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Summary

Between the 12th and 13th August 2019, Oxford Archaeology East undertook the archaeological strip, map and excavation of an area of 0.12 hectares of land off Beech Road, Saxmundham, Suffolk, in advance of the construction of a compound associated with a residential development. Apart from a short section of modern field boundary ditch being exposed in the northeastern corner of the site, no further archaeological remains were uncovered.

It was expected that a further section of post-medieval ditch, identified during previous archaeological works would be exposed running northeast to southwest across the central part of the site, but this was not present, suggesting that this ditch either terminates or turns abruptly southwards and does not enter the site.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of work

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology (OA) was commissioned by RPS Consulting on behalf of Hopkins Homes to undertake an archaeological strip, map and excavation on land proposed for a compound associated with a residential development to the west of Beech Road, Saxmundham, Suffolk (TM 38907 63482, Fig. 1).

1.1.2 At the request of Rachael Abraham of Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service (SCCAS) a Written Scheme of Investigation was produced by OA (Moan 2019) detailing the Local Authority’s requirements for necessary work and how OA intended to meet these requirements. A copy of the WSI is attached as Appendix C.

1.2 Location, topography and geology

1.2.1 The site lies on a west-facing slope above the River Fromus 200 m to the west, and is cut by a number of shallow valley-tributaries running down to the valley floor. The area, including the 2018 excavation area, varies in height from 23 m OD in the east to 13 m OD in the west.

1.2.2 The bedrock geology of the area comprises sands of the Crag Group. These are overlain by sands and gravels of the Lowestoft Formation (exposed to the west), and these in turn by diamicton (to the east). (BGS map viewer http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html)

1.2.3 Prior to excavation, the site formed part of a large arable field.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.3.1 The following section provides a brief summary of the archaeological background for the site and its immediate surroundings. This draws on information obtained from the following sources, with relevant sites referenced in Figure 2:

- The Suffolk Historic Environment Record (SHER).

Prehistoric

1.3.2 There is now widespread evidence for prehistoric activity in the Fromus Valley dating from the Mesolithic to Iron Age (SXM 022; SXM 036; SXM 037; SXM 043; SXM 049; SXM 051 (the 2018 excavation)). Of particular note are previous excavations to the immediate west and south-west of the site, which have revealed scattered pits and pit
clusters of Early Bronze Age date yielding pottery and worked flint (SXM 022; SXM 036; SXM 043; SXM 051).

1.3.3 Archaeological excavation on the adjacent site, to the immediate west, revealed a small number of Early Bronze Age pits along with Middle and Late Iron Age pits, posthole buildings and ditches. These yielded a modest assemblage of Middle and Late Iron Age pottery and at least two triangular loomweights (SXM 051). A near complete triangular weight of Iron Age date was also recovered from the site during the evaluation (SXM 049).

Roman

1.3.4 Whilst surrounding investigations have revealed a Roman presence in the landscape, to date no clear settlements or settlement-related sites have been positively identified. The excavation immediately adjacent to the west revealed a number of Late Iron Age to Early Roman features and associated pottery (722g, 102 sherds). No pottery post-dating the 2nd century AD was identified.

1.3.5 Small sherds of abraded Roman pottery were also recovered from deposits during the evaluation (SXM 049), with further residual finds (include tegula and Roman glass) recovered from the investigation to the west and south-west (SXM 036; SXM 043). A Roman lamp was also found c. 200m to the west of the site (SXM 001).

Anglo-Saxon

1.3.6 Excavations to the west revealed an Early Anglo-Saxon settlement (SXM 043) with remains of a large rectangular post-built hall, two further post-built structures and nine sunken-featured buildings (SFBs); the latter producing evidence for textile weaving, crop processing, horn working and antler working. Pottery from the site dated to the 6th century.

Post-medieval and modern

1.3.7 The current site lies outside of the medieval and post-medieval settlement of Saxmundham (known historically as 'Samundeham, Sasmundeham, Sasmundesham and Saxmondeham'). However, the excavation to the immediate west (SXM 051) revealed a post-medieval field boundary ditch along with post-medieval and modern metalwork from the colluvium. The earlier evaluation (SXM 049) also revealed cultivation features of a former post-medieval field system. Investigations immediately south (SXM 036) also identified one pit containing a sherd of medieval pottery.
2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The project aims and objectives were to investigate and record archaeological features or deposits encountered during ground works for the compound. Where archaeological features were present their character, condition, date and purpose was investigated.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 An area of approximately 0.12ha was excavated, covering the entirety of the proposed compound area.

2.2.2 All machine excavation took place under the supervision of a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist.

2.2.3 Topsoil and subsoil was stripped to the horizon with the natural geology or the upper interface of archaeological features/deposits. A toothless ditching bucket was used to excavate the area. Overburden was excavated in spits not greater than 0.1m thick.

2.2.4 Metal detector searches took place at all stages of the fieldwork by an experienced metal detector user (Tom Lucking). Excavated areas were detected immediately before and after mechanical stripping. Both excavated areas and spoil heaps were checked.

2.2.5 The top of an exposed modern field boundary ditch was cleared by machine, then cleaned off by hand. As agreed with SCCAS and stated in the WSI, the modern field boundary ditch revealed within the stripped area was not excavated as it is extant on mapping as late as the 1950s.

2.2.6 Excavation characterised the full archaeological sequence down to undisturbed natural deposits.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 No archaeological remains apart from a modern field boundary ditch were encountered during the excavations, and no residual finds collected.

