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Summary

Between the 4th and 7th of April 2011 Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out a field evaluation in the front and rear gardens of The Bungalow, Queen Street, Bloxham, Oxfordshire, on behalf of Corylus Planning and ahead of the construction of three new dwellings.

The evaluation consisted of three trenches and two test pits which were excavated on, or close to, the footprint of the proposed dwellings.

The earliest archaeological evidence comprised a length of ditch containing pottery of late Saxon early medieval date (11th century). A number of other undated ditches might be related and might represent a simple system of ditched enclosures, possibly agricultural, and associated with contemporary settlement nearby.

Evidence was also recovered for stone founded structures fronting on to both Queen Street and Kings Road. Cottages are mapped into the mid to late twentieth century (presumably similar to those surviving today elsewhere on both streets). Pottery and brick from within these structures suggest they may originate in the late medieval/Tudor period, although they may be later structures that incorporate residual or re-used materials.

A relict agricultural or garden soil of post medieval date, sealed by the modern topsoil, was visible in some of the trenches and suggested that the area had been put over to tillage at some point. A large quarry pit was cut through the soil and contained a mixed assemblage of pottery from the late medieval period to the nineteenth century.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work
1.1.1 The area of proposed development (the site) lies within the southern part of the historic village of Bloxham, occupying approximately 0.4 hectares and bounded by Queen Street to the west and King's Road to the east (Fig. 1).

1.1.2 The site is currently occupied by a single bungalow with an associated garage, outbuildings and gardens. Planning permission has been granted on appeal for a replacement dwelling and two new dwellings (planning reference APP/C3105/A/10/2133023).

1.1.3 A condition of the planning permission appeal decision was that an archaeological investigation be carried out prior to demolition, although a formal brief was not issued. The specification for the archaeological investigation was outlined within a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (OA 2011) and agreed by Oxfordshire County Council. The evaluation as specified in the WSI consisted of three trial trenches and two test pits (Fig. 2). Two of the trial trenches were split in two to avoid a buried electric cable.

1.2 Geology and topography
1.2.1 The geology of the area is Jurassic Middle Lias Marlstone, which manifested as clays with ironstone outcrops.

1.2.2 The site is at around 120 m OD on slightly raised ground which falls away gently to the west.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background
1.3.1 A desk-based assessment (OA 2008) looked at the archaeological potential of the site and its environs. The assessment demonstrated that there is low potential for prehistoric remains to be present. Remains of Roman date, specifically burials, have been recorded within Bloxham and therefore a high potential was noted. Remains of medieval date had high potential, as settlement existed in Bloxham during this period. Remains of post-medieval date were also deemed to have high potential due to the presence of cottages on the site as indicated on the Inclosure Map of South Bloxham from 1801.

1.4 Acknowledgements
1.4.1 OA would like to thank Tim Elkins of Johnson Gaunt, and James Burt of Corylus for help in commissioning and setting up the project. Also Richard Oram, the Planning Archaeologist for the Oxfordshire County Archaeological Service who monitored the work, and Mr and Mrs Timms who are resident within the current building. The field work was managed for OA by Nick Shepherd and conducted by Gerry Thacker, Ben McAndrew and Emily Plunkett.
2 EVALUATION AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The aims of the project were detailed in the WSI and are as follows:

(i) To establish the presence/absence, extent, condition, character and date of any archaeological deposits within the area affected by invasive development.

(ii) To establish the potential significance of any archaeological deposits.

(iii) To establish the potential impact on any archaeological deposits by the proposed development.

(iv) To provide sufficient information such that a decision can be taken on the discharge of conditions, or proposals can be formed for mitigation of impact.

(v) To locate any Roman settlement or burial features.

(vi) To locate any medieval settlement features.

(vii) To locate any remains from the earlier demolished cottages on the site.

(viii) To make publicly available the results of the investigation.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 Three trial trenches and two test pits (Fig. 2) were excavated (by a JCB with fitted with a toothless ditching bucket) to the top of the natural geology or other significant higher archaeological horizon. The methodologies as outlined in the WSI were followed at all times.

