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SUMMARY

In 2009 Oxford Archaeology undertook a field evaluation at 60 Lower Cippenham Lane, Slough, Berkshire on behalf of Churchgate Premier Homes prior to the construction of two new dwellings. The evaluation did not encounter any archaeological deposits or features.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 On 29th June 2009 Oxford Archaeology (OA) undertook a field evaluation at 60 Lower Cippenham Lane, Slough, Berkshire on behalf of Churchgate Premier Homes. This was in response to a condition attached to the planning permission for a development of two dwellings on land to the rear of 60 Lower Cippenham Lane, Slough (Planning Application No. P/10323/003). A brief for an archaeological evaluation was produced by Berkshire Archaeology (BA) on behalf of Slough Borough Council. Prior to undertaking this project, OA produced and agreed with BA a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to detail how it would undertake and complete this project in accordance with the brief.

1.1.2 The development site is situated south of central Slough and the access from the A4 onto Lower Cippenham Lane and to the rear of house number 60 fronts onto the street (NGR SU 94935 80412) (Fig. 1). The development area is approximately 0.11 hectares.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 The site lies on Reading Beds with an overlying drift geology of Shepperton Gravel. Cippenham lane lies along the boundary of the Floodplain gravel on the lower lying ground and the Taplow Gravel to the north. Lower Cippenham Lane is close to the southern side of this boundary. The site is currently gardens (grass) situated at approximately 23 m above OD.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 This section repeats the archaeological background from the Brief and WSI. The development area itself has produced limited archaeological evidence although it is identified as being of archaeological potential, due to a number of sites noted on the Berkshire Sites and Monuments Record within the immediate surroundings.

1.3.2 Oxford Archaeology and TVAS undertook evaluation and zoned excavation in advance of the housing development at Cippenham identifying archaeological monuments associated with: the Neolithic relating mainly to ritual activity; burial and habitation activity during the Bronze Age; and farmsteads and field systems from the Iron Age through to the early Roman period. A hiatus occurs from the 4th century to
the Medieval where some pits and enclosures were located in what may then have been a Deer Park.

1.3.3 TVAS carried out an archaeological evaluation and subsequent zoned excavation (report to be submitted) for a similar rear-garden development at Land at 41-47 Lower Cippenham Lane. This fieldwork located ditches, gullies and discrete features most of which, from initial results, date to the Medieval period.

1.3.4 Evaluation and subsequent excavation by TVAS at 225 Bath Road revealed a number of ditches, pits, postholes and gullies dating to the 1st century AD suggesting an occupation area close by.

2 EVALUATION AIMS

2.1.1 The aims and objectives of the evaluation as stipulated in the Brief are as follows:

• To determine the existence or absence of archaeological remains and, should archaeological remains be present, to assess their general nature and significance.
• To determine or confirm the approximate date or date range of the remains, by means of artefactual or other evidence.
• To determine or confirm the approximate extent of the remains.
• To determine the condition and state of preservation of the remains.
• To determine the degree of complexity of the horizontal and/or vertical stratigraphy present.
• To assess the associations and implications of any remains encountered with reference to the historic landscape.
• To determine the implications of the remains with reference to economy, status, utility and social activity.
• To determine or confirm the likely range, quality and quantity of the artefactual evidence present.
• To determine the potential of the site to provide palaeo-environmental, geo-archaeological and/or economic evidence.

3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Fieldwork methods and recording

3.1.1 The evaluation comprised five trenches, each 10 m long and 1.6 m wide, two within the footprint of each new building with the fifth along the route of the access road representing an 8% sample of the site by area (Fig. 2). The trench along the access road was intended to be 15 m long although this was reduced to 10 m due to existing tree and boundary restrictions.
3.1.2 The overburden of each trench was removed under archaeological supervision by a 360° mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless bucket. Each trench was cleaned by hand where features or soil marks were noted and the revealed features were sampled to determine their extent and nature, and to retrieve finds and environmental samples.

3.1.3 All archaeological features were planned and where excavated their sections drawn at scales of 1:20. All features 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).

3.2 *Finds*

3.2.1 Finds were recovered by hand during the course of the excavation and bagged by context. Finds of special interest were given a unique small find number.

3.3 *Palaeo-environmental evidence*

3.3.1 No deposits suitable for environmental sampling were identified during the evaluation.

4 *RESULTS*

4.1 *Trench 1*

4.1.1 This trench was aligned NE to SW and was excavated to the surface of a light reddish brown silty sand with gravel natural (102) (Fig. 2). This was sealed below a 0.35 m thick light brown silty sand buried soil (101) below a 0.30 m thick dark brown silty sand topsoil and turf (100) (Fig. 3, S.100). No archaeological features or deposits were exposed within the trench.