3.2 General soils and ground conditions

3.2.1 The soil sequence was fairly uniform. The natural geology of clay was overlain by a silty clay topsoil. No subsoil was present on this site, and modern plough scarring was visible cutting into the natural geology across the excavated area.

3.2.2 Ground conditions throughout the strip, map and excavation were generally good, although it was noted that the natural geology became dry and cracked very quickly after exposure.

3.3 Results

3.3.1 A modern field boundary ditch was exposed in the northeast corner of the site. The presence of large quantities of coal, modern ceramic building material and pieces of agricultural ironwork in the top of the fill (not retained) confirmed its modern date and it aligns well with a field boundary shown on twentieth-century mapping.

3.3.2 No further archaeological remains were exposed.

3.4 Finds summary

3.4.1 No finds of any period were collected from any context during this investigation.
4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Reliability of field investigation

4.1.1 Apart from the modern field boundary ditch, no archaeological features were exposed during this investigation, but the clear contrast of the natural geology against the overlying layers suggests that if any features were present they would have been visible within the exposed area. For this reason, the results of this strip, map and excavation are considered to have a good level of reliability.

4.2 Interpretation

4.2.1 The lack of archaeological features revealed during this investigation correlates with a previous excavation to the west (SXM 051; Cox and Moan 2019) where archaeological remains were present in greater density on the sandier soils lower down the slope and were sparse on the slightly higher clay soils.

4.2.2 The modern field boundary ditch aligns with a field boundary shown on Ordnance Survey mapping as late as the 1950s, suggesting that this boundary was infilled at some point after this date.

4.2.3 A post-medieval boundary ditch exposed during previous excavations to the west of the compound area did not continue into the excavated area, suggesting that this boundary either terminated or turned abruptly.

4.3 Significance

4.3.1 The lack of archaeological remains on the higher clay slopes in this area is comparable with other excavations nearby, and suggests that locally, archaeological remains may be present, or better preserved, in greater density on the sandier soils lower down the slope.
## APPENDIX A  DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area contained one modern unexcavated ditch and no further archaeology. Consists of topsoil overlying a natural geology of boulder clay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Orientation            | -  
| Length (m)             | 35  
| Width (m)              | 35  
| Avg. depth (m)         | 0.30  
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B BIBLIOGRAPHY


Moan, L, 2019, *Compound strip on land off Beech Road, Saxmundham. Written Scheme of Investigation*. Oxford Archaeology East. Unpublished

Newton, A.A.S, 2013, *Beaker Pits at Church Hill, Saxmundham, Suffolk*. *Proceeding of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History* 43, 1-23

*Electronic Sources*

BGS map viewer [http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html](http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html) accessed 14/08/19.
### Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OASIS Number</th>
<th>oxfordar3-357338</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Compound strip on land off Beech Road, Saxmundham, Suffolk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Start of Fieldwork:** 12th August 2019  
**End of Fieldwork:** 13th August 2019

**Previous Work:** N  
**Future Work:** N

### Project Reference Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>SXM068</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER Number</td>
<td>SXM068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning App. No.:** n/a  
**Related Numbers:** oxfordar3-320745

**Prompt:** NPPF  
**Development Type:** Residential  
**Place in Planning Process:** Not known/Not recorded

### Techniques used (tick all that apply)

- [ ] Aerial Photography – interpretation  
- [ ] Aerial Photography - new  
- [ ] Annotated Sketch  
- [ ] Augering  
- [ ] Dendrochronological Survey  
- [ ] Documentary Search  
- [ ] Environmental Sampling  
- [ ] Fieldwalking  
- [ ] Geophysical Survey  
- [ ] Grab-sampling  
- [ ] Gravity-core  
- [ ] Laser Scanning  
- [ ] Measured Survey  
- [ ] Metal Detectors  
- [ ] Measured Survey  
- [ ] Photographic Survey  
- [ ] Photogrammetric Survey  
- [ ] Rectified Photography  
- [ ] Remote Operated Vehicle Survey  
- [ ] Sample Trenches  
- [ ] Survey/Recording of Fabric/Structure  
- [ ] Targeted Trenches  
- [ ] Test Pits  
- [ ] Topographic Survey  
- [ ] Vibro-core  
- [ ] Visual Inspection (Initial Site Visit)  
- [ ] Watching Brief

### Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Modern (1901 to present)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Saxmundham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER office</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the west of Beech Road, Church Hill, Saxmundham, Suffolk, IP17 1ES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Study Area</th>
<th>0.12 hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Ref</td>
<td>TM 38907 63482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Originators

- **Organisation:** OA East
- **Project Brief Originator:** Rachael Abraham
- **Project Design Originator:** Louise Moan
- **Project Manager:** Louise Moan
- **Project Supervisor:** Thomas Lucking

### Project Archives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Archive (Finds)</td>
<td>SCC Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Archive</td>
<td>SCC Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Archive</td>
<td>SCC Store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Contents</th>
<th>Present?</th>
<th>Digital files associated with Finds</th>
<th>Paperwork associated with Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Bones</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Remains</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratigraphic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Bone</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Stone/Lithic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Media</th>
<th>Paper Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Aerial Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Context Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images (Digital photos)</td>
<td>Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrations (Figures/Plates)</td>
<td>Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Image</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreadsheets</td>
<td>Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Matrices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Reality</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photos (negatives/prints/slides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further Comments**
APPENDIX D  WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION
Compound strip on land off Beech Road, Saxmundham
Written Scheme of Investigation

Client: Hopkins Homes

Prepared by: L. Moan
Date prepared: July 2019
Version: 2

Planning application no.: n/a
Site code: XSFSSC19
Project number: 23640
Project type: Strip, map and excavate
NGR: TM 38907 63482
Parish code: SXM 068
OASIS no.: oxfordar3-357338
## CONTENTS