2.2.2 Trench 1 was orientated north-south and was located to the rear of the current bungalow. The trench was split into two (labelled north and south) to avoid a buried electricity cable. Trench 1 (N) measured 9.5 m long and 1.6 m wide, Trench 1 (S) measured 5 m long and 1.6 m wide.

2.2.3 Trench 2, a test pit, was located to the north of the current bungalow and measured 2 m by 2 m.

2.2.4 Trench 3, a test pit, was located on the front lawn of the current bungalow fronting onto Queen Street, and measured 2.3 m by 1.7 m.

2.2.5 Trench 4 was orientated west-east and was located to the north-east of the current bungalow. The trench was split into two (labelled west and east) to avoid a buried electricity cable. Trench 4 (W) measured 11.25 m long and 1.6 m wide, Trench 4 (E) measured 4 m long and 1.6 m wide.

2.2.6 Trench 5 was located to the rear of the garden, adjacent to King's Road. The northern end of the trench was orientated N-S and then 'dog-legged' to the south west. The trench was 25.1 m long and 1.6 m wide.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction and presentation of results

3.1.1 The results of the evaluation are summarised in section 3.3, and discussed by trench in section 3.4 below. Trench plans are illustrated on Fig. 2 and the corresponding sections on Figs. 3 and 4. A full context inventory is presented in the table in Appendix 1. Finds identification, discussion and quantification form Appendix 2. Environmental data are discussed and quantified in Appendix 3.

3.2 General soils and ground conditions

3.2.1 Topsoil was present within all trenches and varied in depth between 0.11 m (Trench 5) and 0.42 m (Trench 1). A buried garden soil (subsoil) of post-medieval date was present within Trenches 1, 2, 4 and 5. The natural geology was extremely variable, but generally consisted of a heavy, light-yellow clay, although iron stone outcrops were also present.

3.2.2 Ground conditions were dry throughout, although root damage was often extensive especially within trenches 1 and 4.

3.3 General distribution of archaeological deposits

3.3.1 Trench 1 (S) contained an undated ditch, and Trench 1 (N) contained a ditch of late Saxon/early medieval date. Trench 2 contained no archaeological features or deposits. Trench 3 contained a probable post medieval wall and associated floor make up layer. Trench 4 (W) contained an undated ditch, a posthole and a probable nineteenth century quarry pit. Trench 4 (E) contained an undated ditch. Trench 5 contained a post-medieval wall and associated surface, a nineteenth century tree throw or ‘scoop’ and a modern pit.

3.4 Trench 1 (N) (Fig. 3, section 101)

3.4.1 An east-west orientated ditch (Plate 4) was present to the north of the trench. The ditch, 103, exhibited a slightly irregular profile due to root disturbance from an adjacent coniferous hedge. The ditch cut the light yellow clay natural (101). The lower fill (104) was a loose dark orange-brown silty clay containing occasional iron stone fragments. This was overlain by 105, an episode of deliberate backfilling that was a dark brown humic silty clay loam, and which contained large iron stone blocks, and several pottery sherds which dated from AD 900-1100 (see Appendix 2). Animal bones were also recovered from fill 105, the majority of which were from sheep/goat. Three very small fragments of slag and a single small piece of burnt clay/daub were recovered from the fill during flotation. The flots also contained quantities of charred cereal, legume seeds and charcoal (see Appendix 3). The ditch was sealed by a mid orange-brown subsoil (102) that contained charcoal flecks and iron stone fragments. The subsoil was overlain by topsoil (100) which contained frequent mortar and wall plaster fragments and was sealed by turf.

3.5 Trench 1 (S) (Fig. 3, section 100)

3.5.1 A west-east orientated ditch, 106, truncated the orange-brown silty clay natural (109) and had a flat, slightly concave base and regular 45º sides. The lower fill (107) was similar to the underlying natural but with occasional sub angular stone inclusions. The upper fill (108) was a dark grey brown silty clay contained a very degraded bone
fragment which crumbled to powder on lifting. The ditch was sealed by an orange-brown clay subsoil (102) which was overlain by topsoil and turf (100).