4.2 *Trench 2*

4.2.1 This trench was aligned NW to SE and was excavated to the surface of a light yellowish brown silty sand with gravel natural (203). An irregular shaped root hole (205) with uneven sloping sides and concave base was cut into gravel (Fig.2 and Fig. 3, S.200). It measured 1.6 m x 0.70 m x 0.14 m and was filled with a light brown silty sand (204). Two small non-diagnostic struck flints and a single small nodule of burnt flint were recovered from this deposit. This was sealed by a 0.25 m thick light brown silty sand buried soil (202) below a 0.30 m thick dark brown silty sand topsoil and turf (201).

4.3 *Trench 3*

4.3.1 This trench was aligned NW to SE and was excavated to the surface of a light yellowish brown silty sand with gravel natural (302) (Fig. 2). This was sealed below a 0.25 m thick light brown silty sand buried soil (301) below a 0.10 m thick dark brown silty sand topsoil and turf (300) (Fig. 3, S.300). No archaeological features or deposits were exposed within the trench.
4.4  **Trench 4**

4.4.1 This trench was aligned NE to SW and was excavated to the surface of a light yellowish brown silty sand with gravel natural (402). Cut into the natural were two tree root holes (404 and 406) (Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, S.400-402). The first was a sub rectangular feature (404) with uneven sloping sides and concave base. It measured 0.90 m x 0.80 m x 0.10 m and was filled by a mid brown silty sand (403). This feature was a continuation of root hole (205) in Trench 2. The second feature (406) was sub rectangular with sloping sides and flat base. It measured 2.20 m x 0.90 m x 0.10 m and was filled by a mid brown silty sand (403). These were sealed below a 0.30 m thick light brown silty sand buried soil (401) below a 0.25 m thick dark brown silty sand topsoil and turf (400).

4.5  **Trench 5**

4.5.1 This trench was aligned NE to SW along the line of the planned access road and was excavated to the surface of a yellowish brown silty sand natural (502) (Fig. 2). This was sealed below a 0.25 m thick light brown silty sand cultivated soil (501) below a 0.25 m thick dark brown silty sand topsoil and turf (500) (Fig. 3, S.500). No archaeological features or deposits were encountered within the trench.

5  **Discussion and Interpretation**

5.1.1 The five evaluation trenches did not reveal any archaeological features or deposits. Shallow tree root holes were recorded Trenches 2 and 4. Two small non-diagnostic struck flints were recovered from a root hole in Trench 2 although no other substantive dating evidence was present within these features or in the cultivated soil horizons. The presence of a sterile buried soil horizon lacking the inclusion of artefacts through manuring may suggest that this area was formerly agricultural land situated at some distance from contemporary settlement.
## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1  ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctxt No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Thick. (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 m</td>
<td>0.65 m</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.30 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.35 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub soil/ cultivated soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 m</td>
<td>0.45 m</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.30 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.25 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub soil/ cultivated soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of root hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.70 m</td>
<td>0.14 m</td>
<td>1.60 m</td>
<td>Root hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 m</td>
<td>0.45 m</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.10 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.25 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub soil/ cultivated soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 m</td>
<td>0.48 m</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.25 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.30 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub soil/ cultivated soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of root hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.80 m</td>
<td>0.10 m</td>
<td>0.90 m</td>
<td>Root hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of root hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.90 m</td>
<td>0.10 m</td>
<td>2.20 m</td>
<td>Root hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 m</td>
<td>0.55 m</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.25 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.25 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub soil/ cultivated soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3  SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS

Site name: 60 Lower Cippenham Lane, Slough, Berkshire

Site code: SLCIPL 09

Grid reference: NGR SU 94935 80412

Type of evaluation: Five trenches 10 m long and 1.6 m wide prior to development for houses.

Date and duration of project: 29th June 2009.

Area of site: Approximately 0.11 hectares.

Summary of results: In 2009 Oxford Archaeology undertook a field evaluation at 60 Lower Cippenham Lane, Slough, Berkshire on behalf of Churchgate Premier Homes prior to the construction of two new dwellings. The evaluation did not encounter any archaeological deposits or features.

Location of archive: The archive is currently held at OA, Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford, OX2 0ES, and will be deposited with Reading Museum in due course, under the accession number: REDMG 2009.299.
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