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2. Summary

Saltford Environment Group (SEG) have been researching and recording the history of the village. As part of this research a field to the south of the village has been of particular archaeological interest. It is known locally as the Coffin Field. In 1948 a Roman stone coffin complete with a skeleton of a young man was found in the field when the farmer was removing a tree. A year later some trial trenches had been dug, these unearthed pottery fragments, coins, nails, and utensils together with ‘oyster shells too numerous to record’. In recent years metal detectorists have discovered Roman pottery, glass, iron and copper alloy slag or waste, ceramic building materials, pieces of pennant sandstone, flints and tesserae may be spotted when field walking.

In 2018 volunteers from the Bath and Counties Archaeological Society (BACAS) and SEG carried out an excavation at this site. This report constitutes the findings from the excavation and post analysis/assessment of the finds recovered. The excavation was carried out between the 13th to 15th August 2018.
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4. Description and Location of the Site

The field involved in this project lies to the south of Keynsham Manor, Manor Road, Saltford in the Unitary Authority of Bath and North East Somerset. It is shown as Field 3137 on the 1965 1:2500 scale Ordnance Survey National Grid series map, and on older County series maps as Field 794. The field is locally known as the Coffin Field and is 17.0 acres or 7.24 hectares. The field has mixed hedgerows with small trees which delineate its boundaries. At the time of the excavation the cereal crop had been harvested but the land had not been ploughed or harrowed. This field is centred on ST 67326640 at a height of 70 metres OD.
5 Geology and Soils

The underlying geology consists of blue lias formation overlain by a silty sandy clay with copious number of stones (British Geological Survey South Sheet, 3rd Edition 1979). The overlaying soils vary in depth which increases significantly further down the slope, the southern half of the field drains towards the north.

6. Location Maps

Figure 2. General location Map showing the location of Bath and North East Somerset Unitary Authority
Figure 3. OS Explorer Map, 1:25000. © Crown copy 2015. Licence No. 100060399. Site is marked by a black star.

Figure 4. “Map data ©2019 Google”. Site marked by a black star
7. Research Aims and Objectives

The Project Design was to locate any archaeological structure or remains:

To determine the extent, condition, nature, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains present. To establish the Eco factual and environmental potential of archaeological deposits and features, as well as establishing a stratigraphic sequence.

To obtain a coherent plan of the site in terms of complete structures, particularly buildings and to attempt a reconstruction of the history and use of the site.

To recover a well dated stratigraphic sequence and recover coherent artefacts, and environmental samples to assist in defining the character and to the dating of activity on the site.

To address relevant research issues relating to the site, and to place them into context locally and nationally, to make available and to publish the result of the investigations.

8. The Geophysical Survey

A geophysical survey of the field, led by John Oswin, was carried out jointly by BACAS and SEG, in 2015 and 2016.

The first phase of the survey in 2015, which covered roughly half of the field, indicated the possible presence of prehistoric round houses in the northern portion of the field, and signs of what may be a Roman structure on the higher ground in the southern part of the field, near to where a Roman coffin was discovered in 1948.

The second phase of the survey 2016 completed the geophysical and focussed mainly on the southern half of the field. The results suggested that there was a large structure, probably of Roman origin in this area. It would appear to be encompassed within a pair of parallel ditches extending westwards,

Twin-prod resistance Geoscan RM15 and TR/CIA meters also a magnetometer Bartington 601-2 twin fluxgate gradiometer was utilized to obtain these results, see results figures 5 & 6.

9. Conclusion of the Geophysical Survey

Early indications from these geophysical anomalies perhaps suggest occupation of the site for a considerable length of time. In the north and west areas of the field several features can be made out through the plough lines. These round features might represent prehistoric round houses. In the far southern area of the field is an area very disturbed, which appears to contain rectangular shapes. This could be a major structure probably of Roman date, it is curious that it lies across the contours rather than along the slope.
Immediately to the west, this structure is encompassed by a pair of lines, probably ditches, heading west. Field boundaries appear to have been aligned on them, but they could well be older and likely of Roman origin. This conclusion was extracted from the BACAS reports (see Oswin, J. and Vaughan, R. 2016, 2017).