3.6 Trench 2
3.6.1 The trench consisted of topsoil (200) and subsoil (201) overlying the natural ironstone and clay (202). No archaeology was present within the trench.

3.7 Trench 3 (Fig. 3, section 300)
3.7.1 At the base of the trench was a compact layer of mottled orange-brown clay with blue-grey and dark brown clay patches. This layer, 305, was up to 0.08 m deep and overlay the natural orange clay and ironstone bedrock (306). The layer, 305, was hand excavated and two small refitting pottery sherds from an imported Raeren stoneware mug potentially dating from 1475 to 1550 were recovered. This layer is interpreted as the make up layer for a floor.

3.7.2 Layer 305 may have been truncated by a N-S running wall, 304, although the relationship was not clear. The wall was of un-mortared construction and built from limestone and ironstone blocks (Plate 3). The western side of the wall ran N-S, the eastern side ran NW-SE, the whole forming a 'wedge' shape which terminated to the north of the trench, perhaps indicative of a doorway.

3.7.3 Layer 305 was sealed by layers 302 and 303, both of which abutted wall 304. Layer 302, to the east of wall 304, was fairly localised, and may have been caused by a decayed timber, or a build up of material after the building went out of use, but prior to formal demolition. To the west of the wall layer 303, which appeared stratigraphically equivalent to 302, was a redeposited clay rich in ironstone fragments. Layers 302 and 303 were sealed by layer 301 a fairly loose mid to light brown silty clay contain frequent mortar patches and fragments of whitewashed plaster. This layer is thought to represent the demolition of the remains of the cottages, probably in the 1950s and prior to the construction of the present bungalow. Layer 301 was sealed by topsoil and turf (300).

3.8 Trench 4 (W) (Fig. 4, sections 401, 402, 404)
3.8.1 To the eastern end of the trench a NW-SE orientated ditch terminal was present. The ditch, 403, had a concave profile and cut the natural clay 401. The single fill, a mid orange-brown silty clay (404) was root disturbed from an adjacent coniferous hedge and contained no finds.

3.8.2 Adjacent to the ditch was a posthole, 405, which was slightly irregular in plan and contained a single mid to dark brown silty clay fill (406).

3.8.3 The ditch and possible posthole were sealed by a mixed mid orange-brown clay loam subsoil, 402, which contained salt glazed stoneware dating from c.1720 to 1780. To the west of the trench subsoil 402 was cut by a large pit (407) interpreted as a quarry pit for ironstone. Pottery recovered from the homogenous clay backfill (408) contained pottery likely to be of 18th or 19th century date. Subsoil 401 was overlain by topsoil and turf (400).

3.9 Trench 4 (E) (Fig. 3, section 400)
3.9.1 A single N-S orientated ditch (411), which curved slightly to the south-west, was present within the centre of the trench. The ditch cut the iron stone and yellow clay natural (410) The lower fill, 412, was a compact, iron stone rich, dark brown silty clay, which
contained occasional fragments of animal bone, including sheep/goat, pig and red deer. The upper fill, 413, was lighter in colour with fewer inclusions. The fill profiles were reminiscent of the fills of ditch 103 (Trench 1 N) which was of late Saxon/early medieval date. The ditch was sealed by a mid brown silty clay subsoil overlain by topsoil and turf.

3.10 Trench 5 (Fig. 4, sections 500, 502. Plates 1 and 2)
3.10.1 Trench 5 contained the most variable geology (502), with iron stone present to the north, stone rich clay in the centre of the trench, and clay to the south and south-west.

3.10.2 A north-south aligned wall (503) was built directly onto the natural (502) to the south-western end of the trench and was constructed of roughly dressed limestone and iron stone blocks. To the west of the wall a rough surface, (504), was constructed from iron stone cobbles and half bricks, which were pushed into the natural clay (502). A partially articulated pig skeleton was also present within this layer, but may be intrusive. Bricks recovered from this surface dated pre 1600, and had mortar adhering to them from their previous usage.