1 GENERAL BACKGROUND ................................................................. 1

1.2 Circumstances of the project 1

1.3 The proposed archaeological strategy 1

1.4 Changes to this method statement 1

2 THE GEOLOGY, TOPOGRAPHY AND OTHER FEATURES OF THE SITE .... 2

3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND .................................................. 3

3.2 Prehistoric 3

3.3 Roman 3

3.4 Anglo-Saxon 4

3.5 Post-medieval and modern 4

4 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES .................................................................. 5

4.1 Aims of the strip, map and excavation 5

4.2 Research frameworks 5

5 METHODS ......................................................................................... 6

5.1 Background research 6

5.2 Event number and site code 6

5.3 Strip, map and excavate 6

5.4 Recording of archaeological deposits and features 7

5.5 Exceptional remains, including human remains 8

5.6 Metal detecting and the Treasure Act 8

5.7 Post-excavation processing 9

5.8 Finds recovery and processing 9

5.9 Sampling for environmental remains and small artefact retrieval 10

6 REPORTING ..................................................................................... 12

6.1 Report 12

6.2 Contents of the report 12

6.3 Draft and final reports 12

6.4 OASIS 12

7 ARCHIVING ..................................................................................... 13

8 TIMETABLE ....................................................................................... 15

9 STAFFING AND SUPPORT ............................................................ 16

9.1 Fieldwork 16

9.2 Post-excavation processing 16

10 OTHER MATTERS ............................................................................ 17

10.1 Monitoring 17

10.2 Insurance 17

10.3 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 17

10.4 Services, Public Rights of Way, Tree Preservation Orders etc. 17

10.5 Site Security 17

10.6 Access 18

10.7 Site Preparation 18

10.8 Site offices and welfare 18

10.9 Health and Safety, Risk Assessments 18

11 APPENDIX: CONSULTANT SPECIALISTS ....................................... 19
1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

1.1 This WSI conforms to the principles identified in Historic England’s guidance documents Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE), specifically the MoRPHE Project Manager’s Guide (2015) and Project Planning Note 3: Archaeological Excavation.

1.1.2 All work will be conducted in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Code of Conduct and Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Strip, Map and Excavate.

1.1.3 This WSI also incorporates the requirements of the EAA Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England (Gurney 2003) and the Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service’s standards for archaeological evaluation (SSCAS 2017).

1.2 Circumstances of the project

1.2.1 Oxford Archaeology East (OA East) have been commissioned by RPS Consulting, on Behalf of Hopkins Home (the Client), to conduct a programme of archaeological strip, map and excavate on an area of land proposed for a compound associated with the residential development off Beech Road, Saxmundham, Suffolk (centred TM 38907 63482). A plan of the proposed compound location is appended to this document.

1.2.2 This WSI has been prepared on behalf of the Client at the request of Rachael Abraham of the SCCAS.

1.2.3 This work follows on from an excavation (SXM051) undertaken on land immediately adjacent to the proposed compound location (Cox & Moan 2019).

1.3 The proposed archaeological strategy

1.3.1 OA East will coordinate the stripping of the compound (which measures 35 x 35m) and then excavate and record any archaeological features identified. The proposed compound is to be located where the continuation of a post-medieval ditch identified during the excavation is known to extend (see attached plan at the end of this document). This ditch was investigated during the excavation and therefore, no interventions will be excavated into it during this phase of work.

1.3.2 The stripped area and spoil heaps will be metal detected by an experienced metal detectorist during stripping.

1.4 Changes to this method statement

1.4.1 If changes need to be made to the methods outlined below – either before or during works on site – SCCAS will be informed and asked to consider changes before they are made. Changes will be agreed in before work on site commences, or else at the earliest available opportunity.
2 THE GEOLOGY, TOPOGRAPHY AND OTHER FEATURES OF THE SITE

2.1.1 The site lies on a west-facing slope above the River Fromus 200m to the west, and is cut by a number of shallow valley-tributaries running down to the valley floor. The area varies in height from 23m OD in the east to 13m OD in the west.

2.1.2 The bedrock geology of the area comprises sands of the Crag Group. These are overlain by sands and gravels of the Lowestoft Formation (exposed to the west), and these in turn by diamicton (to the east). (http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html).

2.1.3 The location of the proposed compound area is currently an arable field.
3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

3.1.1 The following section provides a brief summary of the archaeological background for the site and its immediate surroundings. This draws on information obtained from the following sources:

- Cox, N. & Moan, L, 2019, Bronze Age to Post-Medieval Remains to the North-East of Beech Road, Saxmundham, Suffolk. Archaeological Excavation Report. Oxford Archaeology East report 2261
- The Suffolk Historic Environment Record (SHER).

3.2 Prehistoric

3.2.1 There is now widespread evidence for prehistoric activity in the Fromus Valley dating from the Mesolithic to Iron Age (SXM 022; SXM 036; SXM 037; SXM 043; SXM 049; SXM 051). Of particular note are previous excavations to the immediate west and south-west of the site, which have revealed scattered pits and pit clusters of Early Bronze Age date yielding pottery and worked flint (SXM 022; SXM 036; SXM 043; SXM 051).

3.2.2 Archaeological excavation on the adjacent site, to the immediate west, revealed a small number of Early Bronze Age pits along with Middle and Late Iron Age pits, postholes buildings and ditches. These yielded a modest assemblage of Middle and Late Iron Age pottery and at least two triangular loomweights (SXM 051). A near complete triangular weight of Iron Age date was also recovered from the site during the evaluation (SXM 049).