Figure 5. Magnetometer Results
Figure 6. Resistance Results
10. Excavation Methods and Techniques

To achieve the research aims it was decided to lay out a single trench across the area where the geophysics survey suggested ditches and other features might be located.

This trench was excavated by hand and was dug down to the uppermost surviving levels of archaeological significance, or until natural deposits were reached.

All discrete features were excavated to a degree enough to establish the extent, character and where possible to date the feature.

An appropriately qualified archaeologist monitored all intrusive groundworks.

A unique site code (CFS/18) was agreed prior to the commencement of the excavation.

All features and deposits were recorded using BACAS pro forma recording systems, with all features and deposits being assigned a unique number.

All archaeological features and deposits were planned at a scale of 1:20 with sections drawn at 1:10. The Ordnance Datum (OD) height of all principal features and levels was calculated, and all plans and sections were annotated with OD heights.

A full photographic record of the investigations and individual features was maintained throughout the excavations using a digital camera.

Finds were treated in accordance with the principles and practices set out by the Institute of Field Archaeologists’ Standards and guidance for Archaeological Excavation (revised 2001).

At the completion of the work, the trench was reinstated using the excavated materials.
11. The Recorded Archaeology from the Trench

Trench 1

The trench was positioned at NGR ST67306645 at approximate height of 78m AOD. and orientated in a north south direction. This trench measured 5.5 metres in length and 2.5 metre in width and varied in depth from 0.45m at the northern end to 0.72 at the southern end; this greater depth is likely to be derived from hill-wash and represents a colluvial action.

After the removal of the stubble from the summer crop, the topsoil was revealed (011), which was a firm dark brown silty clay, containing pieces of white lias and other stones, which amounted to about 10% of the overburden and varied in depth between 15 to 20cm in-depth.

Directly under the topsoil, the subsoil (012) consisted of friable yellowish-brown silty clay with numerous fragments of white lias stone about 20% and averaged 0.75 cm deep.

The trench was divided in half on an east-west axis and allocated separate numbers for fills and cuts [13] was the cut for the northern half and its fill (014) consisted of a firm light fawn to brown layer of small to medium sized white lias stones, on average 0.15cm in-depth which appeared to have been levelled to form a surface. In between these stones were occasional areas of greyish brown clay. The southern half cut [015] and the fill (016) had a similar fill as (014) but the depth average was 0.18cm. This stone layer might represent a layered floor inside an unknown workshop or farm structure, but it might represent an external yard surface, as it was noted that this area had occasional small shallow pits dug into the surface where immature bones of sheep were deposited (see Figure 18).

Context [17] was a laid white lias stone pad in the north east corner of the trench and measured 32cm in length x 30cm wide and 10cm in-depth. What this stone represents is currently unclear, it might be a stone pad onto which a large wooden post would have stood, perhaps to support a roof. It does appear to have been deliberately laid as a level area of clay was discovered under this stone.

After all contexts (11), (12), (14) and (16) were removed the natural underlying white lias bedrock (18) was found. It was not excavated.
Figure 7. Photograph of the trench after the topsoil had been removed.

Figure 8. Photograph of the trench showing the subsoil being excavated.
Figure 9. Photograph of the trench showing the stones being exposed.
Figure 10. Photograph of the trench showing the stones being exposed in the northern half.

Figure 11. Photograph of the trench showing the stones being exposed.
Figure 12. Photograph of the complete trench showing the exposed stones
Figure 13. Photograph of the northern side of the trench showing the exposed stones, East facing.
Figure 14. Photograph of the southern side of the trench showing the exposed stones, East facing.

Figure 15. Photograph of the north west corner of the trench showing the exposed Pad stone.
Figure 16. Photograph of the north west corner of the trench showing the exposed Pad stone.