3.10.3 To the north of the trench a shallow ‘scoop’ (505) was present with an associated posthole (506). Pottery recovered from the upper fill (507) dated to the 19th century. Subsoil (501) was not present to the north of the trench but was up to 0.7 m deep towards the centre of the trench, potentially due to recent landscaping, and with a redeposited iron stone layer (509) sandwiched between 501 and the natural 502. The subsoil was overlain by topsoil (500).

3.11 Finds summary
3.11.1 Detailed finds reports are contained within the appendices.

3.11.2 Finds were recovered from trenches 1, 3, 4 and 5 and included pottery sherds, ceramic building materials, fired clay and fragments of animal bone. Small fragments of slag were recovered from context 105 during flotation, however these were too small to be further analysed. The majority of the pottery was also from context 105 and dated to the late Saxon/early medieval period. The remainder of the pottery was of late medieval/post-medieval date. Bricks removed from surface 504 dated pre 1600. Animal bone was recovered from four contexts and included pig, cattle, sheep/goat and red deer.
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Reliability of field investigation
4.1.1 The evaluation covered a large part of the footprint of the proposed development and can be relied on to have provided a valid sample of buried archaeological remains. Ground conditions were dry throughout and this contributed to good visibility of archaeological deposits.

4.2 Interpretation of archaeology
4.2.1 Ditch 103 within Trench 1 (N) is firmly dated to the late Saxon/early medieval period, and the relatively large amount of cultural material recovered from the fills suggests that the ditch was located in the vicinity of activity potentially relating to crop drying (charred grain), metalworking (slag) and associated settlement (pottery sherds and animal bone). Ditch 411 within Trench 4 (E) had a similar fill profile, and with ditch 106 may form part of an enclosure of late Saxon/early medieval date. Although only ephemeral features, these nevertheless represent good evidence for the medieval origins of Bloxham.

4.2.2 Wall (304) within Trench 3 is certainly associated with a cottage from the row shown on the map of 1801. It seems likely that the wall and possible floor layer 305 are associated, although the imported pottery from that deposit (dating c 1475 to 1550) does may be residual and only provides a terminus post quem for the structure.

4.2.3 The wall within Trench 5 (503) was of similar un-mortared construction to wall 304 and may represent the rear wall of a plot that fronted onto King's Road. The brick from the associated surface (504) dates pre 1600, and although probably not in its primary context, is indicative of a structure of this date in the vicinity.

4.2.4 The archaeological evidence for structures fronting the streets is unsurprising and matches the map evidence. The date of the structures, however, remains uncertain.

4.3 Evaluation objectives and results
4.3.1 The presence of archaeological features, deposits and structures was confirmed by the evaluation. The extent of these was recorded within the footprints of the trenches and test pits. The archaeology was characterised through excavation and datable material recovered where present.

4.3.2 The evaluation located no evidence for prehistoric activity, Roman settlement or Roman burial features.

4.3.3 Ditches likely to relate to an enclosure of late Saxon/early medieval date were located.

4.3.4 The remains of late/post-medieval cottages and associated surfaces were located fronting onto both Queen Street and King's Road.

4.3.5 The proposed development consists of three new dwellings with associated surfacing and services. The excavation of the wall footings and service trenches will impact on below ground remains. However archaeological features within Plot 1 (Fig 2) are likely to have been partly or wholly destroyed on construction of the current bungalow, and much of the area within Plot 3 is occupied by a hollow to a depth that may preclude or lessen any impact on below ground remains. The main impacts on buried archaeological deposits from the proposed development are likely to be within Plot 2.
4.3.6   The results of the investigation will be made publicly available in due course through
deposition of the archive with Oxfordshire County Museum, and of this report with both
the Oxfordshire County Council Historic Environment Record and the through the
Archaeological Data Service (ADS at http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/). Additionally
OA will publish the report on its own online Library (http://library.thehumanjourney.net/).
APPENDIX A. TRENCH DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY

