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SUMMARY

This study was commissioned by Francis Flower Limited in advance of mineral extraction at the lime quarry of Dimmock's Cote, Wicken. The application area is a sub-rectangular property of approximately 6.5ha, part of which had been dealt with by earlier excavations. The site is centred on TL 5470/7240 and field evaluation consisted of 1,518m of trenching. Archaeological trenches were opened on 15th May and remained open until the 14th June.

The archaeology found within the evaluation area continued the dispersed pattern of activity seen at Dimmock's Cote since 1994. Prior to 1994 a series of Bronze Age buildings and other structures had been identified and precipitated in total four phases of examination prior to the present study. The results of the archaeological analysis indicate that there are pockets of intense prehistoric activity occurring beyond the immediate margins of the settlement.

The 2002 evaluations show that these activities included post-built structures, where during the course of its abandonment a 'ritual' of intentional placement of pottery took place, a large pit provisionally interpreted as a well which was back filled with deposits containing significant quantities of pottery, animal bone and local fossiliferous limestone. Artefactually this well was the richest feature on the site. In addition a crouched Bronze Age inhumation was found on the margins of a barrow excavated in 1997.

Results to date suggest a scenario is of an open landscape with an unenclosed settlement and pockets of activity occurring beyond the main focus of habitation. These areas have been geared to pastural activities, industrial activities such as smelting and quarrying, and also ritual activities particularly burial.

In addition to the prehistoric activity there is slight evidence for Iron Age or Roman field boundaries and much of the site is covered in traces of the medieval field system.
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ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION AT DIMMOCK’S COTE WICKEN.  
(TL 5470/7240)

1 INTRODUCTION

This study was commissioned by Francis Flower Limited in advance of mineral extraction. The evaluation aims to define the archaeological potential of the land affected by the development. This report has been compiled by the author in response to a design brief for archaeological evaluation written by Andy Thomas, Development Control Officer, County Archaeology Office (CAO), dated 25th January 2002.

The site, a sub-rectangular area of approximately 6.5ha, is located to the north of Dimmock’s Cote Road, which runs westwards from the north end of the village proper towards Stretham. The site is centred on TL 5470/7240. The subject area outlined in the Brief for this research is the area defined as 'land subject to option agreement to Francis Flower Ltd dated 22nd January 1987'. Part of this area was excavated by the Archaeological Field Unit Cambridgeshire County Council (AFU) in 1997.

2 TOPOGRAPHICAL AND GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

The site lies just outside the village of Wicken, 15km to the north-east of Cambridge. It is a relatively flat area, with heights ranging between 6.4m OD on Fodderfen Drove to the east of the extraction area and 5.8m OD on Dimmock’s Cote Road to the south. There is a benchmark of 5.11m OD on Red Barn Farm to the west and a spot height of 5.5m OD close to High Fen Farm to the north.

In this area, the Jurassic Upware Limestone forms a promontory rising to about 5m OD reaching out into the Fens from Soham (BGS 188). This is the stratum that is being extracted by Francis Flower Limited.

3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic

No confirmed Palaeolithic artefacts have been discovered within 1km of Dimmock’s Cote. Mesolithic flints were found to the south-west of the subject site (SMR 06979). Several Neolithic finds have been made to the north of the development area. Similarly, Neolithic flints have been found 1km to the west of Dimmock’s Cote.
Figure 1 Site Location Map
Bronze Age

Apart from the adjacent excavations, which revealed what may be a small Bronze Age structure, ditches, gullies and pits (SMR 10524, 11141, 11187), only a single other find has been made from this period. This was the Late Bronze Age winged axe found just east of Fodderfen Drove (SMR 06980).

Iron Age

There have been no finds of this date from around or within the subject site, although sherds of possible Iron Age date were found during excavations in 1997 (see section 5 of this report).

Roman

At least four skeletons were disturbed when the quarry was first opened in 1951, and Roman pottery was found nearby, but not directly associated with the burials (SMR 06973). Cropmarks of Roman enclosures have been identified to the south-west (SMR 06981), and a Villa has been found to the west (SMR 10525). Pottery has been found from within a pair of parallel ditches presumed to delineate a Roman trackway during previous excavations by the AFU (SMR 11187A). Pottery was also found to the north-west (SMR 10490A) at a cropmark site that possibly includes the remains of a Roman field system. A cropmark site to the north (SMR 06985) may also be Roman in date.

Anglo-Saxon

There have been no finds of this date from around the subject site.