3.3 Roman

3.3.1 Whilst surrounding investigations have revealed a Roman presence in the landscape, to date, no settlements or settlement-related features have been positively identified. The excavation immediately adjacent to the west revealed a number of Late Iron Age to Early Roman features and associated pottery (722g, 102 sherds). No pottery post-dating the 2nd century AD was identified.

3.3.2 Small sherds of abraded Roman pottery were also recovered from deposits in during the evaluation (SXM 049), with further residual finds (include tegula and Roman glass) recovered from the investigation to the west and south-west (SXM 036; SXM 043). A Roman lamp was also found c. 200m to the west of the site (SXM 001).
3.4 Anglo-Saxon

3.4.1 Excavations to the further to the west revealed an Early Anglo-Saxon settlement (SXM 043) with remains of a large rectangular post-built hall, two further post-built structures and nine sunken-feature buildings (SFBs); the latter producing evidence for textile weaving, crop processing, horn working and antler working. Pottery from the site dated to the 6th century.

3.5 Post-medieval and modern

3.5.1 The current site lies outside of the medieval and post-medieval settlement of Saxmundham (known historically as 'Samundeham, Sasmundeham, Sasmundesham and Saxmondeham'). However, the excavation to the immediate west (SXM 051) revealed a post-medieval field boundary ditch along with post-medieval and modern metalwork from the colluvium. The earlier evaluation (SXM 049) also revealed cultivation features of a former post-medieval field system. Investigations immediately west also (SXM 036) also identified one pit containing a sherd of medieval pottery.
4 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

4.1 Aims of the strip, map and excavation

4.1.1 This strip, map and excavation will investigate and record archaeological features or deposits encountered during ground works for the compound. Where archaeological features are present their character, condition, date and purpose will be investigated.

4.1.2 Metal detecting will also be undertaken of both the excavated areas and spoil heaps to aid recovery of metal objects.

4.2 Research frameworks

4.2.1 This strip, map and excavation takes place within, and will contribute to the goals of Regional Research Frameworks relevant to this area:

5 METHODS

5.1 Background research

5.1.1 A suitable level of background research has previously been undertaken. This research drew on information in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record and Records Office, and included historical sources, maps, previous archaeological finds, and past archaeological investigations in the vicinity. The results are presented separately in previous reports associated with the site (Bush 2017; Clarke 2017; Cox & Moan 2019).

5.2 Event number and site code

5.2.1 A parish code (SXM 068) has been obtained from the Suffolk HER, and a unique site code assigned to the project (XSFSSC19).

5.3 Strip, map and excavate

Excavation standards

5.3.1 The proposed fieldwork and analysis will be conducted in accordance with current best archaeological practice and the appropriate national and regional standards and guidelines.

5.3.2 All work will be conducted in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists’ Code of Conduct and Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Watching Briefs.

5.3.3 All fieldwork will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the OA Field Manual (ed. D Wilkinson 1992), and the revised OA fieldwork manual (publication forthcoming). Further guidance is provided to all excavators in the form of the OA Fieldwork Crib Sheets – a companion guide to the Fieldwork Manual. These have been issued ahead of formal publication of the revised Fieldwork Manual.

5.3.4 The excavation will also adhere to the SCCAS Requirements for Excavation (2017).

Strip, map and excavation procedures

5.3.5 All machine excavation will take place under the supervision of a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist.

5.3.6 Topsoil and subsoil will be stripped to the horizon with the natural geology or the upper interface of archaeological features/deposits, whichever is encountered first. A toothless ditching bucket will be used to excavate the trenches. Overburden will be excavated in spits not greater than 0.1m thick.

5.3.7 The top of the first archaeological deposit will be cleared by machine, then cleaned off by hand. Exposed surfaces will be cleaned by trowel and hoe as necessary, in order to clarify located features and deposits.
5.3.8 All features will be investigated and recorded to provide an accurate understanding of their date, character and function. All relationships between features or deposits will be investigated and recorded. Any natural subsoil surface revealed will be hand cleaned and examined for archaeological deposits and artefacts. A variety of features will be sampled for environmental remains (see 5.9 for full sampling strategy).

5.3.9 Excavation will characterise the full archaeological sequence down to undisturbed natural deposits. Apparently natural features (such as tree throws) will be sampled sufficiently to establish their character.

5.3.10 All excavation of archaeological deposits will be done by hand, unless agreed with SCCAS that there will be no loss of evidence using a machine. The post-medieval field boundary ditch identified on the adjacent site will not be excavated if it is revealed within the stripped area.

5.4 Recording of archaeological deposits and features

5.4.1 Records will comprise survey, drawn, written, and photographic data.

Survey

5.4.2 Surveying will be done using a survey-grade differential GPS (Leica CS10/GS08 or Leica 1200) fitted with "smartnet" technology with an accuracy of 5mm horizontal and 10mm vertical.

5.4.3 The site grid will be accurately tied into the Ordnance Survey National Grid and located on the 1:2500 or 1:1250 map of the area. Elevations will be levelled to the Ordnance Datum.

Written records

5.4.4 A register of all trenches, features, photographs, survey levels, small finds, and human remains will be kept.

5.4.5 All features, layers and deposits will be issued with unique context numbers. Each feature will be individually documented on context sheets, and hand-drawn in section and plan. Written descriptions will be recorded on pro-forma sheets comprising factual data and interpretative elements.