**Trench 1 (NORTH)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context no</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Brown silty loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mid yellow clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Orangey brown silty loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Dark brown silty clay loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Dark brown silty clay loam</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>c. 900-1100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 1 (SOUTH)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context no</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Brown silty loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Orangey brown silty loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Light brown silty clay loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Dark orange-brown silty clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mid orange-brown silty clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench devoid of archaeology.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trench 3

**General description**
Trench contained a floor/floor make up layer butting a N-S aligned stone wall. The wall and floor were overlain by a layer of material consistent with the gradual decay of the building, which was sealed by a layer of demolition material overlain by topsoil and turf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Brown silty loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Demolition layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>&quot;out of use&quot; layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Redeposited natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Floor make-up/ trample Pot c. 1475-1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Light orange-brown ironstone &amp; clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 4 (WEST)

**General description**
Trench contained a N-S running undated ditch which terminated within the confines of the trench. An adjacent possible posthole was also undated. A quarry pit of post-medieval date was located at the western end of the trench.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Brown silty loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Light yellow clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Orange-grey clay loam Pot c.1720-1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Orange brown silty clay fill of 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Dark brown silt clay fill of 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 4 (EAST)**

**General description**

Trench contained a single undated slightly curving N-S aligned ditch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context no</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Brown silty loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Orangey grey clay loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Light orangey brown clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Brown brown silty clay fill of 411</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Brown grey silty clay fill of 411</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 5**

**General description**

Trench contained a N-S aligned stone wall and associated stone and brick surface. Depth of overburden varied from 0.2 m at the north end, 0.7 m to the centre and 0.4 m at the south-west end of the trench.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Avg. depth (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-S/NE-SW</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context no</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Brown silty loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Orangey grey clay loam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clay, Ironstone cornbrash, light yellow clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Stone wall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brick and cobble floor surface</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>c.16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Shallow depression/cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Fill of cut 505 and Post hole 506</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Fill of 505</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Iron stone/cornbrash layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Pottery

By John Cotter

B.1.1 A total of 21 sherds of pottery weighing 176 g. were recovered from five contexts. The pottery is of mixed post-Roman date and includes late Saxon/early medieval and post-medieval material. All the pottery was examined and spot-dated during the present assessment stage. For each context the total pottery sherd count and weight were recorded on an Excel spreadsheet, followed by the context spot-date which is the date-bracket during which the latest pottery types in the context are estimated to have been produced or were in general circulation. Comments on the presence of datable types were also recorded, usually with mention of vessel form (jugs, bowls etc.) and any other attributes worthy of note (eg. decoration etc.). Fuller details of this small assemblage may be consulted in the spot-dates table (see table B.1 below). A brief summary however is provided below.

B.1.2 The assemblage is in a fairly fresh but very fragmentary condition with a mixture of large and small sherds present. Common domestic pottery types are represented. The earliest pieces (context 105) date within c 900-1100. This produced 11 sherds of local and regional Saxo-Norman pottery types - most notably several sherds from one or two vessels in an abundantly shell-tempered ware - probably St Neot’s-type ware (OXR), which is common in the Oxford region c 900-1100 but may well be pre-conquest in date. There is a slight possibility, however, that this is actually Northamptonshire-type shelly ware (OXBK, c 1100-1350) as the shell content is a little coarser than is usual for St Neot’s-type ware. Nevertheless a spot-date no later than the 12th century is likely on the basis of the other regional wares present (OXAC, OXBF).

B.1.3 The other contexts produced only a few sherds of pottery but these range from late medieval to the 19th-century. Context (305) produced the rim of a German Raeren stoneware mug of 1475-1550 which might indicate a fairly well-to-do habitation (at least in terms of the vessel being found so far inland). A few common types of 18th- and 19th-century pottery are also present. The small late Saxon/early medieval element in the collection is of some is of some interest - particularly for dating purposes - but otherwise the assemblage is fairly unremarkable and no further work is recommended.