Medieval

Domesday (1086) records the name Wicken as Wicina, and a probable derivation of the name is ‘dairy-farm(s)’. Dimmock’s Cote is probably associated with the family of Hugo Dymmock, recorded in 1394 (Reaney 1943).

Medieval pottery was found during excavation in the quarry in 1993 (SMR 11187B), and to the north-west of the site lies a series of cropmarks of rectangular enclosures (SMR 10490).

Excavations by the AFU exposed medieval furrows cutting through the Bronze Age archaeology within the development area. One of the strips was found to contain two rectangular pits with a single post-hole suggesting a marker post and pit within the medieval field system (Kemp and Kenney 2002)
Figure 2 Location of 2002 Evaluation trenches in relation to earlier excavations.
4 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK

Apart from Areas I and II, which evaluated the archaeological potential of the quarry in 1992, subsequent excavations have been undertaken within a phased extraction scheme that was defined by Euston Lime.

1992: Areas I and II (Figure 2)

In 1992 two trenches of 2m in width and 275m in length were opened prior to Phase 1 of quarrying (Bray 1992; 4). Archaeological remains encountered during these excavations included two parallel ditches, one of which had a series of post-holes cut into its base. These ditches were initially believed to be of Bronze Age date; but following further work in 1993 they were re-interpreted as the boundary ditches to a Roman trackway (Bray pers. comm.). The only other archaeological feature found during this phase of work was believed to be a sub-rectangular pit of 4 x 3m, although the feature was not completely exposed (Bray 1992; 9). This work suggested that there was a significant quantity of Bronze Age archaeology in the vicinity and was justification for further archaeological excavations.

1993: Area III (Figure 2)

During July, 1993 a trench of 10m in width and 272m in length was opened (Bray 1993; 6). Excavated features consisted of a series of post-holes, sub-circular and square pits including a complex of inter-cutting pits. The two parallel ditches recorded in 1992 continued into this area. Three areas of Bronze Age activity were defined:

1. A series of post-holes believed to represent a circular hut and a curvilinear fence lying close to the parallel Roman ditches. These survived within the area of surviving buried soil (Bray 1993; 6).

2. A pit filled with fired clay, animal bone and a crucible has been interpreted as the remains of a funerary or industrial site (cut 43). This pit lay to the south of the remnants of a buried soil and the main complex of Neolithic and Bronze Age features (Bray 1993; 6).

3. A pit complex which Bray suggests may have been associated with a storage function lay at the southern end of Trench III (Bray 1993; 6).

The two parallel ditches continued to cut across the area enclosed by the circular hut and are therefore presumed to be of a more recent date, possibly Roman as they led towards Roman buildings removed by earlier phases of quarrying (Bray pers. comms). Two undated rectangular pits were also excavated; these were believed to have been overlain by the buried soil and were assumed to be Neolithic in date (Bray 1993; 5).
Apart from the crucible mentioned above other artefacts recovered during this excavation included animal bone, pottery, flint tools, flint knapping waste and a loom weight. These artefacts are likely to indicate the presence of Neolithic and Bronze Age settlement nearby. A phosphate survey was undertaken across the buried soil which identified high concentrations of phosphates within the ancient soil; high phosphate levels are commonly indicative of domestic or agricultural waste and therefore could indicate the presence of an adjacent settlement.

Bray suggests that artefacts recovered during these excavations were largely securely within archaeological features, and the site, at least where it is overlain by the medieval headland, was in a relatively undisturbed condition (Bray 1994; 5). This headland not only protected archaeological deposits, but also the Bw soil horizon of a buried soil which had formed near the base of the original post-glacial soil profile (French 1993; 9). This Bw horizon is referred to as "the Bronze Age buried soil" by Bray on the presumption that it formed between the late Neolithic which is the presumed date of the two pits which it overlies and the Bronze Age when a number of pits were cut in to this layer (Bray 1993:4).

1993: Area IV (Figure 2)

Trench IV, opened in September 1993, was 35m wide, 280m long, and was excavated in advance of Phase 2 of limestone extraction (Schlee 1993).

This work continued the analysis of features highlighted in Trench III. Three types of Bronze Age arrangements were defined in addition to the continuation of the pit complex recognised in Trench III:

1. Six adjacent pits or post-holes lying to the south of the pit alignment were interpreted as a square structure (Schlee 1993; 2).

2. A semi-circular alignment of pits lying within the buried soil was suggested to be the remnants of a small roundhouse (Schlee 1993; 4).

3. Linear pit alignments within the buried soil were interpreted as a fence (Schlee 1993; 4).

The parallel ditches were found to contain Roman as well as Bronze Age pottery probably indicating a historic but pre-medieval date for the infilling and excavation of these features. Rectangular pits similar to those found in Trench III, although on a different orientation, were found to contain medieval pottery.

