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SUMMARY

In March 2006 Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out a field evaluation at North Lodge, Blenheim Park, Woodstock, Oxfordshire (NGR SP 426 186) on behalf of JG Land and Estates. The evaluation revealed the presence of two limestone wall footings, which were associated with the North Lodge buildings. No other archaeological deposits were identified. Grim’s Ditch and Bank survive to the south of the Lodge but do not extend into the evaluation area.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 In March 2006 OA carried out a field evaluation at North Lodge, within the grounds of Blenheim Park, Oxfordshire. The work was on behalf of JG Land and Estates in respect of a pre-planning investigation for the refurbishment of North Lodge, and the construction of a number of new buildings and a swimming pool. A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), outlining how OA would deal with any archaeological remains, was prepared (OA, 2006b) and agreed with the Deputy County Archaeologist, Hugh Coddington. The site is centred at NGR SP 426 186.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 North Lodge lies within the northern part of Blenheim Great Park (Figs 1 and 2) to the west of the Great Avenue. The site generally slopes down very gently from the west. The centre of the site lies at approximately 110 m OD.

1.2.2 The underlying geology of the site is of Jurassic limestone, with marl and raudstone horizons.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The archaeological background to the evaluation has been the subject of a separate desk study (OA 2006a), which should be referred to for a detailed discussion of the archaeological potential of the area.

1.3.2 North Lodge lies within the Grade I Registered Park and Garden of Blenheim Park, which is a World Heritage Site.

1.3.3 It is of particular note that North Lodge lies just to the north of an extant section of Grim’s Ditch, a Scheduled Iron Age earthwork. Where well-preserved, the monument comprises an upstanding bank c 4 m high and 10 m wide, with a ditch c 1 m deep and 8 m wide. Approximately 30 m to the south of the house the ditch and bank are clearly visible, but the monument decreases in height within the North Lodge property and is not visible as an earthwork close to the house (Fig. 2).
1.3.4 North Lodge also lies approximately 150 m to the north of Ackeman Street, a major Roman road.

2 EVALUATION AIMS

2.1 General aims

2.1.1 To establish the presence or absence, extent, condition, nature, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains within the proposal area that may affect the need for further mitigation during the construction process.

2.1.2 To establish the ecofactual and environmental potential of any archaeological deposits uncovered.

2.1.3 To make available the results of the investigation.

2.2 Specific aims

2.2.1 To establish the presence or absence of Grim’s Ditch, to the east of North Lodge.

3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Scope of fieldwork

3.1.1 The evaluation consisted of ten small trenches, measuring between 2 m by 2 m, and 6 m by 2 m. They were located to assess the nature of underlying deposits and the archaeological potential of the site (Fig 2).

3.2 Fieldwork methods and recording

3.2.1 The overburden was removed under close archaeological supervision by a 3CB mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless bucket. Excavation stopped at the upper archaeological horizon or the top of the underlying geology, whichever was encountered first. The trenches were then archaeologically recorded, before further machining was undertaken, to investigate the underlying geological horizons, as part of the geo-technical investigations.

3.2.2 The trenches were cleaned by hand as appropriate and the revealed features were examined to determine their extent and nature, and to retrieve finds. All features were planned and, where excavated, their sections drawn at scales of 1:20. All features and trenches were photographed using colour slide and black and white print film. Recording followed procedures laid down in the OAU Fieldwork Manual (ed D Wilkinson, 1992).

3.3 Finds

3.3.1 Finds were recovered by hand during the course of the excavation and bagged by context.
3.4 Palaeo-environmental evidence

3.4.1 No deposits suitable for environmental sampling were identified.

3.5 Presentation of results

3.5.1 Sections 4 and 5 give a description of the ground conditions and soils encountered, together with a distribution of archaeological deposits.

3.5.2 The empty trenches are briefly described, together with a description of the deposits found. Trenches 2 and 4 revealed standing walls and are described separately.

3.5.3 The stratigraphic description is followed by a description of the finds and a discussion and interpretation of the results.

3.5.4 A table of contexts is given in Appendix 1, which gives details of individual contexts.

4 RESULTS: GENERAL

4.1 Soils and ground conditions

4.1.1 Typically the underlying geology consisted of fragmentary limestone in sandy clays and silts (cornbrash). It became progressively stonier and harder with depth, and intermittent and irregular patches, or bandings, of clean sandy clays were observed. These deposits were typically overlain by a layer of orange brown silty clay and a thin covering of modern topsoil.