Table B.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Spot-date</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>c900-1100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6x OXR St Neots ware (?or OXBK Northamptonshire shelly ware) mostly 1 sagging jar base but also small delicate inturned rim from bowl or cpot. 3x OXAC Cotswolds-type (1 vess, bss). 2x OXBF coarse flint-tempered SW Oxfordshire/Newbury B-type ware, 2 vess incl sag jar base. All fresh. 1x tiny scrap fired clay/daub (left in bag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>c1475-1550</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 vess. Raeren stoneware mug rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>c1720-1780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bs Staffs white salt-glazed stoneware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B.2 Ceramic Building Material

*By John Cotter*

B.2.1 The ceramic building material (CBM) assemblage comprises 3 pieces of brick weighing 3427 g. from a single context (504). These have not been recorded on a separate spreadsheet, as they are so few in number, but are simply described here. As usual, the dating of broken fragments of ceramic building material is an imprecise art and spot-dates derived from them are necessarily broad and should therefore be regarded with caution.

B.2.2 Each of the three fragments comprises about half a brick. Apart from a bit of edge damage these are all fairly fresh. These are typical, thin, early 'Tudor' bricks. A date in the first half of the 16th century is quite likely and certainly no later than c 1600. The bricks are in a very similar soft red fabric, handmade, un-frogged and fairly neatly made. Widths vary between 113-116 mm. and thickness 43-52 mm. Traces of white lime mortar occur on two of the bricks. No further work is recommended.

### B.3 Animal bone

*By Lena Strid*

B.3.1 A total of 88 animal bones were recovered from this site (Table B.2), 63.6% derived from sieved samples. The bone condition was mostly good to fair. One bone was burnt and two had been gnawed by carnivores, probably dogs.

B.3.2 The assemblage contains bones from cattle, sheep/goat, pig, red deer, mole and shrew. Dog is implicitly present in the form of gnaw marks on two bones. The majority of the pig bones came from a single layer (504), and may represent the semi-articulated remains of one animal. Traces of butchery and pathologies were absent.

B.3.3 The assemblage is too small to be useful for a discussion on animal husbandry. However, all species present are common in archaeological assemblages from Oxfordshire.
## Table B.2 All bone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep / goat</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>Red deer</th>
<th>Mole</th>
<th>Shrew sp.</th>
<th>Micro-fauna</th>
<th>Medium mammal</th>
<th>Large mammal</th>
<th>Indet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skull</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacarpal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapodial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (g)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

C.1 Environmental samples

By Julia Meen

Introduction

C.1.1 A single environmental sample was taken for the recovery of charred plant remains, and to establish the quality, range, state and method of preservation of any ecofactual evidence at the site. The sample was from context (105), the fill of a late Saxon/early medieval ditch, and was a yellowish brown silty loam. The sediment had no observable structure and was fairly loose, with frequent subangular/angular yellow-brown ironstone pebbles making up around 10% of the deposit.

Methodology

C.1.2 19L of the sample was processed for the recovery of charred plant remains (CPR) by water flotation using a modified Siraf style flotation machine. The flot was collected on a 250µm mesh and the heavy residue sieved to 500µm, and both were dried in a heated room, after which the residue was sorted by eye for artefacts and ecofactual remains. The flot was scanned for charred plant remains using a binocular microscope at approximately x15 magnification. Nomenclature for the plant remains follows Stace (1997).

Results

Finds

C.1.3 The main category of find to be recovered from the sample was bone, with both mammal and bird/small mammal bones occurring frequently. A small quantity of pottery was also recovered, although limited to fairly small body sherds. Although a large part of the fine residues were strongly magnetic, the only metallic item recovered was a small flake of metal from the 4-2mm fraction; no hammerscale was observed in the 2-0.5mm residue. In addition, two pieces of slag were recovered from the 4-2mm residue. The 2-0.5mm fraction was retained due to its abundance of CPR and small mammal bones.