Figure 17. Photograph of the trench being backfilled firstly by stones
12. Finds

Finds are described and shown in tables set out below. They range in date from the Bronze Age to modern times. Finds comprised: bones (some butchered), ceramic building material, charcoal and coal fragments, daub or burnt clay, flint, glass objects, pieces of glass, iron and lead, sherds of pottery, stone objects and slag or clinker.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roman Coin, Radiate or Nummus AD 260 to 400 very worn.</td>
<td>(012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragment of a Copper Alloy Pin or Off Cut</td>
<td>(011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Roman Coin, Radiate copying a coin of Tetricus AD 275 to 285</td>
<td>(012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Roman Coin, Radiate, unreadable AD 260 to 400</td>
<td>Spoil Heap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Pottery Table

Chronological breakdown of pottery assemblage (number / weight in gm and Kg.)
An assemblage of some 417 sherds of pottery which weighed 2.708Kg was recovered from the trench and the surface area surrounding the trench. Of the 417 sherds of pottery recovered 0.24% was Bronze Age, 1.44% Iron Age, 97.6% Romano-British, 0.24% Medieval and 0.48% Post Medieval.

The pottery assemblage includes diagnostic sherds from the middle to late Bronze through to the post medieval period.

The system used to classify the sherds was based on identifying known wares first; the material was then looked at in terms of its date, origin and any evidence of function, a reference collection was also employed to assist in this process. The assemblage was quantified by weight and shard count and individual sherds were checked using a hand lens (X10) to identify the principal fabric types; the results are shown in the Pottery Table 14.

Almost all the pottery was derived from stratified contexts. The pottery provides the primary dating evidence for the site. Most of this assemblage is in good condition but the Medieval and Post Medieval sherds were probably residual to the site.

The pottery collection suggests that the material recovered is primary domestic in origin and possibly comes from a settlement on or in the near vicinity to the site.

This assemblage of pottery contains important information about the types of pottery to be found in this area and will contribute to the understanding of land usage in and around the Coffin Field area of Salford.

15. Pennant Sandstone Tiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age Pottery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age Pottery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Samain Ware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Black Burnished</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Black Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Grey Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Coloured Coated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman New Forest Pottery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Fine Ware</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Locally Produced Wares</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Savernake Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Severn Valley Type Wares</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Oxford Ware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Wares Green Glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval Ware Brown Glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval Ware Blue/White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28 fragments of Pennant Sandstone roof tiles weighing 2.079Kg were recovered from the site suggesting a building in the near vicinity was roofed using this material.

16. Daub or Burnt Clay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennant Sandstone Tiles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 pieces of daub or fired clay were recovered from the trench. Wattle/twig/stick impressions were found on some of the daub or fired clay, and this may represent structural material from a building with walls made of this material or the remains of an oven.

17 Ceramic Building Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>C (11)</th>
<th>C (12)</th>
<th>C (14)</th>
<th>C (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daub or Burnt Clay</td>
<td>C (11)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C (12)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C (14)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C (16)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 19 fragments of Romano-British Ceramic Building Materials found in and around the excavated trench, which weighed 198gm. These items came predominately from tegulae, Ridge or Imbrex tiles.

18. Shaped Stones or Tool Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>C (11)</th>
<th>C (12)</th>
<th>C (14)</th>
<th>C (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaped Stones or Tools Objects</td>
<td>C (11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Lias Tesserae</td>
<td>C (11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Shaped stones or tools objects were recovered perhaps used to polish or smooth items such as leather. Also found was 1 solitary white Lias tesserae.

19. Slag or Clinger, Iron and Copper Alloy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>C (11)</th>
<th>C (12)</th>
<th>C (14)</th>
<th>C (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copper and Iron Residue</td>
<td>C (11)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C (12)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Glass Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>C (11)</th>
<th>C (12)</th>
<th>C (14)</th>
<th>C (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21
2 Shards of Romano-British window and vessel glass were recorded. Also recovered were 4 shards of Post Medieval window and vessel glass.

### 21. Iron Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>C (11)</th>
<th>C (12)</th>
<th>C (14)</th>
<th>C (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Hobnails</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Nails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Small Bar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Boot or Horse Shoe, Fragments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable Objects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleat or Hasp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

148 Iron objects were recovered weighing 804gm, these items range from the Romano-British through to the modern period.

### 22. Flint Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>C (11)</th>
<th>C (12)</th>
<th>C (14)</th>
<th>C (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flint Objects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 pieces of flint were discovered, none showed any signs of have been struck or worked for tools. A small number of this collection show various degrees of thermal damage by fire. The recovery of this burnt flint is of interest, but not datable.