4.1.2 The ground was well-drained, and ground water was not encountered during the investigations.

4.2 Distribution of archaeological deposits

4.2.1 Apart from the footings of two limestone walls, found within Trenches 2 and 4, no archaeological deposits were identified.

5 RESULTS: DESCRIPTIONS

5.1 Description of deposits

Empty trenches

5.1.1 Trenches 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 revealed no archaeological features or deposits. Typically, within these trenches the underlying limestone bedrock (where reached) was found at approximately 3 m beneath the present ground level. The bedrock was overlain by fragmentary limestone in sandy clays and silts (cornbrash), and intermittent and irregular patches and bandings of clean sandy clays. Typically the upper horizon of the limestone was found between 0.3 m and 0.7 m beneath the present ground level. It was overlain by a layer of clean orange brown silty clay, beneath a thin covering of modern topsoil.
5.1.2 Trench 3 varied from the sequence described above in that the underlying natural comprised mixed limestone and silty clays. These were overlain by a 0.22 m thick layer of buried topsoil. This deposit contained scattered animal bone and was presumed to be a levelling up spread of soil and domestic rubbish, in a broad area of lower ground to the north-east of the house (Fig 2). The buried soil was overlain by up to 0.24 m of a re-deposited dirty orange brown silty clay and the present topsoil.

5.1.3 None of the deposits encountered within these trenches contained any indication of archaeological activity within the area.

5.1.4 Details of all deposits are given within the table of contexts (Appendix 1).

**Trench 2**

5.1.5 Trench 2 was located within gardens to the north of the house (Figs 2 and 3) and measured 2.9 m wide x 2.8 m long. The trench was initially excavated down to a depth of 1.2 m, recorded archaeologically, and then subsequently deepened to an overall depth of 3 m, to test the underlying geology.

5.1.6 Bedrock was revealed within the bottom of the deepened trench at a depth of 1.08 m O.D. and was overlain by cornbrash (207). A large feature (208) cut to this level and appeared to slope down sharply towards the house from the north. The cut was 2.4 m deep by at least 1.6 m wide, it was relatively poorly defined, being mostly recognisable by its lower fill (204). Fill 204 contained relatively loose, large flat limestone pieces in a matrix of pinkish brown silty clay. The fill also contained occasional charcoal flecking and small fragments of brick. A small pocket of pale yellow-white sandy silt (206), seen within the western side of the trench, formed the upper fill of this feature. The presence of charcoal and brick fragments within fill (204) indicates that this cut was relatively modern and is probably associated with the construction of the house.

5.1.7 A 0.25 m thick layer of compact sandy clay (203), containing frequent small and medium sized limestone, lay above the fills of cut 208. The remains of a limestone wall (201) overlay this layer. The wall was aligned NNW - SSE and consisted of roughly laid courses of un-worked limestone pieces. The wall was 0.44 m wide and survived to a height of 0.28 m. It was noted during excavations that this wall corresponded with an extant corner wall stub, incorporated into a low garden wall. This wall was aligned WSW-ENE across the garden, some 4 m to the north of Trench 2 (Fig. 2).

5.1.8 To the west of wall 201 a spread of dark grey-brown sandy clay (205) containing limestone rubble, fragmentary CBM and coal, was revealed. It appeared to be a demolition deposit associated with the wall.

5.1.9 These deposits and wall 201 were overlain by up to 0.35 m of topsoil.
Trench 4

5.1.10 Trench 4 lay approximately 6 m to the east of Trench 2, outside of the present garden fence and to the north of the visible remains of Grim’s Ditch (Fig. 2).

5.1.11 The trench was aligned WSW-ENE, measured 6 m long by 1.5 m wide and was excavated to a depth of 0.95 m. Undisturbed natural deposits of fragmentary limestone in pale orange sandy silts and clays were revealed (402, 404, 406), intermittent layers and pockets of pinkish brown, slightly silty clay were also observed (403, 405; Fig. 4).

5.1.12 Within the west of the trench the footings of a NNW-SSE aligned limestone wall (408) were revealed, approximately 1 m to the east of the existing wooden garden fence-line.

5.1.13 The wall was built of roughly coursed unworked limestone, bonded with a pinkish brown silty clay. It survived to a height of 0.19 m and was up to 0.4 m wide. A blackish brown clay loam (407) containing broken limestone fragments, frequent coal and charcoal flecking and 17th-18th century pottery, lay to the west of the wall. It seems likely that this deposit was either levelling up for a former pathway, or simply a spread of domestic waste.