Excavation of the buried soil took place within eighteen 1m square test pits. Bronze Age pottery was recovered from a depth of up to 0.25m within the buried soil, although the majority of the finds came from the upper 0.05m. Schlee suggests that the Bronze Age buried soil had been disturbed by a combination of bioturbation and later ploughing and it would seem that the buried soil was preserved and largely incorporated in the headland (Schlee 1993; 4).
1994: Area V (Figure 2)

Trench V, opened in November 1994 was 34m wide, 254m long, and was excavated in advance of Phase 3 of limestone extraction (Kemp and Kenney 2002).

This work continued the analysis of features highlighted in Trench IV, but the majority of the features uncovered were hitherto unknown. Three types of arrangements of Bronze Age pits were defined in addition to the continuation of one ditch:

1. Eight sub-circular pits of an estimated 14 were excavated. These were arranged in a sub-linear inter-cutting pattern in a form similar to those encountered in 1993 (Trench IV).

2. A complex of at least four inter-cutting pits extending eastwards beyond the trench edge.

3. Six pits or post-holes were found that can be divided into two sub-groups by shape, either being circular/sub-circular or rectangular/sub-rectangular.

4. Two adjacent but discrete sub-rectangular pits were found in the south of the area.

5. Six pits or post-holes were found at the southern end of the area that can be divided into two sub-groups by shape, either being circular/sub-circular or rectangular/sub-rectangular.

6. The southern east-west ditch seen in Trenches I-IV was found to continue into Trench V, but no sign was seen of its northern companion.

7. Medieval plough furrows, a headland, associated pits and post-holes were shown to continue the pattern seen in previous excavations.

Typological analysis (fabric and form) of the pottery recovered from the linear pit complex suggests a late Neolithic or late Bronze Age date, although no diagnostic sherds were found within these pits. Other artefacts included debitage indicative of prehistoric flint knapping within this area and a few fragments of degraded bone.

Three sherds of pottery were recovered from the most recent feature of the second pit complex. These consisted of flint-tempered fabrics as well as pottery tempered with plant remains; in particular a sherd of Beaker pottery was recovered. Typological analysis has indicated a Neolithic or late Bronze Age date for the plant-tempered fabrics.

Eighteen sherds of flint tempered prehistoric pottery were recovered from the post-holes/pits. The typology of the pottery suggests a Neolithic or Bronze Age date for these sherds.
Thirty one sherds of flint tempered prehistoric pottery were recovered from one of the two adjacent pits, including the rim neck and body of an early Neolithic shouldered bowl. It is likely that both features relate to Neolithic activity in this area.

A single sherd of probable Iron Age pottery was recovered from the east-west ditch.

1996/7: Area VI (Figure 2)

Trench VI, opened in October 1996 with the excavations completed in May 1997 was 20m wide, 170m long, and was excavated in advance of Phase 4 of limestone extraction (Kemp and Kenney 2002).

This work continued the analysis of features highlighted in Trench V, but the majority of the features uncovered were hitherto unknown. Three types of arrangements of Bronze Age pits were defined in addition to the continuation of one ditch:

1. A sub-circular prehistoric enclosure with an entrance to the southeast was identified. It did not contain surviving burial remains and was not at the time interpreted as the remnants of a barrow, however it may still have once been such a funerary monument.

2. A pit complex uncovered in the south of the trench was interpreted as a quarry.

3. The southern east-west ditch seen in Trenches I-V was found to continue into Trench VI, but no sign was seen of its northern companion.

The enclosure was dated as broadly prehistoric by morphology and its location in a rich Neolithic and Bronze Age landscape, while the pit complex produced sherds of Late Bronze Age pottery.

No finds were recovered from the east-west ditch during this season of excavations.

5 METHODOLOGY

Subsequent to the desk-based assessment, which outlined the archaeological potential for the area, field evaluation was undertaken by the AFU. Field evaluation consisted of 1.518m of trenching within a 4.6 ha area. The Brief highlighted an area of 6.5 ha, however part of this area had been excavated in 1997 whilst a bund of soil 5-10m in width separated the evaluation area from the quarry face.

Trenches were opened on 15th May using a 360° excavator with a 2m wide bucket and remained open until the 14th June in order to give suitable time for the archaeology to be evaluated. Topsoil and subsoil removed from the trenches was scanned by eye and a metal detector for the presence of artefacts.
All potential archaeological features were hand excavated. Hand excavation included a sample of furrows and natural features to confirm our interpretation of these features.