5.4.6 Where stratified deposits are encountered, a Harris Matrix will be compiled during the course of the excavation.

Plans and sections

5.4.7 Site plans will be drawn at 1:50. Detailed plans of individual features or groups will be at an appropriate scale (1:10 or 1:20).

5.4.8 Long sections showing layers will be drawn at 1:50. Sections of features or short lengths of trenches will be drawn at 1: 10 or 1:20. All section levels will be tied in to Ordnance Datum.

5.4.9 All site drawings will include the following information: site name, site code, scale, plan or section number, relevant context or feature numbers, orientation, date and the name or initials of the archaeologist who prepared the drawing.
Photogrammetric recording

5.4.10 Plans and sections may be supplemented with photogrammetric recording of the excavation areas. Photogrammetric models will be based on high-resolution digital photographs with a minimum file size of 5 MB. Photogrammetric processing will be conducted using the Agisoft Photosoft (Professional Edition) software, and will incorporate reference points taken by GPS-based survey equipment.

Photographs

5.4.11 The photographic record will comprise high resolution digital photographs.

5.4.12 Photographs will include both general site shots and photographs of specific features. Every feature will be photographed at least once. Photographs will include a scale, north arrow, site code, and feature number (where relevant), unless they are to be used in publications. The photograph register will record these details, and photograph numbers will be listed on corresponding context sheets.

5.5 Exceptional remains, including human remains

Significant archaeological features

5.5.1 If exceptional or unexpected features are uncovered, SCCAS will be informed, and their advice sought on an excavation strategy, as deemed necessary.

Human remains

5.5.2 If human remains are encountered, the Client, County Coroner, and SCCAS will be informed immediately.

5.5.3 Human remains will be excavated in accordance with all appropriate legislation and Environmental Health regulations. Excavation will only take place after Oxford Archaeology has obtained a Ministry of Justice exhumation licence.

5.6 Metal detecting and the Treasure Act

5.6.1 Metal detector searches will take place at all stages of the fieldwork by an experienced metal detector user (Tom Lucking). Excavated areas will be detected immediately before and after mechanical stripping. Both excavated areas and spoil heaps will be checked. To prevent losses from night-hawking, features will be metal detected immediately after stripping.

5.6.2 Metal detectors will not be set to discriminate against iron.

5.6.3 Artefacts will be removed and given a small find number. Labels will be placed on the location of each ‘small find’ and surveyed in with a GPS.

5.6.4 If finds are made that might constitute ‘Treasure’ under the definition of the Treasure Act (1996), they will, if possible, be excavated and removed to a safe place. Should it not be possible to remove the finds on the day they are found, suitable security will be arranged. Finds that are ‘Treasure’ will be reported to the landowner and County Coroner within 14 days, in
accordance with the Act. The Suffolk Finds Liaison Officer from the Portable Antiquities Scheme will also be informed.

5.7 Post-excavation processing

5.7.1 Processing on any finds and environmental remains will take place immediately after fieldwork finishes. Any finds requiring specialist treatment and conservation will be sent for appropriate treatment.

5.7.2 Finds will be marked with context numbers, site code or accession number, as detailed in the requirements of the Suffolk County Council Store.

5.8 Finds recovery and processing

Standards for finds handling

5.8.1 Finds will be exposed, lifted, cleaned, conserved, marked, bagged, and boxed in line with the standards in:
- United Kingdom Institute for Conservators (2012) Conservation Guidelines No. 2
- Watkinson & Neal (1988) First Aid for Finds

5.8.2 Where finds require conservation, this will be done in accordance with the guidelines of the Institute for Conservation (ICON).

Procedures for finds handling

5.8.3 At the start of work, a finds supervisor will be appointed to oversee the collection, processing, cataloguing, and specialist advice on all artefacts collected.

5.8.4 Artefacts will be collected by hand, sieving, and metal detector. Excavation areas and spoil will be scanned visually and with a metal detector to aid recovery of artefacts. All finds will be bagged and labelled according to the individual deposit from which they were recovered, ready for later cleaning and analysis. ‘Special/small finds’ may be located more accurately by GPS if appropriate.

5.8.5 Processing will take place in tandem with excavation, and advice will be sought from relevant specialists on key artefact types. (See the Appendix for a list of specialists.)

5.8.6 All artefacts recovered from excavated features will be retained for post-excavation processing and assessment, except:
- those which are obviously modern in date
- where very large volumes are recovered (typically ceramic building material)
- where directed to discard on site by SCCAS.
5.8.7 Where artefacts are not removed from site, a strategy will be employed to ensure a sufficient sample is retained, in order to characterise the date and function of the features they were excavated from. A record will be kept of the quantity and nature of artefacts which are not removed from site.

5.9 Sampling for environmental remains and small artefact retrieval

Standard methodology – summary

5.9.1 Sampling methods will follow guidelines produced by Historic England and Oxford Archaeology. The project team will consult Historic England’s Scientific Advisor on environmental sampling and dating where necessary. Where possible an environmental specialist(s) will visit the site to advise on sampling strategies which will be reviewed periodically during the length of the excavation. Specialists will be consulted where non-standard sampling is required (e.g. TL, OSL or archaeomagnetic dating) and if appropriate will be invited to visit the site and take the samples.