5.1.14 Wall 408 and spread 407 were overlain by up to 0.14 m of pinkish brown silty clay (401) and a thin spread of modern topsoil.

5.2 Finds

Pottery

5.2.1 A sherd of pottery dated from the 17th-18th centuries was recovered from a dumped layer (407).

Animal bone

5.2.2 Four fragmented sheep bones were recovered from a topsoil deposit (302). The assemblage comprised a left and right humerus, a left sided metacarpal and an unidentified longbone fragment.

Ceramic building material

5.2.3 Two fragments of brick were recovered from topsoil layer 302 and subsoil layer 203.

6 DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

6.1 Reliability of field investigation

6.1.1 The underlying natural was fully tested within all trenches and consisted of fragmented limestone with occasional banded clay (overlying limestone bed-rock at depth).
6.1.2 Trenches targeted on a possible continuation of Grim’s Ditch revealed the natural at a relatively shallow depth with no indication the ditch or bank materials. The only features identified were two limestone walls which were associated with the house. The recovered finds all appear to be post-medieval in date. No evidence of earlier activity was found and the results of the evaluation appear consistent.

6.2 Overall interpretation

6.2.1 The only features identified were the remains of two limestone walls within Trenches 2 and 4. Both of these features are post-medieval in date and are associated with the North Lodge buildings.

6.2.2 During the excavations it was noted that the wall within Trench 2 was aligned with a short corner-stub incorporated into a upstanding ESE-WNW aligned garden wall. The wall was thicker and more substantial to the west of the corner-stub. It therefore seems likely that the revealed wall was the eastern side of a former out-building.

6.2.3 The wall within Trench 4 lay on a parallel alignment, 1 m to the east of the present wooden garden fence-line. This suggests that it is either the remains of an earlier garden wall or possibly a wall bordering a former pathway.

6.2.4 No other features were identified. If Grim’s Ditch had continued beyond its present visible extent it should have been clearly visible within Trench 4. Trench 4 extended 6 m across the line of the ditch and was machined down into the underlying limestone to positively identify any possible cut there. It therefore seems likely that the ditch never extended to this area. It may have stopped to the south to allow access or perhaps to respect a natural feature such as woodland.

Summary of results

6.2.5 The remains of two NNW-SSE limestone walls were identified within Trenches 2 and 4. These were probably associated with the North Lodge buildings. No other features were identified.

Significance

6.2.6 The walls were of relatively little interest. It is not thought that Grim’s Ditch extends as far as the Lodge, and the absence of any other features or finds suggests that there is no archaeologically significant settlement or activity within the immediate area of the North Lodge House.
### APPENDICES

#### APPENDIX 1: ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench 1</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Subsoil?</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.25+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench 2</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>NNE-SSW aligned wall</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.3+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Pebbly clay</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Subsoil?</td>
<td>0.25+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>Post-med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Fill of cut 208</td>
<td>2.4+</td>
<td>1.6+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Demolition deposit?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Fill of cut 208</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Construction cut?</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-med?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench 3</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Re-deposited clay</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Buried topsoil</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBM/Animal bone</td>
<td>Post-med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Silty Clay</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.4+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.4+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench 4</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Subsoil?</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Silty clay</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Silty Clay</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Demolition deposit?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pot</td>
<td>17th-18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>NNE-SSW aligned wall</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Trench 5 | : Not excavated |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench 6</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Subsoil?</td>
<td>0.2-0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Trench 7 | : Not excavated |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench 8</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Depth (m)</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Subsoil?</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Subsoil?</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Hard Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.45+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Subsoil?</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Hard Limestone brash</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Subsoil?</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Powdery Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.7+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Hard Limestone brash</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Subsoil?</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Powdery Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Limestone brash</td>
<td>0.4+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3  SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS

Site name: North Lodge, Blenheim Park, Woodstock, Oxfordshire.
Site code: WOBPAL 06
Grid reference: SP 426 183
Type of evaluation: Ten small trail trenches/ test pits, to assess archaeological potential and retrieve geo-technical information.
Date and duration of project: Three days: 6th-8th March 2006
Area of site: 0.7ha
Summary of results: Remains of two walls associated with the post-med house. No other features, or indication of earlier occupation
Location of archive: The archive is currently held at OA, Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford, OX2 0ES, and will be deposited with Oxfordshire County Museums Service in due course.
Figure 1: Site location
Figure 4: Trench 4; plan and section.