Trench locations were planned using a Total Station, the results of which have been tied into the Ordnance Survey. Hand drawn plans and sections across excavated archaeological features were completed and tied into the Ordnance Datum.

Artefacts were collected from stratified and unstratified contexts and have been analysed accordingly, with dating verified against material identified and catalogued by Jon Last and Nigel Brown during the course of the earlier excavations. Environmental samples were taken as appropriate from stratified, dated and uncontaminated deposits to assist in the interpretation and assess the environmental potential of the archaeology.

As stipulated in the Brief human remains were left in-situ to allow for excavation in an appropriate manner where the burial could be excavated in context to adjacent archaeology lying outside of the evaluation trenches.

The excavation record is presently held by the AFU at Fulbourn alongside the archives from earlier excavations within the quarry.

6 RESULTS

Trench 1
Trench 1 lies in the south-west quadrant of the site and was 61m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.34 m.

Within the trench lay a single north-south orientated furrow. No other archaeological features were encountered.

19gms of Bronze Age pottery was recovered from context 703.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine component</th>
<th>Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>furrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>concave</td>
<td>Broad U-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>furrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Sandy clayey silt. Rare pne, limestone up to 55mm with frequent fecks of chalk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trench 2
Trench 2 lies in the south-west quadrant of the evaluation area and was 61m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.36m.

Within the trench lay a single east-west orientated ditch which was not encountered in Trench 3. Two segments were excavated through the ditch the results of which
indicated that the surviving remains were very ephemeral, with a maximum depth of 30mm, and the suggestion that it may have originally been excavated as a segmented ditch.

No finds were recovered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine and Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irregular linear</td>
<td>uneven</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Silty clay with a high %</td>
<td>Terminating to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/3</td>
<td>of limestone fragments</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yellow brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Silty clay with 30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/3</td>
<td>limestone &lt;5mm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pale</td>
<td>Occasional other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yellow brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>limestone fragments up to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trench 3
Trench 3 was located in the south-east corner of the evaluation area. The length of the Trench totalled 117m. Topsoil depth was 0.31 m

No archaeology was encountered.

No finds were recovered.

Trench 4
Trench 4 was located in the south-east corner of the evaluation area. The length of the trench totalled 106m. Topsoil depth was 0.26m and overlay 0.36m of subsoil.

A single ditch ran east-west through the trench and three segments were excavated. What is presumed to be the same ditch was identified in Trench 16. The results of these excavations suggested that the ditch was originally dug in a series of segmented ditches. The first ditch in the sequence is evidenced by 758. A later ditch (756, 760 and 762) cuts through the earlier alignment

A single sherd of what is probably Bronze Age pottery was recovered from context 755.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine and Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Sandy clayey silt, &lt;1% flint</td>
<td>linear, slightly</td>
<td>uneven</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>and limestone fragments,</td>
<td>irregular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellowish brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Fine and Coarse component</td>
<td>Shape in Plan</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Sancy clayey silt. &lt; 1% flint and limestone &lt;50mm.</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>Open U-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Light yellowish brown</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>Open U-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Sandy clayey silt. &lt; 1% flint and limestone &lt;50mm.</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Slightly concave base</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Yellowish brown</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Slightly concave base</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Sandy clayey silt. &lt; 1% flint and limestone &lt;50mm.</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Uneven and irregular</td>
<td>Wide based V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>10YR</td>
<td>Yellowish brown</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Uneven and irregular</td>
<td>Wide based V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 5**

Trench 5 was located in the north-east quadrant of the evaluation area. The length of trench totalled 94m. Topsoil depth was 0.44m.

No archaeology was identified in this trench.

No finds were recovered.

**Trench 6**

Trench 6 was located along the eastern boundary of the evaluation area. The length of the trench totalled 105m. Topsoil depth was 0.32m.

Two archaeological features were identified, both were ditches generally with an east-west orientation although on a trajectory which suggests that they should intercept with each other to the north of this trench. These ditches were not identified in Trenches 5, 7 or 8 indicating that they are of restricted occurrence.

No finds were recovered.
## Trench 7

Trench 7 was located in the centre of the evaluation area and was 75m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.32 m.

No archaeology was identified in this trench.

No finds were recovered.

## Trench 8

Trench 8 was located in the north-east quadrant of the evaluation area and was 64m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.29 m.

No archaeology was identified in this trench.

No finds were recovered.

## Trench 9

Trench 9 was located on the north-eastern boundary of the evaluation area and was 77m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.32 m.

No archaeology was identified in this trench.