Standards for environmental sampling and processing

Paleoenvironmental remains will be sampled and processed in accordance to the OA Sampling Policy (2005) with reference to the relevant guidelines produced by Historic England:

## Procedures for sampling and processing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.9.2</td>
<td>Environmental samples (up to 40 litres or 100% of context if less is available) will be taken from a range of potentially datable features and well-stratified deposits to target the recovery of plant remains, fish, bird, small mammal and amphibian bone and small artefacts. Samples will be labelled with the site code, context number, and sample number and a register will be kept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.3</td>
<td>Larger soil samples (up to 100L) may be taken for the complete recovery of animal bones, marine shell and small artefacts from appropriate contexts. Smaller bulk samples (general biological samples) of 20 litres will be taken from any waterlogged deposits present for the recovery of macroscopic plant remains and insects. Series of incremental 2L samples may be taken through buried soils and deep feature fills for the recovery of snails and/or waterlogged plant remains, depending on the nature of the stratigraphy and of the soils and sediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.4</td>
<td>Columns will be taken from buried soils or waterlogged feature fills for pollen and/or phytoliths, diatoms, ostracods if appropriate. Soil samples will be taken for soil investigations (particle size, organic matter, bulk chemistry, soil micromorphology etc.) in consultation with the appropriate specialists. Where features containing very small artefacts such as micro-debitage and hammerscale are identified, 1L grid sampling may be employed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.5</td>
<td>Typically, 20 litres of each bulk sample will be processed standard water flotation using a modified Siraf-style machine and meshes of 0.3mm (flot) and 0.5 or 1mm depending on sediment type and like modes of preservation (residue). The remaining soil from a sample will be subsequently processed if appropriate based on the results of an initial assessment. Normally, early prehistoric samples will be fully processed and samples containing human remains will always be fully processed. Heavy residues will be wet sieved, air dried and selectively sorted. Samples taken exclusively for the recovery of bones, marine shell or artefacts will be wet sieved to 2mm. Waterlogged samples will have a sub-sample (approximately 10L) processed as above and the flot will assessed whilst wet and again once dried. Snail samples (2L) will be processed by hand flotation with flots and residues collected to 0.5mm; these flots and residues will be sorted by the specialist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.6</td>
<td>Where practical, waterlogged wood specimens will be recorded in detail on site, in situ. When removed, they will be cleaned and photographed, and stored in wet cool conditions for assessment by a suitably qualified specialist (see the Appendix).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 REPORTING

6.1 Report


6.2 Contents of the report

6.2.1 The report will include:

- a title page detailing site address, site code and accession number, NGR, author/originating body, client’s name and address
- full list of contents
- a non-technical summary of the findings
- the aims of the strip, map and excavate
- a description of the geology and topography of the area
- a description of the methodologies used
- a description of the findings
- tables summarising features and artefacts
- site and trench location plans, and plans of each area excavated showing the archaeological features found
- sections of excavated features
- interpretation of the archaeological features found
- specialist reports on artefacts and environmental finds
- relevant colour photographs of features and the site
- a discussion of the relationship between findings on the site and other archaeological information held in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record
- a bibliography of all reference material
- a copy of the WSI
- the OASIS reference and summary form.

6.3 Draft and final reports

6.3.1 A draft copy of the report will be supplied to SCCAS for comment. Following approval of the report, one printed copy and one digital copy (PDF) will be presented to the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.

6.3.2 If SCCAS requires no further excavation on the site, a summary report will be prepared for the Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History.

6.4 OASIS

6.4.1 A digital copy of the approved report will be uploaded to the OASIS database. A copy of the OASIS Data Collection Form will be included in the report.
7 ARCHIVING

Archive standards

7.1.1 The site archive will conform to the requirements Appendix 1 of Historic England's (2015) Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE), and the SCCAS Archaeological Archives in Suffolk: Guidelines for Preparation and Deposition (2017).

7.1.2 The preparation of the archive will follow the guidelines contained in Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long Term Storage (United Kingdom Institute for Conservation, 1990), Standards in the Museum care of Archaeological Collections (Museums and Galleries Commission 1992), and Archaeological Archives: A guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation (Brown 2007).

Archive contents

7.1.3 The archive will be quantified, ordered, and indexed. It will include:
- artefacts
- ecofacts
- project documentation – including plans, section drawings, context sheets, registers, and specialist reports
- photographs (digital photographs will be stored on CD-ROM, and colour printouts made of key features)
- an archive-standard CD-ROM with electronic documentation (such as GIS and CAD files)
- a printed copy of the Written Brief
- a printed copy of the WSI
- a printed copy of the final report
- a printed copy of the OASIS form.

7.1.4 It is Oxford Archaeology Ltd's policy, in line with accepted practice, to keep site archives (paper and artefactual) together wherever possible.

7.1.5 A digital security copy of all documentary parts of the archive will also be made and retained by Oxford Archaeology.

Transfer of ownership

7.1.6 The archaeological material and paper archive produced from this investigation will be held in storage by OA East who will seek to transfer the complete project archive to the Suffolk County Council Stores, in order to facilitate future study and ensure long-term public access to the archive.

7.1.7 Where the landowner wishes to retain items recovered during excavation, all selected artefacts will be fully drawn and photographed, identified, analysed, documented and conserved in order to create a comprehensive catalogue of items to be kept by the landowner before the remainder of the archive can be deposited in the Suffolk County Council Stores. A written transfer of ownership document will be forwarded to SCCAS before the archive is deposited. In the unlikely event that artefacts of significant
monetary value are discovered, and if they are not subject to Treasure Act legislation, separate ownership arrangements may be negotiated following the creation of a comprehensive illustrated catalogue, as described above.
8 TIMETABLE

8.1.1 The archaeological strip, map and excavate is expected to take up to two working days to complete, based on a five-day week, working Monday to Friday. This does not allow for delays caused by bad weather, but it does include time for site set-up and final backfilling of trenches.