Charred Plant Remains

C.1.4 The CPR flot from the sample contained a large range and number of charred remains. Grains of wheat (Triticum sp.) were common, many of which could be identified as free-threshing wheat (Triticum aestivum/durum), although in the remainder of examples preservation was not good enough to allow identification beyond genus level. There was also one example each of cereal grains to which a possible identification of barley (Hordeum sp.) and rye (Secale cereale) was given. A moderate number of leguminous species were also observed, with at least two examples c.f. pea (Pisum sativum) and at least one of celtic bean (Vicia faba), as well as one small legume, one fragment of large legume, and assorted legume fragments. Little chaff was observed, with a small quantity of cereal nodes/internodes, and one example of a possible free-threshing rachis fragment of wheat (Triticum sp.) The wild/weed seed assemblage was limited to the frequent occurrence of Galium sp (bedstraws). Seeds of Avena/Bromus type were however fairly common, with one example identified as very likely to be cultivated oat (Avena sp.). Charcoal was also present in significant quantity, with many items greater
than 4mm in size. A snail was also observed in the flot. The heavy residues also produced a similar range of charcoal, cereal grains and legumes.

Discussion

C.1.5 The frequent presence of bone in the sample, including small items such as rodent teeth, suggests that conditions are suitable for the preservation of bone at this site. The magnetized nature of the fine residues indicates that the ditch fill was exposed to high temperatures, and the presence of a fragment of metal, together with the two items of slag, is evidence that industrial activity may have been taking place in the vicinity of the ditch.

C.1.6 The charred plant assemblage recovered from this sample indicates that these type of remains are preserved well at this site. Although it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from one sample, the remains do suggest that there was crop processing occurring in the vicinity of the ditch.
Table C.1: Assessment of charred plant remains from Queen's Street, Bloxham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No</th>
<th>Context No</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Sample Volume (L.)</th>
<th>Date/ Phase</th>
<th>Flot vol (ml)</th>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>chaff</th>
<th>weeds</th>
<th>other CPR</th>
<th>Charcoal</th>
<th>Molluscs</th>
<th>CPR/ WPR Potential</th>
<th>Full Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>105 Ditch</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Late Sax to Early Medieval</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: + = 10 items, ++ = 10-50 items, +++ = 50-100 items, ++++ = 100+ items.
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### APPENDIX E. SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site name:</strong></th>
<th>The Bungalow, Queen Street, Bloxham, Oxfordshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site code:</strong></td>
<td>BLOQS11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grid reference:</strong></td>
<td>NGR SP 428 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and duration:</strong></td>
<td>4th to 7th April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of site:</strong></td>
<td>0.4 Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of results:</strong></td>
<td>Between the 4th and 7th of April 2011 Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out a field evaluation in the front and rear gardens of The Bungalow, Queen Street, Bloxham, Oxfordshire. The evaluation consisted of three trenches and two test pits which were excavated on, or close to, the footprint of the proposed dwellings. The earliest archaeological evidence comprised a length of ditch containing pottery of late Saxon early medieval date (11th century). A number of other undated ditches might be related and might represent a simple system of ditched enclosures, possibly agricultural, and associated with contemporary settlement nearby. Evidence was also recovered for stone founded structures fronting on to both Queen Street and Kings Road. Cottages are mapped into the mid to late twentieth century (presumably similar to those surviving today elsewhere on both streets). Pottery and brick from within these structures suggest they may originate in the late medieval/Tudor period, although they may be later structures that incorporate residual or re-used materials. A relict agricultural or garden soil of post medieval date, sealed by the modern topsoil, was visible in some of the trenches and suggested that the area had been put over to tillage at some point. A large quarry pit was cut through the soil and contained a mixed assemblage of pottery from the late medieval period to the nineteenth century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: Trench locations and archaeology against proposed development
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Figure 4: Sections
Plate 1: Trench 5. Wall 503 and surface 504, facing west

Plate 2: Trench 5. Wall 503 and surface 504, facing north
Plate 3: Trench 3. Wall 304 facing south

Plate 4: Trench 1 (N). Ditch 103, section 101, facing east