No finds were recovered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine component</th>
<th>Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 6/6 Brown yellow</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Occasional (5-10%) small fragments &amp; flecks of degraded limestone &lt;20mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>flat to uneven.s</td>
<td>flat based U-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 6/4 Light yellow brown</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Occasional (5-10%) degraded limestone fragments &lt;40mm. Small patches of very small grits and flecks &lt;5mm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>linear with straight sides</td>
<td>gently concave</td>
<td>Open U-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 Plans and Sections for Trenches 2, 4 and 6
Figure 4 Plans and Sections for Trenches 10 and 11
Figure 5 Plans and Sections for Trenches 12 and 14
Figure 6  Plans and Sections for Trenches 15 and 16
Trench 16

Figure 7 Plans and Sections for Trenches 16 and 17

Plate 1 Bronze Age crouched burial in Trench 12
Trench 10

Trench 10 was located in the north-eastern quadrant of the evaluation area and was 65m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.30m in depth and overlay about 0.06m of subsoil.

The archaeology consisted of a post-hole and a small pit located on the margins of a large pit (720). Only one post-hole was categorically identified on the margin of the large pit, others may exist within the un-excavated portion. The presence of a post suggests that a structure was integral to the use of this pit. Provisionally the large pit has been interpreted as a well or pit for water storage although the sedimentology and environmental samples from the pit are inconclusive on this subject. The surviving, excavated, deposits within the pit suggest intentional backfilling. However, due to health and safety limitations the pit was not excavated to its basal limit and waterlain sediments or other sediments indicative of the pits final use may survive at the base. There was no indication from any of the excavated sediments that waterlogged deposits survive within the feature.

Environmental samples from the pit showed no traces of non-carbonised, carbonised macro-botanical remains, small mammal bones or other environmental indicators.

In the centre of the trench, approximately 15m south-west of the area of pitting lay a single north-south orientated ditch. This ditch was not identified in Trench 8, however it may extend into Trench 11 where a similar sized ditch terminates.

Pit 718 contained 48 gms of late Bronze Age pottery, a single flint flake and 3 fragments of un-diagnostic animal bone. A single sherd of medieval tile seems to have been found in the basal deposit of this pit.

Pit 719 contained 1 sherd (4 gms) of probable Bronze Age pottery.

Pit 720 contained a mixed assemblage (302 gms) of Bronze Age shell and coarse flint tempered pottery. In addition there were the occasional fragments of un-diagnostic animal bone (27 gms), burnt flint and 6 pieces of worked flint flakes (47 gms) including 1 blade fragment. One of the pieces of flint has been bifacially worked and heat treated. Only the butt was found during excavation and it is likely that the artefact was broken during manufacture. Over 2700 gms of the local fossiliferous limestone had been discarded into this pit along with a small fragment of granite which show slight evidence of burning.

3 gms of probable Bronze Age pottery were also found in ditch 740.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine and Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>In Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø1.65</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-circular. A little ragged/irregular</td>
<td>Small concave U-shaped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>pit/posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø2.85</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular - truncated by [720] gently concave &amp; slightly uneven</td>
<td>Wide V-shaped with flatish base?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Fine and Coarse Component</td>
<td>Shape in Plan</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>pit/well</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not bottomed</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>Ø1.65</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 6/8</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Rare (1-5%) fragments of degraded chalky limestone &amp; calcareous grits &lt;5mm. Rare (1-5%) gravel &lt;30mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>Ø1.65</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 6/2</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Occasional (5-10%). Calcereous grits &lt;5mm, Rare (1-5%) and degraded limestone fragments &lt;30mm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>pit/posthole</td>
<td>Ø2.05</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5Y 5/4</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Rare (1-5%) small fragments of degraded limestone &lt;20mm. Rarely burnt. Occasional (5-10%) calcareous grits &lt;5mm - rare charcoal flecks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>pit/well</td>
<td>Ø3.2</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 5/4</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Occasional (5-10%) fragments of degraded limestone, &lt;50mm. Rare (1-5%) calcereous grits &lt;5mm, but up to 50mm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Pit well</td>
<td>Ø4</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 5/4</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Occasional (5-10%) fragments of degraded limestone mainly &lt;60mm but up to 80mm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Pit well</td>
<td>Ø0.64</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5Y 6/4</td>
<td>Sandy silt fairly clayey. Frequent calcereous grits 5mm. Occasional. fragments of degraded limestone &lt;70mm. Rare gravels &lt;40mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Fine and Coarse component</td>
<td>Shape in Plan</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Pit/well</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>10yr 5/4 Yellowish brown with very diffuse mottles/staining of 2.5y 5/4</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Occasional (5-10%) degraded limestone fragments &lt;80mm. Moderate calcareous grits &lt;5mm and very occasional charcoal flecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10yr 5/4 Yellowish brown</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Occasional (5-10%) calcareous grits &lt;10mm. Rare (1-5%) larger fragments of degraded limestone up to 40mm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>10yr 6/4 Light yellowish brown</td>
<td>Sandy silt. Occasional (5-10%) calcareous grits &lt;10mm and degraded limestone fragments &lt;40mm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>linear with straight sides.</td>
<td>flat and gently undulating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 11**