8.1.2 Post-excavation tasks and report writing will take a maximum of four weeks following the end of fieldwork, unless there are exceptional discoveries requiring lengthier analysis.

8.1.3 The project archive will be deposited within six months of delivering the final report, unless SCCAS requires further excavation on the site.
9 STAFFING AND SUPPORT

9.1 Fieldwork

9.1.1 The fieldwork team will be made up of the following staff:
- 1 x Project Manager (supervisory only, not based on site)
- 1 x Project Officer/Supervisor (full-time)
- 1 x Finds Assistant (part-time, as required)
- 1 x Environmental Assistant (part-time, as required)

9.1.2 The Project Manager will be Louise Moan. Site work will be directed by Tom Lucking.

9.2 Post-excavation processing

9.2.1 We anticipate that the site may produce later prehistoric to post-medieval remains. Environmental remains will also be sampled.

9.2.2 Pottery will be assessed by Matt Brudenell (prehistoric), Katie Anderson and Alice Lyons (Roman) and Carole Fletcher (Anglo-Saxon and medieval).

9.2.3 Environmental analysis will be carried out by OA East staff, in consultation with the OA Environmental Department in Oxford. The results will be reported to Historic England’s Regional Scientific Advisor. Environmental analysis will be undertaken by Rachel Fosberry (charred plant macrofossils, plant macrofossils), Liz Stafford (land molluscs), and Denise Druce and Mairead Rutherford (pollen analysis).

9.2.4 Faunal remains will be examined by Hayley Foster.

9.2.5 Conservation will be undertaken by Ipswich and Colchester Museums / Karen Barker (Antiquities Conservator), and will be undertaken in accordance with guidelines issued by the Institute for Conservation (ICON).

9.2.6 In the event that OA’s in-house specialists are unable to undertake the work within the time constraints of the project, or if other remains are found, specialists from the list in the Appendix will be approached to carry out analysis.
10 OTHER MATTERS

10.1 Monitoring

10.1.1 SCCAS will be updated on the findings once the area is open to allow for adequate monitoring and site visit, if deemed necessary. Sign off of the archaeological works will need approval from SCCAS prior to any groundworks for the compound commencing.

10.2 Insurance

10.2.1 OA East is covered by Public and Employer’s Liability Insurance. The underwriting company is Lloyds Underwriters, policy number CC004337. Details of the policy can be supplied on request to the Oxford Archaeology East office.

10.3 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

10.3.1 Oxford Archaeology is a Registered Organisation with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CiFA), and is bound by CiFA By-Laws, Standards, and Policy.

10.4 Services, Public Rights of Way, Tree Preservation Orders etc.

10.4.1 The client will inform the project manager of any live or disused cables, gas pipes, water pipes or other services that may be affected by the proposed excavations before the commencement of fieldwork. Hidden cables/services should be clearly identified and marked where necessary. If there are overhead cables on the site or in the approachways, a survey must be completed by the relevant authority before plant is taken onto site.

10.4.2 The client will likewise inform the project manager of any public rights of way or permissive paths on or near the land which might affect or be affected by the work.

10.4.3 The client will inform the Project Manager if the site is a Scheduled Ancient Monument, Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), or any other type of designated site. The client will also inform the project manager of any trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders, protected hedgerows, protected wildlife, nesting birds, or areas of ecological significance within the site or on its boundaries.

10.5 Site Security

10.5.1 Unless previously agreed with the Project Manager in writing, this specification and any associated statement of costs is based on the assumption that the site will be sufficiently secure for archaeological work to commence. All security requirements, including fencing, padlocks for gates etc. are the responsibility of the client.
10.6  Access

10.6.1  The client will secure access to the site for archaeological personnel and plant, and obtain the necessary permissions from owners and tenants to place a mobile office and portable toilet on or near to the site. Any costs incurred to secure access, or incurred as a result of withholding of access will not be Oxford Archaeology's responsibility. The costs of any delays as a result of withheld access will be passed on to the client in addition to the project costs already specified.

10.7  Site Preparation

10.7.1  The client is responsible for clearing the site and preparing it so as to allow archaeological work to take place without further preparatory works, and any cost statement accompanying or associated with this specification is offered on this basis. Unless previously agreed in writing, the costs of any preparatory work required, including tree felling and removal, scrub or undergrowth clearance, removal of concrete or hard standing, demolition of buildings or sheds, or removal of excessive overburden, refuse or dumped material, will be charged to the client, in addition to any costs for archaeological evaluation already agreed.

10.8  Site offices and welfare

10.8.1  All site facilities – including welfare facilities, tool stores, mess huts, and site offices – will be positioned to minimise disruption to other site users, and to minimise impact on the environment (including buried archaeology).

10.9  Health and Safety, Risk Assessments

10.9.1  A risk assessment and method statement (RAMS) covering all activities to be carried out during the lifetime of the project will be prepared before work commences, and sent to the County Archaeologist.

10.9.2  The risk assessment will conform to the requirements of health and safety legislation and regulations, and will draw on OA East’s activity-specific risk assessment literature.