### 23. Charcoal and Coal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>C (11)</th>
<th>C (12)</th>
<th>C (14)</th>
<th>C (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal and Coal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 pieces of Coal and Charcoal were recovered of which 21 wood charcoal fragments were noted. Most of the charcoal was poorly preserved, but species identified included hazel (*Corylus avellana*), alder (*Alnus*) and possibly birch (*Betula*).
## Animal and Bird Bones Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow Bones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig Bones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Bones</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Mammals Bones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Bones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable Bones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Bones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4141g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methodology

All the bones were examined to identify species, type of bone present, and any butchering that has occurred.

A total of 659 pieces of bone were recovered during the excavation, of which 297 (45%) were animal and 12 bird (2%). 350 (53%) could not be identified to species.

In general, the preservation of the vertebrate remains was generally ‘fair’, colour was variable, although mostly light brown, and ‘angularity’ (appearance of the broken surfaces) was also variable with spiky and battered fragments in most contexts. Evidence of butchery, burning and the activities of carnivores were recorded on some of the bones. There was variation between and within contexts.

The unidentifiable bone fragments were also recorded. The assemblage was collected by hand during the excavation, but it should be noted that no sieving of the deposits was undertaken and therefore the assemblage is biased against the recovery of very small bones (e.g. rodents, birds and fish).

The assemblage is that of a typical “Rural site” and the majority of the species identified are domestic mammal, (Sheep/goat 34.7%, Cattle 4% and Pig 5.3%) which were their main source of meat.

![Figure 18. Photograph of immature sheep skeletons buried in a shallow pit.](image-url)
25. Discussion

The focus of the 2016/2017 geophysical survey and the 2018 excavations was to locate any archaeological structure or remains in the Coffin Field at Saltford.

A specific area of the field was targeted for the excavation as the geophysical survey suggested that there might be a Romano-British structures in that location. Unfortunately, where we positioned the trench over the most interesting features in the field, we failed to find any type or form of structure. This is a difficult site to interpret, there is a real possibility that we positioned our trench in the wrong area of the field or perhaps the geophysical survey showed the natural underlying geology and there were no archaeological remains to be found.

Numerous artefacts of varying types mostly from the Romano-British period were recovered also ceramic building material and Pennant sandstone tiles, but no evidence of a building was seen. The recovered finds do suggest there is a structure probably a working farm with workshops, yards etc in the very near vicinity to the position of the 2018 excavated trench.
If a further excavation is planned, a new small geophysical survey should be undertaken, and the area marked out on the ground showing where a structure might be found.

26. Bibliography
The full archive including documentary and physical evidence will be deposited with SEG who it is understood may wish to display some of the finds in Saltford Heritage Centre. A copy of the evaluation report will be given to the landowner Adam Stratton, to BACAS, and to the South West Heritage Trust to enter onto the Historic Environment Record (HER).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench Number</th>
<th>Context Number</th>
<th>Context Type and Brief Description</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Tools used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[010]</td>
<td>Cut of Trench 1, 5.5m x 2.5m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(011)</td>
<td>Topsoil or Overburden</td>
<td>15-20cm</td>
<td>Spade and Trowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(012)</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>6-9cm</td>
<td>Spade and Trowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[013]</td>
<td>Cut of Stone Feature, Northern half of Trench</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(014)</td>
<td>Stone fill of [013]</td>
<td>12-19cm</td>
<td>Spade and Trowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[015]</td>
<td>Cut of Stone Feature, Southern half of Trench</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(016)</td>
<td>Stone fill of [015]</td>
<td>12-24cm</td>
<td>Spade and Trowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[017]</td>
<td>Stone pad in North-East side of Trench</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(018)</td>
<td>Underlying Natural Bedrock</td>
<td>Not Fully Excavated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context sheets [010]
## Project Code:            Area:  Co-ordinates: E / N  Context Type:  Context No:
CFS/18                  Trench 1              /              Cut            [010]

### DEPOSIT
1. Compaction
2. Colour
3. Texture/composition
4. Inclusions
5. Dimensions
6. Contamination
7. Method/level of recovery
8. Weather conditions

### CUT
1. Shape in plan: Rectangular
2. Orientation: North to South
3. Profile: []
4. Sides: Vertical
5. Base: Uneven
6. Dimensions: 5.5m x 2.5m
7. Fill numbers: 11, 12, 14, 16, 18

### STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX
[010]

### INTERPRETATION:
Cut of Trench 1.

### Related Contexts:

### Plan:  Section/other drawings:  Environmental samples:

### Recorded by and Date:  Excavated contents:
R.J.Holley 13th August 2018  See finds register

Context sheet (011)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code:</th>
<th>Area:</th>
<th>Co-ordinates: E / N</th>
<th>Context Type:</th>
<th>Context No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFS/18</td>
<td>Trench 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>(011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEPOSIT

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Compaction</td>
<td>Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Colour</td>
<td>Dark Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Texture/composition</td>
<td>Silty Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inclusions</td>
<td>10% Stones  White Lias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dimensions</td>
<td>5.5m x 2.5m x 15-20cm in depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contamination</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Method/level of recovery</td>
<td>Spade and Trowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Weather conditions</td>
<td>Warm but overcast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CUT

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shape in plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fill numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sketch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further DESCRIPTIVE data including significant physical relationships:

### STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX

(011)

### INTERPRETATION:

Topsoil or Overburden

Related Contexts:

### Plan: Section/other drawings: Environmental samples: Digital:

Recorded by and Date:
R.J.Holley 13th August 2018

Excavated contents:
See finds register

Context sheet (012)
**DEPOSIT**

1. Compaction: Friable
2. Colour: Yellowish Brown
3. Texture/composition: Silty Clay
4. Inclusions: 20% Stones – White Lias
5. Dimensions: 5.5m x 2.5m x 6-9cm in depth
6. Contamination: Medium
7. Method/level of recovery: Spade and Trowel
8. Weather conditions: Warm

**CUT**

1. Shape in plan
2. Orientation
3. Profile
4. Sides
5. Base
6. Dimensions
7. Fill numbers

Further DESCRIPTIVE data including significant physical relationships:

---

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

![Stratigraphic Matrix Diagram]

**INTERPRETATION:**

Subsoil

Related Contexts:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan:</th>
<th>Section/other drawings:</th>
<th>Environmental samples:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colour print:</td>
<td>Colour slide:</td>
<td>Black &amp; White print:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; White print:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Digital:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recorded by and Date:**
R.J.Holley 13th August 2018

**Excavated contents:**
See finds register

Context sheet [013]
Project Code: CFS/18  
Area: Trench 1  
Co-ordinates: E / N Cut  
Context Type: Context No: 013

DEPOSIT
1. Compaction  
2. Colour
3. Texture/composition
4. Inclusions
5. Dimensions
6. Contamination
7. Method/level of recovery
8. Weather conditions

CUT
1. Shape in plan: Half of the Trench
2. Orientation: North to South
3. Profile: []
4. Sides: Vertical
5. Base: Uneven
6. Dimensions: 2.25m x 1.25m
7. Fill numbers: 14
8. Sketch: plan/section/matrix

Further DESCRIPTIVE data including significant physical relationships:

Contd?

STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX

INTERPRETATION:
Cut of Stones Laid feature, Northern Half of Trench only.

Related Contexts:

Plan: 1  
Section/other drawings: 1  
Environmental samples: Digital:

Recorded by and Date: R.J.Holley 13th August 2018  
Excavated contents:  

Context sheet (014)
Project Code: CFS/18  
Area: Trench 1  
Co-ordinates: E / N /  
Context Type: Deposit  
Context No: (014)

**DEPOSIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Compaction</td>
<td>Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Light Fawn/Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Texture/composition</td>
<td>Lias Stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Inclusions</td>
<td>Occasional areas of Clay between the Stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>2.25m x 1.25m x 12-19cm in depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Contamination</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Method/level of recovery</td>
<td>Spade and Trowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Weather conditions</td>
<td>Warm but overcast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Shape in plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Fill numbers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION:**

Fill of Stones Laid feature, Northern Half of Trench only.