Trench 11 was located on the northern margin of the evaluation area and was 87m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.30m and overlay 0.18m of subsoil.

Archaeology consisted of three ditches. 772 lies at the eastern end of the trench and may represent the termination to the ditch (740) excavated in Trench 10. Two narrow ditches (768 and 770) run parallel to each other in the centre of the trench. 770 also terminates within this trench.

No finds were recovered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine and Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5y 5/6 Light olive brown with mottles of 8.2 pale yellow and rarely of 8/1 white</td>
<td>Sandy silt and very chalky/limestone silt. Occasional (5-10%) fragments &lt;30mm of degraded limestone. Occasional (5-10%) patches of grits toward feature edges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>linear with irregular edges</td>
<td>irregular to uneven</td>
<td>open U-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Fine and Coarse component</td>
<td>Shape in Plan</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.5Y 5/8 Light olive brown with mottles of 8/2 pale yellow.</td>
<td>Sandy silt and very chalky/limestone silt, occasional (5-10%) fragments &lt;30mm of degraded limestone, occasional (5-10%) patches of grits toward feature edges</td>
<td>linear with squarish butt end to south</td>
<td>Flattish some localised uneveness</td>
<td>Open V-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch termination</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10YR 5/3 Brownish yellow</td>
<td>Sandy silt, occasional (5-10%) small fragments of degraded limestone, rare (1-5%) gravel stones, 30mm. Single burnt stone 7cm and rare charcoal flecks</td>
<td>linear with straight even sides and a squarish butt end to NW</td>
<td>flattish</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch termination</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trench 12

Trench 12 was located on the eastern margin of the evaluation area and was 120m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.31 m and overlay 0.18m of subsoil.

A single isolated archaeological feature was identified. Limited excavation indicated that this was a crouched burial with a Bronze Age pot located at the head end of the burial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine component</th>
<th>Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
<td>burial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trench 13

Trench 13 was located on the north-west quadrant of the evaluation area and was 120m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.31 m and overlay 0.17 m of subsoil.

No archaeology was identified in this trench.

No finds were recovered.
Trench 14

Trench 14 was located in the north-west quadrant of the evaluation area. The length of the trench totalled 129m. Topsoil depth was 0.31m and overlay 0.17m of subsoil.

At the north-west end of the trench lay a series of irregular hollows (764 and 766) of probable archaeological origin although natural features similar in form lie in close proximity which may make the archaeological interpretation suspect.

Within the centre of the trench lie a disparate series of post-holes of varying shapes and sizes (748, 750 and 752). The probable base of another post-hole is marked by the presence of a medieval tile. Within the trench no obvious alignments are recognisable.

737 is the only excavated linear feature within the trench. This was interpreted as a furrow by the excavator, however the alignment, west-north-west to east-south-east is at odds with the placement of the headland. Other evidence for ridge and furrow in the area suggests that we are on the margins between two furlongs. This would tend to support the aerial photographic interpretation that indicates a north-south orientated headland boundary ran through this area.

Pit 737 contained a single sherd of abraded Roman pottery and a butchered metatarsus from a cow.

Post-hole 752 contained 102 gms of coarse flint tempered pottery of late Neolithic or Bronze Age date.

Pit 764 contained a single (1 gm), very abraded sherd of prehistoric pottery and a single fragment of animal bone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine component</th>
<th>Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>furrow</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td>Light brown</td>
<td>Clayey silt. 5% silt. 5% medium inclinations</td>
<td>straight</td>
<td>concave</td>
<td>unshaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>furrow</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>10YR 4/4</td>
<td>Dark yellow</td>
<td>Clayey silt. 1% Clayey silt. 1% small inclinations</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>concave</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>Post-hole</td>
<td>Ø0.31</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Clayey silt. 5% Clayey silt. 5% small inclinations</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>Post-hole</td>
<td>Ø0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Clayey silt. 5% Clayey silt. 5% small inclinations</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>Post-hole</td>
<td>Ø0.58</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Clayey silt. 5% Clayey silt. 5% small inclinations</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>uneven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>Post-hole</td>
<td>Ø0.58</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Clayey silt. 5% Clayey silt. 5% small inclinations</td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>uneven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Fine component Coarse component</td>
<td>Shape in Plan</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ceramic tile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 5/4 Yellowish brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Clayey silt. 5% medium inclusions and 5% cobbles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td></td>
<td>flat based v-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>10YR 5/6 Yellowish brown</td>
<td>Clayey silt, &gt;6% medium inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>uneven</td>
<td></td>
<td>flat based V-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 15**

