in accordance with current English Heritage guidelines (*The Management of Archaeological Projects*, 2nd edition, 1991). The project archive represents the collation and indexing of all the data and material gathered during the course of the project. It will include summary processing and analysis of all features, finds, or palaeoenvironmental data recovered during fieldwork, which will be catalogued by context. This archive can be provided in the English Heritage Centre for Archaeology format and a synthesis will be included in the Northumberland Sites and Monuments Record. A copy of the archive can also be made available for deposition with the National Archaeological Record. OA North practice is to deposit the original record archive of projects (paper, magnetic and plastic media) with the appropriate County Record Office, and a full copy of the record archive (microform or microfiche) together with the material archive (artefacts, ecofacts, and samples) with an appropriate museum.

3.2.2 **Report:** one bound and one unbound copy of a written synthetic report will be submitted to the Client, and a further two copies will be submitted to the Northumberland County Council SMR. The report will include a copy of this project design, and indications of any agreed departure from that design. It will present, summarise, and interpret the results of the programme detailed above and present an assessment of the sites history; the report will include photographs of any significant features. The report will also include a complete bibliography of sources from which data has been derived, and a list of further sources identified during the programme of work, but not examined in detail. The report will include a description of the methodology and the results. A list of the finds, and a description of the collective assemblage. Details of any environmental work undertaken will be included.

3.2.3 The report will have a summary and a methodological statement, and it will define any variations to the defined programme. It will include recommendations for further work. Illustrative material will include a location map, site map, historic maps, a trench location map, trench plans, survey plans and also pertinent photographs. It can be tailored to the specific requests of the client (eg particular scales etc), subject to discussion.

3.3 **OTHER MATTERS**

3.3.1 **Health and Safety:** OA North conforms to all health and safety guidelines as contained in the OA Manual of Health and Safety and the safety manual compiled by the Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers. The work will be in accordance with Health and Safety at Work Act (1974), the Council for British Archaeology Handbook No. 6, *Safety in Archaeological Fieldwork* (1989).

3.4.2 Full regard will, of course, be given to all constraints (services etc) during the evaluation, as well as to all Health and Safety considerations. OA North provides a Health and Safety Statement for all projects and maintains a Unit Safety policy. A risk assessment will be completed in advance of the project's commencement. If there is a requirement to excavate trenches deeper than 1.25m the trenches will be stepped out to minimise section collapse. As a matter of course the Unit uses a U-Scan device prior to any excavation to test for services. It is assumed that the client will provide any available information regarding services within the study area, if available.

3.4.3 **Insurance:** the insurance in respect of claims for personal injury to or the death of any person under a contract of service with the unit and arising out of an in the course of such person's employment shall comply with the employers' liability (Compulsory Insurance) Act 1969 and any statutory orders made there under. For all other claims to cover the liability of OA North, in respect of personal injury or damage to property by negligence of OA North or any of its employees, there applies the insurance cover of £2m for any one occurrence or series of occurrences arising out of one event.
3.4.4 **Confidentiality:** the report is designed as a document for the specific use of the Client, for the particular purpose as defined in the project design, and should be treated as such; it is not suitable for publication as an academic report, or otherwise, without amendment or revision. Any requirement to revise or reorder the material for submission or presentation to third parties beyond the project brief and project design, or for any other explicit purpose can be fulfilled, but will require separate discussion and funding.

3.4.5 **Project Monitoring:** OA North will consult with the client regarding access to the site. Whilst the work is undertaken for the client, the County Archaeologist will be kept fully informed of the work and its results. Any proposed changes to the project design will be agreed with the County Archaeologist in consultation with the Client.

4. **WORK PROGRAMME**

4.1 The following programme is proposed:

- **Identification Survey**
  One day will be required to complete this element

- **Evaluation Trenching**
  Four days will be required to complete this element

- **Report**
  A ten day period would be to complete this element

4.2 OA North can execute projects at short notice once an agreement has been signed with the client.

4.3 The project will be managed by Jamie Quartermaine BA Surv Dip MIFA (Unit Project Manager) to whom all correspondence should be addressed. OA North adheres by the IFA's Code of Conduct and the Code of Approved Practice for the regulation of Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology.
## APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY CONTEXT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No</th>
<th>Site Subdivision</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Subsoil (Colluvium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Disturbed Silt Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Upper Bank Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Lower Bank Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Grey Silt Layer - ?Building Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Turf Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Stone Tumble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Stone Tumble (Plough Damage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Stone Tumble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Stone Tumble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Middle Bank Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Turf Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Disturbed Silt Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Natural Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Trench 2</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Trench 2</td>
<td>Subsoil (Colluvium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Trench 2</td>
<td>Disturbed Metalled Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Trench 2</td>
<td>Stone Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Trench 2</td>
<td>Matrix for Stone Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Trench 2</td>
<td>Natural Geology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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