10.9.3  All aspects of the project, both in the field and in the office will be conducted according to OA East’s Health and Safety Policy, Oxford Archaeology Ltd’s Health and Safety Policy, and Health and Safety in Field Archaeology (J.L. Allen and A. St John-Holt, 1997). A copy of OA East’s Health and Safety Policy can be supplied on request.
## 11 APPENDIX: CONSULTANT SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SPECIALISM</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Leigh</td>
<td>Worked bone, CBM, medieval metalwork</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Martin</td>
<td>Medieval coins</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Martyn</td>
<td>Zooarchaeology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Katie</td>
<td>Roman pottery</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Sue</td>
<td>Medieval &amp; post-medieval pottery (specifically from Norfolk &amp; Suffolk), CBM and human remains</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamforth, Mike</td>
<td>Woodworking</td>
<td>York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker, Karen</td>
<td>Small find conservation &amp; X-Ray</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayliss, Alex</td>
<td>C14 advice</td>
<td>Historic England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biddulph, Edward</td>
<td>Roman pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billington, Lawrence</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Barry</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinkhorn, Paul</td>
<td>Iron Age, Anglo-Saxon and medieval pottery</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth, Paul</td>
<td>Roman pottery and coins</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreham, Steve</td>
<td>Pollen and soils/ geology</td>
<td>Cambridge University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broderick, Lee</td>
<td>Zooarchaeology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Lisa</td>
<td>Prehistoric pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brudenell, Matt</td>
<td>Prehistoric pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane, Jon</td>
<td>Display &amp; reconstruction artist</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champness, Carl</td>
<td>Molluscs, geoarchaeology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotter, John</td>
<td>Medieval/post-medieval finds, pottery, CBM</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crummy, Nina</td>
<td>Small finds</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowgill, Jane</td>
<td>Slag/metalworking residues</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Anthony</td>
<td>Worked Flint</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodwell, Natasha</td>
<td>Osteology, including cremations</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnelly, Mike</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan, Roger</td>
<td>Slags, metallurgy</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druce, Denise</td>
<td>Pollen, charred plants, charcoal/wood identification, sediment coring and interpretation</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drury, Paul</td>
<td>CBM (specialised)</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, Carole</td>
<td>Medieval &amp; post-medieval pottery, glass, shell &amp; small finds</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosberry, Rachel</td>
<td>Charred waterlogged and mineralised plant remains</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, Hayley</td>
<td>Zooarchaeologist</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryer, Val</td>
<td>Molluscs/environment</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SPECIALISM</td>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Gibson</td>
<td>Osteology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleed-Owen, Chris</td>
<td>Herpetologist (amphibians &amp; reptiles)</td>
<td>CGO Ecology Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffin, Richenda</td>
<td>Post-Roman pottery, building materials, painted wall plaster</td>
<td>Suffolk CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard-Davis, Chris</td>
<td>Small finds, Mesolithic flint, leather, wooden objects and wood technology</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker, Alison</td>
<td>Fish bone</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loe, Louise</td>
<td>Osteology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucking, Tom</td>
<td>Metal detecting</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, Alice</td>
<td>Late Iron Age/Roman pottery</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Toby</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon metalwork and artefacts</td>
<td>Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters, Pete</td>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Cranfield University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McIntyre, Lauren</td>
<td>Osteology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton, Paul</td>
<td>Phosphates/garden history</td>
<td>Peterborough Regional College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mould, Quita</td>
<td>Ironwork, leather</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson, Rebecca</td>
<td>Fish and small mammal and bird bones, shell</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Rog</td>
<td>Aerial photographs</td>
<td>Air Photo Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percival, Sarah</td>
<td>Prehistoric pottery, quern stones</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole, Cynthia</td>
<td>Multi-period finds, CBM, fired clay</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popescu, Adrian</td>
<td>Roman and later coins</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinn, Patrick</td>
<td>Pottery thin section, ceramic petrology</td>
<td>UCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddler, Ian</td>
<td>Worked bone objects &amp; related artefact types</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Mark</td>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland, Steve</td>
<td>Zooarchaeology &amp; osteology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford, Mairead</td>
<td>Pollen, diatoms, etc</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuels, Mark</td>
<td>Architectural stonework</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Ian</td>
<td>Roman, medieval, post-medieval finds, metalwork, glass</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaffrey, Ruth</td>
<td>Worked stone and Roman CBM</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, David</td>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Ian</td>
<td>Zooarchaeology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoorry, Paul</td>
<td>Medieval pottery</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford, Liz</td>
<td>Molluscs and geoarchaeology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberlake, Simon</td>
<td>Archaeometallurgy &amp; geoarchaeology</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyers, Ian</td>
<td>Dendrochronology</td>
<td>Sheffield University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ui Choileain, Zoe</td>
<td>Osteology &amp; zooarchaeology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickers, Kim</td>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>Sheffield University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Helen</td>
<td>Medieval pottery (Essex)</td>
<td>Essex CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SPECIALISM</td>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way, Twigs</td>
<td>Medieval landscape and garden history</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb, Helen</td>
<td>Osteology</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Jane</td>
<td>Medieval Pottery (Lincolnshire)</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zant, John</td>
<td>Roman coins</td>
<td>Oxford Archaeology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Radiocarbon dating is normally undertaken for Oxford Archaeology East by SUERC and by the Oxford University Accelerator Laboratory.

Geophysical prospection is normally undertaken by Magnitude Surveys Ltd.
Phase 1: Early Bronze Age
Phase 2: Middle Iron Age assumed
Phase 3: Late Iron Age to Early Roman assumed
Phase 4: Colluvium
Phase 5: Post-medieval

Proposed compound location

Plan showing compound location with adjacent excavation findings
Figure 1: Site location showing development area (red) and 2018 Excavation development area (orange).
Figure 2: Map showing location of SHER entries
Figure 3: The excavation area with modern field boundary in the northeast corner.
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Plate 1: Modern field boundary ditch, looking east.

Plate 2: Compound area stripped, looking south.
Plate 3: Compound area stripped, looking southeast.