Trench 15 was located in the south-west quadrant of the evaluation area. The length of the trench totalled 87m. Topsoil depth was 0.31m.

Apart from east-west furrows, one of which was excavated, the archaeology in this trench consisted of two gullies. **742** runs north-south and **744** runs east-west. Both are located towards the centre of the trench and are likely to intercept to the north-west of Trench 15. There was no trace of a gully in the southern arm of the trench indicating that if this was a small enclosure, fence or building then the enclosure is interrupted on this side.

No finds were recovered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine component Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>10YR 5/3 Brown with mottles of 10YR 6/2 light grey</td>
<td>Clayey silt Occasional (5-10%) fine limestone inclusions Rare (1-5%) medium angular limestone inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>linear parallel sides</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td></td>
<td>U-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>10YR 6/4 Light yellowish brown</td>
<td>Clayey silt Frequent (&gt;10%) fine sub-angular inclusions Rare (1-5%) medium sub-angular inclusions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>linear almost parallel sides</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td></td>
<td>flat bottom U-shape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trench 16

Trench 16 was located in the south-west quadrant of the evaluation area. The length of the trench totalled 64m. Topsoil depth was 0.27m and overlay 0.22m of subsoil.

In addition to north-south orientated ridge and furrow and five east-west orientated narrow ditches were identified. One of these ditches, excavated as segments 709 and 717, was shown to be over 24m in length and is probably the same as the ditch seen in Trench 4 (756, 758, 760 and 762). The stepped edges of 709 and 717 may suggest that two phases of ditching are represented as was seen in Trench 4. However in this case there was no sedimentological changes to support the interpretation of re-cutting of the original ditch.

No finds were recovered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Fine component</th>
<th>Coarse component</th>
<th>Shape in Plan</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.5Y 6/2 Light brownish grey</td>
<td>Clayey silt. Frequent (&gt;10%) fine sub-angular limestone inclusions and occasional (5-10%) medium sub-angular limestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>Stepped U-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.5Y 6/2 Light greyish brown</td>
<td>Clayey silt. Frequent (&gt;10%) fine sub-angular limestone inclusions and occasional (5-10%) medium sub-angular limestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open U-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.5Y 6/4 Light yellowish brown</td>
<td>Clayey silt. Frequent (&gt;10%) fine sub-angular limestone inclusions and occasional (5-10%) medium sub-angular limestone. Very rare coarse, rounded flint inclusions and fragments of degraded limestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open U-shaped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trench 17

Trench 17 was located in the south-west quadrant of the evaluation area and was 40m in length. Topsoil depth was 0.30 and overlay 0.20m of subsoil.

In addition to the east-west furrow 714, two parallel ditches were identified and excavated. These were in very close proximity and both mirrored the orientation seen in ridge and furrow and probably relate to either this system or to an earlier field system which provided the alignments for medieval cultivation.

No finds were recovered.
### 7 DISCUSSION

The evaluation showed that as in previous years the archaeology is dispersed and is largely composed on prehistoric and medieval features.

The main concentrations of archaeology can be seen on the western side of the evaluation area with some of these archaeological features running eastwards across the evaluation area. A particularly dense area of prehistoric archaeology was discovered in Trench 10 and a human burial was found in Trench 12. The remains of the medieval field systems as shown by the traces of furrows can be traced across most of the field. Headlands survive as slight earthworks.

In the south-west quadrant of the evaluation area archaeology was largely composed of narrow east-west orientated ditches one of which is probably continuous and extends across the whole field, being seen in Trenches 4 and 16. A similarly orientated ditch was found in Trench 2. This is not a ditch system shown on the aerial photographs but was first exposed during the excavations in Area VI in 1997. The format of the ditches and the paucity of finds would suggest that they are field boundaries to an enclosed area extending to the south of Trench 4 and 15. Earlier excavations have not to date indicated evidence for enclosure during the Neolithic and Bronze Age in the Dimmock’s Cote area it is therefore likely that this enclosure is more likely to be associated with the known Iron Age or Roman-British activities in the area. Within Trench 15 similar sized, undated, ditches were found, the alignment of which suggests that there was a degree of complexity to this enclosure and that the area may have been partitioned into smaller units. The two ditches seen in Trench 17 align with the furrows and are larger in size than those seen in Trenches 2, 4 and 16 and are therefore presumed not to be part of this prehistoric ditch system.