**Related Contexts:**

**Plan:** | **Section/other drawings:** | **Environmental samples:** | **Digital:** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recorded by and Date:**
R.J.Holley 13th August 2018  
Excavated contents: See finds register

Context sheet [015]
**Project Code:** CFS/18  
**Area:** Trench 1  
**Co-ordinates:** E / N  
**Context Type:** Cut  
**Context No:** [015]

### DEPOSIT

1. **Compaction**
2. **Colour**
3. **Texture/composition**
4. **Inclusions**
5. **Dimensions**
6. **Contamination**
7. **Method/level of recovery**
8. **Weather conditions**

### CUT

1. **Shape in plan**  
   *Half of the Trench*
2. **Orientation**  
   *North to South*
3. **Profile**  
   *
4. **Sides**  
   *Vertical*
5. **Base**  
   *Uneven*
6. **Dimensions**  
   *3.25m x 1.25m*
7. **Fill numbers**  
   *16*

**Sketch plan/section/matrix**

**Further DESCRIPTIVE data including significant physical relationships:**

---

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

---

**INTERPRETATION:**

Cut of Stones Laid feature, Southern Half of Trench only.

**Related Contexts:**

**Plan:**  
**Section/other drawings:**  
**Environmental samples:**

**Digital:**

**Recorded by and Date:**  
R.J.Holley 13th August 2018  
**Excavated contents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Code:</strong></th>
<th>Area:</th>
<th><strong>Co-ordinates:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Context Type:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Context No:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFS/18</td>
<td>Trench 1</td>
<td>E / N /</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>(016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEPOSIT**

1. **Compaction**
   - Firm

2. **Colour**
   - Light Fawn/Brown

3. **Texture/composition**
   - Lias Stones

4. **Inclusions**
   - Occasional areas of Clay between the Stones

5. **Dimensions**
   - 3.25m x 1.25m x 12-24cm in depth

6. **Contamination**
   - Low

7. **Method/level of recovery**
   - Spade and Trowel

8. **Weather conditions**
   - Warm but overcast

**CUT**

1. **Shape in plan**

2. **Orientation**

3. **Profile**

4. **Sides**

5. **Base**

6. **Dimensions**

7. **Fill numbers**

8. **Sketch**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>plan/section/matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Further DESCRIPTIVE data including significant physical relationships:**

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

**INTERPRETATION:**

Fill of Stones Laid feature, Southern Half of Trench only.

**Related Contexts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Plan:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Section/other drawings:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Environmental samples:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Digital:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recorded by and Date:**

R.J. Holley 13th August 2018

**Excavated contents:**

See finds register

**Context sheet [017]**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code:</th>
<th>Area:</th>
<th>Co-ordinates: E / N</th>
<th>Context Type:</th>
<th>Context No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFS/18</td>
<td>Trench 1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>[017]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEPOSIT**

1. Compaction
2. Colour
3. Texture/composition
4. Inclusions
5. Dimensions
6. Contamination
7. Method/level of recovery
8. Weather conditions

**CUT**

1. Shape in plan: Uneven Square
2. Orientation: West to East
3. Profile:
4. Sides: Uneven
5. Base: Uneven
6. Dimensions: 30cm wide x 32cm long x 10cm deep
7. Fill numbers: N/A
8. Sketch plan/section/matrix:

Further DESCRIPTIVE data including significant physical relationships:

---

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

---

**INTERPRETATION:**

Stone Laid pad in the North-East end of Trench, White Lias.

**Related Contexts:**

---

Plan: Section/other drawings: Environmental samples: Digital:

---

Recorded by and Date: R.J.Holley 13th August 2018

---

Excavated contents:

---

Context sheet (018)
**DEPOSIT**

1. Compaction: Firm
2. Colour: Light Fawn
3. Texture/composition: Lias Stones
4. Inclusions: Occasional areas of Clay
5. Dimensions: 5.5m x 2.5m
6. Contamination: Low
7. Method/level of recovery: Not excavated as natural underlying bedrock.
8. Weather conditions: Warm but overcast

**CUT**

1. Shape in plan
2. Orientation
3. Profile
4. Sides
5. Base
6. Dimensions
7. Fill numbers
8. Weather conditions

Sketch plan/section/matrix

Further DESCRIPTIVE data including significant physical relationships:

```
Contd?
```

**STRATIGRAPHIC MATRIX**

```
(011)  (012)  (014)  (016)
```

**INTERPRETATION:**

Underlying Natural White Lias Bedrock.

**Related Contexts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Section/other drawings</th>
<th>Environmental samples</th>
<th>Digital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recorded by and Date:**

R.J.Holley 13th August 2018

**Excavated contents:**

None