In the northern quadrants of the evaluation area the archaeology is quite different in that there are no traces of the enclosure system seen adjacent to Dimmock’s Cote Road (Trenches 2, 4 and 16). In Trench 14 there are traces of a post-built structure of un-known form. Prehistoric, Roman and medieval finds have been found in the area including a medieval tile which initially appeared to have been used as a post-pad making the dating to the structure problematic as another post-hole contained Bronze Age pottery. The presence of 14 sherds of Bronze Age pottery in one of the post-
holes would suggest a degree of intentional placement, that more than one structure exists in this area, and at least one of these structures is prehistoric in date.

To the north of this structure lies some small irregular scoops in the degraded limestone. In Trench 12 immediately to the east of these features lies a single crouched inhumation of Bronze Age date. These remains were left in-situ in order to facilitate appropriate excavation and sampling in a controlled manner at a later date. The burial lies about 10m to the east of the horseshoe shaped enclosure excavated in 1997 and which was presumed to have been the remains of a Bronze Age barrow.

Trench 10 provided the main concentration of prehistoric activity with over 300 gms of Bronze Age pottery found within the large pit along with fragments of animal bone, flint artefacts and large fragments of the local limestone. These all occurred with backfill deposits to the main pit. The remains suggest that this is either direct evidence of a Bronze Age activity or that these finds were incorporated into the pit during a later period. The presence of medieval pottery from one of the pits may support the latter idea. Either way Bronze Age activity must have been occurring close by and is probably represented by some if not all of the excavated features in this area.

Other isolated ditches are present in Trenches 6 and 11 but do not appear on either the cropmark plots or within adjacent trenches. They indicate the presence of isolated and undated activity of unknown type.

Of the cropmarks plotted for the desk-based assessment (Kemp and Kenney 2002) only the north-south headland is entirely consistent with the aerial photographic evidence. The east-west headland which runs through the northern part of the site was not recognised on the aerial photographs. The northeast-southwest headland which was seen on the aerial photographs does not exist as a headland however some of the narrow ditches seen in 1997 do, for part of the way, follow the course of this cropmark.

The geophysical results were entirely misinterpreted. The majority of anomalies were not of archaeological origin although in one or two cases the variations may be from the detection of ditches rather than the pits of the original interpretation. However these ditches were very small, shallow and narrow, and it is suspected that the anomaly is as a result of recording periglacial features rather than archaeology.
The archaeology continued the dispersed pattern of activity seen at Dimmock's Cote seen since 1993 when a series of Bronze Age buildings and other structures were identified. The results would indicate that there are small zones of intense activity occurring beyond the immediate margins of the settlement. These activities included the post-built structure, where during the course of its abandonment a 'ritual' of intentional placement of pottery was likely to have taken place, a large pit provisionally interpreted as a well, and a satellite burial occurring on the margins of a barrow. Results to date suggest the scenario is of an open landscape with pockets of activity, beyond the main settlement focus. These areas are geared to pastoral activities, industrial activities such as smelting and quarrying, and also ritual activities particularly burial.

Iron Age, Roman, and Saxon/early medieval remains are scarce but suggested by undated ditches and the occasional sherd of pottery. Medieval remains on the other hand consist of extensive traces of cultivation remains particularly furrows and headlands, marker posts and the occasional structure.

The results to date would suggest important components of the Neolithic and Bronze Age landscape, the main focus of earlier studies within the quarry, still survive. Retrieval of further information on the unique elements encountered during this evaluation will allow us to extend our understanding of the local landscape.

Continued study of this area is unlikely to fill many of the gaps outlined by Brown and Murphy (2000), particularly those dealing with the material resources, because of a scarcity of artefactual evidence (pottery, lithics, metal work and animal bone) or environmentally rich deposits on this site. The site as a whole provides a rare opportunity to study a late Neolithic to Late Bronze Age settlement pattern and landscape use, however further thermoluminescence dating of pottery is recommended to assist in the typological studies and phasing of the site. The research being undertaken in this area will also extend our landscape knowledge for studies being undertaken on other parts of the prehistoric landscape in the vicinity particularly along the Fordham Bypass and at Landwade Road, Fordham.

In addition it is of some priority to retrieve the human skeletal remains which have been left on